Editorial

Articles

Media, Muslim Women and ‘The Global War on Terror’: Celebration of Pakistan’s Malala Yousafzai and Suppression of Nabila Rehman
by Sunniya Wajahat

Don McLeod: The Rock that Changed the Pilbara
by Jan Richardson

Reviews
Table of Contents

Edition 20 Number 1

Editorial

Media, Muslim Women and and ‘The Global War on Terror’: Celebration of Pakistan’s Malala Yousafzai and Suppression of Nabila Rehman 1-45

Sunniya Wajabat

Don McLeod: The Rock that Changed the Pilbara 46-76

Jan Richardson

Reviews 77-86
The month of December traditionally represents an important period of transition as we mark the end of the old year and look forward to the beginning of a new one. It’s a time to reflect on the events of previous months and to start thinking about the immediate future. I think it was rather fitting that I ended up writing my very first and last editorial in a suitably reflective yet anticipatory time of the year.

Upon assuming the role of Editor-in-Chief of *Eras* in 2017, I made a priority of taking the journal in a new direction by introducing changes and reforms with the intention of internationalising the journal and expanding its reach and impact. With the help of a wonderful editorial board, the journal has implemented a variety of changes that build on the good work of our predecessors. Of particular note is our new focus on including the work of Honours or recently completed Honours students. The editorial board believes that Honours students should be given the opportunity to publish their original and often innovative work as part of their journey towards becoming researchers. Coincidentally, this new focus aligns with Monash University’s new undergraduate research agenda, which aims to create a vibrant research culture among undergraduate students.

We also introduced the new positions of Assistant Editor, Social Media Director and Secretary to go alongside the long-established positions of Editor-in-Chief, Book Reviews Editor and Technical Editor to create a core leadership team that undertook long-term planning for the future of the journal. In thinking about the future of the journal, the editorial board also collaborated to create new guidelines for board membership and board members’ responsibilities. To reflect these changes, we commissioned one of the journal’s editorial board members, the talented Dimitra Petrakis, to design a brand-new logo. This new logo accompanies a number of modifications we have also made to the format.

Moving on to the topic of the volume itself, Volume 20 includes two fantastic peer-review articles as well as a number of book reviews from new and previous contributors. Though we had hoped to publish more articles in this volume, we unfortunately saw two contributors deciding not to publish with us this year due to the substantive nature of the revisions suggested by peer reviewers. We are hoping that, with some further work, these promising articles will appear in the journal next year. Included in this volume is Sunniya Wajahat’s cogent and detailed
analysis of the contrasting media discourses surrounding Malala Yousafzai and Nabila Rehman within the context of the Global War on Terror. This is an important contribution to the fields of international relations and terrorism studies, adding considerable nuance to conventional narratives about reportage on the Global War on Terror. The other article in this volume is Jan Richardson’s intimate portrait of Don MacLeod and how his upbringing influenced his involvement in and approach to the 1946 Pilbara Strike conducted by Aboriginal pastoral workers. In critically examining MacLeod’s life and times, Richardson extends scholarship on the Pilbara Strike by providing a detailed analysis of one of the strike’s key participants.

This volume would not have been possible without the dedication and hard work of a great number of individuals who generously donated their limited time to the journal. The editorial board for this volume consisted of Alexandra Rubenstein (Assistant Editor), Rosa Martorana (Book Reviews Editor), Meagan Pool (Secretary), Georgina Rychner (Social Media Director), Lucy Mayne (Technical Editor), Elizabeth Miller, Jennifer Lord, Hannah Skipworth, Lana Stephens, Dimitra Petrakis, Iryna Ordynat and Emily Fero. I’d like to extend my deepest appreciation to the team for their efforts in taking the various articles through the peer-review process, collating and editing the book reviews, and for their myriad contributions in our attempts to improve the journal further.

I would like to especially thank and farewell those members of the editorial board who are moving on to focus on completion of their research degrees: our indefatigable Book Reviews Editor, Rosa Martorana, the journal’s Secretary, Meagan Pool, our dynamic Social Media Director, Georgina Rychner, and invaluable board member Elizabeth Miller, who is heading for Macquarie University to start a PhD next year. We wish them every success. I would also like to give special thanks to my predecessor Dr Caleb Hamilton for going above and beyond in providing invaluable advice and support during my tenure as Editor-in-Chief, and to extend a warm welcome to my capable colleague Emily Fero who is taking over from me as Eras’ incoming Editor-in-Chief in 2019. Thanks also to the authors who submitted their work to the journal, the book reviewers who contributed to this volume, and the publishers who furnished us with copies of books to review. Finally, my sincerest thanks to the academics who willingly gave up their precious time to act as peer-reviewers for the articles in this volume. Peer-reviewing is a time-consuming and often thankless service, so I would like to acknowledge the efforts they went through to provide suggestions that helped improve the manuscripts submitted to us.

Bernard Z. Keo
Editor-in-Chief
Media, Muslim Women and ‘The Global War on Terror’:
Celebration of Pakistan’s Malala Yousafzai and Suppression of Nabila Rehman

Sunniya Wajahat *
(University of Melbourne)

Abstract: There are many similarities between Malala Yousafzai (the young Pakistani woman shot by the Taliban), and Nabila Rehman (the young Pakistani woman who suffered injuries from and lost her grandmother in a US drone strike). Both are similar not only in their age, gender, ethnicity, religion and nationality, but also in how they have been victims of violence by different actors in the Global War on Terror. In spite of the comparable message evident in their narratives, the mainstream Western media has covered the victimhood of Malala and Nabila in two radically different ways. Through a content and critical discourse analysis, I demonstrate how the Western media has celebrated the victimhood of Malala but suppressed the victimhood of Nabila. By drawing on concepts and insights from Edward Said’s Orientalism, anthropology, gender studies, media studies and International Relations, I argue that the Western media’s framing of Muslim women’s victimhood has been selective. In particular, victims of the ‘Islamic’ adversary have been recognised for their suffering, while victims of Western imperial violence remain ignored and suppressed.
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The practice of violence, like all action, changes the world, but the most probable change is to a more violent world.

* This article is a revised version of my honours thesis completed in 2015. I am indebted to Dr Irfan Ahmad (Max Planck Institute, Germany) for his invaluable input/comments and detailed discussions throughout the writing of my thesis and also this article. I also thank the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article. Please forward any comments or queries to: s.wajahat@student.unimelb.edu.au.
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Malala Yousafzai

Schoolgirls in Pakistan’s Swat Valley were singing in their bus on the way to school. Suddenly two members of the Tahrink-i-Taliban Pakistan (Taliban) approached the bus (one with a colt 45 pistol). The armed man climbed on the bus and asked: ‘Who is Malala Yousafzai?’ (Malala). Horrified, the girls remained silent. Suddenly, the Taliban member fired three bullets into Malala’s head and neck. She was shot in the head at point-blank range. Soon after, authorities airlifted Malala to a hospital in Peshawar. She received emergency treatment before being transferred to an advanced hospital in the affluent province of Punjab. As threats from the Taliban persisted, Malala was flown on a Saudi jet to the Queen Elizabeth hospital in Birmingham in the UK. By then, her story had captured international headlines. On her 16th birthday, Malala delivered a speech at the United Nations wearing the shawl of Pakistan’s former Prime Minister, Benazir Bhutto. In her UN address, she urged international governments to provide free and mandatory education to all children. This UN speech transformed Malala into a global symbol for women’s rights, education and global peace. In October 2014, Malala became the youngest recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize.

Nabila Rehman


It was the evening before the Muslim ‘Eid-al-adha holiday. Momina Bibi (Momina), a 67-year-old grandmother, wife of a retired high school headmaster and the only midwife in her village, was finalising the embroidery outfit of her nine-year-old grand-daughter, Nabila Rehman (Nabila), and teaching her how to prepare seviyaan, a special ‘Eid-al-adha dessert. The next day, Momina and Nabila woke up early to pick fresh okra and tend the cattle. Suddenly, they heard a humming noise in the sky followed by multiple loud clicks. A US drone strike unleashed its lethal payload onto Nabila’s family. In a flash, the CIA-operated drone caused shrapnel injuries to Nabila and several other children from the Rehman family. Momina died on the spot. In October 2013, Nabila flew to the US to share her story. However, only five out of the four hundred representatives showed up at the Congressional hearing where she gave her testimony about the attack. Nabila’s only question to the five Congressmen was: ‘What did my grandmother do wrong?’ Unlike Malala, Nabila did not capture international headlines. She was not invited to address the UN, nor was she considered to be a candidate for the Nobel Peace Prize.

From these excerpts many parallels can be drawn between Malala and Nabila. They are of a similar age, gender, religion, ethnicity and nationality. Crucially, both have become important representatives of the victims of violence by two key actors in the Global War on Terror (GWOT).

3 Unlike in the West, in South Asia people use first names to refer to others. I, therefore, refer to Malala Yousafzai and Nabila Rehman as ‘Malala’ and ‘Nabila’, respectively.


6 Malala has been adopted as a key representative of victims of the ‘Islamic’ adversary through her advocacy for global peace and women’s education. Similarly, Nabila has become an important
the dominant Western media has framed the victimhood of Malala and Nabila in two very different ways. More specifically, young Muslim women such as Malala continue to generate widespread interest, empathy and admiration from the Western media and wider public. However, young Muslim women such as Nabila, who are victims of the drones launched by the US-led coalition, garner little media sympathy, attention or even recognition. With this in mind, this article will demonstrate the selective recognition of different victims in the GWOT. To this end, I explore the relationship between the global celebration of Malala’s victimhood on the one hand and the suppression and erasure of Nabila’s victimhood on the other. In


8 Similarly, Abu-Lughod notes the example of Bibi Ayesha, an Afghan woman, whose nose and ears were cut off by her husband (a Taliban sympathiser). Ayesha’s mutilated face appeared on the cover of Time Magazine captioned, “What Happens if We Leave Afghanistan?”. See Lila Abu-Lughod, Do Muslim Women Need Saving? (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013), 27–30.


11 I use suppression as defined in the fourth sense by the OED as: “the action or process of keeping something secret; refusal to disclose or reveal.” I use it to imply the near non-attention, if not total erasure, the Western media gave to Nabila’s story. See: OED Online, “suppression, n.” December 2018, Oxford University Press; sourced from: http://www.oed.com.ezp.unimelb.edu.au/view/Entry/194729?redirectedFrom=suppression&eid, accessed December 16 2018.
short, this article is guided by a central question: **what factors influence the mainstream Western media’s discourse on the GWOT in which it continues to celebrate Malala’s victimhood but suppress Nabila’s victimhood?**

Synthesising insights argued by Edward Said in his book *Orientalism*, and concepts derived from anthropology, gender studies, media studies and International Relations (IR), I demonstrate how the dominant discursive construction of the GWOT has articulated strong underlying racialised and gendered narratives. As Laura Shepherd and Richard Jackson argue, this discourse renders the West as a “masculinized, modern, peaceful and civilized” force superior to the “feminized, medieval, violent and savage” Muslim world. More specifically, I contend that victims of the ‘Islamic’ adversary, such as Malala, have been recognised for their suffering. However, victims of Western imperial violence, such as Nabila, have been ignored. Importantly, I hold that this discrepancy is because Nabila’s suffering unsettles what David L. Altheide calls the West’s ‘morally superior’ language as evident in the GWOT. Crucially, I further argue that the subjectivity of the two victims themselves, particularly Malala’s, does not support the Western media’s dominant discourse on the GWOT.

Having outlined my argument, a synopsis of this multi-part article is provided here. First, to help contextualise my argument, I briefly touch on the history and dynamics of the GWOT. Secondly, to help inform my analysis, I delineate key theories and ideas underlying Orientalism and gender in relation to IR and the GWOT. Next, I describe the methodological outline of this

---


13 It is important to stress that most Muslims do not support the ideology and actions of extremist groups such as the Taliban. Additionally, most Muslims do not believe such groups are representative of Muslims or the Islamic faith. To illustrate, many Muslim scholars and civil organisations have condemned such groups and their violence. See, e.g., Associated Press, “Muslim Scholars: Suicide Attacks Violate Islamic Principles,” *Associated Press*, May 12, 2018, accessed July 20, 2018. [https://apnews.com/5295ee1c5f584122abd6a2267857cfc9](https://apnews.com/5295ee1c5f584122abd6a2267857cfc9). Moreover, a great modern example of Islam’s rich tradition of non-violence is Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan’s Ḍuḥūd Khidmatgār (servants of God) movement in British India. This was an Islamically inspired anti-colonial movement committed to non-violence in the North West Frontier Province of British India. See Irfan Ahmad, *Religion as Critique: Islamic Critical Thinking from Mecca to the Marketplace* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2017), 182 – 195.
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Fourthly, I investigate the factors that influence the Western media’s celebration of Malala’s victimhood. In like manner, the following section explores the factors that influence the Western media’s suppression of Nabila’s victimhood. I then add a layer of complexity by foregrounding Malala’s own subjectivity vis-à-vis the Western media’s depiction of her victimhood. Finally, in the conclusion I summarise and reinforce my argument.

To begin, it was following the events of 9/11 that the Bush administration declared the GWOT. Although the GWOT remains a vague war in theory, it has nevertheless triggered two questionable wars in Afghanistan and Iraq that remain subject to sharp criticism, both nationally and internationally.\(^\text{15}\) In this continuing war, extremist non-state actors, such as the Taliban, have targeted many innocent civilians such as Malala. Similarly, the policies and actions of the US-led coalition have killed and damaged the lives of many individuals and families, like Nabila and the Rehman family. Importantly, the GWOT is a military campaign that has continued to grow, with many evolving faces and manifestations. It may be international, national, communal, regional, political or state-sponsored in origin. Despite these variations within the GWOT, Bush invited other states to unite in this war by stating that, ‘Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists!’\(^\text{16}\) This assertion gave the war a dichotomous tone of ‘good’ versus ‘evil’. In turn, the dominant discourses within the GWOT have been premised on this dualistic framework. Such binary discourses are usually inconsistent, like the coverage and sympathy the 9/11 victims received, or the widespread media coverage of Malala following her shooting. In contrast, the victimhood of the thousands of civilians killed in the 2003 American invasion of Iraq were largely ignored and were even referred to as “collateral damage”.\(^\text{17}\) Similarly, the US-led coalition’s drone strike victims, such as Nabila, remain silenced and rarely capture mainstream Western headlines.

Notably, in this context Derek Gregory holds that such Western policies of violence in the Muslim World as part of its GWOT are a type of imperial rule or “colonial present” which bear strong parallels with the past.\(^\text{18}\) Similarly, Paul Tiyambe Zeleza holds that the GWOT will

remains an “imperial war in so far as it seeks to advance the agenda of the world’s pre-eminent imperial power, the United States”. To this end, many commentators and scholars argue that celebrating the victimhood of young Muslim women like Malala enables Western governments to rationalise their imperialist policies in the Muslim world. This is because such young Muslim women are seen as a “potential tool of political propaganda” to be exploited by supporters of the GWOT. More specifically, celebrating Malala’s victimhood enables Western governments to justify the GWOT “which can then be portrayed as a crusade to liberate Muslims from their oppressors”. In a similar context, Saadia Toor discusses the revival of an “imperialist feminism” in the GWOT to help legitimise Western interventions in the Muslim World. More specifically, she posits:

The fact that the meme of the Muslim woman who must be saved from Islam and Muslim men – through the intervention of a benevolent Western state – 11 years after the very real plight of Afghan women was cynically deployed to legitimise a global war, and long after the opportunism of this imperialist feminism was decisively exposed, points to a serious and deep investment in the assumptions that animate these claims.

With this in mind, through the case studies of Malala and Nabila I explore how the respective celebration and suppression of their victimhood allows Western states to rationalise policies of violence in Muslim states (such as Pakistan) in the GWOT. Having introduced my core argument, I now outline my theoretical framework below.

