HUMAN RIGHTS QUARTERLY

Slavery in Europe: Part 1, Estimating the Dark Figure

Monti Narayan Datta & Kevin Bales***

ABSTRACT

The estimation of the "dark figure" for any crime (the number of actual instances of a specific crime committed minus the reported cases of that crime within a population) has primarily rested on the ability to conduct random sample crime surveys. Such surveys are based on the assumption that victims experience crimes that are discrete, time-bound, and of relatively short duration. The crime of enslavement, however, presents a special challenge to estimation because it is of indeterminate duration. The issue of duration most complicates estimation and thus the calculation of the "dark figure" of the crime of slavery. This challenge is compounded by the fact that victims of slavery are also often isolated by the stigma linked to sexual assault, or a sense of shame over their enslavement. Using a unique dataset, based in part of the random sample surveys of Julia Pennington et al. (2009), and extended through a process of extrapolation, this

* *Monti Narayan Datta* is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Richmond. He received his Ph.D. from UC Davis, his MPP from Georgetown University, and his B.A. from UC Berkeley. His current book project, forthcoming with Cambridge University Press, focuses on the consequences of anti-Americanism. He is also working on several projects on human trafficking and modern day slavery with Free the Slaves and Chab Dai.

** *Kevin Bales* is Professor of Contemporary Slavery at the Wilberforce Institute for the Study of Slavery and Emancipation (WISE), at the University of Hull, UK. He was Co-Founder of Free the Slaves, the US Sister organization of Anti-Slavery International and is Emeritus Professor of Sociology at Roehampton University in London. He also serves on the Board of Directors of the International Cocoa Initiative. His book *Disposable People: New Slavery in the Global Economy* published in 1999, was nominated for the Pulitzer Prize, and has now been published in ten other languages.

We thank Julia R. Pennington, Wayne A. Ball, Ronald D. Hampton, and Julia N. Soulakova for their guidance in using their data, and Fiona de Hoog (PhD student, Wilberforce Institute for the Study of Slavery and Emancipation) for her help in collecting data on reported cases of slavery and trafficking from European governments.

paper estimates the numbers of victims of slavery and human trafficking for thirty-seven countries in Europe. These estimated numbers of slavery victims are then compared with reported cases of slavery and trafficking for the same countries.

I. CHALLENGES OF STUDYING SLAVERY

At its most basic level, slavery is a social and economic relationship that is played out in systematic ways. It has patterns of expression; it is grounded in cultures and societies. It lodges within the fabric of the economy as well as within communities and the relationships between individuals. Many patterns of enslavement have been in use for long periods. At its core, slavery is a relationship between individuals, but it exists primarily within communities and is governed by those communities. It can be assumed, however, that the slave/slaveholder relationship is marked by a much more extreme power differential than is found in most relationships. For slavery to exist in a community there has to be an accepted moral economy that justifies and supports it. That moral economy might be grounded in discrimination, concepts of race or ethnicity, in religion or political differences, or simply in perceived vulnerabilities.

What has been lacking in the study of contemporary slavery is a more precise model of slavery as the first step in formulating and testing research questions. Many such research questions obviously require measurable variables. Finding such variables is immediately difficult. Slavery may have an essential core, but it varies dramatically from place to place in its expression. That variation tends to lead researchers into treating slavery as conceptually different wherever it is found to express itself differently, which in turn suggests that qualitative or ethnographic methods of investigation are most appropriate. Those methods, however, present a challenge as to how the common thematic elements of slavery might be clarified so that broader or aggregate inquiry is possible.

The classic work on qualitative unobtrusive social research measures[1] by Eugene Webb, et al., neatly describes this challenge, stating that common thematic measures should be derived from "multiple operationism, that is, for multiple measures which are hypothesized to share in the theoretically relevant components but have different patterns of irrelevant components .

1. Unobtrusive measures are those that have no impact on the research subject. This may be anything from physical trace analysis to archival research. Because slavery is usually hidden, it is often necessary to explore the use of such secondary and unobtrusive approaches. Unobtrusive measures are never used alone, but normally serve as complementary techniques allowing some form of triangulation. There is an obvious potential application in the investigation of hidden activities like slavery.

