

https://dspace.org/

Corruption in South Africa as a deterrent to public trust in government: a case of virtue ethics as a remedial option

Sanqela, Similo

2020
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/30812

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

CORRUPTION IN SOUTH AFRICA AS A DETERRENT TO PUBLIC TRUST IN GOVERNMENT: A CASE OF VIRTUE ETHICS AS A REMEDIAL OPTION

By

SIMILO SANQELA

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, Applied Ethics for Professionals

August 2020



UNIVERSITY OF THE
WITWATERSRAND,
JOHANNESBURG

DECLARATION

I declare that this research report is my own unaided work. It is submitted for the degree of Master of Arts, Applied Ethics for Professionals, in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any other degree or examination in any other university.

Signed: 

Name: _____

Date: _____

DEDICATION

In loving memory of my dear mother, Nomsa Adelaide Sanqela (01 May 1948 - 28 May 2016), whose countless sacrifices prepared me for life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report would not be complete without the patient supervision of Prof. Mary Carman whose guidance, knowledge and critical feedback challenged my analytical and interpretative skills.

I am indebted to my partner and daughter for the love and encouragement that kept me going.

Mostly, thanks be to YHWH for this milestone.

ABSTRACT

Corruption is an important subject and trust is an important quality in a society. Although there are studies on the relationship between corruption and trust, the study recognised that there is still room for philosophical contribution drawing on South African examples to examine the close connections between corruption and trust. The report sought to identify a suitable normative ethics approach to conceptualise the relationship between corruption and public trust in government. The study found a virtue theory as a suitable ethical framework to understand the corruption and trust relationship.

CONTENTS PAGE

Declaration....ii

Dedication....iii

Acknowledgements....iv

Abstract....v

CONTENTS PAGE....vi

CHAPTER ONE – AN INTRODUCTION TO THE MEANING AND EFFECTS OF A DECADE LONG SCOURGE OF CORRUPTION IN SOUTH AFRICA (2009 - 2019)....1

1.1 Introduction....1

1.2 Research Report Objective....3

1.3 Corruption and Trust in the South African Context....3

1.4 The problems of corruption and the role of a breakdown of trust....4

1.5 The importance of the report....10

1.6 Outline of the report....11

CHAPTER TWO - THE CONCEPTUAL CONNECTION BETWEEN CORRUPTION AND TRUST....13

2.1 Introduction....13

2.2 The concept of corruption....14

2.3 The concept of trust....15

2.4 The connection between corruption and trust....17

CHAPTER THREE - HOW CAN THE PROBLEM OF CORRUPTION AS IT RELATES TO TRUST BEST BE CONCEPTUALISED?....21

3.1 Introduction....21

3.2 A deontological framework and how it fares with conceptualising the problem of corruption as it relates to trust....22

3.2.1 Introduction to deontology....22

3.2.2 Kantian deontology 23
3.2.3 Rawls Contractarian Deontology and corruption 27
3.2.4 Deontology, corruption and trust 29
3.3 A utilitarian framework and how it fares with conceptualising the problem of corruption as it relates to trust 31
3.3.1 Act utilitarianism and corruption 32
3.3.2 Rule utilitarianism and corruption 33
3.3.3 Utilitarianism, corruption and trust 34
CHAPTER FOUR - VIRTUE ETHICS AND THE CONNECTIONS BETWEEN TRUST AND CORRUPTION 38
4.1 Introduction 38
4.2 Introduction to virtue ethics 38
4.2.1 Agent-based Virtue Ethics 41
4.2.2 A virtue ethical account of right action 43
4.3 Virtue ethics, corruption, and trust 45
CHAPTER FIVE - USING A VIRTUE ETHICS FRAMEWORK TO IDENTIFY WAYS TO REBUILD TRUST LOST THROUGH CORRUPTION 49
5.1 Introduction 49
5.2 The role of trust in moral relations 49
5.3 Moral repair 51
5.3.1 Society 52
5.3.2 The individual 53
5.3.3 Justice 54
5.4 Recommendations 56
CHAPTER SIX - CONCLUSION 59
REFERENCE LIST 61

CHAPTER ONE – AN INTRODUCTION TO THE MEANING AND EFFECTS OF A DECADE LONG SCOURGE OF CORRUPTION IN SOUTH AFRICA (2009 - 2019)

1.1 Introduction

Corruption is a universal problem that is widespread in human society. Amidst other common challenges presented by corruption is the heightening trust deficit that exists between the public and those engaging in corruption, such as public officials or members of government. This research report identifies the most suitable normative ethics approach to conceptualise the connection between corruption and trust.

This introductory chapter provides a definition of corruption, presents the research objective and discusses its relevance to the South African context. It proceeds by spelling out who the role players are that the research report will focus on, pointing out what is ethically wrong with corruption and in particular focusing on the break of trust that accompanies corruption. The chapter concludes by highlighting the importance of the report for proposing an ethical framework suitable for conceptualising the connection between corruption and trust. The research interest is to show that corruption is not only a matter of sociological or political disciplines, but also philosophical moral concepts.

Corruption is characterised by a lack of honesty, bad moral choices and actions and criminal offenses. What is most disturbing about corruption is how it affects the welfare of society in how it depletes resources in ways that are damaging to the poor. What seems to be clear is that corruption tends to be ruthless in a way that degrades the quality of human relations. It became evident in the protest march of 2017 organised by the Congress of South African Trade Unions that civil society was growing intolerant of the scourge corruption. The march illustrated that corruption is something that citizens do not accept but seem hopeless as to whether government is doing enough to tackle it. Accordingly, the protest march made a call for workers and citizens to stand up against the corruption rot.

A News24 article of 11 July 2019, citing a survey released by Transparency International, reported that of the total number of participants, "[i]n South Africa, a staggering 70% believe government is not doing enough to tackle corruption". The aim of this report is to show that corruption breeds a break of trust. I will argue that there is a conceptual connection between corruption and trust and will propose an ethical framework suitable to draw out this connection.

Although the term corruption seems to have no straightforward definition, administrative corruption (also known as bureaucratic corruption) is the "abuse of public resources and the misuse of public offices for private gain" (Vondou, 2015, p. 10). This definition is not inconsistent with Khan (1996, p. 12) who decodes corruption as "behaviour which deviates from the formal rules of conduct governing the actions of someone in a position of public authority because of private-regarding motives such as wealth, power or status". These amenable definitions provide a point of departure on the interrelation between administrative and political corruption. The interrelatedness of administrative and political corruption is captured well in Amundsen (1999, p. 3) in the point made that "Political corruption is when political decision-makers use political power they are armed with, to sustain their power, status and wealth". Often, these politicians are public representatives in public offices within government. With this in mind, it is easily recognisable that corruption violates the trust the public places in public officials in some way, but the question remains - how are we to understand the connections between corruption and trust?

This report considers corruption as a pressing problem that has plagued South Africa and will present why and how it is wrong. Within this problem, particular focus will be on the breakdown of trust between the public and government, with particular reference to the rise of widespread corruption under the presidency of Jacob Zuma. The term of administration referred to restricted possible development that would have taken place; it eroded the economy, resulting in inequality and poverty. It is thus important to look closely at the phenomenon of corruption and its connections to trust and specifically a breakdown of trust.

1.2 Research Report Objective

This research report aims to provide an applied ethical study of corruption in South Africa. The particular objective is to critically assess the relation between corruption and trust. This will be done through the exploration of virtue ethics as better suited than other dominant ethical approaches, such as utilitarianism and deontological ethics, for conceptualising, and hence understanding, the connection between corruption and trust. As per Kubbe (2013, p. 3), corruption "…harms the reputation of trust in a state", and for this reason the focus of this study will be on understanding the connection between corruption and trust, not necessarily proposing an ethical framework to combat corruption (although this understanding can help design interventions to combat corruption).

Throughout, examples of corruption will be drawn from the South African context. While "Corruption in various forms has been with humankind from the earliest of times" (Vorster 2013, p. 1), the selection of the South African context does not aim to explore, nor promise to propose, anything unique to corruption in South Africa compared to corruption universally. In this study, the South African narrative will provide a local frame of reference to illustrate the shortcomings of the other theories in understanding the connections between corruption and trust, and to argue for the strength of a virtue ethics approach. This will also help to draw out the conceptual connection between corruption and trust.

1.3 Corruption and Trust in the South African Context

A substantial number of corrupt activities in South Africa has been manifested through those in positions of public authority and government. The Zuma Presidency (period between 2009 to 2018), for instance, has been gripped with accusations of corruption. These include, but are not limited to:

- The Arms Deal which has been plagued by accusations of impropriety, irregularity, fraud and corruption. The deal has tainted reputations of many ANC

leaders, “with Jacob Zuma having become the contemporary focus of it all” (Daily Maverick, 2017).

- Nkandlagate, wherein the Public Protector found, amongst other findings, that the President and his family “improperly benefited from the measures implemented in the name of security upgrades that included non-security comforts” (Madonsela, 2014, p. 431).

- Guptagate, which was another scandal that alleged a corrupt relationship between the President and the wealthy Gupta family. The mounting allegations were that the said family had undue influence on the President and his administration. Arising out of these claims has been an institution of a Commission of Inquiry to investigate allegations of State Capture. As this report is compiled, the former President’s corruption trial is adjourned to September 2020. This follows a High Court decision that denied him permanent stay of prosecution.

It is the period of the 4th and the 5th administration of South Africa, Zuma’s presidency, and how it has been embroiled in corruption controversies that has triggered the interest in this study.

The corruption scandals hereto referred indicate an abuse of entrusted power to exploit public institutions, systems and resources to advance personal gain. This abuse increases the wealth of a few at the expense of society in general, leaving the poor suffering the most severe consequences. By nature, corruption destroys the prospects of a good society. It promotes a society with no regard for justice and fairness.

1.4 The problems of corruption and the role of a breakdown of trust

Administrative and political corruption are some of the greatest challenges impeding a good-natured relationship between the public and government. Both administrative and political corruption are the forms of corruption manifested through the abuse, misuse or

exploitation of public roles or resources for private and personal benefit. According to Robinson (2002, p. 2) corruption is of "particular concern for developing countries because it undermines economic growth, discourages foreign investment and reduces the resources available for infrastructure, public services and anti-poverty programmes". This has a direct ramification on people's livelihood and potentially erodes trust between citizens and government.

Rose-Ackerman (1997, p. 35) observes that "corruption is a symptom of a poorly functioning state". For example, when public funds are not used for purposes they are intended for, this becomes a fulcrum of corruption. Corruption results in stagnant infrastructure, a poor public transport system, an unreliable power supply - all of which impact economic activity. For instance, the Presidential cabinet reshuffle of December 2015 was characterised as an artefact of corruption within government which led to economic instability. Subsequent to the reshuffle, prominent industries such as Pioneer Foods and a number of big mining companies announced that they were parking their investments with Roux (2015, p. 32) citing "Pioneer Foods' most strategic risks relate to economic challenges [...]". According to a Corruption Watch article of 3rd February 2014, financial resources that could be spent on service delivery are lost to corruption every year. The Limpopo 2012 textbooks saga, where textbooks that were meant to be delivered to schools never reached the schools, is one example of how corruption undermines service delivery. The Mail & Guardian on 5th July 2012, reported on a leaked confidential Special Investigations Unit Report which found that R680-million tender contracted to Edusolutions was awarded on the basis of nepotism and not on the basis of merit.

The same Corruption Watch article of 3rd February 2014, made reference to the Council for the Advancement of the South African Constitution that reported an estimated 20% of the country's annual Gross Domestic Product lost to corruption.

For the reasons stated, it is essential to look into the role players in corruption, to assess their effect on the erosion of public trust in government, as well as those who are affected by acts of corruption. Three key role players identified for this study are:

1) Politicians - those who take part in how a country is run. Normally they affiliate to groups, referred to as political parties that share common beliefs. In the South African context, these participants (through the electoral system) are deployed by their political parties to government as public officials/leaders. Politicians get involved in corruption in similar ways as public servants when they abuse government power as decision-makers.

2) Public officials/servants - those responsible for the administration and the appropriation of public funds. Where corruption is involved, these officials channel allocated budgets to a use they are not commissioned for.

3) The public - native or naturalised members of a state with an allegiance to the state and deserving of government privileges and/or protection. Often these members are stratified according to 1) the upper class, 2) the middle and the working class, and 3) the poor. Corruption poses different consequences depending on where each member of the public is, in the hierarchy of the contradictions of classes. The domino effect of corruption on the poor is obvious in that they are kept in poverty and perpetually depend on government. The poor remain on the ranches and the margins of society with no prospect of a better life.

These role players stand in certain relations to each other where, crucially, the public places their trust in the politicians and public servants to administer and run the country honestly.

In the period referred to and in the examples provided and role players listed, the deterioration of the functioning of government pointed to a lack of ethics and a morality that was not rooted in an effort to improve the lives of people and promote cooperation between government and the public. Due to this deterioration of the functioning of government, there was corruption, which lacked morality, which led to a break of trust, which decreased honesty and resulted in mistrust between the public and government.

This decreased the value of honesty from the part of government and restrained the social progression of a state resulting in suspicion and mistrust between the public and government. This was evidenced, amongst other occurrences previously mentioned, in:

1) Gross financial and administrative mismanagement that sought to collapse the South African Revenue Service and the awarding of multi-million-rand contracts to external firms that produced sub-standard work so people could personally benefit (Nugent, 2018, pp. 48, 58, 193).

