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Abstract

One of the most striking phenomena of Zimbabwean literature in the past few decades has been the boom in white memoirs. Often written from abroad, these texts respond to the hostile political climate of the land reforms by insisting upon their right to speak as national subjects. This article studies four memoirs by the two most famous exponents of the genre, Alexandra Fuller and Peter Godwin. It argues that their texts negotiate a contested sense of belonging, challenged by their own doubts and expatriate position as well as by government exclusion. Outweighing such concerns, however, are the authors’ continued family connections to the continent they have left behind. Their parents and siblings are used to insist upon the right of Fuller and Godwin, and with them whites more generally, to call Africa home.

Introduction

The crisis in Zimbabwe of the past two decades has been accompanied by a mass exodus of Zimbabweans, black and white, who watch the
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developments in their country from afar.¹ Some have become part of a ‘silent diaspora’ of those who fear retaliation for speaking up, others have used their position of exile to organise political action.² In the realm of literature, one response that has been particularly striking is the boom in memoirs by white Zimbabweans. As observers of the genre have noted, the fast track land reforms of the early 2000s have created a sympathetic audience, in particular in the West, for narratives about the plight of whites.³ While such memoirs published within Zimbabwe have generally been self-published or published through ‘vanity press’, the more established and successful memoirs have come from expatriates.⁴ But whether written from abroad or from within the country, the questioning of the authors’ right to belong and to speak as national citizens is at the base of their narrative, so that their texts become counter-claims to their sense of exclusion.⁵

The two most famous exponents of the genre in recent years are Alexandra Fuller and Peter Godwin, both professional writers who, while now living in the West, continue to write about their Zimbabwean background. Both authors have written several memoirs, of which this

⁴ Pilossof, The Unbearable Whiteness of Being, pp. 130–32.
This is a preprint version. The full, refereed and revised edition is available in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, published online 19 October 2018, vol. 44, issue 5, article DOI: 10.1080/03057070.2018.1500052

This article will treat four: Godwin’s *Mukiwa: A White Boy in Africa* (1996) and *When a Crocodile Eats the Sun: A Memoir of Africa* (2006) and Fuller’s *Don’t Let’s Go to the Dogs Tonight: An African Childhood* (2002) and *Cocktail Hour Under the Tree of Forgetfulness* (2011). As is clear from the subtitles of several of these texts, they stress the authors’ attachments to Africa rather than their contemporary lives in England and America. And yet, their legitimacy as Africans is constantly thrown into question. This article examines the challenges to belonging that face white expatriate Zimbabweans like Fuller and Godwin, and how the authors respond to such challenges through their family connection. I argue that the authors use this intimate community of parents and siblings to persuade the reader that they, and with them whites more generally, may still call Africa home.

Fuller and Godwin’s fame has not only granted them large audiences in the West, but has also instantiated a surge in academic analysis, often of a justifiably sceptical bent. Rory Pilossof, Ashleigh Harris, Muchativugwa Liberty Hove, Ranka Primorac and Anthony Chennells all point out how Fuller and Godwin dehistoricise the present state of affairs in Zimbabwe by focusing on fond childhood memories and on contemporary violence against whites. Primorac has analysed them as part of an emergence of what she calls ‘neo-Rhodesian discourse [...] often articulated from a position of exile’, while Harris has interpreted Fuller as writing in response

---

to ‘the international media’s construction of white Zimbabweans as victims of, and in, their “homeland”’.  

Yet the idea of Zimbabwe as ‘homeland’ is anything but straightforward. Rather, it is continuously complicated by the pull of the ancestral homelands of the authors’ settler parents as well as their current countries of abode and by the criticism of whites in Africa posed by their own postcolonial sensibilities and by the increasingly hostile government of Zimbabwe. However, despite the various challenges to their sense of belonging, Fuller and Godwin use their memoirs to suggest that Zimbabwe, or ‘Africa’, can still be seen as their ‘home’. In the fraught political climate in which they are writing, this is a strategic act which insists upon white claims to African belonging more broadly. The gesture is all the stronger for the authors’ admission of the tortured nature of their relationship to the place where they grew up.

Harris powerfully argues that ‘it is the writing of the memories of childhood, whether nostalgic or traumatic, and descriptions of childhood belonging, that ultimately allows the authors to inscribe their identities as white Zimbabweans into that country’s history, and permits them to write Zimbabwe as “home”’.  

And this is certainly correct, especially for the first two memoirs. Yet their families play a particularly important role in those memories of growing up, and in the authors’ second memoirs, the focus is less on their own childhoods and more on their lingering family attachments to the continent, especially through their parents. The story of the parent by

---

7 Primorac, ‘Rhodesians Never Die?’, p. 204; Harris, ‘Writing Home’, p. 117.
8 Harris, ‘Writing Home’, p. 117.
the child, variously termed the ‘filial narrative’, the ‘intergenerational memoir’ or the ‘patriography/matriography’, is often used to make sense of that personal relationship, but here it serves an additional purpose. As their childhood memories and lives in Zimbabwe become increasingly distant, Fuller and Godwin’s parents are their lasting link to Africa, as innocent in their aging frailty as the authors’ childhood selves.

