# Jus Corpus Law Journal

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2025 – ISSN 2582-7820

Editor-in-Chief – Prof. (Dr.) Rishikesh Dave; Publisher – Ayush Pandey




# The Impact of Federalism on Economic Inequality: A Comparative Analysis


Avilasha Sarkar[a]

[a]CHRIST Deemed to be University, Lavasa, Pune, India



*Received* 18 December 2024; *Accepted* 20 January 2025; *Published* 24 January 2025


---


*This paper analyses how federalism influences the inequality level within countries. It investigates if federalism enlarges or diminishes economic inequalities in income and wealth distribution. Presumably, with various distributions of power and resources at different levels of government, federalism is bound to induce other forms of economic spillovers across regions within one nation. Focusing on the fiscal and administrative autonomy provided to subnational governments, this study traces how those regional bodies make an influence on policy in the areas of the economy, taxation, and public spending, prime constituents of economic equality. The research will be carried out through comparative case studies of countries with different systems of federalism, such as the United States, India, and Germany, to provide insight into the shape of the outcomes that inequality may assume under the differences in fiscal arrangements, intergovernmental transfers, and regional autonomy. The research is analysed concerning whether it is the case that federal structures foster economic convergence or increase regional disparities and, indeed, depends on each of their systems' approaches to revenue generation and redistribution. In systems where the wealthier regions enjoy more fiscal autonomy, inequality easily continues or deepens because poorer regions fail to fund many public services and development initiatives. On the other hand, in systems with robust resource-sharing mechanisms and equalization transfers, disparities in economics between the regions tend to be smaller. This study also explores the engagement of national governments in establishing national policies that affect economic equity, against the tensions of local visions for autonomy and national aspirations for equity.*

**Keywords:** *federalism, economic inequality, fiscal autonomy, regional disparities, income distribution, wealth redistribution.*

## INTRODUCTION

Economic inequality within countries has become an increasingly important issue affecting social cohesion, political stability, and long-term economic growth. In many countries, mostly federal systems, wealth and income vary across regions, thus raising questions about whether federalism amplifies or alleviates these disparities. Federalism is increasingly defined as an institutional arrangement that divides power between a central government and subnational entities, giving regional governments some or all forms of autonomy over fiscal policy, public spending, and economic regulation. The dynamic nature of this division of power opens unique avenues and opportunities for addressing economic inequality. Whereas the federal system would grant the local governments the powers to respond to special regional needs, it could create inconsistencies regarding the allocation of resources and service delivery, augmenting the divisions between the rich and poor areas.

Federalism and economic inequality remain among the most debated issues in academics to date. According to some research scholars, federal systems may become causes of regional disparities since prosperous regions exploit their superior economics to attract more resources and investment, and less prosperous regions are laggards in winning those. Others argued that federal structures, again, those with resource redistribution mechanisms such as equalization transfer systems can play a balancing factor in economic outcomes by transferring resources from already more developed areas to others. This study examines the impact of federalism generally on economic inequality, considering the roles of fiscal decentralization, intergovernmental transfers, and regional autonomy in economic outcomes.[1]

In exploring this question, this paper conducts a comparative analysis of federal systems in several countries: the United States, India, and Germany. These nations represent diverse models of federalism, each with its unique approaches to fiscal policy and economic

[1] Ignacio Lago, *Handbook on Decentralization, Devolution and the State* (Edward Elgar Publishing 2021)

redistribution. By looking into how different federal structures handle income and wealth distribution, this research aims to enlighten the factors within federal systems that have been driving inequality upward or down, respectively. Thus, understanding these dynamics is crucial for policymakers who hope to design federal frameworks that enhance economic equity without sacrificing regional autonomy and diversity.

Such core principles give a fundamental framework for understanding the extent to which federalism impacts economic policy decisions, especially those relating to the distribution of wealth and social welfare. There are differences in federal systems in the way they apply such principles, resulting in different outcomes of economic inequality.[2] In some federal forms, regional governments have an adequate amount of autonomy with regard to fiscal and administrative issues, thereby allowing regions to have a variety of public services, taxation, and abilities to access economic goods.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: FEDERALISM AND ECONOMIC INEQUALITY

A rich theory framework would be crucial for any discussion that attempts to analyze a relationship between federalism and economic inequality. Federalism is a political system that organizes governance by dividing power between the national and subnational governments, giving regions autonomy to deal with most local issues while retaining a single national framework. The relationship between federalism and economic inequality is complex and varies based on the specific design of each federal system, particularly in fiscal policies and redistributive mechanisms.[3] The section discusses important theoretical considerations for federalism, how federal systems handle redistributive issues, and how fiscal decentralization determines the key outcomes of any region's economy.

