

**Arab Families Working Group**

**Minutes of the May 2004  
Core Group Meeting**

**Sofitel Maadi Towers  
Cairo, May 20-22, 2004**

**Arab Families Working Group  
Minutes of the May 2004 Core Group Meeting  
Sofitel Maadi Towers, Cairo, May 20-22, 2004**

**Table of Contents**

Day 1

Coordinator's Report	3
Report on Ford and IDRC Grants	3
Syracuse University Press (SUP)	5
Translation of the AFWG Volume	5
Dissemination: Public Spheres Conference and Fall Stakeholders Workshop	7
AFWG Website Development	9
Coordinates and Agenda	12
Human Subjects Protocols	12
Research Budgets	14
Volume I: Substantive Discussion	20
Chapter One: Introduction	21
A. Why Arab Families	21
B. Why Arab families are a point of departure, not gender studies	22
Terminologies	24
The Literature Reviews	25
Public Discourse Chapter	25
Border Crossings Chapter	26
Data Chapter	27
Collaboration between Research Projects	28
RAs vs. RP Members	28
Non-AFWG Research Participants	30

Day 2

Planning the Empirical Research	31
Public Discourse Project Meeting	31
Youth and Desire	34
Reports on Planning for the Next Phase of Research	40
Palestine: Weddings and War	40
Lebanon	41
Egypt: Educational Desires and Desires for Modernity	42

Day 3

Summaries of the Empirical Projects	45
Border Crossings Projects	45
Public Discourse Projects	46
Thematic Links among the Projects	47
Staging and Phasing	49
A. Reports- Timeframe	49
B. Assignments of Responding to Reports	49
C. Products by September 2005	50

D. What Next in Terms of Research	50
E. Budgets: What More in Terms of Funding	50
Fall and Spring Workshops	50
Volume I Reviewers' Comments and Critical Discussion	52
A- Border Crossings Chapter	52
B- Public Discourse Chapter	57
Reorganization of PD Chapter and Individual Tasks	59
Human Subjects Protocol	60
General Orientation and Tips- Barbara Ibrahim	60
Questions from AFWG Core Group about Human Subjects Protocols	61
Summary of Procedures, Considerations & Tasks Regarding Human Subjects	61
Other forms of Engagement with Stakeholder	64
Other Forms of Dissemination: MESA 2005	64
AFWG Protocols	64
AFWG Office	64

**Arab Families Working Group  
Minutes of the May 2004 Core Group Meeting  
Sofitel Maadi Towers, Cairo, May 20-22, 2004**

**Attendees**

**AFWG Core Group Members:** Lamis Abu Nahla, Ibrahim Elnur, Barbara Ibrahim, Penny Johnson, Suad Joseph, Ray Juriedini, Mona Khalaf, Eileen Kuttab, Jihad Makhoul, Annelies Moors, Nadine Naber, Martina Rieker, Zeina Zaatari. **Absent:** Hoda Elsadda, Omnia El Shakry

**AFWG Staff:** Hania Sobhy. **Population Council Staff:** Alyce Abdalla.

**Day 1**

**First Session**

**Coordinator's Report**

**Suad Joseph:** Welcome everyone. I am glad Lamis could make it for this meeting.

This meeting is paid for through the Ford Grant, so the reimbursement process will be different. It will go through UC Davis. We need everyone's receipts. You may give them to Hania Sobhy, and she will photocopy them. I would like to pay you in cash while I'm here. The reimbursement forms are in your binders: please fill them out today and give them to Hania. I will pay for the accommodation and meals. Any extra charges could be paid individually.

Omnia El Shakry could not make this meeting but she will be in Egypt all of next year, so she will be available for AFWG work at that time.

Huda ElSadda has a conference in the States.

Hania Sholkamy has decided to withdraw from the group. She felt that her work did not fit with what we were doing. But she wants to stay involved, however. We have a category of AFWG Affiliates, which we can offer to her. She asked about referencing the research she has done that is related to some of our AFWG work. Since the Well Being project did not produce or publish, it seemed to me that the best way to handle that was for her to note that her work was informed by the discussions in AFWG.

Penny Johnson and Eileen Kuttab should be arriving this afternoon.

**Report on Ford Foundation and International Development Research Centre Grants**

We have the \$150,000 from Ford.

The IDRC grant was approved but we had problems with the dissemination clause: Clause A6. IDRC reserves the right to digitalize anything we submit to them and put it on their webpage. The conflict is with anything we want to publish. This would be a problem with our Syracuse University Press contract. So we had their lawyers talking to UC lawyers. IDRC did agree to add an amendment that for purposes of this contract: anything that *we* publish, they will not put on the web. So for example, they could put our technical reports on their website. We have to pay attention to what we submit to them to note that we do not want a specific item digitalized for their website with a: *Not for Dissemination*. They committed to always consulting us before putting any of our material on their website.

I had given them some of our concept papers, our protocols (which is a working document and we do not want it to be published on their website).

They did say they would not do publish on their website our material without consulting us.

In any case, anything that goes to them probably should go through me.

**Mona Khalaf:** I have a question, when we talk about working papers, what do we mean by that, a first draft?

**Suad Joseph:** In our first meeting, we had working papers that we produced for each other to present at the workshop. We would not like them to publish these.

**Mona Khalaf:** Do you not think that their digitalization would come after we publish our work? There could be material that was not included in the volume and publications, there would be material that is a byproduct of work we have done after we finish our work, not of primary importance to our work and that they could publish.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We can also think of how we can use their website strategically. If we plan to hold a public forum, that would be a wonderful way to use their website. We can think about using it, as well as protecting ourselves.

**Martina Rieker:** Putting something on a website is considered a publications. Once it is on a website, it cannot be taken to publisher. We should start putting: *Copyrighted by AFWG*.

**Suad Joseph:** I think we do need to be very careful to protect our junior scholars. And they have said, at IDRC, that they would consult us. They have heard a lot from me and from UC lawyers about the seriousness of this issue. Their own program people are sensitive to this issue. It is their lawyers that had written the clause. Anything that we do, as Martina said, we should put: *Copyright AFWG*.

The other clause that is a problem was whether Canadian or California Law applies. For Canadian law to apply, we would need to get a waiver from the UC Board of Regents, all the way to the President. I left them UC and IDRC figuring that out. IDRC is unwavering on this issue.

The IDRC funds are will be transferred over a three-year period

Syracuse University Press (SUP)

I have signed the SUP contract. You have all been sent a copy and you will also find it in your binders. SUP was very helpful. IDRC wanted to have 25 copies. SUP has increased our free copies to 50. They have been very accommodating. Another thing is that they have allowed us to publish our Arabic work *before* our English and they have accepted a flat \$5,000 royalty to allow for the Arabic translation. One thing we do want to come back to is to figure out who is going to translate it and disseminate it. Barbara and I were talking about this and I tapped Moushira Geziri's brain about it. We would like the same agency to translate and publish.

Translation of the AFWG Volume

**Zeina Zaatari:** Dar el Adab in Beirut would do that if they were interested in the material. I know the editor of Adab. I can ask.

**Ray Jureidini:** What is the cost of translation?

**Suad Joseph:** The only experience I have is with my Gender and Citizenship book. It is a bit larger than ours. That cost \$25,000 for translation, publication, distribution, advertizing. Lina Abu Habib group, the Gender Linking Project was commissioned to do it. She has more copies. Lina said \$25,000 was not enough. We have \$35,000 more for our Volume I translation from the Population Council. This includes \$5,000 to SUP.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** It seems to me that distribution is the key.

**Suad Joseph:** I went to a couple of bookstores in Beirut and I did not find any copies of the Arabic translation of my Gender and Citizenship book. I think we need a good press and someone to follow up on distribution. Lina's job is to make sure that it is out. My concern about Lina is that it took her three years to do the translation and launching and that she was not good with communication. The co-funder of that translation project, the Ford Foundation, complained frequently because she did not reply to their emails or submit reports on time. She admitted this.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We could get a publications coordinator.

**Suad Joseph:** Lina's outfit would be ideal, because they have a whole line on gender, but the problem is communication, timeliness and follow up.

**Mona Khalaf:** An institution is better than an individual.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** If an institution is our publisher, it would be able to control the publications coordinator.

**Mona Khalaf:** For example, it could be one person inside Gender Studies at AUC.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** It could be one of our institutions.

**Suad Joseph:** Would the Population Council be willing to provide a publications coordinator?

**Barbara Ibrahim:** This is what Moushira does, but I would hesitate to commit her because she is starting a PhD program.

But let us not tell a publisher that we have \$35,000. We could have mailing costs. We could buy copies and send them. Let us hold back some of these funds to distribute the book.

**Suad Joseph:** Dissemination is our key problem. Mona could you talk to Dar al Nahar? The comment I have heard about al-Nahar is that they would be more journalistic and not attuned to social sciences.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** There is the Women and Memory Forum in Egypt. It is an institution of good standing. We do not know how regional they are.

**Suad Joseph:** Let us assign someone to deal with each of these.

Zeina: Dar al Adab

Barbara: Will you talk to Hoda Elsadda about the Women and Memory Forum?

Mona: Dar al-Nahar

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We can ask them to give us a formal proposal and tell them that timing is important for us.

**Mona Khalaf:** But we have to have quality control over cover, paper and number of pages.

**Annelies Moors:** I think the key is that the translation is good.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** Are you happy with the translation of your book?

**Suad Joseph:** My Arabic is not good enough to tell.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** But the book they did- an Oxfam publication- was awful.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Maybe we should separate the translation from publication.

**Suad Joseph:** Volume I will be about 300 pages.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Do we have a minimum paper standard- we need a quality publication.

**Suad Joseph:** The publisher would do the cover art, good regional distribution and it has to be translated and out in less than one year.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** How about 6 months?

**Mona Khalaf:** I would like to go back to the point that Barbara made: separating the translation and publications. So we need to know before we approach candidates if they will handle one or both.

**Suad Joseph:** We need two proposals, two options. If print only: 3 months, but both translation and printing: 9 months.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** Dirasat al wihda al-arabiya is good.

**Zeina Zaatari:** I know where their office is in Beirut

**Suad Joseph:** Ok, Zeina can contact them. Who will talk to Nur. Judy Makhoul will.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I will have Moushira check with the other branch of Nur in Cairo. Could I say that we tell them 6 months and if they want to bargain about that then we will discuss the time frame?

**Mona Khalaf:** What is the maximum time?

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** One year.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We would have the right to reject or retain the translation.

**Suad Joseph:** It should be built in the contract - the right to review the translation.

We are just talking about the mechanics now of volume one. Zeina is now in charge of getting the deadlines all met. We had some funding left from the Mellon grant- so out of that, Zeina will now be in charge of editing and formatting, putting the volume together.

**Zeina Zaatari:** By June 15, I need all your documents and bios. My deadline is July 15.

**Suad Joseph:** What I am going to do is have everyone sign on to that - what do all think? That means that the groups meetings will discuss how they will meet the deadline for Volume I.

**Zeina Zaatari:** Just one point. You all have the detailed SUP guidelines, but I want to say something, if you do not know, or you are not sure then do not format at all. It is much harder for me to undo the formatting than to have the document without formatting.

**Suad Joseph:** For endnotes, do not do them automatically. Enter them manually.

**Zeina Zaatari:** When you are putting Arabic bibliography, I need the actual Arabic title.

**Suad Joseph:** In terms of the substance of Volume one, Penny and Eileen specifically asked that we postpone that discussion until they come.

#### Dissemination: Public Spheres Conference and Fall Stakeholders Workshop

**Martina Rieker:** We had talked about dissemination. There is an opportunity for this in the Public Spheres Conference in October in Beirut co-organized by Seteney Shami of the Social Science Research Council and AUB. It is in one of our sites. I presume it would a relatively

large event. We could have our own panel, or even a roundtable. It would not cost us much in terms of energy.

**Ray Jureidini:** I think it will be a good opportunity. I do not think it will be enormous, but an excellent opportunity.

**Suad Joseph:** Is there funding to cover the costs of a roundtable?

**Ray Jureidini:** I think for SSRC people mostly, but I am not sure of the details.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** But surely we have money to send people, especially from within the region.

**Ray Jureidini:** Except if we plan an AFWG workshop in Beirut. The only problem is that it is right in the beginning of the academic year.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I also have a feeling this will be an important meeting.

**Annelies Moors:** I have 22-24 October for the Public Spheres conference in Beirut.

**Ray Jureidini:** Yes, that is correct.

**Suad Joseph:** We had planned to do a workshop for stakeholders. We could have our workshop before the conference. Were we thinking for our fall workshop for stakeholders as maybe a one-day workshop? October 21<sup>st</sup> is a Thursday. The purpose is getting stakeholders to think about the ideas we are working on and helping us with our thinking. It also means we are spending the summer planning for the stakeholders workshop when we need to finish Volume I.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** What if we made the decision based on whether two or three members from each group are willing to commit to that.

**Suad Joseph:** We have to have someone to be in charge to know who to invite, identify people we want to be in long-term contact with. Let us come back this at the end of the afternoon. The Stakeholders workshop is independent from whether we have a panel at Public Spheres conference.

**Annelies Moors:** Maybe we want to see if want to do a roundtable or a panel.

**Suad Joseph:** Who could participate in a roundtable at the AUB conference on Public Spheres?

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** Yes I would be willing.

**Mona Khalaf:** It depends on what the topic is- if it is women in the public sphere, then I am ok.

**Ray Jureidini:** I am happy to arrange a roundtable for us.

**Suad Joseph:** Ray and Annelies are willing to go.

Martina: yes.

Barbara: in theory, yes.

Lamis: yes in principle.

Omnia will be in Egypt.

Suad: possibly.

That is 9 possibilities. If we add a half-day, why can we not make it?

**Annelies Moors:** I am not sure it is a good idea to conflict with the conference.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** What is the best time of day to have a stakeholders meeting? It will be Ramadan, so between 10:00 and 1:00 should be the best time.

**Suad Joseph:** The idea is nesting a three-hour Stakeholders workshop, and then an afternoon for the roundtable in the Public Spheres conference. The other possibility is Friday morning, our workshop, and our roundtable on Saturday.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Let us talk about who we would want to invite and this will help us to organize it.

**Ray Jureidini:** We do not even have a tentative plan for the conference, so we cannot be clear on when our roundtable will be. With the correspondence so far, I have not even seen the fact that this will be the middle of Ramadan come up.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** But for NGOs if you tell them a good time ahead, they would come.

**Suad Joseph:** We are not inviting government agencies yet. There are a lot more ramifications to getting them involved.

**Jihad Makhoul:** The government ministry people are more than happy to contribute, like CDR, Majlis Al-Inma' wal 'Imar.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We can negotiate to have our roundtable in the first two days. I think Judy could be the one who would organize this. I think we can have a strategic choice of government friends.

**Suad Joseph:** So Thursday morning, the 21<sup>st</sup>, who can commit to that?

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Why do we not wait for making that decision until other people come? And we can discuss the details of the workshop. Anyone who is interested in the roundtable can sit at a table at lunch and discuss.

