

Review Article

**POLITICAL CORRUPTION:
AN EXAMPLE OF THE UNITED STATES***

UDC 343.352:329](73)

Darko Dimovski¹, Jelena Stanojević²

¹Faculty of Law, ²Faculty of Science and Mathematics,
University of Niš, Serbia

Abstract. *In this paper, the authors explore the notion of political corruption, starting from political parties and politicians as holders of this form of corruption. The causes of corruption are generally similar in all political systems and largely depend on the structure of incentives, the scope of opportunities, risks and consequences underlying its detection. The consequences of political corruption are numerous and far-reaching; they hinder the country's social progress and undermine citizens' confidence in the basic social values and norms. Although political corruption is more or less present in many countries, the paper provides an insight into political corruption in the USA and the measures undertaken to suppress it through the adoption and implementation of appropriate legislation.*

Key words: *political corruption, political parties, United States, suppression measures.*

INTRODUCTION

Corruption, its detection and suppression is a great challenge for everyone, including citizens, business entities and representatives of various public authorities in a country. It is inherent to any political system, different levels of government, public officials who decide on the use of limited state resources or provision of appropriate services. In order to promote the exercise of "the welfare state" concept, state authorities have to embark on a decisive action against all forms of corruption.¹

Received October 15, 2013/Accepted November 11, 2013

Corresponding author: Darko Dimovski, LL.D. Assistant Professor

Faculty of Law, Trg kralja Aleksandra 11, 18 000 Niš, Serbia

Tel: +381 18 500 244 • E-mail: dimovski@prafak.ni.ac.rs

* The paper is a result of scientific research conducted under the projects No 179066 and No 179046, supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

¹ See: <http://www.transparency.hr/dokumenti/tekstovi/brosura.pdf>, access: 09.05.2010

As the basic and most dangerous form of corruption, political corruption is the central point from which corrupt practices stem from, rely on, and spread into all aspects of economic and social life. Politics, as a sum of conscious and planned activities of political entities, is perverted by corruption. As a rule, any authority is prone to corruption, and the absolute authority is commonly most susceptible to corruption.

In order to successfully counteract the political aspect of corruption in a society, the ruling political party must clearly articulate its determination to combat corruption and take preventive action. The analysis of the causes of corruption, its scope and consequences must be based on the analysis of the country's legal system. The prevalence of corruption is seen as one of the symptoms of a dysfunctional legal system. On the other hand, the non-functioning legal system is an evident sign of corruption.

In spite of being characteristic for developing countries, political corruption has also left its mark in the history in some developed countries. Thus, for example, the USA managed to cope with the problem of grand corruption in the late 19th and early 20th century and, today, it ranks among the states with the lowest corruption index. Therefore, this country may be used as a good example for establishing the anti-corruption policy and decision-making processes on anti-corruption measures in the countries which are still struggling with this problem.

1. DEFINITION OF POLITICAL CORRUPTION

Corruption is a threat to the core values of the democratic society. Corruption jeopardizes the exercise of the rule of law and state of law, and diminishes citizens' trust in public institutions, justice and equality of all. Moreover, it increases and intensifies social inequalities, encourages a dishonest way of living and unjustified enrichment by undermining the value of honest work. It hampers the development of an entrepreneurial climate, political culture and other basic social values.

The roots of corruption may be traced back to the dawn of civilization, bearing in mind that even then there were visible cases of a public position abuse for the purpose of attaining personal benefit. Corruption can take many different forms: high-level and low-level corruption, political and bureaucratic corruption, widespread and isolated corruption, corruption involving a network of complex or random transactions, etc. Notwithstanding many interpretations and definitions of corruption, there are three basic elements which are common to all forms of corruption: 1) an act of providing illegal benefits to government officials in addition to regular income related to their earnings, 2) the actions associated with those benefits which imply an explicit breach of law or implicit violation of social norms, 3) losses arising from these actions which are harmful for the society at large (Glaeser, Goldin, 2006: 3).