. . . Once a proposition has been confirmed by two or more independent measurement processes, the uncertainty of its interpretation is greatly reduced."[2] To achieve such triangulation requires thinking through how slavery fits within each society and community, that is, where it occurs within the social matrix. This, in turn, requires us to consider both the levels and units of analysis to be pursued.

Slavery is a social action that generates measurable phenomena at all three levels of social measurement—the individual (micro), the group or community level (meso), and the societal or aggregate level (macro). That said, slavery is primarily a phenomenon of the meso-level. The power differential between slave and slaveholder is, on the one hand, an individual social relationship; on the other hand, however, it also reflects what is allowed within the moral economy of the community. The economic activity of slavery, which is normally a primary aim of enslavement, feeds primarily into the local (meso-level) economic base. In many parts of the world, slavery has a relatively overt place in the community. Like commercial sexual exploitation, it may be tacitly accepted and managed by community leaders, but relegated to a position of official invisibility. The maintenance of slavery in the face of illegality requires some community acquiescence or at least ignorance.

The location of any community on the continuum between acquiescence and ignorance is strongly related to the level of corruption of local officials. But in any community that harbors slavery there will be some people, in addition to the slaves and slaveholders, who are aware of it. They will interact with slavery in some way and will have some knowledge of it. It is this knowledge, and possibly records of those interactions, that make up some of the data that might be collected in a more uniform way.

In the case of contemporary slavery, existing macro-level information is normally unrepresentative aggregations of micro- and meso-level information, often derived from journalistic accounts, as few governments or international agencies are able to collect information that is statistically representative of an enslaved population. Even the few criminological variables that aggregate arrests or prosecutions fail to adequately represent slavery, particularly for reasons that we elaborate below. At the macro-level there are national or regional aggregations of information about either criminal activity or labor practices that may shed light on slavery, but these are rarely comprehensive or representative. And all of these measures are confounded by slavery's unique challenge as a crime to be measured within social or criminological research.

---

2. Eugene J. Webb, Donald T. Campbell, Richard D. Schwartz & Lee Sechrest, Unobtrusive Measures 3 (2000).

II. THE "DARK FIGURE" OF THE DARK FIGURE

The estimation of the "dark figure" for any crime (the number of actual instances of a specific crime committed minus the reported cases of that crime within a population) has primarily rested on the ability to conduct random sample crime surveys. As Albert Biderman and Albert Reiss explained in their original article proposing the use of representative and random sample surveys to explore the prevalence of crime and estimate the "dark figure":

> In exploring the dark figure of crime, the survey generally has several other advantages over other organizationally processed statistics. First, it provides a form of organization that can transcend local practices by providing uniform operational definitions. Second, the survey taps the definitions of victims, independent of organizational processing, and it can compare these with those of formal processing organizations. Third, the survey can identify and compare what is institutionally labeled as crime with that consensually labeled as crime.[3]

With the advent of representative sample victimization surveys, an estimation of the dark figure of most crimes is possible wherever such surveys are possible.

A good deal of analysis has gone into the methodology of these crime surveys, exploring interview subject fatigue, areas of sensitivity in response, interviewer variability, and so on. As far as we can determine, however, none of the large-scale crime surveys, or those scholars who review and critique them, have asked questions about the *length* of the crime event that leads to a record of victimization. The US National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), for example, "asks a number of questions about the *crime event* when respondents indicate that they were victimized by one or more of the measured crimes."[4] Within the survey instruments of the NCVS, crime event questions include determining the time of day when a crime occurred, how many times a crime event has occurred (repeat victimization), and how much time a victim has lost from work because of the crime event—but the NCVS does not ask for an estimation of the duration of the crime event.[5]

---

3. Albert D. Biderman & Albert J. Reiss, Jr., *On Exploring the "Dark Figure" of Crime*, 374 Annals Am. Acad. Pol. & Soc. Sci. 1, 14 (1967).
4. Bureau of Justice Statistics, About this Topic, *available at* http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=tp&tid=95 (emphasis added).
5. *See* Inter-University Consortium for Social & Science Research (ICSSR), National Crime Victimization Survey (2010), *available at* http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/NACJD/studies/31202?q=%22national+crime+victimization+survey%22. Beyond this discussion of the "crime event" is a link to the Codebook for the NCVS . Within the Codebook the question order for victimization reporting can be followed over the course of the interview. Questions are asked that determine the date, time of day, and location of the victimization, as well as whether a similar victimization occurred at another date, as well as a large number of other questions concerning the precise crime event and its aftermath. While there are a number of items asking about the length of recovery after victimization, there are no items that seek to determine the duration of the victimization event.

