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ABSTRACT Street children are the most physically visible and vulnerable groups present in the society who live under extreme conditions of the street without care or guidance of parents or any adult. They are portrayed as socially unacceptable with least concerns from the policymakers. This paper explores the concept of street children in Indian context and also evaluates various policies and planning developed in India after its Independence. Further, the paper will explore the importance of childhood concept and the role of anthropologist in it. After evaluating the policies and the concept of street children and childhood, the paper also suggests several models/approaches that will improve the lives of street children and allows the integration of these children into the mainstream society.

INTRODUCTION

India is one of the fastest urbanizing countries in the world with the decadal growth rate increased to 31.16 percent according to the 2011 census. It is also the home to more than 444 million children below 18 years which is approximately thirty seven percent of India’s total population (GOI 2011). While the aspect of having the largest youth population is often acknowledged, the harsh reality of 18 million children living on/off the street in India is a matter of great discussion (Singh and Purohit 2011). However, it is believed that this estimate is just a rough idea and the total population may be higher. In spite of such a huge underdeveloped population street child never played a role in policymaking or became a major part of developmental memoranda by any political parties due to which a major human resource is being wasted in our country.

Street children constitute a marginalized group in most societies. They do not have what society considers appropriate relationships with major institutions of childhood such as family, education, and health. The continuous exposure to harsh environments and the nature of their lifestyles make them vulnerable to substance use and this threatens their mental, physical, social and spiritual wellbeing. These children are confronted with discrimination and view health and social services with suspicion. This also reduces the effectiveness of interventions that target street children.

Street children exist in every part of the world and large groups of children unsupervised by adults have appeared in almost every country during some part of history. Most are found in large, urban areas of developing countries. The problem has worsened across the globe in recent years because of economic problems, political changes, civil unrest, increasing family separations and conflicts, the epidemic spread of diseases and natural disasters.

Attention towards street children as a concept and their extreme living condition was introduced to the global arena recently in the late 20th century. All the major policies and programs for street children in the world begins after the agreement of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) by the United Nations in the year 1989. The CRC is innovative in making it clear that, with respect to international human rights law, children are active subjects. They not only require certain forms of protection in addition to the “normal” entitlements of human rights law, but they also require special forms of protection because they are in a vulnerable position, both legally and developmentally. These entitlements include the right to have their opinion taken into consideration when adults make decisions on their behalf (Article 12), to express
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their views (Article 13) and to join or form associations to represent their own interests (Article 15) of the CRC by the United Nations in the year 1989. In 1992, the United Nations issued a Resolution regarding the emerging issue of vicious conditions of the street children. The Resolution raises the issue on global forum resulting in enforcement of International child rights for these street children. However, despite so many efforts and raising the issue at the global forum the children living on/off the street in both developed and developing nations choose street to live a better way of life and to run away from the daily issues of their life.

Objectives

To understand street children in Indian context and importance of anthropology and childhood perspective for their betterment, the study was divided into following parts describing the objectives of the paper:

- To describe the basic profile of street children in the Indian context,
- To describe various schemes and policies regarding street children in India,
- Evaluating schemes and providing suggestions for the betterment of street children in India, and
- To explore the role of anthropological studies and the concept of childhood perspective for the welfare of street children in India.

METHODOLOGY

The paper was planned in a manner to explore the multi-dimensional problems of street children in India by describing various planning and schemes in order to delineate problems in the lives of street children. The methodology for the study includes analyses of data gathered through secondary sources like various reports, documents, census, government records and other published as well as unpublished sources to make the study both quantitative as well as qualitative.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Defining Street Children

The term ‘street children’ was first used in the book ‘London Labour and the London Poor’ by Henry Mayhew in 1851. However, the term came to light after the declaration of the United Nations Year of the Child in 1979. Prior to this, they were also referred as homeless, abandoned, or runaways (Scanlon et al. 1998: 1597).

