

# Adult Stigmatization and the Hidden Power of Homeless Children in Russia

CLEMENTINE FUJIMURA

In this article I focus on the plight and hidden power of homeless children in Russia, adult attitudes toward them, and the main cultural hurdles that they have to surmount to survive in Russian society. The project developed as a result of earlier research conducted on the Russian concept of childhood<sup>1</sup> and attitudes toward orphans.<sup>2</sup> My research indicates that Russian parents and educators believe in certain principles of education that apply to all children; however, in practice, not all children are valued as equals. Similarly, the ideal concept of childhood, as a stage in life untainted by adult problems, does not apply to all children. Even though Russian parents and educators view childhood as potentially the most joyous time of life, many children, abandoned by their families, are victims of Russia's social crisis and barely survive from day to day. Relatively few adults concern themselves with the future of those children, and so the infrastructure to support them is not well developed or, in some cases, is absent. As a result, a rising number of children seek solace among themselves, in groups and gangs.

However, despite what appears at first to be a tragic victimization, given the suffering and hopelessness of homeless children, there is a power that comes from the children themselves. In a recent article addressing the cultural synthesis of poverty-stricken people, Metcalf suggests that, in studying poor countries, anthropologists have tended to emphasize the relative powerlessness of individuals in changing political and economic realities, thereby neglecting the power such individuals have in constructing "their own worlds in cultural terms." Metcalf points out, "Indeed, they not only can figure out for themselves what sense to make of a world full of rootlessness, alienation, cultural pastiche, and the rest, they *must* do it themselves."<sup>3</sup> Amazingly, homeless children in Russia are very much like adults in poor countries in that they too experience power in agency, that is, power in their instrumentality to survive and help others like them to sur-

---

Clementine Fujimura is an associate professor at the U.S. Naval Academy, where she teaches Russian language and culture.

vive, by creating for themselves a culture beyond an adult world that offers little more than rootlessness and alienation to them.

The mistrust and contempt that exist between homeless children and the adult world can be traced back to the 1920s, when hunger and abandonment forced thousands of children to take to the streets, as they do today. Many spent little time begging and quickly discovered benefits in stealing. According to Ball, one study conducted from 1925 to 1928 found that the likelihood for children to take to theft largely depended on whether or not they came from the city: "those who had engaged in begging only briefly before moving on to stealing came much more often from urban families than from peasantry."<sup>4</sup> The longer a child remained homeless, the more likely he or she was to become a petty thief. Marked as potential thieves, homeless children were viewed by adults as despicable.

Homeless children, in turn, had little faith in their surrounding society. As Ball explains, "Time and time again, in their actions, interviews and reminiscences, homeless youths expressed aversion for a surrounding citizenry that represented to them only potential victims or persecutors." Already in the 1920s, they had lost their childhood to society. No longer open to adult care and no longer hoping for true empathy, street children found power in paying back the adult world, which only hindered their potential. Homeless children believed, as they do now, in the reproach proclaimed in the title of one of their songs, "And Now My Soul is Hardened."<sup>5</sup>

That homeless children have found power in each other's company is not to suggest that they do not desperately need help. The problem is that, in the past, help offered by the Russian government has been less than a small bandage to cover a deep wound. These children need more than a cold room, a hard bed, and minimal food. They function on a much deeper level and have chosen power in street culture over the life offered in institutions. Only with a better understanding of homeless children on a cultural and psychological level can proper care be instituted.

### **Some Facts**

Russian adults, out of ignorance, require that homeless children live on adult terms; they force them to subsist as adults by earning a living, yet, unlike adults, by taking only menial jobs. (I define children in this article as those sixteen and under, since after sixteen they can finish school and may legitimately earn money toward a pension.) Unlike adults, homeless children have few options as to what they can do to make money. Although children are initially able to get by on the streets of Moscow, their days are numbered. Some children set out to earn a living by cleaning cars or by rummaging through garbage. The money they make is often used to pay for food and shelter for their families. One boy I interviewed was told by his father that he was not allowed to spend the night at home if he did not return with a bottle of vodka. Suffering because of their parents' addictions, many children simply run away.

