

**Where Do We Go From Here? The Intention and Impact of Government Surveillance of
Sex Workers and the Future of Sex Work Legislation**

by

Aidyn Lurie

Submitted to the Department of Sociology

School of Natural and Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of Bachelor of Arts

Purchase College

State University of New York

May 2020

Sponsor: Kristen Karlberg, Ph.D., M.P.H.

Second Reader: Jennifer Uleman, Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| ABSTRACT..... | 2 |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 3 |
| METHODOLOGY..... | 4 |
| BACKGROUND..... | 4 |
| LEGISLATION, POLICING, AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF SURVEILLANCE..... | 5 |
| THE NORDIC (END-DEMAND) MODEL..... | 6 |
| CRIMINALIZATION..... | 7 |
| SESTA/FOSTA..... | 8 |
| LEGALIZATION..... | 10 |
| DECRIMINALIZATION..... | 11 |
| OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY OF SEX WORKERS..... | 12 |
| STIGMA SURROUNDING SEX WORK AND SEX WORKERS..... | 21 |
| THE UTILIZATION OF SOCIAL CONTROL..... | 25 |
| DISCUSSION..... | 26 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 31 |
| LIMITATIONS..... | 33 |
| Bibliography..... | 34 |

ABSTRACT:

This study analyzes existing mechanisms by the government to surveil sex workers, claiming that sex workers are either victims of sex trafficking who need to be saved or perpetrators of serious crimes who need to be punished. The research addresses the following questions: What is the intention of each legislative framework surrounding sex work? What is the impact of these forms of legislation on the occupational health and safety of sex workers? How do stigma and social control play a part in the surveillance of sex workers? What role does the passing of the Stop Enabling Sex Trafficking Act and Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking play in the occupational health and safety of sex workers? However, the main research question addressed in this paper is how should federal and state governments approach legislating sex work in the future in order to protect the livelihood and rights of sex workers? To answer this question, I examine studies on and interviews with sex workers that focus on their feelings regarding their personal safety, police and the impact of policing, legislation allowing for the surveillance of sex workers and the implication of stigma in regard to said legislation, and the role of social control in the surveillance of sex workers. Furthermore, I analyze the pros and cons of each legislative model regarding sex work and how effective they are at protecting the rights and safety of sex workers. The results showed that the best way to go about legislating sex work is by at the very least decriminalizing sex work all together. However, in order to legitimize sex work as an occupation and protect the rights and safety of sex workers, legalization is the best approach, so long as there is proper regulation to follow it. This study emphasizes the need for better regulation surrounding sex work—particularly in the US—and the

legitimization of sex work as a career, in order to protect the rights and safety of working people and effectively decrease violent crime.

INTRODUCTION:

In this article, I examine the close surveillance of sex workers by the government, the intentions of surveillance mechanisms utilized by the government, and the overall impact of surveillance on the rights of sex workers and their occupational health and safety. Much of the discourse among state and federal governments regarding sex work laws focuses on morality and victimization or antagonization. Rarely do lawmakers genuinely take public health, sex worker safety, and human rights into consideration. Sex work is often framed in the same category as sex trafficking, completely undermining the notion that sex work could be perceived as a legitimate line of work and perpetuating the stigma surrounding sex work and sex workers as “at risk” or “risky.” Under capitalism, sex work should be legitimized as any other line of work because simply put, it is an exercise of physical and emotional labor in exchange for some form of compensation. I will begin by providing information on common legal frameworks surrounding sex work from Ane Mathieson (2015). I will then examine the ineffectiveness of each model when applied to a real world context through studies from different countries in my first subtopic. This will address each model’s faults and potential solutions, the personal opinions of sex workers on legislation and policing, and how they connect to surveillance. Then, I will discuss how the occupational health and safety of sex workers are being threatened through surveillance in my second subtopic. In my third subtopic, I will address stigma and connect it to both legislation and health and safety. Throughout the review, I will draw on the themes of

power and social control from each subtopic to show the malintent of the government through the establishment and enforcement of sex work laws.

METHODOLOGY:

For my methodology, I will be analyzing studies on and interviews with sex workers regarding their personal safety and their feelings about police, research on the impact of policing, stigma and legislation used to surveil and control sex workers, and research on how these methods of surveillance are used as a form of social control to preserve the power of the white supremacist, capitalist, heteropatriarchal modern state. I will also examine research on legislative models for sex work and how effective they are at protecting the rights and safety of sex workers as well as influence the stigma surrounding sex work. I intend to connect to literature through feminist surveillance theory and conflict theory, as well as the implications of power and social control to form a new understanding on how to properly address sex work legislation and initiate discourse.

BACKGROUND:

Ane Mathieson's (2015) article describes three different perspectives on prostitution: prostitution is a result of deficient moral character; prostitution is a valid form of labor and is not inherently harmful to women; prostitution is a consequence of social, political, and economic inequality. The overarching argument asserts that women are predominantly recruited into prostitution as a result of their social vulnerability. Three legislative responses are most commonly applied in law: criminalization, legalization/decriminalization, and the Nordic model. Mathieson (2015) notes that criminalization is rooted in the Judeo-Christian tradition that explains that prostitution is a result of women's sinful nature. As a result of this ideology, men

have historically faced far less scrutiny for their accountability in being consumers of prostitution. The position that calls for legalization and decriminalization can arguably advance the wellbeing and individual interests of women. The neoliberalism economic model frames prostitution in terms of personal choice and freedom, as well as market contracts made between rational, consenting adults. The Nordic model prohibits the purchase of prostitution, putting accountability on the consumers and third-party profiteers like pimps and brothel owners.

Overall, Mathieson (2015) argues that criminalization is ineffective in preventing sex work and trafficking or protecting women. Legalization or decriminalization is somewhat effective but, as argued by the Nordic model, allows too much government intervention in the labor and business efforts of women and does not prevent third party profiteers. The Nordic model takes a very different approach, focusing the issue on being a buyer or third-party profiteer of prostitution, with the intention of allowing sex workers to remain economically independent without fear of government interference. This background on each legislative model presents some questions that are not necessarily revealed through the real-world example in Mathieson's (2015) research: How do these different perspectives and legislative actions affect the rights and safety of sex workers? How do sex workers feel sex work should be legislated and why? How does stigma play a role in the legislation, policing, and occupational health and safety of sex workers? What role does surveillance play in all of this? How do sex workers reconcile with these systems and feel about their impact?

