

Online Appendix

A GLIMPSE OF FREEDOM: ALLIED OCCUPATION AND POLITICAL RESISTANCE IN EAST GERMANY

Authors: Luis R. Martinez (r), Jonas Jessen and Guo Xu

Table of Contents

Appendix A Data Appendix	Appendix p.2
Appendix B Additional Figures and Tables	Appendix p.6
Appendix C Retrospective Survey	Appendix p.25

A Data Appendix

Establishing the line of contact

To identify the line that separates the area occupied by the Western Allies within East Germany at the end of WWII from that occupied by the Red Army, the line of contact, we consulted several sources. We studied the following accounts of the final days of the war: Ambrose (2000); Beevor (2002); Jones (2015); MacDonald (1993); Toland (2003). Particularly helpful was MacDonald (1993), as it not only contains a detailed account of the military moves of the allies, but it also includes a series of maps that document specific operations and an appendix with what appear to be official maps tracking the frontline at various locations and points in time. We extracted information from the daily communiqués by the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force (SHAEF), which provide daily updates on allied operations in the western front.⁴⁵ In some cases, we additionally conducted web searches of specific military units that seemed to have been present in areas where the other sources proved unsatisfactory.⁴⁶ Finally, we also used the following Atlases of the second world war: U.S. Army (1945); Natkiel (1985); Pimlott (1995); Badsey (2000); Gilbert (2008).

For the most part, all sources agree on the location of the line of contact. From north to south, it starts at Wismar on the Baltic and goes down Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (through Schwerin and Ludwiglust) up to Domitz on the Elbe. It then follows the Elbe from Domitz up to Dessau-Roßlau at the intersection with the Mulde and follows the Mulde up to Lunzenau. The last segment (stretching from Lunzenau to a point on the Czech border) was the most challenging to pin down, as it is either not shown in some maps (e.g. Pimlott, 1995; Badsey, 2000) or includes too few reference points, such as cities (e.g. U.S. Army, 1945; Natkiel, 1985). Our reconstruction of this segment is mainly based on the location of the easternmost cities in which the SHAEF communiqués confirmed allied presence. Additionally, we conducted desk research by consulting accounts of contemporary witnesses and other sources such as city websites indicating the identity of the occupying force to pin down the easternmost Allied occupied cities in this segment. From Lunzenau to the Czech border, those are Limbach-Oberfrohna, Lichtenstein, Wilkau-Haßlau, Lichteinstein, Auerbach (Vogtland) and Klingenthal. Having established the location of the line of contact, we assigned the identity of the initial occupying force at the municipality-level. Our main outcomes are all based on this fine-grained assignment of the "treatment". Migration patterns in the 1946 census

⁴⁵Consulted in March, 2020 at <https://lib.byu.edu/collections/eisenhower-communicues>

⁴⁶For example, the document "The Mass Surrender of German Troops to the 347th Infantry Regiment on May 6, 1945," consulted in March 2020 at <http://87thinfantrydivision.com/tom-stafford/the-mass-surrender-of-german-troops-to-the-347th-infantry-regiment-on-may-6-1945> was very useful in establishing allied presence in the state of Saxony.

(Appendix Table A4 and Appendix Table A5) are only availability at the county-level. As the line of contact played no role in administrative boundaries defined afterwards, a few counties are crossed by the line (predominantly in Saxony, where larger parts of the line are not defined by rivers). We assign these counties to be either Allied or Soviet occupied according to the predominant area or population share assigned to either side. We check the robustness of the results to the exclusion of these “divided” counties.

Data Sources

Predetermined characteristics - county level and larger municipalities: Unit of observation: Counties and municipalities with population above 2,000 (1925, 1933). Number of observations: 226-519 within 50km of line of contact. Differences stem from the different levels of aggregation across variables (see Hänisch, 1989). For example, some indicators were only aggregated by the statistical office for municipalities with a population above 10,000. Description: Official statistics from the German Reich based on population censuses in 1925 and 1933, and elections in 1933. Source: Falter and Hänisch (1990). Access conditions: Free, but GESIS login required. Outputs: Table 1 (panel A).