A separate but related consideration of the time dimension within victimization concerns the "time window" for the recording or estimation of crime events. An example of this is the work of Graham Farrell, William Sousa, and Deborah Weisel, who examined the effect on reported revictimization rates of the "time window effect"—the fact that the length of the period of observation directly affects the proportion of repeat victimization that is "captured."[6] They found, for example, that: "(1) A one-year time window captures 42% more repeats [revictimizations] than a six-month window; (2) A three-year window captures 57% more repeats than a one-year window."[7] This finding is important in terms of the valid measurement of the true incidence of crime, but it does not address the issue of the length or duration of a crime event.

For the purpose of random-sample crime surveys, it is assumed that most crimes are discrete, time-bound events of relatively short duration. The use of crime surveys is therefore based on the assumption that crime victims were victimized within a discrete, and presumably short-term, event and that they are able to report the occurrence of their victimization at a specific time and place in the past, even if the crime was not reported to the authorities.

Because victim surveys do not address the question of the duration of the crime event, the crime of enslavement presents a special challenge to estimation because of its indeterminate duration. While it also suffers from other confounding factors, discussed below, it is the issue of duration that most complicates estimation and thus the calculation of the dark figure.

Enslavement as a crime is more a process than an event; it is an open-ended victimization. At the initiation of the crime of enslavement, it is difficult to predict how long the victimization will last in that it is ultimately limited only by the lifespan of the victim. Additionally, throughout the indeterminate period of victimization, and unlike the victims of most crimes, the slavery victim is almost always held *incommunicado*, unable to call for help, and unavailable to be contacted so that their experience may be recorded and counted and compared to official reports of crime.

This indeterminate temporal nature is one of the defining characteristics of the crime of slavery. Note that the *Bellagio-Harvard Guidelines on the Legal Parameters of Slavery* state that possession of one person by another can be demonstrated by the control exercised over the enslaved person, and that "Fundamentally, where such control operates, it will significantly deprive that person of his or her individual liberty *for a period of time which is, for*

---

6. Graham Farrell, William H. Sousa & Deborah Lamm Weisel, *The Time-Window Effect in the Measurement of Repeat Victimization: A Methodology for its Examination, and an Empirical Study*, 13 Crime Prevention Stud. 15 (2002).
7. *Id.* at 19.

that person, indeterminate."[8] It is fundamental to the conceptualization of slavery that, once enslaved, a person cannot affect the period of their bondage (except through the risk of attempting escape). And though it might be a *defining* characteristic that the exercise of control over an enslaved person has no expected time limit, this temporal facet of slavery is not mentioned in most official definitions. This fact points to a small paradox—that while the indeterminate length of enslavement over time "goes without saying," this fact also goes unacknowledged as to its effect on the estimation of slavery within criminal statistics.

There is an additional factor confounding the estimation of the prevalence of enslavement within any population, and that is the stigma felt by slavery victims. This stigma is likely to take two forms. Firstly, there is the well-known reticence to report victimization when the crime involved is sexual assault; secondly, there is the less understood shame that many ex-slaves feel over having been a slave. These two forms of stigma share the characteristic that they can be seen as an *irrational* sense of shame or disgrace. In neither case is the victim of the crime responsible for his or her victimization, but such a psychological reaction to both sexual assault and to enslavement is well known.[9] When the victimization event includes both crimes, it might be assumed to make the victim even less likely to report. For example, as Kevin Bales and Jody Sarich explain:

> It is the sexual use of slaves . . . that marks and typifies the enslavement of women. All slaves tend to be reduced to the status of other, virtually all slaves are worked to create economic wealth for their slaveholder, all slaves are denied free will and expect and experience violence, but slaves that are women experience added dimensions to their enslavement. While some male slaves are sexually abused, sexual assault is the norm for enslaved women.[10]

