

Supplementary Appendix

The Effect of WWI Military Casualties on the Population Distribution in Germany

Antonio Ciccone*

May 2021

*Mannheim University; the paper is available at <https://www.vwl.uni-mannheim.de/en/ciccone/>.

Figure 1: Map of Württemberg



Notes: The area shaded in blue corresponds to the historic state of Württemberg. The areas shaded in blue and grey correspond to the modern state of Baden-Württemberg. The area shaded in light yellow corresponds to the rest of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Figure 2A: Effect of World War I Casualties Relative to 1895 Population on Male Population Growth 1900–1910






Figure 2B: Effect of WWI Casualties Relative to 1895 Number of Households on Male Population Growth 1900–1910



Notes: World War I casualties are measured either relative to population or the number of households in 1895. The figures show point estimates and 90-percent confidence intervals when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. There are 1630 municipalities in the full sample. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1895.

Figure 3: Persistence of the 1910–1919 Male Population Shock to 1933



Notes: The estimating equation is (5) in the main paper. The left-hand-side variable is male population growth between 1910 and 1933. The endogenous right-hand-side variable is male population growth between 1910 and 1919. The instrument is World War I (WWI) casualties relative to the 1905 population. The analysis includes all municipality controls in Table 1 in the main paper. The figure shows point estimates and 90-percent confidence intervals when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. There are 1634 municipalities in the full sample. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905.

Table 1: Effect of World War I (WWI) Casualties on Male Population Growth 1910–1919

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
WWI casualties relative to population in 1905	-0.314 (0.058) [0.118]	-0.294 (0.058) [0.113]	-0.302 (0.062) [0.082]	-0.287 (0.062) [0.081]	-0.286 (0.062) [0.082]	-0.371 (0.065) [0.058]	-0.370 (0.065) [0.061]	-0.343 (0.070) [0.059]	-0.331 (0.070) [0.065]
log population, 1905	-0.011 (0.003) [0.005]		-0.050 (0.019) [0.017]	-0.048 (0.020) [0.018]	-0.046 (0.020) [0.018]	-0.045 (0.019) [0.021]	-0.037 (0.020) [0.020]	-0.039 (0.021) [0.020]	-0.055 (0.022) [0.022]
log number of households, 1905		-0.009 (0.003) [0.004]	0.038 (0.018) [0.017]	0.035 (0.018) [0.018]	0.033 (0.018) [0.018]	0.031 (0.018) [0.021]	0.029 (0.018) [0.019]	0.031 (0.020) [0.020]	0.047 (0.021) [0.021]
log male pop. to female pop., 1905			-0.040 (0.025) [0.027]	-0.043 (0.026) [0.025]	-0.037 (0.025) [0.024]	-0.034 (0.028) [0.021]	-0.054 (0.030) [0.023]	-0.065 (0.033) [0.023]	-0.071 (0.036) [0.024]
log population density, 1905			-0.001 (0.005) [0.004]	0.001 (0.005) [0.003]	0.002 (0.005) [0.004]	0.004 (0.005) [0.004]	0.003 (0.008) [0.006]	0.004 (0.008) [0.006]	0.010 (0.009) [0.006]
male population growth, 1905 to 1910			-0.146 (0.048) [0.044]	-0.152 (0.048) [0.045]	-0.150 (0.048) [0.046]	-0.158 (0.049) [0.043]	-0.168 (0.048) [0.039]	-0.177 (0.048) [0.040]	-0.179 (0.049) [0.040]
male population growth, 1900 to 1905			-0.031 (0.047) [0.036]	-0.028 (0.047) [0.036]	-0.034 (0.047) [0.030]	-0.040 (0.050) [0.033]	-0.011 (0.051) [0.037]	-0.002 (0.052) [0.039]	0.006 (0.053) [0.039]
male population growth, 1880 to 1900			-0.051 (0.029) [0.024]	-0.049 (0.030) [0.026]	-0.051 (0.030) [0.024]	-0.071 (0.035) [0.028]	-0.051 (0.036) [0.028]	-0.041 (0.036) [0.028]	-0.033 (0.038) [0.028]
female population growth, 1905 to 1910			0.212 (0.052) [0.036]	0.206 (0.052) [0.035]	0.204 (0.052) [0.038]	0.212 (0.056) [0.040]	0.211 (0.052) [0.035]	0.206 (0.052) [0.035]	0.207 (0.053) [0.037]
female population growth, 1900 to 1905			0.068 (0.046) [0.038]	0.062 (0.046) [0.037]	0.062 (0.046) [0.037]	0.078 (0.049) [0.037]	0.064 (0.048) [0.036]	0.063 (0.049) [0.036]	0.057 (0.049) [0.035]
female population growth, 1880 to 1900			0.105 (0.028) [0.018]	0.098 (0.029) [0.020]	0.099 (0.029) [0.019]	0.101 (0.034) [0.028]	0.095 (0.034) [0.029]	0.084 (0.035) [0.029]	0.079 (0.036) [0.029]
labor force to total population, 1905			0.169 (0.017) [0.012]	0.167 (0.019) [0.011]	0.165 (0.020) [0.012]	0.167 (0.018) [0.010]	0.157 (0.020) [0.012]	0.158 (0.020) [0.011]	0.158 (0.020) [0.011]
log income per capita, 1905				0.013 (0.008) [0.012]	0.014 (0.008) [0.011]	0.023 (0.009) [0.011]	-0.007 (0.011) [0.015]	-0.006 (0.011) [0.015]	-0.011 (0.011) [0.015]
log agricultural relative to total population 1905				0.001 (0.008) [0.009]	0.003 (0.008) [0.008]	0.002 (0.008) [0.008]	-0.007 (0.009) [0.007]	0.002 (0.010) [0.009]	0.008 (0.010) [0.010]
log wage, 1898					-0.006 (0.024) [0.034]	0.008 (0.024) [0.031]	0.038 (0.026) [0.031]	0.046 (0.026) [0.033]	0.053 (0.025) [0.038]
wage growth, 1884 to 1909					0.016 (0.020) [0.028]	0.027 (0.020) [0.025]	0.072 (0.023) [0.026]	0.080 (0.024) [0.028]	0.084 (0.024) [0.032]
log male pop. younger 14 over total male pop., 1875						-0.051 (0.023) [0.014]	-0.033 (0.023) [0.013]	-0.023 (0.023) [0.014]	-0.018 (0.023) [0.014]
log male pop. younger 14 over total male pop., 1880						0.039 (0.020) [0.026]	0.045 (0.020) [0.026]	0.049 (0.020) [0.027]	0.052 (0.020) [0.027]
log male pop. younger 14 over total male pop., 1885						-0.004 (0.007) [0.004]	-0.002 (0.007) [0.004]	0.002 (0.007) [0.004]	0.002 (0.007) [0.004]
log female pop. younger 14 over total female pop., 1875						0.002 (0.022) [0.023]	0.019 (0.022) [0.022]	0.017 (0.022) [0.023]	0.013 (0.022) [0.022]
log female pop. younger 14 over total female pop., 1880						0.010 (0.017) [0.012]	0.009 (0.016) [0.012]	0.010 (0.017) [0.014]	0.011 (0.017) [0.013]
log female pop. younger 14 over total female pop., 1885						0.009 (0.006) [0.003]	0.007 (0.006) [0.004]	0.004 (0.006) [0.003]	0.004 (0.006) [0.004]
log pop. younger 14 over total pop., 1895						0.062 (0.021) [0.020]	0.072 (0.022) [0.019]	0.071 (0.022) [0.019]	0.067 (0.022) [0.018]
log nonagricultural business per capita, 1907/1905							0.005 (0.006) [0.004]	0.003 (0.006) [0.004]	0.002 (0.006) [0.005]
log nonagricultural business taxes per capita, 1908/1905							-0.007 (0.003) [0.003]	-0.008 (0.004) [0.003]	-0.007 (0.004) [0.003]
log building tax per capita, 1905/07							0.075 (0.017) [0.015]	0.073 (0.017) [0.015]	0.064 (0.018) [0.018]
log building tax per building, 1907							-0.037 (0.010) [0.007]	-0.040 (0.010) [0.006]	-0.037 (0.010) [0.006]
log land tax per square km, 1907							0.005 (0.007) [0.005]	0.002 (0.007) [0.006]	-0.000 (0.007) [0.005]
log fire insurance building values per capita, 1908/1905							0.016 (0.011) [0.011]	0.016 (0.011) [0.011]	0.018 (0.011) [0.011]

