

3

Federalism

Politics in Action: Conflict Between Levels of Government



The Controlled Substances Act of 1970 prohibits the possession, use, or sale of marijuana. In 1996, California voters passed the Compassionate Use Act, legalizing the medical use of marijuana with a doctor's prescription. Since 1996 more than 750,000 Californians have obtained a physician's recommendation for marijuana. Seventeen other states and Washington, D.C., have followed California's lead in legalizing medical marijuana. National and state laws are clearly in conflict.

In California there emerged a thriving industry of marijuana growers and storefront dispensaries that paid substantial sums in state and local taxes but that national drug officials saw as largely illegal. Operating under the principle that national law preempts state law, the Drug Enforcement Agency routinely arrested medical marijuana patients and seized the business assets of growers and dispensaries. The Internal Revenue Service also began a crackdown, denying some sellers the right to deduct marijuana-related business expenses.

Medical marijuana users argued the national law exceeded the power granted to Congress by the Constitution to regulate interstate commerce, because the marijuana they used was grown, transported, and consumed entirely within the state in which they lived and thus did not implicate interstate commerce. In *Gonzales v. Raich* (2005), however, the U.S. Supreme Court disagreed. It ruled that under the Constitution's commerce clause, Congress may criminalize the production and use of marijuana even if these occur within states that have approved its use for medicinal purposes. Marijuana grown for medical purposes is indistinguishable from illicit marijuana, the Court reasoned, and local use affected supply and demand in the national marijuana market, making the regulation of within-state use essential to regulating the drug's national market.

National prosecutors and drug agents say that hiding behind the mask of meeting medical needs, much of California's burgeoning marijuana industry is engaged in large-scale illegal sales. Although the Department of Justice has issued guidelines making it a low priority to prosecute patients with serious illnesses or their caregivers who are complying with state laws on medical

3.1

Define federalism and contrast it with alternative ways of organizing a nation, p. 75.

3.2

Outline the constitutional basis for the division of power between national and state governments, the establishment of national supremacy, and states' obligations to each other, p. 77.

3.3

Characterize the shift from dual to cooperative federalism and the role of fiscal federalism in intergovernmental relations today, p. 84.

3.4

Explain the consequences of federalism for diversity in public policies among the states, p. 94.

3.5

Assess the impact of federalism on democratic government and the scope of government, p. 95.



Federalism can put the national and state governments in conflict. Here a California man compares the aroma of various varieties of marijuana on the final day of business of a medical marijuana dispensary, legal in California but put out of business by the national government.



1 **The Big Picture** Decide how much influence you think the federal government should have. Author George C. Edwards III demonstrates how the power of the federal government has grown considerably since the United States was founded, and he explains why that growth has created a lot of tension between the federal government and the states.



The Basics Are you a states-right advocate? This video will help you understand how powers and responsibilities are divided between the national and state governments. You'll also discover how the powers of the national government have expanded and consider whether this is in the best interests of the people.



3 **In Context** What is the primary mechanism for federalism in the United States? In this video, Barnard College political scientist Scott L. Minkoff explains how the national government tries to force state governments to adopt its policies and how state governments respond.



Thinking Like a Political Scientist Find answers to the most current questions that scholars of federalism are raising in the areas of welfare reform and state rights. Barnard College political scientist Scott L. Minkoff explores the challenges faced by state-rights advocates once they are elected to Congress.



5 **In the Real World** Should the federal government be allowed to mandate health care reform or should that power belong to the states? Hear supporters and detractors of Obamacare explain their opinions, and learn about the recent Supreme Court decision that handed this power to the federal government.



So What? If a gay couple gets married in one state, and then moves to a state that does not recognize gay marriage, are they still married? In this video, author George C. Edwards III explains how federalism can help us understand questions like this, and why they are going to be increasingly important in the future.



marijuana, it is nonetheless cracking down on growers and on dispensaries and their landlords. State and national laws remain in conflict, creating ongoing issues and illustrating the importance of understanding American federalism, the complex relationships between different levels of government in the United States.

In exploring American federalism, we will be especially attentive to our themes of democracy and the scope of government. Does federalism, the vertical division of power, enhance democracy in the United States? Does the additional layer of policymakers at the state level make government more responsive to public opinion or merely more complicated? Does it enhance the prospects that a majority of Americans will have their way in public policy? And what are the implications of federalism for the scope of the national government's activities? Why has the national government grown so much relative to state governments, and has this growth been at the expense of the states?

federalism

A way of organizing a nation so that two or more levels of government have formal authority over the same land and people. It is a system of shared power between units of government.

unitary governments

A way of organizing a nation so that all power resides in the central government. Most national governments today are unitary governments.

Defining Federalism

3.1 Define federalism and contrast it with alternative ways of organizing a nation.

Federalism is a way of organizing a nation so that two or more levels of government have formal authority over the same area and people. It is a system of shared power between units of government. For example, the state of California has formal authority over its inhabitants, but the national government (often referred to as the *federal* government) can also pass laws and establish policies that affect Californians. We are subject to the formal authority of both state and national governments.

Although federalism is not unique to the United States, it is not a common method of governing. Only 11 of the 190 or so nations of the world have federal systems, and these countries—including, for example, Germany, Mexico, Argentina, Canada, Australia, and India—share little else as a group (see “America in Perspective: Why Federalism?”).

Most nations instead have **unitary governments**, in which all power resides in the central government. If the French Assembly, for instance, wants to redraw the boundaries of local governments or change their forms of government, it can (and has). In contrast, if the U.S. Congress wants to, say, abolish Alabama or redraw its boundary with Georgia, it cannot.

American states are unitary governments with respect to their local governments. That is, local governments receive their authority from the states, which can create or abolish local governments and can make rules for them, telling them what their speed limits will be, how they will be organized, how they can tax people, on what they can spend money, and so forth. States, in contrast, receive their authority not from the national government but *directly* from the Constitution.

There is a third form of governmental structure, a *confederation*. The United States began as a confederation under the Articles of Confederation. In a confederation, the national government is weak, and most or all power is in the hands of the country's components—for example, the individual states. Today, confederations are rare and mainly take the form of international organizations such as the United Nations. Table 3.1 summarizes the authority relations in the three systems of government.

TABLE 3.1 AUTHORITY RELATIONS IN THREE SYSTEMS OF GOVERNMENT

	Unitary	Confederate	Federal
Central government	Holds primary authority Regulates activities of states	Limited powers to coordinate state activities	Shares power with states
State government	Few or no powers Duties regulated by central government	Sovereign Allocates some duties to central government	Shares power with central government
Citizens	Vote for central government officials	Vote for state government officials	Vote for both state and central government officials

3.1
3.2
3.3
3.4
3.5

3.1

intergovernmental relations

The workings of the federal system—the entire set of interactions among national, state, and local governments, including regulations, transfers of funds, and the sharing of information.

3.2

3.3

3.4

3.5

The workings of the federal system are sometimes called **intergovernmental relations**. This term refers to the entire set of interactions among national, state, and local governments, including regulations, the transfers of funds, and the sharing of information.

America in Perspective

Why Federalism?

Only 11 countries, shown in the following table, have federal systems. All three North American nations have federal systems, but the trend does not continue in South America, where only two nations have federal systems.

Countries large in size—such as Canada and Australia—or large in both size and population—such as India, the United States, Brazil, and Mexico—tend to have federal systems, which decentralize the administration of governmental services. Nevertheless, China and Indonesia—two large and populous countries—have unitary governments, and tiny Malaysia and Switzerland have federal systems.

A nation's diversity may also play a role in the development of a federal system. Brazil, Canada, India, Malaysia, Switzerland, and the United States have large minority ethnic groups, often distinct in language and religion. Many nations with unitary systems, however, ranging from Belgium to most African countries, are also replete with ethnic diversity.

Most federal systems are democracies, although most democracies are not federal systems. Authoritarian regimes generally do not wish to disperse power away from the central government. However, both the former Soviet Union and the former Yugoslavia, perhaps reflecting the extraordinary diversity of their populations, had federal systems—of a sort: in both countries, the central government retained ultimate power. As democracy swept through these countries, their national governments dissolved, and multiple smaller nations were formed.

CRITICAL THINKING QUESTIONS

1. Why might a federal system be useful for a country with a large area or population or for a country with large ethnic minority groups?
2. How might the United States be different if it had a unitary system rather than a federal system?

Nation	Population	Area (Thousands Square Miles)	Diversity (Ethnic, Linguistic, and Religious)
Argentina	42,192,494	1,068	Low
Australia	22,015,576	2,968	Low
Austria	8,219,743	32	Low
Brazil	205,716,890	3,286	Medium
Canada	34,300,083	3,852	High
Germany	81,305,856	138	Low
India	1,205,073,612	1,269	High
Malaysia	29,179,952	127	High
Mexico	114,975,406	762	Low
Switzerland	7,655,628	16	Medium
United States	313,847,465	3,718	Medium

SOURCE: Central Intelligence Agency, *The World Factbook*, 2012.

