

Disposable Domestic is a compelling book that is all too rare these days, combining academic research and theory, political conviction, and moral outrage.

—Kitty Calavita, University of California at Irvine

With patience and clarity, Grace Chang shows us that the work of immigrant women is an indispensable feature of global capitalism. Their blood and sweat has been rewarded only by increasing government regulation, domestic violence, and cultural commodification. Feminists and labor organizers beware! *Disposable Domestic* names the hot-button social justice issue of this decade.

—Karin Aguilar-San Juan, editor of *The State of Asian America*

In her illuminating book, Grace Chang shows us clearly how global capital and international policy are linked with domestic policy to trap immigrant women in their paradoxical position as the most valuable and the most vulnerable workers in the United States today, whether they are domestics and nannies in their homes, farm workers who put food on their tables, or factory workers who benefit both the U.S. and their homeland economies. Chang's book exposes the hypocrisy, cruelty, and insanity of anti-immigrant policies and attitudes that persist toward those whose labor benefits others so much more than themselves. Chang also offers an inspiring account of how immigrant women and immigrant advocates are organizing to fight for justice. I hope everyone will read this important book.

—Elaine Kim, University of California at Berkeley

Disposable Domestic is especially timely given the globalization of the economy and the growing number of immigrant women working for wages in the United States. The analysis provided in this book is critical both for understanding the plight of immigrant women workers and for designing strategies for change.

—Mimi Abramovitz, author of *Regulating the Lives of Women*

DISPOSABLE DOMESTICS

**Immigrant Women Workers
in the Global Economy**

GRACE CHANG
Foreword by Mimi Abramovitz

South End Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Global Exchange

The World Bank, “Welfare Reform,” and the Trade in Migrant Women

We in the Third World are being told by the IMF [International Monetary Fund] and World Bank, “Here are the models in the West,” and [we are] having conditions put on us that take away what little we have achieved in our own countries.

—woman trade unionist, India¹

We are told to tighten our belts—but in this belt-tightening, others are loosening.

—Winnie Byanyima, Uganda²

We see migration as the result of structural adjustment programs—we give up our lands, our products, and finally our people.

—Eileen Fernandez, Malaysia³

Each of these testimonies, given in China in 1995 at the Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) Forum on Women, speaks to the real impacts of structural adjustment programs (SAPs) felt by poor women of the Third World. They reflect these women’s clear recognition that their land, products, labor, and lives are extracted for other people’s profit through these programs. Since the 1980s, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and other international financial institutions (IFIs) based in the First World have routinely prescribed structural adjustment policies to the governments of indebted countries as preconditions for loans. These prescriptions have included cutting government ex-

penditures on social programs, slashing wages, liberalizing imports, opening markets to foreign investment, expanding exports, devaluing local currency, and privatizing state enterprises. While SAPs are ostensibly intended to promote efficiency and sustained economic growth in the "adjusting" country, in reality they function to open up developing nations' economies and peoples to imperialist exploitation.

SAPs strike women in these nations the hardest, and render them most vulnerable to exploitation, both at home and in the global labor market. At the Fourth World Conference on Women and the NGO forum in China in 1995, poor women of color from Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East spoke of increasing poverty and rapidly deteriorating nutrition, health, and work conditions that have emerged for women in their countries as a result of SAPs. When wages and food subsidies are cut, women as wives and mothers adjust household budgets often at the expense of their own and their children's nutrition. As public health care and education vanish, women suffer from lack of prenatal care and become nurses to ill family members at home, while girls are the first to be kept from school to help at home or join the labor force. When export-oriented agriculture is encouraged, indeed coerced, peasant families are evicted from their lands to make room for corporate farms. Many women are forced to become seasonal workers in the fields or in processing areas, or to find work in the service industry, in manufacturing, or in home work producing garments for export.⁴

When women take on these extra burdens and are still unable to sustain their families, many have no other viable option but to leave their families and migrate in search of work. At the NGO forum, Asian women organizers in particular pointed to the massive migration from their countries as a result of SAP-driven poverty. Asian women migrate by the millions each year to work as servants, service workers, and sex workers in Canada, Europe, Japan, the Middle East, and the United States. Not coincidentally, the demand for service workers and especially for private household caregivers and domestic workers is exploding in wealthy nations of the First World undergoing their own versions of adjustment.

For example, in the United States, domestic forms of structural

adjustment, including cutbacks in health care and the continued lack of subsidized child care, contribute to an expanded demand among dual-career, middle-class households for workers in child care, elderly care, and housekeeping. The slashing of benefits and social services under "welfare reform" helps to guarantee that this demand is met by eager migrant women workers. The dismantling of public supports in the United States in general, and the denial of benefits and services to immigrants in particular, act in tandem with structural adjustment abroad to force migrant women into low-wage labor in the United States. Migrant women workers from indebted nations are kept pliable not only by the dependence of their home countries and families on remittances, but also by stringent restrictions on immigrant access to almost all forms of assistance in the United States. Their vulnerability is further reinforced by US immigration policies, designed to recruit migrant women as contract laborers or temporary workers ineligible for the protections and rights afforded to citizens.⁵

Both in their indebted home countries and abroad, women suffer the most from the dismantling of social programs under structural adjustment. In the Third World, women absorb the costs of cuts in food subsidies and health care by going hungry and foregoing proper medical care. Ironically, these same women continue to pick up the slack for vanishing social supports in the First World by nursing the elderly parents and young children of their employers for extremely low wages. Thus, there is a transferral of costs from the governments of both sending and receiving countries to migrant women workers from indebted nations. In both their home and "host" countries, and for both their own and their employers' families, these women pay most dearly for "adjustment."

Women are keenly aware that they bear the brunt of these hardships under structural adjustment, while their nations' governments and elites reap fat rewards in the form of women's cheap or unpaid labor and remittances from migrant women workers abroad. SAPs are founded upon the tacit assumption that poor women of color can make do with less and work more. It is assumed that women will manage, out of sheer resourcefulness, to keep their families afloat in

the face of "austerity measures" in the Third World and "welfare reform" in the First World. Further, they will continue to do low-wage service work, servicing their home countries' debts while providing greater comfort for the elite around the world. As Pamela Sparr puts it, structural adjustment policies "bank on women: they reinforce women's oppression and rely on it in order to work."⁶ Expanding on Sparr, we could say that the elite of the First World and Third World quite literally bank on women, profiting immeasurably from women's paid and unpaid labor under structural adjustment.

