**<AT>Appendix**

**<H1>A.1 Key Players in Platform Writing**

To get a clearer sense of how the platform-writing process works in the states, we built upon Feinstein and Schickler’s 2008 analysis.[[1]](#footnote-1) That research had previously characterized the platform-writing process in 1942 and 1950; we supplemented that study with additional news coverage searches in the contemporary period, focusing on 2014–18.

 Appendix Table A.1 presents summary information from a sample of 117 newspaper articles published in 1942 and 1950 that mention a state party platform.[[2]](#footnote-2) The news coverage makes clear that elected officials, state party officials, and allied interest groups played the most prominent role in writing the platforms during this period. In most cases, the state party or chair or the party executive committee appointed a platform committee. The committee, in turn, often relied upon a subcommittee that generally included state legislators and state party leaders to draft the platform for review by the full committee and convention (see Feinstein and Schickler for additional details[[3]](#footnote-3)). Interest groups’ main formal involvement consisted of testimony before the platform committee.

Table A.1. Summary of Those Involved in Writing State Party Platforms in 1942–50.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Year-State-Party** | **Key Players** | Articles |
| 1942 NJ-D | Elected Officials* Behind-the-scenes fight takes place between governor and Jersey City mayor over platform plank.
* State senator chairs platform committee.
 | 6 |
| 1942 NJ-R | Elected Officials* State Assembly speaker chairs platform committee.
 | 6 |
| 1942 IL-D | Elected Officials* Chicago mayor, a circuit judge, gubernatorial candidate, and candidates for both the U.S. House and Senate are influential in platform writing.

Party Officials* State party committeemen choose platform committee members.
* A county chair, the state party chair, and corporation counsel are influential in platform writing.
 | 5 |
| 1942 IL-R | Elected Officials* State senator chairs platform committee.
* State representative serves as platform committee secretary.

Party Officials* A party regular, who is a member of the platform committee, gives an address re: a proposed plank.

Interest Groups* Former state VFW commander.
 | 8 |
| 1942 NY-D | Elected Officials* Lt. governor heads platform committee.
* Multiple state legislators are involved.

Party Officials* State party chair chooses platform committee chair.

Interest Groups* NAACP, Urban League.
* Brooklyn Real Estate Board.
* 21 other groups, including labor and other civil rights organizations.
 | 12 |
| 1942 NY-R | Elected Officials* State Assembly speaker chairs platform committee.

Party Officials* The chairs of the county parties select platform committee members.
* Party activist serves as platform committee vice chair.
 | 14 |
| 1942 CT-D |  | 0 |
| 1942 CT-R | Elected Officials* Former lt. governor (and current Wesleyan president) chairs platform committee.
 | 2 |
| 1942 CA-D | Party Officials* LA County party chair has role in platform writing.

Interest Groups* Union leaders dominate convention.
 | 3 |
| 1942 CA-R |  | 0 |
| 1950 NJ-D |  | 2 |
| 1950 NJ-R |  | 3 |
| 1950 IL-D | Elected Officials* Cook County clerk chairs platform committee.

Party Officials* State central committee chair selects platform committee members.
 | 8 |
| 1950 IL-R | Elected Officials* Former member of Congress (and current U.S. Senate candidate) is active in platform writing.
* State Senate leader, a state representative are also involved.

Party Officials* A current county chair, former county chair, cochair of the national party “round-up committee,” and a “party regular” are actively involved in platform writing.

Interest Groups* Medical groups.
 | 6 |
| 1950 NY-D | Elected Officials* Binghamton mayor chairs platform committee.
* Various mayors and city councilors serve on platform committee.

Party Officials* Party activist serves as platform committee vice chair.
* State party chair, counsel, party research director, and platform committee secretary hold public hearings on platform.
* Various party members serve on platform committee.

Interest Groups* Railroad workers’ union; CIO; other unions.
* Education groups.
* American Jewish Congress, Anti-Defamation League.
 | 11 |
| 1950 NY-R | Party Officials* Committee is influential in platform writing chaired by state supreme court judge (note: in NY each county has a supreme court; judges are political appointees) and delegate to Republican National Convention.

Interest Groups* Railroad workers’ union.
* League of Women Voters.
* Education groups.
* Women’s rights groups.
 | 5 |
| 1950 CT-D | Party Officials* Wesleyan political scientist Stephen Bailey chairs platform committee.
 | 1 |
| 1950 CT-R |  | 1 |
| 1950 CA-D | Elected Officials* State Assembly member chairs platform committee.
 | 2 |
| 1950 CA-R |  | 0 |

*Notes:* CIO = Congress of Industrial Organizations; VFW = Veterans of Foreign Wars.

 We replicated and extended this analysis by searching for news coverage of the platform-writing process in each state for which we had a platform in 2008, 2010, and 2014. We included two midterm years because state coverage tends to be better when there is not a presidential election, as well as because most governors are elected in midterm years. We used the newspapers.com database, searching within each state for coverage in the lead-up to its party convention, using relevant keywords (e.g., “platform”).

