Introduction

Hila Shamir, Bimal Arora, Shilpi Banerjee, and Tamar Barkay*

There is growing awareness of the role that multinational corporations (MNCs) play in contributing to modern slavery down their supply chains (8.7 Alliance, 2023). According to *Global Estimates of Modern Slavery*, published by the International Labour Organization (ILO), in 2021 there were 27.6 million people trapped in situations of forced labour around the world, with 17.3 million individuals being exploited in the private sector (ILO, 2022). Sectoral analysis of this finding suggests that a third of exploited workers are employed in export-related sectors and are, presumably, part of global value chains (GVCs) (ILO, 2022). The increasing realization, in the last decade or so, that MNCs' profits are linked to modern slavery has driven workers, their representatives, global

* The research has received support from ERC StG grant agreement No. 756672, TraffLab: Labor Perspective to Human Trafficking, PI Prof. Hila Shamir/Tel Aviv University, as well as from ChainGE Lab (ERC) funded by the European Union, Horizon ERC grant ERC-2022-COG (Project No. 101088188, PI Hila Shamir). Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency (ERCEA) (the 'granting authority'). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. It received further funding from the Israel Science Foundation (ISF) grant no. 1866/20.

We are deeply grateful to Debbie Siton for her meticulous work on editing this introduction and for editing and expertly managing the publication of this book. We also thank Jade Kosche for her valuable help with editing and project management in the early stages of the book.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and local activists, consumer organizations, and unions, as well as legislators and policymakers at various levels (local, national, regional, and international), to seek innovative and effective ways to hold MNCs accountable and assign them responsibility (LeBaron, 2020; ITUC, 2020; Trautrims et al., 2021).

This trend suggests a shift in policy responses to modern slavery. Since the adoption of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) Trafficking Protocol in 2000,[1] there has been a predominant view that human trafficking and modern slavery primarily result from the operation of organized crime (H. Shamir, 2012). The expansion of the anti-trafficking and modern slavery policy response towards addressing the role of mainstream business entities, and particularly MNCs, raises multiple complex questions for scholars, policymakers, and activists. These relate to the exact role of MNCs in modern slavery and the practices they adopt, and MNC and supplier compliance (Han et al., 2022); the causes and drivers of modern slavery; the reality of work on the factory floor (and wherever work takes place); and effective policy solutions to change corporate patterns of purchasing, supply chain management, and engagement with suppliers, as well as with workers and their communities.

The aim of this book is to provide an interdisciplinary and multifaceted analysis of the links between the governance and regulation of GVCs and modern slavery. The book focuses on the role of business enterprises in modern slavery. In particular, it centres on governance initiatives that seek to induce corporate action to end or mitigate modern slavery in their global, regional, and domestic value chains, and the impact, potential, challenges, and limitations of such initiatives. The book, organized into three parts, explores the main regulatory tools currently used to address modern slavery and GVCs along the spectrum between private (voluntary) and public (at times, legislative) governance initiatives (Part I: Law and Governance); key actors attempting to address modern slavery in GVCs, most notably states, MNCs, workers and their representatives, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), recruiters, and migration intermediaries (Part II: Actors); and, finally, modern slavery and severe forms of exploitation, applying a sectoral, contextual analysis (Part III: Sectors).

In this Introduction, we first address and define the term 'modern slavery'. Second, we explain the two main critical approaches to the topic addressed through this book's structural analysis: the labour and development approaches to human trafficking and modern slavery. Third, we introduce and contextualize the academic literature, activism, and policy shifts at the centre of this book, specifically looking at different attempts to contend with modern slavery by

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

focusing on the role of corporations and the operation of GVCs. Finally, we describe the book's contributions to the literature on modern slavery and GVCs and provide an overview of its structure and chapters to guide readers.

Defining 'Modern Slavery'

The term *modern slavery* is currently undefined in international law. It was developed in several national contexts in Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries (particularly the UK and Australian Modern Slavery Acts of 2015 and 2018, respectively) in response to the definitional debates around the meaning and scope of the term 'human trafficking' (Fudge, 2018a; Broad and Turnbull, 2018; Plant, 2014). Accordingly, we will first address the 'human trafficking' label and then explain the turn to the language of modern slavery.

Human trafficking has garnered renewed national and international attention in the last three decades. The legal interest in trafficking is by no means a new trend. In 1904, an international treaty on trafficking was adopted, followed by conventions signed in 1910, 1921, 1933, and 1950.[2] This first generation of anti-trafficking conventions reflected an understanding of trafficking that differs from the term's contemporary application. Albeit refraining from an explicit definition of human trafficking, these instruments sought to address what was known at the time as the 'white slave trade' (Doezema, 2000), referring to the forced movement of women and girls across borders for the purpose of prostitution. The second, contemporary, wave of anti-trafficking instruments began in the 1990s, culminating in the introduction of the aforementioned Trafficking Protocol, in which human trafficking was first defined in international law. Under Article 3, trafficking comprises three components: (*a*) a particular *action* – 'the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons'; (*b*) certain *means* for carrying out the action – 'the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person'; and (*c*) the end *purpose* of exploitation. The Protocol defines 'exploitation' sweepingly to include, at a minimum, 'the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labour or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs'. This broad definition marked a new understanding of human trafficking: it is gender-neutral and extends beyond sex

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

trafficking to include multiple types of labour market exploitation, even when within the borders of the victim's own country (H. Shamir, 2017).

Although the Protocol's definition of trafficking attempted to clarify the forms that this practice can take, there remained some ambiguity regarding the 'purpose' and 'means' components of the definition. First of all, the crucial term 'exploitation' was not defined in the Protocol, creating uncertainty as to the conditions under which exploitation amounts to trafficking. Likewise, the elements listed under the 'means' component are not defined, raising the question of the level of coercion and abuse of power required to satisfy this factor of the definition. Where, then, to draw the line? As Gallagher (2010: 49) observes: 'There is general agreement that not all undesirable practices involving the exploitation of individuals could or should be identified as trafficking. Most activists and scholars appear to accept the validity of some kind of a "seriousness" threshold.' In so far as the precise contours of this threshold are left unclear, uncertainty remains as to what exactly constitutes trafficking (UNODC, 2015).

Notwithstanding this definitional vagueness, national and global experience with applying the international definition has provided its 'means' element with content. For example, it has become quite clear that physical coercion is not required for a practice to constitute trafficking and that relatively subtle forms of intimidation suffice. Indeed, practices such as withholding wages or identification papers, continually threatening to expose a worker's undocumented status to authorities, or using indebted labour are all understood to satisfy the 'means' element (ILO, 2009: 1). Moreover, it is now broadly understood that abduction and deception regarding the nature of a job, such as a false promise of waitressing or care work that, upon arrival, is revealed to be forced prostitution, are not the only behaviours that may lead to human trafficking. In fact, many migrant workers who were trafficked appear to have voluntarily embarked on their journeys, seeking paid employment in a line of work they had agreed to in advance (Richards, 2004: 154). Trafficking today is often recognized not only in circumstances of exploitation and manipulation that relate to the type of work one is made to engage in but also in the working conditions attached to an *agreed* type of work. This includes situations in which a worker agrees to perform a certain job yet finds themselves being forced to consent to certain detrimental working conditions, such as restrictions on freedom of movement, inhumane working hours, excessive wage deductions, delayed payment, an abusive and dangerous work environment, or low wages. Human trafficking has emerged, therefore, as comprising a series of labour rights violations. While each one, individually, might not amount to trafficking, when combined they constitute this practice (H. Shamir, 2012).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Despite this wide breadth of contexts and the manifold manifestations of trafficking, in the years since the Trafficking Protocol's introduction and incorporation into regional and domestic law, global attention and enforcement efforts have focused largely on the movement of women and girls across borders into the sex industry (UNODC, 2018; 2022). National and international responses paid less attention to the far more common problem of labour trafficking – the trafficking of persons for the purpose of exploitative employment in a range of sectors (Chuang, 2010). Indeed, the term 'trafficking' was often conflated with prostitution, and anti-trafficking efforts were (and are) conceived as a project concerned with an exceptional social failure that has to do with criminal behaviour, gender disparities, and/or sexual morality (Vance, 2011; Peters, 2015). In addition, institutions and scholars were locked in deep disagreement about the relationship between the different elements of 'exploitation' in the Protocol and about who can be considered a 'trafficked individual'. This led to diverse measurement models and policy solutions being in circulation simultaneously (Engle Merry, 2016).

Attempting to address this unhelpful heterogeneity, anthropologist Sally Engle Merry (2017) demonstrated that the ILO views trafficked victims as a subset of forced labour and, accordingly, proposed that this issue be addressed through enhanced protection of labour rights and the prosecution of employers and individuals involved in profiting from such exploitative labour practices. At the same time, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) discussed trafficking as resulting from the exploitation of 'irregular' migrants and focused its best practices and prevention recommendations on recruitment and border control practices. Engle Merry (2017) also noted that the US Department of State, in its *Trafficking in Persons Report*, framed trafficking as the action of organized criminals whose deception and coercion of victims must be addressed through a firm criminal justice response. And, in yet another response, the influential NGO 'Walk Free', in its Global Slavery Index, positioned slavery as bondage embedded in local social relationships. Therefore, the solutions it pointed to focused on the criminalization of traffickers and the rescue of victims (Engle Merry, 2017).

Against this backdrop – and to minimize further definitional traps, ambiguities, and unproductive disagreements around trafficking – scholars, activists, and policymakers gradually shifted towards using the umbrella term *modern slavery* to refer to various forms of severe labour market exploitation in the global economy, including human trafficking, forced labour, debt bondage, and servitude (Broad and Turnbull, 2018; for example, US Department of State, 2023).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The term *modern slavery* is generally adopted throughout this book, despite some of its ideological baggage, because this terminology has most recently been incorporated into the laws of several countries in different parts of the world and is increasingly accepted by UN bodies. The UK Modern Slavery Act 2015 was the first national legislation to use the term. Yet this terminological change has not escaped criticism – as reflected in some of the contributions to this book (see Gill, Chapter 7, and Arocha et al., Chapter 8). Scholars have argued against the use of 'modern slavery' language because of the imagery of chattel slavery the term may invoke, which does not fit the much more capacious definition of trafficking. Chuang (2014), for example, suggested that such an 'exploitation creep' would move the debate away from the more nuanced understanding of consent and compulsion that developed in the legal discussion around trafficking. Instead, Chuang argued, it may lead to a binary discussion that assumes there is either full consent or full coercion, thereby overlooking the complicated spectrum between the two extremes in which many workers find themselves. Fudge (2018b: 415), along similar lines, argued that

> the modern slavery paradigm tends to reinforce the view that labour exploitation and unfreedom are the result of morally culpable individuals who should be publicly vilified, rather than systemic and institutional features of state policies and practices relating to immigration and labour regulation combined with the 'free market' behaviour of employers.

