

UNIVERSITÀ CATTOLICA DEL SACRO CUORE  
**Dipartimento di Economia e Finanza**

**Working Paper Series**

***Female Genital Cutting and the Slave Trade***

*Lucia Corno, Eliana La Ferrara, Alessandra Voena*

**Working Paper n. 138**

**May 2025**



UNIVERSITÀ  
CATTOLICA  
del Sacro Cuore

# **Female Genital Cutting and the Slave Trade**

**Lucia Corno**

*Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore*

**Elia La Ferrara**

*Harvard Kennedy School*

**Alessandra Voena**

*Stanford University*

Working Paper n. 138  
May 2025

Dipartimento di Economia e Finanza  
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore  
Largo Gemelli 1 - 20123 Milano – Italy  
tel: +39.02.7234.2976 - fax: +39.02.7234.2781  
e-mail: [dip.economiaefinanza@unicatt.it](mailto:dip.economiaefinanza@unicatt.it)

The Working Paper Series promotes the circulation of research results produced by the members and affiliates of the Dipartimento di Economia e Finanza, with the aim of encouraging their dissemination and discussion. Results may be in a preliminary or advanced stage. The Dipartimento di Economia e Finanza is part of the Dipartimenti e Istituti di Scienze Economiche (DISCE) of the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore.

# Female Genital Cutting and the Slave Trade

Lucia Corno, Eliana La Ferrara, Alessandra Voena\*

May 12, 2025

## Abstract

This paper investigates the historical origins of female genital cutting (FGC). We test the historical hypothesis that FGC is associated with the Red Sea route of the African slave trade, where women were typically sold as concubines in the Middle East and infibulation was used as a means to preserve virginity. Using individual-level data from 28 African countries combined with historical records of Red Sea slave shipments from 1400 to 1900, we find that women from ethnic groups whose ancestors experienced greater exposure to the Red Sea slave trade are more likely to undergo infibulation or circumcision today. They are also more inclined to support the continuation of this practice. Our findings are robust to instrumenting Red Sea slave exports with the distance to the nearest port used for this route. We also leverage a dataset on oral traditions (*Folklore*) to show that greater exposure to the Red Sea slave trade correlates with a stronger association between infibulation and the cultural values of chastity and purity, which may have facilitated the diffusion of infibulation among local populations.

**Keywords:** FGC, FGM, social norms, slave trade, Africa

**JEL Classification:** O10; I11

---

\*We thank Ralph Austen, Pietro Biroli, Alfredo Burlando, Stelios Michalopoulos, Owen Ozier, Mohamed Saleh and seminar participants at Brown, Harvard, Oxford, Birmingham, Bocconi, Gottingen, Navarra and Boston University and to the ASSA Meetings and EUDN conference for helpful comments. We are grateful to Nathan Nunn for helpful discussions and for sharing data on slave exports. Francesca Agosti, Silvia Barbareschi, Giulia Buccione, Silvia Farina, Alessandro Fusari, Carolina Marsiglia, Jack Melbourne, Samuel Plach, Armin Satzger and Matthew Schwartzmann provided excellent research assistance. We acknowledge financial support from Economic Development Institutions (EDI) and from Corno's ERC Starting Grant no. 852172 ("HarmfulTraditions"). The usual disclaimer applies. Corno: Department of Economics and Finance, Cattolica University, CEPR, LEAP, lucia.corno@unicatt.it; La Ferrara: Harvard Kennedy School, NBER, CEPR, LEAP, elaferrara@hks.harvard.edu; Voena: Department of Economics, Stanford University, NBER, CEPR, LEAP, avoena@stanford.edu.

*“...some severe forms of genital mutilation may have originated with, or were at the very least intensified by, the institutions of slavery and the harem system.” De Meo, 1997, p.10.*

# 1 Introduction

Harmful gender norms persist in many parts of the developing world, leading to severe consequences for women’s health and well-being. These include practices such as dowry and sex-selective abortion (Anderson and Bidner, 2015; Bhalotra, Chakravarty and Gulesci, 2020), child marriage (Field and Ambrus, 2008; Corno, Hildebrandt and Voena, 2020; Corno and Voena, 2023; Buchmann et al., 2023), restrictions on women’s employment (Jayachandran, 2021), and limitations on mobility during menstruation (Macours, Rueda and Webb, 2024). But what are the historical origins of these norms?

This paper focuses on the origins of one of the most pervasive and harmful gender norms: female genital cutting (FGC). FGC is a practice that involves “the partial or total removal of external female genitalia or other injuries to the female genital organs for non-medical reasons” (World Health Organization, 2022). The most severe form, infibulation, entails the complete closure of the vulva.<sup>1</sup> Despite extremely serious health effects, it is estimated that over 200 million women worldwide have undergone FGC (UNICEF, 2019). The practice is prevalent in approximately 30 countries across Africa and the Middle East, with near-universal rates in some areas: over 90% of women are cut in Somalia, Guinea, Djibouti, Eritrea, Sudan, Egypt, and Sierra Leone. By contrast, in other African countries, FGC prevalence is below 1% (UNICEF, 2019).<sup>2</sup>

The evolution and variation of gender norms across countries have been proved to be influenced by the past (Alesina, Giuliano and Nunn, 2013; Alesina, Brioschi and La Ferrara, 2021; Fernández and Fogli, 2009; Fernández, 2007). However, despite the importance of the topic, there is limited empirical evidence on the historical origins of FGC—a notable exception being Becker (2023). Understanding the origins and diffusion of this harmful norm is crucial for explaining its persistence and designing effective policies to reduce its prevalence. This paper aims at contributing in this direction, by asking the question: can the current prevalence of FGC be traced back to the African slave trade?

A significant number of historical and ethnographic records theorize that the most extreme

---

<sup>1</sup>FGC is classified by the World Health Organization (WHO) into four different types: i) Type 1 (or clitoridectomy) is the partial or total removal of the clitoris; ii) Type 2 (or excision) is the partial or total removal of the clitoris and the inner labia with or without excision of the outer labia; iii) Type 3 (or infibulation) is the removal of the inner and outer labia and closure of the vulva, with or without the removal of the clitoris; iv) Type 4 encompasses all other harmful procedures performed on the female genitalia for non-medical reasons, such as pricking, piercing, incising, scraping, and cauterizing the genital area.

<sup>2</sup>Appendix Figure B1 illustrates the prevalence of FGC across Africa and highlights the countries with legal bans against the practice (WorldBank, 2024). Of the 28 countries with available data, only four do not prohibit FGC, suggesting that differences in prevalence cannot simply be attributed to the presence or absence of legislation.



form of female genital cutting, infibulation, was associated with the Red Sea route of the African slave trade. This route transported slaves from North-East Africa to the Middle East. Along this route, female slaves were typically sold to work as concubines in the harems in the Middle East and infibulation was used as a signal of purity or virginity, as well as to decrease the likelihood of pregnancy during the journey.<sup>3</sup> Infibulated women commanded a higher price on the slave market in recognition of their higher ‘quality’ (De Meo, 1997).

We empirically test this hypothesis. We conjecture that the differential exposure of ethnic groups to the Red Sea route during the African slave trade determined differential adoption of the practice by these groups and that this may translate into differences in the contemporary prevalence of FGC in Africa.

To test this hypothesis, we link contemporary individual-level data from all the available Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) in Africa that elicit information on FGC, with historical estimates on the number of slaves from each ethnic group exported across the four African slave trade routes between 1400 and 1900. We rely on Nunn (2008) for estimates of slave exports along the trans-Saharan, trans-Atlantic, and Indian Ocean routes, given that his data already have broad coverage of these routes. For the Red Sea route, we examine a variety of historical sources (archives, ethnographic materials, manumission acts) and expand Nunn’s (2008) estimates on the number of slaves exported. We thus assemble a new and more comprehensive dataset on the ethnicity and the number of slaves shipped across the Red Sea between 1400 and 1900.

We then use information on respondents’ ethnicity to connect survey data from DHS and MICS with historical ethnicity-level data on slaves. Our analysis is based on a final sample of nearly 600,000 women born between 1942 and 2002, belonging to 198 different ethnic groups and living in 28 different African countries. We test the relationship between exposure to the Red Sea slave route and the contemporary prevalence of FGC separately for different types of FGC, focusing in particular on infibulation—the form most directly related to the practice performed on female slaves. We exploit within-country variation in the exposure of different ethnic groups to the Red Sea slave route, controlling for exposure to other routes and for a number of potentially confounding factors, including geography and historical customs.

Our results show that women belonging to ethnic groups whose ancestors were exposed to the Red Sea slave trade are significantly more likely to be infibulated—and, in general, circumcised—today. According to our most conservative specification, a one standard deviation increase in the slave exports to the Red Sea for one’s ethnic group increases the probability of infibulation by 5.7 percentage points (or 71.4% of the mean for groups not exposed to this slave trade) and the probability of circumcision by about 2.5 percentage points (or 4.5% of the mean for groups not enslaved in Red Sea route). We do not find any effect of having ancestors traded along the other African slave routes, which have not been historically associated with

---

<sup>3</sup>See, among others, Dos Santos (1609); Browne (1799); Larrey (1803); Burckhardt (1819); Cailliaud (1826); Russegger (1843).

infibulation. When we focus only on countries located in East Africa (Egypt, Sudan, Ethiopia, Somalia, Djibouti, Eritrea) we find that a one standard deviation increase in exposure to Red Sea exports leads, on average, to a 5.5 percentage points increase in the likelihood of infibulation (12% of the mean). This finding suggests that differences in exposure to the Red Sea slave trade across ethnic groups within the Eastern part of Africa still explain a non-negligible part of the variation in infibulation today.

We also find significant effects on attitudes towards FGC: women whose ancestors were traded along the Red Sea route are more likely to be in favor of continuing the practice, compared to women whose ancestors were exported via other slave trade routes or not enslaved.<sup>4</sup> This is a relevant finding from a policy perspective, as it suggests that efforts to eradicate FGC in Africa may face obstacles created by distant historical experiences whose effects on culture are still felt today.

A potential concern in interpreting the above results in a causal way may be that societies historically more prone to adopting infibulation might also have been those targeted by the slave raiders.<sup>5</sup> To mitigate potential endogeneity concerns, we propose three strategies. First, we consider slaves exported along all four slave trade routes to control for any unobserved factors that affect the propensity to enslave certain groups, without being specific to the Red Sea route. By doing this, any threat to identification should come from unobserved factors that are specific to ethnic groups historically located along the Red Sea route, and not to the others. Second, we match our data with pre-industrial characteristics of ethnic groups, using the *Ethnographic Atlas* (Murdock 1967). This allows us to control for historical characteristics of ethnic groups potentially correlated with both FGC and the Red Sea slave trade, such as norms related to premarital sexual behavior or dependence on pastoralism. Third, we follow the existing literature that uses distance from the Atlantic coast as an instrument for trans-Atlantic slave exports (e.g., Nunn and Wantchekon, 2011; Whatley and Gillezeau, 2011; Teso, 2019) and we instrument our Red Sea exposure variable using the distance to the closest port of exit for the Red Sea route.<sup>6</sup> Our first stage shows that ethnic groups located closer to the port of exit for the Red Sea route were more likely to be traded along that route. Our IV estimates are significant and very similar in magnitude to the OLS ones, suggesting that the association between infibulation and Red Sea slave trade is unlikely to be driven by selection or omitted variable bias.

Finally, we use the *Folklore* dataset (Michalopoulos and Xue (2021)) to investigate a potential mechanism underlying the contemporary adoption of FGC: the demand for chastity.

---

<sup>4</sup>The effect of a one standard deviation increase in exposure to the Red Sea slave trade on the probability of supporting FGC is +2.6 percentage points, i.e., approximately 7% of the mean for groups not exposed to the Red Sea slave trade.

<sup>5</sup>Note that all our specifications include country fixed effects, hence we compare individuals from different ethnic groups holding constant any institutional factors that vary at the level of the present-day country of residence.

<sup>6</sup>In this regression we also control for the distance to the closest port of exit and the closest coast, to account for any other characteristics potentially correlated with the ports and FGC (e.g., economic development).

*Folklore* is a collection of beliefs and values held by societies as captured in their oral traditions, their narratives, stories, jokes or proverbs. This database represents the lifelong work of the anthropologist Yuri Berezkin and has been validated by [Michalopoulos and Xue \(2021\)](#). In the database, each ethnic group is associated with a series of ‘motifs’, episodes or images found in the set of narratives. Some motifs depict women as chaste, virgin and pure, which can be interpreted as an indication that a society has a preference for these traits. We use text analysis to compute the share of motifs related to chastity and FGC in each ethnic group, which we take as a proxy for an ethnic group’s demand for chastity and purity. We find a positive correlation between the prevalence of themes related to purity and chastity in the oral traditions of a group and the share of women who are infibulated today. Interestingly, this association is only present among the ethnic groups exposed to the Red Sea slave trade. These results are consistent with the idea that groups exposed to the Red Sea slave trade may have internalized the belief that infibulated women were more chaste and pure, contributing to the wider adoption of FGC among non-slave populations.

Our work relates to three strands of literature. At a broad level, it contributes to the literature that studies the long-term effects of history on contemporary attitudes and behavior ([Michalopoulos and Papaioannou, 2020](#); [Valencia Caicedo, 2023](#)), and in particular on gender norms. [Alesina, Giuliano and Nunn \(2013\)](#) and [Alesina, Brioschi and La Ferrara \(2021\)](#) explore the effects of historical modes of production on contemporary gender attitudes and female labor force participation and on intimate partner violence, respectively. The outcome we study in this paper, FGC, is another important component of women’s status, which entails significant health and psychological costs.

Second, our work relates to the empirical literature on the effects of Africa’s slave trade on economic development. This literature has shown long term impacts of this trade on economic performance ([Nunn, 2008](#)), ethnic fractionalization ([Nunn, 2008](#); [Whatley and Gillezeau, 2011](#); [Green, 2013](#)), conflicts ([Fenske and Kala, 2017](#)), trust ([Nunn and Wantchekon, 2011](#)), family structure ([Edlund and Ku, 2011](#)), female labor force participation ([Teso, 2019](#)) and financial development ([Pierce and Snyder, 2018](#); [Levine, Lin and Xie, 2017](#)). All the above papers focus on the role of the trans-Atlantic slave trade. In contrast, our emphasis is on the Red Sea slave trade, which has been significantly less studied by economists and for which we expand the existing data coverage, as well as on an outcome previously not empirically associated with the slave trade, i.e., FGC.

Finally, our paper relates to the growing literature on the drivers and persistence of female genital cutting. A first set of contributions studies coordination failures and the role of people’s beliefs in sustaining the norm ([Mackie, 1996](#); [Bicchieri, 2005](#); [Platteau, Camilotti and Auriol, 2018](#)), including recent tests on the relevance of coordination in field settings ([Efferson et al., 2015](#); [Novak, 2020](#); [Gulesci et al., 2023](#)). Other studies stress the intrinsic value of cutting as a signal of virginity or sexual fidelity that is valued on the marriage market (e.g., [Chesnokova and](#)

Vaithianathan, 2010; Wagner, 2015; Khalifa, 2022). While anthropologists have highlighted the significance of FGC in terms of cultural identity (Shell-Duncan and Hernlund, 2000), until recently the economic literature has not systematically investigated its historical roots. A notable exception, related in spirit to our work, is a recent paper by Becker (2023), who tests the theory that pre-industrial reliance on pastoralism, characterized by extended periods of male absence, made it desirable to control female sexuality and led to the adoption of restrictive norms, including infibulation. Our work offers a complementary (non-exclusive) explanation for the diffusion of infibulation, based on historical accounts linking this practice to the Red Sea slave trade.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides background information on infibulation and the slave trade. Section 3 describes the data used in the analysis, while Section 4 outlines the empirical strategy. Section 5 contains the main empirical results and Section 6 explores the underlying mechanisms. Finally, Section 7 concludes.

## 2 Historical background

### 2.1 The African slave trade

For a period of nearly 500 years, between 1400 and 1900, about 18 million slaves were exported from Africa. This was a profound and devastating shock for the entire African continent. According to calculations by Patrick Manning, in 1850, Africa's population was only half of what it could have been in the absence of the slave trade.


The slave trade was organized along four main routes (Mowafi, 1981; Lovejoy, 1989). The most recent was the *trans-Atlantic route*. Through this route, approximately 12 million slaves were taken from West Africa and West-Central Africa and shipped to colonies in North and South America to work in plantations. The majority of enslaved people worked on sugar cane plantations, an important local crop at the time, but also in the production of other commodities such as tobacco, rice, cotton, fruit, and corn. Three other (and older) routes involved approximately 6 million slaves in total: (i) the *Red Sea route*, where slaves were taken from the inland of the Red Sea and the coast of east Africa and exported to the Middle East, in particular to the Arabian Peninsula and the Persian Gulf (approximately 1.3 million slaves) (Austen, 1988, 1979); (ii) the *trans-Saharan route*, where slaves were taken from the south of the Sahara, moved across the Saharan desert and reached the Northern part of Africa (approximately 3.1 million slaves) (Austen, 1992); and (iii) the *Indian Ocean route*, where slaves were taken from Eastern Africa and shipped partly to the islands in the Indian Ocean (Reunion, Mauritius and Madagascar) and partly to the Arabian Peninsula (approximately 9,700 slaves) (Harris, 1971).

