INTRODUCTION

Corruption is an universal phenomenon. It is not something new either. Corruption in one form or another existed since time immemorial. A review of penal codes utilized in various ancient civilizations clearly demonstrate that bribery was a serious problem among the Jews, the Chinese, the Japanese, the Greeks, the Romans as well as the Aztees of the New World (Thakur, 1979:7). In ancient India large-scale corruption dominated public life (Thakur, 1979:12). As has been observed "corruption prevailed on a larger scale in India during the ancient period and the ones that followed" (Padhay 1986:26). From this one can assume the nature and scale in the increase of corruption from medieval to the present time in the countries of the Indian sub-continent. One of the greatest evils of medieval administration in India was the extortion of perquisites and presents (Sarkar, 1935:83). Corruption was evident during the British rule in India. There was almost regular and systematic corruption involving almost all officials at different levels in the political and administrative hierarchy. There was an underlying belief among officials of "making hay while the sun of British Raj shone" (Dwivedi and Bhargava, 1967:7).

PRESENT CONCERN WITH CORRUPTION

"If corruption has been an age-old phenomenon, deep-rooted evil and an universal malady afflicting each and every society in one form or another at one time or another" (Padhay 1986:1), then why there is so much concern at the present time with
corruption. The reasons are obvious. Pope of Transparency International provides the raison d'etre for this concern.

"Corruption at the highest levels distorts competition so denying the public access to the competitive marketplace. It induces wrong decisions resulting in: wrong projects, wrong prices, wrong contractors, substandard delivery to recoup overpricing, promotes corruption at lower levels and eroded public confidence in leaders. At lower levels, petty corruptions are damaging because they add to transaction costs, exclude those who cannot pay, foster contempt for public servants amongst public and erode capacity for revenue collection" (Pope, 1996:23).

There are still other reasons as to why now corruption is receiving serious attention. First, "there is a widespread perception that the level and pervasiveness of corruption is not only much greater but may well be increasing" (Harris-White, and White 1996:1). Harris-White and White state that both political and administrative corruption is doggedly entrenched in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia and very much part of newly-industrialized countries (NICs) of South East Asia, has touched the very highest levels of political office in many Latin American countries and has quickly reached alarming proportions in the post-communist transitional countries including the former Soviet Union and China (1996:1). Second, developments in the 1980s and 1990s against the backdrop of increasing economic liberalization, third wave of democratization and floating of good governance agenda have heightened expectations that an effective and root-and-branch cure of corruption may be found (Harris-White and White, 1996:2). Third, the coming into prominence of such concepts as decentralization, accountability and transparency, human rights, rule of law and sustainable development have considerably influenced efforts to minimize political and administrative corruption in many countries.

DEFINING CORRUPTION

Defining corruption is also important in the context of global efforts to reduce its influence in public life. But that is not an easy task. Corruption is a social, legal, economic and political concept enmeshed in ambiguity and consequently encouraging controversy. The ambiguity and controversy result from the fact that a number of competing approaches to understanding corruption is available. Naturally, definitions of corruption focus on one of several aspects of the phenomenon. Various approaches to corruption can be placed into five groups. These are public-interest-centered, market-centered, public-office-centered, public-opinion-centered and legalistic. Proponents of the public-interest-centered approach believe that corruption is in some way injurious to or destructive of public interest (Rogow and Laswell, 1970:54). Market-centered enthusiasts suggest that norms governing public office have shifted from a mandatory pricing model to a free-market model, thereby considerably changing the nature of corruption (Tilman, 1970:62-64). Public-office-centered protagonists stress the fact that misuse by incumbents of public office for private gain is corruption (Theobald, 1990:2). Those who believe in public-opinion-centered
definitions of corruption emphasize the perspectives of public opinion about the conduct of politicians, government and probity of public servants (Leys, 1970:31-37). Others have suggested looking at corruption purely in terms of legal criteria in view of the problems inherent in determining rules and norms which govern public interest, behaviour and authority (Scott, 1972).

The five approaches, as discussed above, have concentrated on the nature of corruption. Though the approaches throw some light they do not clarify the meaning of corruption to any satisfaction. Now there are four divergent views on the definition of corruption. The definitions have come from moralists, functionalists, social censurists and social constructionist realists.

The moralists view "corruption as an immoral and unethical phenomenon that contains a set of moral aberrations from moral standards of society, causing loss of respect for and confidence in duly constituted authority" (Gould, 1991:468). One of the well-known proponents of this view, Nye, portrays corruption as "a behaviour that deviates from the formal duties of a public role (elective or appointive) because of private-regarding (personal, close family, private clique) wealth or status gains, or violates rules against the exercise of certain types of private-regarding influence" (Nye, 1997:417). But this way of defining corruption suffers from a number of limitations. It tends to individualize a societal phenomenon and attempts to dichotomize as to what is good and what is bad. In the process societal contexts are ignored and the gap between formal norms and the underlying practice-girded norms are not analysed (Caiden and Caiden, 1977).

