

Dynamics of grassroots governance towards consensus oriented

Dr. Akhilesh Pal

Department of Political Science University of Allahabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

Abstract

Panchayat raj, as a system of governance at the grassroots level in rural India has been rightly conceived as the most viable and proper mechanism of realising the goals of democracy, development, peace and security. Panchayat Raj is a system of maximum welfare of maximum people and based on the principle of equitable justice. After Independence efforts have been made to create the units of self-governance at grassroots level but all went in vain since they could not produce the desired result. After Independence efforts were continued to create the panchayats as units of self-governance but the committed Central Government's initiative came out with 73rd constitutional Amendment for the establishment of panchayat raj institutions in India in 1992.

Keywords: panchayat raj, consensus oriented, gram sabha, gram panchayat, 73rd constitutional amendment, the madhya pradesh panchayat raj amendment 2001

Introduction

The concept of governance is not new and is as old as human civilisation. Governance means the process of decision making and the process by which decisions are implemented or not implemented. Governance is the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented. An analysis of governance focuses on the formal and informal actors involved in decision-making and implementing the decisions made and the formal and informal structures that have been set in place to arrive at and implement the decision (UNESCAP: 2009) [31].

The whole idea of good and responsive governance is that of giving, of serving and of doing good of the people, or solving their problems and making their lives more liveable, satisfying and enjoyable (Sisodia: 2012) [30]. The essential pre-requisite for quality of governance is that the system should be good and suited to the needs, aspirations, background and ethos of the people concerned and that those selected for operating the system should be endowed with character and competence and remain motivated by the spirit of public service. Governance must be democratic, participatory, transparent and accountable. The issue of governance is more crucial and important from the point of view grassroots democracy since at local level the decisions taken by the elected bodies have direct implications for the life of the major chunk of population of the country.

Governance has eight major characteristics. They are participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, consensus orientedness, equity and inclusiveness, effectiveness and efficiency and accountability. Good governance is an ideal, which is difficult to achieve in its totality. From the Indian point of view after independence efforts have been made to meet the needs and expectations of the people. Special efforts have been made to address the rural multifaceted issues involving massive investment with the results which were not up to the expectations. After decade and a half of decentralised governance with the motive of good governance put forward many achievements and dilemmas. The state assured peoples participation in the local governance institutions with adequate gender, class and caste

representation as per the need of the amendment package. Accountable administration and governance at local level are still issues of serious concern. Despite peoples direct participation, transparency is still under scrutiny but transparency is almost ascertained because of a very informal social structure at local level. Governance at local level is directly responsive to the people as routine functioning of the local institutions is visible and questionable. The effective and efficient governance is a matter of concern due to lack of training and capacity building for the grassroots institutions.

To make the democracy meaningful and welfare oriented there is a need of decentralisation. The democracy is fundamentally decentralised system of governance. Indian democracy has adopted a unitary system. Central government at the federal level, state government at the provincial level and local government at the grassroots level. For the establishment of true democracy there is a need of local governance bodies. Fruits of democracy may reach to the public only by the local governance. Local self-government created by an Act of the Central or State Government is a government entity, including the district, town or village consists of representatives elected by the people of an area and for those who exercise their rights to human welfare (Dey, 1961: 91) [14].

The 73rd Amendment to the Constitution of India not only gave a constitutional status to the panchayats; it also provided uniformity and formal structure to these traditional institutions of self-governance for the sake of their effective functioning. The earlier attempts at institutionalising the panchayats were half-hearted and failed due to the absence of supportive constitutional measures and lack of political will. The 73rd Amendment initiated a fundamental restructuring of governance and administrative system of the country, based on the philosophy of decentralisation and power to the people. The new panchayat raj institutions have the potential to usher in a new era of change and development in accordance with people's needs and priorities, and to revitalise a deeply troubled system of democracy (Behar & Kumar: 2002) [4].

