International Journal of Applied Social Science ***RESEARCH ARTICLE***
Volume 4 (11&12), November & December (2017) : 656-665 ISSN : 2394-1405
Received : 25.10.2017; Revised : 23.11.2017; Accepted : 30.11.2017

Begging for Inclusion: State Response to Beggary in India

MOHAMMAD SHAHID AFROZ
Doctoral Candidate
Centre for Comparative Politics and Political Theory
Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi (India)

ABSTRACT

The last few decades have seen rapid urbanisation in India. Some of the pull factors cited behind the movement of population from rural places to urban centres are opportunities for jobs, education, healthcare, etc. On the other hand, there are many push factors responsible behind the movement of people; factors such as natural disasters, discrimination, forced labour, etc. While these factors bring people to cities, their migration often also entails stress, higher costs of living, and marginalisation. Apart from creating issues of hygiene and environmental problems, rapid urbanisation in India has led to an increase in slum population and has given rise to homelessness. There are other causes as well behind homelessness; unavailability of employment opportunities, poverty, lack of affordable housing, mental illnesses, disabilities, substance abuse, and social exclusion being quite significant amongst many others. Many of these homeless and jobless people take to begging for survival. Those who beg are among the most vulnerable people in society. But rather than being seen as a problem of social exclusion, begging is largely seen as an anti-social behaviour. Begging is a criminal offence in most of the Indian states and union territories. When State is seen as a guardian of its people, the Indian State — rather than addressing the underlying social and structural causes behind begging — has kept an archaic, Victorian law intact to deal with the issue of begging by means of incarcerating those who beg. This papertries to look into the causes as to why the State criminalises and punishes the people who are into begging; and also, what might be the political costs involved in keeping this colonial act intact rather than repealing it.

Key Words : State, Justice, Rights, Criminalisation, Bombay Prevention of Begging Act, 1959

Despite tremendous changes that have taken place in Indian society, economy and polity over all the decades after Independence, the archaic colonial laws against beggary have not only persisted, new ones have also been formulated and enacted. Laws such as the Bombay Prevention of Begging Act, 1959 and all its clones are reminders of our colonial hangover. Their continuity puts a question mark on the nature of the Indian state. The people begging in the Indian cities are manifest reminders of the many failures of successive

How to cite this Article: Afroz, Mohammad Shahid (2017). Begging for Inclusion: State Response to Beggary in India. *Internat. J. Appl. Soc. Sci.,* **4** (11 & 12) : 656-665.

governments and their policies in dealing with destitution. To understand it better, we need to see how it all started and progressed.

Begging from a historical perspective:

Since antiquity, human beings have been sympathetic to the sufferings of other human beings. In the olden days, the number of the needy was very low, and the humanitarian and ethical impulses of human beings were sufficient to meet the problems of the needy group (Gore *et al.,* 1959). Begging is a phenomenon which was hardly present in the primitive societies. It is something which came into existence in civil society. Even in the early civil societies, there were certain phenomena which had pre-empted beggary: phenomena such as prostitution, slavery, vassalage, etc. (Gillin, 1929; Gore *et al.,* 1959). Pande (1986) also holds a similar view. He says that in ancient India, the members of the social group lived in relative equality. In this kind of a social system, every member's disability (biological or social) was treated as a collective affair, and was provided for by the immediate family of kinship group. Relying on public charity was hardly present albeit, in a different form, seeking of alms was present in the way the *ashram* education system functioned as pupils used to go to households and sustain themselves through collecting alms.

According to Gillin (1929), begging emerges from social and economic disorganisation. In Israel, there is no trace of begging until the eighth century BCE when agricultural and pastoral economy was disturbed by growing commercial activities. Attempts were made for another two-three centuries to prevent such distress by different means. It is a phenomenon of the later centuries that beggary can be seen publicly.

In Rome, as the empire started to decay and disorganise, the problem of begging started to grow. The advent of Christianity gave rise to the belief that one can wash one's sin by the act of almsgiving. Monasticism strengthened this belief by propounding that those who took to asceticism and lived on what people gave them, and those who gave charity were both benefitting. One because he had taken to asceticism and was living only on what God's people had offered him, and the other because he was giving so as holy men could survive. Thus, Monasticism provided sanctity to begging from both the sides of the giver and the receiver. Thus, it was man's deeply rooted desire to free himself from sin that he either took to asceticism or to give charity (ibid.).

