Data Appendix

Our final data set is compiled from multiple sources: some hand-entered, some shared by other researchers, and some publicly available at Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS), or through the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). We describe each of these data sources and our variables here.

STATE-LEVEL DATA

Information on CAP Grants

State-level information on federal CAP grants is derived from the NARA microdata (Community Services Administration 1981). These records are structured as two data files spanning 1965 to 1981. One data set is observed at the level of 163,483 individual grant actions; the other data set records data on the 4,769 organizations receiving grants. The combined data include information on any "action" on a grant (when it is recorded, extended, renewed, or terminated), dates associated with these actions, and some information about the funded project. We use addresses from the grantee data and grant-action file, which include the name and address of the designated grantee as well as the county where the services are provided in most cases. Because a larger urban organization may be funded to provide services in a rural area, we use information on the area of service delivery in all of our analysis, data permitting. We aggregate these amounts by the fiscal year of disbursement and state of service delivery.[1]

We have verified these amounts by state against information printed in OEO annual reports for FY 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968 (Office of Economic Opportunity 1965–1968). The NARA data have systematically fewer CAP grants than the OEO reports in 1965, which can be attributed to missing Head Start grants in this first year. We are unsure about why these data are missing from the electronic files: the 1965 report tabulates Head Start grants separately from other CAP program grants, and includes all "approved" grants. Since Head Start began as a summer program in 1965, it may be that these grants are charged to the new fiscal year that began in July 1965 and counted in both 1965 and 1966 reports. The other FYs are very close in the NARA and OEO annual reports.

CAP grant-action data include data on the target population of grant proposals; taken together, grants from 1965–1968 total 18 million people targeted by approved CAP grants. The OEO deemed these data unreliable in 1971 and ceased collecting it; available documentation does not indicate how grantees made their estimates or even whether the OEO believed the estimates were too high, too low, or simply too inaccurate.

[1] The grant-action file includes separate variables for the action's fiscal year, "signing date," and "obligation date," as well as a "termination date" in some cases. The documentation does not make clear the meaning of these variables or the distinction between them. The number of grant-actions where the fiscal year recorded and the fiscal year implied by signing and obligation dates accounts for a small share of federal dollars, and using either of these as an alternative fiscal year identifier does not change our results.

Reconstruction of the EOA Apportionment Index, FY 1965–1968

Our reconstruction of the components of the EOA apportionment index in equation 1 requires three state-level components in each year from 1965 to 1967: (A) unemployment counts, (B) public assistance recipients, and (C) counts of children in families with household incomes below $1,000. The House Conference Report on the 1964 EOA (U.S. House 88-1458 1964, pp. 13–14) tabulates the current state-level data on these three measures that was used for FY 1965, and estimates the share of federal funds apportioned to each state based on the data. We hand entered these data for FY 1965.

The three components of the EOA apportionment index for the subsequent years were entered using the following sources.

(A) Unemployment counts come from the annual *Manpower Report of the President* for FY 1966 to 1968 (U.S. Department of Labor 1966–1968). These totals are transformed into state shares of the national total.

(B) Public assistance recipients are derived from the *Social Security Bulletin*'s annual statistical supplements for FY 1966 to 1968 and transformed into state shares of the national total (Department of Health, Education and Welfare 1966–1968). The annual supplement tabulates data for five public assistance programs: old age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, aid to families with dependent children (AFDC), and general assistance. For each of these five programs, the *Bulletin* tabulates total expenditures and expenditure per recipient by state and program; total recipients are derived by state and program by dividing total expenditures ($) by expenditures per recipient ($/person), and then summing across the five categories. This risks double-counting recipients of more than one form of public assistance, but the number of such people are likely to be small relative to the total number of recipients, as old age assistance and AFDC recipients exceed recipients of all the other three forms of assistance by orders of magnitude, and since relatively few elderly people have dependent children. Furthermore, to the extent that such double-counting occurs proportionally in every state, transforming total recipients into state share of the national total eliminates any problem.

