Abstract
This paper tends to focus on the bureaucratic corruption under the Obasanjo’s civilian administration. The objectives of this research are to identify the factor which necessitates the public servant to resort to corrupt practices and to suggest ways to combat corruption in the Nigeria Bureaucratic sector. The study discovers that corruption has created a negative effect on the performance in the civil service. The research work also discovers that corruption under civilian administration is more severe and political corruption often leads to bureaucratic corruption. Arising from these findings of the study, suggestions have been made on how to prevent and combat the growing trends of corruption in the public offices. The researcher is optimistic that if these suggestions are adopted, the trends of bureaucratic corruption in Nigeria would be minimized if not completely eradicated.

Nigeria presents a typical case of a country in Africa whose development has been undermined and retarded by the menace of corrupt practices.

To say that corruption has eaten deep into every sector of the Nigerian society is to affirm the obvious. This can be inferred from the revelations of probe panels that have been set up at different times by different regimes.

In Nigeria, since independence, series of reforms have been carried out in the public service to make the public bureaucracy more efficient and result oriented. However, the anticipated gains of such reforms have not been visible due to series of factors which include corruption. Without doubt, corruption has permeated the Nigerian society and in the words of Achebe, “anyone who can say that corruption in Nigeria has not yet become alarming is either a fool, a crook or else does not live in this country”.

Corruption is a social malaise in any country. This is because corruption like a killer disease erodes the vital structure that makes the society to progress thus putting its very existence on the brink of ruin. This is particularly so, for the less developed countries in that limited and valuable funds and resources that are initially earmarked for industries, hospitals, schools and other infrastructures are either out rightly embezzled, misappropriated or severely depleted through Kickbacks and over invoicing, by agents of government (Agara, 1994).

The depth of corruption constitutes the greatest bane for Nigeria. Virtually every body from the cleaner to the minister is mired in corruption. Government officials are
progressively indifferent in their conduct and show little commitment to promoting the
general welfare of the people and the public good. For instance, Nigeria’s not the first
towards industrialization by the establishment of the Ajaokuta steel company in 1979
was frustrated on account of corruption. More than $6 million was sunk into the
company without a grain of steel produced (Bagshaw, 2003).

General Abdusalami Abubakar’s regime recovered over N100, 000,000 from
General Sanni Abacha. Between Abacha’s Son Muhammad and his brother Abduikair,
the government recovered 346million naira. The government recovered from Abacha’s
National security Adviser Ismailia Gwarzo, 400 million naira (Aghemolo and Osumah,
2003). Going by the Transparency International Corruption Perception Index of 2001,
Nigeria ranks the second most corrupt country in the world, after Bangladesh
Corruption Perception Index of 1995 -1997, Nigeria was named the most corrupt –
ridden country in the world. In 1999, Nigeria was equally named being the second most
corrupt ridden nation in the world (Ojaide, 2000).

The incidence of corruption is not only found in the public sector. In recent
times, lack of facilities at government hospitals coupled with the high cost of health care
at private hospitals and dwindling financial resources have led to the emergence
of private clinics run by all categories of people ranging from under-qualified medical
personnel’s such as nurses and midwives, to quacks with barely any certificates or
evidence of training in orthodox medicine (Olukoya, 1996).

Literature Review

The concept of corruption comes from the Latin word “Corruptus”, meaning to
break. It literally means broken objects. The English Dictionary defines corruption as the
state of being or becoming decayed, a spoiling, deteriorating, a pervasion or a moral
decay. Corruption connotes impropriety, encompassing all forms of reprehensible or
infamous conducts, especially when such envisaged in the performance of some
officials, quasi-officials or fiduciary responsibility.

Corruption arises both the political and bureaucratic offices and can be petty or
grand, organized or unorganized. Though it often facilitates criminal activities. such as
drug trafficking, money laundering, and prostitution. Corruption is not restricted of these
activities. It is a basket that includes such behaviours as bribery (Consideration given as
an inducement to influence contrary to standing rules), embezzlement (the illegal
diversion of goods, met for the public to ones own use, fraud, (a misrepresentation done
to obtain an unfair advantage by giving false information) nepotism (the show of special
favours to one’s relative against other competitors in such areas’ like appointments and
securing of contracts) and money laundering (depositing or transferring money or other
proceeds of illegal activities, it is an act of legitimizing proceeds of illegal activities)
(Ulayi, 2007).