The functionalists usually look at corruption in terms of the actual function that it plays in socio-economic development. Claims are made by functionalists that corruption flourishes as a substitute for the market system; offers an acceptable alternative to violence; increases public participation in public policy (Leff, 1979; Gould, 1980). Some functionalists believe that political and bureaucratic leaders may see a national interest in actively pursuing or tolerating a certain degree of administrative corruption (Klitgaard, 1988). The major criticisms against functionalists are that they ignore the political significance of deviance and lack any consideration of power, interest and social structure in their analyses and at the same time the whole question of the origins of corruption is not considered (Lo, 1993:3).

The two comparatively recent perspectives, i.e., social censure and social construction reality, view corruption radically differently from the other two approaches, i.e. moralists and functionalists. Both the approaches tend to look at corruption from a broad societal perspective. The proponents of social censure believe that in understanding corruption one should take into consideration the capacity of the state to produce a particular form of social relations and shift the theoretical emphasis to the interplay of law, ideologies and political economy (Lo, 1993:5). On the other hand, social construction reality views corruption as problematic and the actors involved can be studied by relating them to contextual information on their social positions, interests and stakes in the system as well as on the political, economic and social conditions within which they function (Pavorala, 1996:25).
In view of the multitude of approaches and views on corruption it is not easy to agree on an unanimous definition of the term. Two definitions of corruption can prove handy. The shorter definition of corruption includes "abuse of authority, bribery, favouritism, extortion, fraud, patronage, theft, deceit, malfeasance and illegality" (Caiden, 1991a). The broader definition of corruption refers to "use of one’s official position for personal and group gain and that includes unethical actions like bribery, nepotism, patronage, conflict of interest, divided loyalty, influence-peddling, moonlighting, misuse or stealing of government property, selling of favours, receiving kickbacks, embezzlement, fraud, extortion, misappropriation, under- or over-invoicing, court tempering, phony travel and administrative documents and use of regulation as bureaucratic capital (AAPAM, 1991). In conformity with these two definitions of corruption the following definitions of political corruption and administrative corruption are adopted here. Political corruption is "the behaviour of (elected) public officials which diverges from the formal components - the duties and powers, rights and obligations - of a public role to seek private gain" (Kramer, 1997). Administrative corruption is defined as "the institutionalized personal abuse of public resources by civil servants" (Gould, 1991). In both cases public officials (elected and appointive) can convert public office into private gain in many ways.

LITERATURE SURVEY

This section contains a review of important facets of corruption from both conceptual and comparative perspective. The discussion have follows logically from what has been presented in the introductory section. Here the focus is on a number of important yet interrelated aspects of corruption. So, there remains a possibility of overlap in the discussions that follow in this section.

CAUSES OF CORRUPTION

Corruption is a phenomenon that takes place due to the presence of a number of factors. An understanding of such factors requires, among other things, a kind of general framework for a clearer understanding of the causes of corruption, especially from a broader perspective.

Genesis of corruption can be explained by looking at three levels - international, national and individual institutional levels (Goudie and Strange, 1997). Competitiveness of international markets provides multinational companies of various sizes with an incentive to offer bribes to gain an advantage over competitors. At the national level basic development strategy of any government moulds opportunities and incentives for corruption. At the same level three relationships - between the government and the civil service, between the government and the judiciary and between the government and the civil society - also affect the nature and discussions of corruption. Three areas of government activity - customs administration, business regulation and management of foreign aid - act as sources of corruption at the level of individual institutions.

Corruption also results from the presence of a number of factors. These include: rapid economic and social change, strong kinship and ethnic ties, new institutions, overlapping and sometimes conflicting views about what is proper public behaviour, governmental monopoly over economic activities, political softness, widespread
poverty and socio-economic inequalities, ignorance, lack of knowledge about individual entitlements, communal bonds, ambivalence towards legitimacy of governmental organizations, asymmetric relationship favouring those in control of state power, economic shortages in which public officials assume extraordinary control over scarce goods and services, greed, patronage and systematic maladministration (Gould and Amar-Reyes, 1985; United Nations, 1990). Most of the above-mentioned factors contributing to corruption can be categorized into "six-fold typology". This typology contains ideological, external, economic, political, socio-cultural and technological variables (Caiden, 1991a).

Some of the major reasons as to why people "collude in different ways, rationalise corrupt practices and tolerate corruption in a large scale" are because of the presence of number of factors. These are: governments act as monopolies in many respects, discretion that government and its monopolistic public agencies enjoy in their decision making and allocative roles, lack of effective accountability in government except in the nominal sense of presenting annual audited accounts and reports to parliament or answering questions in the parliament, citizens have limited information about the rules of the game and the standards of service they can expect from public agencies, and exposure of the average citizen to corruption in the public sector tends to be episodic (Paul, 1997a:1350-1351).

