

The Diplomatic Character(s) of the Early Republic

Katrina Ponti

In its early years the United States, a nation attempting to distinguish itself from the monarchical norms of Europe, sought to arrange its own rules of foreign engagement. What was the diplomacy of a republic supposed to look like? Who would conduct the activities of foreign affairs?¹ Thanks to the formidable digital project *Founders Online* a cooperative effort from the National Archives and the University of Virginia Press, one can begin to trace the development of American diplomacy through its first thirty fragile years, 1783–1812.²

Most people researching diplomatic activity during this era would begin searching *Founders Online* by looking for the noun “diplomat.” However, that word does not come up. The phrase that does emerge to describe a person who participated in the general activity of foreign affairs is “diplomatic character.” This term describes a far-flung group of Americans abroad who acted in some diplomatic capacity, big or small. It includes government-mandated actors such as ministers, consuls, and treaty negotiators as well as a sundry range of merchants, naval officers, intellectuals, and sailors. Anyone who even briefly took on foreign intercourse on behalf of the United States, whether officially or not, could be said to have a “diplomatic character.” The term is useful to describe the rag-tag group of Americans who were on the earliest frontlines of American engagement with the wider world, an engagement that included—and went beyond—the official and often Eurocentric activities of America’s first foreign ministers.

It is from the perspective of these diplomatic characters that I revisit the diplomatic history of the American early Republic in its first thirty years. By shifting the lens of study from secretaries of state and ambassadors to a subgroup of diplomatic actors, we can change the way we look at American foreign intercourse. The American government had only recently been freed from its imperial bond to Great Britain. It had survived its political realignment from the Articles of Confederation to the Constitution. But each of the government’s framers had his own vision for the domestic and international future of the nation. The presidential administrations of George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison each followed separate and often contradictory foreign policies.

As a result, American foreign policy lacked continuity from president to president and even from cabinet member to cabinet member. The United States government forged an inconsistent path through a diplomacy that was often conducted by trial and error. This state of affairs encouraged individuals, official actors or not, to engage in dealings with foreign contacts that were not necessarily coterminous or

consistently aligned with American foreign policies.

Historians have begun to approach the diplomatic and global history of the early Republic by looking through the eyes of these individuals and considering how their actions constituted diplomatic activities. From the perspective of diplomatic characters, two major elements in diplomatic history shift: geography and demography. Americans of all stripes experienced a change in their sense of space as they went into the world and moved from their base in the North Atlantic and Europe to the Atlantic Ocean, which became their highway to the rest of the world.

For historians, this change incorporates new oceanic systems into the narrative and shifts it away from shoreline interactions to other contested spaces inland, such as borderlands.

Occupying these new geographies were new American demographics. Frontline commercial and merchant activity perpetuated these initial geographic shifts, acting as the impetus for American interaction with the world. However, as these mercantile relationships solidified, other groups of actors came on the scene, traveling and

working on board merchant vessels. There are significant studies that have brought to light these other groups, including consuls, naval officers, intellectuals, sailors, and Native Americans, and have shown how they participated in the American diplomatic project.

One of the more recent historiographic discussions of American globalization and diplomatic activity in the early Republic occurred in a roundtable forum in *Diplomatic History* entitled “Globalizing the Early Republic.” Konstantin Dierks’s contribution provides a brief but comprehensive discussion of how the American globalizing project transcended traditional containers of nation and empire. He draws from a variety of milieus to catalog the ways in which Americans encountered the world.³

Despite the arc of the global turn in early American history, the early American Republic, and more particularly these thirty years, gets short shrift in discussions of diplomatic history.⁴ Separating itself from the era’s most global empire, the United States still retained its transnational character. Even during the American Revolution, Americans traveled abroad and maintained far-flung networks of communication, preparing the young nation for its diplomatic debut. Their diplomacy took on an ad hoc character that was somewhat different from the rapidly institutionalizing diplomatic programs of Europe. How have historians discussed the American foreign relations of this period? And how was diplomacy conducted through such a range of official and unofficial channels?

