Abstract
This paper introduces the Global Mass Expulsion Dataset which documents a century of cross-border mass expulsion episodes from 1912-2012. To-date it has been assumed that the causes and motivations of governments engaged in genocide, ethnic cleansing and coercive assimilation are the same as those for mass expulsion. This new dataset is the first to disaggregate mass expulsion from its similar, but distinct, conceptual kin in order to isolate group-based population removal. Though there is existing data on mass expulsions, most research is confined to specific regions (particularly Europe), begins after 1945, only captures the expulsion of citizens, and often conflates mass expulsion, ethnic cleansing, mass killing and genocide. The new Global Mass Expulsion Dataset fills these temporal, geographic and target population gaps documenting 131 expulsion episodes, across all world regions, affecting nearly 30 million citizens and non-citizens. The data is drawn from archival research conducted at the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the International Committee of the Red Cross in Geneva, as well as secondary sources and extant datasets. This paper presents an empirical overview of the data including information on the expelling countries, onset, duration, region, scale, category of persons expelled and frequency. Based on the data, I present a typology of mass expulsion classified by the government’s motivation to expel: fifth column, decolonial, insurgent/reprisal and xenophobic. Although expulsion is a rare event, it is a reoccurring rare event with over one million people expelled in the last three years alone. Its consistent use demands additional empirical and theoretical investigation.

Introduction
In the last three years over one million people have been expelled, en masse, around the world. Over 700,000 Rohingya have been expelled from Myanmar; 100,000 Nigerian refugees from Cameroon; 400,000 Congolese diamond miners from Angola; nearly 70,000 sub-Saharan Africans from Algeria; and most recently, 3,000 Ethiopian migrant workers from Saudi Arabia. Governments consistent implementation of mass expulsion policies demands additional empirical and theoretical investigation. Given the vast existing data on ethnic cleansing, genocide, and mass killing, what justifies another effort on mass expulsion? The new Global Mass Expulsion Dataset disaggregates mass expulsion from the broader, and cloudier, concept of ethnic cleansing\(^2\) in order to isolate policies of population removal—as opposed to population destruction (genocide, mass killing), assimilation (coerce
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1 Ph.D. Candidate, Dept. of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania, megmary@sas.upenn.edu
2 Ethnic cleansing conflates genocide, coercive assimilation and expulsion (O’Leary, 2014).
assimilation) or a combination of the three (ethnic cleansing). By extracting mass expulsion from the umbrella concept of ethnic cleansing, this data will assist researchers interested in analyzing distinct demographic engineering policies and in generating theories about the causes of expulsion to complement existing theories about other mass atrocities, particularly genocide.

This comprehensive and systematic survey of mass expulsion introduces a significant amount of new data to the field by offering wider temporal, geographic and target population coverage than existing datasets on ethnic cleansing and expulsion. First, the dataset ranges from 1912-2012, bridging the pre- and post-Second World War periods, beginning with the Balkan Wars and continuing to the present day to assess the longue durée of mass expulsion. With the exception of Bulutgil (2016), who starts her data collection on ethnic cleansing in 1900, most of the existing data on genocide, mass killing and expulsion begins after 1945 (Harff, 2003; Ulfelder & Valentino, 2008; Henckaerts, 1995; Adida, 2014; Straus, 2015; Butcher et al., 2020). But the foundations for modern mass expulsion were laid in the early twentieth century with leading scholars and politicians advocating for expulsion as a strategy to bring about peace and end deadly wars (Frank, 2012: 11-17). Unlike genocide and ethnic cleansing, influential figures such as Eleftherios Venizelos, Winston Churchill, and Joseph Schechtman viewed expulsion as a positive policy option, a view some still share today—a reason to analyze expulsion on its own.

Second, the new mass expulsion dataset is cross-national, documenting expulsion events across all regions of the world. Most of our existing theories of ethnic cleansing and exclusionary policies come from regional-specific studies, typically confided to Europe (Naimark, 2001; Mann, 2005; Mylonas, 2012; Ther, 2014; Bulutgil, 2016). There are important regional-specific conditions that must be taken into account, however, this global dataset contributes to our understanding of the trajectory of mass expulsion and its diffusion around the world. Lastly, this dataset is the first to
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3 Kaufmann (1996: 156) and Bell-Falkoff (1999: 285-86) are two such proponents.
include the expulsion of citizens and non-citizens—a binary that is often indistinct in practice—connecting disparate strands of the literature that typically evaluate the targeting of nationals apart from the targeting of non-nationals. Because governments that seek to target citizens often sweep up non-citizens in their removals, this arbitrary separation, which characteristically coincides with the partition between ethnic conflict and migration studies inhibits our full understanding of the phenomenon. This dataset focuses on government expulsion policies regardless of the target group’s legal status, yielding dozens of additional cases.

To fill these temporal, geographic and target population gaps I collected data on mass expulsion events around the world from 1912-2012. The data come from primary archival work conducted at the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in Geneva, secondary historical sources and extant datasets. Since most expelling governments do not have open-access archives on these topics, records from the leading UN and humanitarian organizations provided critical insight into governmental motivations and helped to identify new cases. What the data show is that while expulsion is a rare event, it is a recurring rare event with 131 documented episodes of mass expulsion during 1912-2012, across seven world regions affecting nearly 30 million citizens and non-citizens. The reoccurrence of mass expulsion over time and space, and continuance into our present moment, demands additional analysis and theoretical inspection. In documenting the universe of cases that comprise mass expulsion, the dataset aims to assist scholars in refining and enhancing theories of its causes and to inform policy recommendations for anticipating its onset and deterring its use.