**FORMS OF CORRUPTION**

Corruption takes many forms. These forms are: acceptance of money and other rewards for awarding contracts, violation of procedures to advance personal interests, kickbacks from developmental programmes or multi-national corporations, pay-offs for legislative support, diversion of public resources for private use, overlooking illegal activities, intervening in the justice process, nepotism, common theft, overpricing, establishing non-existing projects and tax collection and tax assessment frauds (UN, 1990).

These many varieties of corruption can be categorized further in terms of their nature. Corruption can be foreign-sponsored, institutionalized, outcome of political scandal and administrative malfeasance (Caiden, 1988). In foreign-sponsored corruption the main actors are public officials, politicians, representatives of donor and recipient countries. Bureaucratic elites, politicians, businessmen and middlemen are responsible for political scandal. Corruption becomes institutionalized as a result of the support provided by bureaucratic elites, politicians, businessmen and white-collar workers. In administrative malfeasance petty officials and interested individuals play major role.

Corruption has been differentiated into three types - collusive, coercive and non-conjunctive (Arora, 1993). In collusive corruption the corruptees themselves are willing and active participants in the process and use of corruption as an instrument for inducing wrong action or inaction on the part of authorities, deriving benefit greater than the costs of corruption on their part. Corruption is forced upon the corruptee by those in the position of power and authority in coercive corruption. In non-conjunctive corruption benefits are obtained at someone else’s cost and victims are unaware of their victimization. Five major strategies - mystification, distancing,
COSTS OF CORRUPTION

Corruption is not cost-neutral. There have been claims that not everything is bad about corruption. Its effects can be positive too. Corruption, among other things, assists in capital formation; fosters entrepreneurial abilities, allows business interest to penetrate bureaucracy and permits the logic of market to insinuate itself into transactions from which public controls exclude it (Theobald, 1990). But overwhelming evidence in recent decades suggests that the impact of corruption has been and continues to be negative on all fronts. Corruption has a negative, deleterious and devastating influence on investment and economic growth, administrative performance and efficiency and political development. Continuance of corruption in a country leads to economic malaise and squandering of public resources, lowers governmental performance, adversely affects general morale in the public service, jeopardizes administrative reform efforts and accountability measures, and perpetuates social and economic inequalities (UN, 1990). Corruption reinforces political instability and underdevelopment (Ouma, 1991). In short, corruption impedes economic growth, stifles entrepreneurialism, misuses scarce national resources, weakens administrative capacity, contributes to serious political decay and undermines stability, democracy and national integration (Theobald, 1990).

CHECKING CORRUPTION

Checking corruption is no easy task. Still no one denies the need to check corruption effectively. It may not be possible to eradicate corruption completely but then vigorous and determined actions will go a long way to minimize it. The measures suggested are too many and defy any easy characterization. To contain and minimize corruption a number of measures have been recommended. These include: driving out corruption by means of usually one-off purges or campaigns, setting up of anti-corruption boards, commissions and the like, campaign for moral regeneration or moral re-armament, strengthening of checks on abuse of power and the enhancement of accountability of the powerful as well as public officials, ensuring transparency and openness in governmental activities, develop positive social attitudes, enforcing a code of public ethics, supporting the role of media, improving educational procedures (Theobald, 1990; UN, 1990).

To reduce corruption drastically, a number of fundamental changes must be brought about. These include: reducing the opportunities for corrupt transactions by cutting back the state’s activities; emergence of new centres of power outside the bureaucracy; development of competitive party politics; ascendance of universalistic norms; effectuation of far-reaching administrative reform measures affecting policy, institutional and process levels; strengthening of preventive structures and tightening of prosecuting techniques (Theobald, 1990; UN, 1990).

What is important about checking corruption is that to be successful one must take into consideration both short-term and long-term views combating corruption.

COUNTRY EXPERIENCES
The experiences of a number of countries pertaining to corruption is reviewed in this sub-section. Cross-country survey covers nature, scope, type of corruption as well as the measures taken to curb corruption and outcome of such efforts. But it needs to be stated that not all aspects of corruption have been covered in the countries concerned due mostly to the non-availability of information.

In the Philippines the network of corruption in the public sector is rather extensive and covers petty fixers, workers at lower levels of the organizational hierarchy to mid-level officials taking undue advantage of their positions, and extending to the elite whose profit from corruption transactions with government runs into millions of pesos but whose powerful positions render them almost untouchable by the law enforcement agencies ( Alfiler, 1979). Six types of corruption in the public sector of the Philippines have been identified (Carino and Guzman, 1979). These are: tong, lagay or arreglo, retainer, favor, individualized and systematic corruption. Anti-graft and investigatory agencies appointed by a number of Filipino Presidents failed to effectively check corruption due to organizational instability, frequent changes in leadership, political pressure in employee recruitment, public apathy and strained relations with other branches and agencies of the government (Alfiler, 1979).