Effects of Corruption on Politics, Administration and Institutions

Corruption poses a serious development challenge. In the political realm, it
undermines democracy and good government by flouting or even subverting formal
processes. Corruption in elections and in legislative bodies reduces accountability and distorts representation in policy making. Corruption in the judiciary compromises rule of law, and corruption in public administration results in inefficient provision of services.

More generally, corruption erodes the institutional capacity of government as procedures are disregarded, resources are siphoned, and public offices are bought and sold. At the same time, corruption undermines the legitimacy of government and such democratic values as trust and tolerance. (Kolamofe, 2008).

**Economic Effects**

Corruption undermines economic development by considerable distortions and inefficiency in the private sector, corruption increases the cost of goods through the price of illicit payments. The management cost of negotiating with officials, and the risk of breached agreement or detection. Although some claim that corruption also reduces cost openly, by allowing lengthy regulations rather than covertly allowing them to be bypassed, using bribes as the case maybe. Where corruption inflates the cost of business, it also distorts the playing field, shielding firms with connections from competition thereby sustaining inefficient firms (Anaba, 2008).

Corruption also generates economic distortions in the public sector by diverting public investment into capital projects where bribes and Kickbacks are more. Officials may increase the technical complexity of public sector projects to conceal or pave way for such dealings by distorting investment. Corruption also lowers compliances with construction, environmental, or other regulations, reduces the quality of government services and infrastructure and increases budgetary pressures on government. Some economist like Todaro and Smith (1985) have argued that one of the factors behind the differing economic development in Africa and Asia is that in the former, corruption has primarily taken the form of rent extraction with the resulting financial sector moved over sea’s rather than invested at home. In Nigeria for example, more than 400 billion naira was stolen from the treasury by Nigeria’s leaders between 1960 and 1999. University of Massachusetts researchers estimated that from 1970 to 1996, capital flight from 30 sub-Saharan Countries rotates over $ 187bn, exceeding those nation’s external debts. (The results expressed in retarded or suppressed development, have been modeled in theory by an economist known as Mansur Oslon) (Olopoenia, 2005).

**Environmental and Social Effect of Corruption**

Corruption facilitates environmental destruction. Corrupt countries may formally have legislation to protect the Environment, but it cannot be enforced if the official can be bribed easily. The same applies to social rights such as workers protection, immunization and prevention of child labour. Violation of these laws and rights enables corrupt countries to gain an illegitimate economic advantage in the international market (Fasan, 2008).

As observed by Amartya Sen (1999) “there is no such thing as a political food problem”. While drought and others are naturally occurring, events may trigger famine conditions. It is government action or inaction that determines its severity, and often even whether or not a famine will occur. Government with strong tendencies towards
Kleptocracy can undermine food security even when harvest is good. Officials often steal state property. In Bihar India more than 80% of the subsidized food aid to the poor is stolen by corrupt officials (Koghara, 2004).

Consequences of Corruption in the Nigerian State

Corruption reduces the quality of public infrastructure and services, thereby affecting the quality of life of the people (Mauro, 1997). The Kickbacks and other forms of bribe taking particularly unorganized corruption equally affect the private investment and economic growth. The effect of growth is as a result of reduced level of investment as it adds to investment risk (Lipset and Lenz, 2000).

Corruption equally distorts the composition of government expenditure and so seriously affects the economic performance of the particular administration. Corrupt politicians may be expected to spend more public resources on those items on which it is easier to exact large bribes and keep them secret (Mauro, 1997). large and hard to manage projects (white elephant projects) such as National stadia Airports, road-dualisation or highway, railroad, fraud, kick backs over invoicing etc (Dike, 2003).

Obasanjo’s Administrative Corrupt Practices and the Bureaucratic Corruption in the Power Sector

For eight years, President Obasanjo pretended to be steadfast in the struggle against corruption. Today, thanks to the patriotic investigations and revelations by the National Assembly, We discover that General Obasanjo’s regime was one of the most corrupt regimes in Nigerian’s history (Omoh, 2008). However, actions of the government have left more to be desired as its body language seems to portray the very opposite of what it proclaims. Specifically, note that the tempo of the prosecution of corrupt public officers from the previous regime has slowed down over the past one year (Ehigiator, and Abatan, 2008).

