Empowering Villages: Towards Maximum Autonomy and Minimal Control for Gram Swaraj

Dr. Chaitra
Faculty of Public Administration- MGRDPR University, Gadag

Abstract— **The concept of Gram Swaraj embodies the Gandhian vision of self-sufficient villages built on the principles of autonomy, self-reliance, and participatory democracy. Gandhi imagined villages not as passive recipients of government schemes but as "independent republics" (Gandhi, 1946), capable of determining their own social, economic, and cultural priorities. After independence, India sought to achieve this vision by adopting decentralization as a governance model, culminating in the 73rd Constitutional Amendment, which gave Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) constitutional status. This legal framework was intended to empower villages through political, administrative, and financial devolution. However, the ground reality reveals a different picture. Instead of functioning as autonomous institutions, Panchayats often remain dependent on state and central governments, executing directives rather than shaping policies of their own (Manor, 1999).**

One of the most pressing concerns is the declining participation of people in Gram Sabhas and other democratic platforms at the local level (Jodhka, 2002). This undermines the very spirit of Gram Swaraj, which requires active community engagement and accountability. Furthermore, financial dependence on higher governments continues to weaken local autonomy, as Panchayats lack independent revenue sources (World Bank, 2000). Administrative capacity constraints, political interference, and elite capture by dominant groups further reduce the effectiveness of decentralization in empowering ordinary villagers (Srinivas, 1987; Crook & Manor, 1998).

These limitations raise an important question: can decentralization, in its present form, truly deliver Gandhi's vision of Gram Swaraj, or do we need to rethink the model of rural governance? This paper is a theoretical exploration of whether Panchayats should be given maximum autonomy with minimal control, much like the autonomy granted to states in the federal system after reorganization. It argues that genuine empowerment requires financial independence, greater legislative authority at the local level, and stronger Gram Sabhas that ensure participatory decision-making. At the same time, legal safeguards are necessary to protect Panchayats from political manipulation while ensuring accountability and inclusivity.

The study concludes that decentralization alone is insufficient for achieving Gram Swaraj. Instead, what is needed is a governance model that balances autonomy with accountability, strengthens people's participation, and ensures that villages function as true centers of democracy and development. By rethinking the current framework, India can move closer to Gandhi's dream of villages that are not dependent extensions of the state but self-reliant, empowered communities driving their own development.

Index Terms— **Gram Swaraj, Decentralization, Panchayati Raj, Local Governance, Autonomy, Rural Democracy, People's Participation, Gandhi**

I. INTRODUCTION

The idea of Gram Swaraj occupies a central place in India's political imagination, rooted deeply in Mahatma Gandhi's vision of self-reliant villages. In his seminal work Hind Swaraj (1909), Gandhi stressed that "real Swaraj will come not by the acquisition of authority by a few but by the acquisition of the capacity by all to resist authority when it is abused" (Parel, 1997). For Gandhi, true democracy had to begin at the grassroots, where each village functioned as a small republic, autonomous in managing its social, economic, and political life, yet part of the larger national framework. Villages, in his vision, were not dependent extensions of a centralized state, but living embodiments of participatory democracy and moral self-rule.

Post-independence, Indian leaders recognized the importance of Gandhi's vision, but the path chosen to achieve it was through decentralization. Committees such as the Balwant Rai Mehta Committee (1957) and the Ashok Mehta Committee (1978) recommended democratic decentralization as the most practical means to bring governance closer to the people. This culminated in the 73rd Constitutional Amendment of 1992, which provided constitutional recognition to Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs). The amendment mandated a three-tier structure of governance village, block, and district levels regular elections, reservation for marginalized groups, fiscal devolution, and institutionalized Gram Sabhas (Mathew, 1994). The objective was to empower local communities, reduce bureaucratic distance, and ensure participatory democracy.

However, three decades after this landmark reform, the outcomes remain mixed. On paper, PRIs enjoy political, administrative, and financial authority, but in practice, they are far from autonomous (Mathew, 2000; Manor, 1999). Participation in Gram Sabhas envisioned as the cornerstone of grassroots democracy has gradually declined, turning into a mere formality in many regions (Jodhka, 2002). Moreover, Panchayats often act as implementing agencies of centrally and state-designed schemes rather than as independent institutions capable of formulating their own development strategies. Financial dependence on higher governments, bureaucratic interference, and elite domination further constrain their capacity to embody Gandhi's vision (Srinivas, 1987; Blair, 2000).