To begin, Orientalism is pertinent to understanding how Orientalist and gender processes produce imaginary hierarchical boundaries in the dominant GWOT narrative in order to help legitimise Western imperialist policies in the Muslim World. In particular, contemporary

---

22 Toor, “Imperialist Feminism Redux,” 149.
discourse on the GWOT demonstrates how power, authority, and the legitimacy to define particular ethnicities, religions, and geographies in order to conduct or avoid certain acts, are constructed through symbols that have been part of the repertoire of Orientalism. To contextualise, Said’s pioneering book, *Orientalism*, is a major text of post-colonial theory critiquing the way the West dominates the production of legitimate knowledge. Said’s objective was to address the politics of knowledge production about the Orient, defined as the area spanning from Morocco in North Africa to the Indian subcontinent in South Asia. Said held that the West perceived the people of the Orient as being united through a basic collectiveness that distinguished them from ‘us’ in the West. He argued that the Orient was an imagined entity constructed to serve a specific purpose, namely to secure domination. More specifically, this objective entailed establishing binaries such as irrational versus rational, primitive versus civilised and backward versus developed. Crucially, such language enabled the Orient or ‘East’ to be associated with backward, irrational, authoritarian and primitive qualities as a contrast to the civilised, rational, moral and Christian ‘West’. Orientalism is thus integral to understanding the rationale behind the selective Western recognition of female Muslim victims of violence in the GWOT.

For Said and subsequent scholars pursuing an Orientalist framework, Orientalism is a controlling force that dictates Western discourse about the Orient to help legitimise Western imperialist policies. In this context, Tarak Barkawi observes that Orientalism is about establishing “cultural hegemony, at home and abroad”. In fact, Barkawi argues that Western identity is closely linked to how the “Orientalised other” is constructed. In many situations, the West defines itself against an “inferior” and “Orientalised other” to help strengthen dominant Western identities and ideologies. In turn, these Orientalist “cultural resources” help construct and legitimise Western intervention in the Orient in many forms, such as “imperial rule” and an “informal empire”. For instance, for the US to “liberate” Iraq and thus regard itself as the “liberator”, Iraqis must also wish for “liberation”. This Orientalised construction of the Iraqi people is a type of “identity politics” on the part of the US. Like Barkawi, Said also held that the American invasion of Iraq was all about “imperial arrogance unschooled in worldliness”. Importantly, this linkage between Orientalism and Western imperialist policies is crucial to

---

24 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
27 Ibid, 66.
understanding the nexus between portrayals of young Muslim women’s victimhood and Western imperialist policies of violence in the Muslim World in the GWOT.

In recent scholarship, feminist IR scholars have begun to use Said’s theory among others to analyse interrelations between gender, power and representation in Orientalist discourses in the GWOT. However, before addressing the work of gender scholars who have written in the context of IR and the GWOT, a word is in order about gender and IR here. Importantly, unpacking how masculinities and femininities are shaped, reproduced and performed in the context of IR is key to demonstrating how the dominant GWOT discourse renders the West as the ‘civilised, masculine’ force, in contrast to the ‘feminine and medieval’ Muslim World.

With this in mind, it is important to note that IR theory has only recently started paying attention to gender dynamics within the discipline. In fact, Annick Wibben holds that compared to other areas within the social sciences, the entrance of “feminist contributions” to the discipline has been late. To contextualise, gender can be broadly defined as the “socially learned behaviours, repeated performances, and ideological expectations that are associated with and distinguish between the proscribed gender roles of masculinity and femininity”. IR feminists have analysed the binary oppositional structures which operate in international politics and relations. The characteristics associated with masculinity are perceived to be positive, political, active and rational. In contrast, the attributes of femininity are perceived to be negative, personal, passive and irrational. Examples of such dichotomies regarding masculinity/femininity include: self versus other, civilised versus primitive, reason versus emotion, order versus disorder, autonomy versus dependence and public versus private. Likewise, Desiree Hoffman-Hizi argues that in IR, masculine wisdom is acknowledged as universal and superior. Similarly, Rosa Vasilaki holds that, contra the West, the “Other” non-

---

29 For an example, see Maryam Khalid, “Gender, Orientalism and Representations of the Other in the War on Terror,” Global Change, Peace & Security 23, no. 1 (2011): 15–29. Like Khalid, I have followed “those feminist IR scholars who conceive of gender and gendered identities not as ‘natural’ or pre-given, but as socially constructed”. For an example, see: Judith Butler, Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity (New York: Routledge, 1990).


32 Peterson and Runyan refer to such examples as “androcentric” dichotomies. “Androcentric” means perceiving men as more legitimate, valuable, authentic, natural and hence they remain unquestioned. V. Spike Peterson and Anne Sisson Runyan, Global Gender Issues, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1999), 40–63.

Western Third World is considered to be “subaltern” and “feminine” within IR. In the context of this article, it is important to note the hierarchical gender constructions and identities that are produced and reproduced to help legitimise the ‘masculine’ West’s violent imperial interventions in the ‘feminine’ Muslim World.

In the post-9/11 era, the dominant discourse of the GWOT has been constructed to reproduce “strong references to existing cultural narratives of gender”. Specifically, this places the rational “masculinized” West in a superior position to the irrational and “feminized” enemy abroad (i.e., the Muslim world). In this context, J. Ann Tickner notes that gendered narratives that require men to protect women and children are commonly used to legitimize military intervention. Similarly, Toor discusses the prominent re-emergence of “imperialist feminism” in the West to justify Western interventions. More specifically, she argues that there is a binary “gendered racial[ised] project” central to the GWOT. Following James Baldwin’s argument that the racialised “Nigger” was necessary to maintain white hegemony in the US, Toor says that the archetype of the “dangerous Muslim” plays a key role in strengthening the “racialized world order”. This binary “gendered racial[ised] project” dictates that Muslim women “must be saved from Islam and Muslim men—through the intervention of a benevolent Western state”. Toor claims that this binary enables the West to legitimise intervention in the name of ‘women’s rights’ in Muslim countries such as Afghanistan. Ironically, she notes that the status of women in countries like Afghanistan has declined since the US-led invasion. Toor’s rich analysis of how the GWOT narrative has been racially gendered and constructed to legitimise Western military interventions particularly strengthens my argument: Nabila’s story has not captured the attention of the dominant Western media precisely because her case unsettles the West’s self-claim of liberating Muslim women through war and violent interventions.

\[15, 2015, and cited in Jemima Repo, “Gendering the Militarisation of the War on Terrorism: Discourses and Representations of Masculinities and Femininities” (Master’s thesis, University of Helsinki, 2006), 14.\]


\[35 Shepherd, “Veiled References,” 34.\]


\[37 Toor, “Imperialist Feminism Redux,” 149.\]

\[38 Ibid, 150.\]

\[39 Ibid, 149–50.\]

\[40 Ibid, 149.\]

\[41 Ibid, 148.\]
In like manner, various other scholars have further explored debates on the nexus between the GWOT narrative and the issue of gender. Specifically, the work of such scholars interrogates the one-dimensional cultural accounts of various phenomena clubbed together as ‘Muslim women’ and the GWOT. For instance, Meghana Nayak investigates “how 9/11 allowed and required the USA to revamp specific racialized and gendered violent acts in its celebratory attempt to consolidate US state identity”. Nayak argues that George W. Bush’s rhetoric linked hypermasculinity with a certain Christian ethos in order to “save” America’s state identity. She posits that this process required three key mechanisms: infantilisation, demonisation/dehumanisation and sexual commodification of the Other. For the purpose of my argument, I focus on the first two mechanisms to analyse the dominant media representations of Malala (infantilised) and Nabila (dehumanised). Moreover, Charles Hirschkind and Saba Mahmood argue that to prepare public opinion for the invasion of Afghanistan, Western feminists filtered all information that would have provided a more nuanced understanding of Afghan society and women. They posit that this decontextualised framing of the Afghan war “cast[s] an ominous shadow on the integrity” of Western campaigns that champion Muslim women’s rights. As elaborated later, Mahmood and Hirschkind’s work has a crucial bearing on my argument. More specifically, this is because the Western media’s framing of the actions of the Taliban and Malala’s victimhood also remains largely decontextualised.

Finally, it is crucial to note that gendered identities must be viewed within the wider context of race and social class “to understand the hierarchical organisation of identities”. Importantly, anthropologist Lila Abu-Lughod urges scholars to re-examine the assumption that Islam is responsible for oppressing Muslim women. She argues that the oppression of Muslim women is more closely tied to factors such as the economy, poverty, authoritarianism and political instability. Abu-Lughod’s principal contention is that Muslim women’s rights are highly

---

44 Ibid, 43.
contextual and cannot simply be reductively explained by theology.\textsuperscript{48} Her anthropological findings are relevant to an analysis of the Western media’s celebration and suppression of the two victims because, I argue, the attack on Malala by the ‘Islamic’ adversary influenced and acted as a catalyst for the celebration of her victimhood. More importantly, celebrating Malala’s victimhood allows for the persistence of the dominant narrative that young Muslim women must be ‘saved’, thereby helping legitimise Western imperial violence in Pakistan.

**Methodology: A Theoretical Outline**

I have chosen to analyse the cases of Malala and Nabila, as both young women are key representatives of the victims of violence by important actors in the GWOT. Malala has been selected as a key representative of victims of the ‘Islamic’ adversary. In like manner, Nabila has been chosen as an important representative of Western violence (particularly US drone strike victims) in the Muslim world through her anti-drone advocacy. To this end, I have conducted a content analysis (CA) and critical discourse analysis (CDA) of online news media sources to examine how the victimhood of each young woman has been framed in the Western media.\textsuperscript{49} I have drawn on the work of leading scholars in the field of discourse analysis, focusing predominantly on text positioning and omission in my analysis.\textsuperscript{50}

Conducting a CDA of a particular topic in the news media can help unmask dominant societal ideologies and myths pertaining to the subject matter. With this in mind, my CDA will seek to identify and unveil the pervasiveness of dominant Western GWOT ideologies and myths embedded in the elite news media coverage of Malala and Nabila’s victimhood. Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky contend that media groups not only echo but also assist to produce leading societal ideologies. For them, these ideologies tend to strengthen the political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, political, politi...
economic and social values of the ruling elite. In like manner, Teun van Dijk and Norman Fairclough argue in different contexts that there is a symbiosis between ideology and discourse. More specifically, storytelling and myths have been argued to be an effective tool for disseminating these dominant societal ideologies and discourses. For journalist-turned-academic Jack Lule, myths supply society with oxygen to express “prevailing ideals, ideologies, values and beliefs” as they are the “models of social life and models for social life”. Although myths are not visible in all news stories, Lule notes that journalists often mine “the rich treasure trove of archetypal stories” to reproduce those mythical stories that help us understand this world.

My online media sources have been selected by “purposive sampling”. This is a “type of non-probability sampling that is most effective when one needs to study a certain cultural domain with knowledgeable experts within”. Based on this, I have chosen to analyse the data of three elite Western newspapers: The Age (Australian), The Sydney Morning Herald (Australian) and The New York Times (American). Importantly, these newspapers are all well respected in their home countries and have a decent circulation and readership. For instance, in Australia I have limited my analysis of the coverage of both victims to articles in The Age and The Sydney Morning Herald, as both news outlets come under the category of Australia’s “elite press”. As for America, I have focused on articles in The New York Times.
because of its “prominence and influence” internationally.\(^6^0\) In fact, Lule refers to The New York Times as “our State Scribe, society’s privileged and preeminent storyteller”.\(^6^1\) As with political anthropologist Irfan Ahmad, I have extended Lule’s view of The New York Times to include The Age, The Sydney Morning Herald, and even new media sources (such as social media), as Australian storytellers.\(^6^2\)

The time frame of this study (9 October 2012 to 6 April 2018) covers all key moments in the narratives of the two victims and extends to April 2018 to ensure my data is relevant and up to date. The quantitative articles relevant to the study were selected using two databases: Factiva (The New York Times) and The Fairfax Media Library Edition (The Age and The Sydney Morning Herald). Moreover, to collect my results I narrowed the time frame, media source and typed “Malala Yousafzai” and “Nabila Rehman” in the search option of Factiva and The Fairfax Media Library Edition respectively. In turn, the results displayed the number of articles in each media source for each victim. The qualitative articles relevant to this study were selected using the search function of each newspaper’s online website.\(^6^3\) After typing “Malala Yousafzai” and “Nabila Rehman” in the search option, I randomly selected two articles on Malala within the selected timeframe from the results page of each media source’s website (see Appendix 1).\(^6^4\)

Finally, it is important to note that while I also use a quantitative technique to document the number of articles on Malala and Nabila, my approach is primarily qualitative. I have followed Clifford Geertz’s suggestion that, “the aim is to draw large conclusions from small, but very densely textured facts; to support broad assertions about the role of culture in the construction of collective life by engaging them exactly with complex specifics”.\(^6^5\) I have thus followed Irfan Ahmad and conducted my analysis with the aim of empirically drawing out the “thread that runs beneath the otherwise disjointed facts seldom independent of the lenses through which


\(^{6^1}\) Lule, Daily News, Eternal Stories, 7.


\(^{6^3}\) My qualitative CDA articles were selected on the 28\(^{th}\) of July 2015, during the research for my honours thesis.

\(^{6^4}\) As demonstrated later, there is limited coverage of Nabila’s victimhood in the selected sources. For this reason, I could not randomly select more articles on Nabila from the different media sources.

one reads them” regarding the political cultural narratives and framing of Malala’s and Nabil’s victimhood.

**Malala’s Mania in the Media**

Malala’s message is true, it is profound, it is something the world needs to take note of; education is a right of every child, but Malala has been used as a tool by the West. It allows countries like Britain to hide their sins in Afghanistan and Iraq. It allows journalists to report a feel good story whilst they neglect so many others, like the American drone strikes that terrorise men, women and children in Pakistan’s border regions.  

_Huffington Post, July 15, 2013_

Since her shooting in 2012, Malala’s story has continued to dominate the Western media. The coverage has largely been celebratory. Many celebrities have commended Malala for her bravery in the face of adversity. In particular, she has been considered to be a worthy recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize.

In this section, I examine what factors influence the Western media’s discourse on the GWOT in which it continues to celebrate Malala’s victimhood. More specifically, I argue that this fervent celebration of Malala’s story promotes Western soft power by reinforcing the dominant GWOT narrative of the ‘civilised, masculine’ West which emancipates Malala from the ‘savagery’ of the ‘feminine’ Muslim world, thus helping justify its imperial policies and violence.

---

66 Ahmad, “Kafka in India,” 303.  
68 Phyllis Mentzell-Ryder addresses the celebration of Malala’s story. She highlights how during an interview on the popular American news satire program _The Daily Show_, the host (Jon Stewart) was left speechless when Malala said that she had no animosity towards the Talib (Taliban member) who shot her. It is necessary to “fight others …”, she continued, “through peace, and through dialogue, and through education”. Stunned by her response, the host joked that he would like to adopt her as his daughter. This interview with Malala received over two million views on YouTube. Her autobiography, _I am Malala_, was a _New York Times_ best-seller for twenty-one weeks. In 2013, Malala was awarded The Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought by the European Union. In 2014, she became the youngest recipient in history of the Nobel Peace Prize. See Phyllis Mentzell-Ryder, “Beyond Critique: Global Activism and the Case of Malala Yousafzai,” _Literacy in Composition Studies_ 3, no. 1 (2015): 175.  
Figure 1: Malala posing with her Nobel Peace Prize medal in Oslo, Norway.\textsuperscript{70}

\textbf{Malala’s Celebration}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{graph1.png}
\caption{Coverage of Malala in The Age, The Sydney Morning Herald and The New York Times between 9 October 2012 and 6 April 2018.}
\end{figure}

As Graph 1 demonstrates, Malala received ample coverage in all three media sources. The *New York Times* published 477 articles with some mention of Malala, while in Australia, both *The Age* and *The Sydney Morning Herald* each published over 100 articles referring to her. Based on my content analysis of the three media sources in Australia and the US, it can be inferred that Malala has been widely celebrated and made ‘famous’ through extensive coverage in the mainstream Western media. The question remaining for my CDA, however, is: what factors influence the mainstream Western media’s discourse on the GWOT in which it continues to celebrate Malala’s victimhood?