LEGISLATION, POLICING, AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF SURVEILLANCE:

Feminist theory is centered around factors such as privilege, access, and risk with consciousness that the production of knowledge is intertwined with gendered and sexualized

views. In “Feminist Surveillance Studies,” Dubrofsky and Magnet (2015) explain how surveillance practices and technologies are used to normalize and maintain the white supremacist, capitalist, heteropatriarchal modern state. Sex work obstructs this modern state, as it gives women and people of any race or class the autonomy to personally capitalize off their own bodies. As a response, the government uses tools of surveillance to monitor and control sex workers. Legislation—which is a form of surveillance—is proposed, passed and enforced by police and stigma surrounding sex work justifies the utilization of surveillance to sustain the modern state.

THE NORDIC (END-DEMAND) MODEL:

When reviewing the different legislative policies applied to sex work, Mathieson’s (2015) assertion is that the Nordic Model is the only viable solution to regulating sex work, while protecting the rights and safety of sex workers. However, Levy and Jakobsson (2014) examined how the application of the Nordic Model in Sweden compromised the lives of sex workers, noting that sex workers had less time to negotiate with clients—as clients feared being arrested—and were less often able to identify clients in cases of violence against them because clients were unwilling to leave contact information with sex workers. Similarly, Landsberg et al. (2017) found in their research that experiencing client perpetrated violence was associated with rushed client negotiations among both female and male sex workers. Their findings suggested that sex workers rushed client negotiations regardless of whether the police targeted sex workers or clients. The police presence with the intent of targeting any party involved in the exchange of sex work for money only rushes client negotiations, and is associated with increased client-perpetrated violence. These are not the only examples of the ineffectiveness of this model.

McBride et al. (2019) found that the application of the Nordic Model—or end-demand criminalization—correlated with decreased access to third-party services for sex workers. This is dangerous for sex workers because third party services were independently correlated with greater access to occupational health, such as condom distribution as well as sex worker and community led services. Here, it is evident that the Nordic Model can facilitate the application of policing as a surveillance mechanism to suppress sex workers' rights to safety.

CRIMINALIZATION:

Criminalization is arguably the least effective form of sex work legislation, as Mathieson (2015) explained, because it neither reduced the number of people using sex work as a main source of income, nor protected sex workers from the dangers that arise in their line of work. Research from Yi et al. (2012) shows that criminalization is detrimental to the safety and health of sex workers, rendering the mobilization of female sex workers as an effective way to reduce harm—particularly the risk of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)—unachievable. The impact of criminalization goes beyond female sex workers, though. Transgender sex workers are especially vulnerable to violence and police abuse as a result of criminalization (Lyons et al. 2018). Criminalization prevents sex workers from reporting crimes and allows for an increase in police abuse, therefore putting their health and safety at risk. Lyons et al. conducted research between 2012 and 2013, when sex work was still criminalized in Canada, arguing that transgender sex workers are especially vulnerable to violence and police abuse as a result of criminalization. The criminalization of sex work increases vulnerability of trans sex workers to client violence because they have to rush gender disclosure and sex work negotiations with potential clients. Trans sex workers had feelings that the police would not be of any help to them

either, saying they feel they would either ignore or minimize complaints from sex workers; in some cases there were fears that police would add to the stigmatization of trans people. They also feared incarceration for their crimes as sex workers if they did in fact seek help from the police. Criminalization has also been shaped by state racism (Hsu 2013). In Taiwan, police and judiciary focus on social control and surveillance, directly demonizing and discriminating against sex workers and ultimately perpetuating the subjugation implicated in laws on sex work. Hsu utilized Foucault's work "The History of Sexuality Volume I" to analyze apparatuses of criminalization and state racism used against sex workers and found that state racism developed from eugenics to justify state-sponsored discrimination, as well as Article 80 of the Social Order Maintenance Act, and has deprived sex workers of their personal rights. It goes without saying that criminalization fails to do anything other than incarcerate working people. It endangers the lives of all sex workers and does not reduce the rates of sex work anywhere that it is illegal. Furthermore, it not only alleviates any sort of responsibility from police to protect sex workers from violence against them, but allows them to abuse their power and closely surveil sex workers in the name of the law.

SESTA/FOSTA:

April Petillo argues in her 2019 article "Marking Embodied Borders: Compulsory Settler Sexuality, Indigeneity, and U.S. Law," that laws like the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act (SESTA) and the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act (FOSTA) of 2018 designate legal borders by assigning social locations to specific types of bodies based on a colonizing hierarchical code. SESTA and FOSTA were intended to amend the Communications Act of 1934 "to clarify that section 230 of such Act does not prohibit the enforcement against

providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sexual exploitation of children or sex trafficking, and for other purposes” (United States Congress 2018). It excludes the immunity of online services from civil liability for the enforcement of sex trafficking laws. In other words, site owners are liable for any content they allow on their sites, which reduces a lot of their freedom and holds them accountable for activity they may not even be aware of. Because of this newly enforced liability, online services such as Backpage and the classifieds page on Craigslist were forced to shut down, reducing the number of platforms that online sex workers use to market their services. Petillo draws evidence from the impact of the Page Act in 1875, which prohibited Chinese women from entering the US due to the fear of prostitution. This kind of legislation normalizes stereotypes that sexualize and objectify the Chinese population. Other legislation such as the Mann Act of 1910 allowed for the state to monitor women’s sexual behavior and criminalize sex work as well as consensual interracial encounters. These restrictive understandings of transactional sex are still embedded in US trafficking laws like SESTA and FOSTA. These bills allow for the use of surveillance of sex workers by the government and police in not only a public, but also online context.

In their article “Craigslist Reduced Violence Against Women,” Cunningham et. al (2019) analyzed the impact of the introduction of Craigslist’s erotic services (ERS) on female homicide rates and found evidence to suggest that it reduced the rates by 10-17%. One important factor they found in facilitating sex work online was the use of screening. “Screening is one of the main ways that a sex worker manages the risks of seeing a new client. These methods are diverse and include formal registrations, such as white lists, circulated black lists of bad clients, as well as informal methods such as background checks and calling new clients at work” (24). The

researchers' survey data showed that about 60% of sex workers who use the internet to mediate their search for clients use some method of screening, such as references. Based off their findings, they theorized that increased screening, greater market efficiency, and sex workers' mobility to an online setting from a street-based one contributed to declines in female homicide rates as a result of the growth of Craigslist's ERS. Cunningham et. al also noted the cost-effectiveness of using ERS to reduce homicide rates, as opposed to alternative methods such as hiring additional police officers. However, FOSTA has forced sex workers back to doing street work or having pimps recruit clients, as they have now lost the ability to utilize the internet to for this purpose. Furthermore, FOSTA prevents sex workers from being able to screen clients online, which only increases the potential for violence perpetrated against them.

