

# Corruption and its multifaceted Forms

Noah Mussie , April 12, 2016

Nowadays the word corruption becomes a common word used almost by all levels of our society from high rank officials to the rank and files, scholars, journalists, and people from all walks of life.

But what mostly observed is that corruption is perceived by most of people as bribery and is not well-understood in its broader context.

But Corruption is beyond that which has various forms and applied in different aspects. Today corruption become rampant in our country and it become a burning issue.

Therefore, it is vital to understand the whole context of corruption in order to have the clear picture on the issue and to work in unison in mitigating the practice.

Hence, I Prefer to present the following literature wrote on Corruption by **Inge Amundse, with a topic Political Corruption**; which I used as a reference to write on this issue.

**In this regard we will see:**

- 1. About what Corruption mean;**
- 2. The involvement of state in corruption;**
- 3. The difference between political corruption and bureaucratic Corruption;**
- 4. Private and Collective Corruption;**
- 5. Redistributive and extractive corruption (“from below” vs. “from above”);**
- 6. Some Corruption related concepts;**
- 7. The consequences of Corruption; and**
- 8. Curtailing corruption**

## **1.About Corruption**

Corruption is a disease, a cancer that eats into the **cultural, political and economic fabric of society**, and destroys the functioning of vital organs.

In the words of Transparency International, *“Corruption is one of the greatest challenges of the contemporary world. It undermines good government, fundamentally distorts public policy, leads to the misallocation of resources,*

***harms the private sector and private sector development and particularly hurts the poor”.***

Corruption is found almost everywhere, but it is stubbornly entrenched in the poor countries of Sub-Saharan Africa, it is widespread in Latin America, it is deep-rooted in many of the newly industrialized countries, and it is reaching alarming proportions in several of the post-communist countries.

Besides, corruption is in itself a **many-faceted phenomenon** and the concept of corruption contains too many connotations to be analytically functional without a closer definition. The forms of corruption are diverse in terms of ***who are the actors, initiators and profiteers, how it is done, and to what extent it is practiced.***

Also the causes and the consequences of corruption are complex and diverse, and have been sought in both individual ethics and civic cultures, in history and tradition, in the economic system, in the institutional arrangements, and in the political system.

Corruption has come up as a thematic constituent of this renewed paradigm, in which development necessitates economic reform, which is again dependent on political and administrative reforms like good governance and civil service reforms (CRS), accountability, human rights, multi-partyism and democratization.

Besides, very high levels of corruption has been observed where the government is regarded as **illegitimate** in the eyes of the population (implying widespread disrespect for legal procedures), and in countries where the state plays an interventionist role in the economy. The role of the state and of politics is therefore essential to understand corruption.

## **2. The state is always involved**

The decisive role of the state is also reflected in most definitions of corruption. Corruption is conventionally understood, and referred to, as the private wealth-seeking behavior of someone who represents the state and the public authority, or as the misuse of public goods by public officials for private ends.

The working definition of the World Bank is that ***corruption is the abuse of public power for private benefit.***

In other words, corruption is a particular (and, one could say, perverted) **state-society relation**. On the one side is the state, which is the civil servants, functionaries, bureaucrats and politicians, anyone who holds a position of authority to allocate rights over (scarce) public resources in the name of the

state or the government. Corruption is when these individuals are misusing the public power they are bestowed with for private benefit. The corrupt act is when this responsible person accepts money or some other form of reward, and then proceeds to misuse his official powers by returning undue favors. For instance, it is an act of corruption when a state official takes a bribe to render some public service that is supposed to be free of charge or demands more than the official cost of it.

The involvement of state officials in corruption is also emphasized in an alternative definition, where corruption is seen as “*a form of secret social exchange through which those in power (political or administrative) take personal advantage, of one type or another, of the influence they exercise in virtue of their mandate or their function*” (Méry cited in de Sardan 1999:49).