According to Lewis Aptekar, the definition of street children is ambiguous as such a heterogeneous group cannot be simplified into one single definition (Aptekar 1994). According to him, it cannot be assumed that all the children are homeless as in case studies like study on Latin America by Tacon (1981) and Ennew study on Brazil (1986) which fail to differentiate between working children living in homes and homeless street children. Despite the fact, few prominent definitions of street children are as given:

i. Neela Shroff writes in an article “They are our Children Too: The Vagrant Children’s Project”, “Street children are those young people who live and or work on the streets of the world’s cities” (Phillips 1992).

ii. Cosgrove defines a street child as “any individual under the age of majority whose behavior is predominantly at variance with community norms and whose primary support for his/her development needs is not family or family substitute” (Cosgrove 1990). Cosgrove used two dimensions to define street children that are (i) family involvement (ii) amount of deviant behavior.

iii. “A street child spends at least a part of his/her days in the streets. S/he uses them as a place of congregation rather than simply as a channel for moving from one place to another” (Bibars 1998).

iv. Street children “reside on the streets full or part-time” (Lusk 1989) and tend to generate their income there.

v. “...any girl or boy... for whom the street (in the widest sense of the word, including unoccupied dwellings, wasteland, etc.) has become his or her habitual abode and/or source of livelihood; and who is inadequately protected, supervised, or directed by responsible adults” inter NGO (International Catholic Children’s Bureau 1985: 58).

vi. “A child who eats from a dustbin; a child who feeds on waste food that is spoiled and rotten; one who comes from a poor family;
one who sleep out anywhere because he has no parents; a child with a glue-sniffing addiction; one who begs on streets but goes home; a child who does not wash and dresses badly” (Kariuki 1999).

vii. “Street children as that for whom the street (in the widest sense of the world that is, unoccupied dwelling, wasteland, etc.) more than their family has become their real home, a situation in which there are no protection, supervision or street youth responsible adults” (Benitez 2000).

Some writers define street children as a stage of street life for example, Aptekar (1988) and Visano (1990) defines street children in term of the process of moving from home to the streets in stages. Other writers define them by describing different types of experiences of the children, such as the quality of their play and work and their relations with others (Dorfinan 1984; Lusk 1989; Shifter 1985).

The currently prevalent definition that is used widely by UNICEF defines street children “as anyone under the age of 18 who either lives or works on the street” (Thomas 2013). Here it is also important that many of these children above 14 are bounded to be on the street to fulfill their own or family needs. Also, in some cases it was observed that street life has become a profession for several poor families. It is clear that the definition of street children is a matter of debate due to their heterogeneity throughout various culture and social structure. Thereby, a single universal definition cannot define this terminology adequately and they must need to be address as per the community parameters.

Street Children in India - A Profile

In India, the term ‘street child’ does not exist in the official language until 1997 and these children were classified and helped just like other children who worked on the streets. For instance, identity cards were provided to these kids by the Coordination committee only to safeguard them from the police brutality. During the early 1990s, Government of India under the immense pressure from the non-governmental organizations (NGOs), launched the “Scheme for Assistance to Street Children”. However, none of the recommendations or suggestions made by these NGO’s were incorporated in the final draft of the scheme making it difficult for the NGO’s to participate in it.

Population

According to UNICEF there are approximately 100 million street children worldwide (UNICEF 2003) with that number constantly growing. However, some variance exists between different international organizations and governments estimating their global population in-between range of 100 to150 million children. In the Indian context, there is no official statistic of the number of street children. The primary reason for this is that it is very hard to collect precise data about them because of their transient way of living, inappropriate approaches toward defining them or addressing the issue by the government and lacking a valid proof of their identity.

In 2006, a study was conducted by the UNICEF and was estimated that around eleven million street children live in India (UNICEF 2006). Another study conducted estimates the total number of street children in India as high as 18 million (Singh and Purohit 2011). According to Save the Children (2010) study, alone in Delhi about 51,000 street children live. There are no certain documents which can conclude the exact figures of street children in India. However, there are some accurate estimates of one stream which adds to the number of street children. These are cases of children running away from home using trains to move. The number of such children who run away from home and land on railway platforms is about 80,000 a year. Presently the NGOs and Government child line together is helping 10,000 children only of the 80,000 who arrive on platforms every year. Rest of the 70,000 keep moving on platforms or to the street and thus add to the number of street children (Harper and Iyer 2013).

