

RESPECT for All: The Political Self-Organization of Female Migrant Domestic Workers in the European Union

Helen Schwenken

Abstract

This contribution focuses on the empowering political practices of RESPECT, the European network for migrant domestic workers. The paper contrasts RESPECT's empowering approach with that of other actors in which migrant domestic workers are presented as victims and in which the struggle is situated within the discourse of combatting illegal immigration and trafficking in women. The central hypothesis of this paper is that this distinction between female migrant domestic workers constructed as victims of trafficking or as migrant women with subjectivity, voice, and agency is crucial in determining the type of advocacy strategy and (self-)representation of the women.

Résumé

Cette contribution se penche sur les pratiques d'autonomisation de RESPECT, le réseau européen pour la défense des travailleurs domestiques migrants. L'article contraste l'approche d'autonomisation de RESPECT avec celle d'autres acteurs qui présentent les travailleurs domestiques migrants comme des victimes et qui situent le débat dans le contexte d'un combat contre l'immigration clandestine et la traite des femmes. L'hypothèse centrale de cet article est qu'il existe deux façons de présenter les choses : soit les travailleuses domestiques migrantes sont des victimes de la traite des femmes ou bien, ce sont des femmes migrantes ayant une subjectivité et leur propre voix. Cette distinction est cruciale pour pouvoir déter-

miner le type de stratégie de défense et de/d'(auto)-représentation de ces femmes.

A room full of sixty black women from all over the world. When people from the European Parliament and the Commission see that, they understand the strength of that network. Very unique, migrant women organizing themselves, and especially migrant domestic workers. When people ask ... 'femmes de ménage', they just laugh.¹

It is not easy for migrant domestic workers to organize themselves. Several factors make this task especially difficult. The private household as a working place is usually isolated, and most workers do not have legal entitlements to work and stay in the country. Additionally, working long hours hardly leaves any time for collective action. Nonetheless, a European network for the rights of migrant domestic workers has in recent years been able to act quite successfully to improve the situation for female domestic workers. The network, called RESPECT, is a European network of migrant domestic workers' organizations and supporters that campaigns for the rights of women and men working in private households in European Union (EU) countries.² The RESPECT network originated in the very agile work of the Filipino self-help group Waling-Waling in London and the supporting NGO, Kalayaan. Comparative research, mostly carried out by Bridget Anderson in five European countries on the living and working conditions of migrant domestic workers, was the first step for the enlarged activities in the EU.³ At present, the network com-

prises members from, *e.g.*, Greece, Spain, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Italy, and Belgium. RESPECT supports its members' campaigns and facilitates the sharing of experience and expertise in campaigning, organizing, and lobbying.

In this contribution I will focus on a specific political practice of the network in which migrant domestic workers are encouraged to raise their voices and fight for their rights. This strategy forms the basis of the work of the RESPECT network. I contrast this approach with that of other actors, including the European Council and NGOs such as Anti-Slavery International, which tend to victimize migrant domestic workers and situate themselves in the discourse of combatting illegal immigration and trafficking in women.

Thus the central hypothesis of this paper is that the differences in constructing female migrant domestic workers as victims of trafficking *or* as migrant women with subjectivity, voice, and agency are crucial for the type of advocacy strategy and (self-)representation. This is true for NGO activists and EU institutions as well as for the migrants themselves. As I show in the latter part of this paper, this distinction also has an impact on policy outcomes.

Speaking Up

In social movement research, underlying assumptions about political subjects tend to be problematic when dealing with migrant and refugee movements. Several features characterize the successful activist: s/he is able to assemble in groups; s/he invests some time in meeting, writing petitions, going to demonstrations, and simply discussing and socializing; s/he mobilizes a group of activists and supporters, is eloquent, and raises funds. Moreover, successful social movements have to be able to build up the illusion that politicians are accountable and that social movements represent relevant numbers of voters.

These underlying assumptions about successful social movements mostly fit well-settled, middle-class activists or students. It is a challenge for social movement theory to analyze how migrants, and especially undocumented migrants with reduced citizenship status, are able to mobilize politically.

