

Global Capitalism and Refugee and Migrant Labour

Ranabir Samaddar

Samita Sen

Introduction

Migrant labour has been a feature of global capitalism since the beginning. Capitalism needed labour from colonies, semi-colonies, and other parts of the world. Thus besides Atlantic slavery supplying labour across the ocean there was an increase in the mobility of labour in post-manumission age, when capital became global and global trade became a defining feature of global capitalism. While discussing primitive accumulation Marx wrote that labour was like an army in encampment waiting to move wherever ordered. He also said that much of the capital had no birth-ticket attached to it, and it moved from Great Britain to the United States with traffic of child labour and women's labour across the ocean.

The second half of the nineteenth century was also the great age of plantations – coffee, tea, sugar, rubber, cotton, etc., and massive construction of railway lines and telegraph poles across the globe. It was the beginning of the age of modern mining. While we know the age as the age of nationalism, this was also a distinct age of labour mobility required for plantation, railway lines and telegraph, and mining, and thus the consequent development of the modes of managing and controlling migration. The histories of labour and social governance have brought to us the political significance of migration in the latter half of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century. Since Stephens Castles' and Godula Kosack's joint work on *Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe* (1973) some excellent studies have appeared on labour migration and they indicate a different history of migration. Also, along with the writings on general labour history we have a spate of studies on export of indentured labour, which again enable us to view migration and forced migration in the context of capitalism. Add to these the new crop of historical studies on various aspects of the welfare state and schemes, which suggest a different way of understanding modern governance, where a study of the nation is not at the centre of our political understanding. In its place we have the still largely unwritten history of governing a mobile, unruly world of population flows occupying a much more critical place of significance. These works, some referred to in course of this paper, give us a sense of the hidden histories of conflicts, desperate survivals, and new networks growing as well as old networks being transplanted across great expanse and zones. Studies of hunger in the nineteenth century, of itinerant movements, transportations of coolies, spread of famines, shipping of children, adult girls, trafficking in sex, labour, and human organs, and welfare legislations to cope with this great infamy tell us how actually we have arrived at our own time of subject formation under the conditions of the late twentieth century and early twenty first century neo-liberal empires. This is certainly different from the tradition of nation-centred histories.

Indentured Labour: International Migration in Nineteenth and early Twentieth Century

As an important segment of nineteenth century labour migration, we can refer briefly to indentured labour, particularly from India. In the nineteenth century nearly a million workers left India to labour under indenture in sugar estates in various parts of the colonial world. They were sought as replacements of the newly freed African slave labour and the emphasis was on direct labour input. So

far as planters were concerned, the preference for imported rather than locally settled labour was shaped already by gender. Reproduction was not only irrelevant, its costs also avoidable. Indeed, the circulation of persistently unsettled male indentured workers seemed a better guarantee of docile servitude. Such convictions were short-lived, however. In the 1840s, labour export from India was stopped for three years and then again for four years. Governments of labour importing colonies, beginning with Mauritius, had to come to terms with the uncertainty of continued supply of labour from India. There was a gradual policy shift towards settling Indian labour. With an eye towards maintaining the indenture system, however, the colonies avoided integrating Indian workers within the existing society, but sought instead to create separate communities of Indian workers.

Gender was of central concern in recruitment operations as well as labour deployment in the indentured system. While there were striking commonalities, nevertheless, gender relations developed along very different trajectories in different plantation locations. Indian workers were being sold to sugar plantations in the Australian colonies from the second half of the eighteenth century. In 1815, a batch of Indians convicts was sent to Mauritius for construction work.¹ A more steady flow of emigration began, however, in 1834, immediately after the abolition of slavery. The system of long-term contracts or indentures (ranging between one to five years) was to offset the cost of recruiting and transporting Indian workers and was introduced in 1837.² Soon after this, a batch of workers landed in the Caribbean. The traffic in indentured Indian workers was thus associated closely with the abolition of slavery. The freeing of the slaves, planters argued, left them with inadequate labour to sustain cheap production of sugar, not only because the men could opt out of plantation work but even more because the women were expected to withdraw from field labour. Such arguments did not convince some abolitionists, who bitterly opposed the 'new system of slavery' that the indentured labour system represented. Indeed, the claims of labour shortage were widely contested. There was, however, another powerful argument against the new indentured immigration- it replaced the freedwomen's labour with that of Indian men. The absence of women among labourers from India undermined, it was believed, the family and, therefore, the social order. In the abolitionist rhetoric, disruption of family, domesticity and gender roles had provided a powerful argument against slavery. In the immediate aftermath of slavery, one measure of the success of emancipation was the formation of family units with established gender and generational roles. In this discourse, the instruments of morality- of social order and control- lay in domestication of former slave populations through family and, therefore, marriage. In the Caribbean context, for instance, emancipation was 'celebrated' with 'nearly six thousand marriages'.³ These concerns began to resonate more powerfully as the first trickles of Indian indentured labourers began to swell to larger and larger numbers.

In Mauritius, the project to settle Indian labour was taken early and proved the most successful. South Africa was at the other end of the spectrum, refusing to allow male emigrants to bring in more than one wife and demanding proof of marriage and birth from women and children wishing to join their husbands and fathers in the colony. In the Caribbean, there was a prolonged tussle between planters, who wished only for able-bodied workers, and the colonial governments. In their discussions, the figure of the "Indian woman" came to acquire multiple registers. Gender, far from being marginal, occupied a central place in the processes that created the world of South Asian migrant labour.

There were a number of questions- whether to recruit women for overseas emigration, whether family emigration was to be encouraged or "single" women allowed to migrate, whether women were

to be contracted for compulsory field labour in the overseas plantations, if so, whether for the same period as men- which revolved not only around representations of victimhood and agency, but also crucially around the preoccupation with “free labour”. Indeed, the two nineteenth century preoccupations, free labour, on the one hand, and disciplining family and marriage, on the other, proved highly incompatible in the compass of this global flow of labour. The very process of long-term and long-distance migration unsettled established gender hierarchies. The view of women as free to enter contracts for wage labour disrupted existing modes of control over women’s productive and reproductive labour and sexuality. Any large scale mobilization of individual “single” women was a challenge to a patriarchal system based on the deployment of women’s labour and reproduction exclusively within and through the family-household and the control of their sexuality within marriage. Equally, the notion of women as free agents proved inimical for settlement in the colony.

In the 1830s and 40s there were a number of stops and starts in overseas emigration as lobbyists in England, India and the other colonies tussled over its rights and wrongs. In this period, planters in Mauritius, the chief receiving colony, focused on recruiting working men, including only about ten percent women, ostensibly to be employed in ‘cooking and washing up’.⁴ In both Mauritius and the Caribbean, in the initial years, single male migration rather than family migration was the mainstay of “coolie export”.⁵The problem lay at the demand end. Planters were not concerned with reproduction. To ensure a self-reproducing workforce they would have to incur additional costs of encouraging family migration and financing the migration and maintenance of wives and children. Even if wives were inducted as workers, there would be inevitable ‘financial disabilities due to the financial risks of child-bearing and rearing’.⁶ Rather, they wanted migration to replace workers; settlement and generational reproduction compared unfavourably with the high degree of control exercised over a temporary and unsettled male community of workers, who provided intense labour with hopes of some savings and a return passage. Such a form of labour deployment was, however, too close to conditions of slavery.

