

REPORT ON THE RUSSIAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

MARCH 26, 2000



**A Report Prepared by the Staff of the
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe**

WASHINGTON:2000

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
234 Ford House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6460
(202) 225-1901
csce@mail.house.gov
<http://www.house.gov/csce/>

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH COMMISSIONERS

HOUSE

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey, *Chairman*
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia
MATT SALMON, Arizona
JAMES C. GREENWOOD, Pennsylvania
JOSEPH R. PITTS, Pennsylvania
STENY H. HOYER, Maryland
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland
LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER, New York
MICHAEL P. FORBES, New York

SENATE

BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, Colorado, *Co-Chairman*
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, Texas
SPENCER ABRAHAM, Michigan
SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas
TIM HUTCHINSON, Arkansas
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG, New Jersey
BOB GRAHAM, Florida
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut

EXECUTIVE BRANCH COMMISSIONERS

HAROLD HONGJU KOH, Department of State
EDWARD L. WARNER III, Department of Defense
PATRICK A. MULLOY, Department of Commerce

COMMISSION STAFF

DOROTHY DOUGLAS TAFT, *Chief of Staff*
RONALD J. MCNAMARA, *Deputy Chief of Staff*

BEN ANDERSON, *Communications Director*
OREST DEYCHAKIWSKY, *Staff Advisor*
JOHN F. FINERTY, *Staff Advisor*
CHADWICK R. GORE, *Staff Advisor*
ROBERT HAND, *Staff Advisor*
JANICE HELWIG, *Staff Advisor*
MARLENE KAUFMANN, *Counsel*
KAREN S. LORD, *Counsel for Freedom of Religion*
MICHELE MADASZ, *Office Administrator*
MICHAEL OCHS, *Staff Advisor*
ERIKA B. SCHLAGER, *Counsel for International Law*
MAUREEN WALSH, *General Counsel*

ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION (OSCE)

The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, also known as the Helsinki process, traces its origin to the signing of the Helsinki Final Act in Finland on August 1, 1975, by the leaders of 33 European countries, the United States and Canada. Since then, its membership has expanded to 55, reflecting the breakup of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. (The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Serbia and Montenegro, has been suspended since 1992, leaving the number of countries fully participating at 54.) As of January 1, 1995, the formal name of the Helsinki process was changed to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

The OSCE is engaged in standard setting in fields including military security, economic and environmental cooperation, and human rights and humanitarian concerns. In addition, it undertakes a variety of preventive diplomacy initiatives designed to prevent, manage and resolve conflict within and among the participating States.

The OSCE has its main office in Vienna, Austria, where weekly meetings of permanent representatives are held. In addition, specialized seminars and meetings are convened in various locations and periodic consultations among Senior Officials, Ministers and Heads of State or Government are held.

ABOUT THE COMMISSION (CSCE)

The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), also known as the Helsinki Commission, is a U.S. Government agency created in 1976 to monitor and encourage compliance with the agreements of the OSCE.

The Commission consists of nine members from the U.S. House of Representatives, nine members from the U.S. Senate, and one member each from the Departments of State, Defense and Commerce. The positions of Chair and Co-Chair are shared by the House and Senate and rotate every two years, when a new Congress convenes. A professional staff assists the Commissioners in their work.

To fulfill its mandate, the Commission gathers and disseminates information on Helsinki-related topics both to the U.S. Congress and the public by convening hearings, issuing reports reflecting the views of the Commission and/or its staff, and providing information about the activities of the Helsinki process and events in OSCE participating States.

At the same time, the Commission contributes its views to the general formulation of U.S. policy on the OSCE and takes part in its execution, including through Member and staff participation on U.S. Delegations to OSCE meetings as well as on certain OSCE bodies. Members of the Commission have regular contact with parliamentarians, government officials, representatives of non-governmental organizations, and private individuals from OSCE participating States.