Other religions also teach their followers about being sensitive to the needs and suffering of other human beings and help them in as many ways as are possible. Charity is one way of alleviating the sufferings of others, as long as the sufferings arise from material needs. Hence, in order to help the needy and to ease their sufferings, religions have sanctioned charity. In Buddhist literature, we find instances of public charity. Buddhist teachings and law of *karma* serve as a motivational force for charity. Islam also decrees that every Muslim must give one fortieth of total wealth annually as *zakaat*. This is yet another example of importance attached to charity (Gore *et al.,* 1959).

Further, different events in history such as wars, epidemics or pandemics, as well as economic disturbances rendered people workless. In such situations, people had no other option but to beg (ibid.). Pande (1986) puts forth another way of looking at it. While he uses the term 'social parasitism' for living on alms, he classifies three impetuses behind begging:

one, economic necessity due to extreme level of poverty and destitution; two, because of religious motivation as in the case of *sadhu, sanyasi, darvesh* and *faqirs*; and three, hedonistic considerations designed to avoid the drudgery of hard work and industry.

Anti-vagrancy and beggary prevention laws:

Anti-vagrancy and anti-begging laws trace their origins to the England of fourteenth century. It was a time when feudalism was giving way to capitalist mode of production. In mid-fourteenth century, the Black Death — one of the most devastating pandemics in human history — killed about seventy-five million people (Dunham, 2008). This huge loss of lives resulted in shortage of labour. Also, people saw better prospects in industrial work and migrated from villages to big towns and cities for better wages. This resulted in a huge shortage of labour in villages for the feudal class, and demands for better wages increased. In addition to this, movement of labourers from villages to towns and cities also eventuated (Gillin, 1929).

To tackle the problem of the movement of labour, the first anti-vagrancy law — The Statute of Labourers — was promulgated by Edward III and his council in the year 1349 CE. It was enacted by the Parliament in 1378 under the reign of Richard II (Gillin, 1929). This law was also implemented in order to prohibit people from living in cities without proper housing and, therefore, criminalising homelessness (Gillin, 1929; Chambliss, 1964; Ocobock, 2008). Consequently, by criminalising homelessness, what it also did was that it ensured that people remained in villages and not move to cities. And thus, poor villagers were kept tied with their feudal lords and the wages were kept low (Chambliss, 1964; Ocobock, 2008). The basic nature of the statutes remained more or less unchanged for the next one and a half century, and whatever little changes occurred, they were only to increase the severity of the punishment (Chambliss, 1964).

During the reign of Edward VI, the law provided that if a person offers work to a vagabond, and is denied, he can take the person as a slave for two years. Such a vagabond had to be presented before two judges who got him marked with the letter 'V' (vagabond) and presented him to the person who brought the vagabond to the judges. Absconding once attracted the penalty of being branded with letter 'S' (slave) either on the forehead or the cheek. Running away for second time was such a felony that the person had to suffer death (Gillin, 1929; Chambliss, 1964).

Later, in the statute of 1508 CE, the focus of the vagrancy statute shifted from movement of labourers to control of felons; and this change in statute was primarily because of changes that were taking place in the social structure of England during that period (Chambliss, 1964). Vagrancy attracted as harsh a punishment as death penalty where the offence was repeated twice, that is, in the third occurrence of the violation of the statute (ibid.).

As the sixteenth century started nearing its end, the law was reformulated and it allowed impotent people to beg with a permit from parish officers. Discharged soldiers and mariners also had the permission to beg but not without getting passes for the purpose. In 1656, the Cromwellian parliament put a legal framework in place whereby a judge could punish wandering people as vagabonds and rogues even if they were not begging. These measures also gave the judge an authority to punish such people who were making music or asking

people to hear them make music (Eccles, 2012).

During the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries many amendments and changes happened to vagrancy and many were replaced by new vagrancy laws. In 1792, a new poor law called the 'Vagrant Act of 1792' was passed. This new law was enacted to address many complaints about the existing poor laws not being implemented and also there were voices in favour of tougher measures (ibid.).

Although anyone could catch a vagrant and produce him before a justice of peace, most of the arrests were made by constables and thus, the implementations of the vagrancy legislation were primarily carried out by constables and justices of peace. These constables used to serve without pay as a parish duty though they got certain allowances. But these constables used to face criticism for not being as enthusiastic about arresting vagrants as their superiors wished them to be. The justices of peace also served without pay although they were given wages for the sessions that they attended (ibid).

