

**POLITICS & GOVERNMENT**

shall helped Woodrow Wilson carry Indiana and win the election.

Only a running mate who has his own national constituency can improve a ticket's chances. Ironically, the best example is Spiro Agnew, who was again a major Nixon asset in 1972—this time because of his own intensely loyal following. But, notes Adkison, politicians who bring such strength to a ticket rarely settle for second place.

*Reagan's New Federalism*

"Who Will Care for the Poor?" by Walter Guzzardi, Jr., in *Fortune* (June 28, 1982), 541 North Fairbanks Ct., Chicago, Ill. 60611.

President Reagan's proposal to turn over major federal programs to the states has been attacked as an attempt to institutionalize "benign neglect" of the nation's poor. Guzzardi, a *Fortune* editor, offers two cheers for Reagan's New Federalism, though he doubts that the states should be given all the responsibility the President intends to assign them.

Today's statehouses are peopled by professionals who manage money far better than do their Washington counterparts. Every state constitution except Vermont's requires a balanced budget. Thus, Guzzardi argues, it makes sense to give the states control of more than 40 federal programs worth \$40 billion—school lunches, highway maintenance,



Steve Kelly/San Diego Union.

*Few cartoonists have applauded President Reagan's New Federalism.*

**POLITICS & GOVERNMENT**

---

career education—and gradually trim Washington's contributions.

But the President also wants Washington to pay the \$30 billion tab for Medicaid (medical care for the poor), while shifting to the states the entire \$56 billion burden of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), food stamps, and Medicare (medical care for the elderly). This, charges Guzzardi, amounts to "handing the states the leading social dilemma of our time"—caring for the poor.

The existing social welfare system is part state, part federal. Despite federal contributions designed to minimize wide benefit disparities among states, Mississippi pays a monthly AFDC benefit of \$96 to a family of three; Wisconsin, \$473. But Mississippi's poor make up almost 25 percent of its total population; Wisconsin's, only 8.5 percent.

Other inequities are unrelated to state wealth. Oil-rich Texas's monthly AFDC benefit, \$118, is the nation's second lowest. Arizona offers no Medicare benefits at all. Giving the states full responsibility for social programs could widen such gaps.

Guzzardi believes that the current system of shared federal-state responsibility is inefficient. But he points out that while Reagan favors a federal takeover of Medicaid on grounds of economy, he does not seem to acknowledge that the same logic applies to AFDC and Medicare.

The states may be ready to handle more responsibilities in some areas, Guzzardi concludes, but "in modern times the expressions of our highest values . . . have come from the national government and from national leadership." That, he says, is not likely to change soon.

### *Lying to the Pollsters*

"Is the Public Lying to the Pollsters?" by I. A. Lewis and William Schneider, in *Public Opinion* (April-May 1982), % American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1150 17th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Public opinion pollsters called the 1980 presidential election a "horse race" right up to election day. Yet a "closet Reagan vote" gave the Republican a comfortable 10 percent margin of victory. The public, it appears, concealed its intentions.

Pollsters have been aware of the problem for years, write Lewis and Schneider, *Los Angeles Times* poll director and American Enterprise Institute Fellow, respectively. While people tell pollsters things—about their income, for example, or their political preferences—they might not reveal to neighbors or friends, they also tend to slant their answers towards what is socially acceptable or, as in a test, "correct."

Researcher Theresa Rogers, for example, asked 171 New Yorkers in 1974 whether they had voted in the last year's mayoral election. Of the nonvoters, 40 percent claimed they had voted. And those interviewed in person were more likely to misrepresent themselves than those queried by phone, confirming the suspicion that social pressures affect poll responses. But other studies show that between 10 and 41 percent of