Predetermined characteristics - municipality level: Unit of observation: Municipalities (1946). Number of observations: 5,649 within 50km of line of contact. Description: WWII measures and time-invariant geographic characteristics. Sources: Jewish Virtual Library on Nazi concentration camps ⁴⁷, Synagogue Memorial “Beit Ashkenaz” on synagogues destroyed in 1938 Pogroms ⁴⁸, Department of Defense (2016) on WWII bombing (THOR dataset), Schulz and Briskey (2005) on closest mineral reserve. Own calculations for other variables. Access conditions: Free, but data.world login required for THOR dataset. Outputs: Table 1 (panel B), Online Appendix Figure A2.

Occupation date and length of exposure to Allied forces (1945): Unit of observation: Largest city per county in 1946. Number of observations: 178. Description: Date of occupation at the end of WWII. Change of occupation force on July 3, 1945. Source: Own data collection. Access conditions: Freely available from Martinez et al. (2021). Outputs: Figure 1, Online Appendix Figure A3, Table 2.

Protest indicator (1953): Unit of observation: Municipalities with population above 1000 in 1953. Number of observations: 968 within 50km of line of contact. Description: Dummy for occurrence of protests during 1953 uprising. Source: Crabtree et al. (2018b), based on Kowalczyk (2003). Access conditions: Freely available from Crabtree et al. (2018a).

⁴⁷Available at <https://tinyurl.com/w442yx6> (accessed October 11, 2021).

⁴⁸Available at <https://tinyurl.com/rmbxjb7k> (accessed October 11, 2021).

Outputs: Figures 2-4, Online Appendix Figures A6-A9, Tables 3-5, Online Appendix Table A1, Online Appendix Table A7.

Soviet Occupation zone - Population census at municipality level (1946): Unit of observation: Municipalities in 1946. Number of observations: 5,649 within 50km of line of contact. Description: Demographic characteristics based on the 1946 population census in the Soviet occupation zone. Source: Falter (1997). Access conditions: GESIS login required, data released for academic research and teaching. Outputs: Table 5.

Soviet Occupation zone - Population census at county level (1946): Unit of observation: Counties in 1946. Number of observations: 178 (89 within 50km of line of contact). Description: Migration outcomes based on the 1946 population census in the Soviet occupation zone. Source: Own digitization from Statistisches Zentralamt (1948). Access conditions: Freely available from Martinez et al. (2021). Outputs: Online Appendix Tables A4-A5.

Soviet Occupation zone - State elections (1946): Unit of observation: Municipalities in 1946. Number of observations: 5,649 within 50km of line of contact. Description: Election outcomes (turnout, vote shares) from the 1946 state elections in the Soviet occupation zone. Source: Falter (1997). Access conditions: GESIS login required, data released for academic research and teaching. Outputs: Online Appendix Table A8.

Berlin districts - Election results (pre-WWII and 1946): Unit of observation: Berlin districts (1929, 1930, 1932, 1946). Number of observations: 247 in the panel, 75 in 1946. Description: KPD vote share in pre-war municipal and federal elections, SED vote share in 1946 Berlin state elections. Source: Department for Statistics Berlin-Brandenburg.⁴⁹ Access conditions: Free. Outputs: Figure 7, Table 7.

Municipal mayors (1945-1953): Unit of observation: Cities with population above 10,000 in 2020. Number of observations: 3,356 mayors from 172 cities. Description: Name, party affiliation and term dates of municipal mayors. Source: Own data collection. Access conditions: Freely available from Martinez et al. (2021). Outputs: Figure 5, Online Appendix Figure A10.

Housing stock (1971): Unit of observation: Counties in 1971 (GDR). Number of observations: 85 within 50km of line of contact. Description: Housing stock, disaggregated by date of construction. Source: Own digitization from Statistisches Bundesamt (1994). Access conditions: Freely available from Martinez et al. (2021). Outputs: Table 6.

Spying intensity and political arrests (1980s): Unit of observation: Counties in 1980 (GDR). Number of observations: 83 within 50 km of line of contact (77 with data on spying). Description: Number of Stasi spies and political arrests (normalized by population).

⁴⁹Available at <https://tinyurl.com/4z4e89dw> (accessed October 11, 2021.).

Source: Lichter et al. (2021a). Access conditions: Free. Outputs: Table 6.

