

Research Article

Child Labor in India, Philipine, Iran and the International Human Rights Discourse

Seyed Ali Ehsankhah

Department of Law, International Law,
Tarbiat Modares, Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT:

This article addresses the connections between poverty, illiteracy and child labor through the lens of international human rights discourse, particularly assessing the debate between the developed countries and The lesser developed countries (LDCs) over incorporating a 'social clause' articulating waged worker rights into international trade agreements. Poverty, often viewed simply as lack of income, is now being approached through the broader perspective of lack of opportunities, albeit usually based on income, asset and power deficits. The United Nations *Human Development Report* (HDR) of 1997 conceptualized human poverty as 'the denial of opportunities and choices most basic to human development – to lead a long, healthy, creative life, to enjoy a decent standard of living, freedom, dignity, self-esteem and respect for others'.

Key words: Child Labor, Poverty Alleviation.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most basic opportunities necessary for poverty alleviation is the availability of education, and especially primary education. It is often impossible, or certainly more difficult, for illiterate and semi-literate people to understand, demand and secure their civil, political, social, economic, cultural and human rights, which are essential for human development in general and for increasing one's power to fight exploitation in particular. Many discourses regarding the welfare state and social justice acknowledge the importance of enhancing the competencies of the poor both as individuals and as collectives so as to enable them to access social protection against poverty, destitution, indignity, exploitation and denial of human rights.

The problem of child labor is intimately connected with illiteracy; in that children who are required or expected to perform substantial work

often do not have access to or resources for education. Thus, any reform agenda relating to child labor abolition must be grounded in the concept of poverty as lack of opportunity.

Advocates of social welfare and justice, who have traditionally relied on governmental programmes to address poverty, increasingly find themselves in a state of considerable despair in the contemporary globalizing world. Mainstream economists posit that economic growth, resulting from a 'free' globalized market, will reduce poverty. Thus the alleviation of poverty should be addressed only through the 'trickle-down effect' of market-led gross domestic product (GDP) growth. But market growth does not always facilitate poverty reduction; indeed, it often increases inequality (Bardhan 2001). Economic discourse, parading as scientific rationality, may be oblivious to prevailing social

and cultural infirmities, the rent-seeking potential of certain actors in the economic system, restrictions on the free flow of information, and the susceptibilities of the poor and powerless in the political power dynamics. These issues form the context in which the market mechanism works, and therefore will influence its outcomes. Market mechanisms always suffer from imperfections; they do not address people not having economic power. Thus, governments and independent rights groups cannot assume that the market will alleviate poverty and relinquish their responsibility for addressing basic human values, human rights and social protection of the poor. Since the Second World War, various international institutions have enacted conventions that address human rights and dignity and provide guidance for state actions and programmes that might enrich people's lives. These international prescriptions have been accepted and endorsed in various degrees by many countries, often resulting in legal changes on a state or local level. There are tensions, however, about the mechanisms through which these standards should be implemented. Perhaps one of the most controversial issues in this regard is the attachment of a 'social clause' to world trade agreements by the World Trade Organization (WTO). In the era of globalization, many social justice advocates, particularly in the developed countries, fear a steep diminution in labor standards. Specifically, they fear that workers' rights to free speech and association will be censured and that employers may use more child and forced labor in an attempt to minimize labor costs. Yet many LDCs and, indeed, human rights advocates in the LDCs view some of the standards advocated by developed countries as onerous and particularly resist the adoption of sanctions for human rights employment violations attached to trade agreements with the developed world. They argue that the concept of a social clause is inimical to the political sovereignty of nations

and especially to the economic sustenance of LDCs in the competitive world business environment. Thus, while the social clause is being viewed by the developed world as an important instrument with which to fight world poverty and violations of human rights, many in the LDCs question the genuineness of the developed world's intentions. This section does not deal with all aspects of the debated social clause, but rather examines the structural framework of this body of law and its potential to promote human rights and poverty alleviation in the sphere of child labor eradication. In the next section, I provide a critique of the traditionally perceived causes of child labor and illiteracy in India. The third section documents the extent of child labor and lack of school attendance in India. In the fourth, I articulate the evolution of India's statutory and constitutional legal response to child labor and illiteracy, recognizing the state failure in implementing the constitutional proclamations and other legal rights. In the fifth and sixth sections, I describe widely ratified International Labor Organization (ILO) and United Nations (UN) poverty directives that address child labor and illiteracy. It is argued that while these directives, at least in India, have put considerable pressure on the government, they have not resulted in the desired changes envisaged by the directives. The final section then importantly examines the contents of and motivation behind the social clause as part of trade agreements and assesses the contribution of the emerging international poverty law (IPL) to the issue of child labor and universal primary education.

