

# Shocking Racial Attitudes: Black G.I.s in Europe

*David Schindler, Mark Westcott*

## **Impressum:**

CESifo Working Papers

ISSN 2364-1428 (electronic version)

Publisher and distributor: Munich Society for the Promotion of Economic Research - CESifo GmbH

The international platform of Ludwigs-Maximilians University's Center for Economic Studies and the ifo Institute

Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany

Telephone +49 (0)89 2180-2740, Telefax +49 (0)89 2180-17845, email [office@cesifo.de](mailto:office@cesifo.de)

Editors: Clemens Fuest, Oliver Falck, Jasmin Gröschl

[www.cesifo-group.org/wp](http://www.cesifo-group.org/wp)

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- from the SSRN website: [www.SSRN.com](http://www.SSRN.com)
- from the RePEc website: [www.RePEc.org](http://www.RePEc.org)
- from the CESifo website: [www.CESifo-group.org/wp](http://www.CESifo-group.org/wp)

# Shocking Racial Attitudes: Black G.I.s in Europe

## Abstract

Can attitudes towards minorities, an important cultural trait, be changed? We show that the presence of African American soldiers in the U.K. during World War II reduced anti-minority prejudice, a result of the positive interactions which took place between soldiers and the local population. The change has been persistent: in locations in which more African American soldiers were posted there are fewer members of and voters for the U.K.'s leading far-right party, less implicit bias against blacks and fewer individuals professing racial prejudice, all measured around 2010. Our results point towards intergenerational transmission from parents to children as the most likely explanation.

*David Schindler*  
*Tilburg University*  
*Department of Economics*  
*PO Box 90153*  
*The Netherlands – 5000 LE Tilburg*  
*d.schindler@tilburguniversity.edu*

*Mark Westcott\**  
*Vivid Economics*  
*econ@markw.de*

\*corresponding author

24th May 2020

We would like to thank Ran Abramitzky, Marcella Alsan, Martha Bailey, Leo Bursztyn, Davide Cantoni, Melissa Dell, Stefano DellaVigna, Florian Englmaier, Avner Greif, Saumitra Jha, Petra Moser, Cathrin Mohr, Nathan Nunn, Imran Rasul, Andrei Shleifer, Uwe Sunde, Joachim Voth, Joachim Winter, Daniel Wissmann, Gavin Wright and Noam Yuchtman for their support, encouragement, helpful comments and critiques. Adam Szeidl and four anonymous referees supplied us with comments that substantially improved an earlier draft of the paper. Seminar audiences in Berkeley, Munich, Oxford, Stanford and Tilburg and at the ASREC Copenhagen, Econometric Society World Congress Montreal, European Economic Association Mannheim, Economic History Association Nashville conferences also provided very useful feedback. Michael Biggs, Jocelyn Evans, Captain Philip Grinton and Frank Xu generously agreed to share data with us. Hazal Sezer, Simon Westcott and student helpers at MELESSA and Tilburg University provided excellent research assistance. Historical boundary and demographic data comes from Vision of Britain, who request the following statement be included: “This work is based on data provided through [www.visionofbritain.org.uk](http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk) and uses historical material which is copyright of the Great Britain Historical GIS Project and the University of Portsmouth”. Mark Westcott gratefully acknowledges funding through the “Evidence-Based Economics” International Doctoral Program of the Elite Network of Bavaria. Mark Westcott would like to thank the Department of Economics at Stanford University for its hospitality whilst writing parts of this paper.

## 1. Introduction

Are prejudicial attitudes towards minority groups a constant of the human condition? They are certainly widespread, and a recent empirical literature has shown that anti-minority prejudice persists over the very long run, a consequence of intergenerational transmission of preferences (Voigtländer and Voth, 2012; Acharya, Blackwell, and Sen, 2016). Less is known about what it takes to change such attitudes, and whether any such changes in attitudes might themselves persist. This is important to understanding whether the consequences of prejudice—which include social conflict, hate crime, labour and goods market discrimination—are permanent or temporary features of society.

In this paper we show that the temporary presence of African American G.I.s<sup>1</sup> in the United Kingdom during World War II persistently reduced anti-minority prejudice amongst the British population. As the base of the U.S. military’s European operation, the U.K. played host to over one and a half million U.S. troops during World War II. Around 150,000 of these troops were black, serving in segregated units with non-combat support duties such as transport and supply.<sup>2</sup> Both black and white G.I.s came into contact with the local population whilst off base: troops of all types were frequently to be found in pubs, dance halls and restaurants (Millgate, 2010), and the phrase “got any gum chum?”, used by children to beg soldiers for rations, entered the popular lexicon. Many Britons thereby saw and interacted with non-whites for the very first time. Despite pervasive racist attitudes before the war, we show evidence from surveys that these interactions were positive experiences for both the local population and for black G.I.s.

We test whether these interactions caused persistent changes in attitudes using a newly constructed dataset of U.S. military bases in the U.K., enabling us to measure the racial composition of troops at around 2,000 bases. Combining our new dataset with present-day measures of anti-minority preferences, we show that individuals in areas of the U.K. where more black troops were posted are more tolerant towards minorities sixty years after the last troops left. Firstly, we show that such areas contain fewer members of the British National Party (BNP), a far-right political party with racist policy positions. Next, we demonstrate that voters in affected areas were less likely to vote Conservative in local elections during times when far-right parties were not widely fielding candidates (until the early 2000s). This effect disappears as the BNP emerged as the strongest far-right party and BNP candidates subsequently received fewer votes

---

1. Originally standing for ‘Government Issue’, ”G.I.’ came to refer to military personnel in the early 1940s.

2. The U.S. Army remained racially segregated until 1948. Until this point, only a very small number of black units had combat roles, most famously the aerial units which trained at Tuskegee, and the 761st Tank Battalion, the ‘Black Panthers’.

in locations where black G.I.s were posted. Finally, we show that there is less implicit anti-black bias in these areas, as measured by Implicit Association Test (IAT) scores, and that those living in locations where black G.I.s were posted report warmer feelings towards black people.

We show that persistence has occurred primarily in rural areas and areas which had not seen prior non-white and Irish migration. Results separated into birth cohorts further suggest that local persistence reflects intergenerational transmission combined with a lack of geographic mobility.

We address two potential challenges to our identification strategy. First, an alternative explanation for our findings is that black troops were posted in areas that were already more tolerant towards non-whites, and that this tolerance has persisted until today. In fact, U.S. military policy was to place troops on the basis of military needs (Rash, 1942), and there is no evidence of any exercise to ascertain local attitudes before allocating troops. Consistent with this we demonstrate that the racial composition of troops is orthogonal to a raft of pre-existing economic, social, political, and geographic controls. Second, one could also be concerned that black units were actively reallocated away from areas where they were subject to racial abuse. In fact, those race-based conflicts which did occur were between black and white G.I.s, not between black G.I.s and the local population (Smith, 1987, Chp. 6). Additionally, we find that black units are no more likely to be moved between bases than white units. The evidence is that the racial composition of troops at bases is orthogonal to pre-existing conditions, and that the relationship between presence of black G.I.s and tolerance is causal.

Our results contribute to a large social science literature on the contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954). This posits that contact with minorities can reduce prejudice by causing the majority group to understand the ‘essential similarity’ of individuals belonging to minority groups.<sup>3</sup> Consistent with this hypothesis, Boisjoly et al. (2006), Carell, Hoekstra, and West (2019) and Burns, Corno, and La Ferrara (2016) find that randomly assigning non-white roommates to white students at higher education establishments has positive effects on white students’ attitudes and behaviour towards non-whites. We add to these studies by providing evidence that contact can have economically meaningful effects on racial attitudes in a much broader cross-section of the population, and show that changes in attitudes resulting from the treatment can persist over long time periods.

---

3. This hypothesis has been a major object of study in social psychology. See Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) and Paluck, Green, and Green (2019) for a review of articles, most of which either are small-scale field or laboratory experiments or show correlations between contact and attitudes without demonstrating a causal relationship.

Our findings also add to a large literature on the persistence of cultural norms, within which individual preferences are seen as endogenous to social and family environments. In the model of preference formation provided by Bisin and Verdier (2001), parents take costly investments in their children's preferences, resulting in 'vertical' transmission of values, but children are also socialised by the wider society in which they grow up, resulting in 'horizontal' transmission. Several recent empirical papers have now documented very long-run persistence in preferences, including attitudes towards minorities. Voigtländer and Voth (2012) show that variation in antisemitic attitudes in German towns and cities persisted over a time span of almost 600 years: individuals in locations which saw persecution of Jews during the middle ages were more likely to engage in antisemitic behaviour immediately prior to and during World War II. Acharya, Blackwell, and Sen (2016) show that whites living in U.S. counties with a history of slavery harbour colder feelings towards African Americans, amongst other outcomes. This is a result of institutions and norms preserved by whites in order to entrench control over African Americans after the Civil War. In contrast, our setting suggests contact as an important potential source for triggering persistent changes in attitudes and thus change otherwise persistent cultural norms. Our findings therefore complement Fouka (2020), who investigates the effects of a forced assimilation policy, as an example of causes of cultural change.

By considering effects of the presence of black troops on support for the British National Party, we also contribute to a growing literature on historical determinants of support for far-right parties. Vlachos (2017) shows that conscription of former-French citizens into the *Wehrmacht* during World War II permanently increased support for radical far-right parties, a result of political alienation. Ochsner and Roesel (2020) examine the effects of an inflow of Nazi supporters into areas of Upper Austria, showing persistent effects on support for far-right parties. Cantoni, Hagemeister, and Westcott (2019) demonstrate that right-wing ideology has been persistent in Germany by showing that areas supporting the Nazi party in 1933 have more support for the far-right "Alternative for Germany" party today. These and our findings are consistent with evidence from Avdeenko and Siedler (2017), who show a high level of intergenerational correlation in attitudes towards migration and support for far-right parties.

Finally, we show effects of a historical event on implicit attitudes as measured by a computerised Implicit Association Test (IAT). Implicit attitudes are described as "traces of past experience [that] affect some performance, even though the influential earlier experience is not remembered in the usual sense—that is, it is unavailable to self-report or introspection" (Greenwald and Banaji, 1995, p. 4f.). Implicit attitudes against minority-groups are increasingly used in the eco-

nomics literature to measure bias (e.g. Lowes et al., 2015), and have been shown to be predictive of behaviour in a number of domains, including in hiring decisions (see Uhlmann et al., 2009, for a review). We add to a small literature including Lowes and Montero (2016) and Lowes et al. (2017) which show that historic events can shape implicit attitudes, suggesting they are subject to the same kinds of forces of transmission as stated and revealed preferences.

The paper proceeds as follows: [Section 2](#) provides further historical background, [Section 3](#) provides evidence on the contact which occurred between black troops and the local population. [Section 4](#) describes the data, identification strategy and other necessary preliminaries for the data analysis. [Section 5](#) documents the effect of historical inter-group contact on support for the British National Party, [Section 6](#) provides evidence from other outcome measures, and [Section 7](#) presents some evidence on the underlying mechanism. [Section 8](#) concludes.

## 2. Historical Overview

The United States entered World War II in December 1941. Headquarters for the U.S. military's European operation were established in London the next month and the first combat troops soon arrived via ports in Northern Ireland. The first aerial bombardments of Germany were carried out in June out of bases in Norfolk, part of the Eastern Base Section.<sup>4</sup>

In addition to hosting the European headquarters and providing a base for aerial operations the U.K. also functioned as a staging and training post for the ground troops who would later liberate France and eventually Germany. These troops began arriving in the U.K. in May 1942 in preparation for a mid-1943 land offensive. This planned operation, codenamed 'Bolero', was later cancelled and troop numbers declined from a peak of 230,000 to around 100,000 as troops were reallocated to North Africa or the Pacific. The build-up of troops began again in May 1943 once plans for a 1944 offensive were settled. By November, around 160,000 troops were arriving per month. Troop numbers reached their peak in June 1944 with one and a half million G.I.s stationed in the U.K. [Figure 1](#) shows the numbers of troops in the U.K. for each month between 1942 and 1945.

---

4. The Eastern Base Section, one of four areas created in order to decentralize operations, was predominantly used by the Army Air Force (Waddell, 2010, p. 142). See Appendix [Figure A2](#) for a map of base sections.




Figure 1. Build up of U.S. Army strength in the U.K. from January 1942 to November 1945 and, where available, a breakdown according to type. Data for June 1944 are unavailable. Sources: Ruppenthal (1978, p. 232) and Pogue (1954, p. 541).

Troops were stationed throughout the country, in rural and urban areas alike. The influx of troops into a small country put huge strain on available accommodation; troops were stationed wherever space could be found.<sup>5</sup> Troops were mainly accommodated in newly constructed camps or ex-RAF or British Army quarters. After 1943, the supply of such accommodation was exhausted and some troops were billeted in private homes. To the best of our knowledge black troops were never accommodated this way.

Most American ground troops left England in the course of ‘Operation Overlord’, the airborne and amphibious assault of occupied Europe beginning on 6th June 1944. On the first day of the operation alone 150,000 troops landed in Northern France via beaches in Normandy. By the time the operation ended in August 1944, just 700,000 G.I.s were left in Britain, down from the June peak of

5. Scotland was deemed unsuitable for military facilities, presumably because of its distance from mainland Europe: only very few troops were ever stationed there (U. Lee, 1966, p. 623).

one and a half million. Units continued to cross to Europe, but troop numbers in the U.K. did not decrease much further until the end of the war: the U.K. continued to serve as the headquarters of operations in Europe, as a base for Army Air Force units, as the point of entry for American troops bound for continental Europe and as the main location of military hospitals in Europe. However, by November 1945, almost all American units and their personnel had left the U.K.<sup>6</sup>

### 2.1. Black G.I.s

Over 900,000 African Americans served in the U.S. military during World War II, more than half of them outside of the U.S. (Moore, 2013). As in previous wars, black soldiers served in racially segregated units, normally under command of white officers. With few exceptions, black troops were limited to non-combat 'labour' or 'service' roles, most often supply and quartermaster services, transport, food preparation and sanitation.<sup>7</sup>

U.S. Army Enlistment Records, which provide a record of all individuals who served in the Army during World War II, reveal that the black G.I.s were diverse with regards to their demographics. Appendix [Figure A3](#) shows that around 50% of African Americans serving in the Army had no high school education, a relatively moderate positive selection with respect to the young black male population as a whole, where around 70% of 18 to 30 year-olds had no high school education.<sup>8</sup> Black G.I.s were drawn from both northern and southern states: Appendix [Figure A4](#) shows a map of the states of birth of African Americans who served in the military during World War II.

---

6. 40,000 'war brides' emigrated to the United States, benefiting from free passage to the U.S. for themselves and children. A small number of children born to black G.I. fathers and British mothers were raised in the U.K. A report carried out for the League of Coloured Peoples uncovered 135 such cases, of an estimated 1,700 children born to black G.I.s. in the U.K. (S. Lee, 2011; McNeill, 1946). Whilst we are not able to test the hypothesis, the low numbers make us think it is unlikely that interactions with G.I. children, rather than the G.I.s themselves, explain the effects we find.

7. Racism was institutionalised in the military. General Patton's views expressed in a letter to his wife, "A colored soldier cannot think fast enough to fight in armor." (Sasser, 2014, p. 104), seem to be representative of military leaders' attitudes at the time.

8. Data on the population of black males is provided by the 1940 Census. The slight positive selection on education reflects actions of local draft boards and army requirements on literacy/education. Until 1941, draft boards had discretion to decide whether a potential recruit had the mental capacity to serve; in this period, 'mental deficiency' was the most frequent cause for a pre-inductee to be rejected for service by a draft board. In 1941, a fourth-grade level literacy requirement was introduced, followed by the Army General Classification Test, introduced in 1943. Although the later test purportedly measured generalised intelligence, it has been argued that it in reality measured educational attainment, which was on average lower amongst the black population (Murray, 1971).

Many black G.I.s served abroad; around ten percent of G.I.s who served in the U.K. were African American.<sup>9</sup> The British government initially requested that the U.S. military refrain from sending black troops to Britain. Ostensibly this was to avoid causing conflict between white G.I.s and British citizens, who might show “more effusiveness to the coloured people than the Americans would readily understand”<sup>10</sup>, but a desire to minimize the non-white presence in the U.K. and concerns about sexual activity no doubt also played a role. The matter was taken up by the Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, who claimed that the British climate was ‘badly suited to Negroes’, and likely also by Churchill himself (Reynolds, 2006). Nonetheless, the request was refused, both for practical reasons—black troops made up a considerable share of the support units which were of military necessity—and out of U.S. political concerns. Suggestions were made to limit black troops to port areas, where the U.K.’s small existing black population was concentrated, but these were rejected. The policy instead was to “place them [black troops] where needed” (Rash, 1942).<sup>11</sup>

The U.S. Army’s colour bar was maintained; interaction between black and white soldiers was minimised, with accommodation, dining and training facilities all segregated. A ‘pass system’ was introduced in order to keep black and white troops apart during their leisure time, with black and white units allowed off base on different days of the week or assigned different venues to visit (Reynolds, 2006, p. 310).

The U.K. government was at pains to take no overt actions to enforce segregation, refusing for example to instruct police officers to recommend segregation to local bar and restaurant owners. There are however a few isolated examples of local authorities attempting to limit contact between black G.I.s and British women (Reynolds, 2006, p. 123). Nonetheless, evidence suggests that frequent contact between soldiers and local populations took place: troops visited local bars, restaurants and dance halls during their leisure time. There are also frequent reports of younger British women visiting black troops on base (Smith, 1987, p. 187 ff).

### 3. Evidence on Contact

In most areas of the U.K. where black G.I.s were stationed, locals would have been seeing and interacting with black people for the first time.<sup>12</sup> Despite ev-

---

9. These appear to have been slightly positively selected in terms of education compared to the universe of black G.I.s, see again Appendix [Figure A3](#).

10. E. Bridges to J. Martin, 21 July 1942, in Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, New York, U.S.A, Harry Hopkins papers, box 136.

11. Units arriving in Britain were first assigned to one of several armies by the European Theater Headquarters, and would then be assigned to a base by their army’s headquarters.

12. There is no administrative information on the size of the black population in the U.K. before the introduction of an ethnicity question in the 1991 census. General Eisenhower

idence of wide-spread racial prejudice before the war<sup>13</sup>, the evidence suggests that the British responded positively to black G.I.s, whilst attitudes towards white soldiers were more mixed. Writing in a biweekly newspaper, George Orwell remarked that “the general consensus of opinion seems to be that the only American soldiers with decent manners are the Negroes” (Orwell, 1943). This attitude is also on display in words attributed to an unknown Englishman in 1943, “I don’t mind the Yanks, but I don’t care much for the white fellows they’ve brought with them” (Olson, 2010, p. 287) and in a British woman writing to a friend “Everybody here adores the Negro troops, all the girls go to their dances, but nobody likes the white Americans. They swagger about as if they were the only people fighting this war” (Reynolds, 1995, p. 303).

Below we add to this anecdotal evidence using surveys of U.S. troops stationed in the U.K. and qualitative responses to a questionnaire of U.K. citizens carried out in 1944.

### 3.1. U.S. Military Surveys

Two surveys carried out by a research branch of the U.S. War Department provide evidence on troops’ contact with and attitudes towards the British. These surveys are amongst over one hundred carried out during the war in order to provide army command with information about the attitudes of soldiers (Stouffer et al., 1949). Sampling for each survey took place in two stages; in the first stage, army units were selected from data on troop locations. Sampling in this

---

wrote to General Lee in 1942: “There is practically no coloured population in the British Isles.” (September 5 1942, ETOUSA AG 291.2-B, available online at [https://archive.org/stream/IndoctrinationOfPersonnelArrivingInTheUK/IndoctrinationOfPersonnelArrivingInTheUK\\_djvu.txt](https://archive.org/stream/IndoctrinationOfPersonnelArrivingInTheUK/IndoctrinationOfPersonnelArrivingInTheUK_djvu.txt)). The permanent Asian and black population of the British Isles was estimated in 1939 at around 7,000 individuals (Cabinet Office “Report of the Working Party on Coloured People Seeking Employment in the United Kingdom”, 17/12/1953 in CAB124/1191, via Little (1998)). Existing evidence suggests that this population was concentrated around port cities such as London, Liverpool, South Shields and Cardiff (Spencer, 1997). In a later section, we use names and places of birth from the full count 1911 census to estimate the geographic distribution of non-white migrants in the U.K.

13. The best source on racial attitudes in Britain before World War II is Little (1998), who provides a narrative of changes in attitudes to non-whites from the 17<sup>th</sup> century onwards. In a unique study, Lapiere (1928) surreptitiously questioned 315 individuals in London, Birmingham, North Wales and Liverpool, asking each of them a variant of the question “Would you let children associate with those of good coloured people?”. Based on their responses, respondents were classified as being ‘without prejudice’ (4 percent), ‘doubtful cases’ (15 percent) or ‘with prejudice’ (81 percent), without much variation according to social class. In addition, twenty hotels were contacted and asked “Does the management permit either African or Indian guests?”. Only four hotels responded affirmatively, although the author points out that at one such London hotel, admission was limited to Indian nobility. Lapiere’s results from England compare unfavourably to a similar study he carried out in France, where the majority of individuals questioned reported no colour prejudice.

stage is described as ‘not strictly random’, since the War Department could reduce costs by sampling multiple units at the same base. However, the aim was for the sample to be representative of the population of units in terms of branch and type of unit. In the second stage of sampling, men were sampled from their units by random selection from a duty roster.