**Suad Joseph:** Let us move on to the website.

### AFWG Website Development

**Martina Rieker:** Basically our website now is a mission statement and then a link to members only section. We have to create a public persona. What else would we like to have

there? I have a sample of a website here. We can pass this print-out around. This group does research. It is poorly designed, but they describe who they are. We need to think about what we want on the public site. We could have the project associates. We want something describing our interests. There is money available to hire RAs over the summer, since we have this money for the web and some of it will go to design. We need to address why are people interested in the family now? There is the material on the Moroccan family law changes- perhaps we could hire someone to assemble this stuff and make it into a research project. The more people can use this for their classroom, the more we can become relevant, the better. We need to think for example, for gender studies teaching, or for NGOs, what to assemble on our website.

The other thing is to get a domain name: [www.afwg.net](http://www.afwg.net) or [www.afwg.org](http://www.afwg.org). We can afford it. It is cheap. It could still be mirrored with UC and AUC websites.

**Mona Khalaf:** I think the idea of putting these family law changes on the website is an excellent one. Which countries are we going to be talking about?

**Martina Rieker:** The whole idea is to make this available as a resource.

**Annelies Moors:** I wonder whether Emory University has a site on this. Abdalla An-Na'im has a huge site on Islamic Family Law.

**Martina Rieker:** We can have a link to it, but it should not be duplicated.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Our bibliography could be put there.

**Zeina Zaatari:** The researcher that we hire could look into that: what is out there.

**Suad Joseph:** for those of you who have a website, we can also make a link to it. Are there any other suggestions to Martina? We should have a brief bio about each Core Group member- one paragraph bio, then two paragraphs about intellectual and research interests, and one page that is about our AFWG Associates and Affiliates.

**Nadine Naber:** It seems like the autobiographical description is what you are doing within this project.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We could have link to the c.v.'s for each Core Group member from our own websites.

**Jihad Makhoul:** Two things: This is directly related to AFWG. A lot of the stuff I am doing is very much about families, but more focused on child labor.

**Suad Joseph:** You would emphasize what you are doing within AFWG in the particular Research Project.

**Jihad Makhoul:** From my experience, you would have to have a tree with branches. That would give you an outline of the areas you would have to include in the website. If you start off with a trunk: AFWG. First page is Welcome, the next page three or four links from first page. Maybe one of the branches can be Associates, upcoming events, Research Projects, workshops. To have it there as a skeleton, would help us think of the details of each branch.

**Martina Rieker:** Our biggest problem is content, not structure. Our problem is having material for the public site.

**Suad Joseph:** There are a few things we can include, such as the program of our first meeting in May 2001. The bibliography is another. I do not think we want to put our proposal, but our bios, our affiliates (we have to ask their permission). We can have a one-page description of AFWG, then a page that is links to other sites, and to events.

**Martina Rieker:** The only problem that if there are a lot of links with nothing on them. Everyone could copy and paste their URL, and then send it to me to include as a link. Do we also want in the long run to have resources? Do we want to offer materials to those interested in family?

**Suad Joseph:** On the resource page, we can have the bibliography.

**Mona Khalaf:** The problem with the media is that most of it is in Arabic. There is very little in the Daily Star that is relevant to research.

**Alyce Abdalla:** Is there work that people use right now and could add?

**Mona Khalaf:** I would like to start small and then get big.

**Suad Joseph:** The material that we are collecting ourselves is ok to put out, instead of hiring someone to collect something we are not using anyway.

**Zeina Zaatari:** I think Martina's point is that we want to provide things that are of use.

**Mona Khalaf:** Is AFWG a permanent group? Would we be able to keep it up? I agree with Suad on putting things that are already available.

**Martina Rieker:** We could say in this historical moment, we capture this moment. There is no presumption that we are engaging in long-term project.

**Suad Joseph:** This includes the things that are related to our project, such as family law. The RA would be hired to find these things and put them on there, not to make critical summaries?

**Martina Rieker:** Yes.

**Jihad Makhoul:** Could we have a discussion group? Throw in a question, and people would write in?

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** Can you have Arabic resources? The problem is that a lot of people in the programs do not read English.

**Martina Rieker:** Yes, that is possible.

## Coordinates and Agenda

**Suad Joseph:** In the Binder, there is a form for updating your coordinates, so if your info is not updated, please fill out the form and give it to Hania.

If we can all look at the whole Agenda and look at the way we have things laid out, see if that looks about right and see if we want to shift things around. We can talk about budgeting twice, principles and big picture today and then again when we regroup. Saturday we can talk about the workshop.

## Human Subject Protocols

**Suad Joseph:** This is one of the things we all have to be aware of. Human Subject Protocols are very important. We have to be extremely careful. For all of the steps we take which have human subjects involved, we have to have permission. For children and youth, the proper authorities (teachers and parents) have to approve.

**Jihad Makhoul:** I usually have an introductory letter and I read it out to parents. Before that, NGOs or ministries obtained a formal letter giving you access to community. When I was doing child labor, I got to the parents through the children. We ask the employer, and then the child would take you to the family.

**Suad Joseph:** Do you get a written consent?

**Jihad Makhoul:** When you ask a signature it might be offensive and you are assuming that they can read and understand and can sign, but so far I have had no problem.

**Suad Joseph:** But how do you document that you have received consent?

**Jihad Makhoul:** To require consent would be offensive to the human subject.

**Suad Joseph:** Do you tape the consent?

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We have to demonstrate that we have informed consent and confidentiality. The process will take several months and we have to have a lot of thinking about this before.

**Ray Jureidini:** What AUB has done is establish an ethics course for 3 hours, and you get a certificate in the end.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** NIH has an online program you can do in 40 minutes.

**Suad Joseph:** I think all of us have to take it. The certification lasts for one year. It is easy and it is interesting. Print every page then do the test at the end.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Be sure to click that you need record of your certification.

**Suad Joseph:** Please be sure you do that soon for the empirical work.

**Mona Khalaf:** Would I ask everyone to sign?

**Barbara Ibrahim:** At AUC, we have a third party witness who signs that they observed that you informed and that she gave consent. I think that we can begin to lobby on that and on not needing a signature or a thumbprint.

**Annelies Moors:** But most of my work is just talking to people. How does this relate to informal forms of anthropological research?

**Barbara Ibrahim:** It is there so that if a person complains, we are protected.

**Annelies Moors:** It is different in Europe. Anthropological research is about talking to people.

**Suad Joseph:** I have had a discussion about this. As long the interviews do not end up being published or distributed anywhere, it is ok to talk with informants.

**Ray Jureidini:** It is anonymity not confidentiality that is being guaranteed, unless people agree that you use their name.

**Nadine Naber:** It should be ok as long as you tell them that you will replace names.

**Ray Jureidini:** Within sociology, this has always existed.

**Annelies Moors:** But that is where it is useful.

**Nadine Naber:** But it could be useful also when you talk about very personal issues.

**Suad Joseph:** We have to have a collective process and a collective letter we will all use.

**Mona Khalaf:** Could we have a collective paper for all the subjects? The witness would be the Mokhtar.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I think that it would have to be modified situation by situation. Some of the work will be with youth and it would have a different layer. These can be individual sentences that can be modified.

**Suad Joseph:** We need a template that can be passed by the IRB board at UC Davis.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I think that we can have a year of work planned and our human subjects attached with that.

**Suad Joseph:** Maybe we have a template, and then we add a number of paragraphs and say with this project, we will add this paragraph. We could get audited. You would need to send me copies of permissions to do interviews.

**Annelies Moors:** One side is the legal stuff and the other is the ethical. We all have to deal with bureaucracy. I understand very much the issue of confidentiality in terms of anonymity.

When you write there is so much information that you get from walking around and talking to people. I am not arguing for not informing people.

**Nadine Naber:** I only had to do that for interviews. If I used a story from a wedding I went to, I would go back to the people and ask if they had a problem, if I used this.

**Zeina Zaatari:** But that is not what is required.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I think if you observed something happening in a wedding, even if you used it, you would not be required to get consent. It is not part of your research plan to go to the wedding and hear this.

**Ray Jureidini:** These procedures are in the interest of the institutions, not the participants.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** You need to send us the materials if you want to be in next IRB meeting.

**Ray Jureidini:** We need to discuss how this will limit our research.

**Nadine Naber:** But I have felt protected by them.

**Mona Khalaf:** If you ask women about the remittances they get from husbands, they would think you would report to the Ministry of Finance. If you were to make these people sign a form, they would never be willing to participate.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I do not think we have to send the consent forms to you.

**Suad Joseph:** I think I have to have a copy.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I would worry to DHL them. I would rather keep them locked in my office.

**Suad Joseph:** I can personally collect them at workshops.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I think if we satisfy ourselves, we can finesse the IRB.

**Suad Joseph:** In Egypt, you need formal research permit, but not in Lebanon and Palestine.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Even with the witness issue, we tried to be understanding of the research context.

**Suad Joseph:** We need our own internal IRB at AFWG, would Barbara be willing to be on that sub-committee? Annelies? Let us do a three-person committee, to filter things. We can go back to this on the Saturday after we have decided on the research programs

## **Second Session**

[Arrived during this session: Penny Johnson and Eileen Kuttab]

## Research Budgets

**Suad Joseph:** Let me update you on a couple of things. I visited a program officer at the Hewlett Foundation who I met through Barbara Ibrahim. She said the AFWG project was outside their scope of interest, but she said at times that they have funds at end of year that they have to spend. So she encouraged me to send a brief proposal in September. I have other foundations I am looking at for funding as well.

Please look at the budget in the Binder. It has both the Ford Foundation and the IDRC budgets laid out next to each other. The “Consultants” category in the budget will be used for web development. “Salaries” is my one term buyout and “Equipment” is for the office. They lump everything else in one category. We can shift things around. For Ford, we can reallocate 10% to another category without their permission. IDRC we have to go back to them for everything, but their budget categories are so broad, we would not need to do that anyway. Ford also wanted condensed categories. The Ford grant is technically only for the Public Discourse research project. IDRC is for both PD and BC. From IDRC’s point of view, they think of the two grants as one budget, but Ford does not.

They key arena of latitude is item 8 - money to hire RA, buyout or summer pay. Other stuff is salaries for Hania, for the RA in Davis, for AUC, communications, anyone who could be consultant, purchasing documents. We need to look at what we have here. We can change the categories around and then decide the principles. My proposal last year about distribution of grant funds to Core Group members was the principle of equity: in general, all else equal; no one should be funded more or less than any other person. Some proposed however, that we base it on what the projects call for. We can talk about these general principles first. How do we make the actual decision?

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We could divide stipends and think about stipends as strictly equal and separate from project needs.

**Nadine Naber:** But buyouts are different at each university.

**Suad Joseph:** Most of us are at universities where the salary is a nine-month salary, such as AUC and AUB.

**Mona Khalaf:** If you have an administrative position, it is different.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** At Beirzeit, we get a two-month summer vacation.

**Suad Joseph:** Instead of course buyout, you can get a summer stipend.

**Nadine Naber:** If I took a summer salary, I would not be able to use it for a buyout.

**Ray Jureidini:** If it were just to be divided equally, what would it be?

**Suad Joseph:** If we divided \$330,000 by 15, that is \$22,000 a piece as an overall of the total budget. Otherwise it would be \$19,000 if we divide by the \$298,000 figure. We are really talking about \$18,000 per Core Group member, but that would include RAs and other costs.

Item 8: \$260,000 by 15 Core Group members is about \$17,300. So the \$75,000 should not go to research.

**Suad Joseph:** I think we should talk about a stipend rather than buyout- buyout is so variable. What about one third? \$6,000 seems like a reasonable stipend. The budget technically covers two summers. I do not think we can think about it as each person has so much to spend. These are not individual projects. It is not how each individual uses the \$12,000 out of the \$18,000 for research costs.

**Nadine Naber:** The way we have envisioned our project is that we share the questions but ask them in very different sites.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Groups will have very different costs.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** In terms of this question of equal stipend, is everybody expected to do the same amount of work?

**Zeina Zaatari:** And how are we going to divide them between groups?

**Suad Joseph:** We need to decide this together.

**Ray Jureidini:** At this point the discussion has to be around the \$11,000 times 15. So that is \$165,000.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** Why should it be divided equally?

**Suad Joseph:** It could be based on the project.

**Ray Jureidini:** I would rather talk about this now. Tomorrow when we discuss what we want to do, we will have these costs above \$165,000 and are we going to bargain?

**Jihad Makhoul:** I was thinking how did we get to \$6,000 for the stipend. I prefer we lower our own stipend, and give more to research costs.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** That is your personal choice. And some people's project is only their time and so they have to be compensated.

**Zeina Zaatari:** If someone were to take time off to do the research, but someone else hires an RA, what do they get the stipend for?

**Suad Joseph:** They are still doing the work. In your case Zeina, you may be doing the work yourself, then you will have your stipend and then we add on top of that hiring you to do the part of PD that we are doing.

**Mona Khalaf:** I want to go back to the point Barbara raised. Does the money have to be collected in the name of AFWG. What if I need \$50,000 and raise it; is it divided between us all?

**Suad Joseph:** No, you would take it, but it would be raised in AFWG's name.

**Mona Khalaf:** Once you raise this money it becomes public property?

**Suad Joseph:** No. The group would have to approve the proposal to be raised in AFWG's name, but I do not see why they would not. I do not have an answer to Lamis' point, what if somebody does not do the work?

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** Let us suppose we arrange it so that certain people will not do the same amount of work (because they were assigned to that).

**Suad Joseph:** I will set up letters of agreement and you will all get your \$6,000 upfront.

**Jihad Makhoul:** Putting a plan of action, a timetable, is better for you to monitor your own work.

**Suad Joseph:** With the letter of agreement system, you get the money and then you give a report.

**Mona Khalaf:** At LAU, they charge 65% indirect costs on whatever is paid as salary. Let us assume it is \$17,000. We would lose two thirds of it.

**Suad Joseph:** We have worked out a template. The money can go directly to you, not to the university. There is a way around it. If anybody has another template, I can ask my office of research to approve it. I would hope that your universities would agree to waive this.

**Jihad Makhoul:** The stipend is one thing, but what about RAs?

**Suad Joseph:** I leveraged the fact that we were in final review of these grants. I asked at UC, what would you do to show these foundations that you support these projects, and they offered work-study money for three years, which saves us about \$45,000 money from our project.

**Mona Khalaf:** Are you sure that everyone in the group are interested in being involved in the research phase?

**Suad Joseph:** Ibrahim did voice this concern six months ago. That was an appropriate question. We can raise the question of whether the \$6,000 applies nonetheless.

**Annelies Moors:** If a person is no longer involved in the research, then would they stay in the group, and would they get the money?

**Nadine Naber:** We were involved in this conversation before. We came to a decision, when Ibrahim was thinking of resigning from the group and we value his contribution, and we proposed that he stay even if he was not involved in the research.