Madhya Pradesh was the pioneer state, which implemented the 73rd Amendment by enacting panchayat law, and conducted panchayat elections in 1994. The panchayat raj system in

Madhya Pradesh has constantly evolved during the past decade and half, supported by a strong political will. There were several amendments to the Act and government orders were issued from time to time, which supported and strengthened the decentralisation process. The panchayat raj system in Madhya Pradesh has a dynamic growth, which has constantly responded to the needs emerging from the field. Through panchayat raj, an attempt is being made to initiate a new era of people's empowerment. Importantly, the Madhya Pradesh government perceived decentralisation and people's participation as central to its governance agenda, of which the panchayat system is living example of democracy at the grassroots level (Sisodia: 2007) ^[25, 28].

It could be argued that after fifteen years of its operation, it would be practical to evaluate all what has been constructed in the preceding analysis. The practicality of evaluation notwithstanding, the purpose for which the insights and process documents would be generated, calls for an early evaluation of the new system. Process documents providing insights on reasons for success and failures in decentralised decision making could identify role of awareness of rights of stakeholders, their notions of participatory decision making, exclusion, development, equity and justice in the decision making process. Governance assures that corruption is minimised and the voices of the most vulnerable in society are heard in decision-making. It is also responsive to the present and future needs of society (Sisodia: 2012) ^[30].

This study is premised on the assumption that sooner the decentralisation process is documented and aspects of governance are analysed, the better would be for advocacy and action. This will also help in making midcourse corrections in the new system of governance for human development.

The Madhya Pradesh Panchayat Raj (Sanasodhan) Adhiniyam, 2001

The Amendment related to Gram Swaraj is discussed here in detail. Since the study is devoted to understand the Gram Swaraj, it appears appropriate to provide the detailed elaboration of the Amendment package to interpret the prime motive behind extending direct democracy to the grassroots people.

Madhya Pradesh took the lead in implementing the panchayat raj system as envisaged in the 73rd Amendment and was the first state to conduct elections to panchayats in 1994. The state government continuously devolved powers and authority to the panchayat institutions and initiated innovative measures to empower, strengthen and institutionalise the panchayat raj institutions. An analysis of six years of functioning of panchayat raj in the state clearly indicates that despite several attempts by the government, civil society and other concerned actors, the panchayat raj institutions could not truly emerge as people's institutions. Unfortunately, the distortions of the existing political systems at the state and union levels were replicated at the panchayat level and a new class of elite and power centres led by the sarpanch emerged within the panchayat system undermining the spirit of democratic decentralisation at grassroots level. The state government recognised the growing distortions in the panchayat system and they were in the open criticism of the existing the panchayat raj has degenerated into sarpanch raj. A comprehensive process of evaluations and assessment was initiated by the state government to address the deformity in

the panchayat system and to look for possible solutions. The new system of Gram Swaraj is a result of this process.

On the 21st January 2001, Madhya Pradesh government amended the Madhya Pradesh Panchayat Raj Adhiniyam (Act), 1993, to rename it as the Madhya Pradesh Panchayat Raj (Sanasodhan) Adhiniyam 2001. The citation of the amended Act substituted the words 'Panchayat Raj and Gram Swaraj' in place of the words 'Panchayat Raj'. In fact, the new system of governance, Gram Swaraj, enacted by the Madhya Pradesh Panchayat Raj (Sanasodhan) Adhiniyam 2001 and operationalised from 26th January 2001, is the most significant change and experiment in the system of governance since the adoption of representative parliamentary democracy in India. The operationalisation of Gram Swaraj in Madhya Pradesh will herald the beginning of a new system of governance based on direct democracy instead of indirect representative parliamentary democracy. The experience and operationalisation of Gram Swaraj will also have serious implications for discourses on governance, democracy and modernity.

Gram Swaraj is a new system of self-governance at village level, which moves from indirect to direct democracy. It is based on the premise that in a village people can assemble and sit collectively and therefore representatives to represent the views, aspirations, needs and interests of the people are not required. The new system intends to give power to the people and not to their representatives. To operationalise this system in field, it has been decided that Gram Sabhas shall be strengthened, which under the new structure will exercise all the powers of Gram Panchayats and many more powers will also be devolved to Gram Sabhas. Gram Sabhas will function as decision-making bodies and to discharge their duties and implement decision (Behar & Kumar: 2002) ^[4].