Corruption also exists within and between **private businesses**, within **nongovernmental organizations**, and **between individuals in their personal dealings**, without any state agency or state official being involved. There is corruption also in the form of bribing, swindling, and mafia-methods within and between private businesses, there are treacherous individuals and disloyal employees also in private firms. This kind of corruption may even have repercussions into the political system as it destroys the public morale, and it may be symptomatic for the general economic and moral development of a society.

### **3. Political corruption and bureaucratic corruption (“grand” vs. “petty”)**

In the definition shared by most political scientists, political corruption is any transaction between private and public sector actors through which collective goods are illegitimately converted into private-regarding payoffs (Heidenheimer et. al. 1993:6). This definition does not, however, distinguish clearly between political and bureaucratic corruption. It establishes the necessary involvement of the state and state agents in corruption, without any notion as to the level of authority where corruption takes place.

In a more strict definition, *political corruption involves political decision-makers.*

**Political or grand corruption** takes place at the high levels of the political system. It is when the politicians and state agents, who are entitled to make and enforce the laws in the name of the people, are themselves corrupt.

Political corruption is when political decision-makers use the political power they are armed with, to **sustain their power, status and wealth**. Thus, political

corruption can be distinguished from bureaucratic or *petty* corruption, which is corruption in the public administration, at the implementation end of politics.

Even when the distinction between political and bureaucratic corruption is rather ambiguous as it depends on the separation of politics from administration (which is unclear in most political systems), the distinction is important in analytical and in practical terms. Political corruption occurs at the top level of the state, and it has political repercussions.

Political corruption not only leads to the misallocation of resources, but it also affects the manner in which decisions are made. Political corruption is the manipulation of the political institutions and the rules of procedure, and therefore it influences the institutions of government and the political system, and it frequently leads to institutional decay. Political corruption is therefore something *more* than a deviation from formal and written legal norms, from professional codes of ethics and court rulings. Political corruption is when laws and regulations are more or less systematically abused by the rulers, side-stepped, ignored, or even tailored to fit their interests.

Political corruption is a deviation from the rational-legal values and principles of the modern state, and the basic problem is the weak accountability between the governors and the governed. In particular in authoritarian countries, the legal bases, against which corrupt practices are usually evaluated and judged, are weak and furthermore subject to downright encroachment by the rulers.

The formal legal framework of the state is therefore insufficient as terms of reference to assess and judge the problem of political corruption. Moral, normative, ethical, and indeed political benchmarks will have to be brought in, not at least because it will be necessary to discern legality from legitimacy when it comes to political corruption. Besides, whereas **bureaucratic corruption normally can be dealt with through auditing, legislation, and institutional arrangements**, the degenerative effects of political corruption cannot be counteracted by an administrative approach alone. Endemic political corruption calls for radical political reforms

## **4. Private corruption and collective corruption ("individual" vs. "aggregated")**

Observations as well as input from political theory have led to a second analytically important classification of corruption, namely between *private* and *collective* forms of corruption. The degree to which the money or benefits collected through corruption is "**privatized**", is varying. It may be extraction for the benefit of an individual who will share nothing or very little of the benefits

with his equals, or it may be extraction for a particular group with some coherence and unity.

The “private”, individual and intimate nature of corruption is repeatedly underlined because of the illegal and surreptitious nature of corrupt transactions. The illegality and immorality of corruption necessitates a collusion or conspiracy between individuals, or at least a certain closeness and confidentiality. As noted, Méry called it a form of **secret social exchange** (Méry cited in de Sardan 1999:49). Furthermore, corruption is regarded as “private” or individual also because private benefits are sought and collected. Corruption holds some private benefit for the corrupt actor, his family or his close friends.

However, corruption may also be “**collective**”. First of all because corruption has a substantial economic effect in aggregate terms, but also because corruption may in itself be a deliberate way of resource extraction for the benefit of a larger group. Some definitions of corruption also emphasize the point that the rulers as a group or class, or as an institution or organization, make unjustified use of their influence to extract resources for the benefit of the group as such. Many well-known and well documented cases of grand corruption have involved political parties (ruling parties in particular, but also prospective ruling parties), entire administrative bureaux, and national governments.

