

This article is taken from the Rethinking Series book: Swadener, B.B., & Soto, L.D. (2005). *Power & Voice in Research with Children*. New York: Peter Lang. This paper by Janette Habashi provides a direct encounter with a Palestinian girl and her life narrative, challenging notions of "childhood" as construct, as well as the paradoxes in research. Other authors in the volume, like Jan Jipson, Elizabeth Graue, Brian Edmiston, and Mindy Blaise use decolonizing methodologies and participatory paradigms to humanize and complicate research with/for children.

## Freedom Speaks

**Janette Habashi**

*University of Oklahoma – Tulsa, Oklahoma USA*

This chapter invites readers to join the quest of beginning to understand and unpack the paradoxes of doing research with children and its limitations, using an interview with a Palestinian “child” as a prototype for the process. While this chapter foregrounds children and youth voice, some brief context will be helpful to the reader. This conversation took place during the second Intifada (Palestinian uprising) in the West Bank. For the last half century, the Palestinian people suffered from the Zionist ideology that has displaced generations from their villages, Israeli occupation, and collective punishment. This chapter is concerned with the deep intersection of research with children that is manifested in children’s being and professionals’/adults’ perspectives on children’s ability to participate in society.

Interviewer: Why your parents called you *Hurriyah* (freedom)?

Hurriyah: My mom went for a doctor visit and he told her that in two weeks she would deliver. Next day my mom with my other two siblings went to the Jordan Bridge in Jericho to cross for Jordan. She wanted to finish some work for Palestine before she delivers me. They waited at the bridge from 7:00 A.M. to 11:00 P.M. and at that time my mom was also interrogated by the Israelis. After all of this, the Israeli soldiers told her to come back next day if she wishes to cross to Jordan. This happened three days in a row without any hope to cross to Jordan. On the third day, my mom gave up and went back home to Hebron (a city in the West Bank) with my two siblings. At night, my mom started bleeding and she thought that I am died inside her. She could not call for help, our neighbors were far, five minutes walking distance, and at that

day the Israelis imposed curfew on the city. However, my mom was worried because she thought I was died. She walked to our first neighbors who were two Germanys females. The house was lit, but when my mom knocked at the door their thought that she was an Israeli soldiers and their immediately put the lights off. My mom yelled and yelled and they finally opened the door. They took my mom to Dijian Hospital, the closest one, but the doctor refused to check her in. The reason was that my mom did not have doctor visitations at this hospital. The German girls told the doctor, if you refuse to admit her to the hospital, you need to write it down on paper and if she dies you will be responsible. The doctor was fearful and my mom delivered me and they wanted to call me Nidiaa. But at that time my father was a fidai (freedom fighter), and the Israel government wanted him.

My mother passed the message that I was born through one of my father's friends. My father secretly came to the hospital; the nurse let him in to see me. He spent the night sleeping at the chair but when the shift changed, the new nurse on duty knew about his situation and she nicely took my father to her house for a rest. They wanted to call me Nidaa #1 but my mom said the land should be liberated (freed); that is why they called me Hurriyah (freedom).

- Interviewer: Tell me something about Palestine.  
Hurriyah: It is in the heart of the Arab world. It is a country that was first built by the Cananians. However, when we had the British Mandate in Palestine they gave the land to the Jewish people and they called it Israel.
- Interviewer: Where are the West Bank and the Gaza Strip?  
Hurriyah: Now Palestine has been divided but it is still occupied, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip is occupied by Israel and the rest of the land is now called Israel.
- Interviewer: What does Palestine mean to you?  
Hurriyah: It means everything, it means the country that I live for and in which I want to live in with peace, it is my homeland.
- Interviewer: What makes someone a Palestinian?  
Hurriyah: First any Palestinian person should have a commitment to Palestine, and Palestine should be in his mind and heart. If the

person does not feel he belongs to Palestine, this means that he is a Palestinian in name.

Interviewer: How could one be a Palestinian?

