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This article will explore how settler colonialism must be situated in studies of Islamophobia and racial violence through a case study of the Christchurch Massacre. On 15 March 2019 Australian gunman Brenton Tarrant entered two mosques in Christchurch, New Zealand and brutally killed 51 Muslims. Tarrant utilized the Internet to broadcast white violence and was met with support from white supremacist Internet users. I study the Christchurch Massacre through contexts of settler colonialism, both the settler colony of Aotearoa-New Zealand, as well as the settler colony of Australia, the nationality of the gunman, to highlight how the Christchurch Massacre is sustained through both white sovereigns. As investigated through Stuart Hall’s concept of the “ideological moment”, I purport that disregarding the settler colonial context of the Christchurch Massacre contributes to an “ideological moment” that fails to address Indigenous sovereignty and its nexus to targeting non-Indigenous and racialized Muslims. Drawing on theoretical frameworks in settler colonial and whiteness studies, I ask: how can we reconcile studying the Christchurch Massacre when Indigenous sovereignty is unreconciled? How can we settle Islamophobia in settler colonies?

I start this paper by acknowledging the Traditional Owners of the land on which I write, research and present my work today. I pay my respects to Elders, past, present and emerging, and acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders as the first people of Australia. They have never ceded sovereignty and remain strong in their enduring connection to land and culture.

As an Arab Muslim woman living on occupied, Aboriginal land, I acknowledge that white violence against racialized bodies in Australia and Aotearoa-New Zealand, among other settler colonies, reiterates the settler state. As such, in studying racial violence against Muslim bodies, I have sought to investigate how racial violence against non-Indigenous bodies reinforces the ferocity of the white sovereign. Therefore, I seek to stage this intervention to highlight “the everyday pervasive present-tense and presence of colonial power” that
should “command our political work and analytic attention.”¹ I sought to do so in my Master of Research dissertation at Macquarie University where I investigated settler colonialism as embodied in the Christchurch Massacre, in both Australia, through the nationality of Brenton Tarrant, a white supremacist who killed 51 Muslims, and Aotearoa-New Zealand, where the massacre had taken place at two mosques in Christchurch, New Zealand, both online and offline. I expanded on this with reference to the term I have coined – *digital settler colonialism*, a term that refers to the ways in which the Internet enacts and extends settler colonial violence that punishes Indigenous and non-Indigenous racialized bodies.² I direct my attention to systems that can reiterate the settler state – such as the Internet – rather than Internet users, investigating to what extent settler colonialism is built *into* the Internet.

In this paper I consider how offline structures suture violence against racialized bodies. I will examine the on-the-ground racial violence that exists and is mobilized through the settler state, as Ta-Nehsi Coates writes: “But all our phrasing – race relations, racial chasm, racial justice, racial profiling, white privilege, even white supremacy – serves to obscure that racism is a visceral experience, that it dislodges brains, blocks airways, rips muscle, extracts organs, cracks bones, breaks teeth...with great violence, upon the body.”³ This is a reality that must not be lost in studying the Christchurch Massacre, an event that I will reference to reiterate the importance of studying settler colonialism when investigating Islamophobia – the massacre was a visceral act of violence that was *felt*, blood was drawn, lives were mercilessly taken, final moments of life were terrorized. My research is dedicated to the lives lost, and that continue to be lost, through systems of white violence and settler colonialism, such as the Christchurch Massacre victims. Inadvertently, I write this paper as the second-year memorial anniversary of the Christchurch Massacre approaches. Not a day has gone by where the massacre has not at least crossed my mind. As the victims were murdered during prayer, it urges me to extend an Islamic prayer to honor the lives lost – *Allāhu yarhamuhu*.⁴

In the course of this paper, I will draw upon two incidents, one at a Muslim organized conference, and one at an academic led event on my university campus, to introduce the failure of incorporating the settler colonial realities of the Christchurch Massacre into its academic and community consideration in Australia. I draw on these experiences, inspired by Randa Abdel-Fattah’s urging of critical reflection on everyday interactions to encourage a more textured understanding of Islamophobia to “reveal small crevices of ambivalence and flux, moments of pause and suspension that unsettle and question – even if only for a fleeting moment – enduring and overwhelming narratives, ideologies and tools of racist biopolitics” that will contribute to evaluating Islamophobia through settler colonialism.⁵ The aim when doing so is to reiterate that racial justice cannot be met for non-Indigenous racialized subjects, such as Muslims, without situating white violence through the context of the settler state. In summary – the foundations of racial justice, both online and offline, are uneasy, with regard to Indigenous dispossession and upholding white sovereignty. As a result, how can we expect racial justice for those living on occupied land? How can we reconcile studying the Christchurch Massacre when Indigenous sovereignty is unreconciled? How can we unsettle Islamophobia in settler colonies?
I first situate my research topic within the theoretical frameworks of whiteness and settler colonial studies. Located as an interdisciplinary project that emerged out of race and ethnicity studies, decolonial studies and cultural studies, whiteness studies developed as an area of inquiry that examined the systemic and structural power attached to whiteness and white identity. Despite current embodiment as multicultural nations that are post-assimilationist policy, both Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia are shaped by their colonial past and present as settler colonies. Patrick Wolfe and Lorenzo Veracini argue that settler colonies are territorial and permanent projects which assert themselves as new societies through the displacement of Indigenous communities, histories and identities. As such, Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia are “inexorably based on mass settlement and aspirations for sovereign entitlement” through white supremacist violence of dehumanized Indigenous and Māori subjects to occupy white sovereignty. This central white paradigm highlights the justification of white violence, as Aileen Moreton-Robinson writes, “The existence of those who can be defined as truly human requires the presence of others who are considered less human.” This “logic of elimination” refers not only to the “dissolution of native societies,” rather, it also calculatingly “erects a new colonial society on the expropriated land base – settler colonizers come to stay: invasion is a structure not an event.” Wolfe’s theorization of “settler colonialism is a structure and not an event” can be seen through the continual displacement and institutionalized punishment of Indigenous and Māori bodies in both Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia that appear neutral because they are embedded within the governance regimes of the settler state. Both Indigenous and Māori communities remain targeted and oppressed through criminal justice – incarceration and police brutality, health – higher morbidity and mortality rates and western medicine disregarding traditional herbal remedies, education and employment – affirmative action initiatives for Indigenous and Māori minorities fail to address the systemic disadvantage that long impacts education and employment security, amongst many other governmental streams and institutions. This corresponds with Ruth Wilson Gilmore’s definition of racism as “the state-sanctioned or extra-legal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerability to premature death” – white sovereignty equates the continuous punishment of Indigenous groups as they are treated as people to be “dealt” with, rather than Indigenous and Māori sovereignty posed as a viable option for their own liberation.