Child labor, illiteracy and poverty in India: linkage and causes

Traditionally, children worldwide learned occupational skills in a family environment with the view that they would use those skills as 'positive Traditionally, children worldwide learned occupational skills in a family environment with the view that they would use

those skills as ‘positive assets in adulthood’ (Schildkrout 1980: 480); for example, they would work with their parents as farm laborers in family-owned fields. This was believed to be a normal way of living one’s childhood. But both the production process and the family structure have changed substantially since the Industrial Revolution, resulting in urbanization and more mechanized production. These developments have dissociated children’s work from the family context. As primary education became widespread, particularly in the developed countries, child labor was largely minimized or eliminated. In a large part of the developing world, however, effective attempts to abolish child labor were not made for various reasons. India falls into the category of those countries where little or no progress has been made in the abolition of child labor. Previously, within the caste system in India, the practice of child labor for poor children in a family context was not viewed as demeaning enough to deprive the children of their childhood. The illiteracy of children, however, regardless of caste (although the incidence of child labor and illiteracy is much higher among lower castes), is now viewed as a more serious problem than before (Gupta and Voll 1999). The lack of access to education ensures the perpetuation of such children’s poverty owing to the failure to develop competencies that are necessary to exercise one’s economic, social and cultural rights.

Especially, primary education is the sine qua non of social development; it enables the powerless to appreciate the framework of empowerment and the anti-poverty policies of the state. It is also considered a basic foundation of good citizenship, ‘the primary vehicle for imparting cultural values in children, and making them adjust to the fast-changing environment around them’ (Saini 2001). Therefore, some scholars have argued for expanding the definition of child labor to include even children’s work performed in family contexts, when such work deprives the

children of education. Some have gone to the extent of suggesting that all out-of-school children should be treated as child laborers for purposes of planning and resource allocation (Burra 2001: 481). Child labor is dangerous not just from the viewpoint of perpetuating poverty. Industrial work particularly can be traumatic to children’s human development and cause their physical and moral degradation. It may result in ‘decreasing self-esteem among children and their descent to a subhuman level’ (Sinha 1994: 2694). Child labor takes away the beauty of living one’s childhood. Even if lived in poverty, childhood can be perhaps the most wonderful phase of one’s life. Its psychological importance lies in its ability to evoke nostalgic reminiscence during adulthood (Saini 1998). The loss of childhood due to child labor, I believe, is as important as the impoverishing impact on the economic, social and moral aspects of child laborers. Thus, child labor, especially during the early years, may prove devastating to the tender feelings of childhood, lowering the self-esteem of the child and eventually adversely affecting his or her developmental potential. Why there are child laborers in India is a controversial issue. Some posit that poor parents subject their wards to child labor so that they can be the main or supplemental contributors to family income. Following this line of thinking, most analysts – including government officials – attribute this practice to the high incidence of poverty in the country (Government of India 2000: 169). Thus, child labor is seen as a natural reality associated with poverty, which has come to be known as ‘the harsh reality theory’ of child labor.

The most tangible impact of child labor, whatever its causes, is the denial of education and the possibility of a dignified career to the child. Likewise, the causes of this issue are not free from debate. The choice of whether to attend school is often popularly believed to be that of the parents; the children, rarely asked or allowed to participate, simply acquiesce in decisions that

keep them illiterate. But employers also have avested interest in the perpetuation of child labor owing to cost advantages

The magnitude of the problem

India has the second-highest national population in the world – according to the 2001 census, 1,027 million. The literacy rate among the population aged seven years and above stands at 65.38 per cent. The corresponding figures for males and females are 75.85 and 54.16 per cent respectively.