The constraints for social and political self-organization vary for different groups of migrants. There are, however, at least three common problems which most migrants face. For example, in Germany, some of the difficulties asylum seekers and undocumented migrants might face include:

- 1) Restrictions to mobility and living in remote areas hinder their ability to assemble with other migrants and to participate in demonstrations. Official restrictions of mobility do not exist for undocumented migrants in the same way as they do for asylum

seekers. However, these migrants face self-imposed restrictions on their mobility. One of the most important patterns of behaviour involves learning to be invisible and inconspicuous, especially towards state authorities, in order not to arouse suspicion. Migrant domestic workers face yet another problem of mobility. These workers are frequently isolated in the household and it is consequently difficult for them to build up contacts.

- 2) Difficulties in resource mobilization, a crucial factor in the success of social movements, according to the resource mobilization approach,⁴ arise as another problem for migrants. Due to often exploitative jobs, undocumented migrants have little time to invest in political activities. Furthermore, institutional factors such as the existence of special laws regulating associations of "foreigners" as well as fewer contacts to official institutions limit the migrants' access to official funding.
- 3) The lower social status of asylum seekers and undocumented migrants forms a third common problem. In particular, gendered forms of discrimination and violence must be taken into consideration when discussing female migrants and refugees.

These are all very difficult conditions under which asylum seekers and undocumented migrants attempt to engage in political activities. At the same time, the general political opportunity structures are not encouraging. The political opportunity structure approach⁵ is an important analytical concept in social movement research. According to Sydney Tarrow, political opportunity structures consist of "consistent – but not necessarily formal or permanent – dimensions of the political environment that provide incentives for people to undertake collective action by affecting their expectations for success or failure."⁶ Several dimensions of the political opportunity structure in the European Union exist in the field of asylum and irregular migration. On the one hand, public discourse and political measures in the EU range from a more integrationist and anti-discriminatory approach, to a focus on the call for stricter border controls and measures to combat irregular migration. On the other hand, it is acknowledged that economically beneficial and regulated labour migration must serve national interests.

One could argue that migrants protest because they are severely deprived and suppressed. These "deprivational approaches"⁷ were popular in the social movement literature until the 1970s as a means to explain uprisings by workers and groups of lower economic standing. The deprivation theory postulates that the more one suffers, the more one protests. However, this approach is much too simplistic. No proven direct connection between deprivation and conten-

tion exists. Thus, I argue from a different perspective, drawing on Foucault and his conceptualization of power. For Foucault, power does not oppose victims and powerful actors. Foucault emphasizes that power relations can only exist between parties which *both* are equipped with different kinds of power: "The term 'power' designates relationships between partners (and by that I am not thinking of a zero-sum game, but simply ... of an ensemble of actions which induce others and follow from one another)."⁸ Therefore, Foucault uses the term "power relations" and emphasizes that "power is exercised only over free subjects."⁹

What different kind of power, abilities, and strengths might migrants have which help them to organize effectively in the European Union? I refer to those mentioned by the Commission for Filipino Migrant Workers¹⁰ (CFMW) and the United Workers Association, an organization of five thousand migrant domestic workers in the UK.¹¹ The Filipino community has been quite important for the self-organization of migrants in Europe since the 1960s. As CFMW states, empowered migrants know their rights, document their own situation, and develop a political agenda and strategies to improve their living and working conditions.¹² Furthermore, Natasha Pearce mentions that migrant organizations as multi-national groups which overcome the particularity of only one ethnic group must also be regarded as a particular strength. Moreover, CFMW refers to specific individual qualities such as the "sense of their own actual presence and numbers in a country or region."¹³ These individuals are aware of the fact that they, as migrants, play a vital role for the host country as well as for their country of origin. Thus, they can demand better conditions. One member of the RESPECT network refers specifically to the situation of migrant women: "More Filipinas [are organized] because they speak English and ... this generation of women migrated alone, no husband, not following or bringing their children. And they have more this need of community, this approach of independence They also seem to be more open to the issue of empowerment."¹⁴