Protests (1989): Unit of observation: Municipalities with population above 1,000 in 1989. Number of observations: 900 within 50km of line of contact. Description: Daily information on occurrence of protest events and additional information on their characteristics. Source: Archiv Bürgerbewegung.⁵⁰ Access conditions: Free. Outputs: Online Appendix Table A6.

Election results (1990): Unit of observation: Municipalities in 1990. Number of observations: 2,262. Description: PDS and Allianz für Deutschland vote share in 1990 election, aggregated from polling-station level. Source: Own digitization of Schröder (2010), based on German Federal Archives. Access conditions: Freely available from Martinez et al. (2021). Outputs: Online Appendix Table A6.

Socio-economic characteristics (2018): Unit of observation: Individuals living in East Germany in 2018 and born before 1960. Number of observations: 2,183. Description: Survey responses in German Socio-economic Panel (SOEP, v35). Source: SOEP (2019). See Goebel et al. (2019) for data documentation. Access conditions: Application and data use agreement required.⁵¹ Outputs: Online Appendix Table A2.


Survey responses (2020): Unit of observation: Individuals living in East Germany in 2020 and born before 1960. Number of observations: 472 on initial occupation, 216 on change of occupying army. Description: Survey responses on own or parents' occupation experience at the end of WWII. Source: Own data collection. Access conditions: Freely available from Martinez et al. (2021). Outputs: Figure 6, Online Appendix Figure A11, Online Appendix Table A2, Online Appendix Table A3.

⁵⁰Available at <https://tinyurl.com/5ex6t8za> (accessed on October 13, 2021).

⁵¹Available at <https://tinyurl.com/e9rz8pvz> (accessed on October 13, 2021).


B Additional Figures and Tables

Figure A1: The Times, June 7 1945




Notes: Excerpts from The Times newspaper cover from June 7 1945 showing the cover title and a detailed map of the agreed upon occupation zones.

Figure A2: Density of observations around the line of contact




Notes: Figure plots the density of 1946 municipalities around the line of contact using the estimator proposed in Cattaneo et al. (2020). Negative numbers denote the Allied side of the line and positive numbers the Soviet-occupied side, respectively. For estimation a cubic polynomial and a symmetric bandwidth of 50km is used.

Figure A3: Duration of Allied occupation around the *Line of Contact* (1945)




Notes: Units of observation are municipalities in East Germany in 1946. Plot shows raw means of the number of days of exposure to Allied forces computed in 2 km bins around the line of contact. The fitted polynomials are based on regressions using unbinned data with a linear (solid line), quadratic (dashed line) and cubic (long dashed line) polynomial. Negative numbers denote the Allied side of the line and positive numbers correspond to the Soviet side. Exposure is calculated using (i) the occupation date of the largest city in the county (*Kreis*) in which the municipality is located and (ii) July 3 as the date of Allied withdrawal.

Figure A4: Placebo divisions of East Germany




Notes: Figure shows four illustrative placebo divisions of East Germany on which the estimates in Figure 4 are based. Blue dots denote Allied assigned municipalities, red dots Soviet assigned ones. Restriction on random divisions are that each side may contain at most 60% of municipalities.

Figure A5: The *Line of Contact* and Rivers




Notes: Map shows rivers in East Germany. Blue colored municipalities were initially occupied by the Allies, red colored ones were captured by the Soviet Union. Dark blue lines show the largest rivers flowing through East Germany. The highlighted river segments denote the river placebo lines used in Table 4.

Figure A6: 1953 protest result with border segments omitted




Notes: Figure shows regression estimates corresponding to Table 3 where each of the ten equally large border segments are dropped in turn. Estimates are based on the full specification in column 5. Square denotes the reference estimate of Table 3. Whiskers show 95% confidence intervals.

Figure A7: 1953 protest results with states omitted




Notes: Figure shows regression estimates corresponding to Table 3 where each of the five states are dropped in turn. BB Brandenburg, MV Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, SA Saxony, ST Saxony-Anhalt, TH Thuringia. Estimates are based on the full specification in column 5. Square denotes the reference estimate of Table 3. Whiskers show 95% confidence intervals.

Figure A8: 1953 protest with varying bandwidth




Notes: Figure shows regression estimates of Table 3 with varying bandwidths. Regressions are based on the full specification in column 5. The black square at 50 km indicates the coefficient displayed in the table, the dark grey diamond shows the estimate based on the data-driven bandwidth selection using the procedure developed by Calonico et al. (2014). Dark blue lines shows 95% confidence intervals.