2) Corrupting certain parts of the justice system, e.g., the National Prosecuting Authority to which the Mokgoro Commission (2019, p. 131) reported on the Deputy National Director,

> We find that Jiba's conduct had the effect of seriously damaging public confidence in the NPA [...] We find that as a senior member of the NPA, Jiba has displayed irreverence to the courts and indifference to their processes, resulting in adverse comments being made about her.

3) Undermining set institutional accountability procedures such as the Public Protector e.g., the case of Nkandlagate wherein a sitting President deliberately failed to execute the recommendations of the Public Protector. To this end, a court declared that remedial action in the Public Protector's report is binding (Mlambo, 2017).

All these lead to a state of affairs wherein the public develops mistrust in government, institutional role players and government institutions. Dishonest, self-centered and greedy public officials betray the trust of people in government and its officials.

As such, given the endemic nature of corruption and its potential effects on public trust, there is an ever arising need to constantly tackle corruption by scrutinising the manner in which public officials behave, more specifically the attitude and the posture with which politicians and public officials conduct themselves towards citizens and in performing office duties (Robinson, 2002, p. 2). A relationship of trust between the

public and government is putatively valuable as it promotes cooperation, while reduced trust can undermine cooperation. If corruption reduces trust, then at the helm of its other evils is that it can also impact cooperation negatively.

To regain trust and promote cooperation between the citizens and government, unethical conduct, immoral activities or acts of maladministration ought to be addressed openly, with concise guiding frameworks on how to act against corruption or how to make choices that are morally virtuous in the face of corruption and without fear of reprisals. This is important because it is better to reside and work in a country where corruption is effectively restricted. Hence, there is need to continuously insist on accountability and transparency and unequivocally to reject the scourge of corruption that hinders the nation from progressing (Gildenhuys, 1991, p. 2). Such accountability and transparency would manage further corrosion of public confidence in government by promoting trust and fostering a government machinery that works better and for the benefit of its citizens.

Before exploring the undermining effects of corruption on trust, however, a broad understanding of what is wrong with corruption and the importance of trust is relevant at this point of the report. Specific problems with corruption have already been mentioned, where these problems contribute to why Vondou (2015, p. 9) argues that "Corruption is so dangerous that those responsible for running societies become unable to respond to their true vocation since they are no longer, nor do they recognize, their true selves". The concept of true-self refers to the belief that the agent is to be moral and good. The agent is presumed to have a moral responsibility to act in accordance with the role of being an important contributor to the well-being of a society for there to be an experience of a meaningful life. This is true of South Africa as we have witnessed over the past decade corruption spring to expansive proportions. This has been manifested through elite cartels where closely connected cohorts orchestrated networks for purposes of looting and sharing the proceeds of corruption.

In light of situations like these, Rawls (1988, p. 252) and Walzer (1990, p. 15) argue that for society to function well, a relationship of trust is crucial. Rossouw (1998, p.

1566) advances the point of a critical and sound relationship between, for instance, the electorate and the state as one "cultivated when the elected government adheres to a number of democratic principles". Among these principles, Rossouw (ibid.) lists equality, transparency and public interest, and asserts that when pubic officials are involved in corrupt deeds these principles are violated.

Rossouw (1998, p. 1566) points out that a relationship of trust between the public and government is always needed for government to function well and adhere to "democratic principles" of:

1) "Equality" - when public officials are engaged in corrupt activities the "equality of citizens is violated". When a public official solicits or accepts a bribe, members of the public are no longer equal as some enjoy certain favours,

2) "Transparency" - when others are to receive preferential treatment it should be in line with defined guidelines otherwise citizens are no longer treated the same and the violation of the transparency principle creates room for suspicion and lack of trust increases,

3) "The state act[ing] in public interest" – when corruption occurs, the interest of the public is set aside to advance the interest of the few and this violates public trust.

All these principles if not adhered to, have dire consequences for government: the public lose trust in public institutions and ultimately government legitimacy is at risk. Trust makes possible the formation of a relationship and cooperation between people and government. According to You (2018, p. 1) when trust is betrayed "people's perceptions of fairness" are affected. This, as per You (2018, p. 5), is out of the consideration that when there has been a breach of "interactional fairness" due to corruption, unequal treatment of people ensues. Corruption is a violation of "formal justice" which from a Rawlsian point of view is understood as an "impartial and consistent administration of laws and institutions" (Rawls, 1999, p. 51). As such, people expect a certain level of

conduct from government and public officials wherein citizens are treated "equally and impartially" (You, 2018, p. 24). However, corruption benefits a few while prejudicing against the masses and this affects public trust in government.

Therefore, for a democracy to function well, a relationship of trust is needed between the electorate and the state (Rawls, 1988, p. 252 and Walzer, 1990, p. 15). When politicians or officials of the state become involved in bribery or other forms of corruption, the democratic principles are violated. This leads to an erosion of trust in politicians and worse in political democracy.

The image and integrity of government needs to be protected and defended from untrustworthy public officials in order to renew people's confidence in public officials and their commitment to manage public resources and institutions with moral integrity. To build a credible state, as well as to re-establish trust, means not defending individuals found foul of corruption and acting against the resultant compromise of trust, loyalty and the bestowed confidence that people would have had in public officials and in government. Otherwise, the detrimental effects of corruption are felt by the masses that continue to suffer under the conditions of abject poverty as selfish personal gain is advanced, fostering greater and greater inequality.

Tackling the problem effectively requires a suitable ethical framework to clarify the relation between corruption and trust. As shall be argued in this report, the relation between the two is not just a causal relation but also a conceptual relation. A virtue ethics framework proves to be a viable option for understanding the conceptual connection between corruption and trust.

1.5 The importance of the report

Although studies have been conducted in the fields of philosophy, politics, psychology and sociology on the relationship between corruption and trust, this study argues that virtue ethics is a suitable normative framework for analysis of the relationship between trust and corruption. Broadly, philosophers such as Hursthouse and Pettigrove (2016),

Devettere (2002), Miller (2018) among others, have written extensively on either corruption, virtue ethics or reform and they do so without showing how virtue ethics addresses trust within the context of corruption.

While there are a number of reasons that heighten the break of trust in government, the most common reason is that of corruption. Corruption hinders the collective joining of forces to advance a common good. Baier (1986, p. 232) states that moral philosophy has a keen interest in "cooperation between people". This cooperation requires trust (ibid.). Baier (ibid.), commenting on Plato's work *The Republic* states that "citizens are to trust philosopher kings to rule wisely and expect elites to trust their underlings not to poison their wine, nor set fire to their libraries". Baier (ibid.) proceeds to point out that even in the referred work of Plato, trust or trustworthiness are not virtues Plato dwells on in the requisite cooperation outlined in his "good society". As it will be tabled in the following chapters, this study argues for a more suitable normative ethics approach that can help conceptualise and understand the connection between corruption and trust.

While studies have been devoted to the idea or theory of trust (Fukuyama, 1995; Miller, 1980 and Putnam, 2000), trust is often treated as a disassociated variable to corruption. In instances where the effects of corruption have been studied, i.e., Mexico, they have not been studied with a lens that presents a conceptual connection between corruption and trust. As a result, there remains room to explore this conceptual connection of corruption and trust through an illustrative South African frame of reference.

As such, this research report will critically discuss corruption and trust with particular focus on the South African context, to demonstrate the relevance of virtue ethics for understanding the conceptual relationship between corruption and trust.

1.6 Outline of the report

Chapter Two follows describing the interplay between corruption and trust and arguing that there is a conceptual connection between the two. This interplay will be addressed and illustrated through the expropriation of resources meant for the overall good of a

society for the benefit of a select few. Chapter Three will provide an exposition of the problem of corruption as it relates to trust through the lens of two of the major normative ethical approaches, namely deontological ethics and utilitarianism. These two approaches will be assessed to present how they help us to understand the intricate relationship between trust and corruption. From this their limitations will be drawn out as they relate to understanding the connections between corruption and trust. Chapter Four argues that virtue ethics provides a more favourable approach to conceptualise and explain the relationship between corruption and trust. The chapter is concluded by an endorsement of virtue ethical theory as best suited to conceptualise the connection between corruption and trust by drawing on virtues like trustworthiness. Chapter Five and the conclusion proposes the use of virtue ethical framework to identify considerable ways to remedy the breakdown of public trust in government arising from corruption.

CHAPTER TWO - THE CONCEPTUAL CONNECTION BETWEEN CORRUPTION AND TRUST

2.1 Introduction

The South African government has many roles and functions, amongst which is the duty to secure the welfare of citizens. The government, as such, has a mandated and compelling responsibility to deliver welfare services to people. However, the effects of corruption are extremely corrosive and hinder this mandate and also undermine public trust in government, its institutions, and ultimately delegitimise the state. Given the obstructive enormity of corruption on service delivery and public trust, how can we conceptualise the relation between corruption and public trust in government?

This section of the research report argues that there is a conceptual relation between corruption and trust, which helps to unpack why there can be a breakdown of public trust, specifically within the context of the government. A point of departure in this consideration is developed from You's (2018, p. 3) premise that corruption is a form of behaviour that a person exhibits which fails to meet basic characteristics of good governance such as "honesty, fairness, benevolence, and competence". These basic characteristics are closely linked to the principles that promote trust, as will be expanded on in this Chapter. When corruption is committed, those who act on behalf of citizens use the entrusted power to exploit the faith citizens have in public officials. This involves a betrayal of trust which compromises the integrity, honesty and/or the fairness expected of government officials. Given this consideration, the research report will, in the following chapters, propose virtue ethics as the best suited ethical framework to understand the connection between corruption and trust in the context of government structures in South Africa.

An argument advanced in this Chapter is that there is a conceptual link between corruption and trust. While the causal link between corruption and a breakdown in trust is obvious, the main aim will be to illustrate the necessary conceptual relation between corruption and a break of trust. Herein, corruption will be discussed in terms of a

betrayal of trust. In other words, when one thinks of corruption, one is inadvertently considering the deceptive motive inherent in corruption, where such deception supports principles of mistrust. In the closing arguments, it will be reviewed whether, given the conceptual relation, a reduction in levels of corruption could plausibly result in restoration of trust. This report takes a position that corruption cannot be considered in absence of the idea of betrayal of trust. In what follows, and before drawing the conceptual connection between corruption and trust, it is worthwhile to discuss the concepts of corruption and trust independently so as to offer a clear analysis of the concepts in order to ultimately illustrate the necessity of virtue ethics in the discussion of how corruption relates to public trust.

2.2 The concept of corruption

Corruption is a machinery of dishonest conduct by those in offices of authority, often used to retain power, dominion and illicit personal gain. It is "the abuse of entrusted power for private gain" (Kubbe, 2013, p. 2). This abuse of power is often engineered through the exchange of money and gifts (as bribery offerings) to attain certain advantages, benefits, and privileges. Corruption in government happens when politicians and public officials serve others in return for payoffs. Rendtorff (2010, p. 125) defines corruption as "illegal and unethical because it is an act that goes against or challenges the established and well-defined conceptions and laws of justice".

Corruption is purely an immoral act of selfishness which disregards the basic precepts of democracy such as accountability, fairness, and transparency. Corruption is a threat to government stability and legitimacy, as discussed in Chapter One. A corrupt government "fundamentally distorts public policy, leads to misallocation of resources, harms the private sector and private sector development" (Kubbe, 2013, p. 2).

The extent to which corrupt deeds of the past decade have had bearing on development, service delivery, and consequently, on public trust in government to fulfil its mandate to the people led the current President, Cyril Ramaphosa in delivering the 6th Parliament State of the Nation Address, to boldly say:

> We want […] professional public servants of the highest moral standards and dedicated to the public good […] we are committed to building an ethical state in which there is no place for corruption, patronage, rent-seeking and plundering of public money (Ramaphosa, 2019).

One could read into the president's assertion an admission of not having an ethical state and a commitment to address the need for professional public servants of the highest moral standards who can be relied upon. It can, therefore, be easily seen that corruption is necessarily immoral in that it takes and redirects resources from government that are intended for the mass public to a select group with power and influence. As such, service delivery is provided at lower levels while resources are exhausted by public officials involved in acts of corruption. Effects of corruption include social inequality, erosion of the rule of law, and diminished trust in government officials. The frustrations imposed on citizens by corruption result in a society that cannot trust government officials to shield citizens from poverty and inequality, among many other socio-political ills that plague the country. The ultimate outcome of this is a failed state. What is it about corruption that has these effects, specifically the effects on trust, and is the connection between corruption and trust only causal like this?

2.3 The concept of trust

As discussed in Chapter One, trust is an important determinant that cannot be missed in the effectiveness of government and the quality of life it delivers to its citizens. Trust is a foundational anchor upon which the legitimacy of a government and its institutions are built. It is also important for maintaining social cohesion. For this reason, the break of trust is a noticeable feature of societies plagued with corruption. Corruption disrupts a good value system and fosters a negative and non-trusting relationship between the public and government.

McLeod (2015, p. 20) describes trust as "an attitude we have towards people whom we hope will be trustworthy". To be trustworthy can be understood to mean the belief that someone is dependable, principled, sincere, and effective. Thus, to trust someone means to have confidence that they will not act in ways that are intentionally harmful. The

conditions for trusting someone are that the person will be competent and committed to what they are trusted to do (ibid.). With this said, trust comes with a possibility for betrayal wherein the trusted person may not fulfil that with which they have been entrusted. This is very well the case in point when government officials engage in corruption, trust is lost and the moral value system that should govern the country is broken.