In Uganda corruption is the outcome of self-aggrandizement, of unrealistically low remuneration for public servants and a closed political system (Ouma, 1991). Corruption has resulted in the loss of badly needed revenue and skilled manpower, distorted priorities of public policy and shifted scarce resources away from the public interest (Ouma, 1991). Naturally, distrust among different segment of the society has increased and despondency of the people-at-large has been exacerbated.

In Ghana the way corruption has been institutionalized in the government is fascinating. In one ministry bribe money is divided in the following manner: 50% to the minister, 20% to the junior ministers, 10% to go-between, 10% to the secretary of the political party in power and the rest to an open cash fund kept by the minister for expenses like paying informers within the ministry, providing gifts to individual visitors and maintaining attractive women around the office (Vine, 1975). The causes for such widespread political corruption are: traditional contexts and effects of colonialism; the new men who inherited political leadership after independence; and bureaucratic transition from a colonial to an indigenous administrative system. Political corruption took its toll in the form of waste of resources, instability and reduction in the capacity of government (Vine, 1975).

It is now commonly agreed that corruption has vitiated India’s public life like a cancer spreading over a human body. All sectors, be they administrative or political or economic, have come under the ever-increasing onslaught of corruption. There are many reasons as to why this has happened. Political actors of all shades including ministers, legislators, office-bearers of political parties, and other political office-holders are involved in corruption (Padhay, 1986). Members of the public bureaucracy are no less corrupt. Measures taken to combat corruption like setting up of inquiry commissions have failed. These commissions' findings have not been taken seriously by successive governments and consequently their recommendations have gathered dust. At the same time, some of the commissions were created with a
Corruption control is possible only with the adoption and implementation of four national agenda. They are: reforming the political process, restructuring and reorienting the government machinery, empowering the citizens and creating sustained public pressure for change (Guha and Paul, 1997). Under each a number of appropriate and timely recommendations are made to cleanse the widespread corruption that exists in India at all levels touching almost each and every governmental institutions and their functionaries.

Singapore and Hong Kong are two countries whose success in effectively tackling corruption in the public service is well-known.

When the People's Action Party (PAP) came to power in June 1959 it found a colonial corrupt bureaucracy in place. The PAP, which is still in power, realized something had to be done to minimize corruption in the Singapore Civil Service (SCS). Over a period of time the PAP government introduced a number of measures to curb corruption.

The then existing Prevention of Corruption Ordinance was amended and replaced with the Prevention of Corruption Act (POCA) to curb opportunities for corruption and to increase the penalty for corrupt behaviour (Quah, 1995:148). At the same time additional powers were given to the Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau by POCA. It is obvious that Singapore's anti-corruption strategy has been effective because it is designed to remove two major causes of corruption - the incentives and opportunities (Quah, 1989).

Corruption in Hong Kong public service had been well-entrenched. Public officials were known to make money utilizing their positions. But the situation changed drastically with the arrival of a new Governor, Sir Murray MacLehose, in 1973. He established an Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC). The ICAC under the leadership of a distinguished former public official was given a wide array of powers. The ICAC had the power to arrest people on suspicion, search and seize without a warrant, require information, freeze assets and property and prevent people from leaving the colony (Caiden, 1991b:249). The Commission was assisted in its operations by five advisory committees on Corruption, Operations Review, Prevention, Community Relations and Complaints, drawn from cross-section of the population and reported directly to the Governor (Caiden, 1991b:249). The ICAC was organized into three areas: (a) an operations department to investigate, arrest and help prosecute suspects; (b) a corruption prevention department to restructure government organizations to reduce opportunities for corruption; and (c) a community relations department to change people's attitudes toward corruption (Caiden, 1991b:249).

**POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CORRUPTION IN BANGLADESH**

Corruption has a deep root in the society in this part of the world. A chapter in Kautilya's *Arthasastra* titled "Detection of what is embezzled by government servants out of state revenue" is so vivid and detail that it resembles largely any meticulously prepared official report of today on modes of corruption and how to control such corruption. Kautilya writing many centuries ago identified forty types of embezzlement committed by public servants (Padhay, 1986). In ancient India corruption was prevalent in administration, judiciary and trade. As indicated earlier, corruption
in one form or another became an integral part of politico-administrative systems during the Khilji and Tuglaq dynasties. The situation did not change during the rule of Mughals and the British. Many politicians were charged with corruption and debarred from politics after the promulgation of the first martial law in Pakistan in 1958. Many civil servants, some belonging to the elite Civil Service of Pakistan (CSP), were dismissed from their services on corruption changes.

It has been argued by some that Bangladesh society is a highly complex network involving reciprocal favours and obligations, and that as a result payoff is the lifeblood of the country (Maloney, 1986:173). Payoff benefits include money, jobs, luxury gifts, building supplies, overseas travel and the payment of foreign tuition bills, foreign medical bills, overseas hotel and restaurant bills and personal liabilities (Kochanek, 1993:258). The symptoms of patron-client relationship are further reflected by the practice of some businessmen to maintain rest houses and high-class exclusive hostesses to entertain important foreign guests and big bosses (Siddiqui, et al. 1990). Many of these big bosses are no doubt top-ranking politicians and senior civil servants.