What follows is a conceptual discussion of the distinct phenomenon of mass expulsion; a brief summary of existing datasets on expulsion and related concepts; and a detailed overview of the data collection process and methodology. The core of the paper is a descriptive analysis of the novel dataset noting interesting patterns and trends, as well as highlighting similarities and differences with data on
other demographic engineering policies. After the data analysis, I present a typology of government motivations for expulsion, classifying the 131 observations into four expulsion types: fifth column, decolonial, insurgent/reprisal and xenophobic. The typology is generated through the combination of the alleged or actual threat posed by the target group from the perspective of the government (security or economic), in either its state building or regime maintenance phase. The paper concludes with a discussion of future plans for the dataset and further research on mass expulsion.

**Mass expulsion concept & existing data**

Research on ethnic conflict, mass atrocities and forced displacement does not suffer from a dearth of data. On the contrary, new datasets proliferate rapidly covering a wide range of topics, regions and time periods. There are three categories of existing data that are related to mass expulsion: 1) genocide, politicide and mass killing (Harff & Gurr, 1988; Harff, 2003; Ulfelder & Valentino, 2008; Straus, 2015; Butcher et al., 2020); 2) coercive displacement (Orchard, 2010; Greenhill, 2010; Lichtenheld, 2020); and 3) ethnic cleansing and mass expulsion (Henckaerts, 1995; Adida, 2014; Bulutgil, 2016). In this dataset a mass expulsion episode is defined as a state-ordered or directed, systematic removal, of an ethnic, racial, religious or national group, as such, with no individual legal review and with no recognition of the right to return. The specificity of the definition aims to disaggregate mass expulsion from related, but distinct, concepts such as ethnic cleansing, genocide, mass killing and coercive assimilation. I will briefly outline what events are excluded from the Global Mass Expulsion Dataset.

First, no genocide cases are included. Genocide differs from mass expulsion in its intent—the intent of genocide is *to destroy* whereas the intent of mass expulsion is *to remove* (Straus, 2001: 363; Schabas, 2005: 118; Lieberman, 2010: 45). Therefore, the Herero & Nama (1904-07), Armenian (1915-16), Jewish (1941-45), Cambodian (1975-79), and Rwandan (1994) genocides are not included.\(^4\)
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\(^4\) This is an illustrative, not exhaustive, list of genocide cases in the twentieth century that are often conflated with mass expulsion.
Coercive assimilation also has a different intent than expulsion. Governments that coercively force a target group to abandon its unique cultural traits, through the closure of schools, religious institutions or cultural centers, aim to eliminate a minority by transforming it into the dominant group. These policies are often implemented with tactics including forced evictions, internal colonization, and mass internment, but the intent of forced assimilation is distinct from expulsion. Therefore, cases such as Turkey (1925-39, Kurds), Sudan (1990, Nuba) and China (1990s, Uighurs) are not included in the expulsion dataset.

Mass killing is also distinct from mass expulsion in its target and its intent. Valentino (2004) outlines a typology of mass killing including communist, ethnic, territorial, counterguerrilla, terrorist and imperialist episodes. Only one of his six types—ethnic mass killing—identifies the target population based on group characteristics; the other five types of mass killing are excluded from the dataset on that criterion. This makes ethnic mass killing similar to mass expulsion, but different in its intent to kill, rather than to remove (Valentino, 2004: 10). None of the three ethnic mass killing cases in Valentino’s 2004 book—Turkish Armenia, Nazi Germany and Rwanda (all of which could also be classified as genocide)—are included in the Global Mass Expulsion Dataset. However, this is not to say that large-scale killing does not accompany mass expulsion episodes, it often does. In the Ottoman expulsion of Orthodox Greeks (1913-23), Czechoslovak expulsion of ethnic Germans (1945-47) and Yugoslav (i.e. Serbian) expulsion of Bosnians (1992-95) many civilians were killed. However, the intent of the governments was to remove the population from a specific territory, not “mass, on-the-spot killing” (Ther, 2014: 2). Finally, given that ethnic cleansing conflates distinct phenomena (O’Leary, 2014), some of what are widely deemed ethnic cleansing cases are included in the dataset but those that are fundamentally genocidal, or cases of forcible assimilation, are excluded.

Lastly, the expulsion concept articulated here includes group-based population removal regardless of legal status. In many countries citizenship and legal documentation are precarious at best,
and government expulsion policies that claim to exclusively target non-citizens often sweep up citizens in their removals. Mass expulsion targets specific ethnic, religious, racial or national groups, as opposed to individuals, and therefore, legal paperwork is not a main concern of expelling governments. Nevertheless, documentation of citizenship, legal residence, legal employment or asylum come with certain rights and safeguards to protect against arbitrary removal. While these details are important in international law, mass expulsion episodes are defined by their lack of individual legal review. While countries can (legally) never expel their citizens, they can legally expel non-citizens if a certain set of procedures are followed (Henckaerts, 1995: 5, 51-60). However, in all of the non-citizen expulsion cases included in this dataset, the target group was identified for expulsion based on group (not individual) characteristics and their cases were not individually evaluated before removal.