Through a disregard and denial of Indigenous sovereignty, the white settler state then erects racial violence onto non-Indigenous racialized subjects and immigrants by asserting who does and does not belong in the white imaginary. As Anne Bonds and Joshua Inwood theorize, both Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia illustrate settler colonialism is shaped by “the permanent occupation of a territory and the removal of Indigenous peoples with the express purpose of building an ethnically distinct national community.” It is white supremacy that is grounded in racist violence, normativity and privilege that enables settler colonialism, as Moreton-Robinson states, “In the guise of the invisible human universal, whiteness secures hegemony through discourse by normalizing itself as the cultural space of the West.” Exemplary of this, Nigel Murphy highlights how white assimilationist policies were instilled in Aotearoa-New Zealand to ensure racial homogeneity in the
white imaginary of the “Britain of the South Seas.” This can be seen through the decree of a “98% British” in the colonization of Aotearoa-New Zealand that sought “homogeneity as the aim and various immigration policies were passed that excluded all non-white immigrants based on assumptions of racial and cultural suitability.” This illustrates the explicit exclusion of non-white immigrants that paralleled with genocidal Indigenous dispossession in the nation-building of Aotearoa-New Zealand, however, these racially violent and white supremacist attitudes endure till today. As Jessica Terruhn writes, “these settler narratives of egalitarianism, a “fair go” mentality and mateship – which remain prominent today – intersected with Indigenous dispossession, the unequivocal exclusion of non-white immigrants, and Aotearoa-New Zealand’s own colonial aspirations in the Pacific.” Furthermore, this signifies that “pillars of white supremacy are best understood as logics rather than categories signifying specific groups of people,” Muslims face racial violence within the ongoing structure of settler colonialism that systematically generates genocidal and institutional harm for Indigenous groups, first and most brutally, then targets non-Indigenous racialized subjects. White supremacy, I underscore, impacts Indigenous people and diverse racialized groups in different ways, contexts and spaces. It is through the settler state that in Australia and Aotearoa-New Zealand racialized subjects such as Muslims are punished for occupying space.

In the Australian context, whiteness studies and settler colonial studies often focus on assimilationist histories of the White Australia policy and the ongoing occupation of Indigenous land. Ghassan Hage writes that Australia is a national space “structured around a white culture, where Aboriginal people and non-white ethnics are merely national objects to be moved and removed according to white national will.” Similarly, in Aotearoa-New Zealand, as Bonds and Inwood theorize, settler colonialism is too shaped by “the permanent occupation of a territory and the removal of Indigenous peoples with the express purpose of building an ethnically distinct national community,” regarding Māori identities, communities and histories. Scott Poynting urges the importance of highlighting this, writing “It is essential, for perspective, to keep firmly in mind the long and atrocious history of self-appointed white Australian guardians of the ethnic purity of what they claim as ‘our land’, using overwhelming firepower to mass murder unarmed people in a campaign of what would later be widely understood as genocide…Nor is the killing past, given the ongoing regime of early, avoidable and violent death visited on Indigenous peoples of the Australian continent.” Azeezah Kanji and David Palumbo-Liu also highlight this: “Emergent critiques of Islamophobia as a systemic, transnational phenomenon have tended to stop short of any truly materialist analysis and any deep historical reading of the conditions that support these mobilizations of anti-Muslim sentiment in settler societies.” The article, titled “Settler Colonialism Lurked Beneath the Christchurch Shooting” drew parallels between Australia and Aotearoa-New Zealand to highlight the importance of reflecting on the settler state to address Islamophobia in both countries. In a similar approach, Māori academic Khylee Quince closely examines the rhetoric embodied in the reporting, reception and reflection of the Christchurch shooting and its local context of Aotearoa-New Zealand by critiquing Jacinta Arden’s “this is not us” sentiments, writing: “This is not us’, yet the New Zealand Wars (1800s) happened. ‘This is not us’ and the Treaty of Waitangi became a legal nullity (1877). In 2004, Don Brash’s Orewa Speech happened.” Poynting, Quince and Kanji and
Palumbo-Liu highlight the necessity of examining settler colonialism in the Christchurch shooting, but they also focus their analyses on the broader concerns of Islamophobia in settler societies – illustrating that the Christchurch shooting is not an isolated incident, precisely because it is connected to settler colonialism, but that racial violence permeates in everyday multiculturalism.27 I appreciate the arguments made in these progressive papers and seek to contribute towards their urgings in advocating that settler colonialism is foregrounded in studies of the Christchurch Massacre and other violent forms of Islamophobia and racial violence.28