While there are many South African cases we can draw from to illustrate the concept of trust, I will single out one wherein a senior political figure alleged that:

> "Members of the Gupta family offered me the position of minister of finance to replace then-minister Nene. I rejected this out of hand […] The basis for my rejection of their offer is that it makes a mockery of our hard-earned democracy, the trust of our people, and no one apart from the president of the republic appoints ministers" (The Guardian, 2016, emphasis added).

This senior political figure had recognised that trust means holding a positive moral awareness about the actions of the public official and government. This is also what the public expects of officials - that they will do what is right and fair, which in this case involved recognising that the public expects ministers to be appointed through a principled and meritorious process. If he had acted contrary to the rejection of the offer, he would have broken public trust because he would have contradicted what he was entrusted to do.

From a moral point of view, and as can be denoted in the example provided, trust is a general good which constitutes a key component of social interaction and serves as a glue that binds people together. According to Putnam (1993, p. 170) trust is the cornerstone of a cooperative spirit and a philosophical conception that highlights what people share in common. Uslaner (2002, 4) states that "[t]rust is based upon an optimistic view of the world. Trustors believe that the world is a good place, will continue to get better, and that they can make it better". Even if trustors do not always believe that the world is a good place, forever improving, the key idea is that trust is a cornerstone upon which the well-being and functioning of a society is built. With this,

of course, comes the "intention to accept vulnerability, reliance on another, and positive expectation of outcomes" (Alarcon et al., 2019, p. 1). In this way, trust sets out the socio-psychological and moral philosophical basis for social harmony. Furthermore, Ardelyanova and Obryvalina (2018, p. 65) maintain that trust "determines the dynamics of the development of basic social processes, the integrity of society".

Therefore, it can be drawn from the discussion of trust above that trust is about confidence in people and institutions to meet justifiable expectations. This confidence does not nullify Sztompka's (1999, p. 22) viewpoint that when "facing other people we often remain in the condition of uncertainty, bafflement and surprise" but given that to trust is human we nonetheless derive trust from our natural human predisposition i.e., the trust an infant has on the mother, the caretaker, etc. but with this comes the sentiment to accept vulnerability. Furthermore, Rose-Ackerman (2001, p. 526) adds "honesty" as an important substantive value to trust. This honesty involves integrity of character, life as a whole and respect for other people. This implies that the trustor expects the trustee, in a role as public official, to exhibit responsible behaviour that is benevolent, act in ways that do not break trust but are for the benefit of the good of society.

2.4 The connection between corruption and trust

Corruption and trust can easily be seen as incompatible. Trust comprises good intentions which yield good actions, while suspicion and uncertainty results from corruption. Corruption is more like a destructive state of affairs, while mistrust is an attitude towards government resultant from what corruption erodes. We now have an idea of what the concepts of corruption and trust entail. What remains fascinating is the question regarding the seriousness of corruption. What is it that makes corruption bad? Could it be that it is bad only because it raises negative consequences or could it be inherently bad?

What makes corruption bad is not just the use of public funds nor the use of public funds for personal gain, because we do allow officials to use public funds, even for personal gain. For example, one of the biggest components of public spending is the

remuneration of public officials which is a permissible use of public funds in that it counts as official use. Some of the public officials are paid in accordance to the market role worth of the positions they occupy in order to attract the best skills into government and hopefully drive excellence in service delivery. In this instance, there is no immoral act or abuse of power. We typically do not think of using public funds to pay a salary or to cover expenses of the job as a misuse of funds, even though the official does gain. We could also add the use of public funds for things such as air flights. There does seem to be a point where we no longer think that someone is being paid according to his/her market worth, or we think that first class flights to the Rugby World Cup is a step too far. In such instances, do we begin to see acts that are headed towards corruption? The point of this example is to illustrate that the public's expectations are being let down, even in these more hazy cases. In doing so, the public's expectations of those in power are not always met.

Rather, with regard to how public funds are handled, it is the *misuse* of public funds that makes corruption bad, but what makes it a misuse? Plausibly it is a misuse when officials use funds we have not given them permission to use, even though we recognise that they have the power to do so. This raises the question about the aim of corruption, which is to use what is not rightfully yours, where what makes the use a misuse or abuse is that the use goes against what has been agreed upon as appropriate use. The principles guiding this misuse and abuse include deception, betrayal, dishonesty, etc. Thus, what makes corruption bad is that it is a vice that harms others.

The simple act of trusting that public officials will act in the public interest makes the public vulnerable and exposed to the possibility of being disappointed. When acts of corruption are committed, public confidence in the integrity, competency and reliability of public officials and government is lost because they are being disappointed. So, when public officials misuse public funds, there is something that amounts to a break of trust, and this is core to why corruption is bad, not just because of its consequences but because of what corruption itself is. That is, the very nature of corruption in the principles it involves, such as deception, breaks trust.

Trust can be broken even if no-one finds out about the corrupt act and even if there is not a widespread breakdown of trust in the government/official. This is because the official is still acting against what they have been entrusted to do, regardless of whether anyone finds out about it. In that way, there is a break in trust. From either side, the relationship of trust is broken. When the act is found out, that can have further effects that can lead to a widescale breakdown in trust. Nevertheless, it remains the case that the corrupt act, in itself and without anyone knowing about it, goes against what the official has been entrusted with.

The Limpopo 2012 textbooks saga is one example of how corruption inherently involves a break in trust. The Mail & Guardian on 5th July 2012, reported on a leaked confidential Special Investigations Unit Report which found that R680-million tender contracted to Edusolutions was not awarded on the basis that the company could provide solutions, but on the basis of political connections. The expectation in the government in this example, what they were entrusted to do, was that textbooks would be delivered to schools and that learners would be afforded the right and access to education and thus reduce the inequality gap. However, government and/or its officials not only stole funds in this act but the prospects of a better future for the learners was tampered with and thereby the trust deficit was perpetuated. This was not only because of the negative consequences, but more crucially because of the expectations that were actively gone against.

As it has been established above, corruption wrongfully expropriates what belongs to the public for personal gain, where those in positions of authority are expected to do certain things within their position. This is a violation of public trust placed in politicians and public servants, because those figures fail to do the things justifiably expected of them. This violation illustrates an interplay between corruption and trust that goes beyond the effects of corruption. Corrupt acts by their nature, inherently break trust. When trust is broken, the possibility of a good society and cooperation diminishes as the political and social systems of a just society are abused and in turn this leads to an ineffective government less concerned with human development (Rendtorff, 2010, p. 125; Mauro, 1997, p. 5).

Thus, it can be argued that corrupt public officials produce distrust in society because an act of corruption is an act of breaking trust. On normal day-to-day interactions and relations, trusting someone involves having confidence in them, believing that they are reliable and that your safety will not be threatened by them. With this in mind, trust requires good grounds for government to treat its citizens with respect and civility – that is, to act in good will.

Further on the relationship between trust and corruption, Uslaner (2002, 3) makes an assertion worth analysis that "…as countries become more trusting, they become less corrupt". This does not necessarily imply that the roots of corruption lie in mistrust, but there is still a conceptual connection between the two, because becoming more trusting requires that one's trust is not broken. To some degree, it remains that a corrupt society is a society without trust because of that conceptual connection. That said, Uslaner's (2002, 11) hypothesis can be understood as relying on the moral dimension that believes that people are fundamentally good with a natural instinct to prefer good over bad or evil.

CHAPTER THREE - HOW CAN THE PROBLEM OF CORRUPTION AS IT RELATES TO TRUST BEST BE CONCEPTUALISED?

3.1 Introduction

This chapter and Chapter Four aim to extract and analyse how three standard approaches within normative ethics deal with the problem of corruption. These include a deontological approach and a utilitarian approach, addressed in the current chapter, and a virtue ethics approach addressed in Chapter Four. The primary issue is to investigate which theory provides a best suited approach to conceptualise, at whatever level possible, the scourge of corruption as it relates to trust. In this chapter, the theories of deontology and utilitarianism will be showcased to illustrate their inadequacy to offer a conceptualisation of the links between corruption and trust. From this, I will conclude that the mutual relationship between corruption and trust may require an approach that prioritises neither the nature of the act nor the consequences, but instead the character of moral agents.

In applied ethics, principles such as autonomy, nonmaleficence, justice, and beneficence are applied in different situations. The analyst applies a more relevant normative ethical theory, pre-emptively or reactively, to determine or assess which normative ethical theory is likely to be most relevant in assessing wrongness or rightness of an action (Christie, Groarke, and Sweet, 2007, p. 53). For instance, according to Christie, Groarke, and Sweet (2007, p. 53) "autonomy is abstracted from Deontological ethics, beneficence and nonmaleficence from Utilitarianism, and the principle of justice was originally articulated [as a] source of contemporary Virtue Ethics". As such, in this section, different moral theories are examined in order to arbitrate which theory is most useful to conceptualise corruption as it relates to trust, using examples from the South African context.

3.2 A deontological framework and how it fares with conceptualising the problem of corruption as it relates to trust

There seems to be a connection between corruption and a break of trust, and what is required is an ethical framework that can draw those connections out. To see how a deontological approach fares in drawing out these connections, this subsection begins by introducing a general deontological theory, followed by consideration of a Kantian deontological approach and it concludes by considering some of the premises in John Rawls' contractarian argument to examine how these approaches do or do not illuminate the connections between corruption and trust. This section will arrive at a conclusion that occurrences of the corrupt acts point to something lacking in agents' dispositions to adhere to duties, which underwrites why agents are likely to be ineffective in keeping the duties. Corruption is bad because it breaks trust. However, as will be argued, deontology is not primarily concerned with drawing the conceptual connections between corruption and trust. For this reason, we begin to see that deontology may not be so helpful in the issue we are trying to conceptualize.

3.2.1 Introduction to deontology

Deontology denotes a category of normative ethical theories that maintain that an action is morally right if it is in accordance with rules, duties, rights or maxims. In this sense, if an act is not in harmony with rules, duties, rights or maxims, "it may not be undertaken, no matter the Good that it might produce" (Alexander and Moore, 2016, p. 6). This is consistent with the familiar thought that, "there are some things one just shouldn't do, no matter what" (Shafer-Landau, 2013, p. 481).

Deontology can be summed up as describing a duty-based nature of right action with obligatory and binding underpinnings which confer a moral value on action. From this view, the rightfulness or wrongfulness of an action depends on the inherent nature of the action although the agent is still required to deliberate on what to do in a given situation. This is where the role of intention and the mental state of the agent come into effect as features of an agent-centered deontological approach. As per Alexander and

Moore (2016, p. 8), "[i]ntentions mark out what it is we set out to achieve through our actions. If we intend something bad as an end… we are said to have set ourselves at evil". This way, intentionally committing a crime or engaging in corrupt acts ought to be avoided, for to act in such a way is morally wrong. It is morally wrong because what the person sets out to achieve is an end that is bad, where what makes the end bad will be explained further below. It remains wrong even if such an act is never discovered or known by others, when no one is harmed in the process, or even when many have benefited from the results of the act. What makes the act wrong is a matter of motive and when an act is performed outside the motive of duty, it lacks moral value.

On the other hand, if we predict that a wrongful act of ours will yield good results, such a prediction is a cognitive state and might make us believe that the act is justifiable even though we know it is bad i.e., killing and stealing can yield good results, but the acts are inherently immoral (Alexander and Moore, 2016, pp. 8-9). Nevertheless, on a deontological assessment such an action would be impermissible regardless of the prediction because the nature of the action is bad. This way, we see that deontology maintains that the moral worth of one's actions has less to do with the consequences of the action, but more to do with the principles upon which the action is based upon in the first place.

3.2.2 Kantian deontology

To give more detail to what makes an end bad and what the role of duties are, I turn to Kantian deontology to explain these elements. The greatest proponent of deontological ethics is Immanuel Kant who contrasted ethics with physics and provided an explanation that while physics describes the laws of nature, ethics describes the laws of morality by which the moral agent should act. This sort of "disposition or character is something we all highly value", Kant believed (Johnson and Cureton, 2019, p. 10). Kant held a view that reason alone can be accepted as adequately capable of distinguishing correct moral principles from wrong ones. For Kant, since moral actors are rational beings, laws of ethics could be derived from 'reason' without particular appeal to circumstances or experience (Christie, Groarke and Sweet, 2007, p. 55). An aspect of

the Kantian approach is that if actions are to be considered morally worthy, they should be concerned with adherence to universal moral rules, duties and basic rights i.e., duty entails acting out of respect for the moral law. This is what Kant referred to as the Categorical Imperative. According to Kant (2013, p. 490), "[t]he categorical imperative would be that which represented an action as objectively necessary in and of itself, without reference to another end". Kant's categorical imperative champions the view that we should act as though the principles that we enact were to become law.