Classification of Street Children (Indian Context)

Due to their heterogeneous characteristics throughout various culture and social structure, it is necessary to classify them based on their nature of living. One of the prominent classifica-
tions used for Indian context was given by Ghosh (1992):

a) Children belonging to the families who have migrated permanently.
b) Children belonging to the families who have migrated temporarily and would go back to their homes after some time.
c) Children who come from suburbs and adjoining villages of the city in the morning follow some vocations during the day and go back in the evening.
d) Children of very poor families lacking care and protection.
e) Child workers.
f) Unattached children who include orphans, abandoned children, maladjusted children, delinquent children, runaway children and so on. (Ghosh 1992).

At the global forum, these street children are well classified by the UNICEF (2003) into 3 categories which are (i) children on the street, (ii) children of the street, and (iii) the abandoned children.

Age and Gender

Acquiring precise stats regarding street children is a major challenge due to their floating nature. But according to an earlier study conducted by the National Institute of Urban Affairs in 1989 the average age of children on/off the street was 13 years (Chatterjee 1992). A further study conducted by the Thomas (2013) concluded that approximately seventy percent of the street children fall in the age group of 6-14 years age and thirty percent were between 15-18 years age group.

While taking consideration of gender, most street children in the cities are boys. Their number is more than double the number of street girls. A major reason for the lesser number of street girls being enumerated in the estimation of the population of street children is that they are often not visible and difficult to trace. The moment a girl lands on the streets, there are high chances of her being trafficked for sex trade (Agnihotri 2001).

Religion and Caste

Some studies indicate that most street children in India are Hindus followed by Muslims and then Christians (Philips 1994; Dabir 2005; Save the Children 2011).

In respect to the caste background of street children, there is a lack of clear data. But, recently, a study conducted by Save the Children (2011) in Delhi highlighted about thirty six percent of the children are Dalits, seventeen percent Adivasis, and thirty eight percent belong to the other backward classes. According to Rane and Shroff (1994), half the population of Hindu street children in Mumbai belongs to SC or ST categories.

The Problems Faced by Street Children

Street children, unlike other children, experience a very different childhood on the streets. Early in their life, they are exposed to an unprotected social and physical environment on the streets. Their problems could be grouped into three classes: social, physical, and psychological. The social problems include poverty, illiteracy, biasness towards them, lack of resources, aggressive environment and stigmatization. Whereas, the physical problems include issues like lack of adequate nutritional, sexual and reproductive health problems and common diseases and injuries. These social and physical problems lead to psychological or mental problems like stressful past, a transitory lifestyle, mental health, and substance use (WHO Module 2014).

Also due to their nomadic way of living and the way they were expelled from their temporary abode like an offender by the authorities they face a deep-rooted negative stigma about themselves. They lack basic education, unaware of schemes related to them, poor living standards and healthcare practices. A study undertaken by the Government of India (2007) covering 2,317 street children from 26 districts of 12 states found out that 54.5 percent of these children confirmed sexual abuse experiences in their lifetime.

Planning and Policies for Street Children

Street children never got proper attention in India’s five-year plan. After independence during early five-year plans, no specific policy or schemes were made for street children. They were included within the major arena of children.
First five-year plan (1951-56) was identified with health, nutrition, and education as major areas of concern regarding children. In 1953 (that is, during First five-year plan 1951-56) the Central Social Welfare Board was set up to address the needs of children, women, and persons with disabilities. It was further extended to rural areas in the Second five-year plan (1956-61). In 1958 the Welfare projects become the Coordinated Welfare Extension Projects and the Children’s Act was passed in 1960. During the Third five-year plan (1961-66) holiday homes were promised and the problem of beggars was taken into consideration. During the Fourth and Fifth five year plans no specific programs were made, which directly or indirectly affected the street children in India. However, during the Sixth five-year plan (1980-85) for the first-time planners took into consideration, the needs of working children. Programs were undertaken to improve the health, nutrition and educational status of working children. In 1982 the Voluntary Action Bureau was set up to address the crimes against the children and motivating majority towards their social obligations.

Under the Seventh five-year plan (1985-90), a separate Department of Women and Child Development was introduced in the Ministry of Human Resource Development. In 1986, the Government of India repealed the Children’s Act and passed the Juvenile Justice Act. In 1987, the National Child Labor Project was started in areas that saw a high number of child laborers. Internationally this period was witness to the first comprehensive convention for child rights in the UNCRC. Again, during the Eight five-year plan (1992-1997) no policies were made affecting the street children lives. In Ninth five-year plan (1997-2002) the juvenile (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 1986 was modified in 2000 which provides law for the protection of children and matters related to children in conflict with the law.