The characteristics which a migrant must show in order to successfully mobilize are quite ambitious and demanding. Hence, one must question the extent to which migrant workers can achieve them. The judgment differs dramatically if we ask different political actors, as has already been mentioned in the introduction: some refer to migrant domestic workers as victims of slavery-like practices or trafficking in women and do not even mention questions of empowerment; others call them migrant workers and encourage them to organize. This far-reaching difference has major consequences for the political agenda as well as for the policy outcomes. In the following paragraph I will elaborate on another problematic dimension of the dichotomy between victim and agent.

Voluntary versus Forced Migration?

In determining an individual's right to refugee status, one often makes use of the dichotomy between voluntary and forced migration. However, this dichotomy is problematic. It is more advantageous to consider forced versus voluntary as a continuum which depicts the varying degree of choice or freedom available to the migrants. Voluntary and forced migration are highly socially constructed terms which form the two ends of the continuum. Trafficking in human beings falls at the end of the continuum and represents one form of forced migration. Since the 1980s this problem has increasingly gained scholarly and political recognition. One milestone in the analysis of policy in the field of migrant domestic workers was the substantial widening of the definition of trafficking. For a long time only trafficking in combination with sexual exploitation and abuse was considered trafficking. But in November 2000, after strong transnational lobbying efforts of women's NGOs, the UN adopted a definition which also includes other abusive and exploitive situations, such as those of mail-order brides and domestic workers.¹⁵

Jo Doezema suggests using the idea of "forced to choose" to overcome the voluntary/forced dichotomy which only reproduces stereotypes and divisions among sex workers: "Potentially the most frightening division, however, created by the voluntary/forced dichotomy is that of sex workers into guilty/'voluntary' and innocent/'forced' prostitutes".¹⁶ Regarding the issue of migration, the same problematic dichotomy between innocent/"refugee" or "forced migrant" and guilty/"illegal migrant" would be true. Most migrants *decided* to leave their country and were not "sold," kidnapped, or otherwise forced. In most cases, the decision was negotiated with their family as a result of needing to earn more money or the women being in search of a better economic or more liberal life prospects. This leads us to the distinction between trafficking and smuggling which has only been recently developed but which is of great importance. While the term "trafficking" tends to describe movements of individuals against their will, "smuggling" refers to more voluntary movements on the part of the migrant.¹⁷

After having discussed some of the terms and concepts relating to the dichotomies voluntary/forced, smuggling/trafficking, and victim/agent, the following section will analyze the ways in which social actors including NGOs, groups of self-organized women, and institutions make use of these terms.

Strategic Framing of Social Movements

How do undocumented migrant domestic workers in the European Union and their supporters frame their concerns? The concept of "framing" in social movement theory deals with reality construction and the interaction between move-

ments and opportunities.¹⁸ The theory assumes that one has to choose the correct words and strategy in order to successfully bring one's interests into the public sphere.

In this section, empirical evidence including two policy-outcomes and one example of articulation by migrant workers themselves and support groups will be provided in order to support the hypothesis generated earlier. The first example is the "Report on Regulating Domestic Help in the Informal Sector," adopted by the European Parliament (EP) on the initiative of the Committee on Women's Rights and Equal Opportunities in October 2000.¹⁹ The second example is the report on domestic slavery of the Committee on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men of the Council of Europe.²⁰ Finally, the "Charter of Rights for Migrant Domestic Workers" of the European network for migrant domestic workers, RESPECT, will be discussed.²¹

These documents have been chosen as representing two different ways of dealing with the issue of migrant domestic workers. Both institutions have been addressed for lobbying purposes by NGOs and other stakeholders, including the RESPECT network. The European Parliament regularly adopts reports which have been worked out in the respective committees. Lobbying efforts seek to influence the content and wording of the reports. Although the EP is, in comparison to the European Commission or the member states, not very powerful in the field of migration, declarations of the EP can influence the public opinion.

