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Abstract

This paper examines perceptions of corruption in Croatia, its negative impacts to the development and anti-corruption measures in the context of the future accession of Croatia to the European Union. The main hypothesis of this paper is that there are high perceptions of corruption in Croatia, which is an obstacle to socio-economic development. Seizing corruption is a necessary criterion for the Croatian membership in the European Union, and the lack of effective implementation of anti-corruption policy measures makes the existing anti-corruption policy still inefficient. The corruption prevalence in Croatia is analysed from three different viewpoints. The first one examines international ranking of Croatia as a relatively highly corrupt country. This is followed by the analysis of recent survey results investigating the corruption perceptions of citizens. The third aspect considers the corruption perceptions of entrepreneurs in Croatia. Related findings point out the sectors and forms of highest corruption prevalence and the significance of corruption as an obstacle to the development of entrepreneurship. The comparison of the adopted anti-corruption measures with the EU recommendations indicates that their implementation requires more intense and continuous efforts, with political commitment being the essential factor of success. The anti-corruption policy recommendations emphasise the importance of seizing corruption for the general benefit of Croatia, and not only in the context of the future membership in the European Union.
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1 Introduction

Corruption is nowadays a widely discussed phenomenon, which, until recently, was on the very verge of economic research. Globalisation and raising awareness of negative impacts of corruption on socio-economic development have contributed to greater research and public interest on the problems of corruption. Seizing corruption in Croatia is a political criterion which needs to be fulfilled for membership in the European Union, but also a necessary prerequisite of economic welfare and social progress.

Until 1990s, there were very few empirical studies of the impacts of corruption on economic and social development. This was primarily due to a lack of systematised data on the corruption prevalence. Nowadays, international organisations develop and publish the corruption perceptions indicators for most of the countries in the world. The availability of data enables benchmarking of country position according to the perceived corruption prevalence. The most frequently used corruption perceptions indicators are the Control of Corruption of the World Bank and the Corruption Perceptions Index of Transparency International. Although the corruption perceptions indicators are subjective measures based on a surveyed prevalence of corruption as it is perceived, for the time being they are the only methodologically consistent databases for an analysis of corruption. For Croatia and other countries included in the international integration processes, international ranking according to corruption perceptions indicators reflects an external image of how the country is seen by the international community, political partners, business analysts and foreign investors.

The main hypothesis of this paper is that there is a high perception of corruption in Croatia, which is an obstacle to socio-economic development. While seizing corruption stands as the required pre-condition for Croatia’s EU accession, combat

---


2 Corruption Perceptions Index, CPI, is published on an annual basis by Transparency International organisation for a large number of countries worldwide (CPI for 2005 was published for 159 countries). http://www.transparency.org/surveys/index.html#cpi
against corruption lacks an efficient implementation of anti-corruption policy measures.

The paper will primarily address the question what corruption actually is and why it is important to raise the awareness of corruption as a serious impediment to development. The next chapter deals with the issue of high corruption perceptions in Croatia using corruption perceptions indicators. The relative position of Croatia in comparison with other countries will be assessed. Furthermore, corruption in Croatia will be described by the results of empirical research of the perceptions of corruption among citizens and entrepreneurs.

The paper provides a brief review of the requirements of the European Union in the accession process, according to which seizing corruption is one of the priorities to fulfil the political criteria for Croatia’s EU accession. A comparative analysis will examine the compliance of the adopted anti-corruption policy measures with the requirements of the European Union and international organisations, and a harmonisation of legislative framework for sanctioning corruption activities as criminal offences. It also assesses the problems in the implementation. The final part of the paper summarises the characteristics of corruption in Croatia and derives the anti-corruption policy recommendations.

2 Why Is Corruption a Problem?

Corruption has existed throughout the history to date. It is immanent to all states, regardless of the political system, regional or religious affiliation. It is impossible to eradicate corruption completely, but it can be seized by political will, legal norms and promoting anti-corruption awareness (Caiden, 1988). Corruption is a hidden phenomenon, so the prevalence of corruption cannot be measured precisely, and neither does exist a unique notion of what corruptive acts are. 3 An

---

3 Harmonisation of the treatment of corruption as a criminal offence in legislations of specific countries is a goal of international convention whose signatories include Croatia.
additional problem is an unequal treatment of the corruption deals and legality of its specific forms in criminal law in the world.\footnote{For instance, lobbying is a lawful profession in the USA.}

In the widest sense, corruption is every abuse of rights or authority over the means or rights of others for personal profit or personal gain (Burak et al., 1999), and it can be present in both the public and the private sectors. Today, the most widely used definition considers corruption as “the abuse of public office for private gain” (the World Bank, 1997). Accordingly, the corruption always involves the public sector, notwithstanding if corruption occurs within the public sector itself (for private gain of its employees) or if corrupt transactions occur between the public and private sectors.

