Marxist Insights into the Nature of Sex Work

Samuel Parker

As an activist in the women's movement in India, I have had some experience of the anomalies in the Immoral Trafficking Prevention Act (1956) as it exists in our country today, and its general failure to prevent the exploitation of women in brothel-based prostitution. Like many other activists in the area, however, I have felt alarmed by the initiative which is being taken in the last 15 years after the Palermo Protocol (2000) by a number of international and national agencies to present prostitution as a free transaction between individuals not necessarily linked with trafficking, as 'work' not more exploitative than other kinds of work within the capitalist system. If all work under the capitalist system is exploitative but not illegal on that account, then, it is said, by the same logic, prostitution should have the same legal status as any other work. That is, the Government should meddle as little as possible in this area and should only provide for a system of licensing. It is claimed that through such 'legalization'/ licensing of the sex trade, it would be possible to free women in commercial sex from the social stigma that attaches to them thus empowering them and enabling them to assert their basic human rights. Indeed, these views have been endorsed at least by three United Nations Reports released in 2012-2013. It has seemed to me that this whole thesis takes a superficial and not a systemic view of this age-old institution which has survived by adapting itself to social change. Its true character and role today can only be comprehended by tracing its links with the evolution of social exploitation in general and patriarchy in particular. In such theorisation, some of the writings of Marx and Engels may prove to be particularly helpful and in this article, I have tried to use these to come to an understanding of the phenomenon as it exists today.

In the ITPA, in its present form, 'brothel' and 'prostitution' have been defined, but not 'trafficking'. For a long time, this had been recognized as one of the lacunae in this Act; not only does it ignore other forms of exploitation of trafficked persons, but it also does not sufficiently distinguish the victims from the perpetrators of trafficking. In 2013, when certain amendments were made in criminal laws regarding sexual violence on women, article 370 of the Indian Penal Code was reformulated to include the crime of trafficking and 'trafficking' came to be defined in this section for the first time in Indian law and the definition was more-or-less in accordance with the Palermo Protocol. This gave 'trafficking' a much more comprehensive meaning which went beyond trafficking for the purpose of brothel-based prostitution to cover many different forms of coercive exploitation of labour. Interestingly, however, while the Palermo Protocol had included 'prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation' as one of the ends of trafficking, our law now differs from the Palermo Protocol on this one point that the phrase 'prostitution of others' has been altogether dropped leaving 'any form of sexual exploitation' as an undifferentiated category. What impact this is likely to have on ITPA as it exists today, whether the law needs to be amended in accordance with Section 370 of IPC, or whether it has been rendered redundant by the amendments in the

IPC are exercises yet to be undertaken, but the miasma of controversy over the issue has deepened, and not been dispersed as a result of the changes.

In the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, the term 'prostitution' has a double-edged meaning. It has been defined as 'the act of prostituting [offering sexual activity in return of payment] a person or oneself' and is taken to include both the 'practice of a prostitute' and 'the condition of being prostituted'. ITPA, however, gives a much more restricted meaning to the term. It specifies in Section 2(f) that prostitution means 'sexual exploitation or abuse of persons for commercial purposes' and that the expression 'prostitute' should be 'construed accordingly'. We may take the last part of the sentence to mean that 'a prostitute' is a person who has been prostituted by others and therefore to emphasize the condition of being sexually exploited by others for commercial gain. As mentioned before, the Act nowhere clarifies the meaning of 'trafficking', nowhere speaks of other ways in which traffic victims may be exploited and retains provisions for penalizing the exploited person (the prostituted woman) by sending her to a 'corrective institution' under certain circumstances for her 'own good' as it were. The basic thrust of this Act remains protection of society from brothel-based prostitution rather than protection of women exploited by it. However, in spite of such anomalies, it does implicitly recognize the inextricable links between brothel-based prostitution and trafficking. These links between trafficking and prostitution are now being called into question by extremely powerful agencies professing to represent the voices of prostituted persons themselves. The fact that most of them have been co-opted into the system through a long process and have to defend it for their own survival is brushed under the carpet and the myth of 'free agency' promoted to strengthen the argument for 'de-criminalizing' the trade.