A key factor influencing the celebration of Malala’s victimhood in the Western media is that her celebration allows for the persistence of the Orientalist idea that Islam and Muslim men are ‘primitive’ due to their unequal treatment of women. This can be seen in references to women’s lack of freedom regarding education, marriage or even what they choose to wear. For example, one *New York Times* article in my CDA stated:

> She [Malala] criticizes not just the Taliban, but also the culture of Pakistan, in which women are rarely granted the same rights and opportunities as men. She has become one of the world’s most prominent faces of modern Islam, saying in a recent interview that she tried wearing a *burqa* when she was younger but gave it up: “I realized that it just took away my freedom, and that’s why I stopped wearing it.”

---

71 I conducted this quantitative search on the 23rd of April 2018.
72 By articles, I mean editorials, news articles, opinion pieces and feature articles. It must be noted that not all the articles are primarily about Malala, but all have some reference to her. *The Age* published 117 articles and *The Sydney Morning Herald* published 115 articles in the selected time frame with some reference to Malala.
73 Although new media is not the focus of this article, Malala also remains celebrated on new media, including social media. For example, the official “Malala Fund” page on Facebook has 743,202 likes. See Malala Fund Facebook Page, accessed January 19, 2018. [https://www.facebook.com/MalalaFund/](https://www.facebook.com/MalalaFund/) After typing Nabila’s name into the search bar on my Facebook page, I found no official page dedicated to her cause. Instead, only one article by journalist Murtaza Hussain published by *Al Jazeera English*’s official Facebook page was liked 26,000 times, with 1000 comments and 21,383 shares. See Hussain, “Malala and Nabila: Worlds Apart,” accessed September 26, 2018.
The idea that women have unequal rights in Pakistan is a striking feature of this article. The highlighting of Malala’s statement that the ‘face veil’ usually referred to as “burqa” “took away” her “freedom” helps to reinforce Orientalist ideas about Muslim women’s freedoms. As Lule notes, news comes to us as a mythical story through which prevailing ideologies and beliefs are (re)produced. In this case, Malala’s decontextualised media narrative helps reproduce the prevailing Orientalist idea that the burqa takes away the freedom of Muslim women. To recall Abu-Lughod, Muslim women’s oppression cannot be attributed to religion or culture per se. However, the Western media makes it appear, through the decontextualised celebration of Malala’s victimhood, that Islam and Muslim men singularly oppress women. To put this into context, the burqa [face veil] is a piece of clothing that is not mandatory in Islam. In Pakistan, it is part of Pashtun culture. Maneesha Tikekar aptly writes how the “veil (burkha [sic]) … is not at all common in Pakistan except in Peshawar. In fact, Pakistanis say they see more burkha-clad Muslim women in Delhi and Mumbai than in Pakistani cities.” However, the quote above paints Pakistani women in one broad stroke to further the Orientalist ideology that Muslim women who wear the burqa are ‘oppressed’.

In addition, the article above from The New York Times excludes all socio-cultural contexts and disregards differences between Western and Muslim social norms. Importantly, as Thomas Huckin posits, omitting information is crucial to “backgrounding” the content of texts. Moreover, as Abu-Lughod observes, it is important to respect social/cultural differences between the West and the Muslim world. For instance, anthropologist Saba Mahmood illustrates in her ethnography of Egyptian women that veiling is perceived by many women as a means to be virtuous and attain closeness to God. It is, therefore, important to note that

75 Lule, Daily News, Eternal Stories, 15.
76 Abu-Lughod, Do Muslim Women Need Saving?
77 Pashtuns are the second largest ethnic group in Pakistan. They are native to the Kyber Pakhtunkhwa province which borders Afghanistan. For more on the diverse ethnic groups of Pakistan, see Farhan Siddiqi, The Politics of Ethnicity in Pakistan: the Baloch, Sindhi and Mohajir Ethnic Movements (London: Routledge, 2012).
80 Abu-Lughod, Do Muslim Women Need Saving?
81 Saba Mahmood, “Feminist Theory, Embodiment, and the Docile Agent: Some Reflections on the Egyptian Islamic Revival,” Cultural Anthropology 16, no. 2 (2001): 213–215. Mahmood’s ethnographic account of a Muslim women’s piety movement in mosques of Cairo in Egypt has played an integral role in shifting understandings of Muslim women’s piety, subjectivity and agency. By drawing on her ethnography, Mahmood posits that religious Egyptian Muslim women voluntary adopt disciplinary practices that focus on female modesty, humility and submission to God. Such practices enable these Muslim women to cultivate a personally enhanced Muslim piety that allows them to lead a more
many Muslim women voluntarily adopt so-called ‘patriarchal practices’ (such as the hijab and burqa). However, the Western binary narrative renders Muslim women as either “uncovered” and “liberated” or “veiled” and “subordinate”. This binary distinction denies many Muslim women their own subjectivity regarding religious matters. Such decontextualised reporting, as Teun van Dijk and Normal Fairclough note in a different context, allows the Western media to express and reproduce prevailing Western Orientalist ideologies. More specifically, this narrative highlights that Muslim men are ‘primitive’ because they limit women’s agency by, for example, imposing the ‘patriarchal’ burqa. In turn, the Western media’s recognition of Malala’s victimhood helps strengthen the Orientalist idea that the Muslim world holds values that are ‘primitive’ and ‘backward’ regarding women’s rights. Importantly, the furthering of this specific Orientalist narrative through Malala is a key factor that influences the Western media’s celebratory framing of her victimhood.

Another factor that influences the Western media’s celebration of Malala’s victimhood is that her narrative helps reinforce the putative violent nature of Islam that is central to Orientalism. In fact, the selected articles for my CDA imply that the Taliban is extremist, violent, primitive or threatening to progressive liberal values such as women’s rights. For instance, when talking about Muslim women’s rights, Farooq Ajami asserts:

“This repression, this phobia, has come with the rise of the Islamists – half educated men who take the faith literally and employ the techniques of modernity in their war against it.”

In a similar vein, Laura Bush (former US First Lady) writes:

This repression, this phobia, has come with the rise of the Islamists – half educated men who take the faith literally and employ the techniques of modernity in their war against it.

---


65 This piece was originally published in The Washington Post (on 10/10/2012) and was re-published in The Sydney Morning Herald (on 13/10/12). For the original article, see Laura Bush, “Malala Yousafzai’s Courage Challenges Us to Act,” The Washington Post, October 10, 2012, accessed September 24, 2015. https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/laura-bush-malala-yousafzais-courage-challenges-us-to-act/2012/10/9cd423ea-1316-11e2-ba83-a7a396e6b2a7_story.html?utm_term=.1d44b9a0ce3c
Eleven years ago, America and its allies woke up to the barbaric mindset of the Taliban. Its regime in Afghanistan was dedicated in part to the brutal repression and abject subjugation of women.  

Bush’s piece was published just three days after Malala was shot at. Importantly, Bush’s immediate focus on the ‘threat’ of Islamist groups indicates that Malala’s victimhood narrative helps the Western media lucidly reinforce Orientalist ideas about Islam and violence. In particular, this reflects what Said notes of a culture whose knowledge of Islam is derived from “shabby screeds bearing screaming headlines about Islam and terror, Islam exposed, the Arab threat and the Muslim menace”.  

Further, the fact that not one article highlighted the historical context in which the Taliban emerged reflects that Malala’s victimhood helps the Western media further strengthen the narrative that Islam and the Muslim World are inherently ‘violent’. Mahmood and Hirschkind thus rightly highlight that Westerners ignored the fact that the US had earlier supported the Afghan mujahideen during the Soviet–Afghan War. The coverage of Malala displays Orientalist assumptions as it omits the socio-political context that led to the rise of groups like the Taliban. In effect, framing Malala’s victimhood to shed light on the actions of the Taliban in a de-contextualised manner reflects Abu-Lughod’s argument that the West conveniently “plaster[s] neat cultural icons like the Muslim woman over messy historical and political dynamics”.

---

87 Said, Orientalism, xv.
88 To counter the Soviet occupiers, Jimmy Carter’s administration supplied funding and weapons to local Afghan fighters, known as the mujahideen, during the Cold War. This policy of supporting extremism in the Afghanistan–Pakistan region, ultimately led to the birth of the Taliban in Afghanistan and Pakistan. See Hirschkind and Mahmood, “Feminism, the Taliban and the Politics of Counterinsurgency”, 342–348.
89 Notably, the impact Western intervention has had in sparking, promoting and sustaining violent extremism in the Afghan–Pakistan border region is not given any attention in my qualitative CDA articles.
Moreover, highlighting the shooting of Malala and her victimhood served as the “catastrophic and catalyzing event” that the West needed to help justify its imperial violence in Muslim states like Pakistan.\(^9^1\) In this context, the Western media conflated unrelated actors, events and regions in Malala’s coverage to further justify Western violence. For instance, Maria Golovnina’s article in *The Sydney Morning Herald* demonstrates how this conflation of diverse factors works:

Malala, now aged 17, became globally known in 2012 when Taliban gunmen almost killed her for her passionate advocacy of women’s right to education. She [Malala] has since become a symbol of defiance in the fight against militants operating in Pashtun tribal areas in northwest Pakistan – a region where women are expected to keep their opinion to themselves and stay at home.\(^9^2\)

This excerpt states that Malala is a “symbol of defiance” against militants operating in “Pashtun tribal areas in northwest Pakistan”. As stated earlier, however, Malala was shot at in Swat, which is not part of the Federal Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) in northwest Pakistan. Ahmed Rashid notes that the militancy networks in Swat and FATA were in fact not the same either, and he argues that the Pakistani army’s strategy in Swat and the FATA also differed.\(^9^3\) Golovnina’s conflation of Swat and the FATA region in *The Sydney Morning Herald* is notably similar to the way in which America linked Al-Qaeda to Saddam Hussain’s Ba’ath party to help justify the 2003 invasion of Iraq, as Gregory noted.\(^9^4\) Importantly, blurring geographical regions (such as Swat and FATA) through a ‘catastrophic’ event like Malala’s shooting helps Western governments justify their violent imperial policies in various regions of the Muslim world.

---


\(^9^3\) The Haqqani network is one of Afghanistan’s major insurgent groups and allegedly has support among certain sections within the Pakistan security establishment. See Ahmed Rashid, *Pakistan on the Brink: The Future of America, Pakistan, and Afghanistan* (London: Penguin, 2012), 144.

More specifically, the need of Western governments to legitimise launching drones in the FATA region of Pakistan is a key factor that influences the Western media’s consistent celebratory coverage of Malala’s victimhood. This is because America considers its drone policy to be an “effective” counter-terrorism policy in the FATA region.\textsuperscript{95} Importantly, Herman and Chomsky note that media groups not only reflect but also reproduce ideologies of the ruling elites.\textsuperscript{96} In turn, forcibly connecting Swat and FATA through Malala’s coverage enables the West to help justify launching drones in the FATA region of Pakistan. Following Fairclough and van Dijk, it is apparent in this context how Western governments transmit and justify their drone ideology through an inaccurate media discourse on Malala.\textsuperscript{97} More specifically, this ideology encompasses not just curbing ‘Islamic terrorism’ but also protecting the rights of “infantile[sed]” young women like Malala.\textsuperscript{98} In turn, using Malala’s victimhood to frame Pakistan’s internal regional and political landscape inaccurately is reflective of what Saadia Toor terms “imperialist feminism”.\textsuperscript{99} Specifically, this enables the West to legitimise violence, imperial war and occupation of Muslim countries behind the veneer of upholding ‘women’s rights’.

In sum, this section has demonstrated that Malala’s story has become a case of cause célèbre in the mainstream Western media. More specifically, I have argued that emphasising the Orientalist notions of the poor treatment of Muslim women and the rise of ‘Islamic terrorism’ as a way to legitimise Western imperial violence and intervention in the Muslim world have been key factors that influenced the Western media’s celebration of Malala’s victimhood.\textsuperscript{100}

**Negating Nabila’s Narrative**

There’s really no such thing as the ‘voiceless’. There are only the deliberately silenced, or the preferably unheard.

\textsuperscript{99} Toor, “Imperialist Feminism Redux,” 149.
\textsuperscript{100} To be clear, I do not hold that these are the only factors that influence the way Malala’s victimhood has been covered in the Western media. I acknowledge that Malala’s charisma, courage and passion for young women’s education (including her anonymous BBC diaries about life under the Taliban) make her narrative and victimhood an even more appealing Western news story.
At a White House State dinner in 2010, then-US President Barack Obama famously joked: “The Jonas Brothers are here; they’re out there somewhere. Sasha and Malia are huge fans. But boys, don’t get any ideas. I have two words for you. ‘Predator Drones’. You will never see it coming.”

Obama’s ‘joke’ was not only indicative of his drone policy in Pakistan but was also highly insensitive. This same drone policy had injured and killed scores of innocent civilians. Despite the humanitarian consequences of drones, civilians like Nabila and Momina remain overlooked by mainstream Western governments and media. In this section, I explore what factors influence the Western media’s GWOT discourse which suppresses Nabila’s victimhood. Here I contend that the suppression of Nabila, and the sufferings of young women like her, occur because they do not fit the morally superior language used by the West in the GWOT. Crucially, silencing Nabila’s victimhood helps the West maintain its binary Orientalist GWOT narrative that helps rationalise Western imperial violence in the Muslim World. More importantly, Nabila’s suppression helps conceals the dire humanitarian consequences of drones.


102 Obama’s drone policy is rationalised by the fact that, “all tribal men especially those of North and South Waziristan – are assumed to be either actual or imminent militants, and therefore legitimate military targets”. See Toor, “Imperialist Feminism Redux,” 158. In fact, a report by Stanford and New York University demonstrates that only 2% of drone victims are in fact “high level” militants (italics mine). See James Cavallaro, Stephan Sonnenberg, and Sarah Knuckey “Living under Drones: Death, Injury and Trauma to Civilians from US Drone Practices in Pakistan,” Stanford School of Law and New York University School of Law (2012): vii–viii.
Figure 2: During a news conference on Capitol Hill in Washington D.C, Nabila holds a sketch she made illustrating the American drone strike on her village that killed her grandmother and caused shrapnel injuries to herself and several other children in her family.\textsuperscript{103}

Unlike the overwhelming results relating to Malala, a survey of coverage of Nabila in the selected media sources yielded just one article in \textit{The New York Times} and not a single article in the Australian media.\textsuperscript{104} From this, it is clear that the mainstream Western media has effectively erased and suppressed Nabila's narrative and victimhood (results in Graph 2 below). The question remaining for my CDA, however, is: what factors influence the mainstream Western media's discourse on the GWOT in which it continues to suppress Nabila’s victimhood?


\textsuperscript{104} I conducted this quantitative search on the 23\textsuperscript{rd} of April 2018.
A key factor that has influenced the suppression of Nabila’s injury and Momina’s death in the Western media is that their erasure allows for the persistent production and reinforcement of the binary Orientalist GWOT narrative. More specifically, silencing Nabila’s victimhood avoids undermining the Western GWOT narrative in which the ‘masculine’ West liberates Muslim women from the ‘medieval’ ‘feminine’ Muslim world through violent military interventions. In fact, the only article on Nabila in *The New York Times*, by Declan Walsh, illustrates that Nabila’s victimhood has been suppressed even within the limited coverage she has received.\(^{105}\) Walsh’s article begins by addressing the discrepancy in official figures concerning drone civilian casualties. Here he focuses on the Pakistani government’s revised figures released to lawmakers which estimate as few as “67 civilians were among 2,227 people killed in 317 drone strikes since 2008”. Walsh then moves on to highlight the CIA’s insistence that “strikes have been very accurate and have killed only a small number of civilians”. The next part of the article touches on a report published by Amnesty International which questions the legality of drones and who constitutes innocent civilians. At the very end of his article, Walsh writes:

http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/31/world/asia/pakistan-drone-strikes.html?_r=0
The dead woman’s son and two grandchildren spoke about the attack at a news conference in Washington on Tuesday that was arranged by the Brave New Foundation, a liberal advocacy group that has funded a new documentary about the drone wars. One grandchild, Nabila Rehman, 9, described seeing two missiles fired from a drone kill her grandmother as they worked together in the field. Speaking in Pashto through an interpreter, the girl also said she had suffered shrapnel wounds to her right hand. She was accompanied by her father, a teacher, and her 13-year-old brother, Zubair ur-Rehman, who said that he preferred cloudy days when bad weather grounded the drone fleet. “When the sky brightens and becomes blue, the drones return, and so does the fear,” he said.