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
BACKGROUND	2
ELECTION ADMINISTRATION AND LAW	3
ELECTION CAMPAIGN	3
MEDIA COVERAGE	4
ELECTION DAY OBSERVATIONS	5
ELECTION RESULTS	5
CHARGES OF IRREGULARITIES	6
POST ELECTION TRENDS	6
VISIT TO USAID MOSCOW	8

THE RUSSIAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION MARCH 26, 2000

SUMMARY

- On March 26, 2000, Acting President of the Russian Federation Vladimir V. Putin, running with the backing of the “Unity” party, was elected by a sizable margin to a full 4-year term. As reported by the Central Election Commission, Putin received almost 53 percent, with 39,740,434 votes out of a field of 11 candidates and the option of voting “against all candidates.” His nearest competitor, Communist Party chairman Gennady Zyuganov, tallied a little under 30 percent with almost 22 million votes. The rest of the field showed single-digit percentages. More than 75 million people took part in the election, for a 68.74 percent turnout. A comparatively small number of voters, about 1.5 million, chose the “none of the above” option. Details of the election results are listed below.
- The presidential election was occasioned by the abrupt resignation of President Boris Yeltsin on New Year’s Day, 2000, and his appointment of Prime Minister Putin as Acting President. Yeltsin had been elected to a second term in 1996.
- Throughout the election campaign, Putin had been leading by significant margins in the public opinion surveys. Some commentators had suggested that the March 26 event might better be called a “coronation” rather than an election.
- As Acting President, Putin had promoted a no-compromise policy in pressing the war against Chechnya, and created an image of returning Russia to stability after the economic and social uncertainties of the Yeltsin presidency. Putin ran an almost “above it all” campaign, refusing to issue a platform or make significant election-oriented policy statements. “Watching Putin on television and listening to his speeches, and especially reading the ones that are published, is a waste of time,” wrote Tatyana Tolstaya (*New York Times Review of Books*, May 25, 2000), “the texts are written by speechwriters; the video clips are meticulously put together by image-makers; and everything is vetted by the presidential administration.”
- Putin relied on the government-controlled media to promote his candidacy, and at the same time cast aspersions on his competition.
- In its March 27, 2000 press release, the elections were characterized by the International Election Observation Mission (a joint effort of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Office of Human Rights and Democratic Institutions, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, and the Council of Europe) as “[marking] further progress for the consolidation of democratic elections in the Russian Federation.” However, a media observer writing for *The Moscow Times* called this verdict a “most outrageous piece of propaganda,” in view of the lack of media diversity in several regions of Russia.
- Both the Communist Party and Yabloko leadership claimed to have “evidence of blatant violations in several regions.” The final report of the OSCE/ODIHR observer mission also found that “Notwithstanding the CEC effort to enforce the law vigorously, candidates, campaign organizations and supporters circumvented the law in some cases.”

- The election was observed by approximately 1000 international observers (*Moscow Times*, March 27, 2000), with about 400 from the OSCE, including staff of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe under the aegis of the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE. Under the direction of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), the OSCE carried out an extensive observation program, with both long-term and short-term observers. Commission staff observed the election in the cities of Yaroslavl and Veliky Rostov, and towns along the Moscow-Yaroslavl Highway.
- Commission observers did not note significant violations of generally accepted international norms on election day, except for the absence of private voting booths at one polling place. There were some examples of “family voting.”

BACKGROUND

Russia’s first freely-elected President, Boris Yeltsin, was elected in 1991 to a 5-year term and again in 1996. As described in the U.S. State Department’s *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices*:

Politically, economically, and socially, Russia continues to be a state in transition. While constitutional structures are well-defined and democratic in conception, democratization continues to be slow. The 1993 Constitution establishes a tripartite government with checks and balances. The executive branch consists of an elected president and a government headed by a prime minister. There is a bicameral legislature (Federal Assembly), consisting of the State Duma and the Federation Council, and a judicial branch. Both the President and the legislature were selected in competitive elections judged to be largely free and fair, with a broad range of political parties and movements contesting offices. The judiciary, still the weakest of the three branches, showed signs of limited independence.

For all the real and apparent progress since the fall of communism, Russia continues to be plagued by corruption, a poor economy, a bloated and sclerotic bureaucracy, a ruling class with more than its share of rapacity and irresponsibility (many of whom rose through the ranks of the Communist Party and Komsomol), technological backwardness, and lack of a solid middle class. Statistics indicate that the Russia Federation is losing about 700,000 people per year in terms of annual births and deaths (for more details on Russia’s social and demographic challenges, see Z. Brzezinski, “Living With Russia,” *The National Interest*, No. 61, Fall 2000).