Political corruption, as a special type of corruption, is defined as a specific abuse of a political function for obtaining political advantage for oneself or another person which is contrary to the principles of integrity in politics and the public interest (Fatić, 2008: 29). Another definition of political corruption includes the behaviour in politics which implies violations of certain formal standards or rules established by the political system (Heidenheimer, LeVine, 2009: 156). Legally speaking, political corruption may be defined as conduct by means of which politicians violate the formal standards or a set of rules laid

down by the political system for its public officials (Heidenheimer, Johnston, LeVine, 2009: 156). The scope of behaviour which may be designated as political corruption has been significantly expanded by the definition of political corruption which rests on the criterion of public interest. Therefore, relying on this criterion, Arnold Rogow and Harold Lasswell define political corruption as any behaviour which may jeopardize the political system, public and civil order. Yet, a significant drawback of this definition is the impossibility to specifically define the public interest. Moreover, such a definition allows the politicians to justify all their actions as the public interest, even in cases when they violate specific legal rules (Heidenheimer, Johnston, Levine, 2009: 156). In addition to the aforementioned definitions of political corruption, there is a definition which is based on the majority public opinion. According to this criterion, political corruption is defined as any conduct which the general public perceives as corruption. Yet, this definition lacks a clear criterion for establishing what kind of behaviour is perceived as corruption by the general public (Heidenheimer, Johnston, LeVine, 2009: 156).

The definition of political corruption given by Joseph Nye is a widely accepted one. Nye noted that political corruption implies a behaviour which deviates from the formal duties of a public function for the purpose of gaining private wealth or status (Heidenheimer, LeVine, 2009: 156). Considering the similarity between political corruption and corruption in the public sector, the definition of political corruption should be addressed with utmost caution. Corruption in public institutions can be classified as an abuse of authority in the public sector either for personal gain or for the benefit of another. Such corruption occurs in case of deliberate violation of the principle of impartiality in decision-making processes for the purpose of appropriating some benefit or privilege (Stanojević, Dimovski, 2011: 98-99). The major difference between political corruption and corruption in the public sector is reflected in the holders of corruption. The holders of political corruption are public officials in high political positions in the party and the state, while the holders of corruption in public institutions are public servants in lower positions in the civil services-public administration. However, it should be noted that it is quite difficult to distinguish between political corruption and bureaucratic corruption because, in most states, politics is almost inseparable from public institutions (Amundsen, 1999: 4).

Political corruption encompasses a wide range of infractions and illegal acts committed by political leaders before, during and after exercising their public office. It differs from petty or bureaucratic corruption because it involves political leaders or elected public officials vested with some public authority who are obliged to act in the best public interest. The consequences of political corruption cannot be measured only in terms of money because it also leads to inequality in the access to government and public positions, ultimately resulting in the loss of public confidence in the political system.

In order to comprehensively consider all its consequences, it is necessary to use different approaches. First of all, political corruption can be observed by analyzing direct or indirect payments for obtaining of some benefit. The second approach points out to the frequency of such activities leading to illegal acquisition of benefits, which can be traced (although with some difficulty) by analyzing cases recorded in the court practice or in the media at least. The third approach, which may be most difficult to apply, takes into account the losses that may have long-term effects for the society as a whole (Glaeser, Goldin, 2006: 8). Thus, for example, corruption in education may have a long-term effect on the country's economic growth, not just at the moment when it takes place but also years later.

Political corruption leads the society in a wrong direction, depletes the legitimacy of the government, supports the wrong type of governance and serves as a bad example for future generations. Political corruption may also have other negative effects (Caiden, Dwivedi, Jabbra, 2001: 31):

- it undermines political decisions, gives rise to inefficient use of state resources and clearly indicates individuals' inobservance of the law;
- it points to a loss of moral authority, undermines the effectiveness of government activities, increases the likelihood of organized crime, and encourages police brutality;
- it increases costs, which are ultimately paid by taxpayers; the ultimate price of corruption is too high, particularly for the impoverished citizens who barely make ends meet, but, in the end, everyone pays either directly or indirectly;
- it provides immunity for criminal acts so that the law is practically "on sale" to the highest bidder.

Politicians are corrupt when they misuse their own position in the state hierarchy to make decisions which produce harmful effects to the state, when their actions are detrimental to the public interest and the legal disputes that the state has with various organizations, companies and other countries, when they misuse the public policy for personal promotion and/or gain without taking into account long-term public interests. The higher the politician's position in the hierarchy, the greater is the opportunity for political corruption (Fatić, 2008: 30). This is best supported by Lord Acton's statement: "Power tends to corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely" (Gildenhuis, 2004: 92).