Despite the 1792 law having been reformed because of public cries, there still were complaints that the vagrant laws were *abused* as public demanded a stricter enforcement and also, tougher penalties. In all this, the justices blamed the constables for not being alert and dutiful. They complained that the constables failed to apprehend the vagrants as they were negligent. They also accused that constables even took bribes from the vagrants and made a good amount of money. The peace officers said that arresting vagrants wad pointless as the justices always released them rather than punishing them. The constables, on the other hand, had the point that the public was not supportive enough so that the streets could be cleared of the vagrants (ibid).

The usual sentences for the vagrants were to be sent to a jail for up to a month or whipped. The rogue or the vagabond had to be whipped so many times that his body be bloodied (ibid).

In the United States:

Different states of the United States adopted the vagrancy laws of mid-eighteenth century England, with minor or no changes. In addition, the vagrancy laws of the States were even more concerned about controlling criminals, undesirables and the unruly than was the case in England. Controlling criminals and undesirables was the *raison d'être* of vagrancy laws of the eighteenth century United States. This is equally true in today's context as well (Chambliss, 1964). But this is not to say that the anti-migrant nature of the law had diminished totally because during the Great Depression, the state of California used the vagrancy law to restrict entry of migrants from other states (ibid).

In Canada:

In Canada, as in the United States, the vagrancy legislation was entirely based on its English counterpart. It dates back to as early a time as 1759 CE. The perception about vagrants was that they were highly problematic to the well-being of the nation. Here also, the primary focus of the law was regarding vagabonds, criminals, rogues, and other idle and disorderly persons, and about houses of correction (Ranasinghe, 2010). The nature of the law largely remained unchanged until the mid-twentieth century when certain amendments

were done owing to many shortcomings and inconsistencies in the law (ibid.).

In France:

In September 1777, an officer of the Royal Constabulary in the city of Rennes arrested three men who were begging and were not the local residents of the city. After cross-examination, they were sent to a building which served as a jail and workhouse for beggars. Adams (1990) says that arrest and incarceration of beggars was routine in early modern Europe. In France, it was exercised through two enactments viz. the Declaration of 1764 against vagabonds and the order in council of October 21, 1767 (Adams, 1990).

In India:

In eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, occurrences of repeated famines in India resulted in huge loss of lives. The effect of these famines was not fully felt until the starving poor left the countryside – where famines generally originated – in search of food and shelter, and came to urban centres bringing their plight along (Arnold, 2008).

Because of this movement of famine-struck people from countryside to cities, vagrancy increased. In the late 1830s in Calcutta, the problem of vagrancy got so much intensified that the society urged the government to pass a vagrancy act. This public outcry for a vagrancy act was rejected by the government primarily because of the scale of the problem. But also, the government did not want to hurt Hindu and Muslim sentiment by enacting a law whereby, seemingly, religious mendicancy and almsgiving would be prohibited (ibid).

The forerunner to all the vagrancy laws in India is the European Vagrancy Act, 1874 (ibid). But it was enacted to deal with vagrants of "European extraction" and not Indian vagrants (European Vagrancy Act, 1874). Thereafter, section 109 (b) of the old Code of Criminal Procedure prohibited vagrancy. Then, the Indian Railways Act of 1941 proscribes begging in railway premises anywhere in India (Bhattacharyya, 1977). After this, many state level acts were formulated and enacted. The first amongst them is the West Bengal Vagrancy Act, 1943 followed by many other provinces such as Bombay, Travancore and Madras (all in 1945) (Press Information Bureau, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Government of India, 2010).

The Bombay Beggars Act, 1945 is a precursor to the Bombay Prevention of Begging Act, 1959 (hereinafter BPBA) which forms the basis of the subject of this paper.

A glance at the law:

The BPBA was enacted in the year 1959, with the purpose of preventing people from begging, and rehabilitating them by imparting vocational skills to people in begging. However, its objectives, and motives remain questionable since it is inherently punitive in nature because of the way it define 'begging', and the way it functions.

The definitions of begging as given in the Act are as follows:

— Soliciting or receiving alms, in a public place, *whether or not under any pretence* such as singing, dancing, fortune-telling, performing or offering any article for sale [emphasis added].

— Entering on any private premises for the purpose of soliciting or receiving alms.