The Constitutional Basis of Federalism

3.2

Outline the constitutional basis for the division of power between national and state governments, the establishment of national supremacy, and states' obligations to each other.



The word *federalism* does not occur in the Constitution, and not much was said about federalism at the Constitutional Convention. Eighteenth-century Americans had little experience in thinking of themselves as Americans first and state citizens second. In fact, loyalty to state governments was so strong that the Constitution would have been resoundingly defeated had it tried to abolish them. In addition, a central government, working alone, would have had difficulty trying to govern eighteenth-century Americans. The people were too widely dispersed and the country's transportation and communication systems too primitive to allow governing from a central location. There was no other practical choice in 1787 but to create a federal system of government.



Explore on **MyPoliSciLab**
Simulation: You Are a
Federal Judge

□ The Division of Power

Although they favored a stronger national government, the Framers still made states vital components in the machinery of government. Indeed, as a result of the necessity of relying on the states, the Constitution does not carefully define the powers of state governments. In general, states have responsibility for a wide range of policies and may largely organize themselves and their local governments as they wish. In addition, the Constitution made states responsible for both state and national elections—an important power—and it also gave the states the power to ratify constitutional amendments.

The Constitution guaranteed states equal representation in the Senate (and even made this provision unamendable, in Article V). Furthermore, the Constitution virtually guaranteed the continuation of each state; Congress is forbidden to create new states by chopping up old ones, unless a state's legislature approves (an unlikely event). Congress is also forbidden to tax articles exported from one state to another.

The Constitution also created obligations of the national government toward the states. For example, the national government is to protect states against violence and invasion.

The Constitution is more specific about the powers states do *not* have than about those they possess. As you can see in Table 3.2, limits on the states focus on foreign policy, economic matters, and basic rights, including voting rights. The limitations related to basic rights are the results of constitutional amendments and also restrict the national government.

TABLE 3.2 SOME POWERS DENIED STATES BY THE CONSTITUTION

Economic	Individual Rights	Foreign Affairs
Tax imports or exports	Grant titles of nobility	Enter into treaties
Coin money or issue paper money	Pass bills of attainder	Declare war
Impair obligations of contract	Pass ex post facto laws	
	Permit slavery	
	Abridge citizens' privileges or immunities	
	Deny due process of law	
	Raise or maintain military forces	
	Deny equal protection of law	
	Impose poll taxes	
	Deny right to vote because of race, gender, or age	

3.1

supremacy clause

The clause in Article VI of the Constitution that makes the Constitution, national laws, and treaties supreme over state laws as long as the national government is acting within its constitutional limits.

3.2

3.3

3.4

3.5

Why It Matters to You

Protecting Rights

State constitutions guarantee many basic rights. However, few Americans would feel comfortable with only state protections for their liberties. The Bill of Rights in the U.S. Constitution is the ultimate legal defense of freedom.

The states and the national government have overlapping responsibilities for important matters, such as establishing courts, maintaining law and order, protecting citizens' health and safety, and regulating financial institutions. Both levels of government can raise revenues through taxes, borrow money, and spend for the general welfare of their citizens. They may even take private property for public purposes, with just compensation to the owners.

□ National Supremacy

Divided government power and responsibilities and overlapping powers inevitably lead to disputes between levels of government. In the past, people debated whether the states or the national government should regulate the railroads, pass child labor laws, or adopt minimum-wage legislation. Today, people debate whether the states or the national government should regulate abortions, set standards for public schools, determine speed limits on highways, protect the environment, or provide health care for the poor. Many of our policy debates are debates about federalism.

When the national government places prohibitions or requirements on the states—whether through acts of Congress or agency regulations—inevitably issues arise for the courts to decide. In a dispute between the states and the national government, which prevails? The second paragraph of Article VI of the Constitution, often referred to as the **supremacy clause**, provides the answer. It states that the following three items are the supreme law of the land:

1. The Constitution
2. Laws of the national government (when consistent with the Constitution)
3. Treaties (which can be made only by the national government)

Judges in every state are specifically directed to obey the Constitution, even if their state constitutions or state laws directly contradict it. All state executives, legislators, and judges are bound by oath to support the Constitution.

Occasionally, issues arise in which states challenge the authority of the national government. Several states have challenged federal education regulations resulting from the 2002 No Child Left Behind Act. Some states began a challenge of the requirement that every American purchase health insurance even before the 2010 health care reform bill passed Congress. In such cases, the federal government usually wins.

Over the years, the federal government has gained power relative to the states. The Civil War and the struggle for racial equality were key events in settling the issue of how national and state powers are related. Equally important were the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Tenth and Eleventh Amendments, implied powers, and the commerce clause.

THE CIVIL WAR We typically think of the Civil War (1861–1865) as mainly a struggle over slavery, but it was also a struggle between states and the national government. (In fact, Abraham Lincoln announced in his 1861 inaugural address that he would support a constitutional amendment guaranteeing slavery if it would save the



In 1963, Alabama Governor George Wallace made a dramatic stand at the University of Alabama to resist integration of the all-white school. Federal marshals won this confrontation, and since then the federal government in general has been able to impose national standards of equal opportunity on the states.

Union.) As a result of this struggle, the national government asserted its power over the Southern states' claim of sovereignty.

THE STRUGGLE FOR RACIAL EQUALITY A century later, conflict between the states and the national government again erupted over states' rights and national power. In 1954, in *Brown v. Board of Education*, the Supreme Court held that school segregation was unconstitutional. Southern politicians responded with what they called "massive resistance" to the decision. When a federal judge ordered the admission of two African American students to the University of Alabama in 1963, Governor George Wallace literally blocked the school entrance to prevent federal marshals and the students from entering the admissions office; the students were nonetheless admitted. And throughout the 1960s the federal government enacted laws and policies to end segregation in schools, housing, public accommodations, voting, and jobs. The conflict between states and the national government over equality issues was decided in favor of the national government. National standards of racial equality prevailed.

THE TENTH AMENDMENT Although supreme, the national government can operate only within its appropriate sphere. It cannot usurp the states' powers. But what are the boundaries of the national government's powers?

According to some commentators, the **Tenth Amendment** provides part of the answer. It states that the "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people." To those advocating *states' rights*, the amendment clearly means that the national government has only those powers that the Constitution specifically assigned to it. The states or people have supreme power over any activity not mentioned there. Despite this interpretation, in 1941 the Supreme Court (in *United States v. Darby*) called the Tenth Amendment a constitutional truism—that is, a mere assertion that the states have independent powers of their own, and not a declaration that state powers are superior to those of the national government.

The Court seemed to backtrack on this ruling in a 1976 case, *National League of Cities v. Usery*, in which it held that extending national minimum-wage and maximum-hours standards to employees of state and local governments was an unconstitutional intrusion of the national government into the domain of the states. In 1985, however, in *Garcia v. San Antonio Metro*, the Court overturned the *National League of Cities* decision. The Court held, in essence, that it was up to Congress to decide which actions of the states should be regulated by the national government. Thus, once again, the Court ruled that the Tenth Amendment did not give states

Tenth Amendment

The constitutional amendment stating, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people."

3.1

3.2

3.3

3.4

3.5

3.1

McCulloch v. Maryland

An 1819 Supreme Court decision that established the supremacy of the national government over state governments. The Court, led by Chief Justice John Marshall, held that Congress had certain implied powers in addition to the powers enumerated in the Constitution.

3.2

3.3

3.4

3.5

power superior to that of the national government for activities not mentioned in the Constitution. Nevertheless, in *Bond v. United States* (2011), the Court held that a person indicted under a federal statute may challenge the statute on the Tenth Amendment grounds that, in enacting the statute, the federal government invaded state powers under the Constitution.

THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT A far more specific constraint on the power of the national government over the states is that established by the Eleventh Amendment. Federal courts can order states to obey the Constitution or federal laws and treaties.¹ However, in deference to the states, the Eleventh Amendment prohibits federal courts, state courts,² or federal administrative agencies from hearing cases in which a private party names a state as a defendant or seeks monetary relief from a state officer in his or her official capacity (such as a suit against a police officer for violating one's rights) unless the state gives its consent. For example, the Supreme Court voided a provision of the Americans with Disabilities Act that allowed citizens to sue states for damages because it violated state immunity as established by the Eleventh Amendment.³

However, there are limits to state immunity. Federal courts have the jurisdiction to hear cases in which a private party names a state officer in his or her official capacity as a defendant and may grant injunctive relief (that is, to require the officer to do or refrain from doing certain acts). Courts permit such cases to protect the supremacy of the Constitution in protecting basic rights. Cases arising under the Fourteenth Amendment (usually cases regarding racial discrimination) are also an exception to state immunity,⁴ and Congress may deny state immunity from suits regarding bankruptcy cases.⁵ Moreover, in contrast to private parties, the federal government and other states may bring suits against a state in federal court. In 2011, the Court held that it was permissible for an independent state agency to sue that state in federal court to enforce federal law.⁶

The Supreme Court has also made it easier for citizens to control the behavior of local officials. The Court ruled that a federal law passed in 1871 to protect newly freed slaves permits individuals to sue local governments for damages or seek injunctions against any local official acting in an official capacity who they believe has deprived them of any right secured by the Constitution or by federal law.⁷ Such suits are now common in the federal courts.

