

HAVE WE ASKED THE CHILDREN?

DISCUSSION PAPER

**THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP ON CHILD
LABOUR FEBRUARY 1997**

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

- I. INTRODUCTION
- II. UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE OF CHILD WORK
- III. CHILDREN LIVING AND WORKING IN A CHANGING WORLD
- IV. THE HOLISTIC WELL BEING OF WORKING CHILDREN
- V. HAVE WE ASKED THE CHILDREN
- VI. IN DEFENCE OF their RIGHTS: WORKING CHILDREN AS PROTAGONISTS

APPENDICES:

- I. OBJECTIVES OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP ON CHILD LABOUR
- II. COMPOSITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP ON CHILD LABOUR
- III. RESOURCE PERSONS AND ORGANISATION
- IV. COUNTRY STUDIES
- V. DONORS

I. INTRODUCTION

* Recent years have seen a pronounced upsurge of interest in the work of children. National governments, international agencies, international organisations, local, National and regional NGOs, the trade union community, employers, religious Groups, consumers and the media have all joined the debate with, among other Events and discussions, two major international conferences on child labour – one in Amsterdam in February and another in Oslo in October. Both the conferences will feed into discussions within the ILO on a new Convention to tackle the most intolerable forms of child labour.

* Past experience in this field suggests that there will be many questions as to what should go into such a convention to ensure that it and the accompanying Action plans will really be beneficial to working children, past interventions have not necessarily achieved this, some recommended activities have in fact turned out to be counterproductive and in some cases harmful to the very working children they set out to help.

* this calls for a much more child-centred approach to working children, one which focuses on the child first and foremost, such an approach is backed by the most widely subscribed to international human rights treaty to date, the United Nations convention on the Rights of the child (CRO). One of the guiding principles of the CRC is that ‘the best interest of the child’ be a primary consideration in all efforts to protect the rights of children. This relatively new concept raises many questions with which the world community is currently grappling. What is ‘the best interest of the child’? How is it determined? By whom? And, how is this concept best honoured?

* The international Working Group on Child Labour (IWGCL), established in 1992, felt that these questions could be addressed through a broad field study, which it conducted in 33 countries (see Appendix IV). These studies and other accompanying activities have brought together the information, expertise and experience from a diverse group

including working children, NGOs, resource persons, governments, intergovernmental agencies and international organizations.

* As a result of this process it became apparent that a new conceptual framework is needed to help the major actors think about children and their work. The thinking of the IWGCL has been influenced in this respect through the involvement of working children in its project its consultations with working children which took place in Kundapur, India, in November-December 1996, have provided the IWGCL with a unique and privileged insight into the issues which concern working children as seen from their perspective.

* This discussion paper therefore aims to communicate some of the main points pertinent to such a perspective. It is recognized that the fact that children work is the result of many different factors, and that there are many different thoughts and approaches on how best to address all the elements of this hugely complex issue nor does it attempt to look at all possible solutions. Its focus is on a child-centred approach to working children and its intention is to help inform the discussions at the forthcoming Amsterdam Child Labour Conference on how to combat the most intolerable forms of child labour.

* The final global report of the IWGCL, which will be published later this year, will present the group's comprehensive findings within a new perspective, which focuses on the interventions that are needed to promote the best interest of working children.

II. UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE OF CHILD WORK

* Historically, the working children who have received the most attention are those that have 'intruded' or 'invaded' the world of adults. An example of this is the focus on street children in countries all over the world. The largest groups of working children are less visible and can be found in rural areas, primarily in the economy, in domestic service

outside the home and working within their own homes. These latter two groups are predominantly female and together could represent the largest group of child workers, numerically speaking.

* The work that children do ranges across a whole spectrum, from that which can be beneficial to their normal growth and development (depending of course upon the level of development, gender and ability of the child) to that which is extremely harmful and in some cases intolerable.

* In recognition of this diversity, attempts have been made to try and distinguish between what has been termed as 'work' on the one hand and 'labour' on the other. This has often resulted in a somewhat simple separation of children's work into two categories – the good and the bad.