Sexual transactions between consenting adults for a monetary consideration is not outside the law in our country anyway. It is only when it is compounded with exploiting others for commercial sex, living on the earnings of such a woman, running a brothel, pimping, transacting sex trade in public places or soliciting, that it becomes an offence. But trafficking does not end with illegally trading a person from one place to another (sometimes it does not even require physical shifting), but continues in the total process of induction of a person into the trade which involves other people than the original trafficker, people like the brothel-owner, the pimp, those running escort agencies, hotel and bar-owners, sellers of drinks and drugs, local musclemen etc.. The woman in the sex trade is only a cog in the wheel, caught in a vast network of a world-wide multi-billion dollar business which provides her with her bare livelihood. Sex-trade 'legalized' with necessary certification and protection from the state cannot de-link itself from trafficking and other coercive criminal activities because of the very nature of the services it involves. Certification is protection for those who run the trade for their profit and not for those whom it exploits.

Sexual transactions in return of payment did not originate with capitalism. Frederick Engels' basic formulations can provide a starting point for our enquiries into this social phenomenon. Engels' main point is that it is coincidental with patriarchy and with a family structure that prescribes monogamy for women, whenever and in how many diverse ways it may have

originated in different parts of the world. Those who valorize it by contrasting it with the unpaid sexual labours of a wedded wife may note the fact of the historical contiguity of the two institutions. Promiscuous sex through 'hetaeraism' in the ancient world may have been only the other side of a growingly monogamous society, not liberation from it. This might be one of the originating points of prostitution and Engels calls prostitution and monogamy 'inseparable opposites, poles of the same social conditions' (**Selected Works**, p.503).

In ancient India, the practice of males from the monogamous family buying sexual services from women outside the family probably became systemic in the later Vedic Ages, that is, in BCE 8-7 centuries. There were different routes by which these women were recruited. Scholars of ancient Indian history have told us that neither the 'voyeuristic' approach nor the approach based totally on the concept of exploitation can help us to understand properly the courtesanal traditions in ancient times, but 'ways of moving beyond these sharply polarised perspectives' must be found (Kumkum Roy,2010, p. 112). None-the-less, the patriarchal boundaries within which such traditions operated could not be flouted with impunity. The legend of Ambapali in Buddhist literature tells us that however attractive and talented, the 'ganika' could not enter her profession of her own will, but was chosen for it. Many women like Ambapali may have paid the state taxes for the protection of their profession; they had some freedom of movement and could even acquire property that they could dispose of as donors, but others such as the 'rupajeevas' operating at the lower levels of society must have been in a much worse condition. In Buddhist literature, the 'kumbhadasi' has been said to belong to the wretched of the earth whose body as well as her labour power were completely at the disposal of her masters.

In feudal times, mistresses kept by the aristocracy, 'devadasi's and courtesans flourished under patriarchal patronage, and were hemmed in by the conventions of their own community that may have been different from those which were in force for wedded wives, but were no less strong. Some of them were allowed to cultivate their talents for public entertainment, but their conditions also varied a great deal in accordance with the social strata they were associated with. There were, and still are, marginalized communities where girl-children were brought up specifically to enter the profession. The question of choice for the actual service-providers in commercial sex has always been extremely limited.

Engels points out that with the consolidation of the monogamous family, promiscuity in women comes to be less and less tolerated while for men, it is seen 'at most, as a slight moral stain that one bears with pleasure' **(Selected Works**, p.502). This is why, as the monogamous family becomes the norm, both adultery and prostitution are found to flourish. Both the prototypes of 'chaste' and 'unchaste' women develop under the aegis of patriarchy. With the advent of capitalism, these ambiguities are only further accentuated. This is what the **Communist Manifesto** had pointed to when it had mocked at the bourgeois fear that communist rule would demolish marriage and bring in a 'community of women' and said that a surreptitious community of women already exists in bourgeois society (**Selected Works**, p.50). As Engels says, 'the more the old traditional hetaerism is changed in our day by capitalist commodity production and adapted to it, and the more it is transformed into

unconcealed prostitution, the more demoralising are its effects' on the whole of society. This demoralisation arises from the fact that the open flaunting of the cash nexus does not spell freedom for the woman who sells her sexual services.

This is not just because society hypocritically heaps moral opprobrium on the prostitute, but because the practice shows up the fact that while patriarchy continues to thrive under capitalism, it is morally incompatible with the professions of capitalism to uphold the idea of contractual relationships between 'free' and 'equal' people. This is evident in the institution of bourgeois marriage which upholds 'love marriage' as a human right, but 'continues to be dominated by the familiar economic influences' of cash nexus. Prostitution like marriage is not a contract between 'free' and 'equal' individuals, but consists in the submission of a number of women to the underground 'need' generated by the monogamous family which is morally unacceptable to itself. The woman in the sex trade cannot be free while the wife in the bourgeois family is unfree. This is why it is simplistic to say that merely by state certification of prostitution as 'legal' it would be possible to remove the 'moral taint' from the trade; the taint that bourgeois morality superimposes on the prostituted woman is deeply ingrained into the self-contradiction of bourgeois practice itself. As contrasted with earlier times, the aura of 'free exchange' is given to the transaction, but this only conceals the lack of freedom underneath.