We share the concern that the term may limit what is necessarily a complex understanding of the continuum of exploitation and the nuances of coercion it entails (Dottridge, 2018). Yet, given that it has been increasingly incorporated into public, legal, and academic discourses and is now commonly used, we have decided to use the term here while paying heed to the pitfalls pointed out by its many critics. We turn now to the structural–analytical framework we adopt to address modern slavery.

The Labour and Development Approaches to Modern Slavery: A Structural Analysis

Drawing from the principles of the Trafficking Protocol and the influential US Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (TVPA),[3] both enacted in 2000, the global regulatory response to modern slavery centres around what is

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

known as the '3Ps approach': *prevention* of trafficking, *protection* of victims, and *prosecution* of traffickers (UNODC, 2022; US Department of State, 2023).

Regulators across various contexts have emphasized the implementation of these 3Ps, encompassing the criminalization of offenders and enforcement of criminal law (prosecution), strict border control as the primary tool in thwarting exploitation (prevention), and ex-post human rights assistance for identified victims (protection). This is an individualistic, victim-centred approach to addressing modern slavery that treats it as an exceptional crime (H. Shamir, 2012; Quirk and Bunting, 2015). Its objective is to extricate individuals from harmful work environments and ensure ex-post aid, with victims playing a relatively passive role in the process of their rescue, rehabilitation, and repatriation. While the 3Ps framework certainly extends some assistance to identified victims, there is a growing consensus that it fails to tackle the economic, social, and legal conditions that create workers' vulnerability to exploitation in the first place and is, therefore, mostly ineffective in curbing human trafficking (H. Shamir, 2012, Thiemann, 2016, 2019; Fudge, 2024; Mantouvalou, 2023; Thibos, 2020).

An astounding total of 168 countries around the world have legislated or amended laws to reflect their commitment to end modern slavery (UNODC, 2018: 45). In addition, significant resources have been dedicated to combatting and reducing modern slavery globally. Dottridge (2014) provided a (modest) estimate that, at the time, more than USD 120 million had been invested annually by OECD countries in anti-trafficking activities. Yet, despite impressive-looking commitments and significant resources devoted to the issue, there are no indications that instances of modern slavery have decreased globally. On the contrary, the ILO's 2022 *Global Estimates of Modern Slavery* found an increase of 10 million people in modern slavery from 2016 to 2021 (ILO, 2022: 2). In addition, according to figures reported in the 2023 US *Trafficking in Persons Report*, of the estimated 50 million people in situations of modern slavery (ILO, 2022), a mere 115,322 were identified as trafficked persons worldwide in 2022; and, of these, just 24,340 were identified as victims of labour trafficking (US Department of State, 2023: 76). Furthermore, the numbers of prosecutions and convictions were even lower – as of 2022, there were only 15,159 prosecutions relating to human trafficking worldwide (of which 2,670 were for labour trafficking) and 5,577 convictions (of which 528 were for labour trafficking) (ILO, 2022). The pitifully low rates of prosecutions, convictions, and victim identification reveal that, despite significant efforts and resources, the assistance provided under this traditional paradigm reaches an alarmingly minute percentage of the world's severely exploited individuals.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Indeed, scholars and policymakers alike are starting to reach a consensus that the methods employed thus far to combat human trafficking, forced labour, and modern slavery are inadequate in addressing this complex issue. Research indicates that such methods fail to address the structural conditions present in contemporary local labour markets and GVCs, which are frequently influenced, endorsed, or perpetuated by governmental policies (Mantouvalou, 2023; Fudge, 2020; Niezna, 2022; Jovanovic, 2023; Shamir and Niezna 2022; LeBaron, 2020; Kenway, 2021; Quirk and Bunting, 2015). Together, the authors in this book expand on two structural approaches to modern slavery that have developed, in the literature and in practice, in response to these recognized shortcomings: the labour approach (H. Shamir, 2012, 2021; Niezna et al., 2021) and the development approach (Kotiswaran, 2019).

On the one hand, the labour approach to modern slavery seeks to address those structures that create and enable workers' vulnerability to severe forms of exploitation. Its goal is not only to assist victims of trafficking after they are removed from the exploitative environment but also to transform the structure of labour markets that create and sustain that very vulnerability. Adopting a labour approach shifts the focus away from individual harms to the crucial power disparities between victims and exploiters and the economic and social conditions that make exploitation possible. Understanding workers as *agents*, this approach is grounded in an assumption that, if given the legal and associational tools, workers can resist exploitative working conditions in a manner that does not signal the end of their employment relationships but *transforms* them – bearing in mind that 'rescuing' the workers may, in fact, worsen their life conditions overall. This understanding thus acknowledges that bottom-up change is essential if we are to remedy the structural causes of power disparities. A labour approach focuses on using agentic strategies such as collective action and bargaining, protective employment legislation, contextual standard-setting, and restructuring of economic institutions and corporate governance to address the unequal power relations in labour sectors that are particularly susceptible to trafficking and modern slavery (H. Shamir, 2012).

On the other hand, the critical perspective adopted by contributors to this volume further complements the labour approach to modern slavery with the development-oriented approach. The development approach, first articulated by Prabha Kotiswaran (2019), recognizes the paradox of a developmental state operating in neoliberal times and highlights the importance of policies and programmes aimed at reducing inequality and providing social protections. This paradigm questions the logic of the global economy, which encourages poor

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

workers from developing countries to immigrate to the Global North to secure employment, and suggests a change in perspective. Instead of accepting the economic disparity in the developing world as the root cause of modern slavery and concentrating on working conditions in the receiving countries of the Global North, it emphasizes the need to enhance *domestic* development in Global South countries. The development approach provides a framework for addressing the socio-economic conditions that often underlie labour exploitation of workers coming from the Global South. This includes efforts to reduce poverty, improve education, and expand social safety nets, based on the logic that this will decrease vulnerabilities to modern slavery. According to Kotiswaran, while a labour approach that improves working conditions is important, it will not suffice to address modern slavery.

She takes the case of India to demonstrate the insufficiency of simply improving labour regulations, since these do not apply to the most severe cases of exploitation – workers who are employed illegally and unregistered. In contrast, she prioritizes investment in India's economy and enhancement of public funding to impact the country's overall development and increase the economic well-being and (decent) employment opportunities available to workers (Kotiswaran, 2019).

Both of these two critical approaches share the view that modern slavery is the result of wider socio-economic conditions, legal rules, and institutions that limit workers' bargaining power and choice, potentially placing them (and keeping them) in conditions of vulnerability (see Mantouvalou, 2020; 2023; Niezna, 2022; Fudge, 2020). Under both perspectives, modern slavery predominantly results from systemic, structural conditions that enable exploitation, rather than from isolated instances of criminal activity.

One useful framing that reflects the understanding of both approaches, as well as other critical approaches to the dominant carceral modern slavery policy, is that of a continuum of vulnerability to exploitation (Skrivankova, 2010; Strauss and Fudge, 2013; Scott, 2017; Waite et al., 2015; Phillips, 2013; Costello, 2015; Fudge, 2018b; Davies, 2018). Under this view, modern slavery should be understood not as resulting from a stark binary between slavery and freedom (O'Connell Davidson, 2013) but, rather, in terms of 'stages – or degrees of freedom – varying from enslaved to fully free' (Boucher, 2022: 633). At one end of the continuum are the most empowered workers – those with a work contract based on negotiated terms reflecting their choice and consent (the classic liberal conception of the contract). At the other end of the continuum are the most deeply disempowered and vulnerable workers. Here, workers' weak bargaining

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

power – caused by market dynamics as well as structural and legal elements and often compounded by identity-based vulnerabilities – leads to substandard working conditions, rights violations, and, at its most extreme end, modern slavery (Niezna et al., 2021). This conception of modern slavery as escalated exploitation of worker vulnerability looks to the pervasive political economy and labour market dynamics that enable the exploitation and objectification of the most socially and economically vulnerable workers.

However, not even the labour and development approaches, at least in their original formulations, address corporate patterns of capital ownership and the impact of multi-tiered supply and production, as well as international trade and international labour governance policies. The collection of articles in this volume seeks to add these important perspectives to the engagement of critical modern slavery literature with law and policy, aiming to address structural causes of vulnerabilities. We turn next to discuss the intersection of labour governance in GVCs and modern slavery law and policy.

Modern Slavery in GVCs

Despite growing recognition and criticism of the failures of the paradigmatic modern slavery policy response, as we have seen, there have been very few alternatives added to the 'classic' policy toolbox to address this issue. One notable exception has been the emphasis on the role of MNCs in modern slavery and the potential of labour governance in GVCs to combat it (Crane, 2013; New, 2015). The trajectory of modern slavery policy and activism towards addressing the involvement of large businesses, particularly through their governance of GVCs, has brought together two thriving human rights agendas seeking to transform global markets: international and national efforts by public actors to address modern slavery and the private and voluntary regulatory nature of multi-stakeholder initiatives (MSIs). The convergence of the two agendas has led to an exponential proliferation of business and human rights initiatives aimed at tackling modern slavery in GVCs (McGaughey et al., 2021). These policies and practices view MNCs as key actors that, due to their strong bargaining power in the chain, can often drive certain contractual conditions in their relations with suppliers that may cause or contribute to modern slavery, or, equally, can facilitate its prevention (Lipson, 2019).