Politicians frequently use illegal means to achieve better results in elections.² The political goals are often accomplished by allowing secret donors to contribute to the so-called "black" funds in exchange for a favour (such as: the implementation of some policy or adoption of specific legislation). It is particularly prominent in transition countries in the process of shifting to a market-oriented economy, when companies and businesses resort to "buying" laws. Thus, these companies shape the public policy and the legal environment at the detriment of state economy and other public interests.³

However, in the states based on the election process, politicians who aspire to remain in power are obliged not only to raise money for campaign but also to collect popular votes. They may be involved in corruption either while they are in government or while trying to come to power. Once politicians come to power, they may be involved in corruptive practices involving rent-collection, which is also regarded as the abuse of public position for private financial gain. However, in order to come to power, politicians need money and citizens' support. Hence, they may try to achieve their political goals by using

² In Germany, Helmut Kohl, the former chancellor and leader of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU), was accused of accepting secret donations for his party, even though he claimed that it was in the interest of the party. As the investigation revealed that there was a violation of law, Kohl was ordered to pay a fine of 300.000 DM and the CDU had to pay 21 million Euros, and lost the elections. Kohl's case is an example of corruption carried out by elected officials; it has been designated as an illegal campaign funding.

³ In Serbia, for example, the Socialist Party of Serbia (with the support of some opposition parties) managed to change the Excise Act by introducing an amendment which was favorable to the tobacco company "Monus", owned by a controversial businessman Predrag Rankovic Peconi.

different forms of corruption, such as: illegal campaign funds, buying votes and election fraud (Roux-Ackerman, 2008: 176-177).

2. PERCEPTION OF POLITICAL CORRUPTION IN THE UNITED STATES

The actual scope of political corruption is rather difficult to determine. Namely, the official statistics are frequently unreliable as they measure the work of the judicial bodies. The participants in political corruption do not want to be disclosed, which is an additional reason for failure to determine the actual scope of political corruption. Consequently, we may possibly measure the public perception of political corruption by surveying people (e.g. businessmen) who perceive themselves as victims of political corruption, or making surveys anonymous. Although the perception of political corruption usually does not reflect the real state of affairs, such statistical figures are indispensable because they point to the most critical areas infested by political corruption and reveal whether the taken actions produce results. The factors which contribute to the increase in the public perception of political corruption are public accusations (frequently based on unverified facts), a lack of general consensus on the actual contents of corruption (i.e. what corruption actually covers) as well as the animosity towards politicians. Although the statistics may show that the public perception of political corruption has increased, the actual state of affairs may be quite different. Some researchers believe that the problem of political corruption may be solved only by talking about it—the solution to the problem of political corruption lies in the opportunity to talk about it. Others believe that talking about political corruption certainly leads to an increase in the public perception of political corruption but it is also a sign that political corruption is on the rise.⁴

The Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) is an instrument which provides evidence of corruption on the international scale. From the total number of 174 states observed in the year 2012, the USA ranked in the first 10% of states which had the lowest corruption index.⁵ Nowadays, the United States has a reputation of as a country with a low-level corruption rate. Given the fact that the US used to be one of the countries with the highest corruption rate, its experience may serve as a good example for fighting corruption. However, the survey on the public perception of political corruption in the USA within the American National Election Study shows that one third of Americans believe that government officials are prone to corruption. Another survey conducted in February 2006, after the outbreak of the so-called Abramoff scandal,⁶ revealed that 41% of respondents believe that members of the US Congress take bribes from lobbyists.⁷ The data obtained in this survey may illustrate the claim that the perception of political corruption can be affected by everyday events (such as various scandals). In other words, although the public perception of political corruption has increased, the actual situation may be quite different.