This gap between constitutional intent and practical reality highlights a deeper tension. Decentralization was introduced as the vehicle to achieve grassroots democracy, but it has not necessarily translated into meaningful autonomy or empowerment. Instead, the structures often reproduce dependence on higher levels of government, limiting innovation and local initiative. This raises an important question: can decentralization alone fulfill the promise of Gram Swaraj, or must we rethink the model of governance to ensure villages are truly self-governing?

It is against this backdrop that the present article situates itself. This study is not an empirical assessment but a theoretical exploration of autonomy for Panchayats. It examines whether Panchayats should be granted maximum independence with minimal external control, akin to the constitutional status accorded to states in India's federal framework. In doing so, it analyzes both the potential benefits and challenges of such an approach. The objective is to contribute to the ongoing debate on grassroots democracy by asking whether India needs a deeper transformation of its rural governance system to realize Gandhi's dream of Gram Swaraj.

II. THE IDEA OF GRAM SWARAJ

The idea of Swaraj, meaning self-rule, extends beyond mere political independence to encompass personal, social, economic, and moral autonomy. Mahatma Gandhi, in Hind Swaraj (1909), emphasized that true Swaraj was not just about replacing foreign rulers with Indian rulers but about fostering self-discipline, self-reliance, and decentralized governance. He envisioned a society where individuals and communities governed themselves ethically and responsibly, free from external domination and internal oppression. Economic self-sufficiency through Swadeshi (local production) and social harmony were key aspects of his vision. While political leaders like Bal Gangadhar Tilak interpreted Swaraj as political self-rule, others like B.R. Ambedkar critiqued the idea, arguing that true freedom required dismantling social hierarchies, particularly caste-based oppression. Contemporary discussions on Swaraj relate to participatory democracy, sustainable development, and decentralization, reflecting its enduring relevance in governance and social justice.

The concept of Gram Swaraj, or village self-rule, has been a subject of extensive scholarly discussion, particularly in the context of decentralized governance in India. Mahatma Gandhi's vision of Gram Swaraj emphasized self-sufficient villages where decision-making, economic activity, and social structures were controlled by local communities rather than centralized authorities. In Hind Swaraj (1909), Gandhi argued that true independence would not come from simply replacing British rule with Indian rule but from empowering villages to govern themselves in an ethical, participatory, and self-reliant manner (Parel, 1997). He believed that villages should function as small republics, managing their own affairs with minimal intervention from higher authorities.

Vinoba Bhave, a Gandhian thinker and leader of the Bhoodan Movement, further developed the idea of Gram Swaraj by advocating for voluntary land redistribution and collective resource management. He viewed self-rule not just as a political concept but as a means of ensuring economic and social justice. Bhave stressed that equitable distribution of land, water, and resources within villages was essential for achieving true self-sufficiency and autonomy (Shah, 1990). His work inspired efforts to empower local communities, though practical challenges such as entrenched inequalities often hindered full realization of this vision.

Political scientist Rajni Kothari (1988) analyzed Gram Swaraj as a model of participatory democracy, arguing that decentralized governance could enhance accountability and efficiency. He pointed out that if local decision-making structures were inclusive, they could counterbalance the inefficiencies and bureaucratic delays of centralized governance. However, Kothari also warned that power hierarchies and elite dominance in rural India could distort the democratic process, preventing marginalized communities from truly benefiting from self-rule. His work highlights the importance of institutional safeguards to ensure that decentralization leads to genuine empowerment rather than reinforcing existing social inequalities.

Amartya Sen's work on development and governance aligns with the principles of Gram Swaraj, though he did not explicitly use the term. Sen (1999) argued that decentralized governance improves human development outcomes by allowing people greater agency in decision-making. He emphasized that effective local governance leads to better education, healthcare, and public services because decisions are made closer to the people they affect. This perspective supports the idea that Gram Swaraj can enhance development by making governance more responsive and participatory.

James Manor (1999) examined India's decentralization efforts, particularly through the 73rd Constitutional Amendment, which institutionalized Panchayati Raj governance. While this reform was a step toward Gram Swaraj, Manor highlighted that political and financial constraints limited the autonomy of local governments. Without sufficient fiscal powers and administrative capacity, village institutions often remain dependent on state and central authorities, restricting their ability to function as true self-governing units. His analysis suggests that decentralization must be accompanied by financial devolution and capacity-building to be effective.