The surveys useful for our purposes are “Attitudes Towards The British” (S-122) and “Attitudes Toward Army Life” (S-92). The first of these, carried out in December 1943, surveyed 3,261 individuals with the aim of understanding soldiers’ attitudes towards the British, and provides evidence on the amount and mode of contact between troops and the British population<sup>14</sup>. The survey asks how many local people of each of a number of categories—families, men in the armed forces, girls in the armed forces, civilian girls, civilians (older men and women)—the respondent has got to know ‘fairly well’, in each case being asked to select between none, one or two, several, or a very large number. 86 percent of troops reply that they know at least some families or civilians fairly well. The most common way of meeting English people is described as ‘a chance meeting’ (67 percent), with lower numbers being introduced through a friend (18 percent) or through a service organisation or some other way (14 percent). The most common meeting places were eating places or pubs (33 percent), around town (33 percent) and at dances (17 percent). The number of civilians known to soldiers increases with time in the U.K. (see Appendix [Figure A5](#)), consistent with interactions between troops and civilians taking place on an impromptu basis.

In Survey S-92, carried out in November 1943, troops stationed in Britain were asked “How has your opinion of the English people changed from what it was before you came to England?” and “How do you think the English people’s opinion of Americans has been changed by having American soldiers in England?”. Unlike the December survey, this survey reports whether respondents are black (422) or white (2,257). We visualise the responses to these questions separately for black and white troops in [Figures 2 and 3](#). The median white G.I. reduced his opinion of the English whilst being stationed and believes that the English have lower opinions of Americans as a result of the presence of G.I.s. Strikingly, the pattern for black G.I.s is very different: the majority of black G.I.s positively updated their view of the English whilst being stationed and simultaneously believe that the English have positively updated their opinion of the Americans.<sup>15</sup> We interpret this as evidence of ‘high-quality’ interactions

---

14. Although the survey provides some demographic data (education level and marital status), race was not recorded.

15. Regressions reported in [Appendix Table A2](#) show that the difference in responses given by white and black troops are statistically significant and robust to controlling for the base at which individuals are stationed, their branch of the army, state of birth, rank and education levels.

between black G.I.s and the local population, leading both black G.I.s and the local population to update their beliefs about each other.<sup>16</sup>


### 3.2. Mass Observation

We provide more qualitative evidence on British attitudes to black troops, and the changes caused by contact with them, using data from Mass Observation. Mass Observation was a U.K. based survey organisation founded in 1937 aiming to create an ‘anthropology of ourselves’ by regularly collecting written testimony from a panel of volunteer respondents around the country (Madge and Harrison, 1937). This panel was not designed to be representative of the population, and the occupational listings of participants shows that the panel consists largely of middle- and upper-class professionals. The panellists were asked to keep personal diaries which they sent to Mass Observation on a monthly basis. In addition, they responded to monthly ‘directives’ from Mass Observation which aimed to collect information on opinions about a wide variety of topics. In June 1943, the panel was asked ‘What is your personal attitude towards coloured people, and is there any difference in your attitude towards members of different coloured races? Have wartime events or experiences had any effect on your attitudes in this respect?’. We collected and digitised all responses to the question, of which thirty three (out of 199, or roughly 17%) make explicit mention of African American soldiers. These 33 responses are reproduced in full in [Appendix D](#).


We manually classify these responses along two dimensions – sentiment towards black troops (positive or negative) and whether the respondent has interacted with black troops. Eight responses (24%) mention or imply contact with African American soldiers, of which six (75%) show positive sentiment towards them, whilst a narrow majority (52%) of respondents who make no mention of contact show negative sentiment. This might be a result of selection into contact rather than changes in attitudes caused by such contact—however, six responses explicitly report positive updating of attitudes or beliefs based on the presence of black troops, with only two implying negative updating. Examples of positive updating are “My little contact with the American Negroes made me more sympathetic to them. They liked being over here, because they were treated better here by us than by the white Americans in their own country” and “Have wartime events and experiences had any effect on my attitude[?] The answer is yes. The presence of many more American negroes in this country may make me take less interest [in] them through accepting them as normal and familiar”. These kinds of responses seem to reflect exactly the kinds of changes in attitudes through contact that Allport’s contact hypothesis postulates.

---

16. In doing so, we assume some reflection; that is, when a soldier is asked how he thinks that English opinions of Americans have changed, his response reflects how English opinions of individuals like him have changed.



*Figure 2.* Density plot of individual black G.I.s' responses to the questions 'Has your opinion of the English people changed from what it was before you came to England?' (horizontal axis) and 'Do you think English people's opinion of Americans has been changed by having American soldiers in England' (vertical axis). Darker cells indicate more mass. The sample is 442 black G.I.s posted in Britain in November 1943.



*Figure 3.* Density plot of individual white G.I.s' responses to the questions 'Has your opinion of the English people changed from what it was before you came to England?' (horizontal axis) and 'Do you think English people's opinion of Americans has been changed by having American soldiers in England' (vertical axis). Darker cells indicate more mass. The sample is 2,257 white G.I.s posted in Britain in November 1943.

## 4. Estimation Framework

Having provided suggestive evidence of changes in contemporary attitudes caused by the presence of black G.I.s, we now test for persistent effects of their presence. Concretely, we use three independent data sets with high geographical resolution to test whether proximity to black G.I.s persistently affected local racial attitudes. The first of these provides data on membership of the British National Party, a far-right xenophobic party, across all of England and Wales' 180,000 census output areas ('neighbourhoods'), the lowest level geography on which the national statistics agency collects data. Next, we use voting outcomes from local elections, which for the years 1973-2012 provide vote shares across electoral wards. Finally, we use data generated by 'Project Implicit', a website on which individuals can carry out a test for their implicit racial attitudes. As well as carrying out the test, individuals are prompted to provide self-reported racial attitudes and demographic information including their postcode.

We describe the datasets in more detail later, but first describe the shared estimation strategy that we apply to all outcome measures.

### 4.1. Troop Data

Our empirical exercise exploits a new dataset of U.S. army units in the U.K.<sup>17</sup> The dataset is based on the station lists produced by the U.S. Army Adjutant General's Office (AGO) on a monthly basis throughout the war.

Most station lists for the period June 1943-1953 survive and are housed at the U.S. National Archives in Washington D.C. We were kindly provided with digitisations of sixteen station lists by Captain Philip Grinton and we digitised a further eleven ourselves, resulting in twenty-seven digitised station lists. These lists cover months from June 1943 to December 1945 and are listed in Appendix Table A3. Appendix Figure A6 shows an extract from one of these lists.

Each line in a station list represents a unit, which is identified with an abbreviation of its name (e.g. 1944 QM TRK CO for the 1944<sup>th</sup> Quartermaster Truck Company), and is listed along with the coordinates of the base at which the unit was posted, the nearest town or village, and a symbol to indicate if the unit is a segregated unit with African American troops. There are various types of units, with the most frequent entry being 'company', which contained around 150 men.<sup>18</sup>

---

17. Full descriptions and sources for all datasets used in the paper are given in Appendix B.

18. According to personal conversations with staff at the National Archives in College Park, Maryland, information on the number of soldiers in each particular unit was destroyed at the end of the war. Most listed units are companies, which contained between 100 and 250 men, although some larger units such as battalions are also included. When presenting our results, we will also present a robustness check that uses unit type as a proxy for the number of troops in each unit.

Using these lists, we created a dataset of the units posted at 1,937 military bases/camps (unique according to their coordinates) at twenty-seven points in time. These bases were located widely across England and Wales, with the notable exception of the South East of England. This was a consequence of the plan for the invasion of occupied France: U.S. ships departed from the west of England, the British Navy from the east, and vessels landed on French beaches in the same formation. Appendix [Figure A7](#) shows a map of all bases/camps in the dataset.

#### 4.2. Identification

Our aim is to estimate the effects of the local presence of black units on racial attitudes through inter-racial contact. Whilst we have no way of observing contact between the local population and black G.I.s, the evidence in [Section 3](#) on the types of interactions that took place suggests that the probability of locals coming into contact with troops would have increased in both the number of troops stationed nearby and the length of time they were stationed for. We therefore exploit variation across space in both the time black troops were posted for and their numbers.

Recall that the vast majority of black units were ‘support units’, providing services such as transport and sanitation. In our preferred specification, we control for the presence of support units, both black and white. Again, we do so taking into account both the number of units posted and the time they were present for. This means that our estimates exploit variation in the racial composition of support units across bases through time and space.<sup>19</sup>

We begin by identifying support units based on their names; the list of unit names indicating support status is shown in Appendix [Table A5](#). This list covers 91% of units described by the station lists as being a segregated black unit.<sup>20</sup> Then we count the number of black support units posted at each base in each month we have data for,  $BlackSupportUnits_{b,m}$  where  $b$  is a base and  $m$  a month

---

19. In an alternative specification in Appendix [Table A9](#) we instead exploit variation in the intensity of presence of black units given the intensity of presence of *all* military units, without any substantive changes to results. However, given that the vast majority of black units were carrying out support roles, we want to make sure that our results are not being driven by differences in the types of locations that support and combat troops were posted to.

20. Units described in the records as being black but not classified as support units include ‘Detachment of Patients’ (i.e. those receiving care at a military hospital), ‘Detachment of Prisoners’, and the few combat black units which served in the U.K.: the 320<sup>th</sup> Anti-Aircraft Barrage Balloon, the 333<sup>rd</sup> Field Artillery Battalion, the 969<sup>th</sup> Artillery Battalion, the 452<sup>nd</sup> Anti-Aircraft Artillery Battalion, the 578<sup>th</sup> Field Artillery Battalion, the 614<sup>th</sup> Tank Destroyer Battalion, and the 999<sup>th</sup> Field Artillery Battalion. We ignore these units in our analysis.

in which we observe the allocation of troops. Next, we sum across all such months to produce a base-level measure,  $BlackUnitMonths_b$ :

$$BlackUnitMonths_b = \sum_m BlackSupportUnits_{b,m}$$

We create an analogous measure for the presence of support troops:

$$SupportUnitMonths_b = \sum_m SupportUnits_{b,m}$$

Our identifying assumption is that the presence of black troops at a base (measured by  $BlackUnitMonths_b$ ), is exogenous to pre-existing racial attitudes in the population around that base, controlling for the overall presence of support troops (measured by  $SupportUnitMonths_b$ ).

Our estimation results would be biased if, when deciding which support units to allocate to which military base, black units were strategically stationed in areas with particular racial attitudes. There is no evidence for any general policy to allocate troops according to local sensitivities, and doing so would have violated the US Army European Theater of Operations’s non-differentiation policy.<sup>21</sup> There is evidence to suggest there were frequent hold-ups in both available accommodation and of available service troops (Ruppenthal, 1978, p. 231). Under these circumstances it would seem highly unlikely for race to have played a role in allocation decisions.<sup>22</sup>

In addition, we now show that, after controlling for the degree of presence of support units, the degree of presence of black units at a base is uncorrelated with a large number of pre-existing economic, political and geographic characteristics around that base. For each of these characteristics, we estimate the following regression equation:

$$X_b = \alpha + \beta \cdot BlackUnitMonths_b + \gamma \cdot SupportUnitMonths_b + e_b$$

where  $b$  is a military base,  $X_b$  is the variable of interest and  $e_b$  the error term. Results are shown in [Table 1](#), where each line corresponds to a regression of a separate pre-existing characteristic; full descriptions of the variables are provided in [Appendix C](#). Depending on the data source, the characteristics vary

---

21. The “Uniform policy governing racial inter-relations of Soldiers, and of Soldiers and Civilians” contained the following item “No differentiation, distinction, or discrimination will be made between soldiers of difference races, by practice or inference. Unnecessary discrimination of race will be avoided in official orders, announcements and official or quasi-official communications”, Record Group 498, National Archives, Subject File 218, accessed at <https://www.fold3.com/image/287187922>.

22. Further supporting this evidence, [Appendix Table A6](#) shows that, conditional on the type of unit, black units were not moved between locations any more frequently than white.

either at the parish level, the local-government district level, the constituency level or, for some geographical measures, are directly measured at the coordinates of the base.

The first group of variables shown in [Table 1](#) measure economic conditions around the base; they include the parish-level population density as measured in the 1931 census, the parish-level rate of population growth between 1921 and 1931, sectoral composition of employment at the local government district level, unemployment rate at the local government district level, a binary indicator as to whether the base was inside an urban area, the total area of the local government district, and the average number of rooms in a house at the local government district level.

The second group of variables measure political and societal features. Firstly, we use the full count of the 1911 England and Wales census to estimate the number of non-white migrants in each parish as per 1911<sup>23</sup>, as well as the share of Irish migrants. Our most direct measure for pre-existing racial attitudes is constituency level data on the presence of a branch of the British Union of Fascists (BUF). The BUF was formed in 1932 by Oswald Mosley, a British politician who had served as a Member of Parliament for both the Conservative and Labour parties. Xenophobia was ‘a mainstay of the rhetoric of the BUF’ (Redvaldsen, 2016).<sup>24</sup> Internal Labour Party research in 1934 aimed to ascertain whether a branch had been formed in each of England and Wales’ constituencies, data which we collect and code.<sup>25</sup> We also collect data on the share of the electorate voting for the Conservative party in the last six pre-war elections of 1922, 1923, 1924, 1929, 1931 and 1935.

The third and final group of variables are various measures of geographic isolation. We calculate the distance from each base to the coast, the nearest local government district with urban status in 1931, to the nearest town/city with a 1939 population over 100,000 (of which there are 55), and to the nearest city

---

23. The construction of this variable, which uses place of births and names to infer non-white migrant status, is outlined in [Appendix C](#). A map of its distribution is shown in [Appendix Figure A8](#). There is no administrative information on the size or distribution of the non-white population before the introduction of an ethnicity question in the 1991 census. 1911 is the last year for which full count census data has been released.

24. The focus was clearly antisemitic, although there is evidence of more general racism; a party speech by William Joyce in 1934 talked about removing foreigners “be they Hebrew or any other form of alien”, whilst a party pamphlet contained the text “Under Fascism, no alien shall enter this country to take the jobs of Britons, and aliens who are already here who have abused the hospitality of this nation will be sent back whence they came”, (“Fascism explained: Ten points of fascist policy”, accessed as LP/FA3/34/542 at the People’s History Museum Archive, University of Central Lancashire).

25. Data is held and was accessed as LP/FAS/34 at the People’s History Museum/University of Central Lancashire.

Table 1: Effect of covariates on the presence of black troops

|  | $\hat{\beta}$ | p-value<br>$H_0 : \beta = 0$ |
|--|---------------|------------------------------|
| <i>Economic:</i>   |               |                              |
| Population density in parish, 1931                           | -0.009        | 0.84                         |
| Rate of population growth in parish 1921-1931                | 2.278         | 0.25                         |
| Agricultural employment in local government district, 1931   | -0.003        | 0.51                         |
| Professional employment in local government district, 1931   | -0.005        | 0.17                         |
| Unemployment rate in local government district, 1931         | 0.005         | 0.12                         |
| Urban local government district, 1931                        | 0.022         | 0.08                         |
| Total area of local government district, 1931                | -3.331        | 0.39                         |
| Number of rooms per house in local government district, 1931 | -0.004        | 0.65                         |
| <i>Social and political:</i>                                 |               |                              |
| Non-white migrants in parish, 1911                           | 0.001         | 1.00                         |
| Conservative vote share in constituency, 1922                | 0.004         | 0.61                         |
| Conservative vote share in constituency, 1923                | 0.004         | 0.49                         |
| Conservative vote share in constituency, 1924                | 0.005         | 0.45                         |
| Conservative vote share in constituency, 1929                | 0.003         | 0.58                         |
| Conservative vote share in constituency, 1931                | -0.008        | 0.35                         |
| Conservative vote share in constituency, 1935                | -0.002        | 0.35                         |
| British Union of Facists branch in constituency, 1934        | -0.004        | 0.85                         |
| Irish migrants in parish, 1911                               | -0.000        | 0.99                         |
| <i>Geographic:</i>   |               |                              |
| Distance to coast  | -0.914        | 0.24                         |
| Distance to nearest city, 1939                               | 0.129         | 0.86                         |
| Distance to nearest large city, 1939                         | -0.681        | 0.62                         |
| Distance to nearest urban district, 1931                     | -0.079        | 0.80                         |
| Distance to railway station, 1939                            | 0.085         | 0.32                         |
| Distance to major road, 1939                                 | -0.028        | 0.85                         |
| Distance to port city, 1936-1938                             | -1.362        | 0.25                         |
| Distance to nearest base section headquarters                | 1.262         | 0.43                         |

Notes: Each row reports beta coefficients from a regression of the form  $X_i = \alpha + \beta \cdot BlackUnitMonths_b + \gamma \cdot SupportUnitMonths_b + e_b$ , where  $X_b$  is a control variable and  $e_b$  is an error term. The sample is all bases hosting at least one support unit at one point in time.

with a 1939 population over 300,000 (of which there are 8). We collect data on the location of railway stations in 1939 in order to calculate the distance from the base to the nearest railway station, and digitise a 1946 road map in order to calculate the distance from each base to the nearest major road. Furthermore, we calculate the distance to the nearest port city of the 1936-1938 period and to the nearest Army base section headquarters.

Apart from one variable, the indicator for being inside an urban local government district (significant at the 10% level), we find no statistically significant correlations between pre-existing characteristics around bases and the presence of black troops there. Furthermore, a low F-statistic of  $F(25,524)=1.06$  from a regression of *BlackUnitMonths* on the full set of covariates shows that we cannot reject the hypothesis that all of the covariates are unrelated to deployment patterns ( $p$ -value = 0.3903). This pattern is consistent with the idea that troop placements were made on the basis of *military* requirements, orthogonal to local conditions, and as such any correlation between the presence of black troops and contemporary anti-minority attitudes reflects a causal effect.

#### 4.3. Treatment Definition

Our hypothesis is that, in areas around military bases with black troops, interactions led to changes in local attitudes, and that these attitudes have since persisted, possibly a result of intergenerational transmission. The question remains of how to match contemporary populations to historic bases. In our main specifications, we consider a contemporary location to be ‘treated’ by a given military base if the location and the military base share a common postcode district.<sup>26</sup> That is, we consider any base in the same postcode district as a contemporary location to have contributed to historical contact. Our treatment is defined on the postcode district level as follows:

$$BlackUnitMonths_j = \sum_b \sum_m \mathbb{1}[b \in j] \cdot BlackUnits_{b,m}$$

where  $j$  indexes postcode districts,  $\mathbb{1}[b \in j]$  is an indicator function for whether base  $b$  is inside postcode  $j$  and  $BlackUnits_{b,m}$  is the number of black support units posted at base  $b$  in month  $m$ . We create an analogous measure for the presence of support troops:

---

26. Postcode districts cover very small areas in cities but larger areas in more rural areas (65% of the variance in log-area is explained by log-population density), with a median area of 27 square kilometres. We use postcode districts, with their varying sizes, to define our treatment since this captures the logic that contact between troops and individuals a fixed distance apart was more likely in less densely populated areas. Our results are not sensitive to this choice: Appendix Table A10 shows regressions at the census output area level where treatment is instead defined at the local government district level.

$$SupportUnitMonths_j = \sum_b \sum_m \mathbb{1}[b \in j] \cdot SupportUnits_{b,m}$$

These measures capture the intensity of presence of black and support troops around a given contemporary location. Because we want to exploit variation in the number of support units around a given location which were black, our population of interest consists of individuals living in postcode districts where at least some support units were located. To illustrate the variation that we exploit, [Figure 4](#) shows how the ratio of *BlackUnitMonths<sub>j</sub>* to *SupportUnitMonths<sub>j</sub>* varies across postcode districts.<sup>27</sup>

## 5. Long-Term Effects on British National Party Membership


We now estimate the effects of proximity to black troops on contemporary attitudes towards minorities. We begin by measuring local attitudes using data on local membership of the British National Party (BNP), a far-right political party with extreme positions on race.<sup>28</sup>

The British National Party was founded in 1982 as a splinter group from the National Front, an openly racist organization with links to European neo-Nazis. The party's founder was jailed for conspiracy to incite racial hatred in 1986, and a senior official described the party as '100 per cent racist' in 1995 (BBC, 2001). Police officers and prison officials were banned by their employers from joining the party, and in 2009 a government minister attempted to introduce a similar ban for teachers, citing a desire to 'keep racism ...out of our schools' (The Guardian, 2009).

