



Research Paper

## Rights Violations of Ragpicker Childrens in Cuttack City of Odisha

Dillip Kumar Mallik

Junior Lecturer in Political Science, Dhenkanal Autonomous College, Dhenkanal, Odisha.

### Abstract

All people have the same rights and dignity from birth. These are unalienable moral claims that every person possesses by virtue of their fundamental humanity. These demands have been turned into legal rights and are expressed and defined in what is now known as human rights. Children also have the right to human rights. Both children and adults are acknowledged to have fundamental human rights under international treaties. Since children are more prone to experience abuse and exploitation, they have a specific right to protection. In November 1989, the UN General Assembly ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child. When a child engages in rag picking as a vocation, all of their rights are denied. Rag pickers are youngsters that collect and organize items like plastic, paper, bottles, bones, and metals that may be sold to make a living. We can find them in railway stations, municipal areas, bus stops, industrial regions, garbage dumps, and residential neighbourhoods. The central conundrum of this essay is that the Government outlawed rag-picking following the Child Labor (Prohibition & Regulation) Act of 1986. Why do young people pick up trash? The primary goal of this essay is to investigate and expose the key causes of the rights abuses of rag-picking children in Cuttack City. The article finishes with some recommendations for proactive steps that should be taken to stop the human rights violations of juvenile ragpickers.

**Keywords:** Child, Ragpicker, Rights, Violation

Received 01 June, 2023; Revised 08 June, 2023; Accepted 10 June, 2023 © The author(s) 2023.

Published with open access at [www.questjournals.org](http://www.questjournals.org)

### I. INTRODUCTION:

This essay uses a capacity method to theorize the rights of rag pickers in India, focusing on Cuttack, an Odisha city. There are three sections to this essay. Part I introduces the study and provides a synopsis. The capability approach framework developed by Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum is discussed in the second section to comprehend the history of "rag picker" rights. Additionally, this article investigates the extent to which giving children's rights a specific priority in national or international human rights law will be justified under the capacity approach. The third section of my essay is based on data analysis and information gathered from Cuttack, an Odisha city, where I discuss how ragpickers' human rights are infringed. Then this article short summarises the whole discussion.

A man must pass through the most crucial stage of life in his early years. When a youngster is young, does he or she know what society is like? What is proper? Also, what is work? They gradually learn about all these things through their family members' interactions. However, as they are either migrant children or without parents, these kids were not exposed to these issues while they were young. In their early years, these kids preferred to work as labourers or in other low-skilled jobs to support themselves. We sometimes called them kid labourers, rag pickers, and other terms. Children who work for pay, either part-time or full-time, are said to be engaged in child labour. The practise robs kids of their youth and stunts their physical and mental growth. According to UNICEF, India has the most workers under 14 worldwide due to its more significant population. People who collect rags and other trash from public spaces, such as sidewalks, roadways, drains, and medical facilities, might make money by selling their haul. A child doing this work is called a "child rag picker."

### CHILD RAG PICKERS: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

In the discourse on general rights, the rights of the Rag Pickers have gained prominence in the modern day. The idea of child rag pickers has evolved. Current usage of the term "kid rag picker" refers to youngsters

who gather trash or recyclables in order to make a living. By building on the understanding of the capacities approach (CA) pioneered by Amartya Sen in economics and Martha Nussbaum in philosophy, the study in this section seeks to theorize the rights of rag pickers in India with a specific focus on Odisha. Amartya Sen, an economist and philosopher from India, is most often credited with developing the capability approach in the 1980s. A fresh theoretical paradigm for analysing justice, development, and well-being has just evolved, and it is known as the capacity approach. Often, it is viewed as a conceptual foundation for many normative tasks. It includes the following: (1) assessing one's own well-being; (2) evaluating and assessing social structures; and (3) developing policies and suggestions for societal improvement (Sen, A. 1989). In all of these normative actions, the capacity approach gives some people's beings, doings, and opportunities to achieve them priority (such as their actual access to educational possibilities, their mobility, or their capacity to engage in positive social interactions). This differs from other viewpoints on wellbeing that place a greater emphasis on arbitrary ideas (like happiness) or the material aspects of wellbeing (such resources like income or wealth) (Des, G, 2002). In this part, I argue that since every individual has a right to be treated with respect for their entire human dignity in accordance with the capacity approach, children's rights ought to be recognised as human rights.