Figure 1 stylized the four slave trade routes, using differently colored arrows for each of them: *black* for the trans-Atlantic route, *orange* for the trans-Saharan one, *red* for the Red Sea and *blue* for the Indian Ocean route. In Figure 1 we also report the names and locations of the



main ports of departure for African slaves, which we compiled assembling various historical sources.<sup>7</sup>

Figure 1. African slave trade routes



Source: Authors' elaboration based on historical accounts.

The different geographical destinations of slaves along the four routes generated variation in the type of slaves demanded. The slaves exported across the trans-Atlantic route were typically employed on plantations and were preferably males.<sup>8</sup> On the contrary, slaves traded along the Red Sea route were mainly women. The estimated male-to-female ratio was 1:2 (Segal, 2001; Lovejoy and Richardson, 1995). Female slaves were mainly employed in the royal harems in the Middle East (Harris, 1971). Indeed, during the Ottoman empire, one of the Sultan's privileges was having as many women as he desired (Zilfi, 2010b). Furthermore, Islamic injunctions against the enslavement of Muslims led to the large-scale importation of slaves from the outside. Peirce (1993) mentions that "since the enslavement of Muslims was forbidden, concubines, like other slaves, came from outside the Islamic lands and were generally either

<sup>7</sup>We report the full list of ports of exits from Africa with the corresponding historical sources in Appendix Table B1.

<sup>8</sup>Estimates by Lovejoy (1989) suggest that the ratio of male-to-female slaves involved in trans-Atlantic slave trade was about 181:100 between the 17th and the end of the 19th century.

taken as war booty or purchased from slave traders”.

The trans-Saharan slave trade overlapped significantly with the trans-Atlantic trade, particularly after the 18th century, with the latter primarily focused on providing labor (Lovejoy, 1989, 2000). The Ottoman Empire also exerted influence in North Africa, but studies on slavery in the region tend to highlight the roles of enslaved women in domestic labor and agricultural work (Zilfi, 2010a). Finally, the Indian Ocean slave trade was somewhat more complex and it was the one with the lowest number of slaves. In the 1600s and early 1700s, slave exports were essentially an extension of the trade across the Red Sea and trans-Saharan routes. In the 18th century, however, new currents affected this maritime trade. Slaves were taken to the Dutch settlement in Cape Town and the French relied heavily on enslaved labor in their established plantations on the Mascarene Islands in the Indian Ocean. Europeans were trying to establish in these islands a plantation economy similar to the one created in the New World. The Indian Ocean slave trades occurred only periodically because merchants’ movements depended on trade winds and ocean tides that greatly limited their operations (Lovejoy, 2000). The Red Sea, trans-Saharan and Indian Ocean routes are part of what is also referred to as the Arab slave trade.

The vast majority of those who were enslaved through the trans-Atlantic route were sold by other West Africans to European slave traders (Sowell, 2005), while others were captured directly by the slave traders in coastal raids. The Red Sea slave trade, on the other hand, mainly involved Arabs as the primary merchants. These used smaller ships to move slaves from Africa to the Arabian Peninsula. At a minimum, the journey was 13-weeks long (Renault, 1988). During the journey, sexual abuse of slaves, rape and other forms of violence were common aboard the slave ships.<sup>9</sup>

## 2.2 The origins of infibulation

The practice of infibulation has ancient roots but the exact origin and motives behind its adoption are still scarcely documented. We did our best to gather and cross-check several sources and historical writings by ancient geographers, travelers and historians. Infibulation appears to have been practiced in Ancient Egypt and among nomadic tribes around the Red Sea as a tool to control female sexuality and as a marker of womanhood (Ghalioungui, 1963; Levy, 1962; Boyle, 2005).<sup>10,11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>For example, the slave trader John Newton writes: “The men were packed together below deck and were secured by leg irons. Women and children were kept in separate quarters, sometimes on deck, allowing them limited freedom of movement, but this also exposed them to violence and sexual abuse from the crew” (Newton, 1962).

<sup>10</sup>We did not find any reliable historical sources reporting that the practice originated in the Middle East (Erllich, 1986; Hosken, 1982).

<sup>11</sup>During the Pharaonic era, the Egyptians believed in gods having bisexual features. The sociologist Elizabeth Boyle (2005) recounts that these features were believed to reflect upon the mortals, with women’s clitoris representing the masculine soul and men’s prepuce the feminine one. Thus, she argues that circumcision was considered to be a marker of womanhood and a way to detach a woman from her masculine soul.

The earliest written evidence of infibulation is in a Greek Papyrus of the 163 BC, currently preserved in the London British Museum, which indicates that a certain Harmais of Sarapeum (Alexandria, Egypt) “gave money to the mother of a girl for dowry and the usual ceremony of circumcision” (Kenyon, 1893). About one hundred years later (25 BC), the Greek geographer and historian Strabo (64 or 63 BC-24 AD), after traveling to Egypt and along the West coast of the Red Sea, reported the practice of excision on Egyptian girls. He noted that two groups of people, the Kreophagoi and Koloboi, located on the west coast of the Red Sea, “mutilated the sexual glands and excised their women in the Jewish manner” (Widstrand, 1964; Knight, 2001).<sup>12,13</sup> During the same period, Philo of Alexandria, a Jewish philosopher who lived in Alexandria (20 BC-50 AD), also made reference to infibulation as follows: “the Egyptians, by the custom of their country, circumcise the marriageable youth and maid in the fourteenth (year) of their age, when the male begins to get seed, and the female to have a menstrual flow” (Knight, 2001). Another mention of infibulation is attributed to a Greek physician, Claudius Galenus (129 - 216 AD): “When [the clitoris] sticks out to a great extent in their young women, Egyptians consider it appropriate to cut it out”. The reference to Egyptian origin also emerges from the fact that in some countries (e.g., Somalia, Sudan) infibulation is today called ‘Pharaonic circumcision’.

In the 16th century, Pietro Bembo, a Venetian historian and the secretary to Pope Leo X, provides, for the first time, a detailed description of infibulation on the basis of the accounts of travelers around the Red Sea area. He writes that “the private parts of the girls are sewn together immediately after their birth” since “an indubitable virginity at the marriage is held in such a high esteem” (Bembo, 1551). His position as secretary to the Pope may have given him opportunity to meet and discuss with travelers as well as having access to the papal archives. Afterwards, at the beginning of the twentieth century, ethnographic studies document cases of infibulation around the contiguous areas of the Red Sea coast among the nomadic populations. Seligmann (1913), a British physician and ethnologist, argues that the practice arose in the Hamito-Semitic areas of the Red Sea and maps the locations where it was documented. Widstrand (1964) combines all the ancient writings and also draws a figure on the historical spatial distribution of infibulation within Africa. We report his map as Figure B2 in Appendix B.2, to show that infibulation was present in clusters scattered in North-Eastern Africa, along the Nile valley.

---

<sup>12</sup>Referring to the work of pathologist Grafton Elliot Smith, who examined hundreds of mummies at the beginning of the 20th century, Knight (2001) argues that their genital area may resemble what the World Health Organization classifies as ‘type 3’ circumcision. However, no rigorous evidence shows that infibulation was performed among Egyptian mummies.

<sup>13</sup>The real source of this information seems to be the first book by Agatharchides, a greek historian and geographer, *On the Erythraean Sea*, 2nd century BC.

## 2.3 The historical link between infibulation and slavery

A significant body of historical and ethnographic records suggests a connection between infibulation and slavery. According to descriptions by early travelers, infibulated female slaves had a higher price on the slave market because infibulation, which makes vaginal penetration painful and difficult, was thought to prevent undesired pregnancies during the long slaves' journey and to ensure chastity, 'purity' and loyalty to the owner (Browne, 1799; Larrey, 1803; Burckhardt, 1819; Cailliaud, 1826; Russegger, 1843). In particular, infibulation seems to be connected to the Red Sea route of the slave trade, given that slave women traded along the Red Sea route were employed as concubines and domestic servants in the harems in the Middle Eastern countries and kingdoms (Mackie, 1996; De Meo, 1997).

Several historical sources report on the connection between infibulation and slavery. Joao Dos Santos, a Portuguese missionary, reports that a group from Mogadishu (Somalia) has a "custom to sew up their females, especially their slaves being young to make them unable to conception, which makes these slaves more valuable in the market both for their chastity, and for better confidence which their Masters put in them" (Dos Santos, 1609). The value of slaves "would be diminished by impregnation, or even by the necessary result of coition, though unaccompanied by conception" mentioned Browne (1799). Again, Johann Ludwig Burckhardt (1819), a Swiss traveller and geographer, writes that "I am unable to state whether [infibulation] is performed by their parents in their native country, or by the merchants, but I have reason to believe by the latter. Girls in this state are worth more than others." According to Russegger (1843) "infibulation was done to slave women to keep them virginal prior to selling them in the destination places" and Larrey (1803) indicates that the Turks infibulated female slaves prior to selling them (Hicks, 2018).

More recently, Lightfoot-Klein (1989) reports that "infibulation appears to have been reserved for slave girls, who were transported from Sudan and Nubia, (...) to prevent their getting pregnant. An infibulated virgin fetched a far higher price on the slave market". Finally, De Meo (1997) writes that "girls were once infibulated to ensure their virginity when presented for the Near Eastern harem slave trade. The regions that today practice infibulation were once primary 'capture zones' in the Turk and Arab slave trade for young African girls and boys. This suggests that some severe forms of genital mutilation may have originated with, or were at the very least intensified by, the institutions of slavery and the harem system".

The historical hypothesis that female slaves traded along the Red Sea route were young and so still plausibly virgin is substantiated by the historical records assembled by Miran (2013). He analyzed 67 manumission records where age is provided from Massawa, one of the main ports of exit for the Red Sea route, and reported that 41 percent of female slaves were in the age range between 13-15 years. Although not representative, this suggests that slaves crossing the Red Sea were fairly young. We show these figures in Appendix Table B2. In addition, Browne (1799) mentions that "the operation [infibulation] is performed at all ages from 8 to 16 years



but generally between 11-12 years”.

Further accounts suggest that, once the practice of infibulation consolidated through the slave trade and became associated with traits related to virginity, purity, and beauty, the adoption of the practice spread among other female populations, also taking less severe forms (DeMeo, 2003).<sup>14</sup> Mackie (1996) writes that “the geographic distribution of FGC suggests that it originated on the western coast of the Red Sea, where infibulation is most intense, diminishing to clitoridectomy in westward and southward radiation” and that “a practice associated with shameful female slavery came to stand for honor”. Abdalla (1982) also argues that in this context virginity became a “trademark”.

The reappropriation and transformation of practices originally associated with negative or lower-status origins into symbols of honor or prestige is common across cultures (Galinsky et al., 2003). Communities often redefine these practices to align with their own values and social structures. An illustrative example is the case of tattoos in Western societies (Adams, 2009). Historically, tattoos were associated with marginalized or low status groups (e.g., prisoners, gang members, sailors) and sometimes seen as markers of deviance. However, over time they have been reappropriated as symbols of individual expression and art. In the context of FGC, the reappropriation process may have involved a shift away from its role in the slave trade toward emphasizing perceived benefits, such as purity or aesthetic ideals (Mackie, 1996).

In summary, historical and anthropological evidence suggests a pathway through which infibulation originated in ancient Egypt and intensified during the Red Sea slave trade due to a demand shock for virginal and chaste women. The higher valuation of infibulated female slaves reinforced an association between the practice and perceived traits of chastity and beauty, contributing to the diffusion among the local population. In what follows, we empirically test this hypothesis.

## 3 Data

### 3.1 Contemporaneous data: Female Genital Cutting

Data on female genital cutting (FGC) comes from the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) and the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS). DHS are nationally-representative, individual-level surveys carried out in several countries around the world. We assembled all the DHS datasets publicly available for Africa between 1994 and 2017 with information on respondents’ FGC status and ethnicity. The latter information is crucial as it is used to merge the DHS data with historical data on slavery. We have a sample of 28 countries and 66 waves of data collection.

In the DHS surveys, the information on FGC is collected retrospectively during the woman’s

---

<sup>14</sup>Historical photographic documentation shows ornaments on the genitalia of cut women, highlighting the connection with beauty (Widstrand, 1964).

interview. Women are asked the following questions: 1) “In some countries, there is a practice in which a girl may have part of her genitals cut. Have you yourself ever been circumcised?”; 2) “At what age?”. In most of the countries in our sample, DHS also elicit information on the type of circumcision by asking 3) “Now I would like to ask you what was done to you at that time: (a) Was any flesh removed from the genital area?” (type 1-2 circumcision following the WHO definition); (b) “Was your genital area sewn closed?” (infibulation, or type 3 circumcision following the WHO definition).<sup>15</sup> In our analysis, we consider two main dependent variables: a dummy for whether the woman is infibulated and a dummy for whether she is circumcised (comprising any type of FGC). Infibulation is the most invasive form of circumcision and the one with the most harmful consequences. It is also the practice most closely related to the one originally performed on female slaves, and hence, it will be our primary outcome of interest.

For some countries, information on respondents’ ethnic group (Egypt, Swaziland, Somalia and Sudan) or on FGC (Djibouti, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Somalia and Sudan) was not recorded in the DHS. Therefore, we completed our sample using available data from the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS), a nationally-representative dataset collected by UNICEF that elicits information on FGC as well as on respondents’ ethnicity for a subset of countries. Importantly, the questions related to female genital cutting asked in the MICS are identical to the ones used in the DHS.

Finally, information regarding the respondent’s ethnicity was not available in either the DHS nor in the MICS databases for Egypt, Somalia, Sudan, and Swaziland. Consequently, we exploit data on the respondent’s smallest geographical area of residence (region/sub-region/district) from the DHS and from online sources, such as the Joshua Project (<https://joshuaproject.net/>), to correlate the respondent’s residence location with the predominant ethnic group in that area.<sup>16</sup> Notably, our empirical results remain robust even when excluding countries with incomplete information on the respondent’s ethnicity.

We validated self-reported questions on FGC in the DHS and MICS datasets by analyzing their correlation with country-level FGC prevalence data from the 2009 Gallup World Poll. Given that the DHS and MICS variables on FGC are self-reported and may be affected by social desirability bias, which could vary across countries, we compared the average prevalence from these surveys with Gallup data on attitudes toward FGC. Specifically, we examined correlations with two measures: “FGC is a normal practice” and agreement with the statement “FGC should be illegal”. As shown in Appendix Figure B3, FGC prevalence is positively associated with the belief that “FGC is a normal practice” and negatively associated with agreeing that “FGC should be illegal”.


Figure 2 shows variation in the prevalence of infibulation (Panel A) and circumcision (Panel B) in our sample, disaggregated by country (left panels) and ethnic group (right panels). Infibu-

<sup>15</sup>The DHS does not differentiate between Type 1 and Type 2 circumcision as defined by the WHO.


<sup>16</sup>The Joshua Project website provides details on the ethnic composition of various regions, allowing us to identify the most prevalent ethnic group in the respondent’s current location. This information was then matched with the corresponding historical ethnic groups outlined in Murdock (1959).

Figure 2. Prevalence of infibulation and circumcision

*Panel A: Infibulation*



*Panel B: Circumcision*



*Notes:* Infibulation corresponds to type-3 circumcision, while circumcision corresponds to any type of FGC in the WHO classification.  
*Source:* Authors' calculation based on DHS and MICS data.

lation is practiced mainly in East Africa, with higher prevalence in the northeastern region of the continent. Strikingly, the current distribution of infibulation prevalence mirrors the historical patterns documented in Figure B2. When considering any type of circumcision (including infibulation but also the less severe types), we note high prevalence both in East and West Africa. The rightmost panels of Figure 2 further highlights significant within-country variation across ethnic groups, a key source of variation leveraged in our empirical analysis, as all specifications include country fixed effects.

In Appendix Table B3 we report the fraction of infibulated and circumcised women by country and the average age at cutting. In our sample, 13% of the women are infibulated, while approximately 65% have been circumcised, more broadly defined. The countries with the highest rates of circumcision are Somalia (99%), Djibouti (97%), Egypt (94%), Eritrea (93%), Sierra Leone (91%), and Sudan (85%). The countries with the lowest prevalence are Cameroon (0%), Uganda (1%), Swaziland (1%) and Malawi (1%). There is also significant variation in the average age at cutting, from a minimum of about 4 years in Gambia to a maximum of 12 years in Sierra Leone.

### 3.2 Historical data: Slave exports and ethnicity

Data on the ethnicity and number of slaves exported across different routes were originally assembled by Nunn (2008) and have been already used in a number of papers (e.g., Nunn and Wantchekon, 2011; Teso, 2019). While Nunn (2008) draws on a wide array of different sources and has large samples available for the trans-Atlantic, trans-Saharan, and Indian Ocean routes, the sample of slaves used in his estimates for the Red Sea route, which was not the focus of these studies, is substantially smaller. Therefore, we complement Nunn (2008)’s database of the trans-Atlantic, the trans-Saharan, and the Indian Ocean route with newly collected data for the Red Sea route.