Two competing frames are evident in the case of migrant domestic workers. In the Council of Europe's report the central frame is "slavery" and "trafficking in women." In contrast, the European Parliament's and the RESPECT network's frame is "rights." These frames correspond with the differentiation between forced and voluntary migration and between victims and agents.

First the terms and contexts in which migrant domestic workers are written about in the documents will be analyzed, and afterwards attention will be drawn to the strategies used to improve their situation.

Naming Migrant Domestic Workers and the Emergence of the Problem

The topic of the report of the European Parliament is undeclared paid domestic work. The rising number of domestic workers is situated within the context of demographic developments, the increasing number of single-parent families or full-time employment of both parents, undeclared work, and the black-market economy in general. The report briefly describes in its explanatory statement the situation of female domestic workers and subsequently analyzes the situation in different countries. The tasks domestic workers have to carry out are compared with the ILO *Convention C177 on Home*

*Work*²² and the ILO *International Standard Classifications of Occupations*, both of which offer only narrow definitions.²³ Abuses and the lack of social security are criticized.

In contrast, the report of the Council of Europe talks about "victims of a new form of slavery." A "domestic slave" is a "vulnerable individual forced, by physical and/or moral coercion, to work without any real financial reward, deprived of liberty and in a situation contrary to human dignity."²⁴ Four million women are said to be sold each year.

Finally, the "Charter of Rights for Migrant Domestic Workers" is very brief and refers to "people and workers"²⁵ in different social situations (documented/undocumented, live-in/live-out,²⁶ first/second generation, born in Africa/Asia/South America/Europe). Domestic work is described as "demanding work which requires a variety of skills"²⁷ but which is not adequately acknowledged. The rest of the Charter deals with demands for increased rights.

Both official documents as well as the Charter implicitly refer to the experiences and research made by the RESPECT network or affiliated researchers.²⁸ Interestingly, the same sources are interpreted differently or adopted selectively. For example, the Council of Europe's report states that the London-based NGO Kalayaan has counseled more than four thousand domestic workers, of whom 84 per cent had suffered psychological duress and 54 per cent had been locked up.²⁹ This is valued as proof that domestic slavery exists. In the research of Bridget Anderson and Annie Phizacklea the same problems and figures are described as "worker's problems."³⁰

Lobbying for Undocumented Migrant Domestic Workers

As mentioned above, analyzing the documents reveals (at least) two different frames. Distinctive policy measures are proposed in each of the documents. Because these documents are not primarily argumentative, one must deduce the argumentative scheme from the recommendations and demands presented. This is demonstrated below.

1. The Frame "Combating Domestic Slavery and Trafficking in Women"

In the Report of the Council of Europe, the frame "slavery" is made clear from the beginning and is mirrored in the recommendations to combat domestic slavery.

Among the recommendations are measures to prevent trafficking in human beings, including providing information and combating poverty, implementing repressive measures like stricter border controls and police cooperation, increasing protection and assistance of victims, and returning programs and regulations of domestic work.

Several actors are mentioned, including recruiting agencies/traffickers, employers, diplomats, and international civil servants as abusers; states and the international level as regulating forces, police, and legal prosecutors; NGOs as providers of protection and of social and legal assistance; and the victims. Only once in the document of the Council of Europe are the victims given subjectivity. This is in the mention that they may not wish to return to their country of origin but take advantage of the educational and vocational training opportunities available in the host country.³¹ But the consequence to provide long-term residence permits is not taken.

2. *The Frame “More Rights for Migrant Domestic Workers”*

We can identify three sub-frames within the frame of “rights” which can be deduced from the demands articulated in the Report of the European Parliament and the Charter. These are formulated as workers’ rights, human rights, and women’s rights.

The EP Report and the Charter also mention a number of different actors. These are employers, employees, and social partners as the institutionalized representation of workers and employers; NGOs as advocates; and states as well as the EU as potentially regulating forces.

