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**Appendix A: Alternative Specifications and Additional Results for Reconstruction Analysis**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Measure of Black Population | Measure of Troop Presence | Correlation (Pearson’s R) |
| County Black Population | Troops in County | 0.08 |
| County Percent Black | Troops in County | 0.06 |
| County Black Population | Troops in Buffer Zone | 0.00 |
| County Percent Black | Troops in Buffer Zone | 0.09 |

Table A1: Correlation Between Troop Presence and Black Population, Reconstruction

Downs and Nesbit (2015) report that army outposts were random during Reconstruction, making it reasonable to assume that the placement of army outposts is unrelated to Black population. In Table A1 we report the correlation between troop presence and county racial demographics. Table A1 shows that the correlations between our measures of troop access (whether measured by troops in county or the troop buffer zone) and Black population (whether measured by the Black population in a county of the percent Black in a county) never correlate at or above .1.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Dependent Variable: Black Officeholders |  |  |
|  | Coefficient | Standard Error |
| Prop. Black | -0.3502 | 0.0000 |
| Troops Present | 1.3332 | 0.0001 |
| Turnout (lagged) | 0.0238 | 0.0105 |
| Total Pop. | -0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Prop Black \* Troops Present | 2.6361 | 0.0000 |
| Method: weighted unit Fixed Effects  Quantity of Interest: ATT (Average Treatment Effect for the Treated)  Standard Error: Heteroscedastic / Autocorrelation Robust Standard Error  Residual standard error: 0.4687 on 25081 degrees of freedom |  |  |

Table A2: Proportion Black, Troop Presence, and Black Officeholding–Weighted Fixed Effects

Table A2 presents the results of a weighted fixed effects model using the wfe package developed by Imai and Kim (2017). The modeling strategy is designed to address unobservables under the assumption that the treatment and outcome variables do not influence each other overtime. Ultimately, the results are substantively quite close and our arguments rely primarily on historical context and theory to establish causality, so we choose to present the standard fixed effects estimation without weighting for ease of interpretation. The wfe package also cannot accommodate a third fixed effect (state, in our case).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Dependent variable: | | | |
|  | Black Officeholders | Local Official | Police Official | Education Official |
| Total Population (log) | 0.062\*\*\* | 0.015\*\*\* | 0.005\*\*\* | 0.001 |
|  | (0.008) | (0.003) | (0.001) | (0.001) |
| Troops Present Buffer | -0.820\*\*\* |  |  |  |
|  | (0.029) |  |  |  |
| Troops Present |  | -0.095\*\*\* | -0.030\*\* | -0.040\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.023) | (0.012) | (0.008) |
| Proportion Black | 0.100\*\* | 0.079\*\*\* | 0.035\*\*\* | 0.029\*\*\* |
|  | (0.051) | (0.015) | (0.008) | (0.005) |
| Troop Present Buffer \* Proportion Black | 3.758\*\*\* |  |  |  |
|  | (0.061) |  |  |  |
| Troop Presentco \* Proportion Black |  | 0.649\*\*\* | 0.376\*\*\* | 0.172\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.051) | (0.026) | (0.016) |
| Constant | -0.491\*\*\* | -0.140\*\*\* | -0.045\*\*\* | -0.014\* |
|  | (0.091) | (0.025) | (0.012) | (0.008) |
|  | | | | |
| Observations | 33,696 | 33,696 | 33,696 | 33,696 |
| Log Likelihood | -38,803.990 | -697.165 | 21,666.660 | 37,212.040 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 77,625.970 | 1,412.330 | -43,315.320 | -74,406.080 |
| Bayesian Inf. Crit. | 77,701.800 | 1,488.156 | -43,239.490 | -74,330.260 |
|  | | | | |
| Note: | \*p\*\*p\*\*\*p<0.01 | | | |

Table A3: The Effect of **Troop Presence (Buffer Zones) and Proportion Black on Black Local, Police, and Education and Total Officeholders**