Here, I begin my analysis of the Christchurch Massacre with a clear outline of the asymmetrical relations of power and key political and historical differentials in the way that Indigenous communities and Muslim communities are impacted in Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia. This ethical intervention seeks to acknowledge these differences between Indigenous and Māori bodies, recognizing that they both remain unsettled, as well as Muslim racialized subjects, in imaginaries of nationhood in Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia. I explore this to acknowledge that the continual violent replacement of Indigenous populations, identities and histories complicates the prospect of racial justice to other minority groups such as Muslims living in both settler states. Appreciating the following from Aimee Carrillo Rowe and Eve Tuck, “a framework that does not prioritize Indigenous sovereignty and futurity is “incommensurable” with human and social justice projects as some elements of these processes cannot be aligned.”29 As a result, I purport an approach that encompasses the past and current systemic genocide of traditional custodians of both occupied lands in attempt to criticize white supremacist violence against Muslim communities. As Randa Abdel Fattah writes, “multiculturalism, in all of its policy variants, has been formulated on the basis of the denial of Indigenous sovereignty, coupled with liberal democratic notions of individual liberty, equality and justice, based on a central white paradigm.”30 In settler societies, such as Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia, both whiteness and “settleness” meet and work with one another to displace groups that do not fit into the white imaginary, as Gaia Giuliani argues, “whiteness as a bio-political identity forms a foundational component in the definition of the settler vis-à-vis both Indigenous and exogenous Others.”31 There are a number of works that discuss the place of racialized subjects, such as Muslims, living in both occupied Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia.32 As well, I acknowledge there are individuals who encompass both respective identities, both Indigenous and Muslim, and remain punished through the continual systematic dispossession equated with white sovereignty and racialized criminality, as well as Muslim communities that can reiterate anti Indigenous rhetoric. Finally, I hope to contribute an understanding of an “increasing presence of exogenous Others,” Muslims, in occupied Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia, from a macro lens of settler colonialism that displaces both Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies of color both online and offline.33

THE CHRISTCHURCH MASSACRE: THEIDEOLOGICAL MOMENT

On the 15th of March 2019 Australian gunman Brenton Tarrant entered two mosques in Christchurch, Aotearoa-New Zealand and massacred 51 Muslims and injured 49 Muslims.
With a GoPro camera attached to his body, Tarrant recorded and live streamed the shooting using Facebook’s livestreaming application feature, broadcasting the attack to millions of viewers live and after the shooting. Facebook regulators stated that the social media platform “had removed 1.5 million shares of the video from its platform within the first 24 hours of the shooting,” illustrating how white supremacists co-opt Internet tools, such as Facebook, to encourage, disseminate and desensitize the punishment of racialized bodies, such as Muslims. Tarrant demonstrated that the Christchurch Massacre was conceived with the Internet in mind, as he left behind a trail of digital evidence to support his white settler messages after the shooting. I argue that it is Tarrant’s fixation on ethnic replacement that underpins the Christchurch Massacre, reiterating his stance as an extension of settler colonialism by enacting the “logics of extermination” in order to secure white settler possession. The pre-mature death of 51 Muslims and injury of 49 Muslim in the Christchurch shooting cannot be separated from the logics of white sovereignty that legitimize white subjects to punish groups who do not belong in the white imaginary, and it is through digital settler colonialism, white violence online, that this is broadcasted, celebrated and archived online. In this way, Tarrant’s whiteness and attack is not just about bodies and religiosity, rather, he is a part of “the discursive practices that, because of colonialism and neo-colonialism, privilege and the global dominance of white imperial subjects” that allows attention to be focused on representatives of white supremacy rather than contextualized as exacerbations legitimized by settler institutions. As a result, in locating privilege at the scale of the individual, by focusing on Brenton Tarrant, studies of the Christchurch Massacre “have the potential to leave the underlying structures of racism’s death dealing displacements” out of explorations by disregarding settler colonialism in Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia that legitimize white violence.

After the Christchurch Massacre solidarity emerged across social media for the Muslim community, particularly, the hashtag phrases #ThisIsNotNewZealand and #TheyAreUs proliferated in bid to challenge white supremacy online and condemn the shooter and his online celebration. However, the Christchurch Massacre is not a new phenomenon to Māori communities, as well as Indigenous Australian communities, who have faced genocide in the name of white supremacy. Here we can deploy the following quote that highlights the fallacy of Aotearoa-New Zealand as a peaceful nation, distancing itself from its settler colonial roots and maintenance:

While Māori continue to endure the relentless violence under settler-colonial rule, the belief that European settlement in Aotearoa/New Zealand took place peacefully continues to be widely propagated in mainstream discourse. For example, in 2015 former prime minister of Aotearoa/New Zealand, John Key, infamously said, ‘In my view New Zealand was one of the very few countries in the world that were settled peacefully. Māori probably acknowledge that settlers had a place to play and brought with them a lot of skills and a lot of capital’ (cited in Bell, Elizabeth, McIntosh, & Wynyard, 2017, p. 18). Such a narrative is obviously lacking in coherence when the effects of colonial atrocities continue to play out today with an over-representation of Māori in New Zealand’s neoliberal prisons-for-profit system, along with the relentless and ongoing theft of Māori land by the New Zealand Crown.
It is the harm of white supremacy that is rooted in settler colonialism, which the Internet extends, rather than Brenton Tarrant as a sole agent, that allowed the Christchurch Massacre to happen. In other words, we must move beyond the tendency in scholarship to “invoke understandings of race as social construction,” such as through Tarrant and his racial writing and actions, without also focusing on the way racism is sutured to and produces literal death, legitimized through authorities and the settler state. As highlighted in criticisms of whiteness and whiteness studies “well intended” policies, often created by, within as well as on settler institutions, rely on “gestures” rather than systematic and structural change of white sovereignty. This “entrenches rather than destabilizes settler social formations,” becoming but a fleeting moment of shallow acknowledgment that reaffirms the white sovereign. Similar sentiments can be seen here in the Christchurch Massacre where Jacinta Arden donned a hijab, a demonized religious and cultural item, and on occupied Aotearoa-New Zealand stated “We were not a target because we are a safe harbor for those who hate. We were not chosen for this act of violence because we condone racism, because we are an enclave for extremism. We were chosen for the very fact that we are none of these things.” This gesture resonated warmly with Pākehā settlers and non-Māori communities, as Nishhza Thiruselvam writes, Ardern’s decision to wear a hijab, a move that was celebrated as progressive internationally, ‘Images of Ardern wearing a hijab and comforting those impacted by the attacks have come to symbolize an idealized government that cares for the people. Yet, such gestures of care and acceptance towards Muslim communities are inconsistent with other policies implemented by Ardern and her government, many of which are Islamophobic and hostile towards migrant/refugee communities and those seeking asylum.’ As well, this act accentuates that “if racism is ever recognized, it is either seen as an individual aberration rather than a systemic fact.” The multicultural rhetoric of ‘diversity, kindness, compassion’ does nothing progressive for Muslim communities in Aotearoa-New Zealand, as it invisibilizes the brute force of white supremacy that has, and continues, to harm Māori and Muslim bodies. By instead appropriating the pain of ‘the Other’, Ardern’s enactment of solidarity can appear to be problematic, as Sherene Razack states, “we think we are recognizing not only the other’s pain but his or her difference. Difference becomes the conduit of identification in much the same way pain does.”

Continuing, in my critical and wide reading of academic and journalistic accounts of the Christchurch Massacre I noticed a formulaic approach to how authors introduced their writings. Articles often began with a synopsis of the events of the Christchurch Massacre, the date and the place. For example, recognizing how I too have mimicked this method, in past thesis presentations I have begun my research topic with the following – “On the 15th of March 2019 Brenton Tarrant entered two mosques in Christchurch, Aotearoa-New Zealand and massacred 51 Muslims and injured 49 Muslims.” I could not understand why but this repetitive opening across journalistic and academic accounts, including my own, felt problematic. On critical reflection, I have come to realize my concern with this prescribed approach is that it treats the Christchurch Massacre as if it is an exceptional event, rather than recognizing the complex genealogy of the past and present of settler colonialism in Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia. In my critique of the formulaic openings of the Christchurch Massacre, I deploy the work of Stuart Hall (1984, p. 7) who discusses the socialization of journalists into particular forms and conventions of writing:
They think it is just a set of techniques, like how to write a front-page story or how to write an inside column. But the fact of course is that journalists of very different views and dispositions can tell the same kind of story. I know many radical journalists in the media who tell exactly the same stories: they construct events with the same kinds of language as the people who disagree with them profoundly. So there’s a kind of stabilisation in the institutions and in the available discourses which are sustained in a set of known practices inside those institutions.

Hall then addresses the concept of ideology to further extrapolate how ideology effaces information when accepting practices of news expression and speech: “I am particularly interested in the practical understandings, the practical frameworks which people use, and which are largely unconscious. When people say to you, “Of course that’s so, isn’t it?” That “of course” is the most ideological moment, because that’s the moment at which you’re least aware that you are using a particular framework, and that if you used another framework the things you are talking about would have a different meaning.” By assessing the imitative approach to introducing the Christchurch Massacre and actively deciding to not engage with this trend in this chapter and case study I seek to align with the guidance of Hall who writes that “the first break is to cut into that notion of common sense. You simply have to interrupt the flow of the plausible.” The formulaic repetition of the time and place of the attack, despite necessary for the synopsis of an event, over time removes the accountability and context of the settler state in Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia. This reiterates the crux of my research – that the Christchurch Massacre is not an exceptional event, alternatively, it is an occurrence birthed through the white settler states of Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia that is then extended through the Internet as a form of digital settler colonialism. Rather than contributing another case study with a factual opening, an “of course” ideological moment, in the course of this work I seek to interrogate the Christchurch Massacre as one that does not begin on 15 March 2019, instead, begins with the onset of settler colonization in both Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia and their complex and differential white settler contexts.

THE IDEOLOGICAL MOMENT 1: ACADEMIA

The Christchurch Massacre and its discussion in Muslim and non-Muslim academic environments has largely failed to situate the attack as an extension of the settler colonial realities of both Australia and Aotearoa-New Zealand. Theorizations of Brenton Tarrant and his digital decisions to broadcast white supremacy have not considered the Christchurch Massacre as an emblem of white violence – illustrating that settler colonialism entrenches whatever forms possible, such as the Internet, and seeks to attack the Other in their places of worship, by attacking Muslims at two mosque sites, to insist racialized bodies are not welcome in the settler state. The individualizing of white supremacy at the scale of the individual, rather than exploring the Christchurch Massacre by identifying the systems that maintain racial violence, was embodied in an academic event I attended titled “Living Death: Decoding the Tarrant Manifesto” held by an anthropology PhD candidate at Macquarie University. The speaker’s theoretical framework included a phenology of the digital
manifesto written by Brenton Tarrant and its manifestation in Australian local “proud boy”
extremism and transnational worldviews.

The speaker began his presentation on the day by stating “This is going to be a bit harrowing
isn’t it…I will be discussing the Christchurch shooting, what we can call Australia and New
Zealand’s greatest massacre.”

There it was. A disregard for settler colonialism that the Christchurch shooting is grounded
upon in New Zealand, and Australia, by extension of the nationality of the gunman. Through
this disregard for the settler colonial contexts of Australia and Aotearoa-New Zealand, the
ideological moment is reiterated.