LEGALIZATION:

Legalization can be effective in protecting the rights of sex workers, but it can also allow for the abuse and exploitation of sex workers by third-parties when there is no proper regulation and enforcement. Contempt towards sex workers from bosses resulted in episodes of mental violence towards sex workers in Poland (Ślęzak 2017). Mental violence was very often accompanied by physical and sexual violence towards the workers. In the case of a conflict between a worker and a client, rarely do the bosses stand by their workers. Instead, they give them a financial penalty for an unsuccessful meeting. This shows that even in indoor establishments where sex work occurs and is regulated, the health and safety of sex workers is still threatened. Here, surveillance allows for discrimination and oppression in the form of physical, mental, and sexual violence. Ślęzak highlights the importance of facility-based safety policies and procedures because the workers' safety is also influenced by the actions undertaken

by managers and security workers at the premises. The task of security is to minimize the danger of a client to a sex worker. Migrant sex workers also struggle under a legalized system, specifically due to poor working conditions and regulation. Sex workers at the Guatemala-Mexican border were at risk of vulnerability and STIs due to the isolation in their work environment, the promotion of alcohol use in the establishment, restricted economic agency, and sex work policies and immigration enforcement that violated human rights (Goldenberg et al. 2018). Many researchers felt that their findings were an indication that policy agenda should prioritize violence (Campbell and Sanders 2007) and that policies should be developed to respect sex worker rights by promoting their employment and human rights and citizenship. Currently, the UK does not have any sort of legislation for employment laws and health and safety standards in order to regulate sex work (Campbell et al. 2019), despite the fact that sex work is legalized. Legalization does not equate to destigmatization, and when combined with a lack of regulation and guidelines, legalization does not protect the rights and safety of sex workers. By not establishing and enforcing proper guidelines under legalization in order to protect the rights and interests of sex workers, the government is able to sustain the modern state with little effort. The lack of regulation allows for the violence against sex workers to be perpetuated by third parties in the industry, as well as clients.

DECRIMINALIZATION:

The main difference between legalization and decriminalization is that sex work is legitimized as an occupation under capitalism, and allows for more government intervention and regulation. Some researchers argue that decriminalization is the only viable framework in order to achieve public health objectives and aid in the prevention of sexually transmitted infections

(STIs) (Fawkes 2014). In New South Wales, decriminalization has shown to be effective in both objectives. Research has also shown that decriminalization has improved occupational health and safety for sex workers, as well as contributes to improved human rights. Decriminalization allows for sex workers to address discriminatory practices, according to Fawkes' research. Furthermore, the sex industry does not expand as a result of decriminalization. In other words, decriminalization does not lead to an increase in people opting for sex work as their primary or only source of income.

In terms of sex workers' thoughts and views on how to go about legislating sex work, a 2009 study from Lutnick and Cohan on San Francisco sex workers found that many sex workers are reluctant to advocate for decriminalization or legalization of sex work out of fear that government regulation may hinder their ability to either manage themselves or their own business, maximize their profits, or limit their own drug-usage. However, many other sex workers want decriminalization or legalization in order to ensure they are protected by the police, able to freely and openly advertise their services, and unionize; they want freedom, safety, and support. Lutnick and Cohan also noted that sex workers believe offering help through social services is a constructive response to sex work under a criminalized system, rather than incarcerating them. Ultimately, they want to be helped and rehabilitated, not punished.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY OF SEX WORKERS:

Regardless of whether or not a person is located in an area where sex work is criminalized, the health and safety of sex workers is important not only for the sake of their own human rights, but for the sake of public health. Decriminalization has shown to be the only functioning framework in Australia that aids in HIV and STI prevention for sex workers (Fawkes

2014). For one, third party services were independently correlated with greater access to condom distribution as well as sex worker and community led services (McBride et al. 2019). Other factors that can threaten the health and safety of a sex worker are directly related to the structure of the work environment: isolation in the work environment, the promotion of alcohol use in the establishment, restricted economic agency, and sex work policies and immigration enforcement that violate human rights. These factors significantly increase the threat to sex workers' health and safety. Goldenberg et al. (2018) argued that there is a dire need for support in HIV and STI prevention, economic agency, and protection from violence against and exploitation of recent migrants in order to improve working conditions. But how is health and safety affected in a criminalized or end-demand criminalized society?

Krüsi et al. found in their 2016 study that coexisting stigmatizing assumptions of sex workers as both victims and victimizers deny sex workers the opportunity to live freely and engage as citizens, facilitate the removal of sex workers from public spaces, and perpetuate labor conditions that render sex workers at increased risk for violence and poor health. One sex worker the researchers interviewed noted that the results of stigmatizing assumptions lead to the exercise of power outside of the police:

[Security guards] they're horrible, they're worse than the cops. [...] They just say 'you fucking whore'. They're not professional. They'll go and park so you have to keep moving and then if they decide to get a hard on for you they'll follow you around everywhere. (Krüsi et. al 2016:8).

These risks posited by stigmatizing assumptions also include the potential for the increase in rates of HIV and STIs due to constrained ability to negotiate sexual risk reduction. However,

some research has highlighted the importance of certain third party regulated work environments. Yi et al. (2012) examined the social-ecological factors of sexual risk among 348 female sex workers in Beijing and indicated that managers or “mommies” had a great deal of influence on sex worker networks that provided a base for social capital, not only protecting them economically but also protecting sex workers from other harms. As exemplified by the insufficient occupational health and safety for sex workers in both criminalized and non-criminalized areas, sex work will not be legitimized as an occupation—whether under a criminalized or legalized framework—until safety and conditions for sex workers improve (Banach 1999).

Sanders and Campbell (2007) examine the complexities of violence and safety for indoor sex workers in the UK. They conducted qualitative fieldwork in two different cities in the UK. They documented the types of violence experienced in indoor venues and how the environment in which they are working dictates work-based hazards that increase vulnerability. Then they emphasized the different protection strategies that indoor sex workers and management create to sustain safety and order within the establishment. The researchers used these findings to suggest that the policy agenda should prioritize the prevention of violence. Sanders and Campbell concluded that policies should be developed to respect sex worker rights by promoting their employment status, human rights, and citizenship. This study shows the dangers that exist within indoor sex work and how even with third party management, there needs to be better protection for sex workers. Furthermore, it emphasizes the need for a way to reduce stigma, such as enforcing policies to legitimize the employment status, human rights, and citizenship of sex workers. Levy and Jakobsson’s 2014 study found that 67.8% of surveyed respondents had never

received condoms as an element of sex worker-targeted STI prevention initiatives, and only 5.2% had received condoms from Prostitution Units. They also found that where the sex purchase law appears to be used to displace sex workers from public space, immigration legislation and trafficking rhetoric is used to displace migrant sex workers. This shows that the Sweden's use of the Nordic Model is ineffective in protecting the occupational health and safety of sex workers.