IMPLIED POWERS As early as 1819, the issue of state versus national power came before the Supreme Court. The case that landed it there was *McCulloch v. Maryland*, involving the Second Bank of the United States.

The new American government had moved quickly on many economic policies. In 1791, it had created a national bank, a government agency empowered to print money, make loans, and engage in many other banking tasks. A darling of Alexander Hamilton and his allies, the bank had numerous opponents—including Thomas Jefferson, farmers, and state legislatures—who were against strengthening the national government's control of the economy and who saw the bank as an instrument of the elite. Congress allowed the First Bank of the United States to expire. However, during James Madison's presidency it created the Second Bank, refueling a great national debate.

Railing against the "Monster Bank," the state of Maryland passed a law in 1818 taxing the national bank's Baltimore branch \$15,000 a year. The Baltimore branch refused to pay, whereupon the state of Maryland sued the cashier, James McCulloch, for payment. When the state courts upheld Maryland's law and its tax, the bank appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. John Marshall was chief justice, and two of the country's most capable lawyers argued the case before the Court. Daniel Webster, widely regarded as one of the greatest senators in U.S. history, argued for the national bank, and Luther Martin, a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, argued for Maryland.

Martin maintained that the Constitution was very clear about the powers of Congress (outlined in its Article I). The power to create a national bank was not among them. Thus, Martin concluded, Congress had exceeded its powers, and Maryland had

a right to tax the bank. On behalf of the bank, Webster argued for a broader interpretation of the powers of the national government. The Constitution was not meant to stifle congressional powers, he said, but rather to permit Congress to use all means “necessary and proper” to fulfill its responsibilities.

In their decision, Marshall and his colleagues set forth two great constitutional principles. The first was the *supremacy of the national government over the states*. Marshall wrote, “the government of the United States, though limited in its power, is supreme within its sphere of action.” As long as the national government behaved in accordance with the Constitution, its policies took precedence over state policies, as the Constitution’s supremacy clause said. Because of this principle, federal laws or regulations—civil rights acts, rules regulating hazardous substances, water quality, and clean-air standards, and so on—*preempt* state or local laws or regulations and thus preclude their enforcement.

For example, in *Arizona et al. v. United States* (2012) the Court held that federal law preempted the state of Arizona from making it a crime for immigrants to fail to register under a federal law, or for illegal immigrants to work or to try find work, and preempted it from allowing police to arrest people without warrants if they had probable cause to believe that they had done things that would make them deportable under federal law. However, the Court did uphold the state requirement that state law enforcement officials determine the immigration status of anyone they stop or arrest if there is reason to suspect that the individual might be an illegal immigrant.

The other key principle of *McCulloch* was that *the national government has certain implied powers that go beyond its enumerated powers*. The Court held that Congress was behaving consistently with the Constitution when it created the national bank. Congress had certain **enumerated powers**, powers *specifically* listed in Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution. These included coining money and regulating its value, imposing taxes, and so forth. The Constitution did not enumerate creating a bank, but Article I, Section 8, concluded by stating that Congress has the power to “make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.” That, said Marshall, gave Congress certain **implied powers**. It could make economic policy consistent with the Constitution, including establishing a national bank.

Commentators often refer to the “necessary and proper” clause of the Constitution as the **elastic clause**. Hundreds of congressional policies, especially in the economic

enumerated powers

Powers of the federal government that are specifically addressed in the Constitution; for Congress, including the powers listed in Article I, Section 8, for example, to coin money and regulate its value and impose taxes.

implied powers

Powers of the federal government that go beyond those enumerated in the Constitution, in accordance with the statement in the Constitution that Congress has the power to “make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution” the powers enumerated in Article I.

elastic clause

The final paragraph of Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution, which authorizes Congress to pass all laws “necessary and proper” to carry out the enumerated powers.

3.1

3.2

3.3

3.4

3.5



The supremacy clause allows the national government to preempt state laws if it is acting within its legal sphere. Immigration policy is one example. Here, undocumented immigrants are being repatriated to their home country.

3.1

Gibbons v. Ogden

A landmark case decided in 1824 in which the Supreme Court interpreted very broadly the clause in Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution giving Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce as encompassing virtually every form of commercial activity.

3.2

3.3

3.4

3.5

domain, involve powers not specifically mentioned in the Constitution. Federal policies to regulate food and drugs, build interstate highways, protect consumers, clean up dirty air and water, and do many other things are all justified as implied powers of Congress.

COMMERCE POWER The Constitution gives Congress the power to regulate interstate and international commerce. American courts have spent many years trying to define “commerce.” In 1824, the Supreme Court, in deciding the case of *Gibbons v. Ogden*, defined commerce very broadly to encompass virtually every form of commercial activity. Today, commerce covers not only the movement of goods, but also radio signals, electricity, telephone messages, the Internet, insurance transactions, and much more.

The Supreme Court’s decisions establishing the national government’s implied powers (*McCulloch v. Maryland*) and a broad definition of interstate commerce (*Gibbons v. Ogden*) established the power of Congress to *promote economic development* through subsidies and services for business interests. In the latter part of the nineteenth century, however, Congress sought in addition to use its interstate commerce power to *regulate the economy*, for example, by requiring safer working conditions for laborers or protecting children from working long hours. The Court then ruled that the interstate commerce power did not give Congress the right to regulate local commercial activities.

The Great Depression placed new demands on the national government, and beginning in 1933, the New Deal of President Franklin D. Roosevelt produced an avalanche of regulatory and social welfare legislation. Although initially the Supreme Court voided much of this legislation, after 1937 the Court began to loosen restrictions on the national government’s regulation of commerce. In 1964, when Congress prohibited racial discrimination in places of public accommodation such as restaurants, hotels, and movie theaters, it did so on the basis of its power to regulate interstate commerce. Thus, regulating commerce became one of the national government’s most important sources of power.

Why It Matters to You

Commerce Power

The power to regulate interstate commerce is a critical one. Without it, Congress could not pass policies ranging from protecting the environment and civil rights to providing health care for the elderly and less fortunate.

In recent years, the Supreme Court has scrutinized some uses of the commerce power with a skeptical eye, however. In 1995, the Court held in *United States v. Lopez* that the federal Gun-Free School Zones Act of 1990, which forbade the possession of firearms in public schools, exceeded Congress’s constitutional authority to regulate commerce. Guns in a school zone, the majority said, have nothing to do with commerce. Similarly, in 2000, the Court ruled in *United States v. Morrison* that the power to regulate interstate commerce did not give Congress the authority to enact the 1994 Violence Against Women Act, which provided a federal civil remedy for the victims of gender-motivated violence. Gender-motivated crimes of violence are not, the Court said, in any sense economic activity.

Several other recent cases have had important implications for federalism. In *Printz v. United States* (1997) and *Mack v. United States* (1997), the Supreme Court voided the congressional mandate in the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act that the chief law enforcement officer in each local community conduct background checks on prospective gun purchasers. According to the Court, “The federal government may neither issue directives requiring the states to address particular problems, nor commend the states’ officers, or those of their political subdivision, to administer or enforce a federal regulatory program.”

In 2012, the Supreme Court heard challenges to the health care reform act that Congress passed in 2010. Critics contended that the mandate that everyone purchase health insurance exceeded the reach of the commerce clause and was thus unconstitutional. The Supreme Court held that the mandate exceeded Congress's power under the commerce clause but nevertheless upheld the mandate on the basis of the tax power.⁸

▣ States' Obligations to Each Other

Federalism involves more than relationships between the national government and state and local governments. The states must deal with each other as well, and the Constitution outlines certain obligations that each state has to every other state.

FULL FAITH AND CREDIT Suppose that, like millions of other Americans, a person divorces and then remarries. This person purchases a marriage license, which registers the marriage with a state. On the honeymoon, the person travels across the country. Is this person married in each state he or she passes through, even though the marriage license is with only one state? Can the person be arrested for bigamy because the divorce occurred in only one state?

The answer, of course, is that a marriage license and a divorce, like a driver's license and a birth certificate, are valid in all states. Article IV of the Constitution requires that states give **full faith and credit** to the public acts, records, and civil judicial proceedings of every other state. This reciprocity is essential to the functioning of society and the economy. Without the full faith and credit clause, people could avoid their obligations, say, to make payments on automobile loans simply by crossing a state boundary. In addition, because courts can enforce contracts between business firms across state boundaries, firms incorporated in one state can do business in another.

