



ROLE OF DECENTRALIZATION IN GOVERNANCE

* Dr. M.P. SIVAKUMAR., Ph.D.,

** Mr. K.V. SOBAN, ML.,

Guest Lecturers, Government Law College, Dharmapuri.

ABSTRACT

The government (central and state) decentralised by national level governments and their counter parts at the local level. The decentralised they are different model, financial administration, corporate, multifunctional and grass root level of governance and better public services.

Keywords: Decentralization, Governance, Grassroots level, Financial Administration.

Intonation:

Governance refers to all manners of exercising control and authority in the allocation of resources. Governance issues are the closely tied to the processes of mechanisms through which people access resources. All the issues like right to property, society, gender, as well as social capitalistic though which people of all the sources.

The issue of governance liked they are closely tied to the processes and mechanisms through which people access resources. These include issues of property rights, social relationships, and gender, as well as social capital through which people access resources. The country like a term governance from government It might be a geopolitical government (nation-state), a corporate government (business entity), a socio-political government (tribe, family, etc.), or any number of different kinds of government, but governance is the actual exercise of management power and policy, while the government is the instrument (usually collective) that does it.

The concept of good governance is oldest, is like kautilya is write arthashastra elaborately. The king they have well governed by the state, those subject like not happiness, and welfare is consider as not good. Mahatma Gandhi propounded the concept of 'Su-raaj'. Thus, Good governance often refers to the task of running the Government in an effective manner. It is qualitatively and conceptual superior to a mere good government. Further, Good Governance is not a phenomenon that can be easily described in words; it is rather a phenomenon that can be felt by people. Good governance does not depend only on the executive but depends on the efficient functioning of the legislature, executive, judiciary, private institutions, NGOs, as well as the cooperation of the people.

Citizens' participation in a country's decision-making process is not only imperative but very critical to the state's democratic process. Through decentralization, opportunities are created for the people at the grassroots to be part of the governance. Decentralization Includes political, administrative, fiscal, and market governance. Political decentralization allows decisions to be made with greater participation, and better information and thus more relevant to diverse interests of society than those made by centralized planning. Administrative decentralization is the transfer of the planning, financing, and management of public functions from the central government to field units of government agencies, subordinate units of government, semi-autonomous public authorities, corporations, and local bodies. The core of financial crisis is decentralized.

If local governments and private organizations are to carry out decentralized functions effectively, they must have an adequate level of revenue independent of the central administration. In many developing countries local governments possess the authority to impose taxes, but the tax base is so weak that no attempt is made to exercise that authority. Market decentralization allows functions that had been primarily or exclusively the responsibility of government to be carried out by businesses, cooperatives, private voluntary associations, and other non-government organizations. Under appropriate conditions, all these forms of decentralization can play important roles in broadening participation in political, economic, and social activities in developing countries. If they work effectively, decentralization will help alleviate the bottlenecks in decision-making that are often caused by central government planning and will pave the way to effective governance. Simply speaking decentralization is nothing but governance at the door step of the common man.

- ✓ Governed changes reflect to claim political incentives for credit and avoid blame.
- ✓ Credit-claiming and blame-shifting help explain policy-making that deviated from scientific advice.

Centralizing and decentralizing:

Centralization in government has two dimensions of importance: within and between government. Centralization within government means an increase in the power of the core executive- the head of government and their officials, and in some cases the finance minister or other key generalist central ministries whose task is allocation of priority and money¹. The easiest indicator is usually the extent to which the head of government took charge of communications and decision-making, typically through some combination of ad hoc committees and emergency legislation².

Centralization between governments means an increase in the power of the central government vis-a-vis other "sub-national" governments such as regions, states, provinces, or local governments. "Command and control" is a common recommendation in public health emergencies³ and central governments do often take powers over or away from sub-national governments in

crises. This is most politically contentious in federal states such as Spain, Canada, or Germany, but can happen even in countries where there is a history of only local government (such as Ireland, Portugal, or the Nordic states).