The study conducted in the Dewas district of Madhya Pradesh. The study as an evaluative study on fact based, descriptive and analytical. A proportionate sampling framework adopted. Dewas district which includes eight blocks. Out of eight blocks three blocks were selected randomly for the purpose of this study. From the selected blocks, 5 Gram Panchayats were chosen for in-depth study. Thus, from three blocks 15 Gram Panchayat were chosen for in-depth study. Thus, in all, from 15 Gram Panchayats of three blocks, the size of sample was 75 Panchayat Representatives (15-Sarpanch, 15- Up-sarpanch and 45- Panch) and 150 Gram Sabha Members (75 Male and 75 Female). Thus, the total size of sample was 225. The selection of Gram Panchayat was based on random from the list of all the gram panchayats of the selected block.

For the study, both primary and secondary data were collected. Secondary data were based on books, journals, monographs, occasional papers, governments publications, circular, orders, ordinances etc. For primary data two separate interview schedules were structured and administered among the respondents (gram sabha members and panchayat representatives). The interview schedules broadly included issues of awareness and exposure of the respondents towards the indicators of governance. For data collection included both, the providers and the recipients, therefore the emerging trends were crosschecked with respect to facts, point of view, perception and attitudes towards governance with human development. For this purpose, the qualitative methods include-key informant interviews, in depth interviews,

participant observation and case study analysis. The participatory assessment methods included mainly directional group discussion. Besides these, a village schedule and a directional group discussion were also administered to know the profile of the villages and other similar issues.

1. Analysis and Interpretation of Panchayat Representatives
 Consensus oriented stands for good governance mediating amidst differing interests to reach a broad consensus on what is in the best interests of the group and where possible, on policies and procedures.

Table 1: Problems are Quickly Solve

S. No.	Problems are quickly solve	General (%)	OBC (%)	SC (%)	ST (%)	Total (%)
1	Yes	8 (44.4)	14 (38.9)	11 (55.0)	0 (0.0)	33 (44.0)
2	No	3 (16.7)	16 (44.4)	1 (5.0)	1 (100.0)	21 (28.0)
3	Occasionally	6 (33.3)	4 (11.1)	8 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	18 (24.0)
4	Very difficulty	1 (5.6)	2 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (4.0)
	Total	18 (100.0)	36 (100.0)	20 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	75 (100.0)

Source: Primary Data

Table 1 reflects the problems of quickly solve. 44.0 per cent respondents say that problems are quickly solved. 24.0 per cent respondents are of the view that problems are solving

occasionally. Thus, it is clear from above analysis the maximum number of respondents are of the opinion that problems are not quickly solved. It is not positive feedback.

Table 2: Agreement with the Viewpoint that Complete Benefit of Welfare Measures Reaches the Public

S.No.	Agreement with the viewpoint that complete benefit of welfare measures reaches the public	General (%)	OBC (%)	SC (%)	ST (%)	Total (%)
1	Yes	12 (66.7)	28 (77.8)	16 (80.0)	1 (100.0)	57 (76.0)
2	No	6 (33.3)	8 (22.2)	4 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	29 (24.0)
	Total	18 (100.0)	36 (100.0)	20 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	75 (100.0)

Source: Primary Data

Table 2 explains the view point that complete benefit of welfare measures is reaching the public. 76.0 per cent respondents are of the view that they are in agreement with the viewpoint that complete benefit of welfare measures is

reaching the public. This view point is endorsed to the highest level by ST and SC. It is clear from the above illustration that majority of the respondents are in agreement with the view point and this is indeed a positive feedback.

Table 3: Benefits Expected from Government Schemes

S. No.	Benefits expected from government schemes	General (%)	OBC (%)	SC (%)	ST (%)	Total* Responses (%)
1	Financial benefits	15 (83.3)	33 (91.7)	17 (85.0)	1 (100.0)	66 (88.0)
2	Employment opportunities	17 (94.4)	35 (97.2)	19 (95.0)	1 (100.0)	72 (96.0)
3	Social benefits	13 (72.2)	31 (86.1)	15 (75.0)	0 (0.0)	59 (78.7)

*Multiple Responses

Source: Primary Data

Table 3 describes the types of benefits expected from government schemes for human development. 88.0 per cent respondents expected financial benefits. 96.0 per cent respondents point out that they expect employment opportunity from government schemes. 78.7 per cent

respondents expect social benefit from government schemes. It is very encouraging to know that the three main areas of interventions for government schemes are endorsed by the overwhelming majority of the respondents.