The Categorical Imperative is a principle of action (maxim) that can be universalised. The Categorical Imperative entails those rules that are to be followed no matter what. These rules are unconditional and are absolute for all rational agents. Often, they are derived from reason and are binding to all. Korsgaard (2013, p. 499) states that "this is equivalent to acting as though your maxim were by your will to become the law of nature". These rules are not to be contradicted but are to be upheld in all similar situations i.e., no one should steal, and as such stealing cannot be universalised. If one person steals, it does not follow that others can steal. On the Categorical Imperative, exceptions cannot be made for one and not for others. In the instance of one lying or making a false promise, for example, Kant would say the principle of such an action is in breach of the universal law because a principle of lying cannot be universalised. In addition, lying is disrespectful and can be regarded as using the person lied to as a means to achieve one's own ends rather than treating the person as an end in themselves. Hence, will or motivation should only be to one's duty. If this were not the case, one could make a promise knowing it will not be kept and this would foster deception. This gives rise to Kant's perfect and imperfect duties. Perfect duties could be categorised, as per Statman (1996, p. 211), as duties such as keeping promises and the duty not to murder both of which have "strict injunctions turning every particular act that falls under these duties into a binding duty". By contrast, Statman (1996, p. 211) further states that imperfect duties could fall under the category of duties "such as the duty of charity [which] bind us in a much looser way, leaving ample room for personal discretion".

For example, shooting an intruder in a house break-in to protect the family contradicts the duty to protect lives. From a Kantian approach, the view would be that if killing the intruder is done for the sake of bringing about something else, then we are using the shooter as a means to an end. Kant's humanity as ends formulation states that we should not use persons as instruments to derive certain outcomes. The intruder is immoral to gain access illegally. The family is morally wrong to shoot him. This example illustrates that the agent can be torn between moral duties - the duty to protect family and the duty not to murder. While the agent may deliberate on what the right thing to do is in a given context, s/he remains unjustifiable in killing the intruder regardless of the features of the context. For Kant, the context would have no bearing on moral decision-making. Killing is wrong, whether the victim is innocent or guilty, whether it is suicide or murder. The context does not matter for Kant because context relativises morality (Flikschuh, 2018, p. 14). However, the tension between protecting family and the duty not to murder leaves the agent in a moral dilemma. For this reason, the example provided exposes the limitations of a Kantian approach in an instance where inclination to family and the duty not to murder are in conflict. These conflicting obligations set the agent to moral failure as she cannot satisfy both.

In cases of moral dilemma, how can the person choose what to do? Is, for instance, their intention to do the right thing sufficient for determining a choice between duties? To explore this and lead into another feature of the Kantian view, consider a case of corruption. Suppose, for instance, public official A who is an accountant redirects funds from the feeding scheme accounts to pay for someone's life-saving operation. No one notices that the funds are missing and the misappropriation is for a good cause. This behaviour then becomes perpetual when, in the next instance, the accountant takes the money to save a child (not related to him) and still no person is left worse off. Is such an act morally acceptable in deontological terms? For Kant, it would not be acceptable. The misappropriation of funds involves dishonesty. Even if it is dishonesty for a good cause, it remains dishonesty. From a Kantian ethical viewpoint, concern is more on doing the right thing because it is the right thing to do rather than the agent's self-interest, and in the hypothetical example given, public official A would have not acted out of self-interest, but out of a duty to help and with an intention to do the right thing.

So, from a Kantian approach, consequences are immaterial when considering the moral worth of an action, but assessment is more on the action itself.

What we can draw, therefore, is that Kantian deontology does help to show the moral unacceptability of corruption. Corruption is morally unacceptable because it transgresses the categorical imperative – that much is granted. What one can argue is that Kantian deontology does not account for trust. Corruption, according to Kantian deontology, would have to be avoided, not because it breaks trust, but because it is wrong in and of itself. Quite plausibly, corruption cannot be universalised because if everyone were to act corruptly, society would not function. In part, this is plausibly because we would not trust anyone. So, there is trust here, but it is quite far removed.
While Kantian deontology offer a clear description of corruption as immoral in any situation. However, it does not assist in conceptualising the relationship between corruption and trust because it does not help us to understand what is so special about corruption, over other instances where trust is betrayed. Perhaps it is wrong because 'acting corruptly' cannot be universalised because if everyone were to so-act, the state would fall apart. The reason the state would fall apart is potentially because funds would not be used for what they are needed for, but also because people would not be prepared to put the funds in, in the first place, because they would not trust the public officials to use them appropriately. So, here we have trust entering the picture. However, it is not enough to conceptualise the connections between corruption and trust. The reason it is not enough is because it is quite far removed. In Chapter Two, I argued that an act of corruption is a breaking of trust, whereas now even though a Kantian view might bring in trust, but only insofar as a factor for why acting corruptly cannot be universalised. And perhaps this good enough because it is too indirect and does not get to the heart of the wrongness.

3.2.3 Rawls Contractarian Deontology and corruption

Perhaps let us explore another kind of deontological approach, John Rawls' Contractarian Deontology, to determine whether it may be better suited to drawing out the connection between corruption and a breakdown of trust.

Rawls' Contractarian Deontology considers whether or not an action is morally right on the basis that it is in accordance with the rules rational moral agents would agree to upon on entering a social contract. The observance of the rules must produce mutual benefit. We know Rawls does not tackle corruption in his *Theory of Justice*, but we can reason that corruption raises issues of social justice. Justice includes "substantive justice", "equal liberties", "fair equal opportunities" and the "difference principle" – all of which are basic principles of Rawls' *Theory of Justice*. Rawls (1999, p. 51) defines what he terms "formal justice" as "impartial and consistent administration of laws and institutions". To this end, if an institution is just then it should be impartial and not in any way be influenced by personal, monetary or any other considerations in the handling of its affairs (Rawls, 199, pp. 50-52).

To this end, Rawls proposes a principle of justice he refers to as the original position. According to Swift (2014, p. 49), the original position is a "device of representation [which] models fair conditions by abstracting from people's natural endowments and social (class) position, and from their particular conceptions of good" to foster social cooperation. The main feature of this position is the 'veil of ignorance' whose function is to "represent the equality of persons purely as moral persons, and not in any other contingent capacity or social role" (Freeman, 2019, p. 14). Behind the veil of ignorance component of Rawls' (1999, p. 118) social contract theory are moral agents who do not know who they are - they have no indication of their class, privileges, enjoyment of superior benefit or value, and personality. They simply exist as an impartial group. What this translates to is that the manner in which social rights and duties are distributed exhibits no difference in terms of gender, social and/or economic class or religion. The value of the principle put forth by Rawls advances the idea of justice as fairness since the initial situation is equal, and since the process of deliberation is fair, not being

compromised by inequalities of power, etc. (Rawls, 1999, p. 12). Thus, the principle applied is just and in this way every person is guaranteed basic liberties.

Rawls' Contractarian theory is deontological in that it assesses moral rightness or wrongness of an action on the rationale that it adheres to laws or moral rules. The Rawlsian approach has the advantage over a Kantian approach in that it demonstrates the relationship between the public and its officials and the reasons why such a relationship needs to be underpinned by mutually agreed upon laws and rules. It directs us to how laws and institutions should not be unjust and that moral rules should apply to everyone equally with no room for exception.

As referred to on the problems of corruption and the breakdown of trust in Chapter One, Nkandlagate is one corruption scandal in which about R246 million of the taxpayers' money was spent on the renovation of the President's Nkandla homestead. The incident caused a huge public outcry. The case of Nkandlagate illustrates a violation of "formal justice" and the principle of justice as fairness in Parliament's failure to hold the President accountable for not implementing recommendations of the Public Protector's report into Nkandla. However, while having an advantage over a Kantian approach by demonstrating a relationship between the public and officials, the Contractarian approach still identifies the moral wrongness of the action as lying in a violation of duties. Suppose, for instance, there is public official A who works as a financial accountant in a certain State Owned Enterprise (SOE) and public official B who is a general office worker in the same SOE. As we begin to see world economies shrink due to the impact of the current pandemic, the SOE decides to lay off some of its staff and public official B (who is a general worker) gets affected by the retrenchment. This official has a responsibility of looking after his sick parents and three siblings who are at university and depend on his salary to take care of his family. Public official A (the accountant) is aware of public official B's circumstances and, on learning that he will be affected by retrenchments, fabricates the SOE's books out of duty to help public official B, to somewhat make sure he takes home enough retrenchment package to last him a while. In this hypothesis, the act would have to display a capacity to reason at a universal point of view and judge the situation from an impartial standpoint that

considers the Original Position of contractors under the Veil of Ignorance. As such, Contractarian approach accounts for corruption being morally wrong, but it does not help us to draw a conceptual relation between trust and corruption.

3.2.4 Deontology, corruption and trust

As discussed, corruption on both the Kantian and Contractarian approaches can be seen to be morally problematic because the laws of morality under which the agent should reason and act do not endorse it. Moreover, corruption produces no mutual benefit under the social contract. It can be seen as morally problematic in other ways, however. That is, on how it fares on understanding its relationship with trust.

From a general deontological perspective, for instance, an act is moral if there is adherence to its duty e.g., sharing a resource with a needy person. Refraining from such an action can also be considered morally bad. Ochulor and Bassey (2010, p. 472) state that some acts inherently carry an obligation not to do something and corruption falls under this category of acts with its deliberate intent to subvert common interest for personal benefit. In other words, there is an inherent obligation not to so-act. To take a bribe, embezzle public funds or commit fraudulent activities is to engage in morally bad action or immoral acts, acts one has a duty not to perform. Ochulor and Bassey (2010, p. 472) maintain that to act in such a manner:

> Goes contrary to right reason that one should appropriate what is meant for the public to assuage one's private interest or that one should use his position as a public servant for self-aggrandizement or for private gain, at the detriment of the common good.

As per Napal (2006, p. 5) corruption, therefore, "takes the form of violation of norms of duty and responsibility within the civic order".

In so far as trust is concerned, when public officials are involved in corruption they are stealing from the public and when this happens we can expect that trust will be lost and

society will be fractured. This loss of trust is a consequence or effect of corruption, but, as argued in Chapter Two, there is also a conceptual connection between corruption and a break of trust. A corrupt act does not just result in a loss of trust, but is in itself a break of trust. We want to draw on an ethical approach like deontology to understand the conceptual relationship between corruption and the break of trust. From a deontological perspective, the effect of failure to execute 'duty' is not the primary concern. What is of concern is what moral duty the official might have toward the citizens and whether their actions are guided by the motive of duty, but not so much how that duty is connected to trust.

Deontology evaluates the act in itself and not by its consequences to determine the act's rightfulness or wrongfulness. Because of this, a deontological approach to corruption, as in accordance with Lynch and Lynch's (2003, p. 371) view, is not entirely useful in that, "no laws, codes of conduct, or threats can force public officials to behave ethically". Instead, the imposition of such sanctions that come with rules and duties would not produce the desired results as they may have potential to lower the morale of public officials and lead to inflexible administration in government (Lynch and Lynch, 2003, p. 371). What a deontological approach aims to do is offer a theory of right action according to which some actions are unethical because some duty is not upheld, without lessening unethical actions. All this approach does is tell us about corrupt actions; it does not address the fact that the moral agent conceptually orchestrates an act of corruption and engages in it with a deliberate intent. It is, therefore, granted that deontology tells us that corruption is wrong in itself, but that it does not sufficiently help us to understand its relationship to the break of trust. With this in mind, a Kantian approach does not go beyond stating the obvious that corruption is morally wrong. Nkandlagate models a failure to adhere to 'duty' by those involved and entrusted with the public resources. The duty being infringed upon in Nkandlagate was a perfect duty to use public funds carefully. It must be borne in mind that public officials have a duty to the public no matter what and this binding duty was contravened. However, Kantian deontology does not go as far as to address the violation of public trust in the breach of rules in so far as corruption is concerned. We cannot use Kantian deontology to comment on why trust is broken by the contraventions in the Nkandla case study that

related to a deviation from procurement procedures, escalation of costs on the President's home and the President not feeling any compulsion to stop it all. The Nkandla upgrade was paid for from the public purse, which was morally unacceptable. Besides this reiteration, Kantian deontology does not assist in the question of whether we are able to capture the break of trust inherent in corruption. While the Contractarian approach fares a little better by establishing a framework for rules to be agreed upon between the public and officials, it does not tell us how to understand the connection between corruption and trust.

What we are looking for is more than fulfilling duties or assessing action to determine whether they are good or evil, where we are more concerned with an approach that will not limit corruption to its inherent wrongness and seek to address the dispositions that direct us to the connections between corruption and trust. The conceptual relationship between corruption and trust is one of contradiction or incompatibility so that wherever we have corruption, we break trust. Deontology overlooks the inherent break of trust that occurs with a corrupt act and yet it is the connection between corruption and trust that we want to conceptualise.

3.3 A utilitarian framework and how it fares with conceptualising the problem of corruption as it relates to trust

Whereas deontological theories hold that actions are not justified by the results they produce regardless of how good their effects are, consequentialism determines whether an action is morally right or wrong if it has good or evil consequences. An influential form of consequentialism is utilitarianism, which will be the focus. Broadly, utilitarianism maintains a claim that an action is moral if, for instance, it results in the greatest happiness (utility maximisation) for the greatest number of people and immoral if it generates harm or no happiness. Evidently, in determining those actions that produce happiness, focus is not on the individual or the moral agent, but more on the overall happiness across individuals. The prominent intrinsic value of utilitarianism is happiness. Christie, Groarke, and Sweet (2007, p. 54) define happiness as "pleasure and the absence of pain" and unhappiness as "pain and privation of pleasure". Mill (2013,

p. 418) maintains that social rules or actions should place "happiness […] or the interest of every individual, as nearly as possible in harmony with the interest of the whole". Although universal happiness should precede individual happiness, there remains a chance that universal happiness could be either spread over individuals, or it could be concentrated in one individual. Utilitarianism would not necessarily distinguish between these scenarios, instead it will focus on the greatest quantity of happiness in whatever distribution.

