By DANIEL BRANTLEY

Black Diplomacy and Frederick Douglass' Caribbean Experiences, 1871 and 1889-1891: The Untold History

THIS ESSAY IS A REVISIONIST ACCOUNT of black diplomacy in the nineteenth century, a subject which has not received the critical and scholarly attention it deserves. Black diplomacy — the influence on foreign policy of U. S. Negroes and their supporters — had strong and sometimes interesting effects in the nineteenth century. Negro Americans were major influences for the recognition of Haiti. In America, blacks and their supporters (principally Senator Charles Sumner from Massachusetts) caused the United States to reject the notion of annexing the Dominican Republic to the United States in the late 1840s and 1860s, and in 1871. The efforts of black American newspapers to inform the public of American economic and military expansionists' aims in Haiti, during the last two decades of the nineteenth century, were a contributing factor to the delay of American military occupation of Haiti, which occurred in 1915.

In general, the role of Negroes in American history has been distorted, when it has not been simply omitted from historical accounts. For example, most scholarly treatments of the United States diplomatic history of the nineteenth century fail to make mention of black Americans, except perhaps as a footnote in connection with the issue of slavery and American Civil War diplomacy.[1] The fact is that there was an international aspect of the status of Negroes in the United States and that Frederick Douglass and other blacks served on sensitive diplomatic missions and were federal foreign service officers who had been put in charge of American diplomatic and consular facilities located in the countries to which they were accredited, such as Liberia, Haiti, and The Dominican Republic. Also, the history books have failed, in relating the American foreign policy toward the Caribbean during the nineteenth century, to acknowledge that blacks made any contribution to that policy.

This paper, which defines foreign policy as the sum total of decisions and actions guiding a nation's dealing with another nation, attempts to say something about the impact of black Americans on United States foreign policy in general and the Caribbean policy in particular. The approach is an explora-

[1] Negro slavery has been the subject of American diplomacy going back prior to the birth of the Republic. A dispute arose between the United States and England in 1783 when the American government charged the English government with the violation of a treaty stipulation concerning black slaves. An article by Ralph J. Lowry entitled "The Black Question in Article Seven of the 1783 Peace Treaty" in the *Negro History Bulletin* (June-July 1975): 415-18, analyzes the dispute relating to the stipulation that the English were not to take away blacks from America. The essay describes how the English had violated their promise (Article Seven) because they had promised blacks who fought for them their freedom at the end of the war. The English and the Blacks they had freed left America and went to Canada in the 1780s. The diplomatic dispute concerned the legal status (free or slave) of those blacks who remained in America and others who moved to Canada, both groups having been freed by the English authorities in violation of the treaty that concluded the war between the former thirteen colonies and the English government.

tion of the diplomatic career and Caribbean experiences of Frederick Douglass, a nineteenth century black leader. The article, therefore, is an account of (1) what Douglass did of importance or interest, and (2) what kind of person he was. That is, the paper gives facts about his life and diplomatic career and describes something of his personality. Throughout the essay, an attempt will be made to relate the record of his diplomatic service, to explore his reasons for doing things, and to examine the way he went about doing them. Also, attention is given to things that he failed to do and, of course, what others have said about him. Finally, the article summarizes and assesses the major facts of his foreign service career and identifies the kinds of personal qualities that helped him to achieve greatness.

So little has been written and said about the influence of Negro Americans on nineteenth century international relations that one is left with the difficult decision of where to start. Perhaps the appropriate starting place is the pre-Civil War legal status of blacks in the United States.[2] The majority of the blacks in the American South were slaves, and even the free Negroes who resided in the North were not United States citizens. Prior to 1869 no black man held a diplomatic appointment. It would seem, therefore, that they lacked the opportunity — having no official (i.e., diplomatic and legal) standing — to demand the attention of a worldwide audience in order to inform foreigners about their status and conditions in America and to secure foreign support for the anti-slavery cause and civil rights for free Negroes.[3] Yet, nothing could be further from the truth, because in spite of the absence of official standing, black leaders, such as Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, and Sojourner Truth were able to influence diplomatic relations through their ability to obtain a global audience for their views in the world press and through their foreign trips and participation in and speeches to international conferences and assemblies. This particular kind of black influence in foreign affairs, which has already been equated with black diplomacy, is documented in Charles H. Wesley's article, entitled "International Aspects of the Negro's Status in the United States."[4]