### Definitions and Key Concepts in Federalism -

Federalism is the system of governance in which the central or federal government co-shares sovereignty with the other subnational governments, such as the state, regional, or provincial.

[2] Robert E Goodin et al., *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy* (Blackwell Publishing Ltd 2017)
[3] Antero Jyränki, *National Constitutions in the Era of Integration* (Kluwer Law International 1999)

Authority exercised by each level of government varies and encompasses only specific policy areas. Hence, federal systems facilitate diverse policy responses within one coherent state.

Federal systems are often distinguished by the three key elements.[4]

**Fiscal Autonomy:** The degree to which subnational governments can raise and then address their revenues without interference from the centre.

**Administrative Decentralization:** The degree of discretion allowed to the local authority so that they could determine their policies and decisions.

**Political Representation:** The inclusion of regional representatives at the national level in the decision-making process, mainly in a bicameral legislature where one of the houses represents states or regions.

Such core principles give a fundamental framework for understanding the extent to which federalism impacts economic policy decisions, especially those relating to the distribution of wealth and social welfare. There are differences in federal systems in the way they apply such principles, resulting in different outcomes of economic inequality.[5] In some federal forms, regional governments have an adequate amount of autonomy about fiscal and administrative issues, thereby allowing regions to have various public services, taxation, and abilities to access economic goods.

## IMPACT OF FISCAL DECENTRALIZATION ON REGIONAL INEQUALITY

Fiscal decentralization enables subnational governments to exert control over revenue generation, for example, by setting tax rates and making expenditure decisions, allowing them to respond to more local needs and preferences. This means of autonomy can result in regional development and increased responsiveness but has complex effects on economic inequality:

[4] Hansjörg Blöchliger and Josette Rabesona, 'The Fiscal Autonomy of Sub-Central Governments: An Update' (*OECD*, 2009) <https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2009/06/the-fiscal-autonomy-of-sub-central-governments_g17a2168/5k97b111wb0t-en.pdf> accessed 16 December 2024
[5] Goodin (n 2)

**Regional Resource Inequality:** Fiscal decentralization may even give rise to disparities when regions vastly vary in the economy's strength. A prosperous region with a sound tax base can raise more taxes and invest significantly in infrastructure, education, and health services. Meanwhile, poorer regions that generate less tax revenue cannot provide basic public services and, as a result, continue to strengthen regional economic disparities. For example, some districts in high-property-value states with strong states collect far more in property taxes than districts in poor or rural states. That can generate huge differences in funding and quality of schools from one region to another.[6]

**The trade-off between Efficiency and Equity:** Fiscal decentralization can give a region efficiency in implementation as policies can be fashioned to meet specific regional needs, resulting in economic growth. It creates a risk of opening up inequality as more prosperous regions draw on their resources to achieve better services and facilities. The challenge for federal systems is to design fiscal frameworks that balance efficiency against equity, where decentralization does not leave poorer regions at the tail end.

**Role of Central Government Oversight:** In highly decentralized systems, the absence of control by the central government usually contributes to policy fragmentation and uneven standards in public service delivery. This, in turn, reinforces inequality, as only wealthier regions can set policies that go quite a long way to maximize their resources. Yet, poorer regions lack the capital to tackle more complex social and economic issues. Efficient federal systems usually provide minimum standards or guidelines for public services so regional autonomy does not come at the cost of national equity goals.[7]

---

[6] David Bartolini et al., *Fiscal Decentralisation and Regional Disparities* (*OECD*, 23 September 2016) <https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2016/10/fiscal-decentralisation-and-regional-disparities_g17a2894/5jlpq7v3j237-en.pdf> accessed 16 December 2024

[7] Syawal Zakaria, 'The Impact of Fiscal Decentralization toward Regional Inequalities in Eastern Region of Indonesia' (2013) 4(10) Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Impact-of-Fiscal-Decentralization-toward-in-of-Zakaria/7e5b61e8283d82c2fa94028bd8b9792ed3d0b27d> accessed 16 December 2024

## COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF FISCAL FEDERALISM MODELS

A comparison of fiscal federalism across countries provides explicit dissimilarities in terms of revenue generation, resource distribution, and economic redistribution. Such analysis is essential to understanding how a federal system may either counteract or worsen regional inequalities. The cases of the United States, India, and Germany provide specific approaches that have been developed uniquely by each of these countries. Case law in these jurisdictions expresses the development of court judgments on regional autonomy against centralized redistributive policies. It speaks to the legal foundation of economic equity in federal states.