During the Tenth five-year (2002-2007) for the very first time, a separate Integrated Programme for Street Children was implemented which prevents the impoverishment of children, nutrition, providing shelter, medical facilities, education, and protection against exploitation. Further, the ‘Welfare of Working Children in Need of Care and Protection’ was also implemented which provides education, vocational training to the children to make possible for their integration with mainstream society. Taking consideration for assistance to homes ‘Shishu Greh for Children’ was also adopted which provides grant-in-aid through Central Adoption Resource Agency to government institutions and NGOs for promoting adoptions within the country.

However, the Integrated Programme for Street Children, Shishu Greh Scheme, and Juvenile Justice were later merged into the Integrated Child Protection Scheme in the Eleventh five-year plan (2007-2011). In this plan, strengthening the family capabilities to care and protect the child, schools for slum kids in 35 urban areas with a population more than million, Special interventive programs for migrating children, deprived children, single parent’s children, physically challenged children, and working children in urban slum areas were focused. Further ‘Comprehensive Scheme for Prevention of Trafficking, Rescue, Rehabilitation, and Re-integration of Victims of Trafficking for Commercial Sexual Exploitation’ and child helpline numbers was also started.

Welfare Schemes by the Government

Following are the schemes or programs run by the government:

Integrated Programme for Juvenile Justice

The program is being implemented by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment to provide care to children in difficult circumstances and children in conflict with the law through Government institutions and through NGOs. Under this scheme, the National Advisory Board and juvenile justice fund were established.

Shishu Greh Scheme

The objective of the Shishu Greh Scheme is to promote adoptions within the country and to ensure minimum standards of care in case of abandoned/orphaned/destitute children. Grant-in-aid up to an amount of 6 lakh is being provided per unit of 10 children in a Shishu Greh.

Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act

The Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 provides protection to all chil-
Children less than 18 years of age from the offenses of sexual assault, sexual harassment, and pornography. The Act provides for stringent punishments range from simple to rigorous imprisonment of varying periods. There is also provision for fine, which is to be decided by the Court. The Act incorporates the following child-friendly procedures for reporting, recording of evidence, investigation, and trial of offenses. Under this scheme, no child to be detained in the police station in the night for any reason, medical examination of the child is to be conducted in the presence of the parent of the child or any other person in whom the child has trust or confidence. In case the victim is a girl child, the medical examination shall be conducted by a woman doctor, the in-camera trial of cases by Special courts, the speedy trial of cases by the recording of evidence within a period of 30 days and completion of the trial by Special court within a period of one year.

**Child India Foundation (CIF)**

The CIF has been set up as a nodal organization, supported by the Government of India, to monitor and ensure the qualitative development of the Childline service across the country. Childline is a toll-free telephone service (1098) which anyone can use for assistance in the interest of children. It has prescribed minimum quality standards for the services to be provided by its partner organizations that are implementing Childline programs in various cities of the country.

**National Child Labour Project (NCLP)**

This is a major central sector scheme for the rehabilitation of child labor. The scheme seeks to adopt a sequential approach with a focus on rehabilitation of children working in hazardous occupations and processes in the first instance. The scheme was brought under power by The Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986 which defines a child as a person who has not completed his/her 14 years of age and imposes a ban on employment of children less than fourteen years of age in hazardous occupations. The act was again amended on December 4, 2012, The Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Bill, 2012.

**Integrated Programme for Street Children (IPSC)**

The Integrated Programme for Street Children (2007) was started as initiatives to help children living on the street which is now under the umbrella of ICPS programs (2009-10). The program provides shelter, nutrition, healthcare, education, recreation facilities to street children, and seeks to protect them against abuse and exploitation. The program aims at building society’s awareness of the rights of the child enshrined in the UN CRC and Juvenile Justice Act. However, the scheme does not cover children who live with families and in slum areas.