**Suad Joseph:** The question is do we want that to be the model.

**Ray Jureidini:** If I recall correctly the original discussions about the protocols, part of the recognition was that everything that we discussed belonged to us collectively. We all

contribute in one form or another. It is a collective enterprise. Ibrahim had participated up to a point, so everything up to that point was shared. I know there is always a little ridge when it comes to the distribution of money, and that is probably fair.

**Nadine Naber:** The decision at the time was very basic: do we agree that he was still part of the group? He had already played a huge role in the paper, so of course his name would be on it.

**Suad Joseph:** So does the stipend apply to all AFWG core members or to those actually doing work?

**Penny Johnson:** It is like a socialist paradise!

**Barbara Ibrahim:** It is a reward to getting this far. Did we raise this money to do research?

**Suad Joseph:** Yes.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Maybe we should leave behind what happened before.

**Eileen Kuttab:** I think what we are used to back home is that we have always tied outputs with money. We started with the idea of monthly allowances to encourage research, but not everyone is committed.

**Mona Khalaf:** If they are interested in the work, but not in the research, they stay in the group.

**Suad Joseph:** This came up before and we decided we are a working group, and that we did not have room for observers.

**Eileen Kuttab:** It is not a club.

**Zeina Zaatari:** If someone is contributing through discussions over email in reviews of chapters, but not doing research?

**Suad Joseph:** Is contributing to the meetings enough?

**Penny Johnson:** I think it is related to being in the RP, not at the core group level.

**Suad Joseph:** What if even at the project level over a three-year period, you come to meeting, participate in email discussions, but are not involved in a research project?

**Mona Khalaf:** We cross out their name.

**Suad Joseph:** Up to this point, we encouraged them to participate, and if not, then the affiliate category is more appropriate. Penny's point is valid that all of us are not equally involved at all times. We produce work one year and participate in another way or a year.

**Martina Rieker:** We had this discussion about coming to meetings. So the criterion here could be whether in a two-year time span, you have authored at least one-piece.

**Suad Joseph:** This seems like a good formula - either author a piece, or participate in some AFWG work activity.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** And the decision would be made about this at the project level as to their productivity.

**Suad Joseph:** Some productivity within a two-year period. It is only the funds that are for two years, but the project is longer than that.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** To be consistent with the AFWG Protocols, within this two-year period, a member would have contributed to the output of the project. Productivity includes: writing articles, concept papers, review and editing of articles written by others, proposal writing, media outreach and dissemination.

**Ray Jureidini:** By way of conflict prevention, we may want to spend some time looking at the process by which we would make these decisions.

**Suad Joseph:** The first step is that the RP would discuss what each member does, and then presents it to the Core Group and that is where the decision is made.

**Ray Jureidini:** Also in terms of conflict prevention, we want to be aware that by Saturday, we could be in a position to present a proposal to the group and would be competing for funds.

**Nadine Naber:** Any project could take more funds.

**Suad Joseph:** Any project could use the full amount of money actually. One way to think about it is to think of \$11,000 as a boundary marker.

**Ray Jureidini:** Are we going to re-pool this \$165,000? If the Ford Foundation Grant is earmarked for PD, will a certain amount of money be skewed for that?

**Suad Joseph:** One way to safeguard against these concerns, is to think that the upper limit is the \$11,000, so with five members, it would be about \$55,000.

**Nadine Naber:** Everybody needs a lot more money. It might be easier that everyone gets \$11,000. It would be a difficult discussion to have. There is also the Data Group were RP memberships overlap. If we were to go in that direction, there would not be any money for it.

**Ray Jureidini:** The \$11,000 can be pooled within the group and divided based on expenses.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Maybe we are not thinking of doing major surveys at this point given the limited funds.

**Mona Khalaf:** But my topic is the impact of migration on family well-being.

**Ray Jureidini:** But you could do it as a pilot study.

**Suad Joseph:** If we look at \$260,000 in the budget - for the 6 people in Border Crossings, it would be \$36,000 for stipends and \$66,000 for research (\$102,000 in total). For Public Discourse, it is \$99,000 for research and \$54,000 for stipends (\$255,000 total). This leaves more than \$5,000 for Data. This saves a lot of time to do flat amounts. And the other funds that we have allocated to consultants, we could shift to research.

**Ray Jureidini:** The research meeting in item 1 includes the RP and Core group meetings.

**Mona Khalaf:** For item 7, what kind of Arabic publication does it apply to?

**Suad Joseph:** This is not for Volume one, as we have Population Council funding for that. It is for future publications. We have reached two formulas of letter agreements. The problem is to choose between the stipend, and receiving funds through the university (which means not paying US taxes). I can write the contract any way you want, based on how you could negotiate, whether you would like to write it as stipend, or as research costs. But if you decide to do it by letter of agreement, not to your university, the part that is research account, set up its own account, do not mix it with your own money. You will be accountable to write financial and technical reports. Each of you needs to let me know how you would like that to be done.

**Nadine Naber:** How would you name the kind of research that Zeina was talking about, where you personally do the actual work?

**Suad Joseph:** I guess it would fit into item 4b.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I would suggest you set up a daily rate, and then keep track of the days you worked on that project.

**Suad Joseph:** Do what you would do if you hired someone- how you would ask him or her to account for their time.

### **Third Session**

#### **Volume I: Substantive Discussion**

**Suad Joseph:** We can do a substantive discussion of Volume I, say for an hour and then an hour for the other items on the Agenda. The Introduction in the Binder is the second half of the introduction. Let us say that in the third session on Saturday, we look at Volume I again. Please look through the volume before that time. Let us go through chapter by chapter and get a state of where we are with each chapter.

## Chapter One: Introduction

I suggest we not only look at where the chapter is, but talk about what you would like to see in the chapter, now that you have had a chance to write the section.

**Martina Rieker:** We have an outline of what it should be. Basically, the structure we had thought about is to have a number of sections:

- a. Why Arab families
- b. Why families are a point of departure
  - Gender studies and the family, family as problem space in post-enlightenment thought.
  - Arab family
  - Terminologies
- c. Why Egypt, Lebanon and Palestine.
- d. AFWG Research projects

**Suad Joseph:** Because the Introduction represents us all, let us discuss whether we want to add or change anything. We can go back to the first meeting where we discussed this, use some of the minutes from those meetings here. The Introduction should sum up the discussions of where we started and the excitement of coming to this in a new way. What was so exciting was the tension between the idea of the death of the family; is there an Arab family, and the idea of the Arab family as the center of Arab society. We discussed why family and not class and why families and not women, or the intersections of these concepts and processes. We can link in the transnational process. When we say Arab families do we mean Arab families anywhere or only in the Arab world? Do we assume Arab means a territorial space? We may not answer this question but be aware of this as a question that needs to be woven throughout the discussion. The diasporas need to be organically integrated into how we think of Arab families. We could comment on the hard work of interdisciplinarity and developing the concepts.

### A. Why Arab Families

**Nadine Naber:** I constantly have this concern that we are doing Arab families, and then there is this thing about diaspora, but is it integrated?

**Ray Jureidini:** In the Australian context, we had felt that “Arabic” was the only thing you could agree on in talking about diasporas.

**Penny Johnson:** It is already interesting why Border Crossings and Public Discourse became the subjects that engaged the interests of researchers. I think we need to explain why, because it is not so obvious.

**Jihad Makhoul:** Are we interested in presenting our process? Is documenting this important?

**Suad Joseph:** We have done that to some extent. We will be editing it down.

**Penny Johnson:** We were being dissatisfied with the ways that families were being studied. The paradigms were not satisfactory.

**Eileen Kuttab:** Were there any methodological issues that we discussed which could go to the introduction?

**Suad Joseph:** We were trying to place the families in terms of wars and struggles.

**Jihad Makhoul:** I was thinking of a couple of lines of implications, the implications of section A. How would we be contributing by getting AFWG together, how would it make a difference to various groups?

**Zeina Zaatari:** In terms of methodology, we did talk about being interdisciplinary and comparative.

**Nadine Naber:** We could also explain what collaborative meant for us.

**Annelies Moors:** On the one hand, there was the comparative aspect, and on the other, there was following transnational links.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We also mentioned that we did not want to get a snapshot, but to place our work in historical perspective.

#### B. Why Arab families are a point of departure, not gender studies

We are using families as a theoretical, methodological, analytical point of departure. The research in the 1960s and 1970s shifted to women and gender studies and left the family as a set of relationships and structures that were neglected during that period of time. We are not returning to the family of the 1960s, but looking at the family differently. Gender studies and family studies have never co-resided in the Arab social studies.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I thought that the point way back then, that looking at gender atomized men and women, without the social dimensions. So we are going back to the societal through the lens of family.

**Penny Johnson:** We reflected on why people were fleeing from families in the 1970s.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** So maybe we go to how the paradigm shifted from families, to women to gender studies. But the point is that we are not returning to family studies, because family studies were kinship and it was rigid and stale and essentialized.

**Martina Rieker:** One trajectory we were contemplating for the introduction was to begin with the Republic of Cousins, and notions of cultural difference. We would be looking at the Republic of Cousins as a place where the question of family is a boundary between Arab families and European families. Men's and women's studies is all about the individual which is part of the enlightenment project, but that was incomplete in the Arab region.

**Penny Johnson:** My only reluctance is for the introduction to be breaking new points. It is difficult to start there at the end of three years because it opens a different project. The introduction needs to sum up where we are rather than where the field started. We need to

open the kind of discourse we are inviting people into; so Republic of Cousins takes us backwards rather than forwards.

**Martina Rieker:** But you have to have some genealogy. So the question is where we should start that history.

**Annelies Moors:** What is the argument you want to make with the Rep of Cousins?

**Martina Rieker:** What we have been talking about is wanting to break off from the reading of the Arab family: how individuals gain rights vis a vis the family. The family is still seen as something that one has to fight against rather than as something that one has rights in. The Republic of Cousins is useful because over the past three years, we have been committed to challenging the notion of the Arab family as a prison house. The Republic of Cousins has become a foundational text of the early post-colonial period of the post 1950s about the Mediterranean versus the Arab family. No text is more popular than the Republic of Cousins about the early post-colonial period, which “describes” the difference between Arab and Mediterranean family. So The Republic just gives us the point at which we find a discomfort in the way in which the Arab family gets represented.

**Penny Johnson:** I think to actually trace its influence is kind of a project in itself, and something we have not done.

**Suad Joseph:** Maybe it is a matter of mentioning that as opposed to starting a topic or being the heart of the chapter.

**Nadine Naber:** If we trace what family studies has been doing, and what gender studies has been doing, we do need to give this history to a point and Republic is part of that.

**Martina Rieker:** What is missing is some sort of engagement with what has been happening within the last 150 years. Enlightenment and the Family have rubbed together in uncomfortable ways. The introduction is a gesture that we have a historical consciousness about how our concepts get built. Our ideas have a genealogy. The celebration of Moroccan law changes, for example, is not just the effect a contemporary period, but has historical genealogies.

**Ray Jureidini:** I was thinking of my interest in terms of the domestic workers and whether it relates to the Arab families. What I want to do is to document the last century of domestic work. There is material on the slavery period, then a blank. My question is whether that needs to be brought in and whether it relates to Arab families or to Arab households. How do we include domestic workers in the introduction and the way they are and are not considered a part of family and family history in this region, for example, young girls are brought in and raised as fictive kin.

**Martina Rieker:** This could be brought up under the nuclearization of the modern Arab family, and linked to urbanization and “modernization”.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** This is a discourse; households are structured as nuclear and are different from support kin networks. Living arrangements are different from support arrangements. Could early domestic workers have been extended kin and only later became strangers?

**Eileen Kuttab:** The household versus the family needs to be discussed in the Introduction, especially in the methodological discussion. For example, in Palestine, we started doing research on households and changed to family because that was the relevant unit.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** This relates directly to the work of the Data group. How about census data where you could know all the members living in a household? This really takes us back to the point that we had decided to link with and communicate outside the scholarly community.

**Mona Khalaf:** If we are to talk about household versus family, how do we define the family?

**Ray Jureidini:** Blood.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Blood and marriage.

**Penny Johnson:** Does the Introduction want to refer to the other sections?

**Suad Joseph:** Yes, it should and therefore needs to be written last, in way. Under B: contemporary scholarly models, what do want to review there? Who is talking about the Arab family?

Beshara Doumani

Akram Khater

Barbara Stowasser, how recently the term family is used in region

Elizabeth Thompson

Evelyn Shakir , Bint Arab

**Barbara Ibrahim:** If we are using the English word family, we should look at the equivalent in Arabic. The scholars presume an unproblematic concept of the family.

**Penny Johnson:** There is a kind of literature that blames the family for all sorts of things, the Sharabi kind of literature, it is authoritarian, full of patronage, from neo-patriarchy to discourses of backwardness, families as sick and poisoning societies.

**Eileen Kuttab:** Sharabi and Barakat.

**Martina Rieker:** Kamran Ali points out that migration literature celebrates the absent men how women are freed when men leave, but does not take into account the loss of labor and support for women.

### Terminologies

We will problematize these terms. We need to note how some of these terms are not used in Arabic; family is not used in Arabic, gender is not used in Arabic. Usra is the formal term of the family. A'ili is the popular term, but what they refer to varies. We need to distinguish between household and family.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** This would lead to the Data Project: how terminology gets introduced or fixed by international funding. We could talk about how the state imposes terminology and privileged some terms against others, and how the international development community has done that and how religious institutions impose terminologies.

**Alyce Abdalla** The Egypt Literature review discusses some of these issues.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** This would be the place to discuss why we are using “families”.

**Suad Joseph:** What is lost when we use the framework of women or gender versus family?

**Penny Johnson:** We are trying to put family and gender in a dialogue.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We can say that the limitation of a women’s framework was the focus on individuals at the expense of other social relations and structures, especially men.

### C-Why Egypt/Palestine/Lebanon

This was a strategic choice. Our scholars were already working on those countries. Most of the literature is focused on these three sites. Those countries have institutes focusing on women and gender, doing the most advanced research.

### The literature Reviews

#### *Palestine Literature Review*

**Penny Johnson:** The Palestine Lit review has existed for quite a while, so it has had a fair amount of feedback. It has gone through many revisions.

#### *Lebanon Literature Review*

**Zeina Zaatari:** I would appreciate more feedback. There are areas I have not been able to cover.

**Suad Joseph:** Judy could you help Zeina with that, and Ray as well.

#### *Egypt Literature Review*

Let us come back to this on Saturday.

### Public Discourse Chapter

Zeina: The law and policy is cohesive. The media part dropped the Lebanon section and that needs to be brought back in.

**Suad Joseph:** It needed a lot of integrating.

**Martina Rieker:** The real problem with the chapter is that there are very different writing styles. It is very difficult to know what to do with it.