In 1991, Boris Yeltsin had been a dynamic leader of a renascent Russian state emerging from the shadow of the Soviet Union. Eight years later, tired and apparently in ill health, increasingly out of touch with the country he ruled, he stepped down from the presidency at the end of December 1999. Yeltsin turned over the reins of power to the last of his many Prime Ministers, Vladimir Putin, who had served in that capacity only since August 1999. With corruption investigations reaching the Kremlin itself, Yeltsin was granted broad immunity from possible criminal charges under an agreement brokered with the Duma by Putin.

Prior to his appointment as Prime Minister, Putin had been head of President Yeltsin’s national security council. However, probably the most salient feature of his biography was his 16-year career as an agent of the KGB and his tenure (1998–1999) as head of the KGB’s successor, the Federal Security Service.

Under the Russian Constitution, elections for President are required within 6 months after a President leaves office. As stipulated by the Russian Federation Constitution, the Federation Council (upper house of parliament) scheduled the election for March 26, 2000.

ELECTION ADMINISTRATION AND LAW

A revision of the election law was signed by President Yeltsin prior to his leaving office. In order to be nominated for the Office of President, a candidate had to submit petitions containing at least 500,000 signatures. Reflecting increased publicity about public officials and their sources of income, a new provision required that all candidates—as well as their spouses and children—reveal the amount and sources of all income for the previous 2 years.

As was the practice in the past, the administration of the elections was carried out by a series of “election commissions,” headed by a Central Election Commission in Moscow. The role of the Central Election Committee is essentially to supervise elections at the national level, i.e., to insure (or try to insure) that elections laws and regulations are upheld, and that candidates for office are placed on the ballot, or denied same, in accordance with the law. Subordinate to the CEC are Subject Election Commissions in each of the 89 Subjects of the Russian Federation, and Territorial Commissions within the Subjects. The lowest level commissions in the hierarchy are the Precinct Election Commissions at the approximately 94,000-plus polling stations throughout the Federation.

According to the report of the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights:

Members of Subject Commissions are appointed by legislative and executive bodies [of State power] of the Subject based on suggestions from public organizations and elected bodies of government. One third of the members are chosen from proposals of political parties having factions in the State Duma. Indeed, there appeared to be a cross-section of parties and blocs represented on many of the commissions. Likewise, Territorial Commissions are appointed by the “elective bodies of local self government,” on the basis of proposals from civic associations.

In addition, candidates could request the appointment of a non-voting member of the Territorial or Precinct Commissions.

Domestic observers were accredited by candidates or local NGOs and international observers by the Central Election Commission.

ELECTION CAMPAIGN

The Unity Party’s strong second place showing in the December 1999 parliamentary elections, the image of strength and stability projected by Vladimir Putin in comparison with his predecessor, and the assumption that the ruling apparatus did not want any unpleasant legal consequences in connection with their tenure in the Yeltsin administration, made Putin the heavy favorite. Public opinion polls put Putin comfortably ahead—at one point by 40 percentage points—of his nearest competitor, Communist Party leader, Gennady Zyuganov. The only question was whether the election would go to a second round. Putin’s backers were obviously worried about the publicity accorded a small group of activists who had been campaigning for “against all candidates,” a legitimate option similar to “none of the above” in some

U.S. states. A few days before the election, Putin himself made a personal televised plea to voters to turn out to the polls. According to Michael McFaul in testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on April 12, 2000, Putin's advisors claimed that in mid-January 55 million voters were prepared to vote for Putin. However, this dropped off to 40 million by election day. "If the vote had occurred in June," testified McFaul, "Putin most certainly would have faced a runoff."

Putin himself refused to engage in the typical down-and-dirty of campaigning. He did not debate with opponents or promote himself through campaign advertising, to say nothing of rousing the crowd at campaign rallies in the manner of his predecessor. Instead, he relied on national TV networks that were either government-controlled (RTR) or government-sympathetic (ORT) to give him favorable coverage in his day-to-day conduct of state affairs. Putin created the image of national leader busy at work, traveling about the country and conferring with regional leadership, seeing that pensions were paid, and pursuing a war in Chechnya that, despite occasional setbacks, enjoyed the support of a significant majority of the population.