Frederick Douglass' participation in worldwide reform movements may be cited in support of the proposition that blacks, through their leaders, exercised influence on a global scale at a time when most of them were enslaved in the South, few of them could vote, and none of them were regarded as United States citizens nor served in any foreign service post. Douglass toured Europe on several occasions, speaking for the anti-slavery cause, Irish freedom, temperance, women's rights, world peace, and against the corn laws. In 1845, he made the first of several trips abroad seeking to secure sympathy and

---

[2] It is only after the Civil War that measures were passed concerning the Negro's status which made it possible for blacks, including Frederick Douglass, to enjoy the benefits of full-fledged citizenship: the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments were among the first of these measures. At the time of Douglass' first trip abroad, in 1845, it was generally recognized that blacks (even free ones, which Douglass was not) were not United States citizens.

[3] Charles H. Wesley, "International Aspects of the Negro's Status in the United States," *Negro History Bulletin* 10 (February 1948): 108-13, 118.

[4] Ibid.

support from overseas that might influence American public opinion and official behavior relating to black slavery and civil rights for free Negroes of the North. During his sojourn in the British Isles, he toured England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, where he met with Daniel O'Connell and Father Mathew (Irish leaders) and spoke at the World Temperance Convention in London. Douglass, in a letter from London, denounced the Mexican War and American's part in that war. And in another letter, composed in Scotland, he wrote to Horace Greeley that he opposed the annexation of the Santo Dominican Republic to the United States.

This trip is cited, not for its uniqueness — as has already been mentioned, other blacks traveled abroad, spoke to international organizations about worldwide concerns, and met with prominent leaders — but rather because it demonstrates two points. First, and of greater importance, Negoes, without diplomatic status, could and did make contact with influential individuals in foreign nations and, secondly, blacks, who did not enjoy American citizenship, were not allowed unrestricted foreign travel. Douglass, who was a fugitive slave, was not allowed to travel to Europe because he was not legally an American citizen. According to Douglass' biographer, Booker T. Washington, Frederick Douglass was refused a passport by George M. Dallas, United States Minister of the Court of St. James, to visit France because he was not an American citizen.[5]

Douglass spent twenty-two months in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales performing what Robert Zangrando has called "Black outreach." Black outreach activities, such as those performed by Harriet Tubman, Sojourner Truth, W.E.B. DuBois, Marcus Garvey and many others, are described by Zangrando in a *Phylon* article as being concerned with black Americans' efforts to attract aid and support from beyond continental United States of America.[6]

Typically, such "Black Outreach" efforts have been of a coalitionist-diplomatic, relocationist, and interventionist nature. Coalitionist-diplomatic outreach activities are efforts to secure sympathy and support from overseas that might influence public policy and mass opinion in the United States. This kind of outreach is illustrated by Douglass' 1845-47 tour, during which he spoke for the anti-slavery cause. Interventionist outreach is comprised of efforts to involve formal participation by external agencies in the investigation and correction of conditions existing in the United States. Relocationist activities are aimed at the actual or proposed emigration abroad of blacks with such removal undertaken in the belief that it is a means of improving the status and conditions of blacks. Here, Douglass' activities may also be discussed in terms of the black outreach orientations involving intervention and relocation.

Douglass is not on public record as ever having favored foreign diplomatic (or any other means of) intervention to eliminate slavery in the South and to

---

[5] Booker T. Washington, *Frederick Douglass* (New York, 1906), p. 194.
[6] Robert Zengrando, "Black Outreach: Afro-Americans' Recruiting Efforts to Attract Support from Abroad," *Phylon* (4th Quarter, 1975): 368-77.

secure civil rights and political privileges for Negroes. Yet, he did support American intervention in the affairs of the Caribbean when he favored in 1871 the annexation of the Dominican Republic to the United States. The late nineteenth century saw an increase in American's diplomatic interest in the Caribbean area: the United States was seriously concerned with the annexation (1869-1871) of the Dominican Republic, and it sought to gain military and commercial privilege (1890s) in Haiti.[7] While serving in the first of two diplomatic posts he was to hold between 1871 and 1891, Douglass gave his approval to the annexation of the Dominican Republic, one of only four black independent countries existing in the world.

