

COLONISING DESIRES: BODIES FOR SALE, EXPLOITATION AND (IN)SECURITY IN DESIRE INDUSTRIES

Anna M. Agathangelou

Abstract

Desire industries have emerged as a major social relation of seduction under the Neoliberal Imperium. Through the household domestic and entertainment reproductive sectors, the desire industries promise fulfilment, while intimately tying freedom and prosperity with securitisation for individuals and states alike and preserving wealth through access to the market, the state, and masculine power for what comes to be constituted as the bourgeois and white elite. More concretely, this paper examines how the “higher income generating” peripheries of Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey actively participate in bringing female migrant labour from “lower income generating” countries. Albeit in contradictory ways, these countries work toward realising the historical tendencies of capital by feminising, racialising, sexualising, and constituting the subject of exploitation as a threat to the (re)production of the neoliberal imperium’s relations. Through the “import” and exploitation of cheap reproductive labour for what is referred to in this article as the “desire” or sex industries, these peripheries work toward realising the (re)production of neoliberalism, albeit with strategies, activities, contestations, and struggles. Female migrants face daily violence as their labour is exploited to realise the historical tendencies of capital, and yet, these working class migrant women exceed capital’s push and attempt to seize their corporeal bodies, and/or appropriate their feminine labour. They invest time and energy toward constituting communities that do not exploit, violate, appropriate, and indeed, kill their bodies. In moving to realise this potential, the creative power of labourers, as producers of their own communities, is crucial toward social and self-affirmation and social and self-realisation.

Introduction

With the USA’s declaration of a permanent world “war on terror” and its changed focus from Al Qaeda to the Taliban (i.e. due to its socio-spatial relations to “locals” who can be more easily located), the academic focus seems to have shifted from other kinds of terror and to the centralisation of global political sovereignty

(Johnson, 2000). Much of this focus seems, however, to have also made invisible other intensification processes of restructuring or what some have coined as globalisation, others “imperialist globalisation” and others simply “empire” (Kaplan, 2002; Hardt and Negri, 2000). This new attempt to reconsolidate relations of asymmetrical power relations through “war” military, and otherwise, disrupts many traditional understandings about regions as well as subject formations. Furthermore, the conditions that pushed for such reconsolidations expose the limitations of such understandings or categorisations. Yet, many of the analyses of globalisation seem to presuppose those regions, markets, states, and other civil society relations as if these are not historical phenomena worthy of explanation (Rupert, 1995). Migration or the movement of labour is one such process. The ways these processes draw on feminine, masculine, and racialised codes to constitute power require explanation as well.

In this paper it is argued that the attempts to (re)produce the “New World Order” and its contingent neoliberal policy agendas, depend on the shift of the surplus value produced by the low-waged working classes from peripheral and semi-peripheral regions/spaces and states (as in the cases of China, India, and Russia) and the migration of reproductive labour into other semi-peripheries and dominant states. More concretely, this paper examines how Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey “import” cheap reproductive labour for the “desire” or sex industries. This labour becomes crucial in the (re)production of neoliberalism as both a contradictory social process and a political subject formation’s project. Such labour also takes the necessary time away from the working class to reproduce itself or participate in the articulation and production of other projects as well as toward social, self-affirmation and self-realisation. While exploitation and corporeal violence against these workers redirects their energies toward the production of structures and social relations of capital, these labourers are, albeit contradictorily, entering communities and mediating capital-labour by re-appropriating the means of production to disrupt understandings and practices of labour as “absolute poverty”. Many female migrants, along with non-profit organisations, and other radical feminist workers move to rearticulate and draw out “the general possibility of wealth as subject and as activity” of social transformation (Marx, 1857) and push toward the practice of a less violent “social”, that is, the capacity to produce new living conditions and communities of their own.

Three key questions emerge: How can we understand this redrawing of borders, and the neo-imperial sexualised and racialised social relations of this particular form of migration? What kinds of interventions are desired in the communities within which we work and live? What kinds of stories, both political and theoretical, do we, as radical materialist feminists, articulate to intervene in the social relations of this world?

Reproductive Labour in the Global Economy: Historical and Epistemological Issues

International migration worldwide is intensified with world restructuring or globalisation. The international economic and political power relations create the conditions that make possible the flow of, and control over, migrant labour (Agathangelou, 2004; Lazaridis, 2001; Erder and Kaska, 2003; Erder, 2000; Agathangelou, 2002). Since the economic turmoil of the 1980s, the states of Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, Sri-Lanka, India, the Philippines, and China are exporting in addition to the surplus value produced in these regions, their cheap labourers as value-generating bodies themselves (Agathangelou, 2005, p. 26). These mainly female workers are employed in industries with few social controls (Kempadoo and Doezema, 1998; Enloe, 1989, 1993, 2000). The trade in these industries accounts for the racialised feminisation of the present migration (Lazaridis, 2001; Erder and Kaska, 2003; Lazos, 2002; Democratic Movement, Greece, Women against Violence, Greece, Icduygu, 2006) that allows for the placement of these women as “exploitative casual labour”. It results from the sending and receiving states deregulating labour to enhance flexible accumulation so that they can effectively and efficiently continue the competition and free trade (Ucarer, 1999; IOM, 1996). Within this structurally asymmetrical context the sale of cheap reproductive labour has become a major “technology” and a tool of the neoliberal project(s) in the process of trying to (re)produce the middle class on the cheap.

In their desire to sustain their position in the global economy, states ascribe race, gender, and sexuality to skills and transpose racial, sexual, and gender hierarchies from peripheral countries to more dominant ones (Agathangelou, 2004). The state also facilitates the commodification and fetishisation of desire to “fit into” the capital accumulation machine by normalising whiteness, masculinity (Razack, 2004; Bhattacharjee, 1997), and heterosexuality (Irigaray, 1985, p. 173). The more we participate in constituting black bodies, the more power we accumulate; the more black bodies we can export and import for cheap labour, the more competitive it enables us to be; the more violence we use to exploit these migrant bodies, the more powerful we seem in the global order; and the more corrupt trafficking (that is, exchange strategies) technologies we draw upon to reduce costs of labour, the more “white” we become. Paradoxically, producing and accessing surplus value and supporting the migration of reproductive labour become a priority for the peripheral state even at the expense of the feminisation of its own state and industries, and its own female citizens. What comes to be constituted as the peripheral state will often draw on militaristic and economic crises discourses (e.g. migrants as security threats; the vulnerability of the state to any kind of exigency; the working class as expensive) to moralise and justify the structural theft

of wealth from those peoples deemed to be the trammellers of the state's sovereignty, that is, what is articulated as upper and middle class, masculine, heterosexual, and "white" authority.¹ It will also do so for the export of migrant female labour, arguing that the remittances from "migrant labour" benefit families and the majority of the society (Agathangelou, 2002; Nair, 2006).

Semi-peripheral states such as Greece and Turkey, and core states like the US, Germany, and Canada, work to facilitate the migration of reproductive labour, in terms of both sex and domestic labour, in formal profit-making industries but also in what comes to be produced as shadow economies (Hughes, 2000; Emke-Papadopoulou, 2001; Anthias and Lazaridis, 2000; Ergocmen and Yuksel, 2005). Reproductive labour comprises the physical, mental, experiential, and affective labour toward the child bearing and rearing responsibilities, domestic and intimate tasks undertaken by either sex. It is labour that is required to guarantee the welfare, survival, the pleasure, and the (re)production of individuals – including the offering of intimacy, rearing, educating, feeding, looking after and nurturing household members – all frequently at the expense of the subject who gives of her body and labour in maintaining the household and the welfare of its members.

Epistemological Frameworks and Methods

In analysing the flow of women's reproductive labour and toward the desire industries from lower-income to higher-income generating peripheries² as a result of intensified globalisation, I look at the sexual division of labour in social relations of production, epistemologies, and practices of race, sex, sexualities, gender, and class (Ebert, 1996; Anderson, 2000; Razack, 2004; Agathangelou and Killian, 2006) within them and toward the production of regimes of exploitation and other kinds of violence. Social relations of production here refer to the racialised, gendered, and sexualised class position of the subject of labour: some own the means of production within capital relations and push to command the surplus labour of others, and many own only their labour power which often enables a violent exploitation of such labour (Cotter, 2001; Ebert, 2001; Anderson, 2000; Aguilar, 2004) due to historical tendencies of capitalism to push people to exploit others and succumb to the seductions of profit all in the name of freedom and individual choice. This historical tendency to succumb to exploitation is based on the premise that capitalism is essentially the only viable formation of social relations. Following those feminists who argue that the labour of domestic and sex workers produces the major commodity central to capitalism, labour power itself (Anderson, 2000; Glenn, 1992; Brenner and Laslett, 1989), this research proposes that sex and domestic work together constitute reproductive labour. It is crucial to recognise that there are differences in the ways that domestic and sex workers become hired and used in capital relations, however, there is a larger epistemological logic with ontological presuppositions (e.g. bodies are for sale;

bodies are property; women's labour is just use-value; work equals body) that inform and are informed by these social relations of production. Exploited by property owners and those seeking to produce wealth, sex and domestic workers do not escape being subordinated to the logic of profit despite reproductive labour's "private" nature (e.g. child care happens in the household and sexual gratification happens between two private self-contained bodies). Sex and domestic workers' bodies in the new global economy become constituted as zones marked and exported for their "cleanliness" and sexual orifices.³ In grouping them together we are also able to make apparent the ways in which spaces become declared public or private for exploitative and oppressive reasons, together with the ways in which the "male sexuality [itself] becomes alienated as a female object" (Tadiar, 1998, p. 943),⁴ all in the name of accumulating power (e.g. the ability to work in the market; the ability to divide labour from one's body; the ability to alienate one's body from oneself and others). Through a set of seductive processes (i.e. mirages, metonymic, metaphorical, and synechdotal) and strategies, capital obfuscates the exploitation and commodification of labour, "private" and otherwise. Despite the imaginary constructions of public and private spaces within the borders of neoliberal nation-states, a parallel relation is perceived between a domestic and a sex worker within the desire industries. Whether working in a private household or across town in a public cabaret, hotel, or street, they are both exploited workers, and are often constituted as "enemies" of each other (i.e. many of the domestic workers engage in conversations about their "goodness" (i.e. moral codes) and their productivity (i.e., offer to the global economy and state) in relation and in opposition to the work and identity of sex workers.

Based on a postcolonial feminist historical materialist epistemology which posits that subjects' activity "exceeds the exigencies of capital (such as the historical tendency towards 'feminisation') and the roles that capital expects them to play (ibid. p. 953), I argue that the sex and domestic labourers redirect their labour and bodies instead, toward self-affirmation and self-realisation (Marx and Engels, 1976, p. 765), albeit in contradictory ways. Drawing on postcolonial/feminist historical materialist epistemologies I also posit that these relations take place under "circumstances of reckless terrorism" (Marx, 1976, pp. 732-733). Indeed, under conditions of (re)colonisation.

