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This paper is a commentary on some of the responses to the public narrative of the events after the March 15th Christchurch attack. Several colleagues had publicly and privately, offered their views on the Government’s and media outlets use of terms such as ‘unprecedented’, ‘our loss of innocence’ and ‘our darkest day’. A fiery and impassioned exchange of words emerged on social media about the statement: ‘This is not us’. By exposing the counternarrative to these emotion laden terms, a shady past, and in invisible present was revealed. However, the timing of the talk about colonisation also seemed out of step with the need for sensitivity. This paper also explores the role of White supremacy and casual racism in New Zealand. A personal I/we/us narrative style is used throughout the paper to describe how Muslim and Māori lives intersected prior to, and after the attack. The timeline of events is primarily 1 week, and up to 6 weeks post the attack.

March 15th

On the afternoon of the 15th March I was waiting at the Hamilton airport to pick up my daughter and her family. When I received an email from the University alerting staff to the shooting in Christchurch, I checked the news webpage and saw images of the ambulance, and police situated at Dean’s Ave. The tall trees of Hagley Park formed a backdrop of serenity that was at odds with the chaos that had happened hours earlier; images of distraught people were prominent. At the same time, the plane disembarked and my family came through the gate – shock on their faces. I felt a terror creep up and be swallowed with relief as I saw that they were all safe. They were on one of the last planes to leave Christchurch that afternoon.

My grandson’s creche backs onto Dean’s Ave, close to the Al Noor Mosque. My daughter should have been at the creche that day but instead she travelled with her family to attend the Annual Regatta in Ngāruawāhia, and my son-in-law’s kapa haka group was set to perform for the Māori King and accompanying visitors. My son-in-law was also scheduled to do a ‘mataora’, a facial tattoo, or emblishment for a family friend.

My daughter and I spoke about what might have happened had she or her husband been driving or walking down Dean’s Ave that day. My son-in-law is tall, brown and wears a long bushy beard. We have no doubts about what might have happened had the shooter seen them, or their children. But more than this, our children, like Muslim children, live in a culture that has othered them. The portrayal of Muslim and Māori as savage, misogynistic, undeserving, troublesome and uncultured is a narrative we have lived with since colonisation stepped on to our foreshore (McCreanor, 1997). The words Māori and Foreshore are now synonymous with extreme colonisation. So the question of whether ‘this is not us’, or not, takes Māori to a place where they have been before.

This commentary offers a lens on the social media conversations that occurred immediately after the attack in Christchurch. What was readily apparent was that some were uncomfortable raising the role of racism and colonisation, while others felt that white supremacy had to be talked about because to do so is to call out the institutions and social groups that benefit the most from it. The need to be sensitive and careful, were uppermost in my mind, but so too was the need to consider how marginalised peoples feel about racism.

Being Brown, and Being the Other

How do Māori experiences have any connection to the attack in Christchurch?

The conversation I had with my daughter about what could have happened to her was frightening because we do not really ever feel safe in our own country. I have brown siblings, brown children, and brown nephews and nieces. I worry about them: will they get a job with their Māori names and Māori faces? Will they be given a choice of homes they same way that Pākehā are given choices? Will their Māoriness be undervalued? Will they fall through the casual racism gaps in our health system (Came, McCreanor, Manson, & Nuku, 2019). Or, will they have to fight for every inch of their rights because the society they live in tells them every-single-day, in some overt and covert way, that they are not good enough? I worry about them because we live in a country that Taika Waititi eloquently described as ‘Racist as f*%K’. He was vilified, and some called to have his award ‘New Zealander of the Year’, taken from him.

If we can be proud of Taika and his achievements, why do we recoil in disgust and anger when he tells us, and the world, that we are not quite the race-relations haven we try to portray to the world, and to ourselves? Was there a collective introspection where the nation asked itself, ‘what does he mean?’ Why did our country have to hit rock bottom and lose 50 lives before we asked ourselves to look inwards at the institutions that enabled racism to thrive? Alongside that introspection, did we look at our own actions, or inactions that foster racism, not only towards Māori, but to anyone who was not Christian and Caucasian?