Many sex workers also found themselves in situations of violence perpetrated by clients or their coworkers (Ślęzak 2017). The experiences of sex workers builds a picture of differentiated forms of physical violence that they endured: refusal to put on a condom, an attempt to remove a condom during intercourse, being forced to provide unwanted sexual services, and/or rape. Respondents also mentioned incidents of struggling, destroying clothes, beating, suffocating, burning their bodies with cigarettes, or being threatened with a weapon. Ślęzak also found that novice workers are especially endangered with violence, typically accepting the rules established by the boss with little protest because they lack experience in the field. This shows that even in indoor establishments where sex work occurs and is somewhat regulated, the health and safety of sex workers is still threatened. This goes back to the point of re-shaping and re-conceptualizing the legal framework surrounding sex work because the lack of regulation and enforcement of occupational health and safety rights of sex workers is putting them in danger.

The health and safety of sex workers is not only a concern for street-based and indoor sex workers, but internet-based sex workers too. Campbell et al. (2019) discovered that incidents of violence were low among internet-based sex workers compared to street-based sex workers, but

many internet-based sex workers reported concerns of verbal abuse, repeated unwanted contact, or attempts to contact in person. They found that 60.2% of independent sex workers who provide in-person services encountered threatening calls, texts, or emails in the past 5 years while 55.1% of technology-mediated indirect (TMI) sex workers had the same experiences. Both similarly experienced verbal abuse, but TMI sex workers appeared less likely to have experienced any form of violence in their work, likely due to the fact that they did not perform in-person services. However, the study showed a high-level of under-reporting of crimes to police by both TMI and independent street-based sex workers due to the fear for their own safety if they did report to the police. Lewis et al. (2005) identified 3 factors that influenced the management of risk and safety: location (on- or off- street), organization on an out- or in-call basis, and if it is conducted independently or for a third-party profiler. The researchers concluded that male sex workers overall felt they had good risk management strategies due to their advantage in size. Although many transgender sex workers shared a similar advantage, they held great concern for their safety. Female sex workers had the greatest job mobility in the sex work industry, due to the fact that they had more access to different jobs, and were able to maximize their safety and income. Respondants of all genders and forms of occupational sex work shared a common fear of harassment, discrimination, and assault.

The Australian Capital Territory is considered a world leader in regard to prostitution law reform. The government concerns themselves with protecting public health, while also prohibiting coercion and minor's participation in the sex industry, as well as establishing zoning restrictions for the location of brothels (Pinwill 1999). A Sex Industry Consultative Group (SICG) made up of sex workers and brothel owners were appointed along with health

professionals, police, and lawyers to reform the occupational health and safety within the sex industry to create a guideline for protecting the health and safety of sex workers. The code addressed the following issues: Information about the occupational health and safety act of 1989; an explanation of the legal status of codes and practices; cleanliness of brothels; disposal of sharps; amenities including showers, baths, and toilets; personal protective equipment; personal safety; examination of clients by sex workers; education and training of sex workers; first aid; smoking, drug, and alcohol policy; and fire and electrical safety. The importance of health and safety for sex workers is directly tied to thorough legislative action and enforcement.

The reality is that sex workers are almost always overlooked in discourse surrounding discrimination, which negatively impacts their occupational health and safety. However, where there is discussion regarding discrimination and its impact on the rights and livelihood of sex workers, the focus of the conversation is on white, cisgender sex workers. The experiences of black women, transgender people, and sex workers being ignored only emphasizes the burden that black transgender sex workers carry in their everyday lives.

To break it down, let us first look at the dangers of living as a sex worker. In a 2018 study titled “Sex Work and Occupational Homicide: Analysis of a U.K. Murder Database,” Cunningham et. al assert that in the United States, cisgender female sex workers are not only 18 times more likely to be murdered than the general population of women of the same age and race, but are also often targeted by serial offenders. They cite a study in the UK, arguing that cisgender female sexworkers had a mortality rate 12 times that of women from the general population. The study also found that murder was one of the leading causes of death for sex workers. This research shows that violence against sex workers, particularly acts of violence

such as homicide, is becoming a global epidemic.

In a 2008 research article titled “Prostitute Homicides: A Descriptive Study,” Salfati et. al predicate that prostitutes are 60 to 120 times more likely to be murdered than non-prostitutes and, “prostitutes who solicit on the streets are more frequent (Kinnell, 2001) are more at risk than those who work indoors (such as in saunas and massage parlors)” (506). The researchers also noted that street-based sex workers can be seen as a target group for many serial offenders, like Arthur Shacross, who killed 11 prostitutes in New York between 1988 and 1990. Other examples include William Lester, also known as the “Riverside Prostitute Killer,” who was convicted of murdering 12 prostitutes and suspected of murdering 10 others in California, as well as Saud Hanaei, who confessed to killing 16 prostitutes in 2001 in Iran, and Gary Ridgway, also known as the “Green River Killer,” who pleaded guilty to murdering 48 women—most of whom were prostitutes—from 1982 to 1998. Not only are sex workers vulnerable to being victims of extreme violence and homicide, but also being victims of violent acts perpetrated by serial offenders.

Now that we have examined the dangers faced by sex workers in their everyday lives, let us look at the dangers that transgender people—particularly black transgender people—experience. According to the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy (NCRP), there is a greater experience of social and economic consequences for trans people of color than there is for white trans women and the general population (NCRP 2019). The NCRP also noted large disparities among trans black women. “While 14% of all transgender women live with HIV, 44% of Black transgender women live with HIV” (NCRP 2019). Their research also shows that 38% of trans black women experience homelessness and extreme poverty as a result of discrimination and harassment in the workplace, compared to 9% of cisgender black

women. Other crucial disparities that NCRP lists include the following: 45% of trans black women have reported attempting suicide; 80% of murdered trans people are trans black women; the average life expectancy of trans black women is only 35 years. The statistics are repugnant, and it is clear that violence against trans black women is an epidemic.

In “The Report of the 2015 U.S. Transgender Survey” from the National Center for Transgender Equality (2016), responses show “a clear and disturbing pattern is revealed: transgender people of color experience deeper and broader patterns of discrimination than white respondents and the U.S. population” (4). Trans people of color were also reportedly three times as likely to be living in poverty as the U.S. population. Furthermore, the National Center for Transgender Equality noted that the unemployment rate among trans people of color was four times higher than the U.S. unemployment rate. The responses received regarding HIV status were shocking as well. The report found that 1.4% of their respondents were living with HIV, while the U.S. population rate of people living with HIV was 0.3%. But the rate among black respondents was 6.7% and the rate for black trans women was “a staggering 19%” (4). These reports show the high disparities that black trans women face in their everyday lives, compared to non-black and cisgender people. In terms of mortality rates, reports from the Human Rights Campaign (HRC) noted at least 23 deaths of trans people in the US due to fatal violence in 2016. In 2017, 29 deaths were tracked, and in 2018, 26 deaths were tracked. The majority of the deaths in 2018 were trans black women. The disparities between black trans women and the rest of the population regarding discrimination and violence certainly warrants a need for action.