The basic characteristic of corruption is that it arises from public authority and its discretionary power in decision-making. The most frequently distinguished types are political and administrative corruption. Political corruption is present among high government officials and politicians who are authorised to make political decisions, or who are entrusted with high powers which also result in a high responsibility for representing the public interest in discharge of duty. This is grand corruption, as opposed to administrative or bureaucratic corruption (petty corruption), which pertains to public administration employees responsible for the enforcement of decisions, regulations, and policy measures (Amundsen, 1999).

### 2.1 Political and Administrative Corruption Go “Hand in Hand”

The forms of political corruption are embezzlement in the political system of a country by political candidates and politicians, non-transparency of money flows in politics, enabling the private sector to buy political influence, corruption in electoral procedure, influence on the national judiciary to process inefficiently, and thus protect, criminal offences of corruption, influence on the legislative authority to legalise a preferential treatment for specific vested interests.
Political corruption usually starts with non-transparent financing of political parties or their campaigns. A lack of public information about real sources of financing enables, among other things, for financing from private funds to influence political results (Walecki, 2004).

Not all forms of political corruption are illegal in all countries in the world. It is, therefore, important to harmonise the legislative framework on the international level for the purpose of combating political corruption. In the annual proceedings Global Corruption Report 2004, Transparency International focuses on the problem of a growing presence of political corruption and its increasingly stronger influence on formulating and characteristics of policy measures world-wide. Political corruption is a threat to democracy. The negative allocation of resources is performed through getting around the institutions and the legal system by those whose particular responsibility is to establish and preserve the rule of law.

The presence of political corruption is usually accompanied by a wide-spread administrative corruption. Public administration employees have far lower authorities than officials and politicians. However, their discretionary power in the implementation of policy measures enables them private rent-seeking in the form of bribes or counter-favours obtained for services in the competence of public administration. Thus, public administration employees deprive the citizens of a guaranteed right to use public services pursuant to regulations equally valid for all citizens (Situngkir, 2004). The most frequent forms of administrative corruption are those when a public administration employee, for a bribe or an obtained counter-favour issues permits and certificates in contravention with regulations (by not abiding by criteria or not meeting the deadlines), enables a preferential treatment in the provision of public services, or enables avoiding sanctions or tax evasion. Administrative corruption is of a smaller scale than political corruption and is relatively more easily suppressed by enhanced internal control and an appropriate organisation of public services.

Croatian term “bribe and corruption” indicates that corruption, in addition to the bribery, implies other less known forms of corruptive behaviour. The most
frequent ones are embezzlement, theft, fraud and extortion, nepotism and cronism, influence peddling, patronage and lobbying.

2.2 Negative Impacts of Corruption

Modern theories and empirical research agree upon negative impacts of corruption. Corruption acts as an arbitrary tax which increases costs and disrupts an efficient allocation of resources and fair distribution of income. Corruption increases income inequality and poverty. Corruption revenues are collected by the minority which becomes disproportionately richer, whereas vulnerable groups of population have too weak purchasing power to pay bribes (Hassan, 2004).

Corruption affects mostly the public sector, directly decreasing state revenues and leading to a number of indirect, but extremely harmful consequences. Those are primarily reduced financing left for education, health and social welfare, and for infrastructure (Tanzi and Davoodi, 1997). Corruption in the public sector is manifested in higher expenditures required for state investments, since it makes public procurement and contracts for the construction and maintenance of infrastructure more expensive, primarily transport infrastructure. Given that corruption activities are performed in high secrecy, corruption makes it easy to change the priorities in public investments from the projects aimed at improvement of education and health to the projects targeting financing of defence or infrastructure, which are by nature less under public scrutiny (Shleifer and Vishny, 1993). If economic policy makers are corrupted, the selection of priority development areas depends on their rent seeking, instead of the criteria of development of the national economy and progress in general. Economic policy is less efficient in a highly corrupt environment (Jain, 2001).

In a country with high corruption prevalence, the society strives towards drawing income from rent seeking instead of increasing the productivity. Public administration becomes impotent in discharging its functions and the state loses
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5 Some theories in favour of corruption stress the function of corruption as “a greasing wheel” in the conditions of inefficient public administration (Leff, 1964). However, those benefits are surely less than adverse consequences of corruptive activity in disrupting market-based allocation of resources and income in the society.
its legitimate right to pass economic regulations and ensure a developmental institutional framework (Tanzi, 1998). Once all the institutions of the rule of law are derogated, the judicial system no longer ensures enforcement of contracts and protection of ownership rights. The number of public administration employees is increasing because of an attractive opportunity to make an additional earning from corruption activities on the one hand, and on the other, cumbersome and corrupt public administration is increasingly less efficient, thus closing the vicious circle of its size and poor functioning (Kaufmann and Wei, 2000). Nepotism in employment additionally reduces the efficiency of the public administration since the competence of its employees declines.

In general, inefficiency of institutions in a corrupt society hinders imports and application of new technologies, entry of capital, successful privatisation, labour mobility and increased productivity, as well as other economic performance factors (North, 1990).