Usually, the full faith and credit provision in the Constitution poses little controversy. An exception occurred in 1996, when courts in Hawaii recognized same-sex marriages. What would happen in other states that did not recognize Hawaiian marriages between same-sex partners? Congress answered with the Defense of Marriage Act, which permits states to disregard gay marriages, even if they are legal elsewhere in the United States. Hawaii has since overturned recognition of gay marriage. However, several states have legalized same-sex marriages, while others recognize same-sex "civil unions" or provide domestic partnership benefits to same-sex couples. It remains to be seen whether courts will uphold Congress's power to make exceptions to the full faith and credit clause, but opponents of gay marriage, concerned they might not, have focused on amending the Constitution to allow states not to recognize same-sex marriages.

EXTRADITION What about criminal penalties? Almost all criminal law is state law. If someone robs a store, steals a car, or commits a murder, the chances are that this person is breaking a state, not a federal, law. The Constitution says that states are required to return a person charged with a crime in another state to that state for trial or imprisonment, a practice called **extradition**. Although there is no way to force states to comply, they usually are happy to do so, not wishing to harbor criminals and hoping that other states will reciprocate. Thus, a lawbreaker cannot avoid punishment by simply escaping to another state.

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES The most complicated obligation among the states is the requirement that citizens of each state receive all the **privileges and immunities** of any other state in which they happen to be. The goal of this constitutional provision is to prohibit states from discriminating against citizens of other states. If, for example, a Texan visits California, the Texan will pay the same sales tax and receive the same police protection as residents of California.

There are many exceptions to the privileges and immunities clause, however. Many of you attend public universities. If you reside in the state in which your university is

full faith and credit

A clause in Article IV of the Constitution requiring each state to recognize the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of all other states.

extradition

A legal process whereby a state surrenders a person charged with a crime to the state in which the crime is alleged to have been committed.

privileges and immunities

The provision of the Constitution according citizens of each state the privileges of citizens of other states.



Because of the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution, marriage certificates issued by one state are valid in every state. People are also entitled to most of the benefits—and subject to most of the obligations—of citizenship in any state they visit, thanks to the privileges and immunities clause. Gay marriage is straining these principles, however, as most states refuse to recognize marriages between same-sex partners.

located, you generally pay a tuition substantially lower than that paid by your fellow students from out of state. Similarly, only residents of a state can vote in state elections. States often attempt to pass some of the burdens of financing the state government to those outside the state, for example, through taxes on minerals mined in the state but consumed elsewhere or special taxes on hotel rooms rented by tourists.

The Supreme Court has never clarified just which privileges a state must make available to all Americans and which privileges can be limited to its own citizens. In general, the more fundamental the right—such as owning property or receiving police protection—the less likely it is that a state can discriminate against citizens of another state. Relying on the privileges and immunities clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (which prohibits states from denying the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States), in 1999 the Supreme Court held in *Saenz v. Roe* that California could not require a new resident to wait a year before becoming eligible for welfare benefits that exceeded those available in the state from which the new resident came.

Intergovernmental Relations

3.3

Characterize the shift from dual to cooperative federalism and the role of fiscal federalism in intergovernmental relations today.

Intergovernmental relations today reflect two major changes in American federalism, both related to the shift toward national dominance discussed earlier. The first major change has been a gradual shift in the nature of power sharing between two levels of government.⁹ The second has been the rise of *fiscal federalism*, an elaborate assortment of federal grants-in-aid to the states and localities.

□ From Dual to Cooperative Federalism

One way to understand the changes in American federalism is to contrast two types of federalism. Dual and cooperative federalism are two different ways of dividing power and responsibility.

In **dual federalism**, the national government and the states remain supreme within their own spheres. The national government is responsible for some policies, the states for others. For example, the national government has exclusive control over foreign and military policy, the postal system, and monetary policy. States have exclusive control over schools, law enforcement, and road building. In dual federalism, then, the powers and policy assignments of the two layers of government are distinct, as in a layer cake. Proponents of dual federalism generally believe that the powers of the national government should be interpreted narrowly.

In **cooperative federalism**, the national government and the states share powers and policy assignments.¹⁰ Instead of a layer cake, this type of federalism is more like a marble cake, with mingled responsibilities and blurred distinctions between the levels of government. Thus, for example, after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, the national government asked state and local governments to investigate suspected terrorists, and both national and state public health officials dealt with the threat caused by anthrax in the mail in Florida, New York, and Washington, D.C.

Initially, before the national government began to assert its dominance, the American federal system leaned toward dual federalism. However, most politicians and political scientists today would be more likely to describe the current system as one of cooperative federalism.

Although American federalism has moved from dual to cooperative federalism, even in the beginning it was not characterized by a neat separation into purely state and purely national responsibilities. A look at the area of education, which is usually thought of as being mainly a state and local responsibility, illustrates this point and also shows the movement toward cooperative federalism.

Even under the Articles of Confederation, Congress set aside land in the Northwest Territory to be used for schools. During the Civil War, the national government adopted a policy to create land grant colleges. Important American universities such as Wisconsin, Texas A&M, Illinois, Ohio State, North Carolina State, and Iowa State owe their origins to this national policy. (To learn more about how federalism affects college education, see “Young People and Politics: Federal Support for Colleges and Universities.”)

In the 1950s and 1960s, the national government began supporting public elementary and secondary education. In 1958, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act, largely in response to Soviet success in the space race. The act provided federal grants and loans for college students as well as financial support for elementary and secondary education in science and foreign languages. In 1965, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provided federal aid to numerous schools. Although these policies expanded the national government’s role in education, they were not a sharp break with the past.

Today, the federal government’s presence is felt in every schoolhouse. Almost all school districts receive some federal assistance. To do so, they must comply with federal rules and regulations; for example, they must maintain desegregated and nondiscriminatory programs. The No Child Left Behind Act established standards of performance along with sanctions, including loss of federal aid, for failing to meet the standards. In addition, federal courts have ordered local schools to implement elaborate desegregation plans and have placed constraints on school prayers.

Highways are another example of the movement toward cooperative federalism. In an earlier era, states and cities were largely responsible for building roads, although the Constitution does authorize Congress to construct “post roads.” In 1956, Congress initiated the building of the interstate highway system, a joint federal–state project, and specified the cost and sharing of funds. In this and many other areas, the federal system has promoted a partnership between the national and state governments.

dual federalism

A system of government in which both the states and the national government remain supreme within their own spheres, each responsible for some policies.

cooperative federalism

A system of government in which powers and policy assignments are shared between states and the national government.

3.1
3.2
3.3
3.4
3.5

Young People & Politics

Federal Support for Colleges and Universities

Because most colleges and universities are public institutions created by state and local governments, federalism has direct consequences for the students who attend them. State and local governments provide most of the funding for public colleges and universities, but almost everyone agrees that this funding is inadequate. In response to this problem, the national government has stepped in to support postsecondary education programs.

One could argue that the federal government makes it possible for many students to attend college at all because it is the primary source of financial aid. The federal government provides about \$155 billion in financial assistance (including grants, loans, and work-study assistance) to about 36 million postsecondary students each year. Nearly two-thirds of all full-time undergraduates receive some form of financial aid from the federal government.

The federal government also provides several billion dollars of direct grants to colleges and universities across the nation. Billions more in federal funds support research and training in certain areas, especially science and engineering—which receive about \$30 billion a year. The library,

laboratories, and the buildings in most colleges and universities have received funds from the federal government.

Each year the federal government provides about 16 percent of the revenue for public universities and 30 percent for private, not-for-profit colleges and universities. Few colleges and universities could withstand a 16 or 30 percent budget cut and the loss of most of the financial assistance for their students. Federalism, then, matters quite a lot to college students.

CRITICAL THINKING QUESTIONS

1. Why do state institutions of higher education require aid from the federal government? Why don't the states provide adequate funds to run their own colleges and universities?
2. The federal government is experiencing huge budget deficits. Would it be better to rely completely on state support?

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics*, 2010, Tables 349, 363, 366, 367; U.S. Department of Commerce, *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2012* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2012), Table 291.

The principal basis for cooperative federalism is shared programs such as education and transportation that are mainly state responsibilities. For hundreds of programs, cooperative federalism involves the following:

- **Shared costs.** Cities and states can receive federal money for airport construction, sewage treatment plants, youth programs, and many other programs, but only if they pay part of the bill.
- **Federal guidelines.** Most federal grants to states and cities come with strings attached. For example, Congress spends billions of dollars to support state highway construction, but to get their share, states must adopt and enforce limits on the legal drinking age.
- **Shared administration.** State and local officials implement federal policies, but they have administrative powers of their own. The U.S. Department of Labor, for example, gives billions of dollars to states for implementing job training, but states administer the money and have considerable latitude in spending it.

The cooperation between the national government and state governments is such an established feature of American federalism that it persists even when the two levels of government are in conflict on certain matters. For example, officials in a number of states challenged in court the health care bill Congress passed in 2010. Nevertheless, they typically implemented the act and have cooperated well with Washington on other policies.