**Red-Sea Slave Trade.** For our purposes it is crucial to have complete information on the number of slaves exported across the Red-Sea route, by ethnic group. We conducted a meticulous search of several sources to attempt to expand the representativeness of Nunn’s (2008) data.<sup>17</sup> First, as in Nunn (2008) we rely on data on the total number of slaves exported across the Red Sea route from 1400 to 1900 from Austen (1979, 1988, 1992). Second, Austen (1988) also provides information on the route of the Red Sea slave trade from the origin to the destination countries. Slaves were mainly taken from Sawakin (Sudan), Zayla (Somalia), Tajura (Gibuti), and Massawa (Eritrea), and shipped to the Arabian Peninsula and the Middle East, mainly in Hijaz in western Arabia, in Yemen and in the Arabian/Persian Gulf. Starting from this information and following a procedure similar to Nunn (2008) and Harris (1971), we conducted a detailed search of manumission acts and other relevant documents originating from the various ports of origin and destination.

One of the most relevant data sources we found is a book by Jonathan Miran (2013), titled “*From Bondage to Freedom on the Red Sea Coast: Manumitted Slaves in Egyptian Massawa, 1873 - 1885*”. Miran (2013) examined 233 manumission acts registered in the Massawa Islamic Court Records and compiled individual ethnic information on slaves who may have been captured before their shipment across the Red Sea. For 85 percent of the slaves freed, Miran

---

<sup>17</sup>Nunn and Wantchekon (2011), referring to Nunn (2008)’s data, mention “Since only two of the four slave trades—the Trans-Atlantic and Indian Ocean—have ethnicity data detailed enough to construct reliable estimates of the number of slaves taken from each ethnicity, our empirical analysis is restricted to the transatlantic and Indian Ocean slave trades”.

(2013) was able to retrieve the individual’s ethnicity or geographic provenance. In Table B4 in Appendix B.2 we report the ethnic groups of manumitted slave already assembled by [Miran \(2013\)](#). In addition, we found another particularly useful source: “*Slavery in the Gulf in the First Half of the 20th Century*” by Jerzy [Zdanowski \(2008\)](#). [Zdanowski \(2008\)](#) lists a large number of statements—either applications or acts of manumission—recorded at British Agencies, Consulates and Residencies in Arabia in several locations (Addis Ababa, Bahrain, Bandar Abbas, Basidu, Bushire, Dubai, Kuwait, Lingah, HMS Fowey, HMS Lupin, Muscat, and Sharjah).<sup>18</sup> An example of a statement we found in [Zdanowski \(2008\)](#) book is reported in Figure B4. Between 1906 and 1949 a total of 949 statements were made by former slaves. When the ethnicity of the slave was not reported in the statement, we exploit information related to the slave’s birthplace and the slave’s name (religious, geographical and linguistic origin of the name) to infer the ethnic group of each slave. The main reference throughout this procedure was again [Murdock’s book \(1959\)](#). In cases in which more ethnic groups were possible, we selected the most prevalent one within the region.

Appendix Figure B5 provides examples of statements from [Zdanowski \(2008\)](#), illustrating how we infer the ethnic groups of specific individuals. For instance: i) *Nubi bin Mubarak*: his birthplace is identified, allowing us to determine the ethnic group assigned to Mombasa by [Murdock \(1959\)](#), which is Bajun (Bantu); ii) *Nubi bin Taufiq*: the only information available is that he was born in Africa/Asia, without further details, so no ethnic group could be assigned; iii) *Omar bin Ali*: his ethnicity is explicitly identified as Somali. The Somali ethnic group has been proportionally allocated to the three groups located in Somaliland: Esa, Ishak and Mijertein, consistent with the categorization in [Murdock’s work \(1959\)](#).

We add these two new data sources to [Harris \(1971\)](#) and [League of Nations \(1936, 1937\)](#), which were already assembled and used in [Nunn \(2008\)](#), and cross-check all sources against each other to avoid potential double counting of the same slave.

Appendix [Table A1](#) shows our final sample, by data source. We have a sample of 317 slaves from 66 different ethnicities. To compute the total number of slaves in each ethnic group we follow the same procedure as in [Nunn \(2008\)](#): we first calculate the share of slaves in each ethnic group in the Red Sea slave trade sample (assumed to be constant across time periods) and then multiply these shares by the total number of slaves in the Red Sea route assembled by [Austen \(1988\)](#). In Appendix Table B5 we report the top exporting countries in the Red Sea route: Eritrea and Ethiopia are among the top exporting countries, followed by Kenya, Djibouti, and Sudan.

**Trans-Atlantic, Indian Ocean and Trans-Saharan Slave Trade.** For the remaining three slave trade routes we take the number and ethnicity of slaves from [Nunn \(2008\)](#).<sup>19</sup> It is important to stress that our procedure to compute the exposure to the Red Sea slave route and type of sources used are fully consistent with those of [Nunn \(2008\)](#), hence the data are comparable.

<sup>18</sup>HMS stands for High Majesty’s Ship and are the ships where names of the slaves have been collected.

<sup>19</sup>We refer the reader to [Nunn \(2008\)](#) for details about the construction of his database.

Appendix [Figure A1](#) shows the spatial distribution of the number of slaves across the four different slave trade routes.<sup>20</sup>

### 3.3 Ancestral characteristics

Ancestral characteristics of each ethnic group come from the Ethnographic Atlas, a world-wide ethnicity level database assembled by George Peter [Murdock \(1967\)](#) containing ethnographic information for 1,265 ethnic groups prior to industrialization, most of which were written in the 19th and early 20th century. This dataset has been widely used ([Cao et al., 2021](#)) and recently validated ([Bahrami-Rad, Becker and Henrich, 2021](#)). We rely on this source for our control variables. In particular, we include in our empirical specification five variables that capture the historical characteristics of an ethnic group, which can be correlated with practicing FGC and with exposure to the slave trade.

First, given the potentially high correlation between female and male circumcision, we create a dummy for whether *male* circumcision was historically a common practice for the ethnic group.<sup>21</sup> Second, we construct a variable capturing norms on the premarital sexual behavior of girls, to control for ethnic groups with a stronger demand for chastity and potentially more likely to adopt FGC. Third, following [Becker \(2023\)](#), we construct an indicator capturing the ethnic group's historical dependence on herding animals/pastoralism. Fourth, we take into account any past form of slavery by constructing a variable equal to one if the ethnic group was exposed to the presence of historical slavery. This variable would, for instance, capture if the ethnic group was involved in slavery in Ancient Egypt, well before the African slave trade. The measure comes as well from [Murdock \(1967\)](#) and identifies the precolonial settlement patterns of the ethnic groups, ranging from fully nomadic to permanent or complex settlements. We construct an indicator for nomadic ethnic groups. A more detailed description of the historical controls used in the empirical analysis is provided in Section 5.

### 3.4 Folklore

Our last data source is a dataset recently released by [Michalopoulos and Xue \(2021\)](#), *Folklore*. We use these data to test whether there is an association between ethnic groups' exposure to the Red Sea slave trade and cultural beliefs related to purity and chastity for women. Folklore is a collection of tales, narratives, jokes, transmitted from generation to generation through word-of-mouth and reflecting a society's traditional beliefs, customs and culture ([Cao et al., 2021](#)). The data has been originally assembled by the folklorist Yuri Berezkin who coded the

---

<sup>20</sup>Data of ethnographic boundaries for Africa come from [Murdock \(1959\)](#) and were later digitized by Nathan Nunn and Suzanne Biler. Each historic African ethnic group's location is represented by a polygon in a vector shapefile. The various polygons of the different ethnic groups are non-overlapping. These data are available at [https://worldmap.harvard.edu/data/geonode:murdock\\_ea\\_2010\\_3](https://worldmap.harvard.edu/data/geonode:murdock_ea_2010_3)

<sup>21</sup>Unfortunately, the Ethnographic Atlas ([Murdock, 1967](#)) does not contain information on whether the ethnic group was practicing female genital cutting.



presence of 2,564 motifs across nearly 956 groups. The year of the first publication of motifs in the Folklore dataset is 1638 and the year of the last one is 2015, with the majority of publications being around 1900 (see the Appendix material in [Michalopoulos and Xue \(2021\)](#)).

A motif is a combination of images, episodes, or structural elements that appear in multiple narratives, including both sacred and profane stories. Importantly for our purposes, the data contain motifs that are related to the culture of women’s purity and chastity. To construct the variables relevant for our analysis, we started by selecting a set of seed words associated with two key themes: “chastity” and “female genital cutting”. The seed words we associate with chastity are “chastity”, “purity”, “innocence”, and “virgin”, while those associated to female genital cutting include “circumcision”, “clitoris”, and “female genital mutilation”. Using *ConceptNet*, a freely available semantic network designed with artificial intelligence to help computers understand word meanings, we generated the 50 most closely related words for each seed word. For example, words related to chastity included modesty, fidelity and others, while words related to clitoris included genitals, infibulation and others.

Next, we cross-referenced the words generated by *ConceptNet* with the Folklore dataset by [Michalopoulos and Xue \(2021\)](#). This dataset organizes motifs around specific conceptual themes (*Concepts*) identified through associated keywords. For instance, the concept of “innocence” in [Michalopoulos and Xue \(2021\)](#) includes terms like “innocent”, “naive”, and “simplicity”. Our final selection of words include the overlapping between those generated by *ConceptNet* and the concepts in [Michalopoulos and Xue \(2021\)](#).<sup>22</sup>

We then select motifs containing the final selections of words. For example, the motif “A magic medicine demonstrates that the only chaste woman is a servant girl, king chooses the chaste one” is related to the key theme of “chastity”, while the motif “Female genitals are as long as a big snake” is related to “female genital cutting”. Finally, we compute our variable of interest: the *share of motifs in the domain of chastity and FGC* for each ethnic group. This measure represents the proportion of motifs associated with chastity and FGC out of the total number of motifs attributed to each ethnic group and is a proxy of the relative importance of these themes in a group’s oral tradition.

## 4 Descriptive Statistics

Our final dataset is obtained by matching historical ethnic groups in [Murdock’s Atlas](#) (on which the slave trade data are based) with the ethnic groups reported in the DHS and in the MICS. The procedure we use for the matching is described in Appendix B.1. We were able to match 86% of the ethnic groups in the DHS or MICS (256 ethnic groups out of the 298 originally listed in the DHS), which corresponds to a sample of 198 groups in the [Murdock’s Atlas \(1967\)](#). Our final sample comprises 28 countries and 598,515 women born between

---

<sup>22</sup>Furthermore, we refine our approach by excluding completely unrelated concepts, such as “vaccination” (linked to circumcision), as well as removing flags attributed for generic words like girls, man, or masculine.

1942 and 2002, for whom we have information on whether they are circumcised or not and information on the number of slaves traded across the Red Sea route. The list of countries and survey waves included in the analysis is reported in Appendix [Table A2](#).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

|                                                               | Obs    | Mean    | Std. Dev. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|-----------|
| <i>Panel A: Outcomes and Socio-Demographic Controls (DHS)</i> |        |         |           |
| Infibulated                                                   | 458645 | 0.129   | 0.336     |
| Any female circumcision                                       | 598515 | 0.652   | 0.476     |
| 1 if FGC should continue, 0 if stopped or depends             | 498493 | 0.444   | 0.497     |
| Age                                                           | 598515 | 29.428  | 9.405     |
| Age squared                                                   | 598515 | 954.452 | 587.646   |
| Urban                                                         | 598515 | 0.394   | 0.489     |
| Primary Education                                             | 598515 | 0.263   | 0.434     |
| Secondary Education                                           | 598515 | 0.252   | 0.428     |
| Higher Education                                              | 598515 | 0.059   | 0.233     |
| Muslim                                                        | 598515 | 0.623   | 0.432     |
| Catholic                                                      | 598515 | 0.107   | 0.274     |
| Wealth                                                        | 598515 | 0.090   | 1.443     |
| <i>PANEL B: Historical Controls (Murdock Atlas 1967)</i>      |        |         |           |
| Male Circumcision                                             | 598515 | 0.918   | 0.244     |
| Premarital Sex Permitted                                      | 598515 | 0.315   | 0.325     |
| Herding                                                       | 598515 | 0.578   | 0.453     |
| Historical Slavery                                            | 598515 | 0.934   | 0.225     |
| Nomadic                                                       | 598515 | 0.086   | 0.258     |
| <i>PANEL C: Variables on Slave Trade</i>                      |        |         |           |
| 1 if exposed to the Red Sea slave trade                       | 598515 | 0.271   | 0.444     |
| 1 if exposed to the Trans-Saharan slave trade                 | 598515 | 0.105   | 0.307     |
| 1 if exposed to the Trans-Atlantic slave trade                | 598515 | 0.461   | 0.498     |
| 1 if exposed to the Indian Ocean slave trade                  | 598515 | 0.094   | 0.292     |
| Red Sea Exports/Area                                          | 598515 | 0.181   | 1.303     |
| Saharan Exports/Area                                          | 598515 | 0.044   | 0.428     |
| Atlantic Exports/Area                                         | 598515 | 1.750   | 5.769     |
| Indian Exports/Area                                           | 598515 | 0.007   | 0.128     |
| IHS - Red Sea Exports / Area                                  | 598515 | 0.088   | 0.360     |
| IHS - Trans-Saharan Exports / Area                            | 598515 | 0.029   | 0.173     |
| IHS - Trans-Atlantic Exports / Area                           | 598515 | 0.541   | 0.992     |
| IHS - Indian Exports/ Area                                    | 598515 | 0.005   | 0.077     |
| <i>PANEL D: Folklore</i>                                      |        |         |           |
| Share of motifs in the domain chastity or FGC                 | 590101 | 0.144   | 0.056     |

*Source:* DHS and MICS for socio-demographic characteristics, [Murdock \(1967\)](#) for historical controls, and [Michalopoulos and Xue \(2021\)](#) for Folklore data. *Notes:* All the variables are described in Section 5 in the text. The variable *Wealth* is constructed as the first principal component from a set of household durable goods per capita including electricity, refrigerators, bicycles, motorcycles, cars/trucks, radios, and televisions. The ethnic-level historical controls include an indicator for whether premarital sex is permitted, a dummy for male circumcision, a dummy for the presence of slavery in the past, dependence on animal husbandry, a dummy indicating if the pre-colonial settlement patterns is nomadic.

[Table 1](#) displays summary statistics for key variables of interest. Looking at socio-demographic characteristics (Panel A), we show that 65% of the women underwent some form of female gen-

ital cutting and 12.9% reported the most extreme form, infibulation. The average age of women in the sample is 29 years with 39% living in urban areas, 26% reported to have achieved primary education and 62% are Muslim. In Panel B, we report descriptive statistics on historical controls: 92% of respondents belong to groups that historically practiced male circumcision, 32% belong to groups that allowed promiscuous relationships and permitted premarital sex, and 93.4% belong to ethnic groups that historically experienced ancient slavery. Almost 58% of respondents belong to ethnic groups that historically relied on pastoralism. In Panel C, we report characteristics related to the slave trade. 27.1% belong to an ethnic group that was affected by the Red Sea slave trade, about 46.1% by the Trans-Atlantic trade, 10.5% by the trans-Saharan trade and 9.4% by the Indian Ocean route. If we take into account the number of slaves exported along the various routes from the ethnic groups to which our respondents belong (and normalize by the land area inhabited by the group), we confirm that the trans-Atlantic route was by far the most sizeable route, followed by the Red Sea one, while the trans-Saharan and Indian routes were comparatively smaller. Finally, in Panel D we report descriptive statistics related to the variables in the Folklore dataset. The share of narratives in the domain of chastity or FGC among ethnic groups is 14.4%.

In Appendix [Table A3](#) we examine potential differences between ethnic groups that were exposed to the Red Sea slave trade and those that were not, as well as between women within these groups and women from unexposed ethnic groups. The table displays the coefficients from a regression where the dependent variable measures exposure to the Red Sea route and the independent variables include the covariates we will include in our regressions, as detailed in the next section. We analyze these associations at both the individual and ethnic group levels: in columns 1-2, the correlates include contemporary individual-level socio-economic characteristics and ethnic group-level historical controls, while in columns 3-4, all covariates are at the ethnic group level. Our results indicate no systematic correlation between exposure to the Red Sea slave trade and the individual or ethnic group covariates.