Hurriyah: My family is Palestinian and my community is in Palestine and I belong to Palestine; I feel I have something in Palestine.

Interviewer: Anyone could be a Palestinian?

Hurriyah: No, not everyone; only on one condition that his grandfathers been born in Palestine and they built this land and worked hard for the homeland.

Interviewer: Who are now living in Palestine?

Hurriyah: Israelis, Palestinians, and visitors from abroad.

Interviewer: How do you decide that this guy is a good Palestinian and the other is a bad Palestinian?

Hurriyah: The bad Palestinians first of all are the collaborators [spies]. The one who spies against his homeland and give away his fellow brothers; this one is not a good Palestinian. The good Palestinian is the one who would not give away his homeland and he fights for his homeland, this is a good Palestinian.

Interviewer: How could you fight for your homeland?

Hurriyah: Through education, because when he grows up, he could do something for Palestine, he should fight for Palestine. Do anything for his people in Palestine.

Interviewer: Everyone could fight?

Hurriyah: Yes.

Interviewer: Are you fighting?

Hurriyah: Yes, I am fighting now; when I go to school every day and I get educated, I am fighting. This is one way but also when I want to buy candies, if I see Israeli product that is good and I see beside it the same product but it is Palestinian made that might not be as good as the Israeli one. I will buy the Palestinian product in order to support the Palestinians manufacturers; in this way I am fighting. In this way everyone could fight.

Interviewer: How should children know these things?

Hurriyah: From anyone, from their environment, families, from parents; if a child listens and he does not understand now, eventually he will.

Interviewer: Who taught these things?

Hurriyah: From school, news, and also when I see children dying. One starts thinking why the Israeli product is developing because Palestinian people are buying it and why the Palestinian product is not improving, because no one is supporting it. We need to help them improve their line of product.

Interviewer: What you mean by environment?

Hurriyah: I learn from the environment, when I walk every day I see people around me, imagine a small child trying to cross the street he tries to imitated the people around him, he is trying to learn in this way.

Interviewer: What do you learn from the streets in Palestine?

Hurriyah: A child who is walking in the street first learns the language. Imagine if I am in any neighborhood and they say this place is Israel I grow up knowing that this land is Israel, but if they say this is Palestine, I grow up knowing it is Palestine. This determines what you feel about your surrounding. Also what is written on the walls is a sign, if something is written in Hebrew, I know that this is not its place, this is a Palestinian country and it should be written in the Arabic language.

Interviewer: What does the street tell you about Palestine?

Hurriyah: If one looks around he sees trees, he will know that our grandfathers were farmers, if you look at the tools people used you will see the kind of civilization and what kind of economy they had.

Interviewer: Does the school teach you the same as at home and the streets?

Hurriyah: Every place teaches you different things.

Interviewer: Does the information conflict?

Hurriyah: No, every one complements the other, for example, at home you learn how to behave with your family in the street you learn how to behave with people around you and in school you learn science.

- Interviewer: What does the home teach you about Palestine?  
Hurriyah: In every house there are traditions, and these traditions express the Palestinian heritage and how in the old days the Palestinians lived and what kind of tools they had.
- Interviewer: What is the meaning of Palestinian refugees?  
Hurriyah: Palestinian refugees are people who were evacuated in 1948 from their homeland and homes. This happened because of killing and occupation. In 1948 Israel colonized us; some Palestinians fled but on the assumption of coming back and some people took their house keys with them. I am a refugee from a village called Faluja, near Gaza, even though I live in Rammallah [city in the West Bank] I am still a refugee.
- Interviewer: Does your family talk about Faluja?  
Hurriyah : They say it is a nice place and I also dream about it, and I want to see it. My father says it is a nice place and his wishes to live there.
- Interviewer: What is your dream?  
Hurriyah: I dream that Faluja is a cultivated land; it looks green and there are flowers everywhere and people are living together like brothers and sisters and there is no occupation. It is like a village all people are talking with each other and everyone knows everyone and no one is hurt.
- Interviewer: Do you talk about Faluja a lot?  
Hurriyah: In our house we talk a lot about these issues, we talk about life in the old days and how they were living and why the Palestinians were evacuated. It was against their will, we never had a free will.
- Interviewer: Who also talks about Faluja in your family?  
Hurriyah: My grandfathers passed away, but my parents were *fadaiyin* [freedom fighters], my mother was jailed for six months and my father was jailed for six years and he also was wanted by the Israelis.
- Interviewer: You used an interesting word, *fidai* [freedom fighter], what you mean?

