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3.1 FORMS OF CORRUPTION

The presentation of an adequate explanation of the particular manner in which corruption exists, or a particular manner in which the corrupt act is carried out in society, is fundamental to the systematic understanding of the issue of corruption. What should be stressed from the beginning of this elaboration is that corruption is not only practiced in developing societies, and its forms are not restricted to the payment and receipt of bribery. Corruption takes various forms and is practiced in all types of societies. However, we could just manage to clarify the main dimensions that corruption could be observable as a phenomenon in the societies in the form of bribery and extortion, nepotism and graft.

3.1.1 Bribery and Extortion

Bribery is one of the major forms of corruption. According to the Black's Law Dictionary, a bribe is: "any valuable thing given or promised, or any preferment, advantage, privilege or emolument, given or promised corruptly and against law as an inducement to any person acting in an official or public capacity to violate or forbear from his duty, or to improperly influence his behavior in the performance of his duty."¹

The Century Dictionary defines bribery as: "a gift or gratuity bestowed for the purpose of influencing the action or conduct of the receiver; especially money or any valuable consideration given or promised for the betrayal of a trust or the corrupt performance of an allotted duty, as to a judiciary agent, a judge, legislator or other

public officer, a witness, a voter, etc."² Bribery from a legalistic point of view "is the crime of offering, giving, receiving or soliciting anything of value with the intent of influencing someone in a responsible position to act contrary to his or her duty. Both the giver and receiver of a bribe are guilty of the offence; the giver is said to have committed active bribery and the receiver to have participated in passive bribery."³ It is also noted that literally speaking, bribery refers to the demanding, accepting or offering of valued, tangible objects (e.g., properties or gifts) that are not legally promised for so as to induce or persuade somebody to do something (often dishonest) for the giver. For instance a client may bribe a public official to get faster service, or to expedite the processing of his papers/application, or to get services or goods that have nothing to do with merits.

It is, however, observed that the offering or acceptance of bribes can be voluntary or involuntary. Voluntary bribery means that both the giver and the recipient have the will to exchange privileges and thus are mutually satisfied. Involuntary bribery means imposed bribes that take many forms: (a) forced bribery in which the recipient is compelled (e.g., by politicians, superior officers, etc) to accept bribes and the giver is forced to comply. (b) Extortionate bribery in which it is the will of the recipient to force the giver to pay. (c) Imposed bribery in which the recipient is forced to accept while it is the wish of the giver to pay.⁴ The above classification of bribery shows that extortion is included in involuntary bribery.

---

This would suggest that extortion is one aspect of bribery, which needs to be clarified and distinguished from bribery.

To extort means: "to compel payments by means of threats of injury to person, property or reputation" or "the corrupt demanding or receiving by a person in the office of a fee for services which should be performed gratuitously; or, where compensation is permissible, or a larger fee than the law justified on a fee not due." In other words the action of extortion has been taken to obtain something valuable from somebody by violence, threats, etc. The difference between bribery and extortion could be presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bribery</th>
<th>Extortion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- A bribe is a payment made to induce the payee to do something for the payer that is improper.</td>
<td>- Extortion is a payment made to deter the payee from harassing the payer in some way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The initiator of bribery is the payer.</td>
<td>- The initiator of extortion is the recipient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The objective is improper favor.</td>
<td>- The object is obtaining something of value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The motivating influence is the offer of something of value.</td>
<td>- The motivating force is a threat of harm to the payer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, bribery is basically initiated by the bribe offer and the recipient usually initiates extortion. The distinction between bribery and extortion seems to be frequently blurred. This could be attributed to the difficulty in classifying particular transactions in particular contexts, because they include aspects of both types of payments, and are usually practiced indirectly or in an unseen manner or in a concealed way. Moreover, in whatever condition (in bribery or extortion), when the

---

5 Black's Law Dictionary, op. cit., p. 731.
illegal exchange of privileges exists it is a form of corruption, however, it is by no means synonymous with bribery as Brooks had suggested. But, bribery is however, more direct, less subtle; there can be no bribe-taker without a bribe-giver, but corruption can and frequently does exist even when there are no personal tempters or guilty confederates. The sociological interpretation of the process of bribery shows that the act of bribery is a matter requiring considerable skills.

In the process there is often considerable preliminary negotiation in order to achieve an intimate relationship with the person to be bribed. He is given "good" and plausible reasons for doing what he is being bought to do. Sometimes, advantages are taken of his financial needs, and he may be in a way "coerced" to accept. From another aspect, as it has been observed from some of the instances recounted, the clerks who deal with innumerable small formalities expect individual payment, and if they do not receive it, they attend to the matter with deliberate delay or invent a pretext for shelving it forever.

Generally, those who are professional in the corrupt practice of bribery have enough skills to secure their benefit and protect themselves. Meanwhile, those who are new to the field of bribe-giving and taking, will learn the process of bribery through their seniors or through the day by day practice and thus, they know how and to whom to pass a bribe, and if they become a special contact person in the process of bribery they will also learn how to keep a part of the bribery for themselves. In government construction, for example, among the techniques used to cover up the

---

practice of bribing in the process of bribery. A superior, after receiving a bribe could refer to the rules and regulations to give a privilege to a contractor without any bid, or in the outward of the fact the official follows all process provided in the administration regulations, while in the inward and by the influence of bribery he has already made an agreement to give privilege to a particular bidder. In almost all societies where bribery prevails and becomes a part of the culture, mastering the process of bribery becomes much easier and faster because the practice of bribery is already a part of the social life and everybody will be socialized with it. In this situation it is quite impossible to get through any official business without bribery. because the official's dealing with his clients or other officials usually depends upon how much illegal money or other tangible material he will receive or has received. In the case of Ghana, for example, Le Vine quoted: "We Ghanaians are so accustomed to bribing our officials and they to stealing our rate-money. that it would be odd if we didn't bribe and they didn't steal".10 Thailand is another good example in this concern. Girling reported that during the 1980's enormous bribes were being paid at that time in various government ministries and agencies (e.g.; National development, transport, highways, police, etc.) with millions of baht changing hands in a single transaction.11

Similarly, in developed countries such as the U.S. it has been reported that: "historically, as far as American business has been concerned, it was more important to do business and try to make a profit even if corruption was involved."12 This means that if American companies do not make the required payments or pay the required bribes in their business activity, they will simply not do business. Therefore,

---

11 Girling, Corruption, Capitalism and Democracy, op. cit., p. 67.
if there is no bribe there is no business. This, in fact, strengthened the position that,
those who are interested only in their own profit are an immoral force in the society.

The payment of bribery in the underdeveloped countries is deeply embedded
in the social and cultural fabric of these countries in such a way that such payments
are so much a part of nearly every culture that most languages provide a word for the
term. Some of these terms are: “United States of America: Pay-off, Germany: Trinkgelt,
France: Pot au vin, Italy: Bustarella, Japan: Wairo, Indonesia: Wang Sogok, Thailand:
Sinbone, Philippines: Lagay, Pakistan: Roshvat, Iran: Roshveh, Nigeria: Dash, Egypt:
Baksheesh.”

The comprehensive understanding of bribery as a form of corruption requires
some elaboration on the mode and purpose of payment of bribes. The mode of
payment of bribery can be, cash, gifts of property (e.g., jewelry, watches, paintings,
free samples), gifts of services (e.g., use of automobiles, aircraft, hunting lodges,
payments of rent on homes), payment of travel and entertainment expenses,
providing scholarships and education expenses for children or relatives, purchasing
property from the payee at an inflated price, selling property to the payee at a
deflated price, transfer of deposit in numbered foreign bank (usually Swiss banks)
accounts etc. It is important to note that the mode of payment of bribery is related to
the process of bribery admitted/ accepted/ known in every society. Therefore,
according to the special cultural context, the specific service required, the importance
of the goal to be achieved and the nature of the bribe taker, the bribe giver will
identify the mode and the value of the bribe, and the way in which to pass it to the
recipient.

11 Ibid., pp. 6-7.
The objectives of bribery vary from case to case and from one social context to another. Bribery may be carried out with the aim of influencing the behavior of government officials, politicians, political candidates, and employees in their legislative, administrative and judicial actions. Bribery may be a means of retaining a privileged position, which would otherwise have been lost earlier. Bribery has been a convenient way to avoid legal requirements, which may be impracticable in application. Bribery may be given to obtain or retain business, avoid harassment, reduce taxes and political risks, by voters in elections, etc. In the education system some students may bribe the examiners to obtain the required marks or to know the examination questions before the exam. In the legal field, lawyers may bribe a judge, police officials and the opposing advocates, to win the case. In view of the fact that the objectives and functions of bribery are numerous, it seems necessary to stress that the most obvious function of bribery is to influence or induce official action within the framework of exchanging privileges and benefits. In addition to this, in the context of government expansion, there are areas where a great deal of bribery is practiced: customs, public work, licensing boards, tender boards for government purchases and construction, foreign exchange control boards, tax offices, loan agencies. These sections of the bureaucracy are more likely targets for corrupt influence than others.

In the legislation of almost all countries, bribery is considered as a crime, which deserves a penalty. But we are still witnessing the existence/occurrence of cases of bribery. The problem seems to be that laws are of little use unless the great majority of people respect them, the penalties are sufficient to deter those who are involved in the bribery process, the consequences of the law (penalty) must not be evaded by any means, and the legal code must seek to reach both the bribe-taker and
the bribe-giver and must consider whatever payments of offers as threats to the common interest and thus any payment must be prohibited.