Recently, there has been a growing challenge to the assumption that poor women of color can continue to "adjust" without limits, that women will always be able to pick up the slack for vanishing social supports, or that they will be willing to do so at their own expense and for the gain of others. At the Beijing NGO forum, women from around the world shared stories of struggling to secure basic needs for their families and bitter accounts of exploitation as migrant workers. At the same time, they called for accountability from the IMF and World Bank and their own governments, and connected with other women organizing for migrant worker rights around the world. During the November 1999 protests in Seattle against the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Workers' Voices Coalition, representing communities of color, immigrant rights groups, and women's organizations, mobilized to protest what it sees as a "profound deterioration in the conditions of immigrant and women workers worldwide as a direct result of Free Trade policies, globalization, and privatization."⁷

Testimonies of Women Living Under SAPs: Living Without Basic Needs

At the NGO forum of 1995, women from the Third World gave first-hand testimony on the impacts of SAPs on their daily lives and struggles for survival. The phenomenon consistently reported is that overall standards of living, and conditions for women and girls in particular, have deteriorated dramatically since the onset of SAPs. Often this has occurred after periods of marked improvement in women's employment, health, education, and nutrition following

national independence movements.

In a workshop on the impact of SAPs on women, an organizer from rural India spoke of the particular hardships women face as those most affected by cuts in social programs and as the first to be displaced from their farmlands. She reported that lands in India formerly used to produce rice have been rapidly converted to shrimp farms and orange orchards. While rice has always been a staple for local consumption, shrimp are purely cash crops for export to Japan, and oranges are exported to the United States for orange juice. In her community, peasant women ran in front of bulldozers to try to prevent these lands from being taken over, but to no avail.⁸

Women from many other Third World countries reported similar conditions. An organizer from Malaysia observed, "We are adjusting with no limits to capital mobilizing everywhere. Malaysia has used all of the SAP principles, including privatization of services and deregulation of land acquisition." This woman reported that land once held by small farmers in Malaysia has also been shifted to shrimp cultivation; and Sri Lankan peasants see their lands being taken up to cultivate strawberries for export to other countries.⁹ Similarly, peasant women from the Philippines testified that under SAPs, they have been forced to relinquish all the profits of their labor to landlords; lands once used to grow rice, corn, and coffee have been converted to growing orchids and "other exotic flowers that you can't eat" for export.¹⁰

In each of these countries, women bear the brunt of SAP-induced poverty daily through lack of health care, housing, and food.¹¹ Filipina rural women have reported going without power for four to eight hours of every day and coping with little or no water.¹² Urban women from the Philippines reported working an average 18-hour day doing domestic work, laundry work outside their homes, and begging, while men face increasing unemployment. Their children are most often on the street rather than in school, and many families are becoming homeless due to the high price of housing and the demolition of houses under development. Families often eat only once or twice a day because they can't afford to eat more often. Most go without any health care, as the public hospitals demand payment up

front and prescription medicines are prohibitively expensive.¹³ Similarly, one rural organizer from India reported that prices for essential medicines have gone up 600 percent since the onset of SAPs, severely reducing Indian women's access to proper health care.¹⁴

One woman from Egypt, typically considered a "medium developing country," testified that IMF-dictated SAPs in her country have also resulted in food shortages and even the first occurrences of deaths from starvation in recent Egyptian history. Egyptian women report hardships from frozen wages and tax increases by the government to pay its debts (for example, sales taxes of 18 percent on food and clothes). The end of free education and health services has been most devastating to women and girls, with girls being kept home from school, sent to work, and married off earlier. While girls in Egypt once were educated at levels comparable to boys, now 66 percent are illiterate and only 50 percent of girls continue on to high school. Finally, there has been a growing trend of early pregnancy with no prenatal or postnatal care.¹⁵

The "official" figures corroborate these first-hand testimonies of women in countries under structural adjustment. Between 1969 and 1985, per capita food production declined in 51 out of 94 developing countries. Simultaneously, access to food has been severely limited by increased food prices with the devaluation of local currencies under SAPs. Expenditures on education in all poor developing countries except China and India declined from 21 percent of national budgets in 1972 to 9 percent in 1988. Health-care expenditures were also reduced from 5.5 percent to 2.8 percent of national budgets during this period.¹⁶

As women have been displaced from their lands and homes under structural adjustment, women who were once small farmers have been forced to do home work, to migrate to cities to work in manufacturing and the electronic industry, or to migrate overseas to do nursing, domestic work, sex work, and "entertainment."¹⁷ Commentary of women organizing in countries impacted by SAPs reflects an acute awareness of the ways in which the governments and economic elites of their countries and First World countries profit at the expense of women's labor conditions, education, nutrition, health,

and safety. As one labor organizer from India remarked:

Our governments are surrendering to these multinational corporations and Western agencies. These magnates and mafias, in the name of globalization, want to exploit our workers and resources. Our real concerns are food, water, clean, sanitary conditions, health, shelter, and no exploitation. These are the human rights we want. All these governments are telling us to talk about human rights. What are they doing?¹⁸

Exporting Women: The "New Heroes"

Each day, thousands of Filipinas leave their homes and families in search of work abroad. The Philippine government estimates that more than 4 percent of the country's total population is overseas contract workers. About 700,000 Filipina/os were deployed through a government agency, the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA), each year in 1993 and 1994.¹⁹ In 1991, women constituted a larger proportion of the country's overseas workforce (41 percent) than its domestic workforce (36 percent). Of those overseas, approximately 70 percent are women working as domestic servants in middle- and upper-class homes in Europe, Japan, the Middle East, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Many of the others work as nurses, sex workers, and entertainers.²⁰ Such massive migrations of women have led to public outcries that the Philippine government is selling or trafficking women.

Indeed, this massive migration is no mere coincidence of individual women's choices to leave the Philippines. The Philippine government receives huge sums of remittances from its overseas workers each year. "Host" country governments and private employers welcome the migrant women workers for the cheap labor that they perform. These governments and employers accrue savings not only by paying extremely low wages, but by denying public benefits and social services to these temporary workers. Finally, recruiting agencies and other entrepreneurs on each end of the trade route reap tremendous profits from providing employers in "host" countries with ready and willing service workers and caregivers of all kinds.

