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ABSTRACT

Anti-graft institution by every examination is established to check and balance the problem of corruption in any country. The Nigerian state since independence has been bedeviled with issues of corruption at every regimes/governments despite the presence of anti-graft agencies. Hence, it is within the core of this perspective that this paper anchored to examine “anti-graft institutions and corruption” in Nigeria from 1975-2016. Analyzing this paper from a historical lens would give us a view, as to whether, if these anti-corruption institutions have been able to tackle the issue of corruption ravaging the country or not? Findings from this research revealed that anti-graft institutions in Nigeria since 1975 have not been able to tackled the question of corruption in the country effectively. It was also found that corruption has been on the increase despite the existence of anti-graft institutions structured to mitigate corruption. The paper adopts the Historical...
Research Methods (HRM) using qualitative technique approach. Secondary sources, as well as online (internet) materials were consulted. The paper concludes by way of submission, on the failure of anti-graft institution to tackle the questions of corruption in Nigeria.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Corruption as a concept can be understood from a general and broad perspective. The generic and universal nature must be seen as a phenomenon of menace to all countries irrespective of their status of development or under development. Corruption despite its global spread can be specifically interpreted on individual country basis and also from the sphere of society which includes: social, political, economic, cultural, administrative, legal, technological and educational types. Aluko in line with the objective of the paper stressed that fact that, from all indications, Nigeria is not one of those that can effectively handle corruption, despite its unending corruption commissions and all the noise made by every administration on the efforts to transform the nation into a corruption free society [1]. According to her, there are many unresolved problems, but the issue of the upsurge of corruption is alarming. Corruption is endemic in Nigeria. The damages it has done to the polity are astronomical. This menace has led to situations like slow movement of files in offices, police extortion of toll fees, port congestion, queues at passport offices and petrol stations, ghost workers syndrome, election irregularities, among others [2]. Hoffman and Patel observation also disclosed that, “close to $400 billion was stolen from Nigeria’s public accounts from 1960 to 1999 and that between 2005 and 2014 some $182 billion was lost through illicit financial flows (ICF) from the country” [3].

The above estimation for the country is basically with the omission of the years 2000-2004 (4years). The estimation and analysis by years divided with the supposed amounts lost to corruption is clear as to the magnitude of the period. The years from 1960-1999 clearly shows thirty nine (39) years of existence, and where the said amount is divided in the years you see an approximated amount of about $10.2 billion stolen yearly. The division for the years 2005-2014 shows a period of nine (9) years and where this is divided by its approximate stolen amount we see clearly the sum of 20.2 billion stolen yearly. This clearly shows the magnitude and level of corruption in its growth in Nigeria. It can be submitted also that the issues of anti-corruption laws and institutions became glare and important, so also is this paper in its measurement of these institutions and corruption in Nigeria.

Transparency international in its definition of corruption summarily keys into our universal and global construct to which it document it, as “the abuse of entrusted power for private gain” [4]. In the same light also Kanu, and Osunbajo defined the concept as; “the conscious or well-planned act by a person, or group of persons to appropriate by unlawful means the wealth of another person or persons” [5]. Despite these sphenal types that are broad in nature, there is the relative concept and specially contextual in nature to which countries or regions of the world can be classified using the prevalent and persistent nature of practice. In light of this contextual explanation, is the paper’s focus and examination of the concept of corruption from a unique perspective, which gives an insight understanding of the Nigeria’s corruption situation.

The paper in its theme is one that views from a historical lens an examination that is analytical and fact ladden by tabular/documentation details that gives an understanding of the effects in anti-corruption crusades by regimes/governments and also projects that effort of anti-corruption institutions by measure of its contribution to curbing or aiding corruption in Nigeria.