Table 4: Human Problems are Prioritised for Solution

S. No.	Human problems	General (%)	OBC (%)	SC (%)	ST (%)	Total* Responses (%)
1	Increase in educational institutions	3 (16.7)	7 (19.4)	8 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	18 (24.0)
2	Health facility	8 (44.0)	26 (72.2)	11 (55.0)	1 (100.0)	46 (61.3)
3	Employment	12 (66.7)	33 (91.7)	20 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	66 (88.0)
4	Proper implementation of PDS	9 (50.0)	11 (30.6)	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	21 (28.0)
5	Sanitation/cleaning of village	2 (11.0)	2 (5.6)	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (6.7)
6	Constructions of toilets	8 (44.4)	16 (44.4)	8 (40.0)	1 (100.0)	33 (44.0)
7	Drinking water	12 (66.7)	13 (36.1)	11 (55.0)	0 (0.0)	36 (48.0)

*Multiple Responses

Source: Primary Data

Table 4 shows the prioritised for solution of human problems in village. The problems referred by the respondents are as follows: increase in educational institutions (24.0%), health facility (61.3%), employment (88.0%), proper implementation of PDS (28.0%), sanitation/cleaning of village (6.7%),

constructions of toilets (44.0%), drinking water (48.0%). employment is referred highest by all caste categories respondents. Thus, it is very clear from the responses that all major problems related to villages have been prioritised for the solutions.

2. Analysis and Interpretation of Gram Sabha Members

Table 5: Problems quickly solved

S. No.	Problems quickly solved	General (%)	OBC (%)	SC (%)	ST (%)	Total (%)
1	Yes	11 (26.2)	12 (14.5)	2 (8.7)	0 (0.0)	25 (16.7)
2	No	5 (11.9)	34 (41.0)	8 (34.8)	1 (50.0)	48 (32.0)
3	Occasionally	20 (47.6)	16 (19.3)	8 (34.8)	1 (50.0)	45 (30.0)
4	By very difficulty	6 (14.3)	21 (25.3)	5 (21.7)	0 (0.0)	32 (21.3)
	Total	42 (100.0)	83 (100.0)	23 (100.0)	2 (100.0)	150 (100.0)

Source: Primary Data

Table 5 reflects the problems quickly solved. Only 16.7 per cent respondents say that problems are quickly solved. 30.0 per cent respondents are of the view that problems are solving

occasionally. Thus, it is clear from above analysis that the maximum number of respondents are of the opinion that problems are not quickly solved. It is not positive feedback.

Table 6: Agreement with the Viewpoint that Complete Benefit of Welfare Measures Reaches the Public

S. No.	Agreement with the viewpoint that complete benefit of welfare measures reaches the public	General (%)	OBC (%)	SC (%)	ST (%)	Total (%)
1	Yes	10 (23.8)	26 (31.3)	6 (26.1)	1 (50.0)	43 (28.7)
2	No	27 (64.3)	51 (61.4)	16 (69.6)	1 (50.0)	95 (63.3)
3	Don't know	5 (11.9)	6 (7.2)	1 (4.3)	0 (0.0)	12 (8.0)
	Total	42(100.0)	83(100.0)	23(100.0)	2(100.0)	150(100.0)

Source: Primary Data

Table 6 explains the view point that complete benefit of welfare measures is reaching the public. Only 28.7 per cent respondents are of the view that they are in agreement with the viewpoint that complete benefit of welfare measures is

reaching the public. It is clear from the above illustration that less than half of the respondents are in agreement with the view point, which is indeed a negative feedback.

