## Appendix A: Supplementary Results

Figure A-1: Placebo Test Using Rivers


Notes: The red line shows the 1698 boundary of Dai Viet's administrative expansion and the thick blue lines show rivers that form part of this boundary. Thin blue lines show all rivers.

Figure A-2: Correlation Plots


Notes: Each point is an outcome averaged within a bin. The regression line is fit on the raw data.

Table A-1: Randomization Inference

| Variable | p value | Variable | p value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household Consumption | 0.000 | Health Workers Visit Regularly | 0.000 |
| Years Schooling ( $>25$ ) | 0.000 | Health Station in Village | 0.013 |
| Telegraph Density 1878 | 0.005 | Maternity Clinic in Village | 0.770 |
| Telegraph Density 1901 | 0.026 | Education LCA | 0.068 |
| Rail/Road Density 1878 | 0.441 | Primary School Access | 0.012 |
| Motor Road Density 1910 | 0.043 | Primary School Completion | 0.028 |
| Rail Density 1910 | 0.023 | Secondary School in Village | 0.180 |
| Paved Road 1926 | 0.005 | Secondary School Attendance | 0.034 |
| Rail Density 1926 | 0.246 | Law Enforced Day/Night | 0.000 |
| Log Family Income | 0.000 | Police Regularly Present | 0.000 |
| Economic LCA | 0.000 | Government Provides Assistance | 0.000 |
| Non-Rice Food Available | 0.000 | Share Communes with Lower Secondary | 0.009 |
| Manufactured Goods Available | 0.000 | Government Responsive to Citizens | 0.034 |
| Surplus Goods Produced | 0.002 | Local Officials Successful | 0.000 |
| Households Require Assistance | 0.006 | Knows Village Administrative Structure | 0.052 |
| \% Households Access Vehicle | 0.000 | LTT Fairly Administered | 0.000 |
| Land Unfarmed Due to Bad Security | 0.878 | National Govt. Performs Poorly | 0.002 |
| Population Growth | 0.680 | National Govt. Manages Economy Poorly | 0.002 |
| Civil Society LCA | 0.000 | Active in Interest Group | 0.000 |
| \% Households Participate in Civic Orgs. | 0.000 | People Decide SDP | 0.007 |
| \% Households Participate in Econ. Train. | 0.000 | Security LCA | 0.876 |
| \% Households Active in PSDF | 0.001 | VC Forces Present | 0.032 |
| Self-Development Project Underway | 0.000 | VC Base Nearby | 0.541 |
| Council Convenes Meetings | 0.704 | Village Guerrilla Squad | 0.292 |
| Organized Youth Activities | 0.457 | VC Main Squad | 0.092 |
| \% Households Attend Govt. Meetings | 0.000 | VC Infrastructure Activity | 0.338 |
| RD Cadre in Hamlet | 0.704 | VC Taxation | 0.715 |
| \% Households Participate in RD Cadre | 0.000 | Friendly Forces Nearby | 0.610 |
| Civic Orgs. Provide Assistance | 0.000 | Air/Art. Strike Nearby | 0.371 |
| Contributes to Charity | 0.000 | U.S. Initiated Attack | 0.513 |
| Local Administration LCA | 0.060 | SVN Initiated Attack | 0.000 |
| Govt. Systematically Collects Taxes | 0.230 | Territorial Forces Present | 0.473 |
| Village Committee Filled | 0.174 | Agricultural Households | 0.000 |
| Village Chief Present | 0.057 | Agricultural Land Size | 0.730 |
| Hamlet Chief Present | 0.115 | Main Job in Industry | 0.037 |
| Chief Controls RD Cadre | 0.017 | Share Annual Land Certified | 0.000 |
| Lack Provincial Assistance | 0.804 | Share Perennial Land Certified | 0.000 |
| Technical Personnel Visit | 0.955 | Share Residential Land Certified | 0.000 |
| Provincial Land Affairs Visits | 0.987 | Household has Interest Expenses | 0.000 |
| Health Care LCA | 0.000 | Employed Informal Sector | 0.000 |
| Govt. Medical Services Available | 0.000 |  |  |

The p-values give the share of 1000 absolute placebo coefficients that are larger in magnitude than the absolute coefficient for the actual effect of being on the Dai Viet side of the boundary on the outcome under consideration.

Table A-2: Household Consumption:
Placebo Boundaries

|  | Sample is: |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Placebo Boundaries |  |  |
|  | River | Province | Expansion |
|  | $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ |
| Dai Viet | -0.090 | 0.092 | -0.044 |
|  | $(0.097)$ | $(0.109)$ | $(0.064)$ |
| Obs | 1,603 | 1,534 | 5,351 |
| Clusters | 165 | 160 | 400 |

The unit of analysis is the household. All columns include a linear RD polynomial in latitude and longitude, a control for distance to Ho Chi Minh City, household demographic controls, year fixed effects, and boundary segment fixed effects. Robust standard errors are clustered by village.

Table A-3: Human Capital: No HCM

| Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Coars Schooling |  |  |  |
|  | $>25$ | $25-40$ | $40-60$ | $>60$ |
|  | $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ |
| Dai Viet | 0.970 | 0.886 | 1.045 | 1.045 |
|  | $(0.201)$ | $(0.195)$ | $(0.244)$ | $(0.240)$ |
| Obs | 33,001 | 14,186 | 13,353 | 5,462 |
| Clusters | 365 | 364 | 365 | 354 |
| Mean | 7.28 | 8.26 | 7.50 | 4.16 |

The unit of analysis is the individual. All outcomes measured between 2002-2012. All columns include a linear RD polynomial in latitude and longitude, a control for distance to Ho Chi Minh City, boundary segment fixed effects, and survey year fixed effects. Robust standard errors, clustered at the village level, are reported in parentheses.
Table A-4: Economic Outcomes South Vietnamese Period: Controlling for Population

|  | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Log <br> Family <br> Income <br> (1) | Econ LCA <br> (2) | Non-rice <br> Food <br> Avail. <br> (3) | Manuf. Goods Avail. <br> (4) | Surplus <br> Goods Produced (5) | Households Require Assist. <br> (6) | \% HH <br> Access <br> Vehic. <br> (7) | Land Unfarmed Bad Sec. (8) | Pop Growth <br> (9) |
| Dai Viet | $\begin{gathered} 0.218 \\ (0.046) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.144 \\ (0.054) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.250 \\ (0.058) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.156 \\ (0.061) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.152 \\ (0.050) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.058 \\ & (0.039) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.129 \\ (0.019) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.018 \\ (0.047) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.005 \\ (0.006) \end{gathered}$ |
| Obs | 18,273 | 2,348 | 388 | 388 | 388 | 2,330 | 2,332 | 330 | 2,276 |
| Clusters | 220 | 399 | 388 | 388 | 388 | 397 | 396 | 330 | 396 |
| Mean | 9.93 | 0.83 | 0.71 | 0.63 | 0.44 | 0.61 | 0.34 | 0.26 | 0.01 |
| The unit of Outcomes ear RD po fixed effect | analysis easured nomial Robus | house een 19 itude a dard er | old (colv 1972 ( longitu rs, clus | 1), ha <br> mn 1) <br> a cont <br> d at th | let (colum d 1969-19 for dista village lev | s $2,6,7$ an <br> (columns <br> e to Ho Ch <br> are report | ), or vill <br> ). All r <br> Minh Cit <br> in pare | ge (colum ressions in and bound heses. | 5 and 8). <br> a lin- <br> segment |

Table A-5: Economic Outcomes South Vietnamese Period: No Ho Chi Minh City

|  | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Log <br> Family <br> Income <br> (1) | Econ <br> LCA <br> (2) | Non-rice Food Avail. (3) | Manuf. Goods Avail. (4) | Surplus <br> Goods Produced (5) | Households Require Assist. <br> (6) | \% HH <br> Access <br> Vehic. <br> (7) | Land Unfarmed Bad Sec. (8) | Pop Growth <br> (9) |
| Dai Viet | $\begin{gathered} 0.176 \\ (0.039) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.135 \\ (0.055) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.256 \\ (0.060) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.159 \\ (0.064) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.171 \\ (0.052) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.132 \\ (0.039) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.118 \\ (0.019) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.009 \\ (0.047) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.000 \\ & (0.006) \end{aligned}$ |
| Obs | 8,491 | 1,568 | 327 | 327 | 327 | 1,551 | 1,553 | 324 | 1,532 |
| Clusters | 168 | 338 | 327 | 327 | 327 | 336 | 335 | 324 | 338 |
| Mean | 9.78 | 0.75 | 0.66 | 0.57 | 0.41 | 0.56 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.01 |