In 1994, the Central Bank of the Philippines recorded the receipt of \$2.9 billion in remittances by overseas workers. Remittances through informal channels have been estimated at \$6 to 7 billion annually. These remittances are the country's largest source of foreign exchange—surpassing income from either sugar or minerals—and provide currency for payments toward the country's \$46 billion debt. In 1993, overseas contract workers' remittances were estimated at 3.4 percent of the Gross Domestic Product, which is the equivalent of 30 percent of the trade deficit or the entire interest payments on the country's foreign debt. These estimates are based on official figures alone and do not include money that entered through informal channels. As the Freedom from Debt Coalition has put it, "Indeed, what the country cannot achieve through export of goods, it compensates for through the export of human resources."²¹

Of less importance to the Philippine government, but certainly significant in explaining the continued massive migration flows, are estimates that approximately 30 to 50 percent of the entire Filipina/o population is dependent on migrant worker remittances.²² Furthermore, it has been found that migrant women workers send home a larger proportion of their wages than their male counterparts do, even though they tend to earn less than men.²³ Such contributions led one ambassador from the Philippines to Canada to proclaim: "The migrant workers are our heroes because they sustain our economy."²⁴

"Host" countries are eager to receive these female mercenaries, as they bolster their economies also. As many countries of the First World undergo downsizing and the dismantling of public supports, migrant women workers offer an ideal source of cheap, highly exploitable labor. These women are channeled directly into the service sector, where they do every form of care work for a pittance and no benefits. Ironically, immigrant domestic workers, nannies, in-home caregivers, and nurses pick up the slack for cuts in government services and supports that pervade the First World, as well as the Third World. Overseas, they provide care for the ill, the elderly, and children, while their own families forego this care because of the economic restructuring that drives them overseas.

Nurses and Home-Care Workers

Currently, there are 100,000 registered nurses in the Philippines, but almost none actually reside in the country. Similarly, 90 percent of all Filipina/o medical-school graduates do not live in their country. Since the 1970s, the United States has imported women from the Philippines to work as nurses, ostensibly in response to domestic shortages in trained nurses. This importation system became institutionalized in the H-1 nursing visa, which enables a hospital or nursing home to sponsor or bring a nurse with a professional license from abroad to work here for two years.

Under the H-1 program, applicants must take the US nurses' licensing exam. If she passes, she can gain permanent residency after two years. During those two years, she is nearly captive to her original sponsoring employer. If she fails the exam, she loses her sponsorship and technically must leave the country. More often, such women go underground until they can take the exam again. Sometimes, they work in nursing homes, where they are paid as little as \$5 an hour; others arrange green-card marriages.

In 1988, the Filipina Nurses Organization fought for the Nursing Relief Act, which has provided some rights and stability to H-1 nurses in the last decade. The law grants nurses permanent residency after five years of living in the United States and working in the nursing profession. Prior to this act's passage, H-1 nurses had to go home after five years and could only return and apply to have their H-1 visas renewed after one year's residence in their home countries. This system served to keep nurses in low-wage, temporary positions, forcing them to begin again and again at entry level with no seniority or benefits. The Immigration and Naturalization Service routinely conducted raids at hospitals to ensure that this turnover of temporary workers occurred.

Mayee Crispin, a Filipina nurse, organizes H-1 nurses at St. Bernard's Hospital on the south side of Chicago. At St. Bernard's, 80 percent of the nurses are single Filipina women on H-1 visas. The starting wage is \$14 an hour, in contrast to \$16 an hour at other hospitals, and the ratio of patients to nurses is high. But many of the

nurses are reluctant to organize, fearful of losing their jobs or their employers' immigration sponsorship if they are identified as being pro-union. Many are sending remittances to their families at home and struggling to pay off their debts from migration.

Crispin proposes that importing nurses from the Philippines is a moneymaking venture for hospitals and the nursing recruiters they contract. According to Crispin, a hospital typically gets workers from overseas by making an official certification that they cannot find US workers to fill its nursing positions. (This is usually because the hospital offers wages that few US workers are willing to accept.) The hospital is then free to contract a recruiter to go to the Philippines in search of nurses. A nurse must pay, on average, between \$7,000 and \$9,000 to the recruiter. Ostensibly, a portion of this fee goes to the recruiter's salary, and a portion goes to a lawyer to arrange the woman's visa. Since most women cannot afford this fee, they agree to have it deducted from their wages. After paying off such fees and sending roughly 25 to 30 percent of their wages to their families at home, their monthly wages disappear quickly. In essence, most of these women live in a situation much like indentured servitude or debt bondage for at least two years. Crispin says that hospitals, by hiring migrant nurses, not only get cheap labor, they also get a workforce that is extremely vulnerable, fearful, uninformed of its rights, and thus likely to resist unionization.

Ninotchka Rosca of Gabriela Network USA observes the ironic history of Filipina nurses in the United States. In the 1980s, the nursing profession in the United States was extremely low-paying, with salaries at about \$20,000 a year. So the country experienced a drastic shortage of nurses. With few US citizens going into the field or willing to work for such low wages, many Jamaican and Filipina women migrated here to do this work. With the downsizing in health care, many of those same nurses who have been here for more than a decade are now finding themselves just as vulnerable as new migrants. Hospitals are attempting to reduce costs by firing their most experienced, and thus highest-paid, nurses. Rosca suggests that US hospitals and the health-care industry would collapse without Filipina nurses. She comments: "We take care of everybody else's

weaker members of society, while we let our own society go to hell."²⁵

Home health care is another industry in which immigrant women are highly concentrated and fall prey to both profit-seeking agencies and the cost-cutting US government. Many home-care workers are employees of the state, working under a state-funded program called "in-home support services" (IHSS). Some of these women are registered nurses, while others are not trained as nurses at all. The program provides no training, no regulations, and no monitoring of the work, which includes everything from performing medical procedures to preparing meals and cleaning to helping elderly, frail, or ill clients to get to the toilet, to bathe, and to move about. To keep costs down, the state pays workers a minimum wage of \$4.50 an hour and provides no benefits, including no sick leave, family leave, overtime pay, compensation for injuries on the job, or reimbursement for bus fares or gasoline to run errands for patients or to take them to the doctor.²⁶ In California, there are 170,000 of these workers statewide, of whom approximately 80 percent are women, 60 to 70 percent are people of color, and 40 percent are immigrants.

