



The racial gap in education and the legacy of slavery

Graziella Bertocchi^{a,*}, Arcangelo Dimico^b

^a University of Modena, CEPR, CHILD and IZA, Dipartimento di Economia Politica, Viale Berengario 51, I-41121 Modena, Italy

^b Queen's University of Belfast, Management School, Riddel Hall, 185 Stranmillis Road, Belfast, BT9 5EE, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Available online 21 April 2012

JEL classification:

J15
I24
N31
O11

Keywords:

Race
Inequality
Education
Slavery
Development

ABSTRACT

Bertocchi, Graziella, and Dimico, Arcangelo – The racial gap in education and the legacy of slavery

We study the evolution of racial educational inequality across US states from 1940 to 2000. We show that throughout this period, despite evidence of convergence, the racial gap in attainment between blacks and whites has been persistently determined by the initial gap. We obtain these results with 2SLS estimates where slavery is used as an instrument for the initial gap. We address the question of the excludability of slavery by instrumenting it with the share of disembarked slaves from the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade. Using the same approach we also find that income growth is negatively affected by the initial racial gap in education and that slavery affects growth indirectly through this channel. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 40 (4) (2012) 581–595. University of Modena, CEPR, CHILD and IZA, Dipartimento di Economia Politica, Viale Berengario 51, I-41121 Modena, Italy; Queen's University of Belfast, Management School, Riddel Hall, 185 Stranmillis Road, Belfast, BT9 5EE, UK.

© 2012 Association for Comparative Economic Studies Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Among the several dimensions of inequality, racial inequality is a rather peculiar characteristic of American society, if compared to other countries at similar levels of development. Because of the crucial role played by human capital in determining earnings prospects, the unequal distribution of income between blacks and whites is in turn closely associated with the underlying racial gap in educational attainment. Over time, black–white gaps in schooling have actually decreased.¹ At the same time, however, this trend has come to a halt in more recent decades,² confirming the persistence of deeply-rooted racial disparities despite the observed process of convergence. These recent developments suggest that the dynamics of the racial gap in attainment follow path dependence, i.e., they are influenced by initial conditions.

To test the hypothesis that racial educational inequality persists over time and depends on its initial level, which can be measured from the year 1940,³ would inevitably expose the empirical analysis to omitted variables and measurement errors bias leading to inconsistent estimates. To address this problem, it is legitimate to turn the attention to the association between the racial gap in education in 1940 and past slavery. Collins and Margo (2006) narrate how in the aftermath of the Civil War the

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: graziella.bertocchi@unimore.it (G. Bertocchi), arcangelo_dimico@hotmail.it (A. Dimico).

URL: http://www.economia.unimore.it/Bertocchi_Graziella (G. Bertocchi).

¹ Collins and Margo (2006) document these progresses for the period before 1960, while Smith (1984) and Smith and Welch (1989) provide evidence for the 1940–1980 period, and Neal (2006) for the 1960–2000 period.

² Neal (2006) documents that among 26–30 years old, the racial educational attainment gap in 2000 is actually slightly larger than in 1990.

³ State-level census data are available from 1940 to 2000.

“legacies of slavery” determined extremely high rates of illiteracy among blacks. Margo (1990) documents how the obstacles subsequently encountered by black children in acquiring education represented the channels through which past slavery ended in inequalities which were still present at the eve of World War Two. Indeed the correlation between the racial educational gap in 1940 and the share of slaves over population in 1860 is extremely high: 0.90 and 0.81 at the high-school and bachelor level, respectively. However, to use past slavery as an instrument for the initial gap in education raises questions regarding its excludability, which may not be warranted in the presence of any direct effect on educational outcomes.

The goal of this paper is twofold. First, we aim at obtaining empirical estimates of the persistency of the effect of the initial gap on subsequent educational disparities between whites and blacks. Second, we try to establish that past slavery – being a crucial determinant of the initial gap – still plays a considerable role in American society.

We can present our empirical strategy and our results in two steps. First, we look at the determinants of the racial educational gap over the 1940–2000 period using a simple OLS estimator, with a focus on the potential effect of past slavery. This preliminary step reveals that slavery in 1860 does appear to influence the dependent variable only through the initial gap. This indirect effect of slavery therefore suggests that slavery may be a suitable instrument for the latter. However, omitted variables and measurement errors bias may once again be present in the relationship between slavery and the initial gap, yielding inconsistency of OLS and consequent under-estimation of the effect of the initial gap on subsequent inequality. Moreover, the excludability of slavery needs to be assured more formally. To address these problems, we use an instrument for slavery in 1860 which we construct on the basis of information on the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade (TAST). In more detail, we use the ratio of disembarked slaves in any given state to the total number of slaves disembarked in the US during the TAST as an instrument for the state's slave share in 1860. The relevance of the instrument is assured by the high correlation between the two variables (almost 0.49). Its excludability can be defended on the ground that it is reasonable to expect that the impact of the share of disembarked slaves on contemporaneous racial educational inequality only runs through the effect on the slave share in 1860 and its subsequent influence on disenfranchisement and education policy. The resulting 2SLS estimates – where slavery is instrumented with the share of disembarked share – confirm the absence of a direct effect of slavery in 1860 on the racial educational gap and that slavery only affects the latter through the initial gap.

As a second step, we proceed by estimating the effect of the initial gap in 1940 on the subsequent evolution of educational inequality using a 2SLS estimator where past slavery in 1860 is employed as an instrument for the initial gap in 1940. While the relevance of the instrument is assured by its previously-reported high correlation with the initial gap, our results from the first step now also support its excludability, since in previous regressions we show that past slavery affects the educational gap only through the initial gap. The 2SLS estimates confirm the impact of the initial gap and thus the persistence of racial educational inequality. These results, taken together with the link we establish between initial gap and slavery, validate the conjecture that the origins of education inequality are indeed very deeply rooted throughout American history.

Once having established the nature of the link between past slavery and racial educational inequality, we turn to its potential association with income growth throughout the 1940–2000 period. Again we proceed in two steps. First, we show that slavery in 1860, again instrumented with the share of disembarked slaves resulting from the TAST, has no direct effect on growth. Second, we can use slavery in 1860 as an instrument for the initial educational gap and show that the latter exerts a negative influence on growth. Thus, we find that slavery matters for growth but once again only indirectly and we identify this channel as racial educational inequality.

To sum up, our results show a persistent effect of the 1940 level of racial educational inequality both on subsequent racial educational inequality and income growth. We also find that past slavery still matters for both outcomes, not directly but indirectly through its influence on the initial gap in attainment between blacks and whites. In other words, those US states that relied more intensively on the use of slave labor still exhibit today larger racial disparities in education and lower growth, through a channel which is represented by the initial gap in attainment, i.e., through the transmission of human capital.

As a by-product of our investigation, we also suggest that past slavery can be used as an instrument for the degree of educational inequality across US states still prevailing at the eve of World War Two, because it affects contemporaneous outcomes only through this indirect channel. Since previous work on the link between inequality and development has been plagued by reverse causality and omitted variables bias, this result is of independent interest and could be exploited in future research.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 summarizes the related literature. Section 3 presents the stylized facts and begins our empirical investigation on the determinants of the racial educational gap over the 1940–2000 period through OLS estimates. In Section 4 we illustrate our two-step instrumentation strategy to obtain consistent 2SLS estimates. Section 5 extends the analysis to the determinants of income growth. Section 6 derives our conclusion.