Attempting to increase its electoral relevance, the party began to outwardly reject claims of racism in 1999, but its ideology is still widely considered to be just that (see e.g. The Spectator, 2009). Most tellingly, non-white members were banned from the party until this was deemed illegal by a court in 2010. Even whilst espousing a 'modernization' agenda, Nick Griffin, the party's leader from 1999 to 2014 continued to call for the 'repatriation' of non-white Britons, who

27. Appendix [Figure A9](#) and Appendix [Figure A10](#) show maps of the two variables separately. Appendix [Figure A13](#) shows that the ratio between black and white units remained relatively constant throughout time. Appendix [Figure A11](#) and Appendix [Figure A12](#) show the evolution of *BlackUnitMonths* across postcode districts through time.

28. This variable measures preferences at the tail of the distribution, but the evidence suggests that this correlated with preferences more generally. Biggs and Knauss (2011) show that, on the constituency level, BNP membership is related to the share of the population voting for the BNP in the 2005 national election, a less extreme measure. [Table A11](#) shows, again at the constituency-level, that BNP membership is correlated with unease about the cultural effects of migration, even once controlling for the unemployment rate and non-white population share in the constituency.



*Figure 4.* Figure shows variation across English and Welsh postcode districts in the share of support-unit months which are due to black units. Grey districts are not part of the analysis, as they never hosted support units. Also shown are grid-cells used to generate grid-cell fixed effects.

a party manual referred to as ‘racial foreigners’. Further evidence of the party’s racist ideology is provided by the BNP’s website, extracts from which from 2008 are displayed in [Appendix A](#).

In addition, we provide suggestive evidence of the opinions of British National Party members using a survey carried out by YouGov on behalf of Goodwin and Evans (2012), who kindly shared their data. YouGov contacted 2,951 members of its national panel who, according to their data, had indicated being supporters of the British National Party, the United Kingdom Independence Party or the English Defence League. The response rate was 73%, including 54 members and 58 former members of the BNP. The opinions of these individuals on race/migration are reported in [Figure 5](#). A large majority believes that immigrants are the main cause of crime and of disease, and 47 percent believe in innate differences in intelligence between black and white Britons. Majorities also believe in the unconditional repatriation of foreigners and reject the concept of non-white Britishness. Although we can not guarantee that the respondents to the survey are a representative sample of BNP members, the evidence suggests that members have extreme views on race.

Our regressions make use of data from Biggs and Knauss (2011), who geolocate members of the party using a membership list published online in 2008.<sup>29</sup> The list was confirmed by the party to be genuine and is understood to provide a complete listing of members of the party in November/December 2007, although the BNP has claimed that the list contains a number of ex- and prospective members too. Membership of the British National Party was not contingent on the presence of a local branch; at the time the membership list was published, individuals were able to join the party by completing a paper or online form. Since joining the party entailed some cost<sup>30</sup>, membership data provides a revealed preference measure of racial attitudes.

The membership list comprises information on 13,009 individuals, including a home address with a valid U.K. postcode in 97% of cases.<sup>31</sup> Biggs and Knauss (2011) aggregate the data to the 2001 ‘output area’ level (the lowest level geography on which the Office of National Statistics aggregates demographic and social data) and report the number of members within each area. The authors kindly shared their dataset with us. We match the data to the most recent neighbourhood definitions, resulting in data on the universe of the census output

---

29. Due to legal constraints in Germany, where most of the analysis was carried out, we were not able to process this information directly from the original, leaked membership list.

30. Membership for pensioners, students and the unemployed cost £15 a year, a standard membership cost £30 a year and a ‘gold’ membership £60.

31. There are over one million unique postcodes throughout the U.K., with each postcode covering on average 15 households.




Figure 5. Opinions of 112 members and former members of the BNP. Source: Goodwin and Evans, 2012.

areas across England and Wales, which we refer to as neighbourhoods. Of the 184,109 neighbourhoods in England and Wales (median population: 303), 12,513 (6.7%) include at least one BNP member. The maximum number of members per neighbourhood is 11, a neighbourhood in Barnsley, in the north of England. The neighbourhoods containing BNP members are displayed in Appendix Figure A14, which also shows the U.K. geographies with active BNP branches in 2008.<sup>32</sup> The figure reveals that membership of the BNP was geographically diverse, and members live in areas both with and without local branches.

### 5.1. Estimation and Results

Our dependent variable is the number of BNP members per 100,000 white residents in a neighbourhood.<sup>33</sup> We limit our sample to neighbourhoods inside England and Wales since negligible numbers of troops were posted in Scotland

32. Data on the existence of BNP branches comes from the BNP newspaper, the 'Voice of Freedom', Issue 100. Last accessed August 2017 at <https://www.scribd.com/document/25905300/Voice-of-Freedom-101>.

33. As described above, the data on BNP membership is provided at the neighbourhood level. We run our main regression at the neighbourhood level too, without further aggregation, since this allows us to accurately match each unit to larger historical geographies. This simplifies the generation of control variables, since neighbourhoods almost always fit completely inside historic boundaries, something which would not be the case for larger geographic units. Appendix Table A12 reports results from regressions at the postcode district level, albeit without a full

and because Northern Ireland contained only negligible numbers of BNP members. In constructing our dependent variable we divide by the number of white residents in the neighbourhood to avoid a mechanical correlation between the outcome measure and the size of non-white population. Further, as described in [Section 4](#), we limit our sample to neighbourhoods in postcode districts where support units were posted, so as to exploit variation in the racial makeup of support troops posted around any given location in our estimation. Summary statistics of the dependent and independent variables in our sample are reported in Appendix [Table A4](#).

We thus estimate regression equations of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BNP members per 100,000 whites}_i = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{BlackUnitMonths}_j \\ & + \beta_2 \text{SupportUnitMonths}_j + \mathbf{X}_i + u_i \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $i$  is a neighbourhood,  $j$  stands for that neighbourhood's postcode district,  $\text{BlackUnitMonths}_j$  and  $\text{SupportUnitMonths}_j$  are constructed as per [Section 4](#),  $\mathbf{X}_i$  is a vector of controls and  $u_i$  is the error term. In order to account for correlation in the error term between observations, we cluster standard errors at the modern local authority level, which divides England and Wales into 348 administrative regions. Our key parameter of interest is  $\beta_1$ , the estimated effect of the presence of black troops, conditional on the presence of support troops, on BNP membership.

Results of estimating [Equation 1](#) are displayed in [Table 2](#), with each column representing a separate regression with a different set of control variables. To ease the interpretation of coefficients, both the explanatory and dependent variables are standardised to have zero mean and a standard deviation of one. The regression shown in Column 1 includes no additional controls. We introduce further controls in a piecewise fashion, starting with Column 2. First we include grid-cell fixed effects, generated by imposing an arbitrary eight by ten grid on the map of England and Wales and matching neighbourhood to these cells (the cells are shown in [Figure 4](#)). Estimation in this and subsequent columns exploits *within grid-cell variation* in the presence of black troops, comparing neighbourhoods which are relatively close to one another but which vary in terms of the number of black units posted.

For the remaining columns, we match contemporary neighbourhoods to their historic geographies: 1931 parishes, 1931 local government districts and 1918-1945 constituencies, using boundary data provided by the Vision of Britain

---

set of controls. These are in-line with our main specification. In addition, Appendix [Table A7](#) reports estimation results from alternate model specifications.

Table 2: Effect on BNP membership

|                          | BNP members per 100,000 whites (std.) |                      |                      |                      |                   |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
|                          | (1)                                   | (2)                  | (3)                  | (4)                  | (5)               |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.022***<br>(0.008)                  | -0.023***<br>(0.008) | -0.022***<br>(0.008) | -0.023***<br>(0.009) | -0.029*<br>(0.01) |
| Support unit-months      | ✓                                     | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                 |
| Grid-cell fixed effects  |                                       | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                 |
| Economic controls        |                                       |                      | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                 |
| Geographic controls      |                                       |                      |                      | ✓                    | ✓                 |
| Socio-political controls |                                       |                      |                      |                      | ✓                 |
| Clusters                 | 234                                   | 234                  | 234                  | 234                  | 172               |
| Observations             | 48,732                                | 48,732               | 48,665               | 48,665               | 26,498            |

*Notes:* Each column reports coefficients and standard errors (in brackets) from an OLS regression where both the dependent variable and main independent variable have been standardised to have mean zero and standard deviation one. The unit of observation is the neighbourhood (2011 census output area). The outcome variable is BNP members per 100,000 white inhabitants. Black unit-months, the reported independent variable, is our measure of the presence of black troops in the neighbourhood's postcode district. Support-unit months is the measure of presence of support troops in the neighbourhood's postcode district. Economic controls are: population density (in the 1931 parish), change in population (in the parish between 1921 to 1931), the share of employment due to the agricultural sector (in the 1931 local government district), the share of employment due to the professional sector (in the 1931 local government district), the unemployment rate (in the 1931 local government district) and a dummy variable for urban status (1931 local government district). Geographic controls are distances to the coast, to the nearest large city, to the nearest city, to the nearest urban district, to the nearest railway station and to the nearest major road. Social- political controls are the share of the votes in the 1935 constituency going to the Conservative party, and a binary indicator for the presence of a British Union of Fascist branch in the constituency, measured in 1934. Standard errors are clustered at the local authority district level and reported in brackets. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

Project. In most cases, neighbourhoods are completely contained within these geographies; if not, they are matched to the geography which contains the neighbourhood's population-weighted centroid. Based on these historic geographies, we add controls for pre-existing economic conditions in Column 3, for geography in Column 4 and for socio-political variables in Column 5. These are drawn from the same set of controls we used to demonstrate exogeneity of the treatment measure in [Section 4.2](#).

In the baseline specification, Column 1, a one standard deviation increase in the presence of black troops, as measured by *BlackUnitMonths<sub>j</sub>* reduces the number of BNP members as a share of white citizens by 0.02 of a standard deviation. Comparing coefficients across the columns shows that adding grid-cell fixed effects, economic controls or geographic controls makes only a marginal difference to the estimated coefficient (this follows from the exogeneity of the treatment established in [Section 4.2](#)). The estimate shown in Column 5, which includes socio-political controls, is estimated with less precision because we do not have data on the existence or otherwise of a British Union of Fascist or the share of Conservative party votes for all constituencies. However, the coefficient is still statistically significant at the 10% level and is in fact larger than that of the previous columns.<sup>34</sup>

To further assuage concerns that these results may be due to selection on unobservables, we follow the approach by Oster (2019), who emphasizes the importance of movements in  $R^2$  next to coefficient stability. Using her suggested bounding value of increasing  $R^2$  by a factor of 1.3, above which she argues results can be considered as robust, for Column 4 of [Table 2](#), we require a relative degree of selection on observed and unobserved variables of  $\delta = 34.51$  to explain away our finding. This is substantially above equal selection ( $\delta = 1$ ), which has been suggested as an appropriate upper bound in empirical studies and effectively shows that selection on unobservables would have to be excessively large in order to be responsible for our results.

## 5.2. Robustness

In this section we examine the extent to which the results presented in [Table 2](#) are robust to changes in specification or the sample.

In the first four columns of [Table 3](#), we show that our results are robust to changes in the specification of the model. In Column 1, we run a logistic re-

---

34. An alternative explanation for the results reported in [Table 2](#) is that the presence of black troops caused individuals with anti-minority preferences to migrate away. However, the evidence is that the disruption to the housing market during war time made such moves unlikely. Appendix [Figure A15](#) shows that the building of new houses all but ceased during the war period, and Appendix [Figure A16](#) uses an online archive of local newspaper adverts to show that the supply of non-new properties also collapsed.

Table 3: Effect on BNP membership, alternate models & subsamples

|                         | (1)                   | (2)                           | (3)                             | (4)                         | (5)                  | (6)                 | (7)                  |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
|                         | Logit<br>model        | Negative<br>binomial<br>model | Dep. var.<br>IHS<br>transformed | Dep. var.<br>IHS &<br>Logit | Inland               | Not<br>London       | No BNP<br>Branch     |
| Black unit-months       | -0.0036***<br>(0.001) | -0.0038***<br>(0.001)         | -0.012*<br>(0.007)              | -0.046**<br>(0.02)          | -0.034***<br>(0.009) | -0.021**<br>(0.009) | -0.022***<br>(0.008) |
| Support unit-months     | ✓                     | ✓                             | ✓                               | ✓                           | ✓                    | ✓                   | ✓                    |
| Grid-cell fixed effects | ✓                     | ✓                             | ✓                               | ✓                           | ✓                    | ✓                   | ✓                    |
| Economic controls       | ✓                     | ✓                             | ✓                               | ✓                           | ✓                    | ✓                   | ✓                    |
| Location controls       | ✓                     | ✓                             | ✓                               | ✓                           | ✓                    | ✓                   | ✓                    |
| Clusters                | 234                   | 234                           | 234                             | 234                         | 179                  | 226                 | 220                  |
| Observations            | 48,664                | 48,665                        | 48,665                          | 48,664                      | 27,048               | 47,937              | 46,092               |

Notes: Coefficients from several regressions. Outcome is BNP members per 100,000 white inhabitants, except for Column 1 where it is a dummy whether the neighbourhood contains any BNP members. Column 5 includes all neighbourhoods at least 20 kilometers away from the coast. Column 6 excludes neighbourhoods inside Greater London. Column 7 excludes neighbourhoods in districts where a local branch of the British National Party is active. Independent variables and clustering as per Table 2 Standard errors in brackets. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

gression on a dependent variable that indicates whether there is at least one BNP member in a given neighbourhood. Multiple BNP members within a given household or spillover effects between neighbours might increase BNP membership within a given neighbourhood, without necessarily indicating stronger racial prejudice. In Column 2, we estimate a negative binomial model, which explicitly accounts for the fact that BNP members per neighbourhood is a count variable. When estimating the negative binomial regression, we constrain  $\ln(\text{Whites}_i)$  to take the value one to account for the fact that BNP membership in any neighbourhood is constrained by the number of whites living there. In Column 3, we transform our dependent variable by taking its inverse hyperbolic sine (Burbidge, Magee, and Robb, 1988). The distribution of BNP members across neighbourhoods is highly skewed, and the inverse hyperbolic sine transformation makes the distribution more normal, reducing the influence of outliers. In Column 4, we both transform the independent variable and estimate a logit model. The coefficients are not comparable across specifications, but coefficients on *BlackUnitMonths* are negative and statistically significant in all regressions. This suggests that the results found in our main specification are not driven simply by model selection.

Columns 5 through 7 of Table 3 report results on selected samples. In Column 5 we drop from the sample any neighbourhoods within twenty kilometers of the

coast. This excludes all locations in which the small pre-war black population of England and Wales was concentrated. We exclude London from the sample in Column 6, and in Column 7 exclude all areas with an active BNP branch in 2007. Across all our specifications, the coefficient on *BlackUnitMonths* remains highly significant.

Further robustness checks are reported in the Appendix. [Appendix E](#) explores what level of proximity is required between a base at which black troops were posted and a contemporary location in order for the presence of troops to have had a persistent effect on attitudes. In [Appendix Table A7](#) we examine robustness to alternative treatment indicators, and in [Appendix Table A8](#) to an alternative main control variable. In [Appendix Table A13](#), we show our results are robust to weighting neighbourhoods by the size of the population. In [Appendix Figure A17](#) we report results of regressions where we leave counties out of the sample one at a time, and show that the results are not driven by any particular county in the U.K. In [Appendix Table A14](#) we show that results are robust to choice of the geographical fixed effect, and in [Appendix Table A15](#) we vary the geographical cluster level. In [Table A16](#) we use listed unit types (e.g. company, battalion) to estimate the number of soldiers in each unit, allowing us to generate an alternate measure of treatment intensity that takes into account variation in size between units. Finally, in order to assuage concerns that spatial correlation might cause biased estimates of standard errors, [Appendix Figure A18](#) reports the results of randomization inference. We randomly reassign the share of support unit-months due to black units between bases in order to create a simulated assignment of  $BlackUnitMonths_b$ . We then estimate [Equation 1](#) using the simulated  $BlackUnitMonths_b$  and the real  $SupportUnitMonths_b$ . We repeat the exercise 8,000 times, generating a distribution of estimates of  $\beta_1$ , which is centred around zero. The estimate of  $\beta_1$  with the real  $BlackUnitMonths_b$  is larger in magnitude than all but 0.1% of the counterfactual estimates.

### 5.3. Heterogeneity Analysis

We examine heterogeneous effects of the BNP results along two dimensions in [Table 4](#). According to data from the U.K. household longitudinal study ‘Understanding Society’ (University of Essex. Institute for Social and Economic Research, 2016), rural areas of the U.K. see only low levels of internal migration. Within rural areas, 25% of individuals were living within two miles (3.2 kilometres) and 47% within five miles (8 kilometres) of the place they were grown up. Urban areas are however magnets for migration, both international and domestic. As such, those in rural areas are more likely to have ancestors who lived close to their current address. Given this, a model of vertical transmission of attitudes from parents to children would predict more persistence in rural compared to urban areas.

Table 4: Effect on BNP membership, heterogeneity

|                          | <i>Dependent variable:</i>           |                  |                    |                  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|
|                          | BNP members per 100,00 whites (std.) |                  |                    |                  |
|                          |                                      |                  | Non-white share    |                  |
|                          | (1)                                  | (2)              | (3)                | (4)              |
|                          | Rural                                | Urban            | Bottom<br>Quartile | Top<br>Quartile  |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.031***<br>(0.008)                 | -0.015<br>(0.01) | -0.037**<br>(0.02) | -0.022<br>(0.03) |
| Support unit-months      | ✓                                    | ✓                | ✓                  | ✓                |
| Economic controls        | ✓                                    | ✓                | ✓                  | ✓                |
| Geographic controls      | ✓                                    | ✓                | ✓                  | ✓                |
| Clusters                 | 196                                  | 204              | 63                 | 61               |
| Observations             | 15,659                               | 33,006           | 13,233             | 10,415           |

*Notes:* Each column reports coefficients and standard errors from an OLS regression. Outcome is BNP members per 100,000 white inhabitants. Column 1 includes only neighbourhoods in rural areas, Column 2 only neighbourhoods in urban areas, Column 3 (4) only neighbourhoods in local authority districts with a bottom (top) quartile non-white share. Independent variables and clustering as per Table 2. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

We therefore begin by splitting the sample by the 2011 rural-urban status of the neighbourhood.<sup>35</sup> Column 1 reports the results of regressions of the form of estimating Equation 1 with controls as per Column 4 of Table 2, but with the sample limited to rural neighbourhoods. Column 2 does the same for urban areas. The results reveal that the effect of black troops on BNP membership is about twice as large in rural areas as in urban areas. In fact, the effect in urban areas is not statistically significant at any conventional level, despite a larger sample size.

In Columns 3 and 4 we investigate heterogeneity according to the share of the non-white population in 2011. In areas with larger non-white populations, indi-

35. The Office of National Statistics classifies neighbourhoods as belonging to one of four urban categories or six rural categories based on the typical settlement of the households in the neighbourhood. Urban categories are major conurbation, minor conurbation, city and town, city and town in sparse setting. Rural categories are town and fringe, town and fringe in sparse settings, village, village in sparse setting, hamlets and isolated dwelling.

viduals have more opportunities to update their beliefs about non-whites, and we would therefore expect less persistence compared to areas which are still predominantly white. To test this hypothesis, the regression reported in Column 3 includes only neighbourhoods which are part of a local authority area with a bottom-quartile share of non-whites, in Column 4 we only include those with a top-quartile share of non-whites. We indeed find that the effect of black G.I.s is almost twice as large in areas which are predominantly white.

Our results align with the findings in Voigtländer and Voth (2012), who demonstrate that the persistence of anti-Semitism in Germany across a period of 600 years ‘fails’ in cities which are open to trade and migration.

#### 5.4. Assessing the Effect Size

The regression results reported in this section so far have displayed a consistent pattern: a one standard deviation increase in black unit-months led to a 0.02 to 0.03 standard deviation decrease in BNP membership. Using the summary statistics reported in Table A4, this effect implies that increasing all bases in a postcode district by in total 31 *BlackUnitMonths*; (e.g. one base hosting an additional two black units for a little more than a year), decreases BNP membership by around 10%. Importantly, these small effect sizes are the result of an intention-to-treat approach (ITT), since not every British person in the vicinity of a U.S. Army base would have interacted with American troops, especially since the presence of American troops in the U.K. was of limited duration. Furthermore, the effect might have worn off over time due to intergenerational decay.

To convert our ITT estimates to a sensible average treatment effect on the treated (ATOT), we proceed in three steps. First, in the spirit of Perez-Truglia and Cruces (2017), we scale the ITT estimates by the share of the population directly exposed to the treatment. Second, we then incorporate the effects of decay among the treated population, and third, we analyse how spillover effects on the non-treated population could have influenced the ATOT estimate. Since many of these scaling decisions involve assumptions, we will present our preferred scaled effect alongside a more conservative estimate.

In the absence of reliable information on the share of the population having contact with black G.I.s, we utilise U.S. Army survey “Attitudes Towards The British” (S-122). In the survey, soldiers answered how many English families, English men in the armed forces, English girls in the armed forces, English civilian girls, as well as older English civilian men and women they had gotten to know. The answering scale went from a) none, b) one or two, c) several to d) a fairly large number. To convert this scale to numbers, we enlisted 100 U.S. residents through surveymonkey.com and asked them to provide us with a sensible estimate for c) and d). After eliminating 12 responses where the number

provided for c) was larger than for d), we obtain a median answer of 7 for c) and of 20 for d). For b), we choose the midpoint of 1.5.