When is it ok to talk about colonisation?

The Prime Minister, Jacinda Ardern, and others used terms like ‘our darkest days’, ‘lost innocence’, and ‘unprecedented’ to describe reactions to the Christchurch attack. At the same time, my colleagues hit back on social media saying that the attack was not unprecedented, and that we were never innocent. We argued that ‘this is not us’, really meant, ‘actually, yes it is’. If it
wasn’t why did the New Zealand Settlement Act (1863) happen? ‘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. So if this is not us, how did the rise of the alt-right happen? Former Society Bicultural Director, Dr Rose Black commented that ‘We Pākehā sit on the continuum from superiority to white supremacy, and we don’t even know that we are’ (personal communication, 2019).

My own view on the public commentaries was that as tangihanga had not even started, now was not the time to talk about colonisation. While Māori funeral custom is to raise concerns as a way of paying respect to the the deceased, and honouring their family, the funeral had not yet happened. I made, what I thought was a brave decision to challenge my colleagues on social media – ‘Wait,’ I said. ‘Raise these issues later, at least until after the burials.’ This is not to say that I didn’t agree with them. Because I did.

My colleagues disagreed with me. They were angry and they knew that everything they had been saying about land confiscation, decimation of Māori culture and language, enforced poverty, systemic racism and structural violence was everyday, unacknowledged white supremacy in action. Our experiences taught us that we live within concentric circles of racism, and a deeply held belief in white supremacy as an ideology and practice. This is so deeply ingrained in the history of New Zealand that we do not recognise it, or want to know when we are called to account.

The point my colleagues were making is that New Zealanders should know that everyday acts of casual racism towards Māori, Pacific, Asians and Muslims is endemic and often silenced. Māori are not strangers to terrorism, and the commentators wanted to make that fact public. To do otherwise was to silence those who had suffered, and exonerate those who were complicit in institutionalised programmes of eugenics and classism.

My colleagues also suggested that for our country to heal, we needed to know how this land was colonised, who paid the price for it, and who continues to benefit. Jackson, (2019) commented on the importance of acknowledging the links between the past and present as the massacres and the ideologies of racism and white supremacy, which underpinned them, did not come about in a non-contextualised vacuum. Jackson also argued that the colonisation of New Zealand has a whakapapa – a genealogy, premised on brutality, Christianity, an enduring belief in racial superiority, and a view of Māori as the noble savage (McCreanor, 1997) who cannot attain high intellectual functions, and certainly should not have resources that Pākehā could put to better use.

It may seem strange to say this in a learned journal, but I am reminded of the times I watched Thomas the Tank Engine with my son. Each time the character Diesel appeared, (he was the black train) Middle Eastern music played. Diesel always seemed to be dirty, oily and slick. He was also cast as arrogant, untrustworthy, and deceitful. That same language, with its racist connotations, is used to describe Māori and Muslim communities.

Recognising our colonial history

Within a day of the attack, and largely prompted by the media headlines stating that the attack was unprecedented - angry commentaries spoke of the massacre at Rangiwahia in 1864. These were conversations that felt out of place. Some asked about the relevance of bringing up an event where colonial militia herded men, women and children inside a church in Te Awamutu, which was then set alight. Did we also need to be reminded of how those who escaped were shot in the back as they tried to run away? My colleagues wanted it known that our people were murdered in a Christian church because they had resisted the advance of colonisation.

In the Waikato in the 1860s, Māori refusal to sell land, and the establishment of a King movement, provoked the Colonial government in 1863 to demand that Māori pledge their allegiance to the Crown, or face ejection from their land. Without waiting for a reply, the Waikato was invaded a day later (O’Malley, 2016). Some of us wanted to stay silent, to not compare disasters. I thought it was important to say ‘We cannot sympathise with someone who has lost family by ripping open your own scar and saying, ‘This happened to me too’.

