Elitist Corruption and the Anti-Corruption Crusade in Nigeria

Ozy B. Orluwene, JP
Elitist Corruption and the Anti-Corruption Crusade in Nigeria

By

Ozy B. Orluwene
Dept. of Political Science
Rivers State University of Education, Port Harcourt, Nigeria
E-mail: ozywene@yahoo.com Mobile: +234-8033089458

Abstract
Corruption is a global phenomenon and as such not unique to Nigeria. Its effects we argue vary from one society to the other due to differences in level of economic development and commitments to anti-corruption measures. However, corruption has become so prevalent in Nigeria that almost all governance crises, economic woes and development predicament are attributed to the problem. The paper examines the situations in the country and argues that it is indeed a serious problem. This cankerworm is so systematic as it is fuelled by patron-client politics and patronage system in government and other sectors of the society. The paper also observe that elitist corruption in Nigeria has made corruption to be systemic, pervasive and endemic to the extent that she is rated among the most corrupt nations of world and therefore a bane to the nation’s anti corruption crusade. The methodology adopted for this work is the use of secondary data. However, personal observation will equally be employed where necessary. The paper posit(s) that elitist corruption can be addressed and significantly reduced if the government is committed to its anti corruption initiative which must not be selective, not haphazard but consistent.
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Introduction

Nigeria is endowed with abundant resources – oil, natural gas, solid minerals and agricultural resources, as well as human (manpower) produce that are capable of positively impacting on the lives of Nigerians, yet the people are bedeviled by poverty because of elitist corruption. Furthermore, Nigeria has the potential of becoming a highly developed country. Indeed, it was regarded in the 1960s as a potential Africa tiger, but by 1995, according to World Bank sources, it had slipped far behind Malaysia, with which it was roughly on par in that decade, to the status of one of the world’s most indebted and poorest countries. This decline was attributed to mismanagement of the national economy itself attributable to regime instability, the disenableness of rational planning and deployment of resources by centrifugal politics, primate accumulationist inclinations of state resources, pervasive corruption and the absence of ineffectiveness of institutions of oversight (Osaghae, 2002:15).

Above all, Nigeria is blessed with a friendly and favourable eco-system that should assist it towards national development. Despite these glaring advantages, poverty is increasingly becoming the lots of an average Nigerian because of the high scale elitist corruption in Nigeria, to the extent that it is ranked one of the most corrupt country in the world, is worthy of consideration. Available evidence indicates that elitist corruption in Nigeria is increasing despite the frantic efforts by government aimed at stemming the tide. The more anti-corruption law is
enacted, the more it appears to be an astronomical crescendo in the spate and tempo of elitist corruption in the country.

Statement of the Problem
It is a sad fact of life that Nigeria, a Sub-Saharan African largest oil producer and also endowed with abundant human and material resources capable of positively impacting on the lives of the citizens, yet its people are bedeviled by agonizing poverty. Furthermore, Nigeria is blessed with friendly and favourable eco-system that should assist it towards national development. However, it is a sad fact of life that instead of lifting millions of citizens out of poverty, these glaring advantages have all too often been a curse. The mismanagement in Nigeria has led to high levels of economic and political instability, corruption, civil strife and debt, lack of transparency and insufficient oversight have allowed resources (money) to be misspent or stolen by unaccountable elites and government by extension to the detriment of the great majority of poor citizens.

Thus, elitist corruption became most ubiquitous form of corruption in Nigeria where “speed money” or “grease payment” causes decisions to be weighted in terms of money, not human needs which negatively impacted on the efforts and success of anti-corruption crusade because the issue of accountability is now a rhetoric in the that the more emphasis is placed on it, the more it becomes a no place matter in the practice of office holders. It is against this background that this paper is motivated by the effort to unveil the link between the elitist corruption and anti-corruption crusade in Nigeria. For corruption practices have systematically because a high potent scourge and the cancerous underbelly of the Nigerian polity.

To properly situate the problem clearly, the study addresses the following questions:
(i) Is there any significant relationship between elites and corruption?
(ii) What are the motives behind elitist corruption?
(iii) What are the impacts of elitist corruption on the anti-corruption crusade?