Corruption has a strong inclination for “**collectivization**”. To keep quiet and gradually take part in the practice is usually much less costly than to blow the whistle, inform, and confront. A conspiracy between individuals is easily extended into a larger practice involving colleagues, partners, assistants, patrons and superiors. Instances of petty corruption may therefore develop into **larger networks, cliques and medium-sized brotherhoods**, and finally into large-scale institutionalized corruption if unchecked, if there is “room for maneuver”.

As corruption spreads, the social acceptance of it may also increase. When it is generally understood that there is a climate of corruption, still more people will believe it is inevitable and expected. In particular is corruption in high places contagious to lower level bureaucrats and other state agents, as these will follow the predatory examples of, or even take instructions from, their principals.

## **5. Redistributive and extractive corruption (“from below” vs. “from above”)**

In whose interest does corruption take place, and who benefits the most from corruption? The various definitions of corruption maintain that the state (or some state agent) is always involved, and that corruption is basically a particular state-society relationship. It is furthermore maintained that this relationship is based on a mutual exchange of benefits, that it is an exchange from which both the state (the state agent) and the society (the individual citizen, client or businessman) will draw some immediate and private benefit. This relationship of mutual exchange is rarely balanced, however. In aggregate terms corrupt practices will generate a flow of resources either from the society to the state (**extractive corruption, or corruption from above**), or from the state to the society (**redistributive corruption, or corruption from below**).

This implies for instance that the state as a group or elite may extract substantial resources in the form of wealth and power *from* the nation or the society at large, while the society in return will have only symbolic resources like protection and national identity. In many cases, corrupt practices have established extremely well to do political and state-based elites (ruling classes) amidst poverty and recession.

On the other hand, businesses and other groups may be very successful in getting tax exemptions and other privileges from corrupt officials in weak states, to the extent that the unity and coherence of the state and its policies are ruined, the policy implementation capacity ravaged, and the resources of the nation depleted. In extreme situations, the state may be held hostage to and torn apart by forceful groups in society.

## **The theory of redistributive corruption**

In what can be called the *theory of redistributive corruption*, the state is the weaker part in the state-society relationship. Here, various social and economic groups, interests or individuals are organized and powerful enough to draw more benefit from the corrupt practices they engage in with the state as a counterpart, than is the state and the ruling elite. The main beneficiaries of the resources extracted, privatized and consumed are not the political and state-based elite, but state resources are depleted and distributed to various groups and interests according to the power configurations in each country.

Who, in society, will benefit the most from this kind of corruption depends on the local distribution of forces. It might be powerful ethnic or regional groups or clans who are strong enough to extract much more from the state than their fair part of public investments, development projects, international aid, regional autonomy and representation in national institutions. It might be foreign or local corporate interests that are able to buy under-priced national resources, concessions, preferential treatments, permissions, and tax exemptions. It might be the general population, individuals who are able to buy

benefits like tax exemptions, subsidies, pensions, or unemployment insurance, or get preferential access to privileged schools, medical care, housing, real estate or ownership stakes in enterprises being privatized.

**Feudalization** is a term that has been used when weak states are manipulated by strong societies, when the state is losing control to “civilian” forces. Feudalization refers to the “privatization” and “decentralization” of the state, and underlines the clientelist relationship involved. Feudalization occurs when entire geographical areas, economic sectors and/or military units are taken over by “private” interests.

## **The theory of extractive corruption**

In the alternative view, in what can be called the *theory of extractive corruption*, the state is the stronger part in the state-society relationship. According to this theory, the corrupted (the state or some state agent) benefits the most from corruption and the corrupter is more or less a passive player. Essentially, the ruling elite is the strongest force in society, this elite or class uses the state apparatus as its instrument to extract resources from society, and it does so for the benefit of the rulers. This theory is partly based on the operation of authoritarian countries in general, and on the experience of the neo-patrimonial states in particular.