**Suad Joseph:** I thought that you and Annelies would be able to deal with that.

**Martina Rieker:** But that means rewriting the whole chapter.

**Suad Joseph:** This is something that we face in all the groups.

**Zeina Zaatari:** I do not see there is a problem in different writing styles. Maybe one person integrates each section (law, youth, media), but let the chapter have different voices in it; and different writing styles within it. They will be pulled together in introduction and conclusion.

**Martina Rieker:** I could not envision how transition would even work, because it would be strategically difficult, which voices do we privilege. We could divide it into subsections.

**Suad Joseph:** Section II can be Public Discourse Section. Then do separate chapters within it on youth, on media, on law, and on education. To make it all parallel throughout the volume, one section of literature reviews would have subsections. Border crossing could also set up theirs this way.

**Zeina Zaatari:** We could do section I introduction, then chapters of literature reviews in one section, then a section on public discourse with chapters, then border crossings.

**Martina Rieker:** I would as a reader prefer the Lit reviews later.

**Nadine Naber:** It could have a good introduction that would make them stand out as state of the art literature reviews.

**Suad Joseph:** We need to make the literature reviews parallel.

**Zeina Zaatari:** Do we have to make them parallel? The authors and the literature are very different.

**Suad Joseph:**

Here is the suggested Table of Contents:

Section I: Introduction

Section II: Three chapters: PDRP, BCRP, Data Surveys RP

Section III: Three chapters Lit. Reviews: Palestine, Lebanon, Egypt

Section IV: Policy Implications Chapter

Section V: AFWG Bibliography

Index

### Border Crossings Chapter (Chapter 2 of Section II)

**Nadine Naber:** Some of our chapter sounds more like a proposal than actual research. It was difficult to write because we had not done the research yet. We say there are a lot of questions that need to be asked, but it does not sound like a paper. We would appreciate advice on how to make it into paper. One way would be to build up our ideas further.

**Annelies Moors:** It is the same problem with the Public Discourse chapter. We are trying to write a substantive chapter on something for which we have not done the research.

**Ray Jureidini:** Part of that arose from standardizing the section based on the proposal. I agree that it does lack depth and what it lacks is a much more abstract critical theoretical review and critical discussion. The last time in Beirut we had time to discuss Mona's proposal. We did not have time to include Mona's proposal here.

**Nadine Naber:** The other concern is that I felt that we are making statements that we have not done research on yet.

**Eileen Kuttab:** My problem was to follow the format we put in the very beginning. It impedes creativity.

**Suad Joseph:** Maybe we need to rethink that format.

**Ray Jureidini:** It was very useful at the time and got us going. We are in a position to revise that. Can we do that in time, though?

**Suad Joseph:** Would it help you to follow the PD format of different structures?  
Let me make a proposal to both PD and BC. We can add two more weeks; push the deadline to June 30, to get things to Zeina.

**Eileen Kuttab:** Maybe we should sit as a group and discuss it.

**Suad Joseph:** So let us say for the two project sections, we can have those two extra weeks.

**Nadine Naber:** How do you imagine these papers? The approach we started from was here are some issues that are interesting.

**Penny Johnson:** We had sites.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** We had assignments.

**Suad Joseph:** Our chapter is a rationale for what we will be doing, whereas you went ahead to the proposal phase. Let me suggest between now and Saturday we have two people that are here today address the other chapters.

- Zeina and Annelies will lead the discussion on the Border Crossings Chapter
- Martina and Nadine will lead the discussions on the Public Discourse Chapter.

Look at Saturday, session two; we have added human subject review. We will add the review discussions to the third session.

### Data Chapter

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We have a meeting on Sunday and the working meeting on the Felucca. Martina has given us something to work from but we have not gone beyond that.

**Martina Rieker:** Those of us who are in Cairo have recommendations for the group, we can distribute that.

### Collaboration between Research Projects

**Suad Joseph:** Let us look at our topics for this session. A number of you have said that you would hire Research Assistants. We need to decide: do they get authorship if they are paid for the work they are doing as Research Assistants? The first item- staging- we can postpone and we can discuss the others. But please look at the proposal- what we said we would do- before we launch the project. For funding accountability we need a product (books, workshop).

We have understood from very beginning, core group members would participate in other RPs and that was wise. The question is how do we want to deal with that?

**Penny Johnson:** What is the problem?

**Suad Joseph:** Authorship.

**Annelies Moors:** It depends on what you do.

**Zeina Zaatari:** When you review something, this warrants an acknowledgement, but if you write, then it is authorship.

**Penny Johnson:** We all think that review is normal.

**Mona Khalaf:** What if they hire an RA?

**Suad Joseph:** Then they are paid out of that project's funds.

### RAs vs. RP Members

**Suad Joseph:** We need to be clear about the line between Research Assistant work which is acknowledged in endnotes and when a research assistant becomes a co-author.

**Mona Khalaf:** Data gathering has nothing to with authorship.

**Ray Jureidini:** What if an assistant makes interviews and types them out and you use it to do the analysis. Who owns that?

**Suad Joseph:** You do.

**Nadine Naber:** I referenced a person who did the interview. They did not co-author the paper.

**Annelies Moors:** When you pay a person, then it does away with ownership. Their pay is their compensation.

**Suad Joseph:** The data collected by the RA would belong to AFWG.

**Ray Jureidini:** When we employ the RA, we enter a contractual relationship, this has to be made clear, we may have to draw up a contract, it would save tremendous problems.

**Annelies Moors:** So if a person does a number of interviews for us, can they use it for their own purposes?

**Suad Joseph:** Absolutely not. As we decided when we talked about the Protocols: the bottom line is money. If it is paid for by AFWG funds, it belongs to AFWG.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** The RA is not doing the thinking, because you are telling them the ideas.

**Ray Jureidini:** The role of the RA is to gather the data and give it to you. What if you have used the assistant's writing verbatim in whatever you are writing?

**Suad Joseph:** There are two kinds of data. Raw data is not their words, but the words of the person they are interviewing. But if analytical theoretical work is done and I used it verbatim, then the RA gets authorship, but if you take it and retheorize it, then they do not get authorship.

**Annelies Moors:** We are discussing it as though we are putting the ideas in the person's head, but this is not always the case.

**Jihad Makhoul:** In terms of authorship, the way I do research is that my RAs are with me from step one to the end, so the approach I use is ethnographic inductive. We all do the work, think through the data, we start analyzing from day 1, so it is a collective process. Then at the end, we collectively write a paper, with them being second or third authors.

**Suad Joseph:** Even if we all agree to have collective authors, RAs would not own the work.

**Jihad Makhoul:** But can they appear as second authors even if they are not part of AFWG?

**Suad Joseph:** Yes, but they have to be aware of our protocols for publications process.

**Penny Johnson:** I have no problem with ownership. With authorship, part of what we are doing is that we are building research capacity, so the more we can encourage young scholars and students to work with us, the better. There are a lot of bright young researchers who have very little opportunities. I think we can see this in a positive way and build it in the project: fostering researchers and keeping relations with younger researchers in the field.

**Mona Khalaf:** If I have two or three assistant helping me, you thank them on the first page, if they have not been there from the start.

**Ray Jureidini:** If it is not analytical that is ok to just thank them.

**Suad Joseph:** We have fostered young scholars in AFWG. We invited Sherine Hafez and Rania Salem to become authors even though we hired them and paid them as RAs to do background work. But we also have our own young scholars in AFWG, and they need to be fostered and protected as well.

**Eileen Kuttab:** The main author is the first one listed and the others are listed in relation to their work.

**Ray Jureidini:** Some journals are requiring that you list which proportions written by whom, and that you even separate them, some social science journals require this.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Can we just say that our general rule is transparency and letting them know from the start, for example if someone will do data collection and will not be an author. It may mislead junior people, if things are not clear from the start.

**Suad Joseph:** It may even disadvantage our own junior people. Clarity is real important upfront. Ray summarized this very well the analytical vs. mechanical is the line that should divide authorship.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Can we say that in any publications we make, we will be as inclusive as possible.

**Suad Joseph:** I think we all agree on acknowledgment, but it is authorship we are talking about.

**Ray Jureidini:** We have not talked about publications. Do we hold off any articles we might come up with AFWG for the volume?

**Suad Joseph:** Yes, but also any publishing outside AFWG has to go through AFWG's review process, which we collectively agreed upon in our Protocols.

**Martina Rieker:** Can we also revisit conferences tomorrow?

#### Non-AFWG Research Participants

**Suad Joseph:** What about a colleague of our stature, what do we do with them, if they actively work on the research, do we just pay them and treat them as other RAs?

**Eileen Kuttab:** When they review our work, they get an acknowledgment.

**Suad Joseph:** Are we hiring them as a consultant with research expenses? When do they get co-authorship? We have to think these things through clearly.

**Penny Johnson:** What if a RP wanted to include someone new?

**Eileen Kuttab:** I think this is the understanding we have when the budget is for an institution. I think the principle is openness and flexibility. We do not want to destroy it by

expanding it too much. Getting in other people can be enriching, but it has to have limitations.

**Suad Joseph:** If we invite someone to join a RP, s/he would have to have a long-term commitment. We have left that flexibility to RPs to invite people to do specific research work.

## Day 2

### Planning the Empirical Research

#### **First Session**

**Suad Joseph:** Let us plan our timetable. Today is dedicated to the RPs to plan their research. We have the proposals we are committed to, especially the staging. The IDRC proposal is the latest version of our project. It has the products, which is what we said we would do by a certain period. The other thing you have to decide is what it is going to cost, especially what you would like to have in order to do what you want to do, so that we can begin thinking of future fundraising. Could somebody take as detailed minutes as possible in each group? We have a printer to print your work. Whatever you have by the end of the day, we would like to circulate to the other group. So look at the grants, the staging, the products, and the funding. You can have a separate section of your minutes on that. If you depart from the proposal, then give a rationale why, and look especially at Year One, who is going to do what and what concrete things you are going to produce. Third, think through the money part- each group knows what it has. The \$11,000 per person for research we talked about does not belong to person, but to the group. Think of what you want, what is the next phase, if you had more money. We would like to tell funders what Phase Three is about so we can begin raising funds for that. We are funded through the summer of 2006.

**Nadine Naber:** My question had to do with the phasing. We wrote that we were not going to be writing before year three.

**Suad Joseph:** The product can be a workshop, a conference, report of a seminar, what is on the website. The report has to stand on its own, because what they will do is that they will take that report and put it on their website. But we have lots of choices, such a workshop with stakeholders. I have to give a technical report at the end of the year, so we have to have a product at end of year one. Tonight everyone is free, tomorrow night the data group will meet, and again Sunday morning at Population Council.

### Public Discourse Project Meeting

**Suad Joseph:** May I suggest we open the Binder to IDRC proposal? The Phasing part.

**Penny Johnson:** Section XI, page 23.

**Suad Joseph:** Let us think in terms of the \$99,000 and then what we would do next if we have funding.

**Penny Johnson:** Just looking at what we said we would do: youth and the ideal family. Whatever we do in Year One, we keep youth and ideal family together. We try to take both of those strands and put them together because I do not think they will make sense without the other. I know that we will look at contemporary debates. I am giving up the 1860s for the moment. I think in terms of historical we are looking at post-World War II with the spread of universal education, post national and globalized broadcast and print media and in very different settings. Palestine of course has a very exceptional history. My point was to link family and youth and not to do separate projects. We are looking at contemporary debates and we could define a historical debate.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** If Hoda ElSadda were here, would she be comfortable cutting off the earlier history?

**Annelies Moors:** We do not have to cut it off. It is a matter of starting point and emphasis.

**Penny Johnson:** I would think that Hoda is also interested in television and the 60s.

**Martina Rieker:** I have no objection over post-WW II. Omnia had said last time that she is a historian and was interested in the historical component of the project.

**Suad Joseph:** I do not see what Penny is saying as necessarily antithetical to this. Omnia is a junior faculty in a history department and she needs to produce work that is directly tied to her field.

**Annelies Moors:** If we can find one focus on a number of issues we mentioned together, something sufficiently concrete. We could either start from the general theme, which is so broad it is hardly manageable, or we could start from one thing- very concrete and tied with our personal interests.

**Suad Joseph:** The ideal family has been, in one way, built around the idea of youth. The ideal family is conceived within the nationalist project.

**Annelies Moors:** I was thinking of something very concrete that to me this is still very broad, such as changes in marriage and changing conceptions of it, marriage of youth, and we can branch out from this. And we have a very interesting comparative element.

**Suad Joseph:** Would we not want to do something within the realm we set out- media, education, and law?

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Marriage and law.

**Suad Joseph:** If you choose marriage as the concrete thing, changes in family law would be part of it.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Think of choice of spouse and the ideal family and how it is in conflict with what the parents want. Housing shortages and on the other hand, houses being destroyed are linked to that.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** With the first *intifada* a lot of things changed. Music was not allowed for weddings- only the gown, and no big celebrations.

**Penny Johnson:** The Palestinian wedding is a theme across discourses.

**Suad Joseph:** It seems like a new project, sounds like what we had before the focus on youth.

**Annelies Moors:** The marriage contract is the central link with the law, and there is relatively little work on it.

**Zeina Zaatari:** I can see it but I think we are shifting away from the project on the ideal family. The only thing I could think of, in terms of the ideal spouse in Lebanon, is that there is more material requirements. I am not sure how this links with the ideal family.

**Martina Rieker:** We are talking about freeze-framing one particular moment. This can be in terms of understandings about the law, nation and education, because all these things are part of a different discourse.

**Penny Johnson:** When we were thinking about youth, the sense of volatility and problems is about unmarried youth, young guys who are the source of all sorts of things- both in discourse and in practice. How do we move that subject in?

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Could we not say that our topic is marriage and non-marriage?

**Penny Johnson:** I am not making it that defined. If we think of youth and how it has been constructed, it is the period before marriage that was not problematic, but it has become problematic.

**Suad Joseph:** We do not want to set up marriage as the solution for youth somehow, where we tend to set up a dichotomy where the problem is that they are not married.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** But that is part of the public discourse, not that we have to take that for granted. Nadine and I are working on a paper using courtship data on Arab Americans in San Francisco and small Egyptian villages. We found very similar tactics for opening up choices. We are using marriage as the point of forming new families. This is also the site of legitimate sexual activity in our part of the world, more so than other societies.

**Zeina Zaatari:** In Lebanon, there is an increase in the number of single mothers. We could bring that in.

**Annelies Moors:** We need to also compare with what happens on the ground, not just discourses.

**Suad Joseph:** What excited me about starting a project about youth idea was that it had not been done and it was looking at this huge portion of the population— two thirds of the population. The youth project raises questions of consumption, war, conflict, culture, and there is new and interesting literature on youth as target population. Somehow with marriage as a point of departure, we miss that.

**Annelies Moors:** Marriage is sort of the end point of youth.

**Penny Johnson:** We have this other strand of seeing marriage as a way of looking at the discourses of the ideal family, but I think Suad is right: it does not deal with our other strand. The question is how to develop an equal focus on younger people.