Hurriyah: *Fidai* is one who defends his homeland, and he is sacrificing himself in order to free the homeland. He thinks he could die for the homeland. He dies in order that someone will not die, he sacrifices his soul so that his homeland will be free and he has his homeland back. If we continue in this way more people will die, now one or two are dying every day, but if occupation continues a lot of us will die.

Interviewer: What is the difference between *fidai* [freedom fighter] and a martyr? Which one do you prefer and which term should we use?

Hurriyah: I prefer the *fidai* because he defends his homeland he might die but he is defending his homeland, but if someone becomes a martyr, it might happen by accident and this person did not do anything for his homeland, but the *fidai* is fighting for the homeland.

Interviewer: What is the meaning of martyrdom?

Hurriyah: Someone who dies for his homeland.

Interviewer: What you think about someone dying for his homeland?

Hurriyah: I like it, but I do not like it at the same time. If they say that this guy is a martyr. It means that he died for his homeland. I hate the word martyr because it says that someone died. I hate for someone to die, however, to die for his homeland is much better than to die for something else.

Interviewer: Why did we change the term for *fidai* [freedom fighter] to martyrdom?

Hurriyah : Long time ago people used to be *fidai* but now they are thinking about death. They do not think in terms of sacrificing and resisting, they are thinking in terms of dying, they do not have hope. Although they have hope because they are fighting but it is not like the way they had before.

Interviewer: Give me an example.

Hurriyah: Long time ago the *fidai* who used to resist used to fight but not necessarily to be a martyr, but now there are a lot of death and martyrdom and they think about death, before they thought that one would resist but not necessarily to die. Now they are thinking about death and martyrdom.

Interviewer: What you think about the term martyrdom, is it associated with the religion?

Hurriyah: I think the freedom fighters could also go to heaven as well as the martyrs, because they are fighting for their homeland; I do not associate it with religion because both of them have the same goal.

Interviewer: Do you think both words [*fidai* and martyrdom] are the same?  
Hurriyah : Maybe, but the term changed; I feel the term *fidai* is closer to my heart. The term *fidai* has hope; *fidai* is defending his homeland and hoping he will come back. The martyr he has no hope, because he is going to die. He does not think if he dies it might result badly on Palestine. Now we are in need for those people, we need them not to die. If we all die and we had the same way of thinking, when we grow up there will be no one, and therefore no Palestine, this time Israel will have it all.

Interviewer: Who taught you this?

Hurriyah: Life.

Interviewer: How?

Hurriyah: I thought about it, when someone dies and after him another one and so on how we will continue.

Interviewer: What is the main political problem for us?

Hurriyah: It started a long time ago, we are not living in peace we have occupation.

Interviewer: Do you talk a lot about political issues?

Hurriyah: No, but when the family comes together, even if they do not talk, I am witnessing what is going around me. I do not need anyone to tell me.

Interviewer: What you are witnessing?

Hurriyah : People are dying, one is going to throw a stone and a bullet kills him. There is no compatibility between a stone and a bullet.

Interviewer: Do you know other villages that had the same experience as Faluja?

Hurriyah : Haifa, Jaffa, Besian.

Interviewer: Did you ever visit Haifa?

Hurriyah : Yes and it is nice.

Interviewer: Do you know in which form of colonization Israel came about?