2. Related literature

This work is related to an emerging literature which is focused on the long-term effect of slavery on the US economy and society. Building on Engerman and Sokoloff (2005), Nunn (2008a) finds that past slave use is negatively correlated with current economic development for a sample of US counties.⁴ Over the same sample, Bertocchi and Dimico (2011a) instead show that the main effect of past slavery is on current income inequality, while the effect on income is not robust to controls for structural differences across US states. They also suggest that the channel of transmission from slavery to inequality is human

⁴ Similar conclusions are reached by Mitchener and McLean (2003) and Lagerlöf (2005).

capital, since current income inequality is primarily influenced by slavery through the unequal educational attainment of blacks and whites.⁵ While racial educational inequality in Bertocchi and Dimico (2011a) is simply measured by years of schooling in the year 2000, in this paper we expand the investigation to a state-level panel dataset over the 1940–2000 period which contains specific information on educational attainment by race. This allows us to improve our understanding of the dynamics of racial inequality along the educational dimension.

A separate research line, which is also relevant to our approach, has focused on the impact of race on inequality. This work has documented that, since emancipation and especially since 1940, the average income of black Americans has increased greatly. Both the civil rights movement, through its impact on labor market discrimination, and the gradual closing of the human capital gap have been advanced as possible explanations of the observed trend (Heckman, 1990; Margo, 1990). As mentioned in the introduction, the evolution of racial inequality in educational attainment has been illustrated by Smith (1984), Smith and Welch (1989), Margo (1990), Collins and Margo (2006), and Neal (2006).⁶ The evidence collected by these authors document the evolution of racial differences both in the quality and the quantity of education. After the Civil War, African-Americans had essentially no exposure to formal schooling, as a legacy of the extremely high rates of illiteracy that existed under slavery. The first generations of former slaves were able to complete far fewer years of schooling, on average, than whites and had access to racially segregated public schools, mostly in the South, where they received a qualitatively inferior education, even if compared to that received by Southern whites.⁷ Initially the combination of low educational attainment and inferior educational quality determined the persistence of large income gaps. Subsequently, however, the racial schooling gap declined, as successive generations of black children received more and better schooling, with an eventual impact on earnings. Overall, despite the initial conditions and the persistence of discrimination, the reported evidence on the evolution of educational differences, in a wide number of dimensions (such as literacy rates, years of educational attainment, spending per pupil, and returns to literacy), points to long-term convergence but also to persistence of the legacies of the past.⁸ Our contribution to this line of research is to provide empirical estimates of the determinants of the evolution of racial educational inequality and to establish how it is linked to past slavery.

Finally, this paper is also related to the literature on the evolution of the US educational system and its effects on income distribution and growth. An exhaustive discussion of the topic is provided by Goldin and Katz (2001), who point to the expansion of secondary education in the twentieth century (the high-school movement) as the main determinant of the subsequent growth differentials between the US and Europe. Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1991), Jones (2002), Higgins et al. (2006), Aghion et al. (2009), and Galor et al. (2009) also view education as the main driver of economic growth across US states. However, while most of the literature on education and growth looks at the level of education, either as investment in human capital or schooling attainment, here we focus on the distribution of education across different races, i.e., on the racial dimension of educational inequality.⁹

3. The determinants of the racial educational inequality

We start looking at the dynamics of racial inequality along the educational dimension using a panel of educational attainment across races for the US states in the 1940–2000 period. Table 1 shows the shares of whites and blacks with at least either a high-school education or a bachelor degree. Over the 1940–2000 period whites are on average more educated than blacks. The share of white population with at least a high-school level of education is above 60% against a 47% of black population. The gap between whites and blacks is even larger (in relative terms) when we consider the share of population with a bachelor degree (15.4% against 8.8%). In this case the share of black population holding a bachelor degree is in mean 40% smaller than the corresponding white. In addition, the population in the North of the US seems to have a higher level of education both within the black and the white population.

In Fig. 1 (the two plots at the top) we show the time evolution of the educational gap between whites and blacks calculated as the ratio of the share of whites to the share of blacks with at least a high-school diploma (on the LHS) or a bachelor degree (on the RHS). The figure shows a sort of convergence in the share of population (belonging to the two groups) with a high-school education. The gap between the shares of whites and blacks holding a bachelor degree also decreases over time, but this seems to occur at a slower rate. In the two panels at the bottom of the figure we plot the educational gap against the initial educational gap. The panels show that those states which started with a larger gap are nowadays the ones which still have larger racial inequality in terms of education, both at the high-school (LHS) and the bachelor (RHS) level. Therefore, on the one hand we observe a sort of convergence across racial groups over the period (the two panels at the top). On the other

⁵ For a sample of Mississippi counties, Bertocchi and Dimico (2011b) find that the legacy of slavery prevails over political institutions as the main force driving post-war development.

⁶ See also Goldin and Margo (1992), Goldin (1998), and Goldin and Katz (1999).

⁷ Naidu (2010) estimates the effect of the nineteenth century disenfranchisement laws for blacks in the South and finds that they are associated with a fall in black educational inputs and thus with low-quality Southern schooling. For Mississippi Bertocchi and Dimico (2011b) show that black disenfranchisement exerts a persistent and significant effect on the number of black teachers per black pupil and education expenditure for blacks in the subsequent decades, at least up to the 1950s. On school segregation in the US South see also Welch (1973), Orazem (1987), Card and Krueger (1992), and Fishback and Baskin (1991).

⁸ A related stream of the literature has measured the long-term influence of family background. See for example Cameron and Heckman (2001) and Sacerdote (2005).

⁹ On the empirical links between inequality and growth in the US, see for example Partridge (1997), Panizza (2002), and Frank (2009).

Table 1
Educational attainment, by race, 1940–2000.

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
<i>All states</i>					
High-school diploma (Whites)	297	60.2291	21.34998	16.37847	94.43
Bachelor degree (Whites)	297	15.42412	9.624878	2.813198	77.3
High-school diploma (Blacks)	297	47.18088	26.79546	2.594816	95.9
Bachelor degree (Blacks)	297	8.758676	6.594131	.3484704	34.82
<i>Northern states</i>					
High-school diploma (Whites)	199	64.82332	20.23654	20.85144	94.43
Bachelor degree (Whites)	199	16.91558	10.25016	3.544309	77.3
High-school diploma (Blacks)	199	54.32846	25.12736	5.924223	95.9
Bachelor degree (Blacks)	199	10.1778	7.026015	1.125535	34.82
<i>Southern states</i>					
High-school diploma (Whites)	98	50.90004	20.58661	16.37847	86.31
Bachelor degree (Whites)	98	12.39555	7.375334	2.813198	34.73
High-school diploma (Blacks)	98	32.66692	24.17767	2.594816	78.95
Bachelor degree (Blacks)	98	5.876993	4.404805	.3484704	20.29




Fig. 1. The educational gap between whites and blacks, 1940–2000.

hand there has been a sort of divergence across states such that the absolute educational gap between racial groups has been absorbed faster in states which started with a lower gap (the two panels at the bottom).

Descriptive statistics for educational gaps (which again we proxy with the white share of educated over the black share of educated, both at the high-school and bachelor level) are reported in Table 2. The table also reports the pairwise correlation between the initial gaps in 1940 and the share of slaves in 1860 over population. At the high-school level the correlation is 0.90, while the correlation at the college level is almost 0.81. The large correlation between the share of slaves in 1860 and the initial gap suggests that one could consider the former as a mere proxy for the former. However the association between the two variables requires a more formal inspection.