States are responsible for most public policies dealing with social, family, and moral issues. The Constitution does not give the national government the power to pass laws that *directly* regulate drinking ages, marriage and divorce, or speed limits.



devolution

Transferring responsibility for policies from the federal government to state and local governments.

3.1

3.2

3.3

3.4

3.5

Cooperative federalism began during the Great Depression of the 1930s and continues into the twenty-first century. The federal government provides much of the funding for interstate highways, for example, but also attaches requirements that states must meet.

These policy prerogatives belong to the states. They become national issues, however, when aggrieved or angry groups take their cases to Congress or the federal courts in an attempt to use the power of the national government to *influence* states or to convince federal courts to find a state's policy unconstitutional.

A good example of this process is the federal requirement that states raise their drinking age to 21 in order to receive highway funds. Candy Lightner, a Californian whose 13-year-old daughter was killed by a drunk driver, formed Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) in 1980. After an intense lobbying campaign by MADD, Congress passed a law withholding federal highway funds from any state that did not raise its drinking age to 21. Today, 21 is the legal drinking age in every state.

□ Devolution?

The shift toward greater power and responsibility for the national government has not gone unchallenged. Party goals have played a role in the debate.

For most of the twentieth century, Democrats supported increasing the power of the federal government in order to advance national policies ranging from child labor laws and education to Social Security and health care. Republicans, in contrast, generally opposed these policies and favored states taking responsibility for such issues. They often articulated their opposition to increased federal power in terms of a defense of state authority in a federal system. However, when Republican Ronald Reagan tried to reduce the national government's role in domestic programs and return responsibility to the states, few officials at either the state or national levels agreed with him. Despite their objections, Reagan's opposition to the national government's spending on domestic policies, together with the huge federal deficits of the 1980s, forced a reduction in federal funds for state and local governments.

In the 1994 elections, Republicans captured Congress, the first time in 40 years that they had majorities in both houses. Their rhetoric centered on **devolution**, the transferring of responsibility for policies from the federal government to state and local

3.1

fiscal federalism

The pattern of spending, taxing, and providing grants in the federal system; it is the cornerstone of the national government's relations with state and local governments.

3.2

3.3

categorical grants

Federal grants that can be used only for specific purposes, or "categories," of state and local spending. They come with strings attached, such as nondiscrimination provisions.

3.4

3.5

governments. They followed this rhetoric with action, for example, repealing federal speed limits, allowing states more latitude in dealing with welfare policy, and making it more difficult for state prisoners to seek relief in federal courts.

Soon, however, Republicans became less concerned with abstract principles and more with adopting a pragmatic approach to federalism to accomplish their goals. They found turning to the federal government—and *restricting* state power—the most effective way to achieve a wide range of policy objectives, including loosening economic and environmental regulations, controlling immigration, setting health insurance standards, restricting the expansion of government health care coverage, stiffening penalties for criminals, extending federal criminal penalties, and tracking child-support violators.¹¹

Continuing this more practical approach, during the presidency of George W. Bush, Republicans passed a law removing most class-action lawsuits from state courts. Most significantly, they passed the No Child Left Behind Act, the largest expansion of the federal role in education since Lyndon Johnson's Great Society and a policy that has allowed more federal intrusion into a state domain than almost any other in U.S. history. Many states have complained loudly about the problems and the cost of implementing the legislation.

In this decade, some political leaders, especially those associated with the Tea Party movement, have called not only for a smaller national government in general but also for devolving the principal responsibility for policies such as health care and income security to the states. Most Americans, however, embrace a pragmatic view of governmental responsibilities, seeing the national government as more capable of—and thus responsible for—handling some issues (such as managing the economy, ensuring access to health care and the safety of food and drugs, preserving the environment, and providing income security for the elderly), and state and local governments as better at handling others (such as crime and education).¹² Nevertheless, both levels of government are, of necessity, involved in most policy areas.

□ Fiscal Federalism

As you have already seen, shared program costs are a key element of cooperative federalism. Indeed, the second major change in American federalism has been the rise of **fiscal federalism**, in which *grants-in-aid*, federal funds appropriated by Congress for distribution to state and local governments, serve as an instrument through which the national government both aids and influences states and localities.

Why It Matters to You


Grants-in-Aid

The federal system of grants-in-aid sends revenues from federal taxes to state and local governments. This spending transfers the burden of paying for services from those who pay state and local taxes, such as taxes on sales and property, to those who pay national taxes, especially the federal income tax.

The amount of money spent on federal grants has grown rapidly from the 1960s and especially since the 1990s, as you can see in Figure 3.1. For 2013, federal grants-in-aid (including loan subsidies, such as cases in which the federal government pays the interest on student loans until a student graduates) totals more than \$600 billion. Federal aid, covering a wide range of policy areas, accounts for about one-fourth of all the funds spent by state and local governments and for about 17 percent of all federal government expenditures.¹³

FIGURE 3.1 FISCAL FEDERALISM: FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Federal grants to state and local governments have grown rapidly in recent decades and now amount to more than \$600 billion per year. The sharp increase in grants for 2010 and 2011 was the result of the stimulus package designed to counter the country's financial crisis. The distribution of grants is not static. The percentage of grants devoted to health care, especially Medicaid, has increased substantially, mostly at the expense of income security programs.



SOURCE: Office of Management and Budget, *Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2013: Historical Tables* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2012), Tables 12.1 and 12.2.

THE GRANT SYSTEM There are two major types of federal grants-in-aid for states and localities: *categorical grants* and *block grants*. **Categorical grants** are the main source of federal aid to state and local governments. These grants can be used only for specific purposes, or categories, of state and local spending.

Because direct orders from the federal government to the states are rare (an exception is the Equal Opportunity Act of 1982, which bars job discrimination by state and local governments), most federal regulation is accomplished in a more indirect manner: as you have already seen, Congress attaches conditions to the grants that states receive. Such restrictions on grants have been especially common since the 1970s.

3.1

project grants

Federal **categorical grant** given for specific purposes and awarded on the basis of the merits of applications.

3.2

formula grants

Federal **categorical grants** distributed according to a formula specified in legislation or in administrative regulations.

3.3

block grants

Federal grants given more or less automatically to states or communities to support broad programs in areas such as community development and social services.

3.4

3.5

One string commonly attached to categorical and other federal grants is a nondiscrimination provision, stating that aid may not be used for purposes that discriminate against minorities, women, or other groups. Another string, a favorite of labor unions, is that federal funds may not support construction projects that pay below the local union wage. Other restrictions may require an environmental impact statement for a federally supported construction project or provisions for community involvement in the planning of the project.

The federal government may also employ *crossover sanctions*—using federal dollars in one program to influence state and local policy in another. Crossover sanctions are being applied when, for example, funds for highway construction are withheld unless states raise the drinking age to 21 or establish highway beautification programs.

Crosscutting requirements occur when a condition on one federal grant is extended to all activities supported by federal funds, regardless of their source. The grandfather of these requirements is Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which bars discrimination in the use of federal funds because of race, color, national origin, gender, or physical disability. For example, if a university discriminates illegally in one program—such as athletics—it may lose the federal aid it receives for all its programs. There are also crosscutting requirements dealing with environmental protection, historic preservation, contract wage rates, access to government information, the care of experimental animals, the treatment of human subjects in research projects, and a host of other policies.

Categorical grants are of two types:

- **Project grants**, the more common type, are awarded on the basis of competitive applications. National Science Foundation grants obtained by university professors are an example.
- **Formula grants**, as their name implies, are distributed according to a formula. These formulas vary from grant to grant and may be computed on the basis of population, per capita income, percentage of rural population, or some other factor. A state or local government does not apply for a formula grant; the grant's formula determines how much money the particular government will receive. Vigorous political battles are fought in Congress over the formulas. The most common formula grants are those for Medicaid, child nutrition programs, sewage treatment plant construction, public housing, community development programs, and training and employment programs.

Complaints about the cumbersome paperwork and the many strings attached to categorical grants led to the adoption of the second major type of federal aid, **block grants**. These grants are given more or less automatically to states or communities, which then have discretion within broad areas in deciding how to spend the money. First adopted in 1966, block grants support programs in areas like community development that can be used for policies such as housing and expanding employment opportunities for persons with lower incomes.

THE SCRAMBLE FOR FEDERAL DOLLARS With \$600 billion in federal grants at stake, most states and many cities have established full-time staffs in Washington.¹⁴ Their task is to keep track of what money is available and to help their state or city get some of it. There are many Washington organizations of governments—the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities, for example—that act like other interest groups in lobbying Congress. Senators and representatives regularly go to the voters with stories of their influence in securing federal funds for their constituencies. They need continued support at the polls, they say, so that they will rise in seniority and get key posts to help “bring home the bacon.”

Despite some variations, on the whole federal grant distribution follows the principle of *universalism*: something for everybody. The vigilance of senators and representatives keeps federal aid reasonably well spread among the states. This equality makes good politics, but it also may undermine public policy. Chapter I of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the federal government's principal

endeavor to assist public schools. The primary intent of Chapter I was to give extra help to poor children. Yet the funds are allocated to 95 percent of all the school districts in the country. President Clinton's proposal to concentrate Chapter I funds on the poorest students failed when it ran into predictable opposition in Congress.