While they locate the audience of these texts abroad, Pilossof, Harris, Chennells, Hove and Primorac do not consider the implications of the expatriate position of Fuller and Godwin in detail. Yet for texts that seek to stake out claims of belonging to a country, it is surely crucial that they have been written from abroad. Even more significantly, while noting the prominence of the family and of childhood memories, these critics do not provide in-depth analyses of the role of the family in these memoirs. I will argue that Fuller and Godwin use the family connection to negotiate a space for themselves in spite of the triple exclusion offered by government hostility, their expatriate position and their settler background which causes the authors to doubt whether they ever fully belonged in the first place.

In the following, I will first consider these different kinds of challenges before I proceed to examine how the authors respond to them.

**Challenged Belonging**

---


Born in 1957 and 1969 respectively, Godwin and Fuller have grown up in a country which was internationally regarded as anachronistic in its white supremacist rule and have experienced its demise during their formative years. Their memoirs reflect the unravelling of Rhodesia and the new African government that took over, including the deteriorating political climate of the new millennium. As part of the post-2000 land reforms, 4,000 out of 4,500 white families were forced off their land over the course of two years, while Robert Mugabe’s government promoted a ‘reworked narrative of nationalism, [in which] veterans were cast as the heroic liberators of the land from whites seen as unreconstructed racists’, ‘foreign’ and ‘enemies’. While their black farm workers were also dubbed ‘sell-outs’ and suffered more violence at the hands of the land occupiers, it was the predicament of white families that created a sympathetic audience in the West for narratives about whiteness under siege. As Pilossof writes of white memoirs from within Zimbabwe, they write against the narrative promoted by ‘ZANU-PF, which has dogmatically maintained that white people do not belong in Zimbabwe, and are outsiders or non-citizens. These autobiographies and memoirs are a direct attempt to combat these notions and prove belonging.'

---

The second challenge to belonging is their expatriate status. Fuller and Godwin write about their African childhoods and their families’ continued lives there after having lived abroad for many years. Fuller moved to Wyoming to live with her American husband in 1994 while Godwin was exiled to England after having covered the Matabeleland massacre in the early 1980s. Their memoirs are informed by the overriding question of whether they can authoritatively talk about Zimbabwe or ‘Africa’ as ‘home’ after years or even decades overseas. Even their parents provide challenges to their home claiming, through scathing remarks about people who ‘let down’ their community by ‘abandoning’ the country – remarks which prompt moments of critical introspection.

This leads us to the final challenge to authorial belonging which is the memoirists’ own self-interrogations. Fuller and Godwin both describe their youthful uncertainty about where they belonged and their continued feeling of being split between several identities. Yet despite these multiple inner and outer challenges, the memoirs remain rhetorical acts that establish the authors’ enduring ties to Africa. Writing from overseas, Fuller and Godwin use their families to justify this continuing sense of belonging. The authors assert that they feel at home on the continent where they grew up, and they rely on their family attachment as an indisputable link that is more or less universally acknowledged as signifying home.

Alison Blunt and Robyn Dowling argue that ‘home’ is ‘a spatial imaginary’ which is at once ‘a place/site, a set of feelings/cultural meanings, and the relations between the two.’\textsuperscript{16} In other words, ‘home’ is at once deeply intimate and a carrier of cultural meanings.\textsuperscript{17} The geographical place of Rhodesia/Zimbabwe has been continuously overwritten with multiple meanings depending on shifting regimes and still signifies different things to different people.\textsuperscript{18} It is within this palimpsest of meanings that Fuller and Godwin try to navigate. Their feeling ‘at home’ can be linked to their Rhodesian childhoods which have been rendered morally ambiguous by the worldwide condemnation of white supremacy, while the present challenges to their belonging stem from an equally rejected dictatorial regime. Indeed, so fraught is the relationship that Godwin often refers to Rhodesia/Zimbabwe as ‘this place’, thus avoiding the choice between one name or the other, and both authors often speak of ‘Africa’ rather than any country in particular.\textsuperscript{19} This is also revealing of their imagined audience. As Pilossof notes, “‘Africa’ sells. Westerners can relate to and identify ‘Africa’, not necessarily Zimbabwe, Malawi, Chad or any other remote ‘African’ country of indistinct blackness.’\textsuperscript{20} Also remarking on the reductive gesture of referring to ‘Africa’, Dennis Walder argues that ‘[t]o


\textsuperscript{17} See also W. Webster, \textit{Imagining Home: Gender, ‘Race’ and National Identity, 1945-64} (London: Routledge, 2003), p. ix.

\textsuperscript{18} As Luise White maintains, even referring just to Rhodesia/Zimbabwe is a reductive move which does not do justice to the complexity of the country’s history. L. White, \textit{Unpopular Sovereignty: Rhodesian Independence and African Decolonization} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015), pp. 1–3.


remember Africa is not to remember it; it is to remember “Africa”, that is, a construct of the remembering self.'

