

‘VIOLENCE ALL AROUND US’

Dilemmas of Global and Local Agendas Addressing Violence against Palestinian Women, an Initial Intervention

PENNY JOHNSON
Birzeit University, Palestine



ABSTRACT

How do international human rights frameworks function in addressing violence against women in situations of prolonged political violence and colonial conflict? How do other voices, generated locally, take on, contest or interact with, these frameworks? These questions are addressed in the Palestinian context through examining two recent reports, the first, a problematic November 2006 report by Human Rights Watch, *A Question of Security: Violence Against Palestinian Women and Girls*, and the second, a report issued in March 2007 by the Palestinian Violence Against Women Forum, a network of local Palestinian NGOs. Data from the first Palestinian national survey on domestic violence (2005) are also scrutinized. Beginning with a specific incident of a recent honor crime in a Palestinian refugee camp, this initial intervention also probes the history of public debate research and activism on domestic violence in Palestine and argues for careful attention to the diversity of community responses.

Key Words ◇ gender and conflict ◇ human rights ◇ Palestine
◇ Palestinian women ◇ violence against women

In the summer of 2002, a graduate student at the Institute of Women's Studies at Birzeit University (Palestine) conducted a series of in-depth interviews with an impoverished family in Amari refugee camp near Ramallah as part of our project to understand how families and family members survived in, and how gender roles and responsibilities responded to, the highly adverse and insecure circumstances of the second *Intifada* in Palestine. In the course of a visit to the family, she encountered an unexpected problem: the father, a

porter in the vegetable market, was absent from the household and his work; other family members were obviously in turmoil. Amal,² his 19-year-old daughter finally confided that her father had been arrested by the Palestinian police, along with his own father and brothers, for the killing of his sister, a widow who had recently borne a child outside marriage.

In a flurry of conversations and emails, researchers in the project discussed a number of issues, including research ethics, legal obligations and the situation and safety of the graduate student. I will return to some of the consequences and perceptions of this particular ‘crime of honor’—widely discussed in the camp—at the end of my article. Here, I would like to briefly reflect on my reaction at the time when I emailed a colleague: ‘how a subject we were somehow avoiding has hit us in the face’.

What did I mean by ‘avoiding’ the subject of ‘honor crimes’? To be sure, this was my own personal response, but I think it is true to say that as researchers at the Institute of Women’s Studies developed gender research agendas through collective discussions over the last twelve years, we steered away from topics that we considered had been framed, exoticized and sensationalized by western media and writers as Orientalist tropes or emblems of Palestinian or other Arab societies. We were also critical of ever-escalating donor gender agendas and their funding interest in ‘violence against women’, which included individual male violence but seemed to exclude the pervasive colonial violence in which Palestinian women, men, and children lived their lives, and sometimes met their deaths.

Our critique was valid, I think, but looking back, I wonder if we might have failed in a critical engagement—including the difficult task of a conceptual reframing of the operations of violence in public and domestic spaces—as well as the requisite empirical investigations. To be sure, other researchers in Palestine have made important conceptual and empirical contributions (see Kervokian, 2004), but without a strong research tradition (or data) on which to build. In this regard, it is noteworthy that like other classic (or perhaps timeworn) subjects on Arab society, such as kin marriage (see Johnson, 2006a), honor codes and ‘honor crimes’ have attracted more sustained attention from Israeli, than Palestinian, anthropologists (see Ginat, 1997; Kressel, 1981; Stewart, 1994).

The question of responsibility and priority remains. In the present period when imperial agendas use powerful images or even icons of Middle Eastern women’s oppression as *casus belli*, ‘choosing silence’—to borrow an apt phrase from Nadine Naber (2000: 20)—as a strategy to ‘avoid’ these sensationalized issues, may not be a responsible option. This is particularly so when militarization, violent conflict, severe oppression and social fragmentation might lead to increased family violence, violence against women, and its acceptance.²

Dilemmas of Human Rights: The Human Rights Watch Report

I was provoked into my current project (irritation may not be a noble reason but it is a great motivator), which is to trace the local and global discourse on violence against women and girls in the Palestinian context from 1990 to the present, by the November 2006 publication of a highly publicized,³ if problematic, report from the New York-based and well-respected human rights organization Human Rights Watch called *A Question of Security: Violence Against Palestinian Women and Girls*. Unlike most reports of human rights violations against Palestinians, including those of Human Rights Watch, this one was the subject of a major feature article in the *New York Times*, and received other major media coverage.