(C) We found no state-level information on child poverty counts beyond the 1964 information printed in the House Conference Report (U.S. House 88-1458 1964 p. 13), nor do we know how subsequent figures would have been computed at the OEO. Consequently, our primary analysis uses the published 1964 child poverty rates for *subsequent* fiscal years. Because our state-level analysis relies on the index being what the OEO actually used, the lack of child poverty data could introduce measurement error. Therefore, we also examine the robustness of our results to a measure of child poverty that is linearly interpolated between 1964 and the 1970 census, which we compute using the 1970 IPUMS Census 1 percent sample.

COUNTY-LEVEL DATA

Except as noted, all data are reported at, aggregated to, or mapped onto consistent geographic units. The final data set contains 3,091 counties[2] or supercounties.

[2] Throughout this article, we use "county" to refer to both proper counties and county equivalents, including independent cities and Louisiana parishes.

Supercounties are the aggregations of individual counties into a single unit for analysis, either because some data are reported at a supercounty level, or because county boundaries change over the period of study. These supercounties include:

(1) the five boroughs comprising New York City;
(2) Menominee, Oconto, and Shawano Counties, Wisconsin;
(3) La Paz and Yuma, Arizona;
(4) Cibola and Valencia, New Mexico;
(5) Washabaugh and Jackson, South Dakota;
(6) Armstrong and Dewey, South Dakota;
(7) Yellowstone National Park designated area and Yellowstone County, Montana;
(8) Yellowstone National Park designated area and Park County, Wyoming;
(9) Lexington City and Rockbridge County, Virginia;
(10) Elizabeth City and Hampton City, Virginia;
(11) Emporia City and Greensville County, Virginia;
(12) Norfolk County and South Norfolk City become Chesapeake City, Virginia;
(13) Princess Anne County and Virginia Beach City, Virginia;
(14) Franklin City and Southampton County, Virginia;
(15) Warwick County and City and Newport News City, Virginia;
(16) Fairfax City and Fairfax County, Virginia;
(17) Salem City and Roanoke County, Virginia;
(18) Bedford City and Bedford County, Virginia;
(19) Manassas City, Manassas Park City, and Prince William County, Virginia; and
(20) Poquonson City and York County, Virginia.

For each of the data sets described below, we aggregated county information (count information is summed and share information is population weighted) to our set of consistently identified counties and supercounties and then linked these data sets together. Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia are excluded from analysis. Additionally, Bradley and Independence Counties, Arkansas, are missing 1960 presidential election data from all sources and are excluded from analysis. Necessarily, all are reported at the county level or lower.

Figure 3 maps per capita CAP spending at the county level using GIS shape files obtained from the Newberry Library (Siczewicz 2011). We extracted county borders as of December 31, 1959 from their panel of U.S. historical county boundaries. In a small number of cases where map counties were more disaggregated than our supercounties, the supercounty value is mapped in each constituent county.

Demographic Information

Demographic information are data entered from the U.S. Census publications and posted at ICPSR by Michael Haines (2010; ICPSR data set 2896). Variables from this data set include shares of population living in urban, farm, and rural nonfarm areas; shares of the population that are white and nonwhite; shares of population younger than five years old and older than sixty-four; share of population in households earning less than $3,000 per year or more than $10,000; shares of population with less than or equal to 4 years educational attainment and with greater than or equal to twelve years.

Haines (2010) is also the source of several additional demographic and political controls included in Appendix Table 5, used to replicate as closely as possible for the 1960s the variables used in Price Fishback, Shawn Kantor, and John Wallis's (2003) study of the New Deal. These additional variables include the civilian unemployment rate, inverse population density, voter turnout, total population, change in per capita retail sales 1958 to 1963, share of population with less than four years of education, share of land in farms, average farm size in 1964, and change in average farm size 1959 to 1964.