**Integrated Child Protection Scheme (ICPS)**

The Ministry of Women and Child Development is implementing the ICPS, a centrally sponsored scheme since 2009-2010 through the State government/UT Administration on a pre-defined cost-sharing financial pattern. The ICPS brings together multiple existing child protection schemes of the Ministry under one comprehensive umbrella and integrates additional interventions for protecting children and preventing harm. It involves steps to strengthen families and prevent them from break-up leading children to become homeless and without care and protection. It provides support to children already outside the mainstream right from emergency outreach services to final rehabilitation with their families/society. This scheme provides provisions for open shelters, National Open School Programme, vocational training, healthcare, etc.

**National Urban Health Mission**

The National Urban Health Mission (NUHM) as a part of National Health Mission (NHM) has been approved by the Cabinet on 1st May 2013. It covers all state capitals, district headquarters and cities/towns with a population of more than 50000. NUHM envisages meeting the healthcare needs of the urban population with the focus on urban poor, by providing them essential primary healthcare services at a very low cost.
Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS)

The program was introduced in 1975 following the National Policy for Children (1975) but discontinued after 1978 by the Morarji government. It was re-introduced in the Tenth Five Year Plan covering children under the age of 6 year and women in the age group of 16-44 years. This scheme provides provisions for pre-school education, primary healthcare, immunization, etc.

Evaluation of Policies and Planning

Despite so many schemes launched by the government for the welfare of children, only a few schemes among them target street children specifically. Also, those schemes are later merged under single umbrella scheme of ICDS and ICPS which focus on all children. Since the street children are not homogenous group and differ from general children therefore, specific targeted schemes should be made and implicated carefully. Even after past and present efforts by the government and non-government organizations, the street children are still visible in every urban area. A study conducted by Save the Children on 8 parameters in protecting childhood, India ranked 113 out of 176 countries in End of Childhood Index (Save the Children 2019). This indicates poor implications of these schemes and negligence by the central or state governments.

Following are the facts observed while undergoing various schemes and policies:

i. While studying these schemes from different states, one thing that can be easily observed is the disparity among the goals achieved by these states. This disparity shows the negligence by administrative officials and politicians which seems to be a major challenge. One of the examples depicting disparity among the states is the Infant Mortality Rate, which has decreased from 66 deaths per 1000 to 39 deaths per 1000 respectively in the period of 2000 to 2014. But the progress among the states has shown an uneven trend. In Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh, the infant mortality rate is four-time higher than that of Kerala (India Policy Forum 2016).

ii. Another fact depicting the negligence of these children by the politicians and administration is the share of children in the Union Budget of 2018-19. Despite the fact that India is home to more than 444 million children, they receive 3.24 percent of the total financial resources in comparison to 3.32 percent in 2017-18. Budget for children education is 2.25 percent, a decline of 0.9 percent points from 2017-18. While the budget for their health and child development increased to .13 percent and .82 percent, a rare increase of 0.01 percent and 0.02 percent respectively in comparison to the 2017-18 budget. It also seems to be illogical that while the share in the budget has been decreased, the number of schemes for the children is increased from 84 to 89 in 2018-19. This decrease in budget directly impact the goals of those schemes (Indian Union Budget 2018-19).

iii. While evaluating the National Policy for Children (2013), it was found that in its preamble healthcare of the highest standard and quality education terms are used without defining the criteria of the standards. Also, under ICPS there are no provisions for ascertaining the total population of street children in India. This scarcity of research and lack of sufficient data in this regard is a major factor for failures of these schemes. Further, the qualitative data are not acknowledged in most of the schemes due to which they fail to assess the problems properly. It also gets complicated due to their nature of fluidity that is, moving from one place to another that makes them an unrealistic target.

iv. It was also observed that despite increased involvement of children in crimes by approximately seven percent and 13.6 percent increase in crime against children between 2015 and 2016, there are no specific measurements taken for children mental healthcare and treatment. Also, out of 1,11,569 missing children, only 55,944 children were traced and rest of 55,625 children (20,811 males and 34,814 females) were untraced (Crimes in India 2016). In November 2018, 539 childcare institutions were closed down by the Ministry of Women
v. At last, it was observed that factors related to children like education, health, child development come under different ministries. For example, education is a part of Ministry of Human Resource Development while monitoring agency of Right to Education NCPCR (National Commission for Protection of Child Rights) falls under the Ministry of Women and Child Development. Due to lack of coordination among these Ministries, proper implications and evaluation of the schemes fail to uphold the expectations to fulfill the goals.