* Children's work, given its range and diversity, cannot be so neatly classified. Most children work in circumstances that fall somewhere between the extremes of intolerable and beneficial, and out of range of child labour legislation designed to help them, for example, it has not been possible to enforce child labour legislation in sectors where the majority of working children are to be found, such as agriculture, the informal sector and domestic service. The latter is a sector where the invisible workforce of girls is highly concentrated.

* In formulating strategies it is necessary to consider both the characteristics of the work that children do (including occupation and conditions of work) and the characteristics of the child (including level of development, gender and ability).

* This mitigates against a single global strategy, and implies looking at work situations in a more localized and concrete manner in order to ascertain their specific characteristics while, at the same time, keeping the child and his/her situation as the central focus.

* Through this more focused process it will be possible to determine whether a particular type of work is intolerable. If it is the solution must be to remove the children involved in a planned way that not only meets their basic needs, but which also ensures that the basic causes for their working in the first place are rigorously tackled.

* The majority of working children find themselves in the ill-defined areas between work, which is potentially of benefit to them, and that which is intolerable. The reality of continuing poverty suggests that many of these children will probably have to continue to work for the foreseeable future. A commitment to challenge this status quo is needed not just for this group, but for all working children, if the reality of poverty is not to persist indefinitely. This means understanding not only the causes but also the deprivations children face in their lives and which are not necessarily related to the work that they do. If both causes and deprivations are addressed in a comprehensive way, children and their families' will no longer be forced to view the work of children as the most immediate means of improving their situations.

* A more child-centred approach to understanding the nature of child work necessitates understanding it from the perspective of the child, differentiating it from the viewpoint of adults.

III. CHILDREN LIVING AND WORKING IN A CHANGING WORLD

* Poverty is a major factor influencing the entry of the children into the workforce. Families faced with the consequences of absolute poverty are severely constrained in the survival and child protection options open to them.

* However, it is true that, around the world, many children from better-off families also work, sometimes to the detriment of their education. Studies from various countries indicate that, in certain circumstances, children from the poorest families actually work less than their somewhat more prosperous peers. In some industrialized countries, middle-class children are more likely to find jobs than are those from poorer classes

because more employment opportunities may be available to them and, in certain developing regions, rural children from families owning some land may work more than the children of landless families living from seasonal labour.

* In Reality, many factors impact on children and the likelihood of them working or working in potentially harmful situations. Understanding these from both the “micro” standpoint of the family and the “macro” viewpoint of the society is an essential first step toward formulation of successful intervention strategies.

* The pressure, which families and their children feel most directly, include immediate survival strategies – children who work understand this very well. Focusing discussion of child work only on its risks and negative effects ignores the possible costs to children if they do not work. This is only one aspect however. The working child does not exist in isolation. Simple addressing the circumstances of one member of the family could have an effect on the other members through a shifting of work burdens. This can further limit options available and subsequent choices made and could have negative consequences for other adults and children within the family.

* In many cases, family poverty is related not only to income, but also to debt, and many children work to pay family debts, medical fees or their own or their siblings education. Social and cultural factors – including traditional perceptions of childhood and the role of children and gender discrimination – often play a critical role in determining the work of children. More recent influences include changes in family structure, such as rapid increase in female-headed households.

* Children are often taught the value of hard work for the common good as part of their socialization process, and through work, they become an integral part of the community, which, in turn, accords them respect. This social reward is more rural than urban however, in cities the work of children is more likely to be regarded in a negative light. Such negative perceptions promote violence towards children as perceived vagabonds or

delinquents, when in fact the children involved may view their work as an honest alternative.

* Proximate causes of the child work include not only household conditions of income, family structure, gender roles, cultural values and so forth, but also community conditions that bear directly on family options. Ethnic and gender discrimination environmental degradation, climatic changes such as droughts and storms, lack of community control over resources, and even some positive development inputs like irrigation, especially at the local level, may trap families in dependency that throws a heavy work Burdon on their children.