⁴ See: http://www.transparentnost.org.rs/aktivnosti/antikorupec_sav/pdf/ALAC-pojam%20korupcije%20i%20korupcija%20kao%20krivicno%20delo%203.pdf; access: 02.12.2013

⁵ See: <http://www.transparency.org/cpi2012/results>; access: 05.05.2013

⁶ See: <http://www.infoplease.com/encyclopedia/history/abramoff-scandal.html>; access: 01.12.2013

⁷ See: <http://appl003.lsu.edu/artsci/polisci.nsf/%24content/brown+bag/%24file/kirbys+paper.pdf>; access: 01.12.2013

In 2013, the US conducted a survey aimed at establishing which sectors are most susceptible to corruption. The survey has shown that three-quarters of Americans believe that political parties are most corrupt; they are followed by the legislature, the mass media, public officials and businesses. The police, non-governmental organizations and the educational system are believed to be least corrupt.⁸ Observing these data in a wider context, we note that political parties, the legislature and public servants may be seen as falling into the same category as their activities are closely interrelated, which significantly increases the public perception of political corruption.

3. THE NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR COMBATING POLITICAL CORRUPTION IN THE UNITED STATES

Political corruption was immanent on the American continent even before the American Revolution against Great Britain. At the end of the 19th and early 20th century, corruption in the US was in many respects similar to the one which is today present in underdeveloped and developing countries. The governors appointed by the British used their positions to get enriched. The situation was similar after the American Revolution because of the government contracts which allowed for various forms of corruption. The main vessel of political corruption at that time was the Department of Indian Affairs.⁹

In the United States, fund-raising by political parties was prominent both in the political culture and in the legal context. In late 19th and early 20th century, the US passed many laws aimed at preventing the funding of political parties through donations from private funds. The implementation of these provisions was not always efficient considering that parties found ways to circumvent them.

In 1883, the US Congress tried to put an end to corruptive practices in the presidential election. In his election campaign, the seventh US president Andrew Jackson promised government jobs to his supporters if they gave him a percentage of their salary. In the 1830s, the Democratic Party determined the percentage that was to be paid by the employees at the Customs House in New York (Sabato, Ernst, 2007: 147). Although several congressmen proposed a bill to put an end to such practices, the bill was not approved. The assassination of US President James Garfield by a disgruntled job-seeker pursuing a position in the federal administration was an incentive for regulating this area. The 1883 Civil Service Reform Act expressly prohibited political parties and officials to solicit contributions from federal civil servants and provided that all individuals were equally entitled to apply for federal government positions (Sabato, Ernst 2007: 147).

Another area that had to be regulated pertained to donations given by representatives of various private corporations. In order to reduce the likelihood of political corruption by bribing the politicians, in 1905, American President Theodore Roosevelt called for prohibiting the participation of corporations in the presidential campaign (even though he had been involved in such a scandal himself only a year before). Soon afterwards, in 1907, the US Congress enacted the so-called Tillman Act, which prohibited corporations

⁸ See: <http://www.usnews.com/news/newsgram/articles/2013/07/10/majority-of-americans-say-corruption-has-increased>; access: 02.12.2013

⁹ See: <http://suite101.com/article/politican-corruption-in-america-a64786>; access 17.04.2013

and businesses to contribute money for political campaigns. Under the Tillman Act, any corporation representative who violated this provision was to be awarded a fine and sentenced to a term of one-year imprisonment at the most. Although the final version of the Act contained no provision obliging the political parties to disclose the donors, in 1908 both the Republicans and the Democrats started publishing their financial reports on the donors. Yet, the outreach of the Tillman Act was rather moderate; the only indictment raised on the grounds of a violation of this Act contained charges against the American Brewers Association, which made a donation to a candidate for the House of Representatives (Kazin, Edwards, Rothman, 2011: 61). Regardless of the fact that political party representatives voluntarily submitted financial statements (on donations), the proponents of combat against political corruption believed that it was necessary to adopt a new act which would explicitly prescribe such an obligation.