The concept of commercial transactions between 'free' and 'equal' individuals through which the worker sells his labour (in reality, his labour power) to the owner of capital is one of the most crucial ideological underpinnings of the capitalist system according to Marxist thought.. Even in early texts where he analyses this issue, Marx consistently points out that the worker within this system is 'free' only in an extremely restricted sense. In **The Communist Manifesto** itself, the 'daily and hourly enslavement of the worker' to the machine, the overseer and the individual capitalist is emphasized (**Selected Works,** p.41-2**)**. In **Wages, Price and Profit,** however, Marx says, what distinguishes wage labour from other historical forms of labour is that here the unpaid part of labour which constitutes the fund from which profit is formed remains hidden. There is the 'false appearance' that the aggregate labour is paid labour and therefore free labour, while actually a part of it is being surreptitiously stolen by the capitalist (**Selected Works,p.**211). In **Wage Labour and Capital,** he contrasts the worker with the slave and the serf by saying that the former belongs 'neither to an owner nor to the land' although 'eight, ten, twelve, fifteen hours of his daily life belong to him who buys them'. 'The worker leaves the capitalist to whom he hires himself whenever he likes', but still the sole source of his livelihood being the sale of his labour power, he 'cannot leave the whole class of purchasers, that is, the capitalist class, without renouncing his existence. He belongs not to this or that capitalist, but to the *capitalist class'.* (**Selected Works**,p.74-75)

Thus on many occasions, Marx describes the 'free' worker as being in reality 'enslaved'. He does not however mean by this that the condition of the worker within the capitalist system is the same as that of a slave, any more than he means that the condition of the worker is the same as that of the prostituted woman when he says (in a footnote to the **Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844)** that 'prostitution is only a *specific* expression of the

general prostitution of the labourer' (**Collected Works**, p.295). The comparison is made not to emphasize the 'freedom' of the prostitute as a worker, but to highlight the ultimate unfreedom of the worker selling himself/herself 'piecemeal' to the owner of capital.

In the same text, there is another stark passage which similarly compares working under the capitalist with prostitution and with slavery. The worker must make everything that he has '*saleable*, that is, useful'. There is no transgression of this law, Marx said ironically, even if I extract money by offering 'my body for sale, by surrendering it to another's lust' or 'if I sell my friend to the Moroccans'. 'Cousin Ethics' and 'Cousin Religion' may think differently, but 'how can I live virtuously if I do not live at all?' (**Collected Works**, p.309-10) What Marx is talking of here is the greater and greater estrangement of the worker from his life and humanity and it is this that makes factory workers in France 'call the prostitution of their wives and daughters the 'nth working hour'. This certainly does not mean that the 'nth working hour' is like other working hours, but that it takes the self-estrangement of both the male and the female worker beyond all limits. It is an extreme illustration of the fact that 'All passions and all activity [of the worker] must therefore be submerged in *avarice*. The worker may only have enough for him to want to live, and may only want to live in order to have that.' When a worker is in this condition his lack of freedom is not 'hidden' any more, but virulently manifest. In Marx' perception this also applies to the prostituted woman.

In another passage in **Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844,** Marx describes prostitutes among the ranks of 'ruined proletarians' (**Collected Works**, p.258), from whom 'interest' is obtained by owners of landed property like owners of brothels and pawnshops. What does the term 'ruined' imply here? The adjective does not stigmatize the subject but pinpoints the moment when exploitation of labour power completely crushes the humanity and the power of resistance of the subject. As the reserve pool of labour grows larger, there is keener competition and wages are depressed to force workers at the low end into the most degraded, most insecure and most impersonalized forms of labour. As the capitalist resorts more and more to division of labour and mechanization to enhance profit, the worker becomes a 'simple, monotonous productive force that does not have to use intense bodily or intellectual faculties'. Therefore, as labour 'becomes more unsatisfying, more repulsive, competition increases and wages decrease'(**Collected Works**, p.91), that is, even the limited freedom that wage work gave to the worker to move from one capitalist to another or to bargain about wages is taken away from the former at the extreme, often invisible margins of capitalist exploitation. The dehumanisation of the worker is complete. This is the crucial difference that Marx suggests between the proletarian and the 'ruined proletarian'. In the latter case, the element of slavery, of coercion persisting within the frontiers of capitalist relationships becomes fully exposed.

