

# Heteroglossia and the Destabilisation of Authorial Voice in Bruce Moore-King's *White Man Black War*

**Cuthbeth Tagwirei**

## Summary

Through a reading of Moore-King's *White Man Black War*, this article seeks to demonstrate that white Zimbabwean narratives belong to a heteroglot world, a world of multiple languages, which destabilises the assumed monologism of the white Zimbabwean literary canon. *White Man Black War* privileges an authorial ideology at the expense of other voices in its pursuit of a single "Truth", something which reflects Zimbabwe's critical tradition that sees coherence in the white Zimbabwean literary canon. This tendency is not only predicated on a fallacy, that monologue is possible, but provides the impetus to relegate other voices and narratives to the margins. Regardless, even where monologue appears to be privileged, it is nevertheless unattainable. By incorporating other voices into its narrative design, even with the intention of containing these voices, *White Man Black War* is internally destabilised to the extent that its voice(s) become multiple and conflictual. In such a scenario neither the individual text nor the literary archive can be successfully unitary.

## Opsomming

Hierdie artikel poog om, deur 'n ontleding van Moore-King se *White Man Black War*, te demonstreer dat wit Zimbabwe se vertellings tot 'n heteroglot-wêreld hoort – 'n veeltalige wêreld, wat die veronderstelde monologisme van die wit Zimbabwe se literêre kanon destabiliseer. *White Man Black War* bevoorreg 'n ouktoriële ideologie ten koste van ander stemme in sy strewing na 'n enkele "waarheid", iets wat Zimbabwe se kritiese tradisie, waarvolgens die wit Zimbabwe se literêre kanon deur samehang gekenmerk word, weerspieël. Hierdie tendens berus nie bloot op 'n dwaalbegrip – naamlik dat monoloog moontlik is – nie, maar dien as aansporing om ander stemme en vertellings na die kantlyn te skuif. Nietemin, selfs waar monoloog bevoorreg blyk te wees, is dit steeds onbereikbaar. Deur ander stemme in die verhaalontwerp te inkorporeer, selfs met die doel om hierdie stemme in toom te hou, is *White Man Black War* intern gedestabiliseer in so 'n mate dat die stem(me) daarvan veelvuldig is en deur konflik gekenmerk word. In so 'n scenario kan nóg die individuele teks nóg die literêre argief met sukses unitêr wees.

Recent criticism of Zimbabwean literature has slowly begun to accommodate white writing in post-1980 Zimbabwe as a legitimate subject for literary evaluation. This trend is manifest more in the critical works which emerged on the eve and aftermath of 2000, a watershed year when white citizenship and belonging was called to question by the black Zimbabwean government. The critical and evaluative works of this period include Moyana (1999), Primorac and Muponde (2005), Primorac (2006), Javangwe (2011), Pilosof (2012), Hove and Masemola (2014), Manase (2016) and Tagwirei (2016). Before this period, there exists a silence on white writing, as can be noted in Zimunya (1982) and Veit-Wild (1993), or a tendency to dismiss the archive as irrelevant to the fabric of Zimbabwean literature (Zhuwarara 2001). The work of Chennells (1982; 1995) is important in its focus on “the Rhodesian novel” published before 1980 although the latter work could have shed light on developments in white writing since the end of white minority rule. Both Moyana (1999: 1) and Javangwe (2011: 64) insist on the Rhodesianness of white narratives written after 1980. Underlying the above-mentioned attitudes by the early critics and the post-2000 critics is the unexamined view that white narratives are monolithic and are not characterised by contradictions. In this article, I examine Bruce Moore-King’s *Black Man White War* which, at the surface, appears monologic and enthralled to a stiff authorial voice in order to demonstrate that white Zimbabwean narratives, like any other narratives, are subject to internal destabilisations and, resultantly, multiple voices.