According to the ‘inverted pyramid’ principle, or what van Dijk’s refers to as the top-down “thematic realization” concept, journalists place the most salient information at the start of a news article, while the facts and arguments presented at the end of an article are of less significance. With this in mind, it can be seen that Walsh does not begin his piece with Nabila’s victimhood nor is she the subject of his title or piece, and he addresses Nabila’s story at the far end of his article, suggesting he views her story as less important. Nabila therefore stands suppressed not only due to the lack of coverage she has received in the Western media but also within the limited coverage she has received. Glossing over Nabila’s victimhood in this way helps build the perception that drones were indeed surgical weapons, as the West had claimed all along. Importantly, this framing further strengthens the West’s dominant Orientalist binary GWOT narrative. This is because the West is framed as the ‘peaceful, benevolent and superior’ force that is seeking to surgically remove the ‘violent, malevolent and inferior’ forces within the Muslim World through its near ‘precise’ drone policy.

Moreover, to help cultivate the Orientalist “cultural resources” needed to legitimise Western violence and imperial rule, Walsh’s language remains soft on America’s violent drone policy...
that injured and killed Nabila and Momina.\textsuperscript{110} As, van Dijk notes in his analysis of news articles in \textit{The New York Times} and \textit{The Washington Post}, American state ideological positions influence different elements of discourse semantics.\textsuperscript{111} It is within this ideological context that van Dijk finds that Arabs are frequently referred to as “terrorists” in \textit{The New York Times} articles. However, the term “terrorist” is seldom used to describe Israelis who kill Palestinians.\textsuperscript{112} Van Dijk’s insights are relevant here, as the Taliban were always implied to be ‘terrorists’ and ‘fundamentalists’ in the selected qualitative articles on Malala. Notably, Walsh’s \textit{New York Times} article on Nabila does not refer to the US drone policy as ‘state terrorism’ or as ‘inhumane’. Crucially, this soft framing gives the West the relevant “cultural resources”\textsuperscript{113} to help sustain its ideological perception of being the hegemonic ‘civilised masculine’ force in the GWOT and International Relations. More specifically, it helps limit criticism and even helps legitimise violent Western interventionist policies in the Muslim World. This dominant Western Orientalist framework for depicting the US-drone policy and its victims in the GWOT has dulled media interest and numbed many to the struggle of victims like Nabila.

Silencing Nabila’s story also enables the US-led Western coalition to conceal the dire humanitarian consequences of its drone program. Fairclough notes that dominant societal ideological beliefs are transmitted and popularised through media discourse.\textsuperscript{114} As Graph 2 shows, Nabila has been ignored – she is mentioned only once in the selected sources. The one article in \textit{The New York Times} in which Nabila is mentioned downplays the number of civilian deaths caused by US drones:

\begin{quote}
The [Pakistani] Ministry of Defence released figures to lawmakers saying that 67 civilians were among 2,227 people killed in 317 drone strikes since 2008. The remainder of those killed were Islamist militants, the ministry said. The figures represented a civilian casualty rate of about 3 percent, falling far below earlier estimates from independent groups – and other government departments….\textsuperscript{115}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{110} Barkawi, “Orientalism,” 63.
\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Ibid}, 259–60.
\textsuperscript{113} Barkawi, “Orientalism,” 63.
\textsuperscript{114} Fairclough, \textit{Language and Power}; Fairclough, \textit{Media Discourse}.
\textsuperscript{115} Walsh, “Fewer Civilians Died by Drones”.

\textit{Eras Journal | Volume 20 | Issue 1}
http://artsonline.monash.edu.au/eras/
In fact, Walsh’s title, “In a surprise, Pakistan says fewer civilians died by drones”, emphasises the US state ideology, by implying that drones cause minimal civilian deaths and that the humanitarian consequences of drones are more nuanced than critics often suggest. This framing assists the West to cultivate an abundance of rich “cultural resources” that help it legitimise its violence and sustain its imperial rule and empire in the Muslim World as part of its GWOT.

It is, however, important to keep in mind that this Western Orientalist GWOT media framework continues to overlook the fact that America’s drone policy has killed many Pakistani civilians. This helps the West further mask the human cost of its violent drone policy. To illustrate, the Bureau of Investigative Journalism conservatively estimated that up to 969 civilians — of whom up to 207 were children — died in Pakistan from US drone strikes between 2004 and 2018. For the Western media to efface over hundreds of drone civilian casualties on the one hand and to focus on young women like Malala on the other demonstrates how Orientalism works in the GWOT discourse in two specific ways. First, the US-led coalition sought to launch ‘precision’ drones to act as the ‘masculine saviour’ of Pakistani civilians from the menace of ‘Islamic terrorism’. However, highlighting and humanising Nabila’s victimhood would have made it clear that drones were, contra media, not ‘precision weapons’. Secondly, as stated earlier, highlighting Nabila’s struggle would expose the ‘feminine and medieval’ traits of the ‘masculine’ West that it attributes to the Muslim World.

In fact, the West’s suppression of Nabila’s victimhood recalls Nayak’s notion of the “mammy” archetype that is “dehumanized” in the GWOT to help the West immunise itself against criticism for its drone policy. To elaborate, by drawing on Deborah Gray White’s research

---

119 In fact, the report on drones by Stanford and New York University confirms this by claiming that one element that decreases precision is “latency”. This is “the delay between movement on the ground and the arrival of the video image via satellite to the drone pilot”. See Cavallaro, Sonnenberg, and Knuckey, “Living under Drones,” 9–10.
on female African American slaves on plantations in southern America, Nayak highlights the archetype of the “maternal, submissive, non-thinking woman” excluded from civilisation. She is “dehumanized” since her “violent experiences really do not matter”. To Nayak, these violent practices render other victims as “collateral damage, conditionally worthy or dangerous”. With this in mind, Nayak contends that this “dehumanization” is integral to the narrative of “disgust and apathy” used by the US state in an attempt “save” its self-identity in the GWOT.\textsuperscript{121} If viewed from Nayak’s perspective, Nabila is the Western media’s submissive woman whose victimhood is silenced and dehumanised as ‘collateral damage’. Ironically, the same Western media that celebrated Malala’s bravery and support for women’s education, silences the victimhood of drone victims and peace advocates (such as Nabila) and even classifies their victimhood as ‘collateral damage’.\textsuperscript{122} In turn, this renders Nabila’s struggle as necessary for the ‘greater cause’ of reducing global militancy and terrorism. Importantly, this approach helps the West ‘save’ itself from receiving criticism for its violent drone policy in the Muslim World.

To conclude, in my analysis of the negligible coverage Nabila received I have demonstrated that the mainstream Western media has largely silenced Nabila’s victimhood. Here, I build on the idea that the dominant GWOT discourse has been underpinned with racialised and gendered narratives. To this end, I have argued that drone victims (such as Nabila) remain suppressed because their sufferings do not fit the ‘morally superior’ language of the West. Importantly, this helps the West maintain its binary Orientalist GWOT narrative, as it helps immunise itself against criticism for the humanitarian consequences of its drone policy. In turn, this framing helps the West legitimise its imperial violence (particularly drones) and rule in the Muslim World in the GWOT.

\textbf{Self-Perception and Subjectivity of Malala}

Up until now, this article has focused on the framing of Malala’s and Nabila’s victimhood in the Western media. It has not accounted for the self-perception of these characters and their own subjectivity. With this in mind, this section is devoted to accounting for the subjectivity of

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid.
Malala. This is particularly important because the subjective voices of the two female victims have been largely absent from the dominant Western political discourse.

In fact, a closer critical discourse analysis reveals that the way Malala perceives herself is not aligned with how the dominant Western media has depicted her. As mentioned earlier, my CDA found that the selected articles framed the violent and misogynist activities of the Taliban in a decontextualised manner. However, in *I am Malala*, Malala outlines the context in which the Taliban gained support in the Swat Valley:  

We Pashtuns love shoes but we don’t love the cobbler; we love our scarves and blankets but do not respect the weaver. Manual workers have made a great contribution to our society but received no recognition, and this is the reason many of them joined the Taliban – to finally achieve status and power.

Malala also implies that the policies of America and General Zia-ul-Haq during the 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan played an integral role in radicalising groups like the Taliban in Pakistan. To substantiate this, Malala quotes a local Pakistani information minister: “If we had not put guns in the hands of madrasa students at the behest of foreign powers, we would not be facing this bloodbath in the tribal areas and Swat”. Importantly, Malala’s memoir makes it clear that while she is critical of the violence perpetrated by the Taliban, she is equally critical of the West’s violent intervention in the region. As Ryder notes, Malala has resisted using platforms given to her to justify Western military action against non-state extremist groups like the Taliban. She also does not hold that their actions are derived from religion. It can, therefore, be seen that Malala herself refuses to accept the Western rhetoric of the ‘masculine’ West saving the ‘feminine’ Muslim world. In fact, placing the actions of the Taliban within the larger social, political, economic and historical context in her memoir is one of many instances

---

123 I do not have the relevant materials to reclaim Nabila’s voice and subjectivity for she has been silenced through minimal media coverage of her case.


126 Ibid, 173.

where Malala seeks to move away from the dominant Western dualistic framework according to which Islam and Muslim men ‘oppress’ Muslim women. Interestingly, as was shown in my CDA earlier, these layered elements of Malala’s narrative have seldom captured the Western media’s attention.

It thus follows that it is not analytically beneficial to continue to articulate the GWOT as a strict dichotomy between the ‘modern, masculine’ West versus the ‘medieval, feminine’ Muslim world. No doubt, such a gendered and racial framework may allow young women such as Malala to be iconised and idolised as the West’s tool for its self-proclaimed goodness. However, women such as Nabila remain silenced and erased from the Western media and public domain. This process includes only some and excludes many more. It would be more useful, as Swati Parashar suggests in a different context, to articulate and view such binary oppositions through more “flexible and porous frameworks”. Following Nira Yuval-Davis, there are also numerous factors, such as class, age, power and ethnicity, which may help determine the power dynamics and gendered rhetoric of the GWOT. Viewing the GWOT through an anti-dualistic framework will pave the way for a more nuanced understanding of the war and its different victims.

**Conclusion**

This article has questioned what factors influence the mainstream Western media to present two largely similar victims in the GWOT – Malala and Nabila – in different ways. To address this complex question, I drew on the writings of Laura Shepherd and Richard Jackson to contend that since 9/11 the dominant GWOT discourse has been underpinned with strong binary, racialised and gendered narratives that render the West as the “modern, masculinized, peaceful and civilized” force superior to the “medieval, feminized, violent and savage” Muslim world. More specifically, I have argued that only those women who are a direct victim of the ‘Islamic’ adversary, such as Malala, have been acknowledged for their suffering. However, victims of Western imperial violence, such as Nabila, have been ignored. Crucially, this discrepancy exists because Nabila’s struggle would unsettle what David L. Altheide refers to

---

129 Nira Yuval-Davis observes that gender relations/roles in the military are never between just men and women. There are other factors, such as ethnicity, class, age and ability – all of which have a crucial bearing on determining who is included or excluded. I apply this to my gendered analysis of the GWOT. See Nira Yuval-Davis, *Gender & Nation* (London: Sage Publications, 1997), 96.
as the ‘morally superior’ language of the West in the GWOT.\textsuperscript{131} I have further argued that the subjectivity of the two victims themselves, particularly Malala’s, does not support the Western media’s dominant discourse on the GWOT. With this in mind, I have argued that viewing the GWOT through an anti-dualistic framework will help develop and allow for a more nuanced understanding of the GWOT and its victims such as Malala and Nabila.

Importantly, throughout this article my analysis has been informed by synthesis of insights from the subfields of: Orientalism, anthropology, gender studies, media studies and International Relations. This multidisciplinary framework enabled me to understand how Orientalist logic and gender constructs operate to uphold dominant Western political interests in the Western GWOT narrative. Based on an analysis of six articles in \textit{The Age}, \textit{The Sydney Morning Herald} and \textit{The New York Times}, I have argued that Malala’s victimhood has been celebrated by the mainstream Western media because this allows for the persistence of the gendered-Orientalist narrative in the GWOT.\textsuperscript{132} Specifically, the celebration of Malala’s victimhood highlights that the Muslim world is the ‘feminised medieval’ force in International Relations due to its ‘savage’ treatment of women and the rise of ‘Islamic terrorism’. In turn, this enables the West to rationalise its violent imperialist policies in Muslim countries like Pakistan. Specifically, the celebratory coverage of Malala for defying the Taliban to attend school enables elite Western political establishments to justify their actions of drone strikes, invasions and bombings in the Muslim world behind the veneer of “See, we told you, this is why we intervene to save the natives”.\textsuperscript{133}

In stark contrast, through an analysis of the limited coverage given to Nabila in the selected media sources, I have shown that Nabila remains erased and suppressed because her case unsettles the dualistic and imperialist hubris of the Western GWOT narrative. More specifically, I have argued that drone victims like Nabila remain silenced because this assists the West to maintain its Orientalist GWOT narrative that helps legitimise Western imperial violence (particularly drones) in the Muslim World and, importantly, helps Western governments conceal the dire humanitarian consequences of drones. Such consequences reflect the many blind spots in the Western narrative that is determined to produce a ‘civilised-us’ versus ‘savage-they’ narrative. In fact, this binary language is a classic illustration of German...\textsuperscript{133}

\textsuperscript{131} Altheide, “Fear, Terrorism and Popular Culture,” 11.
\textsuperscript{132} I am aware a limitation of my study is that my sample size is too small. However, as I stated in the methodology, while I partially employ a quantitative technique to demonstrate the numerical frequency of Malala and Nabila, my approach is primarily qualitative.
\textsuperscript{133} Baig, “Malala Yousafzai and the White Saviour Complex”.

\textit{Eras Journal} \textit{Volume 20} \textit{Issue 1}
\url{http://artsonline.monash.edu.au/eras/}
philosopher Carl Schmitt’s delineation of politics as marking a distinction between ‘us’ and ‘them’, “friend” and “foe”.\textsuperscript{134} In fact, he believed the greater the distinction, the more likely the success.\textsuperscript{135} With this in mind, former British MP George Galloway’s observation that “if Malala had been murdered in a drone-strike, the UK media would never have told you her name” thus cries for attention from analysts and academics alike.\textsuperscript{136}
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## Appendix 1: Malala Article Selection


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Source</th>
<th>Date Published</th>
<th>Headline</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[^137]: As the story of Nabila was only covered in one article in The New York Times, I have not created a table on her as I have with Malala.
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Don McLeod: The Rock that Changed the Pilbara

Jan Richardson
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Abstract: In Western Australia in the 1930s, Don McLeod, a white man, was a prospector and miner in the remote northwest Pilbara. He worked throughout this vast region of mineral-bearing rocks that, if they could be cracked, could bring a miner great wealth. McLeod was successful, and he hoped to become a millionaire, but instead, a chance encounter with an Aboriginal pastoral worker changed his life. He became an activist for Aboriginal rights, and amongst his own people it made him the most hated man in the north-west. For the Aboriginal people it made him a key to their liberation. They had endured nearly a century of oppression under state laws that were intended, but failed, to protect them from exploitation by Western Australian settlers. McLeod was instrumental in challenging this situation, and in 1946 empowered the Aboriginal pastoral workers to organise a strike for better wages and conditions. The strike lasted three years, by which time the workers had reframed their strike from an industrial issue to a human rights struggle. Many never returned to the pastoral stations, choosing instead to form a collective and, advised by McLeod, became financially independent through alluvial mining. Pilbara social, political and economic structures were irrevocably changed. McLeod was vilified and persecuted to prevent him empowering the Aboriginal strikers, but his philosophy and traits made him a man as hard as the Pilbara rocks and he could not be defeated. This article looks at McLeod’s characteristics to understand why.