Forms of utilitarianism can be divided between act and rule utilitarianism. Brandt (1983, p. 37) unpacks act utilitarianism as concerned with the philosophical "view that the benefit or harm done by an act, or class of actions, or prohibition of an act-type, determines whether it is wrong or right morally". As per Emmons (1973, p. 226), "[a]ct-utilitarians contend that the rightness or wrongness of an action is determined by the consequences of that action alone". Whereas, for a rule-utilitarian, "the rightness or wrongness of a unit of behaviour is a quite different function of consequences" – it is the function of the value derived from following a particular rule (ibid.).

3.3.1 Act utilitarianism and corruption

Act utilitarianism asserts that an act is right on the basis of whether it maximises good, understood as happiness. To illustrate act utilitarianism we could use the example of texting while driving. Texting while driving is something drivers should not do in most cases. However, in a context where the driver sends a text while driving to seek emergency medical help, the contravention is justifiable if and only if the results it will produce - i.e., saving lives – will result in the maximisation of utility. The driver would have acted in a manner that reduces pain and promotes utility. On Act utilitarianism, consequences could be morally permissible while the act is seemingly bad. On application, this means an act-utilitarian ethical analysis may consider corruption acceptable if its effects result in a situation where the overall benefit exceeds the total cost.

From a utilitarian approach, the permissibility or impermissibility of corruption is determined by whether or not the act minimises or maximises utility. It is recognisable that corruption can maximise happiness for a select few but that this may create more social suffering than utility for the overall public. However, if the public were not to suffer from funds lost to corruption or that the effects of corrupt acts did not result in any pain, act utilitarianism would be found wanting in the assessment of whether corruption is right or wrong given that such judgment would be based on the fact of no one having suffered any harm. So, act utilitarianism is found wanting because it allows an act of corruption to be morally permissible, despite its inherent connection to a break of trust and the problems discussed in Chapters 2 and 3.

3.3.2 Rule utilitarianism and corruption

Rule utilitarianism claims rightness of action is determined by the rules the action adheres to. This could be applied in the example of texting and driving. On rule utilitarianism, texting and driving would be something like: the rule is that texting while driving should not be done presumably because, on balance, more utility is generated by not texting while driving than it is by texting while driving. It is known that this infringement distracts concentration. In the event of corruption, to engage in such an act is to devalue rules put in place to ensure public safety, protection of people's rights and the safeguarding of society from any form of harm and abuse. To uphold these rules promises prospects of good consequences. When corruption is committed the opposite happens and people are then unable to live together cohesively. If this is correct, then unlike with act utilitarianism, an act of corruption would be morally impermissible even if it doesn't result in much harm.

However, violations of rules could be permitted on a rule utilitarian approach, which sets it apart from a deontological approach. For instance, texting while driving to arrange an emergency medical intervention to save lives would be counted a permissible breach of rule that results in utility. Equally, the rule not to commit corrupt acts could be permissibly violated if it maximises utility.

Once exceptions are allowed, however, rule utilitarianism, at least of this version, could collapse back to a form of act utilitarianism. Further, on rule utilitarianism, while corruption could be morally wrong, the rule faces its own problems in so far as determining what the majority would agree are rules, their ineffectiveness, etc. In this way rule utilitarianism, in many respects, faces the same worries raised for deontology given that it also prescribes the following of rules, except in this instance an act is moral if conformity to the rules leads to overall good or happiness. In the case of rule utilitarianism, one would suppose that since the rules are made in advance they are to proactively prevent deeds of corruption.

3.3.3 Utilitarianism, corruption and trust

On a general utilitarian approach, either act or rule, corruption can be morally wrong, but given the right consequences, it could also be morally correct. The moral agent is to pursue those actions that bring about the most possible satisfying state of affairs and refrain from actions that hinder this state of affairs. With corruption we could end up in a situation where there are not enough public funds to pursue any project of sufficient reach to significantly impact overall happiness but there is enough public funds to make one individual incredibly happy. The most possible satisfying state of affairs could be one where the individual does pocket the public funds. On this consideration, corruption can be morally correct.

Acts such as bribery, extortion or cronyism do not maximise good and yet under certain circumstances they can be good. The same can be argued in high-stake scenarios where we witnessed officials may lie to protect each other on Nkandlagate. A City Press article of 7th July 2018 reported that "Public Works Minister Thulas Nxesi misled Parliament when he told Speaker Max Sisulu he did not have powers to declassify the Nkandlagate Report". However, he later confirmed that he had classified the same report as "top secret" and was the only one who had authority to declassify it. In so doing, Nxesi acted dishonestly and in a manner that perpetuates corruption. His action sought to limit exposure of wrongdoing that way his action guarded the utility of the small number of beneficiaries of the Nkandlagate scandal.

Nevertheless, his actions were not for the good of the majority of people in society, and on a balance of utility would be morally wrong. However, Nxesi's action does not help us draw out the connection between corruption and trust, but takes us to a causal-consequent link between his action and its morally bad effects. Two points to note here are 1) there is something inherently wrong about corruption that utilitarianism does not uncover; 2) while utilitarianism can help us to understand a connection between corruption and a breakdown of trust as problematic because of consequences, it does not help us to understand the conceptual connection involving a break of trust.

In summary, on the utilitarian view, corruption is not inherently bad. Corruption would be judged as morally bad in the event that it causes harm to the majority of people in society. Closely related to such harm is the breakdown of trust that comes as a result of the deceit inherent in corruption. Overall, what makes corruption bad could be argued to be its negative effect on trust. On the subject of corruption, a utilitarian can compromise e.g., the values of justice to maximise happiness in that by its nature there are no absolute moral rules. Everything depends on the results of the rules or actions. This fluidity leaves room for a violation of good moral conduct. As such, an act utilitarian could accept corruption as permissible if more people benefit from it or if the happiness it produces is greater than the harm it brings to society, and a rule utilitarian could allow an exception to a rule when the prospects of utility are maximised. The rightness of the act depends on its function for the greater good. However, act and rule utilitarianism face challenges in an era wherein freedom or independence of thought and action are an important quality of society as opposed to shared effort and responsibility to maximise overall good. The wrongness of corruption from a utilitarian framework shows how corruption may have negative consequences. However, it does not assist much in the conceptualisation of the connection between corruption and trust where the effects of corrupt choices would negatively affect the overall human welfare or well-being of a society. It ends with evaluating the consequence of an act to determine its rightfulness or wrongfulness, or whether the act fulfilled "flourishing or well-being or happiness of human individuals or communities" (Grisez, 1978, p. 22).

The disadvantages of a utilitarian approach in understanding the relationship between corruption and trust are thus that:

1) Under this approach the agent, under certain circumstances can betray trust as he/she may decide not to act in ways that promote overall human welfare and societal well-being. On these grounds, the claims provided by a utilitarian approach become difficult to maintain, but they also make it difficult to understand the connections between corruption and trust.

2) In general, people cannot always be trusted and when duties and rules are removed, there is chance agents may act selfishly. Public officials may conveniently maximise their personal gain and in so doing produce harm to society. This way trust is broken because they would not be acting in a way that results in the happiness of the entire society but on the agent's own happiness. For these reasons, and in relation to the conception of corruption and trust, a consequentialist approach is vulnerable to opportunism. This is not a problem with the theory per se, but rather highlights how the connection to trust is one that requires something to hold about the agent and perhaps their character and integrity.

These problems create limits in how utilitarianism can help to conceptualise the relations between corruption and a breakdown in trust because to assess the moral worth of an action on the basis of its good effects regardless of the means, corrupt or otherwise, so long as there is utility maximisation, tramples on the value of trust as a necessary feature of social cooperation.

Both consequentialist and deontological approaches offer a view that are either relative to the outcome, i.e. utilitarianism, or they offer a view that is concerned with the nature of the act, i.e. deontology. Neither view offers a plausible way to account for the conceptual relation between trust and corruption. The inadequacies of both deontological and utilitarian approaches in understanding how they both fare in conceptualising the relationship of corruption and trust thus prods one to pay attention

to something that falls between the outcomes and the nature of the act, such as the inherent qualities and character traits of the moral agent as an actor. What is left to do is to consider whether an approach that has to do with an individual's character offers a better way to account for the conceptual relation between corruption and trust.

CHAPTER FOUR - VIRTUE ETHICS AND THE CONNECTIONS BETWEEN TRUST AND CORRUPTION

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, a claim is made that a virtue ethics based approach is a better suited ethical approach than the alternative theories to conceptualising the connection between corruption and trust. The claim is largely due to the consideration that corruption is inherently bad because none of its principles engender virtues. It is to this end that virtue ethics is elected as a better suited approach given that it pays attention not only to isolated acts, rules or consequences but to the character of the actor - the moral agent.

4.2 Introduction to virtue ethics

Virtue ethics is universally accepted as less concerned with prescribing what a person should do and more concerned with resolving ethical dilemmas through understanding what it means to be a virtuous person. Hursthouse (2013, p. 646) states that virtue ethics concerns itself with being rather than doing. It sets a distinction between right and wrong in terms of good or bad character, propelling the moral agent to consider in any given situation the sort of person s/he should be, which would then shape how s/he would act. It is regarded as being agent-centered as opposed to being act-centered or result-centered because the concern is more on virtues or vices of a person's character than on upholding the motive or outcome of moral conduct. Therefore, it becomes apparent that virtue ethics is agent-based as opposed to utilitarianism, which is result-centered and more concerned with maximisation of pleasure or the overall happiness resultant from an action for the greatest number of people, and as opposed to deontology, which is act-centered and deals with right and wrong principles of action. The presuppositions of both deontology and utilitarianism give no guidance about how one should act until one knows what accounts for best consequences or correct moral rules and principles (Hursthouse, 2013, p. 646). Whereas, for a virtue ethicist, the premise for specifying right action is informed by what virtues an agent ought to pursue

in her character, where it is the character that shapes one's behaviour, which can be judged as virtuous or vicious.

The concept of virtue is derived from a trait of character, such as being prudent, courageous, just or displaying temperance. This trait of character makes a person morally good, excellent, admirable or otherwise (Robertson, 2018, p. 2). Typically, in the case of corruption, corrupt public officials would use their positions to facilitate bribery and extortion to award a tender, for instance. Corrupt conduct like this shows a lack of honesty, justice, and compassion. Whereas, someone who is virtuous would foster good moral character and be able to treat others well by living well.

Included in virtue are dispositions of a distinctive set of reasons for acting, inherently manifested in varied situations. To have a virtuous character is of great moral importance and is morally fundamental if we want people to act rightly in any given case, on this account. From the very basic understanding of virtue ethics, the capacity to discern key aspects of a situation is required for genuine virtue to be exhibited. The capacity to discern involves having the knowledge and judgment that allows for the demonstration/expression of virtue across diverse situations. This is known as phronesis - a form of practical wisdom that develops with experience.

Although there is a range of versions of virtue theory, the original formulation of the theory is attributed to Aristotle. In his view, good character is what matters for persons to flourish in society. Thereby, for Aristotle what is regarded as a good character involves the understanding that the goal of human existence involves doing those things that are distinctly human and doing them well. What is considered as distinctly human is "to be good as a human being" (van Hooft, 2006, p. 51). In this way, the idea of virtues of character relate to human goodness on account of acquiring a habit or disposition and wanting to act in virtuous ways (ibid, 58). Virtue is, in part, characterised by what Aristotle calls "the mean", which has to do with the right amount or degree that avoids deficiency or excess (ibid, 59). In other words, acting virtuously involves neither doing too much nor too little. This, however, does not encourage mediocrity or moderation. Aristotle's assertion as per van Hooft (ibid, 60) is that the

way we conduct ourselves in everyday life requires the disposition to apply the required mean in a particular situation. In accordance with the idea of the mean, corruption would count as a vice because it does not fit with the idea of goodness in humanity, but also because it is a matter of greed – an excess of greed, which is neither good for the person nor for the common good.

As per Hursthouse (2013, p. 647), character "is useful or agreeable to its possessor and to others" for the realisation of the best possible conditions for people in so far as virtue, morality and a well-lived life are concerned. This sets a standard for the type of character that is needed for eudaimonia - for human flourishing and living well. Human flourishing is objectively determined and is the highest end in itself with the virtuous character as a means. In this regard, public officials should be concerned with the public good. If what counts as human flourishing is performing one's distinctive function excellently, in their role as public official, what counts as a good public official is someone who serves the needs of the public.

The virtuous moral agent, in a specific role as a public servant, should exhibit that which maximises human flourishing for himself and the common good in the execution of his/her roles as a servant of the people. This moral phenomenon is explained in terms of virtuous character or traits. To be a good public servant requires character traits such as honesty, charity, honour and sensitivity towards justice.

What implications does this have for understanding the connections between corruption and trust? To emphasise honesty, we must "prize the truth" as merely teaching not to lie will not achieve this end (Hursthouse, 2013, p. 649). This does not necessarily deny that teaching avoidance of lies will not be useful but indicates a distinctive view between deontology and virtue ethics on the moral agent's action-guidance, for instance, which helps to conceptualise the connections between corruption and a trust. To unpack this, I will do so by examining agent-based virtue ethics and a virtue ethical account of right action. This distinction is important to highlight as it addresses the viewpoint that virtue ethics has no grounds that inform the agent about what to do except to concern itself with good or bad character and nothing about right or wrong action

(Hursthouse 2013, p. 645 and Swanton 2013, p. 664). The distinction in fact highlights the ideal that virtue ethics has a contribution on the concept of right action i.e., "An action is right if it is what a virtuous agent would characteristically […] do in the circumstances" (Hursthouse 2013, p. 646). This way, we are able to evaluate both the character and the act of the agent.