*White Man Black War* is a war narrative written by a former Rhodesian soldier who served in several Rhodesian units fighting against majority rule in Zimbabwe. The narrative, dwelling primarily on hindsight, contests several myths which fed and nourished the white Rhodesian offensive against black nationalism (Vambe 2009). Throughout the narrative, the author tries to maintain a tight grip on the story which is posited as “the Truth” about the war by insisting on the validity of his voice against what he considers the fallacies of Ian Smith and his lieutenants parodied as “the Elders.” The narrative depicts numerous war and post-war incidents which challenge Rhodesian myths of invincibility, civilisation and Christianity. As the author intimates in several places, “Truth” is at the centre of *White Man Black War*. The narrative prepares the reader for this at the onset when the Elders’ version of events is dismissed: “This is not the Truth” (4). What follows is therefore cast as the “Truth”.

Through a reading of Moore-King’s *White Man Black War*, this article seeks to show that white narratives belong to a heteroglot world, a world of multiple languages, which destabilises the assumed monologism of the white Zimbabwean literary canon. In such a scenario neither the literary archive nor the other languages can be successfully unitary. The archive is already multiplied from within. It suffices to say in comparison to a novel such as Tim McLoughlin’s *Karima* where characters are allowed to hold contradictory views and even challenge the author concerning the war, *White Man Black*

*War* is a novel “of the monologic type” (Bakhtin 1984). The “novel of the monologic type” is fundamentally different from the polyphonic novel in that it does not create “a world of autonomous subjects” (Bakhtin 1986: 7, 82-83). Its monologism, like that imposed on the white Zimbabwean literary archive, is, in Bakhtin’s terms, “posited” (1981: 270). Bakhtin further observes that “at every moment of its linguistic life [unitary language] is opposed to the realities of heteroglossia” (270).

This article explores how multivoicedness is achieved in *White Man Black War* through the incorporation and organisation of heteroglossia. The import of this assertion is that the text should be read in view of the heteroglot world from which it emerges despite its own channelling of alternative voices and attempt to silence them. This point needs underlining specifically because in *White Man Black War* the dialogue among characters is restrained. Unlike in polyphonic novels where polyglossic utterance is expansive, energetic and open, in *White Man Black War* the author pursues a dualism in which he deliberately sets up two orders of discourse against one another, precisely in order to show how they destabilise each other. In a sense, Moore-King, in such a reading, works against the perception that white people uniformly share “settler” myths and stereotypes, as suggested by Chennells (1982). He seeks to demonstrate, as a white man, and as a former settler, how vulnerable settler mythologisation is to destabilisation. This is performed simply by an orchestrated employment of events in the war carrying their own inevitable logic – a logic that refutes the white meta-narrative, and by implication also the ZANU PF meta-narrative about uniform whites. Moore-King’s novelistic plan employs polyphony in a strategic sense. It consists of juxtaposing contrasting views in order to demonstrate the multiplicity of perspectives.

Two processes, which are discussed simultaneously, contribute towards the novel’s multiplicity: Moore-King’s novelistic plan, achieved through the aforementioned dualism, and the text’s refusal to be contained by the author’s monologic design. The limitation of Moore-King’s novelistic plan is precisely that the voice of the author is unitary and seeks to reduce the socio-ideological content of the novel into a single authorial consciousness. Nevertheless, the incorporation of heteroglossia, defined by Bakhtin (1981: 272) as “languages that are socio-ideological: languages of social groups, ‘professional’ and ‘generic’ languages, languages of generations and so forth”, where literary language is just one of the many languages, ensures that the novel retains multiple dimensions or “lines of flight” (Deleuze & Guattari 1987: 9) which enable the opening up of new vistas, new perspectives and new worldviews. In other words, lines of flight deconstruct “territorial” or unitary and foundational boundaries imposed on a text and point the narrative towards other meanings besides that intended by the author. It is important, then, to establish the dialogic parameters of Moore-King’s narrative.