The turn to the governance of GVCs and the role of MNCs in addressing modern slavery derives, in part, from research showing that despite the distributive

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

potential of GVCs to support development in emerging economies and improve workers' incomes, such 'economic upgrading' is not inherent in GVCs and that some GVCs may be characterized by misdistribution of power and profit along the chain (Nathan, 2019; Gereffi, 2018; LeBaron and Lister, 2021; Ponte et al., 2023). Furthermore, some GVC scholars have raised concerns about 'social upgrading' and distributive injustice along the value chain in relation to local communities and, particularly, workers (Rossi, 2019). Indeed, a growing body of GVC and labour literature highlights the often exploitative working conditions of workers in the lower tiers of GVCs. It suggests that MNCs, despite being contractually removed from the workers, may have significant power and control over their working conditions and income through the contractual conditions they impose on suppliers, such as short production timelines and price (Eller, 2020; Salminen, 2020).

Scholars show, for example, that in some buyer-driven GVCs, cost squeezes on the supply side, predatory purchasing practices, and increased demand for work intensity, and quick production rates may contribute to workers' exploitation, as well as to verbal and physical abuse and gender-based violence (Campling and Quentin, 2021; Anner, 2020; 2019; Bartley, 2018). Building on such findings, anti-modern-slavery-in-GVC initiatives often begin with an acknowledgement that a substantial portion of today's corporate revenues can likely be traced back to severe forms of labour exploitation, including trafficking, forced labour, and modern slavery (Faure, 2015; ITUC, 2016). If modern slavery is generated and sustained, then, by the very structural conditions under which GVCs are free to operate – plagued by gaps and loopholes in governance – it must be tackled by addressing GVC governance (Bair and Palpacuer, 2015; Raigrodski, 2016). Yet, attempts to govern various features of GVCs, including modern slavery, have, to date, met with the challenge of attributing liability – contractual or otherwise – to the lead firms at the top of the chains (Dahan et al., 2016).

There is a wide array of human rights and labour governance initiatives related to modern slavery in GVCs (Gómez-Mera, 2017). Elsewhere, two of the authors of this Introduction (Shamir and Barkay, forthcoming) have suggested that such initiatives can be categorized, according to the actors that lead them, as corporate-driven, worker-driven, or state-driven (see also Haipeter et al., 2021). While such initiatives are led by different stakeholders, many are MSIs that involve global and local actors and are characterized by the proactive role taken by non-state actors in setting (private) standards to end severe forms of labour market exploitation (Locke, 2013; LeBaron and Lister, 2021; Shih et al., 2021).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Beginning in the early 1990s, under conditions of a global governance deficit, exploitative working conditions in MNCs' supply chains and MNCs' lack of accountability became prime targets for consumer and political pressures (Locke, 2013; Bartley, 2018). Consumer boycotts, tort litigations, and the threat of new regulatory demands prompted lead firms that were found to have severely exploited workers in their supply chains to develop corporate social responsibility (CSR) strategies and join MSIs (Carrington et al., 2021a). These corporate-led initiatives developed in the ensuing years into a dynamic 'industrial complex' involving a range of private, public, and civil society actors that developed and deployed numerous self-regulatory and social performance measurement tools (O'Rourke, 2006; R. Shamir, 2010; Bartley, 2011; Gereffi and Lee, 2016).

The business management and governance and regulation literatures commonly treat CSR as a 'beyond compliance' tool located at the voluntary end of a wide regulatory spectrum that has been broadened in the last few decades to include other self-regulatory, soft law, public–private, and other soft public regulation tools and mechanisms (Bernstein and Cashore, 2007; Choudhury, 2018). Within this literature, the state is depicted as either a passive bystander or an active facilitator of soft regulation, nudging corporations to take responsibility for their impact on society (Rühmkorf, 2018). In contrast, critical socio-legal and political sociology literatures treat CSR as a contested battleground shaped by, and adapted to, transformations in power relations within the contemporary global economy (R. Shamir, 2010; Djelic and Etchanchu, 2017). Accordingly, in these literatures, the voluntary nature of CSR is theorized as a constructed outcome of institutionalization and mainstreaming processes fuelled by corporate anti-regulatory interests (Rowe, 2005; Kinderman, 2016). While scholars diverge in their evaluations of the actual and potential implications of CSR, a growing body of critical literature questions CSR's ability to transform corporate action (Locke, 2013; Bartley, 2018; Kuruvilla and Bae, 2021; Kuruvilla and Fischer-Daly, 2021). Whatever their assessment, however, scholars appear to share the common understanding that the growth of such soft, self-regulatory forms of governance has become a main feature of governance in the current order (Levi-Faur, 2011; Kolben, 2014).

Clearly, policies in relation to modern slavery in GVCs *have* impacted aspects of corporate policies and behaviour, yet there is ample empirical research showing that many initiatives have done little to secure labour rights and human rights on any significant scale (Locke, 2013; Lee, 2016; Rossi, 2014). This is the case either because they are only partial in their reach and impact, or because the costs associated with ensuring labour rights are pushed down the supply chains.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This may result in cascading exploitative labour practices down the chain, usually to more unorganized and informal segments of the market, rendering them even more invisible and harder to trace and eradicate.

Amid growing awareness that CSR was not leading to the required change in corporate practices, starting in the early 2010s, UN agencies, supranational organizations, and governments began to take action, and a number of state-driven initiatives were developed. Legislators on the international, national, and regional levels began enacting new laws requiring corporations to disclose their actions to protect workers' rights down their supply chains (known as 'transparency legislation') (Fudge, 2018a; Barkay et al., 2024). Such measures were adopted, for example, in the US state of California (2010), the UK (2015), and Australia (2018). Other laws required firms to implement a Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD) process to identify, prevent, mitigate, and account for how they manage potential adverse human rights impacts in their supply chains, including protection of workers' rights (Landau, 2019; Sarfaty, 2020; LeBaron and Rühmkorf, 2019; Landau, 2023; Landau and Marshall, Chapter 4 of this volume). First introduced through the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights in 2011, HRDD laws have since been legislated in France (2017), the Netherlands (2019), Norway (2021), Germany (2021), and Canada (2023) and are being considered in other OECD countries. In its most recent iteration, in 2024, the European Parliament passed the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (see Shift, 2022; Marshall et al., 2023; Zumbansen, 2024). However, it should be noted that both HRDD and Transparency Acts, despite being state-driven and legislation-based, are concerned with enhancing market-based forms of supply chain governance and predominantly rely on consumer sanctions for compliance. As such, they should not be understood as 'hard law' (see Barkay and Shamir, Chapter 6 of this volume).

Another emerging state-driven innovation has been the introduction of trade-related tools and, specifically, forced labour import bans (see Ebert et al., Chapter 3 of this volume). These are measures to prevent the entry of imported goods into a country if it is suspected that those goods were produced under conditions of forced labour or modern slavery (Pietropaoli et al., 2021; A. Brudney, 2020; LaFianza, 2022). While, to date, very few countries have imposed such bans – notably, the US and Canada – there is increasing interest in the effectiveness of this tool as hard regulation accompanied by significant economic sanctions, unlike the 'soft' regulation adopted in this field so far (Kolben, 2023; Polaski et al., 2022).

Despite what may seem like encouraging developments, current research indicates that the transparency and HRDD legislation, along with trade

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

bans as presently formulated, is continuing to prove inadequate to bring about transformative improvements in working conditions within GVCs (McCorquodale and Nolan, 2021; LeBaron, 2020; LeClercq, 2022; Vogt et al., 2022; Marshall et al., 2023). Attempts to demand that corporations fulfil their commitments regarding labour conditions through litigation have also mostly failed (Fudge and Mundlak, 2023). Moreover, research suggests that voluntary commitments and self-regulation by corporations – including those originating in transparency and HRDD legislation – have not mitigated corporate institutional antagonism to unionizing and collective bargaining (Kuruvilla and Li, 2021; Vogt et al., 2022). In addition, mounting evidence of the ineffectiveness of such regulatory mechanisms reveals major gaps in the regulation of labour standards in GVCs. These gaps can be attributed to various factors, including the reluctance of corporations to monitor and enforce their commitments (Lee, 2016; Lim and Prakash, 2017); the insufficiency of private accreditation and enforcement mechanisms (LeBaron, 2018); the limited power of consumers to economically sanction corporations in many contexts (Carrington et al., 2021b); the unwillingness of states to supervise and enforce corporate commitments and to create state-backed sanction mechanisms (LeBaron, 2020); and the lack of workers' input in defining, enforcing, and monitoring standards (Lee, 2016; Lim and Prakash, 2017; Brooks, 2007; Rende-Taylor and Shih, 2019). As a result, concerns have been raised in academic and policy circles over the effectiveness of *voluntary* corporate commitments to protect workers' rights in GVCs (Allain et al., 2013; Anner et al., 2013; Kuruvilla and Li, 2021).

A more promising alternative, hailed by activists and scholars, is the worker-driven social responsibility (WSR) model (Mieres and McGrath, 2021; Asbed and Hitov, 2017; Fine and Bartley, 2019; Sellers, 2021). WSR is a supply chain governance scheme that originated from workers and their communities and involves both suppliers and lead firms. WSR was conceived to address the identified failures of CSR, HRDD, and transparency legislation, in that it is premised on worker agency and, specifically, the exercise of that agency through new forms of supply chain collective bargaining (Dias-Abey, 2018; Donaghey and Reinecke, 2018; see also Barkay and Shamir, Chapter 6 of this volume). Some of the foundational features of the WSR model distinguish it from traditional CSR initiatives: the process is *worker-driven*, it is based on *effective* monitoring and enforcement, and it requires *legally binding* commitments (WSR, 2017). Indeed, the 'worker-related' term was chosen by the model's architects to mark it as an alternative to CSR structures, both unilateral corporate-led codes and MSIs. As its name suggests, WSR's key advancement over – and criticism of – existing

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CSR frameworks is the absence of workers' voice and power therein. As Gordon (2017: 4) writes, 'frequently, the parties most affected by labour codes and MSIs – the workers whose lives are affected by the standards being negotiated – have no say in any part of their design or implementation'.