In Marxist thought, then, the condition of the prostituted woman within the capitalist system is like that of a slave. It presupposes the alienation of the most intimate parts of her personality as well as near-total lack of freedom to choose employers and to bargain about wages. It is to some extent comparable with the condition of women and children pressed into working in the mining industry in Great Britain at very low wages in the early years of the

Industrial Revolution, or with that of many migrant workers today in a globalized economy, being kept in an illicit state of semi-bondage to extract more profit. But sex-trade is even more exploitative in so far as the woman in it has to alienate herself from any sense of private pleasure in what is considered to be an act of pleasure in order to satisfy the customer. This is the basic condition of the transaction. Just because she has multiple clients, it does not mean she is any more in command of her own sexual faculties than a wedded wife.

Using Marxist terms, sometimes it is being said these days that women in the sex trade are doing useful 'social reproductive work—like care work and domestic work' and that the 'sexual labour' they are engaging in forms a part of socially useful 'entertainment industries' or even constitutes 'creative work' (Gothoskar, Kaiwar, p.57-58). Even those who say this have to admit that there is no equality here as what is 'entertainment' for some is 'labour' for others. While in Marx' analysis in the texts quoted above, the argument revolves around the condition of the person being used by the capitalist system and possibilities of liberation from this, the present thesis promotes the idea of the identity of interest of those who are using these services and would benefit from its perpetuation and those who are exploited through it. Carework and domestic work, for all the usefulness it has for society, belongs to the lowest stratum of the service sector so far as working conditions go, even when it is paid for. Since it still largely supplements the unpaid work women do inside the family and is not seen as work that is useful for the whole society, its recognition is minimal. This is evident in the fact that even in Government schemes like ICDS and ASHA, the workers are not regarded as workers but basically as social volunteers. Those who run 'care work and domestic work industries' for profit thrive on the availability of unskilled workers from an unending pool of women job-seekers. Similarly 'entertainment industries' like bar-dancing and strip-shows also exploit a huge reserve army of women in the labour market who work in a highly competitive field without much option to leave it. Using the Marxist formulation of 'reproductive labour' to valorize such occupations is to hopelessly romanticize the concept itself, something that Marx certainly had not done. To impute creative/ altruistic satisfaction to the women who are constrained to provide these services in lieu of meagre subsistence is like glorifying manual scavenging by saying that it is 'socially useful' work.

There is no doubt that there are, as there were in pre-capitalist times, social and economic ranks in which women in the sex trade are organized. Women working for high class 'escort agencies' are certainly better off economically and socially than women working in brothels. Even in a large brothel there are tenants and sub-tenants subservient to those who own their own premises. 'Flying' service-providers in the sex-trade are often more vulnerable to all kinds of exploitation than those living in brothels. Again, poor women in the unorganized sector working as domestic servants or as helpers in the construction industry sometimes have to sell their sexual services part time to make ends meet. The picture of exploitation is further complicated by the fact that often one who entered the trade as a young traffic victim has to, for reasons of survival, later become an agent in recruiting and training others. There are communities in which it is a 'tradition' for mothers to prepare their nubile daughters to enter the profession. Even among such communities, there is a 'higher end' and a 'lower end'. What is interesting is that our experience in recent times tells us that these 'traditional'

practices seem to be having a revival and feeding the proliferating sex-industry. This seems to be happening particularly at the lower end of the social scale, such as among some ‘denotified’ tribes who have remained to this day deprived of the fruits of national and regional development. Trafficking networks are spreading virulently in areas where poverty and lack of employment are rampant. The argument about the viability of ‘sex-work’ fits in nicely with a situation where no other work is available.

The myth that those who could have earned their basic subsistence without selling their sexual services are attracted to this trade because they earn more without working too hard grossly underestimates the manifold difficulties in earning basic subsistence in a globalized economy where poverty has been feminized. Marx’s point about a growing reserve army of labour leading to the devaluation of labour and to potential workers at the lower end being forced to submit to the worst forms of slavish exploitation is not irrelevant in the era of neo-liberalism. This neo-liberal dispensation multiplies and makes manifest the original unfreedom of the worker even as the factory system is dismantled and all petty producers are subsumed under the aegis of corporate power. The global market now penetrates into the domestic life and the private preoccupations of the worker forcing him/her to commoditize those aspects of that life which had not been in the market earlier.