To indicate the distinctiveness of the new dataset, I have documented its overlap, or lack thereof, with the three datasets that are most closely related in Table 1.

| Table 1. Summary comparison of existing expulsion datasets |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Existing Datasets               | Concept         | Temporal Coverage | Geographic Coverage | Target Group                      | No. Cases |
| Bulutgil (2016a)               | Ethnic Cleansing| 1900-2000         | Europe             | Residents (excluding temporary workers & refugees) | 41        |
| Bulutgil (2016b)               | Ethnic Cleansing| 1955-2010         | Africa             | Residents (excluding temporary workers & refugees) | 28        |

In the most comprehensive legal analysis of mass expulsion, Henckaerts (1995) includes an appendix with 53 mass expulsion events during 1945-95. In full, the Global Mass Expulsion Dataset documents 131 episodes of mass expulsion (1912-2012): 37 which overlap with Henckaerts, and 94 new cases. Adida’s (2014) quantitative analysis of why some sub-Saharan African governments expel immigrants and others do not documents 44 cases of mass immigrant expulsion (1956-99). The new mass
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5 Bulutgil’s (2016) data is listed as two entries because her book is centered on European ethnic cleansing (2016a), but she also includes a list of African cases (2016b) as a theoretical and empirical extension.
expulsion dataset contains 39 total cases of expulsion in sub-Saharan Africa, 26 that Adida includes and 15 new cases. Bulutgil (2016) offers the most comprehensive data collection of ethnic cleansing to-date, including 69 cases of ethnic cleansing in Europe (1900-2000) and Africa\(^6\) (1955-2010). The Global Mass Expulsion Dataset documents 95 cases of expulsion in Europe and continental Africa, 35 included in Bulutgil’s data and 60 new episodes. Lastly, to reinforce the distinction between this dataset and related concepts, such as mass killing, none of Straus’s (2015) 33 cases of large-scale violence against civilians in sub-Saharan Africa (1960-2008) are included. This analysis suggests that the Global Mass Expulsion Dataset introduces a significant amount of new data to the field as a result of its cross-national nature, extended duration, and the inclusion of citizen and non-citizen expulsions.

**Methods**

The Global Mass Expulsion Dataset covers a one-hundred-year period from 1912-2012. This range was chosen because 1912 marks the beginning of the Balkan Wars and is the first documented mass expulsion event of the twentieth century.\(^7\) Concluding in 2012 allows for a century of examination and avoids the problem of a lack of data on more recent cases. In order for an event to be included in the expulsion dataset it must meet five criteria, drawn from the above definition, and two scope conditions. The five criteria are:

1. The expulsion must be ordered or directed by the government of an established state\(^8\);
2. The government must have intentionally removed the target population;
3. The target population must be an ethnic, racial, religious or national group;
4. The population must be removed based on their shared group characteristics (not incidentally displaced by violence); and
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\(^6\) Inclusive of North Africa.

\(^7\) The first case of ethnic cleansing in Bulutgil’s (2016) list of European cases from 1900-2000 is Bulgaria in 1912.

\(^8\) Mass expulsion by non-state actors is not included in the dataset, nor are ‘from below’ cases of violence initiated by individuals, or communities, that are not organized by the government.
5. The expulsion must be intended as permanent at the time of the removal (i.e. no recognition of the right to return).

In addition to these five criteria, an expulsion episode must meet two scope conditions: 1) the expelled population must be moved across an international border, and 2) at least 1,000 persons must be expelled in an annual period.

The purpose of the first scope condition is to distinguish between episodes of internal and external expulsion. When a government removes a target population beyond its sovereign boundary into the territory of another state there are different consequences and calculations than if the population is moved internally. Cross-border removal is not simply a domestic decision but has international ramifications affecting the state(s) receiving the expellees and the international community. Restricting the dataset to cases that remove the target group outside of the state delimits the tradeoffs expelling governments must consider. This does not diminish the importance, severity or scale of internal expulsions, it simply excludes them from the dataset in order to more precisely identify the causes of cross-border mass expulsion. The second scope condition quantifies the ‘mass’ in mass expulsion, an inherently tricky exercise. While 1,000 persons expelled is an arbitrary limit, it aligns with the international relations literature on civil wars (Sambanis, 2004), and excludes small-scale expulsions of a few hundred persons that are difficult to verify, as well as those without a confirmed number of victims.

The sources of the data come from archival research conducted at the UNHCR and ICRC in Geneva, Switzerland, secondary historical sources and existing datasets. Other evidence was compiled from UN reports, press releases and Commission of Experts documents; Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International and Minority Rights Group International reports and briefs; the U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants digital archive containing Refugee Reports (1979-2006) and
World Refugee Surveys (1961-2009); Africa Contemporary Record—an annual survey of events and documents concerning Africa (1968-2000); and news articles.

Despite best efforts to include all incidents of mass expulsion accurately, there are limitations to observational data. Particularly for events in the first half of the dataset (1912-62), data quality and sources are more suspect because of the rudimentary nature of data collection at the time, especially international data collection. Accuracy in the number of persons expelled is particularly variable, therefore I documented low- and high-end estimates to provide a range of the total persons affected in each case. The minimum number of persons expelled has been used in analyzing the data, to error on underestimating, rather than overestimating, the phenomenon. Because expulsion is a political decision, sources documenting expulsion events are inherently biased with the expellees and the expellers often having different versions of events. Efforts have been taken to collect data from both sides (e.g. from Turkish and Greek sources for the 1923 Turkey-Greece population exchange) as well as more neutral third parties (humanitarian response agencies and human rights organizations). In an attempt to overcome uncertainty, multiple sources were collected for each episode to verify its occurrence and details of the event. While the present dataset may not be exhaustive, due diligence has been performed to include the majority of mass expulsion episodes during 1912-2012.