Table 7: Benefits Expected from Government Schemes

S. No.	Benefits expected from government schemes	General (%)	OBC (%)	SC (%)	ST (%)	Total*Responses (%)
1	Financial benefits	37 (88.1)	71 (85.5)	21 (91.3)	2 (100.0)	131 (87.3)
2	Employment opportunities	41 (97.6)	80 (96.4)	23 (100.0)	2 (100.0)	146 (97.3)
3	Social benefits	32 (76.2)	69 (83.1)	19 (82.6)	0 (0.0)	120 (80.0)

*Multiple Responses

Source: Primary Data

Table 7 describes the types of benefits expected from government schemes for human development. 87.3 per cent respondents expected financial benefits. 97.3 per cent respondents point out that they expect employment opportunity from government schemes. 80.0 per cent

respondents expect social benefit from government schemes. It is very encouraging to know that the three main areas of interventions for government schemes are endorsed by the overwhelming majority of the respondents.

Table 8: Human Problems Prioritised for Solution

S. No.	Problems	General (%)	OBC (%)	SC (%)	ST (%)	Total* Responses (%)
1	Increase in educational institutions	19 (45.2)	36 (43.4)	16 (69.6)	2 (100.0)	73 (48.7)
2	Health facility	32 (76.2)	63 (75.9)	19 (82.6)	1 (50.0)	115 (76.7)
3	Employment	34 (81.0)	73 (88.0)	19 (82.6)	2 (100.0)	128 (85.3)
4	Proper implementation of PDS	19 (45.2)	41 (49.4)	9 (39.1)	0 (0.0)	69 (46.0)
5	Sanitation / cleaning of village	16 (38.1)	20 (24.1)	8 (34.8)	1 (50.0)	45 (30.0)
6	Constructions of toilets	18 (49.2)	44 (53.0)	8 (34.8)	1 (50.0)	71 (47.3)
7	Drinking water	30 (71.4)	55 (66.3)	13 (56.5)	1 (50.0)	99 (66.0)

*Multiple Responses

Source: Primary Data

Table 8 shows the problems in the village which are to be solved on priority basis. The problems referred by the respondents are as follows: Increase in educational institutions (48.7%), health facility (76.7%), employment (85.3%), proper implementation of PDS (46.0%), sanitation /cleaning of village (30.0%), constructions of toilets (47.3%), drinking water (66.0%). Thus, it is very clear from the responses that

all major problems related to villages have been prioritised for the solutions.

Conclusions

Consensus oriented stands for good governance mediating between differing interests to reach at a broad consensus on what is in the best interest of the group and where possible, on

policies and procedures. The maximum number of respondents are of the opinion that problems are not quickly solved, it is not positive feedback. Majority of the respondents are in agreement with the view point and this is indeed a positive feedback. Three main areas of interventions for government schemes are endorsed by the overwhelming majority of the respondents. All major problems related to villages have been prioritised for the solutions.

The maximum number of respondents are of the opinion that problems are not quickly solved. It is not positive feedback. Less than half of the respondents are in agreement with the view point, which is indeed a negative feedback. Three main areas of interventions for government schemes are endorsed by the overwhelming majority of the respondents. All major problems related to villages have been prioritised for the solutions.

Suggestions

- The provisions of the State Acts should be translated into simple Hindi and local dialect and be distributed to all panchayat functionaries in the form of pocket booklets as ready beckoners.
- The Panchayat Raj Institutions have specially empowered people to work as units of self-governance but it has been observed that the level of awareness and exposure among panchayat raj representatives and gram sabha members are very low. It is therefore important to initiate special training packages, awareness campaigns and capacity building programmes.
- It appears that the required number for quorum is very high which needs to be relooked with ground reality.
- Gram Sabhas have been provided supreme position in the new system but people at large are least informed about these provisions. They are still accepting the supremacy of gram panchayat. For this purpose public awareness campaigns can be launched through NGOs. Electronic media (Community Television) can also be an effective medium.
- Panchayat expected has to perform a very specific role to tackle social issue as well. The panchayat through the gram sabha should also take lead to minimise the social evils.
- The study suggests that merely by resorting to amendment in the State Act and specific provisions for new system cannot change the scenario of villages. There is an urgent need to explore effective devices whereby maximum people can be informed, made aware and motivated to come forward for the proper implementation and execution of panchayat raj to achieve the goals of good governance.

