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ABSTRACT
This paper explores Graham Lang’s depiction of the Zimbabwean crisis, migration and identity in Place of Birth (2006). The text, by foregrounding the experiences of a white Zimbabwean family’s attempts to survive the crisis, offers a hitherto marginalised discourse/narrative in Zimbabwean literature, which largely focuses on the experiences of black Zimbabweans. Lang’s understanding of the nexus between the Zimbabwean crisis, migration and identity is chiefly centred on the Zimbabwean government’s land reform programme. However, Lang’s depiction of the Zimbabwean crisis in general and the land reform programme in particular largely resonate with colonial perceptions of the African, which project him/her as inherently atavistic in nature.
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Introduction

Lang’s Place of Birth is a fictional text that explores the experiences of the Bourke siblings as they try to exhume and rebury their ancestors in crisis-torn Zimbabwe. The text has an apocalyptic foreboding tone as the Bourke family encounters violence, threats and death in their attempts to protect their farm from appropriation. Thus, the text focuses on the “disruptive nature” of the land reform programme and its threat to white “economic livelihoods” (Muzondidya 2009: 173) as well as the subsequent migrations that ensued. I argue that Place of Birth typically describes the larger white community and its attempts to re-imagine itself in the ensuing post-2000 land reform programme. The land reform programme resulted in white displacement and dislocation and created an ambivalent and contradictory relationship between whites and the Zimbabwean nation state.
Land reform, white farmer displacement and white writing

Lang’s *Place of Birth* falls within a body of literature that can be classified as white Zimbabwean literature. This literature, as Primorac (2006) argues, is largely marginalised in mainstream academic discussions and debates of Zimbabwean literature, which is treated as synonymous with black Zimbabwean literature. Thus, Zimbabwean literature can be conceptualised as made up of two strands. The first strand is the black one which assumes hegemonic status in the narration of Zimbabwean experiences and is epitomised by Zhuwarara (2001). The white Zimbabwean narrative, which constitutes the second strand, generally exists on the margins of Zimbabwean society. However, the post-2000 emergence and explosion of white Zimbabwean writing has generated interest in this body of literature. Zimbabwe’s land reform programme and its impact on whites is generally the central theme of this literature. This, however, should not be taken to imply that white Zimbabwean writing suffered a lag prior to the land reform programme, as testified by the existence of writers such as Eppel (1993) and Godwin (1996). Raftopoulos (2009) argues that the ensuing displacements and the attendant transformations in the fortunes of white farmers and their families had profound economic and political implications and spurred a new genre of postcolonial “white writing” that inscribed a new sense of victimhood on white identities. The key moment, as already argued, that marks the implosion of this literature is the dispossession of many white farmers of their land. Similarly, Harris (2005) notes that the immediate context for white writing is the land reform programme and the impossibility of reconciliation between the Zimbabwean government and the white farming community.

The Zimbabwe African National Union – Patriotic Front’s (ZANU-PF) hegemonic and essentialised narratives of national identity and citizenship (Ranger 2004; Ndlovu 2009; Tendi 2010) project whites as “aliens” and “foreigners” and therefore not entitled to land. However, this meta-narrative is contested by white writers such as Buckle (2001), Lang (2006), Godwin (2006) and Rogers (2009) who inscribe their Zimbabweaness and sense of belonging to the nation state. Thus, the imagining and mapping of identity in white Zimbabwean literature is largely centred on the concept of “crisis” mainly provoked by the land reform programme, which significantly altered white “colonially inherited privilege” (Muzondidya 2009: 172). This sense of “crisis” has provoked a crisis of a discursive nature as whites have been forced to re-think their identity and sense of belonging. This ambivalence is noted by Alexander (2004: 194) who observes that:

> White Zimbabweans, historically a numerical minority, have become a persecuted minority over the last five years. This shift in their status within the nation has left them feeling caught between a decision to remain in the country of their birth and a decision to emigrate and start over in an alien place.

Thus, the white dilemma to “remain” or “emigrate”, aptly captured by Alexander (2004: 194) above, is associated with white displacement and dislocation and the need to re-invent oneself. In addition, this white dilemma can be interpreted as constituting white liminality. McClintock (1995: 24 citing Turner 1969: 95) argues that the liminal condition is ambiguous and eludes the “network of classifications that normally locate states and
positions in cultural space”. An existence on the margins between what is “known and unknown” (McClintock 1995: 24-25) forced whites to become creatures of “transition and threshold” (McClintock 1995: 25) as they had to re-create themselves.