This pervasive sexual assault on women slaves is an appropriation and control of the interior as well as the exterior of their physical beings. The psychological impact of this assault is profound but little studied, though it has been explored by novelists like Toni Morrison.[11] As Bales and Sarich also point out, the types of violence imposed on male slaves, even when sexual, are almost always about power and punishment aimed at increasing work

---

8. Bellagio-Harvard Guidelines on the Legal Parameters of Slavery (3 Mar. 2012), *available at* http://www.qub.ac.uk/schools/SchoolofLaw/Research/researchfilestore/Filetoupload,286201,en.pdf (emphasis added).
9. *See, e.g.*, Ronnie Janoff-Bulman, *Characterological Versus Behavioral Self-Blame: Inquiries into Depression and Rape*, 37 J. Personality & Soc. Psychol., 1798 (1979).
10. Kevin Bales & Jody Sarich, *The Paradox of Women, Children, and Slavery*, *in* Trafficking in Slavery's Wake: Law and the Experience of Women and Children in Africa 241 (Benjamin N. Lawrence & Richard L. Roberts eds. 2012).
11. *See, e.g.*, Toni Morrison, Beloved (1987).

output.[12] For women, sexual violence in itself can become a profit-making endeavor for the slaveholder through forced commercial sexual exploitation.

In addition, slaveholders regularly manipulate the reproductive biology of enslaved women. Abortion, sterilization, hysterectomy, female genital cutting, and the sewing up or other surgical alteration of the vagina, are all potentially part of enslavement. The point is that male slaves are primarily seen as beings of labor potential; while female slaves are seen as beings of labor potential *and* as bodies that can be used in other ways: as sexual outlets, for their reproductive potential, and as items of conspicuous consumption. This leads to a second paradox: while enslavement is the total control of one person by another, the enslavement of women achieves a totality exceeding that of men. The sexual assault on both men and women in slavery can lead to a sense of stigma and concealment of the crime through underreporting.

To summarize, the dark figure of the crime of slavery is especially problematic for at least three reasons. First, there is the stigmatization of victims of sexual assault and their unwillingness to report being a victim, noting that sexual assault is common within the crime of enslavement. Second, there is the stigma or shame felt by victims of slavery that reduces their propensity to report the crime of enslavement, a factor that applies to men who are enslaved as well as to women. Third, at the initiation of the crime of enslavement it is difficult to predict how long the victimization will last. Throughout the indeterminate period of victimization, and unlike the victims of most crimes, the slavery victim is unavailable to be contacted and have his or her experience recorded and counted and then compared to official reports of crime. This challenging temporal dimension of slavery as a crime also tends to be ignored in the normal collection of criminological statistics. For these reasons, the actual prevalence of, and thus the dark figure of the crime of enslavement, has hitherto lacked sufficient measurement or estimation.

III. MEASURING THE DARK FIGURE OF SLAVERY

With regard to the European focus of this paper, a key source is the collection edited by Gillian Wylie and Penelope McRedmond.[13] In their introduction, Wylie and McRedmond note, "early EU action was partly based on the belief that perhaps as many as 500,000 women were being trafficked into the EU each year for the purposes of sexual exploitation. Yet, the origin of this figure is not discernable . . . and the question of methodological opacity is

12. Bales & Sarich, *supra* note 10, at 242.
13. Human Trafficking in Europe: Character, Causes and Consequences (Gillian Wylie & Penelope McRedmond, eds., 2010).

one that has haunted most trafficking studies."[14] They continue, citing work by the International Organization for Migration and the Austrian Ministry of the Interior, "all parties agree that the exact extent of human trafficking remains unknown and we still 'completely lack evidence-based information on the actual scope and trends.'"[15]

Unlike all previous research,[16] the key variables used in this analysis were not assembled from secondary source aggregation; instead, we use recent representative survey data to build a system for the extrapolation of estimates of the incidence of slavery. The data used to anchor this extrapolation comes from pioneering research carried out by Julia Pennington, A. Dwayne Ball, Ronald Hampton, and Julia Soulakova.[17] Their project added questions concerning human trafficking and slavery to a large household-based cluster-sample study conducted in 2006 in Belarus (n=1045), Bulgaria (n=955), Moldova (n=1069), Romania (n=1092), and Ukraine (n=1345). The three questions added were:

1. "How many members of your close family traveled abroad because they were offered a domestic or nursing job, but upon arrival were locked and forced to work for no pay?"