The theory of extractive corruption is furthermore derived from the relatively stable and rather flexible **neo-patrimonial** political systems found in most of Africa and in a few Latin American and Asian countries. Neo-patrimonialism is a widely used concept in political science for this sub-category of non-democratic and semi-democratic regimes characterized by pervasive patron-client structures, the non-distinction between public and private, and political weakness.

**Neo-patrimonialism** is defined as a political system where the chief executive maintains authority through personal patronage, rather than through ideology or law.

In neo-patrimonial systems, there is no clear distinction between the public and the private domain. Public office and position is seen as a personal asset and a personal right, and it is treated as a private resource. Thus, the entire political system is characterized by a deep and thorough privatization and usurpation of public resources. Politics is to a large extent about distributing resources in the form of jobs, contracts, scholarships, gifts and other public resources to one's relatives, friends and political allies.

Furthermore, politics is about acquiring wealth and prestige through the system of prebendal accumulation, which has also been called “**parasitism**” and

“**kleptocracy**”. That is, public authority is used by the rulers to extract resources from the ruled and from the nation’s riches. Public office is used to enforce the collection of prebends and “gifts” of all sorts from the dependent clients. **Corruption, embezzlement, theft and extortion** are used to make private fortunes, and political power is used by power-holders to enter into profitable businesses (and to establish monopoly rights, tax exemptions and other advantages for these). **Nationalization, indigenization, privatization, the allocation of monopoly rights, land entitlements, subsidies, subsidised credits, import and export licenses and tariffs, and a number of other public resources** are likewise distributed according to the patrimonial logic.

*Clientelism* is a basic feature of the neo-patrimonial system. This is the sophisticated hierarchic network of patron-client relationships through which the patrons grant services, positions, and public support to his clients, in exchange for political and material support. These clientelist “**networks of reciprocities**” or “**nets of interaction**” are used by patrons at different levels to build support through the extraction and distribution of wealth and prestige, constructing a pyramid of social differentiation.

## 6. Some corruption-related concepts

Around corruption itself; there is a confusing array of other concepts and notions linked to and sometimes used interchangeably with corruption. However, with the distinctions made between political and bureaucratic corruption and between extractive and redistributive corruption; these various practices and the related concepts can be located within a broader scheme.

### 6.1 Bribery

“**Bribery**” is the payment of a fixed sum, a certain percentage of a contract, or any other favor in money or kind paid to the state official in charge of making contracts on behalf of the state or otherwise distributes benefits to companies or individuals, businessmen and clients. To pay or receive a bribery is corruption *per se*, and should be understood as the essence of both extractive and redistributive corruption. The bribery is the payment (in money or kind) given to or taken by the state official in a corrupt relationship.

There are many equivalent terms to bribery, like ***kickbacks, baksheesh, sweeteners, grease money and pay-offs***, which are all notions of corruption seen from below, as “redistributive” corruption. These are all payments needed or required to make things pass swifter, smoother or more favorably through a bureaucracy, or to avoid some burden. By “greasing palms” many corporations and business interests are for example able to buy political favors and escape the full burden of taxation and environmental regulations, others are able to buy protected markets and monopolies, import/export licenses, etc.

Bribery, however, is also extraction. It is a kind of “informal” taxation when public officials charge extra **under-the-table payments** or “gifts” from clients. It is an extractive form of bribery when a party boss goes on a promotion tour, and fills the luggage compartment of his car with “donations” and “gifts” from the “devoted followers” in his constituency.

## 6.2 Embezzlement

“**Embezzlement**” is theft of public resources by public officials, and as such it is understood as another form of misappropriation of public funds. The state official steals from the public institution in which he is employed and from resources he is supposed to administer on behalf of the state and the public. However, disloyal employees in private firms can also embezzle their employers and firms, and several kinds of resources may be embezzled.