During his long social reformer-politician career, which spanned 54 years, Douglass battled with great skill various relocation-oriented outreach efforts, including plans and schemes calling for U. S. blacks to settle abroad in, for example, the West Indies and South America.[8] Efforts to transport blacks away from the United States, according to Carter G. Woodson, were supported by blacks and whites as a solution to racial problems. Douglass, however, desired to see Negroes remain in America rather than try to better their conditions by going to foreign lands; even internal emigration met with Douglass' disapproval.[9] Bill D. Higgin's "Negro Thought and the Exodus of 1879" describes Douglass as a leader of the opposition to the migratory movement known as the Exodus of 1879.[10] The movement resulted from difficult economic conditions in the South in the late 1870s which led to spontaneous migration of blacks to the West.

The remaining portion of the essay focuses on Frederick Douglass' diplomatic career through a brief examination of his role in the Caribbean policy of the United States during the last three decades of the nineteenth century. In his *Life and Times of Frederick Douglass* and his diplomatic writings, Douglass describes his two diplomatic missions for the Department of State, shedding interesting light on the dynamics of nineteenth century American diplomacy. His diplomatic career was a brief but eventful one involving only two short-lived assignments. He was assistant secretary of the Santo Domingo Commission (1871) and the United States Minister to Haiti and American Charge d' Affaires for the Dominican Republic (1889-1891) during a time when America's foreign policy-makers were showing expansionist interest in

---

[7] Actually, both the Dominican Republic and Haiti occupy the same island, which is called variously Santo Domingo and Hispaniola. At the time of the suggested annexation, it was somewhat clouded whether Presidents Andrew Johnson and U. S. Grant desired to annex the entire island or just the eastern portion that was the Dominican Republic. The proposal seemed an excellent one, especially as viewed by American business interests (the island being rich in sugar cane, tobacco, and coffee) and by the United States Navy, which claimed that the island had strategic importance because of Samana Bay and Mole St. Nicolas. And, additionally, there was the factor of race; the Dominican leaders who sought to have the United States rule the island, as a protectorate, claimed that the country's population was mostly white and that the Haitians, who were blacks, would take control of Dominican affairs as they had from 1822 to 1844.

[8] Frederick Douglass' career as social reformer-politician began in 1841 when he joined the abolitionist movement as a speaker and it ended with his death in 1895.

[9] Carter G. Woodson, "Longing for Foreign Lands," *Negro History Bulletin* 4 (May 1941): 172, 183-84.

[10] Bill D. Higgins, "Negro Thought and the Exodus of 1879," *Phylon* (1st Quarter, 1971): 39-52. For Frederick Douglass' views on the Exodus, see "The Negro Exodus from the Gulf States," pp. 324-42 in Philip S. Foner, ed., *The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass*, Vol. 4 (New York, 1955).

the Caribbean area.[11] Controversy marked both this policy and Douglass' role as an agent of a policy aimed at two tiny black countries. His two missions will be treated separately since they occurred twenty years apart.

Douglass and United States Efforts to Annex the Dominican Republic

An essential place to begin is with the Santo Domingo (which is another name for the Dominican Republic) annexation controversy. In a chapter of his autobiography, *Life and Times of Frederick Douglass,* Douglass set forth his version of the Santo Domingo controversy. The chapter is aptly named "Weighted in the Balance" because, as a result of his stand on the issue of annexing Santo Domingo, some of Douglass' friends reassessed him and lowered their evaluation. His reputation was seriously hurt, and his status as a black leader was weighed in the balance. As Washington notes in his Douglass biography twenty years after the controversy, some newspapers criticized Douglass' appointment as Minister to Haiti "because at one time he favored the annexation of Santo Domingo."[12]

In 1871, President Ulysses S. Grant appointed Frederick Douglass assistant secretary to the commission of inquiry for the annexation of Santo Domingo. However, before the mission formally had completed its task, Douglass resigned his appointment. The two tasks he executed in this post were accompanying the three commissioners during their tour of Santo Domingo and giving his approval to the commission report that called for annexation.