2. "How many members of your close family traveled abroad because they were offered a job, but upon arrival they were locked and forced to work at an enterprise/ on construction/ in the agricultural field for no or little pay?"

3. "How many members of your close family traveled abroad because they were offered employment, but upon arrival to a country of destination their passport was taken away and they were forced to work in a sex business?"

Based on national populations, the mean family size, the estimated number of families in the country, and the number of families reporting trafficked/enslaved members, Pennington et al. computed the proportion of the sample that reported household members who experienced trafficking/ enslavement for the following countries, as Table 1 details.

---

14. *Id.* at 6.
15. *Id. See also* Federal Ministry of the Interior of Austria & Int'l Organization for Migration, (IOM), Guidelines for the Collection of Data on Trafficking in Human Beings and Comparable Indicators 5 (2009).
16. *See* Kevin Bales, *The Social Psychology of Global Slavery*, Sci. Am., Apr. 2002, at 80; Int'l Labour Organisation (ILO), A Global Alliance Against Forced Labour (2005).
17. Julia R. Pennington, A. Dwayne Ball, Ronald D. Hampton & Julia N. Soulakova, *The Cross-National Market in Human Beings*, 29 J. Macromarketing 119 (2009).

Table 1: Pennington et al.'s Trafficking Estimates

Country	*Proportion of National Sample that are Trafficked Persons*
Belarus	.0012
Bulgaria	.0038
Moldova	.0093
Romania	.0011
Ukraine	.0024

To our knowledge, this is the first time an estimate of contemporary trafficked/enslaved people has been based on a national sample survey. This pioneering work should have greater validity and reliability than estimates based on secondary source reports.[18]

From the estimated number of trafficked/enslaved persons per country, we can calculate what proportion of each national population had been trafficked or enslaved as seen in Table 1. Additionally, a similar proportion was calculated for the US population (.00019)[19] and the UK population (.00007).[20] Combining these numbers with those in Table 1, we now have seven fractions.

We use these seven fractions as the basis for a cross-sectional comparative analysis of Europe. Using these known fractions as reference points, we can employ a process of extrapolation based on five key assumptions. First,

18. For a clearer understanding of the types of data collected for past estimation of the prevalence of slavery, see Kevin Bales, *International Labor Standards: Quality of Information and Measures of Progress in Combating Forced Labor*, 24 Comp. Lab. L. & Pol'y J. 321 (2004).
19. The US estimate is based on two sources: Free the Slaves & Human Rights Center, University of California, Berkeley, Hidden Slaves: Forced Labor in the United States (2004); US State Department, Trafficking in Persons Report (2010), *available at* http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/tiprpt/2010/. The former report estimated 10,000 persons are caught in forced labor, and that the average length of time a person was enslaved in the United States was just over three years. The latter report noted a State Department estimate of 17,500 people trafficked into the United States each year. The estimated fraction was derived from multiplying 17,500 (the State Dept. estimate of flow into the country) by the number of years a person would be held in bondage (equaling 52,500) and then dividing that number by the US population at the time the estimates were made (280 million).
20. In a Memorandum to the (Parliamentary) Joint Committee on Human Rights: Inquiry into Human Trafficking, the Home Office submitted evidence suggesting there were about 4,000 victims of trafficking in the UK in 2003. *See* House of Lords & House of Commons, Joint Committee for Human Rights, Human Trafficking, Twenty-Sixth Report of Session 2005–06, HL 1127 2005–06 (13 Oct. 2006). This estimate was then divided by the UK population for 2003 of 59,834,900 (Source: Office for National Statistics; National Assembly for Wales; General Register Office for Scotland; Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency).