### Revenue Generation and Resource Allocation across Cases -

Revenue generation and resource allocation represent some of the critical variables underlying regional economic inequality. Each country's model reflects its priorities regarding regional autonomy and national economic goals:

1. **United States**

**Revenue Generation:** States in the U.S. have considerable authority in revenue generation, which is primarily done through income, property, and sales taxes. High-income states might be better off financing quality services, whereas poorer states will find it difficult to match those standards. For instance, California and New York have sturdy economies, hence they can accrue a lot of tax revenue, whereas Mississippi's low per capita income makes it hard to raise sufficient funds.

**Case Law: South Dakota v Wayfair, Inc.**[8] is a landmark case where the U.S. Supreme Court sanctioned the rights of states to collect sales tax from out-of-state companies, which further enhanced the fiscal independence of states and made them raise extra revenue through this source. However, it also brought into the limelight some disparity between the states as richer states can put taxes on any online sales for supplementing income whereas the poor states may not gain much out of the same ruling.

---

[8] *South Dakota v Wayfair Inc* [2018] US 585

**2. India**

Since India is a federal country, all states enjoy revenue-raising powers but, to a very large extent, depend on grants from the Centre and tax sharing with it. In better-off states like Maharashtra, substantial revenue is generated, whereas in more backward states, central assistance is relied more on. Another measure which has further centralized the revenue kitty of the states is the Goods and Services Tax, introduced in 2017.

**Case Law: State of West Bengal v Union of India (1962)**[9] is a landmark case in Indian federalism that was dealt with by the Supreme Court; it acknowledged the constitutional rights of the central government to fund and distribute financial resources and further supported resource distribution with a sense of equity so that resources are equitably distributed among states. Thus, this case adopted a balance between state autonomy and national cohesion, especially during an issue of an economically weaker region.

**3. Germany**

**Revenue Generation:** The German federal model practices high levels of fiscal centralization to split revenues significantly between federal and state governments. The Basic Law makes provisions for placing living conditions equitably spread throughout the states; hence a well-coordinated revenue-sharing model will ensure that both rich and poor Länder may maintain service levels at the same level.

**Case Law: Lüth Case (1958)**[10] incidentally speaks to fiscal federalism in that its principles of equality and social justice under the German Basic Law must be upheld. In and of itself, this case was not ostensibly a purse strings case, but rather it determined that policies enacted by the federal government would have to be in confluence with the requirements of the Basic Law regarding equality, thus supporting Germany's complete equalization system.

---

[9] *State of West Bengal v Union of India* (1963) SC 1241

[10] Hannes Rösler, 'Harmonizing the German Civil Code of the Nineteenth Century with a Modern Constitution-The Lüth Revolution 50 Years Ago in Comparative Perspective' (2008) 23 Tulane European and Civil Law Forum <https://journals.tulane.edu/teclf/article/view/1786> accessed 16 December 2024

**The Effectiveness of Equalization Transfers -**

Equalization transfers are vital in lessening regional economic disparities since they provide additional funding to poorer regions that deserve the same standards of services. All federal systems have varying stances on these transfers and represent more general governance principles:

1. **United States**

**Effectiveness of Transfers:** The U.S. federal system does not have a formally established transfer mechanism for equalization purposes. It has implied such a huge disparity in the quality of service across states. Although some federal grants are made to extend aid to poorer states, such an unequal balance makes the gaps truly huge on the economic scale.

**Case Law: San Antonio Independent School District v Rodriguez (1973)[11]** brought to light inequalities within the United States system as far as the funding was concerned, with the Supreme Court holding that the Constitution does not compel all districts in the states to contribute equitably. This led to the elimination of the potential of a federal system to ensure equalization among the states, with the court decreeing education to be placed under the category of state responsibility, thus perpetuating the funding inequalities over time.

2. **India**

**Effectiveness of Transfers:** Here, India has a formal system of equalization through the Finance Commission, whereby allocation to the state is done based on income, population, and economic need. This model is helpful to poorer states though its effectiveness becomes significantly hampered by regional disparities in governance and development.

