

STRATEGIES FOR WINNING THE ANTI-CORRUPTION WAR IN NIGERIA

act:onaid

STRATEGIES FOR WINNING THE ANTI-CORRUPTION WAR IN NIGERIA

Otive Igbuzor

**ActionAid Nigeria, 2nd Floor, NAIC Building,
Plot 590 Cadastral zone, Central Business Area,
P. M. B. 1890, Abuja, Nigeria.**

Tel: +234(0)9 627 0480/2

+234(0)9 4618655

Fax: +234(0)9 461 8656

Info.nigeria@actionaid.org

ActionAid Nigeria

(c) ActionAid Nigeria

First Published 2008

ISBN 978-073-409-0

All Rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the author and/or ActionAid Nigeria.

**ActionAid Nigeria, 2nd Floor, NAIC Building,
Plot 590 Cadastral zone, Central Business Area,
P. M. B. 1890, Abuja, Nigeria.**

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the years, several scholars, development workers, activists, politicians, international organizations, public affairs commentators and members of the public have continued to focus on the problem of corruption and its attendant effects on society. The problem is not new to humankind even though it has reached unprecedented proportions in recent years.

It is as old as society itself and cuts across nations, cultures, races and classes of people. It has been argued that one of the major obstacles to the development of poor countries is corruption. Corruption is undoubtedly one of the greatest challenges of our time, a challenge that not only leads to impoverishment and loss of lives but also threatens the stability of society.

In an opinion poll conducted by the Guardian Newspapers, Nigerians picked corruption, unemployment and bad leadership as the worst problems hindering the country's development. A total of 761 respondents or 70 per cent of the 1,080 respondents picked corruption as one of the worst problems hindering the nation's advancement.ⁱ Corruption in Nigeria is widespread. According to the Executive Director, Office of Drugs and Crime at the United Nations, Dr. Antonio Maria Costa, about US \$400 billion was stolen from Nigeria and stashed away in foreign banks by past corrupt leaders before the return to democratic rule in 1999.ⁱⁱ But according to the Chairman of the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC), Mallam Nuhu Ribadu, Nigeria's previous leaders stole about 64 trillion naira (about US \$507 billion) from public coffers. When benchmarked against the 2008 proposed budget of N2.456 trillion naira, this translates into 26years budget.

Meanwhile, in the recent past, there has been increased focus on how to mitigate the impact of corruption. Strategies, programmes and agencies have been put in place to address the problem of corruption and the attendant poor service delivery in Nigeria. But the challenge remains. What is the extent of the problem of corruption? What are the manifestations of corruption in Nigeria? What are the costs and consequences? What is the relationship between poverty and corruption? What are the strategies that have been used to fight corruption? Why are these strategies not winning the war against corruption? What are the options for winning the war? What can be done to reduce corruption to the barest minimum in such a way that it will not hinder development and lead to poor service delivery? This briefing paper will attempt to address these questions.

In this briefing paper, we argue that corruption has negative consequences on the development of Nigeria. Meanwhile, over the years, universal strategies and policies are emerging that can be used to wage and win the war against corruption.

Unfortunately, the war is not being won because these strategies are not being faithfully and comprehensively utilized and also because of the narrow focus of the war without public ownership.

This briefing paper is divided into eight parts. The first part explains the problem of corruption and poor service delivery in Nigeria. It also raises and attempts to answer some questions. The second part analyses definitional issues, categorizes corruption, explores some of the causes of corruption, manifestation and acts of corruption as well as its impact. The third part outlines the importance of service delivery in any government and the impact of corruption on service delivery. The fourth part describes the poverty situation in Nigeria and explores the relationship between poverty and corruption. The fifth part describes how to build public ownership for the anti-corruption war. The sixth part of the briefing paper describes the effort to wage war on corruption at national, regional and international levels.

It also analyses the policies, strategies and programmes that have been put in place to fight corruption against the actual practice and concludes with the elements that are critical in any effort that can win the war. The seventh part advances reasons for why the war against corruption is being lost and outlines the options for winning the war. The eighth and final part concludes the paper with recommendations on how the war against corruption can be won and the negative impact on development and service delivery mitigated.

2. THE PROBLEM OF CORRUPTION

(a) Definitional issues

Corruption even though a global problem lacks a universally accepted definition. The Oxford Dictionary of Current English defines corruption as an act of dishonesty especially using bribery or an immoral or wicked act.ⁱⁱⁱ This definition focuses essentially on the moral aspects of corruption. Similarly, the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary sees corruption as a dishonest or illegal behaviour especially of people in authority. This definition looks at both the moral and legal aspects. But according to Nye,

corruption is a deviation from the formal duties of a public role because of private-regarding (personal, close family, private clique) pecuniary exercise of certain types of private regarding influence. This includes such behaviour as bribery (use of reward to pervert the judgment of a person in position of trust); nepotism (appointment by reason of ?ascriptive relationship rather than merit); and misappropriation (illegal appropriation of public resources for private regarding uses).^{iv}

The definition by Nye sees corruption as a deviant behaviour. This presupposes that the normal behaviour will be anti-corruption. This definition will be very difficult to operationalise where corruption is widespread and regarded as the norm by majority of the people. Similarly, Samuel P. Huntington defined corruption as behaviour of public officials, which deviates from accepted norms in order to serve private end.^v

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank define corruption as "the abuse of public office."^{vi} According to the World Bank, corruption is

...the abuse of public office through the instrumentality of private agents, who actively offer bribes to circumvent public policies and processes for competitive advantage and profit. Beyond bribery, public office can also be abused for

personal benefit through patronage and nepotism, for example the theft of state assets or the diversion of state revenues.^{vii}

This is a very wide ranging definition, which delineates some of the acts of corruption. Otite defines corruption as the perversion of integrity or state of affairs through bribery, favour or moral depravity.^{viii} This is a broader definition, which looks at the moral aspect as well as the distortion or twisting of procedures. The Transparency International defines corruption as behaviour on the part of officials in the public sector, whether politicians or civil servants, in which they improperly and unlawfully enrich themselves, or those close to them, by the misuse of public power entrusted to them.^{ix} Although the definition of the Transparency International is very descriptive, it focuses only on the public sector. But there is corruption in private sector with negative consequences for the whole of society. The Encyclopedia of Social Sciences defines corruption as the misuse of public power for private profit.^x Like the definition by Transparency International, this one also focuses on the public sector. The Corrupt Practices and other related offences Act, 2000 defines corruption to include bribery, fraud and other related offences like gratification. The Act gave a very wide definition of gratification to mean among other things the offer or promise or receipt or demand of money, donation, gift, loan, fee, reward, valuable security, property or interest in property with the intent to influence such a person in the performance or non-performance of his/her duties.^{xi} Although the definition of corruption by the Act is vague, it gives a wide ranging definition of gratification.

From the above definitions, three things come out clearly. First is that corruption is a dishonest act, wicked and bad. As a result, it will be expected that good people will not be involved in it. Secondly, corruption is seen as immoral and antithetical to the positive virtues of society. This implies that there should be social disapproval of anyone who engages in corrupt practices. Thirdly, corruption involves an abuse or misuse of position and authority. Any of such abuse is expected to be met with sanction.