Objectives of the Study
The primary objective of the study is to establish how elitist corruption has undermined the anti-corruption crusade in Nigeria. The specific objects of this study are to:
(a) Present an overview of elite and corruption.
(b) The motives being the elitist corruption.
(c) The impact of elitist corruption on the anti-corruption crusade.

Literature Review
To give appropriate focus to this paper, it is necessary to first of all clarify the key concepts used. The concepts are elite and corruption.

Elite
The actual definition of elite has been going on within the academia over the years. It has generated a lot of large number of empirical studies such as power elite, political elite, and bureaucratic elite among others. However, Domhoff (2005:6) see power elite as the leadership group of the upper class; it constitute of active working members of the upper class and high level employees in profit and non-profit institutions controlled by members of the upper class through stock ownership, financial support of involvement in the board of directors. While
Burton and Higley (2001:8) define elite (political) as persons who are able by virtue of their authoritative positions in powerful organizations and movement of whatever kind, to effect national political outcome regularly and substantially. They are persons at or near the top of the “pyramid of power” (Putman cited in Best and Higley, 2009) or put differently, they are persons who have the “organized capacity to make real and continuing political trouble” (Higley and Burton, 2006:7). Most frequently elites are decision makers of the society (Parry cited in Ayodele, 2008:32). They are also the sole sources of values in the society and constitute the integration forces in the community. For purpose of this study, elites are persons or groups who think they are better or profess to know more than others or who possess privileges regarded unwarranted. Put differently, elite as guardians without whose protection society would probably fail (Best and Highley, 2009:332).

Corruption
Corruption like other social science concepts has been defined in different ways and different times to reflect diverse practices in different societies. In his definition, Aristotle (cited in Ikubaje, 2006:9) argued that a king who deviates from the accepted social (moral) norms is a tyrant. To him, tyrant is synonymous with corruption. He wrote that “the deviation or corruption of kingship is tyranny”. He was not alone in this line of argument. Most of the founding fathers of western political thought e.g. Plato, Thucydides, Rousseau and Friedrich were also preoccupied with moral corruption of their days. Although political corruption was part of their consideration they place more emphasis on moral corruption (Hutchcraft, 1997:227). Although evidence from literature is scarce, in pre-colonial Africa societies the definition of corruption is not different from the above moral notion. According to Adekanye (cited in Ikubaje, 2005:10), a popular king in Ogbomosho town in old Oyo Kingdom in Nigeria was said to have been forced to commit suicide because he was found to be morally corrupt by his subjects.

Another definition that has gained prominence globally and in recent years is that provided by the World Bank and subsequently adopted by other donor agencies, though at times with little modification, “abuse of public office for private gain” (World Development Report, 1997:101-105). Critics of the above definition argue that the scope of corruption has widened and therefore there is need to enlarge the definition to cover the abuse of all offices of trust, including private offices (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2000:15).

Webster’s New Twentieth Century Dictionary (1980:411) defines corruption as a decoy, rottenness, depravity, wickedness, pervasion or deterioration of moral principles, loss of purity or integrity, bribery, a thing of influence that corrupts”. Lesley (cited in Ezeani, 2003) defines corruption as “pervasion of a person’s integrity in the performance of especially official or public duty or work”. According to Wilkens (1970:111), “Corruption is behaviour which is different from or conflicts with the standards which are accepted as normal within a group of social system”.

Theorizing in the macro perspective, Ekeh (1975) and Ake (1993) among others have linked the cause of bureaucratic corruption on the failure of the post colonial state in Africa to meet the short and long term interest of the people. According to these scholars, the state does not exist to advance the interest of the generality but has turned out to be an instrument in the hands of some privileged bureaucrats to exploit and oppress the people. Thinking along the same line, Joseph
(1987) came up with the theoretical postulations that bureaucratic corruption is prevalent in Nigeria because people make use of public offices as prebend to meet the short and long term interest of individual or group of individuals rather than those of the general populace. There is usually a patron-client network by bureaucrats who are usually all out to see to the continued prebendalisation to meet individual, family and sectional interest. This is because Nigerian bureaucrats are not governed by moral ethics, recognized by all in society as binding beyond their legal rational justification.