Josie Camacho—at the time, an organizing leader for SEIU (Service Employees International Union) Local 250, a union of home-care workers in Alameda and San Francisco Counties in California—points out that, particularly with the restructuring of hospitals under the ongoing privatization of health care, patients are being sent home too early and thus home-care workers are having to provide what should be trained nursing care, often without any formal training. For example, routine duties can include giving enemas and insulin shots, changing bandages, and hooking up dialysis machines.²⁷ In addition to the grueling work and low pay, immigrant workers in particular frequently report sexual harassment and other forms of abuse from their clients, including threats of deportation and general treatment as slaves. One worker was ordered to clean the bathroom with a toothbrush.²⁸

The union is demanding the workers' rights to dignity and respect, proper training in health and safety procedures, and better wages. Camacho explains that these demands are aimed not only at

improving the standard of living and rights for the workers, but also at improving the quality of care provided to clients. Patients are typically Supplementary Security Income (SSI) recipients and must have assets under \$2,000 to qualify for care under the state program. Thus, the government is relying on the weak positions of both impoverished patients, who have no control over the quality of care offered them, and low-wage workers, who have little recourse to fight these low wages and highly exploitative conditions.

Employing an IHSS worker saves taxpayers approximately \$30,000 a year, the difference between the cost of keeping a patient in a nursing home and the typical salary of \$7,000 a year earned by an IHSS worker who works 30 hours a week. This savings is reaped by state, county, and federal governments, which share the program's annual cost. Robert Barton, manager of the adult-services branch of the California Department of Social Services overseeing the program, commented: "It's a good deal for the government." The union's health-care organizing director in Washington, David Snapp, retorts: "It's a scam."²⁹ The IHSS program provides one of the best illustrations of the tremendous savings to governments through the low-wage labor of migrant care workers. Other savings to the state and employers have not been measured, such as those from not providing public benefits, services, and protections to these workers.

In the private sector, the situation is no better, with agencies and companies turning a profit from placing these workers instead of the state saving money by underpaying workers. Home-care agencies, just like hospitals, make huge profits from recruiting and placing home-care workers. For example, an agency will typically contract out a live-in caregiver to a client for \$120 to \$200 a day, while the worker herself receives only \$80 of that daily rate.³⁰

Domestic Workers and Nannies

The majority of migrant Filipina workers are domestic workers and nannies. Many of them work in Canada, which has had a "live-in caregiver program" since 1992 to facilitate the importation of these migrants. Through this program, a Canadian employer (either an individual or employment agency) may apply through the Canadian

Employment Office for a prospective employee. The employer must show that it first tried to find a Canadian to do the job. The prospective employee must have six months of formal training or 12 months of experience in caregiving work and be in good health. If approved, the employee can gain temporary employment authorization for one year, and this can be extended for an additional year. A nanny must undergo a personal interview with Canadian consular officials and must receive security clearance. Once matched with an employer, she must notify the Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration if she wishes to change employers. After two years of live-in work, a nanny can apply for landed-immigrant status. She can then sponsor her immediate family to join her if they can prove that they have a source of steady income. Three years after applying for landed-immigrant status, she can become a Canadian citizen.³¹

The film *Brown Women, Blonde Babies*, produced by Marie Boti, documents the conditions for Filipina migrant women working as domestics and nannies in Canada. The film shows women who typically work around the clock, from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. and beyond. They earn an average of \$130 a month (in US dollars) after taxes. Women who wish to leave their employers must persuade an immigration officer to let them. In response to one woman's pleas for release from an employer, an immigration officer said coldly, "You didn't come here to be happy."³²

In stark contrast to the conditions revealed in this documentary, employers of domestic workers and nannies in Canada romanticize the work and the "opportunities" they offer to immigrant women. For example, a Toronto newspaper, *The Globe and Mail*, boasted that Canada is the first-choice destination for Filipina migrant workers:

For the women themselves, improving their economic status helps them challenge the Philippines' traditional stereotype of women as submissive homemakers who need to rely on their husbands, fathers, or brothers to survive. The huge exodus of female contract workers from the country in the past decade has created a generation of women who are more confident and independent about their role in a society that has now been forced to ask some hard questions about many of its traditional paternalistic attitudes.³³

Clearly, if Filipina women's roles in their society are subservient, as this statement implies, then those roles are not overturned but reinforced when migrant women are forced to serve as low-wage workers overseas instead of as homemakers. The only difference is that they provide domestic services to employers in the First World, instead of to their own families, while servicing their government's foreign debt at the same time. The *Kanlungan Foundation Centre*, an advocacy group for Filipina migrant workers, points out:

We do not migrate as totally free and independent individuals. At times, we have no choice but to migrate, to brave the odds ... Even from the very start, we are already victims of illegal recruitment, victims of our government's active marketing of our cheap labor.... [S]uffering the backlash of states that fail to provide adequate support for child-care services, we enter First World countries that seek to preserve patriarchal ideology.³⁴

This statement reflects migrant women workers' understanding that they are being used to maintain patriarchy in the First World, as governments in these wealthy nations cut social supports.

Just as employers try to justify exploiting servants by romanticizing the "opportunities" they provide these women, the Philippine government attempts to rationalize the trade in women by glorifying its migrant women exports. In 1988, on a state visit to Hong Kong, President Corazón Aquino declared migrant women the new heroes of the Philippine economy.³⁵ Since then, many officials have taken this up as the party line in justifying the trade in women. The Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC), an organization working to counter SAPs, notes: "Because of their economic contributions, migrant workers are hailed by the administration as the new heroes and labor export is elevated into a national policy, the appalling social costs and the prevalence of abuses notwithstanding."³⁶

Women's Resistance

In July 1994, Sarah Balabagan, a 15-year-old Filipina working as a maid in the United Arab Emirates (UAE), was raped at knifepoint by her employer. In self-defense, Balabagan stabbed and killed her rap-

ist/employer and was sentenced to seven years of imprisonment. In response to protests, Balabagan was retried but was then sentenced to death. In outrage, many overseas Filipinas joined protests staged by Gabriela Network USA in front of the UAE mission and the Philippine government consulate in the United States. Again, Balabagan's sentence was revised. This time, she was sentenced to one year in prison and 100 lashes. She was also ordered to pay her deceased employer's family 150,000 dirhams, or the equivalent of \$41,995. Gabriela's Ninotchka Rosca speculates that the main reason the UAE government rescinded the death sentence was fear of a walkout by the approximately 75,000 Filipina/os working in the United Arab Emirates, which would have paralyzed the country.