log nonagricultural business employment per business, 1907								[0.010]	[0.011]	[0.012]
								0.003	0.005	0.005
								(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
log stillborn or died in first year over all births, 1896-1905								[0.005]	[0.005]	[0.005]
									0.013	0.010
									(0.008)	(0.008)
log pop. born in municipality per total pop., 1900									[0.006]	[0.007]
									-0.001	0.001
									(0.014)	(0.014)
log pop. born in municipality per total pop., 1895									[0.009]	[0.015]
									-0.327	-0.335
									(0.127)	(0.127)
log male pop. born in municipality per total male pop., 1895									[0.129]	[0.133]
									0.081	0.091
									(0.052)	(0.054)
log fem. pop. born in municipality per total fem. pop., 1895									[0.058]	[0.064]
									0.220	0.225
									(0.089)	(0.089)
distance to next train station, 1905									[0.091]	[0.097]
									-0.001	-0.001
									(0.001)	(0.001)
share of farms below 2 hectares									[0.000]	[0.000]
										0.047
										(0.029)
share of farms between 4 and 10 hectares										[0.032]
										0.042
										(0.031)
share of farms between 10 and 20 hectares										[0.027]
										0.071
										(0.035)
share of farms larger than 20 hectares										[0.020]
										0.107
										(0.055)
growth in land area of municipality, 1905 to 1933										[0.045]
										0.016
										(0.022)
										[0.025]
constant	0.084	0.059	0.063	0.080	0.098	0.119	0.004	-0.002	-0.062	
	(0.020)	(0.015)	(0.047)	(0.049)	(0.136)	(0.147)	(0.158)	(0.160)	(0.154)	
	[0.043]	[0.035]	[0.033]	[0.038]	[0.180]	[0.174]	[0.174]	[0.182]	[0.193]	
R-squared	0.019	0.018	0.147	0.149	0.151	0.166	0.192	0.203	0.208	
Observations	1634	1634	1634	1634	1634	1634	1634	1634	1634	

Notes: The left-hand-side variable is male population growth 1910–1919. WWI casualties are measured relative to 1905 population. The method of estimation is least squares. The numbers in parenthesis are robust standard errors and those in brackets are Conley standard errors with a Bartlett kernel and a 100 km distance cutoff. Data sources and descriptive statistics are in Table 2 in the paper.

Table 2: Effect of World War I (WWI) Casualties on Male Population Growth 1910–1919