In India, outrage against indentured emigration found expression in a series of petitions and public meetings, leading to the formation in 1838 of a Committee headed by T. Dickens. Apart from confirming the existence of gross deceit and misrepresentation in recruitment, the committee’s report raised a new point. It argued that the dependents of single male emigrants suffered want and distress in the absence of the breadwinner.⁷Governments were forced to consider also the problem of the complete absence of “family” in the male world of Indian workers in the receiving colonies. Colonial authorities in the receiving countries, concerned with “social instability”, high crime rates and an epidemic of “wife-murder”, gained the ear of the Home Government in Britain, though not all colonial authorities agreed that adverse sex ratio led to more suicides and murders.

Between 1858 and 1860, emigration increased dramatically with 51,247 workers sailing from Calcutta.⁸ In 1868, after several abortive policy initiatives, the Government of India statutorily fixed a minimum of 40 women to every 100 men per shipment.⁹ Mauritius had already moved from labour migration to a colonisation programme in the early 1840s, encouraging family migration and providing free passage to wives and children who wished to join male migrants. In the 1860s, the proportion of women varied between 40 to 45 per cent of total emigration. Since it had a more balanced sex ratio, Mauritius was allowed 33 women for every 100 men. By 1880s, a considerable Indian population had settled in Mauritius and the planters responded to the sugar crisis by seeking to cut down on

importation of women.¹⁰ The Caribbean planters first exhibited some interest in women immigrants when it seemed as though labour migration from India may be stopped altogether.¹¹ The balance between preference for short-term adult male immigrants and the long-term advantages of a self-reproducing workforce gradually began to change.¹² It was the sugar crisis of the 1880s, however, which underlined the importance of family labour. When lower wages and shorter indentures failed to solve their problems, they began to encourage cane farming in small family holdings.¹³ From 1852 to 1866, the Mauritius government paid a bonus of a pound for every woman brought into the colony. The bounty encouraged recruiters and returnees to bring multiple wives into Mauritius. In the case of the Caribbean, recruiters began to charge higher rates for women- by 1910, the disparity in the rates was considerable: Rs. 35 for an adult woman (Rs. 25 for an adult man) in some areas; Rs. 40 for adult women (Rs. 30 for adult men) in others; the Agent for Natal paid Rs. 70 for adult women (Rs. 50 for adult men).¹⁴

There had been opposition to indentured emigration from India from its very inception. There were concerns over depletion of cheap labour for Indian enterprises, abuses in recruitment, especially of women, mortality in transit, harsh conditions of labour in the plantations and the illegitimacy of indenture. All these issues gathered much greater force in early twentieth century, culminating in a movement against indentured immigration. It forced the British Indian government into damaging admissions about the conditions of workers in the sugar plantations.¹⁵

The “slavery” into which Indian labourers emigrated was an emotive plank in anti-indenture rhetoric, and the degradation of women, an imagery already established in the debates over recruitment, provided the most potent symbol of its expression. In a discursive sweep, women’s recruitment for indentured emigration became connected to nationalism. Existing debates over forms of marriages in the plantation colonies were politicized in new ways. The struggles over the recognition of religion-based marriages in the plantation colonies spoke to nationalist concerns in India over reconstitution of caste and gender relations in the diasporic “Indian” communities. The protection of national honour- and the incipient nation’s women- also involved disciplining them. The idea that the women emigrants were ‘prostitutes’ and were to be used as prostitutes in the estates was an old one.¹⁶ First World War put a summary stop to shipments of labour. There had been too many “grave accusations: against the system. In 1917 indentured emigration ceased, but indentured Indians remained in the many colonies to which they had gone. It took another three years for all the dust to settle.

After the expiry of the indenture of exported labour, the return of large sections of indentured labour back to native country in the early decades of the twentieth century – also owing to improved transportation and communication facilities – made circular migration of labour possible.

Other Forms of Migrant Labour

There were, however, other forms of exporting labour under coercive conditions. Take the case of transportation of children. We know something of the transportation of the coolie labour, but we know very little of the ways children were sent across seas and deserts as labour force. In a volume titled *Uprooted: The Shipment of Poor Children to Canada, 1867 to 1917* (2008) the historian of the transportation of child labour Roy Parker gives us detailed account of exportation of hundreds of boys and girls from England to Canada in the second half of the nineteenth century and the first few decades

of the twentieth century – to work in Canada, to be beaten, sexually abused, slave laboured – all to build up Canada and to rid England of its poor destitute children. This was also roughly the time, immediately after the American Civil War when Chinese labour was imported to the United States to build the Central Pacific Railway Line. People speak of the monumental engineering tunneling feat amidst snow and rare air at the heights at Sierra Nevada (1867). There are now films, museums, and archives on the railway line construction, (<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/films/tcrr/>), these material are mostly on companies, and the enterprise of the businessmen, yet not much on the details of the immigration of labour, labour forms, labour conditions, etc., except what we get from very few books on the Irish and Chinese labour in railway construction in the United States. Chinese peasants from the Canton Province began arriving on California's shores in 1850. Initially, they took five-year stints in the mines, after which they prospected or accepted jobs as labourers, domestic workers, and fishermen. They faced intense prejudice and increasingly restrictive laws limiting work opportunity. Leland Stanford the Governor of California promised in 1862 in his inaugural address to protect the state from "the dregs of Asia." However in early 1865 the Central Pacific railway company started recruiting Chinese labour because of acute labour shortage. Most of the early workers were Irish immigrants. Railroad work was hard, and management was chaotic, leading to a high attrition rate. The source mentioned above tells, "The railroad lost uncouncted men to snow. Avalanches could cut down dozens at a time." There was one large snow slide at Strong's Canyon known as Camp 4. Two gangs of Chinese for Tunnels 11 and 12, besides a gang of culvert men were in this camp. The slide took it all, and one of the culvert men was not found until the following spring. Even when the tunnels were done, maintaining them was a monumental task. In the spring of 1868 most of the high-altitude tunnels were completely blocked by ice, which had to be blasted loose and shoveled out. The website says, "When snow wasn't killing men, the work was". (<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/general-article/tcrr-tunnels/>). Plus we have to remember that all these were achieved by mass murdering the Native Americans so that land could be conquered by businessmen for construction of railways. Then, after the conquest, in 1876 the United States celebrated its might, gathered in part from the completion of the railroad, at the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia. Among the exhibits one could see the "very aristocracy of the Indian nation", and the heroic feats of construction of railways. American Indian representatives invited to the Exposition found themselves a curiosity for the fair's visitors. "The struggle was over, and Native American tribes had lost it, leaving the world of the West forever changed. (<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/general-article/tcrr-tribes/>). In that age of globalisation, both capital and labour were being globalised. It is difficult to tell which preceded what. Possibly these two phenomena were inter-connected.