References

1. Akhtar Majeed. Federal India: A Design for Good Governance, Manak Publications, New Delhi, 2005.
2. Bardhan Pranab, Mookherjee Dilip. (eds.) Decentralisation and Local Governance in Developing Countries: A Comparative Perspective, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2007.
3. Barthwal CP. Good Governance in India, Deep and Deep Publications, New Delhi, 2003.
4. Behar Amitabh, Kumar Yogesh, Decentralisation in Madhya Pradesh, India: from Panchayat Raj to Gram

5. Swaraj (1995 to 2001)', Working Paper 170, ODI, London, UK, 2002.
5. Behar Amitabh. Madhya Pradesh Gram Swaraj: Experiment in Direct Democracy Economic and Political Weekly, 2001.
6. Blair H. Participation and Accountability at the Periphery: Democratic Local Governance in Six Countries', World development. 2000; 28(1):21-39.
7. Bryce James. Modern Democracy, The Macmillan Company, 1921.
8. Chattopadhyay Raghavendra, Duflo Esther. Impact of Reservation in Panchayati Raj: Evidence from a Nationwide Randomised Experiment, Economic and Political Weekly, 2004.
9. Haq Mahbub ul. Human Development Report, United Nations Development Programme, 1990.
10. Jayal, Niraja Gopal, Prakash, Amit, Sharma Pradeep K. (eds) Local Governance in India: Decentralisation and Beyond, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2006.
11. Jeremy, Bentham An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, Oxford Clarendon Press, 1907.
12. Jha SN, Mathur PC. Decentralisation and Local Politics-Readings in Indian Government and Politics-2, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 1999.
13. Joseph TM. Local Governance in India Ideas: Challenges and Strategies, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 2007.
14. Kothari Rajni. Panchayati Raj: Re Assessment, Economic and Political Weekly. 1961; 13:757.
15. Kuhn, Berthold. Participatory Development in Rural India, Radiant Publishers, New Delhi, 1998.
16. Lieten GK. Development, Devolution and Democracy: Village Discourse in West Bengal, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 1996.
17. Mathew George. (ed.) Status of Panchayati Raj in the States and Union Territories in India, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 2000.
18. Mehata GS. Participation of Women in the Panchayati Raj System, Kanishka Publishers, New Delhi, 2002.
19. Nambiar Malini. Making of Gram Sabha Work, Economic and Political Weekly, 2001.
20. Oommen MA. Devolution of Resources from the State to the Panchayat Raj Institutions-Search for a Normative Approach, ISS Occasional Paper Series-18, Institute of Social Science, New Delhi, 1995.
21. Palanithurai G. Grassroots Democracy in Indian Society, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 2000.
22. Ram G. Political Development and Modernization in Tribal India, Manak Publications, New Delhi, 2001.
23. Rawls, John. A Theory of Justice, The belknap Press, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1971.
24. Sachchidananda. Empowerment of Dalit Through Panchayati Raj: The Bihar Experience, Serials Publication, New Delhi, 2007.
25. Singla Pamela. Women's Participation in Panchayat Raj: Natural and Effectiveness, Rawat Publications, Jaipur, 2007.
26. Sisodia Yatindra Singh. Decentralised Governance in Madhya Pradesh: Experiences of Gram Sabha in Scheduled Areas, Economic and Political Weekly, 2002.
27. Sisodia, Yatindra Singh. Functioning of Panchayat Raj System, Rawat Publications, Jaipur, 2005.

28. Sisodia, Yatindra Singh. Experiment of Direct Democracy: Gram Swaraj in Madhya Pradesh, Rawat Publications, Jaipur, 2007.
29. Sisodia, Yatindra Singh. Implementation of PESA in Scheduled Areas: An Action Research Study on Working of Panchayat Raj in Tribal Regions of Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Gujrat (Study Report of Ministry of Panchayat Raj, Govt. of India), MPISSR, Ujjain, 2008.
30. Sisodia, Yatindra Singh. Dynamics of Local Governance in Post 73rd Amendment Scenario: A Study Functioning of Panchayat Raj Institutions in Villages of Madhya Pradesh (Study Report of Indian Council of Social Science Research, Govt. of India), MPISSR, Ujjain, 2012.
31. UNESCAP. What is Good Governance?, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, 2009.
32. Verma BM. Social Justice and Panchayati Raj, Mittal Publications, New Delhi, 2002.