This generation of abandoned children may already be lost to a life of panhandling, narcotics, petty theft, and prostitution. As Stoecker points out in her

recent article, "Homelessness and juvenile crime are related phenomena, and many criminologists and sociologists call homelessness the 'mother' of juvenile crime." According to Stoecker, the bleaker the situation of the child, the more serious the crimes he or she is likely to commit: "Simply put, hunger causes theft of food; lack of shelter and food leads to serious theft; and lack of shelter combined with unemployment is a precursor of prostitution among girls." Statistics show that in one region of Russia, Primorsky Krai, "one out of every ten youths becomes homeless."<sup>6</sup> Although statistics on homelessness are hard to come by anywhere in the world, in Russia the rising number of homeless is likely correlated to the rising number of children committing crimes.

In jail, children are hardened by the adult criminals around them: "[O]ccasionally these youths are placed in closed institutions with those who have committed more serious crimes, even rape or murder."<sup>7</sup> According to an informant who spent a number of months in prison on a drug conviction, the victimization of youths in prisons is inevitable.

---

***"Young girls are lured by America and offer their bodies for prostitution in return for a ticket to what they think will be freedom."***

Due to overcrowding, prisoners spend their days in a large hall with fewer beds than people. A hierarchy exists that makes it clear who gets to use the beds and when. If a prisoner is at the low end of the totem pole, he becomes the "girl" for those higher in rank. Youths are thus likely to be raped in prison.

Homeless children are aware of the consequences of crime, but they are also aware that by playing into the hands of adults, by allowing themselves to be committed to shelters and orphanages, their quality of life is diminished to the extent that it is worth taking a risk and joining those living on the streets. Many homeless children are not willing to accept help from shelters, which offer little to no emotional comfort and little more than a roof, bedding, and mediocre food: "I earn more on the streets, get better stuff," Alec proclaims.<sup>8</sup> Instead, they use the shelters in times of dire need, returning many times but always leaving again. The children have learned to take only as much as they want and need from adults, acquiring any other comforts, such as love or physical and emotional warmth, from their world of homelessness.

A child's view of the choice between living on the streets and living in shelters is different from that of adults. A director of a Moscow shelter explains the adult view: "Of course, we cannot keep addicted kids. Since they are already so addicted, they are unwilling to be helped. We cannot help those that do not want to be helped, so we only take them in when it is really cold or wet outside and send them out again the next morning. We only have so many beds, which we keep for those who want our help."<sup>9</sup> The children I spoke to, on the contrary, felt they were not "rejected" from the shelter as much as they were "released." The

adult world does not accommodate the addicted homeless child, and once “set free” from the shelters or other institutions, the only shelter that these children may find, besides train stations and abandoned buildings, are prisons.

Many homeless children whom I interviewed differ from their adult counterparts in that they still have hopes of a better future. This “better future,” however, does not include a mainstream ideal. Although they dream of making it big, of earning a lot of money, and of being respected, the children I spoke with have their own ideas of how to achieve that goal. Young girls are lured by America and offer their bodies for prostitution in return for a ticket to what they think will be freedom. One option for some of the boys I spoke with is to be hired as a killer, preferably by an American. America, to them, is the ideal country for such criminal activity. Alec, an eleven-year-old homeless child, said to me, “In America life would be better: I could go to Disneyland.”<sup>10</sup>

Such a difference in opinion about what a good future entails has much to do with what society has made available to them in terms of life stories that can work for homeless children. Bourdieu describes how dominant groups may justify their dominance and, in turn, the inferiority of others. The justification is perpetuated as a social myth ingrained in the people’s minds via the education and socialization they receive. Bourdieu explains, “A large part of social suffering stems from the poverty of people’s relationship to the educational system, which not only shapes social destinies, but also the image they have of their destiny.”<sup>11</sup> To the dominant group these myths may be enabling, but to the dominated they are limiting. Homeless Russian children, in reaction to the negative image of their destiny given to them by the adult world, have taken it upon themselves to beat the system by turning to crime.

Still other children are caught in complex situations out of which there is no escape. For example, at the age of ten Dima was forced to flee with his family from Kyrgyzstan. With little money and nowhere to go, his father left the family, and his baby brother died en route. After many days of living in various train stations, the mother began drinking and attacked a man for his money. She was given a sentence of seven years in prison. Dima, with no papers to allow him into an orphanage in Moscow and no future in his hometown, has nowhere to live. He spends his nights in a shelter, hoping for a miracle.

Perhaps Dima is lucky that no orphanage will have him. In general, Russian orphanages today offer adequate shelter and food. However, children are often left to fend for themselves when it comes to making emotional attachments to people or objects. Toys and other personal belongings are not kept long, since other children will, in all likelihood, steal or break them. Personal relationships experience a similar destiny: They are difficult to maintain, since many children move away and others are mistrusted.