we assume no country in Europe has an indicative fraction at or below 0.0. Second, we assume the calculated fraction for the United Kingdom (.00007), with its tightly controlled borders and comparatively efficient system of law enforcement, is the minimum proportion of a country's population caught in trafficking/slavery within Europe. In other words, we assume the value for the UK is the lower bound for the range. Third, we assume that a mean value of .00013, taken of the UK and US proportions, can be used as the extrapolated population proportion for most Western European countries. Fourth, we assume the mean value of .002204, taken of the proportions of Belarus, Bulgaria, Moldova, Romania, and Ukraine, can be extrapolated as the population proportion for other Eastern European countries. Lastly, although Pennington, et al., build their measures of slavery in East Europe as measures of slaves who were trafficked *outside* those five countries, we assume that those trafficked individuals *originated* from those countries, in which case we can apply these proportions to nations under study. That is, if Pennington, et al., find that there is a proportion of .0012 of the Belarusian population who have been trafficked into slavery and taken away to other countries, we assume that we can treat that proportion of the Belarusian population as victims of slavery crime. Based on these five assumptions, it is possible to build a dataset of the proportions of enslaved persons in the populations of thirty-seven nations in Europe, as Table 2 illustrates.

Table 2 lists the country, the proportion of the enslaved in each country based upon or extrapolated from Pennington, et al.'s estimates, the population of each country, and the number of slaves, which we calculated by multiplying the estimated proportion by the population size. We assume these figures apply to the state of human trafficking and enslavement in Europe in the year 2012.

To calculate the dark figure of slavery in Europe requires first, the population proportion estimate from Table 2, and second, the reported incidence of trafficking/slavery in Europe available from the European Union[21] and other sources. Table 3 presents the dark figure of trafficking/slavery in Europe.[22]

---

21. Eurostat, European Commission, Trafficking in Human Beings (2013). Additional information from the US State Dept., Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, Trafficking in Person Report (2012); *Over 100 Victims of Human Trafficking in Iceland,* Iceland Rev. Online, 31 Oct. 2012, *available at* http://www.icelandreview.com/icelandreview/daily_news/Over_100_Victims_of_Human_Trafficking_in_Iceland_0_394860.news.aspx.
22. This estimated dark figure is reported with several caveats. Firstly, victims that remain in slavery in each country were not available to be counted in random sample surveys or estimated through extrapolation. Secondly, there is no uniformity in the reporting of this crime, or the definition of this crime, across the European Community. Thirdly, the impact of stigma and/or shame linked to the crime of slavery, whether through enslavement into commercial sexual exploitation or some other form of exploitation, is too little understood to suggest how the dark figure estimation might be affected.

Table 2: An Extrapolation Estimate of Slavery in Europe in 2012

Country	*Measured or Extrapolated Proportion of Trafficked Persons in Population*	*National Population*	*Estimated Slaves*
Albania	.00360	3,002,859	10,800
Armenia	.00360	2,970,495	10,683
Austria	.00013	8,219,743	1,069
Azerbaijan	.00360	9,493,600	34,144
Belarus	.00121	9,643,566	11,715
Belgium	.00013	10,438,353	1,357
Bosnia and Herzegovina	.00360	3,879,296	13,952
Bulgaria	.00380	7,037,935	26,727
Croatia	.00360	4,480,043	16,112
Czech Republic	.00360	10,177,300	36,603
Denmark	.00013	5,543,453	721
Finland	.00013	5,262,930	684
France	.00013	65,630,692	8,532
Georgia	.00360	4,570,934	16,439
Germany	.00013	81,305,856	10,570
Greece	.00013	10,767,827	1,400
Hungary	.00360	9,958,453	35,816
Iceland	.00007	313,183	41
Ireland	.00007	4,722,028	331
Italy	.00013	61,261,254	7,964
Luxembourg	.00013	509,074	66
Moldova (Republic of)	.00936	3,656,843	34,236
Montenegro	.00360	657,394	2,364
Netherlands	.00013	16,730,632	2,175
Norway	.00013	4,707,270	612
Poland	.00360	38,415,284	138,161
Portugal	.00013	10,781,459	1,402
Romania	.00113	21,848,504	24,731
Russian Federation	.00360	142,517,670	512,566
Serbia	.00360	7,276,604	26,170
Slovakia	.00360	5,483,088	19,720
Slovenia	.00360	1,996,617	7,181
Spain	.00013	47,042,984	6,116
Sweden	.00013	9,103,788	1,183
Switzerland	.00013	7,925,517	1,030
Ukraine	.00248	44,854,065	111,064
United Kingdom	.00007	63,047,162	4,413
Total		745,233,755	1,138,849