While acknowledging the great promise of WSR, the major successful example of this model, the Fair Food Program (FFP) in Florida, has proven very difficult to replicate and sustain in other environments (Babineau and Bair, 2020). First, WSR has been implemented in only four additional contexts so far: the Accord on Fire and Building Safety in the Bangladeshi garment sector; the Milk with Dignity programme, led by the organization Migrant Justice in the dairy sector in Vermont (US); the 2019 agreement in Lesotho's apparel industry; and the Dindigul Agreement on caste discrimination and gender-based violence signed between various international NGOs, local unions, and global brands with Eastman Exports, a major clothing and textile manufacturer in Tamil Nadu, India, in 2022 (Fudge and LeBaron, 2024). Of these four WSR examples, the latter two represent adaptations of a narrower example of the model because both are geared specifically to address specific harms, focusing on sexual harassment and gender-based violence (Mieres and McGrath, 2021). Yet even these few examples of WSR implementation are struggling to thrive. A case in point is the weakening of the Bangladesh Accord, the future of which looks uncertain due to external and internal challenges in recent years (Bair et al., 2020; Kang, 2021; Champagne, 2021). Indeed, the WSR model is facing the dual challenge of scalability and sustainability in global – as opposed to local – long and complex supply chains (J. Brudney, 2021).

As this brief review suggests, despite the proliferation of initiatives on the international, regional, national, and local levels, and the enormous efforts made, none has brought about effective, wide-reaching change, and modern slavery continues to pose an increasingly urgent global problem. Regrettably, there is little evidence of effective sustainable change on the ground resulting from lead firms' responses to the policy trends outlined in this Introduction. While certain civil society organizations, unions, and corporations have developed some promising best practices, including the WSR model, it remains widely acknowledged that the much-needed systemic change required to improve working conditions in the lower tiers of GVCs has yet to occur.

The emphasis on the importance of transforming labour market structures that enable and sustain modern slavery in GVCs resonates with both the 'labour' and 'development' perspectives. However, while the latter focuses on enhancing workers' agency, politicization, and bargaining power, the former

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

promotes the construction of corporations as private sources of governance and as de-politicized agents of change (Todres, 2012; Barkay et al., 2024). Indeed, so far, there has been little evidence that these regulatory developments and innovations have promoted effective and impactful collective worker mobilization (Kuruvilla and Li, 2021; Donaghey and Reinecke, 2018; Marshall et al., 2023; Kuruvilla et al., 2021) or systematically improved workers' rights (MSI Integrity, 2020; Kuruvilla and Bae, 2021).

Arguably, the fundamental characteristics of common forms of MNC activity around modern slavery in GVCs still appear to be driven by a mindset of preserving business benefits, rather than a genuine commitment to transforming exploitative structures and labour practices. And the large majority of state- and industry-driven initiatives (including trade bans, as Ebert et al. show in Chapter 3 of this volume) still largely depend on goodwill and collaborative gestures on the part of MNCs and their suppliers to insist on workers' rights protections. Traditionally, such transformations have occurred only following long struggles and strong collective action by unions and other civil society organizations. Improvements in workers' rights tend to increase labour costs throughout the supply chain, and, accordingly, increase the costs of production and business operations overall. Absent the countervailing power of workers and unions, the financial costs associated with securing workers' rights – at best, accompanied by enhanced workers' voice and intensification of monitoring and inspections of working conditions – pose a significant challenge for businesses to bring about transformational change (Vaughan-Whitehead, 2014; Crane et al., 2019; LeBaron, 2021; LeBaron et al., 2018; Anner et al., 2023).

Together, the different chapters in this volume aim to enhance our understanding of the rapid developments in the field of modern slavery in GVCs, and, in particular, the possibilities and limitations of existing regulatory tools. It accomplishes this by amalgamating insights from scholarship that critically examines modern slavery law, policy, and research, along with literature on GVC regulation.

Contributions of This Book: Chapter Overview

The chapters collected in this volume employ a multidisciplinary perspective, by scholars from the developed and developing world, on the intricate relationships between business models, production and consumption patterns, workers' rights, and modern slavery within GVCs. From a range of angles, they offer

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

an in-depth, panoramic account of the power dynamics, structural gaps, and governance challenges that shape the impact of the contemporary anti-modern-slavery field of action. The book seeks to intervene in, extend, and develop GVC analysis and modern slavery literature by bringing the two realms of research into direct conversation. To do so, it applies the methodological and analytical traditions and insights of different academic disciplines – law, sociology, economics, geography, and anthropology – to enrich, deepen, and challenge our understanding of the potential and limits of various governance modes – state-, industry-, and worker-driven – in relation to modern slavery in GVCs. We now turn to the four main strands of insight that run through the chapters and form the broad structure of the volume as a whole.

The Role of Law in Enabling and Sustaining Current Patterns of GVCs

First, the book contributes to better understanding how the law manifests in GVC structures and functionalities, and how it ultimately influences the distributive outcomes of these value chains. As Danielson and Bair (2019) observe, the role of law remains 'significantly undertheorized in the burgeoning social science and policy literatures on GVCs' (see also IGLP, 2016). This book seeks to remedy that under-theorization by analysing the legal scaffoldings of GVCs to discern the role of law in *enabling* modern slavery in supply chains (Jovanovic, 2023; Webb and Garciandia, 2019; H. Shamir, 2017; Mantouvalou, 2023), as well as law's potential to transform GVCs and prevent modern slavery. As such, the book offers a multi-faceted discussion of GVCs and law, including an exploration of private and public governance mechanisms, and legal interactions and spillovers (Ashwin et al., 2020) between the two, in the context of modern slavery (Horner, 2017; Smith, 2015; Mayer and Philips, 2017). These contributions are presented mainly, but not exclusively, in Part I, 'Law and Governance'.

By employing critical approaches to the analysis of current developments in the regulation and governance of GVCs, the four chapters in this part expose the role of law – understood as multiple normative sources and regulatory layers, on different scales – in shaping, constituting, and transforming labour practices in GVCs and developing directions for effective regulatory interventions. Sharing the understanding that modern slavery legislation (including international, regional, and domestic norms) and voluntary CSR initiatives have, so far, made limited demonstrable impact, the authors of these chapters offer analyses of the role of law in the governance of GVCs, concerning working conditions and modern slavery.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chapters 1 and 2 focus on the centrality of the transparency ideal in CSR and modern-slavery reporting legislation and critically examine their assumptions and possible implications. In Chapter 1, Klaas Hendrik Eller explores the complex interplay between legal mechanisms, reporting regulations, and corporate governance in the governance of GVCs. The chapter highlights the limitations of the linear narrative of CSR evolving from voluntary to mandatory instruments, pointing out shared structural deficits and the political dynamics at play. The author delves into the role of reporting regulations in addressing corporate responsibility, particularly regarding modern slavery, and suggests a shift in perspective from merely informing stakeholders to altering the very information architecture of GVCs. This involves examining the internal communication and knowledge-building processes among chain actors, in an attempt to enhance transparency and accountability in corporate practices. In Chapter 2, Ioannis Kampourakis critically examines transparency legislation from a different perspective. He argues that transparency legislation, while promoting accountability through market and civil society pressures, often reinforces existing power imbalances and fails to deliver substantive regulatory outcomes. His analysis highlights the need for stronger public regulatory frameworks to complement transparency measures and ensure genuine accountability and sustainability in GVCs.

Chapters 3 and 4 address two additional state-led regulatory tools, HRDD legislation and trade bans, and their interactions with corporate-led and worker-led initiatives. In Chapter 3, Franz Christian Ebert, Francesca Francavilla, and Lorenzo Guarcello analyse the integration of forced labour considerations into trade instruments, and their practical implications for GVCs. The chapter highlights the potential of these trade instruments to foster long-term improvements and address forced labour effectively. Through a case study of the Malaysian rubber glove industry, the research presented in the chapter illustrates how, under certain circumstances, import bans and other trade-related measures can generate significant changes on both the company and the sectoral levels, promoting broader policy efforts to combat forced labour. This analysis explores the scope of trade bans to address forced labour (and their limitations) and highlights their interaction with and spillover effects on corporate-led MSIs to enhance labour standards in GVCs. In Chapter 4, Ingrid Landau and Shelly Marshall examine the potential of mandatory human rights due diligence laws in Europe to improve access to remedy for victims of modern slavery within GVCs. It evaluates the effectiveness of legislation from France, Germany, Norway, and the European Union's Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Directive (CSDDD). While acknowledging that these laws mark significant progress in corporate accountability, the chapter identifies gaps in their ability to deliver meaningful remedies and calls for more robust mechanisms to address the legal and practical barriers faced by victims seeking redress.

Together, the four chapters in this part reveal the challenges faced by legal doctrine and by tools attempting to impact corporate processes and action – and to leverage lead-firm and importing-country power – to drive positive change in working conditions throughout the value chains. They critically examine how, by using private law, corporate law, and trade law, state-driven modern slavery efforts – by activists, workers and their representatives, corporations, and policymakers – might 'use the master's tools to dismantle the master's house' (to paraphrase Audre Lord's provocation) (Lorde, 1984).

Understanding the Roles of Different Actors in Addressing Modern Slavery in GVCs

By considering the complexities of modern slavery as a rich case study, Part II of the volume focuses on the respective roles, capacities, and perspectives of different actors and stakeholders engaged in combating modern slavery in supply chains. Broadly speaking, accounts of the logic driving commodity and value chains within capitalist production and distribution systems tend to apply a lead-firm-centred conceptualization of governance (Gereffi, 2014). Seeking to complicate this view, the authors in this volume demonstrate how adopting the lens of modern slavery provides an opportunity to identify and typify some of the characteristic shortcomings found in lead-firm-centred analyses of GVC regulation and governance and offer a prism through which to analyse the triadic relationship between power, governance, and inequality (Ponte et al., 2023). Taken as a whole, the chapters facilitate a more nuanced understanding of the imbalanced power dynamics involved in GVCs' labour governance. Part II of the book is therefore devoted to 'Actors', both inside and beyond lead firms. The three chapters in this part closely study how various actors involved in modern slavery initiatives can and do interact with, against, and around the law and governance of modern slavery in GVCs. Such actors include corporations, workers, unions and workers' organizations, civil society, and for-profit and non-profit organizations, as well as recruitment agencies and contractors (middlemen).

Roseanne Russell, in Chapter 5, opens this part of the book by exploring the promise and the shortcomings of corporate governance in regulating modern

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

slavery within GVCs. She critiques the ideology of shareholder primacy, which prioritizes investor returns at the expense of labour rights, and argues that this focus facilitates exploitative labour practices. The chapter proposes integrating proportionality principles into boardroom decisions to balance the interests of diverse stakeholders and prevent the worst forms of labour abuses.