Protests continued after this last sentence, with activists pointing out that 100 lashes could actually kill Balabagan. Despite this, the Philippine government agreed to the sentence, reinforcing outrage at its willingness to sacrifice women's lives to maintain good relations with its chief trade partners. Many Filipinas working in the United Arab Emirates have collected a scholarship fund for Balabagan to complete her education once she finishes her prison sentence. She had quit school to work in the United Arab Emirates to support her parents and help pay for her brother's education. Balabagan has since become a symbol for Filipina overseas workers fighting for the recognition and protection of their human and worker's rights.³⁷

Teresita Tristan is a widow who left two children behind in the Philippines for a job in Britain as a domestic worker. Before leaving, she had been promised a salary of \$400 a month; when she arrived, her employers took her passport and informed her that she would be paid \$108 a month. On her first day in the country, she was taken for a medical exam, given medicine to clean her stomach, and instructed to take a bath and not to touch the dishes with her bare hands until five days had passed. Her daily work consisted of cleaning the entire house, taking the children to school, and preparing the family's meals, of which she ate only leftovers. She was not allowed to eat from their plates or glasses or to use the toilet inside the house. When her male employer kept making sexual advances, ask-

ing her to go to the guest house with him, she asked to be released and return home. Instead, she was transferred to her employers' daughter's home, where she was treated just as badly. The children pulled her hair and kicked her, and when she complained, she was told, "They are just children."³⁸

One day, Tristan went to the park and met a British woman who took her phone number and called the police for her. The Commission for Filipina Migrant Workers helped her to leave her employer's home and find shelter. For many weeks, she feared that her employer would come to find her. Now, Tristan belongs to an organization of unauthorized workers fighting for migrant workers' rights. Tristan's story is typical of that of migrant workers, according to Kalayaan, an organization working for justice for overseas domestic workers in Britain. Between January 1992 and December 1994, Kalayaan interviewed 755 workers who had left their employers. These interviews revealed widespread abuses of overseas domestic workers from Brazil, Colombia, Ghana, India, Nigeria, the Philippines, and Sri Lanka. Eighty-eight percent had experienced psychological abuse, including name-calling, threats, and insults; 38 percent had endured physical abuse of some form; 11 percent had experienced attempted, threatened, or actual sexual assault or rape. A full 60 percent had received no regular food; 42 percent had no bed, while 51 percent had no bedroom and were forced to sleep in a hallway, kitchen, bathroom, or storeroom; 34 percent reported being imprisoned or not being allowed to leave the house; 91 percent reported working for an average of 17 hours a day with no time off; 55 percent were not paid regularly; and 81 percent were paid less than what had been agreed upon in their contracts, with an average monthly wage of \$105.

A spokeswoman from Kalayaan says that these widespread abuses are made possible by British immigration law. In 1979, the British government abolished work permits for overseas domestic workers but continued to allow overseas employers and returning British residents to bring domestic workers into the country. This was a concession granted to rich people returning from traveling abroad with their employees. As Maria Gonzalez of the Commis-

sion on Filipina Overseas Domestic Workers puts it: "In the United Kingdom, migrant women are brought into the country like the baggage of their employers."³⁹ Migrant women enter with their employers' names stamped on their passports and cannot change employers after entering. Even in the rare case that a woman negotiates a contract with her employer, she has no bargaining power or legal recourse if the employer violates it.

Migrant workers have mobilized worldwide to expose these abuses and to fight for protection of their rights. Women in countries including Britain, Canada, Japan, and the United States have organized grassroots groups to offer support and legal advocacy and to lobby for the protection of Filipina and other migrant workers abroad. Kalayaan lobbies to change British law to allow migrant workers to receive permits directly, to change employers freely, and to stay and work in the country while pursuing legal action against former employers.

INTERCEDE is a similar organization, based in Toronto, Ontario, undertaking research and advocating for Filipina and Caribbean migrant domestic-worker rights. It provides direct services, such as individual counseling on labor and immigration rights, educational meetings, and social activities to aid settlement. The organization also lobbies the Canadian government. In 1981, INTERCEDE succeeded in convincing the Canadian parliament to grant the same rights to foreign domestic workers on temporary visas that Canadian citizens have under labor laws.⁴⁰ Currently, INTERCEDE is pressuring the government to recognize domestic work as an occupation, to do away with the live-in requirement, and to allow immigrants to gain "landed-immigrant" status immediately upon entering Canada, instead of having to wait two years.

In the United States, the Campaign for Migrant Domestic Worker Rights, a project launched in September 1997 in Washington, DC, is a coalition of lawyers, social-service providers, unions, and human-rights, ethnic, and religious organizations working to monitor and end abuses of migrant domestic workers employed in the private homes of diplomats and officials of the World Bank, the IMF, the United Nations, and other international agencies. The ma-

majority of the workers served by the coalition are poor Third World women who have immigrated to the United States on special visas (A-3 and G-5) to work as cooks, drivers, nannies, housekeepers, gardeners, and other personal servants. Just prior to the coalition's formation, Aegyptidae Bolos, a Filipina housekeeper, sued her former employer, a retired employee of the World Bank, for sexual assault. Bolos had been attacked several times by Robert Mabouche, including one night after her husband, who had worked for the Mabouches, was fired and sent back to the Philippines. She said she did not report the attacks earlier because she was afraid of being deported. In an unprecedented case, Bolos was awarded \$120,000 by a Montgomery County jury for suffering emotional distress, sexual assault and battery, and wrongful termination of employment. Bolos said, "I am so happy because I have found justice.... This is a big help, because the employers take advantage of housekeepers. They think we do not have the money to get justice."⁴¹

The coalition aims to hold employers and institutions such as the World Bank and the IMF (which alone have about 1,000 G-5-visa workers) accountable for their employees' abusive practices and to educate workers about their rights and available social services and legal assistance. The approach of this campaign seems to be well directed at the source of the problems on more than one level. The coalition addresses reported abuses of workers, including gross underpayment or nonpayment and physical, sexual, and psychological abuse. (In one case, a Filipina woman's employer forced her to wear a dog collar and sleep outside with the family's dogs.) On another level, the project targets the institutions and actors that are responsible for the imposition of SAPs and "austerity measures," which wreak havoc on these women's lives in their home countries and force them to migrate.⁴²

Health-care workers, many of whom are migrant women, are employed in the fastest-growing service industry in the United States and are also a prime target for labor organizers as some of the most exploited and, until recently, least organized workers.⁴³ A recent victory by SEIU against the state of California represents the fruits of a five-year struggle by the union on behalf of more than

50,000 home-care workers. In the summer of 1990, the California legislature and Governor Pete Wilson failed to reach an agreement on a budget, and the state stopped issuing paychecks. IHSS home-care workers were the first to feel the impact of the budget crisis. Some workers' paychecks were delayed up to two months. During the budget impasse of 1992, workers suffered the same series of events.