Hurriyah: Through the British Mandate.

Interviewer: Do you know the name of the movement?

Hurriyah: Zionism.

Interviewer: Do you know anything about the Zionist movement?

Hurriyah: No.

Interviewer: What is the difference between Jew, Zionist, and Israeli?

Hurriyah: The Jewish people believe in Judaism, the Israeli are the people who are living in Israel. Zionists are the people who lived in our house or destroyed our homes and rebuild on it.

Interviewer: Which is the most difficult one for you and why?

Hurriyah: The Zionist is the worst one; however, not every Jew is a Zionist. A Zionist is one who colonizes the land.

Interviewer: What about the Israelis?

Hurriyah: He is the one who occupied the land.

Interviewer: According to your definition Judaism is a religion, but when we see an Israeli soldier we call him a Jewish soldier, why?

Hurriyah: Most of the Jewish people gathered from different countries and came and lived in Palestine, and long time they were killed. This why we call them Jewish, I think. We had the British Mandate because they wanted to get rid of the Jews and the solution was to put them in Palestine and the British could take advantage of the land through the Jewish people. The main important thing was to get rid of the Jewish people, they used to hate the Jewish people; they used to kill them. For example, look what happened in Germany. Putting them in Palestine was a way to get rid of them and use the land through them.



- Interviewer: The Palestinians have a problem with the Israelis, Jews, or the Zionists?
- Hurriyah: The Palestinian people have a problem with the Israelis and the Zionists not the Jewish people. We also have a problem with the Zionists as Arab people and we have a problem with the Israelis as Palestinians. We have a problem with the Israeli people and their government because if you do not approve of what the government is doing why are you complying. The Israeli people elected the Israeli government; the government is part of the people.
- Interviewer: What is the political problem for the Palestinian people?
- Hurriyah: Peace.
- Interviewer: What is peace?
- Hurriyah: Is to live in freedom, we could not move in freedom. We should have rights, and no one should attack our land and our homes, we should have jobs.
- Interviewer: There are some Palestinians who are still living in Haifa and Jaffa what do you call them?
- Hurriyah: I refuse to call them Arab-Israelis; they are Arab of 48 or Palestinian of 48.
- Interviewer: What you think about the Palestinians who are living in Israel or Palestinian of 48?
- Hurriyah : I have different feelings about them, sometimes I feel that they are better than us because they did not flee the land but sometimes I do not feel good about them, I do not know.
- Interviewer: Could a Palestinian become an Israeli?
- Hurriyah: No, as we said that the Palestinians of 48 have Israeli citizenship but they are not Israelis. Like we see now, there are some Palestinians from 48 who are defending their land and helping their Palestinians brothers in the West Bank. But if they were Israelis they will not defend us and they will not acknowledge that there is such thing as Palestinian people. They are a part of the Palestinian people and Palestinians of 48 are also defending Palestine.

- Interviewer: How are the Palestinians of 48 living now?  
Hurriyah: I do not think they are happy; however, if someone gives me an Israeli passport I would not be happy, and if they tell me you are Israeli I would not be happy.
- Interviewer: What you mean by giving me an Israeli passport?  
Hurriyah: If you do not have an Israeli ID or passport you would not be allowed to live in Israel and Palestinians do not want to leave and they want to stay in their homes, therefore they have to take it. If you do not take it you have to leave.
- Interviewer: How are people in the West Bank living?  
Hurriyah: First of all, we do not have rights, we are living in humiliation; when I say we do not have rights it expresses everything.
- Interviewer: How are people in Gaza living?  
Hurriyah: They are living in a difficult situation. It is not easy when your house is demolished and then after a second you die from by shelling attacks.
- Interviewer: Do you know anyone from the 48?  
Hurriyah: Yes, my sister's friends are from the 48 and friends of my grandfather; the grandfather who is living in Hebron.
- Interviewer: What is the difference between living in the 48 and here in the West Bank?  
Hurriyah: It is possible, they are living in their original place, they are in their land, but we could not go back. I do not know which one is better.
- Interviewer: Do you think everyone should resist?  
Hurriyah: Yes, all of us, everyone has a way.
- Interviewer: How?  
Hurriyah: I am getting my education, I am resisting, the ones who are committing martyr operations are resisting, the ones who are throwing stones are resisting, the ones who are boycotting Israeli products are resisting.
- Interviewer: How are you resisting when you are boycotting Israeli products?