That a white Zimbabwean polyphonic novel such as *Karima* and a novel of the monologic type such as *White Man Black War* exist in the same literary

corpus serves to show that white Zimbabwean writing generates *multiple modes of speaking*. Whereas in *Karima* the war is told from multiple sites created through character zones, in *White Man Black War* multiplicity is achieved through the incorporation of speech genres. *White Man Black War* is a multi-generic narrative which combines literary fiction, rhetoric, song and reportage. Among the voices woven in the text are attributions to the former Rhodesian Prime minister Ian Smith, David Brooks of the Rhodesian Special Air Services, and a writer, Diana Mitchell. The narrative's use of incorporated voices amplifies the discourse on the Rhodesian war. It is demonstrated in this article that in the coexistence of genres in *White Man Black War*, white perceptions of the war become increasingly varied to the point where uniformity, as noted by Even-Zohar (1979: 291), "need not be postulated".

Dividing genres into primary and secondary, Bakhtin (1986) notes that primary genres – which consist of short responses of daily conversation, everyday recitations, brief model military orders, verbal signals in industry, letters, diaries, minutes, and so forth, notable for their referentiality to and function within the pragmatic communicative contexts of "extra verbal reality (situation)" (83) – appear in novels to expand the scope of its dialogue in order to enable the heteroglossia of fictional narrative. Heteroglossia, when incorporated into the novel, enables the existence of a multiplicity. The work-utterance ceases to function as a single unit. On the contrary, it becomes a site of many languages and, of course, the socio-ideological views that these represent. Guo-Wei explains that "the notion of multi-genre is primarily a functional one: the realization of a goal [...] it is an overall goal or purpose that connects a number of different genres with each other" (2010: 85). The narrative's use of other voices thus contained in primary genres is inseparable from the overall purpose of the text; what Bakhtin calls the "*specific authorial intent*" or "the speaker's *speech plan* or *speech will*, which determines the entire utterance, its length and boundaries" (1986: 77; emphasis in original). In *White Man Black War*, the author insists that this purpose is "Truth" about the war. The author exhibits what Nietzsche (Levy 1913: 197) refers to as "the Will to Truth", a tendency whose overall effect is the elimination of perceived falsehoods. Truth is made the objective of the narrative, a feat that of necessity requires a special kind of relationship among genres.

It is important to demonstrate how monologism or a unitary language is posited in *White Man Black War* from the onset. In the process, it should be borne in mind how the white literary archive is similarly rendered in nationalist narratives. On the blurb of the 1989 edition of *White Man Black War* one finds a comment attributed to Africa South, published quarterly by Africa South Publications in South Africa, that the text is "[t]he first book to tell *the truth* about an ignoble war written by a former Rhodesian soldier who strips away *the lies* he had been fed from his cradle" (emphasis added). The merits of this assertion notwithstanding, it appears that this South African reviewer adopted a dominant reading of the text, that is, one which is

consonant with the author's intended meanings. Moore-King himself is keen to develop the truth element in his account of the war to the extent that the word "truth" appears in his text at least twenty times, fifteen of them capitalized. Words such as "lie", "fact", "real", "reality", "true" and "truly" are sprinkled throughout the narrative to extend the discourse of "truth". A typical opening statement to a passage in the text reads thus: "[T]his is the way it was" (15). Statements, events and people are judged on the basis of a truth that the author seeks to render transcendental. From the outset, the reader is drawn into an ironclad binary coding which pits "truth" against "lies" in a discursive arena where only one of the two terms is allowed to survive. For Moore-King, the terms are irreconcilable and their conflict has only one solution: the banishment of "lies" in order for "truth" to flourish. This corrosive polemic permeates the discourses of *White Man Black War*.

The narrative itself commences with the rejection of a contrary view of the war by an unnamed "long-time friend and ex-regular soldier". This contrarian view is dismissed, in the author's note, for falling victim to "selective memory and convenient myth" about the war. A declaration that "this is not the Truth" (4) immediately follows against perceived falsehoods perpetrated by the older generation of Rhodesians. The resolution towards the end of the narrative is a declaration of what is deemed the "Truth". The narrative structure is clearly based on the dichotomy between what is supposedly not true and what is scripted as true. As if to augment his case for the truth, the author unconventionally provides a list of twenty three references – ranging from historical, literary and newspaper sources – at the end of the narrative, something commonly reserved for academic projects. These 'authoritative sources' validate the truth that the writer scripts; they endorse his project of the "Truth." The author's voice exists in a relation of polarisation against the other voices permitted by the incorporated genres. Unlike in polyphonic novels where other voices exist to make possible dialogically alternative sites of discourse, the authorial voice in *White Man Black War* challenges, purges and limits the scope of alternative positions and voices. This latter tendency is described as "dialogic contraction" (Martin & White 2005: 102).