In Chapter 6, Tamar Barkay and Hila Shamir apply the notion of 'anti-trafficking chains', referring to the dynamic web of anti-trafficking actors, initiatives, and activities in GVCs, to comparatively explore the structural conditions that shape the impact of modern slavery transparency legislation and the worker social responsibility (WSR) model. They argue that transparency laws, while increasing awareness and compliance, often fail to drive substantial corporate change due to their reliance on market-based mechanisms and minimal legal requirements. In contrast, the WSR model, exemplified by the FFP, demonstrates greater potential for systemic change by empowering workers, enforcing strict standards, and leveraging consumer pressure. The chapter suggests that, of the two approaches, WSR has the greater potential to impact GVCs' labour governance, as it can help create a 'bottom-up' anti-trafficking chain that manages to break away from the 'top-down' supply chain dynamics.

Following chapters that explore corporate boards, workers' organizations, and private and public anti-trafficking service providers, in Chapter 7, Sahiba Gill turns to examine the 'human supply chain', specifically focusing on labour migration and the significant influence wielded by recruiters. Utilizing empirical qualitative research on the recruitment of low-wage migrant workers from Nepal to the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries, Gill identifies how GCC employers exert control over recruitment, creating employer-driven human supply chains. The chapter highlights that this control perpetuates recruitment abuses, emphasizing the need for stronger regulatory frameworks to address the power imbalances that are inherent to these chains and prevent modern slavery within these migration corridors. As such, this chapter aligns with other studies in the book that highlight the role of lead firms in global economic governance while also underlining the importance of structural changes that empower and enable other actors – whether workers' organizations, NGOs, or states, but also suppliers and recruiters, for instance – to disrupt the prevailing supply chain logic.

Overall, the chapters in this part offer a comprehensive examination of key actors and their involvement with labour governance in GVCs, particularly in terms of the power dynamics that fuel exploitation in these chains.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Using GVC Analysis to Expand the Modern Slavery Normative and Policy Toolkit: Contextual and Sectoral Analysis

This book employs GVC analysis as a method to expand the normative and policy toolkit for addressing modern slavery. As noted earlier in this Introduction, the anti-modern-slavery field is still in search of constructive tools, with critical voices gesturing towards the 'development' and 'labour' approaches to the issue. Part III, entitled 'Sectors', shows how certain analytical tools that evolved in the GVC governance literature understand the root causes of severe forms of labour market exploitation – tools that are being developed in some promising new directions. The chapters in this part manifest how spotlighting GVC governance frameworks enables us to discern the regulatory and economic conditions that render modern slavery possible. Further, GVC analysis opens up space for critical engagement with the role of law and businesses – lead firms as well as suppliers – in suppressing, disregarding, enabling, creating, or transforming modern slavery.

Taken as a whole, this part provides a nuanced and sophisticated analysis of the operation of the law and governance of modern slavery (and sometimes the lack thereof) by looking at four distinct sectors in India: sugarcane cutting, sex work, construction, and garment production. Myriad actors are viewed here through the close study of the lower tiers and informal 'loose ends' of particular value chains. Within the single national context of India, this part's focus on different labour sectors – and the GVCs in which they participate – captures the way in which social and economic factors influence working conditions in the lower tiers of GVCs.

In Chapter 8, Lorena Arocha, Bindhulakshmi Pattadath, Meena Gopal, and Roshni Chattopadhyay address the informal and precarious ends of domestic and GVCs in the Indian context, focusing on the sectors of sugarcane cutting and sex work. Through detailed empirical research from the state of Maharashtra, they critique the application of the 'modern slavery' discourse, arguing that this framing oversimplifies and obscures the complex and historically rooted caste, gendered, and class power dynamics at play. The authors signal the need for a nuanced understanding of local contexts and histories to effectively address the exploitative conditions faced by workers in these sectors and value chains. Specifically, they explore how worker mobilization among informal workers in India offers a challenge to exploitative working conditions while simultaneously ensuring livelihoods.

In Chapter 9, Saie Shetye and Divya Priyadarshini offer a detailed analysis of the human supply chain and working conditions in the Indian construction

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sector, exposing the legal infrastructure of construction value chains and the vulnerabilities to exploitation they create. The chapter highlights how the lack of formal employment contracts and regulatory oversight in the construction sector exacerbates abusive working conditions. The authors argue that severe forms of labour exploitation in this sector should not be treated as an exceptional, individualized phenomenon but, rather, understood within the larger context of agricultural distress and land dispossession in Indian villages. Like Chapter 8, this chapter demonstrates the crucial importance of understanding local conditions and the characteristics of informal labour relations if effective governance intervention in supply chains is to be achieved.

In Chapter 10, Dev Nathan and the late Varsha Joshi investigate the factors contributing to the reduction of child labour in India and the challenges that render it difficult to detect. They highlight the roles played by low adult wages, poverty, and lack of access to quality education as key drivers of this phenomenon. Their analysis also contemplates how informal labour practices, particularly within family-based and caste-based divisions of labour, contribute to its persistence. Drawing on experiences from various production sectors, including garment, accessory, and jewellery manufacturing, the authors argue that the most impactful corporate strategies have been automation, which eliminates the possibility of child labour, and the relocation of production processes from home-based settings to factories. However, they note that this relocation is not always straightforward, as some child labour is simply shifted to less regulated environments, such as remote villages. The chapter emphasizes that, while legal and development interventions are crucial, addressing the underlying socio-economic conditions is equally essential for the effective eradication of child labour in India.

Overall, the three chapters in this part discuss how actors respond to, shape, and circumvent governance tools in specific sectors within India in which informal labour is widespread. The prevalence of informality in each of the contexts studied highlights the challenges and opportunities inherent in any attempt to undertake GVC analysis – or apply GVC regulation – at the informal ends of supply chains. As a result, the sectoral analysis developed in this part illustrates why 'one size fits all' solutions, common in the modern slavery policy realm (Chuang, 2006), are insufficient for the complex realities of many GVCs.

The Interaction between Formal and Informal Economy within GVCs

The fourth strand of insight that runs throughout the book is concerned with the interaction between formal and informal economy within GVCs, and here

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

it joins the nascent body of literature directing an analytical gaze towards this issue. Despite the significant impact of informality on GVCs, scholars have observed that research tends to be inattentive to this issue (Pickles et al., 2016; Phillips, 2011; Selwyn, 2019). For example, many diagrams and conceptual models depicting these chains often oversimplify the complexities of informal labour arrangements. They frequently portray clear-cut, linear connections between corporations, suppliers, and workers, neglecting the intricate web of informal actors and the myriad non-standard contractual relationships that actually characterize many GVCs. The omission of informality in GVC literature is concerning because informal, non-transparent labour practices play a pivotal role in shaping working conditions, wages, and overall labour governance within these chains. Informal workers, who are often excluded from state protections and social safety nets, face acute vulnerabilities, such as abusive working hours, low pay, and inadequate working conditions. Ignoring the realities of informal labour hinders a comprehensive, accurate understanding of power dynamics and social implications within GVCs (Marshall, 2019).

Addressing informality requires scholars to explore the involvement of diverse actors, the informal networks operating alongside formal structures, and the interactions between formal and informal practices. Despite the value of this research area, only a limited number of recent studies have contributed to it. Among the exceptions to this scant attention, Barrientos (2019), Nathan et al. (2023), and Marshall (2019) foreground the role of home-workers, household labour, and other non-standard workers in the informal economy, prevalent in many countries of the Global South, in their recent books. Similarly, this volume aims to enhance GVC analysis by addressing the reliance of formal supply chains on the labour of informal workers. Several chapters in the book delve into the significant, yet often overlooked or denied, role of informal work in GVCs. They offer methods to reincorporate the informal sector into GVC analysis and propose innovative ways to regulate and govern GVCs that extend even to their 'fuzzy ends' at the bottom of value chains.

In examining the presence of modern slavery within GVCs from a multidisciplinary perspective, this book underscores the undeniable gravity of this complex issue, urging us to address its profound impact and collaborate on finding effective solutions. By fostering constructive dialogue between modern slavery scholars and GVC researchers, the authors of this book seek to shed light on blind spots in each analysis, leading to a thicker understanding and actionable insights to combat this pressing global challenge.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The genesis of this book lies in a process of knowledge-sharing and deliberation that commenced during a multidisciplinary international conference held at the National Law University, New Delhi, in November 2019. Subsequently, the process continued in an online workshop in September 2021. These events brought together scholars from the Global North and South, representing diverse social science disciplines. Tragically, in 2022, we mourned the loss of our dear friend, collaborator, and co-editor of this book Bimal Arora. His passing left his family, friends, and colleagues heartbroken and grieving. To honour his memory, we dedicate this book to him and to the late Varsha Joshi, an exceptional scholar and activist who also contributed to this book and sadly passed away in 2020. May their contributions and dedication to combatting modern slavery continue to inspire and drive progress towards improving workers' rights in GVCs.

Notes

1. Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, Supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, 15 November 2000, 2237 U.N.T.S. 319 (the Trafficking Protocol).
2. International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, 18 May 1904, 35 Stat. 1979, 1 L.N.T.S. 83. Later international instruments dealing with trafficking include the following: International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, 4 May 1910, 98 U.N.T.S. 101; International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, 30 September 1921, 53 U.N.T.S. 39; International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, 11 October 1933, 150 L.N.T.S. 431; Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, 2 December 1949, *opened for signature* 21 March 1950, 96 U.N.T.S. 271.
3. Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000, Pub. L. No. 106–386, 114 Stat. 1464 (2000).

References

8.7 Alliance (ILO, IOM, OECD, UNICEF) (2023). *Ending Child Labour, Forced Labour and Human Trafficking in Global Supply Chains*. Available at: www.ilo.org/media/405766/download.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Allain, J., A. Crane, G. LeBaron, and L. Behbahani (2013). *Forced Labour's Business Models and Supply Chains*. Belfast: Joseph Rowntree Foundation and Queen's University.

Anner, M. (2019). 'Predatory Purchasing Practices in Global Apparel Supply Chains and the Employment Relations Squeeze in the Indian Garment Export Industry'. *International Labour Review* 158(4): 705–27.

——— (2020). 'Squeezing Workers' Rights in Global Supply Chains: Purchasing Practices in the Bangladesh Garment Export Sector in Comparative Perspective'. *Review of International Political Economy* 27(2): 320–47.