2. PREAMBLE TO CONTEXTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF TERMS

The interpretation of corruption in Nigeria is unique, which found its way from the colonial through the post-colonial era and ingrained into the fabric of the country. The essence of disaggregating Nigeria’s nature of corruption is to give a contextual explanation of the predominant ones that are enhanced by governments systems and seen from the lenses of Political, Economic and Bureaucratic, on which all the others are anchored and protected. The brief expression of this argued primal contextual concept is to clearly
outline and relate the arguments to the theme of the paper in its comparative analysis of anti-graft institutions and corruption in Nigeria. According to the World Bank;

Corruption is the abuse of public office through the instrumentality of private agents, who actively offer bribes to circumvent public policies and processes for competitive advantage and profit. Beyond bribery, public office can also be abused for personal benefit through patronage and nepotism, for example the theft of state assets or the diversion of state revenues. The World Bank also defines corruption as: “The abuse of public office for private gains” [6].

The Corrupt Practices and other related offences Act, 2000 defines corruption to include “bribery, fraud and other related offences like gratification” [7]. In addition, Transparency International defines; corruption as an abuse when public office holders sway public by collecting bribes for self-increase. These definitions bring us to our main understanding of the types of corruption we have in Nigeria. Another understanding of the concept of corruption is seen from the definition of Igwe; as conscienceless promptitude to use power authoritatively for selfish, repressive and oppressive purposes, unpatriotic and unjustifiable political discrimination and victimization, scandalous politicking on the corridors of power, unhealthy and despicable election malpractices as well as political arrogance and bitterness; readiness to sacrifice all values no matter how sacrosanct or strategic in the useless worship of and made rush for money, wealth, scandalous practices of diverting public funds into private coffers and of inflating government contracts and other business deals in the hole of eventual kick-backs [8].

From the definitions of corruption, one would understand that corruption covers all institutions and the concept of corruption is having different definition. Another important definition is in the words of Nye, to him corruption is seen as behavior which deviates from the formal duties of public role. This includes such behavior as bribery (use of a reward to pervert the judgment of a person in a position of trust), nepotism (bestowal of patronage by reason of inscriptive relationship rather than merit), and misappropriation (illegal appropriation of public resources for private- regarding uses) [9].

In supporting this claim Rotimi et al, avers that corruption includes; “bribery, smuggling, fraud, illegal payments, money laundering, drug trafficking, falsification of documents and records, window dressing, false declaration, evasion, under -payment, deceit, forgery, concealment, aiding and abetting of any kind to the detriment of another person, community, society or nation” [10].

The definitions of corruption above bring to our understanding the objective of the paper, which is to bring to limelight the historical trajectories of anti-graft institutions and corruption in Nigeria as from 1975 to 2016. In this case, since we are discussing corruption at the top or upper level, it is important to understand what political corruption is, as it relate to Nigeria situation. Political corruption is when the political power-holders, who are entrusted to make and enforce the laws in the name of the people are themselves corrupt. This corruption is obtained in the three arms of government namely, executive, legislature, and judiciary. This corruption is the worse because it involves State fund. In a similarly fashion, political corruption can also be classify as bureaucratic or administrative in the sense that bureaucratic or administrative corruption is also the abuse of public administrative office by State agents to amass wealth for private gains or benefit at the expense of the society. It is one of the basic mechanism through which the political power-holders enrich themselves. Bureaucratic corruption involves the technocrats, public and civil servants, who implement government policies. Bureaucratic corruption has to do with allocation, release and use of money. The officials are the ones that propose and submit financial needs of the unit as well as transfer and effect payment. While Economic or Financial corruption occurs when business people use corrupt means to pervert the normal institutional regulations, hasten or shorten procedures and get undue advantage or value for goods and services. Economic and financial corruption also occurs at the three levels of governance.

3. UNDERSTANDING GLOBAL CORRUPTION PERCEPTION INDEX AND NIGERIA’S PLACEMENT SINCE 1996-2016

The understanding of the concept of global corruption perception index is key and important to the analysis and interpretation of corruption in any situation. In this paper, the corruption index despite the indices of the corruption provided by the transparency international has been abused and politicized within the scope of placement of
countr

countries by their position. It has also been seen from the scope of publicity propaganda and positioning of government as an achievable attainment/ improvement as it is always done by the government of Nigeria.

The reading of the indices of rating and ranking of countries by transparency international as documented by Olaniyan of the ranking parameters of analysis to include; scale of 0-100 to be the structure to which countries which falls within the range of 0-50% as seen as highly corrupt which those from 50%-100% as perceived as clean and not corrupt. Therefore any country with a rating of less than 50% falls within an index of highly corrupt. The table below by the authors takes into cognizance the corruption perception index (CPI) from 1996 to the last in 2016, with clear classification of the indices used in the analysis of institutions and the global placement of Nigeria.