— Exposing or exhibiting, with the object of obtaining or extorting alms, any sore, wound, injury, deformity, or disease whether of a human being or animal.
— *Having no visible means of subsistence* and, wandering about or remaining in any public place in such condition or manner, as makes it likely that the person doing so exists by soliciting or receiving alms [emphasis added].
— Allowing to be used oneself as an exhibit for the purpose of soliciting or receiving alms (Government of Maharashtra, 1976).

By definition, singing, dancing, performing, fortune-telling, or offering article for sale are pretences of begging. While the arts and performance industry in the formal sector is flourishing in the country, when poor people perform on the streets, it is deemed as begging. Similarly, well known astrologers and god-men are treated as celebrities but fortune tellers soliciting clients on the streets are deemed as beggars. Sale of goods and articles in the formal space is legitimate business but people hawking goods and wares on the streets are criminalised by the law. And for these offences, there are provisions of detention for up to ten years, and in certain cases, life time. These clauses — along with many others — of the Act are violative of basic human rights, and therefore, are a matter of concern.

Overview of the Situation:

In the early days of the vagrancy laws of England, if a person who was into begging, did not have a place to live in the city, was sent back to his native place (Gillin, 1929). This bears a striking resemblance to the situation in India today. In 2007, inmates from the beggars' homes of Delhi were released under the condition that they would go back home. This can be done under section 5 (5) of the BPBA (Ramanathan, 2008). It strikes as strange that a law of twentieth century India bears so much resemblance to a law of England which was formulated centuries ago and was basically meant to control movement and wages of labour. This anti-migrant nature of the BPBA is tantamount to the curtailment of the right of citizens to move about and live anywhere in the territory of India (ibid.).

All the anti-begging laws are based on the assumption that individuals choose idleness voluntarily and also that idleness entails criminality (Goel 2010). Some of the labels attached to people into begging are "ugly face of nation's capital", "obstructers of smooth flow of traffic", "trespassers", and "encroachers on public land" (ibid.). But as has gone in the preceding paragraphs, vagrancy laws had primarily been formulated to check the movement of labour so that they remained tied up to their feudal lords; and their wages remained low.

The BPBA is a reminder of the colonial mindset from which we still have not got ourselves free. The people it criminalises are not actual offenders, rather they are *status offenders*. They offend by being what they are, rather than by doing what they do (Ramanathan, 2008). The Act is problematic at two levels; one is at the conceptual level, the other is at the execution level. First, the assumption that one chooses idleness of her/his own free will is problematic because hardly any one does that; and the assumption that idleness leads to criminality is problematic to the same extent (ibid.). Second, most of the times, there are false arrests, as a committee appointed by the Bombay High Court concluded:

— The arrest is made of the people who are found on the street in dirty clothes and wandering. They are not actually found begging.

— Large number of wrong arrests is made which is inhumane and unjust.
— There are no criteria to decide who is a beggar, who is sick, physically handicapped or in need of economic help (cited in Ramanathan, 2008).

When all the laws define certain actions as crimes, vagrancy laws do not make any specific action or inaction illegal (Ocobock, 2008) but they criminalise the state of being of an individual. Throughout history, those who have been arrested for vagrancy have been poor, young, able-bodied, unemployed, rootless and homeless people.Yet it has been the seeming voluntary unemployment and mobility of people for which vagrancy laws have been designed (ibid.).

This act targets that echelon of the society which is the most vulnerable group, whose lives are marred by lack of choices, too much of necessity and often undeserved want. The Constitution and law are supposed to protect the ones who are less equal than others (Ramanathan 2008) but what they are actually doing in this case are pushing the already marginalised population to further deprivation. Beggary primarily is indicative of extreme poverty. It is the absolute failure on the part of an individual to sustain effectively through certain means of productivity and livelihood (Sarkar, 2007). The individuals trapped in beggary must be given support so that they could pull themselves out of it. Merely incarcerating them in Beggars' Homes only exacerbates the problem rather than mitigating it. According to D. Seers, "[t]he questions to ask about a country's development are: What has been happening to poverty? What has been happening to inequality? What has been happening to unemployment? If all three of these have become less severe, then beyond doubt this has been a period of development.... If one or two of these central problems have been growing worse, especially all three have, it would be strange to call the result 'development', even if per capita income doubled" (cited in Sarkar, 2007). And since all the problems mentioned here have been getting bad to worse, the problem of beggary is also increasing. And if we do not address the causes of the problem, and involve ourselves only to take care of the effects, it will only prove to be like an anodyne. The major problem will remain unchanged.