The unit of analysis is the household (column 1), hamlet (columns 2, 6, 7 and 9 ), or village (columns 3-5 and 8). Outcomes measured between 1970-1972 (column 1) and 1969-1973 (columns 2-9). All regressions include a linear RD polynomial in latitude and longitude, a control for distance to Ho Chi Minh City, and boundary segment fixed effects. Robust standard errors, clustered at the village level, are reported in parentheses.
Table A-6: Civil Society: Controlling for Population

|  | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% H Part Civic Org | useholds cpate in Econ. Train. | $\% \mathrm{HH}$ Active in PSDF | Self-Dev. <br> Project <br> Underway | Org. <br> Youth Activ. | Council Convenes Meetings | $\% \mathrm{HH}$ Attend Govt. Mtgs. | RD Cadre in Hamlet | \% HH Part. RD Cadre | Civ. Soc. Provides Assist | Contrib. to Charity Fund |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) |
| Dai Viet | $\begin{gathered} 0.190 \\ (0.033) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.262 \\ (0.028) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.220 \\ (0.027) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.067 \\ (0.028) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.097 \\ (0.024) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.053 \\ (0.033) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.011 \\ (0.021) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.106 \\ (0.029) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.021 \\ (0.030) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.174 \\ (0.036) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.162 \\ (0.043) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.153 \\ (0.037) \end{gathered}$ |
| Obs | 2,348 | 2,325 | 2,348 | 2,330 | 388 | 388 | 384 | 2,331 | 2,337 | 2,314 | 2,206 | 5,889 |
| Clusters | 399 | 397 | 399 | 397 | 388 | 388 | 384 | 397 | 397 | 396 | 388 | 450 |
| Mean | 0.79 | 0.37 | 0.22 | 0.62 | 0.83 | 0.78 | 0.93 | 0.37 | 0.76 | 0.52 | 0.24 | 0.65 |

Table A-7: Civil Society: No Ho Chi Minh City

|  | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dai Viet |  | \% H Part Civic Org | useholds pate in Econ. Train. | \% HH Active in PSDF | Self-Dev. <br> Project <br> Underway |  | Council Convenes Meetings | \% HH Attend Govt. Mtgs. | RD Cadre in Hamlet | \% HH Part. RD Cadre | Civ. Soc. Provides Assist | Contrib. to Charity Fund |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) |
|  | 0.153 | 0.224 | 0.198 | 0.037 | 0.090 | -0.069 | -0.006 | 0.075 | -0.026 | 0.129 | 0.145 | 0.157 |
|  | (0.030) | (0.024) | (0.028) | (0.025) | (0.024) | (0.033) | (0.020) | (0.026) | (0.030) | (0.032) | (0.043) | (0.037) |
| Obs | 1,568 | 1,546 | 1,568 | 1,551 | 327 | 327 | 323 | 1,552 | 1,558 | 1,535 | 1,467 | 4,689 |
| Clusters | 338 | 336 | 338 | 336 | 327 | 327 | 323 | 336 | 336 | 335 | 331 | 362 |
| Mean | 0.72 | 0.26 | 0.19 | 0.58 | 0.82 | 0.74 | 0.93 | 0.30 | 0.69 | 0.43 | 0.18 | 0.62 |

Table A-8: Local Administration: Controlling for Population

Table A-9: Local Administration: No Ho Chi Minh City

|  | Dependent variable is: Provincial Placebos |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Local Admin. LCA (1) | Govt. <br> Syst. <br> Taxes <br> (2) | Vilg. Comm. Filled (3) | Vilg. Chief (4) Pre | Hamlet <br> Chief ent <br> (5) | Chief <br> Controls <br> RD Cadre <br> (6) | Lack <br> Prov. Tech. <br> Assist. <br> (7) | Tech. <br> Pers. <br> Visit <br> (8) | Prov. Land Affairs Visit (9) |
| Dai Viet | $\begin{gathered} 0.026 \\ (0.012) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.075 \\ (0.036) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.052 \\ (0.028) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.056 \\ (0.033) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.021 \\ (0.023) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.075 \\ (0.020) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.008 \\ & (0.031) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.020 \\ & (0.046) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.008 \\ (0.056) \end{gathered}$ |
| Obs | 1,568 | 327 | 327 | 327 | 1,538 | 321 | 329 | 327 | 304 |
| Clusters | 338 | 327 | 327 | 327 | 335 | 321 | 329 | 327 | 304 |
| Mean | 0.97 | 0.85 | 0.84 | 0.92 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 0.17 | 0.52 | 0.73 |
| The unit of analysis is the hamlet (columns 1 and 5) or the village (columns 2-4 and 6-9). All outcomes measured between 1969-1973. All regressions include a linear RD polynomial in latitude and longitude, a control for distance to Ho Chi Minh City, and boundary segment fixed effects. Robust standard errors, clustered at the village level, are reported in parentheses. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table A-10: Public Goods: Controlling for Population

|  | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Health Care LCA (1) | Govt. Med. Serv. Avail. (2) | Health Wkrs. Visit Reg. <br> (3) | Health $\mathrm{Cli}$ $\text { in } \mathrm{Vi}$ <br> (4) | Mat. ic lage (5) | Educ. LCA (6) | Access. <br> (7) | imary <br> hool <br> Completion <br> (8) | Secon Sch In Vilg. <br> (9) | dary <br> ol <br> Attend. <br> (10) | Police <br> Reg. <br> Present <br> (11) | Law Enforced Day/Night (12) | Govt. Provides Assist. <br> (13) | Share Communes Lower Sec. (14) |
| Dai Viet | $\begin{gathered} 0.113 \\ (0.039) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.157 \\ (0.033) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.319 \\ (0.042) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.129 \\ (0.050) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.010 \\ (0.066) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.031 \\ (0.041) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.048 \\ (0.023) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.076 \\ (0.031) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.034 \\ (0.053) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.022 \\ (0.013) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.131 \\ (0.046) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.201 \\ (0.046) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.143 \\ (0.047) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.292 \\ (0.069) \end{gathered}$ |
| Obs | 2,348 | 2,339 | 2,336 | 388 | 388 | 2,348 | 2,336 | 388 | 388 | 388 | 2,339 | 2,333 | 2,221 | 124 |
| Clusters | 399 | 397 | 397 | 388 | 388 | 399 | 396 | 388 | 388 | 388 | 397 | 397 | 390 | 124 |
| Mean | 0.88 | 0.39 | 0.47 | 0.79 | 0.61 | 0.84 | 0.90 | 0.61 | 0.35 | 0.18 | 0.56 | 0.79 | 0.30 | 0.78 |
| The unit of analysis is the hamlet (columns 1-3, 6-7 and 11-13), the village (columns 4-5 and 8-10) or the district (column 14). Outcomes men 1-13) or 1999-2004 (column 14). All regressions include a linear RD polynomial in latitude and longitude, a control for distance to Ho Chi fixed effects. Robust standard errors, clustered at the village (columns 1-13) or district (column 14) level, are reported in parentheses. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Health <br> Care <br> LCA <br> (1) | Govt. Med. Serv. Avail. (2) | Health Wkrs. Visit Reg. (3) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Health } \\ \text { Cli } \\ \text { in } \mathrm{Vi} \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Mat. ic lage (5) | Educ. <br> LCA <br> (6) | Access. <br> (7) | imary <br> hool <br> Completion <br> (8) |  | dary <br> ol <br> Attend. <br> (10) | Police Reg. Present (11) | Law Enforced Day/Night (12) | Govt. Provides Assist. <br> (13) | Share Communes Lower Sec. (14) |
| Dai Viet | $\begin{gathered} 0.099 \\ (0.038) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.199 \\ (0.038) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.313 \\ (0.041) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.136 \\ (0.050) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.006 \\ (0.069) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.015 \\ (0.041) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.070 \\ (0.021) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.084 \\ (0.031) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.053 \\ (0.059) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.021 \\ (0.013) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.085 \\ (0.039) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.175 \\ (0.043) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.123 \\ (0.049) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.310 \\ (0.076) \end{gathered}$ |
| Obs | 1,568 | 1,560 | 1,557 | 327 | 327 | 1,568 | 1,557 | 327 | 327 | 327 | 1,560 | 1,554 | 1,482 | 112 |
| Clusters | 338 | 336 | 336 | 327 | 327 | 338 | 335 | 327 | 327 | 327 | 336 | 336 | 333 | 112 |
| Mean | 0.83 | 0.35 | 0.40 | 0.77 | 0.56 | 0.78 | 0.90 | 0.59 | 0.28 | 0.17 | 0.36 | 0.69 | 0.30 | 0.79 |
| The unit of analysis is the hamlet (columns 1-3, 6-7 and 11-13), the village (columns 4-5 and 8-10) or the district (column 14). Outcomes mes 1-13) or 1999-2004 (column 14). All regressions include a linear RD polynomial in latitude and longitude, a control for distance to Ho Chi fixed effects. Robust standard errors, clustered at the village (columns 1-13) or district (column 14) level, are reported in parentheses. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table A-12: Public Opinion: Controlling for Population