4.2.1 Agent-based Virtue Ethics

All virtue ethics focus on the agent. The moral status of actions is reliant on the agent's motives and character traits. It focuses on actions derived from ethical claims that are fundamentally about dispositions of the individuals to perform those actions. Slote (2013, p. 654) insists on the evaluation of individuals' actions with particular reference "to the health and virtue of the individual soul". This means, for example, to avoid wrongdoing the moral agent must avoid those actions that model bad or flawed inner motives. Equally, to be admirable one's inner motives must uphold higher standards and requirements guiding their actions. Slote (2013, p. 656) terms this "inner strength". As such, acts are not considered as virtuous or admirable but the agent is the one who is virtuous and whose actions express admirable motivation or inner strength. As shall be argued, in a virtue ethical account of right action, acts have to exhibit the inner dispositions of the agent. These motives of action offer a moral account that encourages agents to act well and to act out of loyalty, and this binds communities together. The role of motivation can be seen in circumstances where, for instance, the virtuous agent sees a situation, determines the right thing to do in that situation, and acts accordingly because of an inner disposition to act in that way. This is in contrast to a deontological point of view where one would act in a way that adheres to rules discounting internal interests, attitudes or desires i.e., a Kantian will act out of duty irrespective of context since morality should have universal validity.

An agent-based approach can be drawn on to examine the relation between a public official and the public. For instance, an agent-based virtue ethics approach considers that the health and strength of the soul determines the moral agent's kindness to people, where they have a disposition to act in ways that do not harm or deceive them and

refrain from any actions that are unjust, wrong or evil, such as lying or stealing. Acts that exhibit a positive motive are right and good and those that do not are wrong and evil because of the motive and trait of the person that underlies them. The admirability of these acts is that they yield benevolence - benevolence being the yardstick for the moral evaluation from an agent-based view. As per the example of Slote (2013, p. 655), an agent who refuses to help another person in need while in a position to help would not count as admirable because of his/her failure to act benevolently.

Slote (2013, p. 658), in his argument in defence of agent-based ethics, suggests self-reliance and self-sufficiency as undergirding foundations that can be used in agent-based ethics to justify the virtuous agent's actions devoted to the well-being of others. He states in his example that:

> To depend passively on society or others in the way a child depends on his parents counts as an instance of parasitism and is wrong and deplorable as such, whether we are talking about welfare chiselling on the one hand, or, on the other, the leisured existence of the wealthy; and a person who is opposed to parasitism will presumably want to be useful and make a contribution to society, so as to counterbalance all that has been done for him by others (Slote, 2013, p. 658).

This dependency is not reprehensive in the child-parent relationship, but the parent has a responsibility to, amongst other things, care and love the child. The child is also responsible to the parent i.e., to respect and obey the parent. Similarly, government has a responsibility to deliver services to its citizens and citizens have a responsibility to elect a government (trusting it will work in their interest), to hold government accountable and to pay taxes for government to be resourced to fulfil its function. This means citizens have to take into account that they place people of virtuous character in offices of authority. Public officials, in turn, are to be driven by who they are characteristically as they assume public offices and discharge their duties. This does not negate that while character is introduced here as necessary it is not a sufficient condition for responsible leadership.

This dual contribution to society can serve as a touchstone to evaluate actions that are harmful to others and those that do not contribute positively to the well-being of others. Self-sufficiency, on the other hand, assists in the evaluation of altruistic behaviour i.e., being generous or sharing/giving out of sufficiency rather than out of pity or obligation is more admirable and noble and speaks to the motive driving the giving. This kind of giving is out of one's own well-being and it advances the well-being of others.

The agent-based approach tells us something important about the character of public officials in that they will practice virtues such as honesty, will be honourable, just, and generous. These virtuous habits will guide public officials in making the right choices. From this we are most likely to have public officials who are people of excellence and goodwill in terms of their conduct and that way trust will begin to develop.

4.2.2 A virtue ethical account of right action

A virtue theory places emphasis on the character of the agent rather than ethical duties and consequences of actions. On this understanding, some might raise an objection to a virtue ethical account of right action as dependent on action. As should be apparent from the discussion so far, it would be a misnomer that virtue ethics makes actions less important. Instead, a virtue ethical account of right action appeals to the moral character of the agent carrying out the action and what is expected of such a virtuous agent. The idea is to give thought to whether the virtuous moral agent acted well, in a manner that is admirable or good. What this appeals to is right action in terms of what is good and virtuous and not in the sense of what a moral agent ought to do. Swanton (2013, p. 665) proposes a criterion that provides the basis of accounts of rightness of action through the "notion of the target or aim of a virtue" in so far as action guidance is concerned.

Swanton (2013, p. 664) is of the conviction that the notion of the target or aim of a virtue can "provide a distinctively virtue ethical notion of rightness of actions". This is done from the basis of virtue ethical accounts coined "qualified agent" which is understood to mean "an act is right if it is what a virtuous agent would do in the circumstances… [or] only if it is what a virtuous agent would characteristically do"

(Swanton, 2013, p. 664 & 665). Another ethical account is that of being "motive-centered" which recommends that "an action is right if and only if it exhibits or expresses a virtuous (admirable) motive, or at least does not exhibit or express a vicious (deplorable) motive" (Swanton, 2013, p. 665). This suggests there is not much dissimilarity between right-action-based and agent-based virtue ethics other than the former emphasising the moral value of motive and the latter emphasising the aim of action.

Swanton (2013) adds what I consider a critical element, target. Taking into account the virtue of benevolence, Swanton's (2013, 667) "target of a virtue" of promoting the good of others is the target the agent should aim to hit. Swanton asserts that "an action is virtuous if and only if it hits the target of virtue" - that is, if it realises the end of benevolence or generosity, as an example (Swanton, 2013, p. 665). Swanton (ibid.), describes hitting the target as stemming from a disposition which acknowledges and responds to a situation in a good or excellent way according to the intent of a virtue. This way, an act is right if it hits all the targets relevant to it. The good of an action considers the aim of an exhibited virtue in a given circumstance.

Consider, for example, adherence to the rule not to steal. The virtue of justice concerned with keeping this rule intends to honour (in the secondary effect of the virtue) the status of the one who would suffer harm if stolen from. Thus, to steal misses the target of a virtue of kindness, causing harm and failing to act out of goodwill, as it does not respect another person's possession, appreciate the person's, sometimes, hard-earned possession of the stolen item or good, or exhibit any sense of value for the person stolen from. The target of virtue demonstrates how the moral agent engages and responds to the world with those character traits that are necessary for human flourishing. In so far as corruption is concerned, there is an intent to act dishonestly in the form of stealing and this is done for selfish gain.

While virtue ethics is agent focused and pays attention to how to be a good person, the virtue ethical account of right action takes the agent-based nature of ethics a step further to demonstrate that an ethical approach centered on the agent can provide guidance on

how the agent is to conduct herself in moral dilemmas. This guidance is done through the types of characteristics the agent exhibits in carrying out an action. It is in light of the qualities and virtues that make an agent a good person that then the agent would know what to do in any situation. The qualities and virtues serve as a suitable guide for action.

What both agent-based virtue ethics and a virtue ethical account of right-action do not take away is that moral decisions and actions belong to the moral agent (the moral agent is responsible) and they reveal something either to be praised or condemned about the agent, hence from a virtue-based point of view the agent will live the best life, be a good person who does the right thing from a disposition of an admirable character. This does not take away that a virtuous person remains independent in his/her conduct and is responsible for acting rightly and for right reasons out of good inner motives.

Thus, considering virtue as a characteristic trait that makes a person good, excellent, or admirable, virtue ethics asks the questions about "How should one live?" or "What is a good life?" or "What are good social values?" These questions, therefore, point to the fact that a moral life should be driven by a purpose and lead to eudaimonia - the highest end of happiness or flourishing. The idea thereby being that "no trait of character can count as a virtue unless it serves the interests, promotes the overall being, of the virtuous individual" (Skorupski, 2010, p. 480). This becomes the entry point for any person's ethical thinking. From this, character is built leading to satisfaction that comes with doing what is right. In this way, in their role as public officials, virtuous public officials will possess the knowledge on the best form of action to take driven by who they are characteristically. Also, the overall being of the virtuous agent will lead into looking out for others.

4.3 Virtue ethics, corruption, and trust

When corruption occurs, government fails to fulfil its moral obligation to citizens and people's trust is dishonoured. Hence, there is need for an ethical framework that helps

conceptualise the arising problems of corruption as they relate to the loss of public trust in government.

In Nkandlagate, when the President and his enablers made the decision that it is better to spend about R250 million on improving the life of the President than to spend that much on improving the lives of the millions of citizens who depend on the state to help them gain a measure of dignity, what does this say about the character of the President and those who justify and defend this wasteful expenditure or cover it up? If a President who earns a R2 million salary with many other benefits cannot be trusted to put the interest of the disadvantaged above his own interest, who can be trusted to do so?

In this case we consider that what is right is what is virtuous and there was no demonstration of such. Thus, the following moral principles were prevented:

- Integrity – public officials did not show honesty and truthfulness in their actions.

- Trustworthiness – the actions of all implicated affected relationship between government and citizens thus breaking public trust.

- Fairness – public resources entrusted to public officials were not meant for the self-enrichment of the president.

- Self-control – had the public officials had self-control, the abuse of public resources would have not happened in the first place.

To change this trajectory, moral agents are to work hard at cultivating their virtues and excel in what nature or circumstances present to them. A public servant should excel at serving and delivering services to the public just as a parent should excel in raising children, where in their role as a public servant certain virtues are especially relevant. The relevant virtues for maintaining the trust relationship include honesty, trustworthiness, being just and exercising self-discipline and prudence. Hence, the Public Service Commission (2002) drafted a Code of Conduct that should act as a guide

for public officials regarding what is expected of them from a moral ethical view, on an individual capacity but also in consideration of their relationship with the public. Also as referred to in the Batho Pele (South Africa Department of Public Service, 2003) initiative which is another example that prioritises the public and enhances quality and accessibility of government services through improved efficiency and accountability to the public as the receivers of government services. Underpinning this is trustworthiness as a firmly embedded persuasion of moral commitments to fulfil moral obligations to the citizens.

In Chapter Two we saw that there is a conceptual connection between trust and corruption and in Chapter Three I argued that deontology and utilitarianism fail to offer adequate conceptualisations to address the conceptual connection between corruption and trust. In this chapter, I have introduced virtue ethics and applied it to the Nkandlagate scenario as a framework best suited to conceptualise the relationship between corruption and trust by drawing on important virtues like trustworthiness. Focus on the moral agent becomes crucial as it is the individual whose actions are to be wise and good. While being corrupt itself can be viewed as a vice that inherently undermines trust, trustworthiness, as a virtue, promotes trust.

Through virtue ethics as a model we are more likely to identify direct links between corruption and trust from which we can work towards a society comprising of people who are of good moral character who can be trusted because they aim to live well and do good. The value of a virtue ethics approach is that it does not reduce situations to simply promoting pleasure, avoiding pain or fulfilling duties, but is more concerned with the moral agent doing what is right (informed by virtue), in a right way, to the right people, at the right time, and for the right reasons (Christie, Groarke and Sweet, 2007, p. 56). ‘Doing what is right’ is to do that which a virtuous person would do in any situation. ‘In a right way’ is doing what is right with integrity, good character and excellent virtue. ‘At the right time’ is to ask what kind of a moral agent one should be in order to get it right all the time. ‘For right reasons’ is not merely doing good but having the right motivating disposition to do good in a certain way.

Government can increase public confidence by promoting a culture where civil servants are virtuous and trustworthy. In this way the public will appreciate that this would yield a clean and just government with positive economic prospects and will increase trust in state institutions and officials. It is for the views expressed above that virtue ethics helps conceptualise the connection between corruption and trust and also captures the necessary conditions for good leadership which are far removed from corruption as corruption is a vice. The conceptual connection is best expressed through the depiction of corruption as a vice and trustworthiness as a virtue that cannot coexist with corruption, but which is necessary for maintaining trust. While a breakdown of trust is a consequence of corruption, and a corrupt act is itself one that inherently breaks trust, a change in leaders' characters can help eliminate mistrust and generate trust by promoting trustworthiness – a virtue that illustrates cooperation and mutual respect.

CHAPTER FIVE - USING A VIRTUE ETHICS FRAMEWORK TO IDENTIFY WAYS TO REBUILD TRUST LOST THROUGH CORRUPTION

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter I argued for the strength of virtue ethics for conceptualizing the connections between corruption and trust. In this chapter I explore the potential implications of adopting a virtue ethics approach given how it helps to conceptualize the said connections. The aim is to use a virtue ethical framework to identify ways to restore trust that is lost through corruption. This framework canvasses for a recognition that virtues cannot be self-acquired or self-instructed in isolation, but that character is necessarily shaped through societal and environmental influences. This can be captured by the saying, "[it]takes a village to raise a child, and a community to change life". Equally, society and/or one's environment have an influence on the process of character construction. To this end, virtue ethics provides a structure that can help find ways to help rebuild trust in the South African context. To explore the implications of a virtue ethics framework, the chapter will draw particular attention to the virtue of trustworthiness to establish what moral repair in relation to corruption would look like and conclude with putting forward the kind of recommendations that a virtue ethics approach can generate.