This re-invention of self is among other factors predicated on internal, regional and transnational migration. Migration, as depicted in most of these white writings, is not just about escaping and surviving Zimbabwe’s political and economic crisis, but is a metaphoric way of fleeing the postcolonial “black peril” which threatens to suffocate “white civilisation”. The notion of trying to escape the postcolonial “black peril” reflects some of the residual white colonial discourses which perceived blacks as incapable of governing themselves, as typified by Douglas Smith (1997) who conceives Zimbabwe’s descent into political and economic chaos as concrete testimony of black failure to self-rule. I also argue that the land reform programme has disrupted the “stable” locus of privilege and power that whites used to have and resulted in white economic and social downward mobility. Migration is thus posited as “a strategy and opportunity for coping with displacement, violence, poverty and vulnerability” (Derman & Kaarhus 2013: 2).

The narrator in Place of birth, Vaughn Bourke, notes that his family’s history is punctuated by migration:

My family, the Bourkes, were regarded as ‘Old Rhodesians’ because we were among the first settlers in Matebeleland. I was born a fourth generation Rhodesian, the youngest of three children: Angela, Angus and me, Vaughn (Lang 2006: 13).

It is critical to note that the narrator confesses that his ancestors were early white pioneers in Matebeleland who “owned and occupied” (Lang 2006: 13) land which they proceeded to (re)name “Hopelands” farm (Lang 2006: 13). This history, which resonates with the colonial history of the pioneer column, thus dramatises the early colonial and often violent acquisition of African land which will reverberate in the 21st century in the form of the land reform programme and the attendant inverse white displacements and dislocations.

Additionally, this history of migration, evocative as it is of colonial intrusion, is epitomised by Vaughn senior and Catherine Bourke who are the family’s patriarch and matriarch. The way we imagine and perform our masculinities and femininities play a crucial role in the dramatisation of colonialism, which McClintock (1995) sees as essentially male. This is epitomised by Vaughn senior who is described as “fierce and stern” with a “bushy beard” and “dark and serious” eyes (Lang 2006: 36). Vaughn senior’s portrait personifies the prototypical colonial who is projected as aggressive and strong willed (Chennells 1982). All these characteristics, which are suggestive of a militant masculinity, therefore result in the expropriation of land and the establishment of a farm in Shangani.

Nevertheless, the image of a seemingly stable white colonial identity is disrupted after the attainment of Zimbabwe’s independence. This new dispensation is depicted as still enabling white characters like Gus, the narrator’s brother, to continue subscribing to the colonial ideology of the superiority of the white race as testified by his continued reference to blacks as “kaffirs”. I therefore argue that Vaughn senior and Catherine’s “primordial” migration into Zimbabwe is the basis of the Bourke family’s physical and discursive mi-
The trope of migrancy is thus eminently pronounced in the text and is emblematised by the opening paragraph:

The hazy expanse of Zimbabwe rises. Abstract brown swathes acquire the raw detail of bush and rock, blurred horizons become solid ... I close my eyes, trying to gather my thoughts. I try to think of what lies ahead. I am returning to my place of birth for the first time in twenty-six years (Lang 2006: 5).

The implied descend, as the narrator’s plane arrives, underscores the apocalyptic tone of the text and is indicative of the narrator’s conceptualisation of his return migration as negative. Thus, the narrator projects his return as “descending” into the world of chaos provoked by the land reform programme. The idea of “descending” is also redolent with colonial tendencies that stubbornly perceive postcolonial Zimbabwe’s trajectories as reflective of a fall from progress. Postcolonial Zimbabwe is therefore reminiscent of McClintock’s (1995: 24) “anachronistic space”. The apocalyptic tone that characterises the above description is also metaphorical of the “descend” of the white community from economic positions of power and privilege to dispossession.