Finally, bribery is considered as a major form of corruption. Some people have the perception that bribery is synonymous with corruption, and actually when they use the term corruption they refer to bribery. It has been illustrated that bribery has a process, requires certain skills, has functions and objectives and can be practiced through various modes. Although bribery is considered as a crime in almost all legislation, it is widespread in the world, embedded in the social fabric of almost all developing countries, and has deeply effected their bureaucracy, to the extent that people have come to believe that they can buy everything with money. In other words they can obtain anything they like or need by bribery.

3.1.2 Nepotism, Favoritism and Cronyism

Nepotism is considered one of the main forms of corruption especially in the underdeveloped countries where family and kinship ties are stronger than the bureaucratic rules and the administrative regulations. The literal meaning of nepotism is "the practice among people with power or influence of favoring their own relatives, especially by giving them jobs."14 Legally speaking, nepotism as a major form of corruption refers to an illegal act that is based on the exchange of favors or sentiments. Hence, an official is corrupt if he deals with clients or other officials on the basis of ascriptive or particularistic consideration (e.g., kinship, friendship or regional ties) rather than merits.15 Alatas defines nepotism as a term

---

15 Lee, Incongruence Between Legal and Folk Norms, op. cit., p. 74.
that refers to the appointment of relatives or friends to positions for which they are not qualified, thereby injuring the interest of the institution and those who are qualified.\textsuperscript{16}

In order to clarify the issue of nepotism it is observable that the most obvious form of nepotistic behavior is the appointment of relatives or friends etc. to positions, which they don't merit. But according to the cases of nepotism occurring in the various societies, giving a job to a person on the basis of ascriptive or particularistic consideration even with merit can be considered as nepotism. In this condition the implication of the nepotistic behavior is less dangerous for the bureaucratic system and the common interest than giving a job to a relative without merit.

It is also observable that nepotism is not only limited to giving a job with or without merit to a relative or friend, but also involves all types of transaction based on the exchange of favors or sentiments rather than laws and regulations in the public sphere. The problem with nepotism is that over wide areas of the underdeveloped societies it is regarded as a virtue rather than as a fault or crime or a corrupt practice. For instance, in wide areas of African society nepotism is regarded with some sympathy and indulgence, and in more sophisticated circles, where it is accepted as wrong, the pressures of society in general, and families in particular, make resistance to it.\textsuperscript{17} A life picture of nepotism can be illustrative in this context: "In West Africa, any man rising to a place of importance in politics will be surrounded by relatives and friends looking confidently to him for patronage; the tradition of centuries leaves them in no doubt that he will provide for them jobs, and that if jobs do not exist they


\textsuperscript{17} Ronald Wraith & Edgar Simpkins. 1963. Corruption in Developing Countries, London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., p. 35.
that refers to the appointment of relatives or friends to positions for which they are
not qualified, thereby injuring the interest of the institution and those who are
qualified.16

In order to clarify the issue of nepotism it is observable that the most obvious
form of nepotistic behavior is the appointment of relatives or friends etc. to positions,
which they don't merit. But according to the cases of nepotism occurring in the
various societies, giving a job to a person on the basis of ascriptive or particularistic
consideration even with merit can be considered as nepotism. In this condition the
implication of the nepotistic behavior is less dangerous for the bureaucratic system
and the common interest than giving a job to a relative without merit.

It is also observable that nepotism is not only limited to giving a job with or
without merit to a relative or friend, but also involves all types of transaction based
on the exchange of favors or sentiments rather than laws and regulations in the public
sphere. The problem with nepotism is that over wide areas of the underdeveloped
societies it is regarded as a virtue rather than as a fault or crime or a corrupt practice.
For instance, in wide areas of African society nepotism is regarded with some
sympathy and indulgence, and in more sophisticated circles, where it is accepted as
wrong, the pressures of society in general, and families in particular, make resistance
to it.17 A life picture of nepotism can be illustrative in this context: "In West Africa,
any man rising to a place of importance in politics will be surrounded by relatives
and friends looking confidently to him for patronage; the tradition of centuries leaves
them in no doubt that he will provide for them jobs, and that if jobs do not exist they

17 Ronald Walsh & Edgar Simpkins. 1963. Corruption in Developing Countries, London, George
Allen & Unwin Ltd., p. 35.
will be created. It is clear that the pressures of the family are very strong to the extent that an educated member of the family holding a government office, or political position is compelled by the demands of the family to be corrupt. In other words, familial bonds prevent him from following the rules and regulations of his job/office. In consequence, he is voluntarily or involuntarily engaged in the nepotism network. The nepotism network is a complex of relationships, with/ among members of the family, close friends, people from the same region and race, business associates, school classmates, client supporters, professional colleagues, superiors, members of the party, clan, movement etc. Through this network of nepotism the individual peasant can use other resources that are indispensable to his daily life such as money, services, labor, jobs, etc. and if he is linked to socially and politically dominant patrons, he can obtain scarce resources; money, prestige, power and honor. If the peasant or any social actor practicing nepotistic behavior finds himself in a position, say, to obtain a license for business, register his child in a school or university, find a hospital bed, expedite the process of an application for whatever etc, then he will look around for someone who is known to him whom he can trust; a relative, friend, co-religionist, co-ethnic, etc to handle his case either personally or, he will put him in contact with someone who will entertain him and deal with his case. Such behavior is usually referred to as nepotism in all societies, whereas in some developing countries such practices are being tolerated or even approved. This behavior is considered nepotism because it is regarded as violating the fundamental principles of public administration where all kinds of dealings with the clients must go through a formal process with respect of all the regulations concerned and the officer is free from pressures of any part of the nepotism network explained earlier.

18 Ibid., p. 34.
The endurance of nepotism and the functionality of its network depends on the nature of the relationship between the known individuals or groups, the incongruence between the folk and the bureaucratic norms, the failure of the government in introducing and maintaining objective and honest standards into the appointment of the bulk of the civil service, and the failure of the civil servants to free themselves from the nepotistic network pressures.

Finally, it is necessary to note that nepotism is one of the major aspects of corrupt behavior. It is, in fact, an interesting social-psychological phenomenon that represents a dilemma and a question of how the emotional feelings of the officials towards clients from whatever type of relationship can be stronger than the bureaucratic rules, and hence, services, and goods were given not based on qualification and merit.

3.1.3 Graft: Embezzlement, Fraud and Blackmail

Graft is another fundamental form of corruption that involves several aspects of the corrupt behavior such as embezzlement of government funds, illegal appropriation of public resources, illegal gain or advantage in any field, etc. The term “graft” refers to the embezzlement or illegal appropriation of public resources; funds and properties, by a single official or a group of officials. This form of corruption is usually an individual act; it does not involve the transaction of material or non-material resources among officials or between officials and clients.19 Le Vine pointed out that graft initially dissipates the various means by which the public resources and goods are used for purposes other than those for which they were

19 Lee, Incongruence Between Legal and Folk Norms, op. cit., p. 74.
originally intended. Graft is conventionally used to illustrate one of the ways in which formal public properties find their ways into what are essentially private hands through informal channels.\textsuperscript{20} The above definitions of graft stress the individual act in the corrupt practice of public officials without the collusion of the public or other intermediaries.

A broader definition that involves other aspects of graft is when something of value given to, and accepted by public officials for dishonest or illegal purposes is commonly called graft. The practice may also involve corrupt officials directing the fraudulent expenditure of public funds for private benefit. A transaction cannot be considered graft except if one of the parties must occupy a position of public trust. The term “graft” probably reflects the idea that extra illegal profits are somehow grafted onto a legitimate transaction. In its least offensive form, graft merely involves favored treatment or unfairness. It usually extends, however, to criminal activity such as, blackmail, theft, fraud and swindling. Some forms of graft that are generally regarded as reprehensible are not covered by the criminal codes and therefore are not subject to penalty.\textsuperscript{21} In its broader sense graft is the abuse of power for personal or party profit. The public official or any person exercising the power of such office; boss or whatever, he may abuse the power, in a sense plays the role of both parties in the other forms of corruption, such as bribery, involving two or more persons, to secure for himself the administrative privilege which would be secured by an outsider either by bribery or nepotism or by both of them. He awards contracts to himself, appropriates public property, uses his office facilities such as car, computer, telephone, fax, photocopy machine etc. for private (non-official) interest or job.


\textsuperscript{21} Encyclopaedia of Humanities and Social Sciences, op. cit., Vol. 18, p. 574.
There are many instances that can be cited here to illustrate the different forms of
graft. Exceeding the official budget, or over spending is eventually one aspect of
graft. Leading the lists of big spenders are generally the top leaders of the country:
King, President, Prime Minister, Ministers, high-ranking officials, etc. It is also
noticed that in some countries the official budget of the King or the President or the
Prime Minister is many times greater than the state budget. For instance, it was
reported that Nkrumah, the former Ghanaian Prime Minister had exceeded the
official budget by 200 percent.\textsuperscript{22} In defense spending, in almost all countries
especially in the Muslim world, the monetary cost is huge. What is amazing is that
only a few countries are seriously threatened, most of the others usually make an
undue fuss about defense on the basis of unrealistic assumptions. Moreover, it is
always possible to have better defense with smaller spending on defense hardware. It
is often forgotten that defense spending imposes not only monetary cost but also
other social and political costs especially the reduced well-being of the people which
usually leads to social unrest and political instability. It is true, as Chandra Muzaffar
said, that some countries would rather spend their money on weapons than on
immunizing babies.\textsuperscript{23} Muhammad Umer Chapra, as an expert in economics,
maintains that in the Muslim countries if efficiency is ensured in the use of resources,
if corruption in defense is removed, if a conciliatory policy is adopted and
unnecessary conflicts with neighboring countries are avoided, it is manageable to
have better defense with smaller spending, and thus spend huge sums on reducing
poverty, providing adequate educational institutions, hospitals, and public utilities,

\textsuperscript{22}Le Vine, Political Corruption: The Ghana Case, op. cit., p. 20.
particularly in rural areas. The waste of government funds (money and property) by the public officials is one form of graft. Alatas quoted that 11,517 pairs of leather ankle boots in good condition but no longer used by the Malaysian Army were tendered together with twenty-nine types of minor motor vehicle spares. The Ministry of Defense received only one offer for all the items that is RM120. The tender board met and decided to accept the offer. Whereas, the original cost of the 11,517 pairs of boots alone was about RM146,000. Forgetting the original cost of the twenty-nine types of motor vehicle spares, and just taking the cost of the boots, this meant that the sole bidder paid about 1.04 Sen for each pair of boots. If we include the cost of the spares, that genius of a bidder must have paid minus one sen for each of the items. It is possible that similar or even more serious cases of waste of government funds can be found everywhere especially in the developing countries. Evading government tax is another face of graft practiced by the tax officers serving as consultants and helping business firms to evade tax. This means that the tax officers are using their influence and power in the government to help business to evade tax at the expense of the government. Accordingly firms, which employ government tax officers, as consultants are virtually immune from investigation by the tax officers and if they pay taxes, the amount, usually do not reflect their earnings or income.