THE MANDATE BLUES States and localities are usually pleased to receive aid from the national government, but there are times when they would just as soon not have it. For example, say Congress decides to expand a program administered by the states and funded, in part, by the national government. It passes a law requiring the states to expand the program if they want to keep receiving aid, which most states do. Requirements that direct states or local governments to provide additional services under threat of penalties or as a condition of receipt of a federal grant are a type of *mandate*. Congress usually appropriates some funds to help pay for the new policy, but whether it does or does not, the states suddenly have to budget more funds for the program just to receive federal grant money.

Medicaid, which provides health care for poor people, is a prime example of a federal grant program that puts states in a difficult situation. Administered by the states, Medicaid receives wide support from both political parties. The national government pays the majority of the bill, and the states pick up the rest. In the past two decades, Congress has moved aggressively to expand Medicaid to specific populations, requiring the states to extend coverage to children, pregnant women, and elderly poor under certain income levels. Congress has also increased its funding for the program, but the new

Point to Ponder

States usually are pleased to accept federal funds, revenue they do not have to raise themselves. The states are not always happy with the strings that come attached with federal funds, however.

Would it be better if states raised their own funds rather than depending on federal aid? Are there obstacles to states raising their own revenues?




A 1949 Herblock Cartoon, ©The Herb Block Foundation

requirements have meant huge new demands on state budgets. In effect, Congress has set priorities for the states. In 2012, the Supreme Court held that the Affordable Care Act of 2010 had gone too far. Congress can offer money to the states to expand Medicaid and can attach conditions to such grants, but it cannot penalize states that chose not to participate in that new program by taking away their existing Medicaid funding.¹⁵

A related problem arises when Congress passes a law creating financial obligations for the states but provides no funds to meet these obligations. For example, in 1990 Congress passed the Americans with Disabilities Act, requiring states to make facilities, such as state colleges and universities, accessible to individuals with disabilities, but did not allocate funds to implement this policy. Similarly, the Clean Air Act of 1970 established national air quality standards but required states to implement them and to appropriate funds for that purpose.

In an attempt to deal with this problem, in 1995, Congress passed a law requiring the Congressional Budget Office to estimate the costs of all bills that impose such mandates. This requirement does not apply to antidiscrimination legislation or to most legislation requiring state and local governments to take various actions in exchange for continued federal funding (such as grants for transportation). The bill also ordered federal agencies to design new processes to allow greater input by state and local officials into the development of regulations imposing mandates.

Mandates coupled with insufficient funds continue to pose problems for state and local governments. Such governments are the first responders in most emergencies: their police forces provide most of the nation's internal security, they maintain most of the country's transportation infrastructure, and they are responsible for protecting the public's health and providing emergency health care. The heightened concern for homeland security since September 11, 2001, led Congress to impose sizable new mandates on the states to increase their ability to deal with acts of terrorism, but Congress has not provided all the resources necessary to increase state and local capabilities. Similarly, as we saw, the No Child Left Behind Act, passed in 2002, threatens school systems with the loss of federal funds if their schools do not improve student performance, but the federal government has provided only a modest increase in funding to help the school systems bring about those improvements.



Policies of the federal government may have major impacts on core policies of state and local governments, like elementary and secondary education, and determine how much is spent on these policies.

Which States Win and Lose the Federal Aid Game?


The national government collects taxes in all states, but the amount of aid it provides to individual states doesn't correspond to the amount of taxes it collects in the state. A recipient state is one whose residents pay less in federal taxes than the state receives in federal aid; a donor state is one whose residents pay more in taxes than the state receives in aid. In 2007, there were 19 donor states and 31 recipient states.

Who pays? DELAWARE, MINNESOTA, NEW JERSEY, and CONNECTICUT

all paid at least \$6,000 more in federal taxes per person than they received in federal aid. 15 other states were net donors.

Net Donor: Over \$5,000 Per Person	Connecticut \$6,241	New Jersey \$6,644	Minnesota \$7,431	Delaware \$12,285
Net Donor: Between \$1 and \$5,000 Per Person	Ohio \$49	North Carolina \$1,108	Massachusetts \$2,133	Rhode Island \$2,732
	Georgia \$434	California \$1,466	Colorado \$2,176	Illinois \$3,640
	Washington \$773	Nevada \$1,616	Nebraska \$2,850	New York \$4,502
	Wisconsin \$1,000	Arkansas \$1,723	Texas \$2,243	

Which Are the Recipient States?




18 out of 23 Republican-leaning states (78%) are recipient states compared to 8 out of the 19 Democratic-leaning states (42%).

Who receives? ALASKA took in twice the federal money in 2007 that it paid in taxes. 31 states are recipient states. Of the top six recipient states, four are southern.

Net Recipient: Over \$5,000 Per Person	Alaska -\$7,448	New Mexico -\$7,143	Mississippi -\$6,765	Virginia -\$6,239	West Virginia -\$5,820	Alabama -\$5,130
Net Recipient: Between \$1 and \$5,000 Per Person	Hawaii -\$4,983	South Carolina -\$3,756	Arizona -\$1,976	Utah -\$792	Pennsylvania -\$385	
	North Dakota -\$4,856	Kentucky -\$3,012	Idaho -\$1,281	Indiana -\$723	Oklahoma -\$376	
	South Dakota -\$4,414	Maryland -\$3,010	Wyoming -\$1,205	Tennessee -\$603	New Hampshire -\$349	
	Maine -\$4,221	Vermont -\$2,854	Missouri -\$1,190	Florida -\$581	Michigan -\$171	
	Montana -\$4,149	Louisiana -\$2,180	Iowa -\$1,075	Oregon -\$474	Kansas -\$154	

Recipient States by Poverty Level



9 of 13 states with high poverty levels are recipient states (69%), while only 9 of 17 states with low poverty levels are recipient states (53%).

SOURCE: Data from United States Internal Revenue Service; *Statistical Abstract of the United States 2012*; and U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 2010.

Investigate Further

Concept How do we determine donor and recipient states? We subtract the federal aid dollars per person sent to a state from the federal tax dollars per person paid in a state. If the result is positive, a state is a donor state, otherwise it's a recipient state.

Connection Are there any correlations between politics and whether states are recipients or donors? Recipient states tend to lean Republican, donor states tend to lean Democratic in national politics. It is ironic that conservative Republican states are on average the biggest recipients of federal spending.

Cause Is there a policy explanation for which states are recipient states? In fighting poverty, the federal government redistributes money. Recipient states usually have higher poverty levels and lower average incomes.

Federal courts, too, create unfunded mandates for the states. In recent years, federal judges have issued states orders in areas such as prison construction and management, school desegregation, and facilities in mental health hospitals. These court orders often require states to spend funds to meet standards imposed by the judge.

A combination of federal regulations and inadequate resources may also put the states in a bind. The national government requires that a local housing authority build or acquire a new low-income housing facility for each one it demolishes. But for years Congress has provided little money for the construction of public housing. As a result, a provision intended to help the poor by ensuring a stable supply of housing actually hurts them because it discourages local governments from demolishing unsafe and inadequate housing. Similarly, a few states have recently rejected some short-term federal aid for unemployment benefits because they did not want to accept the requirements to maintain the benefits in the long term.

The federal government may also unintentionally create financial obligations for the states. California, New York, Texas, Florida, and other states have sued the federal government for reimbursement for the cost of health care, education, prisons, and other public services that the states provide to illegal residents. The states charged that the federal government's failure to control its borders was the source of huge new demands on their treasuries and that Washington, not the states, should pay for the problem. Although the states have not won their cases, their point is a valid one.

Diversity in Policy

3.4 Explain the consequences of federalism for diversity in public policies among the states.

As you have seen, the federal system assigns states important responsibilities for public policies. An important effect is diversity in policy among the states.

One implication is that it is possible for the diversity of opinion within the country to be reflected in different public policies among the states. If the citizens of Texas wish to have a death penalty, for example, they can vote for politicians who support it, even if other states move to abolish the death penalty (see “You Are the Policymaker: Should *Whether* You Live Depend on *Where* You Live?”).

Another is that policy innovation is facilitated. In fact, the American states have always been policy innovators.¹⁶ They overflow with reforms, new ideas, and new policies. From clean-air legislation to health care, the states constitute a national laboratory to develop and test public policies, and they share the results with other states and the national government. Almost every policy that the national government has adopted had its beginnings in the states. One or more states pioneered child labor laws, minimum-wage legislation, unemployment compensation, antipollution legislation, civil rights protections, and the income tax. More recently, states have been active in reforming health care, education, and welfare—and the national government has been paying close attention to their efforts.

States may also take initiatives on what most people view as national policies when the federal government acts contrary to the views of people within those states. Many states raised the minimum wage when Congress did not. Some states funded stem cell research after George W. Bush severely restricted it on the federal level. Similarly, many states have taken the lead in raising the standards for environmental protection after they concluded the national government was too lenient. Other states have enacted strict immigration laws to deter illegal immigration.