The material for this article comes from several sources – historical interpretation of state documents such as employment policies, employment contracts, and analyses on sex and domestic work, media documents; EU documents on migration and female import of sex and domestic workers; and interviews with sex and domestic labourers, including in-depth interviews with state officials, migration officials, policemen, impresarios, clients, focus groups of sex and domestic workers, and feminist theorisations on trafficking, prostitution, and

domestic work. The absence of any previous study on the political economy of sex (i.e. the ways domestic and sex work constitutes social relations of power as well as (re)produces subjects) and the structure of these industries in Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey influenced the method of investigation chosen. It called for interviews with sex and domestic workers that could provide significant insight into their “experiences” with their employment contracts (such as work schedules, earnings, recruitment patterns, the organisation of household and sex work spaces, and the dynamics between the sex and domestic workers, their employers and their clients). In addition to exploring the relationship with the state through the employment contracts and citizenship status, I also sought to explore the self-understandings of these relationships by the women themselves and thereby enable comparative epistemological/interventionist analyses of the same relationship from different angles and perspectives. Feminist/postcolonial historical materialism as an epistemology focuses on the ontological primacy of mediation of social relations and their production and toward social relations and communities whose fundamental premise of formation and reproduction is not violence and terror. In recognising this ontological primacy of mediation, it is possible to explore and look for “other” interventions outside the exigencies of capital. How does migration of reproductive labour (and their contingent body parts) come to fulfil an historical tendency toward “peripheralisation” and marginalisation of states and peoples? How does reproductive labour “sell” its use and surplus value toward the production of subjects and the fulfilment of historical tendencies of capital, albeit through exploitation and other forms of violence such as feminisation, sexualisation, and racialisation of their labour and their bodies?

(Re)colonising Social Relations and their Contingent Desires

Reproduction and sexual relations are at the crux of the (re)production and change of the “New World Order” or what social scientists call the “social.”⁵ Bodies, of a particular kind, are required to make possible the transition to what is called the neoliberal imperium.⁶ The bodies of women from Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, and from states such as India, the Philippines, Sri-Lanka, and Bangladesh are being turned into objects, parts used in the production and legitimating of political power and authority as well as subjectivities of a broad array of players both “inside” and “outside” the desire industries (bourgeois bodies, nations, communities, geographies, masculine authorities, “whiteness”).

The sale of women and children worldwide is not a new phenomenon. What is new is the intensification of what is coined here as the desire industries (Agathangelou, 2002; Agathangelou and Ling, 2003; Agathangelou, 2004).⁷ These intensified processes – the trafficking and sale of women and children – are embodied struggles and contestations at different moments and within different contexts around the (re)production of the social or rather our communities and

within them ourselves and our bodies. Restructuring worldwide has pushed many peripheral economies to reorganise themselves as well as social relations: domestic, local, and international. Many peripheral countries “export” thousands of women daily to other higher income generating states, which are actively participating in reorganising huge parts of their economies into the desire industries. Desire industries depend extensively on reproductive labour, or labour that produces the major commodity central to capitalism – labour power itself (ibid., p. 13).

The labour of women worldwide serves to create bodies and subjects for the neoliberal imperium daily. The production of things is not the only material base for the oppression and exploitation of people; it is the production of people also because it depends on the private appropriation of the use-value and surplus labour of those who own nothing but their labour power to sell (Agathangelou, 2004; Mies, 1998). Within these production relations I argue, unlike Marx and Engels, that colonisation for the ensuring of “primitive accumulation” is not a one- moment relation.⁸ It is an ongoing process. The production of the modern “free” and “outlawed proletariat”, or rather aspects of that subject depend on (re)colonisations of bodies and labour of what comes to be constituted as “unfree” and reproductive peoples. Marx and Engels (1976, pp. 732-733) argue in theorising colonisation:

“The spoliation of the church’s property, the fraudulent alienation of the State domains, the robbery of the common lands, the usurpation of feudal and clan property, and its transformation into modern private property under circumstances of reckless terrorism, were just so many idyllic methods of primitive accumulation. They conquered the field for capitalistic agriculture, made the soil part and parcel of capital, and created for the town industries the necessary supply of a ‘free’ and outlawed proletariat” (Marx, *Capital*, Volume 1, 1984, p. 685).

This production of the “necessary supply of a ‘free proletariat’ and its outlawing” depends on the creation of the “unfree” and reproductive subject who comes to be constituted as a producer of use-value instead of surplus labour by multinational corporations and in capital relations in general. To understand the production of the desire industries it is necessary to begin with this epistemological insight while considering the reorganisation of socio-economic and political relations in order to co-constitute the peripheral states themselves. The desire industries form such a series of social relations which are part and parcel of larger production relations whose major logic is the desire of the upper and middle classes to buy and exploit and expropriate anytime, anywhere, the bodies and surplus-value labour of working class women and men, peoples of colour for satiating and in the process constituting of what is called “white but not quite” subjectivities (Agathangelou, 2002, 2004).

A major method of “moving” women and children across borders for the desire industries is trafficking (Mediterranean Institute of Gender Studies, 2006, <http://www.humantrafficking.org/updates/389>). More specifically, sex trafficking is turning into a global industry. There are different kinds of networks of trafficking of women such as the large-scale network which

“has political and economic international contacts in both the countries of origin and destination. Women are recruited in a variety of seemingly legal ways as au pairs, language students, etc”; as well as “the small scale network traffics one or two women by accompanying her to the country of destination and delivering her to the impresario. The route and mode of transport used will depend on the location of the sending country and also on the women who desire to migrate to other sites for a different life” (Agathangelou, 2004).

What happens when women are trafficked as part of a larger restructuring process (e.g. the development or what the researcher calls the desire of the peripheral economies to acquire part of the labour market and with it political power within the European Union or the global economy)? When women are trafficked as part of a larger restructuring process, epistemologies and practices toward fulfilling historical tendencies (i.e. securing the social and geographic national boundaries of Cyprus or Greece or Turkey vis-à-vis the migrant who is there to work for very cheap wages) seem to prevail. In many cases violence is aimed at women and children and also those states that are not using their laws effectively. For example, particular kinds of men and women are required to urge the “white but not quite” state (i.e. those states that collude with multinational capital but can never be its decision makers or those who have the right to reap the profits of such relations)⁹ to teach those women that are trafficked about “proper” sexualities and ways of cleaning and taking care of children and households. In the process of acquiring a “white but not quite” status, these states and subjects come to mystify their own selves and bodies as superior and deserving and can thus violate the “white but not quite” men and women whose bodies they bought through trafficking.

A series of migrations and fettering, both social and personal (e.g. sexual, racial, class, mental, etc.), push around 4 million women, men, transgender, transsexual, and children to migrate (and be trafficked repeatedly) in order to better their conditions and their families. According to ‘Captive Daughters’ “an estimated 2 million women and children are held in sexual servitude throughout the world, and between 100,000 and 200,000 are trafficked across international borders for the purposes of sexual exploitation each year [<http://www.captivedaughters.org/demand.htm>]. Many countries including peripheral sites are now participating extensively in exchanging bodies for sale. Desires – for exotic black flesh, bodies for cheap labour, and for freedom (i.e. the freedom of the market) – are about

power; it is a power that property owners draw upon to justify using all means available (i.e. the impresario, the sex trafficker including women, the state, us) and even at the expense and death of others to access the following: corporeal bodies, labour and its surplus value, and quick accumulations. The generation and sustenance of the wealth and employment of the desire industries depends extensively on production relations, and with trafficking as a major tool of governance and exchange – a newer form of slavery. The way people produce products and services has changed, and the way capital and labour relate to each other has changed as well. However, the logic and practice of this neoliberal imperium draws extensively on historical tendencies and processes of violence such as exploitation, oppression, feminisation and masculinisation, racialisation and sexualisation and quite often the annihilation of the body of the wage-labourer (Marx and Engels, 1976). For the first time the United Nations Crime Commission defines trafficking in the Trafficking Protocol and states:

“Trafficking in persons shall mean the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation shall include at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labour or services, practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs [with footnote explanation];”

- (1): “The travaux préparatoires should indicate that the reference to the abuse of a position of vulnerability is understood to refer to any situation in which the person involved has no real and acceptable alternative but to submit to the abuse involved.”
- (2): “The travaux préparatoires should indicate that the Protocol addresses the exploitation of prostitution and other forms of sexual exploitation only in the context of trafficking in persons. The terms ‘exploitation of the prostitution of other’ or ‘other forms of sexual exploitation’ are not defined in the Protocol, which is therefore without prejudice to how States Parties address prostitution in their respective domestic laws” (Trafficking Protocol, United Nations, 2000, Article 3).

The UN intervenes to “eliminate” trafficking and begins this work by defining this newer technology of governmentability (Hardt and Negri, 2002). Yet, while this definition gestures toward articulating trafficking as more than a mere technology of exchange, it still remains within that capital framework and does not really engage relations of production and their historical trajectories which time and again enable mediations of violence, sexual, racial, and class exploitation and the contingent vulnerabilities of such relations. Sex and domestic work remain analytically outside

international labour relations than within relations of exchange. This definition “precludes an understanding of the productive capacity of the women who are exchanged and ‘prostituted’ by others” (Tadiar, 1998, p. 952). Moreover, the protocol ensures that its definitions, “exploitation of the prostitution of other” or “other forms of sexual exploitation”, are not addressed because as an organisation it is concerned more with not undermining the spatial division of the state (i.e. its sovereignty and within it, its own definition of domestic laws).

Even when the trafficking of peoples allows for access to the surplus value of labour of previously “unimagined” sites and bodies through violence (e.g. by forcing peoples to sell their bodies), the mediations in this major UN document which foregrounds this “relation of exchange” are still erased. More specifically, the participation of women and others in the “production of the structures of exchange and exchange relationships” and the ontologically primary relation of mediation “in the production of the very differences in which relationships of exchange, exploitation, and oppression are understood to be predicated” are made invisible (ibid, p. 940). Such texts and others that analyse the traffic of women make invisible the mediation that women and children and others participate in order to realise and socialise themselves (ibid.). Indeed, women are not mere products. They are also producers of their own production, the structures of exchange and exchange relationships, one of which is trafficking. The trafficking protocol presumes a sexual difference which helps constitute the category of trafficking (i.e. the “exploitation of the prostitution of other” and sexual exploitation) and yet, this sexual relation is removed from the larger context within which it is produced, including production and sovereign relations, which now appear sexually specific to trafficking (and which itself trespasses sovereign territoriality of the state). To convince as many states as possible to sign the document, the trafficking protocol collapses “exploitation of the prostitution of other” with trafficking. Indeed, this document argues that (1) trafficking is merely a cultural/institutional/human rights issue, (2) trafficking, prostitution, and oppressions of different kinds are one and the same, and (3) states cannot but acknowledge these forms of racism through the demands generated by the globalised market. This protocol, ultimately, ends up presuming and (re)erecting the system of clearly defined sovereign nation-states. “The document is therefore without prejudice [as] to how States Parties address prostitution in their respective domestic laws”. Amid these definitions of the United Nations, we also read other definitions that come to expose these epistemological logics that violently define out of their knowledge productions, peoples, bodies, labour, and violence. Trafficking under globalisation according to the WCAR NGO Forum is more than just merely a technology of exchange.