Two presidential administrations between 1867 and 1871 showed expansionist interest in the Caribbean. In 1867, Secretary of State William Seward unsuccessfully tried to acquire the Virgin Islands. The islands (some fifty small islets colonized by Denmark), which include St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John, were of strategic importance, a fact recognized during the Civil War when President Lincoln expressed hope that the United States would acquire them. Negotiation with Denmark went well, and the Danish government was willing to sell for $7.5 million. Although the people themselves indicated in a plebiscite that they were agreeable to American rule, the Senate refused to approve a treaty of purchase, as Congress was inclined to disapprove any policy of Andrew Johnson's administration.[13]

---

[11] *In The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Haiti, 1776-1891* (Chapel Hill, 1941), Rayford W. Logan has pointed out that, "The Relations of the United States with Haiti have been different from those with any other nation." (p. vii) The race of the Haitian people and the way they became an independent nation (through a slave revolt) are two factors which caused the Department of State and every American president from George Washington to Abraham Lincoln to (1) adopt a policy of non-recognition (which lasted for 58 years, thus establishing a diplomatic record for refusal to extend recognition to a *de facto* government that was not formerly a possession of the non-recognizing power); (2) willingness to consider the annexation of the eastern portion (Dominican Republic) of the island occupied by Haiti but refusing to have any kind of diplomatic dealings with Haiti, on the theory that the Dominicans were white, whereas the Haitians were blacks; (3) exclusion of Haiti and Dominican Republic from the application of a hemispheric policy, that is, the Monroe Doctrine — Dominican Republic, contrary to the doctrine, was allowed to become a Spanish colony or protectorate in 1861, this status lasting until 1865; and (4) achievement of American *de facto* penetration and control of both black nations on the island through commercial and military benfits exclusively granted to a United States business interest and the American government. Rayford Logan, in speaking of the policy of not extending recognition to Haiti, wrote (p. 77) "The evidence is clear that the major consideration was the fact that the independence of Haiti resulted from the revolt of Negro slaves and that the ruling class were Negro."

[12] Washington, op. cit., p. 298.

[13] The United States Senate approved a purchase treaty in 1916 for $25 million for the islands for strategic reasons.

In 1869, President Andrew Johnson expressed eagerness to annex the Dominican Republic (or Santo Domingo) to the United States. This proposal, too, met with no success. The idea of annexation came up again when the President of the Dominican Republic suggested to the Grant administration that the Dominican people were agreeable to the country becoming an American protectorate.[14] However, Haiti (the neighboring black country) did not favor the acquisition plan. The United States Senate rejected the treaty by a tie vote (28-28) in June 1870. Senator Charles Sumner, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, charged that the annexation was a fraudulent scheme by a small group of U. S. businessmen to enrich themselves at the expense of the American public. Although the Senate had defeated the treaty, President Grant refused to give up; he created a presidential commission of inquiry, to which he appointed Frederick Douglass, Senator B. Wade, Dr. S. G. Howe, and Dr. Andrew D. White, President of Cornell University. The commissioners' task was to visit the Dominican Republic and negotiate a treaty for the annexation of the eastern portion (Dominican Republic) of the island of Santo Domingo (or Hispaniola).

The history of the diplomatic relations of the United States with the Caribbean area should have suggested that the commission's work was foredoomed to failure because there was a majority of senators who opposed annexation. And even assuming that a majority of senators favored it, Senator Sumner could have prevented a vote through his influence with the powerful Foreign Relations Committee. In any case, Douglass had forebodings about his part in the venture and sought to disassociate himself from it. To this end, he resigned from the undertaking, but he had been associated with the annexation policy and the public expected him to say or do something for or against the administration's Caribbean policy. Douglass took President Grant's side; he declared the plan to be in the best interest of the United States and of the Dominican people. Also, he attempted to shape public opinion by emphasizing the commercial and military benefits that would be derived by America and the realization of political stability and economic prosperity by the Dominicans. During April and May, he defended the administration's policy.

However, the 1871 position on annexation represented a reversal on an earlier stance taken by Frederick Douglass in 1846 when he viewed the annexation issue (involving Dominican Republic) as closely tied to the desire of the United States for Haiti. From Scotland, on April 14, 1846, Douglass wrote Horace Greeley "Even Haiti, the Black Republic, is not to be spared; the

---

[14] During the 1840s the Dominican Republic sought protection from Haitian control in the protection of a quasi-colony status of major powers such as Spain, France, Britain, or the United States. Several appeals were made to the United States; the 1869 appeal was but the most recent of a series of such requests for protection. The first official appeal to the United States was made in 1845 and was based upon the assertion that the majority of the Dominicans were white, or at least the ruling elite was white and sympathetic to white supremacy. Over the years, a number of missions were sent by the United States to investigate the racial composition of the Dominican population, starting with John C. Calhoun. Calhoun, who was Secretary of State, sent John Hogan on a mission to the Dominican Republic with specific instruction to report back to him on the "aggregate population of the country and the proportion of European, African and mixed races." Logan's *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Haiti* is the source of the quote (p. 239) and he observes that two other missions to the island reported back on the racial makeup of the Dominican and Haitian people.