From the presentation of the table and the documentation by year, countries surveyed Nigeria's ranking, position as a result of the ranking and the percentage of corruption gives a clear picture of a consistent level of placement of Nigeria as highly corrupt, between the years 1996-2016. It can be seen that in terms of position, the country still falls below the 50th position which classifies all countries below as highly corrupt. The cursory comparism of the percentage, position and ranking from 1996-2016 confirms the position of the country as highly corrupt despite the existence of anti-corruption institutions in comparative terms with their years of establishment from 1975 and specifically the ones established in 2000.

4. HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF ANTI-CORRUPTION INSTITUTION IN NIGERIA

The view of anti-corruption institution in Nigeria for many people is the one that is mostly attributed to the return to civil rule and specifically under the leadership of President Olusegun Obasanjo. As much as it constitutes part of the history, it can also be argued that it serves as the last in terms of their establishment since the turnoff of the millennium. The essence of this brief overview and the presentation of the information in tabular and succinct manner are to enhance and deepen the understanding of these institutions by period, regime/government, focus of programme and the challenges that confronted past ones and are confronting the current institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Countries Surveyed</th>
<th>Nigeria's Ranking</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>95.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>75.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>82.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>78.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>81.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Transparency International’s Corruption Perception Index (CPI) Report (1999-2016) and Restructured by the Authors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Regime/Administration</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Organization/Institution</th>
<th>Programmes</th>
<th>Main Challenge/Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975-1979</td>
<td>Muritala/Obasanjo</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau CPIB</td>
<td>Anti-Corruption Crusade</td>
<td>Corrupt leadership frustrated the Bureau by outlawing the use of affidavits as instruments for anti-corruption purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-1983</td>
<td>Alhaji Shehu Shagari</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Ethical Revolution (ER)</td>
<td>Social and Ethical Revolution</td>
<td>Public officials under the legislature frustrated the Code of Conduct Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1993</td>
<td>Gen. Badamasi Babangida</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>National Orientation Movement (NOM)</td>
<td>Holistic Orientation Movement against Bad Attitude and Behaviour</td>
<td>IBB did not make any serious attempt at stopping corruption and was reputed for being &quot;kind in treatment of corruption allegations among principal officers in his government&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-1998</td>
<td>Gen. Sani Abacha</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>War Against Indiscipline and Corruption(WAI-C)</td>
<td>War Against Indiscipline and Corruption</td>
<td>Abacha crusade lost much credibility when he merely deployed six acting administrators found guilty of corruption and himself &quot;proved most stupendous in public treasury looting&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2007</td>
<td>Chief Olusegun Obasanjo</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Code of Conduct Bureau /TribunalCCB/T</td>
<td>Institutional Establishment of Code of Conduct Bureau /Tribunal against Bureaucratic and Public Indiscipline</td>
<td>Lack of political will and commitment to attacking high level corruption diluted his government actions in pursuit of greater transparency through these agencies. Another problem is their acts of Omission and Commission, is that they appear to lack complete independence. The ICPC is slow to act and cannot in the strict sense of things prosecute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2007</td>
<td>Chief Olusegun Obasanjo</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Independent Corrupt Practices (and Other Related Offences) Commission (ICPC)</td>
<td>Anti-Corruption Practices of Independent and Other Related Offences</td>
<td>Lack of political will and commitment to attacking high level corruption diluted his government actions in pursuit of greater transparency through these agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Period | Regime/Administration | Year | Organization/Institution | Programmes | Main Challenge/Failure |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
1999-2007 | Chief Olusegun Obasanjo. | 2002 | Economic and Financial Crime Commission (EFCC) | War against Economic and Financial Crime | Other reasons for the underperformance of the Commission include; inefficiency of the judiciary, lack of societal cooperation, poor staff training, plea-bargaining and systemic disorder. Both the ICPC have been tinted that they have prima facie evidence of wrong-doing against a majority of state governors, but have been unable to prosecute them because of restraining legal frameworks. |

Lack of political will and commitment to attacking high level corruption diluted his government actions in pursuit of greater transparency through these agencies. The 1999 Federal Constitution, immunity is conferred on 74 public office holders, including the President, Vice-President, 36 state governors, and 36 deputy governors, who can neither have criminal proceedings instituted against them or be arrested or imprisoned while in office. These provisions have been blamed for hindering anti-corruption because it is mainly top public office holders that commit heinous economic and financial crimes who yet hide under immunity throughout their tenure 19 spanning four years or eight years if they get a second term.