Yet another implication of diversity is that states, responsible for supplying public services, differ in the resources they can or will devote to services like public

You Are the Policymaker


Should *Whether* You Live Depend on *Where* You Live?

Because the federal system allocates major responsibilities for public policy to the states, policies often vary with the views of the population in different locations. The differences among public policies are especially dramatic in the criminal justice system.

A conviction for first-degree murder in 33 states may well mean the death penalty for the convicted murderer. In 17 other states and the District of Columbia,

first-degree murderers are subject to a maximum penalty of life behind bars.

What do you think? Some people see diversity in public policy as one of the advantages of federalism. Others may argue that citizens of the same country ought to be subject to uniform penalties. Should *whether* you live depend on *where* you live?



education. Thus, the quality of education a child receives is heavily influenced by the state in which the child's parents happen to reside. In 2009, Vermont and Rhode Island spent \$18,913 and \$16,127 per student, respectively, while Arizona spent only \$6,385 (see Figure 3.2).

Diversity in policy can also discourage states from providing services that they might otherwise provide. Political scientists have found that generous welfare benefits can strain a state's treasury by attracting poor people from states with lower benefits. As a result, states may be deterred from providing generous benefits to those in need. A national program with uniform welfare benefits would provide no incentive for welfare recipients to move to another state in search of higher benefits.¹⁷

Understanding Federalism

3.5

Assess the impact of federalism on democratic government and the scope of government.


T

he federal system is central to politics, government, and policy in America. The division of powers and responsibilities among different levels of government has implications for the themes of both democracy and the scope of government.

3.1
3.2
3.3
3.4
3.5

FIGURE 3.2 STATE AND LOCAL SPENDING ON PUBLIC EDUCATION

A downside of the public policy diversity fostered by federalism is that the resources for public services vary widely from state to state. This map shows the great variation among the states in the money spent on children in the public schools.



In addition, the more levels of government, the more opportunities there are for participation in politics. State governments provide thousands of elected offices for which citizens may vote and/or run.

Additional levels of government also contribute to democracy by increasing access to government. Some citizens and interest groups are likely to have better access to state-level governments and others to the national government, so the two levels increase the opportunities for government to be responsive to demands for policies.¹⁸ For example, in the 1950s and 1960s, when advocates of civil rights found themselves stymied in Southern states, they turned to the national level for help in achieving racial equality. Business interests, on the other hand, have traditionally found state governments to be more responsive than the national government to their demands. Organized labor is not well established in some states, but it can usually depend on some sympathetic officials at the national level who will champion its proposals.

The existence of state and local levels has yet another advantage for democracy. Even if a party loses at the national level, it can rebuild in its areas of strength and develop leaders under its banner at the state and local levels. As a result, losing an election becomes more acceptable, and the peaceful transfer of power is more probable. This was especially important in the early years of the nation before our political norms had become firmly established.

Despite these advantages, sometimes decentralization of politics can be a detriment to democracy. Even the presidential election, choosing a leader for the national government, is actually 51 presidential elections, one in each state and one in Washington, D.C. It is possible—as happened in 2000—for a candidate who receives the most popular votes in the country to lose the election because of the way in which the Constitution distributes electoral votes by state. Such a result is a questionable contribution to democracy.¹⁹

Federalism may also have a negative effect on democracy insofar as local interests are able to thwart national majority support of certain policies. As we discussed earlier in this chapter, in the 1960s, the states—especially those in the South—became battlegrounds when the national government tried to enforce national civil rights laws and court decisions. Federalism complicated and delayed efforts to end racial discrimination because state and local governments were responsible for public education and voting eligibility, for example, and because they had passed most of the laws supporting racial segregation.

At last count there were an astonishing 89,527 American governments (see Table 3.3). The sheer number of governments in the United States is, at times, as much a burden as a boon to democracy. The relationships between governments at the

TABLE 3.3 THE NUMBER OF GOVERNMENTS IN AMERICA

Government Level	Number of Governments
U.S. government	1
States	50
Counties	3,033
Municipalities	19,492
Townships or towns	16,519
School districts	13,051
Special districts	37,381
Total	89,527

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Commerce, *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2012* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2012), Table 428.

local, state, and national levels often confuse Americans. These confusions stem from the complexities of the relationships. Locally elected school boards run neighborhood schools, but the schools also receive state and national funds, and with those funds come state and national rules and regulations. Local airports, sewage systems, pollution control systems, and police departments also receive a mix of local, state, and national funds, so they operate under a complex web of rules and regulations imposed by each level of government.

Americans speak eloquently about their state and local governments as grassroots governments, close to the people. Yet having so many governments makes it difficult to know which governments are doing what. Exercising democratic control over them is even more difficult; voter turnout in local elections is often less than 20 percent.

□ Federalism and the Scope of the National Government

One of the most persistent questions in American politics has been the question of the appropriate scope of the national government relative to that of state governments. To address this question, we must first understand why the national government grew and then ask whether this growth was at the expense of the states or occurred because of the unique capabilities and responsibilities of the national government.

Consider first the economic domain, and a few examples of the national government's interventions to help American businesses. Ronald Reagan negotiated quotas on imports of Japanese cars in order to give advantages to the American auto industry. He placed quotas on the amount of steel that could be imported. After airplanes were grounded because of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, Congress approved \$15 billion in subsidies and loan guarantees to the faltering airlines. In 2008, George W. Bush obtained extensive authority for the federal government to intervene in and subsidize financial institutions and automakers—policies Barack Obama continued.

In each of these cases and dozens of others, the national government has involved itself (some might say interfered) in the economic marketplace with quotas, subsidies, and regulations intended to help American businesses. From the very founding of the republic, the national government took a direct interest in economic affairs. As the United States industrialized, new problems arose and, with them, new demands for governmental action. The national government responded with a national banking system, subsidies for railroads and airlines, and a host of other policies that dramatically increased its role in the economy.

The industrialization of the country raised other issues as well. For example, with the formation of large corporations in the late nineteenth century came the potential for such abuses as monopoly pricing. If there is only one railroad in town, it can charge farmers inflated prices to ship their grain to market. If a single company distributes most of the gasoline in the country, it can set the price at which gasoline sells. Thus, many interests asked the national government to restrain monopolies and to encourage open competition.

There were additional demands on the national government for new public policies. Farmers sought services such as agricultural research, rural electrification, and price supports. Unions wanted the national government to protect their rights to organize and bargain collectively and to help provide safer working conditions, a minimum wage, and pension protection. Together with other groups, they pushed for a wide range of social welfare policies, from education to health care, that would benefit the average worker. And urbanization brought new problems in the areas of housing, welfare, the environment, and transportation. In each case, the relevant interests turned to the national government for help.

Why not turn to the state governments instead? The answer in most cases is simple: a problem or policy requires the authority and resources of the national government;


to deal with it otherwise would be at best inefficient. The Constitution forbids states from having independent defense policies, but even if it did not, how many states would want to take on a responsibility that represents more than half the federal workforce and about one-fifth of federal expenditures? A wide range of other issues would not be sensible for the states to handle. It makes little sense for Louisiana to pass strict controls on polluting the Mississippi River if most of the river's pollution occurs upstream, where Louisiana has no jurisdiction. Rhode Island has no incentive to create an energy policy because it has no natural energy reserves.

Similarly, how effectively can any state regulate an international conglomerate such as General Motors? How can each state, acting individually, manage the nation's money supply? Although states could in theory have their own space programs, combining efforts in one national program is much more efficient. The largest category of federal expenditures is that for economic security, including the Social Security program. If each state had its own retirement program, would retirees who moved to Florida or Arizona be paid by their new state or the state they moved from? A national program is the only feasible method of ensuring the incomes of the mobile elderly of today's society.

Figure 3.3 shows that the national government's share of American governmental expenditures has grown considerably since 1929. The period of rapid growth was the 1930s and 1940s, a period that included the Great Depression and World War II. Before that time, the national government spent an amount equal to only 2.5 percent of the size of the economy, the gross domestic product (GDP). Today, it spends nearly

FIGURE 3.3 FISCAL FEDERALISM: THE SIZE OF THE PUBLIC SECTOR

The federal government's spending as a percentage of GDP increased rapidly during the Great Depression and World War II. Recent decades have not seen much increase in spending as a percentage of GDP on the part of either the federal government or state governments. In 2009, however, federal spending increased substantially in response to the economic crisis.



SOURCE: Office of Management and Budget, *Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2013: Historical Tables* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2012), Table 15.3.

3.1

3.2

3.3

3.4

3.5

a fourth of our GDP, if we include grants to states and localities. The proportion of our GDP spent by state and local governments has grown far less. States and localities spent 7.4 percent of our GDP in 1929; they spend about 11 percent today, not including federal grants.²⁰

To return to our initial question, Figure 3.3 strongly suggests that the federal government has not supplanted the states. The states carry out virtually all the functions they always have. What has occurred instead is that, with the support of the American people, the national government, possessing unique capacities, has taken on new responsibilities. In addition, the national government has added programs to help the states meet their own responsibilities.