### *Youth and Desire*

**Martina Rieker:** One thing is how youth manage desire- consumption, nation-building, marriage- for meaning. We look at how things are packaged around marriage. We can look at education, media, and work.

**Suad Joseph:** Then youth becomes a point of departure for moving into those areas rather than a subject in its own right.

**Martina Rieker:** Marriage becomes a debate where youth variously organize themselves around something called marriage and the rebellions are designed around it as well.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I think this sits well with our scholarly audiences, but what about our other audiences.

**Suad Joseph:** How do we get at what youth want, if we do not use the language of desire?

**Zeina Zaatari:** In Arabic the word desire does not necessarily have the same connotations.

**Martina Rieker:** In Iran, an argument I read was that a lot of Islamic movements are not about challenging the social contract, even if they are youth rebellions. At what point is this social contract challenged? If we think of the social contract around what youth want, and how to locate these desires within these contracts, the making and unmaking and what these rebellions mean. The social contract is what youth want, how radical is it what they want? Abdel-khak is the author. She has very nice fieldwork. I can bring it tomorrow.

**Penny Johnson:** The themes of modernities and what they mean.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I like youth and desire, because they seem to go together, desires for participation, for religious meaning. How do we concretize it, in a first phase, one year?

**Suad Joseph:** It would be good if we try to look at a site.

**Penny Johnson:** Let us think of media for a minute, where we can mine for contemporary debates, as well as historical depth.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** And it is huge. There is a project focusing on television, but only in Ramadan. It is a creative way of focusing a moment.

**Suad Joseph:** It looks like we are coming to something: desire and the site of media as a starting point.

**Penny Johnson:** With young people and stigmatized young people, you are at the level of popular and street discourse. For us, it would be a very interesting site. We are talking talk.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** One is on the level of street talk and mobile text messaging.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** How do you collect that data?

**Suad Joseph:** What about Internet sites?

**Annelies Moors:** It is enormous. I know a student working on that.

**Penny Johnson:** It is about how people conceptualize youth. What about Lebanon?

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** But do you not think that the construction of youth is not only people talking about youth, but youth themselves entering into this?

**Penny Johnson:** And not only Palestinian media, international and Israeli media as well, where Palestinian youth are represented as walking bombs.

**Zeina Zaatari:** And not just international media, but how local and satellite media duplicate it. Everybody has satellite. It costs \$6 in Lebanon.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** Chatting on the Internet, is it big in Egypt?

**Martina Rieker:** But again class is very important. Internet access is expensive. Perhaps accessibility should not be exaggerated.

**Suad Joseph:** Are we coming around this idea of youth and desire?

**Penny Johnson:** I think we should keep the marriage strand in the project.

**Martina Rieker:** Is it not the point, if you think of the disciplining of desire. This is something that remains important.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I loved your idea about social contracts and what is questioned within a certain boundary and not beyond: youth and desire, marriage and other social contracts.

**Suad Joseph:** Do we want marriage as a focus, or just as a strand?

**Barbara Ibrahim:** The inter-generational dimension has to come in. The family needs to get in here. Maybe the thing to do now is for each person to reflect on individual interest in this topic.

**Suad Joseph:** I think that is a good idea.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Is everyone comfortable with media?

**Annelies Moors:** And relation to daily realities.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** And with a law focus: how laws are discussed in the media.

**Penny Johnson:** Girls are saying that in the schools there are sexual graffiti on the walls.

**Zeina Zaatari:** Radio call-in shows have shifted to TVs.

**Suad Joseph:** It might be useful to look at specific projects.

**Zeina Zaatari:** In terms of the media in Lebanon and modernity, I would be interested in comparing the media stations. Al-Manar is trying to produce an alternative modernity-Islamism.

**Suad Joseph:** That would be an interesting project - if Hania can do parallel project in Egypt.

**Penny Johnson:** I am not sure in Palestine we can have a parallel project, focused on television.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Having two sites is fine, I think.

**Suad Joseph:** Maybe it is something Lamis can do, look at the way youth and desire are represented on TV.

**Annelies Moors:** People do not really watch that much television.

**Penny Johnson:** How Palestinian youth are represented is a question. If we wanted to focus, maybe looking at something like camp youth, the places where these things are acted on and acted out.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** You have alternative modes of transmitting information: graffiti, bayanat, sms; than simply replicating something that is happening in Lebanon and Egypt.

**Annelies Moors:** Denunciations from the mosque.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** The ministry of youth tried to launch summer camps for youth that were mixed. The mosques were denouncing this and then they had to bring the sheikh to the camp.

**Penny Johnson:** Youth as agents would be more relevant for Palestine.

**Zeina Zaatari:** I was thinking of the TV programs, the Lebanese are not representing a Lebanese perspective. I do not think we need to have the same sites.

**Penny Johnson:** We have gotten very fixed in a contemporary moment. This came out of something with a background.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** It would be fascinating to compare the two generations of the intifada. For Egypt, it could be the revolution and infitah generation and this generation, and each of them with their own media. In Lebanon, it could be the Arab nationalist, the civil war and the post-war periods.

**Zeina Zaatari:** Between the war and the socialist leftist eras, there was a period of economic growth, after Nasser.

**Martina Rieker:** The one thing that would be important if we took that approach, we could look at questions. The themes of youth and nationalism have been done, but there is nothing exciting or new. Marriage has not been done.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** When you look at people's old photos with sleeveless dresses in the 50s, it is quite striking. There was a western secular moment.

**Zeina Zaatari:** It is reflected in the movies. It shocks me sometimes.

**Suad Joseph:** Are we still thinking of different projects?

**Penny Johnson:** To focus on camp marriages and family? In Palestinian families, there is reproduction of all sorts of things that have to do with families.

**Annelies Moors:** But if we do not see changes, then this is interesting, with tremendous shifts, one thing seems stable.

**Penny Johnson:** There is a discourse about the camps and a discourse produced from within the camps.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** What if we compare discourses on the camp, from camp and in the city.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Does Hania Sholkamy not write about how kin marriages are reemerging in certain areas where there is uncertainty?

**Penny Johnson:** I think in all domains, Palestinian youth have a troubled resonance, or an idealized resonance.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We can be starting a list of Year 2, 3 or 4.

**Suad Joseph:** All of the above is interesting, but what are the things that we concretely want to do?

**Annelies Moors:** I think we can sit with the ones who want to work in certain site.

**Suad Joseph:** Maybe each country site can sit together.

**Alyce Abdalla:** I think that the desires of youth- consumption and economic would be interesting thing to look at. For example, what do people want now that their parents did not even think of, what are their strategies for getting it?

**Barbara Ibrahim:** What are the sources of data on that?

**Alyce Abdalla:** One is asking people - to link to media, what are the prizes on talk shows?

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We could enumerate the trousseau.

**Suad Joseph:** What the youth themselves want, what they struggle for and against, what we focus on is representational. To materialize a project on desire, in terms of representation and media, I would look at populations of youth, the representation of desires, how they are debated and fought over among youth and family.

**Zeina Zaatari:** I think it is very important, but we have to look at how many people we can survey.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We do have the funding to hire interviewers and send them to certain areas. It was not terribly expensive when we did this with the courtship- with the same sets of people.

**Suad Joseph:** Zeina could take certain shows, widely viewed, and then the parallel in terms of how youth view these, how they internalize certain messages.

**Zeina Zaatari:** I was thinking of advertisement. It is a huge industry, with a lot of money.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** It would not be that difficult to compare over time the data on advertising.

**Martina Rieker:** Egypt is such a big terrain, but what I would be interested in- this draws on previous work I did - is to look at villages outside Cairo, to look at commodities, such as the refrigerator, to look at the youth, women especially, who are between 12 and 21, who are doing 12 to 14 hours of work in a sort of neoliberal slave labor to purchase these items. I think this would be something different and new to do something about that. On the other hand, how do you say something different about advertisement? Beyond giving local color to existing arguments, what new theoretical questions do we introduce that? If our project really looks at the articulation of neoliberal societies, what happens to villages that become part of the neoliberal economy? If you go at 3 a.m., you see dozens of women who are driven into the desert, slaving at a very low wage, not going to school. Gulf and Libyan migration is not open to them, and you need the work for marriage. With the guys not being able to provide, consumption is not about advertisement, now girls have an incredible stake in not opting for education but for a commodocized household instead. The guy would not buy it later. So they opt for a sort of slave labor in these new agrarian economies to do back-breaking work. Their families are not coercing them. There is something called desire. Women are very much transformed by neoliberalism.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Let us say in the 1960s, you could get public sector jobs, but your goal is still marriage?

**Penny Johnson:** There has been a change in what kind of education you need for a job.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Hence the higher dropout rate for males.

**Suad Joseph:** Lebanon is different. People are trying to get their sons educated.

**Zeina Zaatari:** Now people are leaving the country. If you are from a poor background, you cannot get private education and public education will not help you.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** There is a marked difference between parent houses and children's houses. There are very strong attempts for a middle class look.

**Alyce Abdalla:** But they do not use education as a means for upward mobility.

**Suad Joseph:** I think this is different in Lebanon. I do not think it is less relevant. Education is heavily emphasized.

**Zeina Zaatari:** In Lebanon, the Egyptians who have university degrees are working as doormen, but for Lebanese the university degrees get them somewhere.

**Martina Rieker:** So basic literacy is still a desire in Lebanon?

**Suad Joseph:** Yes, but they have not given up on education as I am hearing.

**Annelies Moors:** It depends on the site. Education does not bring you what you expected to get, so people are trying alternative ways.

**Alyce Abdalla:** How much is it that the desired level of education has changed?

**Zeina Zaatari:** In Lebanon, there is a huge number of private universities. They teach computer science, business and English.

**Suad Joseph:** That is precisely the point; in Lebanon Education is still the thing.

**Penny Johnson:** The role of English is very important. The kinds of things you need to know are changing.

**Suad Joseph:** I hardly know anybody who is not doing something, taking courses, and they are not sure if it is going to get them the job.

**Martina Rieker:** We have to take seriously these desires; a desire for modernity.

**Suad Joseph:** We have brought in the site of education as well as media?

**Penny Johnson:** With marriage, this is when education came up.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I think what we need to do now is talk about methodologies and what we could get done in a year. For Egypt, if Martina's interest is rural, through a node at the

Council, we can look at an urban context, looking at a group of people who took these courses and what happened to them. There is some data from a study on the stalled fertility of the young. It includes information on the economic aspirations of youth.

**Martina Rieker:** The initial work can be done with the Data Project work. With assistance of course- I have limited time this year - I can do the part of drawing out what we know about commodities and these new rural working patterns. That also might be a project, I know some people who could be interested in that- Liz Taylor.

**Penny Johnson:** Yesterday we thought to make a link with Eileen and Border Crossings in camp work. Being able to mobilize common resources at the institute would help. We have a family community project happening in Ramallah.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Annelies, is there a link between your work on marriage and dower and this?

**Annelies Moors:** Yes, I was thinking of something on these lines.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Would Samia Mehrez be interested in these projects in Egypt and Lebanon? I think some of this would fit into other work Alyce and I are doing with work on preparations for marriage.

### **Third Session**

#### **Reports on Planning for the Next Phase of Research**

**Suad Joseph:** We have three sections of what we set out to do- staging and phasing, budget, future research and how to ask for future funding.

**Zeina Zaatari:** We also said we would think of a way to keep the project unified.

**Suad Joseph:** So the fourth thing would be thematic continuity. So first the reports:

- 1- Staging/phasing
- 2- Budget
- 3- Future research and how to ask for future funding
- 4- Thematic continuity.

#### **Palestine: Weddings and War Annelies Moors, Penny Johnson, Lamis Abu Nahla**

**Penny Johnson:** Our focus is weddings and war, including a comparison between the two intifada's. What we mean by weddings and war is looking, both in public discourse and lived experiences, at conditions of marriagibility, and in conditions of lack of security. Public discourse has a role in shaping marriage possibilities. And we would be looking at youth in terms of their imaging their futures. There will be data collection. What we mean by PD is talk, stories, legend and gossip- shaping and imposing constraints on young people, things that are circulating, cassettes, booklets, things coming from mosque or church, or wedding

invitations. We think we will find important differences between the two intifada's. We want to look at Gaza and Nablus, where Annelies can work with families she has been working with. We propose one additional researcher as well as an RA. In the West Bank, aside from us, the additional resources will be for the RA, because the material is ephemeral, we try to catch the things that have happened before us, when we added all this up, we had overspent. We have used up the 33,000.

We thought after the first year we would be in a position to have a working paper. We can go to all sorts of directions, such as marriages to people in prison, or marriages to wanted people. There is a broad canvas of public discourse on marriage and family set against the Israeli discourse on demography, and this is a marked change from first intifada. Marriage, continuity, producing kids, winning the demographic battle; it was there before first intifada but did not have to do with people's practices. This time it may be different. It would be a contribution to look at these discourses.

We are looking at an RA for 6 months, not the whole year.

**Lamis Abu Nahla:** Focusing on comparing two intifadas does not exclude looking at the "relaxed" time between the two.

**Annelies Moors:** We are also interested in the forms of self-presentation of youth, dressing, dressing styles and jewelry. In comparing the two intifadas, the way economics, politics and culture are intertwined, we would like in the first year is to look at what are the interesting paths to pursue. We try to make it broad enough to give us possibility to follow different leads.

#### Lebanon (Zeina Zaatari, Suad Joseph)

**Zeina Zaatari:** We talked about two parts of larger projects of looking into representations of youth in the media and how they are received by youth. We talked about identifying the key representations, we choose three main stations: Al-Manar, LBC, Future and maybe Zein. We look at shows that target and employ youth, the variation in the representations of the ideal family and the gender differences in how youth are represented. Different patterns of consumption the media proposes. We added two components, how Lebanese youth represent Palestinian youth, and American and western youth in those programs. We are also interested in looking at the production process itself, at the producers and whether they are conscious of how they look at act- ideological. We would look at how youth respond, assimilate, reject, rework these representations in their conceptions and discourses. I could focus more on the South so that we can capture regional variation. We wanted to look at the relation between representation and youth desire, ideal family, ideal spouse, childrearing, notions of self, civil society, we listed all areas we could work on.

The phasing: we could identify what we can work on and methodology, taping and watching shows, as we are collecting the data, when we start the preliminary results we could start to work on archival records. Our year ends in fall 2005. We did not talk about budget for other phases of the project. We also talked about how the youth produce representations of themselves, dress body image, demands from family, what they use to leverage positions, or to request things that become contested.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** How would this link to the TV work?

**Suad Joseph:** TV was one site. We want to see if there is a coherent representation of the youth, then we are going to ask what youth see, and then explore the connection between representations of youth and what they come to demand and want.

Egypt: Educational Desires and Desires for Modernity: Barbara Ibrahim, Martina Rieker (possibly Omnia El Shakry, Hoda Elsadda)

**Barbara Ibrahim:** One thread we will pick up is education as a path for mobility and our assumption is that it remains as such but has changed in interesting ways. We would like to look at returns to education at the level above secondary education: private institutes and universities. We would like to have someone to look at Azhar and this would link to Gaza.