Given that corruption acts as an arbitrary tax, it increases the costs of entry and doing business, hampers competitiveness and increases uncertainty (business risk). Just as corruption affects more vulnerable parts of the population, small and newly established companies find it harder to bear the costs of corruption, and at the same time are more exposed to pressures of the growing bureaucracy (Kaufmann and Wei, 2000). On the contrary, large firms have at their disposal internal financial and human resources which resolve administrative problems, and are in a position to protect their own interest through corruption (Tanzi, 1998).

The presence of corruption is related to lower private sector investments (Mauro, 1995; Tanzi, 1998). It has a particularly adverse impact on foreign direct investments (Wei, 1999). Corruption is an impediment for the development of entrepreneurship and the economy in general. The World Bank (1997) declared corruption “the biggest obstacle for economic and social development”. Although this does not exhaust the discussion on adverse effects of corruption on economic and social development, in conclusion, the most important negative impacts of corruption are presented in Figure 1.
It is, therefore, not surprising that countries are trying to combat corruption with a number of anti-corruptive policy measures. However, before looking into the fight against corruption, the presence of corruption in Croatia will be discussed.

3 Perceptions of Corruption in Croatia

Since an analysis of corruption always starts from the perception of its prevalence, the incidence of corruption in Croatia will be reviewed from three different, mutually complementary aspects. The first one indicates the “external” perception of the level of corruption in our country and includes an analysis of the relative position of Croatia in relation to other countries.

Another aspect is the public perception of Croatian citizens. Subjective perception of citizens is, to a large extent, a reflection of anti-corruption awareness and, when
interpreting the results of an analysis, one should always have in mind that the more corruption is highlighted as a problem in the media and the public, the higher are the perceptions of the corruption incidence.

The third and possibly the least subjective assessment of corruption is the perception of entrepreneurs, who, in their daily business, are either exposed to corruption or they themselves resort to corruptive acts.

3.1 Benchmarking of Croatia

There is a relatively high perception of corruption prevalence in Croatia. According to one of the most widely used indicators, Transparency International’s Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI), annual CPI for Croatia and the pertaining place on the international ranking list clearly show negative trends of the level of corruption in Croatia (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bribe Perceptions Index for Croatia and International</th>
<th>1999-2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPI score</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia’s place on the international ranking list</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of countries on the international ranking list</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Corruption Perceptions Index reflects the perceptions of the prevalence of corruption according to the opinion poll of businessmen and analysts. Higher index values imply a lower level of corruption, on the scale from 0 to 10.

In the period between 2001 and 2005, the already low CPI score for Croatia declined from 3.9 to 3.4, marking an increase in the perceived presence of corruption. The nominal drop in Croatia’s position on the ranking list of the overall rated countries world-wide from the 47th to the 70th position was accompanied by Croatia’s lagging behind in comparison with less corrupt countries. Whereas in 2001, 52 percent of the total number of observed countries was ranked lower (lower CPI, i.e. higher perception of corruption), in 2005, 56
percent of countries were perceived as having a higher presence of corruption than Croatia. However, this change of Croatia's rank is a result of the expansion of the list, which each year included new countries with a higher perception of the corruption. Negative trends of the assessment of the corruption prevalence in a specific country, particularly expressed in comparison with other countries, affect the credit rating of a country, the image investors have about risks and costs of investments, the stability of economic policy, and most of all the rule of law and the political system of a country. Publishing of international indicators enables a comparison with other countries and affects the perception on the observed country. However, in that case it is not the prevalence of corruption that is assessed subjectively, but the indices of corruption are taken as an objective indicator for economic decision-making. Therefore, it is particularly important to recognise the characteristics of the corruption prevalence in Croatia, from the point of view of the perception of the population and entrepreneurs on its incidence and impacts on the quality of life and doing business in Croatia.

3.2 Croatian Public on Corruption

Croatian citizens rate the level of the presence of corruption in Croatia as high, as confirmed by a survey of 1000 respondents that Transparency International Croatia conducted in May 2003 and 2005. In a period observed, the perception of corruption prevalence has increased. As much as one-fifth of the respondents believe that corruption in 2005 was much more present than two years before. The citizens consider the lack of strict sanctioning of corruption and the lack of political will and incompetence of the government to prevent corruption as the most responsible for such a situation.

A large number of survey respondents believe that corruption is a particularly spread phenomenon in our country. While in 2003, 85.9 percent of respondents shared that opinion, in 2005 more than 89 percent of respondents considered corruption a spread and a wide-spread phenomenon. Higher perception of corruption was recorded with highly-educated population with higher income of households living in larger settlements. Regional perceptions of corruption indicated that between 2003 and 2005 a drop in the perceived level of corruption
was observed only in Istria, Primorje and Gorski Kotar, whereas at the same time the northern regions and Zagreb reached the highest level (Figure 2).

Figure 2  Perceptions of Regional Incidence of Corruption, 2003 and 2005

Note: Counties in the system of regions are the following: Zagreb and the surroundings - the City of Zagreb, Zagreb County; Northern Croatia - Krapina-Zagorje, Varadlin, Medimurje, Koprivnica-Križevci, Bjelovar-Bilogora, Virovitica-Podravina Counties; Slavonia - Bihac-Petrovac, Brod-Počitelj, Osijek-Baranja, Vukovar-Srijem Counties; Lika, Kordun, Banovina - Sisak-Moslavina, Karlovac, Lika-Senj Counties; Istria, Primorje, Gorski Kotar-Primorje-Gorski Kotar, Istria County; Dalmatia - Zadar, Split-Dalmatia, Dubrovnik-Neretva Counties.