Embezzlement is **not considered as corruption** from a strict legal point of view. In legal terms, corruption is a transaction between two individuals, one state agent and one “civilian” agent, where the state agent goes beyond the limits of the law and regulations in order to secure himself a personal benefit in the form of a bribe.

Embezzlement is therefore regarded as theft, because it does not involve the “civilian” side directly. The general public is stolen only indirectly when public funds are embezzled, and individual citizens have no legal right to present themselves as forfeited.

## 6.3 Fraud

“**Fraud**” is a crime that involves some kind of trickery, swindle or deceit, and it is a broader legal and popular term that covers both bribery and embezzlement. It is fraud when for instance state agencies and state representatives are engaged in the black and grey (informal) markets, and when networks of forgery, trade in illegal goods and smuggling are propped up by “official” sanction and involvement. While serious fraud is generally treated as cases of individual enrichment, fraud can also be “collective”. Fraud is the swindle and deceit used by the ruling group to make more benefits for the rulers, and as such the concept includes what has been labeled extractive corruption.

## 6.4 Extortion

“**Extortion**” is money (or other resources) extracted by the use of coercion, violence or the threats to use force. “Protection” or “security” money is resources extorted in the classical, infamous mafia style. By creating an atmosphere of insecurity where individual citizens, private businesses and

public officials are harassed and intimidated (by the mafia itself), the mafia blackmails and extorts some money in return for their kind of peace. Only those who pay this protection money may be exempted from further harassment. Like bribery, blackmailing and extortion is basically a corrupt transaction, but the money is more violently extracted and the returns are meagre. The exchange of benefits is highly unequal because in return for millions in protection money, the blackmailed may get no more than a negative freedom, a lax promise of impunity.

Corruption in the form of extortion is usually understood as a form of “redistributive” extraction, “from below”. It is for instance when real mafias, like in Russia and Italy, are able to impose their influence upon individual state officials and entire state agencies through threats and intimidation and ultimately by assassinations. What they obtain in return may be preferential business opportunities and privileges, and freedom from taxation, regulations, and legal prosecution.

## 6.5 Favoritism

“*Favoritism*” is a mechanism of power abuse implying “privatization” and a highly biased distribution of state resources, no matter how these resources have been accumulated in the first place. Favoritism or cronyism is to grant offices or benefits to friends and relatives, regardless of merit.

Favoritism is related to corruption insofar as it means power abuse in the form of a corrupted (undemocratic, “privatized”) *distribution* of resources, whereas corruption strictly defined is about the *accumulation* of resources.

However, favoritism in the distribution of resources is intimately related to corruption, in particular the collective and extractive corruption of neo-patrimonial regimes as discussed above.

Favoritism is quite simply the normal human proclivity to favor friends, family and anybody close and trusted. In the political sphere, favoritism is the penchant of state officials and politicians, who have access to state resources and the power to decide upon the distribution of these, to give preferential treatment to certain people when distributing resources. Clientelist favoritism is a basic characteristic of the neo-patrimonial societies, but in most societies it is a rather everyday proclivity to favor one’s kinship members (family, clan, tribe, ethnic, religious or regional group).

**6.6 Nepotism** is a special form of favoritism, in which an office holder (ruler) with the right to make appointments, prefers to nominate to prominent positions his proper kinfolk and family members (wife, brothers and sisters, children, nephews, cousins, in-laws etc.). Many unrestricted presidents have

tried to secure their (precarious) power position by nominating family members to key political, economic and military/security positions in the state apparatus. When “successful”, deeply nepotist systems are getting closer to a “mafia” because of the shared family “values” and loyalties.

## 7. What are the Consequences of Corruption?

Corruption might cause a lot of harm to society; Corruption may also lead to insecure citizens, speculative politicians, and administrators vacillating between huge opportunities, grave risks and much double-pressure. Leaving these aside, a closer look at the economic and political consequences of corruption is pertinent.