This slow progress in improving literacy is despite the constitutional proclamation in 1950 that primary education would be compulsory for all by 1960. The Indian population at the time of the 1991 census³ was 846 million, of which 297 million were children in the 0–14 age group and 203 million were in the age group 5–14. Scholars divide the child population into three sub-sets: those attending school, those employed on a full-time basis, and those who participate in household activities without being in economic employment. The latter category of children is very large; it is also referred to as ‘nowhere children’ (Chaudhri 1997a: 793), children who are neither in paid employment nor in school. The official statistics include only the second-category children as child laborers. The 1991 census data reported that 112 million children were enrolled in the formal school system and about 7 million were in non-formal education. Non-formal education includes those studying at home on their own or in non-recognized organizations. The national literacy rate at the time of the 1991 census for the population aged seven years and above was estimated to be 52.21 per cent. The country today has more than 300 million illiterates. Approximately 83 million children in the age group 5–14 (45 per cent) do not attend school. This age group also has a very high drop-out rate – 54 per cent, of which 59 per cent are girls. Since the country’s population has **Saini | 7** risen past the 1 billion mark, according to the 2001 census, all these figures must have gone up.

Unlike developing countries such as China, primary education has not been a priority on the agenda of the Indian state. India has been spending a very low portion of its gross national product (GNP) on children’s education for the last fifty years, which is a mere 0.8–1 per cent (*Economic Times* 2001: 2). The government’s education agenda has set a goal of 6 per cent of GDP to be spent on education (at all levels), but actual expenditure is far below this dream. Some well-known industries that employ a large number of child laborers include matches, fireworks and explosives in Sivakasi (Tamil Nadu), glass and bangles in Ferozabad (UP), bidi in Nizamabad (AP) and North Arcot District of Tamil Nadu, carpets in Bhadoi, Varanasi and Mirzapur (UP), carpet weaving in Jammu and Kashmir, lock-making in Aligarh (UP), gem polishing in Jaipur (Rajasthan), slate mines in Markkapur (AP), leather units in Agra and Kanpur (UP), diamonds in Surat City (Gujarat), and tea gardens in Darjeeling (West Bengal). The key motive of employers in employing child labor is to minimize costs through lower wages and thus maximize profits. In certain industries (for example, carpet weaving) the ‘nimble finger’ argument is articulated as an additional factor. Some of those who work outside family units are in bonded or forced conditions. A large number of Indian child laborers work in family settings, however, and have been described as ‘nowhere children’. While often not visibly employed, they constitute the largest number of child laborers, working mostly on family farms. Similar to the gender discrepancy in educational expectations noted earlier, there is a gender bias in Indian child labor. A large majority of rural girls work in the agricultural sector. Also, according to the 1991 census, of the 109 million male children, 56.6 per cent were in schools, whereas of the 101 million female children, 44.2 per cent were in schools.

The country needs a substantial number of schools to accommodate the 'nowhere children' and the child laborers, who should be freed from work and required to attend school. If we continue at the current pace of development of the coverage and level of basic education, India is going to face serious problems in the near future. Some economists estimate that by 2010 India will have the dubious distinction of having the largest aggregate number of illiterate workers across castes and classes; and that the Indian workforce will not be competent to handle the demands of technology (Chaudhri 1997a: 807). It is necessary for our culture and our government to focus on the question of compulsory primary education and the role of child labor (Saini 1998). No doubt the pressure for child labor abolition coming from various quarters will contribute to the realization of the wider goal.

In the last two decades, the Indian higher judiciary has increasingly made laws through its judicial power of constitutional interpretation and public interest litigation (PIL) when it finds that the executive and legislative branches of government have failed to act on a constitutional principle. Using this power, the Supreme Court of India, in a significant 1993 judgment,⁷ declared that Article 45 should be interpreted as containing a fundamental right to primary education, which means that citizens cannot enforce it in a court of law, and that the state is obliged to provide primary education throughout the country. In addition, the constitution was amended in 2002 to provide for a right to education up to matriculation as a fundamental right for every citizen (a fuller discussion of this is contained in the penultimate section of this chapter). But this right has yet to be put into operation, and basic education is neither universal nor compulsory in actuality. It is well known that many Indian laws relating to state obligations to the poor and powerless remain merely symbolic (Saini 1995b); it remains to be seen how long it will take for this law to become

fully operational. Article 24, as noted above, guarantees the prohibition of employment of children in factories, mines, plantations and 'hazardous employment'.