The frame of rights is not a homogenous one, but depends on political priorities and cycles. The European Commission appears to be more open to women’s rights than to migrants’ rights as demonstrated by this excerpt: “The European Commission is relatively progressive on the rights of women, more progressive than they are on the rights of migrant workers, and we should try and use that.”³² Consequently, organizations of migrant domestic workers must adjust their policy as one principle of lobbying is to assert a congruence of general opinion between those who lobby and those who are lobbied.

Opposing the Frame of “Trafficking”

Several expert interviews conducted with members of the RESPECT network support the finding that migrant domestic workers themselves argue within the framework of extended rights and criticize the discourse of trafficking³³ which some NGOs follow. A founding member of Kalayaan argues not on a strategic level but with the different needs of trafficked women and migrant domestic workers: “The issue of domestic workers in the private household is about workers rights.... There are other organizations who work with trafficked women.... You need a different approach. We shared with the domestic workers ..., even they said they were in a different situation.”³⁴

In addition to an awareness of the different needs, one co-ordinating member of the RESPECTnetwork describes the consequences of the difference between these two frames.

The Committee against Modern Slavery, and somehow also Anti-Slavery International which are not groups of self organized women, ... decided to follow a completely different track – the one of trafficking. ... They emphasize the worst cases of torture, rape and so – which is a strategy. ... Then to bring it to court, then to show that that’s modern slavery, trade in human beings and then to ask for these women for temporary residence permit on humanitarian ground. ... This approach doesn’t take into account the migrants, because you systematically see them as victims.³⁵

In reference to the self-understanding of the RESPECT network, Bridget Anderson, a researcher and activist in Kalayaan and RESPECT, adds that by Kalayaan “migrant domestic workers were not cast as victims, to be rescued by campaigners; rather the groups worked together, using their different skills and social positions.”³⁶

One important differentiation between these positions is the question of regularization of undocumented migrants. While the RESPECT network argues in favour of this, those organizations which favour the frame of trafficking demand a temporary residence permit on humanitarian grounds which do not include work permits. “For example the *Comité contre l’esclavage moderne* are not in the position of regularization of illegals for example, they don’t want to touch that issue at all, they find it much too controversial”.³⁷

This insight into the different approaches and demands of NGOs and groups of self-organized migrant women reveals that those two frames are difficult to combine. Struggles occur with definitions (such as, “Is it trafficking or not?”) and related strategies and political allies. Clearly, migrant domestic workers know about the two frames and choose the rights discourse. What are the advantages of this? In the following section I show that the rights frame can be, but is not necessarily, successful. In the concluding paragraph, two reasons why the self-organization of migrant domestic workers must make use of this frame in order to maintain their existence are discussed.

Acting Successfully?

Having identified the two competing frames we are led to ask which frame is successful for mobilization at which time and under which circumstances. The frame of “rights” was successful in the British case in 1998. In the UK, migrant domestic workers opposed the legislation stipulating that they could not legally change employers. If the domestic workers were forced to run away because of abusive living

and working conditions, they were not permitted to work for anyone else, or, if they worked on an irregular basis, they were even more vulnerable to exploitation. In the daily work and the political campaign, Waling-Waling, a group of self-organized migrant domestic workers, and the support group Kalayaan worked closely together with the Transport and General Workers Union (TGWU). This cooperation with a strong ally was crucial for their success. Bridget Anderson mentions several campaign strategies such as intensive media and publicity work in order to create sympathy for the situation of the women in public. They did lobbying and parliamentary work at both the national and European level.³⁸ The European level was used in the sense of the “boomerang effect,”³⁹ which means putting the UK under international pressure to change their discriminative legislation. As the election campaign was underway, the campaigners received the promise from the Labour Party that in case of a change in the government, the Labour Party would also change the respective laws. After a long struggle, Waling-Waling, Kalayaan, and their supporters succeeded. The Home Office announced in July 1998 that migrant domestic workers could change their employer and started a regularization procedure for undocumented migrant domestic workers. This example makes clear that the campaigners made use of divided elites and the electoral circumstances. Migrant domestic workers were perceived by the public not only as victims, but also as agents with a voice articulating their demands. The discourse of “rights” led to emancipatory and empowering processes. The combination of relatively open political opportunity structures and the clever and substantive framing strategy contributed to the success.