This underscores the fact that Vaughn Bourke, the narrator, who is the last born in a family of three, first migrates to South Africa and ultimately to Australia to study. Vaughn’s migration, however, destabilises his sense of self as he exists “between identities”, in a “limbo” and “between places” (Lang 2006: 5) and thus is constitutive of his liminality. In addition, Vaughn’s migration to South Africa and ultimately Australia and the attendant (re)formation of identity as he begins to identify himself as an Australian, is part of the strategic repositioning of self in the context of a war in Rhodesia. The Bourke family is further destabilised by Angela’s (Vaughn’s elder sister) migration to Britain. Her migration is provoked by the mid-1980s crisis in Matebeleland, popularly known as “Gukurahundi”. Raftopoulos (2004: xi) notes that the outcome of this conflict was the Unity Agreement in 1987 “which, while it ended the atrocities in Matebeleland, effectively emasculated the major opposition party PF Zapu and confirmed the regional subordination of Matebeleland”. However, “Gukurahundi”, as exemplified by Angela, also resulted in white migration. This underscores the fact that Vaughn and Angela’s migrations are provoked by crisis. In Vaughn’s case it is the 1970s anticolonial war which, because of his liberal inclinations makes the African’s demand for land “historically just” (Lang 2006: 17) and compels him to consider Smith’s Rhodesian government as “illegal” (Lang 2006: 14) that forced him to escape to South Africa and ultimately Australia to study rather than be conscripted into the Rhodesian army. Vaughn’s portrayal as a liberal testifies to the fact that whites are not a homogeneous bloc, as there were some, such as Garfield Todd (Todd 2007) who actively supported the guerrillas and did not subscribe to the Rhodesian colonial government’s rhetoric of war. Vaughn’s migration therefore results in the production of a white liberal identity that is sympathetic to the black cause.

Vaughn’s liberal tendencies, however, do not endear him to his brother who derogatorily refers to him as “Sir Chickenheart” (Lang 2006: 14) on the grounds that Vaughn had betrayed “kith and kin” (Lang 2006: 14) by not joining the Rhodesian army. Thus, migration, though a tactical move assumedly by a “shrewd” individual, can be interpreted differently
by others who might see it as a cowardly act as exemplified by Gus who scorns Vaughn’s migration as betrayal. Nonetheless, Vaughn’s liberal predisposition is destabilised by the killing of his parents by the African nationalist fighters of the 1970s anti-colonial war. The parents’ killing makes his return impossible. The killing of Vaughn’s parents therefore marks the turning point in his discursive and ideological migration. Vaughn, the narrator of the novel, transforms from being a liberal to a displaced and indifferent character: he ceases to be interested in the politics of Rhodesia and later Zimbabwe. Vaughn’s interest in his “place of birth” (Lang 2006: 5) is, nevertheless, reignited by the land reform programme and its subsequent threat to the livelihood of white Zimbabwean farmers and his buried ancestors. Vaughn, by migrating to Australia and becoming “Australianised”, imagined that he had successfully dealt with his Zimbabwean past. However, this past haunts him and forces him to temporarily return to Zimbabwe. Vaughn and Angela’s return migration to Zimbabwe is triggered by a crisis which threatens to erase their family memory and history.

Vaughn, as a consequence of migration, conceptualises identity as shifting and flexible. The idea of perceiving identities as flexible and shifting is supported by Hall (1996: 17) who argues that identities are never unified and are subject to a “radical historicisation”, and are constantly in the process of change and transformation. More importantly, Vaughn notes that migration results in the production of hybrid identities. He points out that “I struggle to sleep that night, so consumed am I with guilt. I yearn for Beth and Michael. Yes, always between places. Neither here nor there” (Lang 2006: 13). The idea of being “between places. Neither here nor there” resonates with Bhabha’s (1994) notion of liminality and the third space where Bhabha (1994) argues that the “third space” emerges when two cultures meet each other, transforming in the process individual identities. In addition, the “third space” is also a site of resistance or the construction of “dissident” identities. By “dissident” identities I refer to identities that do not conform to group identities. Vaughn’s “dissident” identity is a product of his liberal predisposition as he sees the land reform programme as “historically just” (Lang 2006: 17) and is only appalled by the “crooked” and “murderous” (Lang 2006: 17) manner in which it is conducted. His attitude towards the anti-colonial war in the 1970s is also testimony of his “dissident” identity. Vaughn thus rebels against the dictates of most whites who perceived the war as necessary in the preservation of white hegemony and civilisation.