Similarly during the mass importation of labour for mining in Australia, girls, boys and single women would be transported in the decades of the last half of the nineteenth century and specially in the first half of the twentieth century to the stark Edwardian homes in Australia, where (for instance in Adelaide, today the building being known as the Migration Museum) it would be written on the wall by the charity institutions and city councils, "You who have no place else on earth enter this home – never to look back to the outside world, but to take this as home". There is this astonishing collection of documents and writings, done by Mary Geyer, and published by the Migration Museum on the occasion of the Women's Suffrage Centenary in South Australia (1894-1994), titled, *Behind the Wall – The Women of the Destitute Asylum, Adelaide, 1852-1918* (1994), which tell us the destitute migrants' lives behind

the walls. Martine Spensky has chronicled legal quandary over the status of the children sent to Australia from the United Kingdom for work in the Australian mines (2009). These children were in her words *filius nullius* (nobody's child) in *terra nullius* (empty land). We have some other studies conducted little earlier, such as *Uprooted Children – Early Life of Migrant Farm Workers* (by Robert Cole and Senator Mark Hatfield, 1971). Hunger marches began in the second half of the nineteenth century and continued in the twentieth century - in both new and old worlds, colonial and colonised countries - in search for food and job. It is important to see the exportation of coolie labour as part of this broader history of displacement (with thin line between internal and international migration), much of which is still concealed. Works like *Coolies, Capital, and Colonialism – Studies in Indian Labour History* (Eds. Rana P. Behel and Marcel van der Linden, 2006) or the earlier published classic work by Jan Breman, *Taming the Coolie Beast – Plantation Society and the Colonial Order in Southeast Asia* (1989) suggest the broader connection that we must diligently pursue in the interest of understanding what is happening today vis-vis migration and the nation form. In another recent diligently reconstructed account of the late nineteenth century famines in the context of El Nino spells – *Late Victorian Holocausts and the Making of the Third World* by Mike Davis (2002) – we again have a different picture of the making of our time marked by famines and massive population movements induced by dry weather, floods, hunger, and the forcible exit of large peasant communities from the emerging global food market. And on top of that add the histories of formation of large armies to fight wars in distant lands on the basis of recruitment of massive number of men of various nations on earth. The massive works by Premansu Bandopadhyay on Indian sepoy in the British Overseas Expeditions (2011) attest to this. All these histories are to be found in country after country, also at the global level.

This is also true that another process accompanied this phenomenon. We can here refer to the process of development of the basic technologies of governing population flows and trying to achieve in each case the right composition of the population, *the right mix*, as it is termed now, leading to partitions and new boundary making exercises. On this we have a huge literature, yet we do not account for this fact while analyzing the connection between migration, especially forced migration of labour, and the nation centric history we are accustomed to.

All these, let us not forget, happened after the manumission of slavery. The post-manumission period was one of several changing modes of labour process – the slave, indentured, the contract, and the free. These modes historically never appeared as pure types, because much of the availability of labour depended on labour's mobility – making the labour mobile. Indeed the truth is that largely on the condition of making labour mobile that globalisation proceeded. This would always be the underside of the official story of globalisation - the subaltern or the primitive aspect. This would always involve, as Marx explained, the primitive mode of capital accumulation. Therefore, mining, construction of railways, and plantation economy appeared as the primary site of mobile labour – precisely because of the particular nature of labour process involved in these sectors. They foreshadow our age when the entire domestic and care economy has come to depend globally on mobile labour recruitment. Transit labour then as now occupies a crucial place in capitalist production.

Clifford Rosenberg, the historian of *Policing Paris – The Origins of Modern Immigration Control between the Wars* (2006) have shown how colonial authorities gave shape to their immigration policies, precisely when part of the colonial political class was voicing humanitarian concerns in order to institute some protection measures for the immigrants. Rosenberg drawing extensively on the police files in Paris

of that time presents for us a critical moment in the history of immigration control and political surveillance. He shows how in the years after the First World War the French police, terrified by the Bolshevik Revolution and the specter of immigrant criminality, became the first major force anywhere to systematically enforce distinctions of citizenship and national origins. As the French capital emerged as a haven for refugees, dissidents, and workers from throughout Europe and across the Mediterranean in the 1920s, police officers raided immigrant neighborhoods to scare illegal aliens into registering with authorities and arrested those whose papers were not in order. The police began to concentrate on colonial workers from North Africa, tracking these workers with a special police brigade and segregating them in their own hospital when they fell ill. Transformed by their enforcement, legal categories that had existed for hundreds of years began to matter as never before. These categories determined whether or not families could remain together and whether people could keep their jobs or were forced to flee. During World War II, identity controls marked out entire populations for physical destruction. The treatment of foreigners during the Third Republic, Rosenberg contends, shaped the subsequent treatment of Jews by Vichy. These new methods of identification pioneered at that time are once again relevant to the present day. They created forms of inclusion and inequality, which remain pervasive, as rich states of the West find themselves compelled to provide benefits to their own citizens and at the same time recruit foreign nationals to satisfy their labour needs.

These histories testify how the two migration-related issues have come close as marks of modern time – on one hand mixed up, messy, population flows, provoking desperate governmental responses, on the other hand innovations at a furious pace in humanitarian methods, functions, institutions, and principles. As the twentieth century progressed, governments discovered why people moved: not only because people wanted to escape violence, threat of violence, torture, and discrimination (by now banal causes), but that they moved also due to natural disasters, man-made famines and floods, climate change, developmental agenda, resource crisis, environmental catastrophes, and the like. The humanitarian response now has grown accordingly in range. Governments now say that they have to gear up not only to emergencies but “complex emergencies” – a scenario that alludes to a complicated assemblage of factors and elements leading to an emergency situation. To understand how these two issues of our time have come close, we need to go back to the histories of population movements in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. It was then that the basic control systems were put in place, such as the introduction of the passport and the visa system (finely chronicled by John Torpey; also for a broader history see Martin Lloyd)¹⁷ recording the foreigner, developing labour market management tools in order to use immigrant labour for a capitalist market and for control of domestic labour, and finally developing a detailed surveillance system. In this, law, but more than law, new administrative practices proved crucial. The feature of modern democracies practising various social exclusions developed during that time. This is how the societies of the settled with their pre-ordained divisions of labour wanted to return to equilibrium, when the unsettling element had been cured of the problem. By controlling the abnormal, who was generally the migrant, normalcy was to be restored. It was during this time that governing the migrant became a task of attending to pathology. The discourse of abnormality was produced from real life events.

These histories of immigration – some fragments of which we have presented here - tell us how modern migration control mechanisms have evolved and the relation of these histories with the story of global capitalism.