**Martina Rieker:** We felt that none of our projects addressed these (Islamic) desires.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We still feel a significant missing piece is Islamic education. We cannot do it in this round of the project. The way we are thinking of returns to education is not only economic, but to social aspects, to marriage, to dreams. In the first year, we would focus on the hopes and perception for the younger and the parental generation. It would be exploratory. We would begin in Cairo, then on to the south- as the true hinterland left behind in the neoliberal transformation.

**Martina Rieker:** My project would focus on consumption in the neoliberal economy in a series of villages, looking at the data, historicizing this for the modern and the neoliberal period. I would produce an original piece after that first year with the help of an assistant and then exploratory fieldwork. An initial exploration would turn out an article, and then we would need funding for a field study. We might have consultants around that. So the first article would be a historical analytical piece; the second would be to draw on this earlier fieldwork.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Year 1 is preparatory. We have a three year program and two years of funding.

**Martina Rieker:** And the budget is 22,000 LE for the first year.

**Suad Joseph:** It seems that there is an implication that we are allocating \$11,000 per person. Does that make sense; shall we just leave it that way?

**Barbara Ibrahim:** But a question would be if we can ask for consultants.

**Suad Joseph:** That is not a large sum, about \$9,000 and then most of it will go to the web.

**Penny Johnson:** Now our projects have gone very country specific, maybe we can think of a way where we can bring together some comparative work. Are we still aiming for a collaborative output from the three sites? It is one thing to be investigating the themes, but it is a different thing if we are aiming for a collaborative output.

**Suad Joseph:** It could be an edited volume where some themes are dealt with in different ways.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** At this point there is nothing comparative.

**Annelies Moors:** I can see the link in two parts, we start from talk and you start in media. There are other ways of being in the public sphere besides media- politics of presence. The other question is the desired and the imaginaries, looking at self-representation, marriage, marriagibility and non-marriage.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** It is rather interesting that we have an education and a media site - but not law yet.

**Suad Joseph:** What other themes are there?

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Imaginary futures - this might help us breach.

**Suad Joseph:** In Lebanon, 'tumuh' [ambition] is very big.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** What terminology people use about their future..

**Penny Johnson:** I do not know how the war theme runs across the sites. It is a time of war.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** One thing you said was that marriage is the last bastion.

**Penny Johnson:** In the sense of being able to continue and to overwhelm them.

**Suad Joseph:** In Lebanon, it gets materialized in the sectarian issues, with the sense that the Christians are losing the demographic battles.

**Martina Rieker:** Another way to think about these imaginaries is migration and leaving, where the strategy is about trying to get out and the idea is that the region has no future- just to keep that in mind in terms of the implications. Now when you look at statistics, 30-40% of the population wants to leave and this has to do with consumption and other factors.

**Suad Joseph:** To keep the project integrated, we can pass this to the entire group. The thing I am most concerned about is staying as a coherent project. We should set a deadline for us to circulate what we have formulated. We will all have a product for the end of year 1. We should try to work these themes in our project.

Key questions:

1. imaginary futures- non-national futures
2. politics of presence, and demographic presence
3. marriage, marriability and lack thereof.
4. representations of ideal family, youth
5. desires of youth
6. regional identification of youth

**Martina Rieker:** Non-national or non-state: capturing the essence of hopelessness.

**Zeina Zaatari:** I think this has to do with failures of nation states.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Could we recast war as aggressions, police aggression, how youth are identifying with Iraq or the intifada? I was with a young person who wanted to leave the country: because he felt that the individual has no safety, can be rounded up any time.

**Martina Rieker:** I think it is not productive to see Egypt as a normalized state; we may want to disrupt that, without unnameing what is happening in Palestine.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** A possible theme is the regional identification of youth.

**Suad Joseph:** One goal is the panel at MESA.

A timeframe: September 30 all projects send methodology section and thematic framing to others - questions we plan to ask and then again in December - short reports to each other.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** The MESA deadline is in February.

**Suad Joseph:** In December, we send progress report to each other. Who is going to do the organizational work, put the panels together?

**Martina Rieker:** I can organize the MESA panel

### Day 3

#### **First Session**

**Suad Joseph:** The big topic for this afternoon, which is very important, is Human Subjects. Anything you want to add or change on the Agenda for today?

**Annelies Moors:** I was wondering if it was useful to start with the volume.

**Suad Joseph:** Our research is what needs a lot of time. Our decisions yesterday took us in a bit of a different direction so we want that to be reflected in the volume. We can talk about the collective project, or we can have very brief reports, but that might take us some time.

**Penny Johnson:** We could have just the headlines from each of the two projects.

**Suad Joseph:** Ok let us have summaries of the empirical projects.

## Summaries of the Empirical Projects

### Border Crossings Projects

**Mona Khalaf:** The topic is male migration and the feminization of the Lebanese family. Lebanon's asset has been its human resources, but its poor natural resources have prompted them to migrate. Very little work has been done on the effect of migration at the micro level, on the family (as opposed to the economy). My research would look at: the division of labor; the kinship effect; and coping strategies. The goal is to examine whether with the departure of the head of the household, the wife gains additional power, is it temporary or are the power implications permanent. I would be looking at determinants, such as socioeconomic background, education, and religion. I would use questionnaires and in depth interviews using as large a sample as possible. It would rely on a qualitative and quantitative approach.

**Nadine Naber:** My project is on recent Arab immigrants living in poor urban spaces, probably in Detroit, looking at: 1. Shifts in notions of public and private, in post- 9/11 culture of fear; 2. Shifts in the gendered divisions of labor in the context of the diaspora 3. Expansion of kinship idioms beyond blood ties; 4. Deployment of marriage strategies- as a strategy for engaging with issues of citizenship, belonging, economic problems.

**Eileen Kuttab:** It is in the process of polishing. It will be on the impact of internal displacement and cantonization on families, through a youth spectacle (aged 16-22). 1. Redefining space- internally displaced for the second time, household structure more dispersed, more nucleaziation; there is an assumption that youth are responsible- redefine structures in coping- youth as actors rescuers and saviors. 2. The concept of authority: the traditional breadwinner lost his role. The mother now is the protector of household and land because of the separation by the wall and cantonization. 3. The creation of informal kin: idiom of kinship: expansion of informal social networks, new affiliation useful for coping. 4. Empowerment of women because of the loss of male role or migration. The idiom of kinship defines authority. The three sites for this study are intensely affected by displacement: Rafah, Camp Qalqilia and Jennin.

**Ray Jureidini:** From Arab to non-Arab Domestic Workers in Beirut: Dynamics of Gender, Religion, Class and Space in Lebanese Households. It is going to be looking at the shift in Beirut, and may choose particular areas in Beirut, of employment from Arab to non-Arab domestic workers, documenting the history of domestic employment. It will look at different age groups and different religious groups. There may be a pre war post-war division. Areas of focus are: Division of labor within the household; Spatial dynamics within the household; Differentiation between types of domestic workers- differences between Arab and non-Arab domestic workers; Dynamics with members of the family.

**Ibrahim ElNur:** My project will be looking at transit migration and the middle class and new dynamics shaped by that- transit migrant Sudanese. Transit is a loose term. Some people might stay seven or ten years. The areas of focus are: Survival strategies (including transit migration itself); Reproduction of social status and its trajectories; Division of labor Intergenerational interactions; Idioms of kinship: what kinds of networks are produced and reproduced. The project looks at professionals and businessmen and the category of asylum seekers and those who have refugee status and those who are non-refugees. It could be

termed crisis-related transit migration. This is not only on war-related movements, but also on those who are driven out by economic privation, politics, and other conditions.

**Jihad Makhoul:** Tentative title: Displaced Families, Coping and Changes in Post-War Beirut in Selected Low Income Urban Settings. Previous research findings point to the family becoming more violent due to the lack of capabilities of families for supporting their members. Family members are becoming violent and playing it out on children, who join the labor force at an early age. Health effects: there is some work on mental and psychological effects, but not much on how families are coping and changes in family structures. So the research will be on how family structures and dynamics are played out in displaced stressed conditions. My focus is how the dynamics are played out. My interest is in children, specifically in girls. The study will be conducted in two selected urban areas of Beirut.

### Public Discourse Projects

**Penny Johnson:** Our project is called Weddings and War. In some ways, it is a comparison of the two intifadas, through several lenses, especially that of youth, in camp sites. The themes are: Marriageability; Future imaginaries- what marriage represents for these young people; Presentation of self; Some attention to ceremonies; How the survival politics of second intifada affect marriage- demography, population threat- people using this discourse to explain their lives (this is a hunch to be tested by the research). Camp settings are very intense in this way. Setting will be Nabulus, Balat, Ramalla, Gaza. We will look at: Talk, gossip, legend, stories (what is safe, are militants marriageable); Bayanat; Pamphlets- from mosques or churches; Interviews. We will probably pool resources and discuss coordinating with Eileen.

**Martina Rieker:** My project is also a thinking work in progress. It is on the consumptive desires of working women in the shadow side of neoliberal economy, young women on new lands agriculture. Looking at consumption, what it means for the working poor in rural Egypt (which is still close to Cairo, lands within 10-15 KM radius). Consumptive Desires and the imaginative desires of young women in peri urban Cairo. I am looking at a focal site, looking at data in Egypt field, then looking at longer term site, such as a village which is incorporated into proto-corvee labor.

**Zeina Zaatari:** Representation of Youth in TV stations and Working of Youth Desire. Me and Suad will be working on a project in Lebanon on the representation of youth on several TV stations, looking at the ideological constructs behind the representations and productions, how youth are negotiating these representations in their lives, in terms of their future vision of their lives, in terms of notions of ideal family, ideal spouse, ideal job, and how that translates materially into negotiating social relationships in their families; and how they represent themselves as youth. Zeina will do empirical work in the north and Suad will do Metn. Suad will focus on youth and desire, especially in terms of how to displace the liberalist notion of self and desire with different notions of self. This focuses us to displace the production side of feminist literature to look at consumption (not Bourdieu).

**Suad Joseph:** We might ask Mona to add question in her questionnaire, seek Judy's help, perhaps Ray's.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Our project is collective. It will include Alyce and Hania and remains untitled. It comes out of the discussion on youth and desire, by looking at the phenomena of courses and diplomas, and the returns to this kind of education. It ties this with marriagability and employability: looking at perception of these young people themselves (place to meet peers?) and their parents (why they are willing to invest). We identify a gap in Islamic education. We need to look at that, both inside the Azhar system, and the private schools. So we urge the group to consider that in the next round of proposal writing. We should acknowledge that Hoda and Omnia are not with us and their parts remain to be filled in.

### Thematic Links among the Projects

**Suad Joseph:** Desire in the liberalist discourse in the notions of the self. Now we can try to develop some thematic links among the projects: set of concepts and statements that we might want to reflect in the introduction of the volume- but most importantly to keep this a collective project. Martina and I thought desire might be a useful link.

**Martina Rieker:** We have taken seriously the discomfort of Border Crossings with having an organically linked project. Desire is one way to challenge the territorializing of identity. Desire can help us articulate certain sorts of imagining in the region, imaginaries of the future, non-national futures - desire for leaving, desire to migrate, to move elsewhere. We can use the term desire to articulate different notions of imaginaries of youth. There is the dream of moving. The state is no longer the locus of desire of youth. This allows us to undermine the territorialized nation/state and argue that these desires are about non-national desires; they might be about family, consumption, mobility...etc. But this allows us to bring in Border Crossings more organically to the whole project. We always move, and have moved. It is the state that contains and restrains movement. The state holds and holds back desire and movement and imaginaries. Families mediate desires. The immigration of male is to improve the conditions of the family.

**Mona Khalaf:** If we were to adopt this idea of youth and desire, my sample would have to focus on young women.

**Martina Rieker:** We also did not want Egypt to become a normative case, where Lebanon and Palestine are troubled spaces. This thematic link is the conduit into including the two groups Border Crossings and Public Discourse as part of an organic project.

**Suad Joseph:** Yesterday, we tried to grapple with the idea of violence, conflict, war - that could be a theme.

**Ibrahim ElNur:** Population flows?

**Eileen Kuttab:** That would be too passive.

**Martina Rieker:** There is the tension between mobility and locality.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Locally directed desires, and globally connected ones. I think marriage is an interesting pivot as the point at which families are recreated, a site where youth are trying to disengage from one family and perhaps create a new type. Marriage re-invents the family.

**Suad Joseph:** This is the fourth theme. Can we focus on the vocabulary of social violence? We want to find language that links war, migration, displacement, disruption, and social crisis. Social violence is a theme that unites all the projects. But how do we look at this region in terms of war without reinforcing the stereotypes about the region?

**Penny Johnson:** If we think of war more broadly: war, space and place.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** War and social disruption.

**Ibrahim ElNur:** If we think of multiple forms of war and conflict.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** For an Egyptian readership, we would have to do a lot of work to convince them how this is relevant to their context.

**Suad Joseph:** War stands on its own and it can include state violence, police violence, and disruption. War is a violent conflict, including psychological war; war over desires; emotional war. You also do not have to be in specific connection to war to experience it. Iraq, Lebanon, Palestine are disrupting Egypt as well. For example, the First Gulf War forced the return of all Egyptian workers from Kuwait. The whole region has been defined by war for the past half century.

**Ray Jureidini:** Lebanon is trying to get out of that “war”.

**Zeina Zaatari:** But that is our reality. People lived through it. It defined many of our lives.

**Ray Jureidini:** There is a desire to deny it and forget about it.

**Martina Rieker:** It might it be useful for marketing purposes to frame it in terms of “remaking of space and place”, of territory, delayed colonial project, and a certain moment of neoliberal remaking of region is looking at marriage and desire. This is a remaking of space and place – the remaking of Middle East, the belated colonial project that has enabled the authoritarian state in Egypt; the remaking of Iraq, Afghanistan, Lebanon, and Palestine. The family is part of this remaking of space and place. We are talking about the perpetual coloniality in Palestine. War is not an abnormality in our region.

**Penny Johnson:** It is true that there is a perpetuality of war and crisis.

**Suad Joseph:** I like the idea of using war. It is just a theme that we develop and do different things with it. It brings in violent dislocation. It brings in the drama.

**Martina Rieker:** I want to agree with Barbara, representing the Egypt field, given the history of the term “war”; it is almost an offense to Palestine, if we use it to describe Egypt. The term war has a certain history. We cannot dislodge it so easily. It will not work for Egypt. We have to do something creative with war to disrupt that history in Egypt or use different language. We can say that every country has gone through wars. If we take a slice

of time every country has had to deal with wars in the region in some way or another. Another language that is used is that of “violence”, such as development as violence.

**Penny Johnson:** But the problem with “violence” is that it is used against us, that we are violent. War has at least two parties.