Events in the novel are not sequentially connected. Nevertheless, they are all connected by an authorial thread seeking to debunk settler mythologisations that largely informed the war on the white divide. Narrations and descriptions of events are generally preceded by examples of such myths or their questioning in the form of epigraphs by historical figures who include the former Rhodesian Prime Minister, Ian Smith. Events draw us to the challenges that young white soldiers had to go through in serving the interests of the white elite, who included the politicians. One such depiction is of "tired and filthy" (6) soldiers who are furthermore "fatigued with the monotony of their tasks" (12), brutalising innocent civilians and burning their huts down in an inhuman mode. The soldiers described in the story are "not zealots, not idealists, not even exceptional soldiers" (15) as Rhodesian propaganda has

been keen to portray. They are vulnerable men with fears and doubts concerning the war. Right in the midst of war, some of these young soldiers – cooks, radio operators and accountants by profession – think about going home. As the war rages on, these white soldiers have to contend with defeat and post-traumatic disorders resulting from the horrific deeds they perform during the war. Such renditions, following immediately after epigraphs such as that from Ian Smith claiming that “we have struck a blow for the preservation of Justice, Civilisation, and Christianity” (5), demonstrate how the narrative shapes its sense of the “truth” and the “lies.” The descriptions of soldiers’ shabby outward appearances, their troubled inner feelings and their uncoordinated actions serve not only to refute but also to purge white mythologising discourses incorporated into the novel through primary genres.

A binary coding of truth versus lies therefore holds the narrative together, where “truth” and “lies” are structural motifs in the novel. This division informs the overall structure of the narrative. The division runs along categories which include Truth/Lies, “The black tribe”/“The white tribe”, the black war/the white war, “The young ones”/“The Elders”, Zimbabweanness/Rhodesianness. In this binary coding we observe what Spivak (Derrida 1997: xix) has termed “[a] longing for a centre, an authorizing pressure, that spawns hierarchized oppositions.” Undeniably, “[t]he superior term belongs to presence and the logos; the inferior serves to define its status and mark a fall” (xix).

In *White Man Black War* “truth” comprises an array of attributes that characterise people and inform both their actions and narratives. These attributes endure in the face of opposition. Among these attributes is the indistinctly categorised “black tribe”. This black tribe is seen as a mass of black people sharing a single identity, history and future. The “black war” is seen as containing a truth basis. It is a legitimate war founded on a singular truth. Zimbabweanness is an identity that also has its basis in truth while the authorial voice and the young ones represent the true predicament that whites face during the war, despite (and perhaps in spite of) the Rhodesian government’s propaganda. Lies are constructed as the opposite of truth. While the “white tribe” is not depicted as a phoney tribe, some of its elements are. These elements, which include “The Elders” and their “High Priest”, “the enemies” and the various incorporated voices, thrive on lies. It is clear in this regard that Moore-King purposely employs essentialist categories in order to unsettle white Rhodesian mythology. In asserting the limitations of settler mythology, Moore-King is compelled to ascertain a degree of generalisation and essentialism, what Spivak (1987: 205) calls, in slightly different circumstances, “strategic essentialism”. In the narrative’s counter-discursive/counter-displacing project this is seen as a necessary strategy which nevertheless fails to transcend itself and comes out as trite and rigid against Spivak’s caution that essentialism needs to be recognised as such and used strategically rather than foundationally, as a tactic, and only in the short term.