While there is existing research that examines the disproportionate rates at which black trans women and sex workers experience violence and discrimination, there is very little research

that analyzes the experiences of black trans sex workers. While there are many burdens of living as a black trans woman or as a sex worker, there is arguably a greater burden of living as someone who is a black transgender sex worker that needs to be addressed. In her 1989 article titled “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics,” Kimberle Crenshaw maintains that discrimination cases tend to focus on the most privileged groups being affected, while ignoring marginalized people who are “multiply-burdened.” She writes, “... in race discrimination cases, discrimination tends to be viewed in terms of sex- or class-privileged Blacks; in sex discrimination cases, the focus is on race- and class-privileged women” (140). By focusing on the most privileged members in marginalized groups when discussing discrimination, the strive for change and equality is unachievable. Crenshaw attests that this approach to addressing discrimination distorts our perception of racism and sexism due to the functioning notions of race and sex being based off of experiences that do not represent all marginalized people. “If any real efforts are to be made to free Black people of the constraints and conditions that characterize racial subordination, then theories and strategies purporting to reflect the Black community’s needs must include an analysis of sexism and patriarchy. Similarly, feminism must include an analysis of race if it hopes to express the aspirations of non-white women” (166). Crenshaw’s assertion resonates in the context of black transgender sex workers in that if we are to discuss constraints of discrimination and violence against sex workers, we must include an analysis of discrimination and violence against black transgender women who are sex workers.

STIGMA SURROUNDING SEX WORK AND SEX WORKERS:

Conflict theory argues that inequality results from a system of domination and subordination, where those with the most resources exploit and control others (Harris 2002). In this case, domination lies in the government and their tools of surveillance to watch over sex workers and people of interest involved in sexual transactions. By asserting power over them, sex workers are forced into a subordinated group. Power is asserted through systems of surveillance such as policing both online and in the public sphere and self-surveillance in a panoptic society. Anti-sex work laws and the surveillance of sex workers are constituted through the elites of society. In conflict theory, laws that are unequal are legitimized and made to seem fair by the highest members of society. Furthermore, conflict theory posits that different groups struggle over societal resources and compete for social advantages, therefore it only makes sense that members of society with the least advantages will find any way they can to get by. Because classes exist in conflict with each other as they vie for power and economic, social, and political resources (Harris 2002), there is an inclination to surveil other members of society and report them for any wrongdoings. Stigma is the root of exploitation, domination, and control over sex workers. Sex workers are stigmatized as either victims of an oppressive system that exploits them and their bodies, or criminals trying to exploit society for money through an immoral and typically illegal line of work.

Stigma not only affects the safety of sex workers, but also the legislation and policing of sex work. Where sex work is stigmatized as dangerous and sex workers are stigmatized as victims, sex workers find themselves being blamed for violence against them with the reasoning that their continued participation in a dangerous practice is their own fault (Krüsi et al. 2016).

This research links stigma to increased structural vulnerability of sex workers and shows that regardless of the legal framework surrounding sex work, stigma always has the greatest influence on the safety of sex workers.

The minute that they're bringing the new condos next thing you know there's security cars, there's cop cars, god forbid there's a hooker on the condo street. The minute someone buys the building, puts in a condo, it's a whole new set of fucking rules. It's totally changed since they're, I don't even recognise it, and you don't see any girls up there, where I used to work up on the corner of X and Y street. See the cops shift girls to certain areas, and if they deny it, they're lying. (Krüsi et. al 2016:9-10).

Stigma also influences the way sex work is regarded in other discourse. Beloso (2017) argued that by separating queerness and sex work from one another only affirms queer theory's silence in regard to sex work, citing that queer genealogy has utilized Foucault's work to portray sex work as a meaningful practice only in relief against other meaningful practices that intersect with it, such as madness, homosexuality, delinquency, and capitalism. This perspective both questions and doubts the validity of sex work, as well as the validity of being queer as well. We are perpetuating this culture of exclusion and discrimination through our silence regarding sex work and prostitution in queer theory. Beloso's (2017) arguments particularly allude to Foucault's panopticon and the omnipresence of surveillance in society. We all play a part in the criminal justice system by constantly surveilling each other and in doing so, we perpetuate the social control that is put in place to render bodies docile. Queer theory's silence on sex work is

one prominent example as to how demonized and antagonized sex work is in society, that other marginalized groups erase them from their history.

Power is the most influential factor in the surveillance of sex workers. Those who do not have power are often those who suffer from inequality, according to conflict theory. Sex workers have very little power in a society that closely surveils and regulates every move of its people.

Power is taken away from sex workers when: police presence is strong in areas where street-based sex workers tend to look for clients; police are working undercover to trap sex workers and arrest them; websites for finding or vetting clients are removed, obstructing the safety and privacy of sex workers; watchlists are created to track people who search or use certain language online that may be incriminating; social media allows for people to easily report content that is inappropriate and will then block a user's content on their sites, in such a way that the user does not know it is happening (shadowbanning). In "Playing the Visibility Game: How Digital Influencers and Algorithms Negotiate Influence on Instagram," Kelley Cotter delves into the interdependency between users, algorithms, and platform owners, as well as the way algorithms one-sidedly structure the behavior of users on online platforms. She argues that users and their social media presence are influenced by algorithms that are not explicitly laid out in detail for or accessible to them (Cotter 2018). "Algorithms serve as disciplinary apparatuses that prescribe participatory norms" (2). Thus, users are forced to observe content and users in order to gauge these participatory norms that are ultimately rewarded with a stronger presence on social media. Shadowbanning is a form of punishment for not following the participatory norms embedded in algorithms. "[S]hadowbanning' refers to the (perceived) suppression of one's post(s), such that a user becomes virtually invisible to others" (16). The implication of being

shadowbanned for not following the participatory norms has a strong material influence on the strategies of users. For people who utilize social media to market themselves or their brand, the potential threat of being shadowbanned limits room for artistic expression. For online sex workers and sex workers who advertise their services online, this is a form of policing. If a sex worker posts something that is deemed inappropriate, but does not necessarily violate the site's user guidelines, being shadowbanned significantly reduces their online exposure, which hinders their ability to attract potential clients. Therefore, algorithms prevent sex workers from marketing themselves online and profiting off of their social presence.