Figure A9: 1953 protest results with municipalities dropped in vicinity to the line




Notes: Figure shows regression estimates corresponding to Table 3 where subsequently municipalities within x km to the line are dropped (*donut RDD*). Estimates are based on the full specification in column 5. Square denotes the reference estimate of Table 3. Whiskers show 95% confidence intervals.

Figure A10: End of tenure of Allied appointed mayors by party affiliation



Notes: Figure shows the year in which the tenure of mayors appointed under Allied occupation (March-June 1945) ended, disaggregated by party affiliation ($N = 42$). Left-wing parties are KPD and SPD. Other includes CDU, DDP, LDP, NSDAP, and those without partisan affiliation. Mayors without recorded affiliation are dropped in this exposition.

Figure A11: Attrition of survey sample



Notes: Figure shows the attrition of the survey sample. The starting sample exceeds the number of respondents ($N = 1,002$) as second-hand accounts can come from mothers and fathers if the occupation experience was different. The left hand-side of the figure in light-blue corresponds to Panel a of Figure 6, the red right-hand side to Panel b. Source: Own survey.

Table A1: Incidence of protests during the 1953 Uprising around the *Line of Contact* including Free Republic of Schwarzenberg

	Dependent variable: Incidence of protests (Mean: 0.21)						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Allied	0.080** (0.031) [0.025]	0.142*** (0.053) [0.052]	0.131** (0.053) [0.051]	0.119*** (0.045) [0.050]	0.130** (0.055) [0.054]	0.128* (0.073) [0.076]	0.137** (0.064)
Forcing variable $f(\mathbf{g}_i)$		Linear	Linear \times Allied			Quadratic \times All.	Local poly.
Border segment FEs				Y	Y	Y	
Full controls					Y	Y	
Sample				Population $\geq 1,000$			
Bandwidth	50km	50km	50km	50km	50km	50km	50km
Observations	1,043	1,043	1,043	1,043	1,043	1,043	1,043

Notes: The dependent variable is an indicator for the occurrence of protests during the 1953 uprising. The sample consists of all East German municipalities with a population above 1,000, including municipalities of the initially unoccupied *Free Republic of Schwarzenberg*. These observations are assigned to be Soviet-occupied, as Soviet troops captured the area on June 24, 1945. Estimate in column 7 based on Calonico et al. (2014). Border segment FEs correspond to ten equally large segments of the distribution of latitudes of municipalities in the 50 km bandwidth around the line of contact. Controls are latitude, longitude and all municipality-level variables of Table 1 (Panel B). Standard errors clustered at the county level in parentheses. Conley standard errors in square brackets. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Table A2: Comparison of survey sample with East German population

	Own survey (1)	SOEP (2)
Age in years	67.89 (6.39)	72.73 (8.77)
High education	0.48 (0.50)	0.18 (0.38)
Female	0.41 (0.49)	0.55 (0.50)
Birth year of mother	1,923.83 (8.65)	1,923.92 (8.76)
Current state of residence		
Berlin	0.19 (0.39)	0.18 (0.38)
Brandenburg	0.21 (0.41)	0.17 (0.37)
Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	0.07 (0.25)	0.10 (0.30)
Saxony	0.33 (0.47)	0.26 (0.44)
Saxony-Anhalt	0.09 (0.29)	0.15 (0.36)
Thuringia	0.11 (0.31)	0.13 (0.34)
Observations	472	2183

Notes: Table compares the survey sample from Figure 6 with the East German population as of 2018. Both samples are restricted to individuals living in East Germany born before 1960. High education denotes that respondents have obtained at least upper secondary education. Birth year of mother only shown for individuals born after 1940 (see Appendix C). Means in SOEP calculated using sample weights, making the sample representative for the population.