County-Level Measures of Local Government Spending

Data on county-level local government spending are collected from Volume VII, table 28 of the 1964 Census of Governments. (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1964). We collect data on direct general expenditure, which includes all outlays other than outgoing intergovernmental transfers, direct public welfare expenditure, and total local tax revenue. Local government spending is an aggregate of all local governments in a county, including the towns, cities, townships, villages, school districts, special districts, and county government itself. We divide these aggregates by total population to obtain per capita figures.

County-Level Information on Vietnam Casualties

Unfortunately, information on the number of men serving by county is not available from the National Archives or Selective Service, so casualty records are the best information we have on Vietnam mobilization. Data on Vietnam casualties is obtained from the NARA (Department of Defense 2008). The level of observation is the individual decedent. Records for 58,220 decedents contain date of death, state, and home city; most records also have data on home county.

We aggregate individual decedents and compute the cumulative number of deaths in Vietnam in a county per draft-eligible man (× 100) at $t + 2$ because tours were two years long. The number of draft-eligible men by county is calculated using the number of males in the 1960 Census who would have been draft-eligible by year $t + 2$. So, for the share of men in years 1960–1970, we total males aged 8 to 20 in the 1960 Census. (The youngest would have been 18 by the start of 1970; the oldest 26 in 1966.) To confirm that this variable is not driven by outmigration of males in heavily drafted areas, we also construct a backward-looking denominator of *females* aged 21–34 in the 1970 Census. Using this alternative measure of Vietnam mobilization does not affect our results. In practice, deaths appear to be a good proxy for mobilization. The association between two-year rolling windows of Vietnam casualties and lagged mobilization rates at the state level is 0.66.

In 1,709 cases where the decedent's city could refer to areas in more than one county, the county identifier is missing. When a decedent's city is uniquely named within a state, he is assigned to the county containing that city. When a decedent's city of origin is in multiple counties, we assign the casualty to the county containing the larger area or population mass of that city. For example, the incorporated area of Columbus, Ohio includes parts of three different counties, and Columbus decedents are coded as being from multiple counties. However, the largest, oldest, and most populous portion of Columbus is located in Franklin County, and we therefore assign Columbus decedents to Franklin County. When a decedent's city could refer to more than one populated area within a state, we assign the casualty to the county containing the largest populated area. For example, there are two places named Liberty in Illinois.

One is a small town of a few hundred people in Adams County; the other is an even smaller, unincorporated place in Saline County. Two decedents from Liberty, Illinois are assigned to Adams County.

For 13 observations lacking county identifiers, a county cannot be assigned, and these decedents are dropped from the analysis. Once county assignments have been made, casualties are aggregated to the county-year level.

County-year casualty totals are then transformed into a proxy measure of mobilization at year *t* by dividing casualties from 1960 to year *t +2* by the number of males in the 1960 census eligible for service by year *t + 2*. For instance, for year 1966, we total all casualties in a particular county recorded from 1960 to 1968 and divide by the number of males in the 1960 Census aged 10 to 20 (since all would have been greater than 18 and draft eligible by 1968). We look forward two years from year *t* to capture men who may have been drafted in year *t* and killed during their two-year tour of duty. We confirm that this measure is not driven by migration by calculating an alternative version using the 1970 Census and women of appropriate age from Haines (2010).

Information on Riot Intensity

Data on rioting was generously shared by William Collins and Robert Margo (2007). These data were originally collected by Gregg Leigh Carter (1986) and encompass 752 urban riots spanning from 1964 to 1971, observed at the level of individual riots.

We match city names for these riots to counties by hand and then aggregate to the county-year level. Where a city is located in more than one county (e.g., Columbus, Ohio) we match it to its principal county.