In his article from 1993 titled "The Panoptic Sort: A Political Economy of Personal Information," Oscar Gandy defines the panoptic sort as the "all-seeing eye of the difference machine that guides the global capitalist system" (9). The main purpose of the panoptic sort is to invoke a state of conscious and permanent visibility of power in the individual. In other words, there is an omnipresent force that controls and influences the behavior of people. The panopticon is used as an instrument of dissociating the dyad of seeing and being seen; the individual is completely visible without ever seeing the mechanized and deindividualized power asserted over them. Panoptic observation is applied when there is an occurrence of self reflection influenced by the distribution of collective truth claims from a range of social institutions intent on creating disciplinary practices and exercising power over an individual. For example, if a street-based sex worker is approached by a potential client and is offered money in exchange for performing sexual services, they might contemplate the risk of getting caught and being arrested. Even if the area they are in does not have cameras or a police presence to monitor activity, there is still an underlying fear of getting caught breaking the law. Furthermore, the panopticon sorts individuals

based on their “presumed economic or political value” (10). This exacerbates inequalities in that it limits the access of marginalized people to information that is needed to make informed decisions in their everyday lives. Thus, the panoptic sort invokes paranoia in sex workers when navigating their everyday decision-making in regard to their occupation.

Stigma gives power to those who can avoid it most: the elites of society. But not only are the most elite in society given power because of stigma, but it includes anybody who does not involve themselves in sex work. Regular civilians can report sex workers they see on the streets or posting on social media due to the stigma that what they are doing is immoral and that reporting them would be in society’s best interest. Police have the power to absolve themselves from protecting sex workers from violence due to the stigma that their line of work is inherently dangerous, and thereby anything that happens to them as a result of their line of work is their fault.

THE UTILIZATION OF SOCIAL CONTROL:

Social control is a mechanism which discourages or forestalls disobedience, which either punishes such behavior once it has occurred or prevents those with inclinations to disobedience from acting on those inclinations. Systems of surveillance are a means of knowing when rules are being obeyed, when they are broken, and who is responsible for which, as well as the ability to locate and identify those responsible for misdeeds. These surveillance systems are a form of social control. They also reproduce regimes of control and/or exclusion of marginalized groups in societies. Systems of surveillance utilize standardized procedures and hierarchies to institute tracking and monitoring. The law, in this context, allows for the close surveillance of and stigma surrounding sex workers and their line of work. Some of the most effective forms of surveillance

technologies and systems used to monitor sex workers include internet regulation and online watchlists, the panoptic sort, and increased policing. Social control and surveillance go hand-in-hand, as social control is posited as a means to protect the safety and greater interests of the rest of society. Social control is exercised by monitoring sex workers online, in the public sphere through security cameras and police, and by arresting and punishing sex workers where sex work is illegal. These mechanisms intend to deter people from opting for sex work as their occupation by threatening their safety and livelihood.

DISCUSSION:

While legislators try to argue that criminalization intends to reduce sex work and deter people from opting to use sex work as a source of income, it has dangerous effects on the health and safety of not only sex workers, but the general public. If having condoms in one's possession can be counted as prostitution paraphernalia, sex workers will be less likely to use and carry condoms, which can increase HIV and STI rates. Furthermore, the risk of HIV and STI contraction is a lot higher under a criminalized framework due to the constrained ability to negotiate sexual risk reduction. There are also no government-funded advocacy groups or legal third parties in the industry to aid sex workers in sexual risk reduction. Criminalization also leads to higher rates of violence against sex workers, due to the fear of reporting harassment or assault to police because of the potential repercussions for their line of work. Police are also able to relieve themselves of the burden of protecting sex workers under the justification that by breaking the law and participating in sex work, sex workers are to blame for the violence they experience. Research has shown that criminalization is ineffective in reducing rates of prostitution, protecting the lives of both sex workers and the general public, and reducing crime

all together. If legislators wanted to effectively reduce rates of prostitution and protect both sex workers and the general public, there would be programs and groups to aid sex workers in leaving their line of work; there would be efforts to help sex workers exiting their line of work find legal jobs, housing, and treatment for any physical or mental trauma that the government believes results from being a sex worker. But the neglect of advocacy for sex workers only emphasizes that the government's intentions for criminalizing sex work is to justify the increased surveillance of the general public.

The Nordic model, or end-demand model, is also found to be ineffective. Though, in theory, placing the blame on and targeting clients who pay for sex seems effective in protecting sex workers from legal repercussions and reducing prostitution rates, the Nordic model is almost as ineffective as criminalization. Rushed client negotiations still occur as a result, which hinders the ability of sex workers to vet clients and negotiate sexual risk reduction. If clients have to fear the repercussions of paying for sex, they are less likely to provide personal information to be vetted. This also implies that if a sex worker falls victim to violence perpetrated by a client, they will not have sufficient information on the client to report to police. Furthermore, the application of the end-demand model correlated with a lack of access to third-party services for sex workers, reducing access to condoms and sex worker and community led services.

Decriminalization has shown to be a lot more effective than criminalization and the Nordic model, but is still extremely flawed. While sex workers and clients would not have to fear legal repercussions and sex workers would not have to worry about government interference or income tax, there are no regulations to enforce health and safety standards or allow for unions in the industry. This allows third-parties such as brothel owners and pimps to exploit and abuse sex

workers without consequence. However, the research examined has shown a reduction in the spread of HIV and STIs, greater autonomy for sex workers, and decreased violence against sex workers as a result of decriminalization. That being said, decriminalization is arguably more effective than criminalization and the end-demand model, but is still inadequate.

Research found legalization to be an effective legal framework, and its intention to legitimize sex work as an occupation as well as protect the health and safety of sex workers and the general public. Legalization facilitates client negotiations and vetting; increases the ability for sex workers to market and advertise their services both online and in the public sphere; reduces violence and crime perpetrated against sex workers, as they would feel more comfortable and confident in reporting crimes and have better access to information on clients; reduces the spread of HIV and STIs as a result of increased access to health services and third-party services that provide condoms; and gives increased autonomy for sex workers so they can operate in a more professional setting. However, under legalization there is still the potential for exploitation, as there is in any line of work in a capitalist economy. This is part of the reason why a lot of research that includes interviews and surveys with sex workers shows that respondents usually prefer decriminalization over legalization, because they do not want the government being too involved in regulating sex work or having their income taxed. It is important to acknowledge that legalization does allow for increased surveillance, when compared to decriminalization, and that is a concern for a lot of sex workers. Research examined in this study also shows that third-party services still exploit, abuse, and neglect sex workers due to a lack of regulation under a legalized framework. There are still countries where sex work is legal, but there is no legislation for employment and health and safety standards like there are for other lines of work. Furthermore,

even under a legalized framework, marginalized people will still be victims of discrimination and violence. Migrant sex workers, transgender sex workers, and non-white sex workers are not protected from discrimination and violence in their field, just as migrant, transgender, and non-white workers in any other field are not. Unfortunately, there will always be struggle to end racism, transphobia, and xenophobia in the workforce, as explained by conflict theory. But legalizing sex work could be the start to significantly reducing discrimination and violence against all sex workers.