5.2 The role of trust in moral relations

In an article by Lagarde (2018) titled "There's a Reason for the Lack of Trust in Government and Business: Corruption", it is pointed out that in "20 out of 28 countries surveyed […] by the Edelman Trust Barometer, average trust in institutions is less than 50%". A virtue ethics framework best allows us to conceptualize the connections between corruption and trust. Using this framework we can identify ways to rebuild trust lost through corruption.

As argued in Chapter 3, human nature is such that one of our primary forms of interacting with others is through trusting others. Corruption violates trust. As per Walker's annotation on the *Reconstruction of Moral Relations after Wrongdoing*, any form of moral regeneration requires an understanding of the "nature and fundamental roles of trust [to resemble] normal human life and, more particularly, in moral relations" (2006, p. 73). This trust is based on intuition that people are likely to act in a manner favourable to everyone. Humans, as moral agents, are to trust people whether they know them or not. Trust should be easily given until whomever it is given to breaks that trust - that is the basis for moral relations. With this comes the vulnerability of the public in so far as the relationship between government and citizens is concerned because the very interaction is founded on trust. Walker (2006, p. 73) uses everyday human activity examples to illustrate a point about trust: we go to doctors trusting that they will help us, we leave our children with teachers trusting that they will educate and keep our children safe. These are relationships of trust that are not based on any prior history with the people that we are choosing to trust. At every point in our lives we wake up and choose to trust complete strangers with a degree of reliability that the trust will be reciprocated and the people whom we trust will not harm us and expose our vulnerability. It is only when the people we have chosen to trust harm us that we begin to readjust our trust in people, our own judgement and take responsibility.

Walker (2006, p. 74) argues that there are different types of trust. For instance, there is the predictive trust that we place in things to function according to the nature that they were created for, e.g. trusting that car breaks will stop the car. This type of trust is different from human interpersonal trust as the latter is less predictable. We can readily trust those that we interact with often because we learn their predictive behaviour. However, with people we do not know we expect good will and from that expectation we, in turn, trust them. We interact with people on the basis that they are inherently good and therefore will respond to us in goodwill/good faith. People are sometimes motivated by many other 'selfish' reasons to reciprocate trust (ego, wanting to keep the good opinion of themselves, fear of penalties associated with poor performance). Beyond good will people will reciprocate trust because it is beneficial to them. Where there is a selfish pursuit of one's interest and desires, relying on others to do good to us

is likely to leave us vulnerable and shattered when one's actions have no regard for others nor concern if they are harmed or not when one acts in ways that suits him/her. In instances where the relationship of trust is positively reciprocated there are feelings of respect or admiration. These feelings are even more heightened when reciprocated by strangers who might well feel no special responsibility to tend to us.

Where there is dishonesty and lack of loyalty, trust is violated. And where the trust relationship is violated, it can lead to people losing things that are of value or of greatest importance to them. Violations of trust whether perpetrated by an intimate or a stranger primarily require acknowledgment of wrong-doing and showing of remorse on the part of the wrongdoer. These are necessary to begin the process of repairing trust. With an intimate trust can be restored, with a new set of moral rules and future mutual expectations. Not every trust relationship can be restored and in some cases this can lead those violated to live with default and interpersonal trust that is severely limited. In the case of corruption and the public not getting services they should from government, although the violation is severe, trust is never completely lost, there is always room for the public to continue to trust that justice will be served or at the very least there will be accountability. Again, the idea of good will/trust comes in because in the extent that we offer good conduct to others we also expect reliable support in the process of holding each other accountable for our actions. Trust comes with an expectation of praiseworthy behaviour. It is to this end that the character of the public officials should exhibit those dispositions that point to how they are good moral beings from which officials can be regarded as morally good for promoting societal greatness.

5.3 Moral repair

The adoption of a virtue ethics framework helps explore what moral repair might look like. In many respects, to arrive at the possibility of moral repair stakeholders such as society and the individual ought to be looked into. In this study I also include justice.

5.3.1 Society

Reflecting back to when the people's government took the reign in South Africa in 1994, citizens were promised a better life for all. However, upon observing some of the very people who had made sacrifices to fight the injustice of apartheid not enjoying the fruits of that which they sought to do away with – racial discrimination and inequality – is an unbearable state of affairs to live with. It is for this reason that the impact of corruption is a matter whose reality of existence we cannot deny. Within the scope of this topic, corruption is considered a problem of virtue. Corruption is ethically bad and virtue ethics helps to understand its badness because of a link to an important virtue, trustworthiness. Corruption becomes a betrayal of people's aspirations entrusted in government and its officials, as has been discussed. This raises various philosophical dimensions of trustworthiness and being trustworthy, where the latter is a disposition that is both warranted and plausible. It is warranted because public office requires trustworthiness to exist, and plausible because the being or the actions of public officials should always seek to retain public confidence. To this end, McLeod (2015, p. 4) asserts that "Clear conditions of trustworthiness are that the trustworthy person is competent and committed to do what s/he is trusted to do". Now, trustworthiness is itself a virtue and one that requires the one who is trusted to live to honour people's trust. Potter (2002, p. 25) provides a helpful commentary in stating that "one who is trusted can be counted on, as a matter of the sort of person he or she is, to take care of those things that others entrust to one whose ways of caring are neither excessive nor deficient". This invokes the Batho Pele government initiative with which the 1994 dispensation set-forth - an initiative that prioritized the public and enhanced quality and accessibility of government services through improved efficiency and accountability to the public as the receivers of government services. Underpinning this initiative was trustworthiness as a firmly embedded persuasion of moral commitments to fulfil moral obligations owed to the citizens.

Thus, if we are to enhance trustworthiness there is ground to gain through the adoption of virtue ethics. Hursthouse and Pettigrove (2016, p. 3) make a compelling point in arguing that this can be done by paying attention to a number of topics that have always

been considered in virtue ethics tradition: "virtues and vices, motives and moral character, moral education, moral wisdom or discernment…and fundamentally important questions of what sorts of persons we should be and how we should live". This propelling those officials to always ask: what is my character and where does it come from? What shapes the way in which public officials behave or the choices they make? Where erroneous decisions are made; how does that affect public trust in public officials or in government? These questions stand to deliver a nation that has a trustworthy value-driven culture and leadership where the interests of citizens are served.

5.3.2 The individual

A virtue ethics based approach produces individuals who conduct themselves in an exemplary manner and are ethically responsible in their actions. In her examination of moral relationships, Walker (2006, p. 72) highlights the importance of trust in shared standards and suggests that "the trick to inducing trust is to give the other person your confidence". To be able to do this it is necessary to deal with the causes that damage trust which emanate from wrong doing. These individuals as moral agents are morally accountable for their actions and are conscious of the impact their actions have on others and on society as a whole. Their motives are pure and good and place value on eudaimonia. Individuals as both public officials and members of civil society have duties to act in ways that promote justice. This is mostly because if we adopt virtue ethics, then we can also take into account other virtues, where one of these is trustworthiness, for identifying ways to address and conceptualise corruption.

Justice is understood to be an inward disposition that builds a character that is more inclined towards the common good of society. Just individuals would be responsible for civic integrity as each individual would assume his/her appropriated role in society as a citizen. This means when government fails to act in ways that honour the dignity, equality or liberty of the citizen, members of the public will be readily available to hold government responsible to the principle of justice. This goes a long way in ushering a state of affairs wherein public officials act rightly and in a reliable way. This means

they will act with the wholeness of character or integrity. To act with integrity would deliver a society where public officials conduct themselves in ways that are admirable. Their actions would be praiseworthy since they will have a moral compass that does not quiver as their character will be sound and intact. Amongst other possibilities, each individual (public or private) is to act in ways that promote a society where people enjoy equal rights and privileges without any form of advantageous privilege that has potential to discriminate against some while promoting the welfare of a select few.

5.3.3 Justice

Since I have adopted virtue ethics because of its strength in conceptualising connections between trust and corruption, and drawn on the virtue of trustworthiness, I now also recruit the virtue of justice as a disposition necessary for good character and moral judgment from public officials.

In Chapter 3, Rawls was introduced as a contractarian deontologist. In this section, I draw from Rawls' principles of justice out of his regard of justice as the first virtue of social institutions (Rawls 1971, p. 3). Rawls was not the first to regard justice as a virtue, Aristotle thought of justice as a virtue of character (*Nicomachean Ethics* V). The aim here is not to show Rawls as a virtue ethicist but to use justice as a virtue of personal character drawing from Rawls' principles of justice. This position is informed by Haung's (2007, p. 270) assertion that "[t]o city-state citizens, the character of justice is rightly a living and practicing capacity [which] makes for the intrinsic prescription of citizenship in communion with the capacity for the conception of good". The basic idea is that just individuals will act in a just manner that promotes justice in every sphere of society. Thus, to curb any injustice resultant from corruption, these individuals would be expected to consider Rawls principles of justice:

1) The veil of ignorance – the just person would test his choices by imagining what he would like justice, morality or equality mean for him if he was in a situation where he did not know what his social status would be. This would then foster a society in which "no one is advantaged or disadvantaged…by the outcome of

natural chance or the contingency of social circumstances" (Rawls 1971, p. 12). As such this "natural" position will not favour anyone's condition above others.

2) The liberty principle - each person to have equal rights. "Each person is to have the equal right to the most extensive liberty compatible with a similar liberty of others" (Rawls, 1971, p. 60).

3) The difference principle - to be applied in such a way that the "greatest benefit [is] to the least advantaged members of society" (Rawls, 1999, p. 266).

4) Equality of opportunity - positions and offices should be open to all. However, as an example, if education is only accessed on the basis of affordability then the premise creates inequality. Education should thus be approached from a point that makes it accessible to all and from a view that seeks to discover each person's potential, nurture and develop the expertise of each individual so that everyone can contribute, in whatever sphere, positively to the welfare of the community.

While the proposals above speak to an ideal, it would, however, be a possible realistic ideal, which the public must monitor and hold the government to. With this in mind, Rawls circumstance of justice "as the normal condition under which human cooperation is both possible and necessary" becomes a mitigating factor (Rawls, 1971, p. 126). Thus the cooperation makes possible a better life for all than each person seeking to live on their own efforts. Injustice comes about when lack of cooperation takes centre stage and individuals pursue their own interests, concerning themselves quite minimally with the wider community. As such the underpinning anchor upon which a corruption-less community is to be built, is one that stands on the circumstance of justice as a pillar. In that way, positive strides would be made towards setting up a society that distributes primary goods (rights and liberties, attainment and opportunities and income and wealth) in a manner leaning more on fairness than abusing public office for personal gain (Rawls, 1999, p. 466, 467 and 477). With regard to virtue ethics, Rawls is interpreted here from the lens of justice being one of the cardinal virtues, whose

objective is to advance fairness. The basis for this view is Rawls' (1999, p. 383) very assertion that "[a] good person, then, or person of moral worth, is someone who has to a higher degree than the average the broadly based features of moral character […]". This way, Rawls deposes a positive nature on the role of virtues. This virtue ethical adaptation of Rawls fosters as situation where there is cooperation and stability in a society, which promote the welfare of citizens.

Roughly, Rawls principles of justice emphasize equality when it comes to basic liberties and opportunities. The distribution of social goods and opportunities in society is then meant to work for the advantage of all, especially the least advantaged members of society. The fair distribution will increase trust as inequality will be reduced. To achieve this, a person of particular moral character is required. As per Rawls (1999, p. 383) such a person should be "someone who has to a higher degree than the average the broadly based features of moral character […]". This person will be just and trustworthy. The just person can further be trustworthy by acting in ways that are praiseworthy through being able to adopt responsible practices and this way the prospects of a good life for all are promising.

5.4 Recommendations

The link between corruption and trust illustrates how corruption can be attributable to a lack of the virtue of trustworthiness. Corrupt acts threaten trustworthiness and the maintaining of trust. There are other closely related virtues that are at risk when corruption occurs. These could include honesty, justice, or prudence. Everett, Neu and Rahaman (2006, p. 7) argue that virtue ethics is "an integral and embodied part of the person, and that is what is generally needed to make the world a better place". As corruption is a function of moral judgment, virtue is better suited to instil a sense of appropriate moral behaviour on the part of public officials in so far as self-control and self-denial are concerned in order to tackle corruption.

Virtue ethics offers a plausible platform to tackle the root cause of corruption in so far as it relates to trust. It remains a viable option, therefore, that an attempt to draw links between corruption as a moral illness and trust requires a virtue-based approach since

corruption is a vice and trustworthiness a virtue. In many ways, the rebuilding of trust requires an implementation of virtue-based initiatives, such as moral education for building public officials of sound moral character, if we are to reduce the trust deficit owed to corruption. Similarly, lessons can be drawn from how corruption affects public confidence and trust in government.

