

**Appendix Table 7.1: Platform Coding Guide**

General civil rights language	Summary score
Platform advocates a government policy of outlawing discrimination broadly across at least two different issue dimensions in what at least appears to be an enforceable manner (e.g., a Fair Employment Practices Commission with enforcement powers and a ban on segregated primary education).	5
Platform calls for a government policy of outlawing discrimination in one issue dimension in what at least appears to be an enforceable manner.	4
Platform proposes a <i>qualified</i> government policy of outlawing discrimination (e.g., proposed FEPC with explicit time limits or evidently limited enforcement).	3
Platform advocates not the explicit outlawing of discrimination but its discouragement, including incentive plans, alternative opportunities, and nondiscrimination in government (e.g., a proposed commission to educate citizens on the virtues of nondiscrimination).	2
Platform states that the party opposes discrimination, but does not propose any government actions to prevent or discourage discrimination.	1
Platform does not mention civil rights.	0
Platform does not take a position on civil rights legislation, but views some government actors as inappropriate for advancing civil rights (e.g., the courts, the federal government). Platforms employing “states’ rights” language within their civil rights planks are included in this category.	-1
Platform explicitly endorses the status quo (e.g., “current state civil rights legislation is adequate”).	-2
Platform advocates discriminatory policies. This advocacy need not be framed in strictly civil rights language. For example, a plank mentioning “freedom of choice in home sales” qualifies.	-3
Platform warns that civil rights legislation will lead to breakdown in law and order; questions the motives or character of civil rights proponents; or claims that civil rights leaders are exploiting minorities.	-4

Appendix Table 7.2: Issue Scores

(for fair employment practices, housing, public accommodations, and education issues)

Platform proposes law (including commission with apparent enforcement powers) or claims credit for recent passage of law that aims to protect minorities from discrimination in this issue area. (For education issues, this category also includes explicit endorsements of the <i>Brown v. Board</i> decision.)	3
Platform calls for some government action, but proposal does not seem expansive enough to significantly reduce or end discrimination in the issue area (e.g., a plank that proposes a commission on civil rights to examine the issue and make recommendations).	2
Platform is vaguely supportive of civil rights in this issue area, but does not take a position on the appropriateness of legislation (e.g., “we favor such laws as necessary”).	1
Platform does not mention the issue.	0
Platform views the issue as best left to the private sector or condemns past or proposed government action in this area.	-1

(for voting rights issues)

Platform advocates the elimination of multiple barriers to voting through legislation or other binding actions.	3
Platform calls for the elimination of one specific barrier to voting, e.g., the poll tax.	2
Platform is vaguely supportive of civil rights in this issue area, but does not take a position on the appropriateness of legislation (e.g., “we favor such laws as necessary”).	1
Platform does not mention the issue.	0
Platform views the issue as best left to the private sector or condemns past or proposed government action in this area.	-1