* National and international factors are important underlying causes of child work and the risks accompanying it. During the last decade, the restructuring of national economic through economic stabilization and structural adjustment programmes has in many places, led to declining income for the poor as well as cuts in education, health and other essential publicly founded service on which the poor are especially depended. In deed, many poor families cannot meet the output of pocket expenses (for books, papers, and other supplies, uniform, and sometimes even facilities and tuitions) required to send children to ostensibly free state schools, and many children must work in order to pay these expenses if they wish to attend schools. The World Bank has recognized the need to include social safety nets in adjustment programmes in order to protect the poor, but so far, these are not providing a needful relief, being separated, economic policy making decisions and atomized between different national departments and international agencies.

* Globalisation of life styles in another “macro” influence having a strong impact as children in the world over adopt similar consumer aspirations. Various studies have shown that the desire to purchase fashionable items and consumer goods is increasingly important as a motive of child work in both industrialist and developing countries.

* Major social phenomenon of our times having a pronounced impact on child work include rapid, urbanisation and the rule to urban migrate that fuels it. The least urbanized country of the world which are also generally the poorest, having in recent years exhibited the highest urban in growth rate. The cities have increasingly become centres of deprivation as the rural poor, migrating to what they perceive to be greater economic opportunity, crowd into slums on the very periphery. The problems of being poor in such an environment lead many migrant children to become involved in economic activities often placing them at and in condition so unfamiliar to them that they are easily exploited.

*Traditional public policies and services stagger under the onslaught of spreading poverty massive migration chaotic urbanization and other major social problems. Child labour legislation and inspection models originally designed to control formal sector industries in European towns of a century ago cannot begin to cope with the sprawling rural areas and chaotic cities that today characterize developing countries, or monitor child work in agriculture and the informal sector which lie well beyond practical observation and control. Even more disturbing, is that legislation intended to protect children, particularly through prohibition of their work often turns out in proactive to be regressive and counter-productive, driving child work under ground and making children even more vulnerable to exploitation.

* As educational services feel the pinch of stagnant or reduced per capita budgets and major population shifts, they struggle just to keep up with the number of places needed and quality has in many places suffered seriously. For many children, school is not an accessible, productive or happy place, and it is therefore wrong to assume that children freed from full time work burdens would necessarily perceive that returning to school is their vest option. Recent case studies in Bangladesh and morocco have shown that children removed from work do not automatically go back to school. In the first place having been absent from the formal education system in the first place are addressed even relevant schooling can remain out of reach. All over the world child enthusiasm for

school is dampened by the difficulty of achieving in schools which do not cater to the heterogeneous needs of working children, girls and rural children. Disillusionment leads to grade repetition, low attendance and eventual dropout. Some children say they learn through work. There should be opportunities to do this within the education system, an opportunity now altogether too often denied them through discrimination against those who work.

* A full understanding of how children come to be working is essential before planning interventions to ensure that they are not inappropriate, even harmful, and that they promote the well-being of children.

* The options available to children and their families determine the choices that are made. When children and their families are faced with a severely constrained or limited set of options there may be no choice but to let children work, even in potentially harmful situations. The challenge is to expand and enhance the options available. The state has an important responsibility in this regard. The widespread ratification of the CRC commits governments all over the world to ensuring that children have full access to a whole range of services which will enable them to grow and develop to their fullest potential.

IV. THE HOLISTIC WELL-BEING OF WORKING CHILDREN

* The need to remember and address the holistic well-being of the child is clearly defined in the CRC, which has been ratified by nearly all countries. It clearly sets out and describes a set of child rights which constitute the fundamental standards to which all countries should orient their policy and practice, and it impels that all relevant rights should always be taken into consideration, not only the single one which may superficially appear to relate to the concern of the moment. Thus while the CRC explicitly grants children the right to be protected from all forms of exploitation, it is important in policy formulation to ensure that the universal rights for all children as provided for within this convention including adequate survival needs such as food and

shelter, family solidarity and especially participation in decisions affecting their welfare are met.