**Global Mass Expulsion Dataset**

The Global Mass Expulsion Dataset includes 131 episodes of mass expulsion in the century from 1912 to 2012 across seven world regions.\(^9\) Mass expulsion events have consistently been initiated throughout the one-hundred-years examined, see Figure 1. The two peak expulsion periods occurred during and after the Balkan Wars (1912-13) and near the conclusion and in the aftermath of the Second

\(^9\) These regions correspond to the World Bank’s regions: Africa, East Asia & the Pacific, Europe & Central Asia, Latin America & the Caribbean, Middle East & North Africa, South Asia, and North America. According to the World Bank classification, North America includes the United States, Canada and Bermuda. Since there were no Canadian or Bermudian expulsions during 1912-2012, North America is effectively the United States.
World War (1944-46). The single largest expulsion event in the dataset, measured by number of countries involved and persons affected, was the expulsion of an estimated 9-12 million ethnic Germans, the *Volksdeutsche* and *Reichsdeutsche*, from Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Romania and the Netherlands between 1945-47, authorized by the Allied Powers at the Potsdam Conference\(^{10}\) (Douglas, 2012).

More than ten expulsion events occurred in seven of the ten decades examined. The 11 expulsion cases before 1920 are a result of the First and Second Balkan Wars and the collapse of the Ottoman Empire as well as the immediate aftermath of WWI. The Second World War and the post-war peace agreements (1941-50) includes a surge of 20 cases of mass expulsion confined to Europe & Central Asia, plus Israel (1947). Decolonization across Africa and Asia (1960-80) and the end of the Cold War period (1981-89) resulted in an increase in expulsion episodes as new states emerged following the collapse of colonial empires and as new governments vied to maintain and control power. The aftermath of the Cold War in the 1990s saw political upheaval with the first Gulf War, the collapse of Yugoslavia, the aftereffects of the Rwandan genocide, and the secession of Eritrea all

\(^{10}\) The Allied Powers only authorized German expulsions from Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary, but Yugoslavia, Romania and the Netherlands also expelled ethnic Germans from their territories.
leading to various mass expulsion episodes. As indicated by the continued expulsions in the last decade examined (2002-2012), this tool of demographic engineering remains favored by governments around the world at an average rate of 1.64 expulsions per year, over the last 50 years.

While Figure 1 indicates that the absolute number of mass expulsion events initiated has remained fairly steady throughout the period examined, because the number of countries in the world proliferated in the latter half of the twentieth century the relative number of expulsions has decreased over time. In the two peak periods (1912-13 & 1944-46) the number of countries in the state system expelling was just over 10 percent. Since 1950, with the increased number of states in the world system, the proportion of states expelling in a given year has dropped to under 2.5 percent but has remained fairly constant. Figure 2 illustrates the number of active mass expulsion events during 1912-2012. To indicate the pervasiveness of this phenomenon, in 83 of the 100 years catalogued there was at least one ongoing mass expulsion event somewhere in the world.

The duration of mass expulsion episodes, presented in Table 2, indicates how long each expulsion event lasted. This data contains some uncertainty because while the starting point of an expulsion episode is usually clear, its end date is less so. Nevertheless, mass expulsion is marked by a
relatively short duration, compared to other related phenomena, with 67 percent of the cases lasting one year or less; and 88 percent lasting two years or less. Only five cases in the dataset (4 percent) lasted three years or more. The duration of genocide and politicide episodes, by comparison, is typically over three years (59 percent), with 45 percent of those cases lasting more than six years (Harff & Gurr, 1988: 367). The expulsion data matches the intuition that a strategy of removal is more expeditious than one of destruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Duration of mass expulsions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expulsions lasting one year (or less)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsions lasting one to two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsions lasting two to three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsions lasting three (or more) years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geographically, mass expulsion occurs all over the world’s map—no region has been spared (see Table 3). Europe & Central Asia tops the chart with 50 cases (38 percent) of mass expulsion events in the period examined, with 72 percent of those incidents occurring in the first half of the twentieth century. The next largest expulsionist region is sub-Saharan Africa, with 30 percent of total mass expulsion events, all concentrated in the latter half of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first century. The Middle East & North Africa (MENA), East Asia & the Pacific, and Latin America & the Caribbean regions all hover around 10 percent, each, of total cases. South Asia and North America are the least likely to expel, each with two percent of the total caseload.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Mass expulsions by world region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America &amp; the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To see how the regional variation may have changed in recent years, I examined the geographic distribution of mass expulsion from 1990-2012 (third column of Table 3), and the results are largely consistent with the entire period. Europe & Central Asia and sub-Saharan Africa swap spots, but they remain at the top of the list of expulsionist regions, although MENA’s proportion of total expulsion episodes rises to a statistical tie with Europe & Central Asia. The rest of the regions remain in the same order as when compared to the full one-hundred-year period, although North America drops out of the sample with zero expulsion events during 1990-2012.

To determine if a small group of states was driving the geographic distribution of the data, unique expulsionist countries, by region, is depicted in Table 4. The results indicate that 60 distinct countries account for the 131 expulsion events examined. Multiple countries throughout the top four regions have expelled, suggesting intra-regional variety in expulsionist governments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Unique expulsionist countries (by region)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia(^\text{11})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America &amp; the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mass expulsion data shows that the phenomenon is widespread, recurring, and it is implemented on a large scale. Although quantitative data on the number of persons expelled is imprecise as indicated in the methods section, low- and high-end estimates were collected from numerous sources. The sources indicate that from 1912-2012 between 27.79 million and 39.61 million persons were expelled. Table 5 tabulates the number of victims (using minimum estimates) in an expulsion episode. Just over

\(^{11}\) This count includes Serbia, Yugoslavia, Soviet Union and Russia as four separate ‘countries.’ The Ottoman Empire is not included as a separate ‘country’ from Turkey because of the continuity of rule (and rulers) in regard to government demographic policies from 1913 (under Ottoman rule) through 1923 and the creation of the Turkish Republic.
one-third of expulsion cases affected 5,001-50,000 persons, and another third 50,001-250,000 victims. Eighteen percent of cases were small-scale expulsions with less than 5,000 persons expelled, and the remaining 14 percent expelled more than 250,000. Only five cases of expulsion removed more than 1 million persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Mass expulsion victims (min estimates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5,001 and 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 50,001 and 250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 250,001 and 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 500,001 and 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Global Mass Expulsion Dataset documents four different categories of persons expelled: citizens, foreign nationals, resident aliens, and refugees. As stated in the conceptual section above, in practice, the removal of citizens versus non-citizens is not clearly distinguishable. Since the foundation of expulsion is group-based removal, legal status is often irrelevant (or at least less relevant) to the expelling regime. Therefore, to exclude cases of non-citizen expulsion, which much of the existing scholarship on ethnic cleansing does, is to overlook a large portion of expulsion events.