Based on these numbers, we estimate that each American soldier knew an average of 23.54 British people. With approximately 130,000 black G.I.s serving in the U.K., up to 3.06 million British people would thus have had at least some interactions with black soldiers, out of a total population (according to the 1931 census) of 16,774,835 residing in treated areas, or about 18.24%. This likely constitutes a considerable overestimation, as many soldiers may have met locals from the same set of people. We therefore regard it as a conservative estimate of the treated population, and thus of the ATOT estimate. A more realistic approach, and our preferred estimate, would be to assume that only 50% of all G.I.-local interactions were unique, such that 9.12% of the overall population had been treated. Scaling our ITT estimate in column 4 of Table 2 of 0.023 by a treated population of 9.12% yields an ATOT estimate of 0.252 of a standard deviation, already a quite sizeable effect on both, the contemporaneous and the historical population. Under the more conservative assumption of 18.24% of the population being treated, we would still observe an ATOT estimate of 0.126 of a standard deviation.

Such an ATOT estimate, however, neglects the intergenerational decay that may have taken place and thus obfuscate the magnitude of the estimated effect at the time of treatment. Psychologists have found parent-child transmission rates of between 0.2 and 0.4 for racism in other countries (see e.g. Dhont and Van Hiel, 2012; Duriez and Soenens, 2009). We use 0.3 as our preferred transmission rate, and regard 0.4 as a more conservative approach. Assuming that the effect always transmits with 0.3 to the next generation, and dividing the 2010 population of England and Wales into four generations since World War II, we can derive that intergenerational decay may have reduced the treatment to 0.2306 of its original strength.<sup>36</sup> Using the more conservative rate of 0.4 implies a reduction of the effect through intergenerational transmission to 0.3046. Scaling the previous ATOT estimate by our preferred transmission rate thus implies an updated ATOT estimate of 1.093 of a standard deviation (on the historical population). The more conservative transmission rate instead would still have yielded an effect of 0.414 of a standard deviation.

---

36. To divide the 2010 population of England and Wales into generations we proceed as follows. Those born before 1940 we categorise as the first generation (6.6% of the 2010 population), between 1940 and 1969 as the second generation (41.91%), between 1970 and 1999 as the third generation (39.58%), and since 2000 as the fourth generation (11.85%). Cutoffs are based on the fact that the average mother's age at first birth in the U.K. is (and has been historically) approximately 30. The first generation is fully treated, the second generation only with 0.3, the third generation with  $0.3^2$ , and the fourth generation with  $0.3^3$ .

A counteracting factor, however, would be spillover effects from the treated on the indirectly treated (historical) population, effectively reducing the ATOT estimate at the time of treatment and contemporaneously. Political scientists and economists have estimated spillover effects in various contexts to be typically on the order of 50% of the original effect (see e.g. Duflo and Saez, 2003; Nickerson, 2008; Angelucci and De Giorgi, 2009), although our context may have been less conducive to spillovers given the size (and thus likelihood of interaction) of treated and untreated populations. Using 25% as our preferred estimate, we obtain an ATOT estimate of 0.875 standard deviations for the historical, and 0.202 standard deviations for the contemporary population. Taking 50% as the more conservative spillover rate, the ATOT estimate would instead amount to 0.084 standard deviations for the contemporary and 0.276 standard deviations for the historical population.

Our preferred estimate as well as the significantly more conservative estimate imply reasonably large effects both at the time of treatment and in the present. It is important to note that our estimates are effects that arise on top of any nationwide effects of the presence of black G.I.s such as through national (news) media coverage.

## 6. Additional Outcome Measures

In this section, we investigate the effect of black troops on three further measures of anti-minority prejudice. The outcome measure used so far, membership of the BNP, is appealing on account of being a ‘revealed’ preference measure and being measurable for the entire population of the U.K. However, it is also, as we have shown, a measure of *extreme* racial attitudes. Whilst extreme prejudicial attitudes probably have the most impact on minority individuals’ welfare (leading, e.g. to hate crime and overt discrimination), it is also of interest whether the presence of black G.I.s led to changes in attitudes more widely construed. We make progress on this question by presenting evidence that exposure to black troops also influenced electoral outcomes, on measured implicit anti-black bias and on reported attitudes. The findings in [Section 5.3](#) showed that persistent effects of contact are primarily found in rural areas. We therefore restrict all analysis in this section to rural areas.

### 6.1. Local Election Results

First, we investigate whether exposure to black troops also affected election outcomes. This is a natural variable of interest, but also has the advantage of allowing us to document effects closer to the end of the war. General election results are not suitable for such an endeavour as data only exists at the rather large Westminster constituency level, whereas we expect any treatment to oc-

Table 5: Effect on voting in local elections in rural areas

|                          | BNP                |                    | Conservative       |                  |                    |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|                          | (1)<br>2006-2012   | (2)<br>1973-1985   | (3)<br>1986-1995   | (4)<br>1996-2005 | (5)<br>2006-2012   |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.036**<br>(0.01) | -0.052**<br>(0.03) | -0.070**<br>(0.03) | -0.056<br>(0.04) | -0.00033<br>(0.04) |
| Support unit-months      | ✓                  | ✓                  | ✓                  | ✓                | ✓                  |
| Year fixed effects       | ✓                  | ✓                  | ✓                  | ✓                | ✓                  |
| Grid-cell fixed effects  | ✓                  | ✓                  | ✓                  | ✓                | ✓                  |
| Economic controls        | ✓                  | ✓                  | ✓                  | ✓                | ✓                  |
| Geographic controls      | ✓                  | ✓                  | ✓                  | ✓                | ✓                  |
| Clusters                 | 165                | 145                | 151                | 162              | 166                |
| Observations             | 2,812              | 5,153              | 4,348              | 3,249            | 2,819              |

Notes: Each column reports coefficients and standard errors (in brackets). The unit of observation is the electoral ward, restricted to wards in rural output areas. The dependent variable is either the standardized vote share for the BNP or the Conservative Party. All independent variables and clustering as per Table 2. All regressions feature year fixed effects. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

cur on a finer level.<sup>37</sup> Instead, we turn to local government elections, which take place between every two and four years and result in the election of local councillors. Data for each council in England and Wales is available at the electoral ward level from 1973 to 2012 through *The Elections Centre*.<sup>38</sup>

Column 1 of Table 5 shows the result of regressions following the same basic empirical strategy as in Section 5, where the dependent variable now measures the share of votes for the British National Party at the ward level in local elections between 2006 and 2012.<sup>39</sup> The dependent and independent variables are standardised as before. As stated before, we restrict the sample to electoral wards in rural areas.<sup>40</sup> The results show a statistically significant decrease in the BNP vote share in areas where more black GIs were stationed. Interestingly, the co-

37. In Appendix G, we nonetheless present suggestive voting patterns from general elections. These are in line with the findings presented here for local elections.

38. This data is further described in Appendix G.

39. The BNP did not field candidates widely before the mid-2000s. Including all elections since the parties' founding in 1982 does not significantly alter the findings.

40. The BNP vote share is highly skewed, Appendix Table A19 therefore explores robustness to transformations of the dependent variable. Appendix Table A17 shows the BNP results including urban wards, Appendix Table A18 does the same for Conservative voting.

efficient in column 1 is very similar to the effect on BNP *membership* presented in column 1 of [Table 4](#), which is closest in terms of specification.

Columns 2 through 5 compare the BNP results with the Conservative vote share in rural areas between 1973 to 1985, 1986 to 1995, 1996 to 2005, and 2006 to 2012. This allows us to capture outcomes closer to the time of treatment. During much of the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and possibly the early 2000s (not significantly for 1996 to 2005, although the coefficient size is suggestive of a similar effect to the previous two columns) exposure to black troops depressed Conservative voting. With the widespread fielding of BNP candidates in the mid-2000s, this effect disappears (column 5).

These results make sense, as large numbers of candidates from far-right parties only began to stand for election in the early 2000s.<sup>41</sup> However, racist ideologies were on view within parts of the Conservative Party during the mid-1960s.<sup>42</sup> These ideologies were particularly appealing to the more disillusioned sections of the electorate, which felt strongly about immigration (Rich, 1986, p. 54).

Of course, this is not to say that racial attitudes were ever the primary motivation for voting Conservative for the majority of their supporters. Therefore, we would like to interpret the Conservative voting results presented in [Table 5](#) only jointly with the results for the BNP. They suggest that exposure to black troops depressed the Conservative vote at a time where at least some of the Party's representatives espoused racist views, but that the effect attenuated after the BNP established itself as a credible political force.

## 6.2. Implicit Attitudes

Next, we show that presence of black troops has had persistent effects on *implicit* anti-black attitudes. Implicit attitudes have been shown to be predictive for outcomes in a variety of domains when measured by a computerised test.<sup>43</sup>

---

41. The National Front (NF), the predecessor of the BNP, was relatively successful in some council elections during the mid-1970s but never fielded candidates widely.

42. For example, during the 1964 general election, Conservative candidate Peter Griffiths did not distance himself from supporters reportedly using the slogan "if you want a nigger for a neighbour, vote Labour" and publicly supported actions attempting to enforce racial segregation in housing. Perhaps the most well-known example of racist policy positions within the Conservative party can be found in MP Enoch Powell's "Rivers of Blood" speech in 1968, which was widely perceived to amplify racial hatred. In 1970, 63% of supporters of Powell self-identified as Conservatives, while only 16% of those not rating him highly did (Rich, 1986, p. 54).

43. Amongst these, Agerström and Rooth (2011) find that hiring managers' discrimination against obese job applicants is predicted by a test that measures implicit attitudes towards the overweight. In an incentivised experiment, Stanley et al. (2011) show that white subjects' implicit racial attitudes predict their judgement about the trustworthiness of randomly matched black partners, even conditional on their reported racial attitudes.

We use data from Project Implicit, an American non-profit organization which hosts several country-specific websites allowing users to test their implicit attitudes using various Implicit Association Tests ('IATs'). IATs are widely used in psychology (see Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz, 1998, for a review), and increasingly in economics, as a way of measuring implicit attitudes (e.g. Lowes et al., 2015). The test can be applied to measure implicit associations on any topic, but the most common application has been to race. A consistent finding (at least in the U.S.) is of a strong automatic preference towards white people, although there is considerable variation in race IAT scores between individuals. A full description of the test is given in [Appendix F](#).

Project Implicit hosts IATs on a range of subjects (e.g. gender, sexuality, weight), but by far the most popular test is that for race. After completing the race IAT, subjects are asked to answer several questions regarding their attitudes towards religion, minorities, politics and supply their postcode and general demographics. About half of U.K. residents taking the IAT test do so on Project Implicit's U.S. rather than U.K. website. Following an IRB exemption, we received a dataset containing all data collected by the U.K. and U.S. IAT websites between 2004 and 2013.<sup>44</sup> The dataset from the U.K. website contains around 240,000 started sessions, 90,000 of which were seen through to completion. Of these, valid postcode data is provided in 25,826 sessions. We make no claims about the representativeness of the sample: the median age of participants is 29 years, compared to 40 for the population, and roughly two thirds of the participants are male. Subjects are also better educated than the population as a whole. Nonetheless, the sample contains individuals from throughout the U.K. (all 348 of England and Wales' local government districts are represented) and of a wide range of ages (13 to 89).<sup>45</sup>

In order to test whether contact with black G.I.s has had persistent impact on IAT scores, we follow the same basic empirical strategy as in [Section 5](#), but now run individual-level regressions on the "D" score, the summary metric produced by the test, which is also standardised to have mean zero and a standard deviation of one. Higher scores indicate a stronger automatic association of positive words with white faces, with a score over zero indicating implicit racial bias toward whites (Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz, 1998). As before, we restrict

---

44. A public version of the U.S. dataset, without zip codes, is available via the Open Science Framework at <https://osf.io/y9hiq/>

45. Curiosity seems to be the main driver for participation in the test. The most common stated reasons for coming to the website are the recommendation of a friend and mention in news articles. Around 20% of tests in the dataset were conducted in the days after the BBC publicised the test on its news website in April 2005 under the headline "Are you racist? The test that claims to know" (BBC, 2005)

*Table 6: Effect on implicit anti-black bias and warmth of feelings towards blacks*

|                          | Implicit Attitudes              |                        |                        | Thermology                        |                      |                      |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|                          | Degree of Bias Favouring Whites |                        |                        | Warmth of Feelings Towards Blacks |                      |                      |
|                          | (1)                             | (2)                    | (3)                    | (4)                               | (5)                  | (6)                  |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.0653***<br>(0.0224)          | -0.0682***<br>(0.0229) | -0.0719***<br>(0.0246) | 0.0486**<br>(0.0239)              | 0.0609**<br>(0.0288) | 0.0678**<br>(0.0281) |
| Support unit-months      | ✓                               | ✓                      | ✓                      | ✓                                 | ✓                    | ✓                    |
| Demographic Controls     |                                 | ✓                      | ✓                      |                                   | ✓                    | ✓                    |
| Grid fixed effects       |                                 | ✓                      | ✓                      |                                   | ✓                    | ✓                    |
| Economic controls        |                                 |                        | ✓                      |                                   |                      | ✓                    |
| Location controls        |                                 |                        | ✓                      |                                   |                      | ✓                    |
| Clusters                 | 157                             | 157                    | 157                    | 157                               | 157                  | 157                  |
| Observations             | 1,434                           | 1,426                  | 1,424                  | 1,392                             | 1,385                | 1,383                |

*Notes:* Each column reports coefficients and standard errors (in brackets). The unit of observation is the individual, and the sample is restricted to rural districts. The dependent variable is the standardized measure of implicit anti-black attitudes from the IAT (columns 1-3) and the reported thermology score, indicating how warmly individuals feel on a scale from 0 to 10 towards black people (columns 4-6). In the latter, all regressions control for thermology scores towards white people. Demographic controls are age, age squared and gender. Economic controls are: population density (in the 1931 parish), the share of employment due to the agricultural sector, the professional sector, the staple sector, the light sector, and other sectors (in the 1931 local government district), and a dummy variable for urban status (1931 local government district). Geographic controls are distances to the coast, to the nearest large city, to the nearest city, and to the nearest urban district. All other independent variables and clustering as per Table 2. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

our results to rural districts<sup>46</sup> Results are presented in columns 1-3 of [Table 6](#) and show that the presence of black troops significantly decreases implicit bias against blacks.

### 6.3. Thermology

Using the same dataset as above, we now examine the effect of the presence of black troops on stated attitudes. After completing the IAT test, participants are asked a range of survey questions, including a number of ‘thermology’ questions of the form “Please rate how warm or cold you feel toward the following groups (0 = coldest feelings, 5 = neutral, 10 = warmest feelings)”. We take as our dependent variable the thermology score measuring warmth of feelings towards black people and we control for the thermology score towards white people. Results are displayed in columns 4-6 of [Table 6](#). Because of how the question is phrased, a positive coefficient indicates warmer feelings towards black people (the opposite of our implicit bias measure reported in columns 1-3). We indeed find a positive and statistically significant relationship between warmness of feelings to black people and the historic presence of black troops.

## 7. Mechanism

In order to make some progress around understanding channels of persistence, in particular the role of horizontal versus vertical transmission, as well as strengthening the contact hypothesis interpretation of the observed effect, we proceed in two steps. First, we show that pre-WWII Irish and non-white migration substantially dampens our estimated treatment effect. Areas to which these groups migrated may have already had more tolerant attitudes, either because pre-World War II migrants selected into more tolerant areas or through contact. If contact has diminishing marginal impacts, this would result in lower treatment effects in such areas. Second, we provide some descriptive evidence of vertical transmission by splitting the IAT results by birth cohorts and showing that the effect is more prevalent in cohorts which are likely to be descendants of those coming into contact with troops during World War II, consistent with vertical transmission of attitudes.

### 7.1. Irish & Non-White Migration

As the results in [Table 1](#) show, neither existing Irish nor non-white migration to the U.K. by 1911 can predict where black units were stationed. Areas to which these groups migrated, however, may have had more tolerant attitudes directly prior to World War II, both because migrants may have self-selected into a more open environment, or because contact between them and the local population

---

46. Appendix [Table A20](#) shows the results including urban areas.

Table 7: Effect on BNP membership split by quartiles of migration

| Panel A: Irish migration     |                       |                       |                      |                     |                     |                      |                     |                     |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|                              | Bottom Quartile       |                       | 2nd Quartile         |                     | 3rd Quartile        |                      | Top Quartile        |                     |
|                              | (1)                   | (2)                   | (3)                  | (4)                 | (5)                 | (6)                  | (7)                 | (8)                 |
| Black unit-months (std.)     | -0.0289**<br>(0.0120) | -0.0311**<br>(0.0129) | -0.0181<br>(0.0195)  | -0.0282<br>(0.0215) | -0.0298<br>(0.0301) | -0.0504*<br>(0.0294) | -0.0146<br>(0.0109) | -0.0164<br>(0.0113) |
| Clusters                     | 194                   | 194                   | 178                  | 178                 | 174                 | 174                  | 184                 | 184                 |
| Observations                 | 12,524                | 12,515                | 13,377               | 13,377              | 9,972               | 9,972                | 12,859              | 12,801              |
| Panel B: Non-white migration |                       |                       |                      |                     |                     |                      |                     |                     |
| Black unit-months (std.)     | -0.0308**<br>(0.0117) | -0.0319**<br>(0.0141) | -0.00541<br>(0.0155) | -0.0199<br>(0.0129) | 0.00334<br>(0.0198) | -0.0186<br>(0.0218)  | -0.109<br>(0.0986)  | 0.0107<br>(0.109)   |
| Support unit-months          | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                    | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                    | ✓                   | ✓                   |
| Grid-cell fixed effects      |                       | ✓                     |                      | ✓                   |                     | ✓                    |                     | ✓                   |
| Economic controls            |                       | ✓                     |                      | ✓                   |                     | ✓                    |                     | ✓                   |
| Location controls            |                       | ✓                     |                      | ✓                   |                     | ✓                    |                     | ✓                   |
| Clusters                     | 89                    | 89                    | 67                   | 67                  | 54                  | 54                   | 24                  | 24                  |
| Observations                 | 19,791                | 19,763                | 15,930               | 15,925              | 9,481               | 9,466                | 3,530               | 3,511               |

Notes: Each Column reports coefficients and standard errors from an OLS regression. The dependent, all independent variables, and clustering as per Table 2. Columns vary according to the share of the Irish (panel A) or non-white (panel B) population in the 1911 census. Columns 1 and 2 show the lowest quartile, 3 and 4 the 2<sup>nd</sup> quartile, 5 and 6 the 3<sup>rd</sup> quartile, and 7 and 8 the top quartile. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

may have mitigated pre-existing racial prejudice, thereby reducing potential for further effects of contact.<sup>47</sup>

Panel A of Table 7 shows the results for BNP membership when we split the sample into quartiles using the 1911 share of Irish migrants in a parish. Columns 1 and 2 show the quartile with the lowest share of Irish migrants, the next four Columns show the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> quartile, respectively, and Columns 7 and 8 show the effect for the quartile with the highest share of Irish migrants. The results indicate that those areas that saw the fewest Irish migrants before 1911 drive most of the observed effect and the estimates for the top quartile are hardly distinguishable from zero. Panel B repeats this exercise by splitting the sample in quartiles using the 1911 share of non-white migrants in a parish with similar results.

47. These two groups of migrants seemed to have moved to different areas, as their presence within locations is not correlated ( $\rho = -0.0055$ ,  $p$ -value = 0.5561). Note that while Irish migration is not significantly correlated with rural/urban status of a local government district ( $\rho = 0.0289$ ,  $p$ -value = 0.2266), non-white migration is ( $\rho = 0.3421$ ,  $p$ -value = 0.0000). As pointed out earlier, non-white migration focused particularly on few larger cities.

## 7.2. IAT Splits

In order to better understand whether our interpretation of the rural/urban splits in the BNP data is really about vertical, rather than horizontal transmission, we now present some descriptive evidence from the IAT data that lends further support to such a mechanism. The IAT data contains information on the age of participants, allowing us to divide participants into birth cohorts. We group participants based on their year of birth: those born before 1940, between 1940 and 1949, 1950 to 1959, 1960 to 1969, 1970 to 1979, 1980-1989, and 1990-2000.

We would expect those born between 1925-1940 (children and young adolescents during the war) to be directly affected. Under a model of vertical transmission, these treated individuals would pass the effect on to their children. The average age of a mother at first birth in the U.K. is, and historically has been, around 30 years, such that a model of vertical transmission would predict that the effect is next observed in the cohort born between 1960 and 1969. Horizontal transmission, instead, does not prescribe such generational jumps, as the effect persists through geography. Instead, we would expect the effect to be particularly strong shortly after the initial treatment, that is the late 1940s and 1950s.