What is worrying about *White Man Black War* is the creation of bifurcated dualisms, the paradox of a deeply ingrained and pervasive authorial voice imposing a single, subjective version of the war and its aftermath, and the representation of this version in transcendental or monological terms. This putative transcendentalism seeks to establish monologic closure by banishing alternative viewpoints about the war in the final analysis. Numerous other voices are ingeniously incorporated into the authorial monologue in order to buttress the alleged “Truth”. In fact, the declaration “the only Truth is what I see” (Moore-King 1988: 112) is highly essentialist. One of the contradictions in this designation is its coupling of subjectivity and transcendentalism. The authorial voice, therefore, claims the ability to see what others cannot. On that basis, the author claims absolute ownership of an incontestable “truth”. Furthermore, his “Truth” is represented as something permanent, fixed, absolute and eternal. However, this is not all. The author’s truth is also presented as irrefutable. Bakhtin (1981: 342) tells us that “[t]he authoritative word demands that we acknowledge it, that we make it our own; it [...] is located in a distanced zone, organically connected with a past that is felt to be hierarchically higher.” We see this tendency in the authorial voice through its claims to legitimacy. The ability to speak the truth is apparently validated by the author’s direct participation in the war. Boasting of having fought the war in various Rhodesian security units such as the Rhodesian Light Infantry, Police Anti-Terrorist Unit, Rhodesian Intelligence Corps, First and Second Rhodesian Regiments, Rhodesian African Rifles and the Special Branch, the author is confident that this unparalleled expanse of experience makes him an authentic voice of, from and about the war.

In dismissing other views as false, the author privileges his methods of dualistic signification and claims that his is the last word, or the “official line” on the liberation war. Monologic accounts of white narratives work in a similar fashion. They privilege a dualistic signification which regards black and white Zimbabwean literatures in hierarchical fashion where white writing is ultimately dismissed as inferior and irrelevant. The positing of a unitary language in the Zimbabwean literary archive is thus rendered complete. Such is also the result we get in *White Man Black War*. However, and significantly so, a unitary language is never achievable in the narrative. Bakhtin (1981) observes that the very essence of utterances is dialogism. For Holquist (2002: 21) this dialogism “is the name not just for a dualism, but for a necessary multiplicity in human perception”. A novel that maintains a monologic style of utterance, and contains no stratification of discourse is, by definition, not a novel but a tract, a work of propaganda or “bad drama” (Bakhtin 1981: 327). In dialogue, there can be no last word. As Spivak notes in the introduction to Derrida’s *Of Grammatology* “all conclusions are genuinely provisional and therefore inconclusive” (1997: xiii). Dialogue persists even in the face of resistance. It ought to be noted that other writers have also voiced their own “truths” about the war, thereby making Moore-King’s voice merely one

among many others. Of course, any claim to truth suggests a binary opposition.

Following Derrida (1997), I insist that the presence of a binary pairing ineluctably suggests that meaning cannot be transcendental and that the binary inevitably deconstructs itself through a process of erasure. Every binary opposition must of necessity give way to other conflictual and contested forms. What should be said of Moore-King's narrative is that it presents the liberation war in a certain way and not that it presents the ultimate truth about the war. What gives this imaginative literary text its value, as against more instrumental texts, is dialogism and polyglossia: the ability to represent multiple voices about the same incident in stratified, non-unified levels of human discourse (cf. Bakhtin 1981: xx).

Despite the apparent authorial dominance, *White Man Black War* operates alongside the aforementioned *Karima*, several other work-utterances in the white Zimbabwean literary archive and multiple other extra-literary utterances on the war of liberation. Precisely, it is "a link in the chain of speech communication" (Bakhtin 1984: 91). In this regard, the authorial voice maintains "a sideways glance" (Bakhtin 1984: 32) which not only recognises the existence of several other voices, albeit unwillingly, but also lends the novel its heteroglot quality. Bakhtin explains:

Every experience, every thought of a character is internally dialogic, adorned with polemic, filled with struggle, or is on the contrary open to inspiration from outside itself – but it is not in any case concentrated simply on its own object; it is accompanied by a continual sideways glance at another person  
(32)

Never mind that the author insists that the truth is *what he sees*; these glances enable him to see other actors and performers uttering voices which are at odds with his own. The war, it should be underlined, is a performance already internally dialogised. It comprises the accents, values and judgments of other speakers. To narrate the war means to speak with a sideways glance. One need always be conscious of the several voices that have already spoken about the act and the several that will inevitably speak. This is why this same war attracted several names: bush war, liberation war, Second *Chimurenga* and terrorist war.