## 5 Empirical strategy

We exploit heterogeneity across ethnicities within country to test whether ethnic groups historically more exposed to the Red Sea slave route have a higher prevalence of infibulation and female circumcision today, compared to ethnic groups that were exposed to other routes or that were not at all exposed to the African slave trade. We estimate the following linear probability model:

$$FGC_{iec} = \beta_1 Red_e + \beta_2 Saharan_e + \beta_3 Atlantic_e + \beta_4 Indian_e + \gamma X_{iec} + \delta W_e + \lambda_c + \epsilon_{iec} \quad (1)$$

where  $FGC_{iec}$  takes value 1 if person  $i$ , in ethnic group  $e$ , living in country  $c$ , is infibulated

(or circumcised, depending on specification) as self-reported in the DHS/MICS data, and 0 otherwise. The variables  $Red_e$ ,  $Saharan_e$ ,  $Atlantic_e$  and  $Indian_e$  capture the intensity of slave trade across different slave routes. We used two measures for slave exports. First, we normalize the total number of slaves taken from ethnic group  $e$  and shipped through a given route from 1400 to 1900 by its size, measured by the area of land inhabited by the ethnic group  $e$  in the 19th century.<sup>23</sup> Ideally, we would prefer to use a measure of slave exports that is normalized by the historical population of each ethnic group prior to the slave trade. Unfortunately, these data are unreliable. Some historical population data are available from [Murdock \(1959\)](#), but they are from the colonial period (approximately the early twentieth century) after the end of the slave trade, and they exist for only about 85% percent of the ethnicities in the sample ([Nunn and Wantchekon, 2011](#)). Results are however robust using this alternative and imprecise measure. Second, we account for the skewness in the distribution of slave exports by using the inverse hyperbolic sine transformation (IHS).<sup>24</sup>

$X_{iec}$  is a vector of contemporaneous individual controls including: age, age squared, an indicator for residing in urban areas, religion (dummies for Muslim or Catholic), educational attainment (dummies for primary, secondary or higher education) and wealth (measured as the first principal component from a set of durable goods owned by the household: refrigerators, bicycles, motorcycles, cars/trucks, radios, televisions, and electricity).  $W_e$  is a set of historical controls: dummies for male circumcision, norms on premarital sex, reliance herding, ancient slavery, nomadic settlement pattern.  $\lambda_c$  are country fixed effects.

Our main coefficient of interest is  $\beta_1$ : following the historical hypothesis, we should expect  $\beta_1 > 0$ . As for the other coefficients,  $\beta_2$ ,  $\beta_3$  and  $\beta_4$ , we would expect no statistically significant association between FGC and slave trade along the other routes, with maybe a possible exception for the Indian Ocean route, given that some of the slaves along this route were exported to the Middle East. We cluster standard errors at the [Murdock's Atlas \(1959\)](#) ethnic group level.

## 5.1 Identification

In interpreting the  $\beta_1$  coefficient in equation (1) as causal, we make the following considerations. The variables related to slave exports are pre-determined, so endogeneity problems due to reverse causation are not an issue in our case. A potential concern may be the presence of unobserved variables that are correlated with a woman's probability to be infibulated or circumcised today and with her ancestors' exposure to the slave trade. However, note that we include in our specification slave exports along all four slave trade routes. This implies that any unobserved factors that affect the propensity to enslave certain groups, without being specific to the Red Sea route, would generate a spurious correlation for other routes as well as for the Red

<sup>23</sup>Land area is measured in millions of square kilometers and is from [Parker \(1997\)](#). By dividing the number of slave exports by land area, we take into account differences in the historical size of ethnic groups.

<sup>24</sup>The inverse hyperbolic sine transformation is equal to  $\ln(x + \sqrt{x^2 + 1})$ .

Sea one. For example, if the concern was that ethnic groups more prone to violence towards women—and therefore more likely to practice FGC— may have been the ones that supplied a higher number of slaves, this argument should apply regardless of the particular route taken by the slaves.

Any threat to identification should therefore come from unobserved factors that are specific to ethnic groups historically located along the Red Sea route, and not to the others. For example, a potential confounder would exist if slave traders were more likely to select women from ethnic groups that had a greater focus on chastity or beauty to be sent specifically to the Red Sea route (not to other routes) and if the same groups were more likely to practice FGC. While we cannot rule out the existence of such unobserved factors, we follow two strategies to mitigate this concern.

First, we gauge the extent to which unobserved ethnicity-specific factors may be a problem by augmenting our benchmark specification with historical characteristics of ethnic groups, characteristics that may potentially be correlated with both FGC and with exposure to the Red Sea slave trade. In particular, we include among our controls five variables from [Murdock's \(1967\) Ethnographic Atlas](#):

- i) An indicator for whether the ethnic group historically practiced male circumcision, potentially correlated with the historical presence of FGC;
- ii) A variable capturing norms on premarital sexual relationships. Specifically, we construct a dummy taking value 1 if the ethnic group historically allowed premarital sex regardless of pregnancy results or forbade trial marriage and promiscuous relationships, and 0 otherwise;<sup>25</sup>
- iii) A variable measuring the extent to which the ethnic group was historically dependent on animal husbandry/pastoralism. This control variable is particularly important in our context given recent evidence showing that women from historically more pastoral societies are more likely to have undergone infibulation ([Becker, 2023](#)).<sup>26</sup>

Finally, given that it was actually the most developed areas of Africa that tended to select into the slave trades ([Nunn, 2008](#)), following [Nunn and Wantchekon \(2011\)](#) we also use historical

---

<sup>25</sup>The original variable includes information on whether the ethnic groups practiced early marriage, insisted on virginity, prohibited premarital sex but weakly censured it, allowed premarital sex but censured it in case of pregnancy, prohibited trial marriage and promiscuous relations; or freely permitted premarital sex even if pregnancy results.

<sup>26</sup>The Ethnographic Atlas contains information on the degree to which a society depends on animal husbandry, measured on a 10-point scale (variable v4), and on the predominant animal in a society (variable v40). Following [Becker \(2023\)](#), we generate an indicator that takes value 1 if the predominant type of animal is a herding animal (e.g. sheep, goats, donkeys, horses, reindeer, cattle, or camels/camelids), and 0 if it is an animal that is not herded (e.g., pigs, bees, dogs, poultry, or guinea pigs) and multiply this indicator with an indicator for the degree of dependence on animal husbandry (going from 0 to 100). Departing from [Becker \(2023\)](#), we then create a dummy indicating if the historical dependence on pastoralism of the ethnic group is greater than the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile. Nonetheless, the results remain robust when using [Becker \(2023\)](#)'s original measure of reliance on pastoralism.

data to construct two additional proxies for ancient slavery and the initial levels of prosperity. We additionally control for:

- iv) An indicator for whether the ethnic group was historically exposed to ancient slavery. This includes any past form of slavery, including those that preceded the African slave trade (e.g., slavery in Ancient Egypt, etc.);
- v) An indicator for whether the ethnic group had a nomadic precolonial settlement pattern, as opposed to sedentary ones.

As we will show, our estimates of the effect of Red Sea slave exports are not significantly affected by the inclusion of historical controls, which increases our confidence in the fact that unobserved ethnic-specific factors should not drive our results.

Our second way of addressing potential endogeneity, following the previous literature, is to adopt an instrumental variable (IV) approach. This requires an instrument that is correlated with the number of slaves shipped across the Red Sea route but uncorrelated with characteristics of ethnic groups that may affect the adoption of FGC by their descendants. Slave traders purchased slaves at the ports in Africa to ship them to the relevant destinations, making groups located in areas closer to the ports more likely to be traded. Previous literature testing the effect of the African slave trade on economic outcomes has used distance to the Atlantic coast as an instrument for slave exports along the trans-Atlantic route (e.g., [Nunn and Wantchekon, 2011](#); [Whatley and Gillezeau, 2011](#); [Teso, 2019](#)). Since we are interested in the Red Sea route, we instead rely on the distance to the ports of exit of slaves in the Red Sea route as an instrument for the number of slaves exported through the Red Sea route. More details on our IV strategy are reported in [subsection 6.3](#).

## 6 Results

### 6.1 Prevalence of FGC

[Table 2](#) reports our main results. We estimate equation (1) using as dependent variable a dummy taking value 1 if the respondent is infibulated (type 3 circumcision) and 0 otherwise (, i.e. not circumcised or any other type of circumcision). The sample includes all the women for whom we have information on whether they are circumcised as well as on the type of circumcision.<sup>27</sup> In columns 1 to 3, we measure exposure to the slave trade as the number of slaves exported along a given slave route divided by the area of land inhabited by the ethnic group during the 19th century. In columns 4 to 6, we use the inverse hyperbolic sine (IHS) of the exports/area variables, to account for the fact that the distribution of slaves' exports is highly skewed to the left, with a relatively small number of observations taking on large values,

---

<sup>27</sup>The number of observations in [Table 2](#) is smaller than the one reported in [Table 1](#) because information on the type of FGC is available for a little over 450,000 respondents.



Table 2. Infibulation and slave exports

|                                              | (1)                    | (2)                 | (3)                 | (4)                          | (5)                 | (6)                 |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Dependent variable = 1 if infibulated</i> |                        |                     |                     |                              |                     |                     |
|                                              | Red Sea Exports / Area |                     |                     | IHS - Red Sea Exports / Area |                     |                     |
| Red Sea Exports                              | 0.045***<br>(0.016)    | 0.045***<br>(0.016) | 0.044***<br>(0.014) | 0.210***<br>(0.041)          | 0.211***<br>(0.041) | 0.198***<br>(0.044) |
| Saharan Exports                              |                        | 0.000<br>(0.003)    | -0.006<br>(0.006)   |                              | -0.025<br>(0.016)   | -0.041<br>(0.027)   |
| Atlantic Exports                             |                        | -0.001*<br>(0.000)  | -0.000<br>(0.001)   |                              | -0.007<br>(0.005)   | 0.001<br>(0.006)    |
| Indian Exports                               |                        | 0.004<br>(0.004)    | -0.008<br>(0.012)   |                              | -0.004<br>(0.006)   | -0.020<br>(0.016)   |
| Cont. controls                               | NO                     | NO                  | YES                 | NO                           | NO                  | YES                 |
| Hist. controls                               | NO                     | NO                  | YES                 | NO                           | NO                  | YES                 |
| Mean of the dep. var.                        | 0.129                  | 0.129               | 0.129               | 0.129                        | 0.129               | 0.129               |
| Mean of the dep. var. Red Sea = 0            | 0.080                  | 0.080               | 0.080               | 0.080                        | 0.080               | 0.080               |
| R <sup>2</sup>                               | 0.508                  | 0.508               | 0.519               | 0.515                        | 0.516               | 0.524               |
| No. Obs                                      | 458,645                | 458,645             | 458,645             | 458,645                      | 458,645             | 458,645             |

*Notes:* OLS estimates with country and survey wave fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the ethnic group level in parentheses. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at 10, 5, 1 percent level, respectively. Contemporaneous controls include individual level controls: age, age squared, a dummy for living in an urban area, a dummy for primary, secondary and higher education, dummies for Muslim and Catholic religion, and a wealth index. Historical controls are at the ethnic group level and include an indicator for whether premarital sex is permitted, a dummy for male circumcision, a dummy for the presence of slavery in the past, a dummy for dependence on animal husbandry greater than 25<sup>th</sup> percentile, a dummy indicating if the pre-colonial settlement patterns is nomadic. *Source:* Demographic and Health Surveys and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys for socio-demographic characteristics, [Murdock \(1967\)](#) for historical controls.

and a large fraction of the observations taking 0 values.<sup>28</sup> In both cases we estimate three specifications: first with country and survey wave fixed effects only, then adding all the four slave routes and finally including individual socio-economic controls and historical controls at the ethnic group level. For conciseness, in [Table 2](#) we display only the coefficients on the main variables of interest, i.e., slave exports along the various routes. In [Appendix Table A4](#) we also report coefficients on individual and ethnic group level controls.

In column 1 of [Table 2](#), the coefficient on *Red Sea Exports/Area* represents the effect of a unit increase in this variable on the probability of infibulation. This coefficient is positive and statistically significant, as predicted by the historical hypothesis at the core of this paper. The estimated coefficient remains similar in magnitude and significance level when we add among the controls slave exports for the other slave routes (column 2), individual contemporaneous controls and historical controls (column 3). Notably, the exports along the other routes are uncorrelated with the probability of infibulation.<sup>29</sup> The most comprehensive specification is the one reported in column 3: according to this specification, a one standard deviation increase in *Red Sea Exports/Area* increases the probability of infibulation by 5.7 percentage points (or 71.4% of the mean for groups with no Red Sea exports).

When we account for the skewness in the distribution of slave exports by using the IHS transformation (columns 4-6), the results are qualitatively similar to those reported in columns

<sup>28</sup>The share of women in the sample not exposed to the Red Sea, Atlantic, Saharan and Indian slave trade is, respectively, 73%, 54%, 89%, and 90%. The share of women not exposed to any slave trade is 22%.

<sup>29</sup>The small and marginally significant negative coefficient on the trans-Atlantic route in column 2 does not survive the inclusion of additional controls.

1-3: in all specifications the coefficient on the *IHS-Red Sea exports/Area* variable is significant at 1 percent level. In terms of magnitude, based on the estimates in column 6, on average, a 10% increase in exposure to Red Sea exports increases the probability of infibulation by 0.43 percentage points, an increase of 5.4% over the mean for groups with no Red Sea slave exports.<sup>30</sup>

Among the individual-level contemporaneous controls included in the regression (and displayed in Appendix Table A4), primary education, wealth and urban residence are negatively correlated with the probability of infibulation, and religion also plays a significant role. In Appendix Table B6 we also show that our results remain robust when we normalized our exports variable by the historical population instead of by the area of land inhabited by the ethnic groups. Furthermore, in Appendix Table B7, we re-estimate Table 2 excluding countries where the match between slave exports data and DHS/MICS data was done at the regional level (Egypt, Swaziland, Somalia, and Sudan). The coefficient on Red Sea slave exports remains positive and significant at the 1 percent level and, if anything, larger in magnitude.

Table 3. Circumcision and slave exports

|                                              | (1)                    | (2)                | (3)                | (4)                          | (5)                | (6)                |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Dependent variable = 1 if circumcised</i> |                        |                    |                    |                              |                    |                    |
|                                              | Red Sea Exports / Area |                    |                    | IHS - Red Sea Exports / Area |                    |                    |
| Red Sea Exports                              | 0.013**<br>(0.005)     | 0.012**<br>(0.005) | 0.019**<br>(0.009) | 0.118**<br>(0.048)           | 0.117**<br>(0.047) | 0.121**<br>(0.057) |
| Saharan Exports                              |                        | 0.029<br>(0.025)   | 0.015<br>(0.026)   |                              | 0.025<br>(0.105)   | -0.029<br>(0.115)  |
| Atlantic Exports                             |                        | -0.005<br>(0.004)  | -0.005<br>(0.004)  |                              | -0.039<br>(0.044)  | -0.026<br>(0.031)  |
| Indian Exports                               |                        | 0.049<br>(0.031)   | -0.024<br>(0.070)  |                              | 0.047<br>(0.071)   | -0.097<br>(0.130)  |
| Cont. Controls                               | NO                     | NO                 | YES                | NO                           | NO                 | YES                |
| Hist. Controls                               | NO                     | NO                 | YES                | NO                           | NO                 | YES                |
| Mean of the dep. var.                        | 0.652                  | 0.652              | 0.652              | 0.652                        | 0.652              | 0.652              |
| Mean of the dep. var. Red Sea = 0            | 0.556                  | 0.556              | 0.556              | 0.556                        | 0.556              | 0.556              |
| R <sup>2</sup>                               | 0.396                  | 0.398              | 0.453              | 0.399                        | 0.402              | 0.455              |
| No. Obs                                      | 598,515                | 598,515            | 598,515            | 598,515                      | 598,515            | 598,515            |

*Notes:* OLS estimates with country and survey wave fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the ethnic group level in parentheses. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at 10, 5, 1 percent level, respectively. Individual and historical controls as in Table 2. *Source:* Demographic and Health Surveys and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys for socio-demographic characteristics, [Murdock \(1967\)](#) for historical controls.

Next, we move to examine the relationship between having ancestors in the Red Sea slave trade and the probability of being ‘circumcised’, intended as including all forms of FGC (and not only on the most severe form as in the previous analysis). While the historical accounts on female slaves mostly describe practices that can be classified as infibulation, it is possible that different variants of the practice (including milder forms of female circumcision) may have developed over time among populations initially exposed to infibulation.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>30</sup>We calculate this number using the expression for the elasticity in case of IHS-transformed regressors recommended by [Bellemare and Wichman \(2020\)](#). In particular, we compute the semi-elasticity  $\beta \cdot (x/(\sqrt{x^2 + 1}))$ , where  $x$  is the *Red Sea Exports/Area* variable, averaged over the sample with positive exports. With a  $\beta$  equal to 0.198 and  $x$  equal to 0.225, we obtain a magnitude of 0.043 percentage points.

<sup>31</sup>For example, [Gulesci et al. \(2023\)](#) show evidence of transition from type-3 to type-1 and type-2 circumcision

In [Table 3](#), the dependent variable is a dummy variable taking value 1 if the woman is circumcised (with any type of FGC) and 0 if she is not. Similarly to [Table 2](#), we find a positive and significant relationship between having ancestors traded across the Red Sea route and being circumcised today, with very similar coefficients across specifications. The magnitude of the effect is somewhat smaller than that of infibulation: based on the estimates in column 3, a one standard deviation increase in exposure to Red Sea exports increases the probability of FGC by 2.5 percentage points (or 4.5% of the mean for the group with no Red Sea slave trade). For the IHS transformation in columns 4-6, a 10% increase in the volume of Red Sea slave exports increases the probability of female circumcision by 0.22 percentage points (a 0.39% increase over the mean for groups with no Red Sea slave exports) (column 6). Similar to what we found in [Table 2](#), slave exports along trade routes other than the Red Sea one are not associated with contemporary prevalence of FGC.