It has been pointed out by economists that what is described as ‘vulnerable work’ today engages very high proportions of women workers particularly in South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa and South-east Asia. There has been even an increase in certain other kinds of work which are also ‘vulnerable’ but not included in the formal category (such as part-time work, employment in insecure contracts etc.) in which women are to be found in large numbers. The marginalization of women workers constitutes an important factor in the intensification of wages depression. Recent studies have suggested ‘a highly gendered employment crisis’ in our country reflected in patterns of female migration.’ ‘Declining female work participation rates in rural India and extremely low levels of female employment in urban areas’ have been observed.(Mazumdar, Neetha and Agnihotri, p. 62-3) It has even been found to lead to the re-emergence of openly coercive non-capitalist patriarchal forms of exploitation of women’s labour (Dasgupta, Chapter 9, p.6). Prostitution is not a relative liberation from this, but an instance of the reinforcing of retrograde labour practices in the neo-liberal regime. If it is no worse than other forms of similar slavish labour practices, then it is also no better because it all ties up with the over-all situation where women have few options in the labour market.

It has to be admitted that those who may enjoy relative freedom and economic benefits by being in the top ranks of the trade are vastly outnumbered by those who belong to its bottom rungs and in Marx’ words, belong to the ranks of the ‘ruined proletarian’. Further, it would be a grave mistake to think that even for the former, commercial sex operates in a situation which presupposes an agreement between free and equal individuals. It has, for instance been pointed out that rising consumerist standards as well as costs of living among middle classes is leading to the marginal phenomenon of housewives or college students selling sexual services to supplement the high expenses of children’s education or even to get some pocket money. This is presented as commercial sex by choice. But it is almost impossible for any

woman, whatever might be her social background, to sell her sexual services on her own without becoming part of a vast partly invisible network of agents, touts, middlemen, owners of premises, sellers of drinks, drugs and other facilities that go with the trade, keepers of law and ultimately traffickers. It is a multi-million dollar criminal business with roots in all kinds of places both within and outside the country. The victims of this system, whether at the top or at the bottom, cannot be 'decriminalized' simply by granting legal sanction to the criminal trade.

Even the advertisements for escort agencies that keep staring at us from the pages of newspapers with the highest circulation in the country require considerable powers of networking that are generally beyond the reach of individual women entering the trade 'by choice'. To what extent such an individual is able to manipulate this system to retain some autonomy would depend on the extent to which the system benefits from her. But the excessively competitive situation on the ground ensures that the overwhelming majority of 'workers' in this field have to remain in a condition of semi-slavery which is demeaning and repulsive precisely because of its openly or implicitly coercive nature. If 'legalization' means a system of licensing by the state, then the women who are in the lower rungs of the trade and are therefore more subservient to the system will become even more vulnerable to exploitation by the all-powerful agents on whom they will have to depend anyway for getting such licenses from the state.

If instead of quoting Marx out of context to justify our own dubious presumptions, we try to understand the larger Marxist argument about wage labour and capital, we find that it tells us about the transformations in the exploitation of labour that take place in the capitalist system and about older elements of unfreedom becoming systematized in new ways. Gradations within the labour force ensure that the lower we go the more it is intensified and made manifest. The references to prostitution in Marx leave us in no doubt that he regards it as comparable with forms of slavery or bonded labour in which the worker's self-alienation reaches its nadir. Engels' perceptive comment on the monogamous family and prostitution being 'poles of the same social conditions' further points out that this unfreedom operates equally for wedded women working within the family and for women working in the sex trade. The former at least have some legal protection which the latter do not have; and since women's monogamy is sanctioned by the patriarchal family within the capitalist system, legalization of the sex trade cannot give the women working in it the same protection in their relationship with customers, but can only enhance the control over them of those who run the trade. It can help them to run the trade openly in cahoots with the state.