Over half of the 131 expulsion events examined—74 episodes, or 56 percent—targeted citizens of the expelling state. However, of those 74 episodes, only 45 incidents (34 percent of the total caseload) exclusively targeted citizens (see Table 6). Almost all of the 45 cases that only targeted citizens occurred in Europe (91 percent) and 76 percent of those incidents took place in the first half
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12 Citizen, used interchangeably with national, is a legally recognized subject of a state, either native or naturalized; foreign national is not a citizen of the country in which s/he lives; resident alien is a permanent resident of the country in which s/he resides, but not a citizen; refugee, used interchangeably with asylum seeker, is a person outside his/her country of citizenship seeking the protection of another. In some cases (Israel, 1967; Kuwait, 1991; Bangladesh, 1992) the refugees expelled were also stateless persons—defined by the 1954 Convention as “a person not considered a national by any state under the operation of its law.” These three cases involved the Palestinians and Rohingya.

13 Two of these cases are Burma’s expulsion of Rohingya (1991 & 2012). Burma’s 1982 citizenship law denied recognition of the Rohingyas as a national ethnic race and as a result they do not have citizenship of the country and are stateless. Although they are de jure not nationals, they are also not foreign nationals, resident aliens nor refugees. Therefore, they have been included in the ‘citizens’ category with this asterisk.
of the twentieth century. The heavy focus in the existing literature on European ethnic cleansing (Naimark, 2001; Mann, 2005; Ther, 2014; Bulutgil, 2016), may explain why non-citizen expulsions have been largely overlooked. The fact that only 10 cases of citizen-only expulsion occurred after 1950\textsuperscript{14} may at first glance seem to indicate that the customary international law against expelling citizens has diffused. But, on the contrary, the evidence suggests that expelling states have simply modified their strategy to remove citizens simultaneously with non-citizens. There are 29 documented cases of hybrid, citizen and non-citizen, expulsions of which 24 cases (83 percent) have occurred after 1950. These hybrid expulsions include the removal of citizens and a variety of combinations of foreign nationals, resident aliens and refugees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6. Category of persons expelled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of only citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of citizens &amp; non-citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of only non-citizens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps surprisingly, the plurality of expulsion cases (44 percent) during 1912-2012 targeted only non-citizens, something not captured in the existing literature. Most of these episodes (70 percent) targeted foreign nationals and/or resident aliens. The remaining 30 percent expelled foreign nationals and/or resident aliens along with refugees (16 percent), or exclusively targeted refugees (14 percent). Refugees are often swept up in the expulsion of other non-citizens with 13 different states across four regions—Africa, East Asia, South Asia, & MENA—expelling refugee populations, en masse.

Finally, the map below illustrates the frequency of mass expulsion among the 60 countries that have engaged in the practice from 1912-2012 (\textit{darker reds indicate more expulsions}). Fifty-seven percent of the countries in the dataset have expelled more than once: 27 percent have expelled twice, 15 percent

\textsuperscript{14} The two cases of Burmese expulsion of Rohingya are included here. If removed, the number of citizen-only expulsions post-1950 would fall to 8, instead of 10.
have expelled three times, 8 percent have expelled four times and 7 percent five times or more. The remaining 43 percent of countries have implemented a policy of mass expulsion only once.

Since this dataset includes countries with varying durations of existence as modern nation-states, one might conclude that these findings are biased against countries like Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey, tied for the most expulsion events at seven each, which were sovereign states for the full 100 years examined. Perhaps it is also unfair to compare new states that emerged in the latter half of the twentieth century, with older states built on historic expulsions before 1912, such as the United States, France and England. Nevertheless, younger states such as Kenya, Libya, Uganda and Burma have each expelled four times. Length of statehood does not seem to be a prerequisite for repeated use of mass expulsion. The frequency data support the finding of genocide researchers that governments with records of past mass atrocities are more likely to be repeat offenders (Harff, 2003: 66). Therefore, this dataset could, in the future, help inform early warning and prevention systems by closely monitoring high frequency countries.
Typology of Mass Expulsion

While a variety of typologies of genocide and mass killing have been developed (Smith, 1987; Harff & Gurr, 1988; Chalk & Jonassohn, 1990; Fein, 1990; Valentino, 2004\(^{15}\)), none exist for mass expulsion. There are, however, three existing typologies of ethnic cleansing (Bell-Fialkoff, 1999; Mann, 2005; Ther, 2014) offering 35 different types based on diverse classification criteria.\(^{16}\) Bell-Fialkoff proposes eight different categories, or “dimensions,” of ethnic cleansing: historical; geographic; paradigmatic; ideological; strategic; economic; miscellaneous (a catch-all category that includes the targeting of gender, sexual preference, age and other groups); and temporal (1999: 51-56). Mann (2005) proposes 18 kinds of “violence and cleansing in intergroup relations” based on different types of cleansing combined with types of violence (2005: 12). He suggests three scales of cleansing: none, partial and total; and six types of violence: none, institutional coercion, police repression, violent repression, unpremeditated mass deaths, and premeditated mass killing. Each scale of cleansing (3) is matched with each type of violence (6), for a total of 18 different kinds of violence and cleansing ranging from multiculturalism (no violence, no cleansing) to pogroms and communal riots (partial cleansing, violent repression) to genocide (total cleansing, premeditated mass death) (Mann, 2005: 12). Lastly, Ther (2014) proposes two typologies, one historical, similar to Bell-Fialkoff, and one based on “empirical findings” which describe the “character of ethnic cleansing”\(^{17}\) (231-252). In sum, there is a proliferation of different types of ethnic cleansing (of which mass expulsion could be considered a sub-category) but no consistent classification criteria.