In Appendix [Table A5](#) we explore the correlation between exposure to the Red Sea route and the likelihood of being infibulated (columns 1-3) or circumcised (columns 4-6) today, by looking at the extensive margin in exposure –i.e., dummies for whether the respondent belongs to an ethnic group exposed to Red Sea slave trade. Results are consistent with those in [Table 2](#) and [Table 3](#).

Table 4. Infibulation and slave exports in East Africa

|                                              | (1)                    | (2)                 | (3)                 | (4)                          | (5)                 | (6)                 |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Dependent variable = 1 if infibulated</i> |                        |                     |                     |                              |                     |                     |
|                                              | Red Sea Exports / Area |                     |                     | IHS - Red Sea Exports / Area |                     |                     |
| Red Sea Exports                              | 0.044***<br>(0.016)    | 0.044***<br>(0.016) | 0.042***<br>(0.014) | 0.201***<br>(0.046)          | 0.202***<br>(0.045) | 0.140***<br>(0.049) |
| Saharan Exports                              |                        | -0.376<br>(0.397)   | -0.275<br>(0.324)   |                              | -0.500<br>(0.424)   | -0.282<br>(0.337)   |
| Indian Exports                               |                        | 10.703<br>(13.430)  | 5.116<br>(9.255)    |                              | 6.731<br>(10.826)   | 4.632<br>(9.065)    |
| Cont. controls                               | NO                     | NO                  | YES                 | NO                           | NO                  | YES                 |
| Hist. controls                               | NO                     | NO                  | YES                 | NO                           | NO                  | YES                 |
| Mean of the dep. var.                        | 0.406                  | 0.406               | 0.406               | 0.406                        | 0.406               | 0.406               |
| Mean of the dep. var. Red Sea = 0            | 0.456                  | 0.456               | 0.456               | 0.456                        | 0.456               | 0.456               |
| R <sup>2</sup>                               | 0.493                  | 0.496               | 0.560               | 0.501                        | 0.505               | 0.560               |
| No. Obs                                      | 116,747                | 116,747             | 116,747             | 116,747                      | 116,747             | 116,747             |

*Notes:* OLS estimates with country and survey wave fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the ethnic group level in parentheses. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at 10, 5, 1 percent level, respectively. Individual and historical controls as in [Table 2](#). *Source:* Demographic and Health Surveys and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys for socio-demographic characteristics, [Murdock \(1967\)](#) for historical controls.

Given the geographic concentration of Red Sea slave exports in the eastern part of the continent, one may be concerned that the positive coefficient on the Red Sea exports variable merely captures a difference between East and West Africa. While this concern is attenuated by the inclusion of country fixed effects in all our specifications, as a further robustness check in [Table 4](#) we restrict the sample to countries located in East Africa, namely Egypt, Sudan, Ethiopia, in Somalia.

Somalia, Djibouti and Eritrea. We report results for our main outcome of interest, infibulation, but the pattern is similar (positive and significant) if we use as the dependent variable a dummy for any type of FGC. It is reassuring to observe that our results hold in this restricted sample and remain significant at the 1 percent level in all the specifications despite the smaller sample size.<sup>32</sup> This suggests that differences in exposure to the Red Sea slave trade across ethnic groups *within East Africa* explain part of the variation in the prevalence of infibulation across these groups today.<sup>33</sup>

## 6.2 Attitudes towards FGC

In addition to studying the relation between the slave trade and the practice of FGC, we are interested in understanding how the historical experience of slavery shaped culture in a way that translates into contemporary attitudes. The DHS asks respondents the following question: “Do you think female genital cutting should continue, stop, or it depends?” We construct a dummy taking value 1 if the respondent answers that FGC should be continued and 0 if she says that it depends or that it should be stopped. On average, 44 percent of the women interviewed say that FGC should continue.

Figure A2 shows the average share of respondents who support FGC at the country level (panel A), and at the ethnic group level (panel B). Support for the practice is widespread in East Africa but also in West African countries such as Mali, Sierra Leone and Guinea. These are countries where the prevalence of circumcision (all types) is above 90 percent (see Table B3).

In Table 5, we estimate equation (1) using as an outcome a dummy for whether the respondent is in favor of continuing FGC. We find a positive and significant coefficient on the Red Sea variable, indicating that women whose ancestors were traded in larger numbers along the Red Sea route are more in favor of continuing the practice compared to women who had ancestors in other slave trade routes or not enslaved. Based on the estimates in column 3, on average a one standard deviation increase in Red Sea slave exports increases the probability of supporting FGC by 2.6 percentage points (or 7% of the mean for groups not exposed to the Red Sea slave trade). The estimates in column 6 indicate that a 10% increase in exposure to Red Sea exports increases the probability of infibulation by 0.18 percentage points (or 0.49% over the mean of groups not enslaved in the Red Sea route). The above results suggest that efforts to eradicate FGC in Africa may face obstacles created by distant historical experiences with long-term effects on contemporaneous culture.

<sup>32</sup>Based on the estimates in column 3, a one standard deviation increase in our measure for Red Sea slave trade increases the probability of infibulation within East Africa by 5.5 percentage points (or 12% of to the mean for groups with no Red Sea slave trade). According to the estimates in column 6, a 10% increase in exposure to Red Sea exports leads, on average, to a 0.91 percentage points increase in the likelihood of infibulation, or to a 2% increase over the mean for groups with no Red Sea slave exports.

<sup>33</sup>The large coefficient on Indian exports is driven by the tiny mean and variance of this variable, equal to 0.0000793 and 0.000000112, respectively.

Table 5. Attitudes towards FGC

|                                                                      | (1)                    | (2)                 | (3)                 | (4)                          | (5)                 | (6)                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Dependent variable = 1 if respondent says FGC should continue</i> |                        |                     |                     |                              |                     |                     |
|                                                                      | Red Sea Exports / Area |                     |                     | IHS - Red Sea Exports / Area |                     |                     |
| Red Sea Exports                                                      | 0.021***<br>(0.008)    | 0.021***<br>(0.008) | 0.020***<br>(0.006) | 0.123***<br>(0.036)          | 0.117***<br>(0.032) | 0.090***<br>(0.032) |
| Saharan Exports                                                      |                        | 0.035**<br>(0.017)  | 0.013<br>(0.016)    |                              | 0.086**<br>(0.043)  | 0.002<br>(0.061)    |
| Atlantic Exports                                                     |                        | -0.001<br>(0.002)   | 0.003<br>(0.002)    |                              | -0.024<br>(0.024)   | 0.004<br>(0.015)    |
| Indian Exports                                                       |                        | -3.832<br>(2.676)   | -4.078<br>(2.769)   |                              | -3.598<br>(2.345)   | -3.735<br>(2.605)   |
| Cont. controls                                                       | NO                     | NO                  | YES                 | NO                           | NO                  | YES                 |
| Hist. controls                                                       | NO                     | NO                  | YES                 | NO                           | NO                  | YES                 |
| Mean of the dep. var.                                                | 0.444                  | 0.444               | 0.444               | 0.444                        | 0.444               | 0.444               |
| Mean of the dep. var. Red Sea = 0                                    | 0.367                  | 0.367               | 0.367               | 0.367                        | 0.367               | 0.367               |
| R <sup>2</sup>                                                       | 0.288                  | 0.290               | 0.354               | 0.290                        | 0.293               | 0.354               |
| No. Obs                                                              | 498,493                | 498,493             | 498,493             | 498,493                      | 498,493             | 498,493             |

Notes: OLS estimates with country and survey wave fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the ethnic group level in parentheses. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at 10, 5, 1 percent level, respectively. Individual and historical controls as in Table 2. Source: Demographic and Health Surveys and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys for socio-demographic characteristics, Murdock (1967) for historical controls.

### 6.3 Instrumental variable estimates

One potential confounder in the interpretation of the results presented so far is that ethnic groups that were exposed to the Red Sea slave trade may differ from other groups in some unobserved characteristics correlated with the practice of FGC. For example, slave raiders may have chosen to target ethnic groups in which women were more secluded, or potentially even already practicing FGC if these characteristics were considered more desirable at the destination. While we are not aware of any evidence in this direction in the historical literature, in what follows we attempt to rule out this potential endogeneity concern using an instrumental variable approach.

Following Nunn (2008) and the literature on the effects of the trans-Atlantic slave trade, which uses distance from the Atlantic coast as an instrument for exposure to the trans-Atlantic slave trade (Nunn and Wantchekon, 2011; Teso, 2019), we compute the overland distance from an ethnic group's centroid to the closest port of exit of slaves traded through the Red Sea route.<sup>34</sup> We construct a vector of dummies that take value 1 if the distance from the ethnic group centroid and the Red Sea ports is smaller than a given cutoff and 0 otherwise.

We estimate a first-stage relationship between our *IHS - Red Sea exports/Area* variable and each of these dummies separately from 110 to 190 km, controlling for the distances from the centroid of ethnic groups to both the closest port (any port) and to the closest coast. By controlling for these variables, our goal is to pick up generic effects coming from proximity to the sea, not specifically linked to the Red Sea slave trade. These first-stage results are reported in

<sup>34</sup>The centroid of each ethnic group comes from the map of historical boundaries according to Murdock (1959), while the Red Sea ports and their historical sources are displayed in Appendix B.2: Table B1 and Figure A3. The ports of exit characterizing the Red Sea route are Assab, Berbera, Massawa, Suakin, Tajura and Zeyla.

#### Figure A4.<sup>35</sup>

We find that ethnic groups historically located within 110 km, 130 km, 150 km, or 170 km of the Red Sea ports were significantly more likely to have been traded via the Red Sea route. As expected, the first-stage coefficient is larger for shorter distance thresholds and gradually declines in magnitude as the cutoff increases. Based on these results, we use an indicator for whether an ethnic group was historically located within 150 km of the Red Sea ports as our primary instrument for Red Sea slave exports, as this cutoff exhibits the strongest first-stage relationship (Figure A4). For robustness, in Table B9 in Appendix B.2 we also report results using a 170 km threshold.

As additional evidence, Appendix Figure A5 presents the coefficients from a ‘reduced form’ specification where the dependent variable is a dummy for being infibulated, and the distance cutoff dummies are included alongside all individual and historical controls and country fixed effects. The blue dots in the figure are the estimated coefficients on the dummies indicating whether the distance to the Red Sea ports is below the threshold shown on the horizontal axis. The red squares are the equivalent estimates for distance cutoffs to any African port. The figure also displays the 95% confidence intervals for the estimates. Consistent with our hypothesis, we find that proximity to general African ports has no significant relationship with infibulation, while proximity to ports involved in the Red Sea trade exhibits a strong positive relationship.

In Table 6, we report our two-stage-least squares estimates (top panel), as well as the first stage (bottom panel), instrumenting *IHS - Red Sea exports/Area* with an indicator for whether the ethnic group was historically located within 150 km from the ports of exits of slaves in the Red Sea route. The exclusion restriction is that, conditional on the distance to the closest port and coast, proximity to the ports on the Red Sea coast only affects FGC through its effect on the Red Sea slave trade. Under this assumption, the estimated causal effect of the Red Sea trade on infibulation remains positive, statistically significant, and very similar in magnitude to the one estimated with OLS.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup>We stop our first stage estimation at the 190 km dummies because after this threshold the relationship is not longer statistically significant. If we use a *continuous* measure of distance to the Red Sea ports, the results indicate that distance to the Red Sea ports is negatively correlated with Red Sea slave exports, but the relationship is not statistically significant (see Table B8). This finding aligns with Nunn (2008, p. 162), who also notes a weaker relationship between continuous distance and trade volumes for the Red Sea route. This may reflect the relatively limited scale of the Red Sea slave trade, which involved fewer slaves than the trans-Atlantic trade, as well as the differing geophysical characteristics of the two areas. Notably, while the terrain leading to the Atlantic coast in West Africa is relatively flat, the area surrounding key Red Sea ports such as Massawa is mountainous (see Figure 1). These factors suggest that Red Sea slave exports may exhibit a highly non-linear relationship with distance from the Northeastern African coast where the ports were located.

<sup>36</sup>In Table B9 we show first and second stage coefficients when considering as instrument a binary variable indicating ethnic groups located within 170 km from the Red Sea ports. Results still hold but the first stage is weaker.



Table 6. Infibulation and slave export. IV estimates with 150km cut-off

|                                                                      | (1)                 | (2)                 | (3)                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Second stage - Dependent variable = 1 if infibulated</i>          |                     |                     |                     |
| IHS - Red Sea Exports / Area                                         | 0.246***<br>(0.059) | 0.242***<br>(0.060) | 0.220***<br>(0.065) |
| Distance to the closest port                                         | -0.002<br>(0.012)   | -0.008<br>(0.013)   | -0.013<br>(0.014)   |
| Distance to the closest coast                                        | 0.011<br>(0.012)    | 0.012<br>(0.012)    | 0.014<br>(0.014)    |
| IHS - Trans-Saharan Exports / Area                                   |                     | 0.010<br>(0.018)    | -0.008<br>(0.025)   |
| IHS - Trans-Atlantic Exports / Area                                  |                     | -0.011<br>(0.007)   | -0.008<br>(0.010)   |
| IHS - Indian Exports/ Area                                           |                     | -0.016<br>(0.012)   | -0.032*<br>(0.018)  |
| R <sup>2</sup>                                                       | 0.522               | 0.523               | 0.532               |
| Mean of dep. var.                                                    | 0.129               | 0.129               | 0.129               |
| Mean of dep. var. Red Sea = 0                                        | 0.080               | 0.080               | 0.080               |
|                                                                      | (4)                 | (5)                 | (6)                 |
| <i>First stage - Dependent variable = IHS - Red Sea Exports/Area</i> |                     |                     |                     |
| Dummy for being within the 150 km distance to Red Sea ports          | 1.717***<br>(0.567) | 1.741***<br>(0.566) | 1.755***<br>(0.531) |
| Distance to the closest port                                         | 0.131<br>(0.090)    | 0.157*<br>(0.095)   | 0.196**<br>(0.096)  |
| Distance to the closest coast                                        | -0.107<br>(0.082)   | -0.119<br>(0.084)   | -0.141*<br>(0.085)  |
| Cont. Controls                                                       | NO                  | NO                  | YES                 |
| Hist. Controls                                                       | NO                  | NO                  | YES                 |
| Mean of dep var                                                      | 0.106               | 0.106               | 0.106               |
| R <sup>2</sup>                                                       | 0.411               | 0.419               | 0.427               |
| F-Stat of excluded instrument                                        | 9.176               | 9.469               | 10.936              |
| F-Stat > 0 (p-value)                                                 | 0.003               | 0.002               | 0.001               |
| No. Obs                                                              | 458,645             | 458,645             | 458,645             |

*Notes:* Two-stage-least-squares estimates (top panel) and OLS estimates (bottom panel). Standard errors clustered at the ethnic group level in parentheses. Country and survey wave fixed effects included. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at 10, 5, 1 percent level, respectively. Individual and historical controls as in Table 2. All the columns include the squared distances to the closest ports and coasts. The variables *distance to the closest port* and *distance to the closest coast* are computed by dividing the distances measured in meters by 100,000. *Source:* Demographic and Health Surveys and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys for socio-demographic characteristics, [Murdock \(1967\)](#) for historical controls.


## 7 Mechanisms of adoption: The demand for chastity

The previous analysis has established a robust positive relationship between the historical exposure of a woman's ethnic group to the Red Sea slave trade and her likelihood of being infibulated or circumcised today (and of supporting the practice). In what follows, we investigate a possible channel through which the practice of infibulation, historically associated with female slaves, may have spread to the rest of the population: the demand for chastity.

As discussed, infibulated women traded along the Red Sea route commanded a higher price on the slave market due to the association between infibulation and the concepts of 'chastity' and 'purity', important values in the destination markets at that time. Ethnic groups exposed to the Red Sea slave trade may have internalized these views, so that over time infibulation may have become a marker for purity, virginity, chastity and beauty, and may have been spread to a greater extent as a desirable trait by local populations. This hypothesis is mentioned by [Mackie \(1996\)](#).

To measure a cultural preference for chastity, we examine beliefs and values of societies as reflected in their oral traditions using the *Folklore* dataset. As explained in [subsection 3.4](#), we merge our dataset with the *Folklore* data at the ethnic group level and identify motifs related to chastity, purity, and FGC using text analysis. Presumably, if a society places strong emphasis on women’s chastity, purity, virginity, and FGC, this should be reflected in their folklore. We compute the share of motifs related to chastity and FGC among the total number of motifs a society has, and find that this share is 17.8% for ethnic groups exposed to the Red Sea route and 13.2% for groups not exposed to the Red Sea route. The variation in this measure across ethnic groups is displayed in [Figure 3](#). In the eastern part of the continent, the visual pattern resembles that of slave exports across the Red Sea ([Appendix Figure A1](#)).

Figure 3. Share of motifs in the domain of chastity or FGC




Source: Authors’ calculation based on [Michalopoulos and Xue \(2021\)](#) folklore data.

In [Figure 4](#), we show the relationship between the share of motifs associated with chastity or FGC at the ethnic group level and the share of infibulated women. Both variables are residualized from a regression including country fixed effects, the logarithm of the number of publications consulted by Berezkin for an ethnic group, and the natural log of the year of first publication (as in [Michalopoulos and Xue \(2021\)](#) and [Becker \(2023\)](#)). Panel (a) shows that ethnic groups exposed to the Red Sea slave trade exhibit a strong positive correlation between chastity motifs and infibulation. On the other hand, the relationship disappears for ethnic groups not exposed to the Red Sea slave trade (Panel b).