During question time, I politely raised concern regarding his opening statement. I
highlighted that the speaker had disregarded the very macro structures of settler colonialism
that the Christchurch Massacre is grounded upon. I said, “I’m a Muslim, I’m not Indigenous,
but I will tell you that the realities of settler colonialism against Indigenous groups in both
New Zealand and Australia complicate the prospect of racial justice for Muslims like me
living in either country.”

The speaker appeared defensive, replying “I’m not disregarding it, I just did not discuss
it as I did not have the time to in this presentation.” He continued, “I’m not a post-colonial
theorist.” I noted the conflation of post colonialism and settler colonialism together, I did not
reply. You do not have to be a post-colonial theorist to acknowledge the land you are on and
the land that the shooting took place on, a reality that I continue to learn and unlearn at a
postgraduate level. He quickly thanked me and moved on.

An esteemed professor chimed in, gesturing toward me, “I agree, you need to discuss
colonization.” It was only then that the speaker said, “I agree with both of you.” When I was
spoken about in that moment, it was in a group of two. He added to the academic, “I have
years of experience of Native Title, I understand the importance of colonization.” It was very
strange to me, for the speaker to have worked in Native Title, but make an educated opinion
to leave settler colonialism out of his exploration of the shooting. However, upon reflection
I thought perhaps he did not think of settler colonialism at all.

“Internet culture,” the “alt-right” and digitized mass shootings are emerging and popular
explorations in both academia and journalism. They are trendy, well received and timely
just as they are integral areas I hope to contribute to. However, by leaving out factors
such as race, power and settler colonialism, they skim the surface of events such as the
Christchurch Massacre and distract from the structures that maintain them. The reality of
the Christchurch Massacre must be met with a discussion of the relations of power that
allowed it to happen both online and offline. I felt that the brute force of the Christchurch
Massacre, rooted in settler colonialism and the Internet, was not heard by those around me.
Only when another academic voiced agreeing with me was I met with some consideration.
Before that, I was cast aside, quickly overlooked, my commentary minimized.

This event showcased to me that the Christchurch Massacre was not an exceptional event
byway of situating it as an act of foreign violence. Rather, it was a violent act of white settler
colonialism, conducted by Australian white supremacist Brenton Tarrant, on stolen land in
Aotearoa-New Zealand. By killing 51 Muslims and injuring 49 Muslims at two mosques in
the settler colonial state of New Zealand Tarrant embarks on what Ghassan Hage classifies
as ‘a nationalist practice of exclusion.’ Tarrant’s apparent right to dictate the racial fabric
of nations evokes consequences for Muslims as an act that has a sustained history and continuation in the body of the white nation. Tarrant utilizes the right of the white settler, a nativized and legitimate role as a tool to sustain the privilege of the dominant group to remind the Other of their subordinate place. Therefore, in murdering Muslims, Tarrant extends the settler colonial legacies of Australia digitally and physically and seeks to eternally haunt racialized bodies from their being in the white nation. It is the weaponization of Muslim bodies in the site of the Christchurch Massacre that Tarrant utilizes to assert the white sovereign. I ask in lieu of this academic event, what could recognizing the Indigenous violence that the Christchurch Massacre is grounded upon bring digital media and race studies of the event, other than encourage critical and intersectional investigations of race, power and the Internet?

THE IDEOLOGICAL MOMENT 2: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Muslim and Indigenous engagement has a long history in Australia, albeit not often evoked or discussed in studies of Muslim relations and Islamophobia in the present settler colonial landscape of Australia. Scholars have acknowledged the peaceful transactions that took place between Macassan fishermen and Indigenous Australians such as Poynting who explores this history:

Historically, Muslims came to the Australian continent before Europeans...They traded and otherwise interrelated with Aboriginal peoples of the north, leaving traces of their language, and indeed their religion, as well as artefacts, in local Indigenous cultures. There was some intermarriage. Most anthropological accounts indicate peaceable relations, certainly devoid of warfare. Thus, while Muslims came regularly over this time and stayed for extended periods, there was no Islamophobia. Armed British colonialism eventually put a stop to the seasonal migrations, and the trade. It also introduced Islamophobia.

As an Australian Muslim, I have seen many Muslims point to the history of Muslim engagement with Indigenous Australians before the settler colonial project of Australia. However, I am critical of those who seek to evoke this history with no engagement between Indigenous Australians and Muslims presently – why has this discussion halted here and remained a symbol of past Indigenous and Muslim engagement, rather than a possible extension for future solidarity? By acknowledging how settler colonialism and white supremacy structure racial violence against Muslims in the Christchurch Massacre, I align with the work of Andrew Brooks (2020), ‘Any project that seeks to reconfigure the historical terms of political subjectivity must engage seriously with Black and Indigenous study, and with the irreducible relation of Blackness and Indigeneity (which in the Australian context come together in the same body).’

This is a history and criticism I remained cognizant of on the 21st of November where I attended the “Collaborative Approaches to Counter the Extremist Right-Wing and Islamophobia” Conference, an event organized to address the Christchurch Massacre and community engagement strategies. However, I was left with so many questions...
about how complacent Muslims are in the settler state. The event began with a beautiful acknowledgment of country by Graham Davis King, a Wiradjuri and Ngiyampaa artist and activist, who shared Indigenous histories of Parramatta and the importance of the local rivers. He welcomed the Muslim and non-Muslim academic community who sought to address Islamophobia in occupied, Indigenous Australia.