With ‘home’ referring simultaneously to this vague understanding of all of ‘Africa’ and the very intimate realm of family attachments, the authors produce a layered sense of belonging and make room for themselves despite inner and outer challenges.

**Challenges from Within**

To begin with the most intimate challenge, both authors interrogate their own ambiguous sense of home. Fuller stresses the contradictory pulls which affect her sense of belonging. She traces this back to the pre-foetal state:

> I am conceived in the [Victoria Falls] hotel […] next to the thundering roar of the place where the Zambezi River plunges a hundred metres into a black-sided gorge. The following March, I am born into the tame, drizzling English town of Glossop.

> The plunging roar of the Zambezi in my ears at conception.

> Incongruous, contradictory in Derbyshire at birth.

She suggests this split between different locations and cultures has influenced her identity: ‘My soul has no home. I am neither African nor English nor am I of the sea.’ But despite her homeless soul, Fuller nevertheless refers to Zimbabwe/Zambia (where her parents now

---

22 Fuller, *Don’t Let’s Go*, p. 33.
23 Ibid., p. 35.
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live)/Africa as her ‘home’. This is a sentiment, she suggests, that she inherited from her parents. After briefly outlining their dreary life in England, Fuller describes their return to Rhodesia when she was a toddler: ‘When the ship veered into the Cape of Good Hope, Mum caught the spicy, woody scent of Africa on the changing wind. […] She held me up to face the earthy air […] “Smell that,” she whispered, “that’s home.”’ While the child’s initial reaction was to catch a fever (‘I had the constitution of a missionary’), it is clear that the heat and smell of Africa became part of Fuller’s own idea of Africa as home. Thus, her later descriptions of her childhood homes and of returning home as an adult all invoke similar sensory impressions to illustrate an embodied sense of belonging.

Thus the authorial reflection on split belonging is used to finally insist on attachment to Africa. Likewise, Godwin says his book is ‘a tribute to Africa – the home I never knew I had’, at once pointing to a former lack of feeling at home and a present confirmation that Africa was indeed his home. The use of the past tense here is interesting, as it suggests that Africa may no longer be his home at the time of writing. Compared with his second memoir, this first one is much less assertive of his belonging. The context of government hostility towards whites which cast them as aliens arguably had the effect of making Godwin more insistent on his right to call Zimbabwe ‘home’ in his second memoir.

---

26 Ibid., p. 39.
27 This is discussed in further detail below, but see for instance ibid., pp. 133 and 295; Fuller, *Cocktail Hour*, p. 217.
In the mid-1990s, however, Godwin was able to explore his past troubled emotions towards his country of birth, including his childhood envy of Afrikaners for their more uncomplicated sense of identity and his longing for a safer place. In Mukiwa, he discusses his boyhood sensation of only having tenuous ties to Africa and how it made him jealous of Afrikaners and black people because they had ‘lots of relatives in Africa’. Searching for an attachment,

I became a fervent admirer of the Afrikaners. After all, they were real white Africans. That’s what Afrikaner meant, it was simply the Afrikaans word for African. They seemed more secure than us, more settled. I began to wish that I was an Afrikaner with a solid identity and I even started spelling my name the Afrikaans way – Pieter.

While this was only a passing phase, inspired in particular by an Afrikaans teenage sweetheart, it is significant that he juxtaposes Afrikaners and white Rhodesians to elucidate a perceived identity deficit. His name change was an attempt to try to make up for this deficit. Whereas, as we will see, in When a Crocodile Godwin uses his parents to signal his continued belonging in Zimbabwe, in Mukiwa, their first generation migrant status is part of what made his childhood self feel insecure about whether he belonged. The only relative he had in Africa, an aunt, is also used to question rather than confirm his African identity. He describes visiting her

29 Ibid., p. 139.
30 Ibid., p. 187, italics in original.
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grave where he recalled ‘her vain attempts to impose brittle English values on the veld. Her whole life seemed as out of place as a bone china teacup at a beer drink’. He visited the grave after having had to flee Zimbabwe because of his newspaper articles about the Matabeleland massacre which had made him a ‘persona non grata in my own home’.  

By the graveside, Godwin cried ‘wracking gushes of repressed weariness and self-pity. At the impermanence of my family in Africa. At our silly misguided attempts to fashion the continent to our alien ways.’ The alienness of his aunt serves to confirm his own ‘impermanence’. But the image of the aunt as fragile porcelain at a beer drink also stresses his family’s vulnerability. In his first memoir, Godwin’s feeling at home is represented as threatened both by a lack of ancestry which made him feel less secure in his identity than Afrikaners and by the physical threat to his security from African nature and guerrillas as well as eventually by the new African government.