**Penny Johnson:** Another theme is: Marriage, reinvention and reproduction of family.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** The movement out of one moment or form of family and into another. There is a rupture here.

**Suad Joseph:** That is four broad threads:

- 1- Desire- viability
- 2- The Normalization of Egypt
- 3- War
- 4- Marriage, Modernity Projects and the Reinvention of families

To the degree that we can weave them into the way we write- edited books are the least difficult to publish and marketed- except when it has organic and thematic continuities.

## Staging and Phasing

### A. Reports- Timeframe

Sending reports to each other that include thematic framing and methodology, especially questions asked, by: September 30; December 30; March 30. The second thing is that it might be useful to have one person responsible for responding. Let us set that up.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** But also we can say that if someone gets excited about what is sent to them, they can also respond.

**Suad Joseph:**

### B. Assignments of Responding to Reports

1. Martina’s project– Annelies to respond
2. Annelies, Penny, and Lamis’ project– Zena to respond
3. Mona’s project– Ibrahim to respond
4. Eileen’s project– Nadine to respond
5. Zeina and Suad’s project– Lamis to respond
6. Ibrahim’s project– Ray to respond
7. Barbara and Hania and Alyce’s project– Penny to respond
8. Judy’s project– Mona to respond
9. Nadine’s project– Eileen to respond
10. Ray’s project– Annelies to respond
11. Hoda el Sadda’s project– Barbara to respond
12. Omnia el Shakry– Martina to respond (to be considered)

### C. Products by September 2005

We can make a list of products we are aiming for by September 2005.

We have a list of twelve projects. We do not know 2 of them. So, on the table there are ten.

Martina Rieker : working paper

Annelies Moors, Penny Johnson, Lamis Abu Nahla: collaborative working paper

Mona Khalaf: Preliminary Analysis of data

Eileen Kuttab: Discussion Paper

Ray Jureidini: Article

**Suad Joseph:** Does everyone agree to commit to a working paper by the fall of 2005?

[*Agreement* is unanimous]

### D. What is Next in Terms of Research

- Islamic Education
- The Site of Law and Public Policy
- Sexualities
- Curriculum of Education- changes in content of Education- contestations over them
- Local notions of deviancy- what is considered transgressive on the part of state, on the part of family, on the part of youth
- Written Media- image of women in written media in Lebanon
- Law and Universal Human Rights- debates over rights
- Resistance as a coping strategy

### E. Budgets: What More in Terms of Funding

We came to see very quickly that half a million is not very much.

**Penny Johnson:** Do we need more funds for the current projects is one question.

**Suad Joseph:** Would it be realistic to say that you all need double the amount you have? Phase II needs half a million dollars (launching the empirical work). Phase III of work needs \$1 million

## **Second Session**

### Fall and Spring Workshops

A. Public Spheres Conference in Beirut Oct 22, 23, 24

B. February 5, Sat morning Stakeholders

Feb 3 Thursday morning, 4 Friday, 5 Saturday afternoon

Organizer for Stakeholders: Barbara and Population Council

Yes: Martina, Annelies, Eileen, Penny, Ibrahim, Barbara, Judy, Suad, Ray  
Not sure: Mona, Zeina, Lamis, Nadine, Hoda, Omnia  
C. Spring Stakeholders workshop in Beirut  
Mona, Ray & Judy to organize. Mona to send tentative dates

We need to do a booklet on AFWG in English and Arabic to be ready by Fall.  
Zeina to work on it, possibly the web page.

### Fall Workshop

Stakeholders meeting would be on the 21<sup>st</sup>. It only makes sense if two thirds of us can attend. Those who can attend SSRC: MK, JM, MR, RJ, BI, LAN. Definitely no or uncertain: OES, HES, PJ, SJ, NN, AM, ZZ and EK.

**Suad Joseph:** What we are committed to do in this round is the NGO stakeholders Meeting- to bring in the kind of people who work with refugees and youth.

**Penny Johnson:** I think that the Cairo meeting is the right place to start - the funders are here. In Lebanon and Palestine, we could have our own meetings, but more site-specific and topic-specific.

**Suad Joseph:** We are only committed to one in Cairo in the fall.

**Martina Rieker:** Most of the Arab world is imagined from the location of Cairo, from the point of view of funders. I have found that with encounters with NGOs and donors, even if we do not speak the same language, we can learn an awful lot from these encounters. It is a tremendously interesting learning project.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Just responding to Mona's point of giving people something, this could be a briefing sheet on the book that would abstract the chapter or the introduction. Then you do have something, but summarizing what we do on a few pages would be difficult.

**Suad Joseph:** This would be consistent with doing the webpage. So we have agreed on not doing a stakeholders workshop in October in Beirut, but when? Maybe late spring?

**Mona Khalaf:** Yes definitely.

**Suad Joseph:** If the three of you MK, RJ, JM, can meet in Beirut come up with a date for a late spring?

**Mona Khalaf:** Yes.

**Suad Joseph:** How about the roundtable? We have five people who are willing to go.

**Ray Jureidini:** There are though uncertainties with regard to the conference and when we could fit in.

**Suad Joseph:** I need to have someone who would be responsible for looking into that.

**Ray Jureidini:** I could.

**Suad Joseph:** So the decision is that we could have a roundtable in Public Spheres conference. Ray will let us know as soon as he knows if it will be possible.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Let us give him a title he can put in the program.

**Ray Jureidini:** I will need one before June 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Suad Joseph:** And in terms of a late spring stakeholders in Beirut, who can make May 6,7,8? Maybe the Lebanese group can give us several dates and send to the group

**Mona Khalaf:** The pamphlet should be on English and Arabic.

## Second Session

### Volume I Reviewers' Comments and Critical Discussion

**Suad Joseph:** Let us go to item A on session II: Volume I. We will move Human Subjects up to right after the discussion of the volume. Zeina and Annelies will comment on the Border Crossings chapter.

#### A- Border Crossings Chapter

**Annelies Moors:** I really enjoyed reading the material. It is very interesting. But there is one big question. I have some doubts about the audience they are addressing with this text. Why is this interesting for other people except as a preparation for our work? How would reviewers from SUP look at this sort of a product?

**Ray Jureidini:** I think we should discuss that right away.

**Suad Joseph:** I have felt that in reading and writing the PD chapter, that I was having a hard time shifting between writing for funders to persuade them and writing for the purpose of engaging scholars who had already done some research. I noticed this in rest of PD and in BC. We are obviously not writing for funders anymore. The question is how we shift gears. How do we shift to academic audience and a possible practitioners audience? Did BC experience that?

**Ray Jureidini:** This issue did come up. The whole introduction was taken from the original proposal and then the standardization of each particular project, after major themes were articulated. In the end, there were the timelines. We were still involved in thinking about and discussing the funding proposal. IDRC expressed particular interest in the project, and in including the issue of return.

The other thing we could not quite manage, was to write a literature review for the chapter looking for what was missing. This never quite eventuated for any of us. We have an 8-page

limitation. There was confusion with regard to time, space and audience. We lost sight of audience. The issue at this point is how can we shift gears. What we have now is a much clearer vision of the empirical projects. We need to think of what is workable right now, in terms of rethinking the literature, and writing for an academic audience. It is quite a task. I could probably do it fairly easily for my project, but I do not know about the others.

**Annelies Moors:** Even if we make it clearer, who is interested in what we are setting out to do?

**Ray Jureidini:** What we discussed in Lebanon is eliminating everything about what we plan to do and focus on theoretical issues and framing issues. It is hard.

**Ibrahim ElNur:** We are thinking of what is the implicit alternative. We thought about the population issue, population flows, and we have to document it somehow. I think we were not clear with ourselves.

**Suad Joseph:** I think that now this shift has to happen. We have to think pragmatically. A) What is the audience? B) What to do.

**Penny Johnson:** It is just a problem with shifting gears, that you think of what you are drawing on. We are drawing on three years of discussion and debates. You have this and your own work and you have literature. Even with this I felt we were skating on thin ice. The clearest things we developed were ways to frame issues in the discussions. Now we are trying to produce something original.

**Ray Jureidini:** What is missing? Is it political discourse?

**Suad Joseph:** It is the theoretical.

**Annelies Moors:** There are some ideas here, but it is not *new*. I am uncomfortable about publishing something like this, because it is insufficiently new.

**Martina Rieker:** One of the things is thinking in terms of what product it is. It is not a resource book. The other model is Eichelman's model of synthesizing what is out there, and what we offer is somewhat different. Some chapters are written that way. A third approach- not very practical, especially reading BC - is to offer certain themes such as territorialization and de-territorialization, showing how the Arab world is not part of these theories. There could be filler chapters where this material can be pulled together, looking at our part of the world, testing theories that have been applied elsewhere. There could be a chapter on the politics of space in relation to the BC project. So we can write about how we are looking at our region differently from the ways in which it has been looked at before.

**Zeina Zaatari:** This is a substantial amount of work that someone will have to commit to.

**Suad Joseph:** It seems feasible to take these ideas and see where these ideas can be incorporated- ideas such as deterritorialization. We might have sections of chapters that would pull things together, but to commission new chapter would pull us back 6 months.

**Penny Johnson:** The division into sections would give us flexibility in terms of strengthening the already written pieces and adding new ones.  
So you are suggesting some new chapters that might include historical genealogy chapters?

**Martina Rieker:** Yes, to look at how these things have been envisioned elsewhere and how this has or has not been done in our region and how we might look at our region in light of the way in which these have been envisioned elsewhere.

**Suad Joseph:** Rather than doing new chapters, let us do sections of chapters already existing.

**Penny Johnson:** We could complete a discussion draft and give it to funders and a limited number of critical readers for their comments before we finalize the press submission.

**Annelies Moors:** We have tried to introduce the theoretical to move away from the proposal style. We have moved towards the literature review style, and to push it further that way would not be interesting to our audience.

**Ray Jureidini:** There are so many substantive issues and we can tap into a whole set of paradigms. Let us look at this whole project and come up with themes.

**Suad Joseph:** I think what we are trying to do is to put out what we would be doing, to begin an engagement with academic or other audiences on that. If we focus on de-territorialization, is this what we have been working on directly in these three years?

**Annelies Moors:** Whereas these three years have been useful for us, I think that in the practice of writing the pieces, the question is if we can bring this to an audience without it being applied into research.

**Ray Jureidini:** Is it so bad that we should not give it to the publishers? Actually, as a reviewer, I would have problems with it.

**Suad Joseph:** I think if we take out of the chapter the parts about what we want to be doing it would be ok.

**Eileen Kuttab:** It means rewriting the whole thing.

**Penny Johnson:** It is very difficult to do. We tried to do it. Six months is a long time, but if we had more time, we could have an approach to make it better.

**Eileen Kuttab:** The problem for me was conforming to a format that is irrelevant to what I wanted to do. If we want to write about the conceptualization of the issues, then we would take time.

**Suad Joseph:** It may be part of the solution. I saw the biggest difficulty as the fragmentary nature of the writing. We could let it happen and break it out a little more - an introductory section to each project and have each of the different sections stand on its own.

**Penny Johnson:** We may need an extremely strong and frank editor.

**Ray Jureidini:** We cannot abandon this. What are the implications of a six-month delay?

**Suad Joseph:** There is the contract with SUP, and IDRC, Population Council, Mellon. We have obligations. The other reason is that if we push this out, we will not get on with the empirical work.

**Martina Rieker:** The review process may take two years, if the reviewers want a reworking.

**Suad Joseph:** Six months is what we should expect for the review process.

**Penny Johnson:** Could we produce a discussion draft for limited circulation? We would maintain the June 30 deadline. We would finish the remaining chapters. We do not submit it to the press, but possibly to donors, then we could figure out- even using funds from the budget- a small number of critical readers. This would give us some sense of where we are at and we can work out an approach for reformulation, and then we would figure out a new schedule.

**Suad Joseph:** We need a timetable that is very strict.

**Zeina Zaatari:** How far can we negotiate the deadline with Syracuse?

**Penny Johnson:** The donors are interested in it in a different way.

**Ray Jureidini:** Let us be clear about what needs to be done, for everything. If the chapters are not good enough to send to friends and donors, then let us hear more critical comments and see what needs to be done.

**Annelies Moors:** Reading through it, let me mention a few of the larger points, not looking at the minor ones for now.

1- The one thing that goes through the whole chapter is shifts in the private and public. It was invoked many times, but it is not clear what you are trying to say.

2- The issue of the use of borders and boundaries: it remains floating in the air. What you are trying to say? At times it ties in with women, and men and the house, but what it says specifically about the public/private is not clear. The tricky thing here is that there is a large literature about this and you need to take a stance on it.

3- Diasporas, transnationalism migration and return: they are used in different ways at different points in the chapter. It is exciting to look at migration in the context of the literature on transnationalism. The diaspora and transnationalism literature is of use; but the links between that literature and the labor and labor migrations is not clear and needs to be made clearer. Links can be rethought and accentuated. There is shifting between the language of labor migration and transnationalism.

4- The issue of return is dealt with in a very general way and discussed in different ways in the paper- because of trying to bring the projects come together. It is interesting to do it, but requires a lot of work. You need to be clearer about the differences of migrant domestic labor returning versus the Palestinians returning, and to draw out the political implications of the differences in these terms. Do not collapse them.

5- The discussion about migration and refugees also floats in the piece. At certain moments, it is all under dislocations and streams of people and at other moments it is

treated differently. It is difficult to get a hold on this. There is something more to be said there. The reader would like to see more. I wonder where the term exile would come in. Rosemary Sayigh uses the term exile instead.

**Zeina Zaatari:** I agree with the points that Annelies made.

- 1- Where you lay out the historical background is where you can address conceptual issues. For example, where you lay out the historical background of population flows is where you can lay out the differences in terms such as diasporas, migrations, etc. You can explain why you chose the last three decades.
- 2- In terms of the three ideas you chose to focus on (kinship expansion, division of labor, coping strategies), you may need more justification of why these are the tools you chose. What are the problematic issues within all of these in terms of the literature? You explore those later in terms of telling us what you are going to do. If you want to move away from focus on what you are going to do in your projects, you can expand these three and how they are handled in the literature and in other sites.
- 3- Do you want to combine talking about all the different research sites or not in the introduction?

**Annelies Moors:** You mention some literature in some places but you do not say anything about those literatures, such as gender studies, Arab family studies... Can you develop this?

**Ray Jureidini:** It is because different people coming from different paradigms, and who wrote what, so the disjuncture simply comes from different people. There needs to be some agreement about where we are coming from to do six different projects. I do not think it is possible, unless one individual writes this from one point of view. Some of these theoretical orientations are not compatible with each other.

**Zeina Zaatari:** I do not know if PD was successful in this. One thing about picking sites like media and law is that the discourses/literature around that can be explored. Maybe you can add other themes other than the three. I think you have to have one dominant author to have a dominant voice and others can more easily insert their own part.