Labour Migration, Forced Migration and Our Time

Migration history is thus to use the words of Saskia Sassen, “the shadowy cone” over the history of our time – that contains the unreported histories of masses of errant, deported and eradicated individuals who live in a foreign land, in countries that do not recognize their ‘belonging”. These migratory movements have fractured the national, ethnic, and linguistic features of polities and political societies. Today, in a global post-colonial setting, labour flows from “New Europe” to ‘Old Europe” (or, from Mexico or Puerto Rico to the United States) threaten the imperial-civilisational core of the Euro-Atlantic continent. The border/confine in this way is continually under pressure, and the stress reproduces itself in continuous remaking of migrant labour management techniques. Governing strategies must ensure that labour flows must not be directionless; they must conform to the rules the regime of division of labour lays down. The reserve army or the army of surplus labour must conform to the institutional rules of the global labour market. The logic of these institutional rules forming labour immigration quota system, skill absorption, wage remittance procedures, and supervisory procedures was formed in the period we have referred to in the previous sections.

In short, periods of globalisation are the time when the migration controls are put in place. As now then too, control of migrant labour was not the concern of governments only. Employers, recruitment agents, labour brokers in sending and receiving countries, lawyers, courts, training institutes, moneylenders and other credit agencies, bureaucrats, municipal authorities, smugglers, and a wide variety of intermediaries sought to gain from the trans-national flow of workers. Networks grew up, some of them in Charles Tilly’s language, “transplanted networks”. Tilly pointed out that by the early 19th century, evolving capitalist economic and property relations marked by the spread of wage labor, separation of households from the means of production, and the rising productivity of commercial agriculture had combined with diminishing land resources and an expanding demand for labour in urban areas to make long-distance migration a rational choice for many Europeans. Local conditions, including land-tenure patterns, agricultural requirements, and resource management, profoundly influenced rates of migration and return. They also determined the kinds of people who emigrated, such as from certain parts of southern Italy, where land ownership was still possible and therefore the migrants hoped to use their American wages to purchase land upon their return. The sons of Norwegian cattle farmers shut out from ownership also left Europe. In all these acts of emigration, awareness of networks became a critical factor. On the other hand workers developed then too different means to cope with these control mechanisms, even if partially most of the time, and if possible evade them. But vulnerability remained overwhelming. Possibly today’s situation is better with labour rights in place in many cases. But the fact remains that globalisation means globalisation of recruitment of migrant labour, even though the situation is not what it was one hundred and fifty years ago, particularly with regard to migration of skilled labour, and what may be called “immaterial labour”, plus the new constitutive factors behind today’s globalisation. In many cases however, the situation obtaining today reminds us of the time I am speaking of here today, for instance the exploitation inherent in global supply chains (we can today think of the Burmese migrant workers in Thailand), creation of new economic space virtually out of nothing (for instance Macao), Filipino nightclub hostesses and girls in Hong Kong or the Nepali labour there, women migrant workers in Taiwan, and the massive cities marked by migrant workers and trafficked labour (including sex workers) for instance of Georgian or Armenian care giving women in Athens. The

globalization of sex work now proceeds apace with the Internet playing a critical role. A recent study by *The Economist* (9 August 2014) discusses the entry of sex workers of different ethnic origins in an equally differentially constituted global flesh market. Sex workers from Eastern Europe to older Europe and the United States, from Africa and Central Asia to different parts of the globe following the expansion of the European Union and the global financial crash now feature prominently in sex trade. Internet has expanded the market, helped the trade escape different national legislations, allowed entry of part time sex workers, and has created new gatekeepers, new forms of surveillance, new flexibility in hourly rates of the sex workers, and has made sex work decentralized.

Even though studies such as the one done collectively on migrant labour in Asia (*Transnational Migration and Work in Asia*, eds. Kevin Hewinson and Ken Young, 2006) concentrate justifiably on our time, it will be good to have a sense of history of empires, particularly colonial empires, their boundary making exercises, and the bodies that repeatedly hurled themselves on these borders and boundaries, and made migration one of the most bio-political aspects of our age. Conversely we can say that it was in that age that control of mobile bodies began constituting one of the most critical aspects of bio-power. The emergence of some of the different forms of labour subjectivities marking our world today can be traced back to that time.

In many senses today's care industry and the construction industry represent what the plantation and railway construction industries signified in the period referred to in this article. Thousands upon thousands of migrants workers serving worldwide from the United States to the Middle East to South East Asia to the Far East as masons, plumbers, coolies, nurses, ayahs, sex workers, workers in entertainment and construction industry, remind us of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Nursing schools are booming in the developing countries to produce the necessary labour. Bangladesh has 130 such nursing-midwifery schools, Indonesia about 1400 schools, Myanmar 48 schools, Nepal 124, Thailand 80, Sri Lanka 26, and India over 4000 schools. Midwifery and ayahs constitute the bulk of the trained personnel sent abroad. All these while the weekly earnings of registered nurses in the United States for instance remained relative stagnant from 2005 to 2011, in fact suffering 5 % decline in actual purchasing power. The number of guest nurses in the same country increased noticeably in this period. In 1994 about 9 % of the total registered nurse force consisted of guest nurses; by 2008 the share had gone up 16.3 %. And mark it, at the same time in one year – 2010 alone - the incidence of injury and illness due to occupational hazards increased by 6 %. We have similar figures of immigrant labour in sex and other entertainment industries (for details of the US figures, see, DPE Factsheet, April 2012 - <http://dpeaflcio.org/wp-content/uploads/Nursing-A-Profile-of-the-Profession-2012.pdf> ; and on Asian figures, compilation by Prakin Suchaxaya, South East Asian Nursing Union and World Midwifery Report, 2011 - http://www.unfpa.org/sowmy/resources/docs/main_report/en_SOWMR_Full.pdf). Perhaps this piece of news from the BBC will be more revealing than the figures cited above.

Yet what we forget is that these new areas of labour power production had to be secured in the first phase of this round of globalisation with coercive means exactly as in the nineteenth century colonial population had to be sent as part of the armed forces in sea voyages to the areas where plantation industry was to come up not much later. The coincidence of securing areas for occupation and production is not and was not god ordained. Premansu Kumar Bandopadhyay's account of military expeditions to South East Asia from India, *Sepoys in the British Overseas Expeditions* (2011) throws light

on an early phase of this process. The echoes of such expeditions in the hinterlands of India or the Amazons or the forests of Indonesia or the deserts of the Middle East can be heard today.

While we need not overstretch the similarities of the two ages I am suggesting here these similarities should not astonish us. If the earlier period of globalisation marked by industrial capitalism called for massive supply of labour forming its underbelly, this period of globalisation marked by unprecedented financialisation of capital and other resources (including land) calls for similar supply of labour (for opening up forests, construction of new towns, entertainment and care industries, etc.), forming the underbelly of the beast today. Then too, as now, it was preceded by depeasantisation on wide scale. Then too as now the process was preceded by massive application of force.