The supervisor of a class in school or in an institution does not have the time or energy to meet the needs of each individual child, and psychological counseling, if available, is often poorly developed. Children often feel that they are in competition with one another for short supplies of food, toys, compassion, and love. The experience of the orphanage is one reason why many older chil-

dren, adopted into Western families, exhibit an inability to attach to their new families.

Official child institutions do not prepare children for life in society, much less in families. In orphanages, children live a regimented life, one in which they are discouraged from making personal decisions. Moreover, children in orphanages are not encouraged to participate in creative activities or to socialize with the outside world. In a study conducted in 1992, Dement'eva concluded that orphans do not know how to realize themselves through relationships due to their regulated environments in the orphanages.<sup>12</sup>

Many children adopted from Russian orphanages have been assessed as having serious emotional problems. Specifically, attachment disorder is one common result of a life lacking a deep relationship with a caregiver. Symptoms of attachment disorder include an inability to give and receive affection, lack of eye contact, indiscriminate affection for strangers, extreme anger, manipulative behavior, stealing, hoarding or gorging on food, preoccupation with fire or gore, lack of impulse control and cause-and-effect thinking, learning and speech disorders, lack of conscience, lying, lack of friends, incessant chatter, or being inappropriately demanding or clingy.<sup>13</sup>

---

***"Due to lack of funding and educational training, programs providing psychological and emotional support are still rare in Russia."***

The problem with institutions like orphanages, boarding homes, and shelters is that they do not meet the needs of the children they serve. There are, however, a few shelters and programs in Moscow that do reach out to the youths in ways that allow the children to flourish not only physically but emotionally. Although the stories that homeless children have to tell are sad and frightening, some children have found help in these special shelters and daytime programs. The institutions are run by adults who are involved because they actually care. Unlike the orphanages, they are less dependent on the government for funding. Indeed, the government chooses to pay them less, thus forcing the shelters to seek help elsewhere. Lack of funding hampers their ability to give the children all they need, but they treat the children better than the regular orphanages. Adult volunteers and workers in one shelter unanimously agree that traditional orphanages and *internaty* (child boarding homes) are not the best solution for abandoned children.

One shelter in particular, Shelter of Childhood, unlike orphanages around Moscow, tries to create a homelike atmosphere by giving the children more personal attention and affection than traditional orphanages provide. Children in this shelter do not fear their teachers and enjoy frequent hugs. Increasingly, shelters are providing children with basic psychological counseling, promoting their

return to their families, and when this is not feasible, placing children in foster care rather than allowing them to vanish in the social vacuum of orphanages.

Grass-roots programs, such as Maria's Children, an art rehabilitation center for orphans, are few. Maria Yeliseyeva founded the center to help orphans gain a sense of worth and belonging. Due to lack of funding and educational training, such programs providing psychological and emotional support are still rare in Russia, but they are very important if homeless children are to be given an opportunity to survive in the adult social world.

### **From the Perspective of the Child: Kolya's Story**

*"Lutshche sinitza v rukakh, chem zhuravl' v nebe."*

Before Kolya speaks, we need to understand the daily life that serves as a context for Russian homeless children, which is perhaps quite unlike anything a Westerner has ever experienced. The average Russian adult does not question the future, has no space for thoughts about tomorrow, but rather is bound to the here and now. A worker, Oleg, described it best:

You know, for us in Moscow, it is impossible to relate to the majority of the Russian population. They have nothing to work towards and cannot imagine what there might be to look forward to beyond the next vodka bottle. . . . Since perestroika, even with changes in leadership, nothing has changed in the lives of the average Russian. In Moscow, perhaps. But overall, people struggle for food and warmth, especially in the winter. And once that is achieved, they await their pay, which perhaps comes once a year. . . . And when the pay comes, they don't think about what to do with it. You and I may consider investing in a mobile phone, or something useful, or something for the future, but such thoughts do not enter their minds. Their pay is invested in vodka. And once that vodka is bought, everything is taken care of: warmth has been obtained, and hunger has been appeased. Life has improved immediately with that vodka. That is their future.<sup>14</sup>

For the Russian adult, although addicted to alcohol, being able to destroy physical and emotional pain with vodka is taking control of one's own life.