Ranked by the institutions in the public sector, corruption is the most present in the judiciary (80.7 percent of respondents) and health (79.7 percent). Those two sectors on the ranking list of the most corrupt institutions in 2005 surpassed the local government sector, which was rated as the area of the highest presence of corruption in 2003 (Table 2).
In the public opinion, prevalent forms of corruption in Croatia are the “traditional” forms of corruption: nepotism, bribery and counter-favours (Figure 3). Although rated as equally present forms, receiving valuable gifts irritates the public considerably less than receiving money. Public is also concerned about corruptive behaviour of officials who have additional paid functions (such as membership in boards etc.), given that this form of corruptive behaviour could be fought relatively easily by legal regulations.


| Presence of Corruption in the Public Sector, in % of Respondents, 2003 and 2005 |
|-----------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| Corruption is spread and wide spread   | 2003  | 2005  |
| Judiciary                              | 70.0  | 80.7  |
| Health                                 | 71.3  | 79.7  |
| Local government; counties, municipalities, and cities | 72.8  | 73.1  |
| Police                                 | 57.7  | 66.3  |
| Croatian Parliament                    | 55.0  | 64.5  |
| Privatisation Fond                     | 57.6  | 63.9  |
| Government                             | 52.0  | 63.0  |
| Faculties                              | 54.2  | 56.6  |
| Army                                   | 35.2  | 40.0  |
| Elementary and secondary schools       | 22.5  | 27.8  |
| Church                                 | 18.5  | 18.2  |

3.3 Corruption as a Barrier for Doing Business

Further analysis explore to which extent the business in Croatia is exposed to corruption by using the perceptions of corruption among the entrepreneurs of approximately one hundred small, medium and large enterprises in Croatia. Original results - responses to the questions related to corruption from the survey questionnaire Executive Opinion Survey for the annual Global Competitiveness Report of the World Economic Forum conducted in 2002, 2003, and 2004 were used.

---

6 The number of surveyed enterprises: a total of 124 enterprises in 2002 (23 small enterprises with up to 100 employees; 61 medium-sized enterprises with up to 500 employees; 40 large enterprises), a total of 109 enterprises in 2003 (45 small enterprises; 42 medium-sized enterprises; 22 large enterprises), a total of 109 enterprises in 2004 (63 small enterprises; 28 medium-sized enterprises; 18 large enterprises).

7 The National Competitiveness Council provided the author with the original results of annual surveys related to the selected questions from standardized questionnaire which pertain to the perception of corruption in Croatian economy. The author would hereby like to thank for data provided for research purposes.
Like in the previous analysis of corruption persistence and trends perceived by Croatian citizens, businessmen also believe that the corruption prevalence is growing in comparison with the period three years ago. The corruption perceptions, in particular of political corruption, are very high. Approximately 80 percent of entrepreneurs believe that the criteria in policy decision-making and awarding state contracts to specific companies are based on personal acquaintances with government officials. In this process small enterprises are most concerned with corruption in contracting of public investments and with the impact of corruption activities on laws and policy measures. One-half of the respondents rate as usual the distribution of public fund resources to enterprises or persons through corruption (Figure 4). Also, a high percentage of entrepreneurs (60 percent of respondents) assess that there is a link between financing of political parties through which one can obtain favourable policy measures in favour of donors.

In 2004, enterprises in Croatia in their everyday business were exposed to or resorted to corruption mostly for the purpose of obtaining public investment
contracts (57 percent of respondents), to impact laws and policy in order to protect their business interests (46 percent), to obtain a favourable court decision (45 percent), and for the purpose of obtaining import and export licences (35 percent). In other words, Croatian entrepreneurs make informal payments most frequently to officials and public administration to get unlawful protection of their business interests or pay the bribe to get around the norms of the rule of law (Figure 5).

The assessed level of corruptive payments in the economy is up to 3 percent of the total annual income of an enterprise (25 percent of respondents), or between 4 and 5 percent of total income (14 percent of respondents). The level of fee perceived as necessary to get public contracts is between 3 and 10 percent of the contract value; 40 percent of enterprises believe that it is not necessary to pay a fee to secure obtaining a public contract (Table 3).

Figure 5 Exposure to Corruption According to Areas of Business of Enterprises, 2004

Note: Original responses to the question are assessments of a specific respondent on the provided scale from 1 to 7, with 1 signifying the response “constantly”, and the 7 response “never”. The calculated share of respondents represents the responses rated 1, 2 and 3. The total share was calculated by weighting the share of small, medium and large enterprises in the total number of responses.