In addition to the above, other scholars have explored to explain the cause of corruption prevalent as grounded in “colonialism historical” or “colonial heritage”. These scholars have for example argued that colonialism brought different values and administrative practice that promote bureaucratic corruption in Africa, Asia and Latin America (Hyden and Bratton, 1992:178). Prior to these scholars’ argument, Nkurumah (1968:65) long argued that colonial officers were corrupt in their administration as they exploited their home countries’ development through diverse means. The exploitation of these colonies by the colonial officers for personal enrichment and colonial government development made Africans to also see the “new state” as an exploitation entity for private realm development. Unfortunately, this perception and the practice that follow have not changed and it has promoted corruption not only in Nigeria but also in other African countries till date.

While the above “African position” sound convincing, some scholars have nonetheless debunked the position by arguing that corruption is also prevalent in countries like Liberia, Nepal, Thailand and Ethiopia where colonial government were never established (Robinson, 1998:6; Khan, 1968). While it is true that colonialism cannot be the sole explanation for corrupt practices in many countries that were colonized, it is however, right to argue that colonialism impacted negatively on the emergence of new social structure and values in these countries. For example, although it may sound like a modernisation explanation the inability of the indigenous political elites to manage effectively the new independence states in many African countries led to the emergence of conflicts between the new public (state) realm and the old private realm (ethnic group/kingdom). This clarifies why corrupt practices are still prevalent in many African states (Ekeh, 1975:97-112).

Although each of above definition attempts to capture to some extent the meaning of corruption, none seem to suits the purpose of this study. Therefore, in this study, we shall adopt the definition of corruption as used in the Encyclopaedia America (1980:22). Thus, corruption is the misuse of public trust for private gains.

Theoretical Framework
Theoretical framework adopted for this study is the elite theory as propounded by Gaetano Mosca and Vilfredo Pareto. In public policy making process, the elite/mass theory identifies the main power character in policy making process, thus the theory’s thesis rests upon a crest that policy flows downward from the elite to the masses (Johari, 2004:532). The central theme thus is that “policy is product of a powerful group of people which are highly influential. For the major proponents of the theory, Gaetano Mosca and Vilfredo Pareto, their argument is that “in all societies’ two classes of people appear, a class that rules and that class is a group of powerful elites and not the mass. In fact, Geraint assets that the elites are the decision makers of the
society (Parry, 1993:4). They are also the sole source of values in the society and constitute the integrating forces in the community. This theory develops an antithesis to the pluralistic or mass paradigm of policy. Power and rulership cannot be performed by everybody, thus it is the very few privileged, influential or that minority that mirrors what the larger society demands and responds to these demands. For Mosca, it is the minority group that performs all political, functions, monopolizes power, and enjoys the advantages that power beings (Sambo, 1999). The position of the elite theory also negates the Marxian theory which tends to argue that power flow from the acquisition of wealth but from the political and bureaucratic organization (Johari, 2004:532).

Thus the elite theory of public policy conceives the elites as the sole authority and power behind every policy decision. The assumptions of the elite theory are premised on the following:

- That the elites are the most powerful group and not the masses.
- Decisions are made by the minority groups that constitute the elite and thus policies are products of the elites.
- That society is divided into the few who have power and many who do not and that these few who have power dictate or allocate values for society (Dye and Zeigter, 1970:6).

Indeed, the elite theory of public policy in its classical formulation seems to interpret public policy from a narrow-minded minority group which may represent the powerful elements among the organization like the military, business community, its bureaucratic elite, political class and that the group makes policies that reflect the values and interests and that it is only matter of coincidence if these policies decisions are taken with the interest of the masses (Sambo, op.cit:295).