The governments may use their additional power to impose policies on regions is like Local Governments. For example, the central government may set legally binding criteria for introducing lockdown measures based on the incidence or hospital occupation rates. Regional and local governments would still over a implementation. The central government might empower itself to directly give orders to organizations such as police or hospitals that are normally overseen by sub-national governments.

Centralization of power may not always yield the expected results and often may be nominal rather than substantial. It may turn out that an ambitious government or prime minister lacks the political influence, legal authority, resources, or an adequate strategy to actually centralize and hold power. In general, it makes methodological sense to treat centralization as an intention to claim authority; its empirical success should be studied as a separate problem since it is easier to claim authority than to grasp and wield it.

The Nature of Political Competition:

If decentralized governance is improve by democratic proponents claim by chain and must involve competition. Decentralization might reenter (some) competitive political discourse on local - as opposed to national - concerns, or increase levels of political entrepreneurship or heterogeneity by lowering the costs of entry or provoke changes in the internal characteristics of political parties. Any one of these could lead to improvement or degradation in governance outcomes. In present decades forefront in political competition is decentralized

First, it creates new opportunities for independently elected politicians to demonstrate their abilities to govern. The possibility that successful local officials will advance to higher levels of power in a federal system increases the elasticity of political demand for politicians at each level below the top, and thus increases their competitive incentives to offer better public services. The principle of democratic advancement also increases sub-national politicians' efforts to win popular support, which strengthens their party competitively in national elections. But this transmission path works in both directions. Thus national party sponsorship of local challengers can raise competition in local elections, and so improve the quality of local policy-making.

Public Accountability and Corruption:

The question of public accountability has been treated far more extensively in the decentralization literature than in political competition. The theory of decentralization and public accountability goes back to Mill 1895, Montesquieu 1748, Rousseau 1762, and Tocqueville 1835, who debated the optimal size and conformation of political units that served the interests of their citizens. The modern treatment of this question is perhaps best represented by the widely cited

Wallis and Oates (1988), who argue decentralized the government is responsibility to needs tailoring level of consumption is preferences for smaller, more homogeneous groups”.

Fiscal Sustainability:

The connection between decentralization and fiscal sustainability is well researched in the literature. Theoretical findings are mostly pessimistic. The country is like to face intrinsic problem of budget because local politician have strong incentives to overspend and reap the benefits themselves while nationalizing the cost of their behavior through central bailouts. Such behavior is underpinned by the knowledge that at least some of the blame for a local government default, with attendant reductions in public services, investment, and employment, would attach to central government politicians for two reasons: (a) many such services are jointly financed and voters may not clearly distinguish amongst responsible parties, and (b) the center could have averted a default by bailing out the insolvent municipality. Meanwhile, the central government faces a commitment problem: any promise not to bail out in the future is not credible precisely because voters will punish it. All local governments know this, and hence all have incentives to overspend today in the hope of being bailed out (Prud'homme 1995, Rodden 2006, Rodden et al. 2003, and Tanzi 1995). In the aggregate, such behavior can lead to large national deficits, and hence macroeconomic instability.

Conclusion:

These factors are mainly associated with the environment in which relations between individuals and the state take place. Political institutions, by determining this environment, are extremely important in determining the incidence of corruption. Ultimately, the political macrostructure related to the political system, balance of powers, electoral competitiveness, and so on determines the incentives for those in office to be honest, and to police and punish the misbehavior of others, such that the effects are propagated throughout the system to the lower levels of government.

References

1. Lodge, K. Wegrich, Introduction: executive politics in times of crisis *Executive Politics in Times of Crisis*, Springer (2012), pp. 1-15,
2. DM. Fox, Toward a public health politics of consequence: An autobiographical reflection *am J Public Health*, 107 (2017), p. 1604
3. World Health Organization. The world health report, Health systems: improving performance. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2000.
4. Avanish kumar & Vishal narain , Public Policy and Governance in India : The Journal of Business Perspective -January 2015, Vision, 18, 4 (2014): 257-260
5. ciet.nic.in