[Table 7](#) reports the corresponding regression coefficients, for different specifications. In par-

Figure 4. Infibulation and share of motifs in the domain of chastity or FGC



*Notes:* Scatter plot on the correlation between infibulation and the share of motifs in the domain of chastity or FGC, residualized of country fixed effects, log year of earliest publication and log of number of publications. *Source:* Demographic and Health Surveys and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys and [Michalopoulos and Xue \(2021\)](#) data on Folklore.

ticular, we control for log number of sources and log year of first publication (columns 1, 4, 7), socio-demographic contemporaneous controls (columns 2, 5, 8) and historical controls (columns 3, 6, 9). Again, we find a significant positive association between the values of chastity and virginity and infibulation among ethnic groups exposed to the Red Sea slave trade (columns 4-6), but not for the other ethnic groups (columns 7-9). This finding is consistent with the interpretation that exposure to the slave trade may have strengthened the association between positive traits of purity and chastity in a group's culture and the practice of infibulation, facilitating a more widespread adoption also among non-enslaved women.

Table 7. Infibulation and share of motifs in the domain of chastity or FGC

|                                               | (1)              | (2)              | (3)              | (4)                                | (5)                | (6)                | (7)                                    | (8)              | (9)              |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <i>Dependent variable = 1 if infibulated</i>  |                  |                  |                  |                                    |                    |                    |                                        |                  |                  |
|                                               |                  |                  |                  | Exposed to the Red Sea slave trade |                    |                    | Not exposed to the Red Sea slave trade |                  |                  |
| Share of motifs in the domain chastity or FGC | 0.202<br>(0.178) | 0.150<br>(0.161) | 0.295<br>(0.209) | 1.038**<br>(0.469)                 | 0.799**<br>(0.384) | 3.271**<br>(1.258) | 0.057<br>(0.142)                       | 0.053<br>(0.142) | 0.047<br>(0.121) |
| Cont. Controls                                | NO               | YES              | YES              | NO                                 | YES                | YES                | NO                                     | YES              | YES              |
| Hist. Controls                                | NO               | NO               | YES              | NO                                 | NO                 | YES                | NO                                     | NO               | YES              |
| Mean of the dep. var.                         | 0.123            | 0.123            | 0.123            | 0.355                              | 0.355              | 0.355              | 0.072                                  | 0.072            | 0.072            |
| R <sup>2</sup>                                | 0.491            | 0.504            | 0.508            | 0.655                              | 0.679              | 0.715              | 0.372                                  | 0.374            | 0.380            |
| No. Obs                                       | 450,423          | 450,423          | 450,423          | 81,937                             | 81,937             | 81,937             | 368,486                                | 368,486          | 368,486          |

*Notes:* OLS estimates with country and survey wave fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the ethnic group level in parentheses. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at 10, 5, 1 percent level, respectively. Individual and historical controls as in [Table 2](#), as well as the logarithm of the number of publications consulted by Berezkin for an ethnic group and logarithm of the year of the earliest publication cited for each group. For the last three columns, the sample has been restricted to exclude respondents from groups exposed to the Red Sea slave route. *Source:* Demographic and Health Surveys and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys for socio-demographic characteristics, [Murdock \(1967\)](#) for historical controls, and [Michalopoulos and Xue \(2021\)](#) for Folklore data.

## 8 Conclusions

Female genital cutting (FGC) remains a widespread and harmful practice, particularly in Africa. This paper empirically tests the hypothesis, discussed in several historical accounts, that infibulation is linked to the legacy of the African slave trade. We show that contemporary FGC rates are significantly higher among women from ethnic groups whose ancestors were more exposed to the Red Sea route of the African slave trade. Along this route, female slaves

were often taken to the Middle East to serve as concubines in harems, and infibulation was believed to reduce pregnancies during the journey and ensure chastity. In contrast, we find no significant correlation between contemporary FGC prevalence and exposure to other slave trade routes, a result that aligns with historical differences in the roles of female slaves (who were primarily used as concubines along the Red Sea route and as laborers elsewhere).

It should be stressed that our focus on the Red Sea route of the slave trade does not imply that other historical (e.g., pastoralism) and contemporaneous (e.g., cultural identity or religion) factors are unimportant. However, we show that, even after controlling for these factors, the Red Sea slave trade remains a strong predictor of the prevalence of infibulation practices today.

Our results offers potentially useful insights for efforts to reduce FGC. First, our findings underscore the role of historical and cultural transmission in the persistence of this practice. Previous research has emphasized marriage market incentives and coordination failures as key drivers of FGC, leading –for example– to interventions that promote collective abandonment through public declarations. Our results suggest that FGC has deep historical roots and may have evolved into a marker of cultural identity for certain groups. Acknowledging this identity component in policy design could help reshape societal norms and shift demand for the practice, as recent evidence by [Corno and La Ferrara \(2025\)](#) suggests.

## References

- Abdalla, R. H. D.** 1982. "Sisters in affliction: circumcision and infibulation of women in Africa." *Zed Press*.
- Adams, Josh.** 2009. "Marked difference: Tattooing and its association with deviance in the United States." *Deviant Behavior*, 30(3): 266–292.
- Alesina, Alberto, Benedetta Brioschi, and Eliana La Ferrara.** 2021. "Violence Against Women: A Cross-cultural Analysis for Africa." *Economica*, 88(349): 70–104.
- Alesina, Alberto, Paola Giuliano, and Nathan Nunn.** 2013. "On the Origins of Gender Roles: Women and the Plough." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 128(2): 469–530.
- Anderson, Siwan, and Chris Bidner.** 2015. "Property Rights over Marital Transfers \*." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(3): 1421–1484.
- Austen, Ralph A.** 1979. "The Trans Saharan Slave Trade: A tentative census."
- Austen, Ralph A.** 1988. "The 19th Century Islamic Slave Trade from East Africa (Swahili and Red Sea Coasts): A Tentative Census." *Slavery & Abolition*, 9(3): 21–44.
- Austen, Ralph A.** 1992. "The Mediterranean Islamic slave trade out of Africa: A tentative census." *Slavery & Abolition*, 13(1): 214–248.
- Bahrami-Rad, Duman, Anke Becker, and Joseph Henrich.** 2021. "Tabulated nonsense? Testing the validity of the Ethnographic Atlas." *Economics Letters*, 204: 109880.
- Becker, Anke.** 2023. "On the origins of restricting women's promiscuity." *Review of Economic Studies*.
- Bellemare, Marc F., and Casey J. Wichman.** 2020. "Elasticities and the Inverse Hyperbolic Sine Transformation." *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 82(1): 50–61.
- Bembo, Pietro.** 1551. *History of Venice*. the I Tatti Renaissance Library, ed. R.W. Ulery, Harvard University Press. (2007).
- Bhalotra, Sonia, Abhishek Chakravarty, and Selim Gulesci.** 2020. "The price of gold: Dowry and death in India." *Journal of Development Economics*, 143: 102413.
- Bicchieri, Cristina.** 2005. *The Grammar of Society: The Nature and Dynamics of Social Norms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Boyle, Elizabeth Heger.** 2005. *Female Genital Cutting: Cultural Conflict in the Global Community*. JHU Press.
- Browne, William George.** 1799. *Travels in Africa, Egypt, and Syria, from the Year 1792 to 1798*. London.
- Buchmann, Nina, Erica Field, Rachel Glennerster, Shahana Nazneen, and Xiao Yu Wang.** 2023. "A signal to end child marriage: Theory and experimental evidence from Bangladesh." *American Economic Review*, 113(10): 2645–2688.
- Burckhardt, John Lewis.** 1819. *Travels in Nubia*. Association for Promoting the Discovery of the Interior Parts of Africa.
- Cailliaud, Frédéric.** 1826. *Voyage à Méroé: au fleuve Blanc, au-delà de Fâzoql dans le midi du royaume de Sennâr, à Syouah et dans cinq autres oasis; fait dans les années 1819, 1820, 1821 et 1822*. Par autorisation du roi, à l'Imprimerie royale.
- Cao, Yiming, Benjamin Enke, Armin Falk, Paola Giuliano, and Nathan Nunn.** 2021. "Herding, warfare, and a culture of honor: Global evidence." *Working Paper*.
- Chesnokova, Tatyana, and Rhema Vaithianathan.** 2010. "The Economics of Female Genital Cutting." *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 10(1).
- Corno, Lucia, and Alessandra Voena.** 2023. "Child marriage as informal insurance: Empirical evidence and policy simulations." *Journal of Development Economics*, 162: 103047.
- Corno, Lucia, and Eliana La Ferrara.** 2025. "Norms Replacement and Information: a Field

- Experiment on ending Female Genital Cutting.” *Working paper*.
- Corno, Lucia, Nicole Hildebrandt, and Alessandra Voena.** 2020. “Age of Marriage, Weather Shocks, and the Direction of Marriage Payments.” *Econometrica*, 88(3): 879–915. [\\_eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.3982/ECTA15505](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.3982/ECTA15505).
- De Meo, James.** 1997. “The Geography of Male and Female Genital Mutilations.” In *Sexual Mutilations: A Human Tragedy*. , ed. George C. Denniston and Marilyn Fayre Milos, 1–15. Boston, MA:Springer US.
- DeMeo, James.** 2003. “The Geography of Genital Mutilation.” In *Constructing Sexualities: Readings in Sexuality, Gender, and Culture*. , ed. Suzanne LaFont, 120–126. New York:Prentice Hall.
- Dos Santos, Joao.** 1609. *Ethiopia Oriental, E Varia Historia De Cousas notaveis do Oriente*. S. Domingos de Evora.
- Edlund, Lena, and Hyejin Ku.** 2011. “The African slave trade and the curious case of general polygyny.” *Working Paper*.
- Efferson, Charles, Sonja Vogt, Amy Elhadi, Hilal El Fadil Ahmed, and Ernst Fehr.** 2015. “Female genital cutting is not a social coordination norm.” *Science*, 349(6255): 1446–1447.
- Erlich, Monique.** 1986. *La femme blessée: Essai sur les mutilations sexuelles féminines*. L’Harmattan.
- Fenske, James, and Namrata Kala.** 2017. “1807: Economic shocks, conflict and the slave trade.” *Journal of Development Economics*, 126: 66–76.
- Fernández, Raquel.** 2007. “Women, work, and culture.” *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 5(2-3): 305–332.
- Fernández, Raquel, and Alessandra Fogli.** 2009. “Culture: An empirical investigation of beliefs, work, and fertility.” *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 1(1): 146–177.
- Field, Erica, and Attila Ambrus.** 2008. “Early Marriage, Age of Menarche, and Female Schooling Attainment in Bangladesh.” *Journal of Political Economy*, 116(5): 881–930. Publisher: The University of Chicago Press.
- Galinsky, Adam D, Kurt Hugenberg, Carla Groom, and Galen V Bodenhausen.** 2003. “The reappropriation of stigmatizing labels: Implications for social identity.” In *Identity issues in groups*. 221–256. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Ghalioungui, Paul.** 1963. *Magic and Medical Science in Ancient Egypt*. Hodder and Stoughton, London.
- Green, Elliott.** 2013. “Explaining African ethnic diversity.” *International Political Science Review*, 34(3): 235–253.
- Gulesci, Selim, Sam Jindani, Eliana La Ferrara, David Smerdon, Munshi Sulaiman, and H Peyton Young.** 2023. “A stepping stone approach to norm transitions.” *Working Paper*.
- Harris, Joseph Earl.** 1971. *The African Presence in Asia: Consequences of the East African Slave Trade*. Northwestern University Press.
- Hicks, Esther.** 2018. *Infibulation: female mutilation in islamic Northeastern Africa*. Routledge.
- Hosken, Fran P.** 1982. *The Hosken Report: Genital and Sexual Mutilation of Females*. Women’s International Network News.
- Jayachandran, Seema.** 2021. “Social Norms as a Barrier to Women’s Employment in Developing Countries.” *IMF Economic Review*, 69(3): 576–595.
- Kenyon, Frederic George.** 1893. *Greek papyri in the British Museum*. ed. F. G. Kenyon, nr. 24. p. 32, London.
- Khalifa, Suzanna.** 2022. “Female Genital Cutting and Bride Price.” URL: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/12R4sNbsyN42SyY23vIW7U1yAgkN7pC6H/view>. unpublished jobmarket paper.
- Knight, Mary.** 2001. “Curing Cut or Ritual Mutilation?: Some Remarks on the Practice of




- Female and Male Circumcision in Graeco-Roman Egypt.” *Isis*, 92(2): 317–338.
- Larrey, Dominique-Jean.** 1803. *Relation historique et chirurgicale de l’expédition de l’armée d’Orient, en Egypte et en Syrie*. Paris, Demonville.
- League of Nations.** 1936. “U.K. Government Reports to the League.”
- League of Nations.** 1937. “U.K. Government Reports to the League.”
- Levine, Ross, Chen Lin, and Wensi Xie.** 2017. “The origins of financial development: How the African slave trade continues to influence modern finance.” *Working Paper*.
- Levy, Jerrold E.** 1962. “Community Organization of the Western Navajo.” *American Anthropologist*, 64(4): 781–801.
- Lightfoot-Klein, Hanny.** 1989. *Prisoners of ritual: An odyssey into female genital circumcision in Africa*. *Prisoners of ritual: An odyssey into female genital circumcision in Africa*, Haworth Press, Inc.
- Lovejoy, Paul E.** 1989. “The Impact of the Atlantic Slave Trade on Africa: A Review of the Literature.” *The Journal of African History*, 30(3): 365–394.
- Lovejoy, Paul E.** 2000. *Transformations in Slavery: A History of Slavery in Africa*. Cambridge University Press. 2nd ed.
- Lovejoy, Paul E., and David Richardson.** 1995. “Competing Markets for Male and Female Slaves: Prices in the Interior of West Africa, 1780-1850.” *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 28(2): 261–293.
- Mackie, Gerry.** 1996. “Ending Footbinding and Infibulation: A Convention Account.” *American Sociological Review*, 61(6): 999–1017.
- Macours, Karen, Julieta Vera Rueda, and Duncan Webb.** 2024. “Menstrual Stigma, Hygiene, and Human Capital: Experimental Evidence from Madagascar.” *Working Paper*.
- Michalopoulos, Stelios, and Elias Papaioannou.** 2020. “Historical Legacies and African Development.” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 58(1): 53–128.
- Michalopoulos, Stelios, and Melanie Meng Xue.** 2021. “Folklore.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 136(4): 1993–2046.
- Miège, Jean-Louis.** 1981. “Le commerce transsaharien au XIXe siècle.” *Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Méditerranée*, 32(1): 93–119.
- Miran, Jonathan.** 2013. “From Bondage to Freedom on the Red Sea Coast: Manumitted Slaves in Egyptian Massawa, 1873–1885.” *Slavery & Abolition*, 34(1): 135–157.
- Mowafi, Reda.** 1981. *Slavery, slave trade and abolition attempts in Egypt and the Sudan 1820-1882*. Esselte Studium.
- Murdock, George Peter.** 1959. “Africa: Its Peoples and Their Culture History.”
- Murdock, George Peter.** 1967. “Ethnographic Atlas.”
- Newton, John.** 1962. *The Journal of a Slave Trader (John Newton) 1750-1754: With Newton’s Thoughts Upon the African Slave Trade*. Epworth Press.
- Novak, Lindsey.** 2020. “Persistent norms and tipping points: The case of female genital cutting.” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 177: 433–474.
- Nunn, Nathan.** 2008. “The Long-term Effects of Africa’s Slave Trades.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(1): 139–176.
- Nunn, Nathan, and Leonard Wantchekon.** 2011. “The Slave Trade and the Origins of Mistrust in Africa.” *American Economic Review*, 101(7): 3221–3252.
- Parker, Philip M.** 1997. *National Cultures of the World: A Statistical Reference*. London: Greenwood Press.
- Peirce, Leslie P.** 1993. *The imperial harem: Women and sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Pierce, Lamar, and Jason A. Snyder.** 2018. “The historical slave trade and firm access to

- finance in Africa.” *The Review of Financial Studies*, 31(1): 142–174.
- Platteau, Jean-Philippe, Giulia Camiloti, and Emmanuelle Auriol.** 2018. “Eradicating women-hurting customs.” *Towards gender equity in development*, 319.
- Renault, François.** 1988. “The structures of the slave trade in central africa in the 19th century.” *Slavery & Abolition*, 9(3): 146–165.
- Russegger, Joseph.** 1843. *Reisen in Europa, Asien und Afrika: mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die naturwissenschaftlichen Verhältnisse der betreffenden Länder unternommen in den Jahren 1835 bis 1841*. E. Schweizerbart’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Segal, Ronald.** 2001. “Islam’s Black Slaves: The Other Black Diaspora; Black Slavery in the Twenty-First Century.” *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 31: 138.
- Seligmann, C. G.** 1913. “Some Aspects of the Hamitic Problem in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.” *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 43: 593–705.
- Shell-Duncan, Bettina, and Ylva Hernlund.** 2000. “Female “Circumcision” in Africa: Dimensions of the Practice and Debates.” In *Female “Circumcision” in Africa: Culture, Controversy, Change.*, ed. Bettina Shell-Duncan and Ylva Hernlund, 1–40. Boulder, USA: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Sowell, Thomas.** 2005. “The real history of slavery.” *Black rednecks and White liberals*, 111–169.
- Teso, Edoardo.** 2019. “The Long-Term Effect of Demographic Shocks on the Evolution of Gender Roles: Evidence from the transatlantic Slave Trade.” *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 17(2): 497–534.
- UNICEF.** 2019. “Updated data on Female genital mutilation/cutting on the UNICEF website.”
- Valencia Caicedo, Felipe.** 2023. *Roots of Underdevelopment: A New Economic and Political History of Latin America and the Caribbean*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wagner, Natascha.** 2015. “Female Genital Cutting and Long-Term Health Consequences – Nationally Representative Estimates across 13 Countries.” *The Journal of Development Studies*, 51(3): 226–246.
- Whatley, Warren, and Rob Gillezeau.** 2011. “The Impact of the Transatlantic Slave Trade on Ethnic Stratification in Africa.” *American Economic Review*, 101(3): 571–576.
- Widstrand, Carl Gösta.** 1964. *Female Infibulation*. Studia Ethnographica Upsaliensia, 20, 95–122.
- WorldBank.** 2024. *Compendium of International and National Legal Frameworks on Female Genital Mutilation*. . 8th ed., World Bank.
- World Health Organization.** 2022. “Female genital mutilation.” <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/female-genital-mutilation>.
- Zdanowski, Jerzy.** 2008. *Slavery in the Gulf in the First of the 20th Century: a study based on records from the British Archives*. Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education.
- Zilfi, Madeline.** 2010a. *Women and slavery in the late Ottoman Empire: The design of difference*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zilfi, Madeline C.** 2010b. *Women and Slavery in the Late Ottoman Empire. The Design of Difference*. Cambridge University Press.