“Trafficking in persons is a form of racism that is recognized as a contemporary form of slavery and is aggravated by the increase in racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. The demand side in

trafficking is created by a globalised market, and a patriarchal notion of sexuality. Trafficking happens within and across borders, largely in conjunction with prostitution. Women and children are especially vulnerable to trafficking, as the intersectionality of gender, race and other forms of discrimination leads to multiple forms of discrimination. Trafficking in persons must always be dealt with not purely as a law enforcement issue but within a framework of respect for the rights of trafficked persons” (World Conference against Racism, 2001).

The World Conference against Racism exposed this “exchange” relationship as more than just a trafficking relationship. It is a form of racism mediated with “multiple forms of discrimination.” It requires more than just “law enforcement” in a context within which the emergence of desires and their fulfilment are pushing daily for an increase in the demand of bodies that can be “exported” and “imported” instantly. In the process, countless women’s labour and bodies are (re)colonised. Their condition, their disruptions, and their participation toward the articulation of “other” communities cannot be foreseen but need to be understood as they are created in the struggle to determine both the subject and communities/socialities that demand a detachment from the historical and epistemological trajectories of capital, of neo-colonialism, imperialism, and the new age of terror.

Restructuring of World Economy and Re(organisation) of Reproductive Relations

“If money, according to Augier, ‘comes into the world with a congenital blood-stain on one cheek,’ capital comes dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt” (Marx, 1976, p. 712).

“What makes labour a different commodity is in fact its process of reproduction, which is necessarily material and social and follows historically established norms” (Picchio, 1992, p. 2).

Marx foregrounds the development of capital as predicated on the blood and dirt of the body and labour of the worker. Picchio, following Marx, argues that labour is material and social. Labour is not just any commodity. What makes it a different commodity is its reproduction, and the material and historical social relations inform social conditions that make its reproduction possible. However, bodies are ontologically primary for any kind of mediation, including labour relations. As advocated by Marx, the significance of its corporeality in social relations is also engaged with in this article.

With the restructuring of the world economy, and to respond to stringent budgets and resources, lower-income generating states push increasingly more of their major resources to generate profits – women and children into the global

market's tentacles. In the flow of reproductive labour the state plays an important role in the restructured world economy (Kempadoo and Doezema, 1998; Enloe, 1989, 1993) by mediating the relation between racialised and gendered capital and labour through immigration policies and laws, and by controlling labour markets and the cost of reproducing labour.

As migration movements expand, both regular and irregular, more countries are actively participating in the import and export of cheap labour for the generation of remittances and profits. Countries (Cyprus, Greece and Turkey) that historically exported labour are now also becoming importers, specifically of cheap labour. With migration, regular and irregular, human trafficking activities driven by internationally organised networks intertwined with violence are the issues of the day. In this intensified current phase of globalisation in which capital depends on productive wage labour, Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey are now destination countries of cheap productive labour, and more specifically, reproductive labour. Beginning in the 1960s, all three countries followed official policies to attract tourism, enhance their foreign currency reserves (Lazaridis, 2001; Erder and Kaska, 2003; Erder, 2000; Agathangelou, 2002), and "exported" labour to other Western European countries and North America.

In the 1990s the three countries began actively recruiting cheap wage labour from other peripheral economic states such as the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, and the Ukraine. While migrants from different neighbouring countries arrived in these countries before the 1990s, in that decade all three states changed their liberal border policies to respond to intensified capital restructurings by designing more restrictive migration policies to control the labour market. One way that global capital controls the labour market is by dividing the process of migration under the rubrics of regular and irregular. Regular migration refers to the process through which the state officially involves itself to control the movement of the worker. Irregular migration refers to a process involving violations of the national laws of the state. This division and mirage between regular and irregular migration, however, has been systematically acting as a mystification method that works toward privatising the space of the nation-state in such a way that it allows "some people to walk some of the time" (Bhattacharjee, 1997, p. 317) through the use of law. This division of regular and irregular migration enables the control, management as well as the disciplining of women and children, as well as the working class of the importing peripheries, especially if they are found working in what has come to be known as the "shadow" economies of sex.

The EU designed and continues to design and implement policies and laws to control irregular migration, arguing that it is intertwined with drug and human trafficking (Ghosh, 1998; Erder and Kaska, 2003; Lazaridis, 2001; Lazos, 2002;

Country report on trafficking in human beings: Turkey, 2002; Global Survival Network, 1997), but these policies do not seem to stop the exploitation and violence of working-class women who either migrate “officially” or through trafficking. The sale of women’s labour and women’s bodies seem to become inseparable in regular and irregular migration.

The EU is moving to design a comprehensive policy on human trafficking so that it can allow trafficked women to have public recourse. Many theorists and policy makers argue that when these laws and judicial process are implemented in the EU, it will be possible to reduce human trafficking (Ucarer, 1999; Democratic Women’s Movement, Greece; Women Against Violence, Europe, Austria; Research Centre of Women’s Affairs, Athens; Emke-Papadopoulou, 2001). Regulating migration, and with it human trafficking, may prevent some traffickers from circulating in the market. However, it may also generate alliances with policy officers and other administrators to negotiate the terms under which women and children become trafficked. In focusing only on irregular migration (e.g. processes of trafficking as being illegal) may prevent us from seeing that there is a relationship between regular and irregular migration. On many occasions the men who traffic women may access the state and gain the legal permits to enable the women to work in the country of destination. This relation of power is frequently made invisible. Simultaneously, this arbitrary dichotomy becomes a fundamental process in retaining the founding myth of capitalism and its political system of liberal democracy: that the “owner of money” and the female working-class labourer enter the market on equal footing in the eyes of the law, and, therefore, the regulation of migration will succeed in managing abuses in capitalism, such as human trafficking, and within it the high rate of abuse and violence against women and children. Of course, a crucial question that does not get asked is the following: what if “formal” capital relations depend and were always dependent on technologies such as **trafficking**?¹⁰

Sex and domestic workers in Cyprus are drawn mostly from Eastern Europe, such as Russia, Rumania, and Albania, plus the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and mainland Turkey. In the ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’ these women workers constitute one among several groups entering the northern part of the country. Most of them are associated with prostitution and the state has special regulations that govern their entry into the country (Scott, 1995, p. 387). Some travel to Turkey to engage in prostitution, and from there, travel to the ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’. The women who come to Cyprus depend on their employer to deal with entry visa requirements and health and blood tests. As work permits and the employer rather than the employee agrees upon permissions, a change of employment requires permission from the state through the new employer. If women are brought to the country as a group, some formalities are

waived (e.g. health exams). In the ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’, if a woman is travelling alone to find a job, she must produce a visa and health certificates upon embarking on a plane from Istanbul to Kyrenia. The Republic of Cyprus and the Philippines, for instance, work with each other and design laws to cover cheap wage labour import and export. These laws facilitate the transfer of female labour to Cyprus and into those homes and businesses that can afford it through the issuance of visas, training lessons about domestic work, and the production of ideologies about a “sexy”, “economically heroic”, “efficient” and productive labour force.

In Greece the migration of domestic and sex workers began in the late 1970s (Kontis, 2000; Cavounidis, 2002; Droukas, 1998; Demetriou, 2000; Karasavoglou et al., 1998; Lazos, 1997; Katsoridas, 1994; Lazaridis, 1995; Ventura, 1993; Zographos, 1991). As part of a larger migration phenomenon in Southern and South-eastern Europe, many people migrated from places nearby such as Albania, Bulgaria, Poland, Rumania, Russia, the Ukraine, Moldavia, and Georgia. Many others arrived from the Philippines, Ethiopia, Pakistan, and India (Kethi, Human Resources Information, 2002; Ministry of National Economy, 1998, 1999). The migrant population of Greece is primarily from twenty different countries (including Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Pakistan, the Ukraine, Poland, Syria, Moldavia, Egypt, India, Georgia and Russia).

Against the backdrop of the political contestations swirling around its quest for full membership in the EU, Turkey actively participates in the importing of reproductive labour as well. Similarly to Cyprus and Greece, gender and race play a crucial role in the division of labour within Turkey. The new migration flows in Turkey exhibit dramatically different patterns (Erder and Kaska, 2003; Gülçür and Ilkcaracan, 2002; Narli, 2002, p. 2; Guncikan, 1995). Some of the new migrants, both males and females, participate in the “suitcase industry” (ibid., 1995; interviews with sex and domestic workers). They enter Turkey carrying suitcases that contain small commodities and plastic bags from their country of origin so that they can sell and buy goods to take back to their home countries (Gülçür and Ilkcaracan, 2002, p. 3 citing Morokvasic and de Tinguy, 1993; Narli, 2002). Most migrants who participate in this industry are Russians, Ukrainians, Bosnians, Bulgarians, Romanians, Tunisians, and Algerians. A lot of women, who participate in the “suitcase industry”, simultaneously work in the sex industry to “supplement their incomes” (IMO, 2003; Gülçür and Ilkcaracan, 2002, p. 3 citing Beller-Hann, 1995; interviews with women in the sex industry). Women from Russia, the Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldavia work as sex workers, bar girls, and dancers. Women from Moldova and Azerbaijan are now replacing many of the young women from the Philippines who worked as domestic workers (Narli, 2002; Interviews with female Turkish employers in Istanbul, 2000).

The changes in the migration patterns and processes which contribute toward the further fulfilment of the historical tendencies of these sites as peripheries are a result of restructurings of the corporate, state relations, other socio-economic and political reorganisations, and sexual, racial, and class relations. The capital's move to locate, commodify and exploit cheap labour wherever it can be found pushes it to create markets and achieve competitive rates through the cheapest available labour internationally. What do the migration policies and employment contracts embody and constitute simultaneously?