In this context, a capability approach also explains why the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CROC) and various national constitutions should recognize various rights for sensitivity to children's welfare needs and their agency. In Nussbaum's opinion, creating a list of core competencies is the correct way to operationalize the human capability approach. The choice of a list of core capabilities is, in fact, a crucial step toward reducing the capability approach from a framework to a theory.

### **NUSSBAUM'S VIEW ON CHILDREN'S CAPABILITIES**

My earlier paper was based on both of Nussbaum and Sen's understandings of the capability framework for the study of children's rights in Odisha, particularly rag pickers, because they both have different goals with their work on capabilities and have various personal intellectual histories that need to be taken into account when situating their work. I believe that Nussbaum's position is better suited for my research on the study of children's rights because she seeks to construct a partial theory of justice by promoting the political principles that should underpin a constitution. This is because she has looked into the two ideologies surrounding the capacity approach. Nussbaum enters the capacity approach from a moral-legal-political stance to defend the political principles that a government should guarantee to all of its citizens through its constitution. In order to achieve this, Nussbaum develops and supports a list of "basic human qualities" that ought to be incorporated into any constitution. She believes that all governments ought to encourage these capabilities, hence her work on the capability approach is universalist. Sen was interested in the liberal-egalitarian literature's discussion of "What is equality of?" and asserted that there are compelling arguments in favour of emphasising abilities rather than resources or utility. Sen's ideas are inappropriate for my work because of this. Sen, on the other hand, was engaged in much more practical study on poverty and squalor in emerging nations. In the course of his research, he found some "empirical support" for a development economics strategy that placed more emphasis on what individuals can be and do than on the measures that were common in the early 1980s. Sen was not only involved in social choice, but it was also the cornerstone of his academic career. The common language in this field is axiomatic reasoning, which avoids the needless diversion of elaborating on empirical evidence.

### **A LIST OF RELEVANT CHILDREN'S CAPABILITIES**

The right way to operationalize the human capability approach, in Nussbaum's opinion, is to define a list of fundamental human abilities, such as: 1. life; 2. bodily health; 3. bodily integrity; 4. senses, imagination, and thought; 5. emotions; 6. practical reason; 7. affiliation with other species; 8. other species; 9. play; and 10. control over one's environment. In many of her following publications, Nussbaum has expanded on this list (Nussbaum, 2000; 2002a; 2002b; 2003a). Her list is always being updated, therefore one must look at the most recent version. In reality, choosing a list of essential capabilities is a key step in transforming the capability approach from a framework into a theory.

This section lists pertinent children's capacities (Biggeri, 2004). This list encapsulates the unique characteristics of children and the commonalities shared by all children (no age and gender is taken into consideration). Every factor that is significant to the analysis in our case—analyzing the well-being of children—is included in the list of capabilities, and none of them has been omitted.

He names the following list of children's central abilities for the theoretical framework. Please note that the symbol \* denotes that the child's age and maturity should be considered.

- 1. The ability to live a regular life and maintain physical health, including the ability to be born.**
- 2. Love and care: The capacity to love, the capacity to be loved by those who love us, and the capacity to be protected**
- 3. Mental health: the state of being mentally sound.**

4. **Physical safety and integrity: being able to avoid any form of violence.**
5. **Social interactions: having the ability to participate in social networks and provide and receive social assistance**
6. **Participation: the ability to take part in activities, to affect things reasonably, and to get unbiased information**
7. **Education: the capacity for education**
8. Freedom from economic and non-economic exploitation: having the capacity to be safeguarded against both types of exploitation
9. Shelter and surroundings: living in a secure and comfortable setting.
10. She possesses the ability to both to engage in leisure activities and carry out projects.
11. Respect: the capacity to be regarded and shown dignity.
12. Faith and identity: having the option to live a life consistent with one's religion and identity or not
13. Time-autonomy: the capacity to exercise autonomy in time allocation
14. Mobility: the capacity to move around

There are also some other reasons I adopted Nussbaum's idea for studying child rights. These are;

1. The innocence and immaturity of children, especially rag pickers, is the first factor. They cannot carry out their duties. They could accomplish functions for their development indirectly thanks to their parents, community, state, and Government under the constitution.
2. The second reason is that children lack the capacity for choice necessary for their growth or welfare since the move from achieved functioning to capabilities requires the process of choice. The choosing process itself needs to be evaluated if we apply the capacity approach to analyze individual advantage or societal arrangements.
3. Giving citizens defence and reasons for fundamental constitutional values that citizens have a right to demand from their Government is the third reason Nussbaum concentrates her work on capacities.