General Olusegun Obasanjo (1999- 2007) fooled Nigerians into believing that corruption was the major clog in the wheel of Nigerians development and that his government had an antidote that would cure the social menace (Usigbe, and Aziken 2008). His government accordingly, put in place different Anti-Corruption Initiatives. Critical among these are the Economic and Financial Crime Commission (EFCC), The Independent Corrupt Practices and other related offences commission (ICPC), the Nigeria Extractive Industries Transparency Initiatives (NEITI), the Public Procurement Act and Fiscal Responsibility Act. He rounded up his Anti-corruption initiatives with the establishment of the Technical Unit on Government and Anti-Corruption Reforms (TUGAR) (Omonobi, and Usigbe, 2008).

The irony of the above initiatives is unraveled by the recent investigation by the House of Representative in the Power Sector. The investigations have revealed that the Obasanjo’s government wasted public resources to the tune of 16 billion United States Dollar’s in the Power Sector with nothing to show for it (Ehigiator, and Abatan, 2008). Paramount among the revealing information that has emerged is that former President Obasanjo waived due process for most of the contract awards and gave away vast amounts of Nigeria’s hard earned resources to his friends, family and political allies.
The Halliburton Bribery Scandal as a Case of Bureaucratic Corruption

What began as a genuine effort to harness Nigerians gas resources for local consumptions and exports, in 1990s was translated into dirty deals by prominent Nigerians citizens in connivance with foreigners. The scandal, which came to limelight in 2003, remained an albatross against the campaign of both the administration of former President Olusegun Obasanjo and the late president Umaru Yar’ Adua to fight corruption. The same scandal which has refused to abate, will also define the character of Jonathan anti-corruption war (Ige and Komolafe, 2001).


Consequent upon this revelation, the United State Government commenced a probe of U.S oil service companies operating in Nigeria to determine their capability in sordid deals. The investigation culminated in 11th February 2009, indictment of Halliburton, the Parents Company of KBR, a member of the consortium for violations of the country Foreign Corrupt Practice Act, (F.C.P.A.) prohibited U.S companies and their agents from paying bribes to win contract abroad. After six years of legal wrangling, Halliburton offered to pay the U.S government $579 millions in fines, said to be the largest penalty against a U.S company for bribery charges under federal law (Ughegbe, 2010). Albert Stanley, the then Chief executive officer was sentenced to seven years imprisonment for his role in executing the transaction. According to Kankanbu (2009) the K.B.R had plead guilty for conspiring with it joint venture partners and others to pay bribes to Nigerians government officials amounting to about $180million between 1995 and 2004, to win the various contract (Omonobi, 2009).

Damning to these allegations, Nigerian Government has been treating the matter with levity, prompting local and international campaign to bring the culprit to book. Government setup a presidential investigation panel in 2004 to probe the bribery allegation and identify those involved. But the handling of the investigations, so far has left many wondering if government is indeed, committed to prosecuting the culprit (Duru, 2008).

The former Attorney General of the federation, Michael Aondoakaa told Nigerians in May 2009 that government is exploring all diplomatic channels to get the United States to release the names of the officials identified to have received bribes. He said,

The president will not protect any body. He has asked me to prosecute anyone found (culpable, and we will go to any length to bring them to book, Aondoakaa had threatened. But this threat might have been made to give the
The Nigerian Anti-Graft agency, the Economic and Financial Crime commission, EFCC, which commenced investigation into the scandal in 2004, also said on February 2009, that it was working hard to apprehend those who collected the bribes. It attributed the delay to failure of the alleged foreign collaborators to provide details of the various bribes. The result is that six years after the commencement of the investigation the Nigerian government is no where near the prosecutions of the culprits. But the interim report of the presidential panel of investigation on the Halliburton scandal, dated May 25, 2009, had already been presented by then president Umaru Yar‘Adua by the Inspector General of Police, who is the chairman of the panel (Ughegbe, 2010). The panel has been able to establish identity of most of the people implicated. Infact, there is also evidence that progress reports on the investigation are usually made available to the president and the Attorney-General of the federation periodically. This explains why many Nigerians and the international community believed that the way the matter is been handled showed that there is a conspiracy of sweeping the matter under the carpet. (Adesina, 2010).

