

was Dakar the home of the Government-general of French West Africa, but it was also the main port of Senegal. The port of Dakar thus became the primary gateway through which suspicious people as well as mail and periodicals carrying potentially radical political ideas arrived. The focus on Dakar also reflects two other aspects of colonial surveillance and anxieties about suspicious activities: first, it assumes that the vast rural world of French West Africa was not fundamentally at risk of potential radical political activity, which neglects the profound changes that occurred following the end of slavery, colonial efforts to promote commodity production, and the return of African soldiers; and second, it reflects the profound weakness of the colonial state's capacity to surveille. Precisely because Dakar was a primary gateway to the wider world, it was far easier to surveille than the unpatrolled borders of the interior.

Keller provides some fascinating insights into how police information was categorized and organized and how networks of administrators shared information on suspicious travelers from different parts of the empire. We learn little about the army of Africans who served as police agents and informants, who were so necessary to maintain even the colonial state's relatively weakly-developed arts of governmentality. Readers may also want to learn more about the legal procedures for initiating surveillance and for searches of suspects' mail and homes. Keller's chapters on the underworld of Dakar piques the reader's interest in learning more about these worlds that have been analyzed by scholars of other African cities. That *Colonial Suspects* has raised many new questions is testament to its importance.

RICHARD ROBERTS

Stanford University

***Jihād in West Africa during the Age of Revolutions.* By Paul Lovejoy.** Athens: Ohio University Press, 2016. Pp. ix, 396. \$90.00 cloth, \$34.95 paper.

It has become commonplace, in the United States at least, for history and political theory courses on revolutions or the origins of the modern state to assess the U.S., French, and Haitian revolutions collectively. The inclusion of the last of these three in the standard curriculum came, of course, relatively recently in response to efforts to displace Europe and the naturalized construct of whiteness from the center of such origin stories. The inclusion of Haiti and anti-slavery revolts more generally also served to bolster interpretations of the U.S. and French revolutions centered on dialectics of liberation and the constraints of enlightenment liberalism, in ways that can be productively critical but which also often risk reinforcing self-servingly emancipatory readings of U.S. history, from its independence to the Civil Rights Movement.

Despite the fact that the history of the African Diaspora is central to this rethinking of the eighteenth-century revolutions, Africa itself has, unsurprisingly, been left out of the story. While much scholarship of the last two decades has helped Atlantic history begin to

redress its perennial northern/western bias, global studies of revolutions and empires in the early-modern and modern eras have not yet really grappled with African cases.

Paul Lovejoy's *Jihād in West Africa during the Age of Revolutions* is an explicit effort to inject the story of what have come to be known as the Islamic Revolutions of West Africa—a series of military *jihāds* in which Muslim scholars took control of state apparatuses—into this Atlantic canon in three ways. First, he forwards a comparative framework that argues that the long series of movements stretching from Nāṣir al-Dīn's mobilization of Sanhaja Berbers and Torodbe scholars in the 1670s, to al-Ḥājj ʿUmar Tal's wars from 1848 to 1862 should be analyzed according to the same criteria as the eighteenth-century movements in Europe and the Americas. This argument is particularly persuasive, especially the comparison he makes between the contradictory effects—emancipatory in ideology, often quite less so in practice—of the political and intellectual movements. Secondly, he argues, echoing and building on work by Boubacar Barry, Martin Klein, Humphrey Fischer, Rudolph Ware, and others, that these revolutions had a direct shaping effect on Atlantic history by altering the flow of the Transatlantic Slave Trade—a subject whose complexity Lovejoy treats in admirable detail. To that extent, the West African revolutions are not only analogous to the European and American ones, but part of the same causal matrix that produced them—and, by extension, the modern world. Assessing the comparative weight of revolutions in the broad dynamics of the slave trade is, however, difficult and the timing complicates claims for direct linkages. Lastly, he suggests that the objection to the enslavement of Muslims by those influenced by Muslim reformers informed those who resisted slavery in the diaspora, such as in the famous Malê revolt in Bahia in 1835. This provides another way to link the revolutions in West Africa to the emancipatory politics of the late 1700s and 1800s. The details of these links remain, however, the subject of intense debate among specialists.

Insofar as Lovejoy's avowed aim is to reshape the standard account of “Atlantic” history, it should be straightforward to evaluate the success of the book in the long run. In the short run, however, things are more complex. An effort of synthesis and reinterpretation on a vast scale, Lovejoy's account necessarily combines ideas that are well accepted by specialists in the field with those that reflect his own rereading of events through this particular lens. As such, many will find much to quibble with and certain claims—many of which are, as is responsible, couched in rather tentative language—will undoubtedly be subjected to intense scrutiny. Since the work of Barry and Klein few would deny that the *jihāds* should be placed in the context of the Transatlantic Slave Trade; whether that context is the key to unlocking the internal meaning of the movements or their lasting contribution to world history is less certain.

By synthesizing existing arguments, adding new details, and shaping the whole into a focused picture that will be intelligible to Atlantic historians, Lovejoy has performed an important service to the discipline as a whole, whatever the fate of specific pieces of his argument.

SEAN HANRETTA

Northwestern University