All three states' migration policies and employment contracts are tools that inform reproductive labour and relations with employers. In this way, domesticity, intimacy relations, corporealities, and the imperial market – the four spheres/zones “vaunted by middle-class subjects” in these three countries as distinct from each other – “converge in a single commodity spectacle” (McClintock, 1995, p. 32). The contract of the state provides the middle class subject, male and female, a privileged vantage point onto the “global realm” of exchange (ibid.) and his/her interests are prioritised while simultaneously the reproductive labour's basic social rights are marginalised and often violated. Within these contracts imperialism is figured as coming into place through domesticity (clean households and caring of children and elderly through the labour of black women), and sexual intimacies in the cabaret, hotels, and other sites with “white but not quite” bodies and sexual orifices – the site of prostitution. Indeed, reproductive labour presents itself either through domestic spaces and social relations of power, or through sites of prostitution and pleasure “paradigm ... for natural forms” (ibid., p. 34). Within these relations the “labour of changing history” disappears (ibid., p. 40) and within it the marginalisation, the production relations and the disposing of bodies become invisible. For reasons of brevity two examples will be drawn from the work contracts to show how these relations of asymmetrical power relations become constituted together with the effects on “white but not quite” and “black” bodies.

Producing Desire Industries and Peripheries

The (Dis)appearance of Reproductive Labour via Contractual “Equality”

As women migrate for work in Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey, much of the work they do comes to be articulated by these states as a commodity. A commodity here refers to a social relation in that the value of one's labour and personhood is gauged solely by the use value of that labour by those who pay for her services. For example, the Greek Cypriot state's laws (Aliens and Immigration Law 2910/2001, Greece) structure the relationship between employer and employee, and as a tool sets forth who has what “rights” within the national boundaries of Cyprus. The Ministry of Interior Civil Registration and Migration contract states:

“The employer shall pay to the employee as remuneration for her services a fixed annual salary of _____ Cyprus Pounds payable in (12) equal monthly payments of _____ each on the last day of each consecutive month.”

This document by itself does not seem different from any other employment contract. However, upon closer examination, the role of the state in facilitating the flow of the female migrant reproductive wage labour as well as its enforcement of the interests of the owning class becomes apparent in this contract. This contract is a tool for guiding/mystifying the social reproduction of classed subjects within the borders of the state. The state mediates the relation between the worker and the employer by presenting the labourer (from lower-income generating peripheral economies) and the employer (from higher-generating income peripheral economies) as equal because they are both “owners of commodities” (Marx and Engels, 1976)” (cited in Agathangelou, 2004, p. 46). A notion of a free exchange of wages for labour power is fraudulent. Not only does it obfuscate the exploitative racialised and gendered relation between the domestic worker and her employer, it also renders invisible the fact that these services are specifically “domesticated,” sexualised, and racialised (the Sri-Lankan, the Filipina housemaid for the Greek and Turkish subject, the Sri-Lankan, the Filipina home help for the Greek and Turkish subject, and the Eastern European artist who services the Greek and Turkish subject) compensated by cheap wages (Agathangelou, 2004, p. 47). The state’s involvement in the mediation of capital and labour ensures that the production of sex and domestic labour takes its historical trajectory through a series of violent episodes: it is feminised, it is devalued as reproductive labour, it is even removed in the process of constituting the category of universal labour, it is racialised as not the universal race (e.g. whiteness):

“[[I]t is the positing of reproduction as non-value that enables both production and reproduction to function as the production of value. In the continuously aggressive expansion of capital accumulation through increased expropriation of surplus labour, ‘feminisation’ names the drive towards the increased devaluation of the worker’s necessary labour towards non-value, that is, the tendency of labour towards reproductive labour ‘which appear(s) to have had all value stripped from them by capital.’ This condition is ‘feminine’ in as much as it is created by work which is gendered as female, that is, work which is viewed as a ‘natural force of social labour’ engaged in the reproduction of labour power ... As Fortunati shows, which such work creates value for capital, this value remains hidden, incorporated as it were within the forms of masculine labour power which are visibly expropriated by capital ... The operations which enable the disappearance of the value created by ‘reproductive’ work and its hidden expropriation by capital are repeated in the symbolic construction of the concept of universal labour” (Tadiar, 1998, p. 939).

Masculine and class power of labour come to be produced through the exploitation but also the devaluation of women's labour as well as their exploitation of their use value. These actions are a series of violent episodes fundamental to the visible expropriations of capital. It is through these that the production of bourgeois hegemony and subjects are ensured (Razack, 1998, pp. 355-356). These commodified relations between employee and employer are further managed by the state through the following clause of the employment contract that enables the middle and upper class Cypriot woman to both produce herself as a putative manager of the bourgeois heterosexual family and manager of the relationship between herself and her employee:

"The Employer shall employ the Employee and the Employee shall work exclusively for the Employer as nanny/governess/housemaid/home help (strike out what is not applicable) at her residence situate at ... The term of the employment in Cyprus shall not in any way exceed the period of two years ... The employer shall deposit with the Migration Department of Cyprus a bank Guarantee of 500 pounds [about 1,000 dollars] as security for travel expenses of possible repatriation of the Employee" (Immigration Office, 2002, Republic of Cyprus, Contract of Employment).

Through these contracts the state mediates the relation of the employer with the employee by regulating it. Moreover, the state through its process of mediation of relations between capital and wage labour comes to play a significant role in reducing the costs of social reproduction because the state does not have to be responsible for the development and well being of the worker. On the contrary, the state, as the defender of multinational and corporate profits, pushes to privatise social relations such as social responsibility and social reproduction. This cost is passed to the state where the wage labourer originates. The employer must deposit about 1,000 dollars with the state in case the employee (always female from lower-generating income peripheral economies) dies or is fired, and, resources are required for repatriation. Even when this amount of money is deposited, the value that the worker produces for the family is much higher than the deposit and the wages. Indeed, the worker, depending whether she is a sex or domestic worker, enables the production of subjects through her labour (including household care and affective labour) and the active sexual relations that she may have with her clients and impresarios.

In addition, the state mediates the control and discipline of the women's lives and also use of time. Employees are tied to their employers and are expected to perform their duties according to their employers' requirement.

"The employee shall not be allowed to change Employer and place of employment during the validity of this contract in his Temporary

Residence/Work Permit ... shall work 6 days per week, for 7 hours per day, either during the day or the night and shall perform his duties or any other duties relevant to his employment according to the requirements of the Employer ... and contribute to the utmost of his abilities in promoting the interests of the Employer, protect his property from loss, damage etc ... shall obey and comply with all orders and instructions of the Employer and faithfully observe the rules, regulations and arrangements for the time being in force for the protection of the Employer's property and in general the good execution of work ... shall produce work of the highest standards and in no way inferior in quality and quantity to the work produced by skilled or unskilled workers of the same specialisation/occupation in Cyprus" (Cited in Agathangelou, 2004, p. 48: Republic of Cyprus, Contract of Employment).

These property contracts and policies put in place a map of how the employment relationship is expected to unfold. They outline extensively the duties and responsibilities of the employee as well as the exclusive expectations towards the employer. Furthermore, this document not only indicates the state's securing of the interests of its middle and upper class citizens but also outlines what needs to be protected (e.g. property and reputation) by the employees. Thus, the employees are more than workers; they turn into the guardians ensuring the protection of the private property and the reputation of the Cypriot employers. Additionally, the employees are expected to become more and more flexible labourers. They have to follow particular rules if they are to be considered legitimate objects of desire (temporary, healthy, non-contagious). The reproductive labour (i.e. Sri Lankan, Myanmaran, and Filipina) as temporary, flexible, and, in some ways, the "property" of her bourgeois "white but not quite" (Greek Cypriot) employer can be here understood as mediated through this contract and toward the realisation of an historical tendency. The production of the desire industries, the participation of different peripheral states, the participation of women is "predicated on this tendency and it is the effect of these intertwined logics" (Tadiar, 1998, p. 935) that enables the different productions: whole regions (e.g. the Mediterranean) turning into peripheries of multinational corporations and capital, states into peripheries, desire economies, sexual orifices, "unfree" racialised and sexualised workers, etc. The employee's labour power is a commodity, and the person herself becomes a commodity and an object of desire for the peripheral economy and the employer. Indeed, the state turns into a commodity and a periphery in the global economy through its participation in the desire industries and its dependence on trafficking as a technology and operation of transference of cheap reproductive labour. This contract outlines a few major "neo/liberal" principles that come to be embodied by the state, the migrant wage labourer, the employer, and the spatialities of power:

- (1) the role the state chooses to play in the mediation of the relation between capital and female migrant wage labour;

- (2) its role in processing the cost of social reproduction;
- (3) the “agency” and “freedom” of the employer and the worker; and
- (4) the spaces and bodies where “violence can happen with impunity” (Razack, 1998, p. 358).

The contract is signed both by the employer and employee as a stamp of the power of capital.

This neo-liberal democratic labour law/contract does not necessarily precipitate a relationship of violence. However, in many instances this contract becomes a tool that justifies the various forms of violence that trafficked women have experienced. The employer possesses the political rights and agency, whereas the female migrant working-class Sri Lankan, Filipina, or Myanmaran is not defined as a citizen and, thus, does not possess the right to approach the state to hold her employer accountable or even involve herself in political organising.

The contract moves beyond the exchange to outlining that the employee is also responsible for securing the material interests of the employer. Yet, the severity of the contract does not seem to deter female migrants from migrating to Cyprus for dependent employment and even being paid by the hour in homes/cabarets/taverns/clubs (Interviews with domestic workers in Nicosia, Limassol and Larnaca in Cyprus, 2002). Despite claims that the worker is “equal” and “free” to choose her own conditions of labour, it becomes apparent through this contract that the owning and middle class employer who works to ensure the command of her labour seems to have the power and the freedom to do as s/he chooses depending on the situation. S/he has the power to terminate employment of the employee on the spot and without explanation. Even when an immigrant woman possesses the opportunity to become an economic actor in the transnational service economy and society, she still cannot command her own labour. She provides her labour/services to her employer, but according to global capital she is not a political agent who can challenge the violence she faces daily since she lacks citizenship and, therefore, the full rights of the social contract (Mills, 1997; Pateman, 1988).

“Domestication” of Reproductive Labour and Bodies through Contractual Exploitation

A recent bill for immigration policy in Greece (Baldwin-Edwards, 1998, 2002) locates domestic and sex workers’ reproductive labour and bodies in spaces of servitude. The bill’s wording shows the ways in which the state and market mediate the social relations between the Greek subject/employer with the “other” object/employee or wage labourer. Race and sex, for example, are almost always the first sorting mechanisms in reproductive labour services. Female domestic workers are collapsed under the general category of foreigners/Third country

nationals entitled “for the allocation of ‘dependent employment’” (Law 2910/01, Ministry of Labour and Social Security, Greece, Article 19).