But the case of the European Union appears to be less promising, even though the European Parliament closely followed the positions of the RESPECT network in most points. The reason for this pessimism lies in the hegemonic discourse which at the moment does not favour extending rights for migrants and liberalizing unskilled labour immigration policy. Furthermore, the EU itself is not exclusively responsible for this field. The member states retain their competences in this area. It is hard to foresee the future, but it is clear that regulations have been passed which lead in that direction. For example, some important regulations have been published by the European Commission in which combatting smuggling and trafficking and primarily repressive politics are placed high on the agenda.⁴⁰ Questions of regularization procedures or campaigns for undocumented migrants or extended workers’ rights are not evident in these documents. The political opportunity structure is, in this case, quite closed to the broader demands of the migrant domestic workers. Thus the frame of

“combatting trafficking and slavery-like practices” is more likely to be successful than the rights-based frame.

Similar developments can be seen on a global scale. Global regulations to guarantee extended rights for (undocumented) migrants are thus far only ratified by so-called sending countries,⁴¹ while global regulations which intend to combat organized crime, human smuggling, and trafficking have been ratified by a much greater number of states.

It is important that the migrant domestic workers maintain the frame of rights in the future for at least two central reasons. First, it is important for reasons of internal mobilization and identity. The migrant workers have to address subjects and constitute agency among the women because the RESPECT network follows the approach of empowerment and dismisses the victimization of migrant women. Furthermore, the rights frame is important for political reasons. The network can only be successful if the political opportunity structure widens. It is therefore important not to strengthen the security policy approach but to find ways to extend human and women’s rights.

In conclusion, let us look at one final example to illustrate the importance of the development of a subject position from invisible women to self-conscious subject. The self-help group Waling Waling underwent a name-change into the United Workers Association. The background behind this name change is quite interesting. Waling-Waling is the Filipino name for a very resistant flower which grows in the mountains and hides, much as undocumented migrant women must be brave and strong and yet hide themselves. After the above-mentioned success a member of Kalayaan explained the renaming as being related to the new self-esteem gained as “workers” who unite and fight for their rights. “It was in 1998. ... They said ‘oh we gonna be legal all’ ... and they said we’re not a Waling-Waling any more, we will not be undocumented. And what they did is to change the name to United Worker’s Association.”⁴² Clearly, empowerment, subjectivity, and a rights-based framework are central to the success of domestic migrant workers.

Notes

1. Interview with one co-ordinator of the RESPECT network.
2. For further information and activities of the RESPECT network, see the Solidar Homepage, online: <www.solidar.org> (date accessed: 4 March 2003).
3. Bridget Anderson, *Doing the Dirty Work. The Global Politics of Domestic Labour* (London and New York: Zed Books, 2000); Bridget Anderson and Annie Phizacklea, *Migrant Domestic Workers: A European Perspective. Report to DG V of the European Commission* (Brussels: 1997).