Regardless of what legal framework is in practice, the role of stigma is important to address. Criminalization arguably increases the stigmatization of sex workers and sex work, which results in increased violence against them and less legal protection. Police feel they do not need to protect sex workers from client-perpetrated violence under criminalization because they believe since sex work is illegal and is perceived as inherently dangerous and immoral, that it is the fault of the sex worker for choosing to break the law and put themselves in danger. The general public may be more inclined to report sex worker activity to police due to the stigma that sex work is immoral. Criminalizing sex work increases the stigma that sex work is immoral because crime is considered immoral. The Nordic model also increases stigma, because despite the fact that the criminalization is shifted towards the purchase of sex, there is still the underlying implication that purchasing sex work is immoral because sex work is immoral. Decriminalization does not increase stigma the way that criminalization or the end-demand model does, but the inability to legitimize sex work as any other line of work is legitimized implies that sex work is not work. Furthermore, decriminalization still allows police to relieve themselves of the burden of protecting sex workers who fall victim to violence perpetrated by clients, because of the

existing stigma that sex workers have less worth and lack morals when compared to the rest of the population. More importantly, decriminalization does not help fight the stigma surrounding sex work. That being said, legalization does not equate to destigmatization, and when combined with a lack of regulation and guidelines, legalization does not protect the rights and safety of sex workers. However, legalization could be the start to destigmatizing sex work. By legitimizing sex work as a legal profession, regulating working conditions to promote occupational health and safety, and normalizing both the exchange of sex for some form of compensation and sex as a normal occurrence, rather than a sacred act, society as a whole can slowly rid itself of the stigma surrounding sex work.

Why is it so important to fight the stigma against sex work? Stigma is linked to increased structural vulnerability and has the greatest influence on the safety of sex workers regardless of the legal framework in practice. As mentioned earlier, stigma surrounding sex workers gives power to those who are not sex workers. As a result, people do not value the lives of sex workers as they do the rest of the population, which leads to increased violence against sex workers; police can choose to neglect protecting sex workers or abuse their powers to exploit sex workers themselves; and, most importantly, the government can justify their desire to increase surveillance of the population. Increasing surveillance then leads to the removal of power and freedom from not only sex workers, but the rest of the population as well.

Legislation and policing are obvious tools of surveillance, but it is important to recognize that stigma is in itself a form of surveillance, as it enables a panoptic society. As previously mentioned, these systems of surveillance sustain apparatuses of control over and discrimination of marginalized groups in societies. This desire for social control by the government goes

beyond the public sphere when laws like SESTA and FOSTA are passed, allowing for online surveillance of sex workers. Under the guise of protecting the safety and greater interests of society, the government is free to expand surveillance in order to sustain social control.

CONCLUSION:

Power and social control are the underlying intentions of the government when legislating and policing sex work. It is evident through the way current laws and stigma around the world threaten the rights and occupational health and safety of sex workers, rather than legitimizing their line of work within society or at least attempting to help or “rehabilitate” sex workers so they do not feel that it is their only option in making a living. In terms of legislation, the Nordic Model and criminalization are arguably the least effective in reducing sex work and protecting the rights and safety of sex workers. Legalization and decriminalization are both potentially viable solutions to the long-running discourse regarding how to go about legislating sex work. However, with the prevalence of stigma and without proper social institutions and guidelines to help regulate the industry within a legal or decriminalized context, the health and safety of sex workers—as well as their rights—are still threatened. Based off the research analyzed, I would argue that the best legislative model would be to legalize sex work, but with important conditions, for a few reasons: For one, legalizing sex work can help fight the stigma surrounding it. By destigmatizing it, we would see a significant drop in violence against sex workers and an increase in justice for sex workers who do fall victim to violence. Secondly, so long as there is extensive regulation to not only legitimize sex work as an occupation, but also enforce proper working conditions and work environments, sex workers are less likely to be exploited by third-parties than they would under any other legal framework. Third, health and

safety would improve not only for sex workers, but the rest of the population, as the spread of HIV and STI would decrease. Lastly, sex workers would be better protected from discrimination and penalization from things like housing, child custody, future job opportunities, business loans, and so on.

That being said, it is important to address two things: First, we live in a capitalist society and there will always be a fight to preserve the heteropatriarchal, racist modern state. Therefore, the potential for exploitation, stigmatization, discrimination, and injustice will always exist. Capitalism thrives off of class struggle, the exploitation of working class people, and discrimination against marginalized groups. Migrant sex workers, non-white sex workers, and transgender sex workers will still experience discrimination for their ethnicity, race, and gender identity. Thus, legalizing sex work will not fix every problem that sex workers face in their everyday lives because we still live in a society that is unequal. However, legalization is the start to fixing one of many problems that are threatening the livelihood of people within society.

Secondly, legalization still allows for an increase in the surveillance of sex workers. It would allow the government to monitor sex workers finances, enforce laws that regulate their working conditions and environment, and monitor their activity to make sure they are not breaking other laws while working. However, surveillance is not black and white; it is not always a bad thing. Increased surveillance under legalization would allow for extensive protection of and reduced violence and exploitation against sex workers. Therefore, legalizing sex work would be in the best interest of protecting the rights and livelihood of sex workers.

It is time to start a legitimate and constructive discourse for framing sex work laws, especially in the US. This discourse should include the personal views of sex workers, the

evidence of the effectiveness—or lack thereof—of each legislative model through real world application, and the prioritization of the rights, health, and safety of sex workers, rather than the best interests of the government to both sustain a heteropatriarchal, racist, capitalist modern state and preserve their power and social control within society.

LIMITATIONS:

One limitation in this research include a lack of research on the SESTA/FOSTA bills—which are a present issue regarding sex work and privacy in the US and are essentially the reason for my research—because the effects of SESTA/FOSTA can not be accurately measured, given how recently the bills were passed. Other limitations in this research include the inability to quantify discrimination and violence against sex workers who are black and transgender and therefore only allowed me to provide statistics for discrimination and violence against trans sex workers, cisgender sex workers, and trans black women separately, and not including more research that contained the perspectives of sex workers regarding how sex work legislation should be framed. This research also focused mainly on prostitutes, rather than all types of sex workers.