In Article 34 we read the following about sex workers: “It might be possible with the decision of the Minister of Interior to define as entertainment centres other places outside the definition provided in the textual provisions.” The employer of “entertainment centres” can request the entrance of particular artists provided that these artists are under the management and control of the employer while working for them. Of course, the “artist-lover” has to prove to the state that he basically owns the money to initiate and expropriate the labour of the sex worker. Some of the requirements are that he “possesses four times more income from that of his unskilled [artist] worker”; “has supporting documents in which he states that he possesses no criminal record in the past five years and that as an employer he possesses a shop with at least 50 seats and that he employs no more than 20 foreigners”; “possesses a certificate from the general hospital of the artist’s country of origin” stating that the artist has no “sickness that can constitute a risk for the public health in conjunction with the conditions set in WHO” (paragraph 2); “has a bank guarantee note that covers the expenses of (re)promotion (epanaproothisi) or deportation expenses to the country of origin (paragraph 2)” (Agathangelou, 2004, p. 50). Similarly, to the domestic worker contract this bill, paragraph 4 of Article 34 states that the artist is “given a permit of six months that she cannot renew. A change of employer or employment is not allowed.” Once the sex worker is in the country she is faced with the possibility of her “non-value” as a citizen without human rights. The contract frequently becomes a tool of disciplining the movement of women as well as basically violating their basic human rights of existence. Sex workers who were interviewed regarding their work related the following about their bodies and the understandings of their employers of them:

“I am from Belarus. My impresario knew my boss in Greece and sent me to him. The Greek impresario picked me up at the airport. He took me to his house telling me that I had to stay over at his place till the next day when my employer will be ready to meet me at his nightclub. He offered me several drinks and then wanted to sleep with me by telling me: ‘Before I sell you to _____ I want to try you out ... I am your first and foremost boss in this fucking country’” (ibid., p. 80).

The bodies of trafficked women are not merely acknowledged as commodities for sale but are also expected to become the property of the impresario who sells these bodies to different bars, cabarets, and hotels. The male desire for a guaranteed relation to his commodity, securing as it does male property and power, is regularly contradicting the state contract of “equal exchange.” On the contrary, what this moment highlights is that women are always there through sale and non-sale to fulfil their natural reproductive teleological role in the assertion of male heterosexuality

and heteronormativity.¹¹ Thus, the female and racialised body is first and foremost for the pleasure and the (re)production of the male as powerful and property owner of women's bodies and labour. The productive labour of sex and domestic workers becomes subsumed as 'reproductive' labour without value.

Many women head to Greece to work as dancers or waitresses, but, on arrival, they meet an expectation to perform sexual services as part of their job as artists, a euphemism for prostitutes. Other political and social forces affect the commodification of women's labour power and bodies within Greece. For example, the import of sex workers takes place in a country where prostitution is legal and is seen by citizens as a "necessary evil" serving a "necessary function."

The political practices and policies of the state (Kandaraki, 1997 cited in Lazaridis, 2001, p. 96) run parallel to the proclivities of public clientele: their approach to sex workers reflects the same assumption of necessity (Magganas, 1994). When men and women were asked to explain the reasons behind the increased levels of prostitution (Interviews with Greeks in Cyprus and Athens, 2001), they expressed views similar to those found by Kandaraki. Greek men and women seem to assume that men's sexual drives are "natural" (Loizos and Papataxiarchis, 1991, p. 222). Loizos and Papataxiarchis identify two forms of constituted male heterosexuality, one that argues that men have sex to produce the next generation and another in which men's natural sexual desires are informed by kefi. Kefi is "a state of pleasure wherein men transcend the pettiness of a life of calculation" (ibid., p. 17) or "the spirit of desire that derives from the heart" (ibid., p. 226). "Such desire is spontaneous, ephemeral and individualistic" (Lazaridis, 2001, p. 76) and women who participate in fulfilling these desires are condemned as "women of the road" (Magganas, 1994).

The state intervenes to mediate this relation in such a way that it obfuscates the class/gendered/racialised relations between those who are "white but not quite" and "black" working class women whose labour power is expropriated and commodified and those "white but not quite" subjects within the new emerging transnational owning class who command not only the labour power but also the whole person, by exploiting and using different methods of violence such as name calling, beating, sexual assault, and rape. Reproductive labour (both domestic and sexual) is defined by naturalist notions (e.g. kefi, or protection of one's employer's property) camouflaging the mediations, activities, and processes through which such relations participate in realising the historical tendencies as outlined by capital. These politics, which focus on the imaginary of a heterosexually married, two-parent family as the norm, displace and marginalise households that do not fit such a model. This model ends up centralising the social reproduction of the Greek and Turkish bourgeoisie in Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey who are able to access high-

income levels, cheap labour and expensive living space. The female migrant worker as well as the local working class ends up accessing lower wages as well as becoming ghettoised within these peripheral economic states' borders and spaces. The working class, migrant and local, is relegated to the margins by the state and those entrepreneurs who hire their labour. This spatial moral ordering premised on the idea of consent of liberal democratic states makes possible the further domination of the working class and more specifically the sex and domestic workers. Sherene Razack brilliantly articulates how the marginalisation of and the violence against the prostitute secures property and home for men:

“Actual spaces express relations of domination-relations mapped as degrees of belonging to the nation state ... the idea of how much we can care. We care less about the bodies in degenerate spaces and often define out of existence the violence enacted on those bodies. The spatial system of moral ordering is enabled by the notion in liberal democratic states that we are all free individuals entitled to pursue our own interests. The idea of consent as it operates in prostitution bolsters the hierarchy of bodies and spaces. Further, the consent framework effectively dissolves a consideration of the production of spaces. We do not ask what the spaces of prostitution enable or what happens in them. There are simply designated bodies and spaces where so called contractual violence can happen with impunity” (1998, p. 358).

These “designated bodies and spaces” as the different contracts mediate become the sites where “so called contractual violence can happen with impunity.” What is also important is to recognise that the restructuring of spaces (e.g. cabarets) fall within those spaces that Razack names as the degenerate spaces. But the households in which domestic employees work can also become degenerate spaces where violence happens with impunity. The contractual relations between women and employers basically sanction violence in such a way that allows the creation of higher employment rates for the upper and upper middle classes and lower wages, higher stress and levels of violence, including the “use” of bodies and labour for the female migrants and the local working class. Simultaneously, these practices make possible the heterosexual white bourgeoisie production of masculinity and femininity as well as the securing of property, the surplus-value of the labour from the working class and provide the rights to them to treat sex and domestic workers' bodies as zones that can be punished and violated (*ibid.*, p. 358). Moreover, the labour comes to be produced as “white but not quite” and “black” female worker, that is, their life activity appears as a “means to life” (Marx and Engels, 1988, p. 76). The female worker is thus both estranged from her life-activity and from those she works for. This social reproduction of asymmetrical racialised, gender, and class identities is constituted through the social practices (e.g. valorisation and commodification of social reproduction, buying one's labour, signing an employment contract) within an international division of labour. Those

states that participate in their own feminisation through their participation in the desire industries rather than the “formal” economies (i.e. corporations of financial investments; corporations which produce industrial technologies) facilitate an asymmetrical social reproduction, through its mediation and support of the sale and purchase of reproductive labour and its exploitation. The upper and middle class of Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey is constituted as “white but not quite” (economically powerful but not as powerful as their EU core country counterparts) through the labour of women of colour (or black) and “white but not quite” sex workers.¹²

All three peripheral economies and the state mediate the sale and purchases of the reproductive labour of migrant women and in the process encourage prospective employers to specify racial and other social characteristics/contradictions for the reproductive labour and the bodies they wish to buy. This “mediation” supports a particular kind of economic exchange of reproductive labour. However, a different picture unfolds when we take a closer look at the state’s intervention and the people who sell or buy these services and their bodies.

As Marianne and Galena said in an interview:

“When we leave here [Turkey] to go back to Russia and Moldavia we want to be able to sit in our homes with our daughters and mothers and drink our vodka without any impresarios around sucking your blood” [they both laugh].

“Sucking your blood” is a reference to the exploitation that they experience in the desire industries, and yet, their knowing that a structure of exploitative relations exists does not stop them from migrating to make quick cash or from selling their bodies or reproductive labour “as a strategy of subsistence survival” (Ebert, 2001, p. 14). Moreover, knowing this episteme of capital does not stop them from fantasising about or desiring a different life full of pleasure. The root condition of this neoliberal capitalist structure is based on buying and selling women’s reproductive labour as a commodity to produce profit. The “blood sucking” that reproduces the neoliberal imperium happens in conjunction with restructurings of the state and its contingent epistememes of “security”.

Securitisation of Consent and “Freedom”: Traversing an Imperial Geography and Concealing Exploitation

The purchase and sale of reproductive labour did not begin with Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey. It is a dynamic, transnational process. The structural, forced migration of women for reproductive labour began with slave labour that took place from the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries (Anderson, 2000, p. 129; Glenn, 1992). The labour of what comes to be constituted as black and indigenous peoples was exploited, that is, forcefully appropriated by what came to be known as the owning-class (e.g.

theft of the land of indigenous populations; theft of bodies, i.e. slavery; theft of labour) or through the purchase of people's labour. Despite the fact that slavery is illegal under bourgeois democracy (Marx, 1990) so that the fraudulent notion of free exchanges of wage for labour is made invisible, today the sale and purchase of reproductive labour is done "legally" but forcefully as part of licit and illicit exchanges. Though the organisation of the desire industries and the trafficking trade is not the same as the slave system in the antebellum South, this trade still draws on the epistemologies and practices of colonisation (i.e. "primitive accumulation"), exploitation and racism in its everyday constitution and reproduction (Agathangelou, 2004, p. 124). As Anderson (2000, p. 128) argues, "the distinction, if one wishes to make it, can be extremely complicated, but perhaps the key point to make is that the slavery and wage labour ("wage slavery") are not diametrically opposed" when looking at the ways the trafficking of women and children is organised. This seemingly free relation between the employer and labour is guided by compulsion. The legal blocks against slavery have not ended (Farley, 2005). Both sex and domestic workers become reproduced as feminised, non-producers of value within the historical trajectories of capital. Legalistic notions that sex trafficking and other kinds of trafficking are illegal in the EU and in the peripheries of Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey serve to mystify that sexual slavery is an integral part of the formation of the projects of neoliberalism and bourgeois democracy (Conference on Trafficking in Human Beings, International Women Lawyers Federation, Istanbul 2001; Europe Against Trafficking, OSCE Report, October 2001; Erginsoy, 2000). Those states which, historically have been marginal to European and US capital, due to histories of colonisation and imperialism, come to be constituted as peripheral states in the contemporary moment through processes of desire and force. These peripheral states facilitate and manage potential "crises" of imperialist capitalism and play a crucial role in sustaining structural and other social insecurities. These states conceal them by drawing upon the epistemic imperial political frameworks that end up making the working-class and, more specifically, female migrant workers, the scapegoat.

"A majority of individuals, who have financial gains from the ... Natasha Activities show these women as married on paper and make them Turkish citizens. If no measures are taken, the number of people who have acquired Turkish citizenship in this way will increase to hundreds of thousands. This situation will become an important security issue for Turkey ... It will also be an important threat factor in terms of the effect it will have on our human resources ... Most of these women are university graduates and they provide the intelligence units of their countries with intelligence on various issues. It has been established that the intelligence units interrogate some of these women for days after they return to their countries. The state officials, who have been involved in the Natasha activities and who are [in] important positions, may leak extremely important information regarding the general security of the state, to these women. It has been established that some of

these officials have illegal relationships with these women. It is known that the important strategic natural sources and the human structure [of Turkey] are being examined with this method”
[<http://www.cdi.org/russia/johnson/6064-11.cfm>].