From the above analysis, elite theory assumes a selfish and insensitive pattern. It negates the concept of democratic values that appreciate the importance of plurality in policy process. Elite theory, in fact, puts the public behind the scene and tends to characterize the masses as irrelevant, passive and apathetic in policy process. It evidently proved that, some policies that tend to change the status quo may not have been the product of the elite as the theorist claims to be. In strong terms, the elite theory fails to recognize the importance of the feedback process of the system theory because, that feedback, in fact, reflects the decisions of the masses.

For the theoretical framework, elites are persons or groups who think they are better or profess to know more than others or who possess privileges regarded unwarranted. Put differently, elite as guardians without whose protection society would probably fail (Best and Higley, 2009:32).

**Methodology**
The method adopted for this paper is the use of secondary data. Iheanacho (2004) refers to this as report method. Secondary sources are already existing data which the researcher gather and uses for research purpose. In the light of the above, textbooks, journals, magazines and newspapers were consulted. However, personal observation of the researcher was employed as a primary source.
Elitist Corruption: The Nigerian Experience

The extent of corruption especially among the elite group in Nigeria seems to have been institutionalised. It is walking on four legs in Nigeria as cases of corrupt practices by those in various positions speak volume of the magnitude of the phenomenon (Amujiri, 2003:137). Under the colonial system from 1914 up to 1960 when the country got its political independence, various forms of elitist corruption could be identified in Nigeria. Many Nigerians who were employed as public officials by the colonial government were reported to have abused public offices for personal interest/gains to the extent that the colonial officers cited it to challenge the nationalist campaign for immediate disengagement of the colonial government (Tignor, 2003). In 1957 for example, the Forester-Sutton Commission indicted one of the leading Nigerian nationalist, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe who was then the Eastern Nigeria Premier of corruption. The late Dr. Azikiwe was charged that he “abused his office by allowing public funds to be invested in the African Continental Bank (ACB) in which he (Azikiwe) had an interest”. The Commission of enquiry, headed by Justice Strafford Forester-Sutton indicted the accused and also compelled him to transfer all his right and interest in the bank to the Eastern Region government which henceforth then own the ACB. This was one of the elitist corruptions under the colonial regime (Tignor, 2003 and Ibrahim, 2003).

Similarly, immediately after our independence in 1960, the late Chief Obafemi Awolowo, the first Premier of Western Region was dragged to the court of accountability in 1962 over allegations of corruption. He was accused of using some statutory corporations in the defunct Western Region to divert public money into unauthorized projects. The Commission of enquiry appointed by then Prime Minister Abubakar Tafawa Belewa administration to look into the matter indicted Awolowo in its reports. The report reads in part, “we came across evidence of reckless and indeed atrocious and criminal mismanagement and diversion of public fund. We are satisfied that Chief Awolowo knows everything about the diversion of large sums of money… into the coffers of the Action Camp” (Mordi, 2010:18-19). Both Awolowo and Azikiwe denied the allegations against them and challenged the Commissions’ report in separate lawsuits.

In addition to the above, Alhaji Abubakar Tafawa Belewa, the late former Prime Minister of Nigeria was once interviewed on the magnitude of corruption among his ministers. The Prime Minister answered thus “today, they are minister, tomorrow they may not be, if they do not store up for tomorrow, what would they eat” (Ayikeke, 2001). There is no other official legislation that could be more effective than this for more corruption to thrive and accountability eroded.

In other cases, Ukem (1993:10) reported how Nigeria Airways Management flew into murky cloud of scandals involving N2.1 billion Naira. According to him, the management could not explain how it spent N2.1 billion Naira without the Board knowledge. The Board could not understand how the management spent a federal government loan of 64 million US dollars which the government advanced the airline to bail it out.

Ode (1997:5) equally reported how auditors uncovered a can of worm in Nigeria National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) account totaling N30 billion. According to him, this boarder on confusing pricing of oil exports, topping, overloading and under declaration of crude oil meant for export and failure by the corporation to reconcile numerous entries in its accounts.
According to Ukem (2004:10), one other elitist practice perpetuated in Nigeria by their leaders was in 1994. The Okigbo Panel revealed that Babangida established a “dedicated account” into which the windfall from the gulf war was paid. The account held the sum of 12.4 billion US dollars but at the time of enquiry, only 206 million dollars were left there. The two people who managed the account were Babangida and then governor of Central Bank, the late Alhaji Abulkadir Ahmed. The money was not directed into visible project, government said nothing about the windfall, William keeling, and a freelance reporter for the Financial Times of London incurred the wrath of the government when he reported that the windfall has been mismanaged. He was deported from Nigeria.