The causes and dynamics of international labour migration echo in informal migration within countries, for instance in India. Indian cities (like many others) are constituted by migration, primarily from rural hinterlands. Colonial Calcutta attracted labour as much or even more from Bihar, UP, Orissa and Andhra Pradesh as from its own countryside. These flows changed dramatically from the 1970s, when inter-state immigration diminished in response to the city's commercial decline. However, the city still attracts labour migration from districts in West Bengal and some limited numbers from neighbouring states. The increase in migration in the last few decades is considered to be driven by distress. Gadgil and Guha view migrants as "ecological refugees" (1995). While poverty figures largest in explaining migration, scholars have linked this with the state's development policies, which have led to dispossessions, displacements, landlessness, unemployment and impoverishment, forcing people to move (Arya & Roy, 2010:27). Most scholars have characterized labour migration as a forced livelihood response, resulting from relations of debt and dependency rather than simply subsistence failure.

As suggested earlier, the focus on migration is complemented by a renewed concern over trafficking. At one level, the latter is a subset of the former but the two are often elided. In recent years, activists working to prevent trafficking of women and children have recognized the dangers of collapsing the two, given the thin line between protecting women against trafficking and contributing further to their immobilization, especially in societies where regulation of women's mobility is a key element of patriarchal control. The separation of migration and trafficking turns crucially on the nature of intermediation. It is now recognized that the two extremes of 'spontaneous' migration and trafficking are often categorical distinctions, which in practical terms may become so entangled as to be indistinguishable. The elaboration of this distinction involves questions of agency, consent and violence. Critically, trafficking is associated with slavery and discussions on trafficking often invoke the metaphor of slavery, though its many variations now encompass globalised markets in the aggressive sway of capitalism. Trafficking signals the persistence of forms of unfree labour; as Jeffreys writes, "the issue of trafficking threatens to make prostitution, child labour, bonded labour look more like slavery and less like work".¹⁸

With the increase in women's migration, the issue of trafficking has also gained considerable importance. Human trafficking is currently the world's third largest illegal activity, which continues to flourish despite a plethora of legal provisions. Approximately 150,000 women and children are trafficked from South Asia every year and most of them are trafficked to, from, or via India.¹⁹ According to some approximations, the estimated annual turnover of human trafficking in India is around twenty billion rupees. The most disturbing fact is that out of the total number of trafficked victims, eighty per cent are women and fifty per cent are minors, below the age of eighteen.²⁰ Many women experience multiple

migrations in their lives, including rural-rural, rural-urban, urban-rural and urban-urban migration, and the networks of intermediation often overlap with trafficking.

The historical link of trafficking with slavery was extended by the notion of “immoral trafficking” in early twentieth century, leading to over time with a conflation between sex work and trafficking. After the cessation of African slave trade, Europe became concerned with ‘white slavery’, the procurement of white women for the purpose of prostitution. In 1904, the first international agreement on human trafficking– International Agreement for the Suppression of the “White Slave Traffic”– was signed. In 1921, the International Convention for the Suppression of Traffic in Women and Children was signed by the League of Nations. This naming of trafficking in international law exerted a powerful influence on the discourse on trafficking. In 2000, the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime²¹ was opened for signature in Palermo. The Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons Especially Women and Children is at present the chief legal instrument against trafficking, which broadens the definition to include forced labour or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs. One criticism of this broadening is that it risks turning many kinds of market activities into trafficking. These international instruments have been critical interventions. The recognition of trafficking as an organised crime is deemed consonant with human rights and feminist perspectives.²²

The focus on reproduction as a link between domestic and sexual labour in understandings of trafficking should have but has not yet prompted a serious analysis of “marriage migration”. The phenomenon of marriage migration has been long recognized and currently the issue of cross-region marriages has come into public focus- but all these are discussed to understand marriage better. However, better understandings of marriage must also be brought to bear upon migration. Theoretically, this is an easy step- if migration focuses on labour, then marriage as a key institution for deployment of productive and reproductive labour must surely have bearing on processes of migration. Historically, it can be argued, the three have been linked both institutionally and in the trajectories of their development and one way to approach the link is to pay more attention to intermediation that we have previously done. Trafficking is the key in this. Within the omnibus term of “domestic slavery” floated by the colonial state, domestic, reproductive and sexual labour became intertwined. In addition, changes in law facilitated slippages between marriage and slavery, sexual and domestic services. It is from this historical lineage that a term such as “bride trafficking” emerges in today’s India, a term that brings together marriage and slavery.

Refugee and Immigrant Economy in Global Capitalism

We shall close the final section of this background paper with a discussion on the place of refugee and immigrant economy in global capitalism today.

Most writings on refugee economy or the immigrant economy refer to changes in the immigrant labour absorption policies of the Western governments. In these writings, for instance of Stephen Castles, the refugee economy or the immigrant economy never features directly. Castles refers to changes in the immigrant labour absorption policies of the West European governments, reviews the economic activities of the refugees and other victims of forced migration in several countries.²³ These writings reflect on the economic activities of the refugees and other victims of forced migration. Refugees are seen as economic actors in the market. The idea we get is that refugees and other victims

of forced migration want to be economically viable, relevant to host economies; they are economically relevant, but unfortunately discriminated against. These writings showcase refugees' attempts to survive meaningfully in camps, cities, and other settlements, in ethnically homogenous or mixed settings, and the ways they prove useful to market, big business, and organised trade. Several studies along this line tell us of the success stories of migrants' economic activities. The message is: the refugee or the migrant as an economic actor has arrived, do not neglect the refugee, do not dismiss the refugee as an economic actor. Yet the organic link between the immigrant as an economic actor and the global capitalist economy seems to escape the analysis in these writings.

There are other studies taking a somewhat different line. In these studies the refugee is seen as an economic actor, an informal trader, an entrepreneur, but not as labour, so much so that Alex Betts' and his colleagues' recently co-published book *Refugee Economies* does not have the word labour at all, at least not in a significant way.²⁴ Betts and his colleagues' work showcases refugees' attempts to survive meaningfully in camps, cities, and other settlements, in ethnically homogenous or mixed settings, and the ways they prove useful to market, big business, and organised trade. Several studies along this line tell us of the success stories of migrants' economic activities. In these studies, the refugee is an economically viable actor in the market, s/he can be an entrepreneur, and an understanding of the market dynamics and its appropriate modulation can be of immense help to the refugee. While these writings recognise that most refugees and illegal immigrants are denizens of informal economies, the guiding thread once more is that these economies and their actors can be of relevance to market if our analysis and appropriate policy response based on such analysis are correct. In such line of thinking again, the refugee or the illegal immigrant as the labouring subject is absent. Yet as Michel Agier in his detailed study (*Managing the Undesirables: Refugee camps and Humanitarian Government*, 2011)²⁵ of several camps shows, on the ground however, the structure of care and protection put in place ensures that this remains a situation of permanent catastrophe and endless emergency, where undesirables are kept apart and out of sight, while the care dispensed is designed to control, filter, and confine. How can we explain this duality of care and control coupled with exclusion? Camps are transforming, likewise immigrant settlements are changing. Camps are like holding territories of mobile labour, since they hold at one place an enormous quantity of reserve labour. Camps are becoming towns, and other types of big, quasi informal quasi formal settlements. Without a study of the immigrant as the labouring subject it will be difficult to make sense of such transformation.