Source: Compiled by Authors
The history of these institutions would be best appreciated from the lens that gives a brief history into the history of corruption in post-independence Nigeria. This history is one that is best understood from the perspective of the measurement of disease from the angle of epidemic, endemic and pandemic. The Nigerian case study in post-independence era can be attributed to the first republic politician and the coup of 1966, as the issue of corruption formed a main factor to the military that spur the coup according to Nzeogwu Kaduna in his coup speech to which key areas are extracted and documented to give an insight to this submission. “The aim of the Revolutionary council is to establish a strong united and prosperous nation, free from corruption and internal strife…..” [11]. In the speech was the warning and punishment to all from indulging in the acts.

You are thereby warned (sic) that looting, arson, homosexuality, rape, embezzlement, bribery or corruption, sabotage, subversion, false alarms and assistance to foreign invaders, are all offences punishable by death [12].

In a serious indictment format is the identification of the agents of corruption and their extension enumeration as at the time of the coup to envelop the first republic;

Our enemies are the political profiteers, the swindler, the men in high and low places that seek bribes and demand 10 percent; those that seek to keep the country divided permanently so that they can remain in office as ministers or VIPs at least the tribalists, the nepotists, those that, make the look big for nothing before international circles, those that have corrupted our society and put the Nigerian political calendar back by their words and deeds [13].

The snapshot of the part of the speech clearly shows this as the identification of corruption in Nigeria from its epidemic nature and the main aim of the coup. The most interesting part of the speech is in the identification of the enemies of the country and the nature/type of corruption that can be argued has developed in leaps and bound, meaning its trajectory till date with regime/administration into endemic and its now at a pandemic disease nature in the country. This becomes pertinent warrant to our trace of the history of anti-corruption institutions in Nigeria as reflected in this tabulation documentation.  

The explanation of the above table as a documentation highlighting in brief a history of anti-corruption institutions in Nigeria is important and necessary for the understanding of the analysis of the narrative of corruption. The structuring of the table into the period of regime/administration; leader/head of the regime/administration; name of anti-corruption institution; the term of programme/institution and importantly the main challenge/failure of the institution gives an in-depth understanding of this trajectory of the history of anti-corruption institution in Nigeria.

5. ANALYSIS OF CORRUPTIONS AND FAILURE OF THE ANTI-GRAFT INSTITUTIONS TO TACKLED THE PROBLEM

To understand the corrupt practices that gave rise to the creation of anti-graft institutions in Nigeria, it is important to lay some examples to some of the corrupt practices of our leaders during their stay in office. First and foremost, the Murtala/Obasabjo's regime gives an insight and a correlation of the growth of corruption as key to regimes of Gowon (July-1966 and February 1975). Murtala first sequestrated the looted funds and properties accumulated by Nigerians. Example of which was the Yakubu Gowon's administration corruption scandal that was kept away from public view until 1975. In 1975, a corruption scandal surrounding the importation of cement engulfed many officials of the defense ministry and the central bank of Nigeria. Officials were later accused of falsifying ship manifestos and inflating the amount of cement to be purchased [14]. Murtala Muhammed Administration found ten out of the twelve military governors that served in the Gowon government corrupt [15]. The action of the Murtala regimes to the military governors of the then twelve (12) States and to the civil service clearly shows the focus on corruption and also can be argued as a plausible reason for the establishment as seen from our historical documentation of the anti-corruption institution as a point of trace. In substantiating the corruption insight are some of the immediate actions of Murtala.