The phenomenon of beggary and the act of begging do not originate from a vacuum. Many factors and processes are responsible for the fact that someone takes up begging for sustaining oneself and his/her family. The factors that push an individual, a family, or a group of people towards beggary are many. Extreme poverty, physical disability, mental illness, old age, migration, drug addiction, and unemployment, destitution, broken homes, unguided childhood, debts, natural calamities, death of the earning member in the family, and chronic and pernicious diseases are many of the reasons which push people into begging. It also needs mention here that these causes are not mutually exclusive. An individual might face many of these simultaneously (Mukerjee, 1943; Indian Conference of Social Work 1957; Gore *et al.,* 1959). Apart from these, there is religious mendicancy. Another very frequent cause of beggary is workers getting displaced from land. Such workers, when they are unable to find employment or work, are forced to beg for subsistence (Mukerjee, 1943).

People suffer from a plethora of problems, they start begging only after all the options of livelihood are exhausted. In such a state of affairs, the State – rather than coming up with measures to counter the effects of their problems – steps in to criminalise and punish the people who are *guilty of being destitute*. Such is the nature of this Act that it criminalises

people for being what they are rather than what they do (Goel, 2010).

All the anti-begging laws assume that people freely choose idleness and also, that idleness is a potential source of criminality. But begging is a social problem and must not be seen as a crime (ibid.). By legislating laws such as the BPBA, our legislators have proved that we are still living in our colonial hangover.

As has been discussed earlier, the BPBA is a statute under which begging is punishable offence (up to three years of detention in first instance and in repeated cases, may go up to ten years; and lifetime in some cases) (Government of Maharashtra, 1976). The Act was formulated and passed to curb the issue of beggary such that people into begging could be rehabilitated by providing them some vocational training. The training and capacity building would help them in getting employment. But the way it is implemented and, the way beggar and beggary have been defined in the Act, make it a very anti-poor act (Tarique and Raghavan 2011). Article 41 of the Constitution of India states that *"the State shall, within the limits of its economic capacity and development, make effective provision for securing the right to work, to education and to public assistance in cases of unemployment, old age, sickness and disablement, and in other cases of undeserved want"*(Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India 2015). But rather than trying to tackle the larger issues related to beggary, the State is treating its own citizens as criminals by punishing them under this act; not because they do criminal acts but because they have fallen through the social safety net and have nothing else to do but to beg in order to feed themselves and remain alive (Ram Lakhan vs State 2006).

Defenders of the Act argue that at least these people get shelter in forms of Beggars' Homes. But these Beggars' Homes as institutions are nothing less than jails. They label and tag the detained person as a criminal and keep him/her in detention under the pretext of providing shelter, food and providing some training (Dhar, 2014).

The State is treating the problem of beggary from the wrong end. The problems enumerated above should all be first dealt with in order to reduce and check begging. Because as long as these problems persist in society, beggary would exist. The punitive approach of the Act should be reconsidered. Taking a punitive approach to poverty and destitution is not the solution. The BPBA has been in existence and in implementation for more than half a century, but the problem of begging has not reduced, rather it has increased. This fact in itself ridicules the existence of this law (Gopalakrishnan, 2002).

Conclusion:

Tragedies push individuals into the farthest ends of social margins before they take to begging. It has been discussed earlier that many a factors are responsible behind this. The beginning of the act of begging does not happen overnight. It does not happen in a way where a person gets up one fine morning and suddenly decides to beg. It is the result of a long drawn-out process. Only after this process of helplessness, and misery has taken its course that one finally gives up and starts seeking alms at the cost of her/his dignity. It is often assumed that people who are into begging take it as a choice. But it is largely a matter of circumstances. To cite an example, in the aftermath of the U.S. war in Afghanistan, women in *burqa* could be seen in streets asking for alms. Many of these women were highly

educated — doctors, judges, lawyers, engineers, teachers. It was a blow of ill-fate that they were begging in order to feed themselves and their families. Destitution occurs when options are exhausted. But even in instances where begging is the first resort, there must be some or the other social distress behind this activity (Sharma, 2006).

It is, therefore, a matter of concern that the State steps in with an anti-begging law ignoring these conditions, sending people in custody. The failure of the State on the front of destitution and urban poverty is, in itself, a matter of serious concern, but criminalising the most marginalised population for being poor is even more so. One of the reasons because of which the State is behaving this way is it wants to hide its failures in dealing with urban poverty, mental illnesses, disabilities and other socio-economic problems to which the phenomenon of beggary owes its genesis.