In the political arena, fundamental forms of graft are observed, especially where politics is more personal and less visible, hence more suitable to corrupt dealings. Unfortunately, money is at the same time an end and means, and most of

---

25 Alatas, Corruption and the Destiny of Asia, op. cit., p. 60.
the time is embezzled from the government budget, blackmailed or swindled from high ranked politicians, etc. There is a strong likelihood that elected representatives may use some of the decisions either to advance their personal fortunes or to repay their obligations to those who have sponsored and subsidized their political careers. For instance, it was reported that in Japan, nine of the fifteen Prime Ministers who held office between 1955 and 1993 were involved in corruption scandals. It is estimated that at least half of the parliament members could only have obtained their seats through the aid of illegal financing. In Spain the Prime Minister, Felipe Gonzalez, is associated with the use of secret funds to finance the assassination of supporters of the Basque Separatist movement in Spain and France and the extortion of donations to his party from business.

It has been reported by reliable resources that the US President, Bill Clinton, had used various techniques of graft such as, fraud, embezzlement, swindling, etc. before and after getting his position of power. For instance, in Arkansas, which is a state of only 4 million people, Clinton and his cronies had embezzled a US$ 65 million from savings and loans. This is in addition to his most recent scandal of "Whitewater".

The principal area in which government funds are exposed to graft practice is in the financing electoral campaigns. It is unfortunate to note in this concern that so many political scientists have neglected or treated the issue of political finance as secondary and thus have failed to contribute to the systematic analysis of corruption. It is obvious that the use of the government funds, privileges and offices in election campaigns; buying voters, financing their political activities and propaganda and the

24 Ibid.
Like, is a common practice at all levels among the ruling parties. For instance, in Thailand throughout the 1980's money politics featured prominently in electoral and party competition. Newly emerging politicians, without traditional bureaucratic connections to help them, needed money for their electoral campaigns or, more crudely, to buy votes.

It seems that the opposition between the Democrats and the Republicans in the American political system, is nominal and it is in fact a game to enthrall the masses. With their two-party monopoly of power over the American political history, both parties annihilate the genuine opposition that would cause change, by the discrimination in the formulation and administration of law or rules of behavior, and by manipulating the rest of the opposition by pressure. For instance, both the Democrats and the Republicans in Congress have voted to give themselves dozens of special privileges, everything from free airport parking to health clubs to cheap haircuts to passing laws that do not apply to them. Moreover, the strongest evidence of the self-serving agendas of the Democratic and Republican parties can be seen in their blatant efforts to span ballot access laws, to create artificial statuses to deter the way before any opposition to be given a free opportunity to compete on the merits of its ideas. This is in order for them to remain in power, and thus enjoy special privileges on the account of public interest.

There are uncountable corrupt practices, which fall under the rubric of graft. Lack of labor control, the absence of a national employment policy, costly and inefficient public projects undertaken, bulk purchases of unsuitable vehicles, machines, plants, and unnecessary furniture for offices such as expensive carpets, desks, markers, etc., poor management and inadequate control over expenditure are in graft as a form of corruption. In the context of the ordinary forms of graft, Dato' Sri Dr. Mahathir highlighted some instances; an official who is entitled to claim
reimbursement of expenditure he has incurred in the performance of his duties, claims more than he has spent. Similarly, an official who uses government funds to benefit himself, for example, by building a road to his house is guilty of graft. A student gets a scholarship for studying but uses it for other purposes is also committing graft.29

To sum up, it is necessary to stress the point that graft is a fundamental form of corruption that involves various types of corrupt practice, and can be observable in almost all countries. The abuse of power as well as embezzlement of government funds either by fraudulence or swindling are reprehensible and fall under the rubric of graft.

It is noticeable that bribery and nepotism can be used as tools and techniques in the process of graft. The most obvious area, which attracts grafters, is the public sector.

In a general conclusion, the major forms of corruption are bribery, nepotism and graft. These three forms of corruption have become common practice especially in the Third World Countries at almost all levels of officialdom. This is probably due to the fact that public office as an institution and the ethos that goes with it are not well established. In such a situation, bribery, nepotism and graft become embodied in the social fabric of society and thus nobody, individual or group, can get any goods or services except by being involved in corrupt practices. However, the level, scope and impact of these forms of corruption vary greatly from one country to another and may also vary within the same country from one place to another. It is necessary to note that bribery and nepotism always function within the network of transactions where they involve two or more parties, whereas graft usually involves only one party. In addition to this, bribery and nepotism are often combined; an official can

give a job by preference to his kinsmen, for example, but they will still have to hand over to him a part of their pay. It is difficult sometimes to distinguish bribery from the gift-giving practice.

3.2 TYPES OF CORRUPTION

The typology of corruption is by no means an important point in the agenda of systematic corruption research. Contemporary social scientists interested in corruption, unfortunately, have not given a clear and effective typology of the corrupt practices and attitude, besides the differences seen in their attempts in classifying the corrupt behaviors into categories or types. The diversity of typologies of corruption provided by the social scientists can be attributed to the differences in the intellectual potential, academic background and the specific perspective used by the researcher within a specific social context and society. Nevertheless, an attempt to present and discuss the various types of corruption suggested by some scholars is of relevance to the systematic study of corruption.

3.2.1 Extortive, Manipulative and Nepotistic Corruption

In his systematic, critical in-depth analysis of the complex phenomenon of corruption, Alatas divided the corrupt behaviors into three types: the extortive, the manipulative and the nepotistic. Exhortive corruption refers to a situation where one is forced to bribe to defend, or gain one's rights or needs. In other words, it means to compel payments by means of threat of injury to a person by officials in terms of demanding a fee bribe for services, which should be performed gratuitously.

---

or forcing a person to pay a larger fee than the law justified on a fee not due. The payer is compelled to bribe because he has no other option of defending or obtaining his rights and satisfying his needs.

**Manipulative corruption** refers to the attempt to influence decisions in one's favor in any area of life. In this situation, a person has enough knowledge, skills and potential to enable him to control or influence by unfair and illegal means or even clever decisions in his favor in any area of life.

**Nepotistic corruption** refers to nepotism, which is the appointment of relatives or friends to positions for which they are not qualified, thereby injuring the interests of the institution and those who are qualified. The obvious form of nepotistic behavior is that the official in charge of recruitment acts corruptly in favor of his kinsmen, friends, countrymen and the like. He is in fact abusing the laws, rules, regulations and ethics of his job, thus causing harm to his institution and to those who merit the job or position. In fact, and as it was discussed earlier in the forms of corruption, nepotism is not limited to giving jobs to relatives, but it also involves all kind of dealings of an official with clients or other officials on the basis of inscriptive or particularistic consideration rather than on the basis of what the laws and regulations prescribe. In addition to this, bribes can be offered and accepted voluntarily as well, and can be used as a technique of graft especially to manipulate a decision in one's favor. It seems that the typology of corruption worked out by Alatas was based on the assumption that there is no big difference between the term "form" and "type", and thus, Alatas wanted to classify the corrupt behaviors based on the manner in which they are carried out in society, with special emphasis on the
extortive and manipulative types of corruption, perhaps, because they are more harmful to the human community than nepotism.

3.2.2 Petty, Routine, Aggravated, Black, Gray and White Corruption

Heidenheimer discussed three types of corruption; petty, routine aggravated. Petty corruption refers to the bending of official rules in favor of friends. It occurs widely in all types of relationships and communities in a given society. Routine corruption refers to the act of accepting gifts by public officials for generalized good will, nepotism practices in official appointments and contract awarding, official profit from public decisions through sideline occupation and clients’ pledge of votes according to a patron’s direction. Aggravated corruption occurs very rarely and involves corrupt behaviors such as, clients needing patron intervention to get administrative due process, officials tolerating organized crime in return for bribes, officials and citizens ignoring clear proof of corruption, etc. Heidenheimer, then, evaluated those types of corruption and proposed another approach that categorizes corruption into three; black, gray and white. Black corruption designates those actions, which a majority consensus of both elite and mass opinion in a given society would condemn and would want to see punished on grounds of principle. Gray corruption indicates that some elements, usually the elite, would condemn the action, others not, and the masses may be ambiguous. In the case of white corruption, the majority of both the elite and the masses probably would not vigorously support an attempt to punish a form of corruption that they regard as tolerable or inevitable.31

Heidenheimer combines these three types of corruption with ten types of corrupt behavior as they are defined as corrupt by the Western (North American and European) administrative norms and civic behavior rules, and could be prosecuted by an able public prosecutor. The exploration of the incidence of corruption and the emphasis on the variability of societal reactions to various types of behavior from minor forms of nepotism to aggravated forms of extortion, are indeed, an interesting tendency towards finding a solution to the problem of normative evaluation, and thus colors corruption either black, gray or white. However, in reality, Heidenheimer falls into a problem itself, because it seems that his typology cannot be applicable in, at least, certain concrete situations. Furthermore, as Theobald said, terms such as “elite” “elite opinion”, “mass” and “mass opinion” are rather insubstantial and extremely difficult to identify with any degree of accuracy in a specific situation. So, despite its apparent sophistication Heidenheimer's approach does not overcome the vagueness and imprecision of terms like “public opinion”.32 Despite this, one wonders about the effectiveness of coloring the social reality rather than giving a concrete and realistic typology, and also about the typology of some corrupt activities frequently practiced in secret.