**POLITICAL CORRUPTION**

Using position while in power to grant undue favour and benefit to one’s relatives, friends and key supporters is a hallmark of politics in Bangladesh. All the effective rulers have been accused of either direct or indirect involvement in large-scale corruption. During the rule of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman (Mujib) that lasted little over three-and-a-half years (1972-1975) corruption became a major issue in public discussion. Mujib’s tendency to grant political and financial benefit to his close relatives and associates is well-known. Awami League (AL) activists received jobs in nationalized industries, grew rich as smugglers, appropriated Pakistani houses and sold off government permits and licenses to the highest bidders (Kochanek, 1993). Sheikh Abu Naser, Mujib’s only brother, and four sisters were believed to have benefited excessively from their ties of kinship with Mujib (Franda, 1982). Some of the nouveaux-riche created through the distribution of patronage by the Mujib government were ring leaders of smuggling operations (Maniruzzaman, 1982). Election-related corruption was prominent during Mujib’s rule.

Though General Ziaur Rahman (Zia) was not personally involved in corruption, he is credited with institutionalizing corrupt activities (Franda, 1982). It must be said that he instituted legal actions or sacked some ministers on corruption charges, but these people were calling for decentralization in the internal working of his party, i.e. Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP). Local units of BNP became pockets of corruption. Zia’s failed initiative of Sawmirvar Gram Sarker as the model of "grassroots democracy" was built on loyalty to his party and patronage distribution. During his time corruption and misuse of power resulted in the wastage of almost 40% of the total resources earmarked for development (Kochanek, 1993). Under Zia presidential, parliamentary and local level elections were to some extent manipulated in favour of his party (Khan and Zafrullah, 1979; Khan 1989a).

General Hossain Mohammad Ershad’s (Ershad) government established record levels of venality (Blair, et al., 1992). Ershad’s government was primarily based on
calculated and selective patronage distribution to a favoured few. In fact, under Ershad corruption prevailed in each and every sector of national life and the forms of corruption included petty corruption, project corruption and programmatic corruption (Kochanek, 1993). Ershad holds the record of totally distroying the credibility of the electoral system of the country. Like Mujib and Zia before him he considered the Election Commission as a normal administrative unit to be used and misused to serve his personal, coterie and party interests. The control of the Election Commission was ensured through the appointment of weak and pliable persons as Chief Election Commissioner and Election Commissioners. Introduction of the upazila system in 1982 not only legitimized and strengthened his rule but at the same time contributed immensely to the spread of corruption to the grassroots and in the process vitiated local development and adversely affected local participation. Politics of patronage and corruption became the order of the day in the delivery of local services. An overwhelming majority (93%) of the respondents in a survey conducted in 1991 and 1992 in two upzilas in the districts of Kurigram and Mymensingh held the view that corruption had increased significantly since the introduction of the upazila system (Siddiquee, 1997). Most respondents in the same survey felt that the upazila council was the nerve centre of corruption, nepotism and patronage networks (Siddiquee, 1997). The study based on survey indicated how upazila councils in study areas extended their patronage networks by: distributing various construction tenders and work orders to their relatives, friends and political allies; leasing out hats, bazars and jalmahals to their chosen parties; issuing these same people with licenses and permits and selecting the members of their own lobby for various project committees (Siddiquee 1997). During Ershad’s time the politics-business nexus in the arena of corruption became rather prominent. He is known to have received a fixed percentage on any deal involving any amount of money. This contributed to the emergence of a class of fabulously rich people without much effort on their part and who had little understanding of business ethics or norms and adversely affected those who wanted to pursue business in the traditional manner. These new rich people also became prominent in politics as members of parliament and cabinet and eventually some of them became leader of different chambers and other bodies, thereby cementing a close link between politics and business premised on corruption and patronage. One of the outcomes of such a development has been increasing criminalization of politics. Individuals with proven tract records as criminals became an indispensable party in this unholy alliance between Ershad and his promotees in business. It needs to be added that both Mujib and Zia is were instrumental in making individuals with obscure background millionaires. But the difference between Ershad and Mujib and Zia is that the former transgressed all norms, bent rules and broken regulations in order to excessively profit from all state business transactions while the latter operated within limits of civility.