Even on occasions where the refugees or immigrants are considered as labouring subjects it is a matter of labour market segmentation and differentiation. For instance, Stephen Castles and Mark Miller's *The Age of Migration* has an entire chapter on migrants in the labour force.²⁶ They take note of the dominant presence of the migrants in the informal economy, "growing fragmentation of immigrant employment and the range and significance of immigrant labour market diversity",²⁷ and labour market segmentation leading to long term marginalisation of certain immigrant groups and immigrant women workers, and global cities and ethnic entrepreneurs.²⁸ Castles and Miller are of course able to ask some significant questions, such as: impact of economic restructuring on migrant workers, patterns of labour market segmentation by ethnic origin and gender, scope of underground economy, strategies by migrant such as self-employment, small business, mutual aid, ethnic niches, etc., to deal with labour market disadvantages.²⁹ However, in all these, market is the conceptual anchor, be it labour market or trade, or marketing of skills.

As a consequence, the question frequently asked is about the impact of refugees on the host economy, and not, about why economies cannot do without the so-called refugee economies that supply informal labour for the host economy. The further result is that the economic interface of refugees and economies are little understood - also because sufficient data is not available and the question of refugee impacts does not lend itself to conventional impact evaluation methods. One survey found that while refugee households accounted for 5.5% of total income within a 10-km radius of the three camps, 17.3% of surveyed businesses outside the camps reported that their main customers were refugees from the camps. The increase in refugee demand raises host-country incomes and spending which, in turn, generates additional rounds of spending impacts in the local economy. This is of course a familiar story where total expenditures, including savings, equalling total income for all households and activities, ensure that changes in expenditures match changes in incomes for all agents in the local economy. But the snag in the story is that the local poor households may also receive such assistance – cash or in kind or business advance – and thus the problematic is generalised, and does not remain migrant or refugee-centric. Simulations are therefore not always useful tools to understand how impacts unfold in complex systems. Also, the economic impacts of refugees depend on the rules governing interactions between refugees and the host country, the structure of host economies, and the characteristics of refugees.

The studies mentioned here along with several others studies deal with what can be called the internalities of the migrant or refugee economy (thus their ethnic composition, hierarchies, location, survival techniques, etc.), and leave out the externalities, by which I mean the broader forces and dynamics that influence such internal configuration and shape labour markets. A consideration of the externalities will suggest four interactive relations impacting on refugee economies: (a) The deeply close relation between refugees, other victims of forced migration, and the illegal immigrants; likewise the interface of classic refugees and the environmental migrants as the constituting elements of an informal labour market; (b) The similarly close relation between refugees, illegal immigrants, and the internally displaced as labouring subjects; (c) The connection between the refugee economy and the informal economy as a whole; and finally (d) the incredibly dense network between formal and informal economies, shaping certain types of economic activities as in care and entertainment industry, which features the refugee and the immigrant as the labouring subject, and which borders on both formal and informal economies.

Governments have realized that labour market integration calls for investment and viewing the arrival of refugees and other forced migrants as opportunities, triggering further growth. Labour market integration helps fiscal sustainability for the host country, given the specific skill base of the migrants say from Syria. Companies therefore call for more efficient refugee policy, so that admitting refugees and other forced migrants becomes a matter of both short-term and long-term investment rather than sunk cost.

Migrant economies pose the issue of labour market integration. Refugees and other immigrant labour market actors, such as climate migrants, illegal immigrants, economic migrants, etc., carry the signatures of footloose labour, and the refugee economies are in turn subsumed in the dynamics of informal economy. The dynamics of informal economy relating to types of economic activities (for instance in care and entertainment industry in countries of Europe) subsumes all distinctions between refugees and other victims of forced migration, illegal immigrants, environmental migrants, the

internally displaced, the trafficked labour, and so on. While talking of labour market segmentation we have to keep in mind the countervailing reality of the utmost flexibility of capitalism to create informal arrangements in production and circulation everywhere. Michael J. Piore's classic study, *Birds of Passage* (1979) argued that the conventional push and pull theory is simply wrong, and industrial development in one place always creates informal, low paid economy, and calls for the import of informal, low wage labour for jobs that otherwise would not be performed. Indeed, informality and segmentation go hand in hand; between stereotyped and regularised skills and jobs, there is a range of work arrangements creating transitory forms of labour, which navigate several institutional spaces of the market. As said, the refugee economy is a footloose economy, whose relevance to global capitalism today lies in the salience of the informal mode of production and circulation. The global now houses the informal within the formal.

Thus a formal sportswear brand company in its production complex may engage informal makers of shoes, soccer balls, cricket bats, caps, etc., who are located across vast distances, or a fashion company may contract tanneries in distant countries of the South for polished leather goods including leather bags. This is possible because standards are global, and the refugee economy in order to survive has to follow the global standards and protocols. The refugee or the immigrant economy in this way becomes a part of the global supply chain of a commodity. Classic is the case of carpet making by Tibetan refugees in Nepal or Syrian refugees making leather and other garment products in Turkey or Bangladeshi immigrants in India engaged in garment making as in Kidderpore in Kolkata. Opportunities and constraints thus have a pattern.

Syrian refugees present an insightful corpus of experiences of how and when refugees become labouring subjects. All these of course link the management of informal economies on a global scale with the dynamics of global governance. Alexander Betts and his colleagues are only partly right when they say of their work, "The theoretical purpose of these three institutions of refugeehood (urban, protected camp, and emergency camp) is to highlight the ways in which refugees' different institutional contexts shape their economic opportunity structures. Rather than being inherently different from 'citizens' or 'migrants' what makes them distinct is a set of institutional features that shape their economic lives and interaction with markets."³⁰ On the contrary, one may argue that global experiences of refugee and migrant economies suggest a broad uniformity of pattern in the formation of the labouring subjects from refugee and immigrant populations, namely that they form a huge dispersed population of footloose labour whose products are linked to global market chains. These population groups must be made to work as per the requirements of the global supply chains of commodities and labour; on the other hand they must remain invisible from the public eye.

Borrowing from Saskia Sassen we may call this "expulsion"- exactly the dialectical opposite of the inclusion of the immigrant population in the global cities.³¹ Sassen shows, soaring income inequality and unemployment, expanding populations of the displaced and imprisoned, accelerating destruction of land and water bodies can be understood in their complexity only as a type of expulsion from professional livelihood, living space, and the biosphere that makes life possible. From finance to mining, complex types of knowledge and technology are being deployed in ways that produce brutalities and result in predatory formations. Today's financial instruments are backed by engineering expertise that enables exploitation of the environment, trading in futures, also by the legal expertise that allows the world's rich countries to acquire vast stretches of territory from the poorer ones. And the brutal fact is

that the sheer complexity of the global economy makes it hard to trace lines of responsibility for the displacements, evictions, and eradications it produces.