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
WWI casualties relative to number of households in 1905	-0.073 (0.013) [0.022]	-0.073 (0.013) [0.022]	-0.065 (0.013) [0.016]	-0.063 (0.013) [0.016]	-0.063 (0.013) [0.016]	-0.082 (0.013) [0.012]	-0.081 (0.013) [0.012]	-0.076 (0.014) [0.012]	-0.074 (0.014) [0.014]
log population, 1905	-0.012 (0.003) [0.005]		-0.025 (0.018) [0.017]	-0.025 (0.018) [0.018]	-0.022 (0.018) [0.018]	-0.014 (0.018) [0.020]	-0.005 (0.018) [0.017]	-0.008 (0.020) [0.018]	-0.025 (0.022) [0.020]
log number of households, 1905		-0.012 (0.003) [0.005]	0.012 (0.017) [0.018]	0.011 (0.017) [0.019]	0.009 (0.017) [0.019]	-0.001 (0.017) [0.020]	-0.004 (0.017) [0.017]	-0.001 (0.020) [0.018]	0.016 (0.021) [0.020]
log male pop. to female pop., 1905			-0.040 (0.025) [0.028]	-0.044 (0.026) [0.026]	-0.038 (0.025) [0.024]	-0.035 (0.028) [0.021]	-0.054 (0.030) [0.024]	-0.065 (0.033) [0.023]	-0.071 (0.036) [0.024]
log population density, 1905			-0.001 (0.005) [0.004]	0.001 (0.005) [0.003]	0.002 (0.005) [0.004]	0.004 (0.005) [0.004]	0.003 (0.008) [0.006]	0.005 (0.008) [0.006]	0.010 (0.009) [0.006]
male population growth, 1905 to 1910			-0.147 (0.048) [0.044]	-0.153 (0.048) [0.045]	-0.151 (0.048) [0.046]	-0.160 (0.049) [0.043]	-0.170 (0.048) [0.039]	-0.178 (0.048) [0.040]	-0.179 (0.048) [0.040]
male population growth, 1900 to 1905			-0.031 (0.047) [0.036]	-0.027 (0.047) [0.036]	-0.033 (0.047) [0.031]	-0.039 (0.050) [0.033]	-0.010 (0.051) [0.037]	-0.002 (0.052) [0.039]	0.006 (0.053) [0.039]
male population growth, 1880 to 1900			-0.050 (0.029) [0.024]	-0.049 (0.030) [0.026]	-0.051 (0.030) [0.024]	-0.071 (0.035) [0.028]	-0.051 (0.036) [0.028]	-0.042 (0.036) [0.028]	-0.033 (0.037) [0.028]
female population growth, 1905 to 1910			0.212 (0.052) [0.036]	0.205 (0.052) [0.035]	0.203 (0.052) [0.038]	0.211 (0.055) [0.040]	0.210 (0.052) [0.035]	0.205 (0.052) [0.035]	0.206 (0.053) [0.037]
female population growth, 1900 to 1905			0.069 (0.046) [0.037]	0.063 (0.046) [0.036]	0.063 (0.045) [0.037]	0.079 (0.049) [0.037]	0.066 (0.048) [0.036]	0.063 (0.048) [0.035]	0.058 (0.049) [0.035]
female population growth, 1880 to 1900			0.107 (0.028) [0.018]	0.098 (0.029) [0.020]	0.100 (0.029) [0.019]	0.102 (0.034) [0.028]	0.096 (0.034) [0.029]	0.085 (0.035) [0.029]	0.080 (0.036) [0.029]
labor force to total population, 1905			0.168 (0.018) [0.012]	0.166 (0.020) [0.012]	0.164 (0.021) [0.012]	0.166 (0.019) [0.011]	0.156 (0.020) [0.012]	0.157 (0.021) [0.012]	0.157 (0.021) [0.011]
log income per capita, 1905				0.013 (0.008) [0.012]	0.014 (0.008) [0.011]	0.024 (0.009) [0.011]	-0.006 (0.011) [0.015]	-0.005 (0.011) [0.014]	-0.010 (0.011) [0.015]
log agricultural relative to total population 1905				0.001 (0.008) [0.008]	0.002 (0.008) [0.007]	0.002 (0.008) [0.006]	-0.008 (0.009) [0.006]	0.000 (0.010) [0.008]	0.007 (0.010) [0.009]
log wage, 1898					-0.005 (0.024) [0.033]	0.009 (0.024) [0.030]	0.039 (0.026) [0.031]	0.046 (0.026) [0.033]	0.053 (0.025) [0.038]
wage growth, 1884 to 1909					0.017 (0.020) [0.028]	0.028 (0.020) [0.024]	0.073 (0.023) [0.026]	0.080 (0.024) [0.028]	0.084 (0.024) [0.032]
log male pop. younger 14 over total male pop., 1875						-0.050 (0.023) [0.014]	-0.032 (0.023) [0.013]	-0.023 (0.023) [0.014]	-0.018 (0.023) [0.014]
log male pop. younger 14 over total male pop., 1880						0.039 (0.020) [0.027]	0.045 (0.020) [0.026]	0.049 (0.020) [0.027]	0.052 (0.020) [0.027]
log male pop. younger 14 over total male pop., 1885						-0.004 (0.007) [0.004]	-0.002 (0.007) [0.004]	0.002 (0.007) [0.004]	0.002 (0.007) [0.004]
log female pop. younger 14 over total female pop., 1875						0.003 (0.022) [0.023]	0.019 (0.022) [0.022]	0.017 (0.022) [0.023]	0.013 (0.022) [0.022]
log female pop. younger 14 over total female pop., 1880						0.009 (0.017) [0.012]	0.008 (0.016) [0.012]	0.010 (0.017) [0.014]	0.011 (0.017) [0.013]
log female pop. younger 14 over total female pop., 1885						0.009 (0.006) [0.003]	0.008 (0.006) [0.004]	0.004 (0.006) [0.003]	0.004 (0.006) [0.004]
log pop. younger 14 over total pop., 1895						0.067 (0.021) [0.019]	0.077 (0.022) [0.018]	0.074 (0.022) [0.018]	0.071 (0.022) [0.017]
log nonagricultural business per capita, 1907/1905							0.005 (0.006) [0.004]	0.004 (0.006) [0.004]	0.002 (0.006) [0.005]
log nonagricultural business taxes per capita, 1908/1905							-0.006 (0.003) [0.003]	-0.008 (0.004) [0.003]	-0.006 (0.004) [0.003]
log building tax per capita, 1905/07							0.074 (0.017) [0.015]	0.073 (0.017) [0.015]	0.064 (0.018) [0.018]
log building tax per building, 1907							-0.036 (0.010) [0.007]	-0.040 (0.010) [0.007]	-0.037 (0.010) [0.006]
log land tax per square km, 1907							0.005 (0.007) [0.006]	0.002 (0.007) [0.006]	-0.000 (0.007) [0.005]
log fire insurance building values per capita, 1908/1905							0.015 (0.011) [0.011]	0.016 (0.011) [0.011]	0.018 (0.011) [0.011]

log nonagricultural business employment per business, 1907								[0.010]	[0.011]	[0.012]
								0.003	0.004	0.005
								(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
log stillborn or died in first year over all births, 1896-1905								[0.005]	[0.005]	[0.005]
									0.013	0.010
									(0.008)	(0.008)
log pop. born in municipality per total pop., 1900									[0.007]	[0.007]
									0.000	0.003
									(0.014)	(0.014)
log pop. born in municipality per total pop., 1895									[0.009]	[0.016]
									-0.314	-0.322
									(0.129)	(0.128)
log male pop. born in municipality per total male pop., 1895									[0.132]	[0.135]
									0.078	0.087
									(0.052)	(0.054)
log fem. pop. born in municipality per total fem. pop., 1895									[0.059]	[0.064]
									0.213	0.218
									(0.090)	(0.090)
distance to next train station, 1905									[0.093]	[0.098]
									-0.001	-0.001
									(0.001)	(0.001)
share of farms below 2 hectares									[0.000]	[0.000]
										0.048
										(0.029)
share of farms between 4 and 10 hectares										[0.032]
										0.044
										(0.031)
share of farms between 10 and 20 hectares										[0.028]
										0.070
										(0.035)
share of farms larger than 20 hectares										[0.019]
										0.105
										(0.055)
growth in land area of municipality, 1905 to 1933										[0.044]
										0.018
										(0.022)
										[0.025]
constant	0.097	0.076	0.028	0.047	0.065	0.081	-0.034	-0.035	-0.096	
	(0.021)	(0.016)	(0.043)	(0.046)	(0.135)	(0.145)	(0.156)	(0.157)	(0.152)	
	[0.044]	[0.037]	[0.029]	[0.035]	[0.176]	[0.167]	[0.168]	[0.173]	[0.184]	
R-squared	0.021	0.022	0.149	0.151	0.153	0.170	0.195	0.205	0.211	
Observations	1634	1634	1634	1634	1634	1634	1634	1634	1634	

Notes: The left-hand-side variable is male population growth 1910–1919. WWI casualties are measured relative to 1905 households. The method of estimation is least squares. The numbers in parenthesis are robust standard errors and those in brackets are Conley standard errors with a Bartlett kernel and a 100 km distance cutoff. Data sources and descriptive statistics are in Table 2 in the paper.