Source: Own survey and SOEP v35

Table A3: Allied occupation - survey evidence

	Sample mean	Allied coefficient				N
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Arrival of occupying army perceived positively	0.233	0.295*** (0.054)	0.295*** (0.053)	0.261*** (0.062)	0.265*** (0.061)	391
Occupying army distributed food	0.666	0.143** (0.056)	0.124** (0.056)	0.144** (0.063)	0.121* (0.064)	317
Occupying army distributed medicine / cared for injured	0.595	0.158** (0.066)	0.145** (0.066)	0.169** (0.076)	0.149** (0.074)	259
Occupying army mediated conflicts	0.637	0.063 (0.073)	0.068 (0.077)	0.047 (0.083)	0.054 (0.086)	234
Occupying army conducted misbehavior	0.688	-0.225*** (0.081)	-0.221*** (0.081)	-0.237*** (0.089)	-0.238*** (0.090)	221
Number of individuals across all survey responses						472
Controls			Y		Y	
Sample	Full	Full	Full	100km	100km	Full

Notes: All dependent variables coded as binary indicators. Control variables are sex of the respondent, age, education, indicator for own or parent's experiences. The sample is restricted to individuals for whom the indicated identity of the occupying army matched the May 1945 location. Sample size differs as those indicating "not sure" are excluded in the analysis. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: Own survey

Table A4: Population share by pre- and post-war place of residence in East Germany

Place of residence September 1, 1939	State of residence October 29, 1946				
	Brandenburg (1)	Mecklenburg- Vorpommern (2)	Saxony (3)	Saxony- Anhalt (4)	Thuringia (5)
Soviet Occupied Zone					
Brandenburg	0.710	0.007	0.003	0.009	0.005
Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	0.002	0.533	0.001	0.001	0.001
Saxony	0.003	0.002	0.855	0.008	0.010
Saxony Anhalt	0.003	0.001	0.002	0.720	0.006
Thuringia	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.005	0.739
Berlin	0.053	0.012	0.005	0.018	0.015
Trizone	0.009	0.018	0.008	0.020	0.027
Former eastern territories of Germany					
East Prussia	0.021	0.088	0.014	0.023	0.024
Pommerania (east of river Oder)	0.028	0.159	0.003	0.013	0.008
Brandenburg (east of rivers Oder and Lusatian Neisse)	0.059	0.014	0.001	0.008	0.003
Silesia	0.048	0.027	0.075	0.062	0.066
Foreign countries					
Poland	0.027	0.024	0.004	0.019	0.008
Czechoslovakia	0.016	0.080	0.020	0.076	0.070
Soviet Union	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.000
Other foreign countries	0.013	0.032	0.005	0.015	0.013
Other	0.005	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.004

Notes: Table shows state of residence on October 20, 1946 by place of residence on September 1, 1939. For children born after September 1, 1939, the place of the residence of the parents is being used. Trizone refers to the American, British and French occupied zones. *Other* denotes that the 1939 location was not specified. Source: Census of the Soviet occupation zone from 1946.

Table A5: Allied exposure and migration

Mean of dep. variable	Share that lived in same state					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Allied	0.021 (0.018)	-0.001 (0.029)	-0.003 (0.028)	-0.039 (0.058)	-0.012 (0.041)	-0.001 (0.038)
Forcing variable $f(\mathbf{g}_i)$			Linear	Linear \times Allied		
Border segment FEs				Y	Y	Y
Controls						Y
Bandwidth	Full	50km	50km	50km	50km	50km
Observations	178	89	89	89	89	89

Notes: Units of observation are counties of the GDR of 1946. The dependent variable is the population share that lived in the same state on October 29, 1946 as on September 1, 1939. Source: Census of the German Occupied Zone from 1946. Border segment FEs consist of four equally large segments cut along the latitude of districts. Controls are distance to Berlin, distance to the inner German border and latitude / longitude. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Table A6: 1989 protests and 1990 East German general election

	1989 protests		1990 vote share			
	(1)	(2)	PDS		Allianz	
Mean of dep. variable	0.20	0.20	0.11	0.11	0.55	0.55
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Allied	0.058 (0.059) [0.052]	0.072 (0.061) [0.056]	-0.004 (0.013) [0.011]	-0.002 (0.005) [0.005]	0.025 (0.036) [0.026]	0.013 (0.014) [0.012]
Forcing variable $f(\mathbf{g}_i)$	Linear \times Allied					
Border segment FEs	Y		Y		Y	
Full controls	Y		Y		Y	
Sample	Population $\geq 1,000$			Full		
Bandwidth	50km	50km	50km	50km	50km	50km
Observations	900	900	2,262	2,262	2,262	2,262