# Appendix A


## Figures and Tables

Figure A1. Ethnic Groups exposure to the slave trade, by route




*Notes:* The variables used for the graphs represent the total number of slaves by routes in our sample. *Source:* For the Red Sea trade: Austen (1979,1988,1992), Nunn (2008) Harris (1971), Miran (2013) Zdanowski (2008). For the Trans-Atlantic, Indian Ocean, Trans-Saharan Slave Trade: Nunn (2008)

Figure A2. Support for FGC




(a) By country



(b) By ethnic group


*Notes:* The figures represent the share of respondents by country (Panel A) and by ethnic group (Panel B) supporting the continuation of female genital cutting. *Source:* Authors' calculation on Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) data.

Figure A3. Map of the ports of exit of slaves




Source: Lovejoy (1989); Miège (1981); Zdanowski (2008); Mowafi (1981), Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database

Figure A4. First Stage: Red Sea slave exports and distance to the closest Red Sea port



Notes: The figure reports estimated coefficients from a series of regressions using the IHS - Red Sea slave exports/Area as dependent variable and a dummy for whether the centroid of the ethnic group is within X km from the nearest Red Sea port as independent variable, with X taking the values indicated on the horizontal axis. The different set of controls are those reported in Table 2, as well as the distances to the closest ports and coasts and their squared terms.

Figure A5. Reduced Form: Infibulation and distance to the closest Red Sea port



Notes: The figure reports estimated coefficients from a series of regressions where the dependent variable is a dummy equal to 1 if the woman is infibulated on a dummy for whether the centroid of the ethnic group is within X km from the Red Sea ports of exit of slaves with X taking the values indicated on the horizontal axis. The different sets of controls are those reported in Table 2, as well as an indicator for whether the centroid of the ethnic group is within X km from any port of exit.



Table A1. Summary of the Red Sea slave trade ethnicity data

| <i>Region</i>                           | <i>Years</i> | <i>No. Ethnic group</i> | <i>No. Obs.</i> | <i>Type</i>                        | <i>Source</i>                  |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Bombay, India                           | 1837-1882    | 2                       | 5               | Manumission requests               | Harris (1971)                  |
| Jedda, Saudi Arabia                     | 1892-1924    | 32                      | 62              | Refugee records                    | League of Nations (1936, 1937) |
| Massawa, Eritrea                        | 1873-1885    | 13                      | 204             | Destination port traffic estimates | Miran (2013)                   |
| Arabian Peninsula (multiple locations)* | 1907-1942    | 19                      | 46              | Manumission requests               | Zdanowski (2008)               |
| <i>Total</i>                            |              | <i>66</i>               | <i>317</i>      |                                    |                                |

*Notes:* \* The manumission requests were recorded at the British Agencies at the following locations: Addis Ababa, Bahrain, Bandar Abbas, Basidu, Bushire, Dubai, Kuwait, Lingah, HMS Fowey, HMS Lupin, Muscat, and Sharjah.

Table A2. Individual survey data by country

| Country       | Source | Waves                              |
|---------------|--------|------------------------------------|
| Benin         | DHS    | 2001, 2006, 2011-12                |
| Burkina Faso  | DHS    | 1998, 2003, 2010                   |
| Cameroon      | DHS    | 2004                               |
| CAR           | DHS    | 1994-95                            |
| Chad          | DHS    | 2004, 2014-15                      |
| Cote D'Ivoire | DHS    | 1998, 2005, 2011-12                |
| Djibouti      | MICS   | 2006                               |
| Egypt         | DHS    | 1995, 2000, 2003, 2008, 2014       |
| Eritrea       | DHS    | 1995, 2002                         |
| Ethiopia      | DHS    | 2000, 2005, 2016                   |
| Gambia        | DHS    | 2013                               |
| Ghana         | DHS    | 2003                               |
| Guinea        | DHS    | 1999, 2005, 2012                   |
| Guinea-Bissau | MICS   | 2006, 2014                         |
| Kenya         | DHS    | 1998, 2003, 2008, 2014             |
| Malawi        | DHS    | 1996                               |
| Mali          | DHS    | 1995, 2001, 2006, 2012-13          |
| Mauritania    | MICS   | 2007, 2011, 2015                   |
| Niger         | DHS    | 1998, 2006                         |
| Nigeria       | DHS    | 2003, 2008, 2013                   |
| Senegal       | DHS    | 2005, 2010, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 |
| Sierra Leone  | DHS    | 2008, 2013                         |
| Somalia       | MICS   | 2006, 2011                         |
| Sudan         | MICS   | 2000, 2014                         |
| Swaziland     | DHS    | 2006-2007                          |
| Tanzania      | DHS    | 1996                               |
| Togo          | DHS    | 2013-14                            |
| Uganda        | DHS    | 2011, 2016                         |

Table A3. Correlates of exposure to Red Sea slave trade

|                             | (1)                   | (2)                         | (3)                   | (4)                         |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
|                             | Individual level      |                             | Ethnic Group level    |                             |
| <i>Dependent variable =</i> | Red Sea Export / Area | IHS - Red Sea Export / Area | Red Sea Export / Area | IHS - Red Sea Export / Area |
| Age                         | -0.000<br>(0.000)     | -0.000<br>(0.000)           | 0.087<br>(0.095)      | -0.005<br>(0.020)           |
| Urban                       | -0.058<br>(0.042)     | -0.010<br>(0.010)           | -0.623<br>(0.560)     | -0.124<br>(0.157)           |
| Primary Education           | -0.084*<br>(0.045)    | -0.033**<br>(0.014)         | -0.636<br>(0.423)     | -0.232**<br>(0.111)         |
| Secondary Education         | -0.049<br>(0.031)     | -0.018<br>(0.011)           | 0.175<br>(0.726)      | -0.266<br>(0.288)           |
| Higher Education            | 0.032<br>(0.031)      | 0.008<br>(0.012)            | 0.134<br>(0.947)      | 0.687<br>(0.484)            |
| Muslim                      | 0.566<br>(0.364)      | 0.166*<br>(0.100)           | 0.598<br>(0.605)      | -0.024<br>(0.142)           |
| Catholic                    | 0.329<br>(0.216)      | 0.078<br>(0.049)            | 0.410<br>(0.694)      | -0.129<br>(0.153)           |
| Wealth                      | -0.025<br>(0.016)     | -0.007*<br>(0.004)          | -0.336<br>(0.263)     | -0.097<br>(0.077)           |
| Male circumcision           |                       | 0.004<br>(0.039)            |                       | 0.084<br>(0.055)            |
| Premarital Sex Permitted    |                       | -0.064<br>(0.067)           |                       | -0.011<br>(0.093)           |
| Herdling                    |                       | -0.036<br>(0.066)           |                       | 0.183<br>(0.111)            |
| Historical Slavery          |                       | 0.055<br>(0.086)            |                       | 0.059<br>(0.065)            |
| Nomadic                     |                       | -0.024<br>(0.096)           |                       | -0.303**<br>(0.134)         |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | 0.333                 | 0.503                       | 0.041                 | 0.156                       |
| No. Obs                     | 598515                | 598515                      | 198                   | 198                         |

*Notes:* OLS estimates with standard errors clustered at the ethnic group level in column (1) and (2) and robust standard errors in column (3) and (4) in parentheses. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at 10, 5, 1 percent level, respectively. *Source:* Demographic and Health Surveys and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys for socio-demographic characteristics, [Murdock \(1967\)](#) for historical controls.

Table A4. Infibulation and slave exports, full set of controls

|                                              | (1)                   | (2)                 | (3)                         | (4)                 |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Dependent variable = 1 if infibulated</i> |                       |                     |                             |                     |
|                                              | Red Sea Export / Area |                     | IHS - Red Sea Export / Area |                     |
| Red Sea Exports                              | 0.045***<br>(0.016)   | 0.044***<br>(0.014) | 0.211***<br>(0.041)         | 0.198***<br>(0.044) |
| Saharan Exports                              | 0.000<br>(0.003)      | -0.006<br>(0.006)   | -0.025<br>(0.016)           | -0.041<br>(0.027)   |
| Atlantic Exports                             | -0.001*<br>(0.000)    | -0.000<br>(0.001)   | -0.007<br>(0.005)           | 0.001<br>(0.006)    |
| Indian Exports                               | 0.004<br>(0.004)      | -0.008<br>(0.012)   | -0.004<br>(0.006)           | -0.020<br>(0.016)   |
| Age                                          |                       | 0.003***<br>(0.001) |                             | 0.003***<br>(0.001) |
| Age squared                                  |                       | -0.000**<br>(0.000) |                             | -0.000**<br>(0.000) |
| Urban                                        |                       | -0.017**<br>(0.008) |                             | -0.017**<br>(0.008) |
| Primary Education                            |                       | -0.016*<br>(0.008)  |                             | -0.015*<br>(0.008)  |
| Secondary Education                          |                       | 0.005<br>(0.008)    |                             | 0.004<br>(0.007)    |
| Higher Education                             |                       | 0.010<br>(0.011)    |                             | 0.007<br>(0.010)    |
| Muslim                                       |                       | 0.069**<br>(0.032)  |                             | 0.065*<br>(0.033)   |
| Catholic                                     |                       | 0.025*<br>(0.014)   |                             | 0.023<br>(0.015)    |
| Wealth                                       |                       | -0.003**<br>(0.002) |                             | -0.003**<br>(0.002) |
| Premarital Sex Permitted                     |                       | 0.023<br>(0.031)    |                             | 0.027<br>(0.032)    |
| Male Circumcision                            |                       | 0.044*<br>(0.023)   |                             | 0.034<br>(0.022)    |
| Historical Slavery                           |                       | 0.057<br>(0.040)    |                             | 0.039<br>(0.035)    |
| Herding                                      |                       | -0.001<br>(0.020)   |                             | 0.014<br>(0.019)    |
| Nomadic                                      |                       | -0.004<br>(0.052)   |                             | -0.003<br>(0.049)   |
| Mean of the dep. var.                        | 0.129                 | 0.129               | 0.129                       | 0.129               |
| Mean of the dep. var. Red Sea = 0            | 0.080                 | 0.080               | 0.080                       | 0.080               |
| R <sup>2</sup>                               | 0.508                 | 0.519               | 0.516                       | 0.524               |
| No. Obs                                      | 458645                | 458645              | 458645                      | 458645              |

*Notes:* OLS estimates with country and survey wave fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the ethnic group level in parentheses. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at 10, 5, 1 percent level, respectively. Individual and historical controls as in Table 2. *Source:* Demographic and Health Surveys and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys for socio-demographic characteristics, [Murdock \(1967\)](#) for historical controls.

Table A5. Infibulation, circumcision and slave export. Extensive Margin

|                                                | (1)                 | (2)                 | (3)                 | (4)                 | (5)                 | (6)                |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Dependent variable = 1 if</i>               | <i>Infibulated</i>  |                     |                     | <i>Circumcised</i>  |                     |                    |
| 1 if exposed to the Red Sea slave trade        | 0.227***<br>(0.061) | 0.267***<br>(0.069) | 0.250***<br>(0.060) | 0.190***<br>(0.069) | 0.202***<br>(0.064) | 0.171**<br>(0.067) |
| 1 if exposed to the Trans-Saharan slave trade  |                     | -0.114<br>(0.076)   | -0.132*<br>(0.069)  |                     | -0.064<br>(0.078)   | -0.105<br>(0.093)  |
| 1 if exposed to the Trans-Atlantic slave trade |                     | -0.012<br>(0.022)   | -0.004<br>(0.025)   |                     | 0.044<br>(0.050)    | 0.062<br>(0.060)   |
| 1 if exposed to the Indian Ocean slave trade   |                     | -0.041<br>(0.046)   | -0.038<br>(0.047)   |                     | -0.004<br>(0.104)   | 0.018<br>(0.097)   |
| Cont. controls                                 | NO                  | NO                  | YES                 | NO                  | NO                  | YES                |
| Hist. controls                                 | NO                  | NO                  | YES                 | NO                  | NO                  | YES                |
| Mean of the dep. var.                          | 0.129               | 0.129               | 0.129               | 0.652               | 0.652               | 0.652              |
| Mean of the dep. var. Red Sea = 0              | 0.080               | 0.080               | 0.080               | 0.556               | 0.556               | 0.556              |
| R <sup>2</sup>                                 | 0.505               | 0.512               | 0.522               | 0.402               | 0.403               | 0.456              |
| No. Obs                                        | 458,645             | 458,645             | 458,645             | 598,515             | 598,515             | 598,515            |

*Notes:* OLS estimates with country and survey wave fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the ethnic group level in parentheses. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at 10, 5, 1 percent level, respectively. Individual and historical controls as in [Table 2](#). *Source:* Demographic and Health Surveys and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys for socio-demographic characteristics, [Murdock \(1967\)](#) for historical controls.



1. L. Colombo, H. Dawid, *Strategic Location Choice under Dynamic Oligopolistic Competition and Spillovers*, novembre 2013.
2. M. Bordignon, M. Gamalerio, G. Turati, *Decentralization, Vertical Fiscal Imbalance, and Political Selection*, novembre 2013.
3. M. Guerini, *Is the Friedman Rule Stabilizing? Some Unpleasant Results in a Heterogeneous Expectations Framework*, novembre 2013.
4. E. Brenna, C. Di Novi, *Is caring for elderly parents detrimental to women's mental health? The influence of the European North-South gradient*, novembre 2013.
5. F. Sobbrío, *Citizen-Editors' Endogenous Information Acquisition and News Accuracy*, novembre 2013.
6. P. Bingley, L. Cappellari, *Correlation of Brothers Earnings and Intergenerational Transmission*, novembre 2013.
7. T. Assenza, W. A. Brock, C. H. Hommes, *Animal Spirits, Heterogeneous Expectations and the Emergence of Booms and Busts*, dicembre 2013.
8. D. Parisi, *Is There Room for 'Fear' as a Human Passion in the Work by Adam Smith?*, gennaio 2014.
9. E. Brenna, F. Spandonaro, *Does federalism induce patients' mobility across regions? Evidence from the Italian experience*, febbraio 2014.
10. A. Monticini, F. Ravazzolo, *Forecasting the intraday market price of money*, febbraio 2014.
11. Tiziana Assenza, Jakob Grazzini, Cars Hommes, Domenico Massaro, *PQ Strategies in Monopolistic Competition: Some Insights from the Lab*, marzo 2014.
12. R. Davidson, A. Monticini, *Heteroskedasticity-and-Autocorrelation-Consistent Bootstrapping*, marzo 2014.
13. C. Lucifora, S. Moriconi, *Policy Myopia and Labour Market Institutions*, giugno 2014.
14. N. Pecora, A. Spelta, *Shareholding Network in the Euro Area Banking Market*, giugno 2014.
15. G. Mazzolini, *The economic consequences of accidents at work*, giugno 2014.
16. M. Ambrosanio, P. Balduzzi, M. Bordignon, *Economic crisis and fiscal federalism in Italy*, settembre 2014.
17. P. Bingley, L. Cappellari, K. Tatsiramos, *Family, Community and Long-Term Earnings Inequality*, ottobre 2014.
18. S. Frazzoni, M. L. Mancusi, Z. Rotondi, M. Sobrero, A. Vezzulli, *Innovation and export in SMEs: the role of relationship banking*, novembre 2014.
19. H. Gnutzmann, *Price Discrimination in Asymmetric Industries: Implications for Competition and Welfare*, novembre 2014.
20. A. Baglioni, A. Boitani, M. Bordignon, *Labor mobility and fiscal policy in a currency union*, novembre 2014.
21. C. Nielsen, *Rational Overconfidence and Social Security*, dicembre 2014.
22. M. Kurz, M. Motolese, G. Piccillo, H. Wu, *Monetary Policy with Diverse Private Expectations*, febbraio 2015.
23. S. Piccolo, P. Tedeschi, G. Ursino, *How Limiting Deceptive Practices Harms Consumers*, maggio 2015.
24. A.K.S. Chand, S. Currarini, G. Ursino, *Cheap Talk with Correlated Signals*, maggio 2015.
25. S. Piccolo, P. Tedeschi, G. Ursino, *Deceptive Advertising with Rational Buyers*, giugno 2015.