In Table 3 we start by regressing the educational gap on its initial level in 1940, in a parsimonious specification where we only control for population density as well as region and time fixed effects, in order to use the maximal number of observations. Population density is included as a proxy for prosperity. We use a dummy for Southern States in order to control for structural and political/institutional differences between the North and the South of the US. The Atlantic dummy is entered because there is evidence that the vicinity to the coast, and in particular to the Atlantic Ocean, affects the general level of development.¹⁰

¹⁰ See Lagerlöf (2005) and Rappaport and Sachs (2003) for an analysis of the coastal concentration of economic activity in the US.

Table 2
Descriptive statistics.

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
<i>Descriptive statistics</i>					
Educational gap 1940 (High-S.)	297	2.789	2.340	0.303	10.840
Educational gap 1940 (Bachelor)	297	3.225	2.819	0.163	15.638
Slaves/population 1860	336	0.115	0.180	0	0.5718
		Gap 1940 H.S.	Gap 1940 Bach.		Slaves/Pop. 1860
<i>Pairwise correlation</i>					
Educational gap 1940 (High-S.)	1.0000				
Educational gap 1940 (Bachelor)	0.9645		1.0000		
Slaves/population 1860	0.9023		0.8088		1.0000

Note: See Appendix for data sources.

Table 3
The determinants of the racial educational gap, 1940–2000.

Estimation method: pooled OLS	Model 1 Gap H.S.	Model 2 Gap bach.	Model 3 Gap H.S.	Model 4 Gap bach.	Model 5 Gap H.S.	Model 6 Gap bach.
Educational gap 1940 (High-S.)	0.320*** (20.06)				0.300*** (9.49)	
Educational gap 1940 (Bachelor)		0.270*** (17.68)				0.254*** (11.56)
Population density	-0.127*** (-3.04)	0.0559 (0.63)	-0.0359 (-0.94)	0.222*** (3.25)	-0.124** (-2.14)	0.116 (1.20)
Southern states dummy	-0.207** (-2.61)	-0.273** (-2.31)	-0.501 (-1.52)	-0.545 (-1.23)	-0.231** (-2.13)	-0.117 (-0.71)
Atlantic dummy	0.0220 (0.30)	0.00428 (0.03)	-0.0161 (-0.11)	-0.196 (-0.96)	0.0271 (0.32)	-0.0599 (-0.36)
Slaves/population 1860			4.454*** (4.53)	4.274*** (3.04)	0.357 (0.73)	0.0308 (0.05)
Constant	0.954*** (5.93)	0.752** (2.31)	0.951*** (5.87)	0.436 (1.49)	0.920*** (3.82)	0.452 (1.21)
Time dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	297	297	258	258	258	258
R-squared	0.68	0.53	0.64	0.46	0.69	0.53

State-level clustered robust *t* statistics in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$.

** $p < 0.05$.

*** $p < 0.01$.

Model 1 shows that the gap in high-school education depends significantly on the initial gap. Keeping all the other factors constant, the attainment ratio at the high-school level increases by 0.32 for a unit increase in the initial gap. Model 2 shows results for the gap between shares of population holding a bachelor degree. Decreasing the initial gap for the population holding a bachelor degree by a unit decreases the gap by almost 0.27. Population density exerts a negative and significant impact on the high-school gap (Model 1), while its effect on the college gap is not significant (Model 2). The dummy for Southern states is significant and negative.

In Models 3 and 4 we replace measures of the initial gap with the share of slaves in 1860 and find that the share of slaves in 1860 has a significantly positive effect on the racial gaps both at the high-school and bachelor levels. The Southern states dummy now loses significance. When in Models 5 and 6 we enter the share of slaves together with the initial gaps, the former loses significance, which is not surprising given the pattern of correlation previously described.¹¹ These findings suggest that the impact of slavery on the evolution of the educational gap may run through its impact on the initial gaps.

Results in Table 3 confirm the sort of cross-state divergence in education between blacks and whites which is illustrated in Fig. 1. States which started in 1940 with a larger racial gap in terms of education still show a larger racial educational inequality in 2000, if compared to states in which blacks and whites had similar levels of education. Moreover, slavery appears to affect the educational gaps through their initial levels.

In Table 4 we enter interactions between year dummies and the initial gap to evaluate how the impact of the latter evolves through time. In Model 1 the effect of the initial gap on the later gap at the high-school level increases in 1960 and 1970 and then becomes negative starting from the 1990s. This suggests that states with a larger initial gap have started closing the gap (relative to other states) since 1990, which is consistent with the plot in Fig. 1.¹² The pattern can be explained

¹¹ In Models 3–6 the number of observations is lower since a few states (e.g., Hawaii, Idaho, Montana) do not appear in the 1860 Census.

¹² The fact that the interactions at the high-school level turn negative after 1990 does not mean that the gap in education has become smaller in states with an initial larger gap. These negative coefficients mean that the marginal reduction in the gap from 1990 is faster in states with a larger initial gap, even though the educational gap remains larger in absolute terms (see Fig. 1). This is the reason why the gap in 1940 is significant and positive.

Table 4
Controlling for time interactions.

Estimation method: pooled OLS	Model 1 Gap H.S.	Model 2 Gap Bach.
Educational gap 1940 (High-S.)	0.299*** (8.61)	
Educational gap 1940 (Bachelor)		0.171*** (10.07)
Population density	−0.0535* (−1.84)	−0.108*** (−3.21)
Southern states dummy	−0.172*** (−2.74)	0.184** (2.08)
Atlantic dummy	−0.0446 (−0.77)	0.0608 (0.68)
Educational gap 1940 * 1960	0.582*** (13.68)	0.571*** (9.90)
Educational gap 1940 * 1970	0.351*** (4.72)	0.518*** (6.17)
Educational gap 1940 * 1980	−0.101 (−0.53)	0.160*** (3.06)
Educational gap 1940 * 1990	−1.263** (−2.24)	0.0504 (0.48)
Educational gap 1940 * 2000	−2.337** (−2.38)	−0.0200 (−0.14)
Constant	0.683*** (3.97)	1.046*** (8.82)
Time dummies	Yes	Yes
Observations	297	297
R-squared	0.76	0.73

State-level clustered robust *t* statistics in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$.
** $p < 0.05$.
*** $p < 0.01$.

by the beneficial effect on black education of the abolition of the Jim Crow laws in the 1960s. In Model 2 the effect of the initial gap at the bachelor level increases until the 1980s and then remains constant in the following two decades. This means that, even though the gap at the bachelor level has decreased over time (in absolute terms), the relative distance between states has not really decreased in later decades.

4. Controlling for omitted variable bias

4.1. Empirical strategy

Our results from the previous section show that, over the period under consideration, after controlling for a number of key factors, subsequent levels of the racial educational gap are largely explained by the initial gap and that they are only indirectly affected by slavery through its effect on the initial gap. This suggests that slavery may be excludable in a regression for the educational gap on its initial level. If this were the case, slavery would qualify as a reasonable instrument for the initial gap. However, while it is reasonable to link the initial educational gap to slavery, through the channels documented in Margo (1990), the lack of significance of the slave share variable when entered together with the gap does not per se validate this conjecture. Indeed the slave share in 1860 may be correlated with some other factors which we were not able to control for and which exert a direct effect on the gap. If this were the case, the effect of slavery on the current gap may have been over-estimated, because positively correlated with inequality and other discriminatory policies. For this reason, in order to control for such a potential bias in this section we use a 2SLS estimator.