Perhaps time has come to assess the person performing an act in order for us to know what kind of person should be our public official rather than only what that person ought to do in situations presenting ethical dilemmas. In this way there is a window of possibility that our public officials' behaviour will be consistent with their moral character and they will not stumble easily as it would be habitual for them to act morally. This approach subscribes to Miller's (2018, p. 7) assertion that "corrupt actions are typically habitual" and "habits are in large part constitutive of one's moral character". In the quest to restore ethical values in public officials, and where virtue ethics enables us to understand the role of a loss of trust as inherently connected to corruption, virtue ethics proves to be a reasonable means in attempting to rebuild trust lost due to corruption by highlighting virtues like trustworthiness and justice. Virtuous moral agents are likely to be more inclined to conduct themselves in a desirable manner suitable to the role they hold, which requires trust. In that way, the possibilities of officials who are concerned with engaging in corrupt acts will be reduced, where the behaviour of public officials will shift from a corrupt kind to one where the government and its institutions are committed to the public to provide fair and efficient services.

Given the way virtue ethics allows us to conceptualise the relations between corruption and trust, it becomes plausible that public officials will become trustworthy agents of government and, in turn, public attitudes towards government will begin to change and trust should improve. This does not in any way mean that rules-orientated or results-based approaches are not necessary, however, they are not entirely sufficient (Lynch, 2003, p. 373). To this end, Devettere (2002, p. 20) makes a fitting attestation that "virtue ethics is desire and not duty, about what we want to do and not what we ought to do". Clearly, therefore, and notwithstanding other ethical theories, using virtue ethics to

identify interventions has potential to improve moral character and moral behaviour in public officials.

CHAPTER SIX - CONCLUSION

Corruption is a thorny and widespread phenomenon. This report did not intend to put forward a simple or ready-made resolution to the many challenges corruption poses. Instead, the report sought to establish an understanding of the conceptual relationship between corruption and trust between the South African government and the public. To this end, Chapter Two drew out the connections between the corruption and trust phenomena and exposed how corruption decimates cooperation and the prospects of a good society. Chapter Three assessed two ethical theories, namely deontology and utilitarianism in order to evaluate if either was able to adequately articulate the conceptual relation between trust and corruption. The study found that deontology, as an act-centred approach, is not entirely useful in that the imposition of sanctions through rules and duties does not help conceptualise the connection between corruption and trust. It was noted that, while deontology rightly characterises corruption as immoral, it cannot capture the relation between trust and corruption since trust falls outside the rational limits of deontology. Similarly, utilitarianism as a result-centred approach did not assist much in drawing the connection between trust and corruption since it focused on the greatest happiness principle without distinguishing the actions that bring about such happiness. Utilitarianism falls short mainly because it relativises corruption in that in some contexts it does not find fault with corruption if it results in the greatest happiness for the greatest amount of people.

In conceptualising the connection between corruption and trust, the study took into account that corruption is a behavioural act. As such, virtue ethics demonstrated that it fares better as an approach to conceptualise the relationship between corruption and trust. This was derived from virtue ethical claims that are fundamentally about dispositions of the individuals who perform the very action. That is, good moral character leads to good moral behaviour. Conversely, to give perspective in the analysis of corruption, the report proposed paying attention to the character of public officials to establish an understanding of the inherent dispositions that should influence the behaviour, conduct or choices of the very officials (Chapter Four). This does not negate that consequentialist and deontological ethics also provide ways with which we can

tackle the impact of corruption. However, these theories do not give sufficient room for how we can conceptualise the connection between corruption and trust although in themselves they do not entirely condone corruption.

A case was therefore advanced for a virtue ethics account as providing a suitable ethical framework to identify ways to rebuild trust lost through corruption. To imagine a South Africa that is corruption free would be a delusional misconception of ideals. But to live virtuously has the potential to intensively weaken corrupt operations so that there may be a regaining of cooperation between the public and its officials for the requisite well-being of our beloved nation. However, such a change would require officials to pay attention to their self-understanding and reshape themselves into virtuous people who are trustworthy and genuinely care about justice. They would also have to rebuild their characters so they apply the principles of respect and care when acting as guardians of the country. This study intended not only to express views on corruption and trust but also to encourage public officials or members of civil society to adopt a virtue ethical approach as a means to weaken the corrosive impact of corruption. It is the researcher's hope that the study has contributed another dimension to a debate already in motion so as to reduce the prevalent scourge of corruption in South Africa. Such a reduction can be possible if we view virtuosity as a necessary aspect of good leadership.

REFERENCE LIST

Alarcon, G. M., Ryan, T. J., Capiola, A., Jessup, S. A., Wood, D. W., and Schneider, T. R. (2019). The Dynamic Interplay of Trustworthiness and State Suspicions in Teams over Time: A Panel Analysis. *Cogent Psychology*, 1-17.

Alexander, L. and Moore, M. (2016). *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy: Deontological Ethics*. Stanford: Stanford University.

Amundsen, I. (1999). *Political Corruption: An Introduction to Issues*. Chr. Michelsen Institute: Development Studies and Human Rights.

Ardelyanova, Y., and Obryvalina, O. (2018). Comparative Analysis of Inequality, Corruption and Trust in Modern Societies. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(1), 65-69.

Baier, A. (1986). Trust and Antitrust. *Ethics*, 96(2), 231-260.

Brandt, R. B. (1983). The Real and Alleged Problems of Utilitarianism. *The Hastings Center Report*, 13(2), 37-43.

Christie, T., Groarke, L., and Sweet, W. (2007). Virtue Ethics as an Alternative to Deontological and Consequential Reasoning in the Harm Reduction Debate. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 19(2008), 52-58.

Corruption Watch Article of 3rd February 2014. Retrieved from: https://www.corruptionwatch.org.za/corruption-fuels-poor-service-delivery/

Devettere, R. J. (2002). *Introduction to Virtue Ethics: Insights of the Ancient Greeks.* Washington: George University Press.

Emmons, D. C. (1973). Act vs. Rule-Utilitarianism. *Oxford Journals*, 28(326), 226-233.

Everett, J., Neu, D. and Rahaman, A. S. (2006). The Global Fight Against Corruption: A Foucaultian, Virtue-Ethics Framing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 65(1), 1-12.

Flikschuh, K. (2018). Kant's Contextualism. *The London School of Economics and Political Science*, 1-34.

Freeman, S. (2019). *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy: Original Position*. Stanford: Stanford University.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust, the Social Virtues, and the Creation of Prosperity.* New York: Free Press.

Gildenhuys, J. S. H. (1991). *Ethics and the Public Sector.* Cape Town: Creda Press.

Grisez, G. (1978). Against Consequentialism. *An American Journal of Jurisprudence*, 23(1), 21-72.

Huang, X. (2007). Justice as a Virtue: An Analysis of Aristotle's Virtue of Justice. *Frontiers of Philosophy in China,* 2(2), 265-279.

Hursthouse, R. (2013). Normative Virtue Ethics in *Ethical Theory: An Anthology* edited by Shafer-Landau, R. John Wiley and Sons, pp 645-652.

Hursthouse, R. and Pettigrove, G. (2016). *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy: Virtue Ethics.* Stanford: Stanford University.

Johnson, R. and Cureton, A. (2019). *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy: Kant's Moral Philosophy.* Stanford: Stanford University.

Kant, I. (2003). Groundwork on the Metaphysics of Morals in *Ethical Theory: An Anthology* edited by Shafer-Landau, R. John Wiley and Sons, pp 485-498.

Khan, M. H. (1996). A Typology of Corrupt Transactions in Developing Countries. *IDS Bulletin,* 27(2), 12-21.

Korsgaard, C. (2013). Kant's Formulation of Universal Law in *Ethical Theory: An Anthology* edited by Shafer-Landau, R. John Wiley and Sons, pp 499-509.

Kubbe, I. (2013). *Corruption and Trust: A Model Design.* Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Politikwissenschaft: Tel Aviv University.

Lagarde, C. (2018). There's a Reason for the Lack of Trust in Government and Business: Corruption. Retrieved from: http:/www.imf.org/news/articles.

Lynch, D. and Lynch, C. E. (2003). Corruption, Reform, and Virtue Ethics. *American Society for Public Administration,* 63(33), 370-374.

Madonsela, T. (2014). *Secure in Comfort: A Report of the Public Protector.* Report No. 25 of 2013/14.

Mail & Guardian of 5th July 2012. Retrieved from: https://mg.co.za/article/2012-07-05-siu-probes-senior-officials-in-textbook-shame/

Mauro, P. (1997). *Why Worry About Corruption?* Economics Issues 6. International Monetary Fund: Washington.

McLeod, C. (2015). *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy: Trust.* Stanford: Stanford University.

Mill, J. S. (2013). Utilitarianism in *Ethical Theory: An Anthology* edited by Shafer-Landau, R. John Wiley and Sons, pp. 417-424.

Miller, W. (1980). Disinterest, Disaffection, and Participation in Presidential Politics. *Political Behavior,* 2(1), 7-32.

Miller, S. (2018). *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy: Corruption*. Stanford: Stanford University.

Mlambo, D., Boruchowitz, P. and Hughes, W. (2017). *Judgment in the Matter of President of the Republic of South Africa v Office of the Public Protector*: Case No. 91139/2016.

Mokgoro, Y. (2019). *Enquiry in Terms of Section 12(6) of the National Prosecuting Act of 32 of 1998*: Abridged Version.

Napal, G. (2006). An Assessment of the Ethical Dimensions of Corruption. *Electronic Journal of Business and Organizational Studies,* 11(1), 5-9.

News24 of 11th July 2019. Retrieved from: https://www.news24.com/news24/southafrica/news/majority-of-south-africans-believe-corruption-on-the-rise-report-20190711

Nugent, R. (2018). *Commission of Inquiry into Tax Administration and Governance by SARS: Final Report*.

Ochulor, C. L. and Bassey, E. P. (2010). Analysis of Corruption from the Ethical and Moral Perspectives. *European Journal of Scientific Research,* 44(3), 466-476.

Potter, N. N. (2002). *How can I be Trusted? A Virtue Theory of Trustworthiness.* Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publisher.

Public Service Commission. (2002). *Explanatory Manual on the Code of Conduct for Public Service: A Practical Guide to Ethical Dilemmas in the Workplace*. Pretoria.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy.* Princeton: Princeton University.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *The Collapse and Revival of American Community.* New York, NY: Touchstone.

Ramaphosa, C. M. (2019). *State of the Nation Address*. Cape Town: Parliament.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (1988). The Priority of Right and the Ideals of the Good. *Philosophy and Public Affairs,* 17(4), 251-276.

Rawls, J. (1999). *A Theory of Justice:* Revised Edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rendtorff, J. D. (2010). The Concept of Corruption: Moral and Political Perspectives. *Roskilde University Department of Communication Business and Information Technologies*, pp 125-133.

Robertson, H. (2018). *The Details, Strengths and Weaknesses of Virtue Ethics and Some Questions within Metaethics*. Seminar 3. Wits. Unpublished, pp 1-8.

Robinson, M. (2002). *Corruption and Development*. London: Frank Cass Publishers.

Rose-Ackerman, S. (1997). Corruption and Development in *Annual World Bank Conference on Development Economics 1997* edited by Pleskovic, B. and Stiglitz, J. E. pp 35-57.

Rose-Ackerman, S. (2001). Trust, Honesty and Corruption: Reflecting on the State-building Process. *Archives of European Sociology,* 42(3), 526-570.

Rossouw, G. J. (1998). Establishing Moral Business Culture in Newly-found Democracies. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 17, 1563-1571.

Roux, P. M. in Pioneer Foods Realizing our Potential (2015). Integrated Report.

Shafer-Landau, R. (Ed). (2013). *Ethical Theory: An Anthology (Second Edition)*. Sussex: John Wiley and Sons.

Skorupski, J. (ed.). (2010). *The Routledge Companion to Ethics.* Routledge: London.

Slote, M. (2013). Agent-Based Virtue Ethics in *Ethical Theory: An Anthology* edited by Shafer-Landau, R. John Wiley and Sons, pp 654-663.

South Africa Department of Public Service. (2003). *Batho Pele Handbook: A Service Delivery Improvement Guide.* Pretoria.

Statman, D. (1996). Who Needs Imperfect Duties? *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 33(2), 211-224.

Stubbs, A. (1981). Pros and Cons of Consequentialism. *Philosophy,* 56(218), 497-516.

Swanton, C. (2013). A Virtue Ethical Account of Right Action in *Ethical Theory: An Anthology* edited by Shafer-Landau, R. John Wiley and Sons, pp 665-674.

Swift, A. (2014). *Political Philosophy: A Beginner's Guide for Students and Politicians (Third Edition)*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Sztompka, P. (1999). *Trust: A sociological theory*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Thamm, M. (2017). Daily Maverick of 3rd May 2017. Retrieved from: https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2017-05-03-zuma-corruption-and-the-arms-deal-the-gift-that-just-keeps-on-giving/

Vondou, A. (2015). *Virtue Ethics for the Prevention and Fight against Corruption in Cameroon.* Boston College University Libraries.

Vorster, S. W. (2013). Fighting Corruption – A Philosophical Approach. *In die Skriflia/ In Luce Verbi*, 47(1), 1-7.

Uslaner, E. M. (2002). Trust and Corruption. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. Boston: University of Maryland.

Van Hooft, S. (2006). *Understanding Virtue Ethics*. Chesham: Acumen Publishing Limited.

Walker, M. U., (2006). *Moral Repair: Reconstructing Moral Relations after Wrongdoing.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Walzer, M. (1990). The Communitarian Critique of Liberalism. *Political Theory,* 18(1), 6-23.

You, J. (2018). Trust and Corruption. *The Oxford Handbook of Social and Political Trust,* pp. 1-31.