It is not surprising that small enterprises (up to 100 employees) believe that the percentage of the requested fee is higher and payment more frequent in comparison with large enterprises (more than 500 employees). Namely, large enterprises compete for large investment projects where the potential amount of informal payments account for a small share of contract value, while on the other hand small entrepreneurs in contracting small-scale projects have to offer a disproportionately high amount for concluding a deal. In addition, since smaller enterprises conclude public contracts to a relatively smaller extent, their responses reflect a subjective perception of a higher fee offered by other, larger enterprises.

An analysis of corruption of Croatian entrepreneurs has indicated a corruption as a rising and very problematic barrier for doing business. In 2002, corruption ranked 11th on the list of 14 obstacles for doing business, and in 2004 it went up to the high 4th position. A group of large enterprises rank corruption the second most important barrier for doing business in 2004 (Table 4).8

8 “Government instability” ranks the first among problematic factors for doing business as one of the offered answers. The assumption of the author is that in this ranking entrepreneurs were ranking the consistency of Government policy.
In conclusion, there is a high and growing perception of corruption prevalence in Croatia. Both international organisations and citizens, as well as entrepreneurs in Croatia share that opinion. A more detailed analysis which exceeds the scope of this paper and includes demographic, socio-economic and other factors related to the perception of corruption prevalence (Budak, 2005) indicates that with the increase in the freedom of opinion and actualisation of corruption in the world, the awareness of the problem rises as well. Strengthening anti-corruption awareness is particularly marked in active, better educated, younger population, which by nature is more interested in life and work in a corruption-free environment (Lovrinčević et al., 2005). On the same note, an increase in the subjective perception of corruption prevalence may partially be a consequence of strengthening anti-corruption awareness in the first periods of an active anti-corruption policy.
Corruption and EU Accession

The provision of the European Union Charter (1992) on Prevention and Combating Corruption is a basis for formulating the anti-corruption policy of the European Union. The basic determinants of that policy are specified in the Communication of the European Commission (2003). The listed priorities are strengthening political will in the fight against corruption, introducing the standards of functioning of public administration and public procurement, improving cooperation in the fight against corruption and harmonisation of laws of member states pursuant to the Civil Law Convention on Corruption and Criminal Law Convention on Corruption (adopted by the Council of Europe in 1999). Concrete measures that followed pertain to the ban on acknowledging giving bribes as tax breaks, establishing the Group of States Against Corruption,9 establishment of the European Anti-Fraud Office,10 etc. The guidelines of the anti-corruption policy of the European Union towards accession countries, candidate countries and third countries are explicitly listed in an attachment to the Communication, namely:

- Adoption and implementation of the national anti-corruption strategy and programme;
- Ratification and implementation of international anti-corruption conventions;
- Enactment of anti-corruption laws and their persistent enforcement;
- Transparency in the work of public employees; application of merit criteria in employment, openness of the work of public services, a corresponding system of public sector salaries, rotation of employees in sensitive positions, income and assets declaration of public administration employees;
- Establishment of the principle of accountability of public office and transparency in the work of all public services – the judiciary, police, customs office, tax administration, health, public procurement;

---

9 Group of States Against Corruption (GRECO), established in May 1999. In December 2004 GRECO had 37 member states of the Group.
10 European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF), established in 1999.
• Setting up of the code of ethics in the public sector and control of its enforcement;
• Legal protection of persons who report a suspicion of corruptive behaviour ("whistleblowing");
• Strengthening social awareness on the harmfulness of corruption as a criminal offence;
• Transparent financing of political parties;
• Incentives in the private sector aimed at prevention of corruption.

Implementation of those measures in the EU accession countries and candidate countries such as Croatia is monitored on two levels. The first mechanism is related to the member states of the Group of States Against Corruption (GRECO). GRECO is a body of the European Union entrusted with the evaluation and monitoring of anti-corruption policy in member states, candidate countries and third countries. Croatia has been its member since 2000. Each member submits reports to GRECO in the form of a structured questionnaire on the implementation of anti-corruption policy and is subject to an evaluation procedure implemented by the GRECO commission in a specific country. The objective of a permanent monitoring and evaluation implemented by GRECO is to provide assistance to member states of the Group and thereby provide assistance to in the implementation of anti-corruption policy.

4.1 Anti-corruption Policy in Croatia

Another form of anti-corruption policy of the European Union that is directly related to Croatia arises from the requirements of the European Union that countries have to fulfil in the accession process. This process started officially for Croatia in 2001, with the signing of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement. SAA specifies a) the obligation to cooperate in anti-corruption projects (Art. 4 and Art. 80) and b) the obligation to adopt the acquis communautaire, which includes enactment of legislation and establishment of institutions for the fight against corruption, as well as to adopt a national anti-corruption strategy. In the period that followed, Croatia formally fulfilled that part of political criteria for the
membership in the European Union. The national legislation for seizing corruption is in the criminal legislation, and fully harmonised with the ratified Criminal Law Convention on Corruption and the Civil Law Convention on Corruption of the Council of Europe (Official Gazette Nos. 11/00 and 06/03). The following key amendments have been introduced into the Croatian national legislation:  

- The definition of criminal offences has been expanded to include receiving and giving bribes in business operations as well. The bribery includes personal giving or promising of a gift or another benefit as reciprocal favours in concluding business deals or provision of services, as well as mediation in bribery.
- Key amendments to the Criminal Act were also introduced for “influence peddling”. Illegal mediation is performed by a person who offers using of his or her position to another physical or legal person, but also the person asking for such a “favour” (passive unlawful mediation).
- The definition of the term official person has been expanded to include official persons in foreign and/or international law.
- Besides criminal sanctioning of corruption, preventive activity of combating corruption is also regulated by the law (prevention of money laundering, prevention of the conflict of interest).