**Case Law: Bharti Airtel Limited v Union of India (2021)** explained some of the elements of central and state financial authority, with a specific focus on the Indian Supreme Court's jurisdiction in the determination of fiscal federalism disputes. The decision also validated the

[11] *San Antonio Independent School District v Rodriguez* [1972] 406 US 966

role of the Finance Commission as a tool for fairly distributing funds, which accordingly enhanced the role of equalization in enhancing the reduction of inequality across states.

3. **Germany**

**Effectiveness of Transfers**: The fiscal equalization system in Germany is the strongest in the world. Funds are redistributed from the federal government based on economic capacity to ensure a high uniformity across the Länder in terms of public services. It greatly reduces disparities and fosters economic convergence.

**Case Law: Federal Constitutional Court Decision Equalization (1999):** The fiscal equalization system in Germany had to undergo reforms so that it could reveal that where equalization is a needed process, it should also boost the states into optimization in fiscal performance. It further cleared out the perception that equalization has to ensure independence and regional autonomy through an appropriate level of equality.

**Regional Autonomy vs Centralized Redistribution Efforts -**

The imbalance of devolved regional autonomy with the need for redistribution under central control is a critical tension in federal systems. On one hand, regional autonomy enables local governments to impose policies suited to that region's needs, but if there are imbalances without the mechanism for redistribution, inequalities become entrenched. This is how the balance is managed differently in the case of various federal systems:[12]

1. **United States**

**Regional Autonomy:** The U.S. states have huge fiscal independence, and in many ways, they have great discretionary powers in setting tax policies and deciding how much to spend according to the preferences of the local people. However, in this end, such autonomy has been associated with considerable disparities because richer states can afford the heavier addition of public services.

[12] Robert P Inman and Daniel L Rubinfeld, 'Rethinking Federalism' (1997) 11(4) Journal of Economic Perspectives <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2138461?seq=1> accessed 16 December 2024

**Case Law: National Federation of Independent Business v Sebelius (2012)[13]** exemplified the limit to the federal reach into state policy when the Supreme Court held invalid a mandate that forced states to expand Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act.[14] It made it harder to enforce horizontal redistributive policies within an otherwise greatly decentralized system, enabling disparities in access to healthcare to remain intact between states.

2. **India**

**Regional Autonomy:** Indian states, in particular, have post-1991 economic reforms, but they do enjoy a degree of autonomy. Certain large fields of taxation and revenue continue to be in the hands of the central government. This arrangement accommodates national redistributive goals, no doubt at the expense of policy flexibility at the state level.

**Case Law: In the State of Karnataka v Union of India 1978**[15], central authority was maintained in the sphere of revenue distribution when it held national economic goals to be superior to regional autonomy. It did so, thereby strengthening the hands of the central authority in matters of fiscal discretion, by achieving a balance between autonomy and redistribution to bring about economic unity among all the states.

3. **Germany**

**Regional Autonomy:** German Länder have a lot of administrative autonomy; fiscal policies, especially equalization, are greatly coordinated at the federal level to prevent economic imbalances. Thus, notwithstanding the large degree of local autonomy, there is a national commitment to egalitarianism.

**Case Law: Bavaria v Federal Republic of Germany (2006)**, this case dealt with a challenge against the fiscal equalization scheme that Germany has in place. Bavaria challenged the equalization scheme where it felt forced to contribute excessively to poorer states. In this case, the Federal Constitutional Court ruled for the equalization system, stating that Länder is obliged

[13] *National Federation of Independent Business v Sebelius* [2012] 567 US 519
[14] Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act 2010
[15] *State of Karnataka v Union of India* (1977) 4 SCC 608

to mutually support each other for balanced development across Germany. In this case, it reiterated the point of centralization to redistribute so that regional autonomy is preserved without losing equity.

## POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In reducing economic inequalities, federal systems, which try to harmonize regional autonomy with national cohesion, are further challenged. Federal governments have to create a fiscal framework that would allow subnational governments to exercise sufficient autonomy within a framework that ensures the distribution of funds reasonably between regions in the process of achieving equity. This part outlines key policy recommendations on enhancing equalization mechanisms, promoting intergovernmental coordination, and balanced fiscal federalism. These recommendations draw on case law and the experiences of different federal systems in showing how legal precedents inform and shape fiscal policy frameworks.