* Rodent case studies from Morocco and Bangladesh – both instances in which children were suddenly dismissed from their work without regard to any safety net provisions – demonstrate the unintentional harm that can be done to children through interventions that do not carefully consider the consequences in terms of their best interest. A narrow focus on exploitation in the workplace as simply a violation of minimum age standards, a concern in both countries largely orchestrated from the outside left the children involved – almost all girls – in even worse shape and with lessened prospects for the future than when working. The solution is not to disregard inappropriate child work. In both cases children were working long hours and not receiving education or training unacceptable; condition clearly needing clearly needing correction. However, a broader view of the needs of the children involved must be taken, ensuring that they are not merely shunted from one high risk environment to another.

* It is such obvious common sense that the full range of children needs should be taken into consideration when deciding what to do for those caught in damaging work that it must be asked who so apparent a principle seems so often to be neglected.

*The answer, it seems, lies in the historical fact that the ‘traditional’ measures against child work were invented in early 19th century Europe, specifically to deal with child work in a few types of industrialized workplaces – most notably textile mills and mines – and were subsequently extended by colonial administrations and international agreements to developing countries whose child work problems have little in common with the European conditions which these interventions were designed to address. Indeed even in Britain where most of the regulations were first introduced recent studies indicate that they are not working very well to protect working children in today’s world. It is clear that ideas, approaches and mechanisms whose relevance and effectiveness have been eroded by time and changing world conditions, need to be modified or replaced by methods better attuned to today’s realities, especially in developing countries.

* There is particularly need to reconsider national laws and policies ad the international standards intended to orient them. Laws reflect a certain view of childhood, and the globalize view ensconced in traditional legal prohibitions on most child work below a given age does not always correspond to reality in which they are meant to operate. There is also a question of whether such laws reflect the proper responsibility of the State, especially whether it should be the sole arbiter and guarantor of child right and whether the state as such effectively makes it impossible for children to act on their own behalf. Compulsory education for example, can confine children to schools which are so inferior in quality that the development of the child is compromised. On the other hand, if the state commits itself to providing access for all children to education of good quality, the case for compulsory education is more easily justified.

V. HAVE WE ASKED THE CHILDREN?

* Children are the persons most affected by child work problems and yet are the ones who are least consulted about them. Much time and expertise have over the years been devoted to struggling with the ‘dilemma’ of working children, presuming child work to be a social evil in which children are victims to be ‘rescued’ ‘rehabilitated’ and converted to a lifestyle considered more ‘normal’ for them. However not all children view the work they do as a social ill, and they resent the negative connotations others ascribe to their work which in many, but certainly not all, cases is of value to them, their families and even their society.

* Condemnation of all child work without first enhancing the options available to children runs the risk of harming them by placing them in a totally dependant position in which they are unable to pursue and realize their own aspirations and potential. There is an urgent need to widen the choices and to involve children and young people in decision making processes concerning their status and future. Through this, it will be possible to define problems and encounter solutions that are closer to the realities of children’ own world of experience and which therefore make sense to them.

* There is now a growing body of expertise and experience which can be drawn upon in the design and implementation of interventions with an overall positive impact on the children they are supposed to benefit. Many of these have their origins in NGO or community initiatives and there is an increasing realisation of the need to build upon them as well as for governments to take a more pro-active role. Otherwise grassroots success will remain 'oases in the desert', micro' in scale and therefore limited in impact, unless recognized, accepted and promoted by both national and international bodies.

* Legislation, for example, can be used in an innovative way to educate, empower and enable rather than to simply prohibit and punish. One of the most notable examples of this comes from Brazil where national standards have been established and enacted. However, the operational responsibilities for implementing children's rights has been devolved by central government and mandated to joint government- NGO child protection councils in every municipality. These councils have the legal authority. This coming together of government, NGOs and the community has been fundamental in ensuring widespread mobilization in favor of children's rights within the country and provides an important lesson in partnership. While it may be neither feasible nor desirable to simply advocate replication of the practice of Brazil around the world, the basic principle and framework, especially that of 'children first', may well be generally applicable.

