

War Veterans in Zimbabwe's Revolution: challenging neo-colonialism and settler and international capital by W. SADOMBA

Rochester, NY: James Currey, 2011. Pp. 259, \$70 (hbk).

doi:10.1017/S0022278X11000735

The Zimbabwean story often divides opinion. In his openly brutal but brave assessment of the country's tense liberation struggle, Zimbabwean academic and liberation war fighter Wilbert Sadomba endeavours to go beyond the ideological narratives that surround the often jaundiced depictions of the country by journalists who criticise land occupations and vociferously blame 'lawless' war veterans for the country's present political quagmire. Instead, he offers a historical perspective that traces the origins of the conflict, providing an analysis that traces the deep-seated roots of war veterans' frustration over unfulfilled resettlement promises, which effectively yet acrimoniously led to countrywide land invasions in 2000. Land and racially skewed access to it represented the main bone of contention in the conflict.

Interestingly, and contrary to popular belief, Sadomba argues that far from being celebrated advocates of affirmative agrarian redistribution, the war veterans endured years of political insults and isolation from President Robert Mugabe's ZANU-PF party after independence, attracting little attention from government for two decades. He posits that no one took their grievances seriously. In fact, the president, while acknowledging the need for land resettlement, had not been in favour of the ubiquitous assaults on white-owned farms prior to 2000. Sadomba argues that by then the occupations had become irreversible, making it impossible for anyone – including Mugabe – to stop them. Thus the farm invasions were not only waged against the white farmers and their sympathisers abroad, but represented a direct rebuke to ZANU-PF. From 2000 onwards, several of Mugabe's loyalists took the opportunity to join in, declaring their unconditional support for the land invasions for the first time because, he argues, other options had been closed off.

However, Sadomba admits that not everyone who made an attempt to reclaim land had the interests of the masses at heart, and points to a number of individuals who took advantage of the political mayhem to further their egoistic goals. He attributes variations in the political ideologies motivating his comrades to differences in their experience of the liberation struggle and their exposure to the war. The tenor and strategies adopted by the movement led by Hebert Chitepo between 1963 and 1975 were markedly different from those employed by Mugabe from 1977 onwards.

Sadomba himself is supportive of land occupations, justifying them on the basis of Britain's failure to fulfil its promise to fund the exercise. Besides, he notes, land was the main reason why several of his fellow cadres had joined the war of liberation. The failure to reclaim this land some twenty years after independence meant that in their eyes the revolutionary struggle was only partially complete.

Sadomba's book provides a vivid account of his personal experiences and a thorough account of the pain, poverty and repression that the country went through as the locals sought and aspired for political independence. A chronicle of war-time tensions and rivalry between different black African

political camps is also provided and offers a rare glimpse into the events leading to the formation of a unified position against the settlers.

BRUCE MUTSVAIRO
Amsterdam University College

A New Scramble for Africa: imperialism, investment and development edited by R. SOUTHALL and H. MELBER
Scottsville, South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2009. Pp. 439, £33.95 (pbk).

doi:10.1017/S0022278X11000747

The opening statement of *A New Scramble for Africa* informs us that at the start of this millennium, ‘something big was happening in Africa’. Yet this book looks as much to the past, to a history of extraction, exploitation and empire on the continent, as it does to the present, or future. Through every chapter, the enduring phrase of Max Gluckman and the Rhodes-Livingstone anthropologists resonates strongly: *continuity and change*. Taking this temporal framework as a heuristic device, the book as a whole provides an important theoretical and historical overview to current processes of investment and resource extraction in Africa. Chapters by Margaret Lee, Wilson Prichard and Henning Melber emphasise continuity over and above change. Prichard argues that the *new* scramble should rather be viewed as part of a set of cycles of capital investment and mineral extraction in Africa that have been in motion since early colonial exploration. Lee makes the case for continuity more strongly. She argues that European Partnership Agreements, heralded by their architects as a progressive shift in EU–Africa trade relations towards reciprocity, equality, and a focus on poverty reduction, in fact perpetuate the ties of dependency, domination, and underdevelopment through ‘a new partition of the continent reminiscent of the nineteenth century scramble’ (p. 84).

A rather more ambiguous picture of costs, benefits and contradictory agendas emerges from Naidu’s examination of India’s dual role as development partner and ‘new scrambler’. While the common history of colonialism and self-determination inspires the optimistic promise of a mutually beneficial South–South partnership, Naidu warns against such a rose-tinted view. Indian investment in Africa, he reminds us, is driven primarily by the ‘hunt to satisfy resource needs that are vital to its industrialisation’ (p. 134).

However, the binary scheme of ‘continuity and disjuncture’ (p. 240) is in some respects restrictive, privileging the discussion of continuity to the neglect of the dynamic social forces that both shape and are shaped by these multiple and diverse encounters. Crucially, of course, the ‘scramble’ is neither wholly new, nor a replay of the past. It is neither the dawn of a bold new era of business-led development for the continent, superseding state impotence and the failure of the aid industry, nor merely ‘old wine in new bottles’ (Melber p. 12), as new players in the extractive landscape reinvigorate century-old forms of imperial domination, compradore co-option, and ultimately the dispossession of the poorest. At the same time, the current orthodoxies of good governance and economic empowerment (the latest in the guise of progressive development discourse) should not be seen merely as smokescreens for the imperial