Keywords: Don McLeod, Pilbara Strike, Western Australia, History of Indigenous Protest, Mining
The Boy McLeod

Adversity was normal for Don McLeod, and early in his life he exhibited the characteristics that interest this article. He was born in 1908, his parents’ sixth surviving child - the first having drowned before the age of two. His family was living in the small Murchison regional township of Meekatharra in 1912 when his mother died giving birth to her ninth child. To distract the children from her agonising cries, the adults took them for a picnic, but the four-year old McLeod became lost. He was only found after 30 hours. Writing in the local paper, a journalist described how the boy had slept under a bush, despite which he “sturdily asserted he was alright, but he was very stiff and sore and there were big lumps on his groin evidently caused by the strain in negotiating tree trunks and boulders”. Some searchers could barely believe that “such a tiny chap could have travelled so far, perhaps more than 20 miles [32 kilometres] over the hilly and rough country”. It showed “that the little fellow possesses considerable powers of endurance”, the journalist noted.138

So that he was free to travel widely and for months at a time prospecting and mining in remote areas, the children’s father placed them in a Catholic boarding school. About those years in the convent, aged four to ten, McLeod told interviewer Chris Jeffery, “It wasn’t a very happy experience, I think the less said about it the better.”139 In most interviews he was reticent to share his personal life.140 To Leslie Marchant, however, he confided “I objected to the discipline … and I refused to submit myself to them.”141 Three times his brothers helped him to run away until he finally left the Catholic educational system in 1918 at age ten, as reported in the only academic study of McLeod’s early life.142 Lutze shows that in his early life and family of origin, McLeod “rebelled against authority structures.”143 At age 15 or 16, he left school without completing his school certificate.

---

139 Chris Jeffery interview with Donald William McLeod (Perth: State Library of Western Australia, 1978), OH 331.
141 Leslie R. Marchant, Unpublished draft chapters 1-5, Biography of Don McLeod, (Perth, University of Western Australia, 118/13/1, 1955). I thank Anne Scrimgeour for alerting me to this material. I thank the Executor of Marchant’s Estate for permission to use his draft chapters in this article.
143 Lutze, “Donald McLeod”, 33.
The Young Man McLeod

Post-school work began with conflict; he walked off his first job when he considered he was being exploited.\textsuperscript{144} He then undertook work as a stockman and had “scraps” with the squatters.\textsuperscript{145} Adopting his father’s entrepreneurial spirit and ethics, he subsequently worked for himself as a miner and general contractor across the vast distances of the isolated Northwest. Mining could be lucrative but was hazardous in nature. The risks were great in that era, as a miner in the Mid-West experienced; he fell down a shaft and died.\textsuperscript{146} Another fell into an agitating vat and was instantly killed.\textsuperscript{147} Also ever-present was the possibility of succumbing to heat stress, snakes and ubiquitous biting insects.\textsuperscript{148}

The Mature Man McLeod

When McLeod was 24 years old, his father died from a stroke while prospecting alone. McLeod learned to rely on himself, and model his father’s philosophy to do good to others:

\begin{quote}
Not as a pathway from earth to heaven,
and not on an altar to any creed,
but a simple service freely given,
to his own kind in times of need.\textsuperscript{149}
\end{quote}

The mineral-rich rocks of the Murchison and Pilbara regions contained asbestos, tin, manganese and copper and McLeod prospected amongst them.\textsuperscript{150} He acquired competencies in many of the skills valuable to the pastoral industry as back-up when mining was not productive. He could sink water wells, erect windmills, select and cut trees to build fences, cart goods, shoot kangaroos, undertake general handyman tasks, mend machinery and lump wheat-bags from the wharf into the ships for transport.\textsuperscript{151} McLeod told an interviewer that during the Great Depression 1929-1939 the Australian mining industry experienced recession,

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{144} Lutze, “Donald McLeod”, 5.
\textsuperscript{145} Marchant. \textit{Biography of Don McLeod}.
\textsuperscript{146} \textit{Murchison Times and Day Dawn Gazette}, 27 August 1920, 3.
\textsuperscript{147} \textit{Daily Telegraph} and \textit{North Murchison and Pilbara Gazette}, 30 June 1944, 2.
\textsuperscript{148} Temperatures during the summer months could exceed 32°C almost every day and occasionally higher than 45°C.
\textsuperscript{149} Marchant, chapter 1: 8. This is a slightly incorrect rendition of Rudyard Kipling’s \textit{The Sons of Martha}. Kipling wrote: “Not as a ladder from earth to Heaven, not as a witness to any creed, but simple service simply given to his own kind in their common need.”
\textsuperscript{150} William Walker, “Pilbara”, in \textit{Historical Encyclopedia of Western Australia}, eds. Jenny Gregory and Jan Gothard (Crawley: University of Western Australia Press, 2009), 691-693.
\textsuperscript{151} All-important skills to have in the harsh Western Australian environment. See F.K. Crowley, \textit{Australia’s Western Third: A history of Western Australia from the first settlements to modern times} (London: Macmillan and Co Ltd, 1960), 292.
\end{footnotes}
"You had to make your own work as much as you could."152 Those who could work asbestos were advantaged, while bankruptcy for many farmers and others less-fortunate was not uncommon.153 McLeod had enough financial success to state “I was on my way to establishing an empire.”154

The Miner’s Life

McLeod’s peripatetic lifestyle, mining in remote areas of the Murchison and Pilbara regions afforded him opportunities to observe the social and political conditions in the northwest. His increasing awareness encouraged him to explore the Aboriginal people’s perspective, although thwarted in this desire by legal restrictions on interactions between non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal people. The Aborigines Act 1905 (WA), s.36, prevented a white man from visiting Aboriginal people where they were camping, unless he had a permit to employ an Aboriginal person.155 He was able to enter into dialogue with some Aboriginal men when granted Permit 7198 to employ Aboriginal pastoral workers - and recruited Dooley Binbin and Mick Kitchener on one of his station projects.

Binbin and Kitchener eventually discussed with him their people’s grievances about their treatment on the pastoral stations. Both men were also Lawmen for their people and became intermediaries for the flow of information between McLeod and the other Aboriginal leaders.156 This was an unusual collaboration, for it galvanised their belief that they did not have to put up with their treatment by their white oppressors. These constraints were summarised by historian Peter Biskup:

The pastoralists agreed to look after all destitute Aborigines on their stations; as a quid pro quo the administration pegged wages in the pastoral industry and instructed protectors to “discourage” Aboriginal station hands from leaving

155 s.36: “It shall not be lawful for any person, other than a superintendent or protector, or a person acting under the direction of a superintendent, or under a written permit of a protector, without lawful excuse, to enter or remain or be within or upon any place where aborigines or female half-castes are camped. Any person, save as aforesaid, who, without lawful excuse, the proof whereof shall lie upon him, is found in or within five chains of any such camp shall be guilty of an offence against this Act; but no person shall be prosecuted for an offence under this section except by the direction of a protector”. Five chains are the equivalent of 110 metres.
156 Submission by the Nomads Group of Aborigines to the Federal Cabinet, Commonwealth of Australia, Federal Cabinet, 1972, (Kalamunda: Nomads Charitable and Educational Foundation, 1972), 5.
pastoral employment for other occupations.  

Prompted by Binbin and Kitchener, McLeod sought a framework in which to analyse these new ideas.

**Developing an Analytical Framework**

Daytime work was not conducive to peaceful contemplation of concepts about the economic and political structures of society. It demanded considerable physical effort and powers of endurance. Notwithstanding these impediments to consideration of social theories, McLeod had a great thirst for thought-provoking opinions. At night he slung an aerial high into a tree and on a small transistor radio, tuned in to the BBC. In Western Australia, Edward ‘Bill’ Beeby further met his need. Beeby, President of the Anti-Fascist League in Perth and a member of the Communist Party of Australia, gave nightly talks for the League in Perth that were broadcast over the radio. From him McLeod gained new understandings of how social and political structures were conceived of, developed, and established. McLeod became so interested in Beeby’s political analyses that he contacted him when he went to Perth some time before 1943. This meeting introduced McLeod to a new political network; he joined the Anti-Fascist League. On the same radio station, he also heard broadcasts by the Communist Party of Australia, with which the League was strongly linked. The Communist Party additionally had a policy on Aboriginal issues prepared by Tom Wright and published in 1939 as a pamphlet. Lawyer Lloyd Davies claimed that McLeod found Wright’s arguments crystallised his own ideas. He began to apply his new ideas to his own environment.
The Political McLeod

McLeod's nomadic lifestyle exposed him to vast expanses of the Pilbara. According to McLeod, he regularly went up the coast of Western Australia and south inland to his camp in the Shire of Ashburton. He noticed the role of Aboriginal workers on the stations and in the homesteads but had no contact with them. There were political reasons for this; Pilbara society in McLeod's lifetime was divided along social lines.

Two Peoples

Europeans and Asians, generally referred to as whites, were in one social category, Indigenous people in another, although government used terms such as “native” or “Aboriginal”. According to Aboriginal Lawman, Clancy McKenna, the terms “blackfella” and “whitefella” were acceptable. The term “Aboriginal” suggests it was a homogenous group but as historian Bain Attwood pointed out, this is not accurate. Instead, the Indigenous peoples named themselves according to their language and kinship affiliations. It was Europeans during the colonisation process who introduced the term “Aborigine.” On the Pilbara pastoral stations, the standardised nomenclature for the vast and various Indigenous tribes ignored their unique social and political reality, for they each had different histories and tribal affiliations. A simplistic division recognised those from the desert and those from the coastal areas and The Wangka Maya Pilbara Language Centre lists twenty-six languages.

Two language groups with strong ties to country and traditional Law were the Nyangumarta and Manyjilyjarra, whose speakers traditionally came from the Great Sandy Desert. Nyamal people came from the coastal country. In their own terminology, those of mixed descent called themselves madamada or “Half-Caste”. Naming was one way that delineated two major Pilbara social communities; another was government legislation. Both shaped McLeod and influenced his activities.

\[163\] Many of McLeod's memories recorded as oral histories are difficult to corroborate because of lack of evidence from other sources.
\[164\] In his book detailing why and how he became involved in the Aboriginal pastoral workers’ movement for independence, McLeod claimed to be mining in the Ashburton in 1937. See D.W. McLeod, How the West was Lost: The native question in the development of Western Australia. (Port Hedland: the author, 1984), 37.
\[168\] Palmer and McKenna, Somewhere Between Black and White, x.
Over the 60,000 or so years that Indigenous people lived on the continent of Australia before colonisation, they had developed laws to manage their societies. Western laws interrupted traditional Law by classifying the people as an entity different from settlers and legislating to control them. After decades, this legislation had normalised the separation between the majority white society and Aboriginal workers in the Pilbara pastoral industry. As the Pilbara developed into a major wool producer, pastoralists relied upon the Aboriginal stockmen to maintain their economy, and Aboriginal women domestic workers, their social class. This class system reproduced “a version of the class structure of the English countryside: a landed gentry with a quiescent and respectful labour force.” During World War II, Australia’s war effort was increased by the production of Pilbara wool, and the need for a stable industry consequently intensified. Its management was within the purview of the Commissioner for Native Affairs, a position of considerable power over Aboriginal people. War historian Robert Hall believed one Commissioner’s “main concern was the preservation of cheap Aboriginal labour for the pastoral and agricultural industries.” Historian Mark McKenna argued that were Australia to become a republic, both Aboriginal and European cultures would be recognised as equal and the category of “native” would no longer imply inferiority, which had remained the status quo throughout the 1940s. However implicit in the Pilbara culture of the 1940s was the assumption that the Aboriginal people, the “natives”, were inferior to the settlers. Classification of “natives” and whites and legislation that valorised “one culture over another” continued to be entrenched in Pilbara society through amended government legislation.

---

169 Initially, when Britain’s King George IV gave Royal Assent on 14 May 1829 to the founding of Western Australia as a British colony, no special legislation was enacted. Its first constitution of 1 June 1829, the Western Australia Act, 1829 (UK) ignored the original inhabitants of the country. Instead it “effected a settlement upon certain wild and unoccupied lands on the western coast of New Holland and the islands adjacent which settlements have (?) and are known by the name of Western Australia”. Later legislation specific to Aboriginal people was enacted, outlining how they were to be controlled and punishments for non-authorized persons who transgressed.


172 F.K. Crowley reported that when World War II began, Australia’s total wool clip was sold to the United Kingdom, see F.K. Crowley, Australia’s Western Third, 291.

173 Joseph Patrick Lorback, “We Are All Workers”: the 1949 “Black Ban” by the Seamen’s Union to Support the Aboriginal Pilbara Strike, unpublished Honours thesis, (Bundoora: La Trobe University, 2010), 22.


175 McKenna, “Moment of Truth”, 1.

176 Mark McKenna, This Country: A reconciled republic? (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2004), 121.
Government Legislation

The terminology reflected a change in naming the Indigenous people when the Native Administration (WA) Act, 1936 came into force. Under this act, a Department of Native Affairs was established, headed by a Commissioner of Native Affairs. It introduced an employment permit system.177 Historian Paul Hasluck described it as a “system that confines the native within a legal status that has more in common with that of a born idiot than of any other class of British subject.”178 Barrister Kate Auty noted how “The statute presented a bundle of contradictory impulses. It ‘protected’ the Aborigines and it pilloried them; it ousted the rule of law and the common law and increased the power of administrators to an extraordinary degree”.179 Historian Sue Taffe had another name for it: “draconian.”180

Throughout the following years this legislation was amended and government controls over Indigenous peoples became further entrenched. The Aboriginal people were not informed about the impact on them of this legislation.181 McLeod later believed this was not an oversight but that Aboriginal people had been kept “deliberately illiterate, isolated and destitute”.182 He told oral historian Bill Bunbury that he knew about this “notorious Native Affairs Act” and that he “felt he had no alternative but to assist the Pilbara people.”183 By “assisting”, he meant, resisting the Act. In addition to the controls of government, the Aboriginal workers were disadvantaged by their isolation on the pastoral stations.

Virtual Apartheid

This prominent social imbalance was conveyed not only legally, but also through informal social conventions. One consequence of the Aborigines Act 1905 (WA) was the creation of an apartheid-like situation in which those who controlled Aboriginal people were perceived as superior to those whom they controlled.184 A multitude of small signifiers conveyed this social imbalance. One such practice, for example, was that Aboriginal employees did not enter the

---

177 Section 36 of the Native Administration Act, 1936.
183 Bill Bunbury, It’s not the money it’s the land: Aboriginal Stockman and the equal wages case, (Fremantle: Fremantle Arts Centre Press, 2002), 49.
184 Jolly Read and Peter Coppin, Kangkushot: The Life of Nyamal Lawman Peter Coppin (Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 1999), 47.
pastoral station homesteads unless it was women engaged in domestic work. Another was that bureaucrats and station managers could give their Aboriginal employees (arguably demeaning) names to match their idiosyncrasies, such as One-Leg Jimmy, or Half-Caste Billy. Station workers were expected to live in camps on the property, eat food that was inferior to that provided for other workers, keep out the cold night winds by sleeping in the river beds instead of in accommodation units, and work for minimal wages. Historian W.F. Mandle studied the Aboriginal workers' situation and reported that “the majority of them accepted the certainty of low-grade food and accommodation and a pittance of cash in return for surrender of independence.” Thalia Anthony described labour relations in the north as feudal arrangements whereby the pastoralists made their workers dependent by “denying them a place in the market.”

The hegemonic system was, however, a mere social construct and as such, open to challenge. After his own conversations with local Aboriginals revealed that behind the appearance of a contented labour force, the pastoral workers were aware of the fundamental social injustices to which they had fallen victim. McLeod began to question his own society's notion of normality in the Pilbara. He recalled that they asked him “what could they do to get out of the mess they were in”. They elaborated,

"We can’t leave our work, we are tied here, we don’t get any wages for what we are doing, and we can’t leave. If we run away the policeman brings us back. This is our country and yet we’ve got to work here for this bloke, how did this come about?"