|  | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Views of Local Gov. |  |  |  | Views of National Gov. |  | Civic Engagement |  |
|  | Gvt. <br> Responsive Citizens <br> (1) | Local Officials Successful (2) | Knows Vilg Admin. Struct. Well (3) | LTT <br> Fairly Administ. <br> (4) | Nat <br> Performs Poorly (5) | Gvt. <br> Man. Econ. Poorly <br> (6) | Active in Interest Group (7) | People Decide SDP (8) |
| Dai Viet | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.113 \\ (0.045) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.154 \\ (0.074) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.073 \\ (0.056) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.317 \\ (0.080) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.092 \\ (0.038) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.081 \\ (0.040) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.338 \\ (0.146) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.208 \\ (0.055) \end{gathered}$ |
| Obs | 2,779 | 3,487 | 1,457 | 999 | 2,811 | 5,778 | 243 | 353 |
| Clusters | 190 | 183 | 89 | 101 | 182 | 215 | 35 | 53 |
| Mean | 0.37 | 0.52 | 0.22 | 0.57 | 0.19 | 0.31 | 0.18 | 0.23 |

Table A-13: Public Opinion: No Ho Chi Minh City

|  | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Views of Local Gov. |  |  |  | Views of National Gov. |  | Civic Engagement |  |
|  | Gvt. <br> Responsive Citizens (1) | Local Officials Successful (2) | Knows Vilg Admin. Struct. Well (3) | LTT <br> Fairly Administ. <br> (4) | Nat <br> Performs Poorly (5) | Gvt. <br> Man. Econ. Poorly (6) | Active in Interest Group (7) | People <br> Decide SDP <br> (8) |
| Dai Viet | $\begin{gathered} 0.110 \\ (0.041) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.170 \\ (0.077) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.096 \\ (0.046) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.350 \\ (0.075) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.093 \\ (0.042) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.117 \\ (0.033) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.395 \\ (0.146) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.222 \\ (0.052) \end{gathered}$ |
| Obs | 1,590 | 1,750 | 335 | 999 | 1,432 | 2,558 | 243 | 353 |
| Clusters | 141 | 132 | 43 | 101 | 131 | 160 | 35 | 53 |
| Mean | 0.32 | 0.45 | 0.16 | 0.57 | 0.17 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.23 |
| The unit of ear RD po fixed effect | analysis is nomial in Robust s | individua <br> ude and <br> ard error | All outcom gitude, a co clustered at |  | een 197 <br> to Ho <br> are repo | 72. All reg Minh City d in parent | s includ boundary | lingment |

Table A-14: The Vietnam War: Controlling for Population

|  | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Security <br> LCA | VC <br> Forces <br> Present | VC <br> Base <br> Nearby | Vilg. <br> Guerr. <br> Squad | VC <br> Main <br> Squad | VC Infra Activity | VC <br> Taxation | Friendly <br> Forces <br> Nearby | Air/Art. <br> Strke <br> Nearby | U.S <br> Init <br> At | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SVN } \\ & \text { ated } \\ & \text { ack } \end{aligned}$ | Territ. <br> Forces <br> Present |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) |
| Dai Viet | $\begin{aligned} & -0.011 \\ & (0.037) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.033 \\ (0.033) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.009 \\ (0.049) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.073 \\ (0.039) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.100 \\ & (0.040) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.035 \\ (0.032) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.012 \\ (0.016) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.010 \\ & (0.037) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.037 \\ & (0.032) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.000 \\ & (0.002) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.095 \\ & (0.023) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.020 \\ & (0.027) \end{aligned}$ |
| Obs | 2,348 | 2,335 | 390 | 390 | 390 | 2,339 | 389 | 389 | 388 | 2,348 | 2,348 | 2,348 |
| Clusters | 399 | 398 | 390 | 390 | 390 | 398 | 389 | 389 | 388 | 399 | 399 | 399 |
| Mean | 0.83 | 0.15 | 0.49 | 0.20 | 0.23 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.49 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.24 |
| The unit of analysis is the hamlet (columns 1-2, 6, and 10-12) or the village (columns 3-5 and 7-9). Outcomes measure 1969-1973 (columns 1-9), 1970-1973 (columns 10-11), or 1970-1974 (column 12). All regressions include a linear RD polyn latitude and longitude, a control for distance to Ho Chi Minh City, and boundary segment fixed effects. Robust standa clustered at the village level, are reported in parentheses. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table A-15: The Vietnam War: No Ho Chi Minh City

|  | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Security <br> LCA | VC <br> Forces <br> Present | VC <br> Base <br> Nearby | Vilg. <br> Guerr. <br> Squad | VC <br> Main <br> Squad | VC <br> Infra <br> Activity | $\mathrm{VC}$ <br> Taxation | Friendly <br> Forces <br> Nearby | Air/Art. <br> Strke <br> Nearby | U.S. <br> Initi <br> Att | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{SVN} \\ & \text { ated } \\ & \text { ack } \end{aligned}$ | Territ. <br> Forces <br> Present |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) |
| Dai Viet | $\begin{aligned} & -0.016 \\ & (0.039) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.024 \\ & (0.034) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.009 \\ (0.050) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.074 \\ (0.039) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.096 \\ (0.039) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.029 \\ (0.033) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.011 \\ & (0.016) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.046 \\ & (0.038) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.039 \\ (0.032) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.000 \\ & (0.001) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.065 \\ & (0.018) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.032 \\ (0.023) \end{gathered}$ |
| Obs | 1,568 | 1,556 | 329 | 329 | 329 | 1,560 | 329 | 329 | 328 | 1,578 | 1,578 | 1,568 |
| Clusters | 338 | 337 | 329 | 329 | 329 | 337 | 329 | 329 | 328 | 339 | 339 | 338 |
| Mean | 0.76 | 0.21 | 0.57 | 0.24 | 0.27 | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.47 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.78 | 0.35 |

The unit of analysis is the hamlet (columns 1-2, 6, and 10-12) or the village (columns 3-5 and 7-9). Outcomes measured between 1969-1973 (columns 1-9), 1970-1973 (columns 10-11), or 1970-1974 (column 12). All regressions include a linear RD polynomial in latitude and longitude, a control for distance to Ho Chi Minh City, and boundary segment fixed effects. Robust standard errors, clustered at the village level, are reported in parentheses.

Table A-16: Land and Markets: No Ho Chi Minh City

|  |  | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Agric. | Main |  | Share | H.H. | Employed |  |  |
|  | Agric. | Land | Job in | Annual | Perennial | Residential | Interest | Informal |  |
|  | H.H. | Size | Industry | Land Certified |  |  |  |  |  |
| Expenses | Sector |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | $(7)$ | $(8)$ |  |
| Dai Viet | -0.184 | -0.010 | -0.020 | -0.131 | -0.149 | -0.184 | -0.113 | -0.070 |  |
|  | $(0.035)$ | $(0.111)$ | $(0.023)$ | $(0.031)$ | $(0.030)$ | $(0.038)$ | $(0.031)$ | $(0.022)$ |  |
| Obs | 13,205 | 4,471 | 16,518 | 462 | 449 | 445 | 3,590 | 16,504 |  |
| Clusters | 365 | 270 | 365 | 192 | 190 | 189 | 203 | 365 |  |

The unit of analysis is the household (columns 1, 2 and 7 ), individual (columns 3 and 8 ), or commune (columns 4-6). All outcomes measured between 2002-2012. All columns include a linear RD polynomial in latitude and longitude, a control for distance to Ho Chi Minh City, year fixed effects, and boundary segment fixed effects. Robust standard errors, clustered at the village level, are reported in parentheses.