But the term 'hazardous employment' in this constitutional provision has not been defined. Following the Bhopal disaster, the Factories Act of 1948 was amended in 1986 to include provisions protecting workers involved in hazardous processes. The amended Factories Act does define the term 'hazardous process' for the purpose of that act. But this definition has not been applied to the constitutional guarantee in Article 24. Some constitutional experts opine that all labor undertaken by children is hazardous in that it deprives them of their childhood. They argue, therefore, that Article 24 should be interpreted to prevent employment of children in any activity (Baxi 1994). Such an analysis calls into question the underlying premises of a law like the CLPRA, whose comprehensive framework is directed at regulating, rather than abolishing, child labor, and thus perhaps merely perpetuates the problem.

Child labor abolition, human rights and international initiatives

In a country that claims to be the largest democracy in the world (and that for more than half a century), it is intriguing to note that many or even most of the important initiatives in attaining the abolition of child labor have come from outside Indian society and polity. But for the pressure of the ILO and the UN, India might not have declared the fight against child labor as one of its principal political goals. Because most affected children belong to poor families from lower castes who have little voice in the opinion-making dynamics in the country, community participation in the fight against child labor is perhaps unthinkable. Any determination of the government to abolish child labor would involve setting out a workable social change agenda as a fundamental value pursued by an enlightened society. Since this has never been attempted,

pressures from international institutions are desirable. Some of the earliest attempts to articulate human rights for children at the global level were in the form of declarations. In 1924, the Geneva Declaration on the Rights of the Child talked of ‘mankind’s obligation towards children’, owing to them ‘the best it has to give’ (Freeman 1996: 2).

The United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child was adopted in November 1959, stressing certain principles, including ‘entitlement to education, which should be free and compulsory, at least in elementary stages’. These principles envisaged a wider scope than that of the Geneva Declaration, their emphasis being on protection and welfare. But these principles, too, were mere declarations without involving any binding obligations on the member states. The ILO adopted the Minimum Age (Industry) Convention 1989 (No. 5), prohibiting children under fourteen years of age from working in industrial establishments. Later, the ILO adopted a number of sectoral conventions on the minimum age of admission to employment. These related to industry, agriculture, trimmers and stokers, maritime work, Non-industrial employment, fishing and underground work. Primarily, the international initiatives on child labor abolition have come about through the Conventions and Recommendations of the ILO and the UN Convention on Child Rights in 1989.

The Child Rights Convention: the beginning of a shift in the child labor abolition agenda

The adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of the 1989 Convention on Rights of the Child (hereinafter referred to as CRC) is one of the most significant developments in international human rights law related to child development and child labor abolition – indeed, a landmark in the history of child rights. Its fifty-four articles are perhaps the most comprehensive treaty on child rights, comprising a set of international standards and measures that are intended to promote the well-being of children in

society. The most important guiding principle of the CRC is the ‘first call for children’, which provides that the essential needs of children should be of paramount importance when allocating resources. The state is expected to ‘respect and ensure’ that children get a fair and equitable ‘deal’ in society. Articles 12, 28 and 32 of the CRC are especially relevant to child labor.

Article 12 requires state parties to guarantee to a child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting the child. Article 28 requires that primary education should be made ‘compulsory and available free to all’. Article 32 requires the member countries to protect children from performing any work that is ‘likely to be hazardous, or to interfere with the child’s education or to be harmful to the child’s health or physical, mental, spiritual, moral or social development’. The CRC provides four sets of basic rights – the right to survival, protection, development (including a reasonable standard of living, health and basic services, social security, education and leisure) and participation. Thus the Convention may be viewed as ‘a means of empowering children and creating an environment in which all children are able to live securely and realize their full potential of life’ (UNICEF 1994: 1).

The social clause, children’s rights discourse and recent developments in the child labor reform agenda

Many progressive scholars and activists attack ‘globalization’ as reflective of imperialistic thinking. They charge that, by superimposing the ‘rationality’ of market functioning, globalization is wiping out components of the welfare state and the basic rights of working people. Even though there might be truth in these observations, a highly charged debate over a ‘social clause’ connected to international trade agreements may constitute a silver lining for workers in countries that violate certain basic human rights, including employment of child labor. In this context, a

social clause is a special agreement, inserted in international trade agreements, that sets forth minimum demands for ensuring labor dignity, not a comprehensive set of labor rights. These demands should be understood with reference to some of the more fundamental Conventions and Recommendations of the ILO. As noted in the earlier section, these core standards were adopted in the agenda of the ILO in its 1998 annual conference (allegedly at the behest of the developed world). They include, among others, abolition of child labor as one of the core priorities of the international community.