Table 3: Changes in Municipalities Between 1933 and 1939

Municipality 1933	Municipality 1939	County (Kreis) 1939
Unterrombach	Aalen	Aalen
Steinbach	Backnang	Backnang
Heselwangen	Balingen	Balingen
Dürrwangen	Frommern	Balingen
Truchteltingen	Tailfingen	Balingen
Bergerhausen	Biberach an der Riß	Biberach
Hummertsried	Mühlhausen	Biberach
Sommenhardt	Bad Teinach	Calw
Alzenberg	Calw	Calw
Enztal	Enzklösterle	Calw
Iselshausen	Nagold	Calw
Bergorte	Wildbad	Calw
Ingersheim	Crailsheim	Crailsheim
Dettingen	Ehingen an der Donau	Ehingen
Bergach	Ehingen an der Donau	Ehingen
Ingstetten	Ehingen an der Donau	Ehingen
Steinbach&Pfaushausen	Wernau am Neckar	Esslingen
Kleineislingen	Eislingen/Fils	Göppingen
Großeislingen	Eislingen/Fils	Göppingen
Holzheim	Göppingen	Göppingen
Jebenhausen	Göppingen	Göppingen
Kleinfüßen&Großfüßen	Süßen	Göppingen
Mergelstetten	Heidenheim	Heidenheim
Kochendorf&Hagenbach&Jagstfeld	Bad Friedrichshall	Heilbronn
Binswangen	Erlenbach	Heilbronn
Böttingen	Gundelsheim	Heilbronn
Nagelsberg	Künzelsau	Künzelsau
Gerhausen	Blaubeuren	Landkreis Ulm
Eltingen	Leonberg	Leonberg
Winzerhausen	Großbottwar	Ludwigsburg
Zainingen&Böhringen	Donnstetten	Münsingen
Feldstetten	Laichingen	Münsingen
Trailfingen	Münsingen	Münsingen
Böttingen	Münsingen	Münsingen
Magolsheim	Münsingen	Münsingen
Enabeuren	Sontheim	Münsingen
Balzholz	Beuren	Nürtingen
Lindorf	Kirchheim unter Teck	Nürtingen
Ötlingen	Kirchheim unter Teck	Nürtingen
Brucklen	Unterlenningen	Nürtingen
Unterboihingen	Wendlingen am Neckar	Nürtingen
Steinach	Waldsee	Ravensburg
Ohmenhausen	Reutlingen	Reutlingen
Sondelfingen	Reutlingen	Reutlingen
Bühligen	Rottweil	Rottweil
Sulgau	Schramberg	Rottweil
Sulgen	Schramberg	Rottweil
Oberböbingen	Unterböbingen	Schwäbisch Gmünd
Hessental	Schwäbisch Hall	Schwäbisch Hall
Sontheim am Neckar	Heilbronn	Stadtkreis Heilbronn
Neckargartach	Heilbronn	Stadtkreis Heilbronn
Uhlbach	Stuttgart	Stadtkreis Stuttgart
Rohr	Stuttgart	Stadtkreis Stuttgart
Heumaden	Stuttgart	Stadtkreis Stuttgart
Birkach	Stuttgart	Stadtkreis Stuttgart
Vaihingen a d F	Stuttgart	Stadtkreis Stuttgart
Stammheim	Stuttgart	Stadtkreis Stuttgart
Plieningen	Stuttgart	Stadtkreis Stuttgart
Rohracker	Stuttgart	Stadtkreis Stuttgart
Möhrinen a d F	Stuttgart	Stadtkreis Stuttgart
Sillenbuch	Stuttgart	Stadtkreis Stuttgart
Berg	Ailingen	Tettnang
Hirschlatt	Ettenkirch	Tettnang
Oberdorf	Langenargen	Tettnang
Liebenau	Meckenbeuren	Tettnang
Flunau	Neukirch	Tettnang
Obereisenbach	Tettnang	Tettnang
Laimnau	Tettnang	Tettnang
Lustnau	Tübingen	Tettnang
Derendingen	Tübingen	Tübingen
Emmelhofen	Kißlegg	Wangen
Sommersried	Kißlegg	Wangen
Wiggenreute	Kißlegg	Wangen
Eggereute	Wangen im Allgäu	Wangen
Obereppach	Neuenstein	Öhringen
Waldstetten&Weilheim	Weilstetten	Balingen

Notes: When a 1933 municipality was incorporated into an existing municipality by the 1933–1939 territorial reform, the name of the former municipality in 1933 is listed in the first column and the name of the latter municipality is listed in the second column. When there is more than one municipality in the first column, multiple 1933 municipalities were combined into a new 1939 municipality.

Table 4: Effect of World War I Casualties on Male Population Growth 1910–1919

Panel A: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.074	-0.079	-0.078	-0.077	-0.078	-0.071	-0.068	-0.064	-0.064
robust standard error	0.014	0.014	0.015	0.016	0.016	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.020
Conley standard error	0.013	0.013	0.014	0.016	0.018	0.019	0.019	0.019	0.022
N	1634	1552	1470	1389	1306	1225	1143	1062	980

Panel B: Casualties relative to population in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.331	-0.353	-0.348	-0.332	-0.334	-0.303	-0.279	-0.258	-0.262
robust standard error	0.070	0.070	0.071	0.076	0.078	0.082	0.084	0.085	0.090
Conley standard error	0.065	0.066	0.068	0.070	0.080	0.079	0.075	0.070	0.082
N	1634	1552	1470	1389	1306	1225	1143	1062	980

Panel C: Raw casualties relative to the number of households in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.050	-0.053	-0.052	-0.051	-0.051	-0.048	-0.045	-0.042	-0.044
robust standard error	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.011	0.011	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.013
Conley standard error	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.008	0.010	0.010	0.011	0.012	0.014
N	1634	1552	1470	1389	1306	1225	1143	1062	980

Panel D: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905 and agricultural land per household in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.074	-0.077	-0.075	-0.073	-0.072	-0.070	-0.054	-0.054	-0.049
robust standard error	0.014	0.015	0.015	0.016	0.016	0.017	0.018	0.019	0.020
Conley standard error	0.014	0.013	0.014	0.015	0.017	0.020	0.016	0.019	0.018
N	1634	1552	1471	1389	1308	1225	1144	1063	981

Notes: The table shows point estimates and standard errors when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905 in Panels A-C and by the amount of agricultural land per household in Panel D. Raw casualties in Panel C refer to the total number of entries that appear in the database of German WWI casualties when searching for a municipality and county. A drawback of this casualty count is that the same person appears more than once, see page 6 in the paper for a discussion.