### Designing Balanced Fiscal Federalism for Equity -

A balanced approach to fiscal federalism grants regions autonomy in decision-making while still furnishing all of them with the required resources to deliver the very basic public services that people require. Arrangements made through intentional fiscal distributions in federal systems help avoid possible regional inequality regarding fiscal authorities. Therefore, it becomes fundamental that the federal system makes a number of recommendations concerning the policy. Establish minimum standards on public services through federal systems, national minimum standards can be set to ensure all regions achieve a minimum public service standard. Such standards might keep affluent regions from benefiting at others' expense due to decentralization, with poor regions failing to finance basic services effectively.[16]

**In San Antonio Independent School District v Rodriguez (1973)[17],** the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that inequalities in funding for schools did not amount to violations of the U.S.

[16] Rosario G Manasan, 'Designing the Fiscal Features of a Federal Form of Government: Autonomy, Accountability, and Equity Considerations' Philippine Institute for Development Studies Working Paper 56/2017 <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps1756_rev.pdf> accessed 16 December 2024

[17] *San Antonio Independent School District v Rodriguez* [1972] 406 US 966

Constitution and held that education was not a fundamental right under the U.S. Constitution. Thus, this court decision underlined the implications of weak federal standards in a devolved system and further entrenched the disparities between educational resources. Setting minimum standards for services like education and healthcare could alleviate this inequity. The poorer states would then be compelled to retain an adequate standard of services even as they proclaimed they were being treated unfairly.

**Promote Equitable Local Revenue Generation –**

Although decentralization prods districts to generate revenue on their own, the federal framework should also build guidelines that would check the monopolization of resources by richer districts. For example, the states should be encouraged to diversify their sources of revenue, such as sales taxes, local fees, or public-private partnerships.

**Judicial Interpretations: South Dakota v Wayfair, Inc. (2018)**[18] is an example where the U.S. Supreme Court extended the authority of states to collect sales tax from out-of-state businesses and thereby helped states generate revenue on their own. These judicial interpretations help states to increase revenue generation, especially among poorer states. So, support for mechanisms of raising revenue in different ways can stimulate the federal system to facilitate funding for services by the states, fostering economic equity.

**Enhancing Equalization Mechanisms in Federal Systems -**

Effective equalization mechanisms are necessary for reducing fiscal imbalances between rich and poor regions. Equalization mechanisms ensure that economic imbalances are reduced through the redefinition of resources so that all regions can maintain standards in equal status in public services. Recommendations include: Equalization transfers would be strengthened to balance out fiscal gaps if the federal government were to structure equalization transfers so that poorer regions have funds for basic services. This means reviewing the allocation criteria as a function of population needs, economic capacity, and development priorities.[19]

---

[18] *South Dakota v Wayfair Inc* [2018] US 585

[19] James M Buchanan and Richard E Wagner, 'An Efficiency Basis For Federal Fiscal Equalization' In Julius Margolis (ed), *The Analysis of Public Output* (NBER 1970)

**Case Law: In State of West Bengal v Union of India (1962),** the Indian Supreme Court judgment struck down the power of the central government in making an equal share of resources between states, thus this settled the principle of federalism in the Indian structure by adjusting the resource distribution equitably by the Finance Commission according to the requirement of the states and it periodically monitored criteria for equalization which made the federal system capable to ensure that transfers equalize fiscal gaps better and bring in equity.

**Incentivizing Fiscal Responsibility and Economic Performance –**

Equitable Transfers Equalization transfers should support weaker regions without making them dependent on federal grants. Incentives under equalization programs establish performance-based incentives within the federal system to encourage better regional economic management while retaining equity.[20]

**Case Law: In Bavaria v Federal Republic of Germany (2006),** the German Constitutional Court maintained the system of equalization in Germany by holding that wealthier Länder has a duty to contribute to a balancing of regional inequities. However, the court held that avoiding dependence should continue to be and remain the paramount goal and promoted reforms which would make the varying Länder strive to improve their fiscal policies. Performance-based criteria in equalization transfers can also maintain balance in other federal systems by enabling regions to attain fiscal sustainability over time.

## PROMOTING COORDINATION BETWEEN FEDERAL AND REGIONAL POLICIES

Inter-governmental coordination shall be supported by an effective mechanism for creating consistent national policies respecting regional autonomy. Federal and regional governments shall collaborate in carrying out consistent policies to reduce regional disparities and promote

[20] Jenna Bednar, 'The Political Science of Federalism' (2011) 7(1) Annual Review of Law and Social Science <https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-102510-105522> accessed 16 December 2024

national economic development.[21] Recommendations for promoting inter-governmental coordination:

**Intergovernmental Forums for Policy Dialogue:** An intergovernmental forum periodically convenes a council or committee that makes the dialogue between federal and regional leaders periodic and cyclical, with the aim of aligning policies in critical areas such as infrastructure, health, and education.