3.2.3 Primary and Secondary Corruption

With regard to the typology of corruption, O.F. Onoge argued another view in his keynote address to the Nigerian Anthropological and Sociological Association’s Conference on Corruption in 1982. Onoge proposed the notion of primary corruption and secondary corruption and stressed that this typology should be

32 Theobald, Corruption Development and Underdevelopment, op. cit., p. 7.
included in the general discussion of corruption.

Primary corruption refers to the class misappropriation of the surplus value created by the laboring majority. In other words, primary corruption designates that illegitimate appropriation practiced by a minority through the deliberate use of state power to maintain its political and economic ascendancy on the account of the majority of producers. Secondary corruption is a derivative of primary corruption. It refers to the everyday abuse of office. Onoge sees it as highly significant that it is in the ranks of those classes, which live off the producers that we find a large proportion of those who have elaborated illegitimate appropriation to a fine art.33

Although Onoge is interested primarily in Nigeria under the second republic (1979-83), his arguments have a more general application. It could be maintained that there is no grosser form of corruption than the deliberate abuse of power by a minority (elite) to enhance its own material and political position. In this case, exploitation of the majority by the minority in power is considered as the top level of corruption and is thus classified as primary.

3.2.4 Big and Little Corruption

Deleon Peter pointed out that Theodore Lowi distinguishes between two types of corruption: big corruption and little corruption. Big corruption, that contributes to the decomposition, dissolution, or disorientation of the constitution. Little corruption, that reflects or contributes to individual moral depravity.34 Lowi's typology of corrupt behavior is solely based on the consequences of corruption on the constitution and on the individual morals. This typology excludes the emphasis of

33 Ibid., p. 10.
the societal reactions to the corrupt behaviors. Moreover, the individual moral depravity caused by little corruption, as he argued, can be a contributing factor to the decomposition of the constitution. This is due to the fact that the constitution is man-made, can be amended at any time, differs from one country to another, and contains the general rules, principles and code of behavior. Besides, most of the time, especially in the Third World countries, the social reality and what the government practices are not in conformity with the constitution. Hence, the majority may perceive big corruption in a given society as little corruption, or it may not even be viewed as corruption at all. Whereas, little corruption may be perceived as big corruption or it may not be considered as corruption at all.

In conclusion, it is obvious that sociologists differ from each other in approaching the issue of the typology of corruption, and have thus put forward different proposals. Alatas proposed that corruption is either extortive or manipulator nepotistic. Meanwhile, Heidenheimer suggested black, write and gray instead of petty, routine and aggravated corruption. O.F. Onoge divided corruption into primary and secondary. Whereas, Lowi distinguished between two types of corruption: big corruption and little corruption. However, a brief survey on the literature of Transparency International\textsuperscript{15} shows that the most popular terms used to refer to the types of corruption are: black, white, gray, petty, grand, routine. Ulric Von Alemann maintained that the agenda of systematic corruption research should include the typology of corruption according to which there is low level, top level, petty, routine and aggravated corruption.\textsuperscript{16} Nevertheless, the list of typology of corruption can be extended and perhaps includes intentional and spontaneous corruption, or political

\textsuperscript{15} Transparency International is an International Organization established in 1988 in Berlin, Germany, exclusively devoted to curbing corruption and fostering transparency, accountability and integrity.

\textsuperscript{16} Alemann, Corruption in Germany: The Debate in Politics and Political Science, op. cit., p. 7.
and bureaucratic corruption. **Intentional corruption** refers to all forms of corruption practiced deliberately; which is manipulated, guided, planned and by the corrupter. **Spontaneous corruption** that happens spontaneously where an official for example, does not know that his act is corrupt due to his ignorance or inefficiency. **Political corruption** designates all those forms of the corrupt behaviors such as bribery, nepotism and graft occurring in the political sphere. **Bureaucratic corruption** refers to all forms of corrupt practices occurring in the realm of the bureaucracy by officials, or between officials and clients or between officials and officials. Indeed, these typologies of corruption are useful for the conceptual clarification and the empirical research on corruption. The scholars' views on the typology of corruption could be summarized in the following table:

## TYPOLOGY OF CORRUPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOLAR/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>TYPES OF CORRUPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syed Hussein Alatas</td>
<td>Extortive Manipulative Nepotistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold J. Heidenheimer</td>
<td>Black White Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. F. Onoge</td>
<td>Primary Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Lowi</td>
<td>Big Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency International</td>
<td>Black White Gray Petty Grand Routine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 CAUSES OF CORRUPTION

Social scientists have produced a great deal of material on the causes of corruption. However, their works were not detailed studies as such in either developed or underdeveloped societies. Moreover, they have not proposed consistent interpretations of the causes of corruption. For instance, some social scientists have limited themselves to the study of the contributing factors that have abetted the existence or the prevalence of corruption in a specific social, political, economic or bureaucratic milieu. Meanwhile, others have addressed themselves to the study of the immediate causes, which produce a specific form of corrupt behavior in a specific society. The inconsistent interpretations of the causes of corruption provided by the social scientists can be attributed to their different backgrounds and interests and also to their different intellectual capacity. Meaningful analysis of the causes of corruption requires a clear realization of the contributing factors, as well as the immediate and firsthand causes of corruption.

It should be emphasized that this is not a detailed study of the causes of corruption, but an attempt to discuss as much as possible the social scientists' views, classify them in a methodological way and find the logical link between them. Furthermore, it is important to bring out the need for a special emphasis on the sociocultural and political causes of corruption in its general sense. This is because they have been most of the time, overlooked or forgotten. Finding out the causes of corruption is, indeed, of great importance in any strategy for fighting corruption and establishing transparency, accountability and rectitude. It is generally admitted that it is very difficult to classify the causes of corruption with accuracy, or to put them on a scale of priorities. However, an attempt here is made to broadly classify them under
five (5) headings: (1) the socio-cultural, (2) the political, (3) the economic, (4) the legalistic, and (5) the bureaucratic.

3.3.1 The Socio-Cultural Causes

Corruption is not merely an individual fault, but it is a multifaceted social problem. Thus, the socio-cultural factors are important elements in its complicated matrix of causes. These factors can be clarified and classified under three (3) major headings; the civilizational level of the people, the social-economic status or the lifestyle of the people, colonialism and war.

The civilizational level of the people that leads to corrupt practices involves the intellectual standards and the moral values and practice of the people and the process of modernization. As far as the socio-cultural causes of corruption are concerned, Alatas figured out the following: (a) the weakness of religious and ethical teachings, (b) lack of education, (c) absence of environment conducive to anti-corrupt behavior, (d) radical change; whenever a value system is undergoing a radical change, corruption appears as a transitional malaise. He observed that these factors, among others, by themselves are not sufficient to explain the phenomenon.37 There is no doubt that the spread of corruption is originated in the enfeeblement of public values or misunderstanding of some values, notably freedom. For instance, in the capitalistic system morality was removed from the social life and the spirit of individualism and materialism ruled over society. Therefore, "The individual interest was declared as the highest objective, and all kinds of freedom as means for fulfilling that kind of interest. This resulted in most of the severe trials, catastrophes, tragedies

37 Alatas, Corruption and the Destiny of Asia, op. cit., p. 25.
and misfortunes that the modern world has experienced."\textsuperscript{38} Those who have adopted this individualistic-materialistic spirit, definitely, will separate themselves from the interests of society and limit themselves to the beneficial side of their material life. Thus, all means (right or wrong) and all offices or organizations including the state will be used in the service and for the sake of the individual to protect and preserve his interests. It is sad, as Chandra Muzaffar puts it, "that this attitude has become a sanctified pursuit. All what everybody cares about these days is ME, MI: MI:"\textsuperscript{39} Misunderstanding certain values is a contributing factor to corruption. For example, some people who are dominated by the materialistic-individualistic spirit may consider the interests of society (public interest) as embodied in the interests of individuals, since every individual is a social actor. This, in fact, will promote corruption and will enhance wrongdoing. This is because the human tendency to pursue self-interests exists in every area and everybody will rush to maximize profits at all costs; on the account of the moral values, rules and regulations, and the public interest.