Hurriyah: Now there is Palestinian product and Israeli product, when we are not buying Israeli products and we buy Palestinian products we are supporting Palestinian manufacturers. When we buy Israeli product we give them good economy to buy weapons that they use to kill us.

Interviewer: What should people do in order to resist?  
Hurriyah: Anything that could benefit their homeland.

Interviewer: Why should people resist?  
Hurriyah: In order to liberate the homeland from occupation.

Interviewer: What is the political situation now?  
Hurriyah: There is occupation.

Interviewer: Is there another problem?

Hurriyah: The economy.

Interviewer: What is the economy problem?

Hurriyah: There are some people who do not have shelter, and food for their families, this leads to some children working. There isn't enough income for the family.

Interviewer: Before, children were not working?

Hurriyah: Yes they were some, but now during the uprising there are more children working.

Interviewer: What should happen in order to solve our problems?

Hurriyah: First the people should unite, now everyone is saying something different. The Palestinian Authority is say something, the people are saying something else, and we are fighting each other. If we are fighting each other how we as people are going to stand up against Israel. Also we should help each other and resist and think which way is the best the way for resistance and what we can do.

Interviewer: What did you learn about Palestine?

Hurriyah: Borders, history of Palestine, cities.

Interviewer: What will happen after ten years?

Hurriyah: We will die or we will free Palestine.

- Interviewer: Which one you think it will happen?  
Hurriyah: We will liberate Palestine.
- Interviewer: When we liberate Palestine we will fight each other?  
Hurriyah: No, first we can liberate Palestine only if we are united and also to think about what we are doing and to plan the future. If we unite we will never fight each other. We need to correct a lot of things in us, in order to unite and liberate Palestine.
- Interviewer: What do we need to correct?  
Hurriyah: We need to be united, not like now we are killing each other. The people within the Palestinian Authority should have a discussion with each other. This discussion should lead us to a good conclusion.
- Interviewer: Do you talk about these issues in your house?  
Hurriyah: Yes, they call me the political analyst.  
Interviewer: What you think is the perception of adults regarding children throwing stones?  
Hurriyah: My mom objects to this idea; she said that there are other means for resistance rather than throwing stones and dying. Like I said before that we should think before dying, the Palestinian people need everyone, if he dies and other one dies, what will happen to our future?
- Interviewer: What do you think about your mom's opinion?  
Hurriyah: I agree with her, what is the point of children dying, but I also agree on the issue of resisting with stones; children do not see life yet. Sometimes I think it is OK to throw stones and sometimes not. Through throwing stones we show the world that we are standing tall, without the stone we will never have an uprising. We have no weapons the only thing we have is stones and we have to resist. Through stones we show them that we will never give up and we will continue resisting by any means, even though stones are not effective.
- Interviewer: Do you think that when children go to throw stones they know why?  
Hurriyah: Of course, because they want their land back. They do not want to continue living in this situation and they do not want their children living in the same situation, like this.

Interviewer: Do you think adults tell children to go and through stones?  
Hurriyah: No, because no mother or father wants their children killed. There is no conscious parent who want his child to be killed.

Interviewer: What you think is the meaning of *jihad*?  
Hurriyah: It is not important what the term is or the name, what is important is what one does. The *majihad* is defending his homeland, maybe the ones who are throwing stones are *majihad*, but it is not the right way. By education one act in *jihad*, think about solutions for the homeland is *jihad*. The physician is *majihad*, he is helping injured people, and he is helping his people. The one who is helping someone who could not find a piece of bread he is *majihad*. Anything you do for your homeland is *jihad*.