spirit of Freedom, which a sanguinary and ambitious despot could not crush or extinguish, is to be exterminated by the American Republic, because that spirit is dangerous to slavery."[15] Rayford W. Logan, in his work on diplomatic relations between the United States and Haiti, contends that the views Douglass expressed in the quoted passage represented the abolitionists' assertion that United States expansionists included Haiti in their plans of annexation, that Southerners saw Haiti's independence as a threat to their "peculiar institution" (Negro slavery in the Southern U. S. before the Civil War) and, therefore, looked to one day extending an American protectorate over the Dominican Republic and reestablishing slavery in Haiti. However, Logan believed the fears of the abolitionists (including Douglass) regarding an alleged United States policy aim to extend American rule to Haiti was groundless because of his following remarks:

> (1) Haitians were not demanding annexation to the United States; (2) slaveholders had no desire to grow cotton in Haiti; . . . (3) Even if there had been any far-fetched demands for the acquisition of Haiti, it may be questioned that the United States would have undertaken the conquest at a time when she was at war with Mexico and when (President) Polk had (not) show(n) that he contemplated any action against Haiti.[16]

Years later, in writing of his decision to support the commission's recommendations and to defend Grant against Sumner's criticism, Douglass said that he had been "guided by only promptings of my heart."[17] His retrospective assessment of the differing arguments he summarized in these words:

> . . . annexation of Santo Domingo . . . the reasons in its favor were many and obvious . . . those against it . . . were easily answered. To Mr. Sumner, annexation was a measure to extinguish a colored nation, and to do so by dishonorable means and for selfish motives. To me it meant the alliance of a weak and defenseless people, having few or none of the attributes of a nation, torn and rent by internal feuds, unable to maintain order at home, or command respect abroad, to a government which would give it peace, stability, prosperity, and civilization, and make it helpful to both countries.[18]

Arguably, Frederick Douglass believed that annexation to the United States was what the Dominicans wanted and, also, what was in their own best interest. It was his conviction that "San Domingo asked for a place in our union . . . Santo Domingo wanted to come under our government . . . ."[19] And for this principal reason he advised annexing the Dominican Republic. On the other hand, Sumner saw the annexation of the eastern portion of Hispaniola as a naked imperialistic venture of President Grant's administration, guided by American business interests (operating on the island) to enrich themselves. Moreover, for Sumner there was the even more important issue of black nationalism, which he equated with self-determination of a black population. The Dominican Republic was one of several independent Negro states of the world in the late nineteenth century. Ethiopia, Haiti, and Liberia were the

---

[15] Logan, op. cit., p. 242.
[16] Ibid. p. 243.
[17] Frederick Douglass, *Life and Times of Frederick Douglass* (Hartford, Conn., 1884), p. 495.
[18] Logan, op. cit., p. 243.
[19] Douglas, op. cit., p. 493.

only other countries where blacks were in political control of a territory recognized as independent by international law.

Douglass recognized the nationalism element in Charles Sumner's attack on annexation. He spoke about it in his *Life and Times of Frederick Douglass,* when he observed that "To Mr. Sumner, annexation was a measure to extinguish a colored nation . . . " Sumner had suggested that the proposed change in legal status (under international law) of the Dominican Republic would be a degradation, since the republic would, upon annexation to the United States, become either an American territorial possession or a state.[20] In sharp contrast, Douglass observed:

> The idea that annexation meant degradation to a colored nation was altogether fanciful; there was no . . . dishonor to Santo Domingo in making her a State of the American Union . . . (since to do so would be) lifting (a) . . . despised (country from) . . . its isolat(ion) into an organization and relationship which would compel consideration and respect.[21]

Douglass In Haiti: United States Minister (1889-1891)

In 1889, Frederick Douglass had another opportunity to practice black diplomacy. He was asked to serve as U. S. Minister to Haiti. Of this diplomatic post, biographer Washington has said that that appointment typically had gone to black men since 1869. Douglass was happy with the appointment, as it gave him a first-hand opportunity to study Haitian culture and political conditions. His appointment and consequent performance of his diplomatic task related to the American effort to obtain Mole St. Nicolas were bitterly opposed and those who led the attack were bent upon obtaining valuable concessions from Haiti.[22]