Following Collins and Margo, we measure riot intensity using an equally weighted index of five measures of riot intensity (deaths, injuries, arrests, days of rioting, and number of arsons) as a proportion of the sum of these measures for all urban riots from 1964 to 1971 in a specific county-year, measured as shares of the total count of all of these measures in all years and multiplied by a scaling factor of 10,000. The county-year index value is the sum of all riot index values in that county and year. For instance, the riot data set cumulatively counts 15,835 arsons, 69,099 arrests, 1,802 days of rioting, 12,741 injuries, and 228 deaths. The notorious July, 1967 Detroit riot had 7,231 arrests, 1,682 arsons, 491 injuries, 43 deaths, and lasted 9 days. Therefore the 1967 Detroit riot's index value is

$$\left(\frac{1{,}682}{15{,}835}+\frac{7{,}231}{69{,}099}+\frac{9}{1{,}802}+\frac{491}{12{,}741}+\frac{43}{228}\right)\times\ 10{,}000 = 4{,}430$$

Counties with no riots observed in a particular year are assigned a zero value. The Detroit riots were much more extensive than several small riots more typical of the time. During 1968, the worst year of the rioting, there are 167 individual riots, with a mean index value of 126. Of the 330 individual riots observed from 1964 to 1968, the mean index value is 140 and the median index value is 30.

County-Level Poverty Counts

In addition to income measures from the Haines Census files, we obtain counts and shares of families living below $1,000, $2,000, $3,000, and below the poverty line from the 1960 Putnam file (Community Services Administration 1975). The documentation included with the National Archives' copy of the Putnam file explains,

> *[The] OEO needed a definition of poverty and identification of the extent and pattern of poverty in the United States. The definition did not exist previously, and no documentation was available on what constituted poverty. No one knew exactly how the picture of poverty in the United States looked or what programs would act to eliminate it in the nation... To establish this definition and pattern of poverty, the Bureau of the Census took the first step and created the PUTNAM FILE using data from the Census of 1960. The file acquired the name from its originator in the OEO, Israel Putnam... OEO and other agencies used their files recurrently... OEO also used these files to justify the allocation of funds, the Department of Agriculture used them to estimate the cost burden of the Food Stamp Program, and the Center for Infectious Disease in Atlanta used them to identify disease vectors.*

The documentation suggest the Putnam file once included data by city and congressional district as well, but the National Archives holds a copy of county-level data exclusively. The documentation also indicates that the Putnam file is stored as EBCDIC plain text, but we found no software that was able to successfully convert the Putnam file to ASCII. To translate the data into a modern format, we did a "hex dump" of the underlying binary code into a text file recording each byte in hexadecimal (base-16) digits. We then compared individual bytes to a sample page of bytes and corresponding meanings in the National Archives documentation to "decode" the data format of the underlying file. We then translated the hexadecimal output directly into Stata format. We confirmed that this method correctly obtained the underlying data by aggregating poverty counts from the Putnam file and comparing the results to those published in a 1970 Census special report on changes in local poverty rates (Bureau of the Census 1975).

County-Level Information on U.S. Election Outcomes and Voter Turnout

We obtain votes cast by party by county for the 1960, 1964, and 1968 presidential elections from ICPSR (1995), "General Election Data for the United States, 1950–1990." From these data, we create variables for each election measuring the share of votes cast for the Democrat relative to the decisive vote, indicator variables for close vote shares within the county or for Democratic victory, and interactions of these variables. Because county-level 1960, 1964, and 1968 presidential election vote totals for Mississippi and Alabama have missing observations in ICPSR (1995), we hand-entered this information using official state publications: the *Alabama Official and Statistical Register* (State of Alabama 1963) and *Mississippi Election Statistics* (Abney 1968). Bradley and Independence Counties, Arkansas have missing data as well, but we could not find an alternative data source. These two counties are dropped from our analysis.

Specifically, we construct the *relative* vote share as half the difference between the Democratic vote share and the winner (in the case of a loss) or the second-place candidate (if the Democrat is the winner). In a two-party race, a 50–50 split sets this variable equal to 0; a 75–25 win is a relative share of +25 percent; a 60-40 loss is a relative share of –10 percent; etc. For the 1964 election, the share of ballots cast for third parties is small in all states, and the variable is extremely close to this ideal.