Anner, M. and M. Fischer-Daly (2023). 'Worker Voice: What It Is, What It Is Not, and Why It Matters'. U.S. Department of Labor. Available at www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/ILAB/Worker-Voice-Report-Final-3-6-24.pdf.

Anner, M., J. Bair, and J. Blasi (2013). 'Toward Joint Liability in Global Supply Chains: Addressing the Root Causes of Labor Violations in International Subcontracting Networks'. *Comparative Labour Law and Policy Journal* 35(1): 1–43.

Asbed, G. and S. Hitov (2017). 'Preventing Forced Labor in Corporate Supply Chains: The Fair Food Program and Worker-driven Social Responsibility'. *Wake Forest Law Review* 52(2): 497–531.

Ashwin, S., C. Oka, E. Schuessler, R. Alexander, and N. Lohmeyer (2020). 'Spillover Effects Across Transnational Industrial Relations Agreements: The Potential and Limits of Collective Action in Global Supply Chains'. *ILR Review* 73(4): 995–1020.

Babineau, K. and J. Bair (2020). 'The Art of Using Supply Chains to Defend Worker Rights'. *Open Democracy*, 14 December. Available at: https://tinyurl.com/2aka25pk.

Bair, J. and F. Palpacuer (2015). 'CSR beyond the Corporation: Contested Governance in Global Value Chains'. *Global Networks* 15(s1): S1–S19.

Bair, J., M. Anner, and J. Blasi (2020). 'The Political Economy of Private and Public Regulation in Post-Rana Plaza Bangladesh'. *ILR Review* 73(4): 969–94.

Barkay, T., J. Davies, I. Pietropaoli, and H. Shamir (2024). 'Anti-trafficking Chains: Analyzing the Impact of Transparency Legislation in the UK Construction Sector'. *Law and Social Inquiry* 49(4): 2152–83.

Barrientos, S. (2019). *Gender and Work in Global Value Chains: Capturing the Gains?* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bartley, T. (2011). 'Transnational Governance as the Layering of Rules: Intersections of Public and Private Standards', *Theoretical Inquiries in Law* 12(2): 517–42.

———(2018). *Rules without Rights: Land, Labor, and Private Authority in the Global Economy*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bernstein, S. and B. Cashore (2007). 'Can Non-state Global Governance Be Legitimate? An Analytical Framework'. *Regulation and Governance* 1(4): 347–71.

Boucher, A. (2022). '"What Is Exploitation and Workplace Abuse?" A Classification Schema to Understand Exploitative Workplace Behaviour towards Migrant Workers'. *New Political Economy* 27(4): 629–45.

Broad, R. and N. Turnbull (2018). 'From Human Trafficking to Modern Slavery: The Development of Anti-trafficking Policy in the UK'. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* 25(2): 119–33.

Brooks, E. (2007). *Unravelling the Garment Industry: Transnational Organizing and Women's Work*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Brudney, A. (2020). 'Using the Master's Tools to Dismantle the Master's House: 307 Petitions as a Human Rights Tool'. Corporate Accountability Lab, 31 August. Available at https://corpaccountabilitylab.org/calblog/2020/8/28/using-the-masters-tools-to-dismantle-the-masters-house-307-petitions-as-a-human-rights-tool.

Brudney, J. (2021). 'Reflections on Labor Standards in Global Supply Chains: Innovation and Scalability'. In *Power, Participation, and Private Regulatory Initiatives: Human Rights under Supply Chain Capitalism*, edited by D. Brinks, J. Dehm, K. Engle, and K. Taylor, 205–23. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Campling, L. and C. Quentin (2021). 'Global Inequality Chains: How Global Value Chains and Wealth Chains (Re)Produce Inequalities of Wealth'. In *Rethinking Value Chains: Tackling the Challenge of Global Capitalism*, edited by F. Palpacuer and A. Smith, 26–55. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Carrington, M., A. Chatzidakis, and D. Shaw (2021a). 'Consuming Worker Exploitation? Accounts and Justifications for Consumer (In)action to Modern Slavery'. *Work, Employment and Society* 35(3): 432–50.

——— (2021b). *Addressing Consumer Awareness and (In)Action Towards Modern Slavery – Rapid Research Report: Review of Existing Evidence*. London: Modern Slavery and Human Rights Policy and Evidence Center. Available at https://eprints.gla.ac.uk/255488/1/255488.pdf.

Champagne, J. (2021). 'From Public Relations to Enforceable Agreements: The Bangladesh Accord as a Model for Supply Chain Accountability'. In *Power, Participation, and Private Regulatory Initiatives: Human Rights under Supply Chain Capitalism*, edited by D. Brinks, J. Dehm, K. Engle, and K. Taylor, 154–79. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Choudhury, B. (2018). 'Balancing Soft and Hard Law for Business and Human Rights'. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 67(4): 961–86.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chuang, J. (2006). 'Beyond a Snapshot: Preventing Human Trafficking in the Global Economy'. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 13(1): 137–63.

——— (2010). 'Rescuing Trafficking from Ideological Capture: Prostitution Reform and Anti-trafficking Law and Policy'. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 158(6): 1655–728.

——— (2014). 'Exploitation Creep and the Unmaking of Human Trafficking Law'. *American Journal of International Law* 108(4): 609–49.

Costello, C. (2015). 'Migrants and Forced Labour: A Labour Law Response'. In *The Autonomy of Labour Law*, edited by A. Bogg, C. Costello, A. Davies, and J. Prassi, 189–228. Oxford, UK: Hart.

Crane, A. (2013). 'Modern Slavery as a Management Practice: Exploring the Conditions and Capabilities for Human Exploitation'. *Academy of Management Review* 38(1): 49–69.

Crane, A., G. LeBaron, J. Allain, and L. Behbahani (2017). 'Governance Gaps in Eradicating Forced Labor: From Global to Domestic Supply Chains'. *Regulation & Governance* 13(1): 86–106.

Dahan, Y., H. Lerner, and F. Milman-Sivan (2016). Global Labor Rights as Duties of Justice. In *Global Justice and International Labour Rights*, edited by Y. Dahan, H. Lerner, and F. Milman-Sivan, 53–91. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Danielson, D. and J. Bair (2019). 'The Role of Law in Global Value Chains: A Window into Law and Global Political Economy'. Law and Political Economy Blog, 16 December. Available at: https://lpeblog.org/2019/12/16/the-role-of-law-in-global-value-chains-a-window-into-law-and-global-political-economy.

Davies, J. (2018). 'From Severe to Routine Labour Exploitation: The Case of Migrant Workers in the UK Food Industry'. *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 19(3): 1–17.

Dias-Abey, M. (2018). 'Justice on Our Fields: Can "Alt-labor" Organizations Improve Migrant Farm Workers' Conditions?' *Harvard Civil Rights–Civil Liberties Law Review* 53(1): 167–211.

Djelic, M. L. and H. Etchanchu (2017). 'Contextualizing Corporate Political Responsibilities: Neoliberal CSR in Historical Perspective'. *Journal of Business Ethics* 142(4): 641–61.

Doezema, J. (2000). 'Loose Women or Lost Women? The Re-emergence of the Myth of White Slavery in Contemporary Discourses of Trafficking in Women'. *Gender Issues* 18(1): 23–50.

Donaghey, J. and J. Reinecke (2018). 'When Industrial Democracy Meets Corporate Social Responsibility: A Comparison of the Bangladesh Accord and Alliance as

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Responses to the Rana Plaza Disaster'. *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 56(1): 14–42.

Dottridge, M. (2014). 'Editorial: How Is the Money to Combat Human Trafficking Spent?' *Anti Trafficking Review* 3: 1–14.

——— (2017). 'Eight Reasons Why We Shouldn't Use the Term "Modern Slavery"'. *Open Democracy*, 17 October. Available at: www.opendemocracy.net/en/beyond-trafficking-and-slavery/eight-reasons-why-we-shouldn-t-use-term-modern-slavery.

Eller, K. H (2020). 'Is "Global Value Chain" A Legal Concept?' *European Review of Contract Law* 16(1): 3–24.

Engle Merry, S. (2016). *The Seductions of Quantification: Measuring Human Rights, Gender Violence, and Sex Trafficking*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

——— (2017). 'Counting the Uncountable: Constructing Trafficking through Measurement'. In *Revisiting the Law and Governance of Trafficking, Forced Labor and Modern Slavery*, edited by P. Kotiswaran, 273–304. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Faure, J. (2015). 'Forced Labour: Does It Make Economic Sense?' UNU/SIPA Junior Research Fellow Paper Series, United Nations University and Columbia University, New York. Available at: https://collections.unu.edu/eserv/UNU:3293/JRF01_ForcedLabour.pdf.

Fine, J. and T. Bartley (2019). 'Raising the Floor: New Directions in Public And Private Enforcement of Labor Standards in the United States'. *Journal of Industrial Relations* 61(2): 252–76.

Fudge J. (2018a). 'Slavery and Unfree Labour: The Politics of Naming, Framing, and Blaming'. *Labour/Le Travail* 82: 227–44.

———(2018b). 'Modern Slavery, Unfree Labour and the Labour Market: The Social Dynamics of Legal Characterization'. *Social and Legal Studies* 27(4): 414–34.

——— (2020). 'Twenty Years after Palermo, Can We Stop Discussing Labour Exploitation and Start Fixing It?' *Open Democracy*, 19 November. Available at: https://tinyurl.com/yfxmckwj.

——— (2024). *Constructing Modern Slavery: Law, Capitalism and Unfree Labour*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Fudge, J. and G. Mundlak (2023). 'Peeling the Onion: On Choices Judges Make in Transnational Labour Litigation'. In *Social Justice and the World of Work: Possible Global Futures Essays in Honour of Francis Maupain*, edited by B. Langille and A. Trebilcock, 249–60. Oxford, UK: Hart Publishing.

Fudge, J. and G. LeBaron (2024). 'Regulatory Design and Interactions in Worker-Driven Social Responsibility Initiatives: The Dindigul Agreement'. *International Labour Review* 163(4): 575–98.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gallagher, A. T. (2010). *The International Law of Human Trafficking*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gereffi, G. (2014). 'Global Value Chains in a Post-Washington Consensus World'. *Review of International Political Economy* 21(1): 9–37.