A number of existing and new legal regulations have contributed to the harmonisation of the Croatian legal framework with the European anti-corruption legislation.  


Another part of the requirements of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement pertains to the enactment and implementation of the national anti-corruption strategy. The National Anti-corruption Program and the Anti-corruption Action Plan for Croatia were adopted in March 2002 (Official Gazette No. 34/02). The Action Plan provides for eight equally important priority areas:

1. The rule of law and efficiency of the state based on the rule of law;
2. Establishment of a special body for an efficient combat against corruption;
3. Increasing the efficiency of criminal prosecution of corruption;
4. Organisational measures in the system of governance;
5. Decentralisation;
6. Financial accountability measures and other economic measures;
7. International activities;
8. Encouraging political and civil responsibility.

The action plan measures pertaining to the legislative and regulatory framework have been fulfilled, except for the establishment of the Committee of the Parliament of the Republic of Croatia for the implementation of the National Anti-corruption Program. However, there are big slippages in the implementation of the strategy, in USKOK’s operational activities, incomplete criminal statistics and low public awareness on the harmfulness of corruption. One of the outstanding questions is the non-transparent financing of political parties, which is not precisely enough and clearly regulated by the law\(^{13}\) and opens up the possibility for political corruption, where political influence is offered in return for financial support (Kregar et al., 2003).

Insufficient implementation of the anti-corruption policy is also provided for by the documents of the competent bodies of the European Union related to the fulfilment of the political criteria for Croatia's membership in the European Union.\(^{13}\) The Political Parties Act (Official Gazette Nos. 76/93, 11/96, 164/98 and 36/01); The Act on the Election of Representatives into the Croatian State Parliament (consolidated draft) (Official Gazette No. 69/03); The Act on the Election of the President of the Republic of Croatia (Official Gazette Nos. 22/92 and 71/97); The Act on the Financing of Election Promotion for the Election of the President of the Republic of Croatia, (Official Gazette No. 105/04).
Seizing corruption is one of six poignant issues that need to be resolved as part of the pre-accession strategy of Croatia as a candidate country under the future negotiations on the membership in the European Union. Progress in the fulfilment of that requirement is an important criterion for the membership in the European Union, as indicated by the reports on the candidate countries which can be realistically expected to become members of the European Union before Croatia. The latest reports on Bulgaria and Romania evaluate the efforts made so far in the fight against corruption, but they also state the need for an even more efficient implementation of the law. The importance of seizing corruption in the process of the accession to the European Union is also corroborated by an analysis of a sample of 25 transition countries according to the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI, 2004). The average Corruption Perceptions Index for transition countries in 2004 was 3.24 on the scale from 0 to 10, where higher values of the index indicate lower perception of the presence of corruption. Four groups of countries were formed from the sample according to the criterion of their status with regard to the European Union. The pertaining average corruption index for

---


each group clearly indicates that the countries with lower corruption are more successful in the accession to the European Union and vice versa. Eight countries with the lowest corruption have recently become members of the European Union, whereas the countries with the highest corruption in the group “others”, i.e. countries not included in the accession process, are on the bottom of this list (Figure 6).

The necessity of seizing corruption in Croatia arises from the assumed international mandates and international policy of the Republic of Croatia, as well as from strengthening the social awareness of the harmfulness of corruption. Disclosing and processing corruption is one of the indicators of the efficiency of anti-corruption policy to be discussed in the following chapter.
4.2 Disclosing and Processing Corruption in Croatia

There is a large disproportion in disclosing and processing corruption and perception of the public on the high corruption prevalence in Croatia. Public awareness of prevalence and adverse consequences of corruption, in addition to incrimination of corruption, has a preventive effect in seizing corruption. The impacts of the anti-corruption policy are, on the one hand, evaluated by the rating of the perception of corruption prevalence, and on the other, by the number of disclosed and processed corruptive acts. The number of reported corruptive acts in the world and in Croatia is insignificant in relation to the presumed real extent of corruption (Kregar, 2003). However, an increase in the number of reported corruptive acts and a strict sanctioning are one of the basic characteristics of an efficient anti-corruption policy.

In Croatian legislation, although there is a criminal culpability of acts related to corruption, there is no unified determination of corruption. In conventional terms, the term corruption in the national strategy, in accordance with the provisions of the Criminal Act (Official Gazette Nos. 110/97, 27/98, 129/00, 51/01 and 105/04) implies receiving bribe (Art. 348) and giving bribe (Art. 347), illegal mediation (Art. 343), misuse of office of state authorities (Art. 338), abuse of office and authorities (Art. 337), disloyal competition in foreign-trade business operations (Art. 289), bankruptcy abuse (Art. 283), concluding harmful contracts (Art. 249), disclosing official secrets (Art. 351), revealing and unauthorised obtaining of official secrets (Art. 295).