I will discuss some of the analytical and empirical problems in this report briefly but I think its publication, content, and reception also raises a series of questions of general interest. How do international human rights frameworks function in addressing violence against women in situations of prolonged political violence and conflict where the indigenous political authority is transitional, non-sovereign, fragmented and under attack, and where other states also exercise power and thus have obligations? Who applies these frameworks and in whose interest? How useful, adequate, and appropriate are international human rights instruments in addressing such violence? How do other voices, generated locally, take on, contest, or interact with, these frameworks? Or to be a bit more down to earth, as Nadera Kervokian, a leading Palestinian feminist, researcher and long-time activist on violence against women, told me in a recent interview: 'I don't feel the United Nations, and all these international discourses on human rights are supporting us. They are just keeping us busy writing reports.'⁴

On the other hand, Maha Abu Dayyeh, the director of Women's Center for Legal Aid and Counselling, the Palestinian women's organization which has conducted the most active and sustained work on violence against women, expressed a continued strong commitment to the relevance of human rights frameworks as she narrated how the Center's work began in the mid-1990s:

We began to use international human rights and CEDAW. The Beijing conference and our preparations for it opened up a whole new discourse, we trained women to attend international conferences and had education on women's rights according to international law.⁵

For Abu Dayyeh, these human rights principles are an indispensable anchor: 'We never compromise on principles but we compromise on tactics.' Given that Kervokian and Abu Dayyeh worked together through WCLAC to found the first women's hotline, to establish counseling protocols and practices for women who suffered domestic abuse, to liaise with legal professionals and

police on the subject, and to launch a major research project, their differing views are salient. There are, indeed, dilemmas in addressing violence against Palestinian women and girls. Unfortunately, the surprisingly poor analysis and broad-brush culturalist framework of the Human Rights Watch report does not offer a convincing way to address these dilemmas.

Let me preface my critique with two remarks. First, while I share the frustration with the present state of ‘international discourses on human rights’, the development of human rights concepts, instruments, and campaigns is far too important a development historically to be lightly dismissed—for anyone interested in Palestine or in women’s rights and gender equality. Second, since I am not reviewing the Human Rights Watch report in total, I should mention that the report contains a cogent analysis of existing formal legislation, as well as informative interviews with lawyers, police officers, counselors and most movingly and usefully, the voices of women who have suffered severe domestic abuse.

Analyzing the Human Right Watch Report’s Sacred Statistic

The Human Rights Watch report proceeds from the assertion that it is ‘already well established that violence against women and girls is a serious problem in the OPT’ (2006: 4), repeatedly citing—but not carefully analyzing—a finding from the recent first national survey on domestic violence, conducted by the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics that 23 percent of ‘ever-married women in the West Bank and Gaza said that they had been victims of domestic violence in 2005’ (2006: 36). This selection of a ‘sacred statistic’—often a simple frequency—to represent gender oppression in the Middle East is a frequent feature of international agencies and western reporting and thus deserves closer scrutiny. Please bear with me as I take a brief look behind this statistic.⁶

In citing this singular statistic, the report failed to add, as PCBS does in its summary statement of the same finding, that such violent acts occurred ‘at least one time’ in the calendar year (PCBS, 2006).⁷ An analysis of the survey by the Institute of Women’s Studies for PCBS noted that the aggregate figure of 23 percent can be misleading in dealing with ‘the real extent of domestic violence’ (Institute of Women’s Studies, 2006) and provided additional figures for women who experience three or more acts of physical violence from their spouses during the year 2005, finding that about 9 percent of women surveyed experienced this level of physical violence (p. 46).

This is almost one in ten women and is not a negligible figure, but it is obviously important to any assessment to look at the frequency rate—and also the type of violence and its severity, another issue which Human Rights Watch does not analyze. PCBS data is clear, for example, that the most common acts

of physical violence (for married women by spouses) by far were pushing strongly (the most prevalent), slapping the face, throwing an object or twisting the arm or pulling hair, while a small (but not to be neglected) minority report possible life-threatening attacks (PCBS, 2006: table 3.11). Unfortunately, the HRW report seems to place all such acts, from pushing to strangulation, under the rubric of 'crimes', failing to distinguish even between crimes and misdemeanors, let alone acts which fall outside these legal frameworks. This conflation cannot be helpful in developing a strategy, or even a public discussion, to address criminal violence against women and girls.