Putin's "above it all/steady hand at the switch" approach to the campaign appeared to work. Final opinion surveys by two major Russian polling organizations showed him leading his nearest rival, Communist Party chief Gennady Zyuganov, by around 55 percent to 25 percent (*Moscow Tribune*, March 24, 2000).

The attacks of Putin's opponents, either from the right or left, did not seem to resonate with the voters. Zyuganov criticized the poor state of Russia's economy and charged that without a change in power, there would be in Russia "a military-political dictatorship this summer." However, his campaign lacked the vigor of his previous bouts against President Yeltsin. Grigory Yavlinsky continued to criticize the conduct of the war in Chechnya and his concern for the diminution of human rights in Russia. One of his TV ads on the latter subject was banned from state TV channel for alleged "disrespect for state authorities." Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, whom the Central Election Commission had tried to keep off the ballot for violations of the financial reporting rules, vowed to exterminate all separatists ("rivers of blood will flow"). Film director and State Duma member Stanislav Govorukhin concentrated—as he has in the past—on lawlessness in Russia, and at one point ran a campaign video featuring ironic jokes about the country's current state.

Another candidate who had gained prominence outside the political arena was businessman Umar Dzhabrailov. According to a *Time* magazine Special Report of September 8, 1997, "... Umar's name has been publicly linked to the contract-style killing of his American former partner at the Radisson, Paul Tatum. After the November 1996 murder, Umar was denied a U.S. visa. The prohibition is still in force and Tatum's slaying is unsolved. Umar has no criminal record, and blames his visa problems on misinformation."

A few days before the election, political consultant and former government official Yevgeny Sevastyanov dropped out of the race and announced his support for Yavlinsky. Meanwhile, Putin himself had garnered the support of the former "party of power," the "Fatherland" coalition, as well as that of Anatoly Chubais and Sergei Kirienko, prominent leaders of the reform-oriented Union of Right Forces (SPS). However, some SPS activists endorsed Samara governor Konstantin Titov.

MEDIA COVERAGE

Commission staff observers did not have an opportunity to do an extensive analysis of the media coverage of the campaign. However, the Final Report of the OSCE/ODIHR observer mission stated that:

While the media in the Russian Federation remain pluralistic and diverse, independent media have come under increasing pressure. Moreover, as during the State Duma election, important segments of the media, both State-controlled and private, failed to provide impartial information about the election campaign and candidates.

During the last week of the campaign, Russian Public Television produced some particularly biased coverage of Grigory Yavlinsky, showing him allegedly receiving the endorsement of homosexuals and being supported by Jews in yarmulkes. However, according to a Radio Liberty analysis “it is far from clear that television coverage was decisive in Yavlinsky’s poor showing” (*RL, Russian Election Report*, Laura Belin, “Poor Showing Reveals Yavlinsky’s Limited Potential”).

ELECTION DAY OBSERVATIONS

Starting in Yaroslavl, Commission staff observed the election in that city and continued south along Moscow-Yaroslavl Highway, stopping in Veliky Rostov and communities along the way. The precinct level of vote tabulation was observed in the village of Glebovskoye, Yaroslavl Oblast.

The observer team was stopped briefly by police in Veliky Rostov for a document check. (A day earlier, on a trip to Kostroma from Yaroslavl, the observer team was stopped for about 45 minutes at the police post entering the Kostroma Oblast. Supposedly, there was a significant problem with grand theft in the area.)

As has been increasingly the case in election coverage in the former Soviet Union, election day itself appeared to proceed normally in the polling stations under observation. In all of the Yaroslavl polling stations, local observers either from political parties, the local legislature, or social organizations were present. Contrary to the stereotype, several of the Communist Party observers were young people. In most of the polling places, there was a sufficient number of voting booths, although some voters followed the tradition of voting outside the booths, at times discussing their vote with others. Family voting was occasionally observed.

The vote tabulation in Glebovskoye was long and complicated, due to the fact that the polling place served as the tabulation center for “mobile ballots” from even smaller communities off the main road. As a result, instead of “mobile ballots” contributing the usual 5–10 percent of the totals, these ballots made up about 40 percent, which lengthened the time needed to match signatures with requests. In any event, the count appeared to be conducted conscientiously and according to regulations.