Lawyer Nicholas Hasluck summarised the “mess.” He described administration in the Pilbara before World War Two as a “severe, paternalistic regime in which it was normal for Aboriginal workers to receive no payment other than rations of food and clothing.” McLeod determined to understand why and to report his finding to the Lawmen. On a business trip to

---

185 Personal communication with pastoral workers, 1968.
186 McLeod, Donald William versus Richards, George Ronald (Canberra: National Archives of Australia) A10078, 1946/13 Part 1, Exhibit “D”. See also Louis Warren, “Pilbara strike”, in Historical Encyclopedia of Western Australia, 693-694.
189 Chris Jeffery interview with Donald William McLeod. Victoria Haskins and Anne Scrimgeour confirm their protest about police powers to inhibit them moving around freely, see Haskins and Scrimgeour, “Strike Strike, We Strike”, 91.
190 Nicholas Hasluck was a lawyer in the Pilbara Aboriginal Legal Aid Service and a judge on the Supreme Court of Western Australia.
Perth, he investigated government correspondence going back to the 1889 negotiations with the British Crown regarding a Constitution to give Western Australia sovereignty. He discovered the original British intention to protect Aboriginal people through insertion of a clause, Section 70. It stated that the British would control a set amount of the Western Australian annual revenue for their education and welfare. When McLeod tracked the negotiations that saw Section 70 repealed, he believed he could solve the Lawmen's quandary. “From then on, of course”, he told a colleague, “I was committed.” It was the moment he changed his allegiance from working for his own prosperity to working to obtain justice for the Aboriginal pastoral workers of the Pilbara. He returned to the Pilbara and when invited, presented his finding to the Lawmen.

Conversations between McLeod and the Lawmen led to further meetings with Aboriginal leaders, held in secret to avoid McLeod being arrested under Section 36 of the Native Administration Act, 1936. He and the leaders planned to redress the injustice they had endured for generations. They would strike. They set the date as May 1st, 1946 and began planning. They appointed McLeod to be their representative in the Western domain and instructed him to restore Section 70 in the constitution.

The Strike

The strikers' leaders directed their people living on more than twenty sheep and cattle pastoral stations in the Pilbara. In what Haskins and Scrimgeour define as a “series of strikes”, between 1946 and 1946 two or three hundred workers left the stations. According to Bob Boughton

---

192 Analyses of Section 70 by lawyers and historians and McLeod’s efforts to have its repeal overturned have been increasing since 1981, see R.J.T. Butler, The Significance of Section 70 of the 1889 Constitution Act for Western Australian Aborigines, unpublished UWA Social Science Project (University of Western Australia, 1981). See also a special edition of Studies in Western Australian History 30 (2016) with articles on S.70 – many of these articles reference work by others.

193 McLeod conversation with Stan Davey, Port Hedland, 1969, in possession of author.

194 McLeod, How the West was Lost, 38.

195 Descendants of the strikers stated “In the Pilbara it was common practise to forcibly retain Aboriginal people on pastoral stations to be used as slave labour. This practise continued until 1946 when a mass walk off the stations by Pilbara Aboriginal people occurred.” Wangka Maya Pilbara Aboriginal Language Centre, wangkamaya.org.au (accessed 10/02/2018). Scrimgeour specifies the objectives of the strike as being not only for better wage and conditions but "control over their lives", see Anne Scrimgeour, “Leprosy, labour and the ‘low-wage line’", History Australia 9, no. 3 (2012): 109. The story of the strike is told in a film by some of the original strikers, see David Noakes, and Heather Williams, How the West was Lost: The story of the 1946 Aboriginal Pastoral Workers’ Strike, (Ronin Films, 1987).


their struggle “earned them a place in Australian labour history, for mounting the country’s longest continuous strike.” At the time McLeod was the only member of the dominant Pilbara society who actively aligned himself with their cause. Once the strike began to disrupt the profitable Pilbara pastoral industry, he became a target. He had briefly joined the Communist Party and was a suspected communist subversive who had “caused quite a lot of unrest amongst the natives.” As stated in a drama production about the strike, “McLeod’s beliefs … tap into deep anti-Communist sentiment that runs through much of Australian politics after World War II and into the Cold War era.” But McLeod’s association with the Party was not the cause of the strike.

The Pilbara strike that began in 1946 became, according to Anne Scrimgeour, a movement to achieve their autonomy from the dominant society. Initially the Pilbara pastoral workers needed a member of white society to help them interpret its cultural mores and laws, and campaign in the lingua franca of the state, English. Once they had successfully withdrawn their labour from the stations they could have dispensed with his services. Instead, they co-opted him for ongoing advice on managing economic enterprises as the key to their ability to remain financially self-sufficient.

**Insider or Outsider?**

The Lawmen’s appointment of McLeod allowed him to view himself as an insider to their plan. Anthropologist Ghassan Hage defined an insider as a person who feels they can identify with a group, one who can say “we” when an outsider cannot. McLeod maintained he was an insider. Twice the group split over this perception, rejecting him and his intransigence over how to achieve their intended outcome of self-sufficiency. The breakaway strikers’ groups created new organisations without McLeod, and both accepted assistance from white people so long as it was not McLeod. The first split followed a meeting during which the philosophy of independence was discussed. Some leaders favoured seeking integration with the broader
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community, McLeod insisted on remaining separate, and his intransigence polarised the movement.203 Those who were in accord with McLeod's interpretation of independence stayed with him, and those who disagreed formed their own group with Lawmen Ernie Mitchell and Peter Coppin. The second split occurred in 1983. The Manyjilyjarra people were not happy with McLeod. The authority that the Lawmen gave him in 1942 no longer applied to them, they said, and they formed an independent group.204 As he got older, those who stayed with him acknowledged his "increasing crankiness.” Nevertheless, reported Office of Aboriginal Affairs officer Ted Egan, they were "extremely loyal to him, he is their 'spokesman'." Lawman Jacob Oberdoo told Egan, "When everybody else was trying to starve us and smash us, that’s the only man who stayed with us."205 After a group became dissatisfied with McLeod’s philosophy and behaviour, Lawman Minyjunun said he had always stuck by him. McLeod "has always stuck by us," he told the group. "We’re going to stay with him, he got the stations for us. Well go if you must; we’re going to stay here… Mirta (McLeod) brought all us marrngu (Aboriginal people) together and we’re going to stick with his word,"206

In the 1970s McLeod was still available as an intermediary in disputes with settler institutions, as Yinhawangka member Doris Cooke reports. Cooke remembered being terrified of a hostel manager when she was a child, and informing her parents, who “told the old McLeod.” She thinks he took some action because she was removed from the hostel.207 Attwood and Markus acknowledge the value of non-Aboriginal supporters of Aboriginal struggles for their rights but note that the records they create can overshadow Aboriginal voices. In documenting the history of these struggles, they therefore chose to focus on “Aboriginal perspectives and agency” at the risk of marginalising the non-Aboriginal activists' contributions.208 Historian Richard Broome also selects, from the Aboriginal perspective, stories of Aboriginal protests and campaigns to survive colonisation. He comments that the Pilbara strikers invited the white man McLeod to attend the meeting during which the strike was planned.209 Aboriginal activist Oodgeroo Noonuccal (Kath Walker) made another point about the participation of non-Aboriginal activists. “White 'good-will' is a shaky foundation on which to build”, she wrote, “for

203 John Wilson, “Authority and Leadership”, 387.
205 E.J. Egan, Office of Aboriginal Affairs, to Director, "McLeod Group: Port Hedland Area, WA"; National Archives of Australia, Nomads Ltd with McLeod, NAA: A2354, 1970/296 item 73.
they can withdraw the good-will." 210  In her study of the Federal organisation based on collaboration between non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal people for an Aboriginal cause, historian Sue Taffe demonstrates that the opposite can happen. The coalition that successfully founded an organisation and functioned effectively for 22 years was split when Black Power became an important ideology and black people asked white people to leave. 211  The Pilbara strikers, on the other hand, continued to utilise McLeod’s business expertise as they progressed their plans to retain the independence they had gained through the strike. Their immediate need was for income producing activities and as Attwood recorded, the cooperatives that they later worked with had been “organised by a former Communist, Don McLeod.” 212

In studying the motives of non-Aboriginal activists in Aboriginal campaigns, Attwood suggests that many were “passionately committed to the fight against racism.” Others held political, social or religious principles of which they were not conscious. 213  McLeod belonged in Attwood’s passionate category. McLeod stated his motive as being justice for the Pilbara Aboriginal people whom he regarded as “slaves.” This was a word used by Katharine Susannah Prichard when she and other humanitarians formed a committee to support the strikers. 214  In fact, Prichard used this contentious term in a handout she wrote entitled, “Are Aboriginal workers slaves?” 215  McLeod, changed by the teachings of the Aboriginal Lawmen, now interpreted his society through their eyes. What he saw appalled him. When given an opportunity to overcome the constraints imposed upon them, they determined, he said, to “gain control of their estate.” 216  He saw that in the northwest the state had a mandate called “protection,” 217  which implied protection of the Aboriginal people but was, in reality, protection of the pastoral industry. From the pastoral workers’ perspective instead of “protection,” McLeod asserted one should read “enslavement” and this assessment informed his developing philosophy. 218  Once McLeod became committed to the pastoral workers’ claim for justice, the only means he had to assist them were his experiences as a miner, prospector and small businessman. I select three of his actions to investigate the skills and attitudes upon which he drew: his creation of a tool for the pastoral workers to use in organising their strike,
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opportunities he opened for the Aboriginal voice, so long suppressed, to be heard in the public sphere, and his appropriation of a Western business model through which the pastoral workers could gain their civil rights.

**McLeod’s Methods**

*An Organisational Tool*

McLeod was pivotal to the pastoral workers’ capacity to organise, inventing a communication device to overcome multiple difficulties. Binbin and he were out in the bush in 1946 discussing how the leaders could advise the families of their decision to strike. Senior Lawmen had appointed two of their leaders to reach all the families on the 22 pastoral stations on which their people worked. Senior Lawmen chose Dooley Binbin and Clancy McKenna. Dooley was a desert man and had authority amongst the desert people. Clancy McKenna was the other man selected, he was a coastal man, and similarly had authority amongst his people. They were to take their word about the strike to each of their family groups but were challenged to find a method that families could use to identify 1st May, the date chosen to start the strike. The date was symbolic, being International Workers’ Day, but also significantly the date on which the profitable shearing season began. Yet dates were a Western creation and likely to be meaningless to many of the families working on the stations, most of whom communicated orally or by sign language and had not been taught to read and write English. Yet for the strike to gain maximum effectiveness, it was imperative that they act in solidarity at the same time. As McLeod told his colleague, “this would put the Australian blackfellows right at the forefront of all the struggles of the working-class peoples of the world, shoulder to shoulder.” He added that this was dangerous business for himself, “Because any man that pokes his nose into what the squatters are doing to the blackfellows was looking for trouble.”

Despite this concern for his safety, McLeod attempted to create a tool that could be used by the Aboriginals in the place of the traditional Gregorian calendar. He imagined a device that was pictorial and accurate. He drew a prototype calendar showing each day in the month of April. Each day was represented by a square with a red ring around the first of May. A family member could mark a box each time the sun went down and when the box with the red ring was the last one, it was time to leave. John Wilson reported that a storekeeper copied it for
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This calendar enabled the families to act in unison. But it also had to meet another criterion: the device had to be, as far as possible, undetectable by those in authority. For if it could be intercepted by pastoralists and departmental officers or police, and withdrawn from circulation, as a communication tool it would fail. With it would go the intention to coordinate the strike on the one day. Such concealment was impossible to safeguard. One of the leaders, Billy Moses-Martin, was taking the calendars around to his people on the stations, and the police, he said, knew something was going on but not know what it was. They were searching Aboriginal people for clues. The one safe place Billy could keep the calendars that he was circulating was in the toe of his “filthy, sockless sandshoe” which, he said, was so odious that the cops would not possibly look in there. Binbin used the same strategy. Police did, however, acquire some calendars and learnt that the Aboriginals were attempting a co-ordinated strike.

Although McLeod’s role in organising the strike was discreet, it had a considerable impact on him for the authorities held him responsible. Evidence for this was contradictory. In a court case to determine a charge against McLeod for persuading Aboriginal workers to leave their employment, Aboriginal witnesses gave two different accounts. Doogiebee Nick said that “we told strike by Dooley”. Dooley said that “McLeod first fellow come around blackfellow talk to him properly and so we all follow him”. Clancy reported, “We told him we go on strike and he to do it for them”. Reggie claimed, “McLeod and Clancy told me to strike”. The storeman, Kenneth Duncan, confirmed that McLeod had drawn the map (calendar). McLeod agreed that he “suggested the date all sit down until demand is met”. Ronnie Captain added that “boys had made up minds long time go on strike”. These quotations were recorded in the transcript of the court proceedings. They reveal an unintended consequence of arresting McLeod. Because his network of supporters for the strikers engaged a lawyer who called some strikers as witnesses, the Aboriginal voice was expressed in public. This breached the practice of Protectors speaking for the Aboriginal people who were facing a charge, thereby silencing them. Now they spoke for themselves.
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McLeod had committed a major offence: he had challenged the government’s control over Aboriginal people in the Pilbara. The premise of this authority in 1946 was based on nineteenth century descriptions of the “natives” as childlike. In a different court case, it was stated that “it is well known that the native is childlike and easily prevailed on.”

In this model the “natives” were incapable of autonomy and their welfare and happiness could only be achieved by government management. This view had prevailed; Government and pastoral station personnel could therefore not believe that “their natives” could organise a strike; the operative had to be McLeod, the Communist troublemaker. Douglas Jordan concluded that McLeod’s membership of the Communist Party “became a focal point of the attack on him and the aims of the strike.”

Antagonism towards McLeod arose not only because he had interfered with the “squatters’ natives” but also because his motive was attributed to Communism. Several threats were made against him. McLeod recalled an incident in 1946 where a publican believed he had a reason to “blow my head off with a 303 [rifle].” A journalist reported that “he is ostracised by most white people there. Some have threatened him with violence if he approaches their homesteads.”

McLeod told colleague Roy Ockendon that he had “grossly underestimated the savagery and persistence of the opposition of the white population, particularly the squatters and the West Australian government and its officers.” Barrister Steven Churches learned that McLeod was “once the most hated man in Western Australia.”

McLeod’s introduction of a seemingly-innocuous “calendar” as an organising tool was a political act and he accepted the consequences. Since childhood he had “rebêlted against authority structures,” and as a young man had walked off the job when he felt he was being
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exploited. He was hardened by those experiences. Then, his defiance was against injustice concerning himself, now it was injustice concerning those with whom he now identified, the Aboriginal pastoral workers.

Aboriginal Voices Heard in Public

To contain the strike, a government strategy focussed on arresting the “ringleaders,” Clancy McKenna, Dooley Binbin and Don McLeod. Detective Sergeant Ron Richards was sent to Port Hedland “to conduct inquiries on behalf of the Police Department.” In his first arrest in 1946, Constable Fletcher charged Clancy McKenna under Section 47 of the Native Administration Act 1905-1936 for persuading natives to leave their employment “on or about 10/3/46.” Richards then arrested Dooley on May 16, 1946 in Marble Bar for the same offence. The objective was, however, to arrest McLeod. Detective Sergeant Richards would eventually do so on May 16, 1946 when he charged McLeod under the same section of the Act for the same offence that Clancy and Dooley committed. In addition, under Section 39, Richards charged McLeod for counselling Clancy and Dooley “to persuade natives employed in the Pilbara [sic] District that on the 1st day of May 1946 they were to leave their lawful service without the consent of a Protector of Natives.” He was remanded until 21 June with bail set at $200 pounds.
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News of such an arrest would normally be confined to Port Hedland, however McLeod found a way to inform some humanitarians in Perth. Although he was held in the Port Hedland Police Lock-Up, he was able to contact the Committee for the Defence of Native Rights (CDNR) of these arrests. He sent a letter delivered by the secret services of the Aboriginal network, Tommy Nunganunga. Nunganunga was working as the Police boy but was part of the strikers' movement and collected McLeod’s mail, thus sabotaging any intention the police may have had to keep McLeod incommunicado and thus reduce his influence. McLeod began his letter, “Although I had no misgivings that ultimately freedom-loving people would actively take up the very just cause of native workers, it is heartening to have news of your timely intervention.” The Workers Star printed it on the front page under the heading “He Writes from Jail.” The CDNR engaged solicitor Fred Curran to defend McKenna, Binbin and McLeod.