In order to validate the authorial voice, several other speakers are incorporated into *White Man Black War*. Of course, the author intends to hold these consciousnesses hostage, so that they contribute towards his monological composition. The incorporated voices, just like "the Elders", have no discursive movement. They appear dead and closed compared to the author's voice, which is given multiple performative accents, albeit unified. It is as if the incorporated voices are incapable of exceeding the full stops that appear at the end of their sentences. In a strategically essentialist sense, this might be regarded as meritorious. Indeed, in privileging the voices of those



previously ignored (such as those of the young white soldiers in Moore-King's case), the voices of perceived oppressors need not be elaborated upon extensively. However, in a *dialogic* sense, such an approach is not only limiting, but unattainable, as Bakhtin suggests when he notes that "such ideas as a special 'poetic language', a 'language of the gods', a 'priestly language of poetry' and so forth could flourish [only] on poetic soil" (1981: 287). To this list we may add *a language of Truth*. In the text, incorporated voices are not objects on display. Multivoicedness therefore enters *White Man Black War* through the incorporation of various speeches, all guaranteeing the relativisation of the authorial voice. Once amalgamated into the novel, the incorporated voices weaken the monological composition of the text, consequently weakening its claim to truth. Disjunctions give the narrative its dialogic character. Between every merged genre and the narrator's voice are disjunctions which provide discordant notes to the narrative in a manner that allows the reader to see the polyvalent nature of discourse. Bakhtin (1981: 339) explains that "not all transmitted words belonging to someone else lend themselves, when fixed in writing, to enclosure in quotation marks". In other words it is not always a successful feat to limit the words of another once they are blended into a novel. It is interesting that among the voices Moore-King is at pains to undermine is precisely that of Smith, represented in the narrative as "the High Priest", a straw-man version of the real Ian Smith, some of whose speeches on Rhodesian radio and at political rallies are incorporated into the text.

Monologic stabs at capturing the "truth" in Moore-King have a special significance that is nevertheless matched by the same tendency in other narratives such as Ian Smith's *The Great Betrayal: The Memoirs of Ian Douglas Smith*, in which the term "truth" appears at least eighty times and the author takes every opportunity to accuse his enemies of "twisting" or "bending" the truth. In this autobiography, Smith insists all he ever wanted was "to find the truth" (1997: 171). He haughtily claims, despite the nationalist uprising during the war, that "the truth was that [blacks in Rhodesia] were better off than the blacks anywhere else in Africa, with more freedom, better justice and a higher standard of living" (375). Elsewhere he recommends the appointment of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission similar to what transpired in South Africa after apartheid (2001: 430). Ironically, Moore-King is authorised by the same discourse which authorises Smith – the discourse of a self-righteous and indisputable truth about the war. This juxtaposition of Smith and Moore-King is by no means evaluative. It is not an attempt to privilege one "truth" over another. Rather it is meant to demonstrate how dialogisation of objects and words used in reference to objects takes place. It demonstrates that truth, thus polemically dialogised despite these authors' attempts to contain its range of reference, slips from one to the other, becoming in fact a weapon against both Moore-King and Ian Smith.

Because any utterance about any subject exists in dialogue with other utterances, the attempt to foreclose dialogue is inherently undermined. The unstable value of discursive signification is thus revealed. The very act of writing is an acknowledgement of the instability that characterises all utterances. It should be underlined that:

the words of a language belong to nobody, but still we hear those words only in particular individual utterances, we read them in particular individual works, and in such cases the words already have not only a typical, but also (depending on the genre) a more or less clearly reflected individual expression, which is determined by the unrepeatable individual context of the utterance.