* Similarly, there are initiatives in the education field which demonstrate innovation and empowerment, From Brazil and Colombia in Latin America, to Bangladesh and India in Asia, to name but a few examples, individual projects have shown how it is possible to provide working children with access to good, child-focused basic education. While much of this has been done through non-formal education programmes it has also proved possible for children in some of these programmes to integrate into the mainstream formal education system. Many of these programmes having a flexible approach so schooling provide children with an education for living rather than merely a preparation for moving up to the next level or grade. This entails a willingness to adapt

to local circumstances and identified needs. As with legislation, these approaches need a commitment from the State to ensure that they reach all children and provide universal access to high quality education. A commitment which is underpinned by the philosophy of providing schools for children rather than children for schools meets the fundamental right of every child to have access to good quality education.

* Designing and implementing interventions which really work for working children requires collaboration with them understanding the problems and the realities they face, listening to and giving legitimacy to their demands, providing them with inputs and information about their rights, facilitating and providing them with space to freely organize and providing a platform for their voices to be heard in matters and decisions concerning them as articulated in the CRC. There must be a commitment to talk through planned interventions with working children who are supposed to benefit from them. This will ensure that strategies have positive consequences for children and are of relevance to their lives. Because there are circumstances when this may simply not be possible all interventions should have built-in process which allow for monitoring their impact upon children based upon previously defined criteria or indicators. Flexible programming is the key to ensuring that interventions not only adapt to changing circumstances and dynamics but also respond quickly, effectively and positively to the results of such monitoring.

Successful intervention to combat the explanation faced by working children cannot be undertaken alone by one single actor. It involves a coming together of experience from many different quarters and opinions in the search of solutions, which consider and attempt to tackle basic causes in a vertical attack right down to the roots rather than a horizontal slicing off top layers of the problem. Solutions, which tackle all the deprivations children face will not be focused exclusively on the work situations. They will rather promote widening of consciousness through involvement of the major players, including working children themselves.

VI. IN DEFENCE OF THEIR RIGHTS: WORKING CHILDREN AS PROTAGONISTS

* Protagonist- the right to mobilise and organise in order to improve or better one's situation- is a universally recognised fundamental right. However, when it comes to working children this right is questioned. Working children like all others facing exploitation or deprivation have this right. It is their way of acting to change their lives and to find solutions. Working Children see their organisation as a means of demanding and establishing their rights both as children and as workers. They also see the movement they form as having a broad social purpose on behalf of working children, as well as children as a group.

* One of the most sacred principles of the ILO is that workers shall be represented by their own elected representatives. There is no cause of the ILO that is more important or central than the right of the workers to organise. However, to date, this principle has only been applied to adult workers. The ILO works within a tripartite alliance between governments, employers and worker's organisation in which it insists on and advocates the right of the organised labour to always be represented in negotiation. Organised movements, even if their actual membership is limited, do represent the concerns and demands and reflect the aspirations of the many, while individuals represent no group at all. The same principle applies for organisations of working children. These organisations are spreading and increasingly represent the concerns and aspirations of working children from many parts of the world. Children use them to help keep work beneficial to them from becoming exploitative.

* Working children, acting on their own behalf through their organisations have already been able to bring about changes to address the problems they face. The negotiations of social security rights for working children in Peru and the resolution of various problems through organised working children's representation and participation in local Panchayats in South India are just two notable examples of this.

* Representatives of organised working children met for the first time at the Global level during the recent International Meeting of Working Children held in Kundapur, India, in November-December 1996. The ten days of meetings provided them with the space in which they could articulate their concerns and demands, based on an analysis of their reality and insight into the circumstances, which cause them to work. Their meeting culminated in a two- day International Consultation with national and international observers, during which working children set out ten recommendations. These ten recommendations (the Kundapur Declaration) were reached by consensus during ten days of deliberation as well as prior processes through which children had mobilised and organised themselves in defence of their rights.