This lack of attention to detailed evidence may be because the criminal is already identified. The killing of Palestinian women in so-called 'honor' crimes, for example, is termed 'the most tragic consequence and graphic illustration of deeply embedded, society-wide gender discrimination' (HRW, 2006: 49). Palestinian society is portrayed as unrelieved and unchangingly patriarchal—with patriarchy conceived largely as a fixed set of attitudes, rather than reflecting material and social interests that are contested, interact with other political, social, and economic dynamics, and, of paramount interest, are thus subject to change.

The report's tendency is to make serious crimes against women—which unarguably exist—emblematic of Palestinian society as a whole, a conflation that would not occur in approaching such violent crimes in a western society, where they are generally treated as individual aberrations. As Shahrzad Mojab points out, 'dividing cultures into violent and violence-free' is in itself a patriarchal myth (2003: 2). Positioning 'honor' crimes as a 'graphic illustration' of society-wide gender discrimination comes uncomfortably close to broader Orientalist depictions of Arab societies. And these deadly acts—at about 10–20 per year in the last few years—become conflated with the much more pervasive and society-wide physical, social, and sexual acts of violence—from the relatively minor to the criminal—that men (and sometimes women) enact in the family.

Clearly, there are questions of comparison and distinction that need to be addressed; the positioning and even the naming of 'honor crimes' are subjects of debate. Feminist researchers have argued wider for a broader categorization of honor crimes to include, for example, forced marriage and other 'marriage-related practices' that violate women's 'rights to life, liberty and bodily integrity' (Coomaraswamy, 2005: p. xii). In the Palestinian context and based on her clinical work with women, Kervokian deploys the concept of 'femicide' to denote 'all violent acts that instill a perpetual fear in women or girls of being killed under the justification of honor' (Kervokian, 2004: 10). Kervokian vividly evokes a 'death zone' inhabited by women in fear of their lives—expressed by one woman as 'I die a million times a day' (Kervokian, 2004: 9). And the Palestinian Non-Governmental Forum Against Violence Against Women (Al Muntada, henceforth the Forum), in its recent report,

both rejected the nomenclature of ‘honor crimes’ and proposed ‘the urgent need to issue penal codes that would judge “honor killing” a crime of murder’ (Abu Nahleh, 2007: 46). (At present, if a case of honor killing is prosecuted, it would be brought to criminal court but there are provisions for reduced sentences; it is interesting in this regard that Israel, in administration rather than law, allows the release by presidential pardon after eight to twelve years for ‘a murder of a woman who engaged in illicit sexual relations or a person who took revenge in a book dispute’ (Ginat, 1997: 17).) For the Palestinian police, honor killings are generally recorded simply when the perpetrators acknowledge them as such.

Parenthetically, I should note here that, while it is difficult to accurately assess the number of honor crimes, or of murders of women in general, the Palestinian Independent Commission for Citizens Rights (PICCR), using police records, reports 28 murders of women in 2006, of which 14 were identified as honor killings and 26 murders in 2005, of which 17 were identified as honor killings. (PICCR, 2007; 82) The Forum, a network of local NGOs, held a discussion in April 2007 of its draft report, written by Lamis Abu Nahleh and based on a collection of case files of incidents of honor crimes, and found a 18 cases in 2006 (and 11 in 2005) registered as honor killings, with an additional five cases of murder with criminal liability that the researcher categorized as ‘with a background of honor’, several of which had clear economic motives as well. The Forum’s report provided important and nuanced insights into community and family involvement which I will discuss in my conclusion. All ‘registered’ honor crimes were committed by members of the victim’s natal family, with brothers as the largest category of perpetrators, followed by fathers and other paternal relatives, a similar pattern to that found by other researchers in earlier studies (Kressel, 1981: 146). Several of the murdered women were Christian. Gaza and West Bank villages witnessed the highest proportion of these crimes.