In court, Aboriginal defendants were customarily represented by a Departmental official, a Protector, who could also be a policeman and as such the arresting officer. The nature of this relationship, resultantly, was one with an unusually large power distance between the defendant and Protector, which often denied the Aboriginal plaintiff or witness an opportunity to tell their story. Engaging a lawyer to defend the Aboriginal strikers and McLeod changed the way information about the strike and conditions for the pastoral workers was managed. It brought the court proceedings into the Western Australian press. More importantly, it brought the Aboriginal voice into the court room. The court was obliged to listen to them speak for themselves, and to record their words. In the Port Hedland Court of Petty Sessions on June 20 and 21, 1946, Curran called six Aboriginal witnesses. According to the Magistrate’s notes, Dooley detailed his actions to organise the strike and named those to whom he “gave him word to strike 1st May.” “Don McLeod first fellow come round blackfellow talk to him properly and so we follow him.” Stories of their poor conditions were revealed. Jackson maintained that he did station work, “slept in creek, no blankets”. Roy McKay stated, “we wanted McLeod be Protector so he could help us … sleep in river, no lavs, [sic] have two blankets each man, we
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Pay twenty-five shillings each for a new blanket, no mosquito nets, no houses.” Paddy Northover said “camped river, no sanitary conveniences, no mosquito nets or ground sheets, more wages, better treatment – housing.” Clancy confirmed that the strike was being orchestrated by his own people: “I took job on myself – he did not ask me to do it – I did it.” 

250 Clancy listed some stations that did not provide facilities. 

251 Police were called as witnesses and denied the Aboriginal statements about poor conditions. These witness statements opened the chasm of misunderstanding and different experiences between the protected and their protectors.

The Magistrate found “All charges were proved.” On 21 June, McLeod was found guilty and fined $50 plus costs of $46/16/6d. Paradoxically, the court system had become a platform for the strikers to speak their own voice, to learn that they had rights to express their views. John Wilson affirmed that marngu were impressed when McLeod provided a lawyer to present their case. They were convinced of McLeod’s sincerity when he went to prison for them. Secretary of the CDNR, Padre Hodge, then travelled to Port Hedland to meet the strikers and see their situation for himself. He arrived on August 13, 1946 and McLeod drove him to the strikers’ camp. Constable Needle followed them and arrested them both for being “within five chains of a group of natives.” Dr Jolly, president of the CDNR, told the Workers Star that convicting McLeod “has no moral justification.” Section 39 was, he claimed, “originally formed to protect natives from immoral white men, and to prevent the sale of liquor to natives, and has been distorted to serve the ends of the reactionary squatters.” McLeod was held in

250 Clancy listed some of his grievances: natives not sat. [satisfied] with condition, they being beat for money taken from wages. They wanted him rep, then see they got justice. We told him we go on strike and he to do it for them. He advised against it as war on and wool wanted. We wanted him [McLeod] as Protector. … I was at camp when Fletcher came, … sd [said] wd [would] all be forced to desert to eat lizards.” The magistrate took notes in his own shorthand. "sd" meant "said", "wd" meant "would".

251 By “facilities”, the witnesses meant “no conveniences for natives, they sleep in river”. Kitchener also stated “We wanted him (McLeod) to be made Ptr [Protector] to help us as we not getting fair treatment … I sleep in river, no lavs – mosquito nets – no house”.

252 Solicitor Curran’s strongest argument was that the term “leaving” did not apply to men on strike as striking was not severing or terminating employment. However, in the Port Hedland Court of Petty Sessions on 20 and 21 June 1946, Resident Magistrate Maurice Harwood found McLeod found guilty on all charges. On the first charge, for counselling Dooley, he was fined £10 + £15.12.2 costs, in default 45 days’ hard labour. On the second charge, for counselling Clancy, he was fined £20 + £15.12.2 costs, in default 105 days’ hard labour (third or subsequent offence), and on the third charge, for attempting to persuade natives to leave their employment, he was charged £20 + £15.12.2 costs, default 105 days” imprisonment cumulative. Clancy and Dooley were also convicted but later released.


254 “Marngu” is the Aboriginal people’s Nyangumarta language word for themselves, who were of the full Aboriginal descent.


256 Section 39 of the Native Administration Act 1905-1936.
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custody for two weeks; upon being found guilty he was given a sentence of three months.  

The CDNR engaged Curran to defend Hodge and McLeod.

In the case against both men, Hodge was tried first. Hodge lost and finally appealed to the High Court of Australia where the Justices made a judgment on March 4, 1947 to quash the conviction. Members of the CDNR perceived this as "their victory." McLeod also appealed to the Supreme Court against the JPs’ decision. On March 27, 1947, Mr Justice Walker upheld his appeal as his circumstances were the same as Hodge’s successful appeal in the Full High Court. Section 39 was now “almost unenforceable.” McLeod was now free to associate with his Aboriginal colleagues. Later, the leaders adopted McLeod’s methods of using the courts to change the law, for “Mitchell and Coppin were not afraid to use the whitefellas’ legal system to fight for their rights. They had seen how it worked and witnessed success early in the strike days.”

Anne Scrimgeour demonstrates how, during the strikers’ campaign in 1957 to break an unjust law in which they employed a solicitor to act for them, the leaders could confidently use the courts to their advantage. When police informed them they would be prosecuted unless they ceased their activities, it was “a prospect welcomed by the group as a means of testing the legislation in court.”

By allowing himself to be arrested, and bringing Aboriginal witnesses into the court system, McLeod had used his defiance against authority to transform the practice of denying the Aboriginal their voice in the Western sphere, and to gain one small act of justice for them. McLeod later generated another method for the people to gain their civil rights: a registered company.

Companies

While working in private enterprise McLeod exhibited an entrepreneurial spirit. When he considered the strikers’ objective to retain the freedom they had gained by striking, he understood they needed an income sufficient to feed and clothe a large number of families.
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One type of work was alluvial mining, at which many individuals were already proficient. However sales of the minerals thus gained needed to be organised efficiently to maximise the workers' efforts. A different strategy was needed, and by 1951 McLeod was able to realise an idea he had introduced in 1948: a company "to handle the Group's business operations." He established a company on the strikers' behalf. It was named Northern Development & Mining Company Pty Ltd (NODAM) and was incorporated on November 19, 1951. NODAM was owned and managed by the strikers and its purpose, said McLeod, was "economic freedom. Through it they could exercise their civil rights. It meant freedom from slavery." McLeod claimed NODAM was "the first private company registered by the Beneficial Owners of Western Australia". Within a year about 600 strikers were working within this company.

A legal entity would give authority to the blackfellows and be a formidable power in the hands of people rendered helpless by Departmental controls. McLeod explained to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, WC Wentworth, that NODAM was

Registered as a company since a company, being an artificial individual, could do anything any citizen can do except vote in elections and be converted to a religious faith. That is to say in this way we got around all the restrictive legislation then on the statute books discriminating against Blackfellows.

It would contribute to the ideal he espoused, portrayed by Scrimgeour "that Aboriginal people were capable of running their own affairs and determining their own future." McLeod’s work was admired by outsiders. A newspaper journalist reported in 1951 that McLeod "an expert miner", was organising the “natives” to prospect for wolfram, scheelite, columbite, tantalite and tin that he sold on their behalf. They already had £6,000 in their bank, and about 200 people
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had a “new and better standard of living.” McLeod later affirmed “That's how we got our civil rights, otherwise we would have never been able to operate.”

Social scientist Charles Rowley was impressed with the concept of corporate bodies for Indigenous people. He theorised that they could provide a “carapace which the Aboriginal social group has always lacked, the protective shell within which … adjustments to change … may be worked out.” McLeod’s proposition went further than the idea of a carapace; it was a major step towards transferring concrete power to the powerless. He explained his thinking to Jessie Street. Until November 1951, the people were working in what may be called a collective partnership unregistered, known as the North West Workers Co-operative, and in his name. This transition into a registered company gave those previously known as The Group, an official identity. In the early days of NODAM’s operation, it needed to employ their own people in the mining industry. The company successfully applied for a Permit and the Department issued General Permit Number 6368. Commissioner Middleton was impressed with NODAM. He noted “This native company is unique in Western Australian native history and its proper development is being encouraged by this Department. There are about 500 natives connected with it.” A Patrol Report by F.E. Gare declared that McLeod had overcome many problems and his ultimate success was undoubted. Furthermore, he wrote “his achievements over the past few years have been remarkable, when it is considered what opposition he encountered.”

The strikers were managing alluvial mining with picks, shovels and crowbars; it was slow work. When an Adelaide company, Western Wolfram, began expanding their operations, NODAM entered into an agreement with them in 1952 whereby NODAM supplied the labour and the larger company supplied mechanical equipment. NODAM had a policy that instead of paying themselves wages they would establish a cooperative fund to receive their earnings. From this fund, through the company, they leased the sheep stations Meentheena and Riverdale.

---

274 McLeod to Ken Liberman, pers. comm. 2015.
276 Jessie Street was a campaigner for women’s and Aboriginal people’s rights, see Heather Radi, “Street, Jessie Mary (1889-1970)”, Australian Dictionary of Biography, accessed online 30 May 2016.
277 McLeod to Jessie Street, National Library of Australia, Street papers, MS2683/10/70, 6. Confirmed in “memorandum Pindan Pty. Ltd. and Donald William McLeod”, 10 May 1955, State Records Office of Western Australia, Pindan, Acc. 2782, item 1959/0049.
278 Confirmed in copy of letter Middleton to Western Wolfram, Adelaide, 5 February 1952. The Commissioner wrote “This native Company is unique in Western Australian Native history, and its proper development is being encouraged by this Department”. Donated by Atkinson.
279 Middleton to Western Wolfram, 5 February 1952, State Records Office of Western Australia, Acc. 3390, item 1952/830 vol. 1.
280 F.E. Gare copy of extract on “Native situation”, no. 2/1951-52, Department of Native Affairs, State Records Office of Western Australia, 3390/1952/830 vol. 1.
These acquisitions were to fulfil one of the Lawmen’s instructions to McLeod to “secure a tract of land in the Pilbara and to bring this land back to its original state with the use of modern technology so that 8,000 desert people could be settled there.”281 This action to reclaim their land pre-dated the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1976* by thirty-four years; it is also noteworthy because the Lawmen were not waiting for government approval or funding. In 1952 the strikers used the money they earned through their mining to buy the pastoral station Yandeyarra, plus machinery.282 The group paid £6,500 of the £9,000 purchase price for 433,933 acres of Yandeyarra.283 Title to the property was in McLeod’s name to overcome the legal restriction, as Aboriginal people were unable to obtain leasehold properties. All other assets of the group were held by NODAM.284

The Western Australian Cabinet decided to investigate McLeod.285 After interviewing and taking written submissions from a wide range of pastoralists, policemen, Departmental officers and miners, McDonald and Bateman reported to Parliament. They observed that “a group of this kind of this magnitude is a new development in the history of our native population.”286 In their summaries McDonald and Bateman reported that in March 1952 the company comprised 663 native men, women and children, their earnings and organisation.287 The group had, they noted,

> prejudicially affected the supply of native labour in the pastoral industry in the Pilbara district’ and it would be in the interests of the District and of the natives themselves if a more balanced distribution of native labour between the pastoral industry and the mining industry could be effected.288

In a recent study of the growth of an Indigenous bourgeoisie, NODAM is presented as “an exemplar of the early commercial activities by indigenes.”289 McLeod’s childhood rebellion

---

283 433,933 acres are the equivalent of 175,606 hectares.
284 John Wilson, “Authority and Leadership”, 81.
285 On January 24, 1952 the Premier authorised magistrates McDonald, QC and Bateman, RM to form a “Committee of Inquiry into Activities of D.W. McLeod and Associates re interests of natives working under his direction.” Report by Sir Ross McDonald QC and FEA Bateman RM, 12 August 1952, Mines Department 1952/0831 vol. 2, 1. State Archives of Western Australia, Mines Department, 3593/66.
286 McDonald and Bateman to the Premier, Report 12 August 1952, Mines Department 1952/0831 vol. 2, 2.
against authority became an asset to the strikers when he refused to accept the state restrictions on their civil rights. His philosophy to provide a simple service freely given, to his own kind in times of need, stimulated him to appropriate systems in the modern economy for the Aboriginal strikers’ political as well as economic benefit.

**Conclusion**

McLeod’s childhood and early adulthood experiences developed his characteristic of defiance against authority. When confronted with the injustices perpetrated by the state against the Pilbara Aboriginal pastoral workers, he had the fortitude to oppose it. His natural gifts of endurance, demonstrated as young as four years old, were developed in the outdoor work he undertook, and when his adversaries placed him in danger or threatening places such as jail, he had the strength to resist their intention to intimidate and undermine him. These attributes were useful to the Aboriginal strikers when they initially planned strategies to wrest their liberty from the controls of the state. His youthful need to create his own income-earning opportunities fostered an entrepreneurial spirit that was also an advantage to the strikers. He could generate unusual ideas to meet extraordinary challenges, such as creating an organising tool for people with no access to normal communication devices or establishing a registered company to bypass legislation restricting Aboriginal people’s private enterprise. His personality and philosophy afforded him physical and mental vigour that toughened him; he would not give in. Like the Pilbara rocks, he was hard; the forces of colonial culture and the self-interest of the pastoralists could not crack him. It made him a formidable fighter for the strikers’ struggle for justice and pivotal to the changed Pilbara social, political and economic culture that they secured.
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Planting Empire, Cultivating Subjects: British Malaya, 1786-1941

Lynn Hollen Lees
Cambridge University Press, 2017; eBook; 374 pages; RRP USD$96; ISBN 9781108547963

The initial inspiration for Lees' book stems from the most surprising of places: a trove of British Malayan documents tucked away in a Philadelphia archive, some 9000 miles away from their original source. In discovering these materials and realising their potential to recount the story of British Malaya's colonial history through a complex network of perspectives, Lees' efforts to uncover these different voices have resulted in a fascinating, eminently readable social history of the region. At its heart, Planting Empire interrogates how different communities in Malayan towns and plantations experienced British rule, from 1786 to 1941. Empire, Lees argues, was moulded by communities and structures both social and political, all brought together in a transnational web of interactions. The book therefore attempts to interrogate the many threads that form this web by revealing the perspectives of indentured labourers, townspeople, administrators, merchants, planters and so on. By demonstrating the permeability of colonial spaces and how different actors moved between, or inside them, the book makes for a compelling investigation into how the colonial experience was never a wholly homogenous one.

Given the tendency for social histories of British Malaya to study ethnic experiences in relative isolation, Lees' contribution to the current corpus is welcome indeed. European, Chinese, Indian, and Malay communities under British rule have been examined in great detail by a number of scholars, but thus far, there has no real attempt to gather these different experiences into a coherent narrative. The inclusion of both town and plantation settings also intervenes into present historiographies which have trended towards strictly urban or rural histories, while interrogations into civil establishments alongside social ones and personal experience offers yet another synthesis of areas. In drawing its material from a variety of different places and perspectives, Planting Empire sits comfortably within a number of intellectual crossroads.

To achieve this, Lees has utilised an extensive range of primary sources which include archival materials, newspapers, photographs, and material objects, the combination of which allows
for a richer, more immersive text. Encountering these reconstructed landscapes, readers gain a richer sense of these places and their peoples: the cacophony of a town centre, for instance, or the cheerful conversations held within social clubs. The inclusion of oral interviews in the second half of the book, in particular, is a valuable addition to current works on British Malaya, as actual voices are given the opportunity to speak into their own histories.