The Director for the Centre of Islamic and Civilization Studies at Charles Stuart University then opened the conference. During his speech he called for “social cohesion and resilience” and stressed the role of conversation to address Islamophobia. I wondered how many Muslims had attempted *dawah*, sharing Islamic faith with others to teach about Islam, with the likes of white supremacists like Brenton Tarrant, hoping it would make a difference. “The times have changed,” said a spokesperson from the Islamic Council of Queensland. “I still think Australia is a beautiful country and I think it is up to Australia to remain so.” I immediately thought of the recent death of Kumanjayi Walker, a 19-year-old Indigenous boy who was shot dead by a policeman who will plead not guilty. Chief Executive of Police Federation of Australia Scott Weber told the press that “There has been a death, but in saying that too, we have a police officer that’s life and career has been taken away from them as well.”

The life of a 19-year-old Indigenous boy was conflated with a police career.

During an “Outcomes and Solutions” session, the conference attendees were organized into groups to identify issues regarding Islamophobia and far right extremism. Sitting on the same table as many of the conference speakers and organizers, I raised my concerns regarding how Muslims are punished within structures of settler colonialism online and offline. When I did this, I was asked by the same man who opened the conference after an Indigenous welcome to country, “Aren’t Indigenous rights another discussion? How are they relevant here?” It seemed that the moment that the Indigenous elder had left the conference, Indigenous history was quickly cast aside to deal with Islamophobia. The Muslim academics speaking at the event showcased a severe disregard for Indigenous Australia, but also, a disenfranchisement for Indigenous and Māori Muslims in responding to the Christchurch Massacre. Alluding to the romanticization of Arab land for Muslims and his tie to sacred land, Indigenous Muslim academic Dr John Andrew Morrow shares the following, which we may draw upon in understanding the complexities of both Indigenous and Muslim identities, as they both remain demonized and unsettled:

*Some Muslims may travel to Arabia, Iraq, and Iran in search of spiritual satisfaction: I find mine here, on my land, the land of my ancestors. Although I have been offered employment in Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, and Iran, I refuse to leave Turtle Island. I would rather perform *tawaf* or circumambulation with the Miami Nation, the Chippewa Nation, and the Métis Nation than performing it in Wahhabi-occupied Arabia where Islam merely exists in name.*

A Muslim lawyer and an advocate with a “passion for community work, protecting human rights,” as stated on her online profile, asked if I feel that by “clumping Indigenous rights and Muslim rights together,” that I am doing a disservice to both. I thought of my Indigenous Muslim brothers and sisters who feel that they must choose a side rather than feel the wrath of both Indigenous dispossession and Islamophobia. An approach cognizant of this reality,
as evoked by the Australian Critical Race and Whiteness Studies Association (2019) who shared the following solidarity with the Muslim community following the Christchurch Massacre, was not echoed by my Muslim brothers and sisters at this event:

We recognize that Islamophobia in Australia cannot be fought without grounding it in a relational understanding of the racial colonial that sets specific forms of racial rule within the context of the persistent negative impact of colonization on First Nations people. We applaud the solidarity actions by First Nations people with Muslim people, while recognizing that there are many Muslim people who are also Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.57

I felt disappointed with the Muslim community, recognizing how Muslims, like the speaker at the academic Christchurch Massacre event I attended, can be complacent regarding settler colonialism and disregard how it intersects to punish Muslim communities. I felt that there was a disregard of the white settler state and the harm it exudes through its maintenance. Whether this is because it is too ‘radical’ to suggest that systems can cause racial violence or whether this was not realistic or productive to other attendees reminded of the following, “This unlearning of colonial and racist readings of Others and cultivating ways of ethically beginning to know the Other, to acknowledge and recognize the Other in ways that is outside of liberal forms of recognition practiced by the white settler state is perhaps one of the more important challenges for all those of us who see ourselves as people of color.”58

Corresponding, Māori academic Khylee Quince recounts in her analysis of the Christchurch Massacre, “The portrayal of Muslim and Māori as savage, misogynistic, undeserving, troublesome and uncultured is a narrative we have lived with since colonization stepped on to our foreshore.”59 I was reminded of the wealth of digital data I found from online white supremacists who dehumanized Māori Muslim converts and Māori activists – how stolen land was a conscious theme that was mocked online by Brenton Tarrant’s supporters.

A non-Muslim professional turned to me after the session ended. She said, “I get what you’re saying. How can we fix Islamophobia on such rocky foundations? Look at how we treat the Indigenous here.” I wish she had supported me when I was speaking. Rather, again, I was cast aside, quickly overlooked, my commentary minimized. However, the importance of the following question was reiterated: What are the grounds for the highlighting the Islamophobia that the Christchurch Massacre charges without acknowledging the spaces, discourses and institutions of the settler state?

THE WHITE SETTLER: EXTERMINATING THE MUSLIM

Acknowledging the differentials of Indigenous and Muslim violence, I seek to contribute how, the Christchurch Massacre, and the racial violence it charges, occurs through the structure and justification of white settler colonialism. Put simply, when we eliminate Muslims, it helps the prospect of the white settler state in removing its Others. Exercising this reflexivity of the dangers of disavowing Islamophobia, as a Muslim myself, seeks to highlight how instrumental Islamophobia was in the Christchurch Massacre and the histories and continuances of anti-Muslim racial violence, Orientalism and Islamophobia
that are implicated in the Christchurch Massacre. In my extensive case study of the Christchurch Massacre and its actor, Brenton Tarrant, my understanding is simply as following: it was because of Islamophobia that 51 Muslims died and 49 Muslims were injured. Specific, Muslim, racialized bodies were targeted as a direct result of Islamophobia and racial violence. However, it was because of settler colonialism and white supremacy that Tarrant felt justified to do so, to take life, to shed blood. Therefore, I seek to understand how Muslims are punished through structures of settler colonialism in the course of this study and utilize settler colonial and whiteness studies to conduct this analysis. In doing so, I align with Salman Sayyid’s conceptualization of Islamophobia as repertoire, “The range of activities covered by Islamophobia exceed its common formulations; rather it occurs as a response to the problematization of Muslim identity.”