(b) Categorization of Corruption

Corruption can be categorized from different perspectives. Corruption can be classified according to how it is carried out in relation to established rules in administration. There are two types of corruption in this regard. The first is done “according to the rule” where an official receives private gain for doing what he/she is paid to do. The second is done “against the rule” where an official is paid bribe to give services that he/she is prohibited from providing.^{xii}

Corruption can also be classified according to the scale i. e. petty or survival corruption and grand corruption.^{xiii} Petty or survival corruption is practiced by civil servants, who may be grossly underpaid and depend on small rents from the public to feed their families and pay school fees. The grand corruption is practiced by high public officials and it often involves large sums of money.

Corruption has also been classified based on the spheres or arena of special activities where it takes place. Using this criterion, Otite classified corruption into five groups: Political corruption, Economic Corruption, Bureaucratic corruption, judicial corruption and moral corruption.^{xiv} Political corruption is manifested in activities connected with election and succession, and the manipulation of people and

institutions in order to retain power and office. Economic corruption occurs when business people use corrupt means to pervert the normal institutional regulations, hasten or shorten procedures and get undue advantage or value for goods and services. Bureaucratic corruption involves buying favours from bureaucrats, who formulate and administer government economic and political policies including foreign exchange, privatization exercises, import licenses, taxes etc. Judicial corruption occurs when law enforcement agencies and the courts pervert the administration of justice. Moral corruption occurs when people engage in practices that are morally reprehensible.

© Causes of Corruption

There are different perspectives on what causes corruption in society. Some scholars have argued that poverty is at the root cause of corruption and that without poverty, there would be no corruption.^{xv} Most people would agree that poverty definitely contributes to corruption. In many poor countries, the wages of public and private sector workers is not sufficient for them to survive. Many people therefore engage in petty corruption to make ends meet. But poverty can definitely not be the only explanation. If poverty is the only cause, it will be difficult to explain why rich people and rich countries engage in corruptible transactions. It has been documented that:

Recent World Bank estimates of the wealth, which corrupt African leaders have stashed away in European banks stands at several billion US dollars. None of these leaders can be described as victims of poverty. Yet, by plundering national treasuries, these African leaders have unquestionably deepened the poverty of their people.^{xvi}

There is also the suggestion that corruption is part of the culture of many developing countries. This line of argument is mostly pushed by Eurocentric scholars. They argue that:

What is regarded as corruption in Africa is a myth because it is expected that a beneficiary should show appreciation for a favour granted him/her. If a government official offers one a job or contract, the beneficiary would be obliged to show appreciation either in kind or cash to the government official just as he would do to a village chief if granted a land to cultivate crops or build a house. Corruption is a myth because 'one's culture's bribery is another's mutual goodwill.'^{xvii}

But this position that corruption is part of African culture has been criticized by many African scholars, activists and politicians. It is clear to any African that the traditional African society frowns at corruption or stealing of anything that does not legally belong to one and there are strong community sanctions for such behaviour. As Maduagwu has argued,

It is mere trivialization of the serious issue of corruption in the modern society for any one to suggest that corruption or embezzlement of public funds or extortion of money (bribes) from people looking for jobs or contracts or other benefits from government could be equated to the customary requirement of bringing presents to the chief for permission to cultivate a land and such things.^{xviii}

President Olusegun Obasanjo also attacked the notion that corruption is part of African culture when he stated that:

I shudder at how an integral part of our culture could be taken as the basis for rationalizing otherwise despicable behaviour. In the African

concept of appreciation and hospitality, the gift is usually a token. It is not demanded. The value is usually in the spirit rather than in the material worth. It is usually done in the open and never in secret. Where it is excessive, it becomes an embarrassment and it is returned. If anything, corruption has perverted and destroyed this aspect of our culture.^{xix}

Furthermore, every society has ways of showing appreciation, which is quite different from corruption as we have defined above. In Europe and America, the giving of tips to bar attendants is an accepted way of showing appreciation akin to appreciation shown to a chief, who gives permission for land to be cultivated.

Related to the myth of culture is the argument that in Africa, there is allegiance to the extended family and community. As a result, when one climbs up the social and political ladder, he/she is expected to and under pressure to give gifts, money, job and contracts to people of his/her community. Therefore, when people bow to these pressures, they slip into corruption. It must, however, be noted that in any society, there are different kinds of pressures. Succumbing to negative pressures in any society cannot be accepted as the norm.

Another argument that has been advanced by Marxist scholars is that corruption is the method that the capitalist class that emerged from colonialism uses to accumulate wealth. They argue that inflation of contacts, over-invoicing, collection of kickbacks and buying off of public enterprises at give away prices are primitive means of accumulation of capital that the emergent bourgeoisie in post colonial countries utilize.

Finally, some scholars have attributed corruption in the African continent to the legacy of colonialism. They argue that the colonial state lacked transparency and accountability to the African people. If there was any iota of accountability, it was to the metropolis in London, Paris, Lisbon or elsewhere but definitely not to African people and institutions. This is why after independence, the post colonial state and government have remained alien to the African.

We have argued elsewhere that colonized people saw government as oppressive and alien; and `` this is why in most African languages, government work is described as white person's job.''^{xx} In our view, corruption is a problem, which is multifaceted. It is caused by a complex of factors and relations ranging from poverty to greed and primitive accumulation conditioned by colonial heritage.

(d) Manifestation and acts of corruption

Corruption manifests itself in various ways. According to the Political Bureau established in Nigeria in 1987, the manifestations of corruption include:

...the inflation of government contracts in return for kickbacks; frauds and falsification of accounts in the public service; examination malpractices in our educational institutions including universities; the taking of bribes and perversion of justice among the police, the judiciary and other organs for administering justice; and various heinous crimes against the State in the business and industrial sectors of our economy, in collusion with multinational companies such as

over-invoicing of goods, foreign exchange swindling, hoarding, and smuggling.^{xxi}

The African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption and Related Offences lists acts of corruption to include:

- a. The solicitation or acceptance, directly or indirectly by a public official or any other person, of any goods of monetary, or other benefit, such as a gift, favour, promise or advantage for himself or herself or for another person or entity, in exchange for any act or omission in the performance of his or her public functions;
- b. The offering or granting, directly or indirectly, to a public official or any other person of any goods of monetary value, or other benefit, such as a gift, favour, promise or advantage for himself or herself or for any person or entity, in exchange for any act or omission in the performance of his or her public functions;
- c. The offering or granting, directly or indirectly, to a public official or any other person for the purpose of illicitly obtaining benefits for himself or herself or for a third party;
- d. The diversion by a public official or any other person, for purposes unrelated to those for which they were intended, for his own or her own benefit or that of a third party, of any property belonging to the State or its agencies, to an independent agency, or to an individual, that such official has received by virtue of his or her position;
- e. The offering or giving, promising, solicitation or acceptance, directly or indirectly, of any undue advantage to or by any person, who directs or works for, in any capacity, a private sector entity, for himself or herself or for anyone else, for him or her to act or refrain from acting, in breach of his or her duties;
- f. The offering, giving, soliciting or accepting directly or indirectly, or promising of any undue advantage to or by any person who asserts or confirms that he or she is able to exert any improper influence over the decision making of any person performing functions in the public or private sector in consideration thereof, whether the undue advantage is for himself or herself or for anyone else, as well as the request, receipt or the acceptance of the offer or the promise of such an advantage, in consideration of that influence, whether or not the influence is exerted or whether or not the supposed influence leads to the intended result;
- g. Illicit enrichment
- h. The use or concealment of proceeds derived from any of the acts referred to in this article; and
- i. Participation as a principal, co-principal, agent, instigator, accomplice or accessory after the fact, or in any other manner in the commission or attempted commission of, in any collaboration or conspiracy to commit, any of the acts referred to in this article.