Notes: Units of observation are East German municipalities. Columns 1-2 restrict the sample to municipalities with a population $\geq 1,000$ to make the sample comparable to the 1953 protest estimates in Table 3. Regressions in columns 3-6 are weighted by votes per municipality. PDS was the successor party of the SED, Allianz für Deutschland was an opposition coalition consisting of the parties CDU, DA and DSU. Standard errors clustered at the county level in parentheses. Conley standard errors in square brackets. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Table A7: Allied exposure and 1953 protest - Radio in the American Sector

Mean of dep. variable	RIAS signal strength		Dependent variable: Presence of protest					
	70.22 (1)	70.22 (2)	0.22 (3)	0.22 (4)	0.22 (5)	0.22 (6)	0.22 (7)	0.22 (8)
Allied	0.530 (1.151) [0.651]	0.250 (0.857) [0.603]	0.142*** (0.050) [0.057]	0.144*** (0.050) [0.057]	0.169*** (0.061) [0.061]	0.159*** (0.060) [0.061]	0.155** (0.061) [0.062]	0.154** (0.061) [0.062]
RIAS signal strength			0.003 (0.003) [0.003]	0.015 (0.021) [0.023]	-0.019 (0.022) [0.026]			-0.020 (0.023) [0.025]
RIAS signal strength ²				-0.000 (0.000) [0.000]	0.000 (0.000) [0.000]			0.000 (0.000) [0.000]
Signal strength (alt.)						0.001* (0.001) [0.001]	0.005 (0.005) [0.005]	0.004 (0.005) [0.005]
Signal strength (alt.) ²							-0.000 (0.000) [0.000]	-0.000 (0.000) [0.000]
Distance to Berlin (km)		-0.078*** (0.028) [0.016]			-0.003** (0.001) [0.002]	-0.002** (0.001) [0.001]	-0.002** (0.001) [0.001]	-0.003** (0.001) [0.002]
Forcing variable $f(\mathbf{g}_i)$	Linear \times Allied							
Border segment FEs	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Full controls		Y			Y	Y	Y	Y
Sample	Pop. \geq 1,000							
Bandwidth	50km	50km	50km	50km	50km	50km	50km	50km
Observations	968	968	968	968	968	968	968	968

Notes: Units of observation are all East German municipalities with a population above 1,000. The dependent variable in columns 1-2 is the signal strength of the Radio in the American Sector (RIAS) and in columns 3-8 an indicator for the occurrence of protests during the 1953 uprising. Protest data and RIAS signal strength at the municipality level from Crabtree et al. (2018a). The alternative signal strength indicator stems from 222 cities in East Germany and are merged by nearest neighbour matching. Controls are all municipality-level variables of Table 1 (Panel B), and latitude / longitude. Standard errors clustered at the county-level in parentheses. Conley standard errors in square brackets. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A8: Outcome of the 1946 State elections around the *Line of Contact*

Dependent variable:	SED vote share					Turnout	Invalid	
Mean of dep. var.	0.428 (1)	0.428 (2)	0.394 (3)	0.394 (4)	0.394 (5)	0.937 (6)	0.076 (7)	
Allied	-0.032 (0.024) [0.022]	-0.049** (0.025) [0.023]	-0.036 (0.023) [0.021]	-0.028** (0.014) [0.012]	-0.030** (0.013) [0.011]	-0.016** (0.007) [0.006]	-0.004 (0.004) [0.003]	
Forcing variable $f(\mathbf{g}_i)$	Linear	Linear \times Allied						
Border segment FEs				Y	Y	Y	Y	
Full controls					Y	Y	Y	
Sample	Pop. \geq 1,000		All municipalities					
Bandwidth	50km	50km	50km	50km	50km	50km	50km	
Observations	1,168	1,168	5,649	5,649	5,649	5,649	5,649	

Notes: Units of observation are East German municipalities in 1946. Dependent variable in columns 1-5 is the vote share of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) in the 1946 State elections in the Soviet occupation zone. Turnout (column 6) is the share of cast votes (valid and invalid) and Invalid (column 7) denotes the share of invalid votes. All outcomes calculated as shares of the eligible population. Border segment FEs correspond to ten equally large segments of the distribution of latitudes of municipalities in the 50 km bandwidth around the line of contact. Controls are latitude, longitude and all municipality-level variables of Table 1 (Panel B). Regressions are weighted by the eligible voting population. Standard errors clustered at the county level in parentheses. Conley standard errors in square brackets. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

C Retrospective Survey

Survey design and implementation

To complement our findings and to gain a deeper understanding of the mechanisms at play, we ran our own survey in spring 2020 using a professional survey company. The company keeps a large pool of pre-selected respondents who have agreed to be contacted for research purposes.