Was Frederick Douglass a black hero in the sense of identifying himself with the nationalistic interests of the Haitian people represented by their government's determination in the Mole St. Nicolas incident? Or, put differently, did U. S. Minister Douglass put the interest of Haiti ahead of the American expansionist policy of the State Department? These questions are raised because some writers who are familiar with Douglass' service in Haiti view him as a champion of black nationalism and an opponent of imperialism. Consider I. J. Domas' thesis (which he offered over thirty years ago in a *Phylon* article) that Douglass' behavior as a diplomat in Haiti in the 1890s might well serve as a model for Ralph J. Bunche in mediating the Arab-Israel problem.[23] In "Israel: Problems in Emerging Nationalism," Domas reviews the background of Arab-Jewish nationalism in Palestine between 1926-1948, finding the situation, from a Jewish nationalist perspective, similar to the Dominican Republic in 1871 and Haiti in 1889-1891. Domas' point is that

---

[20] From 1861 to 1865, the Dominican Republic, at its own request, became a Spanish protectorate, thus, Spain protected the Dominicans from the Haitians.
[21] Douglass, op. cit., pp. 496, 498.
[22] Washington, op. cit., pp. 297-301.
[23] It is noted that Domas' article appeared before Ralph J. Bunche brought about the settlement which earned for him the Nobel Peace Prize in 1950.

Bunche and Douglass were faced with a choice, involving taking either the side of imperialism or that of nationalism.

The situations faced by Douglass and Bunche are similar because of the role annexation played in the Dominican Republic and is playing in the Arab-Israel conflict. In Domas' view, annexation — which reduces territory and deprives a struggling nation (such as the Dominican Republic, Haiti or Israel) of natural resources needed for its self-development — is a tool of imperialist states. Bunche must learn what Frederick Douglass learned. Because he did not understand imperialism in 1871, Douglass supported Dominican Republic annexation to the United States, believing that "the American banking interests . . . supported . . . the better(ment) of the Santo Dominican standard of life."[24] It was in the 1890s that Douglass "learned something of the imperialistic facts of life and became one of the greatest champions of liberty, justice, and equality."[25]

Obviously, there are differences in the situations Frederick Douglass and Ralph Johnson Bunche found themselves in during their greatest diplomatic challenges, respectively in Haiti in the 1890s and in the Middle East of the late 1940s. However, Domas' view of Douglass' Haitian diplomacy suggests an interesting line of inquiry. According to his view, a century ago Douglass identified the American government and certain United States business interested with imperialism, and he sided with and aided the Haitian nationalist cause. Through his identification with Haiti, he became in fact a "Haitian by heart and by sentiment."

Here, it is appropriate to review briefly the history of American, Haitian, and Dominican relations from the period 1790s to 1890s. Chart number I provides information concerning the diplomatic relations of the United States with Haiti and the Dominican Republic, 1791-1891.

There were two principal issues which Douglass had to deal with as the U. S. Minister to Haiti. First was the negotiation of a treaty for an American naval fueling station at Mole St. Nicolas; the second was the settlement of a large claim by the Clyde Steamship Company against the Haitian government. The two negotiations did not go well from an American government and business point of view and Douglass was severely criticized publicly for his role in the incidents. Douglass' version of the negotiations are found in his diplomatic correspondence, in an exchange of letters between him and Secretary James G. Blaine, in the *North American Review* for September and October 1891.

---

[24] I. J. Domas, "Israel: Problems in Emergent Nationalism," *Phylon* (4th Quarter, 1948): 332.
[25] Ibid.

CHART NUMBER I

DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS OF HAITI, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC WITH THE UNITED STATES, 1791-1891