ELECTION RESULTS

As reported by Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, the final results of the election as released by the Central Election Commission on April 5, 2000 were:

Vladimir Putin	Acting President and Prime Minister	39,740,434
Gennady Zyuganov	Chairman of the Communist Party	21,928,471
Grigory Yavlinsky	Chairman of the Yabloko Party	4,351,452
Aman Tuleev	Governor of Kemerovo Region	2,217,361
Konstantin Titov	Governor of Samara Region	1,107,269
Vladimir Zhirinovskiy	Liberal Democratic Party of Russia	2,026,513

Ella Pamfilov	leader of “Civil Dignity” bloc, 1991-1994	758,966
Stanislav Govorukhin	Duma member and film maker	328,723
Yuri Skuratov	former Procurator General	319,263
Aleksei Podberezkin	leader of “Spiritual Heritage” bloc	98,175
Umar Dzhabrailov	businessman	78,498
Against all candidates		1,414,640

CHARGES OF IRREGULARITIES

The OSCE observer mission gave the Russian elections fairly good grades. However, Putin’s two chief competitors, Gennady Zyuganov and Grigory Yavlinsky alleged that irregularities had occurred. Zyuganov was especially vocal, claiming in a letter to the Central Election Committee that “serious irregularities” took place in 25 of Russia’s 89 subjects (see RFE/RL, Russian Election Report, 7 April 2000, Laura Belin, “Fraud Charges Unlikely to be Examined Impartially”). Yavlinsky also expressed “serious doubts” about the results, and charged that in some regions Yabloko observers were prevented from observing the vote tally. Unlike Zyuganov, Yavlinsky did not challenge Putin’s victory itself.

In its final report, the OSCE/ODIHR mission stated that “candidates, organizations and supporters circumvented to the law in some instances.” Examples were 1) distribution of anonymous campaign material, 2) certain groups with ties to electoral campaign organizations posing as non-partisan election observers, and 3) involvement of regional administration personnel in campaign activity.

POST ELECTION TRENDS

There are two aspects of post-election trends in Russia. The first aspect concerns the policies of a future Putin Administration. Putin’s young and activist image obviously stands in contrast to the almost reclusive, detached Yeltsin in the final days of his presidency. His intelligence background and his clear disdain for Western concern over the conduct of the war in Chechnya, have led many to expect a “tougher” Russia vis-a-vis the West—or a more clearly defined “toughness” that had already begun to take shape under Yeltsin in the wake of NATO’s Kosovo bombing and NATO expansion. Veteran human rights activists in Russia have predicted that the Kremlin will undertake a more repressive policy toward political opposition. Putin’s generally pro-market statements on the domestic economy and some of his early appointments rekindled the interest in Western business circles toward investment in Russia, but given past experience, many are waiting to see words translate into a commerce-friendly, rule of law environment.

Much has been made of Putin’s unwillingness to seriously “clean house” of the Yeltsin “family” in the Kremlin. Nevertheless, it is clear that Putin wishes to take charge and be seen as the leader who restored order and direction to a Russia that appeared rudderless during Yeltsin’s last 2 years (although some observers have maintained that domestically the security services had been restoring their own form of domestic order since 1994). As President Putin’s term unfolds, the following developments may be expected:

- The Chechen War is likely to continue at a lower level of intensity, but with the brutality that characterizes an unsophisticated and badly-led military trying to suppress an increasingly desperate guerrilla movement. The Russian Army may actually win eventually, but unlike the Tsarist army in the 19th century—or the U.S. Army against the Apaches—Moscow does not have a 35-year time frame and such a protracted conflict would cost many lives, scarce resources, and domestic discontent.