**Case Law: In National Federation of Independent Business v Sebelius (2012)**, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the federal government did not have the authority to compel states to expand Medicaid, thus illustrating the limits of federal authority in relation to state policies. This case focused on the principle of intergovernmental coordination which is voluntary and not compelled. Periodic forums for policy dialogue would help collaborative solutions attain collaboration that respects the autonomy of the states, especially for nationwide initiatives that require such unification.

**Harmonization of Tax and Regulatory Policies across Regions:** Harmonization of tax structures and regulatory standards among federal systems should be encouraged in an effort to discourage sharp regional economic disparities. They help reduce competition between regions and encourage a fair distribution of investment and growth opportunities.[22]

**Case Law: The Indian case of Mohit Minerals Pvt Ltd. v Union of India (2020)**[23] addressed the hurdles that emerged before India's GST system, whose combination of indirect taxes across states had unified various levies at the state level. Recommendations of the GST Council were upheld by the Supreme Court to harmonize state fiscal autonomy with central taxation to reach greater economic integration. An example of a country with a harmonized tax structure would be India, which reduces regional competition, thus making the environment for investment and growth more equitable among all regions.

[21] Vito Tanzi and A. Lans Bovenberg, 'Is There a Need for Harmonizing Capital Income Taxes Within EC Countries?' In Horst Siebert (ed), *Reforming Capital Income Taxation* (Routledge 2019)
[22] Fernando Velayos et al., 'Regional Integration and Tax Harmonization: Issues and Recent Experiences' in Vito Tanzi et al. (eds), *Taxation and Latin American Integration* (Harvard University 2008)
[23] *Mohit Minerals Pvt Ltd v Union of India* Civ Appl No 1390/2022

**Flexibility in federal programs toward accommodating the states:** a federal system should be able to allow flexibility within national programs so that regional governments can determine policies according to unique contexts while meeting the objectives of the federal policy. For instance, a health or education program at the federal level could set general goals for the country, which may then be implemented at the state or regional level using suitable implementation strategies best for the population.[24]

**Case Law: In the case of Printz v United States (1997)**,[25] the U.S. This means that the Supreme Court ruled that the federal government could not command a state official to implement a federal program, therefore reasserting the principle of state autonomy in federal programs. Despite such a ruling that has reinforced the limitation imposed on the power of the federal government, it also throws light on the requirements for flexible design in a program. Federal systems can honour regional autonomy by providing tailored approaches within the federal programs where regional governments can respond specifically to such needs while striving at national goals.

## CONCLUSION

From this comparison between the federal system and economic inequality, one can see how models of fiscal federalism impact the distribution of wealth and resources in different regions. The more a federal system deviates from dealing with these issues, the greater its capacity to either worsen or improve economic inequalities. These are determined by its stance on generating revenues, decentralization of revenue, equalization mechanisms, and intergovernmental coordination. The United States and India, for example, and Germany demonstrate how regional autonomy may be balanced with redistribution efforts from the centre in different unique ways each, on its own, yields significant insights about the impacts of federal structures on economic equity.

Extreme state autonomy in source generation of revenue has not proven beneficial for the United States since it supports highly developed states in performing their activities and thriving

[24] Bednar (n 20)
[25] *Printz v United States* [1997] 521 US 898

independently while adding major imbalances to financing and quality delivered by public services. In the case of India, the central government is more participative in redistributing resources through the Finance Commission; yet disparities persist because of regional economic differences and bottlenecks in administration. Germany is a financial equalization system that balances all the Länder so that they offer equal services to the citizens, although issues on incentives in fiscal responsibility are still debated.

This means that concrete equalization transfers, minimal standards for basic public services, and coordination mechanisms at the intergovernmental levels are quite essential in enhancing inequality in federal systems. Thus, policies that will push for fiscal autonomy with equity consideration will enable federal systems to better manage economic disparities and promote national cohesion. Thus, as the world becomes an increasingly interrelated place, federal systems will have to become much more sophisticated regarding dealing with economic inequality. It should draw upon comparatively earned experience and continually redefine its approach toward a more balanced distribution of development across the regions.