## Appendix B: Data Appendix

Table B-1: Definitions and Codings (Table 6)

| Column | Original question | Question responses | Coding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Categorical HES economic questions |  |  |  |
| 3 | Is a variety of foodstuffs other than rice and nuoc nam (such as pork, vegetables, fresh fruit, fish, etc) for sale at the local market | $0=$ no; $1=$ limited quantity; $2=$ ample quantity | $0 / 1=0 ; 2=1$ |
| 4 | Are manufactured goods such as bicycle tires, kerosene, and aluminum pots for sale at the local markets | $0=$ no; $1=$ limited quantity; $2=$ ample quantity | $0 / 1=0 ; 2=1$ |
| 5 | Is there a surplus of goods or foodstuffs produced in this village for sale outside the village | $0=$ no; $1=$ yes, small; $2=$ yes, large | $0 / 1=0 ; 2=1$ |
| 6 | Are there households in this hamlet who require assistance from others to maintain themselves at a subsistence level (friends, relatives, government, etc) | $0=$ none; $1=y e s$, a few; $2=10-40 \% ; 3=41-$ $90 \% ; 4=$ all or nearly all | $0=0 ; 1 / 2 / 3 / 4=1$ |
| 7 | Do any households in this hamlet have access to motorized vehicles | $0=$ none; $1=y e s$, a few; $2=10-40 \% ; 3=>40 \%$ | midpoints of intervals, top interval coded at 0.5 (robust to alternative top codings) |
| 8 | Is there farm land which belongs to this village which is not presently cultivated | $0=$ no; $1=y e s$, primarily because of bad security; $2=y e s$, primarily for reasons other than security | $0 / 2=0 ; 1=1$ |
| Other variables (not included in LCA) |  |  |  |
| 1 | How much is the average monthly family income? | 12 income bins | continuous variable coded at midpoints of ranges, top interval coded at 100,000 |
| 9 | total hamlet population | Integer count | We compute quarterly hamlet population growth |

[^0]
## Table B-2: Definitions and Codings (Table 7)

| Column | Original question | Question responses | Coding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HES categorical civil society questions |  |  |  |
| 2 | Do any households have a member(s) participating in non-VC civic or religious organizations (farmers associations, co-ops; boy scouts, etc) | $0=$ none; $1=y$ ys, a few; $2=10-40 \%$; $3=41-90 \% ; 4=$ all or nearly all | A continuous variable coded using the midpoints of the intervals |
| 3 | Did any hamlet households have member(s) participating in government sponsored economic improvement programs (ag, animal husbandry, fisheries, handicraft, etc) during the past quarter | $0=$ none; $1=y$ ys, a few; $2=10-40 \%$; $3=41-90 \% ; 4=$ all or nearly all | A continuous variable coded using the midpoints of the intervals |
| 4 | Do any households have a member(s) active in the PSDF | $0=$ none; $1=<10 \% ; 2=10 \%-40 \%$; $3=41 \%-90 \% ; 4=$ all or nearly all | A continuous variable coded using the midpoints of the intervals |
| 5 | Are self-development projects physically underway | $0=$ no; $1=$ yes but none were selected at open public meetings; $2=y e s$, some were selected at open public meetings; $3=$ yes all were selected at open public meetings | $0=0 ; 1 / 2 / 3=1$ |
| 6 | Are there any organized activities for the youth of this village | $0=$ no; $1=$ yes | $0=0 ; 1=1$ |
| 7 | How frequently does the village council convene open public meetings to discuss village development plans and projects, local grievances, aspirations, etc. | $0=$ never; $1=<$ once per month; $2=$ once a month on average; $3=$ twice a month or more | $0 / 1=0 ; 2 / 3=1$ |
| Variables available only in a selected sample (not in LCA) |  |  |  |
| 8 | Did any hamlet households have a member or members attending any GVN-sponsored public meetings, award ceremonies, etc in the hamlet or village during the past quarter? | $0=$ none; $1=y$ ys, a few; $2=10-40 \%$; $3=41-90 \% ; 4=$ all or nearly all | A continuous variable coded using the midpoints of the intervals |
| 10 | Do any of the hamlet households have a member participating in "people's groups" organized by members of an RD Cadre Team? | $0=$ none; $1=$ yes, a few; $2=10-40 \%$; $3=41-90 \% ; 4=$ all or nearly all | A continuous variable coded using the midpoints of the intervals |
| 11 | Has any welfare assistance been provided by nonGVN voluntary agencies to needy or refugee households in this hamlet during the past quarter? | $0=$ no, none needed; $1=$ no; $2=$ yes | $0 / 1=0 ; 2=1$ |
| Not determined by local civil society (not in LCA) |  |  |  |
| 9 | Have RD Cadre worked in this hamlet during the past quarter? | $0=$ no; $1=$ yes, but no cadre currently working; $2=$ yes, cadre currently working | $0=0 ; 1 / 2=1$ |
| Variables from VHLSS |  |  |  |
| 12 | Has the household made contributions to various funds (natural disaster funds, charity funds,poverty funds, study encouragement funds ....) | $0=\mathrm{no} ; 1=\mathrm{yes}$ | $0=0 ; 1=1$ |
| Variables not reported in main text |  |  |  |
|  | Did any hamlet household(s) have members who participated in self-development projects during the quarter | $0=$ none; $1=y e s$, a few; $2=10-40 \%$; $3=41-90 \% ; 4=$ all or nearly all |  |

Source for variables in columns 2-11 is Hamlet Evaluation System (HES) - National Archives Record Group 472; source for variable in column 12 is Vietnam Household Living Standards Survey (VHLSS)

## Table B-3: Definitions and Codings (Table 8)

| Column | Original question | Question responses | Coding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HES categorical local administration questions |  |  |  |
| 2 | Does the GVN collect taxes in this village? | $0=$ no; $1=$ no, tax amnesty granted; $2=y e s$, but unsystematically or sporadically; $3=$ yes, systematically | $0 / 1 / 2=0 ; 3=1$ |
| 3 | Is there an active government village administrative committee | $0=$ no; $1=y e s$, consists of village chief only; $2=$ yes but two or more positions vacant; $3=$ yes but one position vacant; $4=$ all positions filled | $0 / 1 / 2 / 3=0 ; 4=1$ |
| 4 | Is the GVN village chief regularly present in this village? | $0=$ no; $1=$ no, irregularly; $2=$ yes but only by day; $3=y e s$, day and night | $0 / 1 / 2=0 ; 3=1$ |
| 5 | Is the GVN hamlet chief regularly present in this hamlet | $0=$ no; $1=$ no, irregularly; $2=$ yes but only by day; $3=y e s$, day and night | $0 / 1 / 2=0 ; 3=1$ |
| Variables available only in a selected sample (not in LCA) |  |  |  |
| 6 | Does the village chief have operational control over RD Cadre personnel working in this village? | $0=$ no, no RD Cadre; $1=$ no, no control; $2=$ yes, partial; $3=y e s$, complete | 1/2=0; $3=1$ |
| Policies under the control of provincial governments (not included in LCA) |  |  |  |
| 7 | Have any self-development projects in this village been retarded because of absence of technical assistance from province or district level personnel? | $0=$ no such projects; $1=$ no, no retardation; $2=$ yes, minor retardation; $3=$ yes, serious retardation; $4=y e s$, resulting in project abandonment | $0 / 1=0 ; 2 / 3 / 4=1$ |
| 8 | Do GVN technical personnel visit this village in support of local development programs? E.g. agriculture technicians, animal husbandry specialists, fisheries specialists, etc. | $0=$ no; $1=y e s$, but infrequently (less than once a month); $2=y e s$, periodically ( $1-3$ times a month); $3=$ yes, regularly (once a week or more); $4=y e s$, resident in village | $0 / 1=0 ; 2 / 3 / 4=1$ |
| 9 | Have officials in the Province Land Affairs Service visited this village to assist in implementing the Land to the Tiller program during the quarter? | $0=$ no; $1=$ yes, once; $2=y e s, 2$ to 4 times; $3=y e s$, more than 4 times | $0 / 1=0 ; 2 / 3=1$ |
| Variables Not Reported in Main Text |  |  |  |
|  | How often does the village chief visit this hamlet | $0=$ never; $1=$ less than once a month; $2=1-4$ times per month; $3=$ twice a week or more; $4=$ resident in the hamlet |  |
|  | Is there a functioning government village office located in this village where official business is regularly conducted or where village administrative records are maintained | $0=\mathrm{no} ; 1=\mathrm{yes}$ |  |