We present separate regressions for each of the previously defined age categories, in panel A of [Table 8](#) for implicit attitudes and in panel B for the thermology question. Column 1 in both panels restates the overall effect as in Columns 3 and 6 of [Table 6](#). When analysing birth cohorts, we omit those born before 1940 due to the low number of observations (12 for the IAT, 7 for the thermology question). For the same reason, we pool the 1940-1949 and 1950-1959 birth cohorts. Even having done so, the number of observations is quite low for each cohort. We therefore do not wish the reader to draw strong conclusions from the findings, but rather regard the results as indicative and in line with the proposed mechanism.

Vertical transmission seems to be the more likely mechanism for persistence, as panel A and B of [Table 8](#) show no effect in Column 2 similar to the one in Column 1.<sup>48</sup> In both panels, the 1960-1969 cohort displays an effect similar to the overall effect, although for the implicit attitudes the results barely miss conventional significance levels.

For the cohorts 1970-1979, 1980-1989, and 1990-2000, the effects seem to diffuse, as the coefficients all go in the same direction as the overall effect, albeit not significantly in the case of implicit attitudes, and only starting 1980 for the thermology question. This squares again well with vertical transmission, as the

---

48. We obtain similar results when not pooling the 1940-1949 and 1950-1959 cohorts.

Table 8: Implicit attitudes & thermology: age splits

| Panel A: Implicit attitudes |                        |                    |                     |                     |                     |                     |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|                             | All                    | 1940-1959          | 1960-1969           | 1970-1979           | 1980-1989           | 1990-2000           |
|                             | (1)                    | (2)                | (3)                 | (4)                 | (5)                 | (6)                 |
| Black unit-months (std.)    | -0.0719***<br>(0.0246) | 0.00282<br>(0.106) | -0.141<br>(0.0907)  | -0.0333<br>(0.0800) | -0.0790<br>(0.0544) | -0.0376<br>(0.0782) |
| Clusters                    | 157                    | 94                 | 112                 | 111                 | 123                 | 75                  |
| Observations                | 1,424                  | 211                | 296                 | 285                 | 453                 | 167                 |
| Panel B: Thermology         |                        |                    |                     |                     |                     |                     |
| Black unit-months (std.)    | 0.0678**<br>(0.0281)   | 0.0431<br>(0.0619) | 0.0961*<br>(0.0563) | 0.0148<br>(0.0563)  | 0.0978*<br>(0.0582) | 0.102**<br>(0.0433) |
| Support unit-months         | ✓                      | ✓                  | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                   |
| Demographic Controls        | ✓                      | ✓                  | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                   |
| Grid fixed effects          | ✓                      | ✓                  | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                   |
| Economic controls           | ✓                      | ✓                  | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                   |
| Location controls           | ✓                      | ✓                  | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                   |
| Clusters                    | 157                    | 89                 | 110                 | 111                 | 123                 | 75                  |
| Observations                | 1,383                  | 196                | 287                 | 282                 | 445                 | 166                 |

Notes: Each column reports coefficients and standard errors (in brackets). The unit of observation is the individual. The dependent variable is the standardized measure of implicit anti-black attitudes from the IAT (panel A) and the reported thermology score, indicating how warmly individuals feel on a scale from 0 to 10 towards black people (panel B). In panel B, all regressions control for thermology scores towards white people. All independent variables and clustering as per Table 6. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

variation in parents' age at birth should water down a strong cohort effect the further one moves in time. Clearly, these results speak against horizontal transmission, in which one would expect strong effects for early cohorts (possibly with some decay over time), but clearly no 'generational jumps'.

Importantly, these regressions are based on a small number of observations, such that we cannot rule out that the non-existence of results is due to a lack of power. With such large standard errors, different signs and magnitudes of the coefficient are not very unlikely. But even then, the additional gain in power from moving from 1940-1959 to 1960-1969 is not so large that we would expect it to explain the difference in findings. Therefore, we prefer to interpret them as suggestive of vertical, rather than horizontal, transmission of racial attitudes.

## 8. Conclusion

We have investigated the effect of the presence of black American troops in the United Kingdom during World War II on anti-minority prejudice. Large numbers of black G.I.s were posted in the U.K. at a time where the population was

almost exclusively white. Documentary evidence suggests that the allocation of black troops to military bases in the U.K. took place without consideration of local racial attitudes, and we show that the allocation is orthogonal to a large set of economic, political and social variables. As such, variation across bases as to the number of black units posted allows us to identify causal effects of the local presence of troops.

We found that areas of the U.K. in which black soldiers were posted during World War II contained fewer members of the British National Party, a far-right party with racist policy positions, in 2009. The effect is particularly strong in rural areas – that is, areas where population movements are lower and which remain predominantly white. In addition, individuals in such areas exhibit less implicit anti-black bias, as measured by a computerised Implicit Association Test, are more likely to report warmer feelings towards black people and cast fewer votes for the BNP in local elections. Taken as a whole, our results provide support for the ‘contact hypothesis’ (Allport, 1954), which postulates that contact between groups can reduce animosity towards the minority group, and show that such effects can persist in geographies across time.

It is interesting to note that the contact which we describe meets many of the conditions that Allport postulated were necessary for intergroup contact to lead to improved relations: equal status, common goals, intergroup cooperation and personal interaction. Black G.I.s were in the United Kingdom for a relatively short period of time, to support the war effort, and did not compete for jobs or public goods with the local population. Furthermore, black troops in the U.K. were relatively well educated. This may have been a facilitating factor in creating the positive nature of interaction between soldiers and the local population. With these particular circumstances in mind, we would like to stress that we do not claim our findings to be generalisable to every possible setting, no matter how different the mode of contact is. Rather, our work demonstrates one instance in which contact can work (i.e. when Allport’s conditions are fulfilled) and can have persistent effects. As the anecdotal evidence in this paper described, updating towards white soldiers may have evolved differently, emphasizing the importance of interaction quality. More work is required to understand how the *mode* and *circumstances* of interaction between groups affect any changes in attitudes that contact might produce (Lowe, 2018).

## References

- Acharya, Avidit, Matthew Blackwell, and Maya Sen. 2016. "The Political Legacy of American Slavery." *Journal of Politics* 78 (3): 621–641.
- Agerström, Jens, and Dan-Olof Rooth. 2011. "The Role of Automatic Obesity Stereotypes in Real Hiring Discrimination." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 96 (4): 790–805.
- Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Angelucci, Manuela, and Giacomo De Giorgi. 2009. "Indirect effects of an aid program: how do cash transfers affect ineligibles' consumption?" *American Economic Review* 99 (1): 486–508.
- Avdeenko, Alexandra, and Thomas Siedler. 2017. "Intergenerational Correlations of Extreme Right-Wing Party Preferences and Attitudes toward Immigration." *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 119 (3): 768–800.
- BBC. 2001. *BNP: Under the Skin*. [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/static/in\\_depth/programmes/2001/bnp\\_special/roots/1984.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/static/in_depth/programmes/2001/bnp_special/roots/1984.stm).
- . 2005. *Are You Racist? The Test That Claims to Know*. [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\\_news/magazine/4447471.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/magazine/4447471.stm).
- Biggs, Michael, and Steven Knauss. 2011. "Explaining Membership in the British National Party: A Multilevel Analysis of Contact and Threat". *European Sociological Review* 28 (5): 633–646.
- Bisin, Alberto, and Thierry Verdier. 2001. "The Economics of Cultural Transmission and the Dynamics of Preferences." *Journal of Economic Theory* 97 (2): 298–319.
- Boisjoly, Johanne, Greg J Duncan, Michael Kremer, Dan M Levy, and Jacque Eccles. 2006. "Empathy or Antipathy? The Impact of Diversity." *American Economic Review* 96 (5): 1890–1905.
- Burbidge, John B, Lonnie Magee, and A Leslie Robb. 1988. "Alternative Transformations to Handle Extreme Values of the Dependent Variable." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 83 (401): 123–127.
- Burns, Justine, Lucia Corno, and Eliana La Ferrara. 2016. "Interaction, Stereotypes and Performance, Evidence from South Africa." Working Paper.
- Cantoni, Davide, Felix Hagemester, and Mark Westcott. 2019. "Persistence and activation of right-wing political ideology." Working Paper.

- Carell, Scott, Mark Hoekstra, and James West. 2019. “[The Impact of College Diversity on Behavior Toward Minorities](#).” *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 11 (4): 159–182.
- Dhont, Kristof, and Alain Van Hiel. 2012. “Intergroup contact buffers against the intergenerational transmission of authoritarianism and racial prejudice”. *Journal of Research in Personality* 46 (2): 231–234.
- Duflo, Esther, and Emmanuel Saez. 2003. “The role of information and social interactions in retirement plan decisions: Evidence from a randomized experiment”. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118 (3): 815–842.
- Duriez, Bart, and Bart Soenens. 2009. “The intergenerational transmission of racism: The role of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation”. *Journal of Research in Personality* 43 (5): 906–909.
- Fouka, Vasiliki. 2020. “Backlash: The unintended effects of language prohibition in US schools after World War I”. *Review of Economic Studies* 87 (1): 204–239.
- Goodwin, Matthew, and Jocelyn Evans. 2012. “From Voting to Violence? Far Right Extremism in Britain”. *Hope Not Hate*: 1–36.
- Greenwald, Anthony G, and Mahzarin R Banaji. 1995. “Implicit Social Cognition: Attitudes, Self-Esteem, and Stereotypes”. *Psychological Review* 102 (1): 4–27.
- Greenwald, Anthony G, Debbie E McGhee, and Jordan LK Schwartz. 1998. “Measuring Individual Differences in Implicit Cognition: The Implicit Association Test”. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74 (6): 1464–1480.
- Hanretty, Chris, and Nick Vivyan. n.d. “[Estimating Constituency Opinion in Britain, Technical Report](#).”
- Holmans, Alan. 2005. *Housing Statistics of Housing in Britain*. Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research.
- Lapierre, Richard T. 1928. “[Race Prejudice: France and England](#).” *Social Forces* 7 (1): 102–111.
- Lee, Sabine. 2011. “[A Forgotten Legacy of the Second World War: GI children in post-war Britain and Germany](#).” *Contemporary European History* 20 (2): 157–181.
- Lee, Ulysses. 1966. *The Employment of Negro Troops*. Vol. 8. Government Printing Office.

- Little, Kenneth. 1998. *Negroes in Britain: A Study of Racial Relations in English Society*. Class, Race and Social structure. Routledge.
- Lowe, Matt. 2018. “Types of Contact: A Field Experiment on Collaborative and Adversarial Caste Integration.” Working Paper.
- Lowes, Sara, and Eduardo Montero. 2016. “Blood Rubber: The Effects of Labor Coercion on Institutions and Culture in the DRC”. *Working Paper*.
- Lowes, Sara, Nathan Nunn, James A Robinson, and Jonathan L Weigel. 2015. “Understanding Ethnic Identity in Africa: Evidence from the Implicit Association Test (IAT).” *American Economic Review* 105 (5): 340–45.
- . 2017. “The evolution of culture and institutions: Evidence from the Kuba Kingdom.” *Econometrica* 85 (4): 1065–1091.
- Madge, Charles, and Tom Harnett Harrisson. 1937. *Mass Observation*. Frederick Muller Ltd.
- McNeill, Sylvia. 1946. *Illegitimate Children Born in Britain of English Mothers and Coloured Americans*.
- Millgate, Helen D. 2010. *Got Any Gum Chum?: GIs in Wartime Britain, 1942-1945*. History Press Series. History Press Limited.
- Moore, Brenda L. 2013. “African Americans in the Military”. In *The Columbia Guide to African American History Since 1939*, edited by R.L. Harris and R. Terborg-Penn. Columbia guides to American history and cultures. Columbia University Press.
- Murray, Paul T. 1971. “Blacks and the Draft: A History of Institutional Racism.” *Journal of Black Studies* 2 (1): 57–75.
- Nickerson, David. 2008. “Is Voting Contagious? Evidence from Two Field Experiments”. *American Political Science Review* 102 (1): 49–57.
- Ochsner, Christian, and Felix Roesel. 2020. “Migrating Extremists”. *Economic Journal* forthcoming.
- Olson, Lynne. 2010. *Citizens of London: The Americans Who Stood with Britain in Its Darkest, Finest Hour*. Random House Publishing Group.
- Orwell, George. 1943. “As I Please”. *Tribune* (December).
- Oster, Emily. 2019. “Unobservable selection and coefficient stability: Theory and evidence”. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 37 (2): 187–204.
- Paluck, Elizabeth Levy, Seth A Green, and Donald P Green. 2019. “The contact hypothesis re-evaluated”. *Behavioural Public Policy* 3 (2): 129–158.

- Perez-Truglia, Ricardo, and Guillermo Cruces. 2017. "Partisan interactions: Evidence from a field experiment in the United States". *Journal of Political Economy* 125 (4): 1208–1243.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F, and Linda R Tropp. 2006. "A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90 (5): 751–783.
- Pogue, Forrest C. 1954. *The Supreme Command*. United States Army in World War II: European theater of operations. Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army.
- Rash, FL. 1942. *Internal Memo, Headquarters, Services of Supply, European Theatre of Operations*. National Archives reference: NAI; 290; 57/17/087; Box 43, File 218, 'Negro Troops', September.
- Redvaldsen, David. 2016. "'Science must be the Basis'. Sir Oswald Mosley's Political Parties and their Policies on Health, Science and Scientific Racism 1931–1974." *Contemporary British History* 30 (3): 368–388.
- Reynolds, David. 1995. *Rich Relations: the American Occupation of Britain, 1942–1945*. Random House.
- . 2006. *From World War to Cold War: Churchill, Roosevelt, and the International History of the 1940s*. Oxford University Press.
- Rich, Paul B. 1986. "Conservative ideology and race in modern British politics". In *Race, government and politics in Britain*, edited by Zig Layton-Henry and Paul B Rich, 45–72. Springer.
- Ruppenthal, Roland G. 1978. *Logistical Support of the Armies: May 1941 – September 1944*. The European Theater of Operations: United States Army in World War 2 1. Department of the Army.
- Sasser, Charles W. 2014. *Two Fronts, One War*. Frontline Books.
- Smith, Graham. 1987. *When Jim Crow Met John Bull: Black American Soldiers in World War II Britain*. I.B. Tauris.
- Spencer, Ian RG. 1997. *British Immigration Policy Since 1939: The Making of Multi-racial Britain*. Routledge.
- Stanley, Damian A, Peter Sokol-Hessner, Mahzarin R Banaji, and Elizabeth A Phelps. 2011. "Implicit Race Attitudes Predict Trustworthiness Judgments and Economic Trust Decisions." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108 (19): 7710–7715.

- Stouffer, Samuel A, Edward A Suchman, Leland C DeVinney, Shirley A Star, and Robin M Williams Jr. 1949. "The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life". 1.
- The Guardian. 2009. *Racism Inquiry May Bring Ban on BNP Membership for Teachers*. <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2009/sep/30/ed-balls-orders-racism-inquiry>.
- The Spectator. 2009. *The Rise of British Racism May be Horribly Close*. <http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/3648608/the-rise-of-british-racism-may-be-horribly-close/>.
- Uhlmann, Eric Luis, Anthony Greenwald, Andrew Poehlmann, and Mahzarin Banaji. 2009. "Understanding and Using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-Analysis of Predictive Validity." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 97 (1): 17–41.
- University of Essex. Institute for Social and Economic Research. 2016. "Understanding Society: Innovation Panel, Waves 1-8, 2008-2015. [data collection]. 7th Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 6849."
- Vlachos, Stephanos. 2017. "Inglorious Wars and Political Radicalization." Working Paper.
- Voigtländer, Nico, and Hans-Joachim Voth. 2012. "Persecution Perpetuated: The Medieval Origins of Anti-Semitic Violence in Nazi Germany." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127 (3): 1339–1392.
- Waddell, Steve R. 2010. *United States Army Logistics: From the American Revolution to 9/11*. PSI reports. Praeger Security International.
- Xu, Kaiyuan, Brian Nosek, and Anthony G Greenwald. 2014. "Psychology Data from the Race Implicit Association Test on the Project Implicit Demo Website." *Journal of Open Psychology Data* 2 (1).

**For Online Publication**

# Appendices

## A. Policies of the British National Party

“The British National Party exists to secure a future for the indigenous peoples of these islands in the North Atlantic which have been our homeland for millennia. We use the term indigenous to describe the people whose ancestors were the earliest settlers here after the last great Ice Age and which have been complemented by the historic migrations from mainland Europe” (Mission statement posted on BNP website, 2007, accessed June 2016 via <http://archive.org>)

“IMMIGRATION - time to say ENOUGH! On current demographic trends, we, the native British people, will be an ethnic minority in our own country within sixty years” (BNP Manifesto, 2007, accessed June 2016 via <http://archive.org>)

“We don't 'hate' black people, we don't 'hate' Asians, we don't oppose any ethnic group for what God made them, they have a right to their own identity as much as we do, all we want to do is to preserve the ethnic and cultural identity of the British people” (BNP website, 2007, accessed June 2016 via <http://archive.org>)

## B. Data Sources

### **U.S. Army station lists**

U.S. Army Station Lists are housed in the National Archives in Washington D.C. as Record Group 407, HMS Entry Number NM 3 377 A. Catalog entry at <http://research.archives.gov/description/6883370>. Map coordinates are provided in a coordinate system defined on the Cassini projection, for example WL5715 for a base in Watford. The first two digits of the coordinates indicate an 100 by 100km square, the subsequent digits provide the northing and easting from the bottom left of that square, to an accuracy of 1 kilometer. We reproject coordinates to the British National Grid using a Cassini projection with false easting 500000, false northing 100000, central meridian -1.19276, scale factor 1.0 and latitude of origin 50.617708.

### **U.S. Army enlistment records**

World War II Army Enlistment Records, created, 6/1/2002 - 9/30/2002, documenting the period ca. 1938 - 1946. National Archives and Records Administration. Office of Records Services - Washington, D.C. Modern Records Programs. Electronic and Special Media Records Services Division. (1998 - ) Available online at <https://aad.archives.gov/aad/series-description.jsp?s=3360>.

### **Mass Observation directive responses**

Mass Observation directive responses are downloaded from Mass Observation Online (University of Sussex) in September 2015, <http://www.amdigital.co.uk/m-products/product/mass-observation-online>.

### **War Department surveys**

The American Soldier in World War II: Attitudes Toward Army Life, Nov, 1943 [dataset] USAMS1943-S092, Version 1. Directed by Dr. Samuel A. Stouffer for the Research Branch, Information and Education Division, War Department [producer]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, RoperExpress [distributor], accessed Aug-23-2017. Accessed online at <https://ropercenter.cornell.edu/CFIDE/cf/action/catalog/abstract.cfm?type=&start=&id=&archno=USAMS1943-S092>

The American Soldier in World War II: Attitudes Toward the British, Apr, 1944 [dataset]. [USAMS1944-S122]. Directed by Dr. Samuel A. Stouffer for the Research Branch, Information and Education Division, War Department [producer]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, RoperExpress [distributor], accessed Nov-2-2017. Accessed online at

<https://ropercenter.cornell.edu/CFIDE/cf/action/catalog/abstract.cfm?type=&start=&id=&archno=USAMS1944-S122>

### **BNP membership**

Details on BNP Membership at the 2001 Output Area level was kindly provided to us by Biggs and Knauss (2011).

### **Survey of current and former BNP members**

Extracted from a survey carried out by YouGov on behalf of Goodwin and Evans (2012), who kindly provided us with their data. YouGov is a polling organisation which maintains a panel of around 350,000 respondents. These were screened for individuals who had previously reported supporting, voting for or membership of the UK Independence Party, the British National Party, or the English Defence League, who were then contacted by YouGov and asked to take part in the survey.

### **Results from SurveyMonkey**

Data comes from a survey administered through surveymonkey.com. The questions we asked were: “Imagine yourself in the following situation: You are an American soldier in World War II, stationed in the United Kingdom. U.S. Army officials are interviewing you for a survey. They ask you: ‘About how many English people have you gotten to know fairly well since you came to England?’ The answer possibilities are: a) none, b) one or two, c) several, d) a fairly large number. Imagining this particular situation and given this particular question and answer possibilities, what number of English people do you think most soldiers had in mind when they chose c) several? / d) a fairly large number?”

### **Results from Implicit Association Tests**

Data comes from Project Implicit, an American non-profit organization which hosts several country-specific websites allowing users to test their implicit attitudes using various Implicit Association Tests (Xu, Nosek, and Greenwald, 2014). Following an IRB exemption, we were provided with a dataset containing all data collected by the U.K. IAT website between 2004 and 2013.

### **2011 U.K. census summary**

Office of National Statistics (ONS). Available online at <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011>.

### **Full count England and Wales census, 1911**

“England and Wales Census, 1911.” [Database] FamilySearch. <http://FamilySearch.org>: 14 June 2016. From “1911 England and Wales census.” Database and images. findmypast. <http://www.findmypast.com>: n.d. Citing PRO RG 14. The National Archives of the UK, Kew, Surrey.