(Bakhtin 1986: 88)

No text can therefore claim to be the answer to life's questions. In the present case, the war discourse remains public and political property. As seen in the example of Smith above, the pursuit of monologism is self-deconstructing through Derridian "difference." In attempting to invoke the presence of the author's single consciousness, other voices emerge as this consciousness' (in)convenient others.

Derrida (1997) posits that presence finds its "breathing-space" through difference. He explains:

Without the possibility of difference, the desire of presence as such would not find its breathing-space. That means by the same token that this desire carries in itself the destiny of its non-satisfaction. Difference produces what it forbids, makes possible the very thing that it makes impossible.

(143)

Moore-King's sovereign will delegates its authority by incorporating other voices into the narrative about the war, finding that a single-accentuated voice is not self-sufficient. Owing to *White Man Black War*'s use of competing discourses and despite the text's evident attempt to objectify incorporated speeches, multivoicedness is achieved in the text. The authorial voice, because it is multi-accentuated (seeing that it carries other incorporated literary and non-literary voices), contains lines of flight that point the reader towards directions not necessarily sanctioned nor imagined by the author. The incorporated speeches, in the case of a text which seeks unification, are indexical. They are indices that direct attention towards other voices. In *White Man Black War*, lines of flight are not readily given. They are not part of the author's design. Instead, these lines of flight appear through the indices that are liminal in the text. They point to alternative directions through which the reader can gain access to the subject, in this case the liberation war.

Some of these voices, and their utterances, palpably on the wrong side of history, are nevertheless voices on the war. They enable a discursive explosion about the war and the consequent creation of a multiplicity of

orientations in white writing. Indefensible as the utterances of Smith and his ilk are – having served as propaganda of the worst kind, supporting a racist war against a majority population – they still lend the war narrative its heteroglot quality. Lines of flight can appear as part of the author’s design; or they can function as the text’s unconscious, so to speak. Once the text points us towards other directions, unconsciously drawing lines of flight, we as readers encounter another utterance, and in that work utterance we will find other pointers as well, so that we are left not with a single work utterance, but with a chain of work utterances containing multiple pointers; a chain of consciousnesses multiplying at every opportunity. What we thus find is deferral. Eventually, we are left with a text existing within “a chain of [other] significations” (Derrida 1997: 66).

We definitely know, because the authorial voice carries an index, that there are several other voices besides that of the author and that these voices have another life separate from the life they are afforded in the novel. For instance, the utterance “we have struck a blow for the preservation of Justice, Civilisation, and Christianity and in the spirit of this belief we have this day assumed our sovereign independence” (Moore-King 1988: 5) attributed to Smith, when considered in other speech contexts, assumes a radically different intonation than it has in *White Man Black War*. In Smith’s *The Great Betrayal*, the utterance is submitted by the authorial voice as an expression of patriotism and courage. Conversely, its inflection in *White Man Black War* renders it both parochial and absurd. This is achieved through juxtaposition. Following immediately after the incorporated speech by Smith is the authorial voice polemically repudiating Smith’s voice in the representation of “tired and filthy” programmed soldiers who brutalise defenceless blacks and burn their huts (Moore-King 1988: 6). The dialogisation arising from the juxtaposition between the epigraphs and the descriptions of events which follow them are indeed deliberate and part of Moore-King’s novelistic plan. He intends to show that white society was, and is, by no means uniform. This dialogisation also has an extended effect; that voices, even when enlisted into a text to serve as objects, retain a life beyond that to which they are appended, thereby rendering the text multivoiced.

This article has argued that *White Man Black War* is a novel of the monologic type which privileges authorial ideology at the expense of other voices. In its pursuit of a single Truth, the narrative displays similarity with Zimbabwe’s critical tradition which sees coherence in the white Zimbabwean literary archive. This tendency is not only predicated on a fallacy, that monologue is possible, but provides the impetus to relegate a corpus of texts to the periphery of the Zimbabwean literary archive. The article demonstrated that even where monologue appears to be privileged, it is nevertheless unattainable. By incorporating other voices into its narrative design, even with the intention of containing these voices, *White Man Black War* is internally destabilised to the extent that its voice(s) become multiple, contested and

conflictual. It assimilates other speeches with the effect of expanding the dialogic horizons of the war narrative. Heteroglossia is incorporated in *White Man Black War* in such a manner that the monologic composition of the text is undermined.