The need for immediate gratification, a measure of control, and cessation of distress characterizes not only adults, but homeless children as well. Homeless children are empowered by their ability to meet their physical needs. It all begins with their ability to survive from one day to the next and, on cold days, from one hour to the next. The children take what they can get and devour what they have. Once they have taken care of their most basic physical needs, that is, food and shelter, they look for something to take away the emotional and other physical pain. Drugs and alcohol are, of course, a common solution. They take the children to a warmer state of being where they are detached from their pain. At one point, the emotional needs overwhelm the physical and drugs and alcohol take first priority above food and shelter. The desire for immediate gratification drives the lives of the homeless children.

Russian homeless children are comparable to people in poor countries, who, as Metcalf points out, appear simply to deal with circumstances that are not in their control and who merely "look out for opportunities when they appear on the horizon."<sup>15</sup> However, like adults in those countries, homeless children, even in the

context of Russian social chaos, are able to construct their own world; as Metcalf points out, “[I]n this, they are very far from powerless.”<sup>16</sup>

Kolya, age twelve, told me about his experience on the streets of Moscow and at the Yaroslavsky train station. At the train station, he made his living selling flowers, through which he was able to make enough money to satisfy his physical hunger:

I’d take them [flowers] from an old lady [*babushka*] and at the end of the day give her the money, of which she gave me some. I used to earn more than my mother. There were days when I earned sooo much! One day I started late and I earned about 600 rubles [approximately \$22.00]! I took myself out to McDonald’s, bought myself fries, in short, everything!<sup>17</sup>

From these words, we learn that Kolya feels anything but powerless. In fact, he feels that he comes out ahead and takes great pride in making more than is needed for immediate gratification.

Kolya is a very proud boy and feels he has his life more together than anyone in his family. Life for him is rough, but throughout our conversations he never pitied himself. In fact, he feels he is quite lucky compared to other homeless children: “There was a six-year-old with a family. They’d eat the food and give him the rind. I felt sorry for him.” Kolya feels lucky not only that he gets more than a rind from his family but that he has a family to begin with. He is very close to his sister, who can do no wrong. Even when she is caught prostituting herself, Kolya denies her activities.

Kolya, like many of the children I spoke to, refuses to see himself as a victim. Only when remembering the loss of a beloved dog does he show sadness: “In the summer sometimes, we lived in a specific park. I had a dog, a purebreed. He was very attached to me. But the police shot him.” At this point in the conversation, Kolya became quiet and it was hard for him to say much more. We resumed our conversation another day.

When not confronted by the powerlessness he feels at the loss of a loved one, Kolya feels strong and intelligent. He feels he is the man with the solutions for his family. In describing his life before Moscow, when he lived in a shack with no running water and no heat, he is adamant that he understands how to save money and live better than his mother:

We did not always live in Moscow. We had a dacha in Ryazan—small, but we lived well. But my mama eats so much, we had to come to Moscow to make money. My mama may be crazy. She always has to eat meat, which is expensive! I told my mother over and over again to buy a cheap house so we could live normally. But no, she wants to save money for an expensive house, so instead, she spends money on meat and again we are left without a place to live! And we have little food! When mama gives me a plan on how to sell flowers, it never works, but when I make the plan, I make a lot.

In this last monologue, Kolya identifies himself as the wise one in his family and, in a sense, the leader, the one who is vital to his family’s survival. In actuality, Kolya is the youngest of three and was unable to save his sister from prostitution and drugs, his brother from drugs and petty theft, or his mother from alcoholism.

### **Cultural Constraints in Helping Homeless Children in Russia: Notions of *Svoi*, *Chuzhoi*, and Victimhood**

The question remains why a society that traditionally idealizes childhood finds it difficult to understand and save the children most in need. Part of the answer lies in the economic difficulties that Russia faces today. However, from an anthropological perspective, the problem runs on a sociocultural level. In interviews with me, adults with various educational backgrounds discussed the feelings they have when approaching orphans. Some cannot bear to face the children, so overcome are they by emotion. Others fear the children to be dishonest and potential criminals. Yet others feel that they need to care for themselves and their children first

---

***“As under the Soviet regime, today adults are afraid to adopt. Those who do often do not tell anyone that their children are adopted, including the children themselves.”***

and do not have the time, money, or energy to commit to orphans who, in their words, cannot truly be helped anyway. The pervasive inability or unwillingness to face other people’s problems stems not only from a lack of financial stability, but also from a pervasive feeling among Russians that they are unable to change society.