We can use information from the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database to generate an instrument for slavery in 1860 which, as we will argue below, is plausibly exogenous.¹³ Most of the slaves arrived to the territories that today represent the US between the 17th century and first decade of the 19th. Overall, the Middle Passage brought an estimated 645,000 slaves, mostly from Africa. Initially most of the slaves were forcibly settled in the coastal Southern colonies, where they were employed primarily in agriculture. It is only in a subsequent phase, between the American Revolution and the Civil War, that the Second Middle Passage relocated around a million slaves toward the inland regions where the plantation economy was developing (Berlin, 2003).

The relocation of slaves in the Second Middle Passage implies that the reasons why slaves were disembarked in certain states were not only economic, but also merely geographic. Indeed the vicinity to the coast – and ultimately to Africa – was a

¹³ Nunn (2008b), Nunn and Wantchekon (2011) and Assunção et al. (2011) also employ the same data.




Fig. 2. Exclusion restriction.

factor determining slave imports, i.e., the supply of slaves,¹⁴ while their distribution in 1860 was determined by the demand created by the subsequent development of the plantation economy.¹⁵ In addition to these geographical considerations, the validity of the disembarked share of slaves as an instrument is provided by the fact that it is difficult to envision other channels through which it can affect the educational gap other than through the legacy of slavery and therefore the share of slaves in 1860. The exogeneity of the disembarked slaves variable as an instrument for the share of slaves in 1860 is even more realistic if we consider the discontinuity in the economic history of Southern US states provided by the Civil War which is largely documented, for instance, by Fogel and Engerman (1974), Margo (1990), Margo and Hutchinson (2001), and Ransom and Sutch (1977). After the Civil War, slavery is abolished, the gang system is abandoned (Fogel and Engerman, 1974; Ransom and Sutch, 1977), wages fall relative to the North (Margo, 2004), the cost of capital increases, and labor productivity decreases (Margo and Hutchinson, 2001). Therefore those factors which pushed Southern US states to engage in the slave trade, i.e., the relatively high productivity of slaves associated with the gang system, were reverted after the Civil War. As a consequence, the factors which affected the slave trade are unlikely to display a direct effect on the educational gap in 1940.

Fig. 2 illustrates the exclusion restriction.¹⁶ The educational gap in 1940 is likely to be correlated with omitted factors (e.g., taxation) which affect both the educational gap in 1940 and the subsequent gap. To provide some exogeneity in the educational gap in 1940 we use the share of slaves in 1860 as an instrument for the former. However this instrument may be correlated with the same omitted factors which affect the educational gap (once again, taxation) and because of that the exogeneity condition may be violated. This is the reason why we also check the exclusion of the share of slave in 1860 using another instrument which is represented by the share of disembarked slaves. The only effect of the share of disembarked slaves on education is through the legacy of slavery (i.e., through disenfranchisement, “separate but equal” policies, and the local politics in the post-Reconstruction period) and therefore through the share of slaves in 1860, since it is unlikely that policy variables which may affect education are correlated with the slave trade through other channels. The only problem with the share of disembarked slaves as an instrument would arise if other omitted factors (i.e., higher productivity of slaves and possibly faster economic growth) still had an effect on education which goes through a channel different from the legacy of slavery. This problem, however, can be excluded because of the discontinuity in the economic history of Southern states which ensures that these factors (once again, higher productivity of slaves and faster economic growth) do not impact on education. Thus, the slave trade is likely to be exogenous with respect to education: in other words, the correlation between the error term in the educational gap regression and the slave trade is likely to be equal to zero.

Fig. 3 resumes the causal effect discussed above. The share of disembarked slaves per state during the TAST determined the share of slaves in 1860. The slave share in 1860 had an effect on the enforcement of the institution of slavery and on the extent of disenfranchisement. The latter has affected the educational gap because of its effect on public school funding (Margo, 1982, 1990; Orazem, 1987; Pritchett, 1989; Bertocchi and Dimico, 2011b). Under exogeneity of disembarked slaves the effect of slavery on the educational gap should converge to the true population effect. This means that, if slavery is not significant in a regression for the educational gap over slavery, then by the properties of the IV slavery should represent a suitable instrument for the initial gap in education.

Table 5 reports descriptive statistics for the share of disembarked slaves imported from Africa as well as its correlation with the share of slaves in 1860. On average the share of disembarked slaves per state (to the US total) is equal to 2% against an 11.5% of the slave population (to the total US population) in 1860. The largest share of slaves (50% of the total) disembarked in South Carolina. Virginia came next with 29%. South Carolina is also the state with the largest share of slaves in 1860 (57% of the total population) followed by Mississippi (almost 55%), Louisiana (47%), Alabama, Florida, and Georgia (with shares between 44% and 45%).¹⁷ The correlation between the disembarked share and the slave share in 1860 is almost 0.49

¹⁴ Indeed Nunn (2008b) uses the distance between the port of departure and the port of arrival as an instrument for the share of slaves exported from Africa.

¹⁵ Engerman and Sokoloff (2005) and Lagerlöf (2005) focus on the role of factor endowments (elevation, precipitation, germs, and crops) for the development of the plantation economy.

¹⁶ Solid lines represent effects which are sure. Dashed lines represents possible effects.

¹⁷ See Table A1 in Appendix for details.




Fig. 3. Causal effect of the trans-atlantic slave trade on educational gap.

Table 5

Descriptive statistics for disembarked slaves.

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
<i>Descriptive statistics</i>					
Slaves/population 1860	336	0.115	0.180	0	0.571
Disembarked slaves/total slaves	336	0.0196	0.080	0	0.504
		Slaves/population 1860		Disembarked slaves/total slaves	
<i>Pairwise correlation</i>					
Slaves/population 1860		1.0000			
Disembarked slaves/total slaves		0.4875		1.000	

Note: See Appendix for data sources.

which means that even though the Second Middle Passage relocated a large number of slaves there is a large share which remained in the state of arrival.¹⁸ This correlation should also ensure the relevance of the share of the disembarked slaves as an instrument for the share of slaves in 1860.

4.2. Empirical issues

As it should be clear from the previous subsection our empirical strategy makes use of two consecutive IV estimators. First we try to estimate the consistent effect of slavery in 1860 on the educational gap in 1940. Once this effect is observed we can decide on the validity of slavery as an instrument for the initial gap in order to estimate the consistent effect of the latter on subsequent gaps.

The first model to be estimated can be written as:

$$Gap_{i,t} = \alpha_{i,t} + \beta_1 Gap_{i,1940} + \beta_2 Slave_{i,1860} + \beta_3 X_{i,t} + \mu_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

$$Slave_{i,1860} = \delta_{i,t} + \rho_1 Slave_Trade_i + \rho_2 X_{i,t} + \sigma_{i,t}$$

In the system of simultaneous equations (1) the variable $Gap_{i,t}$ represents the educational gap over the 1940–2000 period, $Gap_{i,1940}$ is the educational gap in 1940, $X_{i,t}$ is a set of time-variant exogenous variables. $Slave_{i,1860}$ and $Slave_Trade_i$ represent respectively the share of slaves in 1860 and the share of slaves disembarked during the TAST. Using a 2SLS estimator we can estimate the consistent effect of $Slave_{i,1860}$ which asymptotically should converge to

$$p \lim \hat{\beta}_{Slave,1860} = \beta_{Slave,1860} + p \lim \frac{\text{cov}(Slave_Trade_i, \mu_{i,t})}{\text{cov}(Slave_Trade_i, Slave_{i,1860})} \quad (2)$$

and under exogeneity of the instrument converges to

$$p \lim \hat{\beta}_{Slave,1860} \xrightarrow{p} \beta_{Slave,1860} \quad (3)$$

Given that the estimated effect of slavery in 1860 should converge in probability to the population parameter $\beta_{Slave,1860}$ we can use this first result to evaluate the exclusion of slavery in 1860. Therefore the second simultaneous equations model to be estimated can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} Gap_{i,t} &= v_{i,t} + \gamma_1 Gap_{i,1940} + \gamma_2 X_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \\ Gap_{i,1940} &= \zeta_{i,t} + \lambda_1 Slave_{i,1860} + \lambda_2 X_{i,t} + \tau_{i,t} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where the exclusion of slavery in 1860 is ensured by the properties of the 2SLS estimator in the first simultaneous equations model.