### 7.1 Economic Consequences

There is an ambiguous relationship between corruption and economic development. Some researchers (and many practitioners) have argued that corruption may be a good thing because it can smooth rigid bureaucratic systems and help get things done.

There is indeed some truth in this, as excessive red tape and immoderate resource extraction can make businesses unprofitable and entrepreneurship impossible. Corruption may ease the squeaky wheel of state bureaucracy, unlock doors, and enable private entrepreneurship and promote businesses.

In economic terms, corruption is not always bad. This is seen for instance in the level of economic growth and the level of direct foreign investment, in highly corrupt nations. In some countries the growth rate does not seem to suffer, as it has been kept on a high level for years despite the existence of systemic corruption. This is mainly the case of some Southeast Asian countries. In other countries, mainly in Africa, high levels of corruption have been inhibitive to growth. Also in terms of foreign direct investment (FDI), some countries have been able to attract huge investments even when they are corrupt, but in other instances corruption is indeed inhibitive to foreign investments.

The economic effects of corruption are nevertheless dependent on the type of corruption in each country, on the way corruption is **organized** or **disorganized**. **Centralized, co-ordinated and disciplined** corruption exists in some countries at the same time as **decentralized, disordered and irregular** corruption exists in others. In general terms, the difference is between **controlled** and **uncontrolled** corruption, and thus between calculable and unforeseeable corruption.

In general, if businesses are able to forecast and estimate the level of corruption, to include it into their calculations as a measurable expense, and if

they know that a paid bribery will have a positive effect, corruption may not be an impediment to investments and trade. If, on the other hand, corruption is disorganized and plentiful, unpredictable and inconsistent, so that a paid bribe is no guarantee that services are rendered and no more bribes expected later, corruption is economically damaging.

## 7.2 Political Consequences

Corruption affects the way countries are ruled. However, like with the economic consequences, the political consequences of corruption is largely dependent on the type of corruption that takes place, and the consequences differs much according to the ways in which the extracted resources are used. In weak states, in states where the ruling elite exercises little control over who will gain how much from what kind of corruption, the legitimacy of the state as such will wane with the lack of service.

Uncontrolled and unrestricted corruption will have the general effect of undermining state institutions and political legitimacy. Strong states on the other hand, states with exclusive and undeniable control of the economic policies, of the formal as well as the informal ways of accumulation, redistribution, and consumption. Here, any extractive corruption will be an integrated part of the overall control over the state apparatus and its operations, including the authoritative allocation of resources.

Strong leaders will exercise a strong control over the various forms of corruption, and will be able to decide who will gain how much from what kind of corruption. The level of corruption can therefore be stable, predictable and acceptable to businesses and the general public. In strong states, the institutions of the state will not necessarily suffer from corruption.

## 8. Curtailing Corruption

Corruption can be challenged mainly from four sources:

1. from the outside (from the external world),
2. from above (from the rulers themselves),
3. from the inside (from administrative and bureaucratic institutions), and
4. from below (from the civil society, the business community and each citizen alone).

### 8.1 *External or international control (“control from the outside”)*

“Political conditionalities” is a part of the contemporary vocabulary and as such a part of the new paradigm that has come to replace the “non-intervention in internal affairs” principle of the Cold War. The European Community, for

instance, reversed its earlier indifference and linked its aid to respect for human rights, democratization, a free press and honest government in a resolution adopted in 1991. The IMF, the World Bank and the donor community have initiated substantial pressure on Third World governments to fight corruption.

Political conditionalities include both the rather technical concept of “good governance”, which means honesty, efficiency and accountability of the bureaucratic departments, and more directly political issues like multiparty elections, “civil society enforcement”, and human rights.