These threats caused him, he says, to dream of leaving the country altogether. From early childhood, ‘I longed to live in a safer place, a place where there weren’t so many dangers to spoil my fun,’ and after listing all the natural and supernatural dangers, he concludes, ‘a place where there were no tsotsis setting fire to the forests or killing Europeans in the chimurenga.’ This place, he says, he imagined might be England, ‘a gentle deciduous place where man had tamed nature and moulded it to do his bidding.’ While his wavering feeling of belonging is linked to an

---

31 Ibid., p. 385, italics in original.
32 Ibid., p. 399.
33 Ibid., p. 138, italics in original.
34 Ibid., p. 139.
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inadequate community of ancestors, his urge to leave is coupled with physical danger. 35 Three times during *Mukiwa*, Godwin’s younger self travels to England, and each of his three trips is associated with escape: ‘I felt a wave of relief that I was still alive, that I hadn’t been killed in this stupid little war, that I was going to be allowed to live to be an adult after all.’36 Conflating the country and the war, he suggests that his homeland had become a physical threat to his very survival and he ‘resolved never to come back to Rhodesia.’37

Yet despite these disavowals of his country, he retrospectively excises all the parts of his life that happened abroad. He even omits the fact that the book is written from London where he has lived for five years at the time of writing – a fact which only comes across in the second memoir.38 For the reader, then, Godwin’s attachment to Rhodesia/Zimbabwe is a pained one, but there is no doubt that it is this attachment that he considers meaningful when trying to convey his identity in the present. Godwin describes going beyond physically leaving the continent to attempting to eradicate his Africanness entirely. After he had been forced to leave the country, he says:

I tried hard to forget about Africa after that. I tried to dismiss it from my head as a brutal, violent place. A place of death. And when people asked me what nationality I was, I replied, ‘English, of course.’ And if

35 Godwin is drawing upon a well-established motif. Thus, Chennells notes that the ‘opposition between a violent Africa and a gentle England which people have shaped to accommodate them is a conventional trope of the imperial romance.’ Chennells, ‘Self-Representation and National Memory’, p. 139.
36 Godwin, *Mukiwa*, p. 310, see also pp. 321 and 383 for his other ‘escapes’.
37 Ibid., p. 325.
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my accent betrayed me, I might concede vaguely, ‘I spent a bit of time in Africa, as a boy.”

This denial of his background only accentuates the impossibility of forgetting. Just as with his teenage name change, he here tried to co-opt a different nationality. Yet his accent revealed his true identity, ‘betraying’ Godwin by obstructing his attempts to hide his African background. Indeed, his self-imposed amnesia was unsuccessful, and four lines later, he has his protagonist back in Africa, reporting from South Africa, Malawi and Mozambique. While he says he tried to forget Africa, it is his time overseas that is left out of his memoir.

**Challenges from Without**

In Godwin’s first memoir, he thus largely passes over any part of his life that did not take place in Africa, but explores his own ambiguous feelings about Zimbabwe as his home. In the second memoir, more of the narrative takes place abroad but at the same time there are fewer concessions to the idea of white African identity as a site of contention. Early in *When a Crocodile*, he describes his life in 1996, when the book starts, in the year his first memoir was published. He says he had lived in South Africa for five years beginning in 1986, and ‘[s]ince then, I have been based out of London, though I come back often to Africa, and I know in my bones that I

40 Ibid.
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will return here to live one day, that this is still my home.’\(^{41}\) This self-assured conviction that Africa is his home despite more than a decade abroad contrasts with the ambiguous emotions of the first memoir where it was his inner struggle rather than external conditions which made him question his belonging. In 2006, Godwin argues emphatically that he does belong and he uses his family attachment deliberately to underscore this.

In *When a Crocodile*, then, it is Mugabe’s government which is responsible for the questioning of white belonging, not the history of white settlement which itself renders their attachment tenuous. At his sister’s grave, Godwin reflects that

> the only solace I can find in all of it is that Jain has been spared the intervening tragedy in which we are all now embroiled, the needless moral and physical debasement of this place we used to call home. She has been spared the scattering of so many of its sons and daughters in a far-flung diaspora from which each passing day makes a return less likely.\(^{42}\)

Again the reflection about home and exile is situated within the family, both at the memorial site for his own sister and through the references to the country’s ‘sons and daughters’. He creates a narrative trajectory in which his early conviction that he would return home is supplanted by the realisation that such return is becoming unrealistic, not just for him, but for

\(^{41}\) Godwin, *When a Crocodile*, p. 12.

\(^{42}\) Ibid., p. 259.
many people in the diaspora. Demonstrating the changing meanings that the spatial imaginary of Zimbabwe has for Godwin, it is now ‘this place we used to call home’. And yet, two pages later, he refers to it as ‘our corner of Africa’, suggesting an enduring sense of ownership of the place and affiliation with the people who still reside there.43

In Godwin’s second memoir, the land reforms and the increasingly hostile political climate explicitly take centre stage. He refers to the new rhetoric which cast whites as outsiders: ‘In the news reports, white Zimbabweans were now referred to as the “nonindigenous,” “Britain’s children,” and even simply “the enemy.”’ 44 For an author who is preoccupied by the question of whether or not he can claim Zimbabwe as home, this government effort to render him foreign is important. He resists this, however, by including himself among white Zimbabweans,

[Mugabe] would show these white people not to meddle in politics. In things that did not concern us. We had broken the unspoken ethnic contract. We had tried to act like citizens, instead of expatriates, here on sufferance.45

Godwin’s use of the first person plural suggests that he still counts himself as one of these white Zimbabweans against whom Mugabe was railing.

43 Ibid., p. 261.
44 Ibid., p. 59.
45 Ibid.
Ironically, while himself an expatriate, here he dismisses the label because it is used to suggest that he is actually a Briton in Zimbabwe ‘on sufferance’.

Now, the contestations come from the outside, from Mugabe’s government and thugs, consistently represented as racist against whites. Godwin describes trying to convince his parents to flee the deteriorating situation in year 2000 and their protest that they would not move:

This is their home, and they’re damned if they will allow Mugabe to drive them out, to win. They still believe that change is coming soon and that they have an obligation to stay to help usher it in. Besides, they feel responsible for so many people – colleagues, friends, employees – people they will not abandon, a way of life they will not surrender.\(^{46}\)

His parents’ stubborn insistence that Zimbabwe is their home secures an attachment for Godwin, and a few sentences later he describes taking a job to do a feature on Victoria Falls because ‘[a]t least it will take me home.’\(^{47}\)

So the fact that this is his parents’ home can be said to open a place for it to continue being Godwin’s home, too. But it is important how he justifies their feeling at home. Whereas in \textit{Mukiwa}, his family is associated with impermanence because of their recent arrival, in \textit{When a Crocodile}, Godwin places less emphasis on ancestry and more on contributions to the country.

\(^{46}\) Ibid., p. 104.
In his representation of many white families in Zimbabwe, including his own, Godwin stresses how much they have built from a barren country after arriving with nothing but their dreams of a home and their will to work hard. In the second memoir, then, home is something you make, not something you earn by birth – challenging Mugabe’s interpretation of whites in Africa as ‘foreign’. In this response to the present political discourse, Godwin leaves behind his previous self-scrutiny to firmly assert the right of whites to call Zimbabwe home because of their efforts to develop the country – after 2000, Godwin no longer sees these efforts as ‘silly misguided attempts’. The idea of his parents’ responsibility towards local people can be read as the particular white liberal strand to which his parents belong, but it also helps Godwin to justify the presence of his parents and other whites as beneficial to Zimbabwe, staying not for their own benefit but out of a sense of obligation.

The above passage also stresses his parents’ insistence upon a ‘way of life’. Like the idea of responsibility (or ‘white man’s burden’, one might say), the invocation of a particular ‘way of life’ is reminiscent of the kind of rhetoric the former prime minister Ian Smith uses in his memoir to defend his fight for white rule.⁴⁸ Luise White has demonstrated the importance in white supremacist discourse of the late 1970s of the notion that Rhodesians were fighting to maintain a certain Rhodesian ‘way of life’ which was

---
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constantly contrasted to the chaos of other African countries. In Godwin’s case, it is not quite clear what ‘way of life’ he implies, and rather than swimming pools and sun-downers, he may be referring to the democratic and tolerant society his parents are said to be working for. However, his depiction of Africa as a ‘geography of doom’ does seem to support the observation of Pilossof and Primorac that the post-2000 years saw white Zimbabweans revert to a rhetoric of the 1970s. For the co-author of *Rhodesians Never Die*, a historical examination of post-UDI Rhodesian mentality, this uncritical rendition of his parents’ and other whites’ assertions of their feeling of responsibility seems somewhat naïve. Be that as it may, Godwin is able to tap into his parents’ sense of obligation towards a local community to place himself vicariously as belonging to that self-same community of whites and blacks in Zimbabwe, united against Mugabe.

The political context is addressed most explicitly by Godwin in *When a Crocodile*, but works as a background for both Fuller’s texts as well, even if she refrains from commenting on the contemporary political situation in Zimbabwe or in Zambia where her parents live at the time of writing. As Primorac convincingly demonstrates, ‘the injustice of [the land reforms] gave her license to tell a story which could not previously be told […]

---

51 Ibid., pp. 203–4; Pilossof, *The Unbearable Whiteness of Being*, pp. 118–19; Primorac, ‘Rhodesians Never Die?’, p. 204.
remov[ing] the previously assumed political incorrectness of a neo-Rhodesian story. Equally importantly, the governmental denial of white belonging acts as a challenge that Fuller and Godwin respond to as they draw on their families to confirm their attachments. Harris argues that their first two memoirs, ‘claim Zimbabwean identity despite, or perhaps because of, Mugabe’s injunction to the contrary.’

Like Godwin, Fuller also describes how other people interrogate her attachment to Africa. These include African children mocking her skin colour and making her realise that

I am the wrong colour […] I stand out against the khaki bush like a large marshmallow to a gook with a gun. White. African. White-African.

‘But what are you?’ I am asked over and over again.

‘Where are you from originally?’ […]

I say, ‘I’m African.’ But not black.