According to Nussbaum, the capacities approach should support a theory of social justice in which the subjects are no longer merely completely compliant members of society throughout an entire life but also the capabilities of those in need (usually youngsters or the elderly). She stated earlier that the Government should guarantee all of its citizens under its constitution in light of children's abilities (Maria, L. T. 2007). The world's most significant child population resides in India. All children in India are given fundamental rights under the Indian Constitution, and the State is given the authority to provide for children in particular ways. The Directive Principles of State Policy give the State precise instructions on protecting children. At the same time, they are still vulnerable to abuse and ensure they have the resources and opportunities they need to grow up with freedom and dignity. The State is responsible for ensuring that children are protected from exploitation and material and spiritual abandonment. Whereas the cause and the best interests of children are enshrined in Parts III and IV of the Indian Constitution, insofar as (Maharukh, A. 2002):

- ❖ Within the boundaries of India, the State shall not deny any individual equality before the law or equal protection of the laws (Art 14)
- ❖ According to Article 15 (3), the State may provide particular provisions for children.
- ❖ No one may be deprived of their life or personal liberty unless by a legal process, according to Article 21.
- ❖ All children between the ages of six and fourteen shall receive free and obligatory education from the State in the manner prescribed by law (Art 21. A)
- ❖ Forced labour and human trafficking are also prohibited by Article 23.
- ❖ No kid under the age of 14 may work in a factory, mine, or any other hazardous occupation (Art. 24)
- ❖ Children are given opportunities and facilities to develop healthily and in conditions of freedom and dignity. Youth are protected against exploitation and moral and material abandonment. The tender age of children is not exploited. Citizens are not forced by economic necessity to enter occupations unsuited to their age or strength (Art. 39 f),
- ❖ The State will work to ensure that all children get early childhood care and education up until the age of six (Art. 45)
- ❖ While providing chances for education to a child or ward between the ages of six and fourteen is a fundamental duty of a parent or guardian (Art. 51A) (Indian Government, 2005)

Although we are committed to providing children with necessary services before and after birth, as well as throughout growing, to ensure their complete physical, mental, and social development under the National Policy for Children 1974 (Govt. of India, 1974). We do, however, emphasize that the State, civil society, communities, and families must work together to fulfil their responsibilities to provide for the basic requirements of children if the best interests of children are to be safeguarded. While we also affirm that the State, Society, Community, and Family have responsibilities to children, these must be viewed in the context of the children's primary responsibilities and the importance of instilling in children a strong sense of moral

principles that are intended to protect and strengthen the Family, Society, and the Nation. By treating children with respect, society is treating itself with respect.

### **RIGHTS VIOLATIONS OF RAGPICKER CHILDREN IN CUTTACK CITY**

Human rights protection and promotion are the province of the State in a democracy. Whether they are the police force, the army, the court, or the civil administration, all State institutions have to respect human rights, prevent human rights breaches, and actively work to promote human rights. Human rights problems and abuses are becoming more widespread today, not just in India but also worldwide. Although the Indian Government has vowed to defend against human rights breaches on both a national and international level, thousands of children are abused as rag pickers daily in India. The issue is that since everyone has been given access to human rights, regardless of age, we cannot isolate their abuses from those of other people from a human rights perspective. What about the Government's responsibility and the legal responsibility with child rag-picking are two questions that spring to mind in this situation. They may observe everything but are powerless to safeguard their human rights breaches, or they may believe that children from slums are insufficiently qualified to contribute to their nation's growth.