Targeting individuals among the cohorts who experienced the end of World War II in 2020 is challenging due to attrition and the lower willingness of older individuals to participate in voluntary pools for online surveys. We thus designed the survey to both include first-hand and second-hand accounts of the experience in 1945. We do so by restricting the targeted population to individuals who are aged 60 or older in 2020. To ensure we identify individuals who either have first-hand or second-hand accounts of the occupation in East Germany, we further restrict the sample to those who either themselves lived in East Germany in 1945, or whose parents lived in East Germany in 1945. The main parent we focus on for second-hand accounts is the mother, as fathers were often absent due to combat-related activities. To maximize the sample, we targeted the entire pool of available respondents in the appropriate cohorts. The survey collected basic demographics, their location at the end of the war and recollections of the occupation period in 1945. The survey was designed to be short, taking about 16 minutes to complete on average.

Appendix Table A2 shows basic socio-demographic information. For comparison, we also report the same average characteristics for a representative sample of individuals older than 60 living in East Germany based on the German Socio-economic Panel (Goebel et al., 2019). Our survey population is slightly younger as the relevant East German population and, as expected given the targeting, on average higher educated. The distribution of states of residence matches reasonably well. Despite our attempts to maximize the sample of first-hand accounts, the majority of respondents are second hand accounts. In our final sample, 68% of the observations stem from second-hand accounts from the mothers, 28% from fathers and only 3% from first hand accounts. Our results are robust to holding constant these differences using respondent type fixed effects.

A second challenge to such a retrospective survey is recall bias. Recollections from a period of upheaval may be particularly blurry, and second-hand accounts may be less reliable due to parents' reluctance to share often traumatic experiences. In our context, there are two particular challenges: first, respondents may not correctly recall the initial occupation of the Allied forces due to the short-lived nature. We thus cross-check the responses by geolocating the reported residence at the end of the war. The final sample only included

individuals who provided accurate responses pertaining the initial occupying force's identity (66%). Second, respondents may not be certain about specific details. To capture this, the survey explicitly allowed respondents to state that they are unsure about certain events. We exclude individuals who provide responses that they are uncertain about.⁵² We follow the same procedure when we analyze the change of occupying army, i.e. we restrict the sample to individuals who at that time lived in Allied occupied territory and correctly identify the Red Army as the new occupying army (see Appendix Figure A11).

Full wording of questions (translated)

Survey questions shown in Figure 6

Panel a:

- How was the arrival of the occupying army perceived by the population in your [or your parent's] place of residence?
 - (1) Very positive (2) A bit positive (3) Neutral (4) A bit negative (5) Very negative (6) Not sure
 - * Coded as positive if *very positive* or *a bit positive* is indicated
- Did the occupying army distribute food?
 - (1) Yes (2) No (3) Not sure
- Did the occupying army distribute medicine / care for the injured?
 - (1) Yes (2) No (3) Not sure
- Did the occupying army mediate conflicts / enforce justice?
 - (1) Yes (2) No (3) Not sure
- Did the occupying army conduct misbehavior?
 - (1) Yes (2) No (3) Not sure

Panel b:

- How was the change of the occupying army perceived?
 - (1) Very positive (2) A bit positive (3) Neutral (4) A bit negative (5) Very negative (6) Not sure

⁵²We do not find that the propensity to be uncertain varies significantly across the line of contact. The results are robust to coding unsure responses as negative responses.

* Coded as negative if *very negative* or *a bit negative* is indicated

- Did the new occupying army distributed food?
 - (1) Less than before (2) More than before (3) Not sure
- Did the new occupying army distributed medicine / care for the injured?
 - (1) Less than before (2) More than before (3) Not sure
- Did the new occupying army mediate conflicts / enforce justice?
 - (1) Less than before (2) More than before (3) Not sure
- Did the new occupying army conduct misbehavior?
 - (1) Less than before (2) More than before (3) Not sure