ADMINISTRATIVE CORRUPTION
Corruption has been and continues to be an integral part of culture. The level of corruption varies depending on how influential a position the particular civil servant holds (Khan, 1997). The civil servants have by and large become accustomed to live a
life style far beyond their legal income (Zafarullah, 1987). The citizens have accepted
the stark reality that nothing moves without adequately satisfying the concerned civil
servant (Khan, 1997).
An opinion survey conducted in 1992 of household heads in Dhaka City found that
68.25% of respondents paid bribes to concerned officials to get services
(Aminuzzaman, 1996). The findings of the survey indicated that members of law
enforcing agencies, customs and income tax departments were involved in
administrative corruption (Aminuzzaman, 1996). Another finding of the survey
reaffirmed the commonly held belief that the higher the level of bureaucracy the
lower the frequency but higher the amount of bribe; and the lower the level of
bureaucracy the higher the frequency but less the amount of bribe (Aminuzzaman,
1996).
The Bangladesh Unnayan Parishad (BUP) only recently conducted an opinion survey
of 2197 individuals selected randomly from sixty districts. This survey indicated that
95% of respondents felt that the police department was most corrupt while 82%
opined that the secretariat (where most ministries/divisions are located) and the
judicial system were most corrupt. In the corruption indicator the customs department
came second with 91% of respondents considering its officials extremely corrupt. The
officials of the Taxation Department were placed in third position as 90% of the
respondents felt they were extremely corrupt (BUP, 1997).
Both the surveys reaffirm the ever-widening horizon of administrative corruption.
Another survey of people’s opinions at two upazilas in Northern Bangladesh indicated
that the then upazila structure was not only controlled by centrally-debuted civil
servants posted there but they were involved in misappropriating public funds for
their own use (Rahman, 1994). Villagers had to bribe civil servants on a routine basis
either to bypass certain access encounters or to speed up the process of service
delivery (Rahman, 1994). The surveys as part of three case studies indicated that civil
servants' control over massive financial resources without proper accountability and
the self-seeking nature of civil servants were major contributing factors to the growth
and sustenance of administrative corruption at the local level (Rahman, 1994).
Now one may ask the question as to why such large-scale administrative corruption
exists. The reasons for such corruption can be summed up (Khan, 1997). First, civil
servants involved in corrupt practices in most cases do not lose their jobs. Very rarely
they are dismissed from service on charges pertaining to corruption. Still more rarely
they are sent to prison for misusing public funds. They have never been compelled to
return to the state their ill-gotten wealth. Second, people have a tendency not only to
tolerate corruption but to show admiration to those civil servants who make a fortune
through dubious means. The underlying assumption is that it does not matter how one
has acquired wealth as long as he has done so. Third, it is easier for a citizen to get
quick service because he has already paid the civil servant rather than wait for his turn.
Fourth, there is now social acceptance of corruption by public officials. Fifth, barring
occasional public procurements, the representatives of the people, i.e. politicians in
power, are unwilling to take effective measures to curb corrupt practices in public
dealings.
Corruption is all-pervasive in Bangladesh. Though corruption has been a part of our politico-administrative heritage, there is little denying the fact that after independence the tentacles of corruption have engulfed the entire society. So strong and sustained is the influence of corruption that most people have come to accept it as a fait accompli. Not only do citizens have accepted it as a part of their daily life experience but more frighteningly they feel themselves powerless to address the phenomenon at any level (Lewis, 1996). The reason for such helplessness is to the presence of corruption in almost all levels of government (World Bank, 1996). The changeover from an authoritarian to a democratic system of government in the 1990s has not had any effect on the nature and dimensions of corruption. Information obtained from the Finance Division of the Ministry of Finance show that over a period of twenty-two years, i.e. between 1971 and 1993, taka 18,000 crore were lost in the public sector due to misappropriation of public funds and theft (Alam, 1996). But this huge amount of money, which is substantial for a resource-poor and aid-dependent country, is only the tip of the iceberg if one takes into consideration all cases of corruption that have been reported by the Bureau of Anti-Corruption over the same period (Khan, 1997).

A government Task Force Report identified a few years back a number of areas where corruption was likely to manifest itself. These areas include: procurement of goods and services including award of contracts by the government; administration of taxes and prevention of smuggling, disposal, sale and allotment of government property including disinvestment of industries and other commercial units; administration of loans by public financial institutions, outright embezzlement of government fund and all kinds of shop-floor malpractices (Ahmed, 1992).

It is usually known that almost all kinds of corruption perpetuate in politics and administration in Bangladesh. The most common form of corruption is pecuniary bribes (Taslim, 1994). Other forms of corruption are: abuse of authority, nepotism, favoritism, fraud, patronage, theft and deceit. In many cases forms of corruptions are intertwined with their consequences.

As one scholar noted:

"Petty corruption takes many forms. Payments are required simply to obtain an application form or a signature, to secure a copy of an approved sanction, to ensure proper services and billing from telephone, natural gas, electric power and water employees.

Project corruption permeates both public and private sector contracting. A substantial commission must be paid to secure large public sector contracts in Bangladesh.

Programmatic corruption involves Food For Work and relief programmes" (Kochanek, 1993:259,263).

The consequences of these three forms of corruption included among others: high losses suffered by public-sector utilities; forcing donor countries and agencies to hire
lobbyists to clear their projects by bribing officials at different levels and failure of Food For Work and relief programmes to reach their targets due to massive theft and huge misuse of resources (Kochanek, 1993).