Thus, in 1910, the US Congress adopted the Federal Corrupt Practice Act which was subsequently amended in 1911. According to this Act, the member of both chambers of the US Congress were obliged to submit financial reports on the funding of their political campaigns both before and after the elections. Concurrently, there was limitation in terms of the funds that a candidate could spend in campaign (\$ 5000 for the House of Representatives and \$ 10,000 for the Senate). In case of any violation, the Act prescribed a fine and a term of two years' imprisonment (Kazin, Edwards, Rothman, 2011: 61). Yet, the Federal Corrupt Practice Act had some drawbacks which were observed in the course of the election campaign. The provisions pertaining to the limitation of financial assets proved to refer only to individual candidates but did not apply to the teams in charge of running the election campaigns. The practice of exploiting legal gaps and loopholes culminated in 1918, when the Republican candidate Truman Newberry defeated his rival, the Democrat car-industry magnate Henry Ford, in the election for the Senate. Ford contested the election claiming that Newberry had spent about \$ 190,000 through his campaign team, far more than he was allowed to under the FCP Act. The conflict gave rise to new court proceedings, and Newberry finally resigned in 1922. The case reached the US Supreme Court which decided that the trial court made mistakes and that certain provisions of the Federal Corrupt Practice Act were unconstitutional given that the US Congress applied them to regulate only the primary elections in federal states.¹⁰ The unconstitutional provisions of this Act were amended in 1924 and 1925, and the total amount of campaign expenditures was increased (Kazin, Edwards, Rothman, 2011: 61-62).

The Legislative Reorganization Act was passed in 1946. *Inter alia*, the Act was an attempt to limit and control lobbying in order to prevent political corruption. This Act stipulated that any person or organized group receiving money to influence the adoption of federal legislation in Congress had to be registered both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate; lobbyists and organizations were also obliged to provide a clear statement specifying their employers, membership, the salary amounts, costs and expenses for their services; moreover, lobbyists were obliged to submit quarterly financial statements on their incomes and expenditures as well as a quarterly report on their work, which was subsequently published in a special journal. For violation of these provisions, the Act envisaged a fine of up to \$10,000 and a sentence of 5 years' imprisonment. How-

¹⁰ See: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/95-489.ZS.html>, access: 30.11.2013

ever, the legislator did not achieve the anticipated goals for several reasons. The first reason was the opinion of the Supreme Court which stated that the Act applied only to lobbyists seeking to exert direct influence on the adoption of federal legislation; in other words, the lobbyists seeking to influence the legislative process through public opinion were not subject to this law. The second reason was embodied in the attitude that lobbyists seeking to influence the legislative process had to be registered but, in practice, they actually managed to find ways of circumventing the application of this provision by asserting that their main objective was something other than the influence on the legislature. Another reason was reflected in the fact that the Act did not include the lobbyists whose work was governed by various the executive branch agencies, nor did it cover the lobbyists testifying before various committees of Congress. Finally, the Act failed to achieve its projected goals because of the passivity of Congress in establishing a special agency which would control the lobbyists' activities (Sidlow, Henschen, 2009: 142).

In 1947, in order to reinforce the combat against political corruption, the US Congress passed the Labor-Management Relation Act, which is widely known as the Taft-Hartley Act (as it was adopted upon the initiative of Republican Senator Robert Taft from Ohio and Fred Hartley, the New Jersey representative in the House of Representatives). This Act significantly reduced the economic and political power of labor unions, which was reflected in the barring the labor unions and corporations from making contributions and supporting candidates in federal elections.¹¹ Concurrently, labour unions were made accountable to the federal government (Genovese, 2010: 466). Labor unions and corporations were also prohibited from funding campaign advertisements for election candidates. In response to this ban, labor unions established the organization known as the Political Action Committees (PACs), primarily aimed at collecting individual contributions from labor union members (workers) rather than contributions by labour unions given to support a particular party and its candidates (Johnson, Uradnik, Hower, 2011: 84).

In the 1950s and 1960s, corporations and businesses were prone to using PACs to indirectly finance political campaigns, which clearly pointed to the need to enact new legislation in order to prevent the possibility of political corruption (Johnson, Uradnik, Hower, 2011: 84 -85). Thus, in 1971, the US Congress adopted the Federal Election Campaign Act which reinforced the strict rules of campaign funding. In 1974, the legislator established the Federal Election Commission, which was in charge of implementing the Act, collecting and publishing financial reports on donors, and managing the public fund for the presidential election (Sabato, Ernst, 2007: 147). In 1974, 1976 and 1979, the Federal Election Campaign Act was amended, and these amendments laid down a clear normative framework for regulating the federal election campaign issues. The adopted amendments introduced: 1) strict limits on contributions to candidates in federal elections; 2) the obligation to disclose donors; 3) the public financing of presidential campaigns; 4) limited expenditures per candidate; 5) limited independent expenditures to \$1000; and 6) limited candidate expenditures from personal funds.