**Suad Joseph:** What about this idea that is being proposed in terms of looking at the three foci that you have chosen, and analyzing the conceptual issues around that. You can look at how they are envisioned in other regions, reference the sites you will be working in without talking about what you will be doing in the on the ground research

**Ray Jureidini:** Initially, the problem was different writing styles.

**Ibrahim ElNur:** It may look like the introduction, which we wrote sentence by sentence. If this is not working then we should quit.

**Zeina Zaatari:** It does present the themes and concepts.

**Eileen Kuttab:** If we think that it is worth continuing the project, we would be looking at the conceptual issues and not make each piece an independent enterprise. It can never be an independent piece. We could take these key concepts– boundaries, displacement, diaspora, territories, transnationalism, population flows, kinship- and develop them conceptually and

abolish the independent projects sections. We would expand the introduction and that would be the project. We would leave out the sites, because they are problematic.

**Martina Rieker:** You can figure out your key concepts and the ones that do not reside well with each other (transnationalism and population flows do not reside with each other). This would be a way to think about which of these debates are more useful.

**Suad Joseph:** How does that sound to the BC group?

**Ibrahim ElNur:** Yes, it sounds good.

**Martina Rieker:** What might be useful for your group, because you come from different approaches, is looking at “Prehistories of Globalization” by Seteney Shami is in 2000 in Public Culture. It has a Middle East perspective. It was tremendously successful article, but it got pushed out of our field.

**Suad Joseph:** May I suggest that BC meet and strategize on the side. But let us talk about a timetable. How about July 30<sup>th</sup>?

**Ibrahim ElNur:** If we do not do it by then, then we will not do it.

**Suad Joseph:** It would be absolutely FINAL. It means you have to have all your references in there, everything, all chapters, and endnotes. July 30 All chapter must be submitted in FINAL FORM, including final endnotes, bios, bibs. We can move to PD now.

## B- Public Discourse Chapter

**Martina Rieker:** I have read this chapter as a passive reader many times. I feel it took a tremendous amount of work. It is well grounded in the literature.

- 1- However, while it is extremely rich, it lacks a thesis, a topic, each section is a jewel in the subthemes, but the overall does not move anywhere as a whole chapter. By the end we do not move anywhere. I think it is quite serious. It is not a matter of gluing in an intro or conclusion. Why are we writing this? The Eickelman approach of summarizing knowledge may not be what we would like, but the summaries of the literature are not standing together to move in a direction. It is not that we need to do more research. One solution is that the individual pieces diverge and focus on where are we going. It is way too long.
- 2- Maybe the different sections do not need to be further polished, but the real question is to ask where are these sections going, what do we want to do with it. Maybe this is my own limitation.
- 3- Three territorial projects and the transnational project need integration
- 4- The naming of western versus ME or West versus Arab is not helpful because we are taking this apart. Evoking these territorial imaginaries as if they were uncontested is problematic. We want to be really careful with that. This happens especially in the first section, and in the second section as well.
- 5- On p.7 part of legal section: “It is too much to claim that the nation state invents the family”... misses the point, because we are looking at the modernity projects. There is

- the colonial mediated project that gets inserted into the modern nation state and its practices. In the field of history, to create absolute moments of colonial and nation-state as distinct and historically separate has been challenged. There are no absolute breaks because the colonial project is inserted into the modern nation state, but modernity can be looked at as the category that links.
- 6- Palestine section: on p.9 the idea of Palestinian democracy– democracy is presented as something troublesome. We have to be careful about how we use language- what can the reader read into this, democracy as opposed to citizenship. But look at the way citizen is used in the Palestinian case. P 11 in Palestine section- Rosemary Sayigh argument about mothers and daughters– this is an important and strategic point for the project, but it was not clear how it was linked to the project and what is the point in the section that the reference wants to make.
  - 7- They are beautifully crafted and researched pieces. But there are issues with the Habermas section around print media, and the need to include mother and women in the crafting of the nation. Najmabadi talks about orality and print media around women in Iran.
  - 8- Cinema section and media genre areas are underdeveloped areas in our part of the world. This section does not shine as much after the previous sections. I did not know where it was going. What arguments are we making? If this is a general issue for this chapter, we need to think of why we are doing this and where are we going with the section on media. People make references to the Internet and family, so it might be worthwhile to more actively gesture towards that. We might make a gesture to the Border Crossings issues because we are making holistic engagements.
  - 9- The conclusion is useful but not powerful enough to get me out of this quandary of thinking about direction and argument.

**Suad Joseph:** We had exactly the same problem, which is that we outlined this chapter as a justification for our project. We may need to drop some sections, like “why youth” as they were justifications for our research project. I suggest that we focus on family in public discourse. It is a theoretically crowded chapter. We would be dropping youth, but bringing youth in through the sites of law, education and media. We do not need a why youth section. Annelies was trying to make us move to that direction. We can take some time to reconceptualize the key conceptual issues.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Maybe we need to go back to why we were excited to become the public discourse group? I think we got one practical suggestion, that youth is a site for work to come. We can allude to it as a site where new enters culture, but not focus on youth.

**Annelies Moors:** Did you have any suggestions about directions?

**Martina Rieker:** One of the things is that there should be a number of separate chapters. This allows us to think of introductory and conclusion pages, as well as somehow have a preface with an anatomy of how one gets at family and family relations and talk about this as an anatomy and that we are grappling with ways of approaching the family. I think it is an extremely valuable piece, but how does one exhibit and display this kind of work? The preface could be useful for the reader to explain this eclectic collection- very powerful, one page. I mean anatomy as a guide to read the body. A reader’s guide is useful but we have to push it further than that. In my opinion, BC has the opposite problem. It would be nice to be consistent throughout the book, so that each section has a preface. So there is a preface

to section on PD, which focuses on the anatomy of how one gets to family. Families can be used as a way to talk about war and desire and other things in the region. The preface is only 1-2 pages, the anatomy: a guide to reading the sections that come later. The sections that follow are not each about the family, but are ways of understanding the family– public discourse, law, education, and media. The preface will make the case for the chapters, in each case. For the reader, these prefaces will be guides within the section on PD, then the section on public discourse, then either three sections on the three sites (law, education, media), or collapse different sections here.

**Ibrahim ElNur:** I want to speak in a less diplomatic language. BC needs to engage more with the literature?

**Martina Rieker:** I would think that pages 1-6 is one section. Law and public policy would be second. Section three: education. Section four would be the rest.

**Suad Joseph:** We drop the youth section and each section alludes to it.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** I think it would be strange to single out youth.

**Annelies Moors:** I have a practical comment: one of central things is that somebody coordinate, because we cannot leave this up to Zeina.

**Penny Johnson:** Annelies is a very good critical reader.

**Annelies Moors:** It would be impossible for me.

**Penny Johnson:** I also have major traveling next month.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Let us be clear each author will have to have an intro and conclusion. If each person does that, I will coordinate. Now we think of it as a stand-alone piece, which requires more coherence. We can work on similar structure. Education can use more theoretical work.

**Suad Joseph:** That is work I have done. I can read it and add to it.

**Annelies Moors:** I think the preface is rather crucial. I have the sense that you, Martina, that you have an idea about what this preface would look like.

**Martina Rieker:** I can write it in the next week and circulate it by June 1. I think that the prefaces will be so essential in all sections that we should take those seriously.

**Suad Joseph:** Penny would be willing to do the literature review preface. Nadine will do the BC.

#### Reorganization of PD Chapter and Individual Tasks

Section 1 of PD chapter is 1-6 in PD current chapter

Section 2 Law and Public Policy

Section 3 Education

Section 4 Media

We drop the youth section as a section and allude to it in each section or allude to different generations.

- Individual authors need to give introductions to each section, development and conclusion to each section. Each section will stand alone, so there needs to be coherence.
- Barbara volunteers to put sections together if each section authors puts works on their piece.
- Martina to send preface to PD by June 1.
- Penny and Zeina to do preface to literature reviews by July 1.
- Nadine and Ray to do the preface to the BC by June 1.
- Suad and Barbara to conference call on Policy Implications in July.
- Suad can add theoretical part to Education section.

### **Third Session**

#### Human Subject Protocols

#### General Orientation and Tips- Barbara Ibrahim

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Step one is to take the course to get your certification. You would go to the site (the NIH website: <http://cme.nci.nih.gov>) when you have an hour and a half to take the course. You can print each page, and be sure to print your certification. You can then send Suad your certification number. The next step would be to work back from any date you wish to enter the field- first contact with research subjects, work back at least two months, and that would be when you get your papers in to Suad. You have to be sure when the deadline is.

Suad and I are still not clear if we will have a big submission, but probably each project will submit this. You must demonstrate the benefit of the research, to the community. You must state the objectives and methodology of your study, then focus on protecting the confidentiality and consent- showing you plan on giving them a chance to decline. In most IRB review procedures, there would be either a signature or a witness required. Sometimes anthropological fieldwork is exempted.

Confidentiality: This is ensured in terms of where the material with names on it being kept, care in terms of sending material to translation, perhaps the only thing that circulates is a number not the name, or a pseudonym.

It is important to leave behind a phone or number so that participants can call back. Paying respondents is discouraged.

Issues that we have faced have to do with getting names and signatures. Using a witness is a compromise. Sometimes we go to an informant, and you do not tell them you are coming back, IRB might not approve you for a second visit. So if you plan repeated contacts over time, be sure you mention this, make sure it is part of the information you give to

informants and build it into your protocols for IRB. Under the legal age of majority (18 in Egypt, except if she marries), we will need permission from parent or teacher or guardian.

### Questions from AFWG Core Group about Human Subjects Protocols

**Annelies Moors:** For me this discussion is very problematic. The bureaucratic system is designed to protect institutions, but protecting institutions and protecting individuals are two different issues.

**Suad Joseph:** Qualitative researchers have been challenging the IRB on this at California. None of the human subjects protocols were written with anthropological research in mind.

**Ray Jureidini:** I think we discussed this at BC. What happens if you come across something that is illegal? The committee asked me if I would reveal that to the police. I said no I am a researcher. Permission for the research was denied.

**Suad Joseph:** I would prefer if we get it approved as a whole project.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** You may work at an institution that would require you to do it, even if you are doing it for AFWG. In our next meeting, we can put ethical considerations on the agenda, like domestic abuse, illegal activities, etc.

**Suad Joseph:** I understand that they have accepted taped consent, but we have to get them approved.

**Ray Jureidini:** Tape-recorded acceptance is legitimate. I agree we should keep these documents, unless we are asked for them- such as a random audit.

**Barbara Ibrahim:** We undertake to train our RA to protect confidentiality.

**Suad Joseph:** Let us say we have a sub-committee that vets the questions. Its members will be Barbara, Suad and Annelies.

### Summary of Procedures, Considerations, Tasks Regarding Human Subjects

#### Procedures for Researchers

1. Researchers abide by University of California guidelines on Human Subjects.
2. Researchers and research assistants have to get certified through the NIH course
3. We undertake to train our RA to protect confidentiality.
4. Send Suad your certification numbers and those of your RAs.
5. Back up from the date from first contact research subjects, at least two months, that is the point you need to have materials to Suad for IRB review at UCD.
6. Demonstrate: Do no Harm, but also show what are the benefits to the communities.
7. Describe the project and its methods then do two things:  
describe how you will protect anonymity of subjects

describe how you will get informed consent and inform subjects of the right to decline participation.

8. Set up procedures to convince the IRB that no one has been recruited into the study that does not know there is a study, and did not give consent. Leave a phone number so if they feel uncomfortable, they can call you.
9. Must include signature of the subject or the signature of a witness to the informed consent.
10. If you have people's names on transcripts you have to take them off the transcripts and put only a code on the interview so that the only thing that circulates is the number/code. Or you can have pseudo names on the interviews.
11. Under the legal age of majority, you need parental informed consent. This is 18 in Egypt, Lebanon and maybe in Palestine. In Egypt, once a girl marries, you no longer need her parents' permissions or husband's permissions.
12. Tape recording consent may be acceptable. We have to submit it to IRB. We cannot get people to sign consent in Egypt, Lebanon or Palestine because of the police conditions. We would ask to have the tape recording consent. Then you can have someone transcribe this as a witness that consent has been given.
13. The researchers should keep the record, not Suad. If they are sent to Suad with the names on it; that in itself is a violation of the anonymity of the subject. Every research should keep a copy of the consent forms.
14. The letter of consent is coming from the principal researcher on site. The principal researchers are the Core Group members only.

### Guidelines and Considerations

1. We need to do the institutional requirements practically, but we need an ethical discussion among ourselves about protecting the subjects of our study.
2. We will not pay informants.
3. We have to think about where we draw our samples and that we do not give our lists to NGOs or others.
4. Marriage records are public domain as are court records.
5. Anything that has Arab or Muslim on it is being monitored. We agree to not do any research where the information might be used against the subjects by agencies in region or outside the region.
6. An American university with links to the American government may impose this on us. We need to be careful what kind of proposals we do and we submit and agree to do. The concern is that universities are part of the institutions of the state. The universities have been under obligation to produce materials on foreigners.

### Tasks

- 1-Developing a template that is a cover letter for the whole project for the IRB and submitting all the protocols for all the projects together. Barbara and Suad will do this.
- 2- Suad to check when the IRB boards meet, whether they meet in the summer, ...etc.
- 3- Suad and Barbara will decide whether we make one submission for the project or many different submissions to the project.
- 4- We should find out who is sitting on UCD IRB board and ask their advice on what to look for and how to submit the protocols.

IRB Boards must include community ethicists. They think of themselves as advocates of the subjects.

#### Other Forms of Engagement with Stakeholder

**Suad Joseph:** This could be in the form of discussions with media. Do we want to think of other forms at this point or wait to see what February teaches us?

**Barbara Ibrahim:** Media is the group to go to at a later stage, when we have findings and they are very carefully articulated.

#### Other Forms of Dissemination: MESA 2005

**Martina Rieker:** Might we suggest that we actually see who would send abstracts, then that would determine what we would do?

**Annelies Moors:** We can do thematic conversation over three years.

**Suad Joseph:** This does not preclude having a panel.

**Martina Rieker:** I will remind people.

**Suad Joseph:** We want to focus our resources on panels, not thematic conversations. Let us plan for a panel and the deadline for that is late February. Martina will coordinate an application for Thematic Conversation But also plan a panel. We will prioritize the panel for those who have to get their way paid. Martina will remind us of deadline to send in abstracts Let us see who send abstracts by Feb 1 and then we decide how many panels we do. In the future, we may want to present at the American Anthro Association, not just at MESA.

#### AFWG Protocols

Things we have decided but have not introduced into protocols:

1. Creating a Category of AFWG Affiliate
2. Ownership of AFWG paid research belongs to AFWG and not to paid researchers.
3. To remain part of AFWG Core Group the member has to have produced a product within a two-year period. Product can be a paper, a workshop, contributing to reading and reviewing work of others in the group.

#### AFWG Office

We have put together a package for the office. We are considering the possibility of a laptop. If we get a scanner, we need to have someone who aggressively scans materials in the library and sends the materials to the Core Group members.