Those feelings and attitudes have developed over time, the result of enculturation and socialization. Negative sentiments toward street children are the outcome of a complex web of teachings under the Soviet regime, a stigma placed on that which is different, foreign, and “not one’s own,” and a cultural-religious sense of martyrdom.

Historically, the average Russian citizen has been discouraged from proactive engagement in social issues. Under the Soviet regime, becoming involved in social problems only disclosed the fact that they existed. Instead, orphans and children with disabilities were confined to institutions. Indeed, many of the adults I interviewed were convinced that under the Soviet regime orphans and disabled children barely existed. Since the collapse of the Soviet regime, Russians have not been given much reason to believe that their vote counts. Instead, they once again feel victimized by the socioeconomic crisis and helpless in the face of social and political turmoil. Even with money and an education in hand, few feel they have the power to make a difference in society.

“Why do Americans want to adopt our children?” is a question I often encounter while studying orphans in Russia. Before I even begin to answer, the person will probably add, “Most of our orphans have all kinds of physical and psychological problems! And why do Americans want a child that is not theirs, neither by birth nor by nationality?” When asked whether they would ever consider adopting, a common response is, “Perhaps if there was no way I could have my own. But even then, I would have to think about it. One’s own is always better.”



One's own: *svoi*. A value-laden concept that underlies not only day-to-day individual and family decisions, but social and political trends as well. Not one's own, *ne svoi*, will never understand and feel the way *svoi* would.

*Ne svoi* is closely related to *chuzhoi*, which means strange or foreign. Many Russians feel that they can never really integrate foreign persons into their society. From a Russian's perspective, one who is *chuzhoi* will never fully become Russian, even if he or she was born and raised on Russian soil. It is in their blood to be different, just as orphans have it in their blood to be different.

Russian adults approach orphans with trepidation because such children remain stigmatized. To this day, the adults I interviewed agreed that an orphan potentially has bad genes and is a threat to society. The argument frequently made is that the parents of these children were incapable of raising them, and therefore the children are likely to have inherited those negative qualities. As under the Soviet regime, today adults are afraid to adopt. Those who do often do not tell anyone that their children are adopted, including the children themselves.

This is not to deny that many of the orphans have physical or emotional problems. Indeed, fetal alcohol syndrome, for example, continues to plague many of the children forced into orphanages. However, as many adoptions in the West have demonstrated, it is frequently the absence of a stable family life, love, and opportunities to succeed, and not their genetic makeup, that forces the children to become social outcasts.

Of course, there are exceptions. Being different may sometimes be better. Sergei, a doctoral candidate in Russian literature and a strong believer in the strength of Russian culture, tells of an orphan who was different, but truly special:

He was adopted by my relatives. We all knew, but of course, no one ever told him. He grew up in our dark-haired family and his blond hair and blue eyes were a striking contrast. He was like an angel, both in looks and in character: such a good person. Then, just as he entered his youth, he was shot. As if he was not meant long for this human world.<sup>18</sup>

Even when an adopted child is loved and appreciated, the difference, the *ne svoi*, is still pointed out.

Another hindrance to helping homeless children and orphans comes from a sense of continuous hardship and martyrdom. "*Kakaya nasha zhizn' tyazhiolaya*," or "How hard life is," is a phrase heard every day. Even when life seems to be going particularly well when, for example, you just bought a new apartment, were given a well-paying job, and your tourist visa to the United States came through (as was the case with one of my Russian acquaintances), you may still begin your day with a deep sigh and proclaim, "*Kakaya nasha zhizn' tyazhiolaya!*"

Sergei adds that Russians and Americans simply do not view life the same way: "The difference between Americans and Russians is that an American may walk by a beggar and think, 'Indeed, how sad. How hard life is.' And walk on, sparing perhaps a kopek or two. The thought of truly helping this person never occurs."<sup>19</sup> Most Russians, according to many interviewed, do not feel that they have any power to help. Life is too overwhelming, complicated, and oppressive. For those who have the financial means to help, the issues do not appear as important to the

country. One Russian businessman, when I questioned him about the homeless situation, responded, "Homeless children? We don't have them anymore."<sup>20</sup>