Other baneful consequences of corruption on the economy include: siphoning away a large chunk of public resources which could have been productively employed somewhere in the economy; undermining of productivity, efficiency and effectiveness of the government; diminishes efficient mobilization of resources and management of development activities; gains through corruption used either in conspicuous consumption or transferred to foreign bank accounts; generates allocative inefficiency by permitting the least efficient contractor or most costly supplier with the highest ability to bribe; bribes and payoffs instead of expediting decisions and facilitating movement of files encourages civil servants to hold back all papers until some payment is made to them; money gained from bribes becomes a part of the expected income; and over-invoicing and under-invoicing of imports and exports and smuggling increases lead to distortion in investment decisions and to capital flight (Ahmed, 1992). Some other equally damaging consequences of corruption are: undermines public confidence in government; engenders wrong economic choices and constrains government’s ability to implement policies; makes the poor pay the price; and threatens government’s strategy of private-sector-oriented growth (World Bank 1996a: 66).

A recent report of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) titled "Corruption and Good Governance" found that bureaucratic corruption and inefficiency are taking a heavy toll on the Bangladesh economy, causing hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of loss in terms of unrealised investment and income (Mustafa, 1997). The report pointed out: "If Bangladesh were to improve the integrity and efficiency of its bureaucracy, its investment would rise by more than five percentage points and its yearly GDP rate would rise by over half a percentage point" (Mustafa, 1997).

ERADICATING CORRUPTION

Eradication of corruption should be the nation’s number-one priority in view of the ever-increasing horizon of political and administrative corruption and its baneful multifarious effects on the society-at-large. It needs to be understood by all that eradication of corruption is only possible if strong political commitment exists. Without strong political commitment, bureaucratic reorientation and a vibrant and effective civil society, checking corruption turns into a very difficult almost impossible task. In the context of Bangladesh only radical and fundamental policy measures initiated and strongly backed by a committed political leadership and supported and implemented by a reoriented bureaucracy and watched and monitored by an organized and vocal civil society can control corruption.

Given the presence of three crucial variables - committed political leadership, reoriented bureaucracy and an organized and vocal civil society - other policy measures need to be adopted to effectively contain as well as control corruption. What is proposed below are a number of long-term and short-term policy measures placed in wider socio-political and economic contexts to control corruption.
The public sector employs over a million people in 35 ministries, 50 divisions, 221 departments, 139 directorates and autonomous bodies and 153 state enterprises (World Bank 1996b:57). It may also be added that since independence the number of ministries, departments and public servants has doubled (Khan, 1997). In the context of present reality there is little rationale for maintaining a huge public-sector edifice which contributes to corruption in public dealings. There is now justification for right-sizing the government. Right-sizing of government will, among other things, will discourage creation and maintenance of redundant agencies and units and restrain doling out of public-service jobs as political favours.

Public-sector accountability is weak, fuzzy and tenuous at best. This has resulted in the inability to enforce financial contracts, stop theft in public enterprises and hold officials accountable for improper or delayed judgment (World Bank, 1996a:viii). A number of actions need to taken simultaneously to institutionalize and strengthen accountability to effectively counter corruption. First, a bi-partisan parliamentary task force be established to bolster the standing committees, instituting the practice of questioning ministers and providing members of parliament with adequate office and research facilities and setting up of an office of Ombudsman (World Bank, 1996a:viii). A parliamentary secretariat should be established outside the sphere of civil service and manned by competent personnel recruited separately and controlled by the speaker of the parliament (Khan, 1997). Second, the office of the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) must be reorganized and strengthened by enhancing the capacity of the CAG (World Bank, 1996a:ix). Third, the standards of performance of ministries/divisions and their attached agencies should be made known to the citizens (Rahman, et al., 1993:52). Fourth, complaint procedures should be in place in government agencies for wider use of citizens (Khan, 1997). Fifth, monitoring procedures need to be tightened so that the concerned civil servant knows the extent of compliance by his subordinates to relevant orders and directives as well as services provided to citizens. Sixth, units be established in each ministry and division to develop and apply performance criteria and measures and to develop internal performance audit (UNDP, 1993:106).

Transparency in public-sector decision making is totally absent. This absence, in turn, contributes to corruption. Civil servants by and large value secrecy and are totally unwilling to share information about decisions with citizens. Openness and transparency are alien concepts in public bureaucracy in Bangladesh (Khan, 1997). A number of actions have been recommended to ensure transparency and thereby considerably empower citizens and consequently contain corruption (World Bank, 1996a:xii). First, the Official Secrets Act of 1923 and Government Service Conduct Rules of 1979 should be suitably modified. Second, a task-force on public-sector transparency should be established with membership from different professional and occupational groups to suggest measures to enhance transparency. Third, necessary steps should be taken to make all contract evaluation reports public, thereby enabling all bidders to see how evaluations are made. Still other steps should be taken to ensure transparency and reduce corruption (Khan, 1997). Fourth, earning and tax payments of all public officials - elected as well as appointed - should be published each year to
enable the people to learn about the assets of public officials. Fifth, interested citizens must be allowed access to relevant files and documents. For this to happen the number of files marked secret and top secret should be drastically reduced. Sixth, civil servants long accustomed to transact public business under the veil of secrecy should be appropriately trained and indoctrinated to bring about necessary changes in their attitudes and work habits.