Bibliography

- Banach, Linda. 1999. "Sex Work and the Official Neglect of Occupational Health and Safety: The Queensland Experience." *Social Alternatives* 18(3):17–21.
- Beloso, Brooke. 2017. "Queer Theory, Sex Work, and Foucault's Unreason." *Foucault Studies* (23):141–66.
- Betteridge, Glenn. 2005. "Report Calls for Changes to the Law to Improve Safety, Security and Well-Being of Sex Workers." *HIV/AIDS Policy & Law Review* 10(3):14–16.
- Campbell, Rosie, Teela Sanders, Jane Scoular, and Stewart Cunningham. 2019. "Risking Safety and Rights: Online Sex Work, Crimes and 'Blended Safety Repertoires.'" *British Journal of Sociology* 70(4).
- Cotter, Kelley. 2018. "Playing the Visibility Game: How Digital Influencers and Algorithms Negotiate Influence on Instagram." *New Media & Society*.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* (1).
- Cunningham, Scott, Gregory DeAngelo, and John Tripp. 2019. "Craigslist Reduced Violence Against Women."
- Cunningham, Stewart, Teela Sanders, Lucy Platt, Pippa Grenfell, and P. G. Maciotti. 2018. "Sex Work and Occupational Homicide: Analysis of a U.K. Murder Database." *Homicide Studies* 22(3):321–38.

- Dubrofsky, R. and Magnet, S. 2015. Introduction to Feminist Surveillance Studies: Critical Interventions. In *Feminist Surveillance Studies*. Duke University Press.
- Fawkes, Janelle. 2014. "Sex Work Legislation Stands in the Way of Australia's Commitments: Decriminalisation for Sex Workers Health, Safety and Rights." *HIV Australia* 12(2):22–24.
- Gandy, Oscar H. 1993. "The Panoptic Sort: A Political Economy of Personal Information." In *Surveillance Studies: A Reader*. Oxford University Press:10-13.
- Goldenberg, Shira M., Teresita Rocha Jiménez, Kimberly C. Brouwer, Sonia Morales Miranda, and Jay G. Silverman. 2018. "Influence of Indoor Work Environments on Health, Safety, and Human Rights among Migrant Sex Workers at the Guatemala-Mexico Border: A Call for Occupational Health and Safety Interventions." *BMC International Health And Human Rights* 18(1):9–9.
- Harris, Scott R. 2002. "Critiquing and Expanding the Sociology of Inequality: Comparing Functionalist, Conflict, and Interactionist Perspectives." *Saint Louis University*.
- Hsu, Ya-Fei. 2013. "Sterilizing Society: Social Order and Policing Sex Work in Taiwan." *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 14(2):272–86.
- Human Rights Campaign. 2019 "Violence Against the Transgender Community in 2019." *Human Rights Campaign*.
- Human Rights Campaign. 2018 "Violence Against the Transgender Community in 2018." *Human Rights Campaign*.
- Human Rights Campaign. 2017 "Violence Against the Transgender Community in 2017." *Human Rights Campaign*.

- James, S. E., J. L. Herman, S. Rankin, M. Keisling, L. Mottet, and M. Anafi. 2016. "The Report of the 2015 U.S. Transgender Survey." Washington, DC: National Center for Transgender Equality
- Krüsi, Andrea, Thomas Kerr, Christina Taylor, Tim Rhodes, and Kate Shannon. 2016. "“They Won’t Change It Back in Their Heads That We’re Trash’: The Intersection of Sex Work-Related Stigma and Evolving Policing Strategies.” *Sociology of Health & Illness* 38(7):1137-1137–50.
- Landsberg, Adina, Kate Shannon, Andrea Krüsi, Kora DeBeck, M. J. Milloy, Ekaterina Nosova, Thomas Kerr, and Kanna Hayashi. 2017. "Criminalizing Sex Work Clients and Rushed Negotiations among Sex Workers Who Use Drugs in a Canadian Setting." *Journal Of Urban Health: Bulletin Of The New York Academy Of Medicine* 94(4):563–71.
- Levy, Jay and Jakobsson, Pye . 2014. "Sweden’s Abolitionist Discourse and Law: Effects on the Dynamics of Swedish Sex Work and on the Lives of Sweden’s Sex Workers." *Criminology & Criminal Justice: An International Journal* 14(5):593-593–607.
- Lewis, Jacqueline, Eleanor Maticka-Tyndale, Frances Shaver, and Heather Schramm. 2005. "Managing Risk and Safety on the Job: The Experiences of Canadian Sex Workers." *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality* 17(1/2):147–67.
- Lutnick, Alexandra and Cohan, Deborah. 2009. "Criminalization, Legalization or Decriminalization of Sex Work: What Female Sex Workers Say in San Francisco, USA." *Reproductive Health Matters* 17(34):38–46.

- Lyons, Tara, Leslie Pierre, Andrea Krüsi, and Kate Shannon. 2018. "Criminal Justice Vs. Health and Human Rights Perspective on Transgender Sex Work." Pp. 420–27 in *Transgender Sex Work and Society*, edited by L. A. Nuttbrock. New York, NY: Harrington Park Press.
- Mathieson, Ane. 2015. "Prostitution Policy: Legalization, Decriminalization and the Nordic Model." *Seattle Journal for Social Justice* 14(2):367–428.
- McBride, Bronwyn, Shira M. Goldenberg, Alka Murphy, Sherry Wu, Melissa Braschel, Andrea Krüsi, and Kate Shannon. 2019. "Third Parties (Venue Owners, Managers, Security, Etc.) and Access to Occupational Health and Safety Among Sex Workers in a Canadian Setting: 2010–2016." *American Journal of Public Health* 109(5):792–98.
- McFarlane, Nichia. 2019. "Philanthropic Investment in the Transgender Community Is Not Commensurate to the Threat Transgender Women of Color Face." *National Committee For Responsive Philanthropy*.
- Petillo, April. 2019. "Marking Embodied Borders: Compulsory Settler Sexuality, Indigeneity, and U.S. Law." *Women's Studies in Communication* 1–6.
- Pinwill, Sera. 1999. "Occupational Health and Safety in the Australian Sex Industry: The ACT Experience." *Social Alternatives* 18(3):22–24.
- Salfati, C. Gabrielle, Alison R. James, and Lynn Ferguson. 2008. "Prostitute Homicides: A Descriptive Study." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 23(4):505–43.
- Sanders, Teela and Rosie Campbell. 2007. "Designing out Vulnerability, Building in Respect: Violence, Safety and Sex Work Policy." *The British Journal Of Sociology* 58(1):1–19.

Ślęzak, Izabela. 2017. "Violence Towards Sex Workers. Analysis Based on Research into the Field of Indoor Sex Work in Poland." *Polish Sociological Review* (198):237–54.

United States Congress, 2018. *Allow States And Victims To Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act*.

Yi, Huso, Tiantian Zheng, Yanhai Wan, JoanneE. Mantell, Minah Park, and Joanne Csete. 2012. "Occupational Safety and HIV Risk among Female Sex Workers in China: A Mixed-Methods Analysis of Sex-Work Harms and Mommies." *Global Public Health* 7(8):840–55.