Of course there are a few empirical issues which need to be addressed. The most important is related to a possible correlation between $Slave_Trade_i$ and the error term $\mu_{i,t}$ in (2) in which case our empirical strategy would be biased.¹⁹

¹⁸ The (unreported) correlation of the disembarked slaves share with the educational gap is 0.39 for the high-school level and 0.24 for the bachelor level.

¹⁹ The bias in the IV estimator can be defined as $ABias(\hat{\beta}_{IV}) = \frac{\rho_{Z,u}}{\rho_{Z,X}} ABias(\hat{\beta}_{OLS})$, where $\rho_{Z,u}$ is the correlation between the instrument and the error term, $\rho_{X,u}$ and $\rho_{Z,X}$ represent respectively the correlation between X and the error term and between the instrument and X , and $ABias(\hat{\beta}_{OLS})$ is the bias in the OLS estimator.

The most important effect discussed in the literature which caused states to engage in the use of slavery is related to the higher productivity of this form of labor in the period before 1860. Fogel and Engerman (1974) argue that plantations which made a massive use of slavery had a higher productivity and they impute this effect to the use of the gang system of production. After 1860 the gang system is abandoned and according to Margo (2004) there is no evidence of a higher productivity of slavery over free labor under different systems of production.²⁰ This trend should exclude any income effect of the slave trade on the gap after the Civil War. On the other hand Engerman and Sokoloff (2000) suggest that the adoption of slavery has been determined by factor endowments which led to the implementation of inequality-perpetuating institutions. However, the implementation of such institutions is the result of slavery (as explained in Fig. 2) and not the reason which led certain states to engage in slavery. In addition, even though there were a positive correlation between the share of disembarked slaves and inequality, this would over-estimate the effect of slavery in 1860 in (1) without affecting the exclusion of the latter in (4).

We now move to the discussion of some possible issues in (4). The exclusion restriction of slavery in 1860 in the second equation is only based on properties of the IV estimators (the convergence in probability together with the possible upward bias discussed above), but there may be some possible speculation about the validity of this exclusion.²¹ The most important factor which needs to be addressed is the effect of slavery on the disenfranchisement of blacks and on party politics given that other factors (i.e., taxation, public goods provision, segregation, “separate but equal” policies, etc.) are the result of these two joint processes. According to Kousser (1974) the effect of disenfranchisement was to cut black electorate ($\rho_{Z,u} < 0$) allowing white Democrats to implement discriminatory policies which may in turn have had a positive effect on the educational gap even in the following years ($\rho_{X,u} < 0$). As a result there is a risk of over-estimating the effect of the initial gap on the subsequent inequality of education between races. For this reason, in order to provide a further check of the exogeneity of slavery in 1860, we also run over-identification tests.

4.3. Results

Table 6 reports 2SLS estimates using the share of disembarked slaves from the TAST Database as an instrument for the share of slaves in 1860. The partial F-Statistics and the Cragg–Donald F-Statistics show that our instrument is a relevant one since it provides sufficiently high correlation with the endogenous variable. The second-stage estimates confirm the insignificant effect of the share of slaves on the educational gap (both at the high-school and college level). On the other hand, the initial educational gap for both dependent variables is still significant. Turning to the first-stage statistics, the coefficients on the share of disembarked slaves suggest that a one percent increase in the share of slaves imported from Africa increases the share of slaves in 1860 by a percentage which is in the range of 23–34%.

Next, given that the slave share in 1860 has no direct effect on the educational gap, we can use it as an instrument for the initial gap in order to have consistent estimates of its effect. Table 7 (Models 1 and 2) reports 2SLS estimates for models in which the initial educational gap is instrumented only with the slave share in 1860. We also report the first-stage coefficients for the instrument as well as the first-stage partial F-Statistics. As expected the share of slaves in 1860 represents a relevant instrument for the educational gap in 1940, which is not surprising given that the correlation between the two variables is close to 0.9. The effect of the initial educational gap on the subsequent gap is significant and at the high-school level the coefficient estimate is now larger than the one in the corresponding models estimated by OLS (i.e., Models 1 and 2 in Table 3). In Models 3 and 4 we enter the slave trade variable together with the slave share in 1860 as instruments for the initial gap in order to test the exclusion. The over-identification test confirms the validity of our empirical approach. In addition the estimated effect (and standard errors) for the initial gap at the high-school level in Model 3 is exactly the same as in Model 1, while the estimated effect of the initial gap at the bachelor level in Model 4 slightly decreases if compared with the estimated effect in Model 1.

To conclude, we find that slavery has no effect on the racial inequality in education other than through its effect on the initial gap in 1940. This finding generates a suitable instrument to investigate whether during the 1940–2000 period racial educational inequality has been persistently shaped by its initial level. Using the 1860 slave share as an instrument, we establish that indeed the initial gap still exerts a significantly positive impact on the subsequent degree of inequality, which means that initial conditions as of 1940 have shaped educational attainment in a persistent fashion. Moreover, this initial inequality can be linked to the legacy of slavery, which confirms the conjecture that current racial educational inequality has indeed deep roots in the history of the country.

5. Slavery, the educational gap, and economic growth

Having established a robust link between slavery and education, we now turn to a broader question. Has slavery slowed down the development process in states which made a larger use of this form of labor force? And, if so, through which channels?

²⁰ See also Ransom and Sutch (1977) on the declining effect of slavery after the gang system was abandoned.

²¹ For a further discussion of the effect of a violation of the exogeneity condition see Stock et al. (2002). Berkowitz et al. (2012) develop a test to be based on the Anderson–Rubin statistic that makes adjustments for the extent to which the orthogonality assumption is violated.

Table 6
2SLS estimates for slavery.

Estimation method: 2SLS	Second-stage estimates		First-stage estimates	
	Dependent variables: educational gap		Dependent variable: slaves/population 1860	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	Gap H.S.	Gap bach.	Slaves 1860	Slaves 1860
Educational gap 1940 (High-S.)	0.306*** (6.37)		0.047*** (7.44)	
Educational gap 1940 (Bachelor)		0.168*** (2.64)		0.301*** (3.54)
Population density	-0.126** (-2.12)	0.158* (1.89)	0.013** (2.50)	-0.123 (-1.92)
Southern states dummy	-0.212 (-1.57)	-0.715* (-1.71)	0.145*** (3.75)	0.194*** (5.06)
Atlantic dummy	0.0284 (0.34)	-0.121 (-0.80)	-0.005 (-0.25)	-0.001 (-0.06)
Slaves/population 1860	0.233 (0.29)	2.841 (1.45)		
Constant	0.921*** (3.91)	0.404 (1.28)	0.002 (0.08)	-0.011 (-0.40)
Time dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Under-identification test (Anderson LR Stat)	30.950	47.067		
Weak identification test (Cragg–Donald F-Stat)	31.353	49.232		
Stock and Yogo (2005) critical values (10%)	16.38	16.38		
Instrument: disembarked slaves/total slaves			0.230*** (3.35)	0.336*** (3.25)
Partial F-statistics			11.21	16.68
Observations	258	258	258	258
R-squared	0.69	0.51	0.92	0.89

State-level clustered robust t statistics in parentheses.