\(^{15}\) This is an illustrative, not exhaustive, list of some of the most prominent typologies of genocide and mass killing.

\(^{16}\) The three ethnic cleansing typologies were developed by two sociologists and one historian, no political scientists have engaged in this effort.

\(^{17}\) Ther acknowledges that his empirical typology is not “based on the kind of theoretical models used in social science” which is why it is slightly different than standard typologies. His five characteristics of ethnic cleansing include: 1) ethnic cleansing during or after war; 2) forms of violence applied; 3) contractual or unregulated; 4) difference between ethnic cleansing and genocide; and 5) retrospective or forward-looking (2014: 237-238).
Typologies proposed by genocide scholars most frequently classify their cases by the perpetrator’s objective or motivation (Straus, 2001: 368-369). Following this line of work, I have developed a typology of mass expulsion that introduces four distinct types based on the government’s motivation to expel. Each type corresponds to the presumed threat posed by the target group (from the perspective of the government) and the phase of either state building or regime maintenance. The target group threats—security or economic—indicate the type of danger that the government believes that the group poses. Security threats concern both territorial and political control of the state such as challenges to a state’s sovereignty or claim to authority; relations with enemy external powers; secessionist movements; inter-state disputes; and “refugee warriors.”18 Economic threats relate to the control of state resources, industries, assets and employment opportunities. Threats that governments identify may be genuine, based on specific actions or events, or simply manufactured to produce a desired outcome. In the latter case, government officials often use propaganda to win internal support and persuade public opinion. In short, the threats that motivate mass expulsion are those that affect the security or economic interests of the expelling state.

These threats combine with phases of either state building or regime maintenance to produce one of four particular motivations for, or types of, mass expulsion (see Figure 3). The state building phase includes the process by which newly created states define their membership: who is included within the demos. Given that this dataset examines the century between 1912 and 2012, state building encompasses the creation of new nation-states after the collapse of empires, the emergence of new states after the end of colonial rule, and state expansion through territorial annexation or contraction through the cession of formerly annexed territories—particularly during and after the Second World War. Conversely, regime maintenance suggests a focus on the preservation and consolidation of the
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18 Refugee warriors refers to militant elements of refugee populations that continue to engage in cross-border military operations against their home country and in turn associate the host country with acts of war (Zolberg, et al., 1986: 275-77).
existing state and the current regime. To operationalize these phases, the first 15 years after a state gains its independence, or the first five years after territorial changes to state borders, are categorized as in the state-building phase; and a state is considered in the regime maintenance phase after 15 years of independence or changes to its borders. Any attempt to classify 131 events over the course of a century into four neat categories is bound to encounter challenges. Not every case is a perfect fit, but most cases are accurately captured by the four types, described in detail below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group Threat</th>
<th>State Building</th>
<th>Regime Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Column</td>
<td>Security (34 percent)</td>
<td>Insurgent/Reprisal (29 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decolonial</td>
<td>Economic (10 percent)</td>
<td>Xenophobic (27 percent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fifth Column Expulsions** *(security threat, state building)*: Fifth column expulsions target groups that are believed to pose an existential security threat to the territorial integrity of the state, most often based on their real or alleged ties to an external “kin state.” These expulsions typically occur in the wake of imperial collapse (e.g. Ottoman Empire), following territorial annexation or cession (e.g. Germany’s *Anschluss*, 1938; Bulgaria, 1940), or in the aftermath of war as populations are “unmixed” to fit newly drawn borders (Turkey, 1923; Czechoslovakia, 1945). Governments engaged in fifth column expulsions seek to remove “disloyal” minorities and homogenize their populations. Turkey removed its Christian minorities to become a Turkish-Muslim state (1912-23), Israel expelled Palestinians to create a Jewish state (1947-49), and Hungary removed Slovaks to establish a state for the majority Magyars (1946). The idea of homogenous nation-states, and the congruence of national and
demographic boundaries, is the core of the Gellnerian explanation of nationalist sentiment and is why this type of mass expulsion closely aligns with the state building phase.

The modality of fifth column expulsions is either unilateral force or transfer (58 percent), bilateral population “exchange” agreements (27 percent), or multilateral population “transfers” or “exchanges” (15 percent). At the beginning of the twentieth century, particularly after the First World War, negotiated treaties to “unmix” populations, however involuntary, were widely viewed as the best solution for the maintenance of international peace and security (Frank, 2017: 28-29). However, by mid-century population transfers and exchanges fell out of fashion and the usage of these agreements drastically declined, although they still have their proponents.