Another example of misconception can be cited here, that is when people feel that the whole society is corrupt, and corruption becomes a way of life and no one is affected by it directly. This atmosphere is conducive for corrupt practices because everyone from the big man down to the small is out to get his, and a people who have had little in the past will take advantage of opportunities with a feeling of "why shouldn't we as long as no one gets directly hurts."\textsuperscript{40} Due to this misunderstanding or misconception, behavior that is obviously corrupt by legal norms becomes either

\textsuperscript{38} Muhammad Baqir As-Sadr. 1989. Our Philosophy, Translated by Shams C. Inati, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edn., Islamic Republic of Iran, Ansarian Publications, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{39} Muzaffar, New Straits Times, op. cit., p. 8.
condoned or not considered corrupt. Therefore, the issue of perception is very important in discussing the contributing factors to corruption. Ignorance in general and ignorance of the ever-increasing rules and regulations especially the anti-corruption legal codes, contributes to the prevalence of corruption. For instance, in Thailand it is proven that corruption is partly a consequence of the legal ignorance of the people including the officials. Lee said: "From his surveys in Thailand, Thinapan Nakata found that (1) only a small number of the officials (ranging from 5% to 41.7%) and of general citizens (ranging from 2.2% to 8.6%) could specify some of the anti-corruption legal codes, (2) less than one-half of the officials (44.3%) and only one fifth of the citizens (20.3%) believed that they know what the heaviest penalty for corruption is and (3) very few officials (7.4%) and citizens (1.4%) could rightly point out that the heaviest penalty for corrupt offences is death."

It is observable that corruption is widespread in most of the Third World societies where the rate of ignorance and illiteracy is high, and thus, people would be most likely to observe their own social norms rather than the legal and bureaucratic norms. Among the intellectual and psychological obstacles that contribute to the occurrence and prevalence of corruption is the attitude of imitation. Lee maintains that "when it appears that many people in the society are corrupt and successful, a person would naturally ask himself "why not me?" The social climate of corruption, therefore, increases one's tendency to corrupt.

Moreover, when corruption becomes more widespread, people would become more tolerant of other people's corrupt practices, thus giving rise to more

---

41 Lee, Incongruence Between Legal and Folk Norms, op. cit., p. 103.
opportunities of corruption.\footnote{Ibid., p. 105.} One's tendency to corruption is enhanced through imitating notorious corrupt individuals or groups, especially those high ranked officials or politicians. This issue was clarified by Ibn Khaldun when he maintained that the vanquished always want to imitate the victor in his distinctive characteristics, his dress, his occupation, and all his other conditions and customs, indeed in everything.

According to Ibn Khaldun the reason for the imitation is that the soul always sees perfection in the person who is superior to it and to whom it is subservient. This can be attributed either to the respect that the vanquished has for the victor or the perfection of the victor himself.\footnote{Abdurrahman Ibn Khaldun. 1967. The Muqaddimah, Translated by Franz Rosenthal, Abridged and edited by N.J. Dawood, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, p. 116.} When the attitude of imitation becomes a firm belief, corruption will be fixed in the society and will prevail sharply. This is because everybody will adopt all the corrupt practices of the victor, or any person who has authority (e.g., officials, politicians), and follow him, then co-generates and becomes conventional and will be tolerated. It should be noted that one of the influential factors in the process of imitation is the comparison of the existing condition of the "vanquished" own existing condition with that of the "victor" (those in better condition). Obviously, then the "vanquished" will realize that he does not have as much wealth, prestige and power as the corrupt "victor" does. However, in order for the "vanquished" to change his situation and reach the level of the "victor", most probably he will resort to illegal and improper means such as bribery, extortion, fraud, etc. Lee argued that this attitude generates jealousy, which in turn, motivates people to resort to illegitimate means for getting more wealth, higher prestige and
greater power, especially since the legitimate means are limited. He, therefore, maintained that a central problem of human societies in the process of modernization is the frustration of jealousy.44 Jealousy as a psycho-social disease can be considered as a contributing factor to corruption in the atmosphere of modernization. However, modernization itself, especially in the Third World context, is viewed as a cause of corruption. In this regard Monteiro said: “Modernization and urbanization also are causes of corruption. A society that goes in for a purposively initiated process of a fast rate of change has to pay a social price, the price being higher where the pace of change excludes the possibility of leisurely adjustment which is possible only in societies where change is gradual. Thus, there is a certain amount of weakening of the old system of values without its being replaced by an effective system of new values.”45 It is observable in many instances that modernization and urbanization are perceived by the normal people as physical development in cities, in terms of building the infrastructure, apartments, houses, offices and shopping centers, etc. This physical development is usually faster than the moral development. Therefore, many bad behaviors including corruption prevail in society because people will follow their social norms and stick to the old system of values.

Ibn Khaldun touched upon this matter, when he maintained that the Bedouins, who are a savage nation rooted in the desert life, once they dominate a society and live in an urban area will spread mischief and the society will be quickly ruined. This is because the Bedouins are fully accustomed to savagery and the things that cause it, they do not appreciate either the profession or the labor, they are not concerned with

44 Lee, Incongruence Between Legal and Folk Norms, op. cit., p. 95.
laws, or with deterring people from misdeeds, they care only for the property that they might take away from people and they have no interest in any thing further.\textsuperscript{46}

In this atmosphere of incongruence between physical and moral development, and between the rural and urban life, "traditional obligations to kin, tribe, village, or religious sect are so strong that they contribute to a certain amount of corruption in new nations."\textsuperscript{47} It is clear that the most influential factors leading to nepotism, favoritism and cronyism are the family, friends and group pressures.

The miserable social-economic conditions of the people, especially in a social milieu that is characterized by ignorance, weak religious belief and law morality, urge people to resort to corrupt practices. For instance, low-paid officials most likely will be involved in corruption because the salary is not sufficient to obtain their basic needs. In Thailand, for example, Thinapan Nakata observed that the "public officials may feel that their salaries do not match the socially expected costs of living; hence many of them have to raise their income by illegally manipulating the power of their offices."\textsuperscript{48} It should be emphasized that this insufficiency is produced by corruption. For example, if taxes are not properly collected because of corruption, a good government will not be able to pay its officials sufficiently. Alatas has realized this reality and reported that: "According to Admiral Sudomo, the former Minister of Manpower in the Indonesian Cabinet, the Indonesian government would be able to pay its civil servants sufficiently if taxes are properly collected."\textsuperscript{49} The other aspect of the problem (insufficiency as an effect of corruption), is that in almost all Third World Societies the increment of the civil servants salaries is not adequate to the

\textsuperscript{46} Ibn Khaldun, The Muqaddimah, op. cit., pp. 118-120.
\textsuperscript{47} Scott, Comparative Political Corruption, op. cit., p. 11.
\textsuperscript{48} Lee, Incongruence Between Legal and Folk Norms, op. cit., p. 94.
\textsuperscript{49} Alatas, Corruption and the Destiny of Asia, op. cit., p. 68.
ever-increasing cost of living. In this situation the officials have to find ways to earn extra income to satisfy their needs. An honest low-paid official may find many honest ways to solve the problem, such as, to look for a well-paid job, or urge his wife and children to work and get some income, or work overtime, or work in their free time etc. However, dishonest low-paid, an even well-paid, officials, certainly will resort to corrupt practices to get extra income. Low-paid officials get involved in corruption to survive and satisfy their basic need. Whereas, well-paid officials fall into corrupt behavior either to achieve a luxurious life and live like those who are in luxury, or to maintain their level of luxury. Finally, the insufficiency of monthly income can be attributed to the lifestyle adopted by some civil servants. These civil servants spend more than they earn and live beyond their means. This insufficiency is therefore caused by internal factors, which usually push them to corruption. The luxurious lifestyle, especially within the ruling group, is a direct cause of corruption.

Ibn Khaldun maintained that by its very nature, royal authority claims all glory for itself and goes in for luxury. Thus its prosperity and well-being grow and progress from the necessities of life to the luxurious life emerges. In this condition people get accustomed to a great number of things, their expenses become higher than their allowances and their income is not sufficient to pay for their expenditure. Furthermore, every new generation wants to surpass the preceding one in the luxurious lifestyle and pass it on to later generations. In addition to this, Ibn Khaldun argued that luxury corrupts the character because through luxury, the soul acquires diverse kinds of evil and sophisticated customs and consequently people lose the good qualities and adopt the contrary, bad qualities. This ultimately leads to
dissolution, disintegration, and death of the dynasty and society.\(^{59}\)

Alatas has made a thorough comment on Ibn Khaldun’s approach, which deserves to be mentioned in this respect. He said: “Ibn Khaldun considered the root cause of corruption to be the passion for luxurious living within the ruling group. It was to meet the cost of luxurious living that the ruling group resorted to corrupt dealings. The other causes were further effects generative of further corruption. They were the chain reactions released by corruption. The corruption of the ruling group brought about economic difficulties, and these difficulties in turn induced further corruption.”\(^{51}\) Finally, an assessment of the role-played by colonialism and war in enhancing or originating corrupt dealings will be provided.

There is an agreement among some social scientists that colonialism is a cause of corruption. However, slight dissimilarities have appeared in their attempts to address the question: how and why is colonialism a cause of corruption? For instance, Monteiro pointed out that: “colonialism is commonly blamed in developing states as the principal cause of corruption. The argument runs that because the government was carried out by aliens, citizens developed an attitude of irresponsibility and felt obliged to thwart the government in every possible way, including cheating – the cheating of foreign devils in government came to be admired as a patriotic virtue.”\(^{52}\) Meanwhile, Alatas maintained that colonialism is among the factors that have brought about corruption, because an alien government does not awaken the loyalty and devotion capable of inhibiting corruption.\(^{53}\)

---


\(^{52}\) Monteiro, Corruption: Control of Maladministration, op. cit., p. 68.