B.R. Ambedkar was one of the strongest critics of Gandhi's vision of Gram Swaraj. He argued that Indian villages had historically been centers of caste oppression and social exclusion, making them unsuitable as the foundation for democracy. In Annihilation of Caste (1936), Ambedkar contended that village-centric governance could perpetuate traditional hierarchies, keeping marginalized communities, particularly Dalits, in a state of subjugation (Jaffrelot, 2005). Instead, he advocated for a strong constitutional framework that ensured equal rights and protection for all citizens, rather than leaving governance to local elites who might reinforce existing social divisions.

Sociologist M.N. Srinivas (1987) also examined the realities of rural governance, highlighting the dominance of upper castes in village decision-making. While decentralization theoretically promotes democratic participation, he found that in many cases, power remains concentrated in the hands of a few influential families or caste groups. This dynamic can hinder the equitable distribution of resources and opportunities, making it difficult for Gram Swaraj to function as an inclusive and just system of governance. His findings underscore the need for mechanisms that promote social equity within decentralized governance structures.

In contemporary governance, elements of Gram Swaraj are visible in India's Panchayati Raj system and other efforts to empower local communities. However, scholars argue that challenges such as bureaucratic interference, financial dependence, and social inequalities continue to limit the effectiveness of decentralized governance. Jodhka (2002) points out that while some regions have successfully implemented participatory governance, others struggle with issues like corruption and lack of administrative capacity. Similarly, Sharma (2009) argues that true Gram Swaraj requires not just political decentralization but also economic empowerment and social reform to ensure that all sections of society can participate meaningfully.

The idea of Gram Swaraj remains a compelling vision for grassroots democracy, but its practical implementation requires careful consideration of local realities. While Gandhi's ideal emphasized minimal control and maximum autonomy for villages, scholars highlight that structural challenges must be addressed to prevent decentralization from becoming a means of reinforcing existing inequalities. Moving forward, research and policy efforts need to focus on creating governance models that balance local autonomy with accountability, equity, and inclusive development.

III. HOW TO ACHIEVE GRAM SWARAJ?

Achieving Gram Swaraj requires a multi-dimensional approach that ensures political decentralization, economic self-sufficiency, social equity, and community participation. The first step is strengthening grassroots democracy through robust Panchayati Raj institutions, ensuring local bodies have real decision-making power, financial autonomy, and administrative capacity. Genuine devolution of power both political and fiscal can enable villages to function as self-sufficient units with minimal control from higher authorities. Effective implementation of the 73rd Constitutional Amendment, which grants constitutional status to local governance, is crucial in this regard.

Economic self-sufficiency is another key pillar of Gram Swaraj. Promoting local industries, small-scale enterprises, and sustainable agriculture can reduce dependency on external markets and create local employment. Encouraging Swadeshi (local production) and cooperative models for farming and trade can enhance economic resilience. Rural electrification, digital access, and improved infrastructure can further enable economic self-reliance while integrating villages into broader economic frameworks without compromising autonomy.

Social equity is essential to ensure that Gram Swaraj benefits all sections of society, particularly marginalized groups such as Dalits, women, and tribal communities. Addressing caste-based and gender-based discrimination within village governance structures is necessary to create an inclusive and just society. Educational and awareness programs promoting social harmony, skill development, and collective decision-making can empower communities to govern themselves effectively.

Community-driven governance is at the heart of Gram Swaraj. Encouraging participatory decision-making through gram sabhas (village assemblies) ensures that development is aligned with local needs and aspirations. Transparency, accountability, and people’s involvement in planning and resource allocation can strengthen democratic governance. Additionally, integrating environmental sustainability through community-led water conservation, afforestation, and organic farming initiatives can ensure long-term rural sustainability.

Ultimately, Gram Swaraj can be realized through a balance of autonomy and institutional support. While villages must have the freedom to govern themselves, policy frameworks should provide necessary assistance in terms of education, technology, and resource management. A decentralized yet interconnected governance model, where local self-rule operates within a supportive national structure, can turn Gandhi’s vision of Gram Swaraj into a practical reality.