As soon as Murtala became head of State, all of the twelve military governors that served under Gowon were immediately retired. Murtala also ordered a probe into their conduct in office ten of the twelve were found to have illegally enriched themselves while in office. Murtala said they had “betrayed the trust and confidence reposed in
them by the nation......... (and) betrayed the ethics of their professions and they are to be dismissed with ignominy "the retirement of military governors found guilty of corrupt enrichment was converted to dismissal........
.Only Brigadiers Oluwolde Rotimi and Mobolaji Johnson were found innocent of corruption [16].

This submission shows clearly that among the other issues listed in Murtala's inaugural speech was the issue of corruption in the military that came as a result of revenge and reprisal coup of 1966 that brought the same set into power. The civilians who served under Gowon were also not left out as, apart from the commissioner of finance Shehu Shagari and the commissioner for mines and power Ali Munguno, all of Gowon's civilian ministers were also found guilty of corrupt enrichment and were shipped of illegally obtained assets. Among those found to have corruptly enriched himself was the veteran nationalist politician Anthony Enahoro, who several years later would become a staunch opponent of military rule of the military governor. Ogbemudia forfeited 11 properties in the midwest region, Bako forfeited 23 properties across Nigeria, Asika 5 properties, Gonwalk 6 developed plots, Diefe-Spiff 18 developed plots in port-Harcour, Faruk 14 buildings, Johnson forfeited plot 9, W.N.H.C Estate in Ikeja and Bamigbaye, usman and Kyari forfeited 4 properties each. Esuene had to reimburse N25, 672 and Edwin Clark (federal commissioners) lost 16 properties including light cinema houses, an undeveloped plot at Jjora, a super market and other developed plots in warri Benin and Lagos. Other public officials made to forfeit properties and assets included J.E Adetoro, Philip Asiodu, J.H Bassey, V.I Bello and I.M Damcida, O Ahmadu-Suka and F.A Ijewere. Bello Ijewere had to refund N56, 776 and 186, 641 respectively [17].

It is important to point here that, much of the ill-gotten assets seized by Murtala were returned several years later by the regime of General Ibrahim Babangida for reasons that have never been fully explained. This decision by Babangida was all the more battling, given that he was a member of the regime that stripped the assets in the first place. The Babangida regime issued the forfeiture of assets (Release of certain forfeited properties etc) Decree No. 24 of 1993 which returned some of the forfeited properties to Farule and his wife Asika, Gonwalk, Kam Salem, Adetoro, Asiodu, Bako, Johnson and Usman. The Decree was silent on Ogbemedia, Babangida, Bamigboye, Diene-Spiff, Clark, Kyari and Esuene [18].

The first administration of Olusegun Obasanjo was a continuation of the Murutala Mohammed administration and was focused on completing the transition program to democracy, as well as implementing the national development plans. Major projects including building new refineries, pipelines, expanding the national shipping and airlines as well as hosting FESTAC was done during this administration. A number of these national projects were conduits to distribute favors and enrich connected politicians. The famous Afrobeat musician, Fela Kuti, sang variously about major scandals involving the international telecommunication firm ITT led by Chief MKO Abiola in Nigeria, which the then Head of State, Gen Olusegun Obasanjo was associated with [19]. In addition to this, the Operation Feed the Nation Program, and the associated land grab under the Land Use Decree implemented by the then Head of State was used as conduits to reward cronies, and his now-famous Otta Farm Nigeria (OFN) was supposedly a project borne out of this scandal [19].