Essentially is it fair for Māori to claim our own colonial trauma, while the recovery response was still in progress? Moon and Derby (2019) argued (in an unrelated article) that modern Māori cannot know what historical trauma is because we were not there to experience it. They further claimed that Māori portray a one-sided, revisionist view of history and colonisation, while ignoring the benefits of being colonised, and seek to blame, and be angry at a specific ethnic group (the British) while conveniently overlooking the trauma at the hands of our own pre-European Māori.

What then about Muslim experiences of trauma? It is convenient to say that trauma does not pass down to future generations simply because we tell ourselves about it. As we were not there (when the trauma happened) how could we be traumatised? This statements show a disregard for human experiences and overlooks the power of narrative history as a tool for healing, and for reconciliation. (see also, Pihama, Smith, Evans-Campbell, Kopu-Morgan, et al, 2017) for a nuanced exploration of historical trauma).

Many of us will have a future narrative about the Christchurch attack, and it is important that it is one based on recovery and learning. It is concerning that if we cannot accept that Māori have a collective experience of colonisation and trauma, how are we going to manage what we hear in the future? Anjun Rahman the leader of the Islamic Women’s Council of New Zealand wrote: ‘How does a heart break? Does it shatter into a million pieces? Does it split into two aching, throbbing halves? Does it break with a low keening wail or an earth-shattering scream of pain?’ Pain of this magnitude is always remembered.

Racism and white supremacy

Some of the difficult commentaries I managed were from Māori who had learned to hate Muslims. It is the ‘some of my family and friends are racists’ story that was touchy to navigate. Māori values of manakaitanga, and whānau were clearly not extended to Muslims, and we had to call each other out on that. I was particularly tired of seeing racist, Islamophobic comments from Māori who live in Australia, as if they had never known racism growing up in New Zealand, or the racism towards Indigenous Australians.

Another narrative that we discussed was that Māori, and Muslims were under intense surveillance by State Services while white supremacists were ignored. Despite members of the Muslim communities having told police, the State Service Commission, the Security Intelligence Service, Department of Internal Affairs, Government Ministers and the Human Rights Commission about
the death threats they had received from the alt-right they did not feel heard, or protected (Rahman, 2019). Was it too unbelievable and unpalatable to scrutinise White supremacists as potential terrorists? Is it white imagination to say that only certain people can commit acts of terror, while white people do not?

Despite the high rates of gun violence in the United States committed by White Americans, they are not collectively held to account like Muslims are. White shooters are described as loners (or a lone wolf), someone not part of an organised unit, or group. But are they really alone? In relegating the ‘lone wolf’ to the position of an unhinged outsider, we are not exposed to the white supremacists’ collective belief in their right to eliminate anyone they see as a threat to their self-idealised supremacy (Jackson, 2019).

This tricky side-step also enables the ‘this is not us’ narrative to float, because that type of person seems too far down the other end of the white supremacist continuum. Māori commentators on the other hand did not see the difference between white supremacy that kills quickly, and white supremacy that is insidious and kills slowly (Kanji & Palumbo-Liu, 2019). The removal of Māori children by Oranga Tamariki, the abuse of children and youth in state care, and in faith-based institutions, and Māori experiences of mental health services (Russell, Levy & Cherrington, 2018) are just a few examples.

The language used to other Muslim experiences was perhaps most telling in the way that the shooter’s background was portrayed in the media. Without a doubt, had the shooter been Muslim, or Māori, the entire ethnic group and culture would have been vilified and portrayed as barbaric, with a primitive nature. However, there is a propensity to assuage potential white fragility by portraying white killers as inherently good – and that they have somehow gone bad. Australian and British newspapers showed a photo of a blonde, blue-eyed boy, with his father – the headline read ‘Angelic boy who grew into an evil far-right mass killer’. The killer was also described as “a likeable and dedicated personal trainer running free athletic programmes for kids”. Other terms used were ‘ordinary, white-man, of Australian, Irish, Scottish and British descent’ and a ‘working class mad-man’.

