

Block grants are inherently superior to the federal mandate for two reasons: one, the more efficient execution of the will of the local population, and two, the lessened potential for underfunding.

A block grant is a delivery of federal funds to a state or states for a broad yet still defined purpose, whereas a mandate is a delivery of funds under very strict and specific conditions, with the potential for withholding of funds should the conditions not be met.

On execution, this system of flexibility allows local officials and residents to discuss and allocate funds as they see fit. This is inherently superior to the mandate, where little to no room for adjustment exists. By allowing the residents and leaders of a specific area to deliberate on where to allocate funds rather than ordering, block grants allow those with local knowledge to make local decisions, thus benefiting the people in that area more.

On underfunding, it's well known that funding can be withheld in the event that the conditions for funds to be delivered are not met. While this is an effective tactic in enforcement, this may actually work against the state. If the state refuses to comply for a valid reason or it works against the will of the people, there exists a risk of underfunding or withdrawal, where states are unable to fund certain sectors, which is at best unproductive to the state and at worse dangerous for its citizens.