The union brought a class-action suit against the state (*Caldman v. California*) on behalf of more than 10,000 IHSS workers. It argued that the workers suffered extreme hardship because of the delayed payments, including having electricity turned off in their homes and not having enough money for food. Judge Levi of the US District Court for the Eastern District of California ruled on March 17, 1994, that the delayed payments violated the Fair Labor Standards Act. A settlement reached in May 1995 awarded damages of \$4 million to be divided among approximately 50,000 workers who joined the action. It has taken as long as six years for the workers to receive individual settlements of between \$126 and \$340, or \$680 if their payments were delayed in both 1990 and 1992.⁴⁴ This SEIU struggle represents a victory over a government that all too easily evades responsibility for the well-being and basic rights of both its impoverished and ill citizens and the migrant workers it actively recruits to care for them.

Josie Camacho, then-organizer for SEIU Local 250, points to the ongoing challenges of organizing home-care workers. First, there is no central workplace, with workers scattered among as many as 6,000 different work sites in a county. Second, some immigrant workers feel indebted to their employers and are not only reluctant to join the union but have reported other workers who do. Third, the union has had to identify an "employer" on which to make their demands, as the state is unwilling to identify as much. The union has had to create an employer, called the "public authority," made up of disability advocates, clients currently receiving IHSS, and senior citizens.

This need to create an employer illustrates a central challenge in organizing for migrant worker rights. No party is willing to admit responsibility for, or to be held accountable for, the rights and protection of these workers. All parties, including both the sending and

receiving countries' governments, employers, and employment agencies, evade or completely disclaim responsibility. Yet all benefit immensely from these workers' labor, extracting foreign currency, profits, savings, and care services.

Groups such as the Campaign for Migrant Domestic Workers' Rights, INTERCEDE, Kalayaan, and SEIU Local 250 focus on organizing immigrant workers and providing direct services to them in "host" home countries while lobbying these sending-country governments to change oppressive immigration and labor policies. Other organizations have a different emphasis, putting pressure on the Philippine government and IFIs to recognize the impact of SAPs on poor women of the Third World at home and abroad. They work to demonstrate that migration is not a matter of an individual woman's free choice, but a response to poverty created by First World imperialism and perpetuated by SAPs. They aim to expose how the Philippine government facilitates the export of women migrant workers, sacrificing women in the futile effort to keep up with debt payments. Finally, they pressure the Philippine government to redirect expenditures away from debt servicing, to institute protections for migrant workers abroad, and to stop the export of women from the Philippines and other impoverished countries.

As Mercedes Cruz of the FDC has commented, "While many analysts would root the cause of the problem of migration in poverty, I would like to be more pointed in the analysis of just what constitutes this poverty and what structural forces bring it about." Cruz described the rice crisis that forced the Philippines, once the leading rice producer in Asia, to import rice from Thailand and other Asian neighbors. Cruz cautioned that while many people mistakenly blamed the rice cartels for this crisis, she held the Philippine government and IFIs responsible. Under SAPs, farmers lost critical subsidies, and those in the hinterlands could not bring their produce to the market for lack of roads resulting from cuts in infrastructure spending.⁴⁵

Compare Cruz's analysis with the following simplistic account put forth in the Toronto *Globe and Mail*, in the same article celebrating the fabulous employment opportunities in Canada for nannies:

Armed with little more than enormous optimism and pluck, more than 1,300 migrants a day leave the Philippines to escape crushing poverty and carve out a better future for their families. With few opportunities for them in the dysfunctional economy of the Philippines, a country plagued by corruption and political instability, they travel halfway around the world to work as nannies and housekeepers for middle-class working couples in New York, Hong Kong, Vancouver, or Toronto.⁴⁶

This account reflects the prevailing mind-set in many "host" countries, highlighting the tremendous challenge the FDC and other organizations face in demystifying the causes and consequences of Filipina migration. Certainly many would agree that corruption has plagued the Philippine government and economy, but advocates for immigrants' rights propose that corrupt officials and imperialist systems supporting them should be held accountable. Gabriela demands that the Philippine government negotiate reduced payments and repudiate fraudulent loans; it also insists that the IMF collect any remaining debts from the Marcos family.⁴⁷

At the 1995 NGO forum, the FDC demanded a commitment to freeing public resources currently devoted to debt service, redirecting them to rural infrastructure and social services such as primary health care, education, and housing:

In order to prevent the hemorrhagic flow of migrant Filipinas to all corners of the globe, the FDC has always maintained that freeing the money that goes to debt payments will contribute significantly to the creation of jobs and a genuine and balanced industrialization, and ultimately to the development of the Philippine economy. Then and only then can we prevent the disintegration of the Filipino family, and the Filipino nation as a whole due to the debt, the SAPs, and migration.⁴⁸

While many organizations focus on fighting for protections for migrant workers overseas, others propose that ultimately the global trafficking in women must stop. Gabriela has led the fight against the trade in Filipina and other migrant women. Gabriela accused the Philippine government of feeding young Filipinas into the sex in-

dustry in Japan after 35 violations were discovered within a four-month period when a Department of Labor and Employment policy prohibited women under age 23 from migrating to Japan to work as entertainers. Gabriela found that the department made exceptions for four "favored" recruitment agencies. The department's former secretary confessor admitted that it granted exemptions to the minimum age requirement, but denied that Filipina migrants were falling victim to prostitution in Japan.⁴⁹ In response, Gabriela asked who benefits from these exemptions and called the Philippine government the biggest pimp in the country. Gabriela has called for the government to begin weaning the economy away from—and ultimately stop—the export of labor. The Philippine government denies that it participates in such a trade.⁵⁰

Mainstream US feminist responses to the issue of the trade in women have been lukewarm at best. When Gabriela called on women's organizations around the world to put the issue of the global trafficking of women on their agendas, the National Organization for Women declined to do so, stating that it does not deal with international issues.⁵¹ Perhaps the real issue is that privileged women of the First World, even self-avowed feminists, may be some of the primary consumers and beneficiaries in this trade.