The purpose of this section of the paper is to examine how the 54 articles of the convention on the rights of the child (CROC), which the United Nations General Assembly adopted in 1989, relate to the rights violations of ragpickers in Cuttack City using primary data gathered from this Odisha city. Of 54 articles, I found a few that I might use for my paper on the rights abuses committed by rag pickers. The following are discussed:

**Article 2-** *“States Parties must take all necessary steps to safeguard children from discrimination and punishment based on the status, pursuits, voiced opinions, or beliefs of the child's parents, guardians, or other family members”.*

This article pointed out that the state protects children's rights from discrimination based on their status, such as poverty and other status-based factors. However, I discovered in my research report that 100% of children in Cuttack, Odisha, engaged in rag picking due to poverty and poor. Children who pursue this occupation often do so because of poverty and bad living situations. What is the state's function in this situation, and why doesn't it take proactive measures to safeguard rag-picking kids from prejudice?

**Article 7** – *“The child shall be registered immediately after birth”.*

My research focuses on unregistered children who do not have names after birth. When I questioned their parents about why they had not registered their children's names, they responded that they were not of where to do so. One thing I discovered is that because their names are not registered, they are not receiving any services from the Government or society. They are also ignorant of their rights.

**Article 8** – *“The right of the child to preserve his or her identity”*

I discovered that youngsters who clean up trash suffer identity crises during the data-gathering phase. The main issue with rag-picking kids is that they do not know who their parents are because when I asked them about them, they gave me the name of one person, but the neighbours gave me the name of another.

**Article 13** – *“The child shall have the right to freedom of expression”.*

One of a child's most crucial rights is the freedom of expression. Although those children receive an education and are aware of their rights, they are like rag pickers and lack proper identification and educational opportunities, so they are unaware of the meaning of freedom of expression. Because they lack the freedom to express themselves, these children have no voice.

**Article 16** – *“No child shall be subjected to arbitrary or unlawful interference with his or her privacy, family home or correspondence. The child has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks”.*

According to my study, none of the 100 ragpickers' families who reside in Cuttack is recognized by the law. Police frequently visit their Basti when there are criminal incidents in the area and abuse, not just the youngsters but also their family members. Thus, they lack privacy in this sense. They are not opposed to such forms of meddling and attacks since, as I have already indicated, they are not legally recognized by society and lack a voice.

**Article 24**– *“States that Parties recognize the child's right to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health and facilities for the treatment of illness and rehabilitation of health”.*

Children who work as ragpickers in Cuttack City are in grave danger to their physical health. They do not use hand covers while collecting rags, so they occasionally suffer from major cut injuries. Additionally, they must travel a reasonable distance each day for employment, which puts them in danger from traffic. Back pain results from the enormous burdens they carry on their backs. More serious health concerns, like lung conditions, must result from dust and pollution. The lack of adequate or clean water sources at work and in the slum makes it easy for bacterial diseases to spread among workers, making the filth even more deadly. Furthermore, there is little to no hope of receiving compensation if the children suffer disabilities or other adverse effects due to rag-picking. Children who work as ragpickers face significant problems with their mental health.

**Article 25** – *“The right to benefit from social security”*

In India, there is no social security system, which significantly increases the prevalence of child labour. The kids might be unable to feed their families and themselves without rag-picking. This raises challenging problems about how to decrease child labour without escalating poverty. For instance, a complete prohibition on child rag-picking would negatively impact impoverished households, leaving them with a significant income reduction due to the relatively high pay of the job. There are a variety of beliefs about how to lessen child labour without reducing the income of the poor. If child labour were outlawed, fertility patterns might change; once parents learn that it is not an option, they might have fewer kids. However, this is difficult in a nation where youthful marriage and contraception are still somewhat taboo. Other hypotheses contend that prohibiting children from working will lead to labour scarcity and higher adult wage rates, paying adults a minimum wage will increase adult incomes and eliminate the need for child labour, etc. All of these are challenging to put into practice in the instance of rag-picking because it is a self-employed occupation. Investment in social security programmes, especially unemployment benefits, is therefore crucial.

**Article 28**– *“The child's right to education...in particular (a) make primary education compulsory and available to all”.*

The core of rights abuses against ragpicker children is the interaction between prejudice and lack of education. Nearly all other rights specified in the Convention are informed and influenced by the right to education. According to the Childs Rights Information Network, a child's access to quality fundamental education is crucial to their capacity to assert and enjoy the rights of an informed and responsible citizen. Societies can change in a single generation thanks to a high-quality education that promotes children's engagement, critical thinking, and the instillation of the principles of peace and human dignity. The universal elementary education programme was prioritized in India's National Policy on Education in 1986. It was advised that all children up to the age of 14 should have access to free and compulsory education of sufficient quality before the country entered the twenty-first century.