Child labor in Philippines

As of 2013, there are 3.210 million **child laborers in the Philippines**. In 2001 there were 2.4 million. There are a total of 9.8 million children aged 5 to 17 working in the Philippines. 2.46 million (44.9%) of these are doing legal work. 66.8% of child labourers are boys. 2.4 million children did hazardous work in 2001 out of a total number of working children of 4 million. In 1995, the number of children doing hazardous work was 2.2 million, out of a total of 3.6 million. In its report *Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor* in 2013, the U.S. Department of Labor estimated the percentage of working children aged 5 to 14 to be around 11% which corresponds to about 2,180 million children. 65% of these children were found in the agricultural sector, 5% in the industrial sector and 29% engaged in domestic service. The 2014 *List of Goods Produced by Child Labor or Forced Labor* reported 13 goods produced exclusively by child labor in the Philippines. These included 8 agricultural goods (namely sugarcane, bananas, coconuts, corn, hogs, rice, rubber, and tobacco). Gold mining, pornography and pyrotechnics complete the list.

Philippine Program Against Child Labor

The Philippine Program Against Child Labor (PPACL) is the founded from the National Program Against Child Labor (NPACL) framework. Led by the Department of Labor and

Employment, the latter framework was established for the period 2001-2004 to combat child labor. The program partners used it as a way to unify the goals, missions, visions, and other points needed of the programs to be established. When the period ended, the National Child Labor Committee added breadth to the framework by identifying new objectives that would help sustain the environment NPACL fostered and continue preventing the progressing situation of child labor in the Philippines

ChildFund Philippines

In 1971, ChildFund began by partnering with religious organizations, and eventually, the communities in the Philippines. The organization helps secure the future of children vulnerable to exploitation, child labour, and other causes, and builds a community that would ensure their safety and protection. Each year, they contribute \$8 million to their partnerships worldwide, including the Philippines, directly helping 250,000 children and counting.

ChildFund is notable for two projects: Child Protection Committees (CPCs), wherein they protect children from dangerous and harmful acts such as bullying, child abuse, exploitation, and other measures in schools. Another would be the Conditional Socialized Education Assistance: Provide educational assistance to children who face disabilities to meet their educational needs.

Currently, their target provinces are: Ifugao, Benguet, Baguio City, Mountain Province, Quezon, Batangas, Laguna, National Capital Region (Metro Manila), Sorsogon, Camarines Sur, Capiz, Iloilo, Negros Occidental, Cebu, Ormoc, Misamis Oriental, North Cotobato, South Cotobato, Cotobato, Maguindanao, Sulu, Zamboanga del Norte.

A view of the outcomes of child labor in Iran

Reviewing the literature on labor children in different countries has confirmed the existence of physical, mental and social problems in these children (Scivoletto, Da Silva, & Rosenheck, 2011). Thuderic-Ghemo (2005), in a review of

studies about street children in Russia, Colombia, Bulgaria, India, Rwanda, Kenya, South Africa, Swaziland and Zimbabwe, showed that living on the street causes some normally treatable diseases (e.g) malnutrition, severe weight loss, pneumonia, malaria, nausea) and some problems due to cold air such as sore throat, headache and nasal irritation, skin diseases such as lice and scabies, and sores around the mouth. Long-standing effects of diseases in street children caused damage in the central nervous system, heart, liver, kidney and bone marrow, and consequently these hazards caused a higher risk of mortality among them. Van-Rooyan & Hartell (2002) believe that, in addition to physical problems, street children have been ignored psychologically, resulting in their insufficient growth. Also, Adlaf and Zdanowicz in 1999 showed that 30–40% of street children had reported depression, paranoid ideas, conduct disorder and suicide (cited in Thuderic-Ghemo, 2005). Labor children are exposed to other hazards. Based on the United Nations study ‘Violence against Children’, they mainly had a history of runaway, and physical and sexual abuse in Canada, making them extremely vulnerable to sexual exploitation. To care for themselves, many street children are involved in begging, drug trafficking, stealing, prostitution or survival sex (offering sex for food, shelter and medicine) (Save The Children, 2005). Overall, the findings of several studies indicate that street children are exposed to severe risks of physical, mental and social problems.