Source for all variables is Hamlet Evaluation System (HES) - National Archives Record Group 472

## Table B-4: Definitions and Codings (Table 9)

| Column | Original question | Question responses | Coding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Categorical HES health care questions |  |  |  |
| 2 | Are government sponsored medical services available to hamlet residents | $0=$ none accessible; $1=y e s$ but further than a nearby hamlet; $2=y e s$, in a nearby hamlet; $3=y e s$ in this hamlet | $0 / 1 / 2=0 ; 3=1$ |
| 3 | Do government health workers visit this hamlet | $0=$ no; $1=<$ once per month; $2=1-3$ times per month; $3=$ once a week or more; $4=$ resident in hamlet | $0 / 1 / 2=0 ; 3 / 4=1$ |
| 4 | Is a government sponsored public health station (dispensary) accessible to residents of this village | $0=$ none accessible; $1=y$ es but further than an adjacent village; $2=y e s$, in the adjacent village; $3=$ yes in the village | $0 / 1 / 2=0 ; 3=1$ |
| 5 | Is a government sponsored maternity clinic accessible to the residents of this village | $0=$ none accessible; $1=y$ es but further than an adjacent village; $2=y e s$, in the adjacent village; $3=y e s$ in the village | $0 / 1 / 2=0 ; 3=1$ |
| Categorical HES education questions |  |  |  |
| 7 | Are the children of hamlet residents able to attend primary school classes (grades 1-5)? | $0=$ no; $1=y e s$, but school located further than nearby hamlet; $2=y e s$, school located in nearby hamlet; $3=y e s$, school located in this hamlet | $0 / 1=0 ; 2 / 3=1$ |
| 8 | Do any of the children of this village complete the five year primary education program | $0=$ none; $1=y e s$, a few; $2=10-40 \% ; 3=41-$ $90 \%$; $4=$ all or nearly all | A continuous variable coded using the midpoints of the intervals |
| 9 | Is a GVN-accredited secondary school (grades 6-12) accessible? | $0=$ no; $1=y e s$, but further than adjacent village; $2=y e s$, in adjacent village; $3=y e s$, in this village | $0 / 1 / 2=0 ; 3=1$ |
| 10 | Do any of the children of village residents attend secondary school | $0=$ no; $1=<5 \% ; 2=5-20 \% ; 3=>20 \%$ | A continuous variable coded using the midpoints of the intervals |
| Other public goods in HES |  |  |  |
| 11 | How often are police or NPFF present in the hamlet? | $0=$ never; $1=$ less than once a month; $2=1-3$ times a month; $3=$ once a week or more; $4=$ regularly present by day; $5=$ regularly present, night and day | 0/1/2/3/4=0; $5=1$ |
| 12 | During daylight hours, do GVN authorities enforce the laws in this hamlet?/During hours of darkness, do GVN authorities enforce the laws in this hamlet? | $0=$ no; $1=$ yes, but marginal; 2=yes, adequate | $2 / 2=1$; otherwise $=0$ |
| 13 | Has any welfare assistance been provided by GVN sources to needy households in this hamlet (excluding assistance provided to GVN-recognized refugees) during the past quarter? | $0=$ no, none needed; $1=$ no; $2=$ yes | $0 / 1=0 ; 2=1$ |
| Variables from provincial yearbooks |  |  |  |
| 14 | Share of communes in district with a secondary school | Continuous variable between 0 and 1 |  |
| Variables not reported in main text |  |  |  |
| Is attendance at primary school restricted by lack of <br> teachers?$\quad 0=$ no; $1=$ yes |  |  |  |
| Is attendance at primary school restricted by the absence or over-crowding of nearby facilities <br> $0=$ no; $1=$ yes |  |  |  |
| Is attendance at primary classes restricted because of security conditions? |  | $0=\mathrm{no} ; 1=\mathrm{yes}$ |  |

Source for variables in columns 1-13 is Hamlet Evaluation System (HES) - National Archives Record Group 472; source for variable in column 14 are provincial yearbooks for the 1999-2004 period.

Table B-5: Definitions and Codings (Table 10)

| Column | Original question | Question responses | Coding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | How Responsive in Respondent's Opinion is the Government to an Individual's Problems/Necessary Paperwork | $\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{very}$ responsive, problems are attended to immediately; <br> $\mathrm{B}=$ very responsive under certain conditions; $\mathrm{C}=$ somewhat responsive under certain conditions; $\mathrm{D}=$ unresponsive, there are usually long delays; $\mathrm{E}=$ very unresponsive, interminable delays, unneccessary red tape, etc | $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{D} / \mathrm{E}=0 ; \mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B}=1$ |
| 2 | What do the People of the Community Think of the Performance of Local Officials in their Role of Insuring Security? | $\mathrm{A}=$ actively work with the people and armed forced to keep the vc out with good success; $\mathrm{B}=$ strive to improve the security situation in the community, but not enitrely successful; $\mathrm{C}=$ have some degree of success in improving security situation; $\mathrm{D}=$ have little or no success in improving the security situation | $B / C / D=0 ; A=1$ |
| 3 | How Well Does the Respondent Know the Village Administrative Organizational Structure? | $\mathrm{A}=$ knows it well; $\mathrm{B}=$ has some knowledge; $\mathrm{C}=$ has little knowledge | $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{C}=0 ; \mathrm{A}=1$ |
| 4 | Do You Believe the Land to the Tiller Program is Being Administered Fairly in Your Village? | $\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{yes}$, very fairly; $\mathrm{B}=\mathrm{yes}$, usually fairly; $\mathrm{C}=$ no, somewhat unfairly; $\mathrm{D}=$ no, very unfairly | $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{D}=0 ; \mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B}=1$ |
| 5 | What do the People of the Community Think About the Performance of the National Government? | $\mathrm{A}=$ the gov't has performed as well as could be expected under the circumstances; $\mathrm{B}=$ with a few exceptions gov't has performed as well as could be expected given the circumstances; $\mathrm{C}=$ gov't has performed adequately; $\mathrm{D}=$ with a few exceptions, the gov't performance has been inadequate; $\mathrm{E}=$ gov't incapable of performing | $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B} / \mathrm{C}=0 ; \mathrm{D} / \mathrm{E}=1$ |
| 6 | How Does the Respondent Rate GVN Performance in Handling Economic Problems? | $\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{very}$ poor, has aggravated problems of people; $\mathrm{B}=$ poor, has done nothing to solve problems; $\mathrm{C}=$ has strived to solve economic problems with some success; $\mathrm{D}=$ has strived to solve economic problems with great success | $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{D}=0 ; \mathrm{A}=1$ |
| 7 | If the Respondent has or is Participating in a Self Dev Project, was or is the Respondent a Member of a Special Interest Group? | $\mathrm{A}=$ involved in self dev, member of group that is very active; $\mathrm{B}=$ involved in self dev, member of group ocassionally active; $\mathrm{C}=$ involved in self dev, member of group that is inactive; $\mathrm{D}=$ not involved in self dev but knows of people who are involved and are group members; $\mathrm{E}=$ not involved in self dev, not a group member and knows nothing of special interest groups | $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{D} / \mathrm{E}=0 ; \mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B}=1$ |
| 8 | Who Decides What Self Development Projects will be Approved? | $\mathrm{A}=$ district chief; $\mathrm{B}=$ village chief; $\mathrm{C}=$ village council or management board; $\mathrm{D}=$ hamlet chief; $\mathrm{E}=\mathrm{RD}$ Cadre; $\mathrm{F}=$ religious leaders; $\mathrm{G}=$ people of the hamlet; $\mathrm{H}=$ american advisors | $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B} / \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{D} / \mathrm{E} / \mathrm{F} / \mathrm{H}=0 ; \mathrm{G}=1$ |