### Conclusion

The divide in world view between Russian adults with homes and Russian homeless children is immense. Each understands childhood in different terms: the adult sees childhood as a protected and nurtured time of life, whereas the homeless child sees childhood as a time of independent struggle with the demands of the adult world. Adults see homeless children as victims of the evils of their society, yet also as untouchables; homeless children see themselves as manipulators of a world they mistrust. Unlike those trying to save the children from the streets, the children themselves believe they cannot be helped. "Answering questions about their dreams and desires, homeless children in 1999 do not want, as they did before, nice clothing, toys, books. They do not hope to be adopted and do not want help with finding homes. Today's homeless are tougher, less trustful and more pessimistic."<sup>21</sup>

Instead of reaching to the adult world, homeless children, taking their own initiative, have figured out how to cope. In doing so, they have shown "remarkable resiliency."<sup>22</sup> Recent psychological literature suggests that rather than perceiving street life as a problem and reacting by trying to "normalize" the behavior of the children, one needs to understand and respect the children's culture and worldview: "Instead of attempting to put children back into . . . mainstream society with the hope of 'normalizing' their behavior, the way forward may be to recognize the strengths that street children have developed and build upon their survival skills."<sup>23</sup> Thus, one may come to see the homeless children's lives not as "pathological," but as resilient.

Until we recognize the hidden power of homeless children, they will remain, in a sense, at war with the adult world in which they live. Adults, whether Westerners from charity organizations or Russians hired by the government, nurture this war by rounding up homeless children and trying to force them to grow up in prisonlike institutions. The war will be lost on both ends if adults do not take the initiative, as they have in past wars, to "understand the enemy." Homeless children need to be understood and taken care of beyond their physical requirements. They need to be respected differently from children who have been nurtured in families. They need to be seen as extremely able and empowered by their experiences, although simultaneously marginalized by the world in which they exist.

It is my hope that via an anthropological contextualization of the reality orphans face on a daily basis, those reaching out to homeless children will come together and help them on a deeper level than in the past, thus ending the rift that exists between the Russian adult and homeless children's worlds.

### NOTES

1. Clementine Creuziger, *Childhood in Russia: Representation and Reality* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1996).
2. Clementine Creuziger, "Russia's Unwanted Children: A Cultural Anthropological

- Study of Marginalized Children in Moscow and St. Petersburg,” *Childhood* 4, no. 3 (1997): 343–59.
3. P. Metcalf, “Global ‘Disjuncture’ and the Sites of Anthropology,” *Cultural Anthropology* 16, no. 2 (2001): 167.
  4. Alan Ball, *And Now My Soul is Hardened: Abandoned Children in Soviet Russia, 1918–1930* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).
  5. *Ibid.*, 82.
  6. Sally Stoecker, “Homelessness and Criminal Exploitation of Russian Minors: Realities, Resources and Legal Remedies,” *Demokratizatsiya* 9, no. 2 (2001): 319–36.
  7. *Ibid.*, 332.
  8. Alec, homeless boy, interview with author, Moscow, October 1999.
  9. Sapar Mulaevich, director of homeless shelter Way Home, interview with author, Moscow, December 1999.
  10. Alec, interview, October 1999.
  11. Pierre Bourdieu, *Acts of Resistance: Against the Tyranny of the Market* (New York: New York Press, 1998), 43.
  12. Irina Dement’eva, *Sotsial’nye problemy sirotstva* (Moskva: Rossiskaya Akademiya Nauk, Institut Sotsiologii, 1992).
  13. See the Attachment Center at Evergreen’s web page <<http://attachmenttherapy.com>> for more information.
  14. “Oleg,” worker, interview with author, Moscow, April 2000.
  15. Metcalf, “Global ‘Disjuncture,’” 167.
  16. *Ibid.*
  17. Kolya, homeless boy, interview with author, January 2000. (All subsequent quotes from Kolya are from my interviews with him.)
  18. Sergei Zhozhikashvily, interview with author, Moscow, November 1999.
  19. *Ibid.*
  20. “Boris,” interview with author, Moscow, June 1996.
  21. RAN, *Rossiya 1999: sotsial’no-demograficheskaya situatsiya*, 211–13, in Stoecker, “Homelessness and Criminal Exploitation,” 324.
  22. Catherine Panter-Brick, “Nobody’s Children? A Reconsideration of Child Abandonment,” in *Abandoned Children*, ed. Catherine Panter-Brick and Malcolm T. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 11.
  23. Angela Veale, Max Taylor, and Carol Linchan, “Psychological Perspectives of ‘Abandoned’ and ‘Abandoning’ Street Children,” in *Abandoned Children*, ed. Catherine Panter-Brick and Malcolm T. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 131–45.