### **Population of cities, 1939**

Southall, H.R., Aucott, P., Dorling, D., Ell, P. (2004). Great Britain Historical Database: Census Data: Age and Sex Statistics, 1851-1971. [data collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 4551, <http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-4551-1>

### **Parish and local-government statistics, 1921 and 1931**

Great Britain Historical GIS Project (2017) ‘Great Britain Historical GIS’. University of Portsmouth. <http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/>

### **Parish and local-government boundaries, 1921 and 1931 and constituency Boundaries, 1935**

Great Britain Historical GIS Project (2017) ‘Great Britain Historical GIS’. University of Portsmouth. <http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/>

### **Electoral results, 1935**

Field, W. (2007), British Electoral Data, 1885-1949. [data collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 5673. <http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-5673-1>

### **General election results, 1922-2017**

politicsresources.net (defunct). Accessible through <http://web.archive.org/web/20180216152334/http://www.politicsresources.net/area/uk/edates.htm>

### **Local election results, 1964-2012**

Available online from The Elections Centre. Accessible through <http://www.electionscentre.co.uk/>

### **Labour Party questionnaire on local fascist activities**

Held and accessed as LP/FAS/34 at the People’s History Museum/University of Central Lancashire.

### **Ordnance Survey planning maps, 1946**

Available online from the National Library of Scotland at <http://maps.nls.uk/view/91542574>

**Railway Network Inspire dataset**

Published by Network Rail and available at <https://data.gov.uk/dataset/railway-network-inspire>. Accessed April 2016.

## C. Construction of Control Variables

### **Estimated non-white population in parish, 1911**

We first search the full-count release of the 1911 England and Wales census for individuals with birth places in Asia or Africa. In order to filter out births to British subjects on colonial service, we exclude all individuals with a surname that is listed on either <http://www.surnamesdb.com> or <http://www.houseofnames.com>, websites that provide genealogical information on traditional British surnames. Finally, we exclude all individuals with a first name that features in a list of the top 100 boys' and girls' baby names in the 1911 census published online at <http://www.weddingvendors.com/baby-names/popular/1911/>.

### **Estimated Irish population in parish, 1911**

We search the full-count release of the 1911 England and Wales census for individuals with birth places in Ireland by parish and divide by the parishes' population in 1911. We remove the very few parishes with a share of  $> 1$ .

### **Population density in parish, 1931**

Population density of the parish containing the base/output area.

### **Rate of population growth in parish, 1921-1931**

Change in parish between 1921 and 1931.

### **Urban district, 1931**

Dummy variable indicating whether the location in a local government district is an urban (as opposed to rural) district.

### **Agricultural/professional share, 1931**

Share of population employed in agricultural/professional industries, measured at the local government district level.

### **Unemployment rate, 1931**

Unemployment rate, measured at the local government district level.

### **Area of parish, 1931**

Total area, measured at the parish level.

### **Number of rooms, 1931**

Average number of rooms per house, measured at the parish level.

**Distance to coast**

Distance to the coast, calculated using R.

**Distance to nearest city, 1939**

Distance to nearest city with a population of at least 100,000 in 1939, calculated using R.

**Distance to nearest large city, 1939**

Distance to nearest city with a population of at least 300,000 in 1939, calculated using R.

**Distance to nearest urban district, 1931**

Distance from base or centroid of output area to the nearest district with urban (as opposed to rural) status, calculated using R.

**Distance to railway station, 1939**

Distance to the nearest railway station active in 1939. The Railway Network Inspire dataset provides details on all railway stations in the U.K. in 2016. In order to approximate the railway network in 1939, we supplement this with data from the Wikipedia page ‘List of closed railway stations’, available at [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_closed\\_railway\\_stations\\_in\\_Britain](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_closed_railway_stations_in_Britain). From this list, we collect geographic coordinates for all railway stations closed after 1939 and append these to the Inspire dataset. Distance to the nearest station from each neighbourhood and base is calculated using R.

**Distance to major road, 1946**

Calculated based on the basis of a map of the UK road network in 1946 at 1:625,000 scale from the Ordnance Survey Planning Maps series. First, we georeference and digitise the map using ArcGIS. Then we calculate, for each district and base, the distance to the nearest trunk or class I (A) road using R.

**Distance to major port city, 1936-1938**

Shortest distance to either London, Liverpool, Hull, Southampton, Bristol, Newcastle and Tyne Ports, Swansea, Grimsby, Immingham, or Cardiff, calculated using R.

**Distance to nearest base section headquarters**

Shortest distance to either London, Wilton, Watford or Chester, calculated using R.

**Conservative vote share, 1922-1935**

Share of voters voting for the Conservative candidate in the 1922, 1923, 1924, 1929, 1931 and 1935 election, measured at the constituency level. Missing if no Conservative candidate stood for election in the constituency.

**British Union of Fascists branch**

Dummy variable indicating if a location is inside a constituency which contained a branch of the British Union of Fascists, according to internal Labour Party research carried out in June 1934. Missing if the local Labour party branch did not reply to the central party's questionnaire.

#### D. Mass Observation Directive Responses

“War time events and experiences have changed my outlook very little on this matter. From time to time I have seen coloured soldiers drunk and disorderly in the West End of London. That taught me not to begin to idealise the coloured people but to see that they were human beings, with weaknesses, like ourselves.”

“Now for the second part of the question – have wartime events and experiences had any effect on my attitude. The answer is yes. The presence of many more American negroes in this country may make me take less interest them through accepting them as the normal and familiar, they seem a great deal more acceptable to the British public than the American whites.”

“When negro American troops first came over here there seemed to be growing up a nasty situation. To read the New Statesmen one would have thought that the presence of negro troops, & the white U.S. forces attitudes towards them, had the makings of a grade A situation; a potential flaw in allied unity. But my experience in East Anglia, Cornwall & the north tells me that friction of any kind has been very rare (or else I just haven’t heard about it). What is certain is that U.S. coloured troops have behaved so excellently over here that everybody has good words for them; they like the cheerful grins that come from behind the steering wheels of a convoy of U.S trucks; they like the well-behaved little swagger of negro troops off-duty. During the summer of 1942 there was that army order about keeping aloof from coloured troops to avoid the risk of rows with white U.S. troops. That, I’m glad to say was very unfavourably received by the troops – both non-combatants & royal engineers of the bomb-disposal company in which I was at the time. My girl in the Waafs down in Cornwall looks back with pleasure on the many lifts she’d had into town from the aerodrome by coloured US truck drivers. They would always stop for you, she says, often without being thumbed; would come round to the back of the truck to hoist the girls into the truck & would drop you obligingly at whatever point you wanted to reach. And they were always cheerful & friendly & good-mannered; never ‘fresh’ like some American soldiers (she said) were.”

“I usually get on well with American negroes, who have nicer manners than white Americans.”

“I don’t think wartime has had any effect on my attitude, expect to make me feel more disgusted than ever with America for her attitude to the negro population. It seems to me quite incomprehensible for a country calling itself democratic and progressive.”

“What I hear of USA soldiers & darkies mixing with white women made me furious. After all [negroes only in USA at all on [??] of this of our English fathers. Their place is in Africa.”

“I was really shocked (literally) the other day to read of some white girls frequenting a negro military camp. I don't know how they could. Of course I think negroes should have full entry to all hotels etc'.”

“Contact with U.S troops in this country has confirmed the fact their attitudes towards black people is revolting and quite undemocratic. It is every bit as justifiable as Jew baiting.”

“The N. American negroes are good natured fellows, & several have distinguished themselves well above the average white, but I am horrified at the idea of a British girl marrying a black man. The wars have not changed my opinion on this artefact.”

“War time experience of U.S. army negroes has been disheartening. Taking a cross-section, I can't deny I have found them culturally and mentally lower than, say, our Pioneer Corps chaps.”

“I do not like the coloured Americans over here & do not think they should have been sent to this country. They are a cause of a great deal of trouble at dance-halls etc. The way girls run after them is a disgrace & in my opinion this little hussies should be spanked.”

“White & dark American soldiers were both stationed near a town in which my unit was for some time. The darkies were more charming & less self-assertive. The colour-bar has been made against the wrong colour.”

“Wartime has only strengthened my feeling. I hate to think of coloured Americans over here not being treated properly.”

“One seldom comes in contact with the Negro African, and although one now sees many American coloured troops, one doesn't come to know them. I suppose I am inclined to think of them as a rather inferior class of American, and I suppose that in the mass they are, despite outstanding figures like Paul Robeson and others'... I do not think that the war has had any effect whatsoever on my outlook on this question, and I have never spoken to a coloured person since its outbreak.”

“More recently, knowledge of several American Negro troops has confirmed me in believing that they are in everyway as intelligent and cultured as their white colleagues.”

“I do not consider the colour of a persons skin as a matter of any importance at all, and I doubt whether there [are] any innately inferior races. However I was concious of a slight shrinking when a negro soldier came and sat by me in a restaurant before. I have not noticed this before.”

“But I have had little actual contact with coloured people. Perhaps I should act like those whom I now criticise. Certainly, it is repugnant to me when I see Leicester factory girls – ignorant & of low maturity through most of them may be – associating with coloured troops and it gives me rather a shock, or feeling of disgust, when I see a white woman with a coloured child of her own.”

“Wartimes experiences or contact with coloured people have been nil, except that I have seen American coloured troops in the district but never spoken to them.”

“I have no explicit feeling towards coloured races except perhaps a little against American Negroes. [] The slight feeling of revulsion with Negroes is due to American Negro troops.”

“Perhaps my angle on the negroes is partly as it is because of my experience of black troops in this area, though that has merely confirmed previous impressions: it has been found necessary to move these troops constantly, and often at short notice, to avoid outbreaks of violence, while even so the number of rapes and assaults of all kinds has been enormous. []. Lynching becomes explicable.”

“My little contact with the American Negroes made me more sympathetic to them. They liked being over here, because they were treated better here by us than by the white Americans in their own country.”

“We have very few coloured people in this district. There are one or two American negroes stationed here that I have seen in the streets & a few odd children – negro fathers and white mothers.”

“I haven’t actually met any coloured people. [] I am furious with the Americans for having such a bad attitude to the negroes.”

“The only alteration in my attitude caused by this war is the realisation that the American negro is surprisingly childish. I had been told this before but by coming into contact with the American Negro troops, I have no illusions left as to the negro being equal in mental powers to the white man.”

“I have never had anything to do with any negroes. The American negroes who drive the lorries over here look very good tempered.”

“I have never come into contact with any of the coloured American troops over here, but they seem well behaved and no worse than the average American soldier.”

“Emotionally, the negro American soldier frightens me, I dislike them, I suspect them to whip out a knife and slit my through & definitely do not like to see them with white girls. [] The fact remains I have a considerable emotional prejudice against black men with whole women. The dislike of negroes is due, I think, to a hangover from childhood & would disappear with greater familiarity.”


“There are American Negro troops in Belle Vue Manchester. They never seem to be around the city.”

“The only wartime event which has had any effect on my attitudes is the tales I hear of US white & black troops, & the reception they have in England. It’s a pity to antagonize the US whites by being more courteous to the blacks, but I suppose it’s natural to English people who believe the blacks are persecuted in the States.”

“African negroes I know nothing about & American only from books and recently from seeing their cheerful well conducted troops in the streets of Bristol. Their best can obviously be very good.”

“War time events have not had any effect on me, as I have not had anything to do with the black American troops I have had no personal connection with coloured people except two or three Indian students and these were friendly. It was a surprise to find that the first American troops I saw were coloured & not a welcome surprise.”

“Yes certainly wartime events have considerably changed my attitudes towards coloured people. There are many coloured soldiers around here. Their ’cause is our cause’.”



*Figure A1.* Geographic decay. Point estimates and 95% confidence intervals are displayed for eight regressions, varying the radius around a location at which bases are counted as contributing to potential contact, i.e. varying  $k$  in Equation 2.

### E. BNP: Geographic Decay

In this section, we investigate what level of proximity is required between a base at which black troops were posted and a contemporary location in order for the presence of troops to have had a persistent effect on attitudes. To do so, we assume that a military base affected a neighbourhood if the neighbourhood is within a given distance of the base,  $k$ . For various values of  $k$ , we generate a treatment variable which measures the presence of black units in a  $k$ -kilometre radius around the neighbourhood:

$$BlackUnitMonths_{i,k} = \sum_b \sum_m \mathbb{1}[d(i,b) \leq k] \cdot BlackUnits_{b,m}$$

where  $j$  indexes postcode districts,  $d(i,b)$  is the Euclidean distance in kilometres between the population-weighted centroid of neighbourhood  $i$  and base  $b$  and  $BlackUnits_{b,m}$  is the number of black support units posted at base  $b$  in month  $m$ . We create an analogous measure for the presence of support troops:

$$SupportUnitMonths_{i,k} = \sum_b \sum_m \mathbb{1}[d(i,b) \leq k] \cdot SupportUnits_{b,m}$$


We then use these new measures in regressions of the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{BNP members per 100,000 whites}_{i,k} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{BlackUnitMonths}_{i,k} \\
& + \beta_2 \text{SupportUnitMonths}_{i,k} + \mathbf{X}_i + u_i
\end{aligned}
\tag{2}$$

Note that the treatment measure now varies on the neighbourhood level, the level at which we observe our outcome measure. The results of these regressions, for distances between two and ten kilometres, are visualised in [Figure A1](#); all variables are again standardised, so that the coefficients can be interpreted as beta coefficients. The magnitude of the point estimate decreases with distance, and at a radius of five kilometres or above, the effect is no longer statistically significant from zero. As such, the effect of the black G.I.s appears to be highly localised. This is consistent with our assumption that the closer a location was to a base, the more likely it was that contact took place between the population there and any black G.I.s on the base.

## F. Description of Computerised Implicit Association Test

The race IAT consists of five steps. In each step subjects have to assign a 'stimulus' (a word or a picture of a face) to one of two groups by pressing keys on their keyboard. In step one, subjects sort pictures of black and white faces into the categories 'black' and 'white'. In step two, subjects sort words into two categories, 'positive' or 'negative'. The words are all easy to categorise (e.g. "terrible" and "hurt" vs. "joy" and "peace"). In step three, the tasks are combined – for example asking participants to assign black faces and positive words to one category, white faces and negative words to the other. In step four participants again assign faces to categories. Step five is akin to step three, in that participants have to sort both faces and words, but this time the groupings are reversed (the test randomizes whether black faces are shown in step three or step five). So the participant might now have to assign black faces and *negative* words to one category, white faces and positive words to the other. If individuals require more cognitive effort to pair a) black faces and positive words and b) white faces and negative words than a) black faces and negative words and b) white faces and positive words, their response times will vary between blocks three and five. This is measured by the "D" score, the average difference in response times between step three and step five, normalised by the standard deviation of response times in all steps. Higher scores indicate a stronger automatic association of positive words with white faces, with a score over zero indicating implicit racial bias toward whites (Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz, 1998).



Screenshot from Project Implicit IAT.

## G. Electoral outcomes

### G.1. General elections

As described in the main text, general election voting results are only available aggregated at the Westminster constituency level, and such may hide substantial variation in our treatment measure, which is defined at the postcode district level. In this appendix section, we nonetheless report general election results even though we put less trust in the obtained estimates.

We scraped election data from [politicsresources.net](http://web.archive.org/web/20180216152334/http://www.politicsresources.net/area/uk/edates.htm) (now defunct, still accessible through <http://web.archive.org/web/20180216152334/http://www.politicsresources.net/area/uk/edates.htm>) for all available general elections (including by-elections). This yields data from elections between 1922 and 2017 from 35 (by-)elections. We match each constituency electoral outcome to the constituency's historical boundary (we could not find boundaries between 1974 and 1980, for these years we match to the 1973 boundaries). Then, we count the number of black unit-months and support-unit months in each constituency. As in previous regressions, we standardise the outcome and treatment variables to facilitate the comparison across variables and specifications.

In [Table A1](#), we investigate the impact of exposure to black G.I.s on four different electoral outcomes, a) a change in voting for the Conservative party after WWII, b) a change in voting for the Conservative party after the 1964 election which was overshadowed by racially charged incidents, c) voting for the BNP, d) voting for UKIP. For a), we estimate a difference in differences specification of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Conservative vote share}_{(i,t)} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{BlackUnitMonths}_i \cdot \text{PostWW2}_t \\ & + \beta_2 \text{SupportUnitMonths}_i \cdot \text{PostWW2}_t \\ & + \beta_3 \text{BlackUnitMonths}_i + \beta_4 \text{SupportUnitMonths}_i \\ & + \gamma \cdot \text{YearFE}_t + \delta \cdot \text{ConstituencyFE}_i \\ & + \epsilon_{(i,t)} \end{aligned}$$

Where  $i$  denotes the constituency and  $t$  is an election year. Our coefficient of interest is  $\beta_1$ , capturing the interaction of exposure to black units and elections starting in 1945 (i.e. after WWII). We include fixed effects to account for both a) the time-invariant political leaning of a particular constituency, and b) the countrywide political trend in each election. Note that, for identification purposes, we include both, black unit-months (as well as support unit-months) and constituency fixed effects. The reason that black unit-months is not fully absorbed

Table A1: Effect on general election voting

|   | Conservative Vote Share (std.) |                     | UKIP Vote Share (std.) |                  |                   | BNP Vote Share (std.) |                   |                   |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|   | (1)                            | (2)                 | (3)                    | (4)              | (5)               | (6)                   | (7)               | (8)               |
| Black unit-months (std.)<br>× Post WWII | -0.048<br>(0.07)               |                     |                        |                  |                   |                       |                   |                   |
| Black unit-months (std.)<br>× Post 1964 |                                | -0.066***<br>(0.02) |                        |                  |                   |                       |                   |                   |
| Black unit-months (std.)                |                                |                     | -0.0090<br>(0.04)      | -0.016<br>(0.04) | -0.0096<br>(0.04) | -0.021<br>(0.02)      | -0.0081<br>(0.02) | -0.0043<br>(0.02) |
| Support unit-months<br>× Post 1964      |                                | ✓                   |                        |                  |                   |                       |                   |                   |
| Support unit-months<br>× Post WWII      | ✓                              |                     |                        |                  |                   |                       |                   |                   |
| Support unit-months                     | ✓                              | ✓                   | ✓                      | ✓                | ✓                 | ✓                     | ✓                 | ✓                 |
| Black unit-months                       | ✓                              | ✓                   |                        |                  |                   |                       |                   |                   |
| Year fixed-effects                      | ✓                              | ✓                   |                        |                  |                   |                       |                   |                   |
| Constituency fixed-effects              | ✓                              | ✓                   |                        |                  |                   |                       |                   |                   |
| Economic Controls                       |                                |                     |                        | ✓                | ✓                 |                       | ✓                 | ✓                 |
| Location Controls                       |                                |                     |                        |                  | ✓                 |                       |                   | ✓                 |
| Observations                            | 5851                           | 5851                | 1591                   | 1391             | 1391              | 2355                  | 2064              | 2064              |

Notes: Coefficients from OLS regressions where both the dependent variable and the main independent variables have been standardised to have mean zero and standard deviation one. The unit of observation and independent variables are at the constituency level. The independent variable is 'Black unit-months'. Control variables are as per Table 2 (but aggregated at the constituency level). Standard errors are clustered at the constituency level. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

by the fixed effect is because constituency boundaries change over time. Instead of aggregating (black and support) units at the postcode district level, we now aggregate at the constituency level such that any change in the constituency boundary over time (even if the constituency retains the same name) creates variation in the number of units posted for the following election.

The results are shown in column 1. A one standard deviation increase in black unit-months triggers a decrease of 0.048 of a standard deviation in voting for the Conservative Party from before to after WWII, although the effect is not statistically significant due to large standard errors. The point estimate, however, is of comparable magnitude (but slightly larger) as our BNP and IAT estimates.

Since voting for the Conservative Party may reflect a host of different issues, and therefore may not necessarily be indicative of voters solely expressing racist prejudice, we then focus on the 1964 general election, during which supporters of Conservative candidate Peter Griffiths in the constituency of Smethwick

allegedly used the slogan “If you want a nigger for a neighbour, vote labour!”. With candidate Griffiths not condemning the use of the slogan, the issue gained nationwide attention through the press and is at times credited as having helped the Conservative Party to gain votes from far-right voters.

For b) we estimate a difference in differences specification of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Conservative vote share}_{(i,t)} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{BlackUnitMonths}_i \cdot \text{Post1964}_t \\ & + \beta_2 \text{SupportUnitMonths}_i \cdot \text{Post1964}_t \\ & + \beta_3 \text{BlackUnitMonths}_i + \beta_4 \text{SupportUnitMonths}_i \\ & + \gamma \cdot \text{YearFE}_t + \delta \cdot \text{ConstituencyFE}_i \\ & + \epsilon_{(i,t)} \end{aligned}$$

Where  $i$  denotes the constituency and  $t$  is an election year. Our coefficient of interest is  $\beta_1$ , capturing the interaction of exposure to black units and elections starting in 1964 (while we call it Post 1964, the dummy includes the 1964 election). We include fixed effects to account for both a) the time-invariant political leaning of a particular constituency, and b) the countrywide political trend in each election. Note that, for identification purposes, we again include both, black unit-months (as well as support unit-months) and constituency fixed effects. This is possible because constituency boundaries change over time. Instead of aggregating (black and support) units at the postcode district level, we now aggregate at the constituency level such that any change in the constituency boundary over time (even if the constituency retains the same name) creates variation in the number of units posted for the following election.