Interviewer: Is *jihad* associated with religion?  
Hurriyah: No, one could say I will *jihad* through education, I am going to *jihad*, and there are lot of ways to do the same thing. I am going to *jihad*. Maybe also I want to do an operation. I do not think it is right when we kill them [Israelis].

Interviewer: Why?  
Hurriyah: It is the same that we do not like it when they kill us. They do not like it when we kill them, maybe there is another way.

Interviewer: Like what?  
Hurriyah: Like nonviolence policy, there is no need for violence, why kill? People should live; we did not create them therefore we should not kill them.

Interviewer: What makes you proud of being a Palestinian?  
Hurriyah: We are people who do not lose hope, we are dying but we do not lose hope. The thing I like is hope. We are killed but we are still going on resisting and defending our homeland. If we were another nation and we did not have hope everyone would hide and no one could *jihad*. I am acting in *jihad* when I go to school and cross the Israeli checkpoints. It is very risky to cross these checkpoints. This is only to go to school and not to illiterate people.

Interviewer: What did you learn about Palestine at home?

Hurriyah: It is an occupied land and the Palestinian people are fighting for the land and they are dying and children work and how people could not find food because of occupation. And how children do not have rights and how occupation took their rights away, not only the children but also adults and everyone.

Interviewer: Now it is your turn to ask me.

Hurriyah: The Palestinians of 48 are they good people? Why is Israel killing us? How could a Palestinian be a collaborator? Why the Palestinian Authority do not provide for the poor people? Do you agree with what the Palestinian Authority, last week the Palestinian Authority came and arrested my father's friend, because a long time ago he was a member of the Palestinian Front Liberation for Palestine? Why is the Palestinian Authority trying to please the Western countries? Why does the Palestinian Authority not want us to resist? What do you think about the political position of the Arab world? Why do we have writings on the walls that are against the Palestinian Authority, how are we going to liberate Palestine if there are disagreements between the Palestinian Authority and the people? Did you ever hear about the Masonic Organization and the Freemasons? What are they? Do they have ties with Israel?

The aim of disclosing this particular interview is to provide an example of children's sophistication and their ability to reflect on the geopolitical surroundings; therefore to produce a paradoxical narrative. Hence, the objectives of sharing this interview are neither for its political statement nor to advocate a political position. As a result, I ask the readers not to draw assumptions or attempt to interpret the views of the interviewee. The significance of the interview is to guide us through the paper discussion; consequently, any postulations would not lead to an accurate conclusion. The chapter, nevertheless, is trying to challenge the inherent problem of the researcher role and the assumptions of child development across cultures. The dispute is in how we as scholars could be self-critical in the process while we conduct research, in anticipation of examining the power and imposition of adults' extent to the political empowerment of children's voices. These pages are presenting the journey of a research wherein children played a role in understanding the research questions and provided insight in the analysis process.

From the first reading of this transcript, I learned new perspectives on the issues that are in the line of personal, national identity, family role, and the political circumstances influencing the young individual in forming identity and national memory as articulated in Beck and Jennings (1991), Flanagan and Sherrod (1998), Hicks (2001), Jankowski (1992), Kansteiner (2002), Liebes and Ribak (1992), and Merelman (1980). Hurriyah in this context was sharing her reflections as being an active witness. She situates herself as part of the geopolitical spectrum in which she was able to reconstruct and position herself as a member of the community. The questions that Hurriyah raised to scholars are beyond the issue of identity and historical memory; they are concerned with her views and if they are communicated in research. If you notice, the transcript does not indicate the age of Hurriyah—one could speculate that the voice is that of a young adult or an adult, which has a different implication than if it was a child. The notion of the narrative changes in particular when realizing the age of Hurriyah. Hurriyah is twelve years old—I recommend reflecting on your reactions before proceeding to read: Are there nuances knowing Hurriyah's age? Would you think differently if her age were eighteen, older, or younger?