On 2nd January 1975, a New York Senator James Buckley filed a lawsuit with the District Court in Washington against the Secretary of the Senate, Francis Valeo. In his claim, he challenged the constitutionality of some provisions contained in the Federal

¹¹ See: <http://unitedrepublic.org/a-history-of-corruption-in-america/>; access: 17.04.2013

Election Campaign Act by arguing that they violate the rights envisaged in the First and the Fifth Amendment of the US Constitution. As the District Court denied Senator Buckley's request, he lodged an appeal with the Court of Appeal seeking to overturn these provisions. The Court partially upheld the Senator's request. Ultimately, in 1976, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the contribution limits and obligation of candidates for federal offices to disclose donors; however, the Court ruled that the provisions concerning the limitations on campaign expenditures, independent expenditures by individuals/groups and candidates' expenditures from personal funds were unconstitutional.¹² In another case (*Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee v. Federal Election Commission, 1996*) heard by the US Supreme Court, the Federal Campaign Committee of the Republican Party challenged the Federal Election Campaign Act provision imposing limitations on the political parties' expenditures in connection with the general election campaign for a single congressional candidate.¹³ The Supreme Court decided that political parties may spend unlimited amount of the so-called independent expenditures in the course of election campaign for US Congress (Foerstel, 1997: 37).

After the Watergate scandal in 1977, the US Congress passed the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act which expressly prohibited US companies to give, offer or promise anything of value to any foreign (non-US) official for the purpose of obtaining some advantage. This Act was adopted as a response to the facts discovered during the investigation into the Watergate scandal; the findings proved that US companies paid an amount of almost \$ 2 billion (in today's currency) to foreign officials in order to ensure contracts in other states. The Act regulates two major issues: the prohibition of corruption and the record-keeping standards (Cassin, 2008: 12). First, the Act expressly prohibits bribing foreign government officials in order to secure employment or keep the existing job; it also prohibits giving bribe to political parties abroad, their representatives and candidates for political functions. The Act also prohibits a direct and indirect corruption of foreign government officials, except in cases where the money is given to a foreign government official for the purpose of securing a foreign government decision in regular administrative proceedings (e.g. obtaining a license or other official document). In case of violating these provisions, a natural person may be awarded a fine and/or sentenced to a term of imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, whereas a legal person may be awarded a fine not exceeding \$ 2 million (Sayed, 2004: 205-207).

In an endeavour to improve the legislation on lobbying carried out by state officials, the US Congress passed the Lobbying Disclosure Act in 1995. Once it entered into force, this Act invalidated the related provisions on lobbying contained in the 1946 Act, which Senator William Cohen considered to be substantially flawed (Genovese, Farrar-Myers, 2010: 311). The Justice Committee stressed the importance of the new 1995 Act for strengthening the public confidence in the US Government and creating a uniform legal ground for regulating the activities of professional lobbyists (Straus, 2011: 2) who were now legally required to disclose their activities. Pursuant to this Act, a lobbyist is deemed to be any individual who receives regular payment for his lobbying activities and whose earnings from such services make at least 20% of the total income earned over a 6-month

¹² See: www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL30669.pdf, access: 29.11.2013

¹³ See: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/95-489.ZS.html>, access 30.11.2013.

period (Pozuelo-Monfort, 2010: 170). Moreover, the Lobbying Disclosure Act simplified the lobbyist registration procedure and obliged them to submit semi-annual reports identifying their clients, the lobbying issues and costs of their services (Straus, 2011: 2).

The 1995 Act was subject to further changes in 2007, when the US Congress enacted the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act, which introduced some changes in the definition of lobbying, the number of registered lobbyists and the periodic reports to be submitted by lobbyists. Unlike the 1995 Act which obliged the lobbyists to submit semi-annual reports, the new 2007 Act requires them to file reports in three-month intervals; by posting them on the Internet, the reports are made available for public scrutiny. Moreover, the total income for lobbying activities has been reduced from \$5,000 to \$2,500 over a three-month period, whereas the total expenses in connection with lobbying activities have been reduced from \$20,000 to 10,000\$ over a three-month period (Straus, 2011: 5). The accuracy of data in registration documents and reports is subject to a separate analysis.¹⁴ Lobbyists are also required to substantiate that they have not give a Congressman or a Congress employee some gift or bonus trip, which would imply a violation of the Rules of Congress (Hrebenar, Morgan, 2009: 181).