4. For the resource mobilization approach in social movement theory see: Mayer N. Zald, "Looking Backward to Look Forward: Reflections on the Past and Future of the Resource Mobilization Research Program," in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, ed. A.D. Morris and C. McClurg Mueller (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), 326–48; John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald, "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory," in *Social Movements in an Organizational Society. Collected Essays*, ed. M.N. Zald and J.D. McCarthy (New Brunswick (USA) and London: Transaction Publ., 1994), 15–42. A critique provides, e.g., Myra Marx Ferree, "The Political Context of Rationality: Rational Choice Theory and Resource Mobilization," in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, 29–52.
5. See, e.g., Doug McAdam, "Political Opportunities: Conceptual Origins, Current Problems, Future Directions," in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, ed. D. McAdam, J.D. McCarthy, and M.N. Zald (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 23–40; Hanspeter Kriesi, "The Political Opportunity Structure of New Social Movements: Its Impact on Their Mobilization," in *The Politics of Social Protest: Comparative Perspectives on States and Social Movement. Social Movements, Protest, and Contention*, vol. 3, ed. C.J. Jenkins and B. Klandermans (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995), 167–98.
6. Sidney Tarrow, *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 85.
7. See, e.g., James C. Davies, "Eine Theorie der Revolution," in *Empirische Revolutionsforschung*, ed. Klaus von Beyme (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1973), 185–204; Detlef Baum, *Relative Deprivation und Politische Partizipation* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1978).
8. Michel Foucault, "Afterword 'The Subject and Power'," in H.L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 217; see also, e.g., Michel Foucault, *Dits et Écrits 1980–1988*, vol. 4 (Paris: Ed. Gallimard, 1994).
9. Foucault, *Afterword*, 221.
10. The Commission for Filipino Migrant Workers (CFMW) in Europe started working in 1979 in London and Rome; since then they have been regularly organizing European conferences and run an office in Amsterdam. CFMW works "in partnership with the Filipino migrant community and aims to develop migrant empowerment and capacity building through self-organization, education and campaigns for migrant rights and welfare and for solidarity with migrants of other nationalities against racism." CFMW Homepage, online: <www.cfmw.org/cfweb2003a_bestanden/page0006.htm> (date accessed: 4 March 2003).
11. Natasha Pearce, "How Can Migrants Organise Themselves?" unpublished paper presented at the Rosa Luxemburg Conference, "Future Conditions of Work. Trade Unions – Migrants – Women," Hamburg, 25–26 November 2000).
12. CFMW, "Perspective on Migrant Empowerment: Filipino Migrant Community in Europe" (paper prepared by CFMW for the 6th Regional Conference on Migration in Asia, 28–30 March 2000, Chiang Mai, Thailand), (Amsterdam: 2000).
13. *Ibid.*, 2.
14. Interview with a member of RESPECT/Solidar.
15. The exact definition is as follows:

Trafficking in persons' shall mean the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harboring 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 other or other forms of sexual exploitation, forces labour or services, slavery of practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs.

Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, Supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, adopted on 15 November 2000, Doc. A/55/383 (not yet in force); online: <http://untreaty.un.org/English/TreatyEvent2002/Texts/English/CTOC_Prot2_10.pdf> (date accessed: 4 March 2003) [hereinafter *Protocol against Smuggling*].
16. Jo Doezema, "Forced to Choose: Beyond the Voluntary. V. Forced Prostitution Dichotomy," in *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance, and Redefinition*, ed. J. Doezema and K. Kempadoo (New York and London: Routledge, 1998), 42.
17. European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE), "An Overview of Proposals Addressing Migrant Smuggling and Trafficking in Persons" (Brussels and London: ECRE, July 2001); online: <www.ecre.org/research/smuggle.shtml> (date accessed: 4 March 2003); *Protocol against Smuggling*.
18. William A. Gamson and David S. Meyer, "Framing Political Opportunity," in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, ed. D. McAdam, J.D. McCarthy, and M.N. Zald (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 276.
19. European Parliament (EP), *Report on Regulating Domestic Help in the Informal Sector (2000/2021(Ini)). Committee on Women's Rights and Equal Opportunities. Rapporteur: Miet Smet. Final A5-0301/2000. En.* (Brussels, 2000).
20. Council of Europe, Committee on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men, *Domestic Slavery. Rapporteur: Mr Connor, Ireland, Epp/Cd. Draft Report. As/Ega (2001) 2. 3 January 2001* (Strasbourg, 2001) [hereinafter *Domestic Slavery*].
21. RESPECT, *Charter of Rights for Migrant Domestic Workers*. (London and Brussels, 2000); online <<http://www.solidar.org/Document.asp?DocID=162&tod=63616>> (date accessed: 4 March 2003) [hereinafter *Charter*].
22. *C177 Home Work Convention*, 20 June 1996 (entered into force 22 April 2000); online: <<http://ilolex.ilo.ch:1567/cgi-lex/con-vde.pl?C177>> (date accessed: 4 March 2003). Only four coun-