YEAR	EVENT
1791	Slave insurrection led to overthrow of French colonial rule in Haiti. During 1790s, the United States was for the first time faced with the issue of recognition of a new country as opposed to that of the recognition of a new government as in the case of France in 1793. 1791-1803 was a period of quasi-independence for Haiti under Toussaint L'Ouverture, who never declared complete independence of Haiti.
1804	On January 1, 1804, Jean Jacques Dessalines proclaimed Haiti an independent country. Haiti, first Negro state in modern era, the second republic in the Western Hemisphere, and only nation to base its independence upon a revolution of slaves.
1804-1862	U. S. policy of non-recognition of Haiti is enforced for 58 years, between 1804-1862. In spite of extensive commercial relations with Haiti, the American government refused to recognize the *de facto* Haitian government, on the basis that the United States had promised France to "forever" respect its colonial possession. This guarantee was a part of Franco-American alliance during the American War of Independence.
1820s	During the 1820s, the proposal for colonizing free Negroes in Haiti became a major issue in abolitionist circles; however, such plans were viewed in U. S. newspapers as merely pretexts to obtain recognition for the Haitian government.
1840s	In 1844, Dominican Republic gains its independence from Haitian rule and sets up a sovereign government; however, to ensure its protection from Haiti, it sought protection from Spain, France, Britain, and the United States and recognition of its independent status as a country. Haitians and Dominicans occupy the same island (called both Santo Domingo and Hispaniola), with Haiti ruling the whole island from 1791 to 1801, when the Haitians briefly lost their own independence to France, but gained control of the island in 1822. But the Dominicans, after 22 years of Haitian domination, successfully revolted in 1844. The official appeal made to the Polk administration in 1845 was based upon the assertion that the majority of the Dominicans were whites and or sympathetic to white supremacy. Subsequent presidential administrations have either considered extending recognition to the Dominican Republic or annexation of the eastern portion of the island. Frederick Douglass, in 1846, attacked the American policy of annexation of the Dominican Republic, in a letter written from Scotland to Horace Greeley.
1860s	From 1861 to 1865, Dominican Republic, at its own request, became a Spanish protectorate. The protectorate status of the Dominicans violated the spirit if not the letter of the Monroe Doctrine, and has caused some writers to argue that the United States did not stop it because the American policy — creating for itself a hemisphere of influence — excluded for its application, the two Black Caribbean nations of Dominican Republic and Haiti, because of the racial makeup of the two countries. The United States recognized the independence of Haiti in 1862, after the Southern states had seceded. The U. S. Minister to Haiti was white but by 1869, the State Department began to send only black Americans to represent it in Haiti, as Minister-Resident and Consular-General.
1870s	Senate of United States rejected in 1870 an annexation proposal involving the Dominican Republic; this was the second or third time the Senate was asked to vote on either recognition or annexation of that country since 1845. In 1871, President Grant appointed Frederick Douglass as assistant secretary to the three-member commission of inquiry charged with examining the annexation issue. Douglass sided with Grant against Sumner's position on annexation.
1889-1891	Douglass serves as U. S. Minister to Haiti and Charge d'Affaires to Dominican Republic. America fails in effort to obtain lease of Haitian port and Douglass resigns because of dispute over his role in the failure.

A full history of the two incidents is beyond the scope of the present study. It is sufficient to say that both incidents are somewhat clouded by charges and counter-charges. The following statements contain the bare facts which are not disputed. The Navy Department wanted to establish a coaling station at Mole St. Nicolas, territory belonging to Haiti. Dutifully, the State Department, under James Blaine, President Harrison's Secretary of State, gave instructions to open negotiations for the lease of the Mole St. Nicolas as a naval coaling station. Douglass had been Minister to Haiti for one year, during which time he had worked to bring an end to Haiti's self-imposed policy of national isolation. Blaine named a naval officer to be chief negotiator, thus undermining Douglass' position. This type of treaty-making was a part of the routine responsibility of the U. S. Minister-Resident (title held by Douglass) of the affected country. By entrusting the treaty-making task to a special agent, Rear-Admiral Gherardi seems to suggest that the State Department had some doubts about Douglass' diplomatic skills. Douglass seriously considered resigning his post but did not. There is no record of his having advised the Secretary of State that the negotiations were ill-timed because the Haitian authorities were still very bitter over the activist part the American government had played in imposing a settlement in the affair of the Clyde Steamship Company's claim. Douglass aided Admiral Gherardi's diplomatic efforts, but the Haitian government refused to lease its port — at Mole St. Nicolas — for use as a fueling station. Between January and May 1891, Douglass was engaged in a dispute with the State Department over its maneuvers to get the Haitian authorities to lease the port. While back in the United States on official leave from his post, Douglass visited Blaine and, as a result of this meeting, the Secretary of State instructed Douglass to continue to try to get the military concession from the Haitian government.[26] Subsequent to his return to Haiti, Douglass resigned as Minister of Haiti and publicly discussed the circumstances associated with the efforts of the United States to acquire the port for use as a naval station.