The Corrupt Practices and other related offences Act 2000 lists offences, which are punishable by the Act to include among other things gratification by an official, corrupt offers to public officers, corrupt demand by persons, fraudulent acquisition of property, fraudulent receipt of property, making false statement or return, gratification by and through agents, bribery of public officers and using position for gratification.

***** (e) Cost and Consequences of Corruption**

Corruption has a lot of negative impact on every sphere of societal development: social, economic and political. As Ikubaje has argued, corruption is a global phenomenon and its effects on individual, institutions, countries and global development have made it an issue of universal concern.^{xxii} According to the Lima declaration,^{xxiii} the impact of corruption include the erosion of the moral fabric of society, violation of the social and economic rights of the poor and vulnerable, undermining of democracy, subversion of the rule of law, retardation of development and denial of society, particularly the poor, of the benefits of free and open competition.

Bello-Imam, on the other hand, has outlined the negative consequences of corruption to include:

- i. Retardation of Economic Growth: Corruption lowers investment and retards economic growth.
- ii. Misallocation of Talent: Where rent seeking proves more lucrative than productive work, talent will be misallocated. People will be lured to rent seeking rather than productive work.
- iii. Limitation of Aid Flows: Where corruption is rampant, donor agencies are unwilling to put in their money.
- iv. Loss of Tax Revenue: Revenue is lost through tax evasion or claiming improper tax exemptions.
- v. Adverse Budgetary Consequences: When corruption is rampant budgeted amounts will not deliver the required services.
- vi. Negative Impact on Quality of Infrastructure and Public Services: When public contracts are procured through a corrupt system, it results in lower quality of infrastructure and public services.
- vii. Negative Composition of Government Expenditure: Corruption often tempts government officials to choose government projects less on the basis of public welfare than on the opportunity they provide for extorting bribes. Under such a situation, large projects, whose exact value and benefit are difficult to monitor, usually present lucrative opportunities for corruption while returns on teachers' salaries and textbooks could be zero for the same set of officials.^{xxiv}

As the Chairman of Transparency International, Peter Eigen correctly noted, "corruption doesn't just line the pockets of political and business elites; it leaves ordinary people without essential services such as life saving medicines and deprives them of access to sanitation and housing. In short, corruption costs lives."^{xxv}

3. CORRUPTION AND POOR SERVICE DELIVERY

Service delivery to the people is a key function of government. Government has a responsibility to provide services to its people. It is in recognition of this that the Nigerian 1999 Constitution provides that the security and welfare of the people shall be the primary purpose of government and that the state shall direct its policy towards ensuring:

- the promotion of a planned and balanced economic development;
- that the material resources of the nation are harnessed and distributed as best as possible to serve the common good;
- that the economic system is not operated in such a manner as to permit the concentration of wealth or the means of production and exchange in the hands of few individuals or of a group; and

- that suitable and adequate shelter, suitable and adequate food, reasonable national minimum living wage, old care and pensions, and unemployment, sick benefits and welfare of the disables are provided for all citizens.^{xxvi}

It must be pointed out that the fact that this section of the constitution is not justiceable by virtue of Section 6, subsection 6 © does not mean that it is not a part of the constitution. Interestingly, the oath of office of the President and other executive and legislative officials clearly states that they “will strive to preserve the Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy contained in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.” Government therefore has a responsibility to ensure that its policies, programmes and actions are in consonance with Chapter Two of The Constitution.

From the above, it is clear that governance is all about service delivery. A recent survey indicates that the Nigerian public expectations from the public service in terms of service delivery include:

- An organization that is staffed with competent men and women and is well managed;
- Courteous, friendly, receptive and helpful relationship with the public;
- Eager and proactive offer of information to the public with feedback and follow-up;
- Transparency, honesty and averse to corruption, fraud and extortion of the public in official dealings;
- Exemplary standards of efficiency in production and rendition of services, with minimal waste;
- Punctuality and time consciousness in all official business;
- Well planned programmes with activity schedules and calendars that are firm and respected;
- Prompt response to problems and complaints of the public, which are conclusively attended to;
- Objective, professional, fair and patriotic treatment of matters of public interest or cases entailing competition among persons or organizations;
- Services and products that are almost of cutting-edge standard and rendered with minimal need for members of the public to leave their homes to visit the office concerned or to spend substantial amounts of money or provide copious documents and passport photographs
- Charges and billing systems that are affordable and convenient to the public;
- Public infrastructure facilities that are built to unblemished standards, regularly maintained and promptly repaired;
- Continuous improvement in service mix and methods, based on communication and feedback from the public.

In an effort to meet the expectations of the people and as part of the Federal Governments’ reform agenda in the past four years, the Service Delivery Initiative (SDI) was conceptualized and launched as a social contract between the Federal Government and all Nigerians: Service Compact with all Nigerians (SERVICOM). According to the NEEDS 2 draft, SERVICOM gives the Nigerian people the right to demand good service as entitlements, contained in SERVICOM charters reflecting the mission and vision statements of each government department along with goals, objectives, details of services, standards of performance as well as system of redress should there be service failure.^{xxvii}

Unfortunately, the present state of the public service can neither deliver services to meet the expectations above nor meet the standards expected by SERVICOM for several reasons including lack of capacity, poor orientation and attitude, weak incentives, weak monitoring and evaluation system and corruption. Corruption is probably the most important factor affecting service delivery in Nigeria today.

4. POVERTY AND CORRUPTION

Nigeria, which was one of the richest 50 countries in the early 1970s, has retrogressed to become one of the 25 poorest countries at the threshold of the twenty first century.^{xxviii} It is ironic that Nigeria is the sixth largest exporter of oil and at the same time hosts the third largest number of poor people after China and India. Statistics show that the incidence of poverty, using the rate of US \$1 per day, increased from 28.1 per cent in 1980 to 46.3 per cent in 1985 and declined to 42.7 per cent in 1992 but increased again to 65.6 per cent in 1996.^{xxix} The incidence increased to 69.2 per cent in 1997.^{xxx} If the rate of US \$2 per day is used to measure the poverty level, the percentage of those living below poverty line will jump to 90.8 per cent.

However, the National Planning Commission's 2004 report indicates that poverty has decreased to 54.4 per cent. Nigeria fares very poorly in all development indices. The average annual percentage growth of GDP in Nigeria from 1990 –2000 was 2.4. Although the growth rate has increased to about 6 per cent from 2004-2006, the poor is yet to feel the impact of the economic growth. All development indices are precarious: under five mortality rate per 1,000 live births is 153; maternal mortality rate per 100,000 live births is 1,100; and life expectancy is 46 years for males and 48 years for females.¹⁴

There are certain unique characteristics about the incidence of poverty in Nigeria. First, statistics show that majority of the poor in Nigeria are located in the rural areas. Second, there are differences in the incidence of poverty across the geo-political zones in Nigeria with the incidence highest in the Northern parts of the country. Third, there are disparities in poverty between males and females. This was clearly documented in Nigeria's IPRSP. According to the document,

In 1996, the literacy rate for males was 62 per cent and 39 per cent for females; the corresponding figures for 1997 were 61 per cent and 47 per cent respectively, and 61 per cent and 46 per cent respectively in 1998. In addition, the average net primary school enrolment in 1996 was 55 per cent for boys and 45 per cent for girls, with 57 per cent for boys and 44 per cent for girls in 1997. Similarly, post primary school enrolment in 1996 was 53 per cent for boys and 47 per cent for girls.^{xxxi}

This is not surprising for it has been documented that women account for 70 per cent of the world's poor.^{xxxii} Finally, poverty in Nigeria is in the midst of plenty.^{xxxiii} Nigeria is among the 20 countries in the world with the widest gap between the rich and the poor. The Gini index measures the extent to which the distribution of income (or in some cases consumption expenditure) among individuals or households within an economy deviates from a perfectly equal distribution.^{xxxiv} A Gini index of zero represents perfect equality while an index of 100 implies perfect inequality. Nigeria has one of the highest Gini index in the world. The Gini index for Nigeria is 50.6.