 The news coverage in the more recent period suggests that the platform-writing process worked in a way broadly similar to the 1940s. Platform committees and subcommittees were often referred to as framing the initial proposal for the convention. While the coverage rarely provided details on who sat on these committees, in the cases where we were able to find this information, it reflected patterns similar to those during 1942–50. For example, the 2010 Texas Democrats had platform subcommittees chaired by state representatives. The 2010 Maine Republicans had a committee appointed by ranking members of the state legislature and congressional delegation. In some states, like Idaho, citizens submitted resolutions that the platform committee then sorted through and decided to include or not.

 The news coverage made clear that one of the central roles of the convention was to debate, consider, and approve the platform committee’s draft. The delegates, based on the coverage, were drawn from the ranks of state and local elected officials, party officials, and amateur activists. There were brief mentions of party leaders, including discussions on preventing certain planks from being added to platforms, silencing extremists, choosing the city in which the convention would be held, voting alongside delegates, and instructing delegates on how to vote (i.e., the physical process of casting votes).

In a handful of instances, the articles noted internal discord on the platform committees. The committee would vote on divisive platform planks before presenting them at the conventions, and at times, controversial definitions or planks were opposed. On a few other occasions, the party central committee struck down planks or language in the platforms (e.g., Nevada Republicans in 2014).

A key feature of Republican platform debates in several states concerned whether to impose stricter loyalty to conservative positions on candidates and officials. In one instance, the platform committee proposed that the party would only fund candidates who agreed to the platform by signing it, but members of the state legislature refused to sign onto this provision (Montana Republicans in 2014). In that same state and year, the party committee proposed a resolution for a closed primary to prevent less conservative Republicans from gaining support, and delegates voted in favor of this at the convention. However, the party chairman suggested that the proposal may not be implemented by the state legislature. The actions taken by the party in Montana are not too dissimilar to that of the 2014 Wyoming Republican delegates, who censured their governor for refusing to follow their party platform. In 2008, conservative Hawaii Republican delegates wanted to move their platform to the right, but party leaders just hoped to maintain the 2006 platform—party leaders managed to silence the more conservative faction of the party to pass the 2006 platform wording again. In Maine in 2010, the Republican party leaders wished to appease fringe delegates and allowed for additional conservative ideas to be incorporated. During these years, there was less discussion of ideological divisions among the Democrats, though a brief examination of the most recent cycles indicates that the growing strength of progressive forces within the party has generated parallel debates within several state conventions.

In sum, the news coverage supports the claim that state parties continued to take the contents of their platforms seriously as reflections of party members’ ideological commitments and stances on key issues. The process of writing platforms primarily involved party and elected officials, with those officials keeping an eye on the full convention as a check on their authority.

**<H1>A.2 Codebook for Annotations**

We are providing a list of trigrams, which are sets of three words, found jointly in state party platforms released by both major U.S. political parties over the last century. Please review each trigram and to the best of your ability, and please annotate the trigram into the following categories. We will provide a visualization of partisan usage over time for some trigrams, which may help in deciphering their meaning. You are very welcome to use Google or other search engines to try to determine the common uses of these phrases where it is not apparent. When it doubt, construe the categories below narrowly.

NONSENSE—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram is not a meaningful three-word phrase, 0 otherwise

PROPERNOUN—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram uses a proper noun (“presid\_bush\_congress”), 0 otherwise

WHICHPROPERNOUN—text indicating the proper noun used (e.g., “George W. Bush”)

ISSUE—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram in question can be linked to a specific political issue, 0 otherwise

WHICHISSUE—text; please enter the single issue that fits best (see list below). Please enter the text exactly as it appears below (e.g., “Abortion”). Please propose new/missing issues to Prof. Hopkins. Where the trigram involves multiple issues, please list the first or main issue.

SPECIFICPOLICY—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram identifies a specific government program (e.g., Social Security, SSDI, etc.) 0 otherwise

ABSTRACTION—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram makes any reference to abstract ideals or principles (e.g., “life, liberty, and happiness,” “private property rights” “innocent human life”), 0 otherwise

ECONOMIC—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram in question is connected to an economic issue (labor, taxes, health care), 0 otherwise

SOCIAL—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram in question is connected to a social issue (abortion, gay marriage, gun rights, religion in society, etc.), 0 otherwise

GROUP—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram has a clear connection to an identifiable group of people (e.g., women, immigrants, African Americans, LGBT, businesspeople, etc.)