In the above newspaper text, the episteme of capital and masculinisation (that is, authority of particular subjects; devaluation and hidden expropriation of labour and its value) is prioritised. The text argues that women have “ways” of drawing out crucial information from officials about national security that may compromise the sovereignty of the state (Agathangelou, 2004, p. 126). On centralising the security of the state, this text participates in silencing the racialised/sexualised class struggles ensuing, the state’s collusion with the multibillion dollar industries of desire, trafficking, and smuggling to ensure their profitable operation while also infantilising the men as being used by women, while expropriating their surplus value. Even when the text emphasises the agency of the state officials, this text also characterises women as potential threats to state security and “exploiters” of the Turkish economy. The focus on the Russian woman and its relation to the Turkish official makes invisible the structural racialised and gendered relation of what comes to be produced as “black” labour and “white but not quite” capital as well as the state and other terrors that migrants face daily. Most of these reports in the media regime are informed by reports produced by the state (Natasha Activity Report and the Interior Ministry) and play an active role in both making invisible the violence (including the exploitation) that women experience as well as produce them as threats to its sovereignty. The considerable insecurity that the female working-class migrants and children embody is rendered unimportant and invisible. These are major strategies of terror that contain popular discontent and contribute toward disarticulating mass organising (Petras, 1987, p. 103; and Pigem, 2003).

Globalisation as a process engenders new forms of transnational marketisation for cheap wage-labour and trafficking of humans to serve others and new cooperative/domination relations among different states. The licit and forced movement of people is constantly articulated as a national security threat “as Turkish citizens, we live in an uncomfortable area. We have to consider the internal security of our country. All of our regulations respond to the logic of stabilising the security of our country” (Frelick, 1997, p. 47). These, though, are epistemological tools and modes of governmentability that new emerging transnational institutions as well as states use to affirm their role as providers of protection and security and to mystify anxieties about their structural economic precariousness in international relations of labour and capital within world economy and conceal the violence exerted on migrants from private powers. As Bigo (2002, p. 70) argues:

“The ‘will to mastery’ on the part of the politicians has only one effect but an important one. They change the status and say (at the national – or, in the

contemporary European context, Schengen – borders), declaring legal and illegal the arrival and they stay in the country, but they know that a person who wants to enter will succeed anyway. Thus, in an illegal situation, the immigrant becomes, for the politician ... the personal enemy. Politicians see themselves as insulted by the incapacity to enforce the integrity of the national body they represent. The 'migrant' is seen as both a public enemy breaking the law and a private enemy mocking the will of the politician."

A synecdochal move by the state and its agents to identify the migrant as their public and private enemy activates epistemologies that link migration and security. This linkage blurs the methods and categories such as sovereignty and security that are associated with a "particular way of governing – that of the so-called Westphalian state and its modern ... variations" (ibid., p. 68). These approaches obscure unresolved structural questions such as exploitation, poverty, unemployment, and urbanism and converge in a space that lacks political solutions. Moreover, these activations make invisible just what they are in response to (e.g. in Greece for instance, the migrant and the student movement has been challenging the restructurings of the state). Such epistemological punctuations enable the articulation and implementation of particular practices of exploitation and violence:

"This is not your job. It is closing your eyes, surviving, and if you finish your "ambassadorship to Turkey" with some money in your pocket, you are in good shape ... you know cabaret is only for sex and prostitution and, of course, I can't ever say anything negative about the Russian, the Moldavian, or any other impresarios even when they steal your money and do not do anything for you ... and you know the reasons behind this silence" (Elena, Russian sex worker in Turkey).

Within Elena's words we hear an epistemological contestation of aspects of the neoliberal imperium: the earning of some money through one's "ambassadorship in Turkey" does not come for "free." It comes through "closing your eyes" and "surviving" the many forms of violence and incessant fears that come with such earning, including the different impresarios who may be considered nationally connected to Elena. As a representative of Russia, Elena arrives in Turkey precisely in the name of ensuring the earning of some money. The class politics that are embedded in that conceptualisation expose the many ways that the state enables one class's possibility through migration (e.g. ambassadors to other countries either as political figures or sex workers). This epistemology speaks of the ontological mediations: the "white but not quite" Russian woman participates through her sexual services toward the production of the "white but not quite" Turkish man which indeed would allow her to constitute herself as Russian, always sexual object (i.e. with sexual orifices of seduction). This epistemological articulation speaks to the violence embedded in these social relations as well as the cultures of terror that are

central to the formation and continuation of the desire industries. More specifically, these epistemologies expose the many strategies that migrant and/or trafficked women, the impresarios, the state, work with to sustain in place a regime of “wage slavery” which in turn, results in supporting the further feminisation of aspects of the economy of the peripheral economic state (Gülçür and Ilkcaracan, 2002).

By Way of Conclusion: Disrupting Neoliberal Formations and Articulating “Other” Social Relations

The new neoliberal projects push on turning women’s, children’s, and working class’ bodies into borders and war zones. Yet, daily these same peoples disrupt these demands, albeit contradictorily, and imagine and draw on such borders and war zones as their sites of political intervention and change. How are feminists and other radical theorists disrupting these compulsive and seductive pushes of “brutal solidarities” between “blacks” and “whites”, between capital and states, between peoples at the margins and peoples in the centres? In recognising that wars, racisms, sexism and other kinds of violence are methods and approaches of shackling more people in the prisons of capital and its agents, radical feminists and other organic intellectuals are reminded that autopsies of nation-states, families, communities and migrant bodies would read dirt and the blood of women, children, peoples of colour, and the working class. As an intervention and a strategy of solidarity with the working class, the working class of migrant women, the children; those dying daily on the front lines to secure the interests of the middle and upper classes, this piece acts to disrupt aspects of such violence. It is a contribution to those who daily redirect their energies toward cementing movements of solidarity and change rather than metamorphosing war zones and borders of violence. We, as intellectuals need to ask: How is knowledge produced about the migration of reproductive labour in peripheral economies toward the production of the desire industries? “Who are ‘we’ that this question of trafficking becomes a question for us?”; “How has the ‘we’ been constructed in relation to this question?”; “How does the epistemological question itself become possible?” (Interview with Butler, 1998.) Why is it produced this way and what are the implications materially and socio-ontologically of such knowledge production? And what are the political stakes in these productions?

In raising these questions about productions of knowledge and insecurity, a crucial ontological question arises: How can we produce social relations of desire and sex differently? The trafficking of women is not merely about work or violence. It is about the ways that historical trajectories become realised; it is about the role that different technologies, including trafficking, play in securing racial and heterosexual patrimonies and military regimes (i.e. migration offices, police

institutions, prisons) in today's transnational world. Moreover, the trafficking of women for the desire industries becomes a major restructuring tool of peripheral states which collude with the leadership of the neoliberal world order in covering over its contradictions: the promises that it will provide for the majority, and yet, it actively provides maximum access to resources and bodies to a very small minority in the world. By investing in logics and practices that emphasise the equal exchange of labour for cash silences, the fact is rendered invisible that both the production of peripheral economies, and, within them, the peripheral "shadow" economies, depend on turning the working class migrant women and children into war zones and borders. In these relations, those who own the resources expropriate the surplus value of bodies deemed exploitable toward enabling their own possibility of reproduction (that is, the reproduction of their identities and their own communities) as well as property relations and the neoliberal imperium at the expense of less violent and less alienating worlds. When people and states as social relations push to mediate their activities in such a way to draw on labour to produce it as an object, social relations become impoverished. However, such relations are not produced without struggles from the migrant women who are expected to redirect all their resources toward the (re)production of bourgeois subjects "white but not quite" and with risking their own death on a daily basis. Even when extreme measures are taken by the peripheral state to contain and manage conflicts of interest, contradictions, and antagonisms inherent in the racialised sexual and class divisions of labour (Anderson, 2000, p. 1) as well as the larger sexual and economic structures, migrant women are exceeding the logics of capital by making connections with "local" peoples of working class and other peoples interested in movements that articulate non-racist, non-militaristic, exploitation. Women, children, and the working class in these sites are crossing borders daily to create alliances and solidarities which challenge these patrimonies, and by re-entering communities and by re-appropriating their means of production and labour and toward the creation of other worlds and communities less violent and death inducing.

Domestic and sex workers challenge the isolation and the alienating conditions that they face daily. They organise by coming together outside the context of the households which are sites of ongoing exploitation and violence. Many migrant workers in all three countries draw on their wages collectively to rent apartments and use them as spaces within which they come to reflect on their daily lives and the need for alternatives which can dismantle the power relations of exploitation (Agathangelou, 2004), including their intervention in "local" movements even when they are not articulated as political agents. Many of these women are joining different organisations and transnational movements toward the production and realisation of other selves and worlds. Sex, domestic workers, academics, and non-profit organisations join in different collectives and confront the regime of profit

(Greek Helsinki Monitor, Global Change Institute, Reintegration Centre for Migrant Workers, Greece). Working together in solidarity, they build movements, confronting the asymmetries that exist among us based on the positions that we each occupy in the international division of labour. Through such movements, it becomes possible to reorganise power till the asymmetries approach a vanishing point. “The stakes in the struggle to solidarity are different for all of us; however, our entry point into this struggle is informed by a sexual raced division of labour and vision for an alternative world” (Agathangelou, 2004, p. 173). This article is written as an intervention in commandeering the creative, libidinal forces that produce the world in capital’s imagination. This writing attempts to intervene by demonstrating that the creative, socio-subjective practices and activities of women migrants must be viewed from the sites of production, exchange, and the peripheral states where migrant women are declared “marginal,” “white but not quite,” “black,” “feminised”, etc. Both radical feminists who claim the death of patriarchy and Marxist analysts (who claim the primacy of labour) at times naturalise women’s reproductive labour and dominant power relations which use as their contingent strategies mystification, invisibility, appropriation, exploitation, and sexual violence. Seduced by the radicalness of our frameworks, we can end up colluding with capital’s dreams and imaginaries all in the name of freedom and choice. To what end? The working class, “peripheral states”, and academics can disrupt the mythologies of self, freedom and choice, and social crises and redirect their material and symbolic resources toward the constitution of worlds and communities of life.