This compares poorly with other countries such as India(37.8), Jamaica(37.9), Mauritania(37.3) and Rwanda(28.9).

Various scholars have attempted to describe factors that have exacerbated the poverty situation in Nigeria. They include among other factors the following:

- Unstable political history
- Lack of accountability
- Mismanagement and Corruption
- Poor administration of justice
- Poor policy formulation, implementation and evaluation
- Lack of involvement of the poor
- Dependence of the economy on oil
- Poor economic policies and management
- Poor revenue allocation and distribution
- Ethnic and religious conflicts
- Poor infrastructures

Poverty is no doubt one of the greatest problems confronting the Nigerian people. Over the years, public policies have been designed to tackle the problem but poverty continues to increase. The crucial question is: why have these public policies failed and what kinds of policies are needed to eradicate poverty in Nigeria? In our view, there are at least five reasons why public policies in Nigeria have failed to stem the rising tide of poverty in the country. First, there is confusion among policy makers on the approach to deal with the poverty situation in Nigeria. At different points in time, various programmes were conceptualized and implemented with the hope that they will impact on poverty in the country.

The programmes involve the Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRFRI), the National Directorate of Employment (NDE), the Better Life Programme (BLP), the Family Support Programme (FSP), Agricultural Development Programme (ADP), the People's Bank of Nigeria (PBN) etc. At another time, the Poverty Alleviation Programme (PAP) was launched. Then, it was changed to Poverty Eradication Programme (PEP). While implementing the PEP, the Federal Government of Nigeria embraced the Poverty Reduction Strategy Process (PRSP) initiated by the World Bank in 1999.

Even before Nigeria could produce an Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, it abandoned the PRSP process for the National Economic and Empowerment Development Strategy (NEEDS). It is important to point out that the terms reduction, alleviation or eradication as applied to poverty is not just a matter of semantics but are heavily ideologically loaded. The neo-liberal approach to poverty takes the view that poverty cannot be eradicated but can only be reduced or alleviated. Indeed neo-liberalism is based on the view that there must be the rich and the poor in society and that political power ought to be in the hands of those who own property.^{xxxv}

On the contrary, the rights based approach to poverty insists that poverty can be eradicated. It proceeds from the premise that living under conditions of extreme poverty is a violation of many of internationally recognised human rights. They argue that if the internationally recognised human rights in their entirety had been fully

implemented, poverty would not have existed. Secondly, programmes and projects implemented under the policies to deal with poverty in Nigeria consist of dishing out of handouts.

But as noted above, poverty results from failure to observe and implement human rights. Therefore, discretionary ad hoc handouts and market led growth with the hope of trickle down effect cannot alleviate or eradicate poverty. Thirdly, the poor for whom the programmes are implemented do not participate in the conceptualization, implementation and evaluation of the programmes.

Meanwhile, scholars are in agreement that when citizens participate in the planning, execution, utilisation and assessment of programmes, social amenities or facilities designed to improve their welfare, success of those efforts are assured. As Onibokun and Faniran have argued,

...participation gives the people the pride of ownership of the facilities completed in the process of community development. When, for example, people refer to social services within the community as our school, hospital, or market, they are implicitly expressing enthusiasm and confidence in their community, with a strong feeling of belonging to it. The very idea of a community doing something for itself through the participatory effort of its people depicts development at its best.

The principle of citizen participation extols collective efforts for community development as the catalyst by which human efforts can pursue the interchanges of energies and satisfactions for the growth of communities and the development of the wider society. The principle is itself embedded in the psychology of man, i.e. understanding and accepting as the best those actions which he has helped to originate. For example, where a citizen has a part in an action, he agrees with it, and it has meaning for him.

If a citizen can feel that he is part of a group in an action, this tends to ease out a major developmental challenge, through the development of the potential of the individual, as a member of a social group, a worker, a learner or a thinker, in an environment, which enables him to acquire the necessary knowledge, skills and the freely chose values to live by. It is this development that enables citizens to create a more wholesome social and material environment on which their succeeding generations can base and build.^{xxxvi}

Another reason why the policies have failed is the lack of co-ordination of the various programmes and inability to target the poor and vulnerable. Finally, the programmes do not have connection with other programmes and policies that should have impact on poverty situations. We have argued elsewhere that poverty is complex and multidimensional and requires multi-sectoral approach in its eradication.^{xxxvii}

Scholars have argued that to eradicate poverty requires strategies for special protection of the poor and marginalised; participation of the poor; mitigating the negative sides of the market; regulating trans national corporations; provision of a clean, healthy and decent environment; promotion of the right to development; performance by the state of its role especially in regulation and provision of social

services and joint action by different actors in all kinds of political, economic and legal means.^{xxxviii} The policies that have been implemented in Nigeria lack the above elements. As Economic Commission for Africa correctly noted, Nigeria's recent economic history shows that the country has rarely committed to the right policy mix to translate its formidable potential into economic performance.^{xxxix}

There have been a lot of studies that have tried to explore the relationships between poverty and corruption. Most of the studies lead to the conclusion that corruption exacerbates conditions of poverty (low income, poor health and education status, vulnerability to shocks and other characteristics) in countries already struggling with the strains of economic growth and democratic transition.^{xi} Similarly, countries experiencing chronic poverty are seen as natural breeding grounds for systemic corruption due to social and income inequalities and perverse economic incentives.

A review of the literature points to the conclusion that corruption by itself does not produce poverty but rather, corruption has direct consequences on economic and governance factors, intermediaries that in turn produce poverty.^{xii} Also, corruption impedes economic growth by discouraging foreign and domestic investment, taxing and dampening entrepreneurship, lowering the quality of public infrastructure, decreasing tax revenues, diverting public talent into rent-seeking, and distorting the composition of public expenditure. In addition, corruption exacerbates income inequality and distorts the economy and legal and policy framework. The governance factors include the fact the corruption reduces governance capacity through weakening political institutions and citizens' participation leading to lower quality government services and infrastructure.

The effect of corruption on poverty was aptly described by the former United Nations Secretary General Kofi Anan when he said:

Corruption hurts poor people in developing countries disproportionately. It affects their daily life in many different ways, and tends to make them even poorer, by denying them their rightful share of economic resources or life saving aid. Corruption puts basic public services beyond the reach of those who cannot pay bribes.