The challenge in researching children's issues, in my judgment, is that while children are contemplating life discrepancies such as regarding issues of poverty, racism, war, privileges, or adults' power, are the paradoxes of these issues conveyed in research from the perspective of children, or are they considered contradictions and lack of maturity? This leads to the question of whether the current research paradigms and methods mirror children's discernments, especially when the two, the child narrative and research tools, are not necessarily compatible. The diversity of children's perspectives is not inclusively integrated in the research of children, whether in social science or child psychology (Glass, 2001; Kennedy, 1998; Woodhead, 1999; Zimiles, 2000). In addition, accounting for children's perspectives does not necessarily evoke new research approaches. The cross-cultural research provided new situations and norms that altered the traditional human development theories; however, it did not intersect in challenging our deep assumption of children's voice. The apparent reason is due to the dominant supposition of children's definitions that continue to prevail in research and its unconscious guidance to interpret children's narratives particularly when children are revealing political views (Flanagan & Sherrod, 1998; Peterson & Somit, 1982). Children invoking political issues undermine adults and policy makers, which results in retreating to the traditional position of child definition. Within this position adults and professionals have created hegemony to limit children's articulations. Such hegemony is instrumental in the duplication of adults' imposition in child research as well as in developmental matters. The center of understanding child

development, whether it is from the perspective of multi-truth or from child laboratory, is still within the assumption of adults knowing and children lacking experience. The beliefs that children lack sophistication and that any contradiction on the part of children is a lack of understanding are the foundations of echoing paradoxes.

The characteristics of a child definition lay the foundation to restrict the acceptance of children's geopolitical narratives. Therefore, the discourse of child chronological descriptions continues to direct and appropriate children's intellectual exchange, especially in political situation or when debating the right of children to vote (Harris, 1982). Although there are new attempts by the reconceptualists of childhood to include children's voices and allow more space as well as accept more child norms, it is missing the insight to develop a paradigm that is separate from the traditional thinking of children. The reconceptualizing theory stems from the criticism of the traditional understanding of children. The challenges of the traditional child theory are inherited in the reconceptualist notion because both theories are intertwined. In addition, the issue of child-adult power relation is not debated. The struggle of defining "child interest" and the interest of adults is in the core of inherited problems of the reconceptualizing theorists.

To present children voices as part of multi-truth assumptions does not necessarily provide an equal stand for a child's voice. To touch on the surface of the issue, one should ask how many books are written by children. Literature that is concerned with children's development, growth, and culture has found a place in libraries. However, there are no books written by children, but more books for children (Cooper & Schwerdt, 2001). Even though the books written about children might include their voice, it is concluded by adults. Apparently the shortage is not in the amount of research paradigms or critiquing traditional child discourse or in finding research questions, but in the crisis of expectations that is assigned in the prepositions of chronicle development and maturity. Insofar, the quandary is in the deficiency in providing insight on the role of researcher and its power in "interpreting children's voice" or conveying children's perspectives. The dilemma is that researchers deny their role as adults and how much their statuses perpetuate the traditional role of adults. Hence, this might sound contradictory to the premises of this chapter—I did not want to include this discussion part and I thought Huyrriah is able to speak. On the other hand, I was much tempted to interpret the dialogue and its relation to children's sophistication in war zones, especially when I was worried about reader interpretations—I was thinking as a protector—but I refused to pursue this path.



The design of this chapter upholds some traditional views regarding children's voices, especially when adding the discussion part. However, this presents new challenges in this area. The scholar's struggles are within two domains: first, the child's classification and its effects on data as explained earlier. Second, the topics of research; traditionally we assume that children will grow to be adults and the focus is how to guide them to be so or children are not capable of presenting a complex argument or they should be sheltered. Therefore, there is little research done on children's political knowing, but more on children's citizenship education, which is hierarchal relation. Children are educated by adults/teachers. In addition, there are researches on political socialization but within a stable nation-state. It is drawn from the same assumption of hierarchal state doctrine. At one point, such themes deeply intersect but are not necessarily the same. The subject of political knowing is explicitly controversial and it touches on issues that the adult did not yet resolve. Scholars are reluctant to tap on these grounds; therefore, they reject the idea that children are political entities and politicians (Harris, 1982; Oldman, 1994), and the idea is more exclusively denied to children in a war zone.