Even among grassroots organizations fighting for justice for migrant women workers, it may prove difficult to develop a unified position or strategy. The effectiveness and viability of one strategy, imposing a ban on recruitment of Filipinas for migrant work, has been debated since such a ban was imposed by the Aquino administration in 1988. A coalition of 22 migrant-worker groups in Hong Kong formed to press the Aquino government to repeal the ban, arguing that it hindered Filipinas' ability to secure employment, actually debilitating rather than protecting them.⁵²

Almost ten years later, debate over the tactic of a ban continues. Felicita Villasin, executive director of INTERCEDE and executive board member of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC) in Canada, says that she does not embrace the strategy of calling for a reduction of or stop to labor migration. She sees this as an impractical measure that will only drive women to face

greater danger and abuses as illegal migrants. Instead, she calls for structural changes in the Philippine economy that will make migration a choice, not a necessity. At least on this last point, Villasin asserts, there seems to be consensus among the women's groups involved in Filipina migrant-worker struggles.

Since before the NGO forum, INTERCEDE has undertaken popular education among its members and the public about the connections between labor migration and SAPs imposed on indebted countries of Asia and the Caribbean, exposing the structural reasons that many of its members have had to leave their families to migrate for work. INTERCEDE is a member organization of NAC, a coalition of 600 women's groups that, according to Villasin, "seek our counterparts in the South to work not just towards solidarity or sympathy but towards strategy on an international level."⁵³

Asian/Pacific Islander and other feminists of color in the First World would do well to take the lead from groups like INTERCEDE and many of our Third World sisters who have been mobilizing around the issues of SAPs and the trafficking of women. At the NGO forum, many First World women remarked that they were the least well-informed or organized on global economic issues. Many First World feminists of color came home from the forum resolved to undertake or redouble efforts to understand and expose the links between economic restructuring in the First World, SAPs in the Third World, and the global trade in women.

In Canada, NAC and the Canadian Labour Congress cosponsored a monthlong, nationwide Women's March Against Poverty in May and June 1996. The march culminated in a rally at the nation's capital to demand that Parliament redress women's poverty in Canada and globally. Its call to action included the need to strengthen employment conditions and opportunities for women, to reinforce social services, and to adopt the elimination of women's poverty "as a foreign policy objective."⁵⁴

In the United States, Miriam Ching Louie and Linda Burnham of the Women of Color Resource Center returned from the NGO forum committed to designing a popular education project, Women's Education in the Global Economy (WEDGE). The project

includes a curriculum and set of trainings focused on a broad range of global economic issues and trends impacting women: the global assembly line; SAPs; women's unpaid, contingent, and informal work; welfare; environmental justice; women's human rights; sex trafficking and migration; and organizing around these issues.⁵⁵

The goal in each of these efforts is to educate women broadly about global restructuring as a complex of interconnected systems that bolster patriarchy, racism, capitalism, and imperialism in oppressing poor women of color worldwide. In the United States, for example, more needs to be done to expose how "welfare reform," attacks on social spending, and SAPs in the Third World all contribute to the channeling and entrapment of migrant women and women of color in exploitative, low-wage service work.

SAPs and other economic restructuring policies affect Third World women in similar ways the world over, making survival more precarious, and women's unpaid labor burdens heavier, and exacerbating women's exploitation as low-wage workers both at home and abroad. Yet the struggles and triumphs of women like Balabagan and Tristan—and the efforts of groups such as INTERCEDE, Gabriela, Kalayaan, and SEIU Local 250—stand as testament to the ability of women to resist this global assault on Third World women workers.

Conclusion

In *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization*, Saskia Sassen describes what she calls the trends of "denationalization" of economics and "renationalization" of politics in the new global economy. She argues that "the existence of two different regimes for the circulation of capital and the circulation of immigrants, as well as two different regimes for the protection of human rights and the protection of state sovereignty, poses problems that cannot be solved by the old rules of the game."⁵⁶ Sassen suggests that the rise of global capitalism has transformed the institution of citizenship into one of "economic citizenship" such that corporations and markets may now act in the accountability functions that states were once presumed to do. In such a system of a "global, cross-border economic electorate . . . the right to vote is predicated on the possibility of registering capi-

tal."⁵⁷

Sassen proposes that these transformations offer expanded potential for immigrant-rights movements to claim rights based on international human-rights codes and institutions, such as the 1990 International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families adopted by the UN General Assembly.⁵⁸ That is, displaced communities of immigrants do not derive rights exclusively from citizenship in their nation-state but from a broader base with the denationalization of economics.

I believe that this is an optimistic view of the political transformations accompanying globalization. In reality, displaced migrant workers now have an even more limited base from which to claim rights as they look to their countries of origin for the protection of their political, economic, or social rights. Moreover, the extent to which an immigrant worker can derive such protections from her or his country of origin depends on the economic stature of that country within the global economy. This is amply illustrated in the stories of two young women who worked in live-in housekeeping and child care in the United States: the widely publicized case of Louise Woodward, the British "au pair," and the little-known case of Maria "Cuca" del Refugio Gonzalez Vasquez, a Mexican "maid."⁵⁹ Both of these young women were charged with and tried for the murder of infants in their care. I am less interested in the guilt or innocence of each of these women than in the gross differences in how each was treated at the hands of the US legal system, the public here, and the governments and public in their home countries.

Louise Woodward was a 19-year-old woman from Britain employed as an au pair by a married, professional couple in suburban Newton, Massachusetts, and charged with murder for shaking the eight-month-old infant under her care, Matthew Eappen, before his death. In Woodward's case, a jury found her guilty of murder prior to state judge Hiller Zobel's reduction of her conviction to involuntary manslaughter and of her sentence to time already served. The judge wrote, "I believe that the circumstances in which [Woodward] acted were characterized by confusion, inexperience, frustration,

immaturity, and some anger, but not malice (in the legal sense) supporting a conviction for second-degree murder."⁶⁰

Woodward had several factors in her favor, including her being a white citizen of a First World nation and having been recruited and sponsored by a high-priced agency that paid her lawyers' bills. Her attorneys brought in costly defense experts who showed that the fatal injury to the infant could have been an old one, inflicted prior to Woodward's admittedly "rough" handling. Woodward promised the judge that she would remain in Massachusetts and agreed to yield her passport while her lawyers appealed her conviction. She left the courthouse accompanied by her parents and a police motorcycle escort. Her team of lawyers, including Barry Scheck, who had been one of O.J. Simpson's lawyers, stated that they would shelter her from public attention in the meantime.