The Kundapur Declaration

1. We want recognition of our problems, our initiatives, proposals, and our process of organisation.
2. We are against the boycott of products made by children.
3. We want respect and security for ourselves and the work that we do.
4. We want an education system of which the methodology and content are adapted to our reality.
5. We want professional training adapted to our reality and capabilities
6. We want access to good health care for working children.
7. We want to be consulted in all decisions concerning us, at local, national or international levels.
8. We want the root causes of our situations, primarily poverty, to be addressed and tackled.
9. We want more activities in rural areas and decentralisation in decision making, so that children will no longer be forced to migrate to the cities.
10. We are against exploitation at work, but we are in favour of work with dignity and appropriate hours, so that we have time for education and leisure.

Among these ten recommendations was the demand that their right to be consulted in decisions concerning them to be respected and translated into a reality at the local, national, and international level. This is a right recognised by the world community through its widespread ratification of the CRC yet, as these children testified, it is rarely practised. They are very aware that there is still no automatic channel through which their future will be governed. The children demanded an equal place and an equal voice in these debates, particularly in relation to the international conferences on child labour which are taking place this year and the international debate concerning the proposed new ILO convention on the most intolerable forms of child labour.

*Future questions and challenges that must be addressed include:

- How to find organised space for children in all tasks and discussions in which their future is decided?
- How to obtain the right to representation for children in a world in which this is not seen so far as a right?
- How to give legitimacy to movements of working children such as that given to adult workers' movements, which mandate representatives to speak on their behalf?

*All countries participating in the ongoing international meetings and debates have ratified the CRC. This convention clearly states that children have the right to be heard and the right to freedom of association. Working children are concerned that their voices be heard in a way which is just and which can be made to incorporate as broad a number of children as possible, especially the international level, and this necessarily entails organised representation.

*Working children and adults need to find a way to work together on this issue in order to answer these questions and meet these challenges. Policy makers would be making a grave mistake to ignore this. Interventions, which are designed which ignore working children and what they have to tell us will result in yet more failure to tackle and to solve the problem effectively.

Appendix I: Objectives of the International Working Group on Child Labour.

The IWGCL was established by the International Society for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (ISPCAN) and Defence for Children International (DCI) in September 1992. It has drawn its core membership from NGO community combining both its academic and activist elements (see Appendix II)

The purpose of the IWGCL has been to develop and promote, together with a wide range of partners, comprehensive and specific strategies for the eradication of exploitative child work. A broader perspective aims to bring the issue of child work centre stage, create the space for the specific strategies to be discussed and facilitate the inception of a world wide movement which brings together working children, NGOs and other major actors.

Within this wider context, the IWGCL has four main objectives:-

- * To influence government policies and programmes and to propose effective strategies to be undertaken both by intergovernmental bodies and governments leading to the abolition for child labour, based on knowledge and analysis of the problem and experience of grass root groups working in the field of child labour, to ensure that these proposals contain concrete actions that take into account regional differences and meet the needs of those grass-root and other groups that are combating child labour.
- * To share knowledge and experience in the area of child labour with international agencies (intergovernmental and non-governmental) in order to build solutions and ensure their effective implementation at the country level.
- * To facilitate and ensure the active participation of grass-roots activities in the development of these alternatives and enable them to exercise pressure on the corresponding governments for their implementation.

* To facilitate and to ensure (wherever possible) the active, equal and intimate participation of working Children in the development of these alternatives, as well as in efforts to improve their working conditions.