Popular opinion on Douglass' diplomatic performance in Haiti was mixed; while some (perhaps a majority) including the Haitian government and people, regarded his work as satisfactory, there were others who were of a very different view. The Haitian appointment marked the last American diplomatic office held by Douglass, but later a grateful Haitian government appointed him as Commissioner in charge of their pavilion at the World's Fair in Chicago in 1893. Thus, Douglass' career came to an end, a public career involving social reform, politics, and briefly diplomatic service, spanning better than half a century. Chart number II, entitled "Douglass' Chronology," summarizes his foreign travels and emphasizes his Caribbean experiences.

---

[26] See Washington, op. cit., pp. 297-301; Foner, op. cit., pp. 455-68; Rayford W. Logan, *The Diplomat in Haiti: The Diplomatic Correspondence of U. S. Minister Frederick Douglass from Haiti, 1889-1891* (Salisbury, N. C.: Documentary Publications, 1977).

CHART NUMBER II

DOUGLASS' CHRONOLOGY

YEAR	AREA OF GLOBE	REMARKS (Detailing motivation for trip, principal activity and accomplishment)
1845	British Isles	He spent 22 months in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, between August 1845-March 1847. Douglass left U. S. for England, to avoid slavery and to spread the anti-slavery cause. During his first visit abroad, he was reminded that he was not an American citizen when he was denied a passport to travel to Europe (i.e., Paris) by Minister Dallas. Douglass spoke at meetings for Irish Home Rule, against the Corn laws, for temperance and world peace, and he met with Irish leaders Daniel O'Connell and Father Mathrew. He arrived in England a fugitive slave but returned to the U. S. a freeman, through efforts of his foreign friends who raised money to purchase his freedom.
1859-60	Canada (Quebec) England and Scotland	He visited Canada, England, and Scotland during October 1859-May 1860. Douglass fled to Canada, later to England to escape arrest on charge of being an accomplice in John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry. He lectured on U. S. Constitution in Scotland.
1861	Plans visit to Haiti	Douglass had planned to visit Haiti on April 25, but outbreak of the American Civil War caused him to change his plans.
1871	Santo Domingo	Douglass was appointed assistant to the commission of inquiry to Santo Domingo. He spent three months (January-March) touring that island nation with the commission, whose membership included Senator Wade, Dr. Howe, and Dr. White. After his return in March to the United States, Douglass supported the commission's conclusion calling for annexation to U. S. of Santo Domingo. He spent April-May defending President Grant's policy of annexing the Dominican Republic.
1886-87	Europe and Middle East	Speaking tour (September 1887-August 1888) of England, Italy, Egypt, and Greece.
1889-91	Santo Domingo	July 1889-July 1891. Douglass was appointed Minister-Resident and Consul-General to the Republic of Haiti by President Harrison, subsequently also appointed Charge d'Affaires of Dominican Republic. In January 1891, he was engaged in dispute with U. S. government over its handling of negotiations to acquire a naval station from Haiti, but in July Douglass had resigned and publicly critized State Department's role in aiding U. S. business interests to a port from Haiti. Also he published his version of the dispute in the *North American Review* for September and October 1891.
1893	United States	Douglass served as Haiti Commissioner at the World's Fair in Chicago. As commissioner he was in charge of the Haitian pavilion.

In conclusion, black diplomacy, epitomized by Frederick Douglass' diplomatic service for the United States in connection with the annexation of the Dominican Republic and his role in Haiti, has not found its way into most of the American diplomatic historical accounts of the nineteenth century Caribbean policy of the United States. Clearly, the scholars who write these histories are guided by too narrow a definition of what deserves inclusion in their chronicles. It is the contention of this paper that the coalitionist-diplomatic, relationist, and interventionist outreach activities of American ethnic communities are a rich source of diplomatic data and, therefore, deserve inclusion in diplomatic history. After careful study of this type of data, however, many scholars may well conclude that some of it is not deserving of inclusion in chronicles but may warrant being included as footnote material. However, this paper argues that the decision on whether to include information should come only after careful analysis of the data. What is (or should be) totally unacceptable is the view that such data are not to be included because there is no precedent for their use as diplomatic history source material.

Black diplomacy, it is argued (and hopefully has been shown in this paper's description of Douglass' Caribbean experiences), is too important, in terms of the number and quality of the contacts of black leaders with foreign organizations and leaders, to be given merely footnote space in diplomatic historical accounts of dealings of the United States with the Caribbean. Douglass' diplomatic service points out, if it does nothing else, that there is a rich and, as of yet, relatively untapped source of data relating to the U. S. Caribbean policy which deserves to be researched, compiled, analyzed, and interpreted, along with the standard source materials.