The Forum’s report attempts to find patterns but its community-based approach does not degenerate into unitary stereotypes. In contrast, the HRW report seems to view all Palestinian women as potential victims of these crimes:

A Palestinian women’s life is at risk if she is suspected of engaging in behavior her family or community considers taboo, such as talking with a man who is not her husband or a blood relative (even in a public place), refusing to tell a close male relative here she has been and with whom, or marrying someone without the approval of her family . . . (HRW, 2006: 49)

Many Palestinian women, as well as men, would find this statement not only unreflective of their lived experience, but offensive in its stereotypical generalization. Just as important, this view seems to preclude wider community

mobilization—after all, the family and community are indivisibly united against the 'misbehaving' woman—to address and prevent such serious crimes, leaving punishment, rather than prevention, as the only remedy. In a thoughtful article on combating crimes of honor, An Naim argues that such community involvement discourse is essential:

Unless one subscribes to the patronizing and authoritarian view that people should simply be coerced into 'doing what is good for them,' it is necessary to gain their cooperation and support through an internal discourse within the community around cultural norms and institutions associated with these crimes. (2005: 65)

Although recognizing the present weakness, but not the transitional legal status, of the Palestinian Authority, the report laid much of the blame and accountability on that Authority for its failure to take decisive action. Israel's continuing occupation, siege and attack on PA institutions were acknowledged rather briefly, but called 'no excuse for inaction'. Leaving aside questions of the absence of the Palestinian Authority's criminal jurisdiction outside Area A constituting the main Palestinian cities and acknowledging the many failures of the Authority towards its population, this statement does not acknowledge the responsibility under international law of the Israeli occupying power to enforce human rights treaties. This is a strange omission for a human rights report which is generally strong in its legal analysis of existing discriminatory criminal legislation. Those who tried to explain the Palestinian Authority's failure in the context of this occupation, siege and the Authority's restricted and weakened powers, were unfortunately dismissed as 'defenders of the status quo'.

The HRW report does acknowledge that domestic violence in Palestine may be 'aggravated during times of political violence' (2006: 3) but offers no wider framework that includes the pervasive violence faced by Palestinian women (men and children) from the Israeli occupation and Israel's siege against the Palestinian people.⁸ The effect of the ongoing profound political and economic crisis on social and family relations is largely absent, although it is emphasized by Palestinian NGO activists themselves (see IRIN, 2007).

Three Palestinian activists interviewed by Human Rights Watch for the report expressed their frustration to me that none of their analysis of violence of the occupation and siege and its effects on women and families had been included in the report. While 'blaming the occupation' for all the social ills in Palestinian society would also be unhelpful, the HRW report isolates domestic violence and implicitly gender relations and Palestinian families from all the contexts in which they function. Such isolation cannot reflect the reality—whether literally, when Palestinians are made homeless by Israeli air raids or bulldozers, or conceptually, as family relations both extend into, and are affected by, the political and economic realm.

Community Discourses: 'We are All Together'

If international human rights frameworks are insufficient, what is the status of alternative community discourses in combating violence against women and girls? Did such a discourse develop in Palestine and what has happened to it? Again, I have just begun this project but it is interesting to examine the first public meeting where domestic violence was discussed. In 1990, Palestinian women activists and researchers gathered in the Friends School in Ramallah in a pioneering conference discussing domestic violence in the West Bank and Gaza. The late Dr Hala Atallah, a faculty member in Birzeit University's Department of Education and Psychology, and Nadera Kervokian, then a graduate student and now a leading researcher on crimes against women, gave presentations. Atallah provided a comparative framework for understanding domestic violence while Kervokian, drawing on her doctoral research in the Jerusalem area, argued that violence against women in the home was a significant issue and cut across classes and settings in Palestinian society. The researchers made no claims either for universal knowledge or for complete solutions but rather aimed to initiate a collective discussion among women's movement groups, the legal profession and other interested parties in Palestine. Soraida Hussein, then in her late twenties and a grass-roots activist in a women's committee, recalled the impact of this first public discussion of family violence and violence against women and said simply: 'It changed my life.'⁹ Not all participants were so receptive: one woman lawyer vigorously argued the point that would haunt the movement as it continued: the speakers, she said, were mouthing western agendas. Both the speakers and members of the audience, however, were clear that addressing domestic violence in the Palestinian context required collective, rather than individual, approaches and responsiveness to the lived experiences of Palestinians under occupation.

Undoubtedly, the confidence generated by the contribution of Palestinian women and women's organizations to the national struggle against occupation during the mass mobilization of the first Intifada underlay the timing of the conference. Nadera Kervokian recalls that the immediate impetus for the organizers of the conference was a 'horror story' of a woman who was raped by her husband. A group of women activists met and asked the question: 'What shall we do about it?' The palpable sense of agency reflects the strength of the women's movement and its (actual and perceived) ties to nation and community in the crucible of the first Intifada.