We obtain county-level estimates of voter turnout and measures of Democratic vote share in elections to the House of Representatives from 1950 to 1972 from Jerome M. Clubb, William H. Flanigan, and Nancy H. Zingale (2006, ICPSR 8611). This data set estimates the number of eligible voters using interpolation between decennial censuses and laws governing voter eligibility. As such, turnout can exceed 100 percent when

county vote totals exceed their estimated number of eligible voters; see their documentation for more details. Some counties are missing election data in this source in each election cycle; as such we use a balanced panel of 2,585 counties in our analysis of turnout and Democratic vote share that are observed in each election from 1950 to 1972.

Clubb, Flanigan, and Zingale (2006) is also the basis of several additional political variables included in Appendix Table 5 to replicate as closely as possible for the 1960s the variables used in Fishback, Kantor, and Wallis's (2003) study of the New Deal. These additional variables are the Democratic presidential vote share over nine election cycles, the volatility (measured by standard deviation) of Democratic share over ten election cycles, and the swing in Democratic share since the previous election.

County-Level Information in Agriculture

An indicator variable for the census "plantation county" designation is derived from a special report on 1910 cotton production in 337 counties characterized by plantation agriculture (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1916). The list of these counties was generously provided in machine-readable form by Paul Rhode.

Sharecroppers as a share of farm operators are derived from counts of total operators and croppers from the U.S. Censuses of Agriculture for 1930 and 1959. Data for 1930 and 1935 were kindly provided by Fishback, Haines, and Rhode. Total operators for 1959 were obtained from Haines (2010). Sharecropper counts for 1954 and 1959 Censuses of Agriculture were hand-entered by Depew, Fishback, and Rhode (2012).

Measures of Congressional Power and Committee Chairmanship

Party identification and committee membership and rank data for members of Congress is observed at the level of the individual, with one observation per committee assignment, per congress (Nelson 2012). We matched these data to counties using a crosswalk constructed from the district number variable in Clubb, Flanigan, and Zingale (2006) and maps in the *Atlas of Congressional Districts* (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1964, 1966, 1968). Following Lee J. Alston and Joseph P. Ferrie (1999, p. 45), we define the powerful committees of the House of Representatives as Ways and Means, Appropriations, Rules, Education/Labor, Judiciary, and Agriculture.

House representatives in leadership positions—that is, Speaker of the House or the leader or whip of either party—who do not also serve on committees are missing from the data set. We add information about these people and their leadership roles to the data manually, using the printed edition of Nelson's data (1993).

We use our crosswalk to turn these variables and their interactions at the level of the congress-representative-assignment level into variables at the county level. Some counties have more than one representative in the House. We create indicator variables equal to one if *any* county representative is a member of a powerful committee or in a House leadership position; if *any* representative is in chair or senior minority member of a powerful committee or in a House leadership position; if *any* representative is both a Democrat *and* a committee member or a leader; and if any representative is both a Democrat *and* a committee chair or member of the House leadership; otherwise, each variable is equal to zero.

We also create a variable equal to the share of a county's representatives that were Democrats. When counties have more than one representative, the variable for a

Democratic representative is equal to: (Number of county Democratic representatives) / (Total number of county representatives). Since most counties have a single House representative, in the 88th Congress there are only 150 of 3,093 counties where this variable is not equal to zero or one.

Information on CAP Grants

See discussion on CAP grant data under state-level discussion. Note that the address of the provision of services may differ from the grantee's primary address, so we use information on the delivery of services to aggregate to the county level when available. For 55 grant actions where service delivery county codes are missing, grant actions are assigned to a local area based on the location of the grantee organization. For 24 grant actions missing both grantee and grant-action county codes, geographic codes are assigned by inferring a project's probable location from the project description string variable which contains this information. Then, federal CAP funding is aggregated to the county-FY level using these geographic codes and the dates of likely disbursement.