**Table 1 in the manuscript reports the effect of troop presence on total Black officeholders. In Table A3 we report different specifications of the same model. In column 1 of Table A3, we report the effect of the troop presence buffer zone on total Black officeholders. Troop buffer zones** provide information not only about troop location but also the distance that federal troops could potentially travel in a single day, and the places where freedmen might travel to make a complaint, which is a day’s journey from the troop location. Buffer zones include counties with a troop presence and any county center point that is within 30 miles of a troop post. Column 2 presents the effect of troop presence on local officeholders, column 3 presents the effect of troop presence on police officeholders, and column 4 presents the effect of troop presence on education officials. All models follow the similar pattern presented in Table 1 in the manuscript, which is a positive and statistically significant relationship between troop presence (or troop presence buffer zone) and proportion Black on Black officeholding.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | |
|  | Dependent variable: | | |
|  |  | | |
|  | County | State | Federal |
|  | Officeholders | Officeholders | Officeholders |
|  | | | |
| Total Population (log) | 0.017\*\*\* | 0.052\*\*\* | 0.001 |
|  | (0.003) | (0.006) | (0.0005) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Troops Present | -0.217\*\*\* | -1.165\*\*\* | -0.017\*\*\* |
|  | (0.027) | (0.054) | (0.004) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Black | 0.104\*\*\* | 0.231\*\*\* | 0.007\*\* |
|  | (0.018) | (0.037) | (0.003) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Troop Present \* Proportion Black | 1.140\*\*\* | 5.837\*\*\* | 0.095\*\*\* |
|  | (0.058) | (0.116) | (0.009) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | -0.154\*\*\* | -0.442\*\*\* | -0.007 |
|  | (0.030) | (0.071) | (0.005) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | | | |
| Observations | 33,696 | 33,696 | 33,696 |
| Log Likelihood | -5,264.763 | -28,606.080 | 56,667.570 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 10,547.530 | 57,230.150 | -113,317.100 |
| Bayesian Inf. Crit. | 10,623.350 | 57,305.970 | -113,241.300 |
|  | | | |
| Note: | \*p\*\*p\*\*\*p<0.01 | | |

**Table A4: The Effect of Troop Presence and Proportion Black on Black County, State, and Federal Officeholders**

**In column 1 of Table A4 we report the effect** of troop presence and proportion Black on county officeholders, column 2 presents the effect on state officeholders, and column 3 presents the effect on federal officials. All models follow the similar pattern presented in Table 1 in the manuscript, which is a positive and statistically significant relationship between troop presence and proportion Black on Black officeholding.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | |
|  | Black Population % Change | | |
|  | No FE | With FE | 2-Year Lag |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | | | |
| Lagged Troops Present | 2.944\* | -1.899\* |  |
|  | (0.346) | (0.661) |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 2-Year Lagged Troops |  |  | -0.986 |
|  |  |  | (0.527) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 1.959\* |  |  |
|  | (0.044) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| County FE | No | Yes | Yes |
| Year FE | No | Yes | Yes |
| Observations | 28,205 | 28,205 | 27,258 |
| R2 | 0.003 | 0.396 | 0.409 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.003 | 0.370 | 0.382 |
|  | | | |
| Notes: | \*\*\*Significant at the [\*\*\*] percent level. | | |
|  | \*\*Significant at the [\*\*] percent level. | | |
|  | \*Significant at the 1 percent level. | | |
|  | Population changes only calculated for counties with Black populations >= 100. Values winsorized at 5th/95th percentiles. | | |

**Table A5: The Effect of Troop Presence on Black Population Change**

Table A5 reports the effect of troop presence on changes in the Black population. Column 1 presents results without fixed effects, showing that counties with troop presence experienced about a 2.9 percentage point increase in Black population. However, after accounting for county and year fixed effects in Column 2, this relationship becomes negative, with counties experiencing a 1.9 percentage point decrease in Black population when troops are present. Column 3 examines whether these effects persist using a 2-year lag of troop presence, finding no statistically significant relationship.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |
|  | Number of Black Officeholders | |
|  | Base + Pop Change | Full Interactions |
|  | (1) | (2) |
|  | | |
| Troops Present | -1.585 | -1.662\* |
|  | (0.625) | (0.609) |
|  |  |  |
| Prop. Black | -0.308 | -0.313 |
|  | (0.286) | (0.287) |
|  |  |  |
| Black Pop. % Change | 0.004\* | 0.004\* |
|  | (0.001) | (0.001) |
|  |  |  |
| Total Pop (logged) | 0.352\* | 0.356\* |
|  | (0.074) | (0.075) |
|  |  |  |
| Troops Present \* Prop. Black | 7.738\* | 7.716\* |
|  | (1.784) | (1.784) |
|  |  |  |
| Troops Present \* Pop. Change |  | 0.017 |
|  |  | (0.016) |
|  |  |  |
| County FE | Yes | Yes |
| Year FE | Yes | Yes |
| Observations | 28,205 | 28,205 |
| R2 | 0.358 | 0.358 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.330 | 0.330 |
|  | | |
| Notes: | \*\*\*Significant at the [\*\*\*] percent level. | |
|  | \*\*Significant at the [\*\*] percent level. | |
|  | \*Significant at the 1 percent level. | |
|  | Population changes only calculated for counties with Black populations >= 100. Values winsorized at 5th/95th percentiles. | |

**Table A6: The Effect of Black Population Change on Black Officeholding**

Table A6 examines whether changes in Black population affected Black officeholding independent of or in conjunction with troop presence. Column 1 shows that while changes in Black population had a small positive effect on Black officeholding (0.004 officeholders per percentage point increase), the main relationship between troop presence, proportion Black, and officeholding remains robust. Column 2 tests whether troop presence interacted with population changes but finds no significant interaction effect, suggesting that troops' influence on officeholding operated independently of demographic changes.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |
|  | Statistic | Value |
|  | | |
| 1 | Number of Counties | 1,349 |
| 2 | Number of Observations | 28,205 |
| 3 | Mean Change (%) | 2.008 |
| 4 | Standard Deviation (%) | 7.418 |
| 5 | 5th Percentile (%) | -7.527 |
| 6 | 25th Percentile (%) | -1.937 |
| 7 | Median (%) | 1.360 |
| 8 | 75th Percentile (%) | 4.938 |
| 9 | 95th Percentile (%) | 13.554 |
|  | | |

**Table A7: Summary Statistics of Black Population Change**

Table A7 provides summary statistics for changes in Black population across counties, calculated only for counties with Black populations of at least 100 persons to avoid extreme percentage changes from small base populations. The median county experienced a 1.4 percent increase in Black population, with the middle 50 percent of counties experiencing changes between a 1.9 percent decrease and a 4.9 percent increase. These statistics demonstrate that while some counties saw substantial demographic changes, most experienced relatively modest shifts in their Black population during this period.

**Appendix B: Alternative Specifications and Additional Results for VRA Analysis**

**Part 1: Mississippi-Delta Event Study**
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Figure B1: Proportion of County Black Along Mississippi Delta, 1968

Figure B1 shows the proportion of the county that is Black along the Mississippi Delta in 1968. As shown in the figure, the counties that we compare in Table 4 and Figures 7 and 8 in the paper have similar racial demographics.
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Figure B2: Share of County Officeholders Black in Mississippi and Arkansas

Figure B2 shows that after the VRA was enacted in 1965 (the first election covered being in 1966), the share of a county’s officeholders that were Black began to increase in Arkansas and Mississippi Delta counties, though at a much faster rate in Mississippi.



Figure B3: Event Study: VRA Effects in Mississippi vs Arkansas Border Counties

Figure B3 presents an event study analysis comparing Black officeholding in Mississippi and Arkansas border counties before and after VRA implementation. The analysis accounts for different institutional structures in county governance between the two states by examining the share of available county offices held by Black officials. The results show no significant pre-trends before VRA implementation, followed by a steady increase in Black officeholding in Mississippi relative to Arkansas border counties. By 25 years after VRA implementation, Mississippi border counties had about a 59 percentage point higher share of Black county officeholders compared to similar Arkansas counties, controlling for Black population share and total population. This equation is used in the other border analyses performed in Part 2 of this Appendix (while substituting in other states where necessary).

yᶜˢᵗ = Σ βₖ(MSₛ × 1[t-1965=k]) + γXᶜˢᵗ + αₛ + δₜ + εᶜˢᵗwhere:

* yᶜˢᵗ is the share of county officeholders who are Black in county c in state s at time t
* MSₛ is an indicator for Mississippi
* 1[t-1965=k] are indicators for years relative to VRA passage
* Xᶜˢᵗ is a vector of time-varying controls including log population and the Black population share
* αₛ and δₜ are state and year fixed effects
* εᶜˢᵗ is the error term, clustered at the state level

The βₖ coefficients trace out the differential evolution of Black officeholding in Mississippi relative to Tennessee border counties, with k=0 normalized to 1965 (year of VRA passage). The sample is restricted to counties within 5km of the MS-AK border.

**Part 2: Border Analysis Comparisons Across Mississippi-Arkansas, Mississippi-Tennessee, and Mississippi-Alabama**

The strength of using the Mississippi-Arkansas border region as a test case is that the political-geography of the region makes the assumption that the counties across the border are comparable except for treatment by the Voting Rights Act. For this reason, we focus just on this border region in the paper and the above analysis. However, as a robustness test, we also apply the same analysis to the Mississippi-Tennessee Border, although covariates are less well balanced across this border (see Table B1). We also include the Mississippi-Alabama case as a placebo test. Because both states received coverage by the Voting Rights Act, we should not, and do not, see any differences in outcome.



Figure B4: Event Study Design Panel for MS-AL, MS-AK, and MS-TN

Figure B4 presents event study analyses comparing Black officeholding in Mississippi border counties to adjacent counties in Alabama, Arkansas, and Tennessee before and after VRA implementation. The analyses account for different institutional structures in county governance across states by examining the share of available county offices held by Black officials. The results show no significant pre-trends before VRA implementation, followed by increases in Black officeholding in Mississippi relative to neighboring states' border counties. The effects are strongest for the Mississippi-Arkansas comparison, where Mississippi counties show approximately a 60 percentage point higher share of Black county officeholders by 15 years after VRA implementation, controlling for Black population share and total population. We include the border between Mississippi and Alabama as a placebo test, because Alabama was also covered by the VRA we should (and do not) see any differences across this border segment.



Figure B5: Raw Share of Officeholding Comparison for MS-AL, MS-AK, and MS-TN

Figure B5 shows the raw average share of Black county officeholders over time in Mississippi border counties compared to adjacent counties in Alabama, Arkansas, and Tennessee. The figure demonstrates that while all areas saw increases in Black officeholding after VRA implementation in 1965, the increases were substantially larger in Mississippi's covered counties when comparing to Arkansas, slightly larger when compared to Tennessee, and roughly equal to increases when compared to Alabama (which was also covered by the Voting Rights Act).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Border Pair | State | Number of Counties | Mean Population | Black Population Share (%) | Turnout (%) |
| MS-TN | Mississippi | 6 | 21760 | 27.6 | 19.3 |
| MS-TN | Tennessee | 4 | 202107 | 34.6 | 21.3 |
| MS-AR | Arkansas | 5 | 27958 | 51.5 | 24.7 |
| MS-AR | Mississippi | 6 | 34932 | 60.3 | 17.5 |
| MS-AL | Alabama | 10 | 61132 | 27.3 | 23.1 |
| MS-AL | Mississippi | 12 | 31122 | 29.3 | 21.8 |

Table B1: Covariate Balance Statistics for Event-Study Design

Table B1 presents balance statistics for counties included in the border pair analysis. For each border pair, we report the number of counties, mean population, Black population share, and turnout rates. The statistics demonstrate that while there are some differences across state borders, the counties are reasonably well-matched on key demographics. For instance, Mississippi-Alabama border counties show similar Black population shares (27.3% vs 29.3%), though mean populations differ. The Mississippi-Arkansas comparison includes counties with higher Black population shares (51.5% vs 60.3%), while the Mississippi-Tennessee comparison shows moderate differences in Black population shares (27.6% vs 34.6%) and substantial differences in mean population.

**Part 3: National VRA Analysis**
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Figure B6: Section 5 VRA Coverage

Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia required federal oversight of their elections starting in 1965. Texas required federal oversight starting in 1975. Alaska and Arizona also required federal oversight over their elections, but we do not include these states in our analysis since they are not formally Confederate Southern states.

Covered counties in Florida include Collier County, Hardee County, Hendry County, Hillsborough County, and Monroe County. All counties required coverage in either 1975 or 1976.

Covered counties in North Carolina include Anson County, Beaufort County, Bladen County, Camden County, Caswell County, Chowan County, Cleveland County, Craven County, Cumberland County, Edgecombe County, Franklin County, Gaston County, Gates County, Granville County, Halifax County, Harnett County, Hertford County, Hoke County, Jackson County, Lee County, Lenoir County, Martin County, Nash County, Northampton County, Onslow County, Pasquotank County, Perquimans County, Person County, Pitt County, Robeson County, Rockingham County, Scotland County, Union County, Vance County, Washington County, Wayne County, and Wilson County. All covered counties required federal oversight over elections in either 1965 or 1966.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | | |  |
|  | Dependent variable: | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | |  |
|  | Federal | State | County | City | Judicial | Education |
|  | Official | Official | Official | Official | Official | Official |
|  | | | | | |  |
| Total Population (log) | 0.005\*\*\* | 0.159\*\*\* | 0.035\*\*\* | 0.374\*\*\* | 0.113\*\*\* | 0.162\*\*\* |
|  | (0.001) | (0.010) | (0.013) | (0.038) | (0.012) | (0.016) |
| Proportion Black | 0.018\*\*\* | 0.861\*\*\* | 0.372\*\*\* | 1.361\*\*\* | 0.772\*\*\* | 1.040\*\*\* |
|  | (0.005) | (0.079) | (0.102) | (0.296) | (0.096) | (0.131) |
| VRA Coverage | 0.0002 | -0.105\*\*\* | -0.511\*\*\* | -1.130\*\*\* | -0.315\*\*\* | -0.350\*\*\* |
|  | (0.002) | (0.020) | (0.029) | (0.081) | (0.027) | (0.037)o |
| VRA Coverage \* Prop. Black | 0.002 | 0.566\*\*\* | 2.742\*\*\* | 5.294\*\*\* | 1.695\*\*\* | 2.192\*\*\* |
|  | (0.005) | (0.062) | (0.092) | (0.254) | (0.085) | (0.114) |
| Constant | -0.051\*\*\* | -1.706\*\*\* | -0.249 | -3.291\*\*\* | -1.163\*\*\* | -1.621\*\*\* |
|  | (0.007) | (0.115) | (0.160) | (0.487) | (0.146) | (0.207) |
|  | | | | | |  |
| Observations | 21,314 | 21,314 | 21,313 | 21,314 | 21,314 | 21,314 |
| Log Likelihood | 32,831.090 | -20,480.700 | -28,810.880 | -50,438.600 | -27,097.670 | -33,455.880 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | -65,644.180 | 40,979.400 | 57,639.760 | 100,895.200 | 54,213.340 | 66,929.750 |
| Bayesian Inf. Crit. | -65,572.480 | 41,051.110 | 57,711.470 | 100,966.900 | 54,285.040 | 67,001.460 |
|  | | | | | |  |
| Note: | \*p\*\*p\*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | |  |

**Table B2: The Effect of** **VRA Coverage and Proportion Black on federal, state, county, city, judicial, and education Black Officeholders**

**Table 2 in the manuscript reports the effect of VRA coverage and proportion Black on total Black officeholders. In Table B2 we report different specifications of the same model.** Column 1 presents the effect on federal officeholding, column 2 presents the effect on state officeholding, column 3 presents the effect on county officeholding, column 4 presents the effect on city officeholding, column 5 presents the effect on judicial officeholding, and column 6 presents the effect on education officeholding. All models, except for the effect on Black federal officials, follow the similar pattern presented in Table 2 in the manuscript, which is a positive and statistically significant relationship between VRA coverage and proportion Black on Black officeholding. We suspect the reason we don’t find a similar relationship for Black federal officeholding is because there simply aren’t enough Black Senators and Congress people during this time period. Hayes et al (2023) find a similar result when looking at the effect of Black turnout on Black officeholding in South Carolina on different levels of offices. They find an association between turnout and officeholding for all levels of office that we present above except for federal officials.

**Appendix C: Estimating Black Turnout in Reconstruction Analysis**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |
|  | Estimated Black Turnout | |
|  | (1) | (2) |
|  | | |
| Troops Present | 6.235\* |  |
|  | (1.257) |  |
| Troops Present (Buffer) |  | 4.634\* |
|  |  | (0.493) |
| N | 27,467 | 27,467 |
| R2 | 0.672 | 0.674 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.656 | 0.658 |
| Residual Std. Error (df = 26145) | 7.926 | 7.903 |
|  | | |
| \*p < .01 | | |

**Table C1**: **Troop Presence and Black Voter Turnout**

We estimate Black turnout by weighting congressional turnout in a county by the proportion of the county that is Black. Table C1 uses county-year fixed effects to estimate the effect of troops entering and leaving a county (Model 1) or troops present buffer (Model 2). Table 1 shows that there is a **six percent increase in Black turnout in response to troops being stationed within a county. Living near a location where troops are stationed, within a 30-mile buffer zone of troop deployment, leads to a four percent increase in Black turnout.**

While Table C1 shows that estimated Black turnout increased when troops were present in a county, this estimate is subject to the ecological inference problems discussed above. Table 2 attempts to mitigate this problem by showing that when troops are present in a county, turnout only increases in the counties that have a larger share of the Black population. We use this as indication that Black turnout in this county is increasing. Using county-year fixed effects again, we show in Model 1 of Table C2 that when troops are present each year in a given county where there is no Black population, subsequent turnout in this county decreases by seven percent. Model 1 also shows that the more Black Americans in a county, as seen by the proportion Black, without the presence of federal troops, the more likely turnout decreases. In other words, there is a 16 percent decrease in turnout when the proportion Black in a county increases without the presence of troops. Critically, the interaction between proportion Black and troops present is positive and statistically significant. This means that when troops are present in counties that have a larger Black population share, turnout increases by three percent. Moreover, the standalone coefficients for proportion Black and troops present is negative.

Models 2 through 4 of Table C2 demonstrate a similar relationship as Model 1. Model 2 shows that turnout decreases by four percent for individuals living within a 30-mile buffer zone of federal troops. Turnout also decreases when the proportion Black in a county increases. But again we see that when troops are present within a 30-mile buffer zone in a county with substantial Black Americans, as demonstrated by the interaction term, turnout increases by about two and half percent. Models 3 and 4 present the same analysis as Models 1 and 2 but control for the total population.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | |
|  | Turnout | | | |
|  | County-Year Fixed Effects | County-Year Fixed Effects | County-Year Fixed Effects | County-Year Fixed Effects |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  | | | | |
| Troops Present | -0.724\* |  | -0.763\* |  |
|  | (0.113) |  | (0.110) |  |
| Troops Present (Buffer) |  | -0.459\* |  | -0.483\* |
|  |  | (0.047) |  | (0.047) |
| Prop. Black | -1.609\* | -1.874\* | -1.463\* | -1.638\* |
|  | (0.333) | (0.301) | (0.335) | (0.297) |
| Total Pop (logged) |  |  | -0.101\* | -0.170\* |
|  |  |  | (0.038) | (0.035) |
| Troop Present \* Prop. Black | 3.010\* |  | 3.097\* |  |
|  | (0.233) |  | (0.231) |  |
| Troop Present (Buffer) \* Prop. Black |  | 2.617\* |  | 2.698\* |
|  |  | (0.094) |  | (0.097) |
| N | 27,467 | 27,467 | 27,467 | 27,467 |
| R2 | 0.551 | 0.578 | 0.551 | 0.579 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.528 | 0.556 | 0.529 | 0.558 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.687 (df = 26143) | 0.666 (df = 26143) | 0.687 (df = 26142) | 0.665 (df = 26142) |
|  | | | | |
| \*p < .01 | | | | |

**Table C2:** **Troop Presence, Electorate Demographics, and Turnout**

Tables C3-C8 report summary statistics relevant to the Reconstruction Era analysis models.

**Table C3: Black Officeholders by State by Year**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| State | 1868 | 1872 | 1876 | 1880 | 1884 | 1888 | 1892 | 1896 | 1900 | 1904 | 1908 |
| Alabama | 71 | 59 | 24 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Arkansas | 13 | 35 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Florida | 28 | 27 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia | 68 | 48 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kentucky | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Louisiana | 92 | 108 | 66 | 33 | 16 | 12 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mississippi | 24 | 118 | 131 | 27 | 18 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Missouri | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Carolina | 134 | 73 | 46 | 22 | 18 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Texas | 17 | 28 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 130 | 180 | 123 | 18 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Tennessee | 13 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Virginia | 37 | 50 | 21 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

**Table C4: Black Officeholders (Major) by State by Year**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STATE | 1868 | 1872 | 1876 | 1880 | 1884 | 1888 | 1892 | 1896 | 1900 | 1904 | 1908 |
| Alabama | 33 | 49 | 22 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Arkansas | 6 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Florida | 21 | 26 | 17 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia | 32 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kentucky | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Louisiana | 61 | 90 | 53 | 32 | 15 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 14 | 81 | 92 | 20 | 13 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Missouri | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Carolina | 43 | 43 | 35 | 18 | 15 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Texas | 7 | 20 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 94 | 158 | 110 | 17 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Tennessee | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Virginia | 24 | 34 | 18 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

**Table C5: Black Officeholders (County Level) by State by Year**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STATE | 1868 | 1872 | 1876 | 1880 | 1884 | 1888 | 1892 | 1896 | 1900 | 1904 | 1908 |
| Alabama | 33 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Arkansas | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Florida | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kentucky | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Louisiana | 4 | 17 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 5 | 39 | 42 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Missouri | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Carolina | 91 | 46 | 26 | 11 | 11 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Texas | 8 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 14 | 23 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tennessee | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Virginia | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

**Table C6: Proportion of Counties Occupied by Federal Troops by State by Year**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STATE | 1868 | 1872 | 1876 | 1880 | 1884 |
| Alabama | 0 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0 | 0 |
| Arkansas | 0 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0 |
| Florida | 0 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0 |
| Georgia | 0 | 0.1 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0 |
| Kentucky | 0 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0 |
| Louisiana | 0 | 0.22 | 0.18 | 0.02 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 0 | 0.21 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 |
| Missouri | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Carolina | 0 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0 |
| Texas | 0 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.07 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 0 | 0.56 | 0.22 | 0 | 0 |
| Tennessee | 0 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0 | 0 |
| Virginia | 0 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0 |

**Table C7: Proportion of Counties Accessible to Federal Troops by State by Year**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STATE | 1868 | 1872 | 1876 | 1880 | 1884 |
| Alabama | 0 | 0.8 | 0.63 | 0.06 | 0 |
| Arkansas | 0 | 0.67 | 0.49 | 0.16 | 0 |
| Florida | 0 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.31 | 0 |
| Georgia | 0 | 0.72 | 0.64 | 0.23 | 0 |
| Kentucky | 0 | 0.81 | 0.35 | 0.07 | 0 |
| Louisiana | 0 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.21 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 0 | 0.94 | 0.78 | 0.01 | 0 |
| Missouri | 0 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0 | 0 |
| North Carolina | 0 | 0.69 | 0.52 | 0.2 | 0 |
| Texas | 0 | 0.61 | 0.55 | 0.33 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 0 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.06 | 0 |
| Tennessee | 0 | 0.76 | 0.56 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Virginia | 0 | 0.71 | 0.48 | 0.23 | 0 |

**Table C8: Number of Black Officeholders by Year by State**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STATE | 1968-1970 | 1972-1974 | 1974-1976 | 1978-1990 | 1984-1986 | 1988-1990 |
| Alabama | 153 | 149 | 149 | 1312 | 1058 | 2127 |
| Arkansas | 104 | 153 | 176 | 667 | 866 | 1248 |
| Florida | 68 | 69 | 69 | 358 | 469 | 706 |
| Georgia | 58 | 135 | 135 | 979 | 1043 | 1870 |
| Kentucky | 42 | 140 | 96 | 147 | 132 | 281 |
| Louisiana | 111 | 119 | 131 | 1011 | 891 | 2004 |
| Mississippi | 115 | 204 | 215 | 1402 | 1453 | 2437 |
| Missouri | 67 | 143 | 78 | 330 | 449 | 655 |
| North Carolina | 109 | 0 | 153 | 952 | 873 | 1659 |
| South Carolina | 26 | 98 | 230 | 551 | 10 | 716 |
| Tennessee | 67 | 7 | 43 | 345 | 426 | 597 |
| Texas | 50 | 0 | 76 | 712 | 778 | 1202 |
| Virginia | 52 | 0 | 63 | 306 | 345 | 541 |
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**Figure C1: Black Officeholders by County During Reconstruction**
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**Figure C2: Black Officeholders by County During the VRA Era**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statistic** | **Reconstruction Era** |  | **VRA Era** |  |
|  | With Zeros | No Zeros | With Zeros | No Zeros |
| Mean | 0.12 | 2.47 | 1.59 | 7.88 |
| Median | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 4.00 |
| Q1 (25%) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 |
| Q3 (75%) | 0.00 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 9.00 |

**Table C9: Distribution of Black Officeholders: Reconstruction and VRA Era**