Source for variables is PAAS - National Archives Record Groups 330 and 472

Table B-6: Definitions and Codings (Table 11)

| Column | Original question | Question responses | Coding | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HES categorical variables on insurgency |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Were armed enemy military forces present in inhabited parts of the hamlet during the month | $0=$ no; $1=y$ ys once; $2=y$ es, sporadically; $3=$ yes frequently | $0=0 ; 1 / 2 / 3=1$ |  |
| 3 | Are there areas in or adjacent to this village which enemy forces use as assembly areas for operations against friendly activities in the general area | $0=$ no; $1=$ yes, temporary havens; $2=$ yes, small base areas; $3=$ yes, major base areas | $0=0 ; 1 / 2 / 3=1$ |  |
| 4 | What is the estimated size of the largest village guerrilla unit regularly present in this village (do not include local or main force units) | $0=$ none; $1=$ less than a squad; $2=$ about a squad; $3=$ about a platoon; $4=$ more than a platoon | $0 / 1=0 ; 2 / 3 / 4=1$ |  |
| 5 | What is the estimated size of the largest enemy main or local force unit regularly present in this village or adjacent villages | $0=$ none; $1=$ less than a squad; $2=$ about a squad; $3=$ about a platoon; $4=$ more than a platoon | $0 / 1=0 ; 2 / 3 / 4=1$ | individuals |
| 6 | Which of the following most closely reflects the activity of the VC Infrastructure | $0=$ no known or suspected infrastructure; $1=$ sporadic covert activity, little or no overt activity; $2=$ regular covert activity, sporadic overt activity; $3=$ regular overt activity but not firmly established; $4=$ unchallenged authority in the village | $0 / 1=0 ; 2 / 3 / 4=1$ |  |
| 7 | During this month, was the main surface route leading from this village to the province capital open during daylight hours | $0=$ no; $1=$ yes but regular enemy harassment or taxation; $2=$ yes, sporadic enemy harassment or taxation; $3=$ yes, no enemy harassment or taxation | $3=0 ; 0 / 1 / 2=1$ |  |
| Questions on U.S. and South Vietnamese Interventions |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Have friendly external forces operated in this village during the month? | $0=$ no; $1=y$ ys, no enemy contact; $2=$ yes, light contact with enemy; $3=y$ ys, heavy contact with enemy | $0=0 ; 1 / 2 / 3=1$ |  |
| 9 | Were any friendly artillery fires or air strikes directed in or near the inhabited area of this village during the month? | $0=\mathrm{no}$; $1=\mathrm{yes}$, once; $2=\mathrm{yes}$, sporadically; $3=\mathrm{yes}$, repeatedly | $0=0 ; 1 / 2 / 3=1$ |  |
| 10 | U.S. initiated attack indicator | The data record the coordinates and dates of all U.S. initiated attacks, undertaken by both small and large |  |  |
| 11 | SVN initiated attack indicator | The data record the coordinates and dates of all SVN initiated attacks, undertaken by both small and large |  |  |
| 12 | Regional Forces Indicator | Indicator for whether there was presence of regional forces in the hamlet in the month. |  |  |
| Variables not reported in main text |  |  |  |  |
|  | Did the enemy initiate action against local security forces in or near the hamlet during the past month | $0=\mathrm{no}$; 1=yes once; $2=\mathrm{yes}$, sporadically; $3=$ yes frequently |  |  |
|  | Were any attempts at selective terrorism (kidnapping, assassination) directed at particular government officials, prominent residents, or local leaders of the hamlet during the month | $0=\mathrm{no} ; 1=\mathrm{yes}$ once; $2=$ yes, more than once |  |  |
|  | Were any acts of non-selective terrorism (mining, sabotage, harassing fire, bombing of a public place) directed against people of this hamlet | $0=\mathrm{no} ; 1=\mathrm{yes}$ once; $2=\mathrm{yes}$, more than once |  |  |
|  | Have incidents targeted against government non-military activities (projects, offices, police) occurred in this hamlet | $0=\mathrm{no} ; 1=\mathrm{yes}$, minor; $2=$ yes, serious |  |  |
|  | Do any households have a member or members who participated, by coercion or otherwise, in enemy-organized non-military group activities | $0=$ none; $1=<10 \% ; 2=10 \%-40 \% ; 3=41 \%-90 \% ; 4=$ all or nearly all |  |  |
|  | Were any enemy propaganda meetings held or was printed propaganda distributed in this hamlet | $0=\mathrm{no}$; $1=$ yes once; $2=\mathrm{yes}$, more than once |  |  |
|  | What was the estimated size of the largest enemy local or main force unit present in or near inhabited areas in this village during the month | $0=$ none; $1=$ less than a platoon; $2=$ about a platoon; $3=$ about a company; $4=\mathrm{a}$battalion or more |  |  |
| What was the most serious level of enemy-initiated military activity directedat local security forces$0=$ none; $1=$ minor harassment (sniping, mining, etc); 2=attack by coordinated <br> small arms or automatic weapons fire; $3=$ attack by heavy weapons fire <br> (mortar, rocket, rr, etc.); $4=$ ground assault, repelled; $5=$ ground assault, <br> friendly position overrun |  |  |  |  |
| Which of the following most closely reflects the status of the enemyinfrastructure $\quad$$0=$ no known or suspected infrastructure; $1=$ sporadic covert activity, little or no <br> overt activity; $2=$ regular covert activity, sporadic overt activity mostly at <br> night; $3=$ the primary authority in the hamlet at night but most act covertly <br> during the day; $4=$ the primary authority present day and night |  |  |  |  |
| Do enemy forces tax goods and produce moving to or from this village $0=$ no; $1=$ yes, sporadically; $2=$ yes, regularly |  |  |  |  |
| Does the enemy collect taxes from hamlet households $\quad 0=$ no; $1=$ yes sporadically; $2=$ yes regularly and systematically |  |  |  |  |
| Do any hamlet households have a member(s) in enemy service $\quad 0=$ none; $1=$ yes, a few; $2=10-40 \% ; 3=41-90 \% ; 4=$ all or nearly all |  |  |  |  |
| During daylight hours, do government authorities enforce the laws $\quad 0=$ no; $1=$ yes but marginal; $2=$ yes adequate |  |  |  |  |
| During nighttime hours, do government authorities enforce the laws $0=\mathrm{no} ; 1=$ yes but marginal; $2=$ yes adequate |  |  |  |  |
| Civilian casualties caused by enemy military activities $\quad 0=$ no; $1=$ yes, none killed; $2=$ yes $0-5$ killed; $3=$ yes, $>5$ killed |  |  |  |  |
| Property damage caused by enemy military activities $\quad 0=$ no, $1=$ yes minor, $1=$ yes serious but localized $3=$ yes widespread |  |  |  |  |
| Source for variables in columns 2-9 is Hamlet Evaluation System (HES) - National Archives Record Group 472 <br> Source for variables in columns 10-11 is Situation Report Army (SITRA) - National Archives Record Group 218 |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix C: Complete Analysis of HES Questions

This appendix examines questions contained in the Hamlet Evaluation System (HES) that fall outside the main scope of the study. There are three reasons why we do not examine questions in the main text: 1) For many variables, we have no clear theoretical predictions about how the historical state would affect them. Hence they do little to elucidate the hypotheses that we are testing and are also not good candidates for placebo outcomes. 2) Some questions are only answered by hamlets meeting certain criteria - which may themselves be affected by treatment - complicating the interpretation of the coefficients. For example, a village would answer a question about how self-development projects were progressing only if some projects were underway. 3) Some questions were only collected for part of the sample period. Questions were removed if challenges to their interpretation came to light. Moreover, if the set of questions changes over time, the inputs to the latent class index also change, making the average of this index across the sample period more difficult to interpret. For completeness, Tables C-1-C-6 examine all these outcomes, and the online appendix list the question text and coding. The conclusions that emerge are highly consistent with those in the main text.