Apart from the fact that the education is frequently of inferior quality, the ragpicker children still encounter significant difficulties even after being admitted to a government-run school. They are mistreated since they are ragpickers by both teachers and other kids. This is a reflection of the widespread prejudice towards them in society. Many people feel ashamed that they are frequently older than their peers. Due to families' inability to continue paying for their children's education and their need for additional income, there is a significant dropout rate.

In summary, education is the key to escaping poverty and careers as hazardous and demeaning as rag-picking. It is undeniably true that educated individuals have more significant earning potential and can subsequently raise the standard of their lives. Even a fundamental education gives people more political and social power since it gives them more choice and control over their life and allows them to engage in society at large actively. In this sense, the ragpickers are genuinely trapped in a vicious cycle because poverty is both a cause and a result of having insufficient access to education. However, it would be far simpler for ragpicker children to escape the

oppressive situations they are currently in if the state had proper control over this fundamental right. Additionally, keeping kids in school is a well-known tactic for minimizing child labour.

**Article 31** – *“The right of the child to rest and leisure, to engage in play and recreational activities”*.

Lack of free time is one issue that ragpicker kids must deal with. In contrast to students in school, they do not have fixed free time or structured days. They enjoy sports and painting a lot, in my experience, but there is not much room to foster creativity. They do so because having sex is enjoyable, but this is problematic because they are frequently inexperienced and unaware of the emotional and physical hazards.

**Article 32** – *“The right of the child to be protected from economic exploitation and 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 Government’s failure to propose or carry out strong anti-rag-picking legislation is a clear breach of this Article.

**Article 37** – (a) *“No child shall be subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment; (b) No child shall be deprived of his or her liberty unlawfully or arbitrarily”*.

Cops frequently apprehend children who pick up trash. They are arbitrarily detained and arrested without due process or substantial evidence against them; illegal detentions and arrests are, by definition, "arbitrary." Children who pick up trash expressed amazement that there were nations where the police were a tightly regulated and respected institution. The fact that the ragpicker children are held without a valid basis has made them lose faith in the police. For instance, two ragpicker kids barely eight years old were detained for two days after being apprehended on suspicion of stealing from a shop. The police beat them and did not let their parents know they were also being held. The police have shown absolutely no respect for due process. The right to know the circumstances surrounding an arrest, the right to appear before a judge or other judicial official without delay after an arrest, and the right to swift administration of justice—whether during a trial or after release—are all fundamental procedural rights of those who are detained. Additionally, those who have been wrongfully arrested are entitled to compensation. Regarding youngsters who work as ragpickers, these laws are not upheld.

**Article 40** – *“The right of every child alleged as, accused of, or recognized as having infringed the penal law to be treated consistently, promoting the child’s sense of dignity and worth”*.

The Indian Penal Code (amended in 1993) and the Code of Criminal Procedure are the two main statutes representing the criminal justice system, which is descended from the British model (1973). Both are subject to the constitution, which in Article 14 outlines the principle of equality before the law. However, how these standards are applied varies greatly depending on the accused’s socioeconomic position and background. Although I am unaware of any ragpicker kids who have gone through the criminal justice system, it is essential to note that the JJ has specific regulations governing the sanctions that can be meted out to kids, which the police and courts ought to abide by. These options include letting the child go home after counsel or reprimand, taking part in group therapy, volunteering, paying fines, being released on probation (Section 15(1)), getting a social investigation report (Section 15(2)), and not having juveniles and adults participate in the same trial (Section 18), among others. These must be rigorously adhered to. There is no doubt that the 1986 Act was not followed. Human Rights Watch reported in 1999 that police in India routinely detained street children without charging them with any crimes and failed to bring them before magistrates within the time frame required by India’s Juvenile Justice Act; beatings are a common feature of police treatment of children in detention.