Geographic Shifts

The emergence of Atlantic history in the 1980s and 1990s as a conceptualizing framework for transnational American history provided a fresh geographic lens to study the colonizing enterprises of European empires in the early modern era. It helped scholars reconsider the formation of the United States separately from traditional nationalist narratives. This geographic perspective suggested that the individuals who lived in the region that would become the United States were already deeply enmeshed in a centuries-old geographic system of trade, intelligence, and politics. But the creation of the United States at the end of the eighteenth century marked a turning point in the periodization of the Atlantic world. By the time the United States emerged as a nation in 1783, the Atlantic was increasingly becoming a route to the rest of the world, not just a space to cross or a place to explore new connections.⁵

The concept of the Atlantic as an entry point to the rest of the world introduced Americans as a mobile, global, and globalizing people and paved the way for Nancy Shoemaker's proposal of "maritime geographies" that comprised the extraterritorial United States during the early Republic. But arbitrary geographic boundaries did not restrain the movements of Americans. They created and occupied their own spaces of foreign engagement.⁶

The Atlantic world was already part of a global system of imperial trade by the late eighteenth century and was thoroughly enmeshed in a global network of trade and commerce. And as Paul Gilje asserts, since it was commerce that drove Americans into the world in the first place, it was natural that commercial agents would form the first cohort of diplomatic characters in the early Republic. These people helped to create and negotiate new geographies on behalf of the United States.⁷

I wish to discuss three broad geographic lenses that historians have recently used to approach early American commercial-diplomatic activities: the oceanic world, the South Atlantic, and the American West. The first geographic lens completely shifts the Eurocentric mode of American diplomacy. In 1783, the first American merchant vessel left for China, exposing a vast transoceanic region to American markets and interests. As vessels left the Atlantic to reach Asian markets, they traveled through the South Atlantic, a region slighted by the dominant North Atlantic lens of American diplomatic history. Examining the Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean, and South America uncovers informal American involvement in revolutions and colonial unrest. Finally, often overlooked in broad discussions of American global history and foreign affairs are the borderlands of the American West. These became spaces that Americans entered as foreigners, spaces where they acted in both peaceful and violent ways.

From the perspective of individual activities, the narrative of the United States's relationship with the world made its truly international debut not in Paris or London, but on a half-mile strip of land in Canton on the China Sea. The Asian and Pacific world became a realm where American influence was surpassed only by that of the British.⁸ James Fichter describes the United States's trade with Asia in the thirty years following independence as "greater than that of any other Western nation on earth, save Britain."⁹ While the ink was drying on the Treaty of Paris in September of 1783, a syndicate of merchants that included statesman and financier Robert Morris re-outfitted the American privateer *Chinese Queen* and rechristened it *Empress of China*. The

American government struggled to make sense of its new place in the world, but this cohort of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia merchants knew exactly where the future lay: in Asia.

The story of the *Empress of China* is now a common point of embarkation for historians who are attempting to illuminate the movement of American foreign activity away from the Atlantic and outline the role of private initiatives in making such new movements possible. The "first generation" of American sailors, merchants, and officers in Asia, which is described in Dane Morrison's book *True Yankees*, left remarkable documents describing experiences that helped to shape a young American identity, one that valued individual enterprise over political influence. These

documents show that the American government had a limited role in guiding the growing number of American vessels entering the Asian markets.¹⁰

However, the United States did play a small role in these early forays to the Pacific. John Haddad, also using the *Empress of China* as a point of introduction,

initially focuses on the vessel's supercargo, Samuel Shaw, who left a detailed diary of the voyage and the personal relationships that he formed in Canton. From Shaw's account we find that the Americans, who wanted to escape the political grasp of the British in the Atlantic, eagerly sought economic acceptance from them in the Pacific. British approval in Canton also came with the approval of the port's international community, which was equally valuable to Shaw. He was tasked not only with forming economic relationships, but also with establishing political contacts within the community. He did not seek the role, but the Continental Congress had provided him with a letter notifying him that Congress had appointed him U.S. consul to Canton. Shaw could also use the letter to introduce himself to the political powers in that port.¹¹

Shaw was not entitled to a salary or any other type of remuneration. The American government saw its chance to expand American foreign relationships without actually paying for the service, in what Haddad calls "low-budget diplomacy."¹² Shaw's appointment set a precedent for the selection of future consuls and other individuals who permanently or temporarily acted on behalf of the U.S. government abroad. It relied on preexisting, cost-free networks of communication that were facilitated by individuals who had established relationships within such networks.