IV. ONLY THROUGH DECENTRALIZATION?

Decentralization strengthens democracy by empowering grassroots institutions like Panchayati Raj. The 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act of 1992 was a significant step in this direction, giving constitutional status to local self-governments. This allowed villages to take charge of their development, plan local projects, and make decisions that directly impact their communities. When people actively participate in governance, it fosters accountability, transparency, and efficient resource utilization.

Several classical theorists have emphasized the importance of local governance in strengthening democracy. Alexis de Tocqueville (1835) argued that decentralized governance enhances political participation and fosters civic responsibility. John Stuart Mill (1861) supported the idea that decision-making should occur at the lowest possible level to promote efficiency and public involvement. In modern political economy, Oates (1972) introduced the "decentralization theorem," which suggests that local governments, being closer to citizens, have better knowledge of their needs and can provide more efficient public goods.

Decentralization is generally categorized into political, fiscal, and administrative forms. Political decentralization involves transferring decision-making powers to locally elected officials, fostering greater accountability and representation. Fiscal decentralization refers to the allocation of financial resources to local governments, enabling them to fund public services and development projects. Administrative decentralization concerns the delegation of responsibilities to lower levels of government for service implementation and policy execution (Falleti, 2005).

Empirical research highlights several benefits of decentralization. Studies suggest that it improves governance by making decision-making more responsive and inclusive. It also enhances public service delivery by allowing local governments to design policies tailored to local needs (Smoke, 2003). Economic research indicates that fiscal decentralization contributes to regional economic growth by promoting competition among local governments and encouraging efficient resource allocation (Rodríguez-Pose & Gill, 2004). Additionally, decentralization has been linked to social empowerment, particularly in countries where marginalized communities have gained political representation through local governance mechanisms (Blair, 2000).

Despite its advantages, decentralization also presents challenges. A major concern is the capacity gap many local governments lack the administrative expertise and financial autonomy to manage decentralized functions effectively (Crook & Manor, 1998). Additionally, fiscal decentralization can lead to disparities between regions if financial resources are not equitably distributed, exacerbating economic inequality (Prud'-homme, 1995). Political interference from central authorities can also undermine local autonomy, limiting the effectiveness of decentralized governance (Treisman, 2007).

Case studies from various countries illustrate mixed outcomes. In India, the Panchayati Raj system has empowered rural communities by giving them a voice in decision-making, but challenges such as financial dependence and bureaucratic control persist (Jha, 2002). In Latin America, decentralization has improved public service delivery in some countries but has also led to governance fragmentation and corruption in others (Grindle, 2007). African countries have seen both successes and failures, depending on how well decentralization policies are implemented and whether local institutions are strong enough to handle new responsibilities (Olowu & Wunsch, 2004).

The literature on decentralization suggests that its effectiveness depends on factors such as institutional capacity, financial autonomy, and the level of citizen participation. While decentralization holds significant potential for strengthening governance and promoting development, it requires careful planning and implementation to avoid inefficiencies and inequalities. Further research is needed to explore innovative governance models that balance local autonomy with accountability and equity.

V. LIMITATIONS OF DECENTRALIZATION

Decentralization, while essential for empowering local governance and enhancing democratic participation, comes with several limitations that can hinder its effectiveness. One major challenge is the lack of administrative and financial autonomy. In many cases, local bodies such as Panchayats depend heavily on state and central governments for funding, limiting their ability to implement independent policies and programs. Without adequate financial resources, decentralization remains more symbolic than functional.

Another key limitation is the persistence of local power hierarchies, were dominant caste and economic groups control decision-making. This can lead to elite capture, where a few influential individuals manipulate local governance for personal gain, marginalizing weaker sections of society, such as Dalits, women, and landless laborers. In such cases, decentralization does not lead to true empowerment but reinforces existing inequalities.

Capacity constraints also pose a serious limitation. Many local government officials and representatives lack the technical skills, education, and administrative experience required to manage resources efficiently. Inadequate training and bureaucratic inefficiencies can result in poor service delivery, corruption, and mismanagement of funds. Additionally, frequent political interference from higher levels of government often undermines local decision-making, making local bodies less effective in governing autonomously.

Another issue is regional disparities in implementation. Some states and districts have successfully leveraged decentralization for development, while others lag due to weak institutions, poor governance, or a lack of community participation. This uneven development reduces the overall effectiveness of decentralization as a nationwide governance strategy.