By diverting scarce resources intended for development, corruption also makes it harder to meet fundamental needs such as those for food, health and education. It creates discrimination between different groups in society, feeds inequality and injustice, discourages foreign investment and aids, and hinders growth. It is therefore a major obstacle to political stability and to successful social and economic development.^{xlii}

Similarly, the 2006 Corruption Perception Index points to a strong correlation between corruption and poverty with a concentration of impoverished states at the bottom of the ranking.^{xliii} The relationship between corruption and poverty is therefore a vicious circle. According to Harford:

The rot starts with government but it afflicts the entire society. There's no point investing in a business because the government will not protect you against thieves. (So you might as well become a thief yourself.) There's no point in paying your phone bill because no court can make you pay. (So there's no point being a phone company.) There's no point setting up an import business

because the customs officers will be the ones to benefit. (So the customs office is under funded and looks even harder for bribes.) There's no point getting an education because jobs are not handed out on merit. (And in any case, you can not borrow money for school fees because the bank will not grant you the loan.)

The correlation between poverty and corruption has made some scholars to suggest that the fight against both development problems must be co-ordinated and linked. According to Eberlei and Fuhrmann, corruption is a cause of poverty and constraint to successful poverty reduction hence:

The fight against poverty is closely linked to the fight against corruption. In fact, the two are inter-linked. Corruption is one cause of poverty. It impedes poverty reduction. Poverty is one cause of corruption. It impedes the fight against corruption. In the poorest countries in particular, which are afflicted by structural poverty and systematic corruption, the fight against corruption can only be successful (i.e. the two problems can only be reduced) if and when the two phenomena are addressed on a co-ordinated basis.^{xliv}

Similarly, on the basis of similar argument, other scholars have concluded that anti-corruption programs crafted to address economic growth, income distribution, governance capacity, government health and education services and public trust in government are likely to reduce corruption and poverty as well.^{xlv}

5. BUILDING PUBLIC OWNERSHIP FOR THE ANTI-CORRUPTION WAR

It has been recognized by development theorists and practitioners that to address any developmental challenge requires ownership of the content and process. Ownership has been defined in various ways. Ownership has been described as the state of having or holding the legal right to something; to control.^{xlvi} But according to Wikipedia encyclopedia, ownership is the state or fact of exclusive rights and control over property, which may be an object, land/real estate, intellectual property or some other kind of property.^{xlvii}

From the two definitions, two main characteristics of ownership are right to and control over. The implication, however, is responsibility for actions regarding what is owned. Therefore, building public ownership of the anti-corruption crusade will involve all the processes that will make the public or citizens to have right and control over the content and process of the anti-corruption crusade in Nigeria. When that ownership is operationalised, the public or citizens will now see it as their responsibility to design, implement and evaluate the anti-corruption crusade and defend it when it is attacked by corrupt individuals and their collaborators.

It is important to point out that public ownership can be built or operationalised through public participation. Like most terms in social sciences, the concept of participation though a familiar one lacks an acceptable universal definition. But according to Onibokun and Faniran, one of the most useful definitions is that which defines it as the organised effort to increase control over resources and regulative institutions in given social conditions.^{xlviii} Participation can be classified into two broad categories namely macro level (top-down) participation and micro level (bottom-up) participation:

Macro level (top-down) participation is that imposed by the government in order to mobilise the masses to implement specific activities or programmes.. It is an induced or enforced act, which involves the manipulation of the masses. Although it is easier to achieve, its survival depends on continued coercion, pressure or incentive.

Micro level (bottom –up) participation on the other hand involves authentic empowerment of the masses at micro levels of activity, where homogenous values and interests are not difficult to find and mobilize. This form of participation is generated by the people themselves through self-help projects and activities. Micro level participation is however, the most difficult to elicit and sustain; it is also the most indispensable to genuine (political) development. It starts at the bottom and reaches progressively upward. It is initiated by the concerned non-elite population (and) matures into a social force incorporating the mass of participating communities.^{xlix}

Public participation has been defined as a process by which the government and civil society open dialogue, establish partnerships, share information and otherwise interact to design, implement and evaluate development policies, projects and programs...that require the involvement and commitment of all interested parties, including among others the poor and traditionally marginalized groups especially disadvantaged racial and ethnic minorities.¹ Some scholars see participation as a continuum ranging from information sharing to consultation, negotiation/collaboration and then to delegation.

Information sharing	Consultation	Negotiation/Col laboration	Delegation
Sponsor provides information on on-going activities	Interchange of information; inputs requested; concerns addressed at option of sponsor	Joint problem solving; evaluation of alternatives	Decision making power shared or transferred to beneficiaries
No systematic feedback	Responsive feedback and accountability	Consensus building, bargaining & collaboration	Power sharing/ transfer; Veto power
Participant as beneficiary; impact recipient	Participant as client	Participant as partner	Participant as Manager
Passive role	Discussion of options and risks	Influence	Shared Control

Source: Building a Framework for Consultation and Public Participation: A Discussion paper by Sustainable Development Department. Washington Dc March 7, 2000.

Participation should be guided by certain principles including inclusiveness, comprehensiveness of scope of participation, adequacy of timing, appropriateness of information, fairness and legitimacy of the process, openness and transparency of the process, co-ordination and efficiency of the process.

It is well established that participation by public or citizens is crucial for democracy and development. For citizens to effectively participate in the political process, they should have unfettered access to information. Scholars are in agreement that when citizens participate in the planning, execution, utilisation and assessment of social amenities or facilities designed to improve their welfare, success of those efforts are assured.^{li}

It is important to note that certain factors have been identified to make citizen participation imperative. These factors include:

- The presence of a nagging or persistent problem-poverty, social insecurity, environmental degradation e.t.c.
- The Equilibrating attractions of collective, group actions supported by both social theory and experience
- The emergence of advocacy planning; and
- The claiming of the democratic (fundamental human) rights of citizens. leading to their empowerment

Also, there is a recent trend all over the world that emphasises the participation of the people particularly the poor and those that were hitherto excluded in governance and development issues. It has been noted that whether in budgeting, policy dialogue, planning, project appraisal, poverty assessment, monitoring or evaluation, there are “participatory” alternatives to expert driven processes. There is also a shift from participation as “beneficiaries” in projects to the more political and rights based definitions of participation by citizens, who are the “makers and shapers” of their own development. This is why a lot of effort is being put in to strengthen the process of participation.

However, it has been argued that strengthening the process of participation alone cannot bring about community empowerment and development but that it has to be complemented with strengthening the accountability of responsiveness of democratic institutions and public policies that will ultimately lead to just and accountable governance.

An important dimension of participation is the need to develop specific technique and programmes to involve women, who constitute at least half of the population. It has been shown clearly that when women are involved development happens faster. It is important to note that participation of women is not just about good politics. It is also about good economics.

Another important dimension is that the kind of spaces where participation occurs is very crucial. It has been argued that there is a difference between invited “spaces” created from above through donor or governmental intervention, and spaces which are chosen, taken and demanded through collective action from below. Whatever their origins, spaces for participation are not neutral; power relations shape them. This is why the following questions must be examined:

- a. What spaces and mechanisms exist for community participation?
- b. Who is creating these spaces and why?
- c. Who fills the spaces?
- d. Do the new spaces carry within them tracks and traces of previous social relationships, resources and knowledge?

- e. What prevents long established patterns of power from being reproduced?
- f. Who speaks?
- g. For whom?
- h. Who is heard?

It has argued elsewhere that efforts should be made to ensure that the spaces available for participation are taken, owned and utilized by the community and civil society for their own development. For this to happen:

- Communities should be involved in the conception, implementation and evaluation of projects that have impact on their lives.
- Community Based Organisations, Town Development Unions and Faith Based Organisations should be involved in implementation of government projects that impact on livelihoods.
- Communities, labour and relevant civil society organizations should be involved in committees, panels and commissions set up by government.
- Participation of civil society representatives should be done openly and transparently in a systematic manner.