Column 2 shows a highly significant decrease of 0.066 of a standard deviation in Conservative voting starting in 1964 following a one standard deviation increase in black unit-months during WWII. Next to being statistically significant, the effect is also larger in magnitude than the effect estimated in column 1. This makes sense, as voting conservatively should have only been influenced by the treatment if it was clearly linked to racism. Only starting in 1964 did racist incidents in the Conservative Party gain nationwide attention, making the party more attractive for those feeling negatively towards those of other ethnicities.

We then also investigate voting for the c) BNP and d) UKIP. The results are reported in columns 3-5 for UKIP and 6-8 for the BNP in the above table. Since we are not interested in within-constituency changes after a specific date (such as World War II or racist incidents), we cannot use the difference in differences specification we used for Conservative voting. Instead, we employ an empirical specification as close as possible to what we report in the main paper.

We compute geographic controls (i.e. distances) from each constituency's centroid (analogous to the main paper, where these distances are distances from the census output area's centroid). Economic controls (at the parish or local government district level) are also matched to the respective constituency. We do not employ grid-cell fixed effects as constituencies are rather large geographic entities. The control variables are otherwise the same variables we used in the main paper. Furthermore, in the UKIP regressions and the BNP regressions we restrict the sample to election years in which either party has fielded candidates, i.e. 1983-2017 for the BNP and 1997-2017 for UKIP.

Throughout all columns, we observe a negative coefficient for both BNP and UKIP voting, but never with high enough precision to be statistically significant. The effect for UKIP voting seems to be relatively stable across specifications, while the BNP point estimates decline upon the inclusion of additional control variables, although the substantial level of noise leaves them statistically indistinguishable. It is worth pointing out that the number of observations is rather low for both of these parties as they only participated in general elections recently.

While the estimates for the post 1964 elections turned out to be highly significant, most of the voting results do not. We believe that three factors are particularly likely to be responsible for the absence of a strong effect. First, for the rest of our analysis, the treatment is defined at the postcode district level, a much finer geographic resolution than the rather large Westminster constituencies. We would thus expect to observe larger standard errors but potentially also inflated or deflated coefficients. Second, voting for the Conservative party (or for UKIP) may certainly be driven by political issues other than racial animus. The Conservative party campaigns on a host of topics important to the electorate and UKIP is primarily focused on anti-European policies, which may be seen as different to primarily racist policies. Third, both UKIP and the BNP fielded candidates relatively recently, depriving us of the possibility to obtain the necessary statistical power to estimate precise effects.

## G.2. Local elections

We obtained local election data through *The Elections Centre* (<http://www.electionscentre.co.uk/>). They include results at the electoral ward level for each council within a given local authority. These are 36 metropolitan boroughs (1973-2012), 200 shire districts (1973-2012), 49 unitary councils (1995-2011), 37 Welsh shire districts (1973-1991), 22 Welsh unitary councils (1995-2012), as well as 32 London boroughs (1964-2010).

For each ward and year, the data includes the ward's name, the electoral district in which the ward is located, the absolute number of votes (and the vote share) for each candidate and their party affiliation. After transforming the data into

a format suitable for data analysis, we match the resulting 116,379 ward-year observations to geographies using the 1971, 1981, 1991, 2001 and 2011 ward boundaries. We are able to successfully match 109,671 observations to geographies ( $> 94\%$ ). Subsequently, we match these to postcode districts (to calculate our measure of exposure to black troops), 1921, 1931 parishes and 1931 local government districts (to calculate the previously used control variables), and the 2011 local authority district (unit of clustering standard errors). Vote shares for the BNP are then calculated only for years in which the party fields at least one candidate in any ward (starting in 1982, the year of the party's founding). We also calculate the Conservative vote share for each ward-year starting in 1973 as earlier years only include results from the boroughs of London.

## H. Extra Figures and Tables







Figure A2. Base sections in the U.K., figure taken from Ruppenthal (1978, p. 85).



*Figure A3.* This figure compares the education levels of black males aged 18-30 in the U.S. population as per the 1940 census, G.I.s coded as black in the U.S. Army Enlistment Records to the black G.I.s sampled in the War Department's "Attitudes Towards Army Life" survey (S-92), carried out in the U.K. in November 1943.



*Figure A4.* Figure depicts the state of births of enlisted African American G.I.s, according to U.S. Army Enlistment Records. Darker colours indicate more black G.I.s serving from a given state.




*Figure A5.* Proportion of soldiers knowing at least several English families, according to the amount of time spent in Britain. The sample is 3,261 individuals posted in Britain in April 1944. Source: "Attitudes Towards The British" (S-122).

**SECRET**


| LINE NO | A<br>ORGANIZATION NAME | B<br>APO | C<br>STATION  | D<br>MAP COORD | E<br>ECH | F<br>SIB |
|---------|------------------------|----------|---------------|----------------|----------|----------|
| J0      | 686FA AN 155HOW        | 349      | *NEW NN       | V07322         |          |          |
| S6      | 686 CJ COMPL U         | 063      | *FAIR QFD     | V25421         |          |          |
| S6      | 687 GH COMPL U         | 294      | EVER SIG4     | VJ6474         |          |          |
| S6      | ORD DESPT 0-691        | 413      | LONDON        | W07309         |          |          |
| S7      | 691 QY BN              | 152      | SUDBURY DERRY | VK6252         |          |          |
| S5      | 693 QY BN              | 152      | SUDBURY DERRY | VK6252         |          |          |
| S5      | 694 QY TRK CO          | 152      | AMPTFIELD H   | VJ8244         |          |          |
| S1      | 695 ORD A44 CO         | 226      | *MARLBOROUGH  | VJ6224         |          |          |
| V6      | 695 44F BAVD           | 252      | STOWE         | VK3254         |          |          |
| S6      | 697 QY SR CO F         | H71      | LYDNEY        | V20825         | 1        |          |
| V1      | 697 SHIP HOSP PL       | 754      | *WHEATLEY     | W05225         |          |          |
| S2      | 700 QY DEP CO S        | 203      | EAST HARLING  | W24405         | 1        |          |
| L6      | 700 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | TIBBENHAM     | W25904         | 1        |          |
| S6      | 701 MED SAV CO         | 504      | *CARDIFF      | V26369         | 1        |          |
| L6      | 701 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | TIBBENHAM     | W25904         | 1        |          |
| L6      | 701 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | TIBBENHAM     | W25904         | 1        |          |
| L6      | 702 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | TIBBENHAM     | W25904         | 1        |          |
| L6      | 703 MED SAV CO         | 409      | *SOUTHAMPTON  | VJ8632         | 1        |          |
| L6      | 703 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | TIBBENHAM     | W25904         | 1        |          |
| L6      | 704 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | HUNGAY        | W27904         | 2        |          |
| S6      | 705 MP BN              | 519      | *MILTON       | VJ5452         | 2        |          |
| S6      | 705 MED SAV CO         | 511      | *NETLEY       | VJ4622         | 2        |          |
| L6      | 705 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | HUNGAY        | W27904         | 2        |          |
| L6      | 706 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | HUNGAY        | W27904         | 2        |          |
| L6      | 707 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | HUNGAY        | W27904         | 2        |          |
| L6      | 708 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | RATTLES DEN   | W44377         | 2        |          |
| L7      | 708 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | RATTLES DEN   | W44377         | 2        |          |
| L7      | 709 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | RATTLES DEN   | W44377         | 2        |          |
| L7      | 710 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | RATTLES DEN   | W44377         | 2        |          |
| L7      | 711 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | RATTLES DEN   | W44377         | 2        |          |
| L6      | 712 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | SEETING       | W27816         | 3        |          |
| S6      | 713 ENG DEP CO         | 134      | HARR          | V25649         | 3        |          |
| L6      | 713 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | SEETING       | W27816         | 3        |          |
| L6      | 714 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | SEETING       | W27816         | 3        |          |
| L6      | 715 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | SEETING       | W27816         | 3        |          |
| J0      | 717 FANK BV            | 649      | CHUDLEIGH     | V23002         | 3        |          |
| J0      | 724FA AN 155HOW        | 417      | RANIKET       | W15944         | 3        |          |
| S6      | 724 MED SAV CO         | 314      | *SOUTHAMPTON  | VJ8632         | 3        |          |
| L7      | 725 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | DEOPHAM GREEN | W24714         | 3        |          |
| L7      | 725 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | DEOPHAM GREEN | W24714         | 3        |          |
| L7      | 729 ENG DEP CO         | 152      | SUDBURY DERRY | V26699         | 3        |          |
| S5      | 729 MED SAV CO         | 349      | *PORTHAWL     | V26699         | 3        |          |
| L7      | 729 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | DEOPHAM GREEN | W24714         | 4        |          |
| L7      | 730 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | DEOPHAM GREEN | W24714         | 4        |          |
| L7      | 731 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | DEOPHAM GREEN | W24714         | 4        |          |
| L7      | 732 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | DEOPHAM GREEN | W25211         | 4        |          |
| S7      | 733 ENG DEP CO         | 152      | SUDBURY DERRY | V26699         | 4        |          |
| L6      | 733 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | OLD RUCKENHAM | V26252         | 4        |          |
| L6      | 734 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | OLD RUCKENHAM | W25211         | 4        |          |
| S6      | 735 MP BN              | 413      | LONDON        | W07309         | 4        |          |
| L6      | 735 BOMB SQ H          | 554      | OLD RUCKENHAM | W25211         | 4        |          |
| L0      | 739 44F BAVD           | 234      | HIGH WYCOMBE  | W28413         | 4        |          |
| S6      | 740 MED SAV CO         | 409      | *NETLEY       | VJ4622         | 5        |          |
| L0      | 742FA AN HI HOW        | 552      | FIDDULPH      | VK3577         | 5        |          |
| L0      | 743FA AN HI HOW        | 552      | FIDDULPH      | VK3577         | 5        |          |
| L0      | 744FA AN HI HOW        | 515      | FATTENHALL    | VJ9589         | 5        |          |
| L0      | 745FA AN HI HOW        | 507      | WALLASEY      | VJ7815         | 5        |          |
| L0      | 746FA AN HI HOW        | 240      | BLACKSHAYNOOR | VK4480         | 5        |          |
| L9      | 746 RLY OPER BN        | 240      | BANBURY       | V29161         | 5        |          |
| L0      | 747FA AN HI HOW        | 240      | NIGHTWICK     | VK3214         | 5        |          |
| L0      | 748FA AN HI HOW        | 152      | NESPOOD       | VK6446         | 5        |          |
| L5      | 748 BOMB SQ H          | 557      | GLATTON       | W26105         | 5        |          |
| L5      | 749 BOMB SQ H          | 557      | GLATTON       | W26105         | 6        |          |
| S6      | 750 ENG H S CO         | 205      | THATCHAM      | VJ9687         | 6        |          |
| L5      | 750 BOMB SQ H          | 557      | GLATTON       | W26105         | 6        |          |
| S6      | 751 ENG P S            | 518      | ASHCHURCH     | V23854         | 6        |          |

DECLASSIFIED  
 Authority AWD 735017

Figure A6. Example station list. An asterisk (\*) indicates a segregated black unit. Photo taken in the National Archives in Washington D.C.



*Figure A7.* Troop locations across England and Wales. This map shows all locations where, according to our data, U.S. troops were stationed at any point in time during World War II.



*Figure A8.* Figure shows the estimated distribution of non-white migrants across parishes in England and Wales, 1911.





Figure A9. Distribution of *BlackUnitMonths<sub>j</sub>* (standard deviation  $\sigma = 27.3$ ) across postcode districts.



*Figure A10.* Distribution of *SupportUnitMonths*, (standard deviation  $\sigma$ ) across postcode districts.



Figure A11. Distribution of *BlackUnitMonth<sub>6</sub>* across postcode districts for points in time between June 1943 and November 1944.






Figure A12. Distribution of  $BlackUnitMonths_j$  across postcode districts for points in time between December 1944 and December 1945.



*Figure A13.* Absolute number of units posted over time, reported separately for black and non-black units.



*Figure A14.* Locations of BNP members and BNP branches.




Figure A15. New houses built by year in the U.K. Source: Holmans (2005)






Figure A16. Newspaper housing adverts. We search the British Newspaper Archive (<http://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/>) for adverts containing the keywords 'semi-detached house', 'detached house' or 'house to let' in each year, and normalise this by the number of adverts containing the keywords 'for sale' or 'to let'.



*Figure A17.* Leave-one-out plot. This figure plots the coefficients (black circles) and 95% confidence intervals from regressions of *BlackUnitMonths* on BNP members per 100,000 whites, at the neighbourhood level. In each regression, all neighbourhoods inside a given county (shown on the horizontal axis) are excluded from the sample. The estimated coefficient from the baseline specification is shown with a solid black line.



*Figure A18.* Randomization inference. This figure presents the distribution of coefficients resulting from estimating equation (1) under counter-factual treatments. For each base  $b$ , we calculate  $(BlackUnitMonths_b/SupportUnitMonths_b)$ , i.e the share of support unit-months due to black units. We then randomly shuffle this value between bases, and create a counterfactual  $BlackUnitMonths_b$  for each base by multiplying the shuffled value of  $(BlackUnitMonths_b/SupportUnitMonths_b)$  by the true value of  $SupportUnitMonths_b$ . We then estimate Equation 1, using the counterfactual values of  $BlackUnitMonths_b$  and the true values of  $SupportUnitMonths_b$  to generate the postcode district-level treatment variables, and estimate Equation 1. We repeat the procedure 8,000 times, generating a distribution of counterfactual estimates on  $BlackUnitMonths_b$ , which is plotted in the figure. The baseline estimate is depicted as a black vertical line, and is larger in magnitude than all but 0.1% of the counterfactual estimates.

*Table A2: Changes in opinions caused by American presence in the U.K.*

|                     | <i>Dependent variable:</i> |                   |                   |  |                   |                   |
|---------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|
|                     | Higher opinion of English  |                   |                   | English have higher opinion of Americans |                   |                   |
|                     | (1)                        | (2)               | (3)               | (4)                                      | (5)               | (6)               |
| Black               | 0.28***<br>(0.02)          | 0.28***<br>(0.03) | 0.29***<br>(0.04) | 0.21***<br>(0.02)                        | 0.19***<br>(0.03) | 0.17***<br>(0.04) |
| Unit controls       |                            | ✓                 | ✓                 |  | ✓                 | ✓                 |
| Individual controls |                            |                   | ✓                 |  |                   | ✓                 |
| Observations        | 2,560                      | 2,560             | 2,525             | 2,503                                    | 2,503             | 2,471             |

*Notes:* Columns report results from OLS regressions. The sample is soldiers surveyed in the War Department “Attitudes Toward Army Army Life” survey (S-92), carried out in the U.K. in November 1943. The dependent variable in Columns 1 to 3 is a binary variable indicating if a survey respondent’s opinion of the English has become more favourable since being stationed in the United Kingdom. The dependent variable in Columns 4 to 6 is a binary variable indicating if a survey respondent thinks that the English people’s opinion of Americans has become higher as a result of having American soldiers in England. Individual controls are rank, education level, age and state of birth. Unit controls are indicator variables for the branch of the army to which the unit belongs and the station at which the unit is posted. Robust standard errors are reported in brackets. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

*Table A3: U.S. Army Station Lists used to construct dataset*

| Date     | Title   | Source                 |
|----------|---|------------------------|
| 21/06/43 | MRU United Kingdom Station List                 | Captain Philip Grinton |
| 14/08/43 | MRU United Kingdom Station List                 | Captain Philip Grinton |
| 30/09/43 | MRU United Kingdom Station List                 | Captain Philip Grinton |
| 14/11/43 | MRU United Kingdom Station List                 | Captain Philip Grinton |
| 31/12/43 | MRU United Kingdom Station List                 | Captain Philip Grinton |
| 21/01/44 | MRU United Kingdom Station List                 | Own digitalisation     |
| 21/02/44 | MRU United Kingdom Station List                 | Captain Philip Grinton |
| 31/03/44 | MRU United Kingdom Station List                 | Captain Philip Grinton |
| 30/04/44 | MRU United Kingdom Station List                 | Captain Philip Grinton |
| 31/05/44 | MRU United Kingdom Station List                 | Captain Philip Grinton |
| 30/06/44 | MRU United Kingdom Station List                 | Captain Philip Grinton |
| 14/07/44 | MRU United Kingdom Station List                 | Own digitalisation     |
| 31/08/44 | MRU United Kingdom Station List                 | Captain Philip Grinton |
| 31/10/44 | MRU United Kingdom Station List                 | Captain Philip Grinton |
| 25/11/44 | MRU United Kingdom and Continental Station List | Captain Philip Grinton |
| 16/12/44 | MRU United Kingdom and Continental Station List | Captain Philip Grinton |
| 01/01/45 | MRU United Kingdom and Continental Station List | Own digitalisation     |
| 02/02/45 | MRU United Kingdom and Continental Station List | Own digitalisation     |
| 17/04/45 | MRU United Kingdom and Continental Station List | Own digitalisation     |
| 02/05/45 | MRU United Kingdom and Continental Station List | Own digitalisation     |
| 04/06/45 | MRU United Kingdom and Continental Station List | Own digitalisation     |
| 05/07/45 | MRU United Kingdom and Continental Station List | Own digitalisation     |
| 02/08/45 | MRU United Kingdom and Continental Station List | Own digitalisation     |
| 04/09/45 | MRU United Kingdom and Continental Station List | Own digitalisation     |
| 30/09/45 | MRU United Kingdom and Continental Station List | Own digitalisation     |
| 08/11/45 | MRU United Kingdom and Continental Station List | Own digitalisation     |
| 11/12/45 | MRU United Kingdom and Continental Station List | Own digitalisation     |
| 29/12/45 | MRU United Kingdom and Continental Station List | Captain Philip Grinton |

Table A4: Summary statistics

|                                | All neighbourhoods |       |     |        | Neighbourhoods with support units |       |     |        | Neighbourhoods with black units |       |     |        |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-------|-----|--------|-----------------------------------|-------|-----|--------|---------------------------------|-------|-----|--------|
|                                | Mean               | S.D.  | Min | Max    | Mean                              | S.D.  | Min | Max    | Mean                            | S.D.  | Min | Max    |
| Neighbourhoods                 | 181,380            |       |     |        | 48,732                            |       |     |        | 27,621                          |       |     |        |
| Local authority districts      | 348                |       |     |        | 234                               |       |     |        | 166                             |       |     |        |
| Black unit-months              | 9.9                | 27.9  | 0   | 292    | 12.5                              | 30.8  | 0   | 292.0  | 22.1                            | 38.3  | 1   | 292    |
| Support unit-months            | 51.9               | 109.3 | 0   | 1584   | 65.4                              | 119.0 | 1   | 1584.0 | 94.6                            | 146.1 | 1   | 1584   |
| Months with black units        | 2.7                | 4.6   | 0   | 27     | 3.4                               | 5.0   | 0   | 27     | 5.9                             | 5.4   | 1   | 27     |
| Months with support units      | 8.0                | 8.2   | 0   | 28     | 10.1                              | 7.9   | 1   | 28     | 12.3                            | 7.9   | 1   | 28     |
| BNP members per 100,000 whites | 7.6                | 66.1  | 0   | 3409.1 | 20.9                              | 107.4 | 0   | 3409.1 | 18.9                            | 101.7 | 0   | 3409.1 |

Notes: Table shows summary statistics for neighbourhoods (output areas) in the United Kingdom.