- * $p < 0.1$.
 ** $p < 0.05$.
 *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 7
2SLS for the educational gap.

Estimation method: 2SLS	Second-stage estimates			
	Dependent variables: educational gap			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
	Gap High	Gap bach.	Gap H.S.	Gap bach.
Educational gap 1940 (High school)	0.326*** (5.86)		0.326*** (5.84)	
Educational gap 1940 (bachelor)		0.256*** (4.03)		0.244*** (3.64)
Population density	-0.131*** (-3.79)	0.115* (1.69)	-0.131*** (-3.80)	0.119* (1.73)
Southern states dummy	-0.208 (-1.61)	-0.114 (-0.79)	-0.207 (-1.63)	-0.0658 (-0.43)
Atlantic dummy	0.0309 (0.27)	-0.0589 (-0.37)	0.0309 (0.27)	-0.0633 (-0.40)
Constant	0.917*** (5.72)	0.452 (1.56)	0.917*** (5.72)	0.458 (1.58)
Under-identification test (Anderson LR Stat)	287.358	186.559	296.759	205.967
Weak identification test (Cragg–Donald F-Stat)	505.332	262.020	265.547	150.283
Stock and Yogo (2005) critical values (10%)	16.38	16.38	19.93	19.93
Hansen over-identification test (J-Stat.)			0.9774	0.2130
Instrument: slaves/population 1860	13.665*** (15.29)	16.680*** (9.00)	14.282*** (14.65)	18.167*** (9.14)
Instrument: disembarked slaves/total slaves			-2.254*** (-3.74)	-5.439*** (-4.61)
Partial F-statistics (first stage)	233.64	81.02	0.6834	55.02
Time dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	258	258	258	258
R-squared	0.68	0.53	0.68	0.53

State-level clustered robust t statistics in parentheses.

Educational gap 1940 is the instrumented variable.

- * $p < 0.1$.
 ** $p < 0.05$.
 *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 8

Personal income per capita at current and constant prices.

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
P.C. income at current US\$	404	8318	10,004	197	41920
P.C. income at constant 2000 US\$	404	15,909	8486	2031	41920
P.C. income growth at current US\$	353	0.057	0.032	-0.017	0.137
P.C. income growth at constant 2000 US\$	353	0.024	0.013	-0.004	0.083

In order to shed light on this issue we first look at a direct effect of slavery on economic growth and then we move forward to evaluate its potential indirect effect, which works through educational inequality between races. More precisely, we assess whether the initial educational gap between blacks and whites can work as a possible channel of transmission. In order to look at these possible direct and indirect effects we proceed in two steps as in the previous section. We start by using a 2SLS estimator to estimate the effect of slavery on economic growth. If this effect is found not significant then we can assume that slavery is excludable in a regression for economic growth on the initial educational gap. Therefore we can use slavery as an instrument for the initial racial gap in education to estimate the effect of racial education inequality on economic growth. Rates of per capita annual income growth over the 1940–2000 period are computed using first differences for the log of personal per capita income at the state level over the 1930–2000 period. This allows us to construct 10-years episodes of growth over the 1940–2000 period. The data source is the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA).²²

Since data on personal income per capita from the BEA are at current US dollars in order to correct for inflation we use data on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) from the Bureau of Labor Statistics to convert personal income at current prices into personal income at constant 2000 US dollars. Table 8 shows descriptive statistics for both the current- and the constant-prices versions of personal income per capita. Average personal income per capita at current prices over the 1940–2000 period is \$8318 and its average growth rate over the 60 years period is equal to 5.7% with a maximal rate of growth of 13.7. When converted into constant 2000 US\$ average personal income per capita is \$15,909 and its average growth rate over the period is 2.4% with a maximal rate of growth of 8.3.

Table 9 reports 2SLS estimates. In each model we enter the initial condition, i.e., the lagged level of income per capita, as well as growth determinants such as population growth and the amount of bank deposits per capita as a proxy for saving and therefore investment.²³ We also enter a proxy for agricultural dependence, which is equal to the ratio of farms to manufacturing establishments, in order to control for potential differences in the production function (see Temple, 2005) and other geographical dummies. Due to data limitations over such a long time horizon our specification is quite parsimonious, but the exogenous variation in the initial gap provided by our instrument should ensure that estimates converge in probability to the true population parameters (conditional on the exogeneity of the instrument) and because of that they should not be affected by the omission of other factors. On the other hand, this parsimonious specification is also shared by similar papers on development and education in the US (e.g., Aghion et al. 2009; Higgins et al., 2006).

In the first model we look at a possible direct effect of slavery on economic growth.²⁴ As in the previous section we use a 2SLS estimator where the share of disembarked slaves in each state during the TAST is employed as an instrument for the share of slaves in 1860. Once again the idea behind its exclusion is that the share of disembarked slaves only has a direct effect on the share of slaves in 1860 and, through the latter, on the consequent political economy of Southern states (e.g., public goods provision) and on economic growth. Other than through this channel we should not expect any direct effect of the disembarked slaves share on economic growth over this time period. Model 1 shows the effect of slavery on economic growth. We find that the share of slaves in 1860 has no direct effect on economic growth even though the model is well identified. Incidentally, we also find evidence of convergence and a positive effect of the amount of deposits per capita.

Since the share of slaves in 1860 is found to be an insignificant determinant of economic growth we can move forward to the second step. In Model 2 we use the share of slaves as an instrument for the educational gap between blacks and whites in 1940 to test a potential indirect effect of slavery which works through educational inequality between races. The exclusion restriction for this model is validated by results from the previous model. The effect of the initial educational gap in Model 2 is significant at a 5% level. On average a unit increase in the educational gap between whites and blacks in 1940 decreases the rate of growth by almost 0.5%. Moreover, as expected the higher is the state's level of income ($t - 1$) the lower is the rate of economic growth. A one percent increase in income per capita decreases growth by almost 0.31%. The amount of deposits per capita also spurs economic growth while the level of agricultural dependence lowers it. In Model 3 we enter the share of the disembarked slaves as an additional instrument in order to evaluate the exogeneity of our instruments. The Hansen over-identification test is equal to 0.2893 which provides evidence at support of the exogeneity of the instrument.

Given the stationarity of GDP, in order to have a further check of our results in Model 4 we use a 2-step GMM estimator. Of course GMM estimators provide consistent estimates in panels with a large N and a small T . Given that in our sample N is quite small and T is relatively large, we do face a potential problem with too many instruments being used. However, the fact that the estimated coefficients of the initial gap is exactly the same as in previous models increases our confidence in the

²² BEA also provides data on GDP per capita at the state level but these data are only available starting from 1963. We use data on personal per capita income because they are available over a longer time span.

²³ As for GDP per capita, BEA provides data on investment to GDP only starting from 1963.

²⁴ The proxy for the educational gap in the first two models is dropped because of the weak relevance of the instrument in the presence of the gap.

Table 9
Economic growth, slavery, and the educational gap.