Disadvantages of child labor in Iran

In response to the continuing problem of child labor in Iran, many institutes and universities have tended to study the issue. Because of the existence of so many noticeable researches in the country and the need for evidence-based policy-making, planning and intervention, evaluating and summarising the results is necessary. This study intended to collect and classify research evidence on the aetiology of becoming street

children and the outcomes of being a child labor. Of the variables researched in studies, some could be considered either risk factors for becoming a street child or its outcomes based on their nature, but their designs, which were cross-sectional, correlational or case–control, prevent us from drawing such a conclusion. Therefore, based on their dual nature, we preferred to name all of them as ‘disadvantages’ instead of either risk factors or outcomes, keeping in mind the potentiality of being one of the two.

CONCLUSION

Child labor has a multiplier effect, perpetuating economic, social and cultural poverty. The concern of developed countries, as expressed through their government and trade representatives, although of course contested within their societies, about the presence of child and forced labor in various developing countries, is predominantly driven by trade exigencies rather than guided by concerns relating to humanity and morality. While the social clause may be viewed by progressives as necessary for preserving workers’ rights, it is also a non-tariff barrier in favour of the developed world. In addition, there is a world of difference between states’ projections and actual poverty alleviation, especially in LDCs, where the covert nexuses between the powerful vested interests against the less powerful are very strong, and where those who have assets and power are largely oblivious to the problems of child laborers. Thus, the opposition to the social clause on the part of governments, employers and the trade unions, both within LDCs and the developed world, is complex and highly problematic. Many governments in developing countries have the political goal of ensuring the success of globalization because they have been led to believe that their economic survival depends on a global economy, which necessitates the subordination of social justice and human rights issues to the wider imperatives of globalization.

This creates a still greater incentive for employers to minimize costs through the perpetration of child labor. In fact, there is evidence that in post-globalization India a greater degree of casualization of labor is taking place, largely for female and child laborers, who tend to offer their services at wages lower than market rates (Gupta and Mitra 1997). Also, because of the general decline of pluralism and the countervailing power in society, the social health in poorer countries is likely to be under greater strain. In view of these realities, it is essential to look outside the traditional viewpoints of both the developed world and the LDCs to question how best to respond to what appears to be a bleak future for child laborers and the poor in a globalized world. Despite my belief that the intentions of the developed world regarding the social clause are not fully genuine, my intuitive uneasiness repeatedly compels me to support the social clause as a means to address child labor and hence illiteracy. I am limiting my pro-social-clause conclusion to the issue of child labor, because other aspects of the social clause advocated by the developed world are more problematical and beyond the scope of this chapter. I sincerely wish to see the social clause as an important part of the emerging international poverty law, however, alongside the UN Convention on Child Rights, in order to put the requisite pressure on governments to realize their fundamental responsibility for implementing universal primary education. Historically, there are not very many instances of the use of trade sanctions to combat child labor. But it happened in the 1930s in connection with trade between states of the US. The federal government used trade sanctions that were under its jurisdiction to prohibit the use of child labor by the states (see Chaudhri 1997a: 791; Brown et al. 1992). Based on our systematic review, we can see that street children in Iran are confronted with a series of disadvantages in their hard day-to-day lives. While it seems that some of these unpleasant

situations, like their parents' divorce, living in a house with an addicted family member, involvement of parents in crime and being mentally and physically abused by them, along with poverty and the necessity to acquire income, are pushing the children onto the streets, their other miseries are probably the result of living and working on the street. Obviously, many of them are physically ill, some are depressed, some are involved with drugs and delinquency, and many are exposed to violence on the streets.

Street children in Iran belong to a low socio-economic class (Vameghi et al, 2012) and therefore it is highly suspected that most of them are on the street to help themselves and their families survive. Meanwhile, the high percentage of their parents' divorce and separation (29.3%), along with the high frequency of drug abuse (59.8%) and violence in 530 M. Vameghi et al.