New Deal Spending and Covariates

Column 4 of Appendix Table 5 adds a vector of correlates of New Deal spending to a county-level analysis of War on Poverty grants. These variables include demographic, political, and structural measures of the American economy up to year 1932, and are described in detail in the Data Appendix to the working paper version of Fishback, Kantor, and Wallis (2003) (see NBER Working Paper No. 8309). The county-level data were obtained from Price Fishback's web site in June 2013, available at http://www.u.arizona.edu/~fishback/Published_Research_Datasets.html.

MISCELLANEOUS DATA

County Boundaries

Figure 3 maps real 1965–1968 per capita War on Poverty spending at the county level. County boundaries were obtained from the Newberry Library's *Atlas of Historical County Boundaries* (Siczewicz 2011) available at http://publications.newberry.org/ahcbp/index.html and downloaded in August 2013. Shape files for counties as of December 31, 1959 were extracted from the full panel of U.S. county shape data using ARCMap software. The map was created by merging our county-level data set with the extracted shape files using the shp2dta and spmap Stata .ado extensions. As described above, our data set is observed at the level of "supercounties"; when a super-county corresponded to more than one county shape, the same supercounty value is mapped to all component counties.

Roll Call Votes

Roll Call votes in the House and Senate for passage of the Economic Opportunity Act are taken from ICPSR data set No. 4, "United States Congressional Roll Call Voting Records, 1789–1998." Roll call votes are coded as a 1 for a YES and 0 for a NO (including paired votes), and coded as missing for members not voting or voting present.

Congressional District Demographic Data

The roll call vote analysis in Appendix Table 6 uses demographic and economic data from the *Congressional District Data Book* for the 88th Congress obtained from E. Scott Adler's homepage, available at http://sobek.colorado.edu/~esadler/Congressional_District_Data.html.

Congressional Tenure

The comparative analysis with New Deal spending uses ICPSR and Carroll McKibbin's (1997) data on individual congresspersons to construct a measure of tenure. We define tenure as the total number of Congresses served by a Representative of Senator in their respective chamber at the time of the vote for passage of the Economic Opportunity Act. Partial terms (*e.g.*, those who took office in a special election) are counted as equivalent to full terms. Nonconsecutive terms are included, but service in the other chamber of Congress or in other political office is not.

APPENDIX TABLE 1
SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR COUNTY DATA SET

		Mean	Median	SD
Federal CAP funds (Cumulative in thousands 1968$, others current thousands $)	1965–1968	783,576	10,528	4,633,000
	1965	46,111	0	413,798
	1966	188,728	0	1,101,000
	1967	253,857	0	1,568,000
	1968	265,428	0	1,445,000
Local government direct general expenditures per capita	1962	183.1	171.1	77.78
Local government public welfare expenditures per capita	1962	9.743	3.001	15.48
Local government tax revenue per capita	1962	87.23	79.62	55.48
Share of Population ≤ 5 years old	1960	0.111	0.111	0.018
Share of Population > 64 years old	1960	0.106	0.104	0.033
Share of Nonwhite population	1960	0.107	0.024	0.165
Share of Population living in urban areas	1960	0.321	0.311	0.284
Share of Population living in rural farm areas	1960	0.226	0.204	0.162
Share of Population with income <$3K/year	1960	0.079	0.068	0.051
Share of Population with income ≥ $10K / year	1960	0.355	0.335	0.162
Vietnam deaths 1960–1965 per men aged 11–20 in 1960 x 100		0.129	0.117	0.12
Vietnam deaths 1960–1968 per men aged 10–20 in 1960 x 100		0.21	0.202	0.149
Vietnam deaths 1960–1969 per men aged 9–20 in 1960 x 100		0.256	0.243	0.161
Vietnam deaths 1960–1970 per men aged 8–20 in 1960 x 100		0.267	0.257	0.16
Collins-Margo Riot Intensity Index	1964	0.90	0	29.0
	1965	1.63	0	87.5
	1966	1.09	0	25.7
	1967	4.48	0	93.1
	1968	5.62	0	64.8
Democratic vote share for president	1964	0.0534	0.0765	0.151
Democrats win electoral votes	1964 (0/1)	0.731	1	0.443
Presidential vote margin within 10 pct. points	1964 (0/1)	0.233	0	0.423
Dem win * close election	1964 (0/1)	0.138	0	0.344
Democratic vote share for president	1960	–0.0208	–0.0388	0.134
Democrats win electoral votes	1960 (0/1)	0.38	0	0.486
Presidential vote margin within 10 pct. points	1960 (0/1)	0.275	0	0.446
Dem win * close election	1960 (0/1)	0.118	0	0.322
Croppers as share of farm operators	1930	0.0837	0	0.14
Percent Change in cropper share of operators	1930–1959	–33.64	0	42.56
Census plantation county designation	1910 (0/1)	0.109	0	0.312
Northeast	(0/1)	0.0689	0	0.253
Midwest	(0/1)	0.341	0	0.474
South	(0/1)	0.457	0	0.498
West	(0/1)	0.133	0	0.34