Estimation method	Second-stage and 2-step GMM estimates			
	Dependent variable: per capita economic growth			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
	IV	IV	IV	2-Step GMM
Slaves/population 1860	0.142 (0.79)			
Educational gap 1940 (high school)		−0.00527** (−2.37)	−0.00556** (−2.49)	−0.00556** (−2.23)
Income per capita ($t - 1$) (Log)	−0.243*** (−4.60)	−0.306*** (−10.00)	−0.307*** (−10.00)	−0.360*** (−6.21)
Population growth	0.586 (1.39)	0.283 (0.82)	0.284 (0.82)	0.0370 (0.05)
Bank deposits per capita (Log)	0.0247*** (2.60)	0.0172** (2.27)	0.0173** (2.27)	0.0165 (1.46)
Atlantic dummy	0.0132 (1.24)	0.0266*** (2.95)	0.0268*** (2.98)	0.0257* (1.84)
Southern states dummy	−0.0472 (−1.00)	0.00168 (0.18)	0.00248 (0.26)	−0.0113 (−0.70)
Agricultural dependence	−0.00714 (−0.26)	−0.0594*** (−2.66)	−0.0597*** (−2.68)	−0.105*** (−2.96)
Constant	2.387*** (4.44)	3.110*** (10.04)	3.119*** (10.05)	3.673*** (6.30)
Under-identification test (Anderson LR Stat)	25.50	272.869	283.510	
Weak identification test (Cragg–Donald F-Stat)	25.367	464.809	246.520	
Stock and Yogo (2005) critical values (10%)	16.38	16.38	19.93	
Hansen over-identification test (J Stat.)			0.2893	0.983
Instrument 1: disembarked slaves/total slaves	0.312** (2.30)		−2.469 (−1.65)	
Instrument 2: slaves/population 1860		15.434*** (6.30)	16.102*** (6.23)	
Partial F-statistics (First Stage)	25.50	272.869	283.510	
Time dummies	25.367	464.809	246.520	
AR (1) test	Yes	Yes	Yes	0.000
AR (2) test				0.163
Observations	288	252	252	252
R-squared	0.95	0.96	0.956	

State-level clustered robust t statistics in parentheses.

Windmeijer (2005) robust 2-step GMM standard errors used in Model 4.

The first and the second lags of X_t and ΔX_t are used as instruments in Model 4.

* $p < 0.1$.

** $p < 0.05$.

*** $p < 0.01$.

consistency of our results. Of course t -statistics are relatively smaller in the GMM model because of the loss of efficiency of the IV estimator.

In Table A2 in Appendix we also test the effect of the educational gap at the bachelor level, rather than at the high-school level as in Table 9. We obtain similar results, which is not surprising given that the exogenous variation provided by slavery makes the two predicted variables quite correlated.

To conclude, we find no consistent evidence of a direct influence of slavery on income growth, even after instrumenting it with information about disembarked slaves during the TAST. This finding is not only interesting per se, but also carries the advantage of generating a suitable instrument to investigate whether racial educational inequality has had any influence on growth during the 1940–2000 period. Using the 1860 slave share as an instrument, we establish that indeed the initial gap negatively affects growth. In other words, in 1940 the degree of racial educational inequality is still determined by the 1860 slave share. It is through this channel that slavery hampers economic development.

6. Conclusion

The legacy of slavery still looms over American society, but debate arose over whether this legacy can still exert a measurable influence on the economic and social achievements of blacks. This paper shows that the contemporaneous degree of racial inequality in education is indeed affected by slavery through its effect on the level of the gap at the eve of World War Two. Over the same period, we also find that income growth is negatively affected by the initial educational disparities between blacks and whites, which uncovers a negative influence of slavery on development that runs through the accumulation of human capital. Therefore, our investigation on the evolution and perpetuation of racial inequality in the US confirms,

on the one hand, how deeply are they rooted in the country's history and, on the other, identifies through which channel they still manifest themselves on contemporaneous outcomes.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the editors Daniel Berkowitz and Marla Ripoll and an anonymous referee for helpful comments and suggestions. Generous financial support from the Fondazione Cassa Risparmio di Modena and the Italian University Ministry is gratefully acknowledged.

Appendix

The following datasets have been used

- (a) Measuring America: The Decennial Censuses from 1790 to 2000 (<http://www.census.gov/prod/www/abs/decennial/>) is used for the following variables: Total slaves number in 1860, total population in 1860, and shares of whites and blacks with either a high-school diploma or a bachelor degree
- (b) Data on personal per capita income from 1930 to 2000 is collected from the Bureau of Economic Analysis (www.bea.gov). Historical data on inflation are collected from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (<http://www.bls.gov/>).

Table A1
Slaves/population in 1860 and disembarked slaves/total slaves, by state.

State	Slaves/population 1860	Disembarked slaves/total slaves	Freq.
AL	.45123371	.0004817	8
AR	.25517282	0	8
CA	0	0	8
CO	0	0	8
CT	0	0	8
DC	.04242142	0	8
DE	.01602267	0	8
FL	.43970403	.01835292	8
GA	.43715513	.04243812	8
IA	0	0	8
IL	0	0	8
IN	0	0	8
KS	.00001866	0	8
KY	.19510783	0	8
LA	.46853822	.03498485	8
MA	0	.00081014	8
MD	.12690361	.06168001	8
ME	0	0	8
MI	0	0	8
MN	0	0	8
MO	.09723336	0	8
MS	.55178595	.00939685	8
NC	.3335197	.00849551	8
NE	.00052009	0	8
NH	0	0	8
NJ	.00002678	.00115609	8
NM	0	0	8
NV	0	0	8
NY	0	.01040043	8
OH	0	0	8
OR	0	0	8
PA	0	.00196623	8
RI	0	.00126557	8
SC	.57183659	.50423902	8
SD	0	0	8
TN	.24844004	0	8
TX	.30215403	.00826419	8
UT	.00072009	0	8
VA	.30749825	.29606843	8
VT	0	0	8
WA	0	0	8
WI	0	0	8
Total	.11538126	.02380953	336

Note: In New Jersey a few colored apprentices for life remained after an act to abolish slavery was passed on April 18, 1846. In the 1860 census, these apprentices are classified as slaves. In Kansas, Nebraska and Utah slavery was still permitted though they were not slave states.

Table A2

Economic growth, slavery, and the bachelor gap.

Estimation method: 2SLS	Second-stage estimates	
	Dependent variable: per capita economic growth	
	Model 1	Model 2
Educational gap 1940 (Bachelor Degree)	–0.00415** (–2.26)	–0.00431** (–2.45)
Income per capita ($t - 1$) (Log)	–0.303*** (–10.14)	–0.284*** (–9.90)
Population growth	0.245 (0.72)	0.0335 (0.10)
Bank deposits per capita (Log)	0.0176** (2.26)	0.0177*** (2.26)
Atlantic dummy	0.0252*** (2.83)	0.0281*** (3.28)
Southern states dummy	0.0005 (–0.07)	–0.00229 (–0.25)
Agricultural dependence	–0.0572*** (–2.60)	–0.0560*** (–2.63)
Constant	3.271*** (11.25)	3.263*** (11.37)
Under-identification test (Anderson LR Stat)	189.560	211.656
Weak identification test (Cragg–Donald F-Stat)	266.880	156.621
Stock and Yogo (2005) critical values (10%)	16.38	19.93
Hansen overidentification test (J Stat.)		0.9930
Instrument 1: slaves/population 1860	19.614*** (3.93)	21.239*** (4.08)
Instrument 2: disembarked slaves/total slaves		–6.145** (–2.05)
Partial F-statistics (First Stage)	15.94	10.95
Time dummies	Yes	Yes
Observations	252	252
R-squared	0.95	0.96

State-level clustered robust t statistics in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$.** $p < 0.05$.*** $p < 0.01$.