The China trade opened new oceanic worlds for Americans, connecting them to the Pacific and Indian oceans, which they passed through on the way to Asia. Pacific world encounters are beginning to frame a new area of study in early American history. Dissertations by Dael Norwood and Michael Block focus particularly on the journeys of American merchantmen through the Pacific and on the relationships they made along the way. The creation of these relationships played on the American political imagination and confirmed that the United States had a bright commercial future in the international marketplace.

American vessels further expanded their reach in the Pacific world, exploiting its wealth of natural resources, including seal furs, sea otters, and guano, to sell in the Chinese and Asian markets, which had little interest in North American grain and rum stores. The exploitation of these resources brought these Americans into direct contact with the Spanish colonial empire that governed the eastern Pacific.¹³

American merchants also took the Indian Ocean

route to Asia around Africa to Madagascar and India. Kevin McDonald refers to the integration of this route into American travels as the “Indo-Atlantic world,” which he sees as an extension of the Atlantic system to accommodate the American merchant networks in Madagascar and India.¹⁴ These oceanic approaches to American globalization begin to uncover merchant networks and relationships that the U.S. government believed would form the foundation for American foreign affairs. It also became a low-maintenance and low-cost intelligence network that the government could harness more directly when the situation required.

Transit through new oceanic spaces also enabled Americans to create new personal trade relationships in the Latin world that were otherwise limited while the American colonies remained in the British Empire. However, the way was not always free of conflict. When the Americans opened the South Atlantic to new influences, for example, that region was fraught with colonial mismanagement and anti-colonial revolutions. To take advantage of this political unrest, the Americans took on additional commercially driven roles as adventurers, privateers, and smugglers. They manipulated the shifts in the political landscape of the Latin Atlantic and, as the Age of Revolutions crested, put themselves in the center of the unrest in pursuit of personal gain. At the same time, they were also America’s eyes and ears abroad amid the major diplomatic quarrels of the time.

In Spanish Florida and Louisiana, American adventurers, acting independently of the American government, hoped to exploit the uncertain political control of these borderlands between the United States and the Spanish Atlantic world. It is easy to forget that in these thirty years Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana were not the inevitable anchors of what is today the United States’s Deep South. When Americans did enter the region, they were vastly outnumbered by the Spanish, French, Creoles, blacks, and Native Americans who had occupied this space for hundreds of years. These Americans shaped foreign affairs in this landscape both through collaboration with the Spanish colonial occupiers and through conflict, conducting filibustering raids on West Florida lands in hopes of overthrowing the Spanish regime.¹⁵

The emphasis on a pragmatic balance between collaboration and conflict as a mode of conducting American foreign affairs in this region was also characteristic of American privateers and smugglers. Americans joined Spanish privateers to actively manipulate American, Spanish, British and French powers to their own ends. These Americans negotiated for physical and economic space in this region to achieve personal aims; they were not acting as American citizens trying to achieve manifest destiny for their nation.¹⁶

American commercial agents became experts at negotiating the uncertain commercial and political landscape and altering it in their favor. Tyson Reeder’s dissertation examines the techniques used by American merchants to shift their trade networks to accommodate political unrest in Portuguese Brazil and the larger South Atlantic.¹⁷ The activities of Americans during the Haitian Revolution show similarly creative navigation. In his book, James Dun explores how the reports written by American merchants who were observers of the Haitian Revolution came to influence culture and foreign policies in Philadelphia. Their published observations exposed Americans to the nature of these foreign revolutions and outlined the limited role that the U.S. government could play in supporting them.¹⁸

Political participation in these foreign events required creative individuals to navigate the waters of unrest. In *Democracy in Black and White*, Ron Johnson argues that ultimately, while merchants did provide intelligence on the state of affairs in Haiti, it was Dr. Edward Stephens who

proved the most resourceful diplomatic and economic actor forwarding information on Haiti to the United States.¹⁹ Such individuals, in their private capacities, inventively negotiated the new political landscapes of the Atlantic world and enabled the U.S. government to understand the nature of the political unrest in its hemisphere without risking financial and military entanglement in its outcome.