Notes

1. “Whiteness” here is understood as an ideal signifier but also a process that pushes for organising social relations in certain ways. This process is contingent on historical tendencies; its embodiment changes depending on the spatial and time re-constitutions within which social relations unfold.
2. It is crucial here to note that the production of and the participation by states in the desire industries either through export or import of labour is ‘peripheralising’ the state’s labour, and indeed, its own location in the global economy. This peripheralisation (i.e. feminisation and racialisation of aspects of the socio-economic and political relations of different sites) draws on gender, sexuality and/or race to constitute the general category of “labour” (i.e. the industrial working class proletariat).
3. Tadiar (1998, p. 931) analyses the Philippines in the new global economy and she argues that the bodies of women “are detailed for increasingly specialised and fragmented tasks in the electronics, garments, textiles, and prostitution industries. The subcontracting of production processes hence entails the subcontracting of Filipina body parts and their respective ‘skill’. Such a correlation represents the national body and the individual body as sites for the reception and processing of capital-intensive flows and,

therefore, as effects of the same gendered and gendering, sexualised and sexualising global production processes. This is the perspective one arrives at when one proceeds from the presumption of the privileged, unified detaining agency of capital”.

4. Tadiar (1998) brilliantly articulates that the processes through which the hom(m)o-sexuality regime of relations of production becomes constituted depends on the sublimation of male labour and the alienation of male sexuality as a “female object”. She draws on Marx’s Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 to make the point that “sexual intercourse thus assumes the role of a spontaneous activity, an activity in which the worker regains his self, the loss of which becomes embodied in the woman who occupies the domestic sphere, from he is as labour separated ... Opposed to labour, ‘recreation’ (for example, in military Rest and Recuperation [R&R]) turns sexual activity into aggression: ‘begetting’ is virile, masculinising. Since work is an emasculating activity turned against the male worker, configured as that which does not belong to him, activities defined against work, such as private sexual pleasures, become avenues of aggression” (p. 943).
5. “Social” here refers to our societal relations (e.g. society, structures, and institutions and more specifically, the relations and the processes (i.e. how do we go about organising our daily lives through which such structures, institutions, and regimes become formed and sustained and under what conditions).
6. I define neoliberal imperium here as a set of disjunctive neocolonial processes, social relations worldwide. More specifically, I refer to the West’s (e.g. the US, Western Europe etc.) economic and military power and its technocratic political culture whose contentious surface hides a firm consensus about the supremacy of capital (e.g. property relations and privatisation of social relations).
7. Desire industries refers to those activities that deal primarily with the (re)production of subjects, including their sexual, racial, and corporeal aspects and whose primary economic value is derived from the racialised and sexualised reproductive labour.
8. Harvey has called this process accumulation through dispossession.
9. Here I am following critical theorists of race, who argue that “whiteness” as a process “is a structural privilege” and it “whiteness” as a process is “violence and terror” and denote the historical legacy of colonialism and imperialism (Brander, Rasmussen, Klinenberg, Nexica, and Wray, 2001, pp. 10-12). I would also argue that there are continuities with colonialism but also disjunctures in race relations today. However, understanding them outside colonialism and imperialism is impossible as contemporary benefits based on racial divisions and asymmetries are created based on asymmetrical divisions of labour. Whiteness is not merely about “black” and “white” or just about the colour of one’s skin. It is about a global system of racial relations that ethnicises some (i.e. a more sanitised way of racialisation)/racialises all and locates them asymmetrically with regards to access to resources and production relations by drawing on different codes (e.g. black vs. white).
10. There are other technologies as well such as slavery, reservation structure, and the prison structure (See Agathangelou, Bassichis, and Spira, forthcoming).
11. Homonormativity is another major process in the restructuring of global economies (See Agathangelou, Bassichis, and Spira, forthcoming).

12. "White but not quite" here as a category does not apply "equally" to the sex worker and her employer. It is rather a signifier of power. More so, I am drawing on this category not to constitute a universal category that applies to/and represents subjects equally but rather that such categorisations themselves are mediated in social relations continually and contingently. Within the social relations of reproductive labour "domestic workers" are in many instances understood as "black" bodies due to the relations they have with women that come from Eastern European states who are considered according to capital more legitimated subjects for "sex" due to their whiteness (i.e. more beautiful and more attractive). These categories do not gesture to essential traits of identity even when they are used as such in a synecdochal manner (as an apparatus of power) in the epistemologies of capital to underwrite the historical tendency of certain subjects toward dependence and sexual exploitation. In the movement to undo this tendency of collapsing (i.e. reducing a body as 'colour' of the epidermis of one's skin) bodies with "colour" and identities we must recognise the practices of peripheral states and the desire industries as constitutive of the general marginalisation of international labour relations.

Bibliography

- Agathangelou, A.M. (2002) 'Sexing "Democracy" in International Relations: Migrant Sex and Domestic Workers in Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey' in Chowdhry, G. and Nair, S. (eds.), *Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations: Reading Race, Gender and Class*. New York, Routledge, pp. 142-169.
- — —. (2004) *The Global Political Economy of Sex: Desire, Violence and Insecurity in Mediterranean Nation-States*. London, MacMillan/Palgrave.
- — —. (2005) 'Colonizing Desires: Bodies for Sale, Exploitation and (In) Security in Desire Industries'. Invited Presentation at the Captive Daughters Conference, Chicago, United States, March 2005.
- Agathangelou, A.M. and Kyle, D. Killian (2006) 'Epistemologies of Peace: Poetics, Globalisation, and the Social Justice Movement', *Globalisations*, Vol. 3, No. 4 (December), pp. 459-483.
- Agathangelou, A.M., Bassichis, D. and Spira, T. (forthcoming) 'Intimate Investments: Homonormativity, Global Lockdown, and the Seductions of Empire'.
- Agathangelou, A.M. and Ling, L.H.M. (2003) 'Desire Industries: Sex Trafficking, UN Peacekeeping, and the New World Order', *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Vol. X, No. 1, pp. 133-148.
- Aguilar, D. (2004) 'Questionable Claims: Colonialism Redux' in Aguilar, D.D. and Lacsamana, A.E. (eds.), *Women and Globalisation*. New York, Humanity Books, pp. 404-423.
- Aliens and Immigration Law 2910/2001, Greece.
- Anderson, B. (2000) *Doing the Dirty Work? The Global Politics of Domestic Labour*. London, Zed Books.

- — —. (2004) 'Who Needs Yehudi Menuhin? Costs and Impact of Migration' in Aguilar, D.D. and Lacsamana, A.E. (eds.), *Women and Globalisation..* New York: Humanity Books, pp. 262-277.
- Anthias, F. and Lazaridis, G. (2000) *Gender and Migration in Southern Europe; Women on the Move.* New York, Berg Press.
- Baldwin-Edwards, M. (1998) 'The Greek Regularisation: A Comparative Analysis with the Spanish, Portuguese and Italian Experiences'. University of Reading, Centre for Euro-Mediterranean Studies, Working Paper 98/2, April [<http://www.rdg.ac.uk/EIS/research>], accessed 11 October 2003.
- — —. (2002) 'Immigration and the Welfare State: A European Challenge to American Mythology'. MMO, Working Paper, 4, November [<http://www.antigone.gr/southern>], accessed 11 October 2002. *European Labour Markets and Immigration.*
- Beller-Hann, I. (1995) 'Prostitution and its Effects in North Eastern Turkey', *The European Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 2, pp. 219 – 235.
- Bhattacharjee, A. (1997) 'The Public/Private Mirage: Mapping Homes and Undomesticating Violence Work in the South Asian Immigrant Community' in Alexander, M.J. and Talpade Mohanty, C. (eds.), *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures.* New York/London, Routledge.
- Bigo, D. (2002) 'Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease', *Alternatives*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 63-92.
- Brander, B., Rasmussen, I.J., Klinenberg, E., Nexica, E. and Wray, M. (2001) 'Introduction' in Brander, B., Rasmussen, I.J., Klinenberg, E., Nexica, E. and Wray, M. (eds.), *The Making and Unmaking of Whiteness.* Durham, Duke University Press, pp. 1-24.
- Brenner, J. and Laslett, B. (1989) 'Gender and Social Reproduction: Historical Perspectives', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 15, pp. 381-404.
- Briggs, L.J. (2002) *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and US Imperialism in Puerto Rico.* Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Cavounidis, J. (2002) 'Migration in Southern Europe and the Case of Greece', *International Migration*, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 45-70.
- Costera M.I. and Prins, B. (1998) 'How Bodies Come to Matter: An Interview with Judith Butler', *Signs*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 275-286.
- Cotter, J. (2001) 'Eclipsing Exploitation: Transnational Feminism, Sex Work, and the State', *The Red Critique*, (Spring) [<http://redcritique.org/spring2001/eclipsingexploitation.htm>], accessed 21 October 2006.
- Demetriou, A. (2000) *Strictly Akatallion. Greek: From Omonia to Alkazar.* Athens, Oxi.
- Droukas, E. (1998) 'Albanians in the Greek Informal Economy', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (April), pp. 347-365.
- Ebert, T.L. (1996) *Ludic Feminism and After: Postmodernism, Desire, and Labour in Late Capitalism.* Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- — —. (2001) 'Globalisation, Internationalism, and the Class Politics of Cynical Reason', *Nature, Society, and Thought*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 389-410.
- Emke-Papadopoulou, I. (2001) 'Trafficking in Women and Children: Greece a Country of

- Destination and Transit'. MMO, Working Paper 2, August
[\[http://www.uehr.panteion.gr/data_en/3541.htm\]](http://www.uehr.panteion.gr/data_en/3541.htm), accessed October 2003.
- Enloe, C. (1989) *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- — —. (1993) *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- — —. (2000) *Manoeuvres: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Erder, S. (2000) 'New Tendencies in International Migration: Is Turkey Becoming a Receiving Country?', in Atacan, F., Ercan, F., Kurtulus, H. and Turkey, M. (eds.), *Mubeccel Kiray icin Yazila, Baglam Yayinlari*. Istanbul, Baglam Yayinlari.
- Erder, S. and Kaska, S. (2003) 'Irregular Migration and Trafficking in Women: The Case of Turkey'. IOM International Organisation for Migration.
- Erginsoy, F.G. (2000) 'Female Child Sex Workers in Istanbul Metropolitan Area, Turkey: Gendered and Informal Child Labour in the City'. Paper presented at International Association for Feminist Economics, Bosphorus University, Istanbul, 15-17 August.
- Ergocmen B. and Yuksel, I. (2005) 'Migration and Internally Displaced Persons in Turkey'. Hacettepe University, Institute of Population Studies
[\[http://hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/tyyona/tyyona.htm\]](http://hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/tyyona/tyyona.htm), accessed 21 October 2006.
- Europe against Trafficking, OSCE Report (2001) Conference Report, Berlin Conference 15-16 October [\[http://www.osce.org/publications/odihr/2001/01/14182_290_en.pdf\]](http://www.osce.org/publications/odihr/2001/01/14182_290_en.pdf), accessed 21 October 2006.
- Farley, P.A. (1997) 'The Black Body as Fetish Object', *Oregon Law Review*, Vol. 76, No. 3, pp. 457-535.
- — —. (2005) 'Accumulation' [\[http://teachingfromtheleft.org/downloads/Farley_1.pdf\]](http://teachingfromtheleft.org/downloads/Farley_1.pdf), accessed 21 October 2006.
- Frelick, B. (1997) 'Barriers to Protection: Turkey's Asylum Regulations', *International Journal of Refugee Law*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 8-34.
- Ghosh, B. (1998) *Huddled Masses and Uncertain Shores: Insights into Irregular Migration*. The Hague: IOM: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- — —. (2000) *Managing Migration: Time for a New International Regime?* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Glenn, E.N. (1992) 'From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labour', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Vol. 18 (Spring), pp. 1-43.
- Global Survival Network (1997), A Conference on Trafficking, Moscow, 3-5 November.
- Gülçür, L. and Ilkkaracan, P. (2002) 'The "Natasha" Experience: Migrant Sex Workers from the Former Soviet Union in Turkey' (forthcoming in *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol. 25, No. 4).
- Guncikan, B. (1995) *Bir Kitap: Haraso'dan Natasa'ya* [From Haraso to Natasa]. Istanbul, Arion.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2000) *Empire*. Cambridge/MA, Harvard University Press.