And I say, ‘I was born in England,’ by mistake.

But, ‘I have lived in Rhodesia (which is now Zimbabwe) and in Malawi (which used to be Nyasaland) and in Zambia (which used to be Northern Rhodesia).’

And I add, ‘Now I live in America,’ through marriage.

And (full disclosure), ‘But my parents were born of Scottish and English parents.’

54 Harris, ‘Writing Home’, p. 117.
Fuller describes the predicament of so many migrants and their descendants whose appearance prompts demands that they account for their background in a way other people do not have to. The fast forward from the childhood memory of children asking her where she is from to a more recent memory from after her marriage of people still inquiring about her origins serves to suggest that this is a permanent condition of questioned belonging. As her final self-reflection shows, she is not only subjected to questions from others but also to her own ponderings about what her complicated trajectory makes her. Fuller implies that her attachments to Britain are somehow suspect, since telling about them constitutes a ‘mistake’ and ‘full disclosure’ which undermine her claim to being ‘African’. Like Godwin’s, Fuller’s parents are invoked in this rumination about individual belonging, where their overseas background, like her own expatriate status, are part of what complicates her claim to calling Africa home.

Yet these thoughts about origins do not bring about the kind of questioning of home that they did in Godwin’s first memoir. Both Fuller’s memoirs are full of stories of the family moving from one farm to another, but these do not present the protagonist with existential anxiety. Rather, it seems that home is where her family is. Indeed, she describes coming ‘home’ to her parents’ farm from the US, in spite of never having lived on

---

55 Fuller, *Don’t Let’s Go*, p. 8, italics in original.
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this farm herself.\(^{56}\) Like Godwin, Fuller only mentions her American life very briefly in *Don’t Let’s Go* and only slightly more often in *Cocktail Hour*. Yet in her second memoir, she, like Godwin, uses the firm focus on her parents and their African presence to make up for an increased recognition of her own absence. Thus, their families provide the occasion for the authors’ return visits. Both authors almost always come back with the express purpose of visiting their parents and the scenes from the airport often include a welcome committee of family members.\(^{57}\)

But it is also the authors’ own intimate familiarity with the sensations of ‘home’ that provide the link. While Fuller lives in the US at the time of writing, she legitimates her claim to calling Africa home through her continued bodily response to the place. She explains how much like second nature the smells and sounds of Africa were to her as a child: ‘What I can’t know about Africa as a child (because I have no memory of any other place) is her smell; hot, sweet, smoky, salty, sharp-soft.’ She contrasts this to ‘the damp wool sock of London-Heathrow,’ which smells ‘flat-empty’, ‘car fumes, concrete, street-wet’, and proceeds to describe the noises of the bush.\(^{58}\) Ann Laura Stoler and Karen Strassler have suggested that such sensory impressions are a different way of structuring memories, more focused on the habitual, the intimate and the domestic than on grand events.\(^{59}\) In Fuller’s memoirs, her familiarity with smells and sounds are

\(^{56}\) Fuller, *Cocktail Hour*, p. 217.


\(^{58}\) Fuller, *Don’t Let’s Go*, pp. 133–34.

indeed used to confirm her intimate connection to Africa as home and to link the domestic family home to the larger attachment to the land.

Like her early childhood memories, Fuller’s adult homecoming scenes tend to invoke the senses:

I’ve been overseas, in Canada and Scotland, at university. The more I am away from the farm in Mkushi, the more I long for it. I fly home from university at least once a year, and when I step off the plane in Lusaka and that sweet, raw-onion wood-smoke, acrid smell of Africa rushes into my face I want to weep for joy.  

Similarly, descriptions of her many childhood homes all centre around the land, the quality of the pasture, the animals, smells and sounds of the bush.

Indeed, as Harris suggests, in Fuller’s case, ‘[b]elonging […] is closely tied to an idealized notion of land.’ She also notes, though, that the family moves around a lot and ‘as their relationship with the land becomes increasingly transitory, the landscape is described as increasingly hostile.’ Yet as Harris herself observes, this hostility does not diminish Fuller’s claim to belonging. Instead, this claim is partly staked out through rendition of traumatic memories of losing three siblings there, which are part of what makes Africa appear hostile to the family, but which also secure its status as home: ‘The land that takes these children is the homeland; not through a
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nostalgic memory of childhood or idealistic reinvention of the relationship to that land, but through the personal trauma experienced there." While Harris suggests that Fuller’s vision of the land is not nostalgic, I would argue that its hostility is in fact part of what Fuller seems to long for. Indeed, she tends to romanticise danger. While Godwin explicitly says the dangers of Africa were a motivating factor for his settling abroad, Fuller seems to revel in the natural and human threats. When landing in Lusaka as an adult, Fuller is overwhelmed by happiness at the casual hostility of the airport officials: ‘I want to kiss the guns-swinging officials. I want to open my arms into the sweet familiarity of home. The incongruous, lawless, joyful, violent, upside-down, illogical certainty of Africa comes at me like a rolling rainstorm, until I am drenched with relief.” In this sensuous image, it is the danger of Africa that releases the satisfaction of home, suggesting that peril acts as an attraction to her. At another return visit, a card game is interrupted by dogs barking: ‘It’s been years since I’ve heard that particular bark, but I recognize it instantly. I put my cards down and look at Dad. “That’s a snake bark,” I say.” This instinctive reaction to danger despite years abroad signals Fuller’s continued knowledge of Africa, not only through her parents but through her own embodied responses.