Chapters have been divided into two broad temporal sections. Part 1: The Nineteenth Century is on the formation of the plantation industry and the birth of urban centres, while Part 2: The Twentieth Century investigates the maturing of these spaces and the communities within them, with a larger focus being placed on towns.

The first two chapters deal specifically with plantations. Here, we begin to uncover the interconnected layers of British administration, Asian mediators, European planters, and immigrant workers who helped create a thriving agrarian economy. However, these layers often had elements of tension between them. Possession and control are the two main themes which Lees explores in physical, legislative, spatial, and cultural terms. Of note is the inclusion of women and families into discussions of plantation labour – a space predominantly seen as masculine.

The third and fourth chapters examine the spread of urban development across Western Malaya, with a focus on how physical and institutional establishments affected social interactions. Whilst it has long been known that British administration overlaid pre-existing structures of political control, Lees’ investigations into the socioeconomic elements of the latter and how they affected different communities makes for a fresh approach. Another useful contribution can also found in discussions on colonial subjecthood as a learnt identity, an area of study in which British Malaya has yet to be properly integrated.

The second half of the book opens with an examination of how the rubber industry affected different swathes of society, the racial inequalities of plantation labour being starkly juxtaposed with the issues of urban cosmopolitanism in the proceeding chapter. In Chapter Six, readers gain an in-depth look into the social life of multicultural towns from the 1920s to the 1930s, this being explored through discussions on the role of literacy and language, clubs and associations, and conceptions of ‘modernity’.

Lees uses the final two chapters to unpack the symbiotic relationships that existed between the surface layers of colonial management and the underlayers of indirect control perpetuated by clans, communities, and societies. Different populations moved fluidly between each as they managed multiple allegiances under colonial rule. This in turn provides a smooth transition into discussions surrounding colonial subjecthood, and how colonial identities were set within broader, transnational contexts. To close, the spread of anti-colonial sentiments
during the 1930s are also appraised alongside their influences, this leading up to the 1942 Japanese Occupation.

*Planting Empire* achieves its goal of telling the stories of different peoples living under Empire with much grace, meticulous research, and few unnecessary frills. Lees’ writing and treatment of her subjects indicate that she cares deeply about not only having these stories told, but told well, resulting in an accessible tome written in clear, lively language that will easily find appeal outside academic circles. In attempting to have all these voices speak at once the book does however run into the issue of certain sections feeling oversaturated, as the narrative flits from one perspective to the next in quick succession. Readers barely have time to get acquainted with the subject before another is introduced, leaving us to feel that there is still much more to be explored. This is a great pity given the wealth of material that Lees has at her disposal, but in the face of corralling so many aspects of society all at once, it is inevitable that some detail has to be given up in favour of a book under a thousand pages long.

Similarly, in attempting to cover so many different aspects of a colonial space, some areas such as the role of clubs and societies are returned to multiple times across separate chapters, and this repetition leads to the narrative being more scattered than it should be. Of course, within a project of this scope it can be difficult to balance thematic and temporal groupings. Slightly tighter internal section structures might have helped alleviate this, but overall, this detracts little from the content and reading experience. At times, the constant movement between areas even manages to structurally capture the overarching theme of permeability between colonial spaces. Ultimately, these are small critiques in the face of what is an ambitious and much-needed update to present social histories of the region. *Planting Empire* creates more space for human voices to be heard, these coming from all manners of places which have previously not been examined alongside each other. In marrying plantation stories with urban ones and questioning what it meant to be a colonial subject, Lees has managed to capture the messy multiculturalism that made British Malaya.

*Joanna W.C. Lee*

*Monash University*

Colin A. Hope, assisted by Bruce E. Parr.


This volume presents the corpus of blue-painted pottery from Kom Rabia, as part of the archaeological survey of the Memphite region, in Egypt. The volume is especially unique as the corpus from this site spans the duration of the manufacturing period of blue-painted pottery, from mid-Dynasty Eighteen until the middle of Dynasty Twenty. This makes the publication an excellent collection and volume for collaborative discussion and future analysis with other material of a similar nature. At the outset this highlights the importance of such publications, of which the EES Excavation Memoir series provides many examples for archaeologists, ceramists, historians, and more.

Associate Professor Hope was the Director of the Centre for Ancient Cultures at Monash University where he taught Egyptology until his recent retirement. Throughout his distinguished career he has been an authority on Egyptian ceramics, especially those of the New Kingdom, and more specifically blue-painted pottery. It is fitting that his previous experience with this type of material culture is drawn upon in this volume, stemming from his deep knowledge and experiences since 1973 when he began his study of blue-painted pottery at Malkata, and the early collections from sites such as Karnak North and Amarna. This enables the present volume a distinct flow and credence with its discussion of the evidence from Kom Rabia. This is also combined with recent research undertaken on the source of blue paint from Dakhleh and Kharga Oases for pigments, and the application post firing based on studies the author has been involved with through his role as a Principal Investigator of the Dakhleh Oasis Project.

The main aim of the volume is the documentation of the evolution of blue-painted pottery based on the analysis of decoration and forms for this ceramic type. Hope notes that the material from Kom Rabia, drawn from a controlled excavation area, provides material from both closed and disturbed contexts, to indicate the sequence of evolution, based on the decorative program used. The documentation of this material here is given a wider context through the comparison of material from other sites indicated above.

The introduction sets out the aim, the fabrics, and surface treatment categories applicable to the discussion in subsequent chapters and the appendix. This has been written in conjunction with Bourriau’s recent publication of New Kingdom pottery from Kom Rabia (2010), also part of the same series.
Chapter Two begins by setting out aspects of methodology applied to the analysis and interpretation of the decoration motifs of blue-painted pottery, which has is based on previous research and developed (Hope 1980) and evolved through the authors career. This approach has been applied to the material from Kom Rabia, which seems to confirm the original analysis of blue-painted pottery from Malkata and Amarna.

The analysis of decoration is separated into several parts including elements which comprise to form a motif. Motifs are then grouped into families (floral, faunal (with sub-family groupings), human and deities, hieroglyphic, and abstract). Further categorisation occurs with structure classes falls into three categories: simple, composite, and complex, which are used with motif groups to produce motif classes. The structure of motifs is discussed, with all of the analysis providing comprehensive details. The motifs are organised into panels with make-up the overall design on a vessel, with different design classes. This arrangement made by Hope provides an in-depth detailed analysis, unique at times for its easily accessible outlay, but easily applied elsewhere and adapted with future research. This is because Hope has established a reference system here for design classes to the technique of decoration for blue-painted pottery.

All of the fragments of blue-painted pottery analysed by Hope are presented within their find contexts, which is organised by a well-structured catalogue in Chapter Three. This material is arranged in a chronological framework for the duration of the production of this type of pottery. Importantly, Hope notes that any aesthetic appreciation of decoration is subjective, and as such, only basic observations are given in this volume. The author does rightly note that any distinct relationship between the vessel and shape and decoration may stem from the desire to emphasis and stimulate the structure representation of the motif of vessel shape.

Chapter Three also sets out the sequence of blue-painted pottery chronologically at Kom Rabia via Levels V upwards in the archaeological sequence to modern levels. Due to the fragmentary nature of the material, the corpus forms are not provided, and parallels are not frequently provided, as it was a difficult task to complete with the state of perseveration of the corpus. This is the largest chapter, setting-out the bulk of the data on blue-painted pottery from the site, and it is here that the comparative nature of the volume shines for possible future research.

The fourth chapter characterises the decoration by motifs and frequency of classes and sub-classes. This allows any determination of frequency use throughout the archaeological levels and sub-phases. It also allows Hope to compare the use of design classes and sub-classes found at the site with others listed above, and then to determine if the Kom Rabia corpus.
attests to a Memphite tradition for the manufacture of blue-painted pottery and to briefly discuss the functional value of the material.

Notably, this volume presents a comprehensive listing of decorative motifs from a wide range of sites, again helping, and hopefully prompting further analysis and discussion of ceramic research on Egyptian blue-painted pottery. Hope highlights that the volume and nature of comparative material is not uniform, nor are the social contexts of different sites, so results can be tentative. Hope also points out that due to the fragmented nature of the corpus from Kom Rabia makes any discussion of the morphological evolution of ceramic forms, and associated decoration very difficult to engage with. However, this type of publication means that future analysis and discussion can be undertaken, perhaps in conjunction with other corpora from different sites for a wider and holistic approach to the topic. Fortunately, the author has outlined similarities of the decorative motifs from other sites such as Amarna, Karnak North, Malkata, and Qantir.

This volume discusses ceramic theory, and importantly applies it well, providing a useful application for other corpora. Given the short discussion of the material, the volume is suitable for those setting out in Egyptological studies, with an interest in archaeology from Egypt or the ancient world, and specifically those focussing on ceramics. The layout of EEF volumes is such that they provide a well laid-out and accessible series, with a good flow and structure to any level of reader. The catalogue/appendix is easily accessible and well explained, providing further emphasis on why this volume will be useful to future comparative research.

Caleb R. Hamilton

Monash University
Prehistoric Pottery from Dakhleh Oasis, Egypt.

Ashten R. Warfe.

Oxbow, Dakhleh Oasis Project Monograph 18, 2017, 144 pages.


This volume presents the prehistoric ceramic corpus from Dakhleh Oasis, and is well aligned with a plethora of material currently being published from this region. Covering the period from the early and mid-Holocene, this volume uniquely provides and discusses one of the earliest bodies of material to be surveyed and excavated in this part of the Egyptian Western Desert. It is the result of the authors PhD research, completed through Monash University (2008), and is highly anticipated due to the important contribution it makes to understanding this period of occupation of the Western Desert, and specifically the Dakhleh Oasis by the Sheikh Muftah cultural unit, amongst other cultures. It is important to note that this volume is a shortened version of the authors PhD research, forming three chapters from the authors previous work, though now matched with new content to provide a description, classification, and also quantification of the early pottery from Dakhleh.

Warfe focuses on the fact that pottery is an essential part of the material culture that remains from the late prehistory in this part of Egypt, and Africa. Rightly so, Warfe uses this category to examine the long-term human development and occupation of the Dakhleh region. The material comes from 101 sites in this region, though a small amount of these were not registered with the Dakhleh Oasis survey. An important aspect of the ceramics analysed is the fact that they derive from settlement contexts, rather than burials, with the latter traditionally a strong source of analysed objects from Egypt. The author has associated the ceramics with hut circles, hearths, and lithic scatters, amongst other site types, which allows the data and conclusions from this volume to be used in future research to construct a more complete understanding of the Masara, Bashendi A and Bashendi B, as well as the various phases of Sheikh Muftah cultural development. Overall, this helps to present a more holistic understanding of these cultures during the Holocene towards the establishment of the Egyptian State in the Nile Valley, and its subsequent expansion towards the Dakhleh Oasis and the interaction between the later Egyptians and the Sheikh Muftah. This understanding of the different local cultural units, through the innovation in ceramic traditions, is also compared to other traditions in the desert region. Through this, the work of Mary McDonald and others more recently helps to situate the study by Warfe with other researchers and artefact categories.
A corpus of over 10,000 sherds was analysed by the author (as outlined in Chapters Two to Four), showing the depth of the examination and the importance of the conclusions that form Chapter Seven. The discussion allows for the establishment of a detailed cultural sequence, and Warfe has therefore been able to indicate stylistic variations between investigated sites and through the time period framing the study. The appendix provides a useful list of the 96 registered sites and five unregistered site collections from Dakhleh Oasis. Notably, the author has used this artefact category to provide useful comments on the social relations and economic capabilities of the inhabitants of the region across time. The short, though well-structured conclusion (Chapter Seven), provides thought-provoking comments on the study of ceramics from this region of Egypt, and helps to promote a better understanding of the early and mid-Holocene cultural units.

One of the more significant aspects of the discussion within this volume is the provenance of the ceramics, which helps to provide a better context of this corpus within archaeological research in northeast Africa. As the author notes, this allows future research a useful comparative and contrasting reference of ceramic material from the Western Desert. The technical detail of the volume makes it suitable for ceramicists, archaeologists focussing on northeast Africa, more specifically the Egyptian Western Desert, though early Egyptological studies as well. It is more appropriate for those well-trained and versed in these fields, and some students may find it accessible, for advanced studies. As part of the Dakhleh Oasis Project Monograph series, there are other useful volumes that may match the research in this present monograph, though an abundance of more recent articles also supports the research presented here.

_Caleb R. Hamilton_

_Monash University_
Amheida II: A Late Romano-Egyptian House in the Dakhla Oasis

Anna Lucille Boozer et al.,
New York University Press, 2015; 460 pages; 160 figures; 19 tables; RRP USD$55; ISBN 9781479880348

The study of life in Roman Egypt (30 BCE – AD 350) has long suffered from a dearth of reliable archaeological evidence, but this situation is beginning to change as the results of well-funded and large scale excavations are seeing publication. The volume under review is the second in a series of report/discussion monographs to come out of the Amheida Project mission, an ongoing multidisciplinary research project designed to understand the archaeological history of the settlement today called Amheida in Dakhleh Oasis in Egypt’s Western Desert.

The town of Amheida, in ancient times called Trimithis, is one of the chief sites of archaeological investigation in the Oasis. The focus of the present volume, House B2, was excavated between 2005 and 2007. The volume proposes to “…contribute[s] to the growing corpus of data on Romano-Egyptian daily life…” (Boozer et al. 2015, 17) by showcasing the results of the excavations through a series of chapters organised by reference to various elements of material culture, among them ceramics (Chapter 8), unfired clay objects (Chapter 9), figurines (Chapter 10), features of adornment (Chapter 11) and glass vessels (Chapter 12). These are preceded by an extensive description of the excavation history of the house (Chapter 4), the building techniques employed by the original inhabitants, insofar as that can be determined (Chapter 5). Other chapters present theoretical material and discussion relating to research methodologies (Chapter 3) and materiality (chapter 7).

While the core of the volume lies with those chapters concerned with either the excavation of the house itself or the various categories of material evidence which were extracted and noted, Boozer attempts to situate these data within an integrative framework which also draws on a range of abstract theoretical positions. For example, her discussion on architecture (Chapter 6) brings methods originally applied in the context of Pompeiiii to bear on the spatial analysis of room layout in the B2 house. This analysis serves as a jumping off point from which comparisons to other houses and domestic structures in Roman Egypt (and further afield) are made. Boozer draws useful contrasts with better known house types discovered in the Roman Fayum at Karanis, emphasising the ‘verticality’ of the spatial arrangement in these structures as opposed to the apparent ‘horizontal’ layout of House B2 (174-181). Boozer further speculates that such arrangements might provide additional evidence for the presence of vast spatio-temporal ‘architectural regions’ within the Roman empire, an idea originally supplied by Simon Ellisii. Such comparative work is useful,
although it is always valuable to ask about the extent to which limited amounts of material evidence (from one structure, no less) are sufficient for the examination of themes like this.

In the same discussion Boozer (175) writes, “The layout of House B2 is typical of what appears to be a local Dakhlan domestic architectural tradition…” The “domestic architectural tradition” such as it is, is known mostly from the excavations of the town of Kellis, situated some miles to the south-east of Amheida. Boozer’s analysis of this tradition from the Kellis excavations is subtle and is suggestive of a greater synthesis, but again it drives toward a broader conclusion, even when the evidence presented in the remainder of the volume is partial and incomplete. In the case of Amheida the settlement remains largely unexcavated, and only House B1 and B2 have been excavated and recorded in depth. The town of Kellis is more thoroughly exposed, but its excavators have been limited and cautious about the extent to which the archaeological picture of the town should be put in the service of grand synthesising narratives or theories. Boozer, too, is cognizant of this when she writes that “In an area of nascent study, such as Romano-Egyptian houses, we ought to remain mindful of the many comparative examples that have been lost to us…” (174)

The volume helpfully presents a wide series of fascinating results, and certainly succeeds in its ambition to further our archaeological knowledge of Roman Egypt. The ceramic, architectural, and numismatic data are presented and handled clearly, but the book suffers in its discussion sections from an overemphasis on theoretical considerations which the evidence is not yet comprehensive enough to come into contact with.

Benjamin Bassett

Monash University

---