- — —. (2002) *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. London, Hamish Hamilton Book.
- Hughes, D. (2000) 'The "Natasha" Trade: The Transnational Shadow Market of Trafficking in Women', *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 53, No. 2, pp. 625-651.
- — —. (2005a) 'The Demand for Victims of Sex Trafficking', June 2005 [<http://www.uri.edu/artsci/wms/hughes/pubtrfrep.htm>], accessed 15 January 2006.
- — —. (2005b) "'How Can I Be Sold Like This?'" Trafficking of North Korean Women Refugees', *National Review Online*, 19 July [<http://www.uri.edu/artsci/wms/hughes/pubtrfrep.htm>], accessed 15 January 2006.
- Icduygu, A. (2006) 'The Labour Dimensions of Irregular Migration in Turkey'. CARIM: Euro-Mediterranean Consortium for Applied Research on International Migration. Research Report, San Domenico Di Diesole [http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/e-texts/CARIM-RR2006_05_Icduygu.pdf], accessed 12 October 2006.
- Immigration Office (2002) *Contract of Employment*. Nicosia, Republic of Cyprus.
- International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (2006) *A Form of Slavery: Trafficking Women in OSCE Member States*, (June), pp. 21-24.
- International Organisation of Migration (1996) *Trafficking in Women to Austria for Sexual Exploitation*. IOM, Geneva.
- International Organisation of Migration (2001) 'Trafficking In Migrants', No. 23, (April) [http://www.old.iom.int/documents/publication/en/tm_23.pdf], accessed 21 October 2006.
- Interior Ministry Interviews in Cyprus (2000). Nicosia, Cyprus.
- Interviews with domestic workers from Rumania, Bulgaria, and Moldavia (2002). Istanbul.
- Interviews with female Greek employers of domestic workers (2001). Nicosia.
- Interviews with female Turkish employers of domestic workers (2000). Istanbul.
- Irigaray, L. (1985) *This Sex which is Not One*. Translated by C. Porter. Ithaca/NY, Cornell University Press.
- Johnson, C. (2000) *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire*. New York, Henry Holt.
- Johnson, D. (2002) 'Russian Prostitutes Seen to Pose Threat to Turkey's Security, Economy'. Translated by Ersin Ramoglu 'Natashas Being Used by Secret Services' [<http://www.cdi.org/russia/johnson/6064.txt>], accessed 10 October 2003.
- Kaplan, A. (2002) *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of US Culture (Convergences: Inventories of the Present)*. Cambridge, Harvard Press.
- Karasavoglou, A., et. al. (1998) *Foreign Workers in Kavala*. Turkey, School of Social Statistics.
- Katsoridas, K. (1994) 'Foreign Workers in Greece', *Information Bulletin of Labour Institute (INE)*.
- Kempadoo, K. and Doezema, J. (eds.) (1998) *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance, and Redefinition*. New York, Routledge.
- Kethi, Research Centre for Equality (2002) 'Human Resources Information' [<http://www.kethi.gr/greek/meletes/index.htm>], accessed 10 October 2001.

- Kollontai, A. (1977) *Selected Writings of Alexandra Kollontai*. Edited and Translated by A. Holt. New York, Norton.
- Kontis, A. (2000) 'Greece as a Receiving Country of Foreign Migrants', in Kostandinidis, S. and Pelagidis, Th. (eds.), *Greece in the 21st Century*, Athens, Papazisis, pp. 293-324 (in Greek).
- Law 4310 of 1929/Legislation regulating the status of alien immigrants, Greece.
- Lazaridis, G (2001) 'Trafficking and Prostitution: The Growing Exploitation of Migrant Women in Greece', *The European Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 8, pp. 67-102.
- Lazarides, G. and Romaniszyn, K. (1996) 'Albanian and Polish Undocumented Workers in Greece: A Comparative Analysis', *European Social Policy Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 42-56.
- Lazos, G. (1997) *Sexuality as a Value in Modern Greece*. Athens, Delfini.
- . (2002) *Prostitution and International Trafficking in Contemporary Greece*. Athens, Kastaniotis.
- Loizos, P. and Papataxiarchis, E. (1991) *Contested Identities: Gender and Kinship in Modern Greece*. Princeton/New Jersey, Princeton University Press.
- Lukacs, G. (1971) *History and Class Consciousness; Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. Translated by R. Livingstone. Cambridge/Mass, MIT Press.
- Magganas, A. (ed.) (1994) *Ta Ekdidomena Atoma. Pornia: Pareklissi h Paravasi [The Issued Persons: Prostitution: Deviation or Infringement?]*. Athens, Papazisis.
- Marx, K. (1976) *Capital*, Vol. 1. Translated by B. Fowkes. London, Penguin Books.
- . (1986) 'Economic Manuscripts of 1857-58' in Marx, K. and Engel, F.'s *Collected Works*, Vol. 28. Translated by E. Wangermann. New York, International Publishers.
- . (1990) *Capital*, Vol. 1. 1976. London/New York, Penguin.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1976) *The German Ideology*. Moscow, Progress Publishers.
- . (1988) *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. New York, Prometheus Books.
- McClintock, A. (1995) *Imperial Leather [electronic resource]: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Conquest*. New York, Routledge.
- Mediterranean Institute of Gender Studies (2006) 'Mapping the Realities of Trafficking Women in Cyprus' [<http://www.medinstgenderstudies.org/wp/?p=16>], accessed 21 October 2006.
- Mies, M. (1998) *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour*. London/New York, Zed Press.
- Mills, C. (1997) *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Ministry of National Economy (1998). Athens, Greece.
- Ministry of National Economy (1999). Athens, Greece.
- Morokvasic, M. and de Tinguy, A. (1993) 'Between East and West: A New Migratory Space' in Rudolph, H. and Morokvasic, M. (eds.), *Bridging States and Markets: International Migration in the Early 1990s*. Berlin, WZB.

- Nair, S. (2006) 'Hegemony and its Discontents: Migrants, Security and the State in Southeast Asia'. Paper presented at National Sun Yat-Sen University, Taiwan, 2 June.
- Narli, N.A. (2002) Human Smuggling and Migration of Illegal Labour to Turkey. Istanbul, Marmara University.
- Nilüfer, N., Türkmen, A., Ekrem, S. and Çoban, M. (2002) 'Transit Migration and Human Smuggling in Turkey: Preliminary Findings from the Field Work' [<http://www.ucansupurge.org/newhtml/english/links/movementarchive/transitmigration.php>], accessed 10 January 2002.
- Organisation of Development of Human Resources (1998) Athens, Greece.
- Pateman, C. (1988) *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford/California, Stanford University Press.
- Petras, J. (1987) 'Political Economy of State Terror: Chile, El Salvador, and Brazil', *Crime and Social Justice*, No's. 27-28, pp. 88-109.
- Picchio, A. (1992) *Social Reproduction: The Political Economy of the Labour Market*. Great Britain, Cambridge University Press.
- Pigem, J. (2003) 'The Altered Landscape' in *We are Everywhere: The Irresistible Rise of Global Anticapitalism*. Notes from Nowhere (eds.) London/New York, Verso, pp. 408-412.
- Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, Supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (2000) [http://www.uncjin.org/Documents/Conventions/dcatoc/final_documents_2/convention%20traff_eng.pdf], accessed 15 December 2006.
- Razack, S. (1998) 'Race, Space, and Prostitution: The Making of the Bourgeois Subject', *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 338-376.
- — —. (2004) *Dark Threats and White Knights*. Canada, University of Toronto Press.
- — —. (2005) 'Racial Violence and Masculinities of the New World Order: Lessons from Peacekeeping'. Presentation York University, Toronto, Canada, 8 March 2005.
- Rupert, M. (1995) *Producing Hegemony: The Politics of Mass Production and American Global Power*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, J. (1995) 'Sexual and National Boundaries in Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 22 (Fall), pp. 385-403.
- Stoler, A. (1989) 'Making Empire Respectable. 'The Politics of Race and Sexual Morality in Twentieth Century Colonial Cultures', *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 16, pp. 26-51.
- Tadiar, N. (1998) 'Prostituted Filipinas and the Crisis of Philippine Culture', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 927-954.
- Trafficking in human beings in South Eastern Europe (Belgrade, UNICEF, OHCHR and OSCE-ODIHR, June 2002).
- Trafficking Protocol, United Nations Article 13 (2000) Office of the United High Commissioner for Human Rights [<http://www.ohchr.org/english/law/protocoltraffic.htm>], accessed 21 October 2006.
- Turkey Country Report (2002) Country Report on Human Rights Practices. Released by the

- Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labour, US Department of State.
[<http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2002/18396.htm>], accessed 3 January 2003.
- Ucarer, E.M. (1999) 'Trafficking in Women, the European Union, and Nongovernmental Organisations'. Paper presented at the International Studies Association, Washington, DC, 16-20 February.
- Ventura, L. (1993) 'Female Migration: Birth and Development of the Scientific Interest', *Dini*, Vol. 6 (May) (in Greek).
- Women against Violence, Europe, Austria (2005) 'Violence against Women: Good Practices in Combating and Eliminating Violence against Women', 17-20 May, Vienna Austria [<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/egm/vaw-gp-2005/docs/background/wave.paper.pdf>], accessed 21 October 2006.
- World Conference against Racism (2001) 'World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance', Durban, South Africa, 31 August-8 September [<http://www.un.org/WCAR/durban.pdf>], accessed 21 October 2006.
- Zographos, A. (1991) 'I Katastasi ton tritokosmikou ergaton stin Ellada' [The Condition of Third Workers in Greece], *Kinoniki Ergasia*, Vol. 23, pp. 165-184.