Finally, the ongoing work of Paul Mapp and Alan Taylor continues to point to the American West for a vital geographic perspective.²⁰ Building off this work, historians have harnessed the perspectives of diplomatic characters in continental/borderland studies to consider the weak role of the federal government in acquiring and militarily controlling western lands. Again, commercial factors and agents proved the initial points of entry into this still-foreign territory through frontier trade forts. However, Peter Bottiger and John Reda note that these endeavors in the Mississippi and Ohio valleys, while partially supported by the U.S. government and the military, became subservient to the individual, familial, and often violent initiatives of European fur traders, American settlers, Native Americans, and métis communities.²¹ The struggle of the American government to understand this creole world as truly foreign territory further complicated the federal system in the West.²² It was a space that used kinship bonds, commercial relationships, and violence as the tools of diplomacy rather than “early American” ideologically based attempts to civilize an untamed landscape.²³

Americans with commercial objectives moved in all directions from their Atlantic home base. Asian markets, open from the nation’s inception, cast the nature of American foreign engagement in a new geographic light and set a precedent for the U.S. government’s hands-off and cost-free approach to diplomacy, using merchants and other actors with commercial aims. As American global traffic increased, Americans creatively inserted themselves into old communities experiencing political upheaval around the southern Atlantic. They participated in these Atlantic revolutionary moments as citizens of a new nation, as well as independent actors harnessing uncertainty for personal economic ends. This participation in turn influenced American policies.

These diplomatic actors functioned largely without the direct intervention of the American government, but it is from their perspective in the American West that we find the federal government struggling to control relations in transnational borderlands. Initially thwarted by independent commercial actors, the government resorted to violence to force negotiation. These geographies, which shifted with American independence, altered the diplomatic outlook of the United States in the early Republic and paved the way for new groups of diplomatic characters to come to the fore.

Demographic Shifts

Commercial goals became a major means of conducting American diplomacy around the world, and merchants paved the way for other groups of Americans to participate in the American diplomatic project. Historians have begun to discuss these Americans from two thematic angles: institutional actors and social actors. American institutions of foreign engagement were in their infancy. They had little regulation and were subject to serious lags in communication, as well as shifts in policy from president to president. The U.S. consular corps and the navy were the earliest government institutions to encounter the world; however, their diplomatic successes were limited.

Recent historiography has also begun to alter the types of social groups that are discussed as part of American foreign affairs. It is likely that a majority of Americans abroad in this period were white male merchants. However,

not all fit this description, nor were all affluent. Americans went abroad for assorted reasons: scientific discovery, literary endeavors, service in a labor force, and fortune. Their diplomatic activities were frequently secondary to these primary motivations.

The largest group that might be considered a diplomatic institution was the U.S. consular corps. A widespread and motley group of merchants, expatriates, and sometimes just foreigners who could speak English served as the points of contact for American vessels in major global ports. Historians who discuss these disparate and poorly managed consular networks focus on consuls within small regions. Bernadette Whelan's research concentrates on Ireland, for example, while Brett Goodin's focus is on North Africa.²⁴

Efforts are being made, however, to chart this global institution by collating more of the stories and connections of individual consuls. Two historians have begun digital mapping projects to uncover the full international (but still incomplete) reach of consuls. Nicole Phelps at the University of Vermont is in the early stages of her project, which endeavors to map the complete U.S. Consular Service between 1789 and 1924.²⁵ Jean Bauer's *Early American Foreign Service Database* maps a smaller portion of the U.S. Foreign Service.²⁶ Both are wonderful resources for charting the proto-foreign service; both introduce digital methods to understand the wide reach but limited efficacy of early consular networks.

While the U.S. contingent of consuls existed throughout the early Republic as a geographically extensive form of diplomatic engagement, the U.S. Navy formed a smaller corps for conducting foreign affairs. Disbanded at the end of the Revolution and not recommissioned until 1794, the navy's international presence was limited, and it struggled to find an identity, veering between defense force, offensive military force, and agent of diplomatic intimidation. It built up its complement of ships and men slowly, relying largely on sea-hardened civilian officers and sailors with limited military experience.

When we view naval officers as diplomatic characters, we find that some steered their ships at will, ignoring or creatively interpreting official orders. For example, Captain David Porter's voyage to the Pacific in the *USS Essex* resulted in the conquest of the Marquesas Islands. This act, which was not directed by the government, proved disastrous for his crew.²⁷ There are many similar stories about naval officers that show how often they blurred their martial and diplomatic roles. Oliver Hazard Perry and Stephen Decatur were both dashing heroes of military engagements, but their diplomatic credentials reflected the confused identity of the institution that they represented.²⁸

Other recent biographies show that pