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# APPENDIX A

The 1925 census of occupations groups the following occupations together (Occupation Group "D"): administration, armed forces, church, and free professions (*Verwaltung, Heerwesen, Kirche, und Freie Berufe*). In 1933, some of these groups are reported separately: Occupation Group 51 of the 1933 census reports the number of people working in jobs related to administration, armed forces, church, education, and others (*Verwaltung, Wehrmacht, Kirche, Bildung, Erziehung usw.*), while Occupation Group 54 deals with occupations connected to theatre, cinemas and movie recording, broadcasting, music, sports, and showmen (*Theater, Lichtspiele und Filmaufnahme, Rundfunkwesen, Musikgewerbe, Sportliche, und Schaustellungsgewerbe*). Clearly, the latter group is not in the focus of my analysis. However, since these professions are contained in Occupation Group D of the 1925 census, I also included them for 1933 and added the Occupation Groups 51 and 54 of the respective census.

The 1939 census makes even finer distinctions: Occupation Group 61 deals with administration and armed forces (*Berufe der öffentlichen Verwaltung und Rechtspflege, der Wehrmacht usw*), Occupation Group 62 with teaching professions and artists (*Lehr- und Bildungsberufe, künstlerische Berufe*). Church-related professions are reported in Group 63 (*Berufe der Kirche, Mönche und Nonnen*), while Group 64 contains professions related to legal counselling (*Berufe der Rechts- und Wirtschaftsberatung*). Group 68 finally contains the entertainment industry (*Berufe des Unterhaltungsgewerbes (außer Künstler)*). Again, a better measure would be to only count Groups 61 and maybe 62 and 64, but due to the reporting schemes in 1925 and 1933, I added up the number of people working in groups 61–64 and 68.

Which different sectors and occupations does this aggregate measure contain? The following gives an overview of the different subcategories in the three censuses. Unfortunately, apart from 1939, these subcategories are not reported separately at the city level.

* 1925
	+ Occupation Group D: Administration, armed forces, church, free professions (*Verwaltung, Heerwesen, Kirche, freie Berufe*)
		- W137. National, state, district, and municipal administration, judicature, (if in civil service position), penal system (*Reichs-, Landes-, Bezirks- und Gemeindeverwaltung, Reichtspflege (soweit in beamteter Stellung) und Strafvollzug*)
		- W138. Army and navy, army and navy administration (incl. military hospitals) (*Heer und Marine, Heeres- und Marineverwaltung (einschl. Militärlazarette)*)
		- W139. Church, divine service, mission, institutions, and associations for religious purposes (*Kirche, Gottesdienst, Mission, Anstalten und Vereine für religiöse Zwecke*)
		- W140. Education, instruction, libraries, scientific institutes, and art collections (*Bildung, Erziehung, Unterricht, Büchereien, wissenschaftliche Institute und Kunstsammlungen*)
		- W141. Legal counselling and representation of interests (*Rechtsberatung und Interessenvertretung*)
		- W142. Artists, private scholars, and authors (*Künstler, Privatgelehrte, Schriftsteller*)
		- W143. Theatres and operas, music business (*Theater und Opernhäuser, Musikgewerbe*)
		- W144. Cinemas (*Lichtspielwesen*)
		- W145. Broadcasting (*Rundfunkwesen*)
		- W146. Sports business, horse rental, and showman business (*Sportliche Gewerbe, Pferdeverleihung, Schaustellungsgewerbe*)
* 1933
	+ Occupation Group 51: Administration, armed forces, church, education, and others (*Verwaltung, Wehrmacht, Kirche, Bildung, Erziehung usw.*)
		- 511. National, state, and municipal administration, public judicature (*Reichs-, Landes- und Gemeindeverwaltung, öffentliche Rechtspflege*)
		- 512. Wehrmacht (incl. army and navy administration, naval yard, army and navy hospitals etc.) (*Wehrmacht (einschl. Heeres- und Marineverwaltung, Marinewerft, Heeres- und Marinelazarette usw.)*)
		- 513. Church, institutions, and associations for religious purposes (*Kirche, Anstalten und Vereine für religiöse Zwecke*)
		- 514. Education, instruction (*Bildung, Erziehung, Unterricht*)
		- 515. Visual arts, free literary and scientific activity (*Bildende Kunst, freie schriftstellerische und wissenschaftliche Betätigung*)
		- 516. Legal and economic counselling, representation of interests (*Rechts- und Wirtschaftsberatung, Interessenvertretung*)
		- 517. Residential business (administration incl. allocation) (*Wohngewerbe (Verwaltung einschl. Vermittlung*)
	+ Occupation Group 54: Theatre, cinemas and movie recording, broadcasting, music, sports, and showmen (*Theater, Lichtspiele und Filmaufnahme, Rundfunkwesen, Musikgewerbe, sportliche, und Schaustellungsgewerbe*)
* 1939
	+ Occupation Group 61: Occupations in public administration and judicature, Wehrmacht etc. (*Berufe der öffentlichen Verwaltung und Rechtspflege, der Wehrmacht usw*)
	+ Occupation Group 62: Teaching and instruction occupations, artistic occupations (*Lehr- und Bildungsberufe, künstlerische Berufe*)
	+ Occupation Group 63: Occupations in the church, monks, and nuns (*Berufe der Kirche, Mönche und Nonnen*)
	+ Occupation Group 64: Legal and economic counselling (*Rechts- und Wirtschaftsberatung*)
	+ Occupation Group 68: Entertainment occupations (excl. artists) (*Berufe des Unterhaltungsgewerbes (außer Künstler)*)

To give a sense of what Occupation Group 61 in 1939 measures, the following professions were reported separately at a coarser level (state or Prussian province): Judges and attorneys (*Richter und Staatsanwälte*), trainee judges and civil servants (*Regierungs- und Gerichtsrefendare*), bailiffs and executory officers (*Gerichtsvollzieher, Vollstreckungsbeamte*), officers (Wehrmacht) (*Offiziere (Wehrmacht)*), non-commissioned officers and long-serving privates (Wehrmacht) (*Unteroffiziere und langdienende Mannschaften (Wehrmacht)*), leaders and trainee leaders of the Reich Labour Service (*Reichtsarbeitsdienstführer und - anwärter*), police (*Polizei- und Gendarmerieoffiziere*, *Vollzugsbeamte der Ordnungspolizei (ohne Offiziere)* and *Vollzugsbeamte der Sicherheitspolizei (ohne Offiziere)*)*,* fire brigade (without engineers and technicians) (*Feuerwehrleute (ohne Ingenieure und Techniker)*), leaders and men of the armed units of SA and SS (*Führer der bewaffneten Einheiten der SS und der SA* and *Männer der bewaffneten Einheiten der SS und der SA*), civil servants in administration (if not included in other occupations) (*Verwaltungsbeamte (soweit nicht in anderen Berufen nachgewiesen)*), and clerical assistants (also department managers) and similar employees in public administration and judicature, in the NSDAP, in the public administration of labor and the economy etc. (if not included in other occupations) (*Sachbearbeiter (auch Dienststellen - und Abteilungsleiter) u. ähnl. Angestl. in der öffentlichen Verwalt. u. Rechtspflege, in der NSDAP, in der öffentl. Arbeits- und Wirtschaftslenkung usw. (soweit nicht in anderen Berufen)*).

The largest of these categories are the Wehrmacht and the civil servants in public administration. In the whole of Germany, Occupation Group 61 comprised 1,074,571 members in 1939. Of those, 328,819 were in the *Wehrmacht*, and 403,019 were *Verwaltungsbeamte*. Another 86,848 people belonged to the broad category of *Sachbearbeiter (auch Dienststellen - und Abteilungsleiter) u. ähnl. Angestl. in der öffentlichen Verwalt. u. Rechtspflege, in der NSDAP, in der öffentl. Arbeits- und Wirtschaftslenkung usw. (soweit nicht in anderen Berufen)*. Many of those were public administration employees that were not in the civil service (that is, *Angestellte* as opposed to *Beamte*). Various police categories accounted for 125,222 members and the leaders of the Reich Labour Service for another 50,767. The armed branches of SA and SS were relatively small outfits, amounting to only 29,882 or less than 3 percent of the whole measure.

For the regressions where I use the number of civil servants (*Beamte*) as outcome variables, I use the 1933 and 1939 census. In 1933, the respective occupational class is called “civil servants and soldiers, excluding those in senior positions” (*Beamte und Soldaten (ohne die in leitender Stellung*)).[[1]](#footnote-1) In 1939, the respective category is called “civil servants” (*Beamte*).

In Table 4, I analyze a city's social class composition, using the categories of blue collar, white collar, and self-employed. Blue collar is defined to contain laborers (*Arbeiter*), helping family members (*Mithelfende Familienangehörige*), and domestic workers (*Hausangestellte*). The white collar category contains the census categories of employees (*Angestellte*) and civil servants (*Beamte*), which are reported separately in 1933 and grouped together in 1925. Self-employed is a census category in itself (*Selbstständige*). In 1933, it also contains high-ranking civil servants and officers (*Beamte und Offiziere in leitender Stellung*). As described in the text, the 1925 census does not report the number of people working in each broad category, but the number of workers and their dependents, whereas the 1933 census reports the number of people working in each category. However, such uniform differences in measurement should be absorbed by the year fixed effect.

# APPENDIX B

In order to address the problem caused by city mergers and restructurings, I analyzed all cities whose growth rate between either 1910 and 1925, 1925 and 1933, or between 1933 and 1939 exceeded the respective mean growth rates by more than one standard deviation. For those cities, I examined whether they grew by 25 percent or more alone because of enlargements. Details about which cities or villages were added to the respective cities were obtained from Wikipedia unless stated otherwise. The names, population data, and sources for the cities are given later. I used Statistisches Reichsamt (1915), Statistisches Reichsamt (1928), and Statistisches Reichsamt (1934) for the censuses of population of 1910, 1925, and 1933, respectively.

From 1925 to 1933, 25 cities exceeded the mean growth rate by more than one standard deviation. Nineteen of them were dropped for the following reasons.

Beuthen's population in 1925 stood at 62,543. Newly added districts had a total population of 26,080 in 1925 according to the Statistisches Jahrbuch Deutscher Städte 1928. Hence, Beuthen grew by 40 percent alone due to these acquisitions. Similarly, Bielefeld (population in 1925: 86,062) received incorporations totaling a 1925 population of 27,893 (Statistisches Jahrbuch Deutscher Städte 1932), representing a growth of more than 32 percent. Bochum (population in 1925: 211,249) was enlarged through several rounds of incorporations that, according to the Statistisches Jahrbuch Deutscher Städte 1929 and 1931, totaled 156,462 and meant that it was dropped from the dataset as well. Duisburg incorporated several cities and towns in 1929, including the large city of Hamborn. According to the Statistisches Jahrbuch Deutscher Städte 1930, Hamborn alone led to a population growth of more than 46 percent. Essen grew by 161,977 people or nearly 35 percent relative to its baseline level of 470,525 in 1925 (Statistisches Jahrbuch Deutscher Städte 1931). Gelsenkirchen incorporated Buer and other cities in 1928, leading to growth of nearly 60 percent (Statistisches Jahrbuch Deutscher Städte 1930). Hagen's incorporations were as large as 43,900 or 44 percent of its 1925 population. Herne incorporated the towns of Börnig, Sodingen, Cray, Oestrich, Bladenhort, and Holthausen. The 1925 census gives the following numbers for Börnig, Sodingen, and Holthausen, respectively: 7,979, 8,198, and 5,942. The other villages are not listed and hence must have been smaller than 2,000 inhabitants. Still, even without them, the three larger ones totaled 22,119 people, which represents a 32 percent increase in population for Herne. Hindenburg in 1927 acquired several surrounding towns and municipalities, growing by nearly 69 percent (Statistisches Jahrbuch Deutscher Städte 1928). Luenen acquired Brambauer and parts of another town, Derne. Brambauer alone led to growth of around 56 percent. Neustrelitz, a town of 12,260 inhabitants in 1925, was merged with Strelitz, thereby gaining 4,687 inhabitants as of 1925, or 38 percent. Oberhausen incorporated several surrounding entities, totaling 84,466 according to the Statistisches Jahrbuch Deutscher Städte 1931, or nearly 80 percent of the city's 1925 population. The towns of Lennep and Lüttringhausen (together 27,826 according to the 1925 census) were added to Remscheid, making it grow by 36 percent. Rheine had a 1933 population of 17,732. According to the homepage of the administrative district of Münster (of which the city is a part), the city acquired additional territory in 1929 that made its population grow by about 10,000 inhabitants (Bezirksregierung Münster 2013). Bad Salzemen (9,998) and Frohse (2,064) (both numbers according to the 1925 census) were added to Schönebeck, which as a consequence grew by 56 percent. Solingen's 1925 population was more than doubled by the acquisition of Gräfrath, Höhscheid, Ohligs, and Wald, totaling 83,799 inhabitants (census of population 1925).

Several towns were incorporated into Wiesbaden, making its 1925 population of 102,737 grow by 30,684 or nearly 30 percent according to the Statistisches Jahrbuch Deutscher Städte (1928). Witten's population in 1925 stood at 45,295. Annen, Stockum, Düren, and parts of Langendreer and Bommern were added to this. While Düren is missing from the 1925 census list and hence must have had less than 2,000 inhabitants, Annen and Stockum had 1925 populations of 17,822 and 3,196, respectively. Zweibrücken received the villages of Bubenhausen and Ernstweiler. Bubenhausen's population as of 1925 was 3,817, or 24 percent of Zweibrücken's in the same year. For Ernstweiler, the census contains no population data. However, even under a very conservative assumption of only 200 inhabitants, the two acquisitions would exceed the 25 percent threshold, so Zweibrücken was also dropped.

Six cities were not dropped, although they experienced substantial territorial gains.

 Dortmund, with a 1925 population of 321,743, received additional incorporations totaling 70,491 according to the Statistisches Jahrbuch Deutscher Städte 1931, or 22 percent. Similarly, Eschweiler received the surrounding villages of Nothberg, Hastenrath, and Scherpenseel. Nothberg and Hastenrath are listed in the 1925 census as having populations of 2,176 and 2,187, while Scherpenseel had less than 2,000 inhabitants. Even under the conservative assumption that it was exactly at this cut-off, the sum of the three gains would total only 6,363, or 24 percent of Eschweiler's 1925 population. Ellguth-Zabrze (2,205), Sosnitza (6,453), Richtersdorf (3,661), and Zernik (2,083, all figures from the 1925 census) were made part of Gleiwitz, making its 1925 population grow by 17.5 percent. Heilbronn experienced substantial population growth between 1925 and 1933, but I could not find any evidence for territorial gains. Mainz acquired Bretzenheim (5,692), Weisenau (6,637), Ginsheim (4,611), Bischofsheim (5,438), and Gustavsburg (below 2,000, all figures from 1925 census). Even if Gustavsburg's population had been at 2,000, this would have resulted in growth of 22.5 percent relative to the 1925 level. Euren, Biewer, Kürenz, Olewig, and a part of Pallien were made part of Trier (1925 population: 58,140). The 1925 census gives the population of Euren and Kürenz as 3,248 and 4,268, respectively; Biewer, Pallien, and Olewig are not listed and hence must have been smaller than 2,000 inhabitants. However, even under the most conservative assumption that they each had exactly 2,000 inhabitants, the sum of the added populations would only reach 23 percent of Trier's 1925 population.

Between 1933 and 1939, 15 cities exceeded the mean growth rate by more than one standard deviation. Seven of them were dropped.

 In a large-scale reorganization, the cities of Altona, Wandsbek, and Harburg-Wilhelmsburg were added to Hamburg (1,129,307). Their population as of 1933 stood at 400,818. Potsdam (1933 population: 73,676) acquired several surrounding towns, including Nowawes (1933 population: 29,229). Radebeul (1933 population: 12,949) was merged with Kötschenbroda (1933 population: 18,909). Weingarten (8,385 according to the census of occupation 1933) was incorporated into Ravensburg (18,930) in 1939, making the latter grow by 44 percent. Stolberg (17,394) acquired parts of Büsbach, Eilendorf, and Eschweiler, whose total is given as 12,199 by the census 1933. In a curious reorganization, Rüstringen (48,562 in 1933 according to the census) was added to Wilhelmshaven (1933: 28,016). Zweibrücken was dropped already because of its large growth between 1925 and 1933.

Eight cities were not dropped.

 For Neubrandenburg, Oranienburg, and Swinemünde, I could not find any evidence of territorial gains. Cuxhaven acquired Groden (1,678), Westerwisch and Süderwisch (864), Stickenbüttel (644), Duhnen (725), and Neuwerk with Scharhörn (63), totaling nearly 18 percent of its 1933 population of 22,234. Dessau incorporated Rosslau, Jonitz, and Naundorf. The latter had been excorporated just before the 1933 census and were then reincorporated in 1935. Their respective populations according to the 1933 census stood at 12,845, 1,721, and 527, which represents a growth of around 19 percent relative to Dessau's 1933 population of 78,634. Landau acquired Queichsheim and Mörlheim, totaling 3,013 inhabitants or 18 percent of Landau's 1933 population (all data from the 1933 census). Suhl (15,477) acquired Heinrichs. Heinrichs' population as of 1925 was 2,895, which would mean a growth of 18.7 percent. Even if Heinrichs experienced further growth between 1925 and 1933, it is very unlikely that it would exceed the 25 percent threshold, so I did not drop Suhl. Wittenberg incorporated Teuchen and Labetz in 1938. Both towns are not listed in the 1925 census and hence together cannot have exceeded 4,000 inhabitants in 1925. Given Wittenberg's 1925 population of 23,457, the two towns fell considerably short of the 25 percent threshold in 1925, and it is highly unlikely that they grew so fast as to exceed it in 1933, when Wittenberg's population stood at 24,480.

Between 1910 and 1925, 25 cities exceeded the mean growth rate by more than one standard deviation. Thirteen of them were dropped.

Berlin experienced a massive increase in area and population due to the Greater Berlin Act of 1920. Gera (1910 population according to the census: 49,276) acquired a vast number of surrounding towns and villages. Four of them alone (Debschwitz, Untermhaus, Pforten, and Zwötzen) had a combined 1910 population of 23,967, leading Gera to be dropped. Greiz was enlarged by the acquisition of Pohlitz, Dölau, and several smaller villages. The two former alone had a combined population of 6,025, enlarging Greiz's 1910 population of 23,245 by more than 25 percent. Hirschberg with its 1910 population of 20,564 acquired several smaller towns and Kunnersdorf/Cunnersdorf according to Bruno Salomon and Erwin Stein (1928), which in 1910 had a population of 5,411, making the city grow by more than 25 percent alone. Osternburg and Eversten were added to Oldenburg, boosting that city's population by more than 66 percent at 1910 levels. Pirna's population in 1910 stood at 19,525. Between then and 1925, several towns and villages were incorporated into it, and the incorporation of Copitz and Neundorf alone added nearly 45 percent of the city's 1910 population to it. Similarly, Riesa incorporated Gröba, Oberreussen, and Weida. While Oberreussen had less than 2,000 inhabitants in 1910, Gröba and Weida had 4,471 and 2,119, respectively, or 43 percent of Riesa's 1910 population of 15,287. Waldenburg incorporated several minor districts and villages and Altwasser, which by itself increased Waldenburg's population by 88 percent in 1910 terms. Wattenscheid was considerably enlarged after 1926. While the Hänisch-Falter database contains data for the enlarged city in 1925, the 1910 census and 1912 election results refer to the original, small city only, which was therefore dropped. The same holds for Castrop-Rauxel, which was created in 1926 through a merger of Castrop, Rauxel, and other municipalities. Bochum, Essen, and Luenen were already dropped due to their enlargements between 1925 and 1933 or 1933/39.

Twelve cities were not dropped.

In the case of Ahlen, Bottrop, Datteln, Gladbeck, Herten, Marienburg, Recklinghausen, and Schneidemühl, I did not find any evidence for territorial acquisitions, their growth seems to have been purely organic. Dortmund acquired Deusen, Dorstfeld, Eving, Huckarde, Kemminghausen, Lindenhorst, Rahm, Wischlingen, Brackel, and Wambel, of which Deusen, Kemminghausen, Rahm, and Wischlingen had fewer than 2,000 inhabitants in 1910. Even under the extreme assumption that they had exactly 2,000 inhabitants, the total growth due to the acquisition of all ten towns would have amounted to only 23 percent, so Dortmund was not dropped. Similarly, Hannover acquired Linden, but thereby growing only by 24 percent. Similarly, Schweinfurt incorporated Oberndorf, but this only represented a growth of around 15 percent at 1910 levels. The most difficult case is Regensburg. Its population in 1910 stood at 52,624. Between then and 1925, it acquired Stadtamhof (4,369) and Steinweg (3,575) as well as five villages that had fewer than 2,000 inhabitants in 1910. If these five villages had a total population of more than 5,212 inhabitants, Regensburg's inorganic growth would have exceeded 25 percent and I would have dropped the city. However, in the respective district of Oberpfalz, the 1910 census gives the average population of all villages below 2,000 inhabitants as 395, so the five villages combined would have had to exceed this average by more than a factor of 2.5 to reach 5,212 inhabitants, which seems unlikely. I therefore decided to not drop Regensburg.

# APPENDIX C

In this appendix, I present several additional results.

One could argue that the 1933 election was not the election that brought Hitler into power; it was only the one that gave him a parliamentary majority. Additionally, since the election happened after the Reichstag Fire and the subsequent prosecution of Communists, it is questionable whether this election was really a free one. In Table C1, I redo the analysis of Table 7, but use the NSDAP vote shares in the election in September 1930, July 1932, and November 1932 as main explanatory variables. While data for the 1930 election are available for all cities in my sample, the results for the 1932 elections were unfortunately only reported at the district level. I therefore run these regressions only on a limited sample that includes cities that were also a district (*Stadtkreise*, as opposed to cities that were part of a *Landkreis*), which decreases the sample size by around one third. Still, the results from Table C1 confirm the previous results, both in terms of sign and magnitude and indicate that there is a positive relationship between voting shares for the NSDAP and subsequent public employment. In addition, the first stage F statistics show that the relationship between the 1912 EA vote shares and the later NSDAP vote shares is stronger in 1932 than in 1930. This is consistent with the NSDAP becoming more and more attractive for the nationalist lower middle class voters to whose preferences the constituent parties of the Economic Association had catered in Imperial Germany 20 years earlier.

A further robustness check is motivated by Figure 1, which shows a slight concentration of large public employment increases in Central Germany. Because of this, controlling for longitude or latitude in a linear form might not be sufficient. Table C2 shows results when additionally controlling for the square of longitude and latitude (interacted with a dummy for post-1939). If anything, allowing for a nonlinear effect of geography strengthens my results: point estimates increase, the first stage becomes more powerful, and the standard errors decrease slightly.

In Table C3, I repeat the robustness check of columns 1–6 of Table 9 for the “placebo check” in Table 8. Generally, the point estimates increase in absolute value, but their precision either stays relatively unchanged (columns 1–3) or decreases (columns 4–6). As a result, there is still no statistically significant effect to be seen, but the relative imprecision of the estimates makes it hard to draw any firm conclusions.

Finally, as mentioned in the main text, the instrumental variable I use has a somewhat unusual distribution: in 191 cities, the EA did not run or did not receive any votes in 1912. In the remaining 55 cities, the mean vote share was 3.12 percent (standard deviation 6.54). Four cities recorded particularly high EA vote shares of more than 20 percent, the extreme case being Siegen with more than 37 percent. The spike at zero and the presence of potentially influential variables on the right tail of the instrument's distribution may mask some heterogeneity in the effect. This is further explored in Table C4. Focusing on the natural logarithm of public employment and on its ratio out of the population as outcome variables, I show IV results for several subsamples, and show how the IV coefficient depends on its two constituents, the reduced form (effect of the 1912 EA share on the outcome) and the first stage. Columns 1 and 5 show the results for the baseline of 246 cities, reproducing the main results from Table 7. In columns 2 and 6, I focus on the 55 cities that had nonzero EA vote shares in 1912. Naturally, the precision decreases when dropping 75 percent of the sample, and the first stage F statistic is weakened. The size of the first stage coefficient decreases, indicating that among the cities where the EA ran in 1912, the translation from EA vote shares to 1933 NSDAP vote shares is smaller. Because of this and a slight increase in the reduced form, the effect size for these cities increases. In columns 3 and 7, I keep the cities with no EA vote share, but drop the four cities with EA vote shares larger than 20. They represent around 1.5 percent of all cities, but more than 7 percent of all those with values larger than zero. Now, the reduced form decreases, while the first stage becomes less precise, but larger in absolute value, both of which leads to smaller effect sizes. Finally, in columns 4 and 8, I drop both the four cities with large EA vote shares and all the cities with no EA voting. The first stage coefficient in this sample is very close to the baseline, but the reduced form is larger, leading to overall larger effect sizes. Overall, the cities with zero EA votes in 1912 are important for the precision of the estimate. However, they tend to decrease the reduced form and increase the coefficient of the first stage, thereby dampening the effect. The four cities with very large EA vales are quite influential in the overall regression, increasing the reduced form and decreasing the first stage and thus increasing overall estimates, as can be seen when comparing columns 1 and 5 to 3 and 7. Among cities with positive EA vote shares, those four cities are more influential for the first stage, tilting its slope closer towards zero (columns 2/6 vs. 4/8). Finally, as columns 4 and 8 show, when focusing on a very limited sample of only cities that have positive EA shares below 20 percent, that is, excluding both extremes, precision is low, but the qualitative conclusions remain the same as in the full sample.
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Table C1

DIFFERENT ELECTIONS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
| Variables | Public Employment |
|  | Ratio to Pop. | Ratio to LF | Natural Log | Ratio to Pop | Ratio to LF | Natural Log | Ratio to Pop | Ratio to LF | Natural Log |
| $$NSDAPshare 1932⋅$$ | 0.158\* | 0.429\* | 0.037 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $$D1939$$ | (0.090) | (0.225) | (0.024) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $$NSDAP share July 1932⋅$$ |  |  |  | 0.090\*\* | 0.235\*\* | 0.025\*\* |  |  |  |
| $$D1939$$ |  |  |  | (0.038) | (0.105) | (0.010) |  |  |  |
| $$NSDAP share Nov 1932⋅$$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.103\*\* | 0.268\*\* | 0.028\*\* |
| $$D1939$$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.046) | (0.129) | (0.012) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 738 | 738 | 738 | 480 | 480 | 480 | 483 | 483 | 483 |
| Number of cities | 246 | 246 | 246 | 160 | 160 | 160 | 161 | 161 | 161 |
| F-stat first stage | 7.200 | 7.200 | 7.200 | 10.11 | 10.11 | 10.11 | 9.591 | 9.591 | 9.591 |
| \* = Significant at p<0.1.\*\* = Significant at p<0.05.\*\*\* = Significant at p<0.01.*Notes*: Panel data results for 1925, 1933, and 1939. Robust standard errors, clustered at the city level, in parentheses. All regressions control for city fixed effects, an indicator for 1939 as well as interactions of an indicator for 1939 with an indicator for being a Gau capital, the Jewish population in 1925, the unemployment rate in 1933, longitude, latitude, and an indicator for being in the Rhineland.*Sources*: 1912 EA vote share from Statistisches Reichsamt (1913), public employment jobs, and labor force from Statistisches Reichsamt (1927–1928, 1935–1936, 1942), 1939 population from Statistisches Reichsamt (1942), latitude and longitude from online geocoding tools, Rhineland according to the definition of the Versailles treaty, Nazi Gau capitals from Das Buch der Deutschen Gaue (1938), remaining data from Falter and Hänisch (1990). |

Table C2

CONTROLLING FOR SECOND-ORDER POLYNOMIALS IN LONGITUDE AND LATITUDE

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| Variables | Public Employment |
|  | Ratio to Pop. | Ratio to LF | Natural Log |
|  |  |  |  |
| $$NSDAP share 1933⋅D1939$$ | 0.097\*\* | 0.260\*\* | 0.026\*\* |
|  | (0.043) | (0.107) | (0.012) |
| F-stat first stage | 16.03 |
| \* = Significant at p<0.1.\*\* = Significant at p<0.05.\*\*\* = Significant at p<0.01.*Notes*: Panel data results for 1925, 1933, and 1939, 246 cities and 738 observations. Robust standard errors, clustered at the city level, in parentheses. All regressions control for city fixed effects, an indicator for 1939 as well as interactions of an indicator for 1939 with an indicator for being a Gau capital, the Jewish population in 1925, the unemployment rate in 1933, longitude, the square of longitude, latitude, the square of latitude, and an indicator for being in the Rhineland.*Sources*: See notes to Table C1. |

Table C3

ROBUSTNESS OF THE METAL INDUSTRY ESTIMATES: ROBUSTNESS TO CITY SIZE

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Variables | Metal Industry Employment |
|  | Ratio to Pop. | Ratio to LF | Natural Log | Ratio to Pop. | Ratio to LF | Natural Log |
| $$NSDAP share 1933⋅$$ | –0.204 | –0.439 | –0.017 | –0.236 | –0.494 | –0.018 |
| $$D1939$$ | (0.137) | (0.302) | (0.015) | (0.186) | (0.406) | (0.016) |
| Observations | 843 | 843 | 843 | 663 | 663 | 663 |
| Number of cities | 281 | 281 | 281 | 221 | 221 | 221 |
| F-stat first stage | 14.46 | 14.46 | 14.46 | 10.37 | 10.37 | 10.37 |
| \* = Significant at p<0.1.\*\* = Significant at p<0.05.\*\*\* = Significant at p<0.01.*Notes*: Panel data results for 1925, 1933, and 1939. Robust standard errors, clustered at the city level, in parentheses. All regressions control for city fixed effects, an indicator for 1939 as well as interactions of an indicator for 1939 with an indicator for being a Gau capital, the Jewish population in 1925, the unemployment rate in 1933, longitude, latitude and an indicator for being in the Rhineland. Columns 1–3 do not drop any cities that underwent size changes during the period of observation, columns 4–6 exclude all cities whose growth between 1910 and 1925, 1925 and 1933, or 1933 and 1939 exceeded the respective mean by more than one respective standard deviation.*Sources*: Metal industry employment jobs and labor force from Statistisches Reichsamt (1927–1928, 1935–1936, 1942). All other variables see notes to Table C1. |

Table C4

IV VALUE DEPENDING ON SUBSAMPLES

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Panel A: 2SLS Estimates | Ratio of Public Employment to Population | Natural Logarithm of Public Employment |
| $$NSDAP share 1933⋅D1939$$ | 0.098\*\* | 0.257\* | 0.048 | 0.175 | 0.023\* | 0.086\*\* | 0.010 | 0.064\*\* |
|  | (0.049) | (0.147) | (0.049) | (0.118) | (0.013) | (0.040) | (0.012) | (0.033) |
| Panel B: Reduced Form | Ratio of Public Employment to Population | Natural Logarithm of Public Employment |
| $$EA share 1912⋅D1939$$ | 0.033\*\* | 0.048\*\*\* | 0.029 | 0.065\* | 0.008\* | 0.016\*\*\* | 0.006 | 0.024\*\*\* |
|  | (0.014) | (0.016) | (0.028) | (0.036) | (0.004) | (0.005) | (0.007) | (0.009) |
| Panel C: First Stage | $$NSDAP Share 1933⋅D1939$$ |
| $$EA share 1912⋅D1939$$ | 0.339\*\*\* | 0.187\*\* | 0.606\*\*\* | 0.373\*\* | 0.339\*\*\* | 0.187\*\* | 0.606\*\*\* | 0.373\*\* |
|  | (0.093) | (0.088) | (0.143) | (0.165) | (0.093) | (0.088) | (0.143) | (0.165) |
| F-stat first stage | 13.21 | 4.564 | 17.87 | 5.123 | 13.21 | 4.564 | 17.87 | 5.123 |
| Observations | 738 | 165 | 726 | 153 | 738 | 165 | 726 | 153 |
| Number of cities | 246 | 55 | 242 | 51 | 246 | 55 | 242 | 51 |
| Sample | All cities | %EA> 0 | %EA < 20 | 0 <%EA< 20 | All cities | %EA> 0 | %EA < 20 | 0 <%EA< 20 |
| \* = Significant at p<0.1.\*\* = Significant at p<0.05.\*\*\* = Significant at p<0.01.*Notes*: Panel data results for 1925, 1933, and 1939. Robust standard errors, clustered at the city level, in parentheses. All regressions control for city fixed effects, an indicator for 1939 as well as interactions of an indicator for 1939 with an indicator for being a Gau capital, the Jewish population share in 1925, the unemployment rate in 1933, longitude, latitude, and an indicator for being in the Rhineland.*Sources*: See note to Table C1. |

1. High-ranking civil servants and soldiers are reported with the self-employed, which is why they are missing from my measure. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)