Anthropological Aspect and Importance of Childhood

Anthropology being the ‘Science of Man’ have undertaken all the aspects of human beings including the aspect of children and childhood associated with it. Studies like Mead (1928), Malinowski (1929), Shweder and Levine (1975), Whiting and Whiting (1975), Gibson (1988), James and James (2004) and Orellana (2009) etc. show the importance of children and childhood studies in the social/cultural anthropology. Anthropologists believe that the most important influence in human development is the cultural setting within which the infant will grow up. Under the process of enculturation, a child acquires one’s own culture during different phases of his childhood. Childhood is somewhat different from adulthood in terms of immaturity, dependency on elders, less responsibility, protection by adults, less role in decision making and in a period of social development that is, the enculturation process. Also, Childhood has been differently understood, institutionalized and regulated in different societies and periods of history. Early childhood has perennially been re-invented and differentiated according to children’s social and geographical location, their gender, ethnicity, their wealth or poverty, amongst other factors (Cunningham 1991; Hendrick 1997). In the case of street children who lives in the all-new harsh environment from that of normal children, a whole new form of culture emerges on the street. They have higher responsibilities as compared to other children, and they have to make their decisions for livelihood or survival on the streets. In the case of street children who do not have parents, there is no formal process of socialization. They learn the process of socialization by themselves via looking at the world in their own reality. Further, they have to learn survival methods on streets in an early phase of life than other children. In this process of learning survival on the streets, they develop their own form of childhood which also comes with the cost of poor mental, physical and psychological development. For example, there are very few cases reported on street children accidents comparison to any other group. Studies like Luchinni (1996), Moura (2002), Davies (2008), and Aptekar and Stoecklin (2014) are some of the prominent studies which depict the importance of understanding childhood.

Since childhood plays a major contribution to individual development leading to community and nation-building. Therefore, it is necessary to the understood childhood of street children in their own way to tackle their problems efficiently and to propose a better scheme or programs to eradicate this problem from roots.

CONCLUSION

Street children are one of the most vulnerable groups in the society who lives in extreme conditions on the streets without care or guidance of parents or adults. Street life is presented as the outcome of an organic and linear chain of adverse factors including migration, economic hardship, family dysfunction, and child abuse. Street children and their families are portrayed as displaying socially unacceptable attributes which place them outside mainstream society. They are among the most physically visible social group in the society still they are the most neglected group during policy making process. Focused policies and programs for street children appear to be very late in the history of India’s five-year plans. Even those plans and policies failed to accomplish their goals as the number of street children rises every year. It is necessary for governments to pay greater attention to this emerging problem.
Further, it is necessary to understand the process of childhood in street children. Street children have their own unique childhood which differs from other children in many perspectives. They lack care and guidance by responsible adults and the warm environment which are must for development of any street children.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To tackle the issue of street children in India, it is necessary to first initiate a nationwide study of their population, their conditions, and their characteristics under the ICPS scheme. Enrolling them in a biometric system like Aadhar and attaching them to their district shelter homes. These shelter homes should provide a family-like environment just like the rehabilitative models of churches and ashrams. To ensure that the complementary benefits like healthcare, training, and education should reach them through targeted schemes so that they can stand on their own and can be integrated into the main society. An initiative like Balaknama, Student Police Cadet, nationwide competitions of arts, sports and others should be initiated which will increase their morale and change perspective of common people regarding them. Projects like rainbow homes should also be boosted to provide assistance and helping vulnerable girls of the street. The role of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s) working at the sheer grass root levels should be appreciated and needs rapid extension. The NGO’s along with the government agencies should also need to focus on Family strengthening programs based upon the JUCONI (Junto con los Ninos) model which works at two levels - prevention and intervention through educational program, reunification of families, community and after based programs. It is regarded as one of the recognized and promising models by the UNICEF in 1994. And at last it is also necessary that the state police and local administrative bodies should change their perspective towards these street children. Special learning programs regarding civil sense, behavior towards the weaker section like street children and others should be incorporated so that they can understand the problems of these groups and can play a significant role for their development.
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