The Second Republic, under President Shehu Shagari, witnessed a resurgence of corruption. The Shagari administration was marked by spectacular government corruption, as the President did nothing to stop the looting of public funds by elected officials. Corruption among the political leaders was amplified due to greater availability of funds. It was claimed that over $16 billion in oil revenues were lost between 1979 and 1983 during the reign of President Shehu Shagari [21]. It became quite common, for federal buildings to mysteriously go up in flames, most especially just before the onset of ordered audits of government accounts, making it impossible to discover written evidence of embezzlement and fraud [22]. True to his nature, President Shehu Shagari was too weak in his administration of the country. A soft-spoken and mild mannered gentleman Shagari was pathetic in his inability to call his ministers and political lieutenants to order or stop them from embezzling state funds. No politician symbolized the graft and avarice under Shagari's government more than his combative Transport Minister, Alhaji Umaru Dikko, who was alleged to have mismanaged about N4 billions of public fund meant for the importation of rice [23].
Muhammadu Buhari led a popular coup that again rescued the economy from the grip of corrupt politicians of the Second Republic. The 1983 coup was carried out with the aim of halting corruption and restoring discipline, integrity and dignity to public life. General Buhari’s regime promised to bring corrupt officials and their agents to book [24]. In 1985, a cross-section of politicians was convicted of corrupt practices under the government of General Muhammadu Buhari, but the administration itself was only involved in a few instances of lapsed ethical judgment. Some cite the suitcases scandal which also coincidentally involved then customs leader Atiku Abubakar, who later became Vice President in 1999, and was indicted for various acts of corruption. “The 53 suitcases saga arose in 1984 during the currency change exercise ordered by the Buhari junta when it ordered that every case arriving the country should be inspected irrespective of the status of the person behind such. The 53 suitcases were, however, ferried through the Murtala Muhammed Airport without a customs check by soldiers allegedly at the behest of Major Mustapha Jokolo, the then aide-de-camp to Gen. Buhari. Atiku was at that time the Area Comptroller of Customs in charge of the Murtala Muhammed Airport” [25].

The regime of General Ibrahim Babangida has been seen as the body that legalized corruption. His administration refused to give an account of the Gulf War windfall, which has been estimated to be $12.4 billion. He rigged the only successful election in the history of Nigeria on June 12, 1993. He lives in a very exquisite mansion in his home state of Niger. In General Ibrahim Babangida’s tenure, corruption became a policy of the state. He routinely disbursed vehicles and cash gifts to people to earn loyalty, and the discipline of the military force eroded [26]. The term “IBB Boys” emerged, meaning fronts for the head of state in the business realm, someone who will transact dirty deals from drug dealing with money laundering. General Ibrahim Babangida used various government privatization initiatives to reward friends and cronies, which eventually gave rise to the current class of nouveau riche in Nigeria. From banking to oil and import licenses, IBB used these favors to raise cash for himself and his family and is regarded as one of the richest ex-rulers of Nigeria supposedly with significant investment in Globacom one of the largest telecom operators in Nigeria, regarded as a front for his empire [27].

In the face of intense public opposition to his rule, General Babangida reluctantly handed the reins of government to a non-elected military-civilian Interim National Government on 26th August 1993 which was later ousted from power by the military under the leadership of General Sani Abacha on 17th November 1993. Abacha’s regime only furthered the deep-seated corrupt practices, which already characterized public life since the inception of the Babangida regime. Under General Abacha, corrupt practices became blatant and systematic [28]. General Abacha and his family alongside his associates looted Nigeria's coffers with reckless abandon. The extent of Abacha’s venality seemed to have surpassed that of other notorious African rulers, such as Mobutu Sese Seko of Zaire (now called the Democratic Republic of Congo). It was estimated that the embezzlement of public funds and corruption proceeds of General Abacha and his family amounted to USD 4 billion [29].

Under Babangida and Abacha regimes, corruption in public offices became so deplorable as to be officially entrenched as the norm. It was unfashionable not to “settle” or give “egunje” to get any service from a public office. Also, systematic emptying of public vaults simply became maddening. Under these two administrations, corruption was institutionalized as a tool of political control. As much as US$ 12.2 billion in oil revenues simply “disappeared” under Babangida’s watch [30]. Abacha alone is believed to have personally stolen between $1 and $3 billion in office [31]. Both subjected their critics to abuses including intimidation, arbitrary detention, and allegedly murder [32]. With this in mind, Ogbeidi opined that:

The Fourth Republic commenced with the election of General Olusegun Obasanjo as the President of Nigeria in 1999. Indeed, the sixteen unbroken years of the military era from the fall of the Second Republic in 1983 and the restoration of democracy in 1999 represents an era in the history of the country when corruption was practically institutionalized as the foundation and essence of governance [33].