Additional Modules: Table C-1 begins by considering the 26 questions - covering a range of topics - that consider "friendly security" - i.e. U.S. security forces, South Vietnamese security forces, and other factors relevant for maintaining security during the Vietnam War. In a few cases the questions reflect features primarily under local control, and the effects are in the expected direction. For example, Dai Viet villages are more likely to have a village security plan (column 18), and they are more likely to have household members in government service (column 26). For most questions, however, we have no clear prior about the direction of the effects. For example, we do not have a theory on how the historical state would affect the time of day that different types of curfews are imposed, and indeed find no effects (columns 21-23). Outcomes like whether or not the village had an air or artillery strike (column 7), which external security force is primarily responsible for maintaining security (column 11), reaction times of nearby forces (columns 15-16), and the amount of fire support that external forces provide to local security forces (column 17) result from the interaction of external decisions and local security conditions, and hence are a less clear test of differences in local conditions or external decisions than the outcomes examined in the main text. With the exception of the question on the security force primarily responsible for maintaining security - which is more likely to be the Popular/Regional Forces (regional defense forces) in Dai Viet areas - the estimates are not statistically significant. ${ }^{1}$ Other outcomes, such as misconduct by security forces (columns 2 and 3 ) and casualties/damage caused by friendly security forces (columns 8 and 9 ), are interesting but beyond the scope of the hypotheses that we focus on.

Next, Table C-2 considers two additional HES modules not examined in the main text: psychological operations (psyops) and Land to Tiller. Psyops aimed to convince South Vietnamese citizens to support the U.S. backed South Vietnamese government rather than the Viet Cong insurgency. Some pysops programs, such as leaflet drops, were planned centrally using algorithms. Others, such as displaying posters, involved the local government. Dai Viet hamlets are more likely to have trained an information cadre to manage propaganda within the hamlet (column 2), although there is no impact on whether the village office also has an information cadre (column 5). They are also more likely to have mobile information cadre visit the village (column 7), perhaps as a result of having more local guerrilla activity, as seen in the main text. As expected given their higher income levels, Dai Viet households are more likely to own a television (column 4). They are also more likely to have new static visual displays (posters) posted regularly (column 3), plausibly as a result of the hamlet information cadre whose job is to maintain such displays.

Columns 8 to 13 of Table C-2 examine measures in the Land to Tiller module, which considers the South Vietnamese land reform conducted during the 1960s and 70s and implemented through cooperation between local and central authorities. There are not statistically or economically significant differences in the share of households that were tenants, landowners, squatters, and wage laborers (columns 9-12). Dai Viet villages are less likely to grant titles (column 13), a result that is highly consistent with the more recent effects on titling documented in the main text.

Conditional Questions: Next, we examine questions that are answered only if some other condition holds. Table C-3 considers outcomes that speak to the categories of variables that are examined in the main text. While some

[^1]caution is required in interpretation, to the extent that effects are statistically significant, they tend to go in the expected direction. The share of the village council that is elected - conditional on there being a council - is higher in Dai Viet villages (column 2). Moreover, self-development projects are more likely to be retarded by material shortages (column 4). The labor for self-development projects was provided through local organizing but materials were received from higher levels of government. To the extent that Dai Viet villages were better able to organize labor for projects, we would expect them to be more likely to hit a material constraint. There are not significant effects on whether self-development projects are progressing satisfactorily (conditional on being underway), on whether the chief corrects grievances raised in village meetings (conditional on those meetings occurring), and on whether the village school is sanctioned by the Vietnamese government (conditional on it existing).

Table C-4 examines the three outcome categories considered in the appendix: friendly security, psychological operations, and Land to Tiller. Effects that reflect outcomes under local control again tend to go in the expected direction: conditional on a police presence, police in Dai Viet villages are more likely to perform daytime (though not nighttime) security checks (columns 1 and 2), conditional on existing the People's Self Defense Force is more likely to be active (column 3), and allowances are more likely to be paid to refugees if they are present (column 10). If anything, outcomes in this table also suggest tenser relations between the village chief and various security and external forces, perhaps reflecting the greater local guerrilla presence documented in the main text: the village chief is less likely to control the popular forces (a regional defense force, column 4) and the national police (a police force operating locally and supported by the South Vietnamese central government, column 12). The RD cadre (the corps of South Vietnamese development aid workers) are less likely to have a positive impact on the hamlet government (as rated by the hamlet government, column 7) and are also less likely to sleep in the village (column 9), possibly reflecting the greater guerrilla presence or hostility towards outsiders more generally. There is no effect on whether the RD cadre cooperate with the local government in executing their duties (column 8), nor are there effects on whether the identities of the local VC infrastructure or guerrillas are known to friendly intelligence personnel (columns 5 and 6).

Questions Asked for Only Part of the Sample Period: Finally, we examine questions that were asked during only part of the sample period (1969-1973). Some were removed when it became apparent that they were not informative, whereas others were added later. To the extent that the questions are less informative, we would expect estimates to be at best noisier. For this reason - and also to ensure that the latent class index contains a consistent set of questions across the sample period - we do not focus on these questions in the main text.

Table C-5 considers outcomes that relate to questions examined in the main text. Most estimates are not statistically different from zero; those that are go in the expected direction given the results in the main text. There are not statistically significant effects on whether prices are publicized and controlled (to reduce inflation, column 1), on whether the hamlet is represented on the village council (most are, column 7 ), or on whether selfdevelopment projects are impacted by corruption (column 8). Households are more likely to have a rice surplus (column 4) but not a non-rice surplus (column 5) or a village labor surplus (column 3). There is less likely to be skills training offered (column 2). Village officials are more likely to settle disputes than traditional authorities or the Viet Cong, as we would expect given the centrality of historical village government (column 6). There is not a difference in whether village officials are sent to a training center subsidized by the central government (column 9). Conditional on there being a legally established budget, Dai Viet villages are more likely to fund the full budget locally (column 10).

Next, in Table C-6 we consider the additional outcomes: friendly security, psychological operations, and Land to Tiller. The effects for friendly security tend to be statistically insignificant. To the extent they are different from zero, they are consistent with the results documented above i.e. Dai Viet households are more likely to own a radio (column 7) and are less likely to have formal title to their land (column 8).
Table C-1: Friendly Security

| Panel $A$ | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Friendly Security <br> LCA <br> (1) | Local <br> Security Misconduct (2) | External Force Misconduct (3) | Local Sec Contacted Enemy (4) | PSDF <br> Engages Enemy (5) | Friendly External Forces (6) | Friendly <br> Air <br> Strikes <br> (7) | Friendly Civilian Cas. (8) | Friendly <br> Property Damage <br> (9) |
| Dai Viet | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.143 \\ (0.056) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.008 \\ (0.005) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.015 \\ (0.004) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.014 \\ (0.015) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.010 \\ (0.006) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.024 \\ (0.037) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.040 \\ (0.031) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.006 \\ & (0.003) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.004 \\ (0.004) \end{gathered}$ |
| Obs | 2,348 | 2,326 | 2,333 | 2,326 | 2,301 | 389 | 388 | 2,331 | 2,331 |
| Clusters | 399 | 398 | 398 | 398 | 397 | 389 | 388 | 398 | 398 |
| Mean | 0.44 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.49 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Panel B | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Friendly Force Defeat (10) | $\mathrm{PF} / \mathrm{RF}$ <br> Primarily Responsible <br> (11) | GVN <br> No Go <br> Darkness <br> (12) | GVN <br> No Go <br> Daylight <br> (13) | Military <br> Base <br> Nearby <br> (14) | Daylight Reaction Time (15) | Darkness Reaction Time (16) | Reasonable Fire Support (17) | Village Security Plan (18) |
| Dai Viet | $\begin{aligned} & -0.011 \\ & (0.011) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.259 \\ (0.053) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.019 \\ (0.018) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.011 \\ (0.014) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.202 \\ (0.048) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.008 \\ (0.018) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.016 \\ (0.027) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.009 \\ (0.008) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.103 \\ (0.040) \end{gathered}$ |
| Obs | 2,341 | 2,339 | 2,337 | 2,329 | 390 | 389 | 389 | 389 | 388 |
| Clusters | 398 | 397 | 397 | 397 | 390 | 389 | 389 | 389 | 388 |
| Mean | 0.03 | 0.52 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.46 | 0.95 | 0.89 | 0.98 | 0.74 |
| Panel C | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NP <br> Enforces Law (19) | NP Reg Present Hamlet (20) | Inhabited Curfew $9: 30$ $(21)$ | Surrounding Curfew $9: 30$ $(22)$ | Road Curfew 9:30 (23) | NP Reg <br> Present Village (24) | NP <br> Procedures Up to Date (25) | HH Member in Gvt Service (26) | Non-comm Political Parties (27) |
| Dai Viet | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.012 \\ (0.028) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.146 \\ (0.033) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.052 \\ (0.061) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.040 \\ (0.072) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.015 \\ (0.054) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.023 \\ (0.022) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.049 \\ (0.025) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.099 \\ (0.025) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.197 \\ (0.035) \end{gathered}$ |
| Obs | 2,338 | 2,339 | 2,339 | 2,339 | 389 | 388 | 388 | 2,333 | 388 |
| Clusters | 397 | 397 | 397 | 397 | 389 | 388 | 388 | 397 | 388 |
| Mean | 0.82 | 0.80 | 0.31 | 0.41 | 0.48 | 0.97 | 0.85 | 0.53 | 0.54 |