It is indeed perturbing that today the state or those who run the state do not seem averse to playing into the hands of the forces of liberalization even if it means withdrawing all welfare-oriented protection from those who need it most. Whether the Government would succumb to the demands of the national and international lobbies for 'legalization' of the sex-trade is still a matter of speculation, although such speculation has been fuelled by public statements made recently by the head of the National Commission for Women. But one thing is certain. The kind of political will that is required to reverse the rising trend in trafficking, to stem

school drop-outs, to reduce domestic violence and other disempowering factors that plague women in their homes, to rehabilitate victims of trafficking and to generate employment in areas and sectors reeling under poverty and lack of livelihood, has diminished significantly even as arguments on behalf of 'legalisation' of prostitution are coming to the forefront. The latter could almost act as an excuse for the former. The last Integrated Plan of Action to Prevent and Combat Human Trafficking prepared by the Government in 2007-8 has been gathering dust for the past few years. In the meantime, only a few months back, the Cabinet has approved certain changes in the Prevention of Child Labour Act (1986) which reportedly allow children to work in family enterprises and in 'entertainment industries'. That these amendments, if passed in Parliament, will increase the number of school drop-outs and encourage slave-like usage of children in 'entertainment industries' which sometimes act as a conduit to the sex-industry, cannot be denied. It seems that even if the Government does not directly endorse the point of view of the 'legalisation' lobby, by default it is allowing sex-trade to continue exploitation of women. If the Government were to license the trade, would it not be to the benefit of the same exploiters?

If we accept the Marxist view of prostitution and the sex trade, the latter has to be regarded as systemic to capitalism and as having undergone transformation to adapt itself to the new system of exploitation. While admitting that it may end only when the system has been overhauled, the activist will also have to engage in political and social struggle against such exploitation here and now. She must take every advantage of the contradictions within the system to strengthen the position of its victims and possible victims. This cannot be done by closing down brothels, banning bar dancing and strip shows or preventing clients from visiting such places through penal provisions. The failure of 'correctional homes' to 'correct' women who have grown used to the closed network within which this business operates demonstrates not only the utter insensitivity of moral guardians appointed by the state, but also the hegemonic power of the sex-trade network in taming women who have entered it. Inbred unfamiliarity with the world outside is compounded by habits propagated to keep them 'on a high' to enable them to serve customers. Apart from forms of direct coercion, these are all means to keep them under control to prevent them from breaking away. Even family oppression continues to operate through those who depend on the woman's earnings, like aged parents or unemployed husbands. All these problems must be taken into account by the activist who fights to enable the woman in the sex trade to resist exploitation.

For this it is important to understand how this 'exploitation' manifests itself to the insider and at the same time to continually seek to include the demands linked to such an inside view into the larger struggle against all forms of exploitation and oppression against women. The demand to the authorities to take all legal and administrative measures to prevent human trafficking in all its forms constitutes an important part of the broader struggle for women's rights; but for developing it local struggles against trafficking need to be evolved and strengthened. This would not only consist of identifying traffickers and seeking to penalize them, but also of efforts to create alternative means of livelihood in the area and to prevent school drop-outs. Rescue and rehabilitation of trafficked women and children is another area in which activists must intervene to make a change in the moralistic, 'correctional' approach

to rescued women to make possible their reintegration into the broader women's movement. Efforts to provide viable livelihood options and social support should be an integral part of our approach. We must also try to build links with women who may not be willing to leave their profession, but may be suffering from problems regarding access to health and other civic services, from problems of educating their children as well as violence from clients or police etc. Many NGOs are engaged in addressing these ably, but the specific thrust of the larger women's movement should be to enable the women to assert their human rights so that instead of remaining confined to their restricted demands they may also participate in the larger struggle for women's rights. This can only be possible when their specific issues find their due place in that struggle.

REFERENCES

HIV and the Law: Risks, Rights and Health, published by UNDP (2012)

Sex Work and the Law in Asia and the Pacific backed by UNDP, UNFPA, UNAIDS (2012)

Note on Sex Work, Sexual Exploitation and Trafficking, UNWomen(2013)

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, **Collected Works**, Vol.3, Moscow, 1975. (Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844)

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels**, Selected Works**, Moscow, 1970. (Origin of Family, Private Property and the State)

Kumkum Roy, **The Power of Gender and the Gender of Power: Explorations in Early Indian History,** OUP, Delhi, 2010.

Jayati Ghosh, **Never Done and Poorly Paid, Women's Work in Globalising India,** Women Unlimited, New Delhi.

Chirasree Dasgupta, **State and Capital in Independent India,** (forthcoming 2015) Cambridge University Press, New Delhi.

T.S.Papola, **Social Exclusion and Discrimination in the Labour Market** Working Paper no.2012/04, Institute for Studies in Industrial Development, New Delhi, 2012.

'Migration and gender in India', I. Mazumdar, N.Neetha and I. Agnihotri, **Economic and Political Weekly,** 48(10), pp.54-64.

'Who Says We do Not Work? Looking at Sex Work', Sujata Gothoskar, Apoorva Kaiwar, **Economic and Political Weekly,** 49 (46), pp.54-61.