However, Vaughn’s return to his “place of birth” (Lang 2006: 5) fails to provide him with a “liminal condition” (McClintock 1995: 24) to renegotiate his identity, but instead accentuates his sense of “foreignness” as he fails to adapt to the situation prevailing in Zimbabwe. Return migration, instead of re-affirming Vaughn’s “Zimbabweanness”, serves to heighten his “Australianness”. This failure to be transformed into Bhabha’s (1994) proverbial “third space” is exemplified by the fact that he is no longer attuned to the Rhodesian-cum-Zimbabwean landscape, which seems to have deteriorated with the transition of the country from being Rhodesia to Zimbabwe. The sense of unfamiliarity, which provokes Vaughn’s feelings of anxiety and uncertainty, is typified by his description of Bulawayo as a ruined and neglected postcolonial city which resembles Ndjio’s (2006: 104) defini-
tion of a necropolis with its “spectacular infrastructure of lack and incompleteness” and a peculiar revolting aesthetics of ugliness. Ndjio (2006: 103) further argues that a necropolis is a thespian city where insecurity, violence and terror have become daily experiences of the vast majority of the city dwellers. Vaughn’s return migration indeed accentuates his sense of estrangement from his place of birth. This estrangement is conveyed through the iconography of landscape. Fisher (2010: 59) argues that in postcolonial Zimbabwe, landscape is crucial in the process of white de-territorisation as the Rhodesian memory was removed from the country’s national holidays, maps and monuments. Fisher (2010: 59) further argues that this rewriting of Zimbabwe’s landscape was done through erasing, overwriting and restitution as the government “set about constructing another version of nationhood with its own local supporting icons of emplacement, and mapping in this way an African identity onto the landscape”.

Thus, Vaughn’s estrangement is reinforced through the depiction of postcolonial Bulawayo, which no longer resembles the colonial Bulawayo that the narrator was familiar with. We are therefore told that postcolonial Bulawayo now has “different street names” and “colonial stalwarts have been replaced by heroes of the war for liberation” (Lang 2006: 7) underscoring the importance of the politics of landscape in postcolonial Zimbabwe and fear of white de-territorisation. In addition, Vaughn uses scatological language in his depiction of Bulawayo, which is described as characterised by “neglect … drab, dirt – stained walls and razor wire, the cracked and littered pavements, the hordes of sullen, ragged people hanging around listlessly” (Lang 2006: 8). The language of scatology and colonial image that the narrator employs is critical in mapping the level of revulsion that the narrator feels in relation to the changed postcolonial Bulawayo landscape. Bulawayo’s description is evocative of the continued existence of colonial stereotypes of Africans. The migration of Bulawayo from being a colonial to a postcolonial city is therefore mediated through colonial prisms and iconography which map postcolonial Zimbabwe as testimony of black failure to self-rule.

The author depicts a continued existence of a colonial mentality that prevents whites from successfully shedding off their “Rhodesianness” and become “Zimbabweans” in post-2000 Zimbabwe. This is typified by Gus who acidly remarks in racist language to Vaughn that:

Every prediction that Ian Smith made about this country falling into the hands of the kaffirs has come to pass … Every bloody warning he gave about what would happen if whites didn’t rule has come true. Tyranny, chaos … where are you clever bastards now, who ridiculed him back then, hey? (Lang 2006: 140-141)

This racist tendency, typified by Gus, highlights the ambivalences associated with white identity in postcolonial Zimbabwe. Ironically, the ZANU - PF has capitalised on these racist tendencies as noted by Alexander (2004: 195) that the fact that the white community as a whole did not engage in the process of change, has resulted in a situation where government can make claims about “the whites” that mask the differentiation within the white population. I therefore contend that the transition of Rhodesia to Zimbabwe in 1980 can be conceptualised as a form of national-politico migration, which was accompanied
by the (re)formation of individual and national identities. However, most white Zimbabweans, as emblematized by Gus, failed to make this transition.