General Abacha as a person and his regime were no different. He personalized the Nigerian Central Bank by issuing cheques at will for billions of Naira for personal use (Momoh, 2005). He was listed among the ten most corrupt world leader with 2-5 billion US dollars lost. There were 4 billion US dollars looted money in which the UK financial services authority indicated fifteen British Banks (Financial Times London cited in Agubamah, 2009:87), and the 4-5 billion US dollars secret Nigerian debt buoyancy scheme (Sunday Times, London cited in Agubamah, 2009). In addition, there was the 2.5 billion US dollars Ajaokuta steel debt buy back scam involving Abacha Minister (see Today Newspaper, Abuja, July 1st, 1997). Other misappropriations according to Nigerian Newswatch, March 31, 1997 include 80 million US dollars over payment to Chase Manhattan Bank, 10 million US dollars reverse payment on Paris Club debts and 27 million US dollars to SACE of Italy.

One of the widely reported cases of elitist corruption under this democratic administration is the indictment of some National Assembly members between 1999-2003 by Senator Idris Kuta led Panel. This panel established cases of corruption against the leadership and some members of National Assembly. They include the then Senate President, the late Dr. Chuba Okadigbo, his deputy, the late Alhaji Abubakar Haruna, Senator Gbenga Aluko and others who were found to have corruptly enriched themselves by inflating furniture allowance, contract sums and by awarding contracts to ghost firms (see Nigerian Tribune, July 27 & 29, 2000 and Nigerian Tribune August, 26, 2000). The former speaker of House of Representative, Alhaji Ghali Na’Abba and other “honourable” members were equally found guilty of looting the National Assembly treasury under all kinds of guises particularly through the contingency vote. It was alleged that Na’Abba, through this means, pampered his supporters with large sum of money as patronage (see Tell Magazine, May 13, 2002).

In another development, USA prosecutors in a court in Oregun have indicted an aid of the president whom the court referred to as Emmanuel Nnamdi “Andy” Uba. He was alleged to have smuggled into the US 170 thousand US dollars (about 21.59 million Naira) on September 20, 2003, while on President Obasanjo’s entourage to the United Nations (UN) General Assembly Summit of that year (see Guardian Newspaper, November 9, 2006).

Furthermore, the 2001 report of the Acting Auditor-General of the Federation, Mr. Azie indicted all the three arms of government for gross financial recklessness and misappropriation of public funds and for breaching laid down financial regulations.
During the Obasanjo years, cases of elitist corrupt practices, some which were beyond comprehension were prevalent. For instance, there were cases which involved colossal sums of money, the presentation of money to top government officials including Ministers, legislators, and the former Inspector General of Policy (IGP), Ta’afa Balogun who was convicted on charges of corruption in 2005 by the Ovbasanjo administration. He was accused of stealing 17 billion Naira from the Nigerian Police. He later pleaded guilty and was jailed for six months. Former Delta State Governor, James Ibori, was slammed with 129-count charges by EFCC for laundering over 9.1 billion Naira. The EFCC decision to prosecute Governor Ibori was especially dramatic because the former governor was widely seen to be as politically untouchable. He is still in court fighting the battle of his life with the EFCC to prove his innocence, he has not denied that he alone doled out a whopping sum of about 9 billion naira for presidential election of late Umaru YarAdua.

Other notable cases of alleged elitist corruption by Former Governors were those of ex-Abia Chief Executive, Orji Uzor Kalu who was accused of using his office to loot the sum of 3.1 billion Naira to fund Slok Airline and two banks in Serria Leone and Gambia, in addition to owing houses in London and USA. Suruami Turaki of Jigawa State accused of spending the State 36 billion Naira to buy “oil block” for himself from Federal Government and ex-governor, Rev. Jolly Nyame of Taraba State charged for alleged stealing 1.6million Naira belonging to the state.