The same question—but from a different perspective on nationalist political field—was asked by Abu Dayyeh, then the director of the Quaker Legal Aid office in Jerusalem, which provided legal aid to Palestinian prisoners. Her

impetus to address the social problems of women, including domestic violence, came from her clients, the wives of prisoners:

I saw women from the villages near Jerusalem seeking legal aid . . . Hardcore Palestinian society walked into my office and I was shocked. The women cursed Abu Ammar [Yasser Arafat], politics, the national movement. They cursed their husbands. They said no body hears us . . . The question was what to do?

In the wake of the 1990 conference, activists began intensive community work and discussions: 'Everything was open', Nadera recalls. 'We discussed different discourses, Islamic, international human rights, even psychopathology. We talked to everyone.'

She recalled another turning point—a 1992 case of a young woman from a village near Hebron who broke her engagement with her cousin and was subsequently abducted by the cousin and his brothers and brutally raped. But this was not only the story of a brutal crime and an abused victim—it was also, Kervokian says, a 'success story', in that women activists were able to shelter the woman and her mother in Jerusalem—and, in what today might seem an unlikely alliance, ' Hamas [acronym for the Islamic Resistance Movement] stood by us.' Hamas activists led a large demonstration against the rapist and tribal elders met in a *sulha* (reconciliation) that resulted in the expulsion of the rapist's family from the village.

'We were all together', Nadera said. When I asked her 'Could you say this today, that everyone is united in combating crimes of violence against women?' she said, with deep regret, 'No. At the time there was clear agreement; everyone was against such violence. This has changed both here and in the region.' There is no simple trajectory from this beginning moment of unity in the early 1990s to the fragmentation and divisions today in Palestine: not only discourses, but catastrophic events have intervened whereby, as Kervokian observes, 'violence has become a language'. She has an important point, succinctly expressed to me in 2006 by a third grader in Amari when asked what kinds of violence she sees around her: 'The Occupation, the checkpoints, between girls at school, kids on the street, between families, hitting without reason' (Johnson, 2006b: 21). There is much work to be done to understand how all these forms of violence operate in diverse settings in Palestine and across classes, genders, and generations. In conclusion, I would like to return to the 2002 event with which I began this article: the killing of a widow in Amari camp by her brothers and father. In our extended interviews with families in the camp in 2003 and 2004, we did not ask explicitly about this murder, but it has been woven into accounts, particularly from women, on major events in the camp and is used to illustrate their strong sense of moral and political dissolution in Palestinian society (Johnson, 2007a). Several women tell a tale of the widow as duped by an unscrupulous man—who tellingly is a stranger from Gaza—sometimes

by sweet talk and sometimes by a drug in her tea. 'In truth this woman prayed and went to the mosque but he made a fool of her', said one middle-aged housewife.¹⁰ Upon hearing of her death, another woman said:

We went to the hospital to wash her and prepare her for burial but the guard said that the woman had to be taken to Abu Kbir [the Israeli forensic institute that does autopsies] because it seemed she had been killed. The police imprisoned her father for ten days and then he was released. My opinion is that she needed to be punished, for she was an adult . . . but not to the degree of killing her.¹¹

This unease that the punishment does not fit the crime was also found by Abu Nahleh in the Forum report, which interviewed neighbors, family, and community members of victims, as well as examining the circumstances of the crime. This community-based research strategy was clearly based on the concept, following Sen and others that 'Honour codes are not solely about individual men controlling the lives of individual women. They are about community norms, social policing and collective decisions, and acts of punishment' (Sen, 2005: 48). To combat these crimes, a mapping of community responses, recognizing diversity as well as consensus, is obviously crucial. The report notes:

Not all family and community members support women's killing even when they believe there is evidence that the victim has violated 'honor codes.' Some believe that killing a woman in the name of 'honor' does not ever 'wipe the shame off' . . . others saw that religion and *Shari'a* do not legitimize women's killing: 'According to *Shari'a*, even if the father was conservative and was sure that his daughter committed adultery he is not entitled to kill her.' Some interviewees tried to give alternatives to women's killing in the name of honor: 'I am against killing because there are other solutions. They can send her abroad and abandon her, but they should not kill her'. (Abu Nahleh, 2007: 38)

Other relatives and neighbors spoke of the victims in terms of their positive qualities.¹² For example, 'She was respectful.' Or 'She was a lovely and genuine person; she never hesitated to help others.' Or 'She observed all her social obligations, she went to all funerals and weddings in the village' (Abu Nahleh, 2007: 22) In the same vein but with a slightly different cast, several respondents point to the victim's strong character, 'She had a strong and courageous personality. Nothing broke her' (Abu Nahleh, 2007: 22). This discourse is not easy to interpret with varying elements of unease at the extreme punishment of killing, a wish for alternatives, and a desire to redeem the dead, as well as sometimes a hint at wrongful accusation. For women, fear and distress, as well as charitable impulses towards the deceased, may well be part of the response.