Table A5: Support units

| Unit Role                   | Black units  | Other units   | Black share |
|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|
| Quartermaster Truck         | 296          | 401           | 42%         |
| General Service             | 242          | 454           | 35%         |
| Quartermaster Service       | 218          | 148           | 60%         |
| Port Company                | 175          | 160           | 52%         |
| Engineer Battalion Company  | 142          | 759           | 16%         |
| Quartermaster Headquarters  | 118          | 160           | 42%         |
| Quartermaster Other         | 110          | 810           | 12%         |
| Detachment of Patients      | 27           | 286           | 9%          |
| Quartermaster Medical       | 62           | 64            | 49%         |
| Ordnance Ammunition Company | 44           | 96            | 31%         |
| Sterilization               | 42           | 50            | 46%         |
| Signal Construction         | 45           | 79            | 36%         |
| Quartermaster Bakery        | 38           | 77            | 33%         |
| Laundry                     | 32           | 69            | 32%         |
| Gas Supply                  | 37           | 35            | 51%         |
| Ordnance Base Depot         | 11           | 302           | 4%          |
| Troop Transport             | 24           | 0             | 100%        |
| Fire Fighting               | 19           | 171           | 10%         |
| Quartermaster Railhead      | 19           | 39            | 33%         |
| Engineer Dump Truck Company | 17           | 7             | 71%         |
| Port Headquarters           | 15           | 65            | 19%         |
| Quartermaster Salvage       | 12           | 49            | 20%         |
| Amphibious Truck Company    | 11           | 9             | 55%         |
| Army Postal                 | 8            | 333           | 2%          |
| Ambulance Company           | 9            | 48            | 16%         |
| Chemical Smoke              | 7            | 6             | 54%         |
| Other                       | 219          | 17,807        | 1%          |
| <b>Total</b>                | <b>1,999</b> | <b>22,484</b> | <b>8.8%</b> |

Table A6: Determinants of frequency of location changes

|              | <i>Dependent Variable:</i>   |                    |                    |
|--------------|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|              | Number of locations per unit |                    |                    |
|              | (1)                          | (2)                | (3)                |
|              | OLS                          | OLS                | Poisson            |
| Black unit   | 0.124***<br>(0.0258)         | 0.0270<br>(0.0293) | 0.0169<br>(0.0182) |
| Support unit |                              | ✓                  | ✓                  |
| Observations | 23,569                       | 23,569             | 23,569             |

*Notes:* Coefficients from OLS regressions in columns (1) and (2) and from a Poisson regression in column (3). The unit of observation is a military unit. Outcome is the number of locations at which this unit was stationed according to our troop location dataset. Independent variables are an indicator for whether the unit is black and an indicator for whether the unit is a support unit. Robust standard errors are reported in brackets. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

Table A7: Effect on BNP membership, alternative treatment measures

|                                 | BNP members per 100,000 whites (std.) |                        |                        |                        |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|                                 | (1)                                   | (2)                    | (3)                    | (4)                    |
|                                 | Baseline                              | + Grid FEs             | + Economic Controls    | + Location Controls    |
| <i>Panel A:</i>                 |                                       |                        |                        |                        |
| Black-units ever stationed      | -0.0576***<br>(0.0211)                | -0.0310<br>(0.0204)    | -0.0286<br>(0.0207)    | -0.0313<br>(0.0207)    |
| <i>Panel B: months</i>          |                                       |                        |                        |                        |
| Months w/ black units<br>(std.) | -0.0272***<br>(0.00879)               | -0.0187**<br>(0.00881) | -0.0180**<br>(0.00859) | -0.0191**<br>(0.00898) |
| <i>Panel C: horserace</i>       |                                       |                        |                        |                        |
| Black units ever stationed      | -0.0462*<br>(0.0252)                  | -0.0258<br>(0.0235)    | -0.0234<br>(0.0244)    | -0.0258<br>(0.0240)    |
| Months w/ black units<br>(std.) | -0.00552<br>(0.0135)                  | 0.00478<br>(0.0114)    | 0.00455<br>(0.0117)    | 0.00436<br>(0.0118)    |
| Black unit-months (std.)        | -0.0123<br>(0.0105)                   | -0.0233**<br>(0.00927) | -0.0231**<br>(0.00966) | -0.0235**<br>(0.0101)  |
| Grid-cell fixed effects         |                                       | ✓                      | ✓                      | ✓                      |
| Economic controls               |                                       |                        | ✓                      | ✓                      |
| Location controls               |                                       |                        |                        | ✓                      |
| Clusters                        | 234                                   | 234                    | 234                    | 234                    |
| Observations                    | 48,732                                | 48,732                 | 48,665                 | 48,665                 |

*Notes:* Each column within each panel reports coefficients and standard errors from an OLS regression. The unit of observation is the neighbourhood (2011 census output area). The outcome variable is BNP members per 100,000 white inhabitants in the neighbourhood. The dependent variables vary by panel. In Panel A, the independent variable is a dummy for whether black units were ever stationed in the neighbourhood's postcode district. In Panel B, the independent variable is the number of months for which black units were posted (standardized to have mean zero and standard deviation one). Regressions shown in Panel C includes both of these variables, as well as our regular measure of presence of black troops, 'black unit-months'. Control variables are as per Table 2. Standard errors are clustered at the local authority district level. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

Table A8: Effect on BNP membership, alternative control variable

|                          | BNP members per 100,000 whites (std.) |                      |                      |                      |                      |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|                          | (1)                                   | (2)                  | (3)                  | (4)                  | (5)                  |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.026***<br>(0.005)                  | -0.023***<br>(0.005) | -0.022***<br>(0.005) | -0.023***<br>(0.006) | -0.035***<br>(0.010) |
| White unit-months        | ✓                                     | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                    |
| Grid-cell fixed effects  |                                       | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                    |
| Economic controls        |                                       |                      | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                    |
| Geographic controls      |                                       |                      |                      | ✓                    | ✓                    |
| Socio-political controls |                                       |                      |                      |                      | ✓                    |
| Clusters                 | 234                                   | 234                  | 234                  | 234                  | 172                  |
| Observations             | 48,732                                | 48,732               | 48,665               | 48,665               | 26,498               |

*Notes:* Each column reports coefficients and standard errors from an OLS regression. The unit of observation is the neighbourhood (2011 census output area). The outcome variable is BNP members per 100,000 white inhabitants in the neighbourhood. Black unit-months, the reported independent variable, is our measure for the presence of black troops in the neighbourhood's postcode district. Control variables are as per Table 2. Standard errors are clustered at the local authority district level. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

Table A9: Effect on BNP membership, controlling for unit-months

|                          | BNP members per 100,000 whites (std.) |                      |                      |                      |                     |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|                          | (1)                                   | (2)                  | (3)                  | (4)                  | (5)                 |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.027***<br>(0.006)                  | -0.024***<br>(0.006) | -0.024***<br>(0.006) | -0.023***<br>(0.006) | -0.038***<br>(0.01) |
| Unit-months              | ✓                                     | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                   |
| Grid-cell fixed effects  |                                       | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                   |
| Economic controls        |                                       |                      | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                   |
| Geographic controls      |                                       |                      |                      | ✓                    | ✓                   |
| Socio-political controls |                                       |                      |                      |                      | ✓                   |
| Clusters                 | 280                                   | 280                  | 280                  | 280                  | 216                 |
| Observations             | 61,370                                | 61,370               | 61,218               | 61,218               | 33,285              |

Notes: Table is as per Table 2, but the main independent variable is unit-months (instead of support unit-months), a measure of the presence of troops (combat and support) in the neighbourhood's postcode district. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

*Table A10: Effect on BNP membership, treatment at the local government district level*

|                          | <i>Dependent variable:</i>            |                      |                     |                     |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|                          | BNP members per 100,000 whites (std.) |                      |                     |                     |
|                          | (1)                                   | (2)                  | (3)                 | (4)                 |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.016*<br>(0.009)                    | -0.024***<br>(0.009) | -0.019**<br>(0.007) | -0.016**<br>(0.008) |
| Support unit-months      | ✓                                     | ✓                    | ✓                   | ✓                   |
| Grid-cell fixed effects  |                                       | ✓                    | ✓                   | ✓                   |
| Economic controls        |                                       |                      | ✓                   | ✓                   |
| Geographic controls      |                                       |                      |                     | ✓                   |
| Clusters                 | 255                                   | 255                  | 254                 | 254                 |
| Observations             | 79,712                                | 79,712               | 79,496              | 79,496              |

*Notes:* Table is as per [Table 2](#), but the treatment varies at the local government district level instead. The dependent variable is still defined at the output area level. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

*Table A11: Attitudes towards migration and membership of the BNP, constituency level*

|   | <i>Dependent variable:</i>     |                   |                    |                    |                    |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|   | BNP members per 100,000 whites |                   |                    |                    |                    |
|   | (1)                            | (2)               | (3)                | (4)                | (5)                |
| Negative attitude to immigration (std.) | 4.99***<br>(0.46)              | 5.14***<br>(0.47) | 8.41***<br>(0.74)  | 7.68***<br>(0.60)  | 7.90***<br>(0.85)  |
| Unemployment rate (in %)                |                                | 1.41***<br>(0.25) |                    |                    | 0.35<br>(0.33)     |
| Population density                      |                                |                   | 0.18***<br>(0.027) |                    | 0.039<br>(0.035)   |
| Non-white population share (in %)       |                                |                   |                    | 0.33***<br>(0.050) | 0.27***<br>(0.065) |
| Observations                            | 573                            | 573               | 573                | 573                | 573                |
| R <sup>2</sup>                          | 0.11                           | 0.16              | 0.16               | 0.20               | 0.20               |

*Notes:* Columns report results from OLS regressions at the constituency level. ‘Negative attitude to immigration’ is the estimate of average constituency attitudes to migration from Hanretty and Vivyan (n.d.). The mean of the dependent variable, BNP members per 100,000 whites, is 25. The estimate is based on answers to the question ‘Do you think that immigration undermines or enriches Britain’s cultural life’ in the 2015 British Election Study data, which was answered on a seven point Likert scale. The variable is standardised to have mean 0 and standard deviation one. Population density is measured in persons per hectares. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

Table A12: Effect on BNP membership, regression at the postcode district level

|                          | <i>Dependent variable:</i>            |                    |                    |                   |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|                          | BNP members per 100,000 whites (std.) |                    |                    |                   |
|                          | (1)                                   | (2)                | (3)                | (4)               |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.37***<br>(0.10)                    | -0.38***<br>(0.10) | -0.38***<br>(0.10) | -0.35***<br>(0.1) |
| Support unit-months      | ✓                                     | ✓                  | ✓                  | ✓                 |
| Grid Fixed Effects       |                                       | ✓                  | ✓                  | ✓                 |
| 1931 population density  |                                       |                    | ✓                  | ✓                 |
| Location controls        |                                       |                    |                    | ✓                 |
| Conley Standard Error    | 0.10                                  | 0.096              | 0.096              | 0.10              |
| Clusters                 | 88                                    | 88                 | 88                 | 88                |
| Observations             | 603                                   | 603                | 603                | 603               |

Notes: Table is as per Table 2, but neighbourhoods have been aggregated to their postcode-districts and the estimation is carried out at the postcode-district level.

Table A13: Effect on BNP membership, weighted regressions

|                          | <i>Dependent variable:</i>            |                      |                      |                      |                    |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
|                          | BNP members per 100,000 whites (std.) |                      |                      |                      |                    |
|                          | (1)                                   | (2)                  | (3)                  | (4)                  | (5)                |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.021***<br>(0.008)                  | -0.023***<br>(0.008) | -0.022***<br>(0.008) | -0.023***<br>(0.008) | -0.029**<br>(0.01) |
| Support unit-months      | ✓                                     | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                  |
| Grid-cell fixed effects  |                                       | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                  |
| Economic controls        |                                       |                      | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                  |
| Location controls        |                                       |                      |                      | ✓                    | ✓                  |
| Political controls       |                                       |                      |                      |                      | ✓                  |
| Clusters                 | 234                                   | 234                  | 234                  | 234                  | 172                |
| Observations             | 48,732                                | 48,732               | 48,665               | 48,665               | 26,498             |

Notes: Table is as per Table 2, but with observations (neighbourhoods) weighted by the size of their white population.

*Table A14: Effect on BNP membership, alternative fixed-effect units*

|                          | BNP members per 100,000 whites (std.) |                            |                              |                      |                         |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
|                          | (1)<br>Baseline                       | (2)<br>Small<br>grid cells | (3)<br>Smaller<br>grid cells | (4)<br>LADs          | (5)<br>Base<br>Sections |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.023***<br>(0.009)                  | -0.026***<br>(0.008)       | -0.024***<br>(0.009)         | -0.028***<br>(0.009) | -0.017**<br>(0.008)     |
| Support unit-months      | ✓                                     | ✓                          | ✓                            | ✓                    | ✓                       |
| Economic controls        | ✓                                     | ✓                          | ✓                            | ✓                    | ✓                       |
| Geographic controls      | ✓                                     | ✓                          | ✓                            | ✓                    | ✓                       |
| Number of fixed effects  | 50                                    | 78                         | 149                          | 234                  | 4                       |
| Clusters                 | 234                                   | 234                        | 234                          | 234                  | 234                     |
| Observations             | 48,665                                | 48,665                     | 48,665                       | 48,665               | 48,665                  |

*Notes:* Table is as per [Table 2](#), but columns vary according to the size of the areas used to define geographic fixed effects. Column (1) includes 75km by 75km cells as per the baseline specification. In Column (2) we use fixed effects for cells half this size, and in Column (3) cells one third this size. In Column (4) we instead use Local Authority District fixed-effects, and in Column (5) we use base station fixed-effects (Central, Eastern, Southern, Western).

Table A15: Effect on BNP membership, alternative cluster levels

|                          | BNP members per 100,000 whites (std.) |                      |                      |                     |                      |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
|                          | (1)                                   | (2)                  | (3)                  | (4)                 | (5)                  |
|                          | LAD                                   | MSOA                 | LSOA                 | Base<br>Section     | Constit-<br>uency    |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.023***<br>(0.009)                  | -0.023***<br>(0.007) | -0.023***<br>(0.007) | -0.023**<br>(0.007) | -0.023***<br>(0.009) |
| Support unit-months      | ✓                                     | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                   | ✓                    |
| Grid-cell fixed effects  | ✓                                     | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                   | ✓                    |
| Economic controls        | ✓                                     | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                   | ✓                    |
| Geographic controls      | ✓                                     | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                   | ✓                    |
| Clusters                 | 234                                   | 2438                 | 9813                 | 4                   | 346                  |
| Observations             | 48,665                                | 48,665               | 48,665               | 48,665              | 48,665               |

*Notes:* Table is as per Table 2, but columns vary according to the clustering level. The regression reported in Column (1) is clustered on the Local Authority District, as per the baseline specification. The regression in Column (2) is clustered on the 'medium-sized output area' and Column (3) on the 'large-sized output area', both collections of neighbourhoods defined by the 2001 Census. In Column (4) we cluster according to the base station (Central, Eastern, Southern, Western) and in Column (5) according to the political constituency.

Table A16: Effect on BNP membership, unit sizes

|                             | BNP members per 100,000 whites (std.) |                      |                      |                      |                    |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
|                             | (1)                                   | (2)                  | (3)                  | (4)                  | (5)                |
| Black soldier-months (std.) | -0.023***<br>(0.009)                  | -0.025***<br>(0.008) | -0.025***<br>(0.008) | -0.026***<br>(0.009) | -0.029**<br>(0.01) |
| Support unit strength       | ✓                                     | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                  |
| Grid-cell fixed effects     |                                       | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                  |
| Economic controls           |                                       |                      | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                  |
| Geographic controls         |                                       |                      |                      | ✓                    | ✓                  |
| Socio-political controls    |                                       |                      |                      |                      | ✓                  |
| Clusters                    | 234                                   | 234                  | 234                  | 234                  | 172                |
| Observations                | 48,732                                | 48,732               | 48,665               | 48,665               | 26,498             |

Notes: Table is as per Table 2, but the main independent variable is ‘Black soldier-months’. This variable is constructed in a similar manner to ‘Black unit-months’ in the main specification, but attempting to take into account variation in size between units. Support unit-months is similarly exchanged for a variable ‘support unit strength’. Little evidence on the sizes of individual units remains, but we use archival sources in combination with the unit names to estimate these. Our main source is the troop assignment plan for Operation Bolero, which contains sizes for some units types in 1942, and <http://secondworldwar.co.uk/index.php/army-sizes-a-ranks/86-army-units-a-sizes>.

Table A17: Effect on voting BNP in local elections

|                          | All               |                  |                  | Rural               |                    |                    |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|                          | (1)               | (2)              | (3)              | (4)                 | (5)                | (6)                |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.0079<br>(0.03) | -0.012<br>(0.02) | -0.016<br>(0.02) | -0.036***<br>(0.01) | -0.036**<br>(0.01) | -0.036**<br>(0.01) |
| Support unit-months      | ✓                 | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                   | ✓                  | ✓                  |
| Year fixed effects       | ✓                 | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                   | ✓                  | ✓                  |
| Grid-cell fixed effects  | ✓                 | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                   | ✓                  | ✓                  |
| Economic controls        |                   | ✓                | ✓                |                     | ✓                  | ✓                  |
| Geographic controls      |                   |                  | ✓                |                     |                    | ✓                  |
| Clusters                 | 216               | 216              | 216              | 166                 | 165                | 165                |
| Observations             | 6,562             | 6,540            | 6,540            | 2,815               | 2,812              | 2,812              |

Notes: Each column reports coefficients and standard errors (in brackets). The unit of observation is the electoral ward. The dependent variable is the standardized vote share for the BNP. All independent variables and clustering as per Table 2. All regressions feature year fixed effects. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

Table A18: Effect on voting Conservative in local elections

|                          | All                 |                     |                     | Rural             |                    |                    |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|                          | (1)                 | (2)                 | (3)                 | (4)               | (5)                | (6)                |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.046***<br>(0.02) | -0.056***<br>(0.02) | -0.059***<br>(0.02) | -0.047*<br>(0.02) | -0.047**<br>(0.02) | -0.049**<br>(0.02) |
| Support unit-months      | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                  | ✓                  |
| Year fixed effects       | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                  | ✓                  |
| Grid-cell fixed effects  | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                   | ✓                 | ✓                  | ✓                  |
| Economic controls        |                     | ✓                   | ✓                   |                   | ✓                  | ✓                  |
| Geographic controls      |                     |                     | ✓                   |                   |                    | ✓                  |
| Clusters                 | 220                 | 220                 | 220                 | 171               | 170                | 170                |
| Observations             | 32,138              | 32,042              | 32,042              | 15,586            | 15,569             | 15,569             |

Notes: Each column reports coefficients and standard errors (in brackets). The unit of observation is the electoral ward. The dependent variable is the standardized vote share for the Conservative Party. All independent variables and clustering as per Table 2. All regressions feature year fixed effects. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

Table A19: BNP voting in local elections, specifications

|                          | Baseline            |                    | Not std             |                    | IHS                  |                     |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|                          | (1)                 | (2)                | (3)                 | (4)                | (5)                  | (6)                 |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.036***<br>(0.01) | -0.036**<br>(0.01) | -0.065***<br>(0.02) | -0.065**<br>(0.03) | -0.015***<br>(0.006) | -0.014**<br>(0.006) |
| Support unit-months      | ✓                   | ✓                  | ✓                   | ✓                  | ✓                    | ✓                   |
| Year fixed effects       | ✓                   | ✓                  | ✓                   | ✓                  | ✓                    | ✓                   |
| Grid-cell fixed effects  | ✓                   | ✓                  | ✓                   | ✓                  | ✓                    | ✓                   |
| Economic controls        |                     | ✓                  |                     | ✓                  |                      | ✓                   |
| Geographic controls      |                     | ✓                  |                     | ✓                  |                      | ✓                   |
| Clusters                 | 166                 | 165                | 166                 | 165                | 166                  | 165                 |
| Observations             | 2,815               | 2,812              | 2,815               | 2,812              | 2,815                | 2,812               |

Notes: Each column reports coefficients and standard errors (in brackets). The unit of observation is the electoral ward, restricted to wards in rural output areas. The dependent variable is the standardized, the non standardized, or the IHS transformation of the vote share for the BNP. All independent variables and clustering as per Table 2. All regressions feature year fixed effects. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

Table A20: Effect on implicit anti-black bias and warmth of feelings towards blacks, including urban areas

|                          | Implicit Attitudes              |                      |                      | Thermology                              |                    |                    |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------|
|                          | Degree of Bias Favouring Whites |                      |                      | Warmth of Feelings Towards Black People |                    |                    |
|                          | (1)                             | (2)                  | (3)                  | (4)                                     | (5)                | (6)                |
| Black unit-months (std.) | -0.0319**<br>(0.0146)           | -0.0277*<br>(0.0162) | -0.0311*<br>(0.0164) | 0.0129<br>(0.0142)                      | 0.0125<br>(0.0151) | 0.0116<br>(0.0156) |
| Support unit-months      | ✓                               | ✓                    | ✓                    | ✓                                       | ✓                  | ✓                  |
| Demographic Controls     |                                 | ✓                    | ✓                    |   | ✓                  | ✓                  |
| Grid fixed effects       |                                 | ✓                    | ✓                    |   | ✓                  | ✓                  |
| Economic controls        |                                 |                      | ✓                    |   |                    | ✓                  |
| Location controls        |                                 |                      | ✓                    |   |                    | ✓                  |
| Clusters                 | 220                             | 220                  | 220                  | 220                                     | 220                | 220                |
| Observations             | 5,455                           | 5,417                | 5,407                | 5,316                                   | 5,282              | 5,272              |

Notes: Each column reports coefficients and standard errors (in brackets). The unit of observation is the individual. The dependent variable is the standardized measure of implicit anti-black attitudes from the IAT (columns 1-3) and the reported thermology score, indicating how warmly individuals feel on a scale from 0 to 10 towards black people (columns 4-6). In the latter, all regressions control for thermology scores towards white people. Demographic controls are age, age squared and gender. Economic controls are: population density (in the 1931 parish), the share of employment due to the agricultural sector, the professional sector, the staple sector, the light sector, and other sectors (in the 1931 local government district), and a dummy variable for urban status (1931 local government district). Geographic controls are distances to the coast, to the nearest large city, to the nearest city, and to the nearest urban district. All other independent variables and clustering as per Table 2. One, two and three stars indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.