The descriptions used above are examples of what Ray Nairn (2019) calls narrative fragments. When we hear a narrative fragment: a phrase or brief sentence cueing a well-known story, we fill in the rest of the story. By describing the killer as ‘blonde, blue-eyed and angelic’ we maintain a view, depending on our life experiences, that white culture is normal, natural, ordinary and the standard against which everyone else is measured.

I wondered, did the child-angel fall off the heavenly perch destined for him as a white Australian? Does the narrative of white supremacy also guarantee entry into the celestial kingdom for Christians in the same way the Crusades promised the spoils of the Holy Land? Does having to write about the not-so-good-white-person leave editors a little out of their depth? Jacinda Ardern told the nation:

“For those of you who are watching at home tonight and questioning how this could have happened here, we, New Zealand ... We were not chosen for this act of violence because we condone racism, because we’re an enclave for extremism, we were chosen for the very fact that we are none of these things, because we represent diversity, kindness, compassion, a home for those that share our values, a refuge for those who need it. And those values, I can assure you, will not and cannot be shaken by this attack.”

Sahar Khumkhor, a reporter for Al Jazeera said that the ‘This is not us’ statement merely showed a ‘comforting conviction’ that extremism and violence are features of backward societies, and not products of western cultures. She went on to say that racism still determines who the ‘we, and they’ are of the world and that ‘this is not us’, ‘… seek[s] to absolve and reject responsibility and shame, and replace them with fragile innocence and even pride.’

The concerns were that by calling the attack unprecedented, or claiming that our innocence is lost, we overlooked the systems that allowed it to happen. Narrative fragments for marginalised peoples highlight racialised concerns and experiences: The Black Lives Matter movement, Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women, Black Deaths in Custody, Pipeline to Prison, At-Risk- Māori and Islamophobia are all examples of inequities that are unattended to. It has become normal to hear about these narratives, to experience them, to disparage and reject the vulnerability of the victims (Palombo, 2019). It feels like negation, not just of my own lived experiences, but also of our own history as a nation. Because, while Friday was a dark day, maybe one of the darkest, Aotearoa’s settler-colonial history is a long white-supremacist storybook. I will not pretend it is new, that it is exceptional, that I didn’t see it coming. I did, and you should have too (Nasr, 2019).

Nasr’s commentary is a painful narrative of discrimination and abuse that has been told to us many, many times. If indeed ‘this is not us’ is actually true how do we reconcile hearing about the abuse of Muslim communities, and doing little to change it?

The role of psychology in assisting with recovery

Within days of the attack, the New Zealand Psychological Society set about preparing a co-ordinated recovery response. Having had some experience following the Christchurch earthquake, we were keen to assist when needed. We updated our webpage, sought relevant material for those affected, either directly or indirectly, and established points of contact in Christchurch, and throughout the branches. I became acutely aware that despite the large amount of resources we had on trauma, we had nothing written specifically for Muslim communities. The Ministry of Health, and the Ministry of Education were in the same situation. This was a major concern, particularly as there were 40 different ethnic groups affected by the attack. None of the resources available talked about how to deal with race-based trauma, or how to work with Muslim children, or distressed Muslim youth. Particular information was also needed for Muslim women who were now widowed, and in the process of iddah; and for Muslim elderly men and women – and importantly, the resources did not offer support to maintain spiritual faith, particularly after the loss of an Imam, and the insidious nature of Islamophobia.
The Charity Hospital in Christchurch had, quite early, started a counselling roster for people affected by the shooting, and the Ministry of Health set up a telephone counselling line. We reached out to our colleagues around the country to seek support for the telephone lines, the Employee Assistance Programme, Victim Support, schools, tertiary institutions, corrections facilities, and hospitals. In Christchurch, a Hub was established where Muslims could access various agencies (ACC, Immigration) and to be together to meet and talk. Our colleagues were working double shifts in Christchurch where they could. We knew that Christchurch was experiencing an influx of help and that we needed to be careful of not getting in the way. Resources were also developed to support those working beyond their usual capacity.

By the end of the week of the 22nd of March, after a prolonged wait, the deceased were returned to their families and burials were planned. Jacinda Arden, politician, and breastfeeding mother (because this job is important), supported the Muslim faith. Imam would lead the service. 