- Moscow will attempt to rein in the authority of the regional leaders. Putin has announced plans to establish seven new “federal districts” to convey Moscow’s policies over the 89 regions that have been operating with varying levels of independence from Moscow (with corresponding varying levels of observance of Russian federal laws). This shake-up will be welcomed by many Russians who see regional governments as arbitrary and corrupt. The danger is that the federal government may create simply another level of bureaucracy with its accompanying corruption.
- The crackdown on independent media has been visible, repeated and at times violent. Since the election, Moscow authorities have briefly jailed media-magnate Vladimir Gusinsky on “embezzlement” charges that were later dropped. Gusinsky’s NTV network has been critical of the war in Chechnya and alleged corruption in Kremlin. Government officials claim that Gusinsky’s troubles were connected with shady business dealings, not politics, but Russian democrats see an increase in curbs on civil liberties in the making. While Putin gives lip service to democracy, rule of law, and freedom of the press, his actions and his words reveal a bureaucratic security service mentality that does not always connect with the concepts. (For example, see the testimony of Sarah Mendelson at the Commission hearing of May 23, 2000, “The Putin Path: Are Human Rights in Retreat?” on the Commission web site: <http://www.house.gov/csce>)
- Moscow has attempted to convince Western investors that “it’s safe to go back into the water.” Prime Minister Mikhail Kasyanov has been wooing the international community with market-based rhetoric and Putin has stated his intention to move on tax and investment legislation. However, as Vladimir Voinovich writes in the March 30, 2000 *New York Times*, Putin’s biggest problem remains the endemic corruption in Russian society, a problem “harder to deal with than the Chechen rebels”. No economic reform legislation, and certainly the accompanying rhetoric, will mean anything if corruption is not reduced to manageable levels.
- Based on trends that were developed during the Yeltsin presidency, the Russian Government will probably continue to resist U.S. foreign policy initiatives which Russians view—or can present—as threats to Russian security or establishing world-wide U.S. hegemony. Russia is not sufficiently powerful to openly challenge U.S. military or economic dominance, but her diplomats will try to create obstacles for U.S. policies (National Missile Defense, U.S. resistance to the International Criminal Court, North Korea policy, stance on Iraq and Serbia, further NATO expansion).

Another aspect of post-election Russia is the political topography: what have the elections shown about Russia’s major political parties/blocs? A few conclusions may be drawn for the near future:

- Combined with the results of the 1999 parliamentary elections, “Unity” becomes the new, younger “party of power,” replacing “Our Home is Russia” and the “party of power wannabe” “Fatherland-All Russia.” Yeltsin’s departure for all practical purposes is a symbolic “turning out the light” on the already declining national political presence of his generation.
- Zyuganov’s second place finish, four times the vote of the third place competitor, indicates that the Communist Party still retains an overall appeal throughout the country, although Zyuganov lost to Putin in his home region of Orel and did not do as well as he did in 1996.
- While many Russian opinion polls indicate that most respondents favor democracy and political reform, this does not translate into votes for Grigory Yavlinsky and his Yabloko party.

- Reform-oriented political leaders continue their post-Soviet split. Yabloko is on its own, the most prominent leadership of the Union of Right Forces supported Putin, while other activists supported Konstantin Titov.
- Vladimir Zhirinovsky's appeal with Russian voters, if it ever was that great, is descending rapidly. His 2.7 percent total was less than half of his 5.7 percent mark in 1996. His LDPR parliamentary caucus has been reduced by a third since its heady days of 1993 to under 20 seats.

VISIT TO USAID MOSCOW

While in Moscow, Commission staffers also met with Connie Carrino, head of the USAID's Assistance to Russian Orphans program, and were briefed on the latest USG/AID initiatives direction of programs aimed at assistance to Russian orphans. AID has contracted with two NGOs—Holt International Children's Services and Mercy Corps International to work with Russian NGOs to support programs designed to help families keep their children at home, rather than turning them over to state institutions. The program does not support assistance to Russian government institutions, orphanages, or international adoption.

This is a U.S. Government publication produced by the
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).

This publication is intended to inform interested individuals and organizations about developments within and among the participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

The CSCE publishes transcripts of official hearings held before the Commission, analyses of developments in the OSCE, and other periodic documents deemed relevant to the region. All CSCE publications may be freely reproduced, with appropriate credit, in any form. The CSCE encourages the widest possible dissemination of its publications.

For a listing of all available CSCE documents, to be placed on or deleted from the CSCE mailing list, or to request additional copies, please contact:

**CSCE
234 Ford House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6460
Voice: (202)225-1901 FAX: (202) 226-4199
E-mail: CSCE @ MAIL.HOUSE.GOV**

Visit our site on the World Wide Web at

<http://www.house.gov/csce/>

for immediate access to our electronic documents, press releases, and other information about the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.