Finally, decentralization can sometimes lead to fragmentation and inefficiencies in policy implementation. When decision-making is highly localized, there may be a lack of coordination between different levels of government, leading to inconsistent policies and duplication of efforts. This is particularly problematic in areas like infrastructure development, disaster management, and large-scale economic planning, where a centralized approach is sometimes necessary for efficiency and uniformity.

VI. CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTING THROUGH DECENTRALIZATION

While decentralization holds immense potential in achieving Gram Swaraj, its implementation faces several challenges. One of the major issues is financial dependency. Many local bodies do not have adequate financial resources to execute development plans effectively. Despite the constitutional provision for fiscal devolution, state governments often control the flow of funds, limiting the autonomy of local bodies.

Bureaucratic interference is another challenge. In some cases, local representatives lack decision-making power as bureaucrats dominate administrative processes. This reduces the effectiveness of decentralized governance and limits the ability of Gram Panchayats to function independently.

Furthermore, lack of awareness and education among villagers often results in poor participation in governance. Many people are unaware of their rights and responsibilities under the Panchayati Raj system, leading to a passive approach toward local governance. Strengthening awareness campaigns and capacity-building programs can help overcome this challenge.

Corruption and political influence at the local level also hinder the true spirit of Gram Swaraj. In some cases, elected representatives misuse their power for personal gains, and political parties manipulate local governance for their own benefit. Strengthening transparency mechanisms, ensuring accountability, and empowering civil society organizations can help address these issues.

Decentralization is a widely discussed concept in governance, public administration, and development studies. It involves the transfer of power, authority, and resources from central governments to lower levels such as regional, municipal, or local governments. Scholars have explored its implications for democracy, economic development, service delivery, and social justice. The literature on decentralization spans various theoretical frameworks, empirical studies, and case analyses, providing diverse perspectives on its benefits and challenges.

VII. AN ALTERNATIVE PATH

After independence, India reorganized its states based on linguistic and administrative factors, granting them autonomy within a federal structure. This process ensured that states had independent legislative, executive, and financial powers while still being part of a unified nation. A similar model could be explored for granting greater autonomy to Panchayats, enabling them to function with minimal control from higher authorities and maximizing self-governance. This would align with the Gandhian vision of Gram Swaraj, where villages are self-sufficient and capable of managing their own affairs without excessive bureaucratic interference.

For Panchayats to function autonomously, they must have independent revenue generation mechanisms. Currently, local governments depend heavily on state and central allocations, which restrict their ability to plan and execute development projects effectively. If Panchayats are allowed to collect and manage their own taxes, receive a fixed share of state revenues, and control local natural resources, they can reduce dependency on external funding and function as true self-governing institutions. Financial self-sufficiency would ensure that they can implement policies based on local priorities rather than waiting for approvals from higher levels of government.

Beyond financial independence, legislative and administrative authority must be strengthened. Just as states have the power to frame laws within their jurisdiction, Panchayats should be given similar control over local governance matters, including agriculture, education, healthcare, and infrastructure. Currently, their powers are often undermined by state-appointed bureaucrats who influence decision-making. To ensure real autonomy, Panchayats should be able to make independent policy decisions while remaining accountable to local communities through transparent governance mechanisms.

Minimal government intervention is necessary to allow Panchayats to operate effectively. While the state and central governments may provide broad policy guidelines and oversight to prevent corruption, excessive control limits the effectiveness of local governance. Frequent interference in financial allocations, project approvals, and administrative appointments reduces the decision-making power of local leaders. Granting Panchayats the ability to govern with minimal external control will enhance their efficiency and responsiveness to local needs.

Empowering Gram Sabhas (village assemblies) is essential for ensuring participatory governance. These assemblies, composed of all adult members of the village, can serve as platforms for direct democracy where decisions are made collectively. If Gram Sabhas are strengthened, they can oversee Panchayats, prevent elite capture, and ensure that development initiatives reflect the interests of the entire community. This would make Panchayats more accountable and transparent, reducing the chances of corruption and mismanagement.

Legal protections and constitutional safeguards must also be in place to prevent arbitrary interference in the functioning of Panchayats. Just as states have a constitutional status that guarantees their powers, Panchayats should be granted similar protections to ensure stability and continuity in governance. This would prevent political manipulation, where local bodies are dissolved or sidelined due to changes in state or central leadership. A legal framework recognizing Panchayats as truly autonomous institutions would be a crucial step toward realizing Gram Swaraj.