Randa Abdel Fattah reiterates the importance of Sayyid’s approach to theorizing Islamophobia – “Sayyid rejects the populist formulation of Islamophobia as hatred or fear of Islam or Muslims” and seeks to encourage the multiplicities of Islamophobia that are beyond a simplistic or reductive definition. Therefore, moved by Abdel-Fattah I seek to explore ‘Islamophobia’s symbiotic relationship with racial Australianization, and the historical and contemporary logics of Australia’s racial state.’

In other words, in the course of this study of the Christchurch Massacre, I examine how both a case of both Islamophobia and settler colonialism work together in the context of Australian and Aotearoa-New Zealander settlerness and digital settler colonialism. As Poynting marks the importance of situating Islamophobia in larger structures of racial power, “I want to underline here that this racism that is Islamophobia, like most modern racisms, arises from colonialism, from imperialism: it is rooted in empire (see, in the Australian context, Al-Asaad 2014; Abdel-Fattah 2017; Lentin 2017; Morsi 2017).”

It is integral to not disregard Islamophobia when studying settler colonialism, as integral as I believe it is to examine settler colonialism when studying Islamophobia, as they both racially terrorize racialized bodies outside of the Muslim victims brutally massacred in the Christchurch Massacre. As Sherene Razack argues, Muslims are spatially evicted from Western law and politics, their tenuous presence always in a place that is at risk of being physically or symbolically ousted. This eviction happens along a spectrum of “stigmatization, surveillance, incarceration, abandonment, torture, and bombs. White violence and a dissonance to the realities of settler colonial violence is further seen where Azeezah Kanji and David Palumbo-Liu problematize studies that ‘mirrored’ the discourse between the Christchurch Massacre and ISIS, writing “They imply that the mass violence at Christchurch can only be understood as an emanation of a foreign phenomenon – perpetuating Islamicophobic representations of Muslims as the benchmark for barbarism.”

Brenton Tarrant’s disavowal of Islamophobia is, aside from the glaring fact that the attack was actually conducted in the name of ethnic replacement, a right that I expand on that emerges from settler colonialism, is further illustrated in his manifesto where he asks writes the following:

Were/are you a “Islamophobe?”

No, I am not afraid of Islam, only that, due to its high fertility rates, it will grow to replace other peoples and faiths. 
Tarrant’s biopolitical focus on fertility rates showcases how “Claims of invasion and colonization function powerfully through the [fourth theme] of the “Other Islamic Bomb” which frames Muslim women’s fertility as the vehicle of the invasion and colonization.” However, settler colonialism is most obviously embodied here in Tarrant’s assumed right to remove racialized peoples, as Ghassan Hage marks, “An image of national space is a prerequisite for the nationalist’s capacity to classify others as undesirable. Just as much as an image of the nation, however, what is also implicit in this mode of classification is an image of the nationalist as someone with a managerial capacity over this national space. Such a space has to be perceived as one’s own national space.” Tarrant canonizes the role of the white settler by thus exterminating the Muslim threat, highlighting that the settler state “is a society that, whether latent or otherwise, feels it is perpetually under threat, and as such furnishes itself with the means to eliminate whatever it deems to instantiate this threat. More than any other colonizing group, settlers have embodied the colonial tendency and the collective will to exterminate, rather than subjugate, the colonized. In other words, the colonized must be discursively “prepared’ for extermination.” In this way, we can see the authorization of Brenton Tarrant to conduct racial violence by way of his role as a settler, “The settler, if known by his actions and how he justifies them, sees himself as holding dominion over the earth and its flora and fauna, as the anthropocentric normal, and as more developed, more human, more deserving than other groups or species. The settler is making a new “home” and that home is rooted in a homesteading worldview where the wild land and wild people were made for his benefit.” The role of the white settler, as one who is truly Australian, nativizes whiteness and thus justifies white violence, depicting who does and does not belong in the white imaginary, as Pugliese and Perera state, “Within the schema of prosthetic white citizenship, citizenship signifies tautologically as white, and thus as both self-evidently embodied and nativized.”

When Tarrant encroached upon places of religious worship, he sought to instill fear in Muslims and promote white settler colonialism globally through an Internet that let him. This symbolized to Muslims “you are not only unsafe, you are also unwelcome and you will literally be removed.” Moreover, this highlighted the operation of whiteness as a “macropolitical structuration of power” in the context of racially inscribed bodies, subjectivities and practices, where sites of religious and cultural worship are problematized through the targeting of Al Noor Mosque and Linwood Islamic Centre in Christchurch, Aotearoa-New Zealand. By distributing the targeting of mosques digitally not only does Tarrant racialize a place of routine, peaceful worship for Muslims, he illustrates the “somatechnics metonyms of an incipient criminality – linking particular racialized bodies to the always-anticipated future anterior of the terrorist event,” through the justifying of mosques as hosts for Muslim extremism. This is seen in Tarrant’s manifesto where he writes “The Christchurch and Linwood mosques had far more invaders, in a more prominent and optically foreign building, with a prior history of extremism” and that they became ideal targets after witnessing Facebook posts from their social media sites that suggested the mosques were “only for Muslims” that “proved their knowledge of their actions and guilt.” Tarrant’s justification for targeting mosques mimics counter terror extremism raids prevalent in both Australia and Aotearoa-New Zealand, as Muslim bodies, cultural items and religious spaces become associated with “could-be” terrorists. Here, “the modern State
can scarcely function without becoming involved with racism at some point, within certain limits and subject to certain conditions,” laying the foundations for further extensions of white violence that is enacted at the Christchurch Massacre through racialized criminality. Similarly, both Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia contain Indigenous and Māori sites that are contained with a white hegemonic hold by settler institutions. For example, the battle waged by Australian politician Pauline Hanson who affirms white sovereignty by violating Indigenous demands to not climb the site, comparing the closing of Uluru to “closing down Bondi Beach,” a fellow site located on Indigenous land that is tied to Australia’s white national identity. An assertion of white sovereignty is further illustrated in ongoing disputes regarding a ‘Special Housing Area’ land project on sacred and occupied Māori land, Ihumātao, a site that contains evidence of settler occupation. As a result, it is integral to highlight the white supremacist violence echoed in attacking sites of sacred worship beyond the Christchurch Massacre that are rooted in white governmentality in both settler states. Tarrant weaponizes important sites for Muslims, furthered by settler institutions who criminalize Islamic religiosity and equip white anxieties, apparent in Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia from their very inception with regard to Indigenous and Māori sites that demonstrate the brute force of settler occupation.