Both direct opposition to honor killings as an excessive punishment or indirect support of the victim's character reminds us that crimes of honor in particular are stamped by community involvement and need to be combated

by the same. Fissures in affected communities, as well as direct public opposition in the wider society, need to be explored. In Amari, the killers have been released, but the story continues. When I asked a woman activist in the camp about the widow's daughter, now in her early teens, she told me: 'Every feast day, she distributes bread in the camp in her mother's memory.'

NOTES

This intervention comes in the initial phase of a research project investigating the trajectories and interactions of local and international discourses on violence against women in Palestine since 1990, and thus focuses more on delineating questions, than providing research results. This intervention is an expanded version of a presentation given by the author at the Gender and Empire II Workshop Series, held by the Institute of Women and Gender's Studies at the American University of Cairo, 13–14 May 2007. The author thanks an anonymous reviewer for several insights and comments that both sharpened this intervention and were helpful for further research.

1. Names of all interviewees from Amari refugee camp have been changed to protect the privacy of interviewees.
2. I would however question the line of thinking that views increased domestic violence as a direct product of political humiliation and impotence of men in the public sphere. For example, Khosrokhavar, in a book on suicide bombers, suddenly opines in a generalization about Palestinian men under Israeli occupation:

They were reduced to passivity and immobility on what they regarded as their own land. As public space had become a place of dishonor, the home became the place where they could defend their honour against their wives and children. Men who had been humiliated outside the home will make up for it inside the family. (Khosrokhavar, 2005)

While political violence can certainly be one (of multiple) determinants of domestic violence, it surely applies as much to the perpetrator as the victim, as Adelman shows in her study of domestic violence in Israel (Adelman, 2003).

3. Coverage was extensive in the western media. In a analysis of a feature news article on the HRW report in the *New York Times*, O'Connor and Roberts found that of 80 human rights reports by major human rights organizations on human rights abuses in the Palestinian–Israeli conflict since 2000, 76 were primarily critical of Israel, of which only two were featured in the *New York Times*, while of the four critical of Palestinians, two received such coverage, including the present report. Equally important, they argue that

... by omitting crucial details and emphasizing certain others, *The New York Times* ... has turned a valuable piece of human rights reporting in to a tool that can be urged to reinforce a Western agenda that has cynically exploited 'saving Muslim women' as an excuse for dominating and abusing the rights of peoples from other cultures. (O'Connor and Roberts, 2006)

4. Interview with Nadera Kervokian conducted by the author on 7 May 2007 in Jerusalem.
5. Interview with Maha Abu Dayyeh conducted by the author, 25 July 2007, Al Ram.
6. For a more detailed statistical analysis, see Johnson 2007b.
7. The PCBS survey also considers psychological violence (the most common at 61.7% of married women ‘exposed for at least one time’ in 2005—three-quarters of whom experienced it three or more times) and sexual violence where 10.9% of ever-married women experienced it at least one time, of which 3.9% experienced it three or more times.
8. All international human rights organizations do not take the same approach. The title of an earlier Amnesty International report (March 2005); offers an implicit critique of this narrow framework: ‘Conflict, occupation and patriarchy: women carry the burden’ (Amnesty, 2005).
9. Interview with Soraida Hussein conducted by author, 13 Feb. 2007, Ramallah.
10. Interview with the wife of A.B. conducted by Amal Ghanem and Kefah Awawdeh, 16 March 2003, Amari refugee camp.
11. Interview with F.H. conducted by Kefah Awawdeh, 27 June 2004, Amari refugee camp.
12. Other interviewees made denigrating comments about the victims, often focusing on matters of dress, negative character traits, and mobility, as well as perceived or actual sexual behaviour.