——— (2018). *Global Value Chains and Development: Redefining the Contours of 21st Century Capitalism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gereffi, G. and J. Lee (2016). 'Economic and Social Upgrading in Global Value Chains and Industrial Clusters: Why Governance Matters'. *Journal of Business Ethics* 133(1): 25–38.

Gibbon, P., J. Bair, and S. Ponte (2008). 'Governing Global Value Chains'. *Economy and Society* 37(3): 315–38.

Gómez-Mera, L. (2017). 'The Global Governance of Trafficking in Persons: Toward a Transnational Regime Complex'. *Journal of Human Trafficking* 3(4): 303–26.

Gordon, J. (2017). 'The Problem with Corporate Social Responsibility'. Worker-Driven Social Responsibility Network, 11 July. Available at: https://wsr-network.org/resource/the-problem-with-corporate-social-responsibility.

Han, C., M. Jia, Jiang, and L. Chen (2022). 'Modern Slavery in Supply Chains: A Systematic Literature Review'. *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications* 27(7): 1–22. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13675567.2022.2118696.

Horner, R. (2017). 'Beyond Facilitator? State Roles in Global Value Chains and Global Production Networks'. *Geography Compass* 11(2): 1–13.

Haipeter, T., M. Helfen, A. Kirsch, S. Rosenbohm, and C. Üyük (2021). 'Industrial Relations at Centre Stage: Efficiency, Equity and Voice in the Governance of Global Labour Standards'. *Industrielle Beziehungen* 28(2): 148–71.

IGLP Law and Global Production Working Group (2016). 'The Role of Law in Global Value Chains: A Research Manifesto'. *London Review of International Law* 4(1): 57–79.

International Labour Organization (ILO) (2009). *The Cost of Coercion: Global Report under the Follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work*. Available at: www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---declaration/documents/publication/wcms_106268.pdf.

——— (2022). *Global Estimates of Modern Slavery: Forced Labour and Forced Marriage*. Available at: www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---ipec/documents/publication/wcms_854733.pdf.

International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) (2016). *Scandal: Inside the Global Supply Chains of 50 Top Companies*. ITUC Frontlines Report. Available at: www.ituc-csi.org/IMG/pdf/pdffrontlines_scandal_en-2.pdf.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

——— (2020). *Towards Mandatory Due Diligence in Global Supply Chains*. Available at: www.ituc-csi.org/towards_mandatory_due_diligence.

Jovanovic, M. (2023). *State Responsibility for 'Modern Slavery' in Human Rights Law: A Right Not to Be Trafficked*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Kang, Y. (2021). 'The Rise, Demise and Replacement of the Bangladesh Experiment in Transnational Labour Regulation'. *International Labour Review* 160(3): 407–30.

Kenway, E. (2021). *The Truth About Modern Slavery*. London: Pluto Press.

Kinderman, D. (2016). 'Time for a Reality Check: Is Business Willing to Support a Smart Mix of Complementary Regulation in Private Governance?' *Policy and Society* 35(1): 29–42.

Kolben, K. (2014). 'Dialogic Labor Regulation in the Global Supply Chain'. *Michigan Journal of International Law* 36(30): 425–65.

——— (2023). 'Labor Chapters Improve Supply Chain Resilience: The Case of the USMCA'. In *USMC Forward 2023: Building More Integrated, Resilient, and Secure Supply Chains in North America*, edited by J. P. Meltzer and B. S. Coulibaly, 105–11. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution. Available at: www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/USMCA-Forward-2023.pdf.

Kotiswaran, P. (2019). 'Trafficking: A Development Approach'. *Current Legal Problems* 72(1): 375–416.

Kuruvilla, S. and J. Bae (2021). 'Has Private Regulation Improved Labor Practices in Global Supply Chains? An Empirical Examination'. In *Private Regulation of Labor Standards in Global Supply Chains: Problems, Progress, and Prospects*, edited by S. Kuruvilla, 79–111. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kuruvilla, S. and M. Fischer-Daly (2021). 'Are Changes in Corporate Governance an Answer?' In *Private Regulation of Labor Standards in Global Supply Chains: Problems, Progress, and Prospects*, edited by S. Kuruvilla, 189–213. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kuruvilla, S., M. Fischer-Daly, and C. Raymond (2021). 'Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining in Global Supply Chains'. In *Private Regulation of Labor Standards in Global Supply Chains: Problems, Progress, and Prospects*, edited by S. Kuruvilla, 148–80. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kuruvilla, S. and C. Li (2021). 'Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining in Global Supply Chains: A Research Agenda'. *Journal of Supply Chain Management* 57(2): 43–57.

LaFianza, J. (2022). 'Threatening Ill-Gotten Gains: Analyzing the Effectiveness of a Forced Labor Import Ban in the European Union'. EU Law Working Paper No. 60, Stanford–Vienna Transatlantic Technology Law Forum. Available

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at: https://law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/EU-Law-WP-60-LaFianza.pdf.

Landau, I. (2019). 'Human Rights Due Diligence and the Risk of Cosmetic Compliance'. *Melbourne Journal of International Law* 20(1): 2–26.

——— (2023). *Human Rights Due Diligence and Labour Governance*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

LeBaron, G. (2018). *The Global Business of Forced Labor: Report of Findings*. SPERI and University of Sheffield. Available at: https://tinyurl.com/4pd57fer.

——— (2020). *Combatting Modern Slavery: Why Labour Governance Is Failing and What We Can Do About It*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

——— (2021). 'The Role of Supply Chains in the Global Business of Forced Labour'. *Journal of Supply Chain Management* 57(2): 29–42.

LeBaron, G., N. Howard, C. Thibos, and P. Kyritsis (2018). *Confronting Root Causes: Forced Labour in Global Supply Chains*. OpenDemocracy and SPERI. Available at: https://tinyurl.com/tabzn4yf.

LeBaron, G. and J. Lister (2022). 'The Hidden Costs of Global Supply Chain Solutions'. *Review of International Political Economy* 29(3): 669–95.

LeBaron, G. and N. Phillips (2019). States and the Political Economy of Unfree Labour. *New Political Economy* 24(1): 1–21.

LeBaron, G. and A. Rühmkorf (2019). 'The Domestic Politics of Corporate Accountability Legislation: Struggles over the 2015 UK Modern Slavery Act'. *Socio-Economic Review* 17(3): 709–43.

LeClercq, D. (2022). 'Invisible Workers'. *AJIL Unbound* 116: 107–12.

Lee, J. (2016). 'Global Supply Chain Dynamics and Labour Governance: Implications for Social Upgrading'. ILO Research Paper No. 14, International Labour Office, Geneva.

Levi-Faur, D. (2011). 'The Regulatory State and Regulatory Capitalism: An Institutional Perspective'. In *Handbook on the Politics of Regulation*, edited by D. Levi-Faur, 662–72. Northampton, UK: Edward Elgar.

Lim, S. and A. Prakash (2017). 'From Quality Control to Labor Protection: ISO 9001 and Workplace Safety, 1993–2012'. *Global Policy* 8(3): 66–77.

Lipson. J. (2019). 'Promising Justice: Contract (As) Social Responsibility'. *Wisconsin Law Review* 2019(5): 1109–60.

Locke, R. (2013). *The Promise and Limits of Private Power: Promoting Labour Standards in a Global Economy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lorde, A. (1984). 'The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House'. In *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches* (2017), edited by A. Lorde, 110–13. Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mantouvalou, V. (2020). 'Structural Injustice and the Human Rights of Workers'. *Current Legal Problems* 73(1): 59–87.

——— (2023). *Structural Injustice and Workers' Rights*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, S. (2019). *Living Wage: Regulatory Solutions to Informal and Precarious Work in Global Supply Chains*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, S., I. Landau, H. Shamir, T. Barkay, J. Fudge, and A. van Heerden (2023). *Mandatory Human Rights Due Diligence: Risks and Opportunities for Workers and Unions*. RMIT University Business and Human Rights Centre; TraffLab ERC; and Labour, Equality and Human Rights (LEAH) research group, Monash Business School. Available at: www.trafflab.org/_files/ugd/11e1f0_e1db27f1ec7f41459ac357d021f6011c.pdf.

Mayer, F. W. and N. Phillips (2017). 'Outsourcing Governance: States and the Politics of a "Global Value Chain World"'. *New Political Economy* 22(2): 134–52.

Mayer, F. W., N. Phillips, and A. C. Posthuma (2017). 'The Political Economy of Governance in a "Global Value Chain World"'. *New Political Economy* 22(2): 129–33.

McCorquodale, R. and J. Nolan (2021). 'The Effectiveness of Human Rights Due Diligence for Preventing Business Human Rights Abuses'. *Netherlands International Law Review* 68(3): 455–78.

McGaughey, F., H. Voss, H. Cullen, and M. Davis (2022). 'Corporate Responses to Tackling Modern Slavery: A Comparative Analysis of Australia, France and the United Kingdom'. *Business and Human Rights Journal* 7(2): 249–70.

Mieres, F. and S. McGrath (2021). 'Ripe to Be Heard: Workers' Voice in the Fair Food Programme'. *International Labour Review* 160(4): 631–47.

MSI Integrity (2020). *Not Fit-for-Purpose: The Grand Experiment of Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives in Corporate Accountability, Human Rights and Global Governance: Summary Report*. Available at: www.msi-integrity.org/not-fit-for-purpose.

Nathan, D. (2019). 'Labour in GVCs: An Analytical Framework'. In *Perspectives on Neoliberalism, Labour and Globalization in India*, edited by K. R. Sundar, 255–71. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nathan, D., S. S. Bhattacharjee, S. Rahul, P. Kumar, I. Dhagani, S. Singh, and P. Swaminathan (2022). *Reverse Subsidies in Global Monopsony Capitalism: Gender, Labour, and Environmental Injustice in Garment Value Chains*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

New, S. J. (2015). 'Modern Slavery and the Supply Chain: The Limits of Corporate Social Responsibility?' *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal* 20(6): 697–707.

Niezna, M. (2022). 'Paper Chains: Tied Visas, Migration Policies, and Legal Coercion'. *Journal of Law and Society* 49(2): 362–84.

Niezna, M., Y. Kurlander, and H. Shamir (2021). 'Underlying Conditions: The Increased Vulnerability of Migrant Workers under COVID-19 in Israel'. *Journal of Modern Slavery* 6(2): 133–58.