\(^{53}\) Alatas, Corruption and the Destiny of Asia, op. cit., p. 25.
However, Lee has treated the issue of colonialism as a problem of political legitimacy. He maintained that "the local people would not trust and respect the colonial regime, and would not feel guilty of having the wants and using the opportunities to violate the rules and regulations introduced by the colonial authority."\(^{54}\) It is not surprising to mention in this respect that six centuries ago, Ibn Khaldun provided a deep insight into how and why colonialism generates corruption and ruin. As it has been discussed earlier, Ibn Khaldun argued that the vanquished always wants to imitate the victor in everything, therefore, there is a possibility that colonial people could be considered as the "victors" and thus local people who are the "vanquished" would imitate them in everything including their corrupt behaviors and practices that lead to corrupt dealings. Furthermore, what is firm in Ibn Khaldun's thought is that a nation that has been defeated and has come under the rule of another nation will perish. "The reason for this may possibly be in the apathy that comes over people when they lose control of their own affairs, through enslavement, become the instrument of others and dependent upon them. Hope diminishes and weakens. The group that has lost control of its own affairs thus continues to weaken and to disintegrate until it perishes."\(^{55}\)

The fact that corruption is partly brought about by colonialism is obvious in human history. The Qur'an, as a revealed Book, confirms this historical, social and political reality when it gives a clear account on some historical events and political developments that occurred during the reign of the Prophet Solomon - Sulaiman


(p.b.u.h.) - (BC 992-952). The Queen Bilqis of Saba\(^56\) was invited by the Prophet Sulaiman to the true Faith -Religion of unity- not for worldly conquest, as most of the colonial powers do, but for the spreading of righteousness under the light of the guidance by Allah (God). The Queen Balqis consulted her council, and her council was ready to carry out her commands in all things, including fighting against any enemy in their country. Then, based on her knowledge about history and her experience as a Queen, Bilqis made a decisive statement. She said: "Kings, when they enter a country, despoil it, and make the noblest of its people its meanest Thus do they behave, but I am going to send Him a present, and (wait) to see with what (answer) return (my) ambassadors."\(^57\) The present could be taken as bribery to avoid the negative consequences of war and colonialism. It could also be taken as a present, which would probably establish better relations between the two Kingdoms. Finally, Balqis failed in her affairs and carried her people with her to submit themselves "with Sulaiman To the Lord of the Worlds"\(^58\) and she continued ruling her country.

Eventually, it should be clear that colonialism, as a cause of corruption, is partly valid for those countries that have been colonized. Moreover, history tells us that corruption may exist before colonial rule, or in the post-colonial period and may even exist in societies that have not been colonized. In this concern, Monteiro said: "but corruption in government existed long before colonial rule. More important, it continues to exist in such countries as the United States, which had colonial rule in

\(^{56}\) Saba' or Sheba was a city in Yemen, said to be 90Km far from the city of Sana' and was provided with every requisite that enabled it to attain a high degree of civilization. See: The Holy Qur'an, 27:22-23; Ali, The Holy Qur'an: Text, Translation and Commentary, op. cit., p. 943.

\(^{57}\) The Holy Qur'an, 27:34-35.

\(^{58}\) Ibid., 27:44.
1789, in France which has been independent much longer, in Thailand, Japan and other nations which have not been contaminated by foreign colonial rule.\(^{59}\)

It is also well known in human history that war is a \textbf{major} means used by colonial powers. Generally, war is a \textit{political decision} made either to defend the nation from an internal or external \textit{enemy}, or to subordinate another nation. However, social scientists observe that it \textit{provides conducive} atmosphere for corrupt dealings in both societies. Monteiro pointed out that "war would probably head the social causes of corruption. War always \textit{provides opportunities for corruption}. It also undermines moral and conventional restrictions."\(^{60}\) Obviously, it is hard for those people in societies which are involved in \textit{war to stick to honest} practices and good values, because of trouble, disorder, \textit{shortage of goods} and \textit{services}, etc. Similarly, it is hard for a government to develop \textit{honest officials} and restrain corruption in an atmosphere of war. More serious than that, corrupt behaviors usually continue to exist in some societies after war and in the post-colonial period. This is mainly because the people have become \textit{accustomed to corruption and to its irresponsible actions}.

\subsection*{3.3.2 The Political Causes}

The purpose of this section is to discuss the \textit{political factors} that produce and affect corruption. Originally, an attempt has been made to treat this issue under two major headings; the weakness of \textit{political leadership} in terms of morality, personality, knowledge etc, and the \textit{political system, which is a by-product or manipulated by corrupt politicians and guided by corrupt political philosophy.}

\footnote{\textit{Monteiro, Corruption: Control of Maladministration}, op. cit., p. 68.}
\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 65.}
In figuring out the causes of corruption, Alatas puts the quality of leadership at the top of the list of causes of corruption. He said: "Corruption has been brought about by the following factor: the absence or weakness of leadership in key positions capable of inspiring and influencing conduct mitigating corruption...if the ruler is sincere and upright, his honest officials will serve in his government and scoundrels will go into hiding, but if the ruler is not upright then evil men will have their ways and loyal men will retire to seclusion."\textsuperscript{61}

Ibn Khaldun had realized and emphasized this matter when he discussed how, "exaggerated harshness is harmful to royal authority and in most cases causes its destruction", which can be summed up that people would be upright and transparent if the ruler is kind and mild to them, and if he keeps a forceful grip on them they will hate him and become corrupted in their minds and behavior.\textsuperscript{62} It is expected that the leadership in key positions, especially the political leaders, will serve as a model of morality and rectitude, otherwise the normal officials and the ordinary peasants would perceive them as corrupt and thus, as Lee puts it, "... would consider it "legitimate" to have the wants to seek illegal opportunities for personal gains".\textsuperscript{63}

Immoral politicians struggle for power not to serve people and administer properly the political sources and institutions, but to possess wealth and its distribution, to live a luxurious life and to achieve high social status. This is because the exercise of power is regarded as a major means to enhance self, family party and class advantages and interests. Scott pointed out that "among the structural factors that encourage corruption in new states (post-colonial states) is the tremendous relative importance of government in these nations as a source of goods, services and

\textsuperscript{61} Alatas, Corruption and the Destiny of Asia, op. cit., pp. 25, 41.
\textsuperscript{63} Lee, Incongruence Between Legal and Folk Norms, op. cit., p. 102.
employment. This mentality, indeed, is not restricted to new states. Because in many instances of corruption in developed countries, the ultimate goal of corrupt politicians is to use the government to acquire wealth and power. Therefore, to look to the government as a source of goods, services and employment is quite similar in both underdeveloped and developed worlds. Love of power as an end in itself encourages politicians to attempt to gain and retain power through corrupt means.

It has been said that a former Chief Minister of Mysore, Mr. K. Hanumanthayya, told his colleagues in New Delhi on 8 August 1963 that with a few laths of Rupees he could become a Chief Minister and with a shave of Rupees he could even snatch the Prime Minister’s position. Among the destructive qualities of the politicians, that encourage corruption are greediness and ignorance. These two qualities prevent them from realizing that the sources at their disposal are a trust from the people. In the realm of politics ignorance is not considered an obstacle to holding key positions. Theobald maintained that: “there are no formal qualifications for politicians, neither are there clear-cut rules and procedures as to how they should behave once elected”. The situation would be much more serious if the politicians are not elected. Because every political position confers on its occupant access to certain political resources and there are no restraints to be endured by politicians. Ignorant leadership also paves the way to political bureaucratic corruption. For instance, “Ministers in their ignorance have to depend excessively on the administrators who take advantage of their weak position”. Weak and ignorant politicians help the growth of corruption. For example, they are not able to set up

--

64 Scott, Comparative Political Corruption, op. cit., p. 12.
65 Monteiro, Corruption: Control of Maladministration, op. cit., p. 56.
66 Theobald, Corruption: Development and Underdevelopment, op. cit., p. 4.
67 Monteiro, Corruption: Control of Maladministration, op. cit., p. 55.
criteria for judging the essential from the inessential, the productive from the wasteful use of tangible and non-tangible resources. Moreover, they are not able to set up and enforce an anti-corruption strategy.

In addition, in most of the post colonial states the political leadership took power after stressing their sacrifices in fighting against the colonial power for independence. This is what can be termed "historical legitimacy". This historical legitimacy is a contributive factor to corruption, because these politicians "have conditioned themselves to believe that their sacrifice during the struggle entitles them to all luxuries and benefits that life can offer."\(^{68}\) It is, indeed, a problem of the mental complex of political leaders.

Collusion between politicians and businessmen has been another contributive factor to corruption. The alliance between the political leaders and big businessmen takes the form of exchange of benefits whereby politicians will be paid for their services rendered to those who are controlling the nation's wealth. These services can be in the form of granting them licenses, protecting their business, shielding them against investigators, etc. Hence, this liaison between both politicians and businessmen has created an atmosphere in which big corruption prevails.\(^{69}\)

On another level of discussing the political causes of corruption, the political system stands as an influential factor that contributes to the emergence and growth of corruption. For instance, on the one hand democracy in its simple meaning is that the majority governs the minority in their vital interests and affairs. This means that the majority has the prerogative to lay down the system and its laws and policies as well as its management in line with its own welfare. In this situation it is assumed that the

\(^{68}\) ibid.

\(^{69}\) For more details see: Girling, Corruption, Capitalism and Democracy, op. cit., pp. 42-72.
ruling group that represents the majority seizes the reigns of power and legislation and adopts corrupt attitudes. What then would be the response of the minority and the opposition? It is not debatable that in many instances the minority, which its welfare and rights have been neglected and manipulated by the majority, most probably, will tend to adopt corrupt dealings to fulfill its needs and enhance its personal interests. The minority may also be involved in corrupt affairs, particularly the embezzlement and the waste of governmental funds, which can be viewed as a “cold reaction” to the injustice of the majority. It is, therefore, observed that under the democratic political system, the majority and its elite resort to corrupt dealings to protect their interests and promote themselves, because they are processing power and controlling the sources of wealth and prestige. However, the minority tends to resort to corrupt affairs to satisfy its desires and to fight back against the unjust majority. On the other hand, the democratic system can be summarized in the respect of political and economic freedom, freedom of belief and expression and individual freedom.