Other former governors charged for various financial crimes include Edo State - Lucky Igbinedion, Ekiti – Ayo Fayose and Chimaroke Nnamani of Enugu State. Nnamani is standing trial for his alleged illegal diversion of public funds totaling 5.6 billion Naira alongside two of his commissioner, Peter Mba and Sam Ejiofor and some companies linked to him (Kofarmata cited in Pogoson, 2009:70). Also, there is the allegation of high level of fraud and money laundering against former governor of Plateau State, Joshua Dariye to the 55 million Naira bribery scandal, which swept Adolphus Wabara, former Senate President and Fabian Osuji, former Minister of Education out of office and the multi-billion Naira fraud charges against former Chairman of the Board of Nigerian Port Authority, Chief Olabode George and some members of the Board that eventually led to their conviction is a damming revelation of so much elitist fraud (see News Magazine, April 18, 2005). There is allegation of bribery against the Justices of the Supreme Court of receiving 13 Honda Civic cars from Honda Place Limited to pervert justice to the confiscation of London and Nigerian assets of former Governor, D.S.P. Alamiesegha of Bayelsa State and his eventual conviction.

Other evidence of elitist corruption practice in this post-military Nigeria that equally needs highlighting is how in Rivers State oil “capital” of Niger Delta, infrastructure development is not commensurate with the revenue it gets. With a budget of 1.3 billion dollars in 2006, the past administration spent 65 thousand dollars a day for transport, the governor 10 million dollars for catering, entertainment and gifts and 38 million dollars for two helicopters (see African Today, 2007). This is like a drop in the ocean of elitist corruption in Nigeria.

The former President children were not left out in these bizarre practices of elitist corruption. Iyabo Obasanjo-Bello, a Senator of the Federal Republic and daughter of Obasanjo was enmeshed in two different financial scandals. In December, 2007, Iyabo was involved in a
contract scandal amounting to 3.5 billion Naira involving her and an Austrain firm. According
the EFCC, the Senator used her mother maiden name, Akinlawon to conceal her identity in the
contract involving M. Schneider GMBH. Senator Obasanjo-Bello was back into the financial
crime news again in a scandal of mismanaged fund in the federal ministry of health. The scandal
led to resignation of Mrs. Adenike Grange and her deputy, Gabriel Aduku.

After a series of hide and seek with the EFCC, Obasanjo, the Chairman Senate Committee on
Health was eventually arraigned in the court over 300 million Naira unspent budget scam (see
the Punch on the web, 2008). Gbenga Obasanjo, the son of the former President Obasanjo and 78
million Naira house in New York strengthen the assertion that the extent of elitist corruption is
extremely high in Nigeria. This phenomenon is equally underscored by the Halliburton, Wilbros
and Siemens exposure in which former Head of States and President, Vice President and
Ministers and other senior public officials were indicted for receipts of huge sums oil money as
bribe.

The American billionaire and Chairman Open Society Institute for West Africa (OSIWA).
George Soros says, during a recent interaction with Nigerian media executives that “resources
belong to the people but are run by leaders who don’t put the people’s welfare ahead of their own
thereby giving rise to “resource curses”. It is a problem of many countries that are rich in natural
resources (see the Punch, February 13, 2008). The Nigerian elites are said to be scornful of their
country and prefers to invest their looted funds abroad, leaving it in what Assisie Asobie and
many other scholars called double-jeopardy. The country is said to have close to 100 billion
Naira, according to Joseph Stigutz in foreign accounts. These monies were ferreted into western
banks by corrupt Nigerian elite with its productive multiplier effect for the citizens of those
countries. Unlike in the South Korean elite who stole state resources and reinvested some in the
country thereby enhancing its massive industrialisation programme.

Results and Discussions
Despite the existence and enactment of more anti-corruption laws, there appear to be an
astronomical crescendo in the spate and tempo of corruption in the country. Habib (2000:29)
made what appeared to be a pathetic observation when he said:

There can be white washing of the stinking dirt of financial recklessness
that has been swept out of the bowel of claim and payment vouchers in the
National Assembly... the public office holders have consistently parted
company with their oath of office with regard to public funds. Driven by
greed, they made deep treasure excavations from the public purse.