CONCLUSION

Political corruption has always existed and it has always been the root of all other forms of corruption (Dimovski, 2010: 409). In spite of the good will and efforts aimed at combating this global phenomenon, political corruption is hard to eradicate. It is a complex problem involving many factors and forces. However, some countries have been more successful than others in fighting corruption. The experiences of these countries, including the United States, may be useful to other countries which are currently struggling with the same problem.

Looking into the US experience, the authors have explored the development of the normative framework on combating political corruption in the United States by providing an overview of the most significant legislative acts which have been used in counteracting political corruption in the US. The authors have also pointed out to the drawbacks of specific legislative solutions, which were used as a corrective in the process of adopting new legal solutions in this area. Given the public perception of the American citizens that political corruption is the most common and widespread form of corruption, the authors have elaborated on the evolution of the US government combat against political corruption.

The awareness of the far-reaching consequences of political corruption has contributed to instituting anti-corruption campaigns, which include not only the anti-corruption agencies but also the society as a whole. Apart from the public support, the success of these campaigns also depends on providing legal, financial and technical support which will ensure prompt identification of corruptive practices and help bring the perpetrators of such illegal acts to justice.

¹⁴ See: <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/secretary/RL34377.pdf>, access: 02.05.2013

REFERENCES

1. Caiden, Gerald E. Dwivedi, O. P. Jabbara, Joseph G., "Where Corruption Lives", Kumarian Press, Bloomfield, CT, USA, 2001.
2. Cassin, R., "Bribery Abroad: Lessons from the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act", 2008.
3. Fatić, A., "Politička korupcija", Revija za bezbednost, Centar za bezbednosne studije, Belgrade, 2008, No 12.
4. Gildenhuis, J. S. H., "Ethics and Professionalism: The Battle Against Public Corruption", Sun Press, Stellenbosch, 2004.
5. Glaeser, Edward L. and Goldin, Claudia, "Corruption and Reform: Lessons from America's Economic History". Chicago, IL, USA: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
6. Heidenheimer, A., Johnston, M., LeVine, V., "Political Corruption: Concepts & Contexts", Transaction Publishers, United States of America, 2009.
7. Rouz S. – Ejkerman, "Ekonomija korupcije", Službeni glasnik, Belgrade, 2008, pp. 176-177.
8. Sidlow, E., Henschen, B., "America at Odds", Cengage Learning, Wadsworth, 2009.
9. Straus, J., "Lobbying Registration and Disclosure: Before and After the Enactment of the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007", Congressional Research Service, 2011.
10. See: <http://www.transparency.hr/dokumenti/tekstovi/brosura.pdf>; access: 09.05.2010
11. See: <http://www.transparency.org/cpi2012/results>; access: 05.05.2013
12. See: <http://suite101.com/article/politican-corruption-in-america-a64786>; access: 17.04.2013
13. See: <http://unitedrepublic.org/a-history-of-corruption-in-america/>; access: 17.04.2013
14. See: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Buckley_v._Valeo; access: 17.04.2013.

POLITIČKA KORUPCIJA NA PRIMERU SJEDINJENIH AMERIČKIH DRŽAVA

U radu autori određuju pojam političke korupcije, polazeći od političkih partija i političara kao nosioca ovog oblika korupcije. Uzroci korupcije su generalno slični u svim političkim sistemima i zavise od strukture podsticaja, opsega mogućnosti, rizika i posledica detekcije. Posledice ovog tipa korupcije su mnogobrojne i dalekosežne, i one sputavaju državu na njenom putu društvenog progressa i podrivaju veru u osnovne društvene vrednosti i norme. Iako, u manjem ili većem obimu prisutna u mnogim zemljama, u radu je dat njen uvid u SAD-u, kao i mere preduzete za njeno suzbijanje kroz donošenje i primenu odgovarajućih zakonskih rešenja.

Ključne reči: *politička korupcija, političke stranke, SAD, mere za suzbijanje*