

## **ADDITIONAL WEB APPENDIX -- NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

In Additional Appendix Table 1 below, we include additional regressions of secondary importance and further robustness checks. In the first column we show that our sample of 144 countries, which is slightly larger than the 137 country sample used in SW (2009), nevertheless benchmarks their results on the univariate impact of genetic distance from the US on per capita GDP in 1995. In column (2), we control for distance to the equator, and find that the impact of genetic distance shrinks. In column (3), we add a dummy for sub-Saharan Africa instead, and again show that the coefficient on genetic distance shrinks. Comparing the two controls, we see that adding distance to the equator increases the R-squared by more than adding a dummy for sub-Saharan Africa, and it also shrinks the impact of genetic distance by more. Column (4) contains the results from a population-weighted least squares regression when we only control for a sub-Saharan Africa dummy and distance to the equator. We arrive at a point estimate of genetic distance which is only borderline significant at 10%. In column (4), we repeat the regression from column (6) of the main paper, excluding sub-Saharan Africa, only we cluster at the continent level. This has the effect of increasing the estimated error on genetic distance to be even larger than the coefficient. In column (6), we show that even if we expand the sample to countries for which we do not have full data for all of our variables, we can still eliminate the significance of genetic distance by controlling for dummies for Europe, sub-Saharan Africa, and contiguity with the US.

In Additional Appendix Table 2, we display the robustness of our results to various measures of genetic distance. Column (1) is the same measure used in the main paper. Column (2) is the  $F_{st}$  genetic distance between the largest ethnic groups in each country-pair. The  $F_{st}$  genetic distance measure assumes that differences arise from genetic drift only, while the Nei distance measure allows for both genetic drift and gene mutation. When we control for an SSA dummy and the tropics, none of the four versions of genetic distance are significant, and the two Nei measures even have the wrong sign.

**Additional Appendix Table 1: Income Level Regressed On Various Distances From the United States, 1995**

	(1) Univariate	(2) Add Distance From Equator	(3) Add Sub-Saharan Africa dummy	(4) Population-Weighted Least Squares, Sparse Controls	(5) Exclude SSA, Continent Clusters	(6) Enlarged Sample, Sparse Controls
$F_{ST}$ genetic distance to the US, weighted	<b>-14.808***</b> (1.632)	<b>-8.650***</b> (2.430)	<b>-8.815***</b> (2.579)	<b>-4.472*</b> (2.650)	<b>-5.335</b> (5.356)	<b>-3.466</b> (2.267)
Absolute difference in latitude from US		1.162** (0.531)	1.416** (0.542)		1.691* (0.655)	
Absolute difference in longitude from US		0.036 (0.452)	0.705* (0.382)			
Geodesic distance from the US (1000s of km)		-0.045 (0.086)	-0.147* (0.077)			
=1 for contiguity with the US		0.823*** (0.197)	0.856*** (0.187)		1.110*** (0.215)	1.165 (0.330)
=1 if the country is an island		0.582 (0.312)	0.263 (0.289)			
=1 if the country is landlocked		-0.450 (0.200)	-0.259 (0.222)		-0.462 (0.563)	
Sub-Saharan Africa dummy			-0.907*** (0.255)	-0.958*** (0.282)		-1.080*** (0.234)
Distance from the Equator		0.032*** (0.007)		0.019*** (0.006)		
Dummy for Europe					1.085*** (0.095)	0.941*** (0.195)
% of land area in tropics and sub- tropics					-0.594 (0.613)	
Observations	144	144	144	144	144	164
$R^2$	0.373	0.506	0.472	0.455	0.427	0.468

Robust Standard errors in parentheses; \*significant at 10%; \*\*significant at 5%; \*\*\*significant at 1%. Notes: Genetic distance data from Cavalli-Sforza et. al. (1994), geographic data from CEPIL, and GDP data is from the World Bank. The constants are suppressed.

**Additional Appendix Table 2: Income Level Regressed on Various Measures of Genetic Distance**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Fst Distance Weighted	-3.61 (2.729)			
Fst Distance Dominant		-1.254 (1.571)		
Nei Distance Dominant			0.052 (0.778)	
Nei Distance Weighted				0.011 (0.135)
Sub-Saharan Africa dummy	-1.225*** (0.270)	-1.370*** (0.244)	-1.522*** (0.230)	-1.526*** (0.246)
% of land area in tropics and sub-tropics	-0.736*** (0.231)	-0.823*** (0.211)	-0.899*** (0.213)	-0.903*** (0.228)
Constant	9.287*** (0.190)	9.122*** (0.130)	9.077*** (0.127)	9.070*** (0.169)
Observations	144	144	144	144
R-squared	0.463	0.458	0.456	0.456

Robust Standard errors in parentheses; \*significant at 10%; \*\*significant at 5%; \*\*\*significant at 1%. Genetic distance data from Cavalli-Sforza et. al. (1994), geographic data from CEPII, and GDP data is from the World Bank.

**Appendix Table 3: Full Table of Correlations**

	(log) GDP per capita	$F_{ST}$ genetic distance to the US, weighted	Absolute difference in latitude from US	Absolute difference in longitude from US	Geodesic distance from the US	=1 for contiguity with the US	=1 for either country is landlocked	=1 for either country is island	Sub-Saharan Africa dummy	Absolute difference in absolute Latitude	Absolute difference in % of land area in tropics and subtropics
(log) GDP per capita	1										
$F_{ST}$ genetic distance to the US, weighted	-0.6107	1									
Absolute difference in latitude from US	-0.2933	0.5911	1								
Absolute difference in longitude from US	-0.0694	0.0712	-0.1281	1							
Geodesic distance from the US	-0.2815	0.3821	0.3432	0.8325	1						
=1 for contiguity with the US	0.1281	-0.0702	-0.0533	-0.2504	-0.2393	1					
=1 for either country is landlocked	0.1886	-0.0305	0.1282	0.1861	0.1219	-0.0434	1				
=1 for either country is island	-0.26	0.2065	-0.0287	0.1448	0.1922	-0.066	-0.2034	1			
Sub-Saharan Africa dummy	-0.6132	0.7693	0.4873	-0.0279	0.2565	-0.0749	-0.1831	0.1565	1		
Absolute difference in absolute Latitude	0.5639	-0.6623	-0.6062	0.1264	-0.243	0.1046	-0.0327	0.0552	-0.5378	1	
Absolute difference in % of land area in tropics	-0.4579	0.556	0.4835	-0.1636	0.0866	-0.0766	0.1479	-0.1084	0.3076	-0.7723	1