Table 5: Effect of World War I Casualties on Male Population Growth 1910–1933**Panel A: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905**

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.059	-0.070	-0.084	-0.090	-0.099	-0.094	-0.098	-0.080	-0.072
robust standard error	0.021	0.021	0.022	0.024	0.025	0.026	0.027	0.029	0.032
Conley standard error	0.015	0.014	0.018	0.018	0.021	0.025	0.032	0.028	0.031
N	1634	1552	1470	1389	1306	1225	1143	1062	980

Panel B: Casualties relative to population in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.259	-0.326	-0.377	-0.393	-0.430	-0.408	-0.424	-0.331	-0.290
robust standard error	0.102	0.103	0.106	0.112	0.118	0.121	0.127	0.135	0.146
Conley standard error	0.068	0.061	0.077	0.082	0.097	0.117	0.140	0.116	0.129
N	1634	1552	1470	1389	1306	1225	1143	1062	980

Panel C: Raw casualties relative to the number of households in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.043	-0.053	-0.062	-0.065	-0.07	-0.069	-0.07	-0.056	-0.053
robust standard error	0.015	0.015	0.015	0.016	0.017	0.018	0.019	0.02	0.022
Conley standard error	0.011	0.011	0.013	0.014	0.016	0.019	0.024	0.022	0.025
N	1634	1552	1470	1389	1306	1225	1143	1062	980

Panel D: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905 and agricultural land per household in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.059	-0.069	-0.093	-0.100	-0.093	-0.098	-0.083	-0.078	-0.074
robust standard error	0.021	0.021	0.022	0.024	0.025	0.026	0.027	0.030	0.031
Conley standard error	0.015	0.016	0.016	0.022	0.023	0.028	0.025	0.029	0.024
N	1634	1552	1471	1389	1308	1225	1144	1063	981

Notes: The table shows point estimates and standard errors when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905 in Panels A-C and by the amount of agricultural land per household in Panel D. Raw casualties in Panel C refer to the total number of entries that appear in the database of German WWI casualties when searching for a municipality and county. A drawback of this casualty count is that the same person appears more than once, see page 6 in the paper for a discussion.

Table 6: Persistence of the 1910-1919 Male Population Shock to 1933**Panel A: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905**

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.796	0.909	1.09	1.198	1.302	1.349	1.47	1.285	1.139
robust standard error	0.268	0.266	0.282	0.305	0.32	0.371	0.424	0.448	0.461
Conley standard error	0.255	0.25	0.261	0.228	0.202	0.276	0.349	0.31	0.347
N	1634	1552	1470	1389	1306	1225	1143	1062	980

Panel B: Casualties relative to population in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.782	0.924	1.084	1.183	1.286	1.346	1.517	1.283	1.107
robust standard error	0.285	0.277	0.293	0.322	0.336	0.39	0.465	0.487	0.495
Conley standard error	0.265	0.255	0.275	0.254	0.23	0.329	0.415	0.362	0.399
N	1634	1552	1470	1389	1306	1225	1143	1062	980

Panel C: Raw casualties relative to the number of households in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.847	0.99	1.191	1.29	1.367	1.44	1.535	1.333	1.197
robust standard error	0.275	0.273	0.293	0.319	0.333	0.382	0.433	0.46	0.455
Conley standard error	0.276	0.271	0.294	0.274	0.248	0.324	0.391	0.393	0.446
N	1634	1552	1470	1389	1306	1225	1143	1062	980

Panel D: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905 and agricultural land per household in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.796	0.906	1.242	1.373	1.289	1.396	1.53	1.459	1.509
robust standard error	0.268	0.271	0.297	0.339	0.339	0.371	0.535	0.546	0.64
Conley standard error	0.255	0.261	0.224	0.248	0.256	0.371	0.583	0.544	0.679
N	1634	1552	1471	1389	1308	1225	1144	1063	981

Notes: The table shows point estimates and standard errors when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905 in Panels A-C and by the amount of agricultural land per household in Panel D. Raw casualties in Panel C refer to the total number of entries that appear in the database of German WWI casualties when searching for a municipality and county. A drawback of this casualty count is that the same person appears more than once, see page 6 in the paper for a discussion.

Table 7: Effect of World War I Casualties on Male Population Growth 1910–1939**Panel A: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905**

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.017	-0.047	-0.066	-0.087	-0.100	-0.106	-0.112	-0.105	-0.097
robust standard error	0.032	0.033	0.035	0.038	0.040	0.042	0.044	0.048	0.052
Conley standard error	0.026	0.024	0.027	0.029	0.034	0.046	0.050	0.054	0.053
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel B: Casualties relative to population in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.080	-0.234	-0.314	-0.395	-0.455	-0.468	-0.513	-0.461	-0.409
robust standard error	0.159	0.158	0.166	0.178	0.188	0.196	0.205	0.221	0.237
Conley standard error	0.122	0.106	0.125	0.138	0.162	0.223	0.242	0.255	0.251
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel C: Raw casualties relative to the number of households in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.022	-0.044	-0.058	-0.072	-0.08	-0.084	-0.086	-0.08	-0.077
robust standard error	0.022	0.022	0.023	0.025	0.027	0.028	0.03	0.033	0.035
Conley standard error	0.018	0.016	0.021	0.024	0.028	0.036	0.039	0.043	0.045
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel D: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905 and agricultural land per household in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.017	-0.035	-0.078	-0.090	-0.099	-0.120	-0.124	-0.107	-0.104
robust standard error	0.032	0.034	0.035	0.038	0.040	0.043	0.046	0.051	0.052
Conley standard error	0.026	0.028	0.024	0.029	0.040	0.048	0.057	0.060	0.053
N	1558	1481	1403	1325	1247	1169	1091	1013	935

Notes: The table shows point estimates and standard errors when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905 in Panels A-C and by the amount of agricultural land per household in Panel D. Raw casualties in Panel C refer to the total number of entries that appear in the database of German WWI casualties when searching for a municipality and county. A drawback of this casualty count is that the same person appears more than once, see page 6 in the paper for a discussion.