Fuller uses all of these affirmations of her enthusiastic familiarity with local dangers to differentiate herself from the whites who are only passing through. When she is back from America, her parents have an English
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visitor whom she describes as a ‘two-year wonder. People like this never last beyond two malaria seasons, at most. Then he’ll go back to England and say, “When I was in Zambia…” for the rest of his life. Fuller sets herself and her parents apart from the kind of transitory whites who cannot handle Africa. She seems oblivious to the irony that her disdain for those who have left is complicated by the fact that she, too, has left Zambia. In Cocktail Hour, she cites the existence of a commemorative community of former Kenyan settlers: ‘Forever they would bore to death anyone who would listen about the perfect equatorial light of East Africa. “When-wes” they were called, as in, “When we were in Kenya. …”’ She does not here recognise that she, too, is one of those people who have left the continent and made a career out of reminiscing about her African past. She even cites her mother’s accusation that she has ‘no patience with nostalgia’ to stress her progressive credentials and advice the reader that the book will not be a nostalgic piece – a warning that jars with the actual style and content of her memoirs that emanate nostalgia for Africa as home.

**Parental Challenges**

The comment about Fuller’s lack of nostalgia is framed by her mother’s snide remarks about her expatriate life. The mother goes so far as to suggest that her daughter must have been swapped at birth,
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To rub it in, she has started introducing me to people as ‘my American daughter.’ Then she leaves a meaningful pause to let my otherness, my overt over-there-ness sink in, before adding with a mirthless laugh, ‘Careful what you say or do, or she’ll put you in an Awful Book.’

In this way, Mum has made it clear that the blood of her ancestors has come to a screeching halt in the blue walls of her veins. Contaminated by my American ordinariness, condemned for my disloyalty, my veins are the equivalent of a genetic tourniquet. I am not a million percent Highland Scottish. I am not tribal. I have no patience with nostalgia. I’ve relinquished wonderful Old Africa and crossed the Atlantic to join the dull New World. And worst of all, I have Told All in an Awful Book, like on the Jerry Springer Show.\(^69\)

The mother’s invective constitutes an interesting complication of the use of family to claim a home in Africa by juxtaposing the memoirist’s expatriate position to her mother’s decision to stay in ‘wonderful Old Africa’. The absurd disowning of her daughter must be read in the larger context of staying as loyalty and leaving as betrayal, a rhetoric which has its origins in the post-UDI period of sanctions against Rhodesia and civil war. Later, Fuller recalls her mother’s attitude to the idea of leaving during the war, ‘leaving was treason talk, cowardly stuff.’\(^70\) As a result, ‘we carried on fighting for Rhodesia as if it were the last place on earth, as if to lose it

\(^{69}\) Ibid.
\(^{70}\) Ibid., p. 185.
would be the same as losing ourselves.' This idea of staying and fighting she associates not so much with white Rhodesians in general as with their specific family unit, ‘Mum makes a fist. “The Fullers aren’t wimps,”’ she says. Fuller and Godwin both mention the idea that they have let down their community by leaving and that this is indeed the same as losing part of themselves. They voice this through their parents’ insistence on staying put. Fuller’s ironic representation of her mother’s ludicrous hyperbole suggests that she does not herself accept the charge, but for Godwin, who seems more prone to self-criticism and more uncertain about his choice to have left, the anxiety that his absence constitutes a betrayal is a recurring worry in the second memoir.

Although less straightforwardly than Fuller, Godwin also hints at parental blame for abandoning Zimbabwe. In When a Crocodile, he describes his father’s refusal to leave:

And anyway, he says, he’s no soutpiel. It’s an Afrikaans word meaning ‘salt penis,’ a term for us Anglo-Africans who, they say, have one foot in Africa and the other in Europe, causing our genitals to dangle in the ocean where they pickle in the brine of cultural confusion. Soutpiels are not ‘real Africans’. We are the first to cut and run."
To ‘cut and run’, incidentally, is what Ian Smith accuses the British of doing in the face of black nationalism in the 1960s, hinting once again at the Rhodesian legacy in the language of abandonment.  While initially presented as an assertion of his father’s complete commitment to Zimbabwe, Godwin turns the remark into a critique of his own absence, as though his father has articulated white Zimbabweans’ idea of people like Godwin. He associates himself with the cowardice and cultural confusion and the accusation of not being a ‘real African’. While Godwin’s father does not seem to target his son directly, he takes the accusation more closely to heart than Fuller. As he leaves Zimbabwe after a visit in 2003 when his mother has had her hip operated and the government has responded violently to protests, Godwin writes,