This means that every individual has the full freedom to pursue any approach and to take up any path for acquiring, enhancing and multiplying his wealth in line with his personal interests and benefits by legal as well as illegal means. The problem, then, with the democratic system is that it has unlimited confidence in the individual and it also seeks to protect his personal interests. However, the moral values and the interests of society, including the interests of the minority and the opposition in various areas, have been ignored or misperceived.

In a monarchical system, corruption is enhanced too. For instance, it is said that: “in a monarchy corruption satisfies the needs of the leading classes through the intermediary of officials who were themselves members of the social elite, thereby
producing the desired effects, both monetary and political. In order to satisfy their needs the leading elite appropriate government institutions. For this reason corruption was eminently subversive.  

Besides this, many social scientists have the idea that in both democratic and monarchial systems "corruption flourishes when the bureaucracy is strongly infiltrated by political appointments and political considerations." Yet, one may think that absolute mastery or dictatorship systems may be corruption-free and hence better than the democratic and the monarchial systems. Indeed, absolute mastership over people is among the most significant causes in the development of corruption as well as other bad behaviors and deeds. Ibn Khaldun pointed out that: "if the ruler uses force and is ready to mete out punishment and eager to expose the faults of people and to count their sins, his subjects (the peoples) become fearful and depressed and seek to protect themselves against him through lies, ruses and deceit. This is becoming a character trait of theirs. Therefore, their mind and character became corrupted." Ibn Khaldun’s thesis seems to be strong because it is based on his historical investigations on the human societies and his own experience because he held numerous political and judicial positions. His thesis is also still valid because up till now corruption can better flourish and develop most rapidly in societies that are ruled by dictators and absolute masters.

In connection with the above analysis, the illegitimacy of the political leadership or the government is a significant cause of corruption. People resort to corrupt dealings, (a) when the ruling group comes to power through illegitimate means, such as a coup, falsification of elections, etc., (b) when the government does

---
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not consult them, (c) when the government is not accountable to them, (d) when people are not equal before the law and justice is manipulated, (e) when the people’s rights and interests are neglected, (f) when the government adopts double standards as regards the Ministers and officials for instance “if there is inquiry usually the Ministers are excluded meanwhile many of them are of favoring relatives with licenses, quotas and easy loans... even if the Ministers are not themselves guilty they know who are guilty and shield them.”

These are some significant criteria of illegitimacy of the government and the ruling elite that have helped the growth of corruption.

Associated with the problem of illegitimacy, the absence of some political institutions, appropriate policies and sincere anti-corruption strategies have further helped corruption to prevail over people’s behavior. For example, “the absence of regular machinery to investigate charges of corruption against Ministers has further encouraged the growth of corruption.” In addition to this, “special anti-corruption bodies may have been turned into partisan instruments whose real purpose is not to detect fraud and corruption but to harm political opponents. The watchdog institutions that should scrutinize government performance, such as ombudsmen, external auditors, and the press may be ineffectual. In some countries the reason may be weak public management systems and inappropriate policies.” The absence of an indigenous development philosophy worked out with sensitivity to the country’s own resources and values, the existing confusion and conflict in policies, the absence of an elected parliament and a free press are the basic contributive factors to
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corruption in Muslim societies, as Chapra pointed out.\textsuperscript{76}

Another contributive political factor to the emergence and growth of corruption is the influence of the government. Alatas has a convincing thesis that government has a strong influence on the spread of corruption, and hence, considered the following factors as potentially contributive to corruption in government activities. He said:

"As regards the influence of government on the spread of corruption, the following factors are clearly contributive: (a) when government lets huge contracts containing terms which can bring fortunes to contractors, (b) when it collects very large sums of taxes hence offering temptation for bribes in exchange for tax reduction, (c) when it fixes rates for certain industries such as railroads, electricity and gas, as well as prices for a wide range of commodities, (d) when it exercises power to select who shall or shall not enter into an industry, as in the case of radio, television, interstate trucking and aviation in the United States, (e) when it grants loans or permits for plants or equipment to be redeemed out of taxes over a short period of time, (f) when government subsidies are paid either openly or covertly."\textsuperscript{77}

As a final discussion in this respect, it should be emphasized that: "political parties (including the ruling party) seeking funds to finance ever more costly electoral campaigns are one example of such collusive practice, which is potential for corruption."\textsuperscript{78} Political parties generate funds through illegal means, spend them in buying voters, state officials and legislators. What encourages them to resort to these types of corrupt dealings is a love of power and wealth, which in turn enables them to pay off all money and effort spent in the process leading to power.

\textsuperscript{76} Chapra, Islam and the Economic Challenge, op. cit., p. 288.
\textsuperscript{77} Alatas, Corruption and the Destiny of Asia, op. cit., pp. 34-35.
\textsuperscript{78} Girling, Corruption, Capitalism and Democracy, op. cit., p. 7.
3.3.3 The Economic Causes

The economic factors, which contribute to corruption and increase its severity, are mainly the economic behavior of the people and the economic system. With regard to the economic behavior of the people, a love of wealth is the most significant contributing factor to corruption. People have different perceptions of the term "wealth". For instance, "to some people wealth is just about being able to buy things, or, having enough money and enough time to do what you want when you want."79 It is generally admitted that wealth is a means of happiness, independence and freedom. However, the purpose of wealth, the ways of acquiring wealth and the use of wealth differ from one person to another and from one economic system to another. Unfortunately, in many instances, the purpose of wealth is power and domination over the poor, or other nations. The ways of acquiring wealth are unlawful and contrary to humanity; bribery, swindling, extortion, etc. The ways wealth should be spent are also corruptible, such as giving bribes, buying voters during an election, inciting people or rebellious groups to fight against the government or against each other, using wealth in exploiting laborers to promote their social status and to enrich themselves etc.

It is also observable that if the conception of true wealth is wrong or corrupted the ways of acquiring and spending it are also unsound. Chapra argued that: "corruption in the literal and the figurative sense can flourish where the making of money becomes the primary aspiration, the dominant criterion of success".80 Levine has a similar view to the above when he said: "it is unfortunate and pathetic that the love of money has become an obsession with some of us, and drives us to

any length to get rich quick without stopping to think of the consequences. So long as we can get the money we do not care whether or not our country is plunged into bankruptcy.  \(^{81}\)

Muzaffar also pointed out that: “economically, there is a rush to maximize profits at all costs. Multi-million-dollar corporations dump toxic wastes into our rivers because it is cheaper than eradicating them in an environmental-friendly way”. \(^{82}\) Ultimately, the love of money and wealth is rooted in self-love and self-interest. It is convincing that when “self-interest becomes a glorified occupation, lines between what is right and what is wrong become so blurred”. \(^{83}\)

Tax evasion is also regarded as an economic behavior that generates corruption, because “these persons who indulge in evasion and avoidance of taxes, accumulate large amounts of unaccounted money by various methods, such as suppressing profits by manipulation of accounts to avoid taxes and other legitimate claims on profits”. \(^{84}\) Tax evasion certainly affects the government budget and the necessary expenditure. Therefore, it is natural that the government imposes more taxes on the honest taxpayers and gets loans to meet the expenditure to which it is already committed. Thus a great deal of corruption will prevail. For instance, “the tax evaders may invest the evaded tax money in loans and collect interest thereon from the honest tax-payers... it amounts to penalizing honesty and rewarding dishonesty. It brings government into disrepute, all this is encouraged because of unrealistic tax rates and wide abuse of discretion by tax officials”. \(^{85}\) Tax evaders usually resort to corrupt affairs to avoid taxes, such as giving bribes to tax officers, either to reduce

\(^{82}\) Muzaffar, New Straights Times, op. cit., p. 8.
\(^{83}\) Ibid.
\(^{84}\) Monteiro, Corruption: Control of Maladministration, op. cit., p. 63.
\(^{85}\) Ibid., pp. 60-61.
due taxes or to avoid them, and appointing retired tax officials, because they know how to manipulate the account, income and cheat the government, and they may also use their nepotistic network. In this situation corruption generates further corruption, and “the motivation to remain honest may be further weakened if senior officials and political leaders use public office for private gain or if those who resist corruption lack protection.”\textsuperscript{86} The capitalistic group that has the upper hand in the economy of the nation, and a strong influence on the political group, usually exercises its power in order to exploit people for its own welfare and for the pursuit of its aims at all costs including corruption. This is to show that group economic behavior is also a contributive factor to the development of corruption. The capitalistic group as an example of approaching the economic cause of corruption is not intended to exclude others but is merely illustrative.

The economic system can corrupt people as much as they adopt its formula. For example, the capitalistic system enhances self-love, which is the most general and the oldest instinct that all other instincts are connected to it. Self-love means that human beings have “their love of pleasure and happiness for themselves.”\textsuperscript{87} The economic system usually identifies the ways and means by which man can earn his living and satisfy his needs therefore, if the system is corrupted for sure it will drive people to corrupt dealings. As-Sadr argued, both the capitalist and the communist systems have generated the materialistic notions of life, which is the origin of all danger for mankind including corruption. He said: “The capitalistic group controls the wealth of the nation and manages this wealth with its own materialistic mentality.