Table 8: Effect of World War I Casualties on Male Population Growth 1910–1950**Panel A: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905**

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.033	-0.062	-0.094	-0.127	-0.149	-0.171	-0.169	-0.154	-0.158
robust standard error	0.037	0.039	0.040	0.043	0.045	0.046	0.048	0.051	0.055
Conley standard error	0.045	0.048	0.044	0.042	0.044	0.052	0.056	0.063	0.066
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel B: Casualties relative to population in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.180	-0.312	-0.445	-0.586	-0.683	-0.779	-0.804	-0.730	-0.721
robust standard error	0.182	0.188	0.193	0.205	0.214	0.218	0.226	0.240	0.256
Conley standard error	0.215	0.224	0.208	0.200	0.204	0.236	0.253	0.284	0.285
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel C: Raw casualties relative to the number of households in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.026	-0.046	-0.068	-0.088	-0.096	-0.112	-0.11	-0.099	-0.105
robust standard error	0.025	0.026	0.027	0.029	0.031	0.031	0.033	0.035	0.038
Conley standard error	0.027	0.028	0.028	0.03	0.032	0.038	0.041	0.045	0.047
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel D: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905 and agricultural land per household in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.033	-0.059	-0.110	-0.130	-0.155	-0.166	-0.168	-0.147	-0.147
robust standard error	0.037	0.039	0.040	0.043	0.045	0.048	0.051	0.054	0.055
Conley standard error	0.045	0.046	0.039	0.041	0.052	0.061	0.059	0.061	0.056
N	1558	1481	1403	1325	1247	1169	1091	1013	935

Notes: The table shows point estimates and standard errors when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905 in Panels A-C and by the amount of agricultural land per household in Panel D. Raw casualties in Panel C refer to the total number of entries that appear in the database of German WWI casualties when searching for a municipality and county. A drawback of this casualty count is that the same person appears more than once, see page 6 in the paper for a discussion.

Table 9: Effect of World War I Casualties on Female Population Growth 1910–1950

Panel A: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.012	-0.032	-0.062	-0.096	-0.119	-0.135	-0.126	-0.118	-0.115
robust standard error	0.037	0.038	0.040	0.043	0.045	0.046	0.047	0.051	0.054
Conley standard error	0.047	0.054	0.049	0.045	0.047	0.050	0.051	0.057	0.057
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel B: Casualties relative to population in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.021	-0.102	-0.230	-0.371	-0.477	-0.543	-0.542	-0.506	-0.472
robust standard error	0.184	0.189	0.194	0.208	0.217	0.220	0.227	0.242	0.254
Conley standard error	0.227	0.253	0.231	0.215	0.214	0.224	0.231	0.256	0.250
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel C: Raw casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.009	-0.022	-0.043	-0.064	-0.073	-0.085	-0.08	-0.074	-0.075
robust standard error	0.025	0.026	0.027	0.029	0.031	0.031	0.032	0.035	0.037
Conley standard error	0.027	0.03	0.029	0.029	0.032	0.034	0.036	0.041	0.043
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel D: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905 and agricultural land per household in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.012	-0.032	-0.074	-0.090	-0.118	-0.116	-0.115	-0.097	-0.100
robust standard error	0.037	0.039	0.040	0.043	0.045	0.048	0.050	0.054	0.055
Conley standard error	0.047	0.048	0.045	0.043	0.053	0.059	0.058	0.058	0.052
N	1558	1481	1403	1325	1247	1169	1091	1013	935

Notes: The table shows point estimates and standard errors when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905 in Panels A-C and by the amount of agricultural land per household in Panel D. Raw casualties in Panel C refer to the total number of entries that appear in the database of German WWI casualties when searching for a municipality and county. A drawback of this casualty count is that the same person appears more than once, see page 6 in the paper for a discussion.

Table 10: Effect of World War I Casualties on Total Population Growth 1910–1950

Panel A: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.018	-0.042	-0.073	-0.107	-0.129	-0.151	-0.146	-0.135	-0.135
robust standard error	0.036	0.037	0.039	0.042	0.044	0.045	0.046	0.050	0.053
Conley standard error	0.046	0.051	0.046	0.043	0.044	0.050	0.053	0.059	0.060
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel B: Casualties relative to population in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.081	-0.186	-0.318	-0.460	-0.560	-0.655	-0.665	-0.612	-0.593
robust standard error	0.178	0.183	0.188	0.201	0.210	0.214	0.221	0.235	0.249
Conley standard error	0.222	0.239	0.218	0.203	0.203	0.226	0.236	0.265	0.262
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel C: Raw casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.015	-0.031	-0.053	-0.073	-0.082	-0.098	-0.094	-0.086	-0.089
robust standard error	0.024	0.025	0.026	0.028	0.03	0.03	0.031	0.034	0.036
Conley standard error	0.027	0.029	0.027	0.028	0.03	0.035	0.037	0.042	0.044
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel D: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905 and agricultural land per household in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.018	-0.041	-0.087	-0.105	-0.132	-0.139	-0.140	-0.121	-0.122
robust standard error	0.036	0.038	0.039	0.042	0.043	0.047	0.049	0.053	0.054
Conley standard error	0.046	0.047	0.042	0.041	0.051	0.059	0.058	0.058	0.053
N	1558	1481	1403	1325	1247	1169	1091	1013	935

Notes: The table shows point estimates and standard errors when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905 in Panels A-C and by the amount of agricultural land per household in Panel D. Raw casualties in Panel C refer to the total number of entries that appear in the database of German WWI casualties when searching for a municipality and county. A drawback of this casualty count is that the same person appears more than once, see page 6 in the paper for a discussion.

Table 11: Effect of World War I Casualties on Growth in the Number of Households 1910–1950

Panel A: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.007	-0.025	-0.057	-0.088	-0.120	-0.137	-0.116	-0.103	-0.099
robust standard error	0.043	0.044	0.045	0.048	0.050	0.052	0.054	0.057	0.061
Conley standard error	0.064	0.067	0.060	0.053	0.054	0.062	0.059	0.059	0.066
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel B: Casualties relative to population in 1905: Casualties relative to population in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.009	-0.154	-0.281	-0.420	-0.572	-0.646	-0.579	-0.513	-0.477
robust standard error	0.210	0.213	0.220	0.230	0.239	0.247	0.253	0.265	0.284
Conley standard error	0.296	0.306	0.277	0.249	0.250	0.277	0.270	0.273	0.289
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel C: Raw casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.008	-0.016	-0.04	-0.06	-0.074	-0.088	-0.074	-0.065	-0.068
robust standard error	0.029	0.029	0.03	0.032	0.034	0.035	0.037	0.039	0.042
Conley standard error	0.038	0.038	0.034	0.032	0.036	0.041	0.04	0.041	0.045
N	1558	1481	1402	1325	1247	1168	1090	1013	935

Panel D: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905 and agricultural land per household in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.007	-0.017	-0.069	-0.085	-0.110	-0.115	-0.115	-0.095	-0.088
robust standard error	0.043	0.044	0.045	0.048	0.050	0.054	0.057	0.062	0.064
Conley standard error	0.064	0.061	0.055	0.049	0.054	0.059	0.061	0.060	0.054
N	1558	1481	1403	1325	1247	1169	1091	1013	935

Notes: The table shows point estimates and standard errors when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905 in Panels A-C and by the amount of agricultural land per household in Panel D. Raw casualties in Panel C refer to the total number of entries that appear in the database of German WWI casualties when searching for a municipality and county. A drawback of this casualty count is that the same person appears more than once, see page 6 in the paper for a discussion.