Appendix II: Composition of the International Working Group on Child labour

Chairperson:	Nandana Reddy (The Concerned for Working Children, India)
Vice-Chair	Maria Cristina Salazar (Defense for Children International, Colombia)
Treasurer:	Stan Meuwese (Defense for Children International, Netherlands)
Members:	Jaap Doek (Free University-Amsterdam, Netherlands) Martin Garate (Defense for children International Chile) Esin Konanc (University of Ankara, Turkey) Margaret Lynch (University of London/Guy's Hospital, United Kingdom) Philista Onyango (African Network for the Prevention and Protection of Child Abuse and Neglect, Kenya) Brain Raftopoulos (Zimbabwe Institute of Development Studies, Zimbabwe)
Secretariat:	
Project Coordinator:	Clare Festinsten (United Kingdom)
Joint Coorinator:	Caroline Gorissen (Netherlands)
Assistant Coordinator	Juli Neiebuhr (Germany)

Appendix III: Resource persons and organisations

Fatima Badry Zalami	(University Hassan II Morocco)
Henk Van Beers	(InDRA, Netherlands)
Bhima Sangha	(South India)
Concerned for Working Children	(South India)
Peter Crowley	(International Save the Children Alliance, Switzerland)
ENDA-Jeunesse Action	(West Africa)
Judith Ennew	(International Consultant, United Kingdom)
Sandy Hobbs	(University of Paisley, Scotland)
Edda Ivan Smith	(Save the Children, United Kingdom)
Julian Kramer	(Redd Barna, Norway)
Tone Lauvdal	(Redd Barna, Norway)
Birgitta Ling	(Redd Barna, Sweden)
Manthoc	(Peru)
Babu Mathew	(National Law School, India)
Jim McKechnie	(University of Paisley, Scotland)
Bill Myers	(UNICEF-CEDC)
National Movement for Street boys and Girls	(Brazil)
Sarah Oloko	(University of Lagos, Nigeria)
Dita Reichenberg	(UNICEF-CEDC)
Beate Scherrer	(Terre des Hommes, Germany)
Asha de Souza	(Terre des Hommes, Switzerland)
West African Movement of Working Children and Youth	(West Africa)
Ben White	(Institute of Social Studies, Netherlands)
Sezen Zeytinnoglu	(ISPCAN, Turkey)

International Meeting of Working Children, 1996

Appendix IV: Country Studies

(i) In-depth country Studies

AFRICA

Kenya
Nigeria
Zimbabwe

ASIA

India
Nepal
Thailand

EUROPE

Britain
Portugal
Romania
Turkey

LATIN AMERICA

Brazil
Colombia
Guatemala

MIDDLE EAST

Egypt
Jordan
Morocco
Brazil

NORTH AMERICA

(ii) Supplementary Country studies

AFRICA

Mozambique
Senegal
South Africa

ASIA

Bagladesh
Indonesia
Sri Lanka
Vietnam

EUROPE

Greece
Italy
Netherlands

LATIN AMERICA

Russia
Spain
Bolivia
Chile

NORTH AMERICA

Canada
USA

Appendix V: Donors

Norwegian Agency for Development cooperation (Norway)

Department for development Cooperation – Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Netherlands)

Swedish international Development Authority (Sweden)

European Commission

Danish International Development Assistance (Denmark)

Federatie Nederlands Vakbeweging (Netherlands)

Redd Barna (Norway)

Radda barnen (Sweden)

Interchurch organisation for development cooperation (Netherlands)

Overseas Development Administration (United Kingdom)

International Federation terre des hommes

General Board of Global Ministries- the United Methodist Church (United States of America)

Christian Children's Fund of Canada (Canada)

Hamline University School of Law, St Paul, Minnesota (United States of America)

Christelijk National Vakverbond (Netherlands)

Terre des hommes (Germany)

Terre des hommes (Switzerland)

Hivos (Netherlands)

Misereor (Germany)

Kinderen in de knel (Netherlands)

World Council of Churches

Kinderpostzegels (Netherlands)

UNICEF CEDC, New York

Mensen in Nood/Caritas (Netherlands)

Embassy of Canada, Peru

PNEM (Netherlands)

Stephen Rubins (United Kingdom)

International Working Group on Child Labour

Office of the Chairperson
Concerned for Working Children
303/2 L.B Shastri Nagar
Vimanapura Post
Bangalore 560017, India

Secretariat
C/O DCI-NL
PO Box 75297
NL- 1070 AG Amsterdam
Netherlands