Downloaded by [5.226.49.219] at 07:09 18 January 2016 their families, suggest that both mechanisms of poverty and adverse familial conditions prepare children to leave their homes for the streets as a way to solve their problems.

ePhilippine Program Against Child Labor (PPACL) is the founded from the National Program Against Child Labor (NPAACL) framework. Led by the Department of Labor and Employment, the latter framework was established for the period 2001-2004 to combat child labor. The program partners used it as a way to unify the goals, missions, visions, and other points needed of the programs to be established. When the period ended, the National Child Labor Committee added breadth to the framework by identifying new objectives that would help sustain the environment NPAACL fostered and continue preventing the progressing situation of child labor in the Philippines.

REFERENCES:

1. Ferguson, K. (2005). Child labour and social capital in the Mezzo system: Family- and communitybased risk and protective factors for street-working children in Mexico. Journal

- of Social Work Research and Evaluation, 6, 101–118.
2. Ghasemzadeh, F. (2003). Street children in Tehran. *Social Welfare Quarterly*, 2(7), 249–263
 3. Agnivesh, S. (1999) ‘A critique of selective Western interventions and WTO’, in Voll (1999)
 4. Ashraf, S. (1999) ‘The elimination of child labour in the carpet belt of north India: possible NGO and trade union strategies’, in Voll (1999)
 5. Bardhan, P. (2001) ‘Social justice in a global economy’, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 3–10 February, pp. 467–80
 6. Baxi, U. (1994) ‘The justice system: is it child friendly?’, Paper presented at the International Conference on Shaping the Future by Law: Children, Environment and Human Health, Indian Law Institute, New Delhi, 21–25
 7. March. Brown, M., J. Christiansen and P. Phillips (1992) ‘The decline of child labour in the US fruit and canning industry: law or economics’, *Business History Review*, 66,
 8. WinterBurra, N. (2001) ‘Cultural stereotypes and household behaviour: girl child labour in India’, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 3–10 February, pp. 481–8
 9. Castle, R. et al. (1997) ‘Labour clauses, the World Trade Organization and child labour in India’, *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 40 (1)
 10. Chaudhri, D. P. (1997a) ‘A policy perspective on child labour in India with pervasive gender and urban bias in school education’, *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 40 (4)
 11. (1997b) ‘Labour clauses, the World Trade Organization and child labour in India’, *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 40 (1)
 12. Chimni, B. S. (1999) ‘Marxism and international law – a contemporary analysis’, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 6 February, pp. 337–49
 13. Chisti, S. (2000) ‘World trade and labour’, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 22 July, p. 2669
 14. Dreze, J. (1998) ‘Elementary education as a pro-poor strategy in India: myth and reality’, *CROP Newsletter*, 5 (3): 1–2
 15. *Economic Times* (2001) ‘Despite tall promises, little funds for education: experts’, *New Delhi*, 5 March, p. 2
 16. Freeman, M. (ed.) (1996) *Children’s Rights – a Comparative Perspective*, Vermont: Dartmouth Publishing Government of India (1969)
 17. Report of the National Commission on Labour, New Delhi: Ministry of Labour and Employment (1984)
 18. Sanat Mehta Committee Report on Child Labour, New Delhi Ministry of Labour and Employment (1986)
 19. National Policy on Education, New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) (1997)
 20. Annual Report 1996–1997, New Delhi: Ministry of Labour
 21. (2000) Annual Report 1999–2000, New Delhi: Ministry of Labour
 22. Gupta, I. and A. Mitra (1997) ‘Child labour: a profile of Delhi slums’, *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 40 (4)
 23. Gupta, M. and K. Voll (1999) ‘Child labour in India: an exemplary case study’, in Voll (1999)
 24. Hensman, R. (2000) ‘World trade and workers’ rights’: to link or not to link’, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 8 April, pp. 1247–54
 25. Heredia, R. and E. Mathias (eds) (1995) *The Family in a Changing World Women, Children and Strategies for Intervention*, New Delhi: Indian Social Institute
 26. Hirway, I. et al. (eds) (1991) *Towards Eradication of Child Labour*, New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing Co.

27. Janardhan, V. (1997) 'Globalization of capital, multinational corporations and labour: towards a perspective', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 32 (35)
28. Kirmani, N. (1994) *International Trade Policies: The Uruguay Round and Beyond*, Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund 174
29. Kjonstad, A. and J. H. Veit Wilson (eds) (1997) 'Introduction', in *Law, Power and Poverty, Comparative Research on Poverty (CROP)*, Bergen
30. Kothari, S. (1983) 'There is blood on those matchsticks: child labour in Sivakasi', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2 July, pp. 1191–2002
31. Lee, E. (1997) 'Globalization and labour standards', *International Labour Review*, 36 (2): 173–89
32. Liemt, G. V. (1989) 'Minimum labour standards and international trade: would a social clause work?', *International Labour Review*, 128 (4): 438–41
33. Maskus, K. E. (1997) *Should Core Labour Standards be Imposed Through International Trade Policy?*, Washington, DC: World Bank (Development Research Group)
34. Mehta, S. S. (1991) 'Why child labour? The Indian case', in Hirway et al. (1991)
35. Mishra, L. (2000) *Child Labour in India*, Delhi: Oxford University Press
36. Nader, L. (1975) 'Forums for social justice: a cross-culture perspective', *Journal of Social Issues*, 31: 151
37. Nath, G. B. (1998) 'Linking international labour standards with trade: implications for India', *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 41 (4)
38. Nonet, P. and P. Selznick (1978) *Law and Society in Transition*, New York: Harper Colophon
39. Pankaj (1995) 'Plight of child labourers', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 25 November, p. 2980
40. Patel, Arjun and K. Desai (1995) 'Rural migrant labour and labour laws', in D. S. Saini (ed.), *Labour Law, Work and Development*, New Delhi: Westvill Publishing House
41. Patel, B. B. (1991) 'Child labour in India: dimensions, issues and policies', in Hirway et al. (1991)
42. Pratim Mitra, P. and A. Kausal (1998) 'International labour standards in India: some key issues', *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 41 (4): 1013–19
43. Ramachandran, V. (2000) 'Literacy, development and empowerment', in Rekha Wazir (ed.), *The Gender Gap in Basic Education – NGOs as Change Agents*, New Delhi: Sage Publications
44. Ramaswamy, E. A. (1999) 'Child labour in the larger context of industrial relations', in Voll (1999)
45. Sahoo, U. C. (1990) 'Child labour and legislation', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 17 November, pp. 2529–30
46. Saini, D. S. (1995a) 'Children of a lesser god, child labour law and compulsory primary education', in Heredia and Mathias (1995) (ed.) (1995b) *Labour Law, Work, and Development*, New Delhi: Westvill Publishing House
47. (1998) 'Combating child labour in India – compulsory primary education in the context of child rights', *Labour & Development*, 3 (1 and 2) (1999) 'Labour legislation and social justice: rhetoric and reality', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 25 September–2 October
48. (2001) 'INDIA: Social Security Law', in R. Blanpain (ed.), *International Encyclopaedia of Laws*, The Hague: Kluwer Law International
49. Schildkrout, E. (1980) 'Children's work reconsidered', *International Social Science Journal*, XXXII (3): 479–89
50. Shaikh, J. (2001) 'Quote–unquote: men of note compare notes ... ', *Delhi Times* (a

- supplement of The Times of India), New Delhi, 24 February, p. 8.
51. Sinha, R. (1994) 'Violation of child rights', Economic and Political Weekly, 8 October
52. Sinha, S. (1994) 'Child labour and compulsory education', Paper presented at the International Conference on Shaping the Future by Law: Children, Environment and Human Health, Indian Law Institute, New Delhi, 21–25 March
54. Srinivas, M. N. (1991) 'On living in a revolution', Economic and Political Weekly, 26 (13)
55. Times of India (2001) 'Only 26% of Indians are poor, claims plan body', 22 February, p. 1
56. Toope, S. J. (1996) 'The Convention on the Rights of the Child: implications for Canada', in Freeman (1996)
57. UNICEF (1994) 'The right to be a child', Unpublished background paper, New Delhi: UNICEF
58. Venkata Ratnam, C. S. (1998) 'International labour standards and India', Indian Journal of Labour Economics, 41 (4): 993–1003
59. Voll, K. (ed.) (1999) *Against Child Labour: Indian and International Dimensions and Strategies*, New Delhi: Mosaic Books
60. Weiner, M. (1991) *The Child and the State in India*, Delhi: Oxford University Press