Review the Chapter



Listen to **Chapter 3** on **MyPoliSciLab**

Defining Federalism

3.1 Define federalism and contrast it with alternative ways of organizing a nation, p. 75.

Federalism is a way of organizing a nation so that two or more levels of government have formal authority over the same area and people. Federal systems are more decentralized than unitary systems but less so than confederations.

The Constitutional Basis of Federalism

3.2 Outline the constitutional basis for the division of power between national and state governments, the establishment of national supremacy, and states' obligations to each other, p. 77.

The Constitution divides power between the national (federal) government and state governments and makes the national government supreme within its sphere. The national government has implied as well as enumerated powers, as *McCulloch v. Maryland* made clear. The Civil War also helped establish the preeminence of the national government, and over the years the Supreme Court has interpreted these powers—particularly Congress's interstate commerce power—broadly, as Washington has taken on more responsibilities to deal with matters such as the economy and civil rights. States have obligations to give full faith and credit to the public acts, records, and civil judicial proceedings of other states, return a person charged with a crime in another state to that state, and accord citizens of other states the privileges and immunities enjoyed by their own citizens.

Intergovernmental Relations

3.3 Characterize the shift from dual to cooperative federalism and the role of fiscal federalism in intergovernmental relations today, p. 84.

States no longer have exclusive responsibility for government functions within their sphere but instead share these responsibilities with the federal government. Through categorical

and block grants, the federal government provides state and local governments with substantial portions of their budgets, and it uses this leverage to influence policy by attaching conditions to receiving the grants. Sometimes Washington mandates state policy without providing the resources to implement the policy.

Diversity in Policy

3.4 Explain the consequences of federalism for diversity in public policies among the states, p. 94.

Federalism allows for considerable diversity among the states in their policies. This constitutional arrangement facilitates state innovations in policy, and it allows states to move beyond the limits of national policy. However, federalism also leaves states dependent upon the resources within their borders to finance public services, and it may discourage states from providing some services.

Understanding Federalism

3.5 Assess the impact of federalism on democratic government and the scope of government, p. 95.

On the positive side, federalism provides for effective representation of local interests, reduces conflict at the national level, encourages acceptance of losing elections, and increases the opportunities for citizens to participate in government and see their policy preferences reflected in law. On the negative side, federalism increases the opportunities for local interests to thwart national policy, can result in the election of a president not favored by a majority of the public, and complicates efforts to make government responsive.

The national government has grown in response to the demands of Americans for public services it can best provide, but it has not in any way supplanted the states.

Learn the Terms



Study and Review the **Flashcards**

federalism, p. 75
unitary governments, p. 75
intergovernmental relations, p. 76
supremacy clause, p. 78
Tenth Amendment, p. 79

McCulloch v. Maryland, p. 80
enumerated powers, p. 81
implied powers, p. 81
elastic clause, p. 81
Gibbons v. Ogden, p. 82

full faith and credit, p. 83
extradition, p. 83
privileges and immunities, p. 83
dual federalism, p. 85
cooperative federalism, p. 85

Test Yourself



Study and **Review** the **Practice Tests**

1. A country in which all power resides in a central government has

- a. a unitary government.
- b. a confederacy.
- c. an intergovernmental system.
- d. a federal system of government.
- e. an enumerated government.

2. Federalism is a system of government in which three or more levels of government (local, state, and federal) have formal authority over the same area and people.

True ____ False ____

3. *McCulloch v. Maryland* established the principle that

- a. as long as the national government does not violate the Constitution, its policies take precedence over state policies.
- b. the national government has certain implied powers beyond those specified in the Constitution.
- c. the Constitution permits Congress to use all means “necessary and proper” to fulfill its duties.
- d. acting within its sphere, the national government can preempt state policies.
- e. All of the above

4. The “full faith and credit” clause in Article IV of the Constitution is primarily designed to ensure _____ between states.

- a. communication
- b. reciprocity
- c. honesty
- d. commerce
- e. goodwill

5. According to the regulation of privileges and immunities between states, a citizen of Texas who buys a product while visiting a store in California

- a. pays the Texas sales tax.
- b. pays the California sales tax.
- c. pays both the California and the Texas sales tax.
- d. can choose whether he or she wants to pay the California or Texas sales tax.
- e. pays the California sales tax, but can ask to be reimbursed when returning to Texas.

6. When the Supreme Court interpreted the commerce clause broadly, it contributed to the expansion of national supremacy over the states.

True ____ False ____

7. Explain how a shift in the balance of power between states and the national government has shaped the history of federalism in the United States. In your answer, explain how different interpretations of the Tenth Amendment, including in several important Supreme Court decisions, relate to the debate regarding the boundaries of state and national power.

8. The shift from dual to cooperative federalism

- a. required an initial devolution in federal influence over states.
- b. involved a clear, discrete shift, related to implementation of the New Deal.
- c. involved gradual change in many policy areas, including education.
- d. involved a shift from presidential to congressional dominance over policy.
- e. resulted primarily from largely partisan efforts by Republicans in the 1950s.

9. Over the past generation, the percentage of federal grants devoted to income security has decreased in favor of grants devoted to health care.

True ____ False ____

10. The United States has undergone a gradual shift from dual to cooperative federalism. In your opinion, what are some of the factors that have explained this shift? What are some possible positive and negative consequences? Use specific examples to explain your answer.

11. Federalism allows states to differ in their policies and thus to reflect the opinions of their citizens but also leaves them reliant on their own resources. Is this an acceptable tradeoff? Should there be greater uniformity on policies such as education? Explain your answer.

12. Federalism

- a. stifles innovation at the state level.
- b. encourages uniform policies among the states.
- c. prohibits states from moving beyond national policy.
- d. leads to differences among states in levels of funding for policies.
- e. encourages states to increase levels of services benefiting the less well off.

13. An examination of the historical growth of federal responsibilities over policy reveals that

- a. the federal government can handle many policy areas more efficiently than can the states.
- b. the federal government responds to interest group demands to take a more active policy role.
- c. the federal government expanded its role over policy as the nation industrialized.
- d. the federal government's share of governmental expenditures has grown rapidly since the New Deal.
- e. all of the above are true.

14. Based on your understanding of the federalism and the framing of the Constitution, why did the Founders establish a federal system of government? In what ways does federalism contribute to and/or limit democracy? In your opinion, does federalism make government more or less democratic? Explain your answer.

15. How does federalism affect the scope of government? Did the national government grow at the expense of state power or did this growth occur because of the unique capabilities and responsibilities of the national government? What are some policies that support your answer?

Explore Further

WEB SITES

www.cfda.gov/index?cck=1&au=&cck=

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance allows you to search through hundreds of federal grants.

www.ncsl.org/statefed/StateFederalCommittees/tabid/773/Default.aspx

Information and discussion of issues on federal–state relations from the National Conference of State Legislatures.

www.csg.org

Council of State Governments Web site offers information on states and state public policies.

usgovinfo.about.com/od/rightsandfreedom/a/federalism.htm

The powers of the national and state governments.

www.aei.org/outlook/11716

Original research on American federalism, sponsored by the American Enterprise Institute.

www.cas.umt.edu/polsci/faculty/greene/federalismhistory.htm

The history of U.S. federalism.

FURTHER READING

Bednar, Jenna. *The Robust Federation: Principles of Design.*

New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Shows how complementary institutions maintain and adjust the distribution of authority between national and state governments.

Beer, Samuel H. *To Make a Nation: The Rediscovery of American Federalism.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

An excellent study of the philosophical bases of American federalism.

Chemerinsky, Erwin. *Enhancing Government: Federalism for the 21st Century.* Stanford, CA: Stanford Law Books, 2008. Argues that federalism allows government to solve problems and to enhance individual liberties.

Feeley, Malcolm, and Edward Rubin. *Federalism: Political Identity and Tragic Compromise.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2011. Overview of key aspects of federalism.

Gerston, Larry N. *American Federalism.* New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2007. A concise introduction to federalism.

Miller, Lisa L. *The Perils of Federalism: Race, Poverty, and the Politics of Crime Control.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. How federalism affects the making and implementation of policy regarding crime.

O'Toole, Laurence. *American Intergovernmental Relations*, 4th ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2006. Essays on many aspects of federalism.

Peterson, Paul E. *The Price of Federalism.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1995. A good assessment of the costs and benefits of federalism.

Posner, Paul L., and Timothy J. Conlan. *Intergovernmental Management for the 21st Century.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2007. Assesses the state of intergovernmental relations in the United States and an agenda for improving them.

Schapiro, Robert A. *Polyphonic Federalism: Toward the Protection of Fundamental Rights.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009. Argues that the multiple perspectives on policy provided by federalism are a great advantage for the United States.