A number of specific policy measures have been recommended to control corruption in politics and administration (World Bank, 1996a:xii; Rahman, et al.,1993:97 and Khan, 1997). First, a high-powered task force to be established consisting of public officials, parliamentarians and leading citizens to review all relevant issues pertaining to corruption and to suggest a comprehensive eradication programme. Second, an autonomous standing committee to be formed with judges, senior public officials and leading citizens to oversee the activities of the Bureau of Anti-Corruption (BAC) as well as authorize investigation in ministries, corporations and other agencies by a statutory appointed and protected public prosecutor. Third, salary and benefits of civil servants need to be at par with their counterparts in the private sector. Fourth, provision of severe punishment including long stays in jails and confiscation of assets and properties to be instituted for civil servants involved in corruption. Other measures have also been suggested to counter political and administrative corruption (Paul, 1997:288-304). Fifth, a code of conduct should be adopted by the parliament to provide guidelines for the conduct of elected representatives and to take appropriate steps when departures from accepted norms are detected. Sixth, elected representatives must be compensated suitably to enable them to devote their attention only to public welfare and service. Seventh, enactment of a law to regulate the functioning of political parties is needed. This law would require political parties to hold regular organizational elections at different levels; maintain prompt and systematic accounts and submit audited accounts to either the Election Commission or the Comptroller and Auditor General; and comply with income tax regulations and guidelines. Eighth, election expenditure needs to be reduced and closely monitored by a designated body. Ninth, deregulation and debureaucratisation, bounded discretion in decision making, realignment of the government’s audit and intelligence are to be encouraged to control corruption. Tenth, existence of free media so that they can investigate and expose corrupt practices. Eleventh, voluntary agencies and religious groups as well as other components of civil society can play significant role in constraining corruption in public dealings.

CONCLUSION
Corruption is a complex multi-faceted social phenomenon with innumerable manifestations. It takes place as an outcome of deficiencies in the existing public administration apparatuses and systems as well as cultural, economic, political and social factors.

Differences of opinion still exist as to the meaning of the term corruption. This is primarily because individuals look at corruption from their own vantage points influenced by surrounding environment. But what is heartening is that in recent years
corruption is viewed from a much broader perspective rather than looking at it from moral and functional angles only.
The causes of corruption are as varied as the phenomenon itself. Corruption results from the presence of a number of factors. Typologies have been offered to make a sense out of so many contributory factors.
There are many forms of corruption. To understand the dynamics of so many types of corruption attempts have been made to classify different forms of corruption into broad categories. What transpires from such a categorization is that corruption can be sponsored by outsiders, resultant of political scandal, institutionalized and administrative malfeasance.
The cost of corruption has been enormous in terms of a country’s socio-political and economic advancement. What has been conclusively demonstrated is that corruption has negative consequences on economic growth, administrative efficiency and political development.
Checking corruption is a crying need of today’s world. At the same time, it is understood that total eradication of corruption is not possible. But that does not mean in any way that corruption cannot be effectively contained. A number of recommendations have been offered as how to check corruption in a decisive manner. But what has been realized is that in order to drastically reduce corruption fundamental changes must be brought about without any delay or hesitation.
Experiences of the Philippines, Uganda, Ghana and India have clearly indicated that corruption networks are extensive and cover within their realms public servants of all types. What is more alarming is that a rather cozy nexus exists among public servants and politicians in power to share the booties of corruption. Almost all efforts to contain corruption in these countries have been unsuccessful. On the other hand, experiences of Hong Kong and Singapore demonstrate in no uncertain terms that given political will and the institution of appropriate anti-corruption mechanisms incidence of corruption can be drastically contained.
The root of corruption in Bangladesh runs deep in history. The existence of a patron-client relationship reinforces corrupt practices in all spheres of public dealing. Almost all political regimes in Bangladesh have been corrupt. Only the nature and extent of corruption varied depending on the nature of the regime, its key leader and his popular power base.
Corruption in the public service is extensive and all-pervasive. Corruption in the political arena has emboldened public servants to become unabashedly corrupt and not bother about it at all.
The prevalence of systematic corruption in Bangladesh society can be explained due to a number of factors. Lack of political will, lack of organized movement by civil society for a change in the status quo, and presence of a change-resistant institutional bureaucracy, lack of ethics in public life, absence of independence of judiciary and media, have all contributed in varying degrees to the continuance of large-scale and systematic corruption in all spheres of Bangladeshi society.
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