Consequently it is important to argue her that, being aware of the decades of systematic corruption perpetrated by the successive military and political leadership of Nigeria and the devastating effects it has had on the country in all ramifications of national life, the Obasanjo-led civilian government strengthened existing anti-corruption laws and established two
important anti-corruption institutions – the Independent Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC) and the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) – to tackle the phenomenon of corruption in public and private life squarely [34]. Various corruption scandals broke out under Olusegun Obasanjo's presidency, including one of the international dimensions when his vice president was caught in cahoots with a US Congressman stashing cold hard cash (literally) in freezers. In addition to this, the KBR and Siemens bribery scandals broke out under his administration, which was investigated by the FBI and led to international indictments indicating high-level corruption in his administration [35]. Some other acts of corruption tied to Olusegun Obasanjo included the Transcorp shares scandal that violated the code of conduct standards for public officers, and the presidential library donations at the eve of his exit from the power that pressured associates to donate. Obasanjo was also said to widely lobby for his failed campaign to alter the constitution to get a third term by actively bribing the legislators, further deepening corruption at the highest levels [36].

Musa Umaru Yaradua's ascent and time in office were short, although a fair number of corruption scandals from previous administrations came to light under his tenure and went uninvestigated due to lack of political will and poor health [37]. One of the allegations of corruption against late President Umaru Musa Yar’adua was his connection with ex-governors who have been entrenched as corrupt [38]. These include James Ibori, the former governor of Delta State, Alamieyeseigha, the prosecuted governor of Bayelsa State; while nominated Sam Eguwu, the former Governor of Ebonyi State as a Minister of Education. The ex-culprits were also nominated for 2009 national award by the former President [39].

The government of Goodluck Jonathan had several running scandals including the BMW purchase by his Aviation Minister, to the tune of N255 million naira and security contracts to militants in the Niger Delta, massive corruption and kickbacks in the Ministry of Petroleum, the Malabu Oil International scandal, and several scandals involving the Petroleum Ministry. In the dying days of Goodluck Jonathan’s administration, the Central Bank scandal of cash tripping of mutilated notes also broke out, where it was revealed that in a four-day period, 8 billion naira was stolen directly by low-level workers in the CBN [40]. This revelation excluded a crime that is suspected to have gone on for years and went undetected until revealed by a whistle-blower. The Central Bank claims the heist undermined its monetary policy [41]. Despite the replacement of the chairperson, EFCC was silenced to deal with corrupt public officials. This was evident in numerous cases of financial misappropriation, including prevention of EFCC to investigate Minister of Petroleum, Diezani K. Alison-Madueke, Stella Oduah, former minister of aviation, Abdulrasheed Maina, chairman of pension reform among others. The former president prevented EFCC from performing its constitutional role [42].

Thus, the analysis from the above clearly shows that, those who established the anti-graft institutions from 1975 to 2016 are themselves corrupt. And the analysis also shows that anti-graft institutions overtime have been guiding and favouring those in office, because those appointed to chair the commission receive orders from their appointee. It is no longer an independent commission but dependent commission. Dependence on those in power have really crippled the strength and efforts of the various anti-graft commission or institutions at every regime/administration.

6. CONCLUSION

From our discussion so far, we can draw the curtain by concluding that anti-graft institutions overtime have become an effective instrument in shielding the looters as well as for political persecution. The incumbent used these institutions to oppress their opponents or rivals from other parties, or those who wish to turn against them. Nigerian leaders who introduced these anti-graft institutions have been guilty of corruption charges in one form or the other. Anti-graft institutions in Nigeria are shadow of themselves, they are toothless bulldogs, who can only bark but cannot bite. The main implication that is clearly overwhelming in nature of how corruption has seriously underdeveloped the nation called Nigeria. The measurement of corruption in the country from the point of our analysis shows that there is no sector of the economic that it has not affected greatly. The lens of the comparative analysis of institutions shows the issues identified as notorious and prevalent that has really affected anti-corruption institutions in their fight against the pandemic disease of corruption in Nigeria. The understanding of the paper from its structured,
fact presentation of tables addresses the global understanding from a perceptual angle of corruption; it also presents an overview of the history of anti-corruption institutions taking into cognizance regimes/administrations and most importantly each institutions main challenge and reason of failure, fraud fighting agencies from the perspective of established law/act, aim/objectives and the aspect of challenges.
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