Table 12: Effect of World War I Casualties on Male Population Growth 1910–1960

Panel A: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.009	-0.033	-0.085	-0.126	-0.166	-0.19	-0.181	-0.162	-0.175
robust standard error	0.058	0.061	0.063	0.069	0.072	0.075	0.078	0.085	0.094
Conley standard error	0.078	0.084	0.072	0.068	0.067	0.076	0.078	0.085	0.094
N	1554	1477	1398	1321	1243	1164	1086	1009	931

Panel B: Casualties relative to population in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.012	-0.131	-0.355	-0.516	-0.689	-0.791	-0.782	-0.686	-0.711
robust standard error	0.289	0.3	0.309	0.332	0.348	0.363	0.376	0.407	0.443
Conley standard error	0.384	0.403	0.347	0.324	0.316	0.352	0.365	0.398	0.419
N	1554	1477	1398	1321	1243	1164	1086	1009	931

Panel C: Raw casualties relative to the number of households in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.01	-0.027	-0.062	-0.084	-0.103	-0.118	-0.112	-0.099	-0.114
robust standard error	0.039	0.041	0.043	0.047	0.05	0.052	0.054	0.06	0.065
Conley standard error	0.045	0.047	0.04	0.04	0.043	0.051	0.055	0.059	0.067
N	1554	1477	1398	1321	1243	1164	1086	1009	931

Panel D: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905 and agricultural land per household in 1905

	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.009	-0.043	-0.101	-0.137	-0.17	-0.172	-0.165	-0.132	-0.129
robust standard error	0.058	0.061	0.064	0.068	0.072	0.077	0.082	0.09	0.097
Conley standard error	0.078	0.079	0.073	0.064	0.071	0.079	0.082	0.094	0.094
N	1554	1477	1399	1321	1243	1165	1087	1009	931

Notes: The table shows point estimates and standard errors when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905 in Panels A-C and by the amount of agricultural land per household in Panel D. Raw casualties in Panel C refer to the total number of entries that appear in the database of German WWI casualties when searching for a municipality and county. A drawback of this casualty count is that the same person appears more than once, see page 6 in the paper for a discussion.

Table 13: Effect of World War I Casualties on Female Population Growth 1910–1960

Panel A: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.003	-0.023	-0.08	-0.11	-0.145	-0.166	-0.146	-0.137	-0.146
robust standard error	0.058	0.06	0.062	0.067	0.071	0.074	0.077	0.084	0.092
Conley standard error	0.074	0.08	0.064	0.062	0.06	0.069	0.072	0.085	0.093
N	1554	1477	1398	1321	1243	1164	1086	1009	931

Panel B: Casualties relative to population in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.109	-0.017	-0.259	-0.367	-0.52	-0.611	-0.575	-0.518	-0.526
robust standard error	0.285	0.295	0.301	0.326	0.343	0.355	0.367	0.396	0.433
Conley standard error	0.376	0.389	0.315	0.301	0.287	0.316	0.339	0.396	0.415
N	1554	1477	1398	1321	1243	1164	1086	1009	931

Panel C: Raw casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.003	-0.021	-0.056	-0.071	-0.088	-0.1	-0.089	-0.081	-0.095
robust standard error	0.039	0.04	0.041	0.046	0.049	0.051	0.053	0.058	0.064
Conley standard error	0.044	0.046	0.036	0.036	0.039	0.046	0.05	0.061	0.068
N	1554	1477	1398	1321	1243	1164	1086	1009	931

Panel D: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905 and agricultural land per household in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.003	-0.031	-0.082	-0.111	-0.145	-0.141	-0.133	-0.092	-0.092
robust standard error	0.058	0.06	0.063	0.067	0.07	0.076	0.08	0.088	0.095
Conley standard error	0.074	0.073	0.069	0.058	0.064	0.073	0.077	0.09	0.096
N	1554	1477	1399	1321	1243	1165	1087	1009	931

Notes: The table shows point estimates and standard errors when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905 in Panels A-C and by the amount of agricultural land per household in Panel D. Raw casualties in Panel C refer to the total number of entries that appear in the database of German WWI casualties when searching for a municipality and county. A drawback of this casualty count is that the same person appears more than once, see page 6 in the paper for a discussion.

Table 14: Effect of World War I Casualties on Total Population Growth 1910–1960

Panel A: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.001	-0.026	-0.081	-0.116	-0.153	-0.18	-0.165	-0.151	-0.163
robust standard error	0.057	0.059	0.061	0.067	0.071	0.074	0.076	0.083	0.092
Conley standard error	0.077	0.083	0.068	0.065	0.063	0.072	0.075	0.084	0.092
N	1554	1477	1398	1321	1243	1164	1086	1009	931

Panel B: Casualties relative to population in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.061	-0.062	-0.297	-0.431	-0.592	-0.706	-0.683	-0.609	-0.628
robust standard error	0.282	0.293	0.3	0.324	0.34	0.355	0.366	0.396	0.432
Conley standard error	0.387	0.401	0.335	0.315	0.302	0.332	0.35	0.393	0.413
N	1554	1477	1398	1321	1243	1164	1086	1009	931

Panel C: Raw casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.005	-0.023	-0.058	-0.077	-0.094	-0.11	-0.102	-0.091	-0.106
robust standard error	0.038	0.04	0.041	0.046	0.049	0.051	0.053	0.058	0.064
Conley standard error	0.045	0.047	0.038	0.037	0.04	0.048	0.052	0.059	0.066
N	1554	1477	1398	1321	1243	1164	1086	1009	931

Panel D: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905 and agricultural land per household in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.005	-0.028	-0.064	-0.078	-0.099	-0.094	-0.093	-0.068	-0.061
robust standard error	0.038	0.04	0.042	0.045	0.048	0.052	0.055	0.061	0.066
Conley standard error	0.045	0.044	0.04	0.037	0.045	0.05	0.054	0.062	0.067
N	1554	1477	1399	1321	1243	1165	1087	1009	931

Notes: The table shows point estimates and standard errors when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905 in Panels A-C and by the amount of agricultural land per household in Panel D. Raw casualties in Panel C refer to the total number of entries that appear in the database of German WWI casualties when searching for a municipality and county. A drawback of this casualty count is that the same person appears more than once, see page 6 in the paper for a discussion.