26. S. Piccolo, E. Tarantino, G. Ursino, *The Value of Transparency in Multidivisional Firms*, giugno 2015.
27. G. Ursino, *Supply Chain Control: a Theory of Vertical Integration*, giugno 2015.
28. I. Aldasoro, D. Delli Gatti, E. Faia, *Bank Networks: Contagion, Systemic Risk and Prudential Policy*, luglio 2015.
29. S. Moriconi, G. Peri, *Country-Specific Preferences and Employment Rates in Europe*, settembre 2015.
30. R. Crinò, L. Ogliari, *Financial Frictions, Product Quality, and International Trade*, settembre 2015.
31. J. Grazzini, A. Spelta, *An empirical analysis of the global input-output network and its evolution*, ottobre 2015.
32. L. Cappellari, A. Di Paolo, *Bilingual Schooling and Earnings: Evidence from a Language-in-Education Reform*, novembre 2015.
33. A. Litina, S. Moriconi, S. Zanaj, *The Cultural Transmission of Environmental Preferences: Evidence from International Migration*, novembre 2015.
34. S. Moriconi, P. M. Picard, S. Zanaj, *Commodity Taxation and Regulatory Competition*, novembre 2015.
35. M. Bordignon, V. Grembi, S. Piazza, *Who do you blame in local finance? An analysis of municipal financing in Italy*, dicembre 2015.
36. A. Spelta, *A unified view of systemic risk: detecting SIFIs and forecasting the financial cycle via EWSs*, gennaio 2016.
37. N. Pecora, A. Spelta, *Discovering SIFIs in interbank communities*, febbraio 2016.
38. M. Botta, L. Colombo, *Macroeconomic and Institutional Determinants of Capital Structure Decisions*, aprile 2016.
39. A. Gamba, G. Immordino, S. Piccolo, *Organized Crime and the Bright Side of Subversion of Law*, maggio 2016.
40. L. Corno, N. Hildebrandt, A. Voena, *Weather Shocks, Age of Marriage and the Direction of Marriage Payments*, maggio 2016.
41. A. Spelta, *Stock prices prediction via tensor decomposition and links forecast*, maggio 2016.
42. T. Assenza, D. Delli Gatti, J. Grazzini, G. Ricchiuti, *Heterogeneous Firms and International Trade: The role of productivity and financial fragility*, giugno 2016.
43. S. Moriconi, *Taxation, industry integration and production efficiency*, giugno 2016.
44. L. Fiorito, C. Orsi, *Survival Value and a Robust, Practical, Joyless Individualism: Thomas Nixon Carver, Social Justice, and Eugenics*, luglio 2016.
45. E. Cottini, P. Ghinetti, *Employment insecurity and employees' health in Denmark*, settembre 2016.
46. G. Cecere, N. Corrocher, M. L. Mancusi, *Financial constraints and public funding for eco-innovation: Empirical evidence on European SMEs*, settembre 2016.
47. E. Brenna, L. Gitto, *Financing elderly care in Italy and Europe. Is there a common vision?*, settembre 2016.
48. D. G. C. Britto, *Unemployment Insurance and the Duration of Employment: Theory and Evidence from a Regression Kink Design*, settembre 2016.
49. E. Caroli, C. Lucifora, D. Vigani, *Is there a Retirement-Health Care utilization puzzle? Evidence from SHARE data in Europe*, ottobre 2016.
50. G. Femminis, *From simple growth to numerical simulations: A primer in dynamic programming*, ottobre 2016.
51. C. Lucifora, M. Tonello, *Monitoring and sanctioning cheating at school: What works? Evidence from a national evaluation program*, ottobre 2016.

52. A. Baglioni, M. Esposito, *Modigliani-Miller Doesn't Hold in a "Bailinable" World: A New Capital Structure to Reduce the Banks' Funding Cost*, novembre 2016.
53. L. Cappellari, P. Castelnovo, D. Checchi, M. Leonardi, *Skilled or educated? Educational reforms, human capital and earnings*, novembre 2016.
54. D. Britto, S. Fiorin, *Corruption and Legislature Size: Evidence from Brazil*, dicembre 2016.
55. F. Andreoli, E. Peluso, *So close yet so unequal: Reconsidering spatial inequality in U.S. cities*, febbraio 2017.
56. E. Cottini, P. Ghinetti, *Is it the way you live or the job you have? Health effects of lifestyles and working conditions*, marzo 2017.
57. A. Albanese, L. Cappellari, M. Leonardi, *The Effects of Youth Labor Market Reforms: Evidence from Italian Apprenticeships*, maggio 2017.
58. S. Perlichizzi, *Estimating Fiscal multipliers in the Eurozone. A Nonlinear Panel Data Approach*, maggio 2017.
59. S. Perlichizzi, *The impact of ECBs conventional and unconventional monetary policies on European banking indexes returns*, maggio 2017.
60. E. Brenna, *Healthcare tax credits: financial help to taxpayers or support to higher income and better educated patients? Evidence from Italy*, giugno 2017.
61. G. Gokmen, T. Nannicini, M. G. Onorato, C. Papageorgiou, *Policies in Hard Times: Assessing the Impact of Financial Crises on Structural Reforms*, settembre 2017.
62. M. Tettamanzi, *E Many Pluribus Unum: A Behavioural Macro-Economic Agent Based Model*, novembre 2017.
63. A. Boitani, C. Punzo, *Banks' leverage behaviour in a two-agent New Keynesian model*, gennaio 2018.
64. M. Bertoni, G. Brunello, L. Cappellari, *Parents, Siblings and Schoolmates. The Effects of Family-School Interactions on Educational Achievement and Long-term Labor Market Outcomes*, gennaio 2018.
65. G. P. Barbetta, G. Sorrenti, G. Turati, *Multigrading and Child Achievement*, gennaio 2018.
66. S. Gagliarducci, M. G. Onorato, F. Sobbrío, G. Tabellini, *War of the Waves: Radio and Resistance During World War II*, febbraio 2018.
67. P. Bingley, L. Cappellari, *Workers, Firms and Life-Cycle Wage Dynamics*, marzo 2018.
68. A. Boitani, S. Perlichizzi, *Public Expenditure Multipliers in recessions. Evidence from the Eurozone*, marzo 2018.
69. M. Le Moglie, G. Turati, *Electoral Cycle Bias in the Media Coverage of Corruption News*, aprile 2018.
70. R. Davidson, A. Monticini, *Improvements in Bootstrap Inference*, aprile 2018.
71. R. Crinò, G. Immordino, S. Piccolo, *Fighting Mobile Crime*, giugno 2018.
72. R. Caminal, L. Cappellari, A. Di Paolo, *Linguistic skills and the intergenerational transmission of language*, agosto 2018.
73. E. Brenna, L. Gitto, *Adult education, the use of Information and Communication Technologies and the impact on quality of life: a case study*, settembre 2018.
74. M. Bordignon, Y. Deng, J. Huang, J. Yang, *Plunging into the Sea: Ideological Change, Institutional Environments and Private Entrepreneurship in China*, settembre 2018.
75. M. Bordignon, D. Xiang, L. Zhan, *Predicting the Effects of a Sugar Sweetened Beverage Tax in a Household Production Model*, settembre 2018.
76. C. Punzo, L. Rossi, *The Redistributive Effects of a Money-Financed Fiscal Stimulus*, gennaio 2019.
77. A. Baglioni, L. Colombo, P. Rossi, *Debt restructuring with multiple bank relationships*, gennaio 2019.

78. E. Cottini, P. Ghinetti, S. Moriconi, *Higher Education Supply, Neighbourhood effects and Economic Welfare*, febbraio 2019.
79. S. Della Lena, F. Panebianco, *Cultural Transmission with Incomplete Information: Parental Perceived Efficacy and Group Misrepresentation*, marzo 2019.
80. T. Colussi, Ingo E. Isphording, Nico Pestel, *Minority Salience and Political Extremism*, marzo 2019.
81. G. P. Barbetta, P. Canino, S. Cima, *Let's tweet again? The impact of social networks on literature achievement in high school students: Evidence from a randomized controlled trial*, maggio 2019.
82. Y. Brilli, C. Lucifora, A. Russo, M. Tonello, *Vaccination take-up and health: evidence from a flu vaccination program for the elderly*, giugno 2019.
83. C. Di Novi, M. Piacenza, S. Robone, G. Turati, *Does fiscal decentralization affect regional disparities in health? Quasi-experimental evidence from Italy*, luglio 2019.
84. L. Abrardi, L. Colombo, P. Tedeschi, *The Gains of Ignoring Risk: Insurance with Better Informed Principals*, luglio 2019.
85. A. Garnero, C. Lucifora, *Turning a Blind Eye? Compliance to Minimum Wages and Employment*, gennaio 2020.
86. M. Bordignon, M. Gamalerio, E. Slerca, G. Turati, *Stop invasion! The electoral tipping point in anti-immigrant voting*, marzo 2020.
87. D. Vigani, C. Lucifora, *Losing control? Unions' Representativeness, "Pirate" Collective Agreements and Wages*, marzo 2020.
88. S. L. Comi, E. Cottini, C. Lucifora, *The effect of retirement on social relationships: new evidence from SHARE*, maggio 2020.
89. A. Boitani, S. Perdichizzi, C. Punzo, *Nonlinearities and expenditure multipliers in the Eurozone*, giugno 2020.
90. R. A. Ramos, F. Bassi, D. Lang, *Bet against the trend and cash in profits*, ottobre 2020.
91. F. Bassi, *Chronic Excess Capacity and Unemployment Hysteresis in EU Countries. A Structural Approach*, ottobre 2020.
92. M. Bordignon, T. Colussi, *Dancing with the Populist. New Parties, Electoral Rules and Italian Municipal Elections*, ottobre 2020.
93. E. Cottini, C. Lucifora, G. Turati, D. Vigani, *Children Use of Emergency Care: Differences Between Natives and Migrants in Italy*, ottobre 2020.
94. B. Fanfani, *Tastes for Discrimination in Monopsonistic Labour Markets*, ottobre 2020.
95. B. Fanfani, *The Employment Effects of Collective Bargaining*, ottobre 2020.
96. O. Giuntella, J. Lonsky, F. Mazzonna, L. Stella, *Immigration Policy and Immigrants' Sleep. Evidence from DACA*, dicembre 2020.
97. E. Cottini, P. Ghinetti, E. Iossa, P. Sacco, *Stress and Incentives at Work*, gennaio 2021.
98. L. Pieroni, M. R. Roig, L. Salmasi, *Italy: immigration and the evolution of populism*, gennaio 2021.
99. L. Corno, E. La Ferrara, A. Voena, *Female Genital Cutting and the Slave Trade*, febbraio 2021.
100. O. Giuntella, L. Rotunno, L. Stella, *Trade Shocks, Fertility, and Marital Behavior*, marzo 2021.
101. P. Bingley, L. Cappellari, K. Tatsiramos, *Parental Assortative Mating and the Intergenerational Transmission of Human Capital*, aprile 2021.
102. F. Devicienti, B. Fanfani, *Firms' Margins of Adjustment to Wage Growth. The Case of Italian Collective Bargaining*, aprile 2021.
103. C. Lucifora, A. Russo, D. Vigani, *Does prescribing appropriateness reduce health expenditures? Main effects and unintended outcomes*, maggio 2021.

104. T. Colussi, *The Political Effects of Threats to the Nation: Evidence from the Cuban Missile Crisis*, giugno 2021.
105. M. Bordignon, N. Gatti, M. G. Onorato, *Getting closer or falling apart? Euro countries after the Euro crisis*, giugno 2021.
106. E. Battistin, M. Ovidi, *Rising Stars*, giugno 2021.
107. D. Checchi, A. Fenizia, C. Lucifora, *PUBLIC SECTOR JOBS: Working in the public sector in Europe and the US*, giugno 2021.
108. K. Aktas, G. Argentin, G. P. Barbetta, G. Barbieri, L. V. A. Colombo, *High School Choices by Immigrant Students in Italy: Evidence from Administrative Data*, luglio 2021.
109. B. Fanfani, C. Lucifora, D. Vigani, *Employer Association in Italy. Trends and Economic Outcomes*, luglio 2021.
110. F. Bassi, A. Boitani, *Monetary and macroprudential policy: The multiplier effects of cooperation*, settembre 2021.
111. S. Basiglio, A. Foresta, G. Turati, *Impatience and crime. Evidence from the NLSY97*, settembre 2021.
112. A. Baglioni, A. Monticini, D. Peel, *The Impact of the ECB Banking Supervision Announcements on the EU Stock Market*, novembre 2021.
113. E. Facchetti, L. Neri, M. Ovidi, *Should you Meet The Parents? The impact of information on non-test score attributes on school choice*, dicembre 2021.
114. M. Bratti, E. Cottini, P. Ghinetti, *Education, health and health-related behaviors: Evidence from higher education expansion*, febbraio 2022.
115. A. Boitani, C. Dragomirescu-Gaina, *News and narratives: A cointegration analysis of Russian economic policy uncertainty*, aprile 2022.
116. D. Delli Gatti, J. Grazzini, D. Massaro, F. Panebianco, *The Impact of Growth on the Transmission of Patience*, luglio 2022.
117. I. Torrini, C. Lucifora, A. Russo, *The Long-Term Effects of Hospitalization on Health Care Expenditures: An Empirical Analysis for the Young-Old Population*, luglio 2022.
118. T. Colussi, M. Romagnoli, E. Villar, *The Intended and Unintended Consequences of Taxing Waste*, settembre 2022.
119. D. Delli Gatti, G. Iannotta, *Behavioural credit cycles*, settembre 2022.
120. C. Punzo, G. Rivolta, *Money versus debt financed regime: Evidence from an estimated DSGE model*, novembre 2022.
121. M. Ovidi, *Parents Know Better: Sorting on Match Effects in Primary School*, novembre 2022.
122. L. Cappellari, D. Checchi, M. Ovidi, *The effects of schooling on cognitive skills: evidence from education expansions*, dicembre 2022.
123. M. Bertoni, G. Brunello, L. Cappellari, M. De Paola, *The long-run earnings effects of winning a mayoral election*, gennaio 2023.
124. M. Bordignon, F. Franzoni, M. Gamalerio, *Is Populism reversible? Evidence from Italian local elections during the pandemic*, gennaio 2023.
125. L. Colombo, G. Femminis, A. Pavan, *Subsidies to Technology Adoption when Firms' Information is Endogenous*, gennaio 2023.
126. L. Pieroni, M. Rosselló Roig, L. Salmasi, G. Turati, *Legal status and voluntary abortions by immigrants*, gennaio 2023.
127. F. Di Pace, G. Mangiante, R. Masolo, *Do firm expectations respond to Monetary Policy announcements?*, febbraio 2023.
128. R. Masolo, *Heterogeneity and the Equitable Rate of Interest*, febbraio 2023.
129. D. Delli Gatti, R. Terranova, E. M. Turco, *Mind the knowledge gap! The origins of declining business dynamism in a macro agent-based model*, ottobre 2023.

130. R. Davidson, A. Monticini, *Bootstrap Performance with Heteroskedasticity*, novembre 2023.
131. V. Colombo, A. Paccagnini, *Uncertainty and the Federal Reserve's Balance Sheet Monetary Policy*, febbraio 2024.
132. M. Bordignon, T. Colussi, F. Porcelli, *Populists at work. Italian municipal finance under M5s governments*, febbraio 2024.
133. A. Boitani, L. Di Domenico, S. Ricchiuti, *Monetary policy and inequality: an heterogenous agents' approach*, settembre 2024.
134. M. Di Giacomo, M. Piacenza, L. Salmasi, G. Turati, *Understanding productivity in maternity wards*, ottobre 2024.
135. D. Bonciani, R. Masolo, S. Sarpietro, *How Food Prices Shape Inflation Expectations and the Monetary Policy Response*, ottobre 2024.
136. G. Battiston, L. Corno, E. La Ferrara, *Informing Risky Migration: Evidence from a field experiment in Guinea*, dicembre 2024.
137. F. Di Pace, G. Mangiante, R. Masolo, *Monetary Policy Rules: the Market's View*, dicembre 2024.
138. L. Corno, E. La Ferrara, A. Voena, *Female Genital Cutting and the Slave Trade*, maggio 2025.