The salience of Syrian and Iraqi refugees and asylum seekers in Europe is that they come from countries occupying the grey zone between the North and the South. With over 80 per cent literacy, wide skill base for entrepreneurship, high rate of women's participation in non-family forms of labour, these countries have produced refugees who have deployed knowledge in not only reaching countries where they seek asylum, they also learn quickly new skills, adapt themselves relatively quickly – in a year or two – to new requirements of language, labour protocols, self-run business rules, and learn to straddle the two different but interacting worlds of formal economy and the informal economy. The eventual absorption of current immigrant flows of skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled labour in labour markets of Europe and countries of other regions (Brazil, South Africa, Hongkong, the Gulf countries, etc.), albeit in differential manner, will not be much different from what had happened in Europe, United States, Canada, and Australia in the pre-Second World War years. In this dense labour market scenario pleas for labour market equality receive consideration from well-meaning economists and refugee studies specialists, but formal (political, legal) equality makes sense only if they are relevant for entry in labour markets. Otherwise as labouring subject, the migrant's lack of political equality is the other side of her economic ability to enter the labour market.

Yet strangely, the absorption of the refugees and the migrants in the informal labour market and informal mode of production also produces the labouring subject's autonomy. The chronicle of Syrian and Iraqi refugees reinforces the argument of autonomy of migration in a way that is somewhat distinct from the original proposition of the thesis of autonomy of migration. The original thesis of autonomy of migration also spoke of footloose labour, borders that created greater knowledge of how to escape controls and new techniques of circumventing borders, and illegalities provoked by legalities and tighter control mechanisms. One study in particular spoke of "border as method", which meant borders as signifiers of multiplication of labour.³² We shall now move on to that discussion on migrants as the plural labouring subjects.

It is strange that migration analysts rarely consider the two aspects together, namely, lack of entry in the formal political arena accompanied by entry in the informal and sometimes formal labour market. Immigrant labour's autonomy, more known as "autonomy of migration" allows the migrant to cope with this dichotomous world. For long, it was a case of political opportunity, but economic closure; now it is the case of economic opening (entry in the informal labour market), but political closure; yet the migrant as the footloose labouring subject copes with this upside down world of politics/economics with his/her autonomy to move. In a way this return of economy to the centre stage of discussions on refugees and migrants is strange, but perhaps should not be so, if we recall that at the heart of the "durable solutions" debate in refugee studies circles, the issue of economic rehabilitation was always paramount. The formation of the UNHCR itself nudged by the UN Economic and Social Council was an effort towards finding out a durable solution to refugee crisis. Economy buttressed by demography has been always the other scene of refugee and migration management in the modern capitalist age. Policy responses concerning labour market form the other side of what has been called the autonomy of migration – a term that means among others the willingness and the capability of the migrants to move on from one condition to another, one job to another, one economic situation to another, and one economy to another. Autonomy of migration means thus heterogeneity of labour forms. This is again

brought out by empirical studies, like the one conducted by Betts and his colleagues. That more than two-thirds of refugees are in protracted displacement, at times in camps and without the right to work or move freely, does not mean that they stay put in one place. As Betts and his colleagues in their research on African refugees demonstrated, despite the constraints placed on them, vibrant economic systems often thrive below the radar, whether in the formal or informal economy. Refugees are not economically isolated; they are part of complex systems that go beyond their communities and the boundaries of particular settlements. Their report tells us of maize grown in settlements then exported across borders to neighbouring countries, and Congolese jewellery and textiles imported from as far as India and China. Somali shops import tuna from Thailand, via the Middle East and Kenya. Thus mostly they are not a burden on host states. Migrant labour is relevant to global supply chains of commodities, it is the global nature of the supply chains that produces footloose informal labour and ensures that various categories of the displaced finally add up to the reserve army of labour to be deployed where and when necessary to the extent that big refugee camps look like townships with specific economies linked to various commodity chains. And it is this condition that accounts for the relative autonomy of migration. Therein is the significance of migrant labour, whose marks are irregularity, informality, subjection to unequal labour regimes, degradation of work, footloose nature, subjection to violence, and the fundamental relevance to the logistical aspect of neoliberal capitalism, such as construction labour, work in supply chains, waste processing including e-waste recycling, and last but not least in care and entertainment industry to which we have already made references in this background paper. The last area of work mentioned above is important for our discussion here, not least because in discussions on migrant economy sex work is almost absent. Yet it is in discussions on sex work and trafficking that we find all the paradoxes of the labour market reality. In fact the trafficking framework is inadequate for the purpose of analysing the experiences of sex work and exploitation in the field of commercial sex. The problems migrants encounter in this field are more often related to the institutional structures of immigration and the implementation of prostitution policies that restrict and prevent possibilities of migration. Sex work is a migrant-dominated field throughout the world. A recent study shows that half of the sex workers in Europe are migrants, and in West Europe the percentage is much higher – nearly 60 to 75 per cent.³³ We rarely analyse the situation from the migrant's point of view because of the dominance of the discourse of trafficking, which means that migrant sex work has been seen always in the context of sex trafficking, known today as modern slavery. We rarely take into account the struggles and negotiations on restrictions of movements and against constraints in the labour market. The trafficking discourse also takes our focus away from labour market analysis, analysis of the associated institutional and structural framework, such as border and immigration controls, visa requirements, and a discriminatory labour protection framework that can be extremely racist. These controls modulate access, in this case of the sex workers, to labour markets. The situation produces circular migrants, who would not have the protection of welfare benefits, but on the other hand face continuous deportation threats and possibilities.

In short, immigration policies produce precarious labour. What is important to note in this context, and this has general significance for the task of theorising the migrant as living labour, is that, migrants in the informal labour market are not always particularly dependent on specific employers. Often their fate depends on immigration policies. They reproduce the overall uncertain conditions of the life of labour under capitalism. This calls for a rigorous analysis of the link between the refugee like condition and

capitalism, and helps to understand thereby the reasons as to why refugees and migrants working for low wages are essential for capitalism.

¹Hugh Tinker, *A New System of Slavery: The Export of Indian Labour Overseas, 1830-1920*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1974. p. 44-45.

² Bihar State Archives, Patna [henceforth BSA] General Emigration July 1895, A1-5, 5-R/13

³ Quoting Reverend William Knibb, a Baptist Missionary in Jamaica. Madhavi Kale, *Fragments of Empire. Capital, Slavery, and Indian Indentured Labor Migration in the British Caribbean*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1998. p. 114-115. For the debates over labour shortage, see Chapter 1.

⁴ Kale, *Fragments of Empire*, p. 158.

⁵ Tinker, *A New System of Slavery*; Rhoda Reddock, 'Freedom Denied: Indian Women and Indentureship in Trinidad and Tobago, 1845-1917', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol 20, No 43, 1985. P. 79-87.

⁶ Reddock, 'Freedom Denied'; Jo Beall, 'Women Under Indenture in Colonial Natal 1860-1911' in C. Clarke, C. Peach and S. Vertovek (eds.) *South Asians Overseas: Migration and Ethnicity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990. The Dickens Committee of 1838 agreed with this reading. 'It appears that no restraint has at any time existed on the emigration of women. Yet very few have gone. The Mauritius Government has really been desirous that they should be sent, but we think it may be fairly inferred that planters have not.' India Office Records, London [henceforth IOR] V/26/820/1.