In order to operationalise the building of public ownership of the anti-corruption crusade in Nigeria, three actions are necessary:

1. Establishment of an all inclusive steering committee to lead the entire process.
2. Development of a strategy for public ownership, which will define the principles of engagement, operational guidelines, institutional mechanisms and accountability systems, and
3. Development and implementation of an action plan that is specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, time bound and costed.

6. WAR AGAINST CORRUPTION

In the recent past, there has been a renewed effort to wage war against corruption all over the world. In fact, the war has taken international, regional and national dimensions. In September, 1997, citizens from 93 countries gathered in Lima, Peru at the 8th International Conference against corruption and adopted what is now known as Lima declaration against corruption. Similarly, in November, 1997, civil society organizations (CSOs) meeting under the auspices of the Global Coalition for Africa in Maputo, Mozambique declared corruption as “a crime against humanity.” One month later the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention was adopted.

In 2003, the UN Convention on Corruption was adopted. The same year, the African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption and Related offences was adopted in July at the second ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the African Union.

In the past one and a half decades, nearly all African governments have had some policies and strategies put in place to fight corruption. These include institutional frameworks to fight corruption. Dr. Specioza Wandira Kazibwe outlined the framework in Uganda as follows:

In Uganda, a number of institutions to fight corruption have been in place for a long time but the country is still bedeviled with corruption. This has led into a deeply held perception in the general populace that the government has almost lost the battle against corruption.

The institutions charged with the task of fighting corruption are the Presidency, the people of Uganda, the parliament, and the judiciary. In addition, there exists constitutional agencies specifically charged with this task. These are the Inspector General of Government (IGG), the Auditor General (AG), the Department of Public Prosecutions. The office of the Vice-President co-ordinates these agencies as well as all anti-corruption activities and integrity building activities in the country. An anti-corruption unit was established within the office of the Vice President to assist the Vice-President with these tasks.

The constitution also guarantees the autonomy of the IGP, DPP and Auditor General. It provides for a Leadership Code of Conduct and punitive measures. In addition to the Constitution, there are other laws in place to combat corruption. These include the Prevention of Corruption Act, the Penal code and its amendments and the Local Government Act. Other measures to combat corruption have also been taken by the National Resistance Movement Government. These include: The Economic reform and Liberalisation, the Civil Service Reform, Decentralization and the improvement of remuneration of judicial officers, top civil servants and political leaders.^{lii}

The war against corruption in Nigeria dates to a very long time. Every community in Nigeria has mechanisms for dealing with corruption with appropriate sanctions for corruption. The fight in the public sector came to the limelight in 1966 when the military identified corruption of the politicians as one of the reasons for taking over. Experience later showed that the military is probably more corrupt than civilian politicians.

The military ruled Nigeria from 1966-1979 and handed over power to Alhaji Shehu Shagari administration in 1979. But barely four years later, the Shagari administration was overthrown by the Buhari/Idiagbon regime. The Buhari/Idiagbon regime launched a war against corruption, tried and jailed many politicians and dismissed many civil servants. But when the Ibrahim Babangida regime overthrew the Buhari regime, it released many of the politicians that were jailed by the Buhari regime and reduced the sentences of others.

In fact, it has been argued that “Babangida’s government was unique in its unconcern about corruption within its ranks and among public servants generally; it was as if the government existed so that corruption might thrive.”^{liii} Scholars no doubt agree that corruption reached unprecedented levels in incidence and magnitude during General Ibrahim Babangida’s regime. It is ironic that the regime also had its own re-orientation and anti-corruption programme, christened MAMSER. By the time President Olusegun Obasanjo came back to power as a civilian President in 1999, corruption had reached unprecedented proportion that it formed a major portion of his inaugural speech.

In Nigeria, there are a number of legislations in addition to specific programmes, such as ethical revolution of Shehu Shagari administration, War Against Indiscipline and

Corruption (WAIC) of Buhari/Idiagbon regime and MAMSER of the Babangida regime. The legislations include:

- The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999
- The Code of Conduct Bureau and Tribunal Act
- The Bank and Other Financial Institutions Act No 25 of 1991
- Failed Bank Act No 16 of 1996
- The National Drug Law Enforcement Agency Act
- Money Laundering Act No 3 of 1995
- The Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Act of 2000
- The Economic and Financial Crimes Act 2004
- The Budget Monitoring and Price Intelligence unit
- The Nigeria Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (NEITI) Act
- Foreign Exchange Miscellaneous Provisions Act No. 17 of 1995

When President Olusegun Obasanjo was sworn in May 1999, he made it clear in his inaugural speech that the fight against corruption would be one of his major programmes. In his speeches and carriage, he continued to sing the anti-corruption song. One of the first bills, initiated by the executive, was the one on anti-corruption. The bill has been passed into law as the Corrupt Practices and other Related Offences Act, 2000. In 2002, the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) was established.

But the former President's anti-corruption campaign has received a lot of criticism. Some argue that it was a one-man campaign, which was bound to fail. Others contend that the president was not sincere with the anti-corruption crusade. According to the former Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriation, Alh. Idris Abubakar, "the president knows quite a number of corrupt officials in the three arms of government. But rather than prosecute them, he is using the dossier collected on them to blackmail them to support his government."^{liv} Some critics have also argued that the former president's campaign lacks seriousness.

According to Scrutiny, there are six questions that should test the seriousness of any anti-corruption crusade. These are: Is it systematic? Is it comprehensive? Is it consistent? Does it have focus? Is it well publicised? Does it carry people along? The Obasanjo's crusade is said to have failed the entire tests except for the one on publicity. Scrutiny concludes that the president is merely using the anti-corruption crusade "as a platform for public posturing, some sort of grandstanding." Consequently, it has been documented that Nigerians are yet to feel the impact of the anti-corruption crusade of President Olusegun Administration.^{lv}

Over the years, scholars, activists and international organizations have identified elements which when present can assist in winning the war against corruption. These elements include:

- a. Legislative Framework for transparent and accountable government and for fighting corruption including Freedom of Information Act (FOI Act), Budget law, Fiscal responsibility law, Whistle blowers' Act e.t.c.
- b. Political will and commitment to fight corruption
- c. Comprehensive strategy that is systematic, comprehensive, consistent, focused, publicized, non-selective and non-partisan

- d. Protection of Whistle blowers
- e. Political Reform to curb political corruption
- f. Reform of substantive programmes and administrative procedures
- g. Mobilisation for social re-orientation with participation of civil society and faith based organisations
- h. Effective parliamentary oversight through the Public Accounts Committee
- i. Independent media
- j. Adequate remuneration for workers to reflect the responsibilities of their post and a living wage
- k. Code of ethics for Political office holders, business people and CSOs
- l. Independent institutions
- m. Movement for Anti-corruption

7. WINNING THE WAR AGAINST CORRUPTION

The war against corruption is being lost in many countries including Nigeria for several reasons. First, most countries do not utilize universally accepted and time tested strategies elucidated above. In most cases, the policies and strategies utilized in fighting corruption are not holistic and comprehensive containing the elements mentioned in the section above. In most countries, there are elaborate legislative framework and policies for fighting corruption. Perhaps, what is missing is a freedom of Information regime and protection of whistle blowers. But political will and commitment of a critical mass of people (both leaders and followers) is lacking.