Muzondidya (2009) observes that many white farmers were generally reluctant to relinquish their colonially inherited privilege and the behaviour of many of them continued to be influenced by the colonial “settler culture”. Kennedy (1987, cited in Muzondidya 2009: 173) defines “settler culture” as:

The great power exerted by settlers, their virtual monopoly over political and legal institutions, their coercive control over the labour and livelihoods of Africans, their manipulative methods for advancing the economic interests of themselves.

Gus exemplifies this “settler culture” as he has a patronising relationship with his workers and continuously refers to Africans as “kaffirs”. It is also important to note that this “settler culture” resulted in the production of a white Rhodesian identity predicated on white hegemony and the inferiorisation of the African. However, Rhodesia’s transition into Zimbabwe in 1980 did not result in much white discursive and subjective migration, as most whites still maintained their economic privileges. Furthermore, the “failure” of the postcolonial government is projected by Lang (2006) as a return migration to pre-colonial times when Africa was perceived as a “dark” continent bereft of civilisation, progress and culture. This thinking, as Said (1978) argues, is integral to the Oriental philosophical outlook that governs the way the West perceives the rest of the world. This is exemplified by the depiction of the Gerber’s farm after its appropriation by the war veterans led by Mtunzi. We are informed that the farm was transformed into unproductive land and was destroyed by the beer-drinking war veterans. Thus, the land reform programme is perceived as a reverse migration into McClintock’s (1995: 24) “anachronistic space” before the arrival of white civilisation, which is projected as having “enlightened” Africa.

Vaughn’s return to exhume and rebury his ancestors also underscores the idea of spiritualised migration. Spiritualised migration transcends our conventional conceptualisation of migration as just physical movement from one point to another. In addition, spiritualised migration is premised on the notion that the ancestors are not really “dead” but live in our memory and continue to influence the trajectory of our lives. Thus, migration is conceptualised as transcending physical movement and encompassing the realm of the spiritual. Just as the Bourke family is forced to migrate from Hopelands to Bulawayo and ultimately Australia and the United Kingdom, so too are the dead Bourkes. The “dead”, who are the family patriarchs and matriarchs, also migrate from their place of burial to a new “home”, the Anglican Church yard in Shangani, which is considered safe. His parents and grandparents were initially interred at Hopelands but since the farm is now under threat, their remains need to be exhumed and reburied somewhere else. Thus, Place of Birth links whiteness, history, crisis and migration in a way that complicates our conventional understanding of migration as solely physical movement from one place to another.

Vaughn conceptualises the land reform as “inevitable” and “historically just” (Lang 2006: 17) but the violent manner in which it is conducted, irks him. This is testified by the death of Tienus Gerber and the acquisition of the Gerber’s farm, which result in
the family migrating to Bulawayo. The Gerbers’ translocation to Bulawayo marks an important juncture in the economic and social downward mobility of the family. The Gerber’s economic and social downward mobility is accentuated by the inflation that characterised Zimbabwe’s plunge into economic, political and social chaos in post-2000. This is exemplified by the way Oom Jasper Gerber’s savings are severely eroded by the ensuing hyper-inflation. Gus, when Vaughn naively suggests migration for the Gerber family, retorts that:

Option? Jesus, you’ve got no idea, boet. The little money the old man has in the bank has been reduced to practically nothing by the inflation. Bella’s salary just keeps them going – if it wasn’t for her, who knows what he’d do? (Lang 2006: 112).

Therefore, Oom Jasper Gerber’s economic and social downward mobility results in the creation of restless and vulnerable white identities. Mobility does not always result in the production of “rich and complex social worlds” that Elliot and Urry (2010) theorise about. Rather, as exemplified by Oom Jasper Gerber, some mobility results in the shrinking and collapse of one’s comfort zones, for Oom Jasper relocates to Bulawayo to vegetate and ultimately die poor as his savings were eroded by inflation.