The Australian Psychological Society (APS) also provided extremely valuable support, and information, including a paper on how to create stronger communities to prevent racialised violence (APS, 2019). There may have been an email overload for some but, as it turns out, there was no co-ordinated plan between the Society, the College and the Board to deal with traumatic incidents. At a time like this, the divisions between our professional bodies were a limitation that needed addressing. Also, coordination with training programmes and Branches and Institutes is needed to inform the Society about the psychology workforce, and their particular skill set. The Psychologists Board does not collect data on religious affiliations, and this is perhaps a limitation.

During this time, I thought about how to connect with Muslim psychologists. I also thought that perhaps the difficulties Māori experience in psychology with limited cultural content specific to our worldviews also occurred for Muslim students. Do Muslim students face a Western worldview of psychology, devoid of any knowledge of the history of Islam’s contribution to psychology, or Islamic healing theories and methods? Could a Muslim student say that their training prepared them to work within an Islamic perspective? Or do they, like Māori, Pacific, Asian, African students, have to learn the cultural perspectives post-training?

As western psychology in New Zealand is typically taught from a White American, European, or British perspective, the history of psychology’s role in colonisation is rendered invisible. Some exceptions are the APS apology to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples in 2016 for their role in the erosion of Aboriginal culture (APS, 2016). Would Muslim students be taught that the gold standard of psychology, the American Psychological Association (APA) colluded with the Department of Defence to permit the torture of Muslim prisoners in their detention centers (i.e., Guantanamo Bay) (Hoffman Report, 2015). Or that the APA changed their code of ethics from ‘to do no harm’ to allow psychologists to participate in the development of torture programmes? Are Muslim students taught that in 2015, members of the American Middle Eastern/North African (MENA) Psychological Network (2015) wrote an open letter to the Board of the APA and the psychological community to raise concerns that psychology was mirroring what was happening across the United States. The writers claimed that Muslims and refugees experienced diminishing civil liberties, human rights abuses, discrimination, threatened and actual violence, and racial profiling since 9/11. The MENA group also felt that the APA had aligned itself indirectly ‘with voices’
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Legitimating state sponsored violence and oppression against marginalized groups in nations around the world. Recommendations to the APA was to increase the visibility of Muslim psychologists in the APA, and to promote the relevance and trustworthiness of psychology for Muslim communities.

Recently, Awad (et al, 2019) argued that MENA group members continued to experience macro and micro level pressures such as: historical trauma, hypervisibility and invisibility, societal and institutional discrimination, interpersonal and macroaggressions, hostile national context and invasive surveillance. The context is the same for Muslims in New Zealand. Psychological training, research, teaching and professional development will now need to consider a recovery response that is truly reflective of the Muslim community.

A starting place is to identify gaps in training, research, teaching and professional development will now need to consider a recovery response that is truly reflective of the Muslim community.

At this point in time, and even over the next few years, can we realistically prepare for the actual diversity in our country without first focussing on ideologies of racism that exist in the doctrines and practices of white supremacy? And even when the focus, or gaze is turned to the more extreme examples of racism, the everyday practices of racism, particularly at structural levels, are usually ignored by the dominant group to which most psychologists belong.

One other event happened in April that warrants mentioning. A decision by the Titahi Bay Returned Services Association (RSA) to have a Muslim prayer at their dawn ceremony commemoration of ANZAC was met with a major public backlash, and death threats were made. Social media could barely contain itself as cultural amnesia played a familiar tune of how Australians and New Zealanders sacrificed their lives for our Christian freedom and our national identity. Muslims also fought in the World Wars for the British Empire, yet there is seldom any mention of their contributions. The cultural amnesia also meant that few people knew that every year, in Gallipoli, Australians and New Zealanders have a special monument and space for them to remember the fallen.