While granting Panchayats maximum autonomy is a promising idea, challenges must be addressed. Social inequalities, power hierarchies, and lack of administrative capacity in some areas could hinder effective self-governance. In many villages, dominant caste and economic groups control local decision-making, marginalizing weaker sections. If Panchayats are given full autonomy without safeguards, there is a risk that governance could become exclusionary rather than democratic. Capacity-building initiatives, leadership training, and legal measures ensuring representation of marginalized communities must be part of any plan to expand local autonomy.

Despite these challenges, maximizing Panchayat autonomy remains a viable and desirable goal. A well-structured approach that balances financial independence, participatory governance, and legal safeguards can ensure that villages function as self-sufficient units. While some level of state and central oversight may still be required for coordination and accountability, reducing bureaucratic interference and empowering local bodies will help realize the true essence of decentralized democracy. Moving toward a system where Panchayats operate with minimal control and maximum autonomy can transform rural governance, making villages more resilient, efficient, and self-reliant.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Granting Panchayats greater autonomy with minimal control is not just a governance reform but a step toward realizing the true essence of Gram Swaraj. While India has pursued decentralization as a means to empower villages, the current system largely restricts Panchayats to implementing policies dictated by state and central governments. As a result, grassroots democracy remains weak, and the goal of self-sufficient village governance remains unfulfilled. To truly achieve Gram Swaraj, Panchayats must be given financial independence, legislative authority, and administrative freedom to govern according to local needs.

However, autonomy without accountability can lead to inefficiencies, elite domination, and mismanagement. Therefore, a balance must be struck one that empowers Panchayats while ensuring transparency and inclusivity through active Gram Sabhas and participatory governance. Instead of treating local bodies as mere extensions of higher government structures, they must be recognized as independent institutions capable of shaping their own development paths.

Ultimately, the success of Gram Swaraj depends not just on legal frameworks but on fostering a culture of self-governance, collective responsibility, and people’s active participation. Decentralization alone may not be enough, and a rethinking of governance models is necessary to transform villages into true centers of democracy, self-reliance, and sustainable development.

REFERENCES

[1] G. Austin, *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1966.

[2] P. Bardhan and D. Mookherjee, *Decentralization and Local Governance in Developing Countries*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 2006.

[3] S. Bhatnagar and R. Schware, *Information and Communication Technology in Rural Development: Case Studies From India*. Washington, DC, USA: World Bank, 2000.

[4] H. Blair, "Participation and accountability at the periphery: Democratic local governance in six countries," *World Development*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 21–39, 2000.

[5] N. Buch, "Women's experience in new Panchayats: The emerging leadership of rural women," *Occasional Paper*. New Delhi, India: Centre for Women's Development Studies (CWDS), 2000.

[6] R. C. Crook and J. Manor, *Democracy and Decentralisation in South Asia and West Africa: Participation, Accountability and Performance*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[7] M. K. Gandhi, *Hind Swaraj and Other Writings*, A. J. Parel, Ed. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

[8] M. K. Gandhi, *Constructive Programme: Its Meaning and Place*. Ahmedabad, India: Navajivan Publishing House, 1997.

[9] T. M. T. Isaac and P. Heller, "Decentralisation, democracy, and development: Kerala's People's Campaign for Ninth Plan," *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 31, no. 35/37, pp. 2361–2375, 1996.

[10] S. S. Jodhka, "Democratic decentralisation and local politics: Panchayati Raj in contemporary India," *Social Change*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 1–23, 2002.

[11] J. Manor, *The Political Economy of Democratic Decentralization*. Washington, DC, USA: World Bank, 1999.

[12] G. Mathew, *Panchayati Raj: From Legislation to Movement*. New Delhi, India: Concept Publishing, 1994.

[13] G. Mathew, *Status of Panchayati Raj in the States and Union Territories of India*. New Delhi, India: Institute of Social Sciences, 2000.

[14] M. A. Oommen, "Fiscal decentralisation to the sub-state level governments," *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 40, no. 30, pp. 3261–3273, 2005.

[15] M. N. Srinivas, *The Dominant Caste and Other Essays*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1987.

[16] R. Tandon, "Civil society, Panchayati Raj, and deepening democracy," *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 285–298, 2002.

[17] World Bank, *India: Decentralization and Local Governance*. Washington, DC, USA: World Bank Report, 2000.