I feel the profound guilt of those who can escape. I am soaring away from my fragile, breathless father with his tentative hold on life. I’m soaring away from my mother, who still lies in her hospital bed surrounded by wounded protesters

The image of his frail parents stresses their innocence in the face of government violence. He expands from this familial abandonment to enumerate all kinds of people he leaves behind to suffer under the dictatorship while he drinks champagne on the flight. While Godwin

75 Godwin, When a Crocodile, p. 229.
76 Ibid., pp. 229–30.
mentions the black ‘wounded protesters’, the focus of Godwin’s text is on the white families he is leaving behind, both his own and a number of farmers whose experiences the memoir documents.\textsuperscript{77}

That the focus is on white victims seems corroborated by Godwin’s concluding remark: ‘I am abandoning my post. Like my father before me, I am rejecting my own identity. I am committing cultural treason.’\textsuperscript{78} The comparison between himself and his secretly Jewish father is used elsewhere in the narrative to equate white Africans with persecuted Jews, which suggests that the ‘cultural treason’ Godwin sees himself as committing is not against fellow-Zimbabweans in general, but against other whites.\textsuperscript{79} In the first memoir, as we saw above, his self-interrogation revolves around whether his white settler background undermines his claim to belonging. In this second memoir, there is some of the same self-flagellation, but here it concerns his abandonment of primarily white Africans. Like Fuller says of her mother during the war, Godwin thinks it is cowardice for him to leave Zimbabwe now that whites are coming under threat.

While Fuller gently pokes fun at her mother’s extreme denial of belonging, she shows through her embodied responses to the land and her parents’ welcoming at airports that she has enduring attachments despite her mother’s disappointment that she lives in the ‘dull New World’. Godwin uses his scruples over leaving to imply that there is something

\textsuperscript{77} For an analysis of this focus on the more ‘grievable’ bodies of white victims, see Rasch, ‘Autobiography After Empire’, pp. 192–94.

\textsuperscript{78} Godwin, \textit{When a Crocodile}, p. 230.

\textsuperscript{79} Ibid., p. 176.
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fundamentally wrong in that his home country continues to be hostile to him. Thus, extending the analogy between white Zimbabweans and persecuted Jews, he suggests that ‘[I]ike Poland was to [my father], Africa is for me: a place in which I can never truly belong, a dangerous place that will, if I allow it to, reach into my life and hurt my family.’ Despite inner struggles and parental remarks about abandonment, the challenge to his belonging comes fundamentally from the outside. In Godwin’s representation, the challenge is more than rhetorical, it is potentially violent, even genocidal, as the continent threatens to hurt that central signifier of home, his family.

**Conclusion**

When Fuller and Godwin stress the idea of leaving the country as abandonment even as they emphasise their continuing feeling of belonging, they cement their parents’ claim to belonging as beyond question. If white expatriates with split identities can feel at home on a continent they only visit occasionally, then surely, those white settlers who remain despite personal sacrifices and government hostility are all the more legitimate national citizens. Thus, the authors’ considerations about their personal belonging become interventions in a political debate about the place of whites in Africa, especially potent after the fast track land reforms in
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Zimbabwe and the outrage that ensued in Western media.\(^{81}\) Like childhood memories, stories of aging parents and family graves have a special capacity to appeal to readers’ sympathy and make highly political claims seem less political and more natural.

Because family is so culturally ingrained as a signifier of home, it allows the authors greater scope to examine and explain their ambiguous sentiments about the place where they grew up and still insist upon an enduring sense of belonging. That this is an affective construction that the authors can use strategically becomes clear when we see the shift between Godwin’s first and second memoirs. Written before and after the land reforms, they use the family quite differently to illustrate his relationship to Zimbabwe, the former being more searching and subtle, the latter more bombastic in his claims to belonging and locating threats to that feeling firmly outside himself. In Fuller’s nostalgia towards danger and her embodied familiarity with the land, we find ways of superseding accusations of settlers as aliens or of expatriates as ‘When-wes’. While she does not address the political situation in Zimbabwe, it seems to inform her way of positioning her past and present selves as at home in Africa despite contestations to the contrary.

When Fuller and Godwin wrote their memoirs, they did not belong to the group holding political power in Zimbabwe. But they did belong to a privileged elite with the means, education and colour to gain acceptance in the West. This had enabled them to leave the deteriorating conditions of the

\(^{81}\) Harris, ‘Facing/Defacing Robert Mugabe’.
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countries where they grew up, and it gave them access to an audience. Yet it was their African past, not their Western present, which interested this audience. In their memoirs, Fuller and Godwin comply with this desire for African narratives in the context of the discursive shifts that followed in the wake of land reforms. Their claim to belonging is challenged by their own self-examination, their expatriate position and increasing government hostility. But through their parents and siblings, the authors insist upon their right to call Africa home. Thus, the political act of legitimating the right of whites to speak as national subjects is rendered as a personal question about a family connection.
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