## **8.2 Executive control (“control from above”)**

Controlling corruption from above can be done through a number of rather efficient mechanisms. Speeches, various campaigns, and other sensitizing and morality enhancing mechanism may be useful, in addition to executive reporting systems, institutional reforms, and a restriction in the size and administrative discretion of various ministries, departments and offices. This is all about strict controls of the administration from above. Most important is nevertheless the executive right of nominations and consequently dismissals. To replace or fire corrupt officials, or the threat of doing so, is very efficient when made credible through action.

However, if corruption is to be curtailed from above, from the governors or the political leadership, one factor will have to be present: *the political will*. Rulers might be corrupt and abusive, and will rarely instigate corruption-curtailing mechanisms by themselves when this runs counter to their private interests. The dilemma of political corruption and power-abuse is that accountability will have to be instituted by sufficiently strong countervailing powers.

## **8.3 Internal or institutional control (“control from within”)**

The *esprit de corps* in the form of bureaucratic professionalism and the defense of the public over the private is to a large extent dependent on the internal and institutional controls of the administrative and executive system. These administrative controls include the various controlling and auditing bodies within the state administration in the form of specially assigned institutions and principles, like for instance the Auditor-General’s office, Anti-Corruption Commissions, Public Account Committees and Ombudsman Offices. These not only include financial auditing, but also human resource audits, organizational audits, and physical performance audits. The efficacy of audit reports is furthermore dependent on their being submitted not only to the executive and legislative branches of government, but also to the broader public via the media.

The separation between the realm of civil service and partisan politics, the professionalization of the bureaucracy through competitive entry, the accountable use of public resources (audited accounts), the competitive compensation and merit systems based on performance (i.e. *meritocracy*) are other instruments of control. The public sector ethics and performance can also be refined through ministerial reorganizations (smaller ministries), the crating or strengthening of central coordinating organs, simplification, standardization, and flexibility (cutting red tape, eliminate non-essential functions, dismissal of redundant civil servants, recruitment procedures, inspection, capacity building in training, eliminate ghost workers, salary increases, the monetarisation of benefits). For instance is the declaration of assets for all officials, and provisions regarding the transparency in bidding for and granting of public sector contracts particularly important. The more discretion officials have through abundant, complex and non-transparent regulations, the more corruption becomes likely.

#### **8.4 Democratic control (“control from below”)**

The democratic control or control from below include all the known checks and balances, the separation of powers, rule of law, and legislative and judicial independence which are the fundamentals of democratic systems. These are necessary institutions to ensure the political responsiveness of politicians and civil servants.

However, also a number of organizations of the civil and political society, and the public, are needed to control and restrict corruption in the various state institutions. Just as strong states are necessary to control and restrict the corrupt and monopolizing tendencies of the private sector, the state itself will have to be controlled from below.

**Parliaments** can reduce corruption through their power of legislation and resource allocation. The role of parliament members in general and opposition party members in particular is to monitor and control the workings of the government and of the administration, it is to criticize and make suggestions, and to inform the general public. The parliament has a right to know, and it can make inquiries, set up oversight committees, make investigations and pose questions to any governmental and administrative act. The political parties are another part of this control mechanism, both those represented in parliament and those in extra-parliamentary opposition.

A free press and an active civil society (for instance non-governmental watchdog organizations and monitoring associations) are also highly relevant counter powers to restrict corruption and executive abuse. However, free and fair elections are the ultimate accountability, restriction and control mechanism. Given the condition that there is multipartyism, real differences

between parties and real party and policy alternatives, and that elections have decisive outcome for the composition of the executive, elections can sensitize, restrict and make accountable the individuals up for election.

## **9. Summary**

We have seen what mean by corruption, the forms of Corruptions, corruption related concepts, Corruption consequences and curtailing corruption. I hope things are now somehow clear about corruption. We have gain insight about the real meaning of corruption and the means for mitigating it.

All the above analysis and facts are also true to our country and we can have a good understanding how corruption can be done in practice. Therefore, we can now aware of the corruption forms and how to refrain ourselves from such practices and identify our roles in mitigating it.

Let me wind up here for today.

Noah Mussie