APPENDIX TABLE 1 — continued

		Mean	Median	SD
Democratic share of U.S. House Reps., 88th Congress	1964	0.589	1	0.48
House Reps. include major committee member/leadership, 88th Congress	1964	0.455	0	0.498
House Reps. include Democrat major committee member, 88th Congress	1964	0.247	0	0.431
House Reps. include major committee chair or leader, 88th Congress	1964	0.0456	0	0.209
House Reps. include Dem major comm. member/leadership, 88th Congress	1964	0.0197	0	0.139

Notes: Summary statistics for 3,091 counties in the 48 contiguous states (excludes Alaska, Hawaii, and District of Columbia; see the Data Appendix).
Sources: Riot data, Collins and Margo (2007); Vietnam data, Defense Casualty Analysis System; 1960 Census data, Haines (2010); Election outcomes, ICPSR (1997); Local government budgetary data, Census of Government (1962); Plantation data, U.S. Census Bureau (1916); and Fishback, Haines, and Rhode (2012).

APPENDIX TABLE 2
SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR DATA SET ON VOTER TURNOUT AND SHARE DEMOCRAT

	Year	Mean	Median	SD
Estimated Voter Turnout	1950	43.98	50.6	22.68
	1952	58.61	67.3	22.07
	1954	44.87	50.2	20.90
	1956	57.46	65.7	21.33
	1958	45.36	52.5	23.06
	1960	61.19	69.9	22.15
	1962	48.01	52.9	21.27
	1964	60.28	65.7	18.46
	1966	49.68	50.8	15.41
	1968	59.65	62.3	14.66
	1970	49.07	50.1	18.56
	1972	56.30	58.9	16.78
Democratic House Election Vote Share	1950	56.55	47.86	27.29
	1952	52.84	44.0	28.31
	1954	56.87	49.19	25.89
	1956	57.18	50.23	25.23
	1958	63.54	56.54	23.78
	1960	59.07	52.4	24.38
	1962	57.10	50.55	23.24
	1964	56.43	52.48	22.14
	1966	51.93	48.19	21.87
	1968	49.31	45.5	22.97
	1970	55.31	51.0	23.17
	1972	52.43	48.5	24.38

Note: Summary statistics for a balanced panel of 2,585 counties in the 48 contiguous states (excludes Alaska, Hawaii, and District of Columbia).
Source: Clubb, Flanigan, and Zingale (2006).

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES
(some not in the main text)

Abney, F. Glenn. *Mississippi Election Statistics, 1900–1967*. Jackson: Mississippi Bureau of Governmental Research, 1968.

Alston, Lee J., and Joseph P. Ferrie. *Southern Paternalism and the American Welfare State: Economics, Politics, and the Institutions in the South, 1865–1965*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Carter, Gregg Lee. "The 1960s Black Riots Revisited: City Level Explanations of Their Severity." *Sociological Inquiry* 56, no. 2 (1986): 210–28.

Clubb, Jerome M., William H. Flanigan, and Nancy H. Zingale. "Electoral Data for Counties in the United States: Presidential and Congressional Races, 1840–1972." ICPSR08611-v1. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [producer and distributor], 13 November 2006.