The white supremacy embodied in the Christchurch Massacre seeks to turn a familiar space macabre – the mosque. The white hand, a tool of elimination, is exhibited here by Tarrant as well as exacerbated through the “white cursor” of digital technology, as video copies of the livestream remain across the Internet despite widescale attempt to remove its digital trace. A wealth of literature has been written regarding white violence forcing Muslim communities to retreat inward, an insidious form of assimilation. The Christchurch Massacre causes the Muslim community to be met with another decision to make: the peace afforded through religiosity at sites of worship, demonstrating īmān, faith, or peace of mind away from the threat of white violence by not risking entering these sites. In this way, attending a mosque becomes a risk Muslims must consider, a further politicized act against white supremacy. Not only does this highlight the “unsettled, disturbed form of authority” of whiteness but also the “insidious essence of violence induced from robbing the Other” of a peaceful, routine place of worship being problematized, resonating with Indigenous and Māori communities all too familiar. When the Christchurch shooting becomes but a memory for the state, it resonates eerily beyond its newsworthiness for Muslim racialized subjects. As Farid Farid writes “Bodies that defy the limits of their racially inscribed signification and that do not fit within the racially vacuous schema of whiteness are pathologically positioned as uncontrollable incursions in the geopolitical permanence of the colonial-settler state.” Here, the mosque becomes a site of organizing terror exposing “the multiple somatic violence’s of whiteness” and how it operates to punish its Others in settler colonies. The authority that is white supremacy “allows” race through then introducing and reaffirming “the logics of anti-Indigenous racism, genocide and orientalism” and these logics shift and becoming re-signified across time, space and place by then enacting white violence onto non Indigenous bodies who do not belong in the white sovereign. White supremacist violence embodied in the Christchurch shooting and exacerbated through the Internet requires us “to view white supremacy not as a static ideology or condition, but to instead focus on its geographic and temporal contingency” that allows acts of settler
violence by individuals on politicized bodies. By disregarding the brute force of white supremacy that sought to terrorize racialized bodies prior to the Christchurch Massacre, the white settler state had an active role in further policing Muslims, showcasing how the white settler state “singles out Muslims as a “problem” in multicultural Australia.” This highlights how “the relationship between Islamophobia and settler colonialism means that anti-Muslim violence cannot be addressed simply as a problem of individual ‘hate crime’ because “settler colonialism is built upon an entangled triad structure of settler-native-slave, the decolonial desires of white, non-white, immigrant, postcolonial, and oppressed people, can similarly be entangled in resettlement, reoccupation, and reinhabitation that actually further settler colonialism.” This corresponds with Claire Renzetti’s argument that “criminologists theorize that committing a hate crime is a means of accomplishing a particular type of power, hegemonic masculinity, which is described as white, Christian, able-bodied and heterosexual.” This violent white masculinity occupies a hegemonic hold in the formation, reproduction and extension of the settler state that is then shared, affirmed and idolized through the Internet. Before we study the giant of the Internet and how it may extend white supremacy, through the term that I have coined, digital settler colonialism, we must understand, investigate and interrogate how this permeates race relations for Indigenous, black and racialized bodies offline.

Moving forward, sympathies for the Muslim community, as we pass the second-year anniversary of the Christchurch Massacre on Indigenous land that continues to be occupied, must be met with the recognition of whiteness as Moreton-Robinson theorizes as the “invisible regime of power that secures hegemony through discourse and has material effects in everyday life,” so to not reinforce white sovereignty and governmentality that disregards Indigenous sovereignty. I urge further considerations aligning that “Studying these events, their genesis and impacts, are important research activities, yet unless they are situated in a global context, they risk creating another version of color-blind racism, one that endorses solving a problem by explicitly ignoring its root structural causes.” This article has argued that exacerbations of Islamophobia, such as the Christchurch Massacre, must be met with close study of the system of relations that allow white supremacists to target racialized subjects – settler colonialism. Recounting on my case study of the Christchurch massacre, I have situated the grievances with the Muslim and academic community that motivated and reiterated the importance of both my study and my theoretical approach to studying Islamophobia and racial violence. As is applied to the case of the settler state of Canada and racial justice for Muslims, “It is futile to ask for justice for Muslims in a nation-state where the genocide, the continual extermination of its Indigenous peoples, is a matter of dull and daily state affairs. Our politics must unsettle these daily practices of violence.” Approaches that attempt to theorize the Christchurch Massacre must take a media and race specific approach that is situated in the larger formation of the white settler colonial state, dissecting the intertwining of white racial violence online and offline that seeks to reinforce racial hierarchies in occupied Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia, as well as other settler colonies such as Canada, occupied Palestine and the United States of America, due to a growing trend in these geographies for white settler anxieties and the role of the white native to be practiced both online, via a racialized Internet, as well as offline, on subjugated land.
NOTES
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