\textsuperscript{87} As-Sadr, Our Philosophy, op. cit., p. 21.
Similarly, when the state nationalizes the whole wealth and eliminates private ownership the wealth of the nation is handed to the same state organization which consists of a group adopting the same materialistic notions of life... thus all the danger for mankind lies in these materialistic notions and in the standards of goals and actions that proceed from these notions". 88 In both economic systems, people resort to corruption because of exploitation, injustice, neglect of their rights by rulers including those who are controlling the wealth, to satisfy their needs, etc. Thus in the individual lives the feeling prevails that everybody is responsible for himself alone and that everyone is endangered by any interests of others that may clash with his. Then everybody will find out a way by which his self-interests can be realized, and of course not all means are honest. What should be highlighted here, is that in the private sector big corruption is encouraged. The World Bank pointed out that corruption could be found in all forms of private sector activities. 89

Import and export of goods and services can be an illustrative example where corrupt dealings are increased. For example, in many developing countries essential as well as inessential national needs have been fulfilled by “high import tariffs and stiff exchange controls, which lead to smuggling, under-invoicing and corruption.” 90 Chapra maintained that these exchange controls have been largely ineffective thus generating dual market and black market exchange rates, which in turn, have encouraged imports and discouraged exports, thus worsening the external balance distorting resource allocation and depressing the rate of economic growth. Chapra then concludes that these economic activities; export import, developing countries
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have only succeeded in promoting corruption and inefficiency and aggravated injustice, whereby, consumers, importers and exporters are affected.\textsuperscript{91}

People's economic behavior and the economic system, as evidence has indicated, largely contribute to the emergence and development of corruption especially, bribery, extortion, and the embezzlement of government funds. Furthermore, these two factors are interrelated and it seems difficult to identify which factor is the most significant in the development of corruption.

3.3.4 The Legalistic Causes

In many respects, the emergence and growth of corruption can be attributed to the legal systems and legislations, law enforcement and the legal ignorance of the people. The legal systems and legislations for combating corruption in many countries deemed to be inefficient. However, in other countries they can act as a deterrent but they will never totally prevent corrupt dealings. Therefore, dishonest and corrupt individuals and groups become involved in corruption. Because, they will always benefit from the weaknesses of the legal systems and find loopholes to exploit. This is probably what has urged Alatas to emphasize the absence of severe punitive measures as a significant factor that has brought about corruption.\textsuperscript{92} On 20 July 1998, a public opinion poll on the attitudes of Italian citizens concerning corruption showed that 76.2% of the population did not feel that the State is adequately protecting their citizens from this danger. It means that the legislation is

\textsuperscript{91} ibid., pp. 305-306
\textsuperscript{92} Alatas, Corruption and the Destiny of Asia, op. cit., p. 25.
inefficient and the demand for proper legality is high.\textsuperscript{93}

Associated with the problem of inefficiency, rigid legislation will also encourage corrupt dealings, whereby ingenious corrupters are willing enough to manipulate the systems. Hence, flexibility in legislation to combat corruption is needed especially since corrupt acts are very difficult to prove and thus it is not easy to prosecute rather than to punish. For instance, Fennell argued that the Local Government, Planning and Land Act 1980 S.91 has provided wider scope and opportunities for corrupt activities, because it gave wide powers to local authorities to acquire compulsorily any land which is in their area and which is suitable for development or re-development. Moreover, many local authorities have acquired lands compulsorily in city centers for the purpose of erecting large shopping and entertainment complexes. The construction of such developments was farmed out to private building companies.\textsuperscript{94} Many scholars are of the view that one of the most important structural factors leading to corruption, are the legislators themselves. Sometimes, they are not capable of considering whether the legislations are congruent with social norms or whether the government has the capacity and the resources to implement them or not.\textsuperscript{95} Monteiro maintained that legislative extravagance is another root of corruption, because it is observed that: the more the laws the greater opportunities for making easy money. Furthermore, it is felt by eminent psychologists that too many controls on a person's behavior and movements


\textsuperscript{94} Phil Fennell. Local Government Corruption in England and Wales, in Michael Clarke (ed.). 1983. Corruption: Causes, Consequences and Control, United Kingdom, Frances Pinter Publishers Ltd., p. 17

often lead to adverse reactions. Then, the people have come to believe that laws are made to be broken, and hence this general attitude has been to flout as many laws as they can.

Besides, the existence of corruption is closely linked with the power of the legislators who are generally guided by their party affiliations rather than by virtue of being elected representatives of the people.96 Doctrinaire attempts to regulate public morals and curb corruption can be a contributive factor to the growth of corrupt dealings. For example, it is said that: "in many respects, the emergence of immorality in American politics reflected the failure of the framers of the constitution to construct governmental institutions that would eliminate or minimize corruptions."97 It is also observable that some conditions created by the parliament in the field of planning law can be one of the most important factors leading to corruption. For instance, Fennell reported that among the factors leading to corruption in the urban and housing development during the early 1970's is when the British Parliament "have put greater strain on a system of locally elected councils whose members may enter public life with little preparation and may find themselves handling matters on a financial scale quite beyond their experience in private life."98

Law enforcement and the legal ignorance of the people are also contributive factors to the emergence and development of corruption. It is generally admitted that if the law is not enforced or is applied in a partisan way whereby, for example, law enforcers are only concerned about nabbing those who accept or give small amounts of money as a bribe and let those accepting millions get off scot-free. This will definitely enhance big and black corruption and paves the way for the prevalence of

96 Monteiro, Corruption: Control of Maladministration, op. cit., pp. 59, 64.
97 Berg et. al., Corruption in the American Political System, op. cit., p. 12.
98 Fennell, Local Government Corruption in England and Wales, op. cit., p. 16.
informal rules. Much worse than this, the World Bank states that some countries do not have the right anti-corruption legal rules to be enforced. In this condition people will be kept away from any legal knowledge about the nature of corrupt acts and subsequently be unaware about their penalties.

Corruption may result from the legal ignorance of the people. For instance, in Thailand, Nakata found out that citizens ranging from 2.2% to 8.6% could specify some of the anti-corruption legal codes, and only 1.4% of them could rightly point out that the heaviest penalty for corrupt offences is death. Nakata concluded that corruption is partly a consequence of legal ignorance.

3.3.5 The Bureaucratic Causes

To understand the bureaucratic causes of corruption, one has to examine the various aspects of bureaucracy that have brought about corruption. Among the direct causes of corruption is administrative delay. In many bureaucracies officers resort to the deliberate delay in the movement of applications and files aiming to extort their clients. In order for the clients to expedite the process of their papers and get what they want, they pay bribes, which are in this context called "speed money." "Speed money" has become one of the major causes of administrative delays. Myrdal pointed out that "administrative delay is deliberately continued so as to obtain some kind of illicit gratification...this custom of speed money has become one of the most serious causes of delay and inefficiency."101
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Poor management, weak systems and inefficient policies are also contributive factors to bureaucratic corruption. For instance, Le Vine maintained that the lack of labor control, unproductive projects undertaken, bulk purchases of unsuitable vehicles and plant and machinery, poor management, inadequate control over expenditure and inefficient accounting system were among the factors, which contributed to loss and corruption. The World Bank considered weak public management systems and inappropriate policies among the causes of corruption that deserve help to be improved. Besides this, inefficient policies as a cause of corruption can be illustrated by Chapra’s statement, whereby he pointed out that bureaucratic corruption springs from the heavy reliance of governments on controls to realize their objectives rather than on moral reform and the creation of a proper enabling environment. Controls are an inevitable source of corruption. Corruption tends to flourish when there are "inadequate controls in areas which are susceptible to corruption, lack of explicit standards of performance for employees and organizational units, poor recruitment and selection procedures for personnel, too much red-tape in government procedures, inability of organizations to provide adequate service to meet the volume of demand, poor working conditions and facilities in public offices, and lack of information made available to the public."

The impact of corrupt society on bureaucracy is seen as one of the reasons for the continued existence of corruption. In a corrupt society people are judged by what they have rather than what they are. This what has urged some people to acquire
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money and material goods irrespective of the means being adopted. The other facet of this problem is that corruption is the consequence of the way of life adopted by the officials. Monteiro observed that: "higher government officials and their wives live beyond their means because the wives are eternally competing with each other in trying to be more fashionable than the other. To a great extent wives are the causes of corrupt practices."106 Associated with this problem, especially in developing countries, the lifestyle of the people is not adequate for the bureaucratic rules and regulations. This is because of various reasons, among which the rules and regulations are "so idealistic that they are not compatible with the existing reality."107 This incongruence between the bureaucratic rules and social norms can be attributed either to the ignorance and inefficiency of legislators, or to the nature and origin of these rules and regulations: born in advanced countries and introduced to developing countries without observing the social, economic and political differences. Moreover, in many instances in traditional societies people are more likely to observe social norms rather than legal and bureaucratic rules. This can be seen clearly in the form of nepotism and cronyism. In such conditions it seems hard to find a leadership that can serve as a role model for integrity and transparency, it is also hard to develop honest officials. This is due to the fact that "the motivation to remain honest may be further weakened if senior officials and political leaders use public office for private gain if those who resist corruption lack protection."108 Yet, it is obvious that "corruption in a bureaucracy reflects the total society"109, and the potential for bureaucratic
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corruption lies in many factors particularly the misuse of the discretionary power and authority by the civil servants in both developed and developing countries.

In conclusion, the above analysis, lengthy as it is, was an attempt to identify the multiple causes of corruption in its general sense. Despite the difficulties in figuring out the different causes of corruption and classifying them with accuracy or putting them in a scale of priorities, the researcher has not resigned himself to this fate but has shown that single factor explanations of corruption tend to be inadequate. Therefore, it is generally admitted that corruption spreads and develops not simply from one factor or dimension, but rather from a complex matrix of causes. The above analysis has shown that social, cultural, political, economic, legalistic and bureaucratic factors are the major causes of corruption, but this list cannot obviously be exhaustive and may not also be sufficient to explain the phenomenon. Although these causes vary greatly from one society to another, and may also vary within the same society from one case to another, are not intended to exclude others, but merely the most significant and illustrative that may effectively help control corruption and drive back its dangers.