USKOK as a body competent for combating corruption has in its legal competence receiving and giving bribes, illegal mediation, abuse of office of state authorities, disloyal competition in foreign-trade business operations, bankruptcy abuse. Originally more narrow defined criminal offences in the competence of USKOK are explained by the fact that each criminal offence specified in the Strategy does not necessarily have to be a corruptive act (Bajić, 2003). Authorities of USKOK were also expanded by the expected amendments to the law in 2005. Criminal offences evidently related to corruption, introduced in the Criminal Act in July 2004 - namely, receiving bribes in business operations (Art. 294a) and giving bribes in business operations (Art. 294b), are also part of the Act on the
Ratification of the Convention of the United Nations against Corruption (Official Gazette No. 02/05).

Besides the non-existence of an unambiguous definition on criminal offences that are considered to be corruption, available statistics per articles of the Criminal Act is not detailed enough. For the period between 1998 and 2003, act of the criminal offences that are defined in the National Anti-corruption Programme, the only available data are those for giving and receiving bribes and abuse of office and authorities (Criminal Act, Art. 347, 348 and 337). More detailed criminal statistics have been published for 2004, and it can be expected that in the forthcoming years statistical reporting will accompany the amendments to the Criminal Act in the segment of corruptive acts as well. For the consistency sake, analyses of criminal offences of corruption in the period from 1998 to 2004 were monitored only as criminal offences of giving and receiving bribes, and abuse of office and authorities. In that period, 6093 persons of age were charged with those criminal offences, of whom for 2185 (36 percent) charges were pressed, and 660 persons were sentenced (Table 5).

In relation to the overall number of criminal offences in that period in Croatia, corruption-related criminal offences accounted for only 1.5 percent of reported cases, 1.1 percent of pressed charges and 0.6 percent of convictions. If the criminal offences of abuse of office and authorities, which represent corruption in a wider sense of the definition, are excluded from the analysis, the share of receiving and giving bribes in the overall number of criminal offences is very low. Besides the fact that those data indicate problems in disclosing corruption, the fact that a very low number of reported cases end up with sanctions is of even greater concern (Aralica and Budak, 2004). While one third of the total reported criminal offences end up in a sentence, the share of the sentenced persons for corruption offences accounts for less than 13 percent of reported cases (Figure 7).
### Table 5: Criminal Statistics – Reported Cases, Charges and Sentences, 1998-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Criminal corruptive act</th>
<th>Art.</th>
<th>Reported cases</th>
<th>Charges</th>
<th>Charges in % of reported cases</th>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Sentences in % of charges</th>
<th>Prison</th>
<th>Financial penalties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giving bribes</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving bribes</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Abuse of office and authorities</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 2004</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Giving bribes</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving bribes</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abuse of office and authorities</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 2003</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Giving bribes</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving bribes</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abuse of office and authorities</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 2002</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Giving bribes</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving bribes</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abuse of office and authorities</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 2001</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Giving bribes</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving bribes</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abuse of office and authorities</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 2000</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Giving bribes</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving bribes</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abuse of office and authorities</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 1999</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Giving bribes</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving bribes</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abuse of office and authorities</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 1998</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 –</td>
<td>Giving bribes</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Receiving bribes</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abuse of office and authorities</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>5417</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL 1998-2003</td>
<td>6093</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In some years, the number of charged and sentenced perpetrators of criminal offence in one year is larger than the number of reported cases for that year. It is due to multiple year duration of the court processes.

Source: CBS, Perpetrators of Criminal Offences of Age, Reported Cases, Charges and Sentences.
Official data of the Central Bureau of Statistics were not elaborated for all articles of the Criminal Act pertaining to corruption, whereas occasional detailed reports of USKOK, Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Interior differ by a larger number of reported criminal offences of corruption (Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal offence</th>
<th>Art. of Criminal Act</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving bribes</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving bribes</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse of office of government officials</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal mediation</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In official statistical data from Table 5 the total number of offences of giving bribes is higher than the number of receiving bribes, which can be explained as
one person receiving bribes from a number of givers. However, since the foundation of USKOK, according to internal records, the number of reported cases of receiving bribes is growing in comparison with giving bribes. It represents a possible positive progress in raising awareness of citizens and proactive anti-corruption campaign (opening hotlines for reporting corruption, activities of non-governmental organisations such as Transparency International Croatia, etc.). With the announced reorganisation and enhancing the authorities of USKOK in the forthcoming period it is possible to expect a larger number of reported corruption cases, and the judiciary reform would contribute to a more efficient processing of filed charges. Since the legal aspect of the combat against corruption is not a subject of this study, it should only be noted that empirical research for the USA have established a positive correlation between the number of sentences for corruptive acts and expenditures for functioning of institutions entrusted with law enforcement and higher salaries of public administration employees (Goel and Nelson, 1998). Also, stricter sanctions for corruption offences have yielded excellent results in combating corruption in some countries, such as Hong-Kong (Kregar, 1999).