REFERENCES

- Abu Nahleh, L. (2007) *Crimes of Women’s Killing in Palestine, 2004–2006*. Ramallah: Palestinian Non-Governmental Forum Against Violence Against Women.
- Adelman, M. (2003) ‘The Military, Militarism, and the Militarization of Domestic Violence’, *Violence Against Women* 9(9): 1118–52.
- Amnesty International (2005) *Israel and the Occupied Territories: Conflict, Occupation and Patriarchy, Women Carry the Burden*. London: Amnesty International (31 March).
- An Naim, A. (2005) ‘The Role of “Community Discourse” in Combating “Crimes of Honor”’: Preliminary Assessment and Prospects’, in L. Welchman and S. Hossain (eds) *‘Honour’: Crimes, Paradigms and Violence Against Women*, pp. 64–77. London and New York: Zed Books.
- Coomaraswamy, R. (2005) ‘Preface: Violence Against Women and “Crimes of Honour”’, in L. Welchman and S. Hossain (eds) *‘Honour’: Crimes, Paradigms and Violence Against Women*, pp. xi–xiv. London and New York: Zed Press.
- Ginat, J. (1997) *Blood Revenge: Family Honor, Mediation and Outcasting*. Eastbourne: Sussex Academic Press.
- Human Rights Watch (2006) *A Question of Security: Violence Against Palestinian Women and Girls*. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Institute of Women’s Studies (2006) *Domestic Violence in the Palestinian Territory: Analytical Study*. Ramallah: Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (Dec.).

- IRIN (2007) 'Femicide on the rise in Palestinian territories, NGOs say' (Integrated Regional Information Networks, 7 March).
- Johnson, P. (2006a) 'Living Together in a Nation in Fragments: Dynamics of Kin, Place and Nation', in L. Taraki (ed.) *Living Palestine: Family Survival, Resistance and Mobility Under Occupation*, pp. 52–102. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Johnson, P. (2006b) *Towards New Horizons: Youth and Children in Amari Refugee Camp*. Ramallah: Bisan Center for Research and Development.
- Johnson, P. (2007a) 'Tales of Strength and Danger: Sahar and the Tactics of Everyday Life in Amari Refugee Camp, Palestine', *Signs* 32(3): 597–620.
- Johnson, P. (2007b) 'Point of Debate: The Human Rights Watch Report and Violence Against Palestinian Women and Girls', *Review of Women's Studies* (Birzeit) 4: 95–106.
- Kervokian, N. (2004) *Mapping and Analyzing the Landscape of Femicide in Palestinian Society*. Jerusalem: Women's Center for Legal Aid and Counselling.
- Khosrokhavar, F. (2005) *Suicide Bombers: Allah's Martyrs*. London: Pluto Press.
- Kressel, G. (1981) 'Sororicide/Filicide: Homicide for Family Honor', *Current Anthropology* 22: 141–58.
- Mojab, S. (2002) 'Honor Killing: Culture, Politics and Theory', *Middle East Women's Studies Review* 17(1–2): 1–8.
- Naber, N. (2000) 'Teaching about Honor Killings and Other Sensitive Topics in Middle Eastern Studies', *Middle East Women's Study Review* (Spring/Summer): 20–1.
- O'Connor, P. and R. Roberts (2006) 'The New York Times Marginalizes Palestinian Women and Palestinian Rights.' Accessed from <http://electronicintifada.net/v2/article6061.shtml>
- Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (2006) 'Press Release: Domestic Violence Survey 2005.' Ramallah: PCBS.
- Palestinian Independent Commission for Citizens' Rights (2007) *Annual Report 2006*. Ramallah: PICCR, in Arabic.
- Sen, P. (2005) "'Crimes of Honor,'" Value and Meaning', in L. Welchman and H. Hossain (eds) *'Honour': Crimes, Paradigms and Violence Against Women*, pp. 42–63. London and New York: Zed Press.
- Stewart, F.H. (1994) *Honor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Welchman, L. and S. Hossain (2005) "'Naming the Crime": "Honour," Rights and Wrongs', *Review of Women's Studies* (Birzeit) 3: 67–79.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

PENNY JOHNSON is an associate researcher at the Institute of Women's Studies at Birzeit University (Palestine) where she co-edits the Institute's *Review of Women's Studies*. She is also an associate editor of the *Jerusalem Quarterly*. Address: POB 1839, Ramallah, Palestinian Authority, via Israel. [email: pjohnson@birzeit.edu]