Table 15: Effect of World War I Casualties on Male Population Growth 1910–1970

Panel A: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.039	0.022	-0.034	-0.078	-0.136	-0.155	-0.155	-0.121	-0.124
robust standard error	0.075	0.078	0.082	0.089	0.094	0.097	0.101	0.109	0.121
Conley standard error	0.096	0.106	0.093	0.091	0.086	0.095	0.102	0.108	0.122
N	1538	1462	1386	1309	1231	1153	1075	999	923

Panel B: Casualties relative to population in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.279	0.197	-0.054	-0.224	-0.467	-0.539	-0.58	-0.408	-0.39
robust standard error	0.369	0.384	0.397	0.429	0.447	0.464	0.481	0.518	0.566
Conley standard error	0.461	0.495	0.434	0.418	0.394	0.436	0.462	0.492	0.528
N	1538	1462	1386	1309	1231	1153	1075	999	923

Panel C: Raw casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.009	-0.003	-0.038	-0.065	-0.096	-0.11	-0.114	-0.083	-0.093
robust standard error	0.051	0.053	0.055	0.061	0.064	0.067	0.07	0.076	0.084
Conley standard error	0.059	0.064	0.056	0.055	0.057	0.067	0.074	0.076	0.086
N	1538	1462	1386	1309	1231	1153	1075	999	923

Panel D: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905 and agricultural land per household in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.039	0.009	-0.055	-0.105	-0.138	-0.142	-0.119	-0.044	-0.038
robust standard error	0.075	0.079	0.084	0.087	0.092	0.099	0.105	0.113	0.124
Conley standard error	0.096	0.1	0.095	0.08	0.088	0.103	0.105	0.112	0.116
N	1538	1463	1387	1309	1231	1154	1076	999	922

Notes: The table shows point estimates and standard errors when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905 in Panels A-C and by the amount of agricultural land per household in Panel D. Raw casualties in Panel C refer to the total number of entries that appear in the database of German WWI casualties when searching for a municipality and county. A drawback of this casualty count is that the same person appears more than once, see page 6 in the paper for a discussion.

Table 16: Effect of World War I Casualties on Female Population Growth 1910–1970

Panel A: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.01	-0.011	-0.064	-0.11	-0.149	-0.185	-0.172	-0.145	-0.152
robust standard error	0.077	0.081	0.084	0.093	0.097	0.097	0.1	0.109	0.12
Conley standard error	0.097	0.105	0.088	0.09	0.083	0.097	0.103	0.116	0.125
N	1538	1462	1386	1309	1231	1153	1075	999	923

Panel B: Casualties relative to population in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.226	0.127	-0.106	-0.239	-0.452	-0.6	-0.598	-0.453	-0.447
robust standard error	0.373	0.387	0.401	0.433	0.451	0.457	0.469	0.508	0.555
Conley standard error	0.482	0.504	0.428	0.425	0.393	0.439	0.464	0.518	0.537
N	1538	1462	1386	1309	1231	1153	1075	999	923

Panel C: Raw casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.004	-0.02	-0.053	-0.071	-0.096	-0.121	-0.117	-0.091	-0.102
robust standard error	0.052	0.054	0.056	0.062	0.065	0.066	0.068	0.074	0.082
Conley standard error	0.059	0.062	0.052	0.054	0.054	0.067	0.072	0.08	0.087
N	1538	1462	1386	1309	1231	1153	1075	999	923

Panel D: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905 and agricultural land per household in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.01	-0.02	-0.072	-0.097	-0.159	-0.166	-0.145	-0.072	-0.08
robust standard error	0.077	0.081	0.087	0.092	0.092	0.099	0.105	0.114	0.123
Conley standard error	0.097	0.097	0.097	0.087	0.091	0.105	0.105	0.112	0.121
N	1538	1463	1387	1309	1231	1154	1076	999	922

Notes: The table shows point estimates and standard errors when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905 in Panels A-C and by the amount of agricultural land per household in Panel D. Raw casualties in Panel C refer to the total number of entries that appear in the database of German WWI casualties when searching for a municipality and county. A drawback of this casualty count is that the same person appears more than once, see page 6 in the paper for a discussion.

Table 17: Effect of World War I Casualties on Total Population Growth 1910–1970

Panel A: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.017	-0.002	-0.058	-0.1	-0.153	-0.172	-0.165	-0.136	-0.141
robust standard error	0.073	0.076	0.079	0.086	0.09	0.094	0.098	0.106	0.117
Conley standard error	0.094	0.103	0.088	0.089	0.083	0.095	0.101	0.11	0.122
N	1538	1462	1386	1309	1231	1153	1075	999	923

Panel B: Casualties relative to population in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.223	0.132	-0.116	-0.273	-0.502	-0.581	-0.601	-0.447	-0.437
robust standard error	0.357	0.371	0.383	0.413	0.43	0.45	0.464	0.501	0.548
Conley standard error	0.464	0.491	0.422	0.413	0.389	0.434	0.457	0.5	0.527
N	1538	1462	1386	1309	1231	1153	1075	999	923

Panel C: Raw casualties relative to the number of households in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	-0.004	-0.017	-0.053	-0.076	-0.104	-0.117	-0.117	-0.089	-0.099
robust standard error	0.049	0.051	0.053	0.058	0.061	0.065	0.067	0.073	0.081
Conley standard error	0.057	0.061	0.053	0.053	0.056	0.066	0.072	0.077	0.086
N	1538	1462	1386	1309	1231	1153	1075	999	923

Panel D: Casualties relative to the number of households in 1905 and agricultural land per household in 1905									
	percentage of most agricultural municipalities dropped								
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
point estimate	0.017	-0.013	-0.073	-0.107	-0.147	-0.155	-0.134	-0.06	-0.062
robust standard error	0.073	0.076	0.081	0.085	0.089	0.096	0.102	0.11	0.12
Conley standard error	0.094	0.096	0.094	0.082	0.088	0.103	0.104	0.111	0.116
N	1538	1463	1387	1309	1231	1154	1076	999	922

Notes: The table shows point estimates and standard errors when the x-percent most agricultural municipalities are excluded from the analysis. The empirical analysis includes all the municipality controls in Table 1 in the paper. How agricultural a municipality is, is measured by the amount of agricultural land per capita in 1905 in Panels A-C and by the amount of agricultural land per household in Panel D. Raw casualties in Panel C refer to the total number of entries that appear in the database of German WWI casualties when searching for a municipality and county. A drawback of this casualty count is that the same person appears more than once, see page 6 in the paper for a discussion.