WHICHGROUP—text identifying the group(s) of people in question

SOCGROUP—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram in question is connected to a group of people defined or delineated in social/socioeconomic terms (e.g., working class, wealthy, businesspeople, etc.), 0 otherwise

RACIALGROUP—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram in question is connected to a group of people defined or delineated in racial/ethnic terms (e.g., African Americans)

INTERESTGROUP—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram in question is connected to an organized interest group (e.g., “National Rifle Association,” “National Association for the Advancement of Colored People”)

RIGHTS—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram makes reference to the rights of specific groups of people (e.g., property rights, freedom of speech, right to bear arms, etc.)

GOVTSIZE—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram is related to issues of the proper scope and size of government, 0 otherwise

LEGAL—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram relates to the Constitution or legal or judicial issues, 0 otherwise

FOUNDING—binary indicator, 1 if the trigram relates to the U.S. founding (e.g., a phrase from the Declaration of Independence, Constitution, etc.), 0 otherwise

ISSUES

*ECONOMIC*

Fiscal/budgetary

Social Security

Taxes

Poverty

Income inequality

Unemployment/jobs

Economic growth

Minimum wage

Energy

Environment and climate change

Health care and health

Welfare/cash assistance/TANF

Infrastructure/roads/transportation

Labor/unions

Farming/agriculture

*SOCIAL*

Language rights

Gay rights

Gun control

Morality and religion in society (includes things like prayer in school, public expressions/symbols of faith)

Racism

Women’s rights

Abortion

Animal rights

*OTHER ISSUES*

Crime

Drugs (abuse and/or legalization)

Education

Child care

Immigration (includes questions of assimilation)

Judiciary

Elections/election reform

*FOREIGN*

International trade

Military strength/defense

Foreign policy

Terrorism and homeland security

**<H1>A.3 Cross-Party Nationalization Measures**

To be sure, there are various metrics of nationalization that one might generate from these data. The metric we report here is useful for local comparisons within eras, but not for global comparisons across broad swaths of time. The reason is that the topic models don’t do as well in identifying issues prominent in the 1970s–80s due to the relative paucity of platforms. As a consequence, Appendix Figures A.15 and A.16 provide this measure of nationalization over the shorter and more comparable period from 1990–2008 while Appendix Figures A.17 and A.18 provide the results for the full period of 1918–2017. The right panels in Figure A.12, meanwhile, report separate estimates for 1940–1964 and 1994–2017. The *y*-axis shows state-level distinctiveness, so declines over time are consistent with nationalization. During the post-1990 period, it is clear that cross-state differences in topic usage are declining, at least until the end of the period (when data sparsity issues limit our precision).

**<Insert figures A.1–A.18 & captions about here; art is in separate file; captions are below>**

**<Insert Tables A.2–A.5 about here>**

**<Figure captions >**

Fig. A.1. Logged words per platform by platform year, *n* = 1,783.

Fig. A.2. These charts illustrate the over-time distribution of various high-frequency trigrams in the corpus, with a focus on trigrams related to social/cultural issues.

Fig. A.3. These charts illustrate the over-time distribution of various high-frequency trigrams in the corpus, with a focus on trigrams related to economic issues.

Fig. A.4. Weighted share of novel trigrams from national platforms versus state platforms.

Fig. A.5. Distribution of usage of select latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA) topics over time for unigrams (top) and bigrams (bottom). Black triangles represent Democratic platforms in (a), (b), (d), and (e); gray circles represent Republican platforms.

Fig. A.6. These charts present topics 1–16 from the LDA output when fit to unigrams from plat form segments.

Fig. A.7. These charts present topics 17–32 from the LDA output when fit to unigrams from platform segments.

Fig. A.8. These charts present topics 33–48 from the LDA output when fit to unigrams from platform segments.

Fig. A.9. These charts present topics 49–55 from the LDA output when fit to unigrams from platform segments.

Fig. A.10. These charts present five different measures of partisan differences in topic usage in the bigram data set over time. The smoothed lines show eight-year averages beginning with the indicated year.

Fig. A.11. These charts present four measures of the within-party difference in topic usage across states using the bigram data set. The sizes of the points represent the relative number of platforms within the party.

Fig. A.12. These charts display the mean and median differences across parties (left) or states (right) for models fit separately to 1940–1964 and 1994–2017. Dot sizes correspond to number of platforms used for each estimation.

Fig. A.13. These charts present six measures of the cross-state differences in topic usage by party in the unigrams’ data set over the full 1918–2017 period.

Fig. A.14. These charts present six measures of the cross-state differences in topic usage by party in the bigrams’ data set over the full 1918–2017 period.

Fig. A.15. These charts present five measures of cross-state unigram usage from 1990 to 2008.

Fig. A.16. These charts present five measures of cross-state bigram usage from 1990 to 2008.

Fig. A.17. These charts present four measures of the cross-state differences in topic usage in the unigrams’ data set over the full 1918–2017 period.

Fig. A.18. These charts present five measures of the cross-state differences in topic usage in the bigrams’ data set over the full 1918–2017 period.
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