- (c) Data on number of farms and manufacturing establishments and on bank deposits are collected from the County and City Data Book downloaded from the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Studies (<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/>).
- (d) Geographical dummy variables are constructed using the US Census regional classification.
- (e) Data on disembarked slaves are downloaded from the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database (see [Eltis, 2008](#). A Brief Overview of the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade. Voyages: The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database, <http://www.slavevoyages.org/tast/assessment/essays-intro-01.faces>).

References

- Aghion, P., Boustan, L., Hoxby, C., Vandenbussche, J., 2009. The Causal Impact of Education on Economic Growth: Evidence from the United States. Mimeo, Harvard University.
- Assunção, J.J., Goulart, T.F., Soares, R.R., 2011. A Note on Slavery and the Roots of Inequality. Mimeo, Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro.
- Barro, R.J., Sala-i-Martin, X., 1991. Convergence across states and regions. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 1, 107–158.
- Berkowitz, D., Caner, M., Fang, Y., 2012. The validity of instruments revisited. *Journal of Econometrics* 166, 255–266.
- Berlin, I., 2003. *Generations of Captivity: A History of African American Slaves*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Bertocchi, G., Dimico, A., 2011a. Slavery, Education, and Inequality. CEPR Discussion Paper No. 8073.
- Bertocchi, G., Dimico, A., 2011b. Race v. Suffrage: The Determinants of Development in Mississippi. CEPR Discussion Paper No. 8589.
- Cameron, S.V., Heckman, J.J., 2001. The dynamics of educational attainment for blacks, hispanics, and whites. *Journal of Political Economy* 109, 455–499.
- Card, D., Krueger, B.D., 1992. School quality and black-white relative earnings: a direct assessment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 107, 151–200.
- Collins, W.J., Margo, R.A., 2006. Historical perspectives on racial differences in schooling in the United States. In: Hanushek, E., Welch, F. (Eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Education*. Elsevier, New York, pp. 107–154.
- Eltis, D., 2008. A brief overview of the trans-atlantic slave trade. Voyages: The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database <<http://www.slavevoyages.org/tast/assessment/essays-intro-01.faces>> (accessed 27.04.08).
- Engerman, S.L., Sokoloff, K.L., 2005. Institutional and non-institutional explanations of economic differences. In: Menard, C., Shirley, M.M. (Eds.), *Handbook of New Institutional Economics*. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 639–665.
- Engerman, S.L., Sokoloff, K.L., 2000. History lessons: institutions, factor endowments, and paths of development in the new world. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14, 217–232.
- Fishback, P.V., Baskin, J.H., 1991. Narrowing the black–white gap in child literacy in 1910: the roles of school inputs and family inputs. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 73, 725–728.

- Fogel, R.W., Engerman, S.L., 1974. *Time on the cross: evidence and methods*. Little Brown, Boston.
- Frank, M., 2009. Inequality and growth in the United States: evidence from a new state-level panel of income inequality measures. *Journal of Economic Inquiry* 47, 55–68.
- Galor, O., Moav, O., Vollrath, D., 2009. Inequality in landownership, the emergence of human-capital promoting institutions, and the great divergence. *Review of Economic Studies* 76, 143–179.
- Goldin, C., 1998. America's graduation from high school: the evolution and spread of secondary schooling in the 20th century. *Journal of Economic History* 58, 345–374.
- Goldin, C., Katz, L.F., 2001. The Legacy of US educational leadership: notes on distribution and economic growth in the 20th century. *American Economic Review* 91, 18–23.
- Goldin, C., Katz, L.F., 1999. The Shaping of higher education: the formative years in the United States, 1890–1940. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 13, 37–62.
- Goldin, C., Margo, R.A., 1992. The great compression: the US wage structure at mid-century. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 107, 1–34.
- Heckman, J.J., 1990. The central role of the south in accounting for economic progress of black Americans. *American Economic Review* 80, 242–246.
- Higgins, M.J., Levy, D., Young, A.T., 2006. Growth and convergence across the United States: evidence from the county-level data. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 88, 671–681.
- Jones, C.I., 2002. Sources of US economic growth in a world of ideas. *American Economic Review* 92, 220–239.
- Kousser, J.M., 1974. *The shaping of southern politics: suffrage restriction and the establishment of the one-party south, 1880–1910*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Lagerlöf, N., 2005. *Geography, Institutions, and Growth: The United States as a Microcosm*. Mimeo, York University.
- Margo, R.A., 2004. The north–south wage gap before and after the civil war. In: Eltis, D., Frank, D., Lewis, F.D., Sokoloff, K.L. (Eds.), *Slavery in the Development of the Americas*. Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. 324–352.
- Margo, R.A., 1990. Race and Schooling in the South, 1880–1950: An Economic History. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Margo, R.A., 1982. Race differences in public school expenditures: disfranchisement and school finance in Louisiana, 1890–1910. *Social Science History* 6, 9–23.
- Margo, R.A., Hutchinson, W., 2001. The impact of the civil war on capital intensity and labor productivity in southern manufacturing. NBER Working Paper No. 10886.
- Mitchener, K.J., McLean, I.W., 2003. The Productivity of US States since 1880. *Journal of Economic Growth* 8, 73–114.
- Naidu, S., 2010. Suffrage, schooling, and sorting in the post-bellum US South. Harvard University, Mimeo.
- Neal, D., 2006. Why has black–white skill convergence stopped? In: Hanushek, E., Welch, F. (Eds.), *Handbook of Economics of Education*, vol. 1. North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 511–576 (Ch. 9).
- Nunn, N., 2008a. Slavery, inequality, and economic development in the Americas: an examination of the Engerman–Sokoloff hypothesis. In: Helpman, E. (Ed.), *Institutions and Economic Performance*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, pp. 148–180.
- Nunn, N., 2008b. The long-term effects of Africa's slave trades. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 123, 139–176.
- Nunn, N., Wantchekon, L., 2011. The slave trade and the origins of mistrust in Africa. *American Economic Review* 101, 3221–3252.
- Orazem, P.F., 1987. Black–White differences in schooling investment and human capital production in segregated schools. *American Economic Review* 77, 714–723.
- Panizza, U., 2002. Income inequality and economic growth: evidence from American data. *Journal of Economic Growth* 7, 25–41.
- Partridge, M., 1997. Is inequality harmful for growth? Comment. *American Economic Review* 87, 1019–1032.
- Pritchett, J.B., 1989. The burden of negro schooling: tax incidence and racial redistribution in postbellum North Carolina. *Journal of Economic History* 49, 966–973.
- Ransom, R.L., Sutch, R., 1977. *One Kind of Freedom: The Economic Consequences of Emancipation*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Rappaport, J., Sachs, J.D., 2003. The United States as a coastal nation. *Journal of Economic Growth* 8, 5–46.
- Sacerdote, B., 2005. Slavery and the intergenerational transmission of human capital. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 87, 217–234.
- Smith, J.P., 1984. Race and human capital. *American Economic Review* 74, 685–698.
- Smith, J.P., Welch, F.R., 1989. Black economic progress after Myrdal. *Journal of Economic Literature* 27, 519–564.
- Stock, J.H., Wright, J.H., Yogo, M., 2002. A survey of weak instruments and weak identification in generalized method of moments. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 20, 518–529.
- Temple, J., 2005. Dual economy models: a primer for growth economists. *Manchester School* 73, 435–478.
- Welch, F., 1973. Black–White differences in returns to schooling. *American Economic Review* 63, 893–907.
- Windmeijer, F., 2005. A finite sample correction for the variance of linear efficient two-step GMM estimators. *Journal of Econometrics* 126, 25–51.