Secondly, there is a disconnect between the utterances of the warriors of the fight and their conduct. For instance, the former Inspector General of the Nigeria Police Force Mr. Tafa Balogun, posing as an anti-corruption crusader once emphasized that:

The evil that corruption has brought to the Nigerian society is very much. Corruption has become a culture in our society today. That is why we have to fight against it so that we would be able to improve our image. We intend to commence an in-house cleaning in the Nigeria Police Force.^{lvi}

Barely two years later, Mr. Tafa Balogun was accused of corruptly enriching himself to the tune of over N13 billion, and was removed from office and convicted. For any crusade to succeed, the leaders of the crusade must match their actions with their words.

Thirdly, for any war to be won, soldiers are required. In many African countries, those who should be playing the role of soldiers for the war (the judiciary, legal enforcement institutions, police and other such official legal bodies) are the biggest part of the problem of corruption rather than the solution.^{lvii} Therefore, winning the war against corruption will require struggle for societal transformation. We have argued elsewhere that for change to occur in any society requires the presence of objective and subjective conditions. Objective conditions exist when situations are evidently abnormal with huge contradictions, which can only be resolved by change.

The subjective conditions are the organizational preparations required to bring about change. In our view, the objective condition for a full scale war on corruption is ripe in Nigeria. The level of corruption in the country is unacceptable. Nigeria was consistently rated by Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index as the

most corrupt country in 2000, the second most corrupt country in 2001, 2002 and 2003 and the third most corrupt country in the world in 2004.

Now, although there is slight improvement in the rating, Nigeria is still among the most corrupt countries in the world. The country cannot continue in the way it is presently being corruptly run without fatal economic, social and political consequences. Unfortunately, the subjective conditions for winning the war are absent. There is no virile political party or movement that is committed to the war against corruption. There are no well organized democratic and popular organizations that are committed to anti-corruption crusade. Although, there are individuals and organizations committed to fighting corruption, including a coalition of CSOs known as Zero Corruption Coalition (ZCC), the organizational support, followership and doggedness required for sustainability and great impact is lacking. The challenge is to build the organizations, especially with dynamic and visionary leadership as well as a committed followership that is dedicated to fighting corruption. For the war to be won, such organizations must engage in concrete anti-corruption programmes beyond the mere holding of workshops. As TI has argued,

Containing corruption in a sustainable way will not be achieved through one-off seminars and workshops. Mere talk-shops are not going to change anything. Still less is going to be achieved through partnerships between agencies and governments alone. Almost invariably, these are seen as self-serving party exercises, conducted by and for the benefit of those (rightly or wrongly) already viewed as deeply implicated in the processes we are working to contain. Unless civil society is a fully independent partner and fully supportive of the processes under way, these exercises and action plans will lack legitimacy and they risk being little more than flannel.^{lviii}

Concrete programming against corruption will involve advocacy for effective regime for the anti-corruption crusade, actual monitoring of public and corporate finance, exposure of corruptible transactions, enforcement of anti-corruption laws, whistle blowing and advocacy.

Moreover, the fight must address the international dimensions including the complicity of developed countries. It has been documented that one of America's oldest banks, Riggs, was brought down because it held the bank accounts of Augusto Pinochet, and the oil revenues of Equatorial Guinea, which was controlled exclusively by President Obiang. Despite this, the United States turns a blind eye to the corruption of and human rights abuses that typify Obiang's rule.^{lix}

Similarly, the British Government regards itself as a world leader in the fight against corruption, as evidenced by establishing the Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (EITI). However, it has seriously undermined its own credibility in this regard, and in turn the international case, by calling off a police investigation into allegedly corrupt arms deal between BAE systems and Saudi Arabia. This sends a clear signal that Britain will tolerate corruption for political reasons.^{lx}

Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly, the fight against corruption in many African countries is not located within the broader paradigm of fighting for the

transformation of society in a way that will deal with the multi-factorial causes of corruption.

Therefore, policy options and strategies for winning the war against corruption must address these issues. The strategy must be comprehensive and holistic. Government should not be fighting corruption and at the same time engaging in political corruption (through election rigging) or implementing policies that would exacerbate corruption. For instance, as we have argued earlier, when the salaries of workers cannot sustain them, there is the tendency to engage in petty corruption. If government is fighting corruption and at the same time implements unbridled neo-liberal policies that further impoverish the people, then the fight against corruption cannot be won. Government cannot pay police officers wages that can hardly pay for increased transportation cost (as a result of increase in petroleum price) and expect them to be honest in the discharge of their duties.

In the same vein, if government is engaging in political corruption through rigging of elections, imposition of party officials, brazen distribution of political patronage^{lxi} and selective prosecution of corrupt officials, then the war cannot be won. Furthermore, when government officials spend money recklessly in the midst of poverty, it is difficult to deal with corruption. For instance, the hotel bill of the former Managing Director of the NNPC (Mr. Gaius Obaseki) was alleged to be at the rate of N155,000.00 per night. This came to about N4.7million in a month and N56.6million per annum.^{lxii}

Finally, the fight against corruption should be a part of the fight to transform society. It should be a fight for humanity. It should be a fight that will challenge power relations, institutions, mechanisms and systems that promote corruption. It should be a fight against political corruption and a fight for empowerment of citizens to enlist them in the war against corruption.

It should be a fight against a system of mediocrity that produces emergency millionaires from being commissioned agents, currency speculators and contactors. It should be a fight for value re-orientation, where Nigerian citizens will begin to see government as their own and not alien and when they will begin to protect government property as they currently protect community property. Fighting corruption should neither be an isolated event nor should it be an end in itself. It must be part and parcel of transforming society and enthroning a just, equitable, efficient and fair system in the world.

8. CONCLUSION

The problem of corruption is as old as society itself and cuts across nations, cultures, races and classes of people. It is undoubtedly one of the greatest challenges of our times leading to underdevelopment and poor service delivery. Corruption has a lot of negative consequences on every sphere of societal development whether social, economic or political. Corruption not only leads to poor service delivery but loss of lives.

Corruption is pervasive in Nigeria with serious negative consequences. Despite the plethora of legislations and agencies fighting corruption in the country, corruption has remained widespread and pervasive because of failure to utilize universally accepted

and tested strategies; disconnect between posturing of leaders and their conduct; lack of concrete sustainable anti-corruption programming and failure to locate the anti-corruption struggle within a broader struggle to transform society.

It is recommended that the anti-corruption fight must be guided by legislative framework for transparent and accountable government; political will and commitment to fight corruption; comprehensive strategy that is systematic, comprehensive, consistent, focused, publicized, non-selective and non-partisan; protection of Whistle blowers; political reform to curb political corruption especially election rigging; reform of substantive programmes and administrative procedures; mobilisation for social re-orientation; independent media; adequate remuneration for workers to reflect the responsibilities of their post and a living wage; code of ethics for Political office holders, business people and CSOs; independent institutions especially electoral, human rights and gender commissions and a movement for Anti-corruption. It is obvious that if these recommendations are faithfully and meticulously implemented, then there would be significant reduction in corruption in Nigeria.

ENDNOTES

ⁱ The Guardian Newspaper, Monday November 6, 2000 p. 19

ⁱⁱ [Http://allafrica.com](http://allafrica.com)

ⁱⁱⁱ The Oxford Dictionary of Current English

^{iv} Nye, J. S. (1967), *Corruption and Political Development: A Cost Benefit Analysis in the American Political Science Review*. Vol.LXI (61) No. 2000.

^v Huntington, S. P. (1968), *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven, Yale University Press.