5 Policy Recommendations for Anti-corruption in Croatia

Corruption in Croatia is a systematic phenomenon with a stronghold in all structures of the society. Bribing of public service employees, nepotism in employment and awarding positions by which appointed persons are in conflict of interest are common in public life in Croatia. Freedom of thought and of expression has enabled a more open disclosure of information on corruption prevalence through the media, however, it seems that an endemic characteristic of corruption has demoralised civil society so much that anti-corruption awareness is at a very low level. This has resulted in conciliatoriness of the public and the common view that it is almost impossible to reduce corruption in Croatia. Therefore, it is not easy to answer what measures of the anti-corruption policy should be used to reach the core of the corruption problem.

17 This interpretation surely does not exhaust all reasons for the described departure. More detailed interpretations by reviewing the content of a filed charge and court case files exceed the scope of this paper.
Normative measures of combating corruption have not yielded expected results. The deficiencies of the created normative framework and its non-compliance enable getting around regulations and opening up the opportunity for corruption. In relation to this, an important initiative for the drafting of a new law on financing political parties and election campaigns was instigated in 2005 by Transparency International Croatia. However, the normative framework for the struggle against corruption does exist, and the inefficiency of the anti-corruption policy cannot be attributed to a deficiency of the law, but to the fact that the anti-corruption measures are not implemented. The implementation of anti-corruption policy requires primarily a political will and commitment in the implementation of measures that are already contained in legal regulations. At the same time, the normative legal and institutional framework should be improved. This is far simpler a task provided there is political will.

Political will is a prerequisite for combating corruption and building confidence in the ruling structures and public administration. Political will, however, arises from the ratio, in economic terms, of costs and benefits, i.e. expected political losses and gains of the government from the implementation of appropriate policy measures, including the anti-corruption measures. A lack of political will is most obvious in the lack of concrete decisive actions of criminal prosecution of perpetrators of corruptive acts, by which it is possible in a relatively short term to initiate a change of the positive public awareness on the disadvantage of corruption and restore the confidence in institutions.

The system of disclosing, processing and punishing of corruptive acts will only be efficient in the conditions of a prevailing rule of law and efficient state based on the rule of law. The judiciary reform is an integral part of establishing the rule of law, which implies adoption of codes of ethics in the judiciary and legal profession, education of employees and technological equipment of the judicial system. The internal control systems, protection of “whistleblowers” who report corruption, training and motivation of the police is another one in the set of measures targeting greater efficiency of criminal prosecution of corruption. Furthermore, statistical reporting on the disclosure and processing of corruption offences should be improved.
A group of measures pertaining to civic responsibility is the introduction and strict adherence to the ban of the conflict of interest, encouraging the work of civil society organisations and freedom of the press, promoting anti-corruption awareness through education, religious education and other civil society institutions. Particularly important measure of combating corruption is the prevention of the conflict of interest. Although there is an explicit legal ban of the conflict of interest in Croatia, it is treated as an incidental obligation of an official. The conflict of interest frequently does not cease with a formal resignation from a function, because informal connections remain very tight, or vacant functions are only delegated to other close persons. Nepotism is an omnipresent pattern of getting around the civil society norms in Croatia.

In this respect, the proposal of a new National Anti-corruption Programme 2006-2008\(^\text{18}\) refers to a number of concrete measures of fighting corruption with an action plan, as well as their proponents. In the area of politics and public administration, the measures pertain to regulating the financing of political parties, prevention of the conflict of interest, objectivising of criteria in employment, enabling access to information and democratic takeover of power. Thorough reforms of the health and judiciary systems are considered an efficient way to remove the source of corruption in those sectors, although only in the long term. Control of the work of local government and direct elections for local self-government bodies have been rated, with a general strengthening of the transparency of work of local self-government and the decentralisation process, as key measures of the prevention of corruption at the local level. A novelty in relation to the 2002 National Anti-corruption Programme is also an explicit listing of measures for combating corruption in the economy. The measures are related to encouraging the freedom of market competition and accelerated privatisation to disable an arbitrary influence of the state on economic subjects and market competition. The proposal of the National Programme also provides for a special range of oversight measures and increased transparency in public procurement procedures.

\(^{18}\) At the moment of the completion of this paper, the proposal of the new Anti-corruption Strategy was presented to the public on 28 October 2005, before being sent to the parliamentary debate. www.pravousudje.hr.
In addition to the described preventive anti-corruption measures, the proposal of the National Programme advocates a reorganisation and operational support to the bodies entrusted with revealing corruption, and for repressive action in criminal prosecuting of corruption. Continual measures of cooperation with international anti-corruption institutions and a public awareness campaign on adverse consequences of corruption make up special chapters of the proposal of the National Anti-corruption Programme.

In Croatia, no doubt, there exists a civic and political awareness of the problem of corruption. However, it remains to be assessed to which extent perseverance in the implementation and political will for combating corruption will yield results in the forthcoming period.
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