O'Connell Davidson, J. (2013). 'Troubling Freedom: Migration, Debt, and Modern Slavery'. *Migration Studies* 1(2): 176–95.

O'Rourke, D. (2006). 'Multi-stakeholder Regulation: Privatizing or Socializing Global Labor Standards?' *World Development* 34(5): 899–918.

Peters, A. W. (2015). *Responding to Human Trafficking: Sex, Gender, and Culture in the Law*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Phillips, N. (2011). 'Informality, Global Production Networks and the Dynamics of Adverse Incorporation'. *Global Networks* 11(3): 380–97.

——— (2013). 'Unfree Labour and Adverse Incorporation in the Global Economy: Comparative Perspectives on Brazil and India'. *Economy and Society* 42(2): 171–96.

Pickles, J., A. Smith et al. (2016). *Articulations of Capital: Global Production Networks and Regional Transformations*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Pietropaoli, I., O. Johnstone, and A. Balch (2021). *Effectiveness of Forced Labour Import Bans*. Policy Brief. London: Modern Slavery and Human Rights Policy and Evidence Centre. Available at: https://tinyurl.com/57j35cpv.

Plant, R. (2014). 'Modern Slavery: The Concepts and Their Practical Implications'. Paper presented at the 'Shaping the Definition of Human Trafficking' Conference, Dickson Poon School of Law, King's College, London (14 May). ILO. Available at: www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/wcmsp5/groups/public/%40ed_norm/%0declaration/documents/publication/wcms_355052.pdf.

Polaski, S., K. A. Nolan García, and M. Rioux (2022). 'The USMCA: A "New Model" for Labor Governance in North America?' In *NAFTA 2.0: From the First NAFTA to the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement*, edited by G. Gagné and M. Rioux, 139–56. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ponte, S., J. Bair, and M. Dallas (2023). 'Power and Inequality in Global Value Chains: Advancing the Research Agenda'. *Global Networks* 23(4): 679–86.

Quirk, J. and A. Bunting (2015). 'The Politics of Exception: The Bipartisan Appeal of Human Trafficking'. In *Popular and Political Representations: Beyond*

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Trafficking and Slavery Short Course Volume One (e-book), edited by J. Quirk and J. O'Connell Davidson, 64–68. Available at: https://cdn2.opendemocracy.net/media/documents/BTS-1-Representations.pdf.

Raigrodski. D. (2016). 'Creative Capitalism and Human Trafficking: The Business Case for Eliminating Forced Labor and Human Trafficking from Global Supply Chains'. *William and Mary Business Law Review* 8(1): 71–134.

Rende-Taylor, L. and E. Shih (2019). 'Worker Feedback Technologies and Combatting Modern Slavery in Global Supply Chains: Examining the Effectiveness of Remediation-Oriented and Due-Diligence-Oriented Technologies in Identifying and Addressing Forced Labour and Human Trafficking'. *Journal of the British Academy* 7(s1): 131–65.

Richards, K. (2004). 'The Trafficking of Migrant Workers: What Are the Links between Labour Trafficking and Corruption?' *International Migration* 42(5): 147–68.

Rossi, A., A. Luinstra, and J. Pickles (2014). *Towards Better Work: Advances in Labour Studies*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rowe, J. K. (2005). 'Corporate Social Responsibility as Business Strategy'. In *Globalization, Governmentality and Global Politics*, edited by R. D. Lipschutz and J. K. Rowe, 122–60. Oxford, UK, and New York: Routledge.

Rühmkorf, A. (2018). 'From Transparency to Due Diligence Laws? Variations in Stringency of CSR Regulation in Global Supply Chains in the "Home State" of Multinational Enterprises'. In *Globalisation of Corporate Social Responsibility and Its Impact on Corporate Governance*, edited by J. Plessis, U. Varottil, and J. Veldman, 177–201. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Salminen, J. (2020). 'Towards a Genealogy and Typology of Governance through Contract Beyond Privity'. *European Review of Contract Law* 16(1): 25–43.

Sarfaty, G. (2020). 'Translating Modern Slavery into Management Practice'. *Law and Social Inquiry* 45(4): 1027–51.

Scott, S. (2017). *Labour Exploitation and Work-Based Harm*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Selwyn, B. (2019). Poverty Chains and Global Capitalism. *Competition and Change* 23(1): 71–97.

Shamir, H. (2012). 'A Labor Paradigm for Human Trafficking'. *UCLA Law Review* 60(1): 76–136.

——— (2017). 'The Paradox of "Legality": Temporary Migrant Worker Programs and Vulnerability to Trafficking'. In *Revisiting the Law and Governance of Trafficking, Forced Labor and Modern Slavery*, edited by P. Kotiswaran, 471–502. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

——— (2021). 'A Labor Approach to Human Trafficking: 20 Years to the International Attempt to Address Human Trafficking'. *Iyunei Mishpat – Tel Aviv University Law Review* 44: 377–482.

Shamir, H. and M. Niezna (eds.) (2022). 'An Alternative Anti-Trafficking Action Plan: A Proposed Model Based on a Labor Approach to Trafficking'. TraffLab Research Group Policy Paper, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv. Available at: www.trafflab.org/_files/ugd/11e1f0_861945c9ea904d57a359c89d44424869.pdf.

Shamir, H. and T. Barkay (forthcoming). 'Labor Governance Chains: A Comparative Structural Analysis'. *ILR Review*.

Shamir, R. (2010). 'Capitalism, Governance, and Authority: The Case of Corporate Social Responsibility'. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 6: 531–53.

Shift Project (2022). *The EU Commission's Proposal for a Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive: Shift's Analysis*. Available at: https://shiftproject.org/resource/eu-csdd-proposal/shifts-analysis/.

Shih, E., J. Rosenbaum, and P. Kyritsis (2021). 'Undermining Labor Power: The False Promise of the Industry-Led Antislavery Initiatives'. In *Fighting Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking: History and Contemporary Policy*, Slaveries since Emancipation, edited by G. LeBaron, J. Pliley, and D. Blight, 141–55. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Skrivankova, K. (2010). 'Between Decent Work and Forced Labour: Examining the Continuum of Exploitation'. JRF programme paper, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York, UK. Available at: www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/migrated/migrated/files/forced-labour-exploitation-full.pdf.

Smith, A. (2015). 'The State, Institutional Frameworks and the Dynamics of Capital in Global Production Networks'. *Progress in Human Geography* 39(3): 290–315.

Strauss, K. and J. Fudge (2013). 'Temporary Work, Agencies and Unfree Labour: Insecurity in the New World of Work'. In *Temporary Work, Agencies and Unfree Labour: Insecurity in the New World of Work*, edited by J. Fudge and K. Strauss, 1–25. New York and London: Routledge.

Thibos, C. (2020). 'Twenty Years of Trafficking: Taking Stock of the World the Palermo Protocol Built'. Beyond Trafficking and Slavery Blog. *Open Democracy*, 15 November. Available at: www.opendemocracy.net/en/beyond-trafficking-and-slavery/twenty-years-trafficking-taking-stock-world-palermo-protocol-built.

Thiemann, I. (2016). 'Villains and Victims, But No Workers: Why a Prosecution-Focussed Approach to Human Trafficking Fails Trafficked Persons'. *Anti-Trafficking Review* 6: 126–29.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

——— (2019). 'Beyond Victimhood *and* beyond Employment? Exploring Avenues for Labour Law to Empower Women Trafficked into the Sex Industry'. *Industrial Law Journal* 48(2): 199–224.

Todres, J. (2012). 'The Private Sector's Pivotal Role in Combating Human Trafficking'. *California Law Review Circuit* 3: 80–98.

Trautrims, A., S. Gold, A. Touboulic, C. Emberson, and H. Carter (2021). 'The UK Construction and Facilities Management Sector's Response to the Modern Slavery Act: An Intra-industry Initiative against Modern Slavery'. *Business Strategy and Development* 4(3): 279–93.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) (2015). 'The Concept of "Exploitation" in the Trafficking in Persons Protocol'. Available at: www.unodc.org/documents/congress/background-information/Human_Trafficking/UNODC_2015_Issue_Paper_Exploitation.pdf.

——— (2018). *Global Report on Trafficking in Persons 2018*. Available at: www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/glotip/2018/GLOTiP_2018_BOOK_web_small.pdf.

——— (2022). *Global Report on Trafficking in Persons 2022*. Available at: www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/glotip/2022/GLOTiP_2022_web.pdf.

US Department of State (2023). *Trafficking in Persons Report, June 2023*. Available at: www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Trafficking-in-Persons-Report-2023.pdf.

Vance, C. (2011). 'States of Contradiction: Twelve Ways to Do Nothing about Trafficking while Pretending To'. *Social Research* 78(3): 933–48.

Vaughan-Whitehead, D. (2014). 'How "Fair" Are Wage Practices along the Supply Chain? A Global Assessment'. In *Towards Better Work: Advances in Labour Studies*, edited by A. Rossi, A. Luinstra, and J. Pickles, 68–102. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Vogt, J., R. Subasinghe, and P. Danquah (2022). 'A Missed Opportunity to Improve Workers' Rights in Global Supply Chains'. Online post. OpinioJuris, 18 March. Available at: https://opiniojuris.org/2022/03/18/a-missed-opportunity-to-improve-workers-rights-in-global-supply-chains.

Waite, L., G. Craig, H. Lewis, and K. Skrivankova (2015). 'Introduction'. In *Vulnerability, Exploitation and Migrants*, edited by L. Waite, G. Craig, H. Lewis, and K. Skrivankova, 1–12. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Webb, P. and R. Garciandia (2019). 'State Responsibility for Modern Slavery: Uncovering and Bridging the Gap'. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 68(3): 539–71.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Worker-Driven Social Responsibility Network (WSR) (2017). 'Factsheet: What Is WSR?' Available at: https://wsr-network.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/What_is_WSR_web.pdf.

Zumbansen, Peer C. (2024). 'Global Value Chain Legislation, Modern Slavery, Climate Change and Finance: Lessons from the European Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive ("CSDDD")'. McGill SGI Research Papers in Business, Finance, Law and Society Research Paper No. 2024–08. Available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4784608.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009591102.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press