All the discussion that has gone in the foregoing paragraphs suggests very clearly that this act must be critically evaluated and its existence be reconsidered.

REFERENCES

Adams, Thomas McStay (1990). *Bureaucrats and Beggars: French Social Policy in the Age of Enlightenment.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Arnold, David (2008). "Vagrant India: Famine, Poverty and Welfare under Colonial Rule." In *Cast Out: Vagrancy and Homelessness in Global and Historical Perspective*, by A L Beier and Paul Ocobock (eds.), 117-139. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press.

Bhattacharyya, S.K. (1977). "Beggars and the Law."*Journal of the Indian Law Institute* 498-502.

Chambliss, William J. (1964). "A Sociological Analysis of the Law of Vagrancy."*Social Problems* **12** (1): 67-77.

Dhar, Aarti (2014). *Centre asks States for data on beggars.* February 02. Accessed October 01, 2016. http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/centre-asks-states-for-data-on-beggars/article5646175.ece.

Dunham, Will (2008). *Black death 'discriminated' between victims.* January 29. Accessed October 01, 2016. http://www.abc.net.au/science/articles/2008/01/29/2149185.htm.

Eccles, Audrey (2012). *Vagrancy in Law and Practice under the Old Poor Law.* New York: Routledge.

1874. "European Vagrancy Act, 1874." London: Taylor and Francis.

Gillin, J.L. (1929). "Vagrancy and Begging."*American Journal of Sociology,* 424-432.

Goel, Ashish (2010). "Indian Anti-Beggary Laws and Their Constitutionality through the Prism of Fundamenatal Rights, with Special Reference to Ram Lakhan V. State."*Asia-Pacific Journal on Human Rights and the Law* 23-38.

Gopalakrishnan, Amulya (2002). "Poverty as Crime."*Frontline*, November 09-22.

Gore, M. S., Mathur, J.S., Laljani, M.R. and Takulia, H.S. (1959). *The Beggar Problem in Metropolitan Delhi.* Delhi: Delhi School of Social Work.

Government of Maharashtra (1976). *The Bombay Prevention of Begging Act, 1959.* Bombay: The Director, Government Printing and Stationery, Maharashtra State.

Indian Conference of Social Work (1957). *Research Study of Beggar Problem in Greater Bombay.*

Bombay: Central Office of Government.

Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India (2015). *Constitution of India (As on 9th November, 2015).* New Delhi: Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India.

Mukerjee, Radhakamal (1943). "Causes of Beggary."*Indian Journal of Social Work,* 23-28.

Ocobock, Paul (2008). "Introduction." In *Cast Out: Vagrancy and Homelessness in Global and Historical Perspective*, edited by A L Bier and Paul Ocobock (eds.), 1-34. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press.

Pande, B.B. (1986). "Rights of Beggars and Vagrants."*India International Quarterly: The Right to be Human*, December: 115-132.

Press Information Bureau (2010). *No Authentic Data on Beggars.* November 29. Accessed October 01, 2016. http://pib.nic.in/newsite/PrintRelease.aspx?relid=67734.

Ram Lakhan vs State. December 05. Accessed October 01, 2016. https://indiankanoon.org/doc/434096/.

Ramanathan, Usha (2008). "Ostensible poverty, Beggary and the law."*Economic & Political Weekly*, November 01: 33-44.

Ranasinghe, Prashan (2010). "Reconceptualizing Vagrancy and Reconstructing the Vagrant: A Socio-Legal Analysis of Criminal Law Reform in Canada, 1953-1972."*Osgoode Hall Law J.,* **48** (1): 55-94.

Sarkar, Sumita (2007). "Beggary in Urban India: Reflections on Destitution and Exploitation."*Indian J. Social Work,* 531-544.

Sharma, Parul (2006). "Begging and Homelessness: A Global Perspective and International Law." In *People without a Nation: The Destituted People*, by Ghazala Jamil, 69-80. New Delhi: Ashray Adhikar Abhiyan.

Tarique, Mohammed and Vijay Raghavan (2011). *India's war on its poor.* October 03. Accessed October 01, 2016. http://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/mohammed-tarique-vijay-raghavan/indias-war-on-its-poor.

****