Fifth column expulsions comprise a third of the total cases in the mass expulsion dataset, 45 of 131 episodes (34 percent). Of the 45 instances, 84 percent occurred in Europe & Central Asia, with the remainder in Africa (Niger, 1963; DRC, 1964; Eritrea, 1998), East Asia (Cambodia, 1975; Vietnam, 1978) and MENA (Israel, 1947; Egypt, 1956). The predominance of European cases in this category aligns with the current literature that explains the causes of expulsion as exclusionary nation-building polices resulting from a combination of inter-state wars, territorial conflict and revanchism, extreme ethnonationalism, and utopias of homogeneity (Bell-Fialkoff, 1999; Naimark, 2001; Mylonas, 2012; Ther, 2014; Bulutgil, 2016). One possible reason for the lack of fifth column expulsions in other regions, particularly sub-Saharan Africa, is the stability of borders and the principle of uti possidetis in the post-colonial period. Most fifth column expulsions (80 percent) occurred in the first half of the twentieth century, but this form of mass expulsion could reappear with the emergence of new states, or changes to existing borders (e.g. Kosovo or Nagorno-Karabakh).

**Decolonial Expulsions** (*economic threat, state building*): Similar to fifth column expulsions, decolonial expulsions occur in the state building phase, but rather than targeting populations that present a security threat, these governments seek to remove an economic threat, typically posed by “alien”
minorities. During the colonial period, European commercial, mining, plantation and urban centers attracted people throughout their empires seeking jobs and economic opportunities. As part of the colonial divide-and-rule strategy, Europeans preferred allegedly industrious outsiders to native inhabitants to keep the majority population economically (and in turn politically) subservient. These alien groups, or “strangers” as they were often called, served as intermediaries between the colonizer and the colonized as traders or civil servants (e.g. Burma, 1962; Uganda, 1972), or as laborers in the colonial resource extraction machine (Sierra Leone, 1968; Ghana, 1969; Zambia, 1971). In the aftermath of colonial rule, economic independence often did not follow political independence and alien populations who controlled key sectors of the economy were targeted for expulsion in order to empower the “indigenous” population, however defined by the government.

Some might wish to label this category “middlemen minority” expulsions, however, it was not just alien middlemen (e.g. Asians in Uganda), those dominating the commercial, petite-bourgeoisie class who were expelled. Similar colonial-induced migrants, sometimes referred to as “enterprising African” foreigners,” such as bureaucrats, doctors, teachers, carpenters and other skilled workers (e.g. Congolese in Gabon, 1962) were also expelled. Therefore, decolonial expulsions encapsulate government policies to remove both alien middlemen and professionals.

Decolonial expulsions are the smallest proportion of the four types of mass expulsion: 13 episodes, or 10 percent. These expulsions are concentrated in three regions—former colonies throughout Africa (69 percent), Asia (23 percent) and MENA (8 percent). All but two of the cases (Indonesia, 1958; Libya, 1970) targeted fellow colonial subjects, many from neighboring countries; Pan-African and Pan-Asian sentiment quickly fell away as economic decline and inequality persisted. This type of expulsion occurred in the two decades between the late 1950s and late 1970s during decolonization when many countries began building their newly independent states. Since the
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19 This could also refer to “enterprising Asian foreigners.”
colonization of territories has been largely eliminated, decolonial expulsion is the least likely to occur in the present time. However, if currently occupied territories obtain their independence (West Bank, Western Sahara), we could see a revival of this form of expulsion, targeting settlers.

**Insurgent/Reprisal Expulsions** (*security threat, regime maintenance*): Insurgent/reprisal mass expulsions are motivated by a real or perceived security threat (similar to fifth column expulsions) in the regime maintenance phase. In these cases, the expelling government is not trying to build a nation-state, or homogenize the population, but instead is trying to consolidate and sustain the existing regime. Threats that motivate insurgent/reprisal expulsions can be internal or external and include domestic rebel or secessionist movements (Burma, 1978; Yugoslavia, 1990s), inter-state disputes (Turkey, 1964; Iraq, 1971), support for the hostile side in third-party conflicts (Peru, 1942; Saudi Arabia, 1990), and “refugee warriors” (Thailand, 1979; Tanzania, 1996). These expulsions aim to remove entire populations branded as insurgents and/or to retaliate against a neighboring state.

Insurgent/reprisal expulsions make up nearly a third of the total cases examined (29 percent). They occur throughout the entire period of study (the first instance in 1937 and the last in 2012) and in six of seven world regions (the majority in Africa, MENA and Europe & Central Asia). While the insurgent and reprisal elements of this type of expulsion occasionally go hand-in-hand, a plurality of these cases (47 percent) are instances of reprisal (e.g. Algeria, 1975; Mauritania & Senegal, 1989), most often in retaliation for a border or foreign policy dispute. Others (42 percent) are more clearly insurgent expulsions (Israel, 1967; DRC, 1995) targeting groups seen to be internally dangerous to the state; and a smaller portion (11 percent) are a mixture of both insurgent and reprisal elements (French Somaliland, 1967; Kuwait, 1991). This type of expulsion is likely to continue as climate change puts increasing strain on natural resources—potentially erupting in inter-state disputes over water and grazing rights—and as the size and duration of refugee flows increase with protracted intra-state conflicts.
Xenophobic Expulsions (economic threat, regime maintenance): Xenophobic mass expulsions target groups that pose an economic threat to the state in the regime maintenance phase. This type of expulsion typically occurs during times of economic crisis or decline when unemployment levels are high, and inflation is rising. While all four expulsion types use the target population as a scapegoat, the concept of deflecting blame is most appropriate for xenophobic expulsions. Governments that deploy this kind of expulsion identify the target group as exclusively responsible for the economic woes of the state. Groups are accused of undermining economic opportunities of the indigenous population and usurping their rights as natives. In many cases governments brand the target population as “illegal aliens” or “illegal immigrants,” regardless of their documentation status. They accuse them of being a burden on the domestic society and economy, sometimes blaming them for increased crime in urban areas. Economic chauvinism is pervasive in these cases with governments justifying their expulsions to nationalize labor, augment native job creation and increase wages by eliminating foreigners who work for a pittance. In all xenophobic cases, the executive promises that the removal of the expellees will solve domestic economic problems. However, since the root causes are not successfully addressed via expulsion, the problems are not resolved and the same group is often targeted for expulsion multiple times (e.g. Mexican agricultural workers in the U.S., 1929 & 1954; Haitian sugarcane cutters in the Dominican Republic, 1991, 1996 & 1999; and Congolese diamond miners in Angola, 2003, 2008 & 2011).