In addition, Oom Jasper Gerber’s migration results in the heightened fear, anxiety and uncertainty for the Gerber family. This is exemplified by his desire to marry off his daughter Bella to Vaughn. Vaughn is projected as a symbol of hope to the besieged white community. Vaughn’s migration to South Africa and later to Australia, which Gus interprets as an act of cowardice and derogatorily refers to as acts of a “Sir Chickenheart” (Lang 2006: 14), is re-interpreted by Oom Jasper as a “wise decision” (Lang 2006: 158), for it enabled him to escape the post-2000 Zimbabwean crisis in which the text is set. Thus, Oom Jasper praises Vaughn for migrating to Australia and starting a “new life” (Lang 2006: 155) “You made a good move, Vaughn … You used your bloody brains and got out of this place before it was too late. This is not a country for civilised people” (Lang 2006: 158). Bella also perceives migration as synonymous with “starting a new life”. She links migration to the idea of escape and freedom. Post-2000 Zimbabwe is metaphorically depicted as a prison which “traps” and has no “future” (Lang 2006: 112) for whites. Thus, Bella observes that “You [Vaughn] and Angela were lucky to get out of this place” (Lang 2006: 106). Bella’s conceptualisation of migration as offering a new lease of life resonates with Elliot and Urry’s (2010: 10) understanding of mobility as generating “new kinds of power for realising ambition and interests, new possibilities and risks for embodied experiences of movement, as well as new ways for engaging with culture, taste and social contestation”. However, most whites’ fear of migration is closely related to the fear of economic and social downward mobility. This is epitomised by Gus who sees migration from the farm as a “nightmare” and is prepared to engage in what I term “tactical and partial” migration. Gus tactically sends his wife and children to stay in Bulawayo while he engages in strategies to keep hold of the farm.

Angela also remarks that Gus “cannot live without the farm” (Lang 2006: 177) as he is “nothing” (Lang 2006: 180) without the farm. It must be underscored that living with-
out the farm constitutes a dislocation and loss of identity for Gus; he would be reduced to “nothing”. Gus thus exemplifies whites who failed to shed off their settler identities in post-independent Zimbabwe and are thus referred to as “orphans of the empire” by Alexander (2004). Gus perceives migration from the farm as impossible and this partly explains why he engages in strategic and partial migration of his family. Gus sends his wife and children to Bulawayo, thus establishing the farm-city migration patterns that have become so common in post-2000 Zimbabwe, while he remains strategically at the farm and even enters into a clandestine partnership with Ncube, a Zimbabwe People’s Revolutionary Army (ZIPRA) war veteran and former police officer, as a way of keeping hold of the farm. I argue that Gus’s inability to move off the farm is directly related to the way white commercial farmers conceptualise and imagine the farm. The farm is projected as a vital source of livelihood, security, identity and pride and is a microcosm of the settler colony where the white person sees himself/herself as hegemonic. To migrate from the farm is to shed off this settler identity premised largely on economic privilege. Therefore, to migrate from the farm is to plunge into a world of uncertainty, anxiety, fear and possibly poverty. Gus typifies this as the impending farm invasion heightens his anxiety and uncertainty about the future. Vaughn thus notes: “I return outside and sit for a while with Angela. When we go to bed Gus is still there in the garden staring at the stars” (Lang 2006: 181). It is also important to note that Gus’s fear of leaving the farm becomes catastrophic as he causes the tragic death of Angela, the violent and traumatic beating of Vaughn and ultimately his impending imprisonment for the murder of Mtunzi, a war veteran who spearheads the acquisition of the Hopelands farm. Additionally, his refusal to leave the farm further displaces his family and exposes it to insecurity and vulnerability, as they ultimately escape to Britain.

**Conclusion**

I have discussed Graham Lang’s depiction of the Zimbabwean crisis, migration and identity in Zimbabwean literature as reflected in *Place of Birth*. The text underscores the importance of understanding white experiences of the Zimbabwean crisis, migration and identity from a literary perspective. I argued that such an approach complements the existing sociological, journalistic and historical literature on Zimbabwean migration and identity that was mainly provoked by the land reform programme, which radically altered white economic privilege. I also argued that literature provides a unique window into the psyche and emotional world of white Zimbabweans and how they imagined and experienced the land reform programme, the attendant migration and subsequent (re)formation of white identities. I focused on the nexus between land, displacement and migration (internal and transnational) and the creation of restless and vulnerable white identities. My conceptualisation of migration was twofold. First, migration was conceptualised primarily as physical movement from one place to another and second, as social and economic upward or downward mobility. I contended that migration, especially transnational migration, is projected as a survivalist strategy deployed by whites to escape the Zimbabwean crisis and at a discursive level calls forth the need to re-think one’s identity.
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