On the memorial wall at Gallipoli there is an inscription of a quote from Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the first leader of the Republic of Turkey:

Those heroes who shed their blood and lost their lives! You are now lying in the soil of a friendly country. Therefore rest in peace. There is no difference between the Johnnyes and Melmets to us where they lie side by side here in this country of ours. You, the mothers, who sent their sons from far away countries wipe away your tears; your sons are now lying in our bosom and are in peace. After having lost their lives on this land they have become our sons as well. Atatürk, 1934

If we cannot tolerate prayers to honour those who suffered in Christchurch, and to honour the ethnic diversity of those who also fought in the War, what does that say about our nation? It that really us?

Mataora and kapa haka: Facial adornment and performing arts

In the opening I said that my family left Christchurch to perform for the Māori king in Ngāruawāhia at the annual regatta, and for my son-in-law to inscribe a facial tattoo (mataora) for a 60 year old Māori male. Māori came so seriously close to losing their skill and knowledge: performing arts, boat racing, and tattoo (tāmoko). To be able to practice Māori cultural practices after 175 years of colonisation is a testimony to our ability to survive, and to be inclusive. My family would have been in Christchurch that day but they came home to participate in Māori activities that the majority of New Zealand know nothing about.

Finally, among the many comments and opinions, Anjun Rahman’s comment stood out as gracious and welcoming. She said that the Indigenous peoples needed to be treated with dignity and respect. Here was a community that had been brutally treated, and continue to be, the world over, and they were asking the Government to respect the Treaty of Waitangi. I hear solidarity and I hear pathways for moving forward together.

Where to from here?

Using a narrative timeline I have described some of the main discourses that prevailed over social media, and the online newspapers since March 15th. There were many others, Senator Anning and Egg-boy, protests about there being too many memorial services, and Destiny Church members stand-for-Christanity outside the Al-Noor mosque. My purpose in this paper is to show the difficult conversations that happened since March 15th because our histories are ignored, and because White supremacy always appears to get a free pass in life. As long as the lives of marginalised peoples intersect we can be united in our approach to challenging injustice to create a flourishing future.

Rather than leave this paper with a hopeful comment and wish for change, I realised that such sentiments need action, not hope. Goals going forward could instead focus on:

1. Connect with Muslim psychologists: (but don’t be a burden) offer support, based on their right to self-determination, to identify a layered approach to healing from the attack.

2. Prepare for the future: Develop a co-ordinated plan with professional
organisations, Crown agencies, community groups and NGOs to respond in a culturally appropriate, and timely manner to adverse, and traumatic events.

3. Look around the room: Increase the number of culturally, and ethnically diverse psychologist and academic staff. Use an equity-based approach. Māori make up 15% of the population, Muslims 1%, Pacific 7.4% and so on. However, the level of need in these communities outweigh simple numbers. For example, if Māori are over 50% of the mental health population, Māori should make up 50% of the psychology workforce.

4. Change the way psychology is taught: Psychology programmes need to embed content in their coursework that reflects the sociodemographics of New Zealand. Why wait for a disaster to happen? Be proactive, and ethically responsive.

5. Learn a language: Expand our exposure and knowledge of diverse cultures and their cultural practices. Keep it local – there are close to 40 different Pacific nations in New Zealand. How many do we know about?

6. Do something about racism in psychology: In my experience, racism in psychology bubbles away in the form of epistemic elitism, a fear of change, and reluctance to accept culturally diverse worldviews. Racism is not immutable. But things are still changing too slowly. Learning about another culture requires us to accept our limitations, and lack of knowledge. Be comfortable with discomfort.

7. Do something about racism in everyday workplaces: We know the statistics about the social determinants of health and wellbeing need changing. Demand better services for clients, and better access to psychologists.

8. Be the one to advocate for change: Ask for more culturally diverse learning opportunities and don’t take no for an answer (discrimination may occur however when we are the squeaky wheel).

9. Grow the psychology workforce to be ethically and skillfully prepared to work with culturally diverse peoples. Inclusivity requires a shift in power – pass opportunities to those who can’t rely on white privilege to succeed.

10. Work with our communities as often as possible: Being prepared means that we have already established our connections, and we maintain them – usually with food and sharing resources.
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