^{vi} Quoted in Akanbi, M. (2002), "Corruption as an Obstacle to Good governance in Nigeria." In *The Nigerian Bar Journal*. Vol. 1, No. 3 Pp 19-26

^{vii} World Bank: *Helping Countries Combat Corruption*, Washington DC, USA. Quoted in Bello-Imam, I. B. (2005), *The War Against Corruption in Nigeria: Problems and Prospects*. Ibadan, College Press and Publishers Ltd

^{viii} Otite, O. (1986), "Sociological Study of Corruption" in Odekunle, F. (Ed), *Nigeria: Corruption in Development*. Ibadan University Press

^{ix} Pope, J. (1996), *National Integrity Systems: The TI Source Book*. Berlin, Germany, Transparency International

^x Senturia, J. J. (1993), *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* Vo. VI

^{xi} *The Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Act 2000*

^{xii} Pope, Op. cit.

^{xiii} Ibid

^{xiv} Otite Op. cit

^{xv} Pope Op. cit

^{xvi} Ibid p. 3

^{xvii} Briggs, D. A. and Bolanta, K. S. (1992), "The Issue of Corruption" in Imobighe, T. A. (Ed), *The Politics of the Second Republic*, Kuru, National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies.

^{xviii} Maduagwa, M. O. (1996), "Nigeria in Search of Political Culture: The Political Class, Corruption and Democratisation" in Gboyega, A.. *Corruption and Democratisation in Nigeria*. Ibadan, Friedrich Ebert Foundation and Agbo Areo Publishers.

^{xix} Obasanjo, O. (1995), "Corruption, Democracy and Human Rights in Africa" in Aderinwale, A (Ed), *Corruption, Democracy and Human Rights in West Africa*, The Keynote Address to the Africa Leadership Forum on Corruption, Democracy and Human Rights in Africa held in Cotonou, Benin Republic from 19-21 September, 1994. Ibadan, ALF Publications.

^{xx} Igbuzor, O. (2005) *Perspectives on Democracy and Development*. Lagos, Joe-Tolalu & associates. P. 222 (African languages word for government work: Hausa: Akin Nasara; Urhobo: Iruoloyibo, and Ibo: Oluoyibo)

^{xxi} Report of Political Bureau (1987), Federal Republic of Nigeria government printer P. 2

- xxii Ikubaje, J. G. (2004), "Corruption in Nigeria: The Challenges and the Way Forward" in Bagudu, N. (Ed), *Corruption and Sustainable Democracy in Nigeria*. Jos, League for Human Rights.
- xxiii Lima Declaration is
- xxiv Bello-Imam, I. B. (2004), *Corruption and National Development in Bello-Imam, I. B. and Obadan, M. I. (Eds), Democratic Governance and Development Management in Nigeria's Fourth Republic 1999-2003*. Ibadan, Centre for Local Government and Rural Development Studies.
- xxv Transparency International (2005) *Global Corruption Report*. London, Pluto Press.
- xxvi Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, Chapter Two, Section 16 (2)
- xxvii National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS 2)(2007). Abuja, National Planning Commission. P.270
- xxviii Obadan, m. I. (2002), *Main Factors in the General Deterioration of the Poverty Situation in Nigeria and Effective Exit Strategies*. A paper Presented at the Interactive Participative Session of the Office of the Vice-President of Nigeria with Civil Society Organisations and Labour Unions held at Abuja from 7-8 November, 2002
- xxix Federal Office of Statistics(FOS), "Poverty Profile in Nigeria, 1980-1996
- xxx Central bank of Nigeria 1999 p.95
- xxxi Draft Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy (IPRSP) (2001), Federal Republic of Nigeria.
- xxxii UNDP, 1995
- xxxiii World Bank, 1996
- xxxiv World Development Indicators, 2002
- xxxv Rodee, C. C., Christol, C. Q., Anderson, T. J. and Greene, T. H. (1983), *Introduction to political Science*. Tokyo, McGraw-Hill International Book Company
- xxxvi Onibokun, A. G and Faniran, A (1995), *Community Based Organisations in Nigerian Urban Centres: A Critical Evaluation of their Achievements and Potentials as Agents of Development*. Ibadan, Centre for African Settlement Studies and Development, Monograph Series 7
- xxxvii Igbuzor, O. (2004), "Public Policy and Poverty Eradication in Nigeria" in *Alternative Poverty Eradication Strategy in Nigeria*. Lagos, Centre for Democracy and Development
- xxxviii Genugten, W. and Perez-Bustillo, C. (2001) *Op Cit*
- xxxix Economic Commission for Africa(2002), *Economic Report on Africa: Tracking Performance and Progress*. Addis Ababa, Economic Commission for Africa
- xl Chetwynd, E; Chetwynd, F. and Spector, B. (2003), *Corruption and Poverty: A Review of Recent Literature*. Washington, Management Systems International
- xli *Ibid*
- xlii Kofi Anan (2003), *Statement at the Merida conference, 9-11 December, 2003* <http://www.un.org>
- xliii Transparency International (2000), *Corruption Perception Index 2006*
- xliv Eberlei, W. and Fuhrmann, O. B. (2004), *Fighting Poverty and Corruption: Integrating the fight against Corruption into the PRS process- Analysis and Recommendations for Development Co-operation*. Eschborn, GTZ
- xlvi Chetwynd, E *Op cit*
- xlvi SIL International (1999) (<http://www.sil.org>)
- xlvi [Http://en.wikipedia.org](http://en.wikipedia.org)
- xlvi Onibokun, A. G and Faniran, A (1995), *Community Based Organisations in Nigerian Urban Centres: A Critical Evaluation of their Achievements and Potentials as Agents of Development*. Ibadan, Centre for African Settlement Studies and Development, Monograph Series 7
- xlix *Ibid*
- ¹ ISP Draft Policy Framework as approved by the CIDS Working Group. Washington DC Nov 11-12 1999.
- ^{li} Onibon, A. G. and Faniran, A. (1995) *Op. cit*
- ^{lii} Kazibwe, S. W. (1998), *Foreword in Ruzindana, A. Langseth, P. and Gakwandi, A. (1998), Fighting Corruption in Uganda: The Process of Building a National Integrity System*. Kampala, Fountain Publishers.
- ^{liii} Gboyega, A (1996) (Ed), *Corruption and Democratisation in Nigeria*. Ibadan, Friedrich Ebert Foundation and Gbo Areo Publishers.

-
- ^{liv} Tell Magazine, No 49, November 20, 2000. p. 24
- ^{lv} Ezeani, E. O. (2003), Public Accountability in Nigeria: Perspectives and Issues. Enugu, Academic Publishing Company.
- ^{lvi} Balogun, T. (2002), vanguard Monday march 25, 2002
- ^{lvii} TI Annual Report 1998
- ^{lviii} TI Annual Report 1998 p.12
- ^{lix} Alley, P et al (2007), To Have and Have Not: Resource Governance in the 21st Century. Berlin, Heinrich Boll Foundation. P.18
- ^{lx} Ibid p.19
- ^{lxi} Recently, the President asked the ruling Peoples' Democratic Party (PDP) to submit names for membership of Boards and parasatals and the names of the wife and son of the Chairman of the party surfaced. A few months ago, the President ordered the cancellation of the sale of houses because it contained the names of many top government officials and relatives of the wife of the President.
- ^{lxii} Bagudu, N. (Ed), Corruption and Sustainable Democracy in Nigeria. Jos, League for Human Rights.