⁷ IOR V/26/820/1. India Public No. 17 of 22 April 1841. Report of the committee appointed to enquire into the abuses alleged to exist in the export of coolies, 1839.

⁸ Tinker, *A New System of Slavery*, p. 100; for additional detail on trends see p. 273.

⁹ These ratios changed over time and for different colonies several times in the nineteenth century: Bridget Brereton, "The Experience of Indentureship 1854-1917" in John La Guerre (ed.), *Calcutta to Caroni*, Longmans, Caribbean, 1974. Also see Brian L. Moore, 'Mating Patterns and Gender Relations Among Indians in Nineteenth-Century Guyana', *Guyana Historical Journal*, Vol 3, 1993, p. 1-12.

¹⁰ Marina Carter, *Lakshmi's Legacy. The Testimonies of Indian Women in 19th Century Mauritius*, Editions de l'Océan Studies, Stanley, Rose-Hill, Mauritius, 1994. See Chapter 1 for a detailed account of the changes in policy regarding women's migration to Mauritius.

¹¹ Reddock, 'Freedom Denied'; Also see Madhavi Kale, "'Capital Spectacles in British Frames": Capital, Empire and Indian Indentured Migration to the British Caribbean,' *International Review of Social History*, Vol 41, No S4, 1996, [special supplement, "Peripheral" Labour? Studies in the History of Partial Proletarianisation].

¹² Reddock, 'Freedom Denied'.

¹³ Ibid., Also see Tinker, *A New System of Slavery*.

¹⁴ WBSA, General Emigration, December 1912, A 6-19. File 3E/5. Letter from R. N. Gibbs, Government Emigration Agent for British Guiana and Natal to the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, Calcutta, 7 February 1911.

¹⁵ WBSA General Emigration, December 1912, A 6-19, 3E/5.

¹⁶ Verene E Shepherd, *Maharani's Misery: Narratives of a Passage from India to the Caribbean*, University of the West Indies Press, Jamaica, 2010, p. 9.

¹⁷ John Torpey, *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009; Martin Lloyd, *The Passport: The History of Man's Most Travelled Document*, Sutton, Stroud, Gloucestershire, 2005.

¹⁸ Sheila Jeffreys, "Brothels without Walls": the Escort Sector as a Problem for the Legalization of Prostitution," *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, Vol 17, No 2, p. 210-234. Nita Bhalla, "Trafficked Maids to Order: The Darker Side of Richer India", 4 December 2012, <http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/12/04/india-trafficking-idINDEE8B300120121204>, accessed on 28 October 2015.

Sakshi Vijay and Niharika Bapna, "Silent Slaves: The Domestic Workers", 30 July 2011, <http://www.legalindia.com/silent-slavesthe-domestic-workers/>, accessed on 28 October 2015.

<http://182.71.188.10:8080/jspui/bitstream/123456789/496/1/Domestic%20Workers%20in%20India.pdf>

Sujata Madhok, "Trafficking Women for Domestic Work", April 2008, <http://infochangeindia.org/women/features/trafficking-women-for-domestic-work.html>, accessed on 28th October 2015. Tasnim Kundan Patel, "Anti-Trafficking Laws in India – Issues and Perspectives", 27 June 2013

<http://www.manupatra.co.in/newline/articles/Upload/A8BAAB65-3219-497E-B214-4E382C6A496A.pdf> accessed on 26 November 2015. "Legislative Brief of Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Amendment Bill," 2006 accessed from the website of PRS Legislative Research, an independent research initiative, http://www.prsindia.org/uploads/media/1167469313/legis1167477521_Legislative_Brief_Immoral_Traffic_Amen_dment_Bill2006.pdf accessed on 26 November 2015.

Ambika Pandit, "Delhi Government Drags its Feet on Draft Bill on Placement Agencies", 29 April 2013, <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/delhi/Delhi-govt-drags-its-feet-on-draft-bill-on-placement-agencies/articleshow/19773310.cms>, accessed on 28 October 2015.

Ambika Pandit, "Jharkhand Haats, Melas Hotbeds of Traffickers", 21 July 2014, <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Jharkhand-haats-melas-hotbeds-of-traffickers/articleshow/38769452.cms>, accessed on 28 October 2015.

¹⁹Indrani Sinha, "Trafficking and Children at Risk," 2005; Masako Iijima, "South Asia Urged to Unite against Child Prostitution," Reuters, New York, 1998; Asian Development Bank 2002.

²⁰"Human Trafficking in India", Policy Proposals for India, 19 February, 2010.

²¹ "United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime and The Protocols Thereto," United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2004, https://www.unodc.org/documents/middleeastandnorthafrica/organised-crime/UNITED_NATIONS_CONVENTION_AGAINST_TRANSNATIONAL_ORGANIZED_CRIME_AND_THE_PROTOCOLS_THERETO.pdf

²² Undurti Vindhya and V Swathi Dev, "Sex Trafficking of Girls and Women: Evidence from Anantapur District, Andhra Pradesh," Governance Working Papers, East Asian Bureau of Economic Research, 2010

²³ See Stephen Castles, "Migration" in David Theo Goldberg and John Solomos (eds.), *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 2002, p. 570-572; also Stephen Castles and Mark J. Miller, *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*, Palgrave MacMillan, Hampshire, Basingstoke, 2003.

²⁴Alex Betts, Louise Bloom, Josiah Kaplan, and Naohiko Omata, *Refugee Economies: Forced Displacement and Development*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2017.

²⁵Michel Agier, *Managing the Undesirables: Refugee camps and Humanitarian Government*, Polity Press, London, 2011.

²⁶ Stephen Castles and Mark J. Miller, *The Age of Migration*, chapter 8, "Migrants and Minorities in the Labour Force", p. 178-197.

²⁷ Stephen Castles and Mark J. Miller, *The Age of Migration*, p. 183

²⁸ Alex Betts and his colleagues also take note of this factor of global cities in the three fold institutional context of refugee economies – urban, protected camp, and emergency camp - *Refugee Economies*, p. 202

²⁹Stephen Castles and Mark J. Miller, *The Age of Migration*, p. 179; the issue of strategies by migrant such as self-employment, small business, mutual aid, ethnic niches, etc., to deal with labour market disadvantages has been dealt at length by Betts and his co-authors.

³⁰ Alex Betts, Louise Bloom, Josiah Kaplan, and Naohiko Omata, *Refugee Economies*, p. 54

³¹Saskia Sassen, *Expulsions: Brutality and Complexity in the Global Economy*, Belknap Press, Harvard, 2014.

³²Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson, *Border as Method, or the Multiplication of Labour*, Duke University Press, Durham, 2013.

³³Report by TAMPEP – *European Network for HIV/STI Prevention and Health Promotion among Migrant Sex Workers* – "Sex Work in Europe: A mapping of the Prostitution Scene in 25 European Countries", Amsterdam, 2009.