- tries (Albania, Finland, Ireland, the Netherlands) have yet ratified this Convention.
23. The ILO uses the following job description: "Domestic Helpers and Cleaners sweep, vacuum clean, wash and polish, take care of the household linen, purchase household supplies, prepare food, serve meals and perform various other duties." *International Standard Classification of Occupations. Sub-Group 9131, Isco-88* (Geneva: International Labour Organisation, 1990).
 24. Council of Europe, *Domestic Slavery*, 1.
 25. RESPECT, *Charter*.
 26. Domestic work cannot be classified well by the type of work done but by distinguishing between live-in and live-out. "Live-in" means to live in the house of the employer and work only for his/her family. Working "live-out" usually means working for several employers. As live-outs feel more independent and usually earn more, most live-ins try to move out after some time. See Anderson, *Doing the Dirty Work*, 39–47.
 27. RESPECT, *Charter*.
 28. See Anderson, *Doing the Dirty Work*; Anderson and Phizacklea, *Migrant Domestic Workers*.
 29. Council of Europe, *Domestic Slavery*, 2.
 30. Anderson, *Doing the Dirty Work*, 2f.
 31. Council of Europe, *Domestic Slavery*, paragraph 46.
 32. Bridget Anderson, quoted from: SOLIDAR and Kalayaan, *Overseas Domestic Workers: Report after the Round Table in Brussels on 5th–6th June 1996* (Brussels and London, 1996), 14.
 33. The RESPECT network decided in February 2001 to disassociate from the concept "domestic slavery" and from campaigns against trafficking in women. See Susanne Schultz, "Domestic Slavery oder Green Card? Feministische Strategien zu bezahlter Hausarbeit." *blätter des iz3w*, 257 (2001), 23–26.
 34. Interview with one of the founding members of Kalayaan.
 35. Interview with one co-ordinating member of RESPECT. Anti-Slavery International is an international human rights organization, founded in 1839 to eliminate the system of slavery around the world by urging governments of countries with slavery to develop and implement measures to end it, lobbying governments and intergovernmental agencies, conducting research to assess the scale of slavery, educating the public about the realities of slavery and campaigning for its end. See Anti-Slavery International Homepage, online: <www.antislavery.org> (date accessed: 4 March 2003).
 36. Anderson, *Doing the Dirty Work*, 95. Anderson refers to the campaigning NGO Kalayaan and a group of self-organized migrant workers, Waling-Waling.
 37. Interview with a member of RESPECT.
 38. Anderson, *Doing the Dirty Work*, 96–107.
 39. See Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1998).
 40. See Commission of the European Communities, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament Combating Trafficking in Human Beings and Combating the Sexual Exploitation of Children and Child Pornography, 21.12.2000, Com(2000) 854 Final (Brussels, 2000); European Commission, Illegal Immigration: Commission Proposes a Balanced Approach. Ip/01/1602. Brussels, 16 November 2001 (Brussels, 2001); Kommission der Europäischen Gemeinschaften, Mitteilung der Kommission an den Rat und das Europäische Parlament über eine gemeinsame Politik auf dem Gebiet der Illegalen Einwanderung. Brüssel, 15.11.2001, Kom(2001) 672 Endgültig (Brüssel, 2001).
 41. See Ilse Lenz and Helen Schwenken, "Feminist and Migrant Networking in a Globalising World: Migration, Gender and Globalisation," in *Crossing Borders and Shifting Boundaries*, Vol. 2: *Gender, Networks and Identities*, ed. I. Lenz, H. Lutz, M. Morokvasic, C. Schöning-Kalender, and H. Schwenken (Opladen: Leske&Budrich, 2002), 147–78.
 42. Interview with a member of Kalayaan.

Helen Schwenken is an academic staff member in the field of Globalization and Politics in the Department for Social Science at the University of Kassel (Germany). The author would like to thank the anonymous referees, Tanja Tästensen, Gülay Çağlar, and Heather McRae for helpful comments.