The implication of the above is that the anti-corruption law notwithstanding, Nigeria in general
and elite in particular has not shown an improvement in ethical and moral dimensions. Sustainable
development, economic, political stability still remain elusive since these elitist
wishes are some indices of corruption free polity. The anti-corruption law, however, was enacted
to as a panacea for our national malaise, for ethics and morality are the norms of every decent
society.
However, the elitist resistance to innovation is conventional; the society's apparent non-responsiveness does not completely spell doom for the anti-corruption law. But the apparent corruption in high place portends a bleak future for the new law in terms of revolutionising the already decadent society. Okonkwo (2002), the provision of the anti corruption laws especially those of the criminal code are very technical and compartmentalised and this has resulted in many loopholes that have been exploited. The result is that in most cases, persons who are obviously guilty of the offences charged are set free on technical ground.

Accountability in Nigeria is form of rhetoric. The more emphasis is placed on it, the more it becomes a no matter in the practice of office holders. The foregoing have numerous effects on the anti-corruption crusade for example, a corrupt act represents a failure to achieve the objectives which government seeks (e.g. corruption in appointments induces inefficiency and waste; corruption in allocation of scarce university places results in best use not being made of a scarce opportunity, etc. Not only this, operators of the law are not adequately funded and not given free hand to operate because there were cases of power tussle between the former Economic and Financial Crime Commission (EFCC), Nuhu Ribadu and former Attorney General of the Federation over jurisdictional conflicts and the powers to approve and to end persecutions as it affects corruption. In addition, there is the problem of uncertainties about the dividing line between the roles, functions and powers of police, State Security Service (SSS), National Intelligent Agency (NIA), the Army, EFCC, Independent Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC), etc. on investigation handling and documentation of fraud or corruption. For instance, Section 4 of the Police Act provides Police with o---------mnibus powers to go into any crime investigation, corruption inclusive. These elitist corrupt practices has raised the pertinent question of how and when does each agency assume jurisdiction of which crime and to what extent does this oust the jurisdiction of other agencies from investigating the same crime (if corruption) simultaneously or subsequently.

From the above, the issue of lack of effective cooperation and coordination between the agencies arises. Can one agency suo moto transfer a case it is investigating to another agency? If so, is the transferee agency obliged to accept the case file and continue from where the transferor agency stopped? Or is it at liberty to start denovo or discontinue altogether. There is no provision for joint investigation team among the agencies. The elitist interests created the fundamental problem of lack of coordination among the agencies; in any case, there is a continuing confusion and conflict about their functions, ranking and operational hierarchy. Thus, elite corruption became most ubiquitous form of corruption in Nigeria where "speed money" or "grease payment" causes decisions to be weighted in terms of money, not human need which negatively impact on the effort and success of anti-corruption crusade.

Conclusions and Recommendations
Corruption generally is absence of accountability, law and order; and widespread corruption is a symptom of poorly functioning state and a poorly functioning state can undermine economic growth. Against this backdrop and views of the various cases of corruption shows that corruption is prevalent and lack of accountability culture. Thus allowing corruption to persist is to allow social decay which also signals and enfeeblement of a people's culture, animating principle and departure from the highest ideal of collective life.
To void Nigeria sinking deeper into this political decay called elitist corruption, the agencies should be funded adequately and given free hand to operate. The anti-corruption agencies should be streamlining, if its operations must be addressed.

It is suggested that the number of the agencies be reduced to make supervision and control easier. If there is no control, the exercises or problems of the agencies like human right abuses, disobedience to court orders, manipulations through function-switching by the executive, lack of coordination about corruption activities among the agencies would rather exacerbate than abate. The Federal Government should, more than before, demonstrate than it has enough political will to fight the monster instead of being mere rhetoric. Appropriate sanctions should be imposed on those found to be corrupt as to serve as deterrent to would be criminals as to enthrone the culture of accountability and transparency.
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