Woodward needed no shielding from the public response in her native Britain, though. As one observer wrote for the *New York Times*, "The ruling unleashed streams of champagne and tears in England, where thousands have rallied for Ms. Woodward's defense and nearly the entire country seemed obsessed by her case."⁶¹ Woodward had gathered an extensive following of supporters in Britain who elevated her to heroine status, proclaimed her innocence, and celebrated her release in public news broadcasts to the tune of the theme song for England's soccer team, used in the 1996 European soccer championships. Woodward's supporters saw her as "the victim in the case, a young, naive girl who had traveled to Boston as a way to spend time between high school and college, and who had been treated with callousness and neglect by her employers."⁶²

The similarities between Woodward's case and that of Vasquez, a young Mexican woman hired as a maid by a professional couple in El Paso, Texas, are uncanny. In both cases, the impetuous, momentary actions of teenage girls could have been seen as causing the deaths of the infants in their care, and each was subsequently charged with murder. But the parallels in the two cases stop there. Vasquez, who was 17 years old, had probably acted in "confusion, inexperience, frustration, immaturity, and some anger, but not malice," as the judge had characterized Woodward's actions, when she

shook Michelle Duran, the two-month-old infant in her care, who died a few days later. The jury found Vasquez guilty of "reckless endangerment" and gave her a suspended sentence with ten years' probation to be administered by Mexican authorities in Juarez.

Vasquez did not have the benefit of an au pair agency hiring a team of lawyers for her defense. In fact, she had not been sponsored or recruited at all to be an au pair after high school and presumably before going on to university. Instead, she had only completed about three years of elementary school, and had been caring for the household and her four younger siblings from the age of 13 until she left her home in southern Mexico to look for work as a maid in Juarez. After working in Juarez for two months for a wealthy Mexican family, she crossed the border "illegally" to El Paso to begin working as a live-in maid for friends of her former Mexican employers. She earned the typical salary of room, board, and about \$50 a week to care for four young children and the enormous house of a Mexican-American attorney and his wife.

The very definition of Woodward's employment situation was a world apart from Vasquez's. According to one au pair employer, an au pair is a young woman who comes to this country "as part of an educational cultural exchange program ... straight out of high school ... seeking international adventure in exchange for work."⁶³ Au pair candidates and their prospective host families go through an extensive application process requiring essays and interviews. Once a match is made, the host family pays a \$400 placement fee, an \$800 arrival fee, and a fee of \$2,970 plus one-way domestic airfare to bring the au pair from New York to their home. Upon her arrival, the expenses paid by the family include a weekly stipend of \$139 for the au pair, room and board, tuition (up to \$500), and car insurance. This averages out to about \$245 a week, not including airfares when the family vacations with the au pair, gas, phone, and temporary child care when the au pair is on vacation for two weeks each year.⁶⁴

One woman, a veteran sponsor of au pairs, advised prospective "host" employers in a parenting magazine after the Woodward spectacle:

According to the guidelines in the program, an au pair's responsibilities may also include cooking, cleaning, and doing laundry for the children. Don't count on this. You'll be lucky if she cleans her own room, but if she's good with the children it may be worth it to not sweat the small stuff.⁶⁵

Compare these expectations with the attitude of Vasquez's employer, Diana Duran, who in her testimony recalled scolding Vasquez because "she would carry around Michelle when she would be doing housework ... [holding] her around the waist with one arm and [doing] work with the other hand." The most obvious difference in conceptions of European au pairs and Third World "maids" is reflected in the terms "sponsor" or "host family" for those employing the former, and "lady" or sometimes "padrona" for those employing the latter. Au pairs are expected to benefit from an educational and mutual cultural exchange with their host families, providing a minimum of child care, while maids are expected to serve their higher-class employers, earning a minimum of wages.

In an ironic twist, the jurors in Vasquez's case, many of whom were Latino, were sympathetic to Vasquez largely because of their resentment or animosity toward her employers, the Durans, who were upper-class Latinos. While the conviction and sentence were softer in Vasquez's case than in Woodward's, however, the long-term impact was far more damaging. Vasquez did not have a police escort from the courthouse nor a fan club celebrating her lighter sentence and anxiously awaiting her return to Mexico. Moreover, Vasquez cannot safely return to the United States ever again. Now, with a criminal conviction, she would certainly go to prison if she were to be caught by the INS, her attorney advised her.

The fate of Vasquez brings into sharp relief the treatment of Louise Woodward as a virtual saint, despite the almost identical criminal charges the two young women faced. Some observers speculated that the outcome for Woodward might have been different had her employers and the baby been white. In any case, we can see how the power relations between First and Third World nations are replicated in the treatment of one young woman from a debtor na-

tion as defective goods to be removed and barred from the country, while under the same circumstances another young woman from a First World nation is treated as a heroine and celebrity to be protected and escorted safely home.

Walden Bello argues in his book, *Dark Victory: The United States, Structural Adjustment and Global Poverty*, that the original intentions of SAPs were to resubordinate the Third World—particularly those nations threatening to become developed—by crippling the authority of their governments, and to repress labor globally to free corporate capital from any hindrances to maximizing profits.⁶⁶ SAPs in the Philippines, austerity programs in Mexico, and other similar debt policies imposed by First World agencies to ensure favorable "trade" arrangements have been an uncontested success by these measures. Third World debtor-nation governments have been unable and unwilling to protect their female citizens abroad, often eager instead to protect relations with the First World. The trade in women from the Philippines and elsewhere has proven immensely profitable to sending countries' governments and entrepreneurs, and highly "economical" to the governments that recruit them and the elite who employ them. When debtor nations export their women as migrant workers in the futile effort to keep up with debt payments, these women live and work in conditions of debt bondage, mirroring the relationship between their home and "host" countries.