To challenge the inherent problems in child research one should realize the traditional communications tools that inhibit us from understanding children. Buckingham (1997) states that children are not obstacles, rather tools of communication. Therefore, I learned to provide the opportunity for the interviewee to ask me questions, in which I perceive such questions as insight into children's abilities. I realized that while interviewing Palestinian children, some started questioning my attempt. I was asked many questions; this led me to reconstruct the approach by providing opportunity for the interviewees to question the attempt. Although participatory research encourages interviewees to be active in the research project, through reviewing the transcript, my approach was more allowing the children to critique the significance of the research in relation to their own lives. In theory, participatory research encourages children's reflection, but it still lacks child insight. If you noticed, Hurriyah asked me questions after the interview. When I introduced myself I made it clear that I welcomed her questions. In addition, I did not perceive the questions as contradictory to her answers, but it provided insight into children's paradoxical life.

In conclusion, our struggles are in the lack of reflections on adult's role, and its implications on restricting children voices, especially when their views challenge our status quo. The question, however, should be how we should start communicating children's views even if they challenge our scholarship.

## References

- Beck, P. A., & Jennings, K. M. (1991). Family traditions, political periods and the development of partisan orientations. *Journal of Politics, 53*, 742–763.
- Buckingham, D. (1997). News media, political socialization and popular citizenship: Towards a new agenda. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 14*, 344–366.
- Cooper, C. A., & Schwerdt, M. (2001). Depictions of public service in children's literature: Revisiting an understudied aspect of political socialization. *Social Science Quarterly, 82*(3), 616–632.
- Flanagan, C. A., & Sherrod, L. R. (1998). Youth political development: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*(3), 447–456.
- Glass, N. (2001). What works for children—the political issues. *Children and Society, 15*, 14–20.
- Harris, J. (1982). The political status of children. In K. Graham (Ed.), *Contemporary political philosophy: Radical studies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jankowski, M. S. (1992). Ethnic identity and political consciousness in different social orders. *New Direction for Child Development, 56*, 79–93.
- Kansteiner, W. (2002). Finding meaning in memory: A methodological critique of collective memory studies. *History and Theory, 41*, 179–197.
- Kennedy, D. (1998). Reconstructing childhood. *Thinking, 14*(1), 29–37.
- Liebes, T., & Ribak, R. (1992). The contribution of family culture to political participation, political outlook, and its reproduction. *Communication Research, 19*(5), 618–641.
- Merelman, R. (1972). The adolescence of political socialization. *Sociology of Education, 45*, 134–166.
- Oldman, D. (1994). Childhood as a mode of production. In B. Mayall (Ed.), *Children's childhoods: Observed and experienced*. Washington, DC: Falmer.
- Peterson, S. A., & Somit, A. (1982). Cognitive development and childhood political socialization. *American Behavioral Scientist, 25*(1), 313–334.
- Rosenberg, S. (1985). Sociology, psychology, and the study of political behavior: The case of the research on political socialization. *Journal of Politics, 47*, 715–731.
- Woodhead, M. (1999). Reconstructing developmental psychology—Some first steps. *Children and Society, 13*, 3–19.
- Zimiles, H. (2000). The vagaries of rigor. *Human Development, 43*, 289–294.

**Author:** Jannette Habashi is a Palestinian from the old city of Jerusalem. She is currently a Professor at the University of Oklahoma in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Her research with children and Indigenous populations examine socialization, national identity, political participation and resistance in policy and research.