## References

- Bakhtin, Mikhail  
 1981 *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.  
 1984 *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.  
 1986 *Speech Genres, and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Chennells, Anthony  
 1982 Settler Myths and the Southern Rhodesian Novel. PhD Thesis, University of Zimbabwe.  
 1995 Rhodesian Discourse, Rhodesian Novels and the Zimbabwe Liberation War. In: Bhebe, Ngwabi & Ranger, Terence (eds) *Society in Zimbabwe's Liberation War Volume 2*. Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications, pp. 102-129.
- Deleuze, Gilles & Guattari, Felix  
 1987 *A Thousand Plateaus*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Derrida, Jacques  
 1997 *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar  
 1979 Polysystem Theory. *Poetics Today* 1(1/2): 287-310.
- Holquist, Michael  
 2002 *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*. London: Routledge.
- Hove, Muchativugwa Liberty & Kgomotso Masemola  
 2014 *Strategies of Representation in Auto/Biography: Reconstructing and Remembering*. London: Palgrave Publishers.
- Javangwe, Tasiyana, D.  
 2011 Contesting Narratives: Constructions of the Self and the Nation in Zimbabwean Political Auto/Biography. PhD Thesis, University of South Africa.
- Levy, Oscar (ed.)  
 1913 *The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche*. London: T.N. Foulis.
- Manase, Irikidzayi  
 2016 *White Narratives: The Depiction of Post-2000 Land Invasions in Zimbabwe*. Pretoria: Unisa Press.
- Martin, James R & White, Peter R.  
 2005 *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McLoughlin, Tim, O.  
 1985 *Karima*. Gweru: Mambo Press.

- Moore-King, Bruce  
 1988 *White Man Black War*. Harare: Baobab Books.
- Moyana, Rosemary  
 1999 An Historical Study of a Selection of the White Rhodesian Novel in English, 1890 to 1994: Content and Character. PhD Thesis, University of Zimbabwe.
- Pilosof, Rory  
 2012 *The Unbearable Whiteness of Being: Farmer's Voices from Zimbabwe*. Harare: Weaver Press.
- Primorac, Ranka & Muponde, Robert (eds)  
 2005 *Versions of Zimbabwe: New Approaches to Literature and Culture*. Harare: Weaver Press.
- Primorac, Ranka  
 2006 *The Place of Tears: The Novel and Politics in Modern Zimbabwe*. London: Tauris Academic Studies.
- Ren, Guo-Wei  
 2010 Text, Genre and Multi-Genre. *Studies in Literature and Language* 1(7): 82-88.
- Smith, Ian D.  
 1997 *The Great Betrayal: The Memoirs of Ian Douglas Smith*. London: Blake.  
 2001 *Bitter Harvest: The Great Betrayal and the Dreadful Aftermath*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball Publishers.
- Spivak, Gayatri, C.  
 1987 *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Methuen.
- Tagwirei, Cuthbeth  
 2016 The Nucleation of White Zimbabwean Writing. *Journal of Literary Studies* 32(3): 5-20.
- Vambe, Maurice, T.  
 2009 Contesting the Myth of "A People's War". In: Bruce Moore-King's *White Man Black*. *War Journal of Developing Societies* 25(1): 107-120.
- Veit-Wild, Flora  
 1993 *Teachers, Preachers and Non-Believers: A Social History of Zimbabwean Literature*. Harare: Baobab Books.
- Zhuwarara, Rino  
 2001 *Introduction to Zimbabwean Literature in English*. Harare: College Press.
- Zimunya, Musaemura  
 1982 *Those Years of Drought and Hunger: The Birth of African Fiction in English in Zimbabwe*. Gweru: Mambo Press.

**Cuthbeth Tagwirei**  
 University of the Free State  
 cuthbeth.tagwirei@gmail.com