Table 3: The Dark Figure for Trafficking/Slavery in Europe

Country	*Slaves*	*Reported Victims*	*Dark Figure*	*Dark Figure %*
Albania	10,800	97	10,703	99.1
Armenia	10,683	22	10,661	99.8
Austria	1,069	62	1,007	94.2
Azerbaijan	34,144	34	34,110	99.9
Belarus	11,715	362	11,353	96.9
Belgium	1,357	130	1,227	90.4
Bosnia & Herzegovina	13,952	25	13,927	99.8
Bulgaria	26,727	432	26,295	98.4
Croatia	16,112	14	16,098	99.9
Czech Republic	36,603	83	36,520	99.8
Denmark	721	53	668	92.6
Finland	684	48	636	93.0
France	8,532	726	7,806	91.5
Georgia	16,439	n/a	n/a	n/a
Germany	10,570	651	9,919	93.8
Greece	1,400	92	1,308	93.4
Hungary	35,816	10	35,806	100.0
Iceland	41	8	33	80.4
Ireland	331	78	253	76.4
Italy	7,964	2381	5,583	70.1
Luxembourg	66	8	n/a	n/a
Moldova	34,236	169	34,067	99.5
Montenegro	2,364	n/a	n/a	n/a
Netherlands	2,175	993	1,182	54.3
Norway	612	319	293	47.9
Poland	138,161	278	n/a	n/a
Portugal	1,402	8	1,394	99.4
Romania	24,731	1154	23,577	95.3
Russia	512,566	100	512,466	100.0
Serbia	26,170	76	26,094	99.7
Slovakia	19,720	38	19,682	99.8
Slovenia	7,181	31	n/a	n/a
Spain	6,116	1605	4,511	73.8
Sweden	1,183	74	1,109	93.7
Switzerland	1,030	46	984	95.5
Ukraine	111,064	n/a	n/a	n/a
United Kingdom	4,413	427	3,986	90.3

The "dark figure percentage" is calculated by dividing the dark figure for a country by the total estimated number of slaves for that country, then multiplying by 100 to convert to a percentage.

IV. CONCLUSION

The size of the dark figure for slavery/trafficking crime for most European countries is so large that it suggests a crisis of public policy and law enforcement. Slavery is a very serious, often deadly, crime; moreover, it is rarely a single crime but a bundle of related crimes, most of which—assault, sexual assault, kidnapping—are themselves extremely serious. To illustrate this by comparison, taking France's slavery dark figure as an example, it is unimaginable that 91.5 percent of all homicides would go undetected. If that were the case, it would be a political scandal, seen as a complete failure of law enforcement and the justice system, and cause for public alarm. The current invisibility of slavery, however, suggests that hundreds of thousands of victims go unnoticed in Europe.

The policy implications are both clear and extensive. A recent exhaustive two-year review of anti-trafficking/anti-slavery provisions and policies in the United Kingdom that was aimed at addressing the invisibility of slavery provided eighty discrete recommendations.[23] Some of these recommendations were unique to the British legal system, but most would apply to all European governments. A stated fundamental basis to all needed reforms was an increased ability to locate and identify this crime, followed by legislation which is comprehensive and holistic, not concentrated on one or another part such as commercial sexual exploitation but on the larger and complex crime. Calls were also made to equip public-facing agencies, in health and social services for example, with the skills and knowledge to identify the indicators of modern slavery. The training of police in the identification of such a serious crime should go without saying, but is still lacking in most European countries, as is a sufficient understanding of the needs of the victims of this crime.

It is our hope that this first estimation of the dark figure of trafficking/slavery in Europe allows a consideration of the appropriateness of existing levels of economic and human resources devoted to law enforcement for this crime, and to the support of victims, as well as to policies that aim to prevent such crime. It is also our intention to follow this analysis with a second exploration of slavery/trafficking crime in Europe that will propose a causal model exploring the underlying conditions that support this crime.

---

23. Centre for Social Justice, It Happens Here: Equipping the United Kingdom to Fight Modern Slavery (2013).