Just over one quarter (27 percent) of the expulsion cases in the dataset are xenophobic expulsions. It is the only type that includes episodes in all seven world regions, the most in Africa (50 percent), Latin America & the Caribbean (21 percent) and MENA (12 percent). Similar to insurgent/reprisal expulsions, xenophobic expulsions occur throughout the entire time period examined, beginning in 1929 and continuing through 2011. These expulsions are likely to persist into the future given the default reaction of governments to blame foreigners when domestic economies
slump. This is particularly concerning in light of the Coronavirus pandemic and the likely sustained economic downturn throughout the world.

Table 7 classifies each of the 131 mass expulsion events in the dataset by the type outlined in the above typology. As shown, mass expulsions are motivated by security threats (fifth column & insurgent/reprisal) in 63 percent of the cases, and by economic threats (decolonial and xenophobic) in 37 percent of expulsions. To date, most of the research on mass expulsion (and ethnic cleansing) has been confined to the left side of Figure 3, where security threats drive the decision to expel. However, the new typology presented here identifies nearly 40 percent of events that are not a result of security considerations, obliging us to widen our understanding of the drivers of mass expulsion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Types of mass expulsion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifth column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurgent/reprisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decolonial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophobic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All four expulsion types target citizens and non-citizens for removal, indicating the importance of incorporating both categories of persons into the analysis of this phenomenon. However, the 45 expulsion episodes that only targeted citizens (34 percent), are all confined to fifth column and insurgent/reprisal expulsions, indicating a security driver for citizen-only expulsion. Since much of the existing scholarship has excluded non-citizens from its analysis, it is perhaps not surprising that security explanations for mass expulsion predominant. Hybrid expulsions, targeting citizens and non-citizens, and exclusively non-citizen expulsions are found across all four types of expulsion.

The typology also indicates that 44 percent of expulsions occur in the state building phase (fifth column & decolonial), while 56 percent occur in the regime maintenance phase (insurgent/reprisal & xenophobic). This suggests that mass expulsion is not an outdated phenomenon confined to the emergence of new states, and the drive for homogenization, but a recurrently available
government policy used to preserve the existing regime and remove unwanted populations. One of the challenges in determining the causes of mass expulsion is to ensure that like cases are being compared. The reasons motivating the Ottoman Empire to expel its Greek Orthodox minority (fifth column expulsion) are not the same as those of Idi Amin in Uganda in deciding to expel the country’s Asian population (decolonial expulsion), despite both using the same demographic engineering policy. The typology presented here helps to clarify distinct government motivations that lead to similar policies of mass expulsion.

**Conclusion**

The Global Mass Expulsion Dataset aims to contribute to the comparative study of expulsion by disaggregating the concept from its similar, but distinct, conceptual kin and documenting expulsion events over a century, across seven regions, targeting citizens and non-citizens. The data show that mass expulsion is a pervasive phenomenon across time and space, with 131 expulsion episodes affecting at least 27.79 million people during 1912-2012. This paper also offers a typology of mass expulsion, classifying events into four types based on government motivations to expel. Governments seek to expel populations that present real or perceived security or economic threats in their state building or regime maintenance phases. The typology clarifies the diversity within the class of events that is expulsion.

While this dataset documents the universe of cases that belong to the concept mass expulsion from 1912-2012, collecting quantitative data on these events is only one aspect of developing theoretical explanations of why and how governments expel. The mass expulsion dataset is part of a larger dissertation project that includes detailed process tracing of four mass expulsion cases corresponding to the four types outlined in the typology. Notably, the dataset only includes cases of mass expulsion, omitting events where mass expulsion may have been likely but where it was not the chosen governmental policy. Examining counterfactual cases of non-expulsion is critical to
determining the enabling conditions that facilitate expulsion and the constraining conditions that prevent its use—the dataset only provides information for half of the puzzle.

Armed with this new comprehensive dataset, scholars can pursue new questions as well as test and refine existing theories about the causes and consequences of mass expulsion. For scholars of civil wars and conflict processes the dataset may offer insight into the trajectory of insurgencies or secessionist movements and the effect of expulsion on escalating, deescalating or sparking inter- or intra-state conflicts. It could also support research into the barriers to labor mobility, circular migration patterns, and regional agreements on refugee and migrant flows. The dataset may also contribute to the investigation of nationalist movements and ‘ethnic homeland’ claims and how the experience of mass expulsion impacts future mobilization and organization. Lastly, it is hoped that this data will be useful for ongoing efforts in the development of early warning systems, like those for mass killing, which may be expanded to include mass expulsion.

As mass expulsion continues to be used by governments around the world—most recently targeting Rohingya (2017), Congolese (2018), and Nigerian refugees (2019)—there is a significant policy objective in developing this dataset. Documenting the universe of cases that comprise mass expulsion may help to refine theories of its causes and inform policy recommendations for anticipating its onset and deterring its use. Given the millions affected by this abhorrent practice, research into its causes and preventative measures is essential.
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