Notes: The unit of analysis is the hamlet (columns 1-5, 8-13, 19-22, and 26) or the village (columns 6-7, 14-18, 23-25, and 27). Outcomes measured between 1969-1973. All regressions include a linear RD polynomial in latitude and longitude, a control for distance to Ho Chi Minh City, and boundary segment fixed effects. Robust standard errors, clustered at the village level, are reported in parenthe-
Table C-2: Psychological Operations and Land to Tiller

|  | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pysch | Hamlet | Static | \% HH | Village | Exposure | Mobile | Land | \% HH | \% HH | \% HH | \% HH | LTT |
|  | Opps | Info | Visual | Own | Info | to GVN | Info | Tiller | Land | Land | Land | Wage | Titles |
|  | LCA | Cadre | Displays | TV | Cadre | Movies | Visits | LCA | Tenants | Owners | Squatters | Laborers | Granted |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) |
| Dai Viet | 0.177 | 0.103 | 0.198 | 0.105 | -0.049 | 0.057 | 0.085 | 0.008 | -0.012 | 0.025 | 0.002 | 0.016 | -0.096 |
|  | (0.038) | (0.037) | (0.044) | (0.023) | (0.040) | (0.053) | (0.040) | (0.040) | (0.021) | (0.036) | (0.008) | (0.021) | (0.033) |
| Obs | 2,348 | 2,313 | 2,336 | 2,330 | 387 | 388 | 388 | 387 | 328 | 330 | 334 | 329 | 326 |
| Clusters | 399 | 393 | 397 | 397 | 387 | 388 | 388 | 387 | 328 | 330 | 334 | 329 | 326 |
| Mean | 0.36 | 0.62 | 0.47 | 0.22 | 0.74 | 0.49 | 0.41 | 0.48 | 0.18 | 0.53 | 0.03 | 0.14 | 0.48 |

Notes: The unit of analysis is the hamlet (columns 1-4) or the village (columns 5-13). Outcomes measured between 1969-1973. All regressions include a
linear RD polynomial in latitude and longitude, a control for distance to Ho Chi Minh City, and boundary segment fixed effects. Robust standard errors, clustered at the village level, are reported in parentheses
Table C-3: Main Outcomes: Selected

| Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Self Dev | Share | Chief | Self Dev | School |
|  | Progress | Council | Corrects | Material | Sanctioned |
|  | Satisfact. | Elected | Grievances | Shortage | GVN |
|  | $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ |
| Dai Viet | -0.000 | 0.019 | 0.001 | 0.147 | 0.002 |
|  | $(0.030)$ | $(0.006)$ | $(0.041)$ | $(0.028)$ | $(0.005)$ |
| Obs | 2,277 | 321 | 385 | 382 | 2,322 |
| Clusters | 391 | 321 | 385 | 382 | 396 |
| Mean | 0.26 | 0.98 | 0.75 | 0.20 | 0.99 |
| Notes: The unit of analysis is the hamlet (columns 1 and 5) or the village |  |  |  |  |  |
| (columns 2-4). Outcomes measured between 1969-1973. All regressions |  |  |  |  |  |
| include a linear RD polynomial in latitude and longitude, a control for dis- |  |  |  |  |  |
| tance to Ho Chi Minh City, and boundary segment fixed effects. Robust |  |  |  |  |  |
| standard errors, clustered at the village level, are reported in parentheses. |  |  |  |  |  |

Table C-4: Alternative Outcomes: Selected

Table C-5: Main Outcomes: Partial Sample Period

|  | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Prices | Skills | Village |  |  | Officials | Hamlet | Projects | Vung | Budget |
|  | Publicized, | Training | Labor | Rice | Non-Rice | Settle | Represented | Affected by | Tau | Funded |
|  | Controlled <br> (1) | Offered (2) | Surplus (3) | Surplus <br> (4) | Surplus <br> (5) | Disputes (6) | Council <br> (7) | Corruption <br> (8) | Training (9) | Locally <br> (10) |
| Dai Viet | -0.021 | -0.164 | -0.069 | 0.240 | -0.070 | 0.052 | 0.024 | 0.010 | 0.067 | 0.136 |
|  | (0.042) | (0.062) | (0.065) | (0.057) | (0.055) | (0.026) | (0.031) | (0.024) | (0.042) | (0.049) |
| Obs | 384 | 382 | 384 | 378 | 379 | 2,234 | 1,592 | 373 | 382 | 331 |
| Clusters | 384 | 382 | 384 | 378 | 379 | 386 | 334 | 373 | 382 | 331 |
| Mean | 0.25 | 0.57 | 0.36 | 0.67 | 0.71 | 0.97 | 0.90 | 0.07 | 0.60 | 0.23 |

Notes: The unit of analysis is the hamlet (columns 6-7) or the village (columns 1-5 and 8-10). Outcomes measured between 1969-
1973. All regressions include a linear RD polynomial in latitude and longitude, a control for distance to Ho Chi Minh City, and boundary segment fixed effects. Robust standard errors, clustered at the village level, are reported in parentheses.
Table C-6: Alternative Outcomes: Partial Sample Period

|  | Dependent variable is: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | VC Targets | PSDP | Local | Local | Police | Police | \% HH | \% HH | LTT | Effort |
|  | Sleep in | Performs | Security | Security | Present | In | Own | No | Land | Implement |
|  | House <br> (1) | Well (2) | Adequate (3) | Plan <br> (4) | Day/Night <br> (5) | Uniform <br> (6) | Radios <br> (7) | Title <br> (8) | Disputes <br> (9) | $\begin{gathered} \text { LTT } \\ \hline 10) \end{gathered}$ |
| Dai Viet | 0.064 | -0.092 | 0.012 | -0.041 | -0.030 | 0.046 | 0.063 | 0.049 | -0.015 | -0.013 |
|  | (0.045) | (0.062) | (0.015) | (0.053) | (0.032) | (0.065) | (0.024) | (0.025) | (0.015) | (0.031) |
| Obs | 2,280 | 1,964 | 2,288 | 384 | 384 | 382 | 2,290 | 300 | 305 | 301 |
| Clusters | 392 | 356 | 392 | 384 | 384 | 382 | 392 | 300 | 305 | 301 |
| Mean | 0.80 | 0.79 | 0.98 | 0.68 | 0.91 | 0.65 | 0.71 | 0.18 | 0.05 | 0.90 |
| Notes: The unit of analysis is the hamlet (columns 1-3 and 7) or the village (columns 4-6 and 8-10). Outcomes measured between |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969-1973. All regressions include a linear RD polynomial in latitude and longitude, a control for distance to Ho Chi Minh City, and |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| boundary | gment fixed | ects. Robu | standard | rors, clust | ed at the vil | ge level, | reporte | in paren |  |  |


[^0]:    Source for variable in column 1 is PAAS - National Archives Record Groups 330 and 472
    Source for variables in columns 3-9 is Hamlet Evaluation System (HES) - National Archives Record Group 472

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Alternatives include the National Police Field Force, the Army of South Vietnam, and the U.S. Army.