Jonathan has since March 2010, when he was still the acting president, received a progress report on the Halliburton bribery scandal, together with reports of the Presidential Panel of Investigation. The report identifies the principal character in the bribery saga, as well as institution involved. Three major character – Wojciech chodan, a polish national with United Kingdom citizenship, Jeffery Tesler, a British lawyer and Albert Stanley, former top level official in the executive arm of government at different times were requested to designate representatives with whom TSKJ relates in respect of the bribes. The TSKJ was said to have struck agreement with the Abacha’s regime in 1994 on the terms of contract awards including $40 million paid to Abacha account and $20 million to other players in the scandalous gas contract. Chodan allegedly served as an agent to TSKJ for the payment of bribes.(Adesina,2010)

According to Ughegbe, (2010) Tesler, serving as a link between Halliburton and various Nigerian officials, transferred funds to the officials through his Company Tristar investment limited. He was said to have received $130 million from Halliburton, which he disbursed to top government officials between 1995 and 2004. Tesler admitted transferring $75,000 to M.D. Yusuf, Former Inspector General of Police, who was then chairman of NLNG board that awarded the original contract to the Consortium. (Aziken, 2009).

Marubeni’s Corporation, a Japanese firm allegedly received N50 million to bribe low level government officials. About $10 million of this amount was said to have been channeled to the officials through Inters Energy Limited, which has Ado Bayero, the Emir of Kano and Atiku Abubakar, former vice president on its board, who allegedly received the money through its London account (Aziken,2009).

Mohammed Gidado Bakare, a businessmen and contractor allegedly received $7 million from Tesler which was paid into his company’s account (Sherwood Petroleum). About $4million of this amount was later traced to the former governor of gombe state.
now a senator Aliyu’s Goje account in Switzerland. The report also traced the sum of $5 million bribe allegedly paid to construction giants, Julius Berger Nigeria Limited for onward transfer to Bodunde Adeyanju, through Gaius Obaseki, Former Group Managing Director GMD, Nigeria National Petroleum Corporation, (NNPC). Adeyanju, who was Special Assistance to Obasanjo, was said to have channeled the money toward the 2003 Presidential Election Campaign of Obasanjo (Lawal, Njoku, et al 2010).

According to Prof. Wole Soyinka, who described the Scandal as a National Embarrassment, Submitted thus

\[
I \text{ am not sure how much the people in this nation are willing to tolerate, but outside, I can report to you but it is nothing but amazement and also a feeling of contempt that the Halliburton Scandal of that magnitude has been treated with such Casualness and indifference by both the government and the people of this nation (Ughegbe 2010).}
\]

Conclusion

Corruption is one of misuse of government power and public offices for personal purposes, such as repression of individuals, opponents or taking undue advantage of other persons for personal gains. Forms of corruption vary, it includes: bribery, trading on influence, Extortion, Cronyism, Nepotism, Graft, and Embezzlement among others.

Corruption facilitates criminal activities such as drug trafficking, money laundering etc. All forms of corruption are prevalent in Nigeria ranging from small scale bribes required from normal bureaucratic procedures to large scale payment of considerable sums of money in return for preferential treatment or access. The level of corruption and the figure invoked stagger belief, usually the figures constitutes a substantial proportion of the resources of the state concerned. Political corruption has done a great harm to Nigeria economy, Political and Social Development which undermines the legitimacy of public institution. Most Nigerian leaders are not really considerate in their administrative decision which gives way for corruption as against the principles of democratic governance.

Recommendations

Nigeria is a rich country of poor people, Nigeria is blessed with mineral resources yet, 60 percent of the population still lives in less than a dollar per day. The negative effect of corruption which has created bad roads and virtually all other sectors, including health, education, agricultures, water resources, power sector etc.

Many of Nigerian’s public hospitals are mere consulting clinics. Corruption drains away resources needed to provide social infrastructure and fight poverty. Despite billions of naira that has been appropriated for road constructions and maintenance, many Nigerians have lost their lives due to preventable accidents, others have been robbed of valuables belongings at bad spots. In the light of these shortfalls in administrative behaviour, the author recommends or suggests the urgent need for all intending public servants and civil servants to undergo training on administrative ethics.
and morality as a standard way of life of Nigerian workers. All institutions and agencies within the Nigerian governance structure must be taught to be objective, transparent, open and accountable in their administrative responsibilities essentially for public interest. There must be strong adherence to the code of conduct as a rule of administrative requirements. If these suggestions are well implemented and monitored, Nigeria would be a better place for everybody with fewer abuses of human rights.
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