Collins, William J., and Robert A. Margo. "The Economic Aftermath of the 1960s Riots in American Cities: Evidence from Property Values." *The Journal of Economic History* 67, no. 4 (2007): 849–83.

Community Services Administration. "Census Tabulations by Income, Age, and Race, for Poor and Non-Poor by County File, 1960 (1960 Putnam File)." Records of the Community Services Administration, Record Group 381. National Archives at College Park, Maryland, 1975.

_____. Office of Management. Finance and Grants Management Division. "Records of the Community Services Administration." Records about Community Action Program Grants and Grantees, Record Group 381. National Archives at College Park, Maryland, 1981.

Depew, Briggs, Price Fishback, and Paul Rhode. "New Deal or No Deal in the Cotton South: The Effect of the AAA on the Agricultural Labor Structure." Mimeo, University of Arizona, Tucson, 27 April 2012.

Price V. Fishback and Michael R. Haines and Paul W. Rhode. "Data Entered from the Agricultural Censuses of 1930, 1935, and 1940." Shared by personal correspondence, June 2012.

Fishback, Price, Shawn Kantor, and John Wallis. "Can the New Deal's Three R's Be Rehabilitated? A Program-by-Program, County-by-County Analysis." *Explorations in Economic History* 40, no. 3 (2003): 278–307.

Haines, Michael R. "Historical, Demographic, Economic, and Social Data: The United States, 1790–2002" [Computer file]. ICPSR02896-v3. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2010.

Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. "General Election Data for the United States, 1950–1990" [Computer file]. ICPSR00013-v1. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [producer and distributor], 1995.

Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research and Congressional Quarterly, Inc. United States Congressional roll call voting records, 1789-1998.ICPSR00004-v3. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2010-05-06. doi:10.3886/ICPSR00004.v.3

Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, and Carroll McKibbin. Roster of United States Congressional Officeholders and Biographical Characteristics of Members of the United States Congress, 1789–1996: Merged Data. ICPSR07803-v10. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 1997.

Nelson, Garrison. *Committees in the U.S. Congress, 1947–1992*. *Congressional Quarterly*, 1993. Data taken from accompanying data file available online at http://web.mit.edu/17.251/www/data_page.html (accessed March 2012).

Office of Economic Opportunity. *Annual Reports.* Washington, DC: GPO, 1965–1968.

Ruggles, Steven, et al. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 5.0* [machine-readable database]. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2010.

Siczewicz, Peter. "U.S. Historical Counties: Data Set." *Atlas of Historical County Boundaries*, edited by John H. Long. Chicago: Newberry Library, 2011. http://publications.newberry.org/ahcbp (accessed August 2013).

State of Alabama. Department of Archives and History. *Alabama Official and Statistical Register*. Montgomery, AL: Walker Printing, 1963.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Plantation Farming in the United States*. Washington, DC: GPO, 1916.

_____. *United States Congressional District Data Books, 1961–1965*. ICPSR00010-v1. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 1963. doi:10.3886/ICPSR00010.v1.

_____. *Congressional District Atlas*. Washington, DC: GPO, 1964, 1966, and 1968.

_____. *Census of Population Supplementary Report*. *Poverty Status in 1969 and 1959 of Persons and Families, for States, SMSA's, Central Cities and Counties: 1970 and 1960.* Washington, DC: GPO, 1975.

U.S. Department of Defense. Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. "Vietnam Conflict Extract Data File." Series: Defense Casualty Analysis System (DCAS) Extract Files. Record Group 330: Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. National Archives at College Park, Maryland, 2008 (retrieved from the Access to Archival Databases at www.archives.gov).

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Social Security Bulletin Annual Statistical Supplement.* Washington, DC: GPO, 1965–1968.

U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor. Committee on Education and Labor. *Report [to Accompany H.R. 11377]* (H.R. Report 88-1458) 88th Cong., 2nd sess., 1964.