## II. CONCLUSION

This paper aims to demonstrate how the Government and other elements of Indian society violate the rights of ragpicker children. It is nearly impossible to imagine how the violations, which are so many and widespread and whose causes are intricate and multifaceted, can be adequately curbed. In order to draw attention to these transgressions, SPAN and other NGOs’ work is essential. Organizations like the Campaign Against Child Labor make national-level interventions by raising awareness, suing, advocating, lobbying, etc. However, no matter how much is done at these many levels, a paradigm shift in how society regards ragpickers is vitally necessary. This, in turn, is reliant on the political drive to see child labour, notably rag-picking, as harmful to the nation’s and the children’s health. Current child labour laws and policies are meaningless if they are not correctly implemented, but political will is essential to change. Sadly, it seems that the Government does not currently offer this incentive. The status quo is advantageous to the Government, partly because the ragpickers’ labour results in cost savings. However, teaching the children of ragpickers that there is a universally recognized standard of human rights would ultimately give them more power because they will realize that they are entitled to the same rights as everyone else.

The debates above have demonstrated the importance of human rights for a child’s personality development and its availability to all children worldwide as human beings, regardless of caste, creed, place of birth, sex, or any other factor. No one can live freely without human rights. I will wrap up with a few recommendations that could aid in protecting children’s human rights against infringement. Implementing the

law correctly and fearlessly is the first. The second is that citizens should be vigilant, knowledgeable, and engaged in their Government. The third is that the central and state governments should work together when making decisions regarding the law. The fourth is that central and state governments should implement human rights awareness campaigns. The fifth is that the court should act swiftly and fairly when it comes to cases involving violations of human rights. The sixth is that the government system should be accountable. (IX) The NHRC and SHRC both conduct preventive actions to stop future human rights violations of children who pick up trash. (X) Last but not least, it is everyone's responsibility to defend the human rights of others without reservation.

### References:

- [1]. Adenwalla.M. (2002), Child Rights and Law: a guidebook for legal interventions, Childline India Foundation (CIF), Mumbai.
- [2]. Aron, S.(2002). Let's Give Them Smiles, Not Tears, Times of India, November 17,
- [3]. Barooah, P. P. (1999). Handbook on Child (With Historical Background), Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.
- [4]. Biggeri, M.(2004). Capability Approach and Children Well-being, paper invited International Conference on 'Promoting Human Rights and Social Policies For Children and Women: Monitoring and Achieving the Millennium Goals', UNICEF-The New School of University.
- [5]. Des. G. (2002), Is Sen's Capability Approach an Adequate Basis for Considering Human Development?, Review of Political Economy 14 (4):435-461.
- [6]. Dhand, H., (2002). Teaching Human Rights: A Handbook for Teacher Education, Authors Press, Asian Institute of Human Rights, Bhopal.
- [7]. Eksteins, M. (1997). Rag-picker: Siegfried Kracauer and the mass ornament, International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society, Volume 10 Number 4/June.
- [8]. Gupta, M., (2002). Rights of the Exceptional Child: The Indian Context, Trends and Thoughts in Education, Vol.XIX, pp-42-49.
- [9]. Gupta, N. (2008). Democracy and Human Development in India Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting Government of India, New Delhi.
- [10]. Mandino, O. (1992). The Return of Rag Picker Bantam Hardcover Edition Published, New York.
- [11]. Mishra, R.N. (2003), Child Labour in Hazardous Sectors, Discovering Publishing House, New Delhi.
- [12]. Naseema, C., (2002). Human Rights Education: Conceptual and Pedagogical Aspects, Kanishka Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi.
- [13]. National Plan of Action for Children (2005), Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Women and Child Development, New Delhi.
- [14]. National Policy for Children (1974), Government of India, Department of Social Welfare, New Delhi.
- [15]. Padmanabhan, R. (2000). Suchitra and The Ragpicker, Scholastic Publisher.
- [16]. Pal, R.M. (1998), Send Kids to School to End Child Labour, Times of India, July 3.
- [17]. Sen, A. (1989). Development as Capability Expansion, Journal of Development Planning 19: 48-51
- [18]. Tommaso, M. (2007). Children Capabilities: A Structural Equation Model for India, The Journal of Socio-Economics 36:436-450
- [19]. UNCRC (United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child), adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1990, is the widely accepted UN instrument ratified by most developed and developing countries, including India. The convention provides standards to be adhered to by all State Parties in securing the best interest of the child and outlines the fundamental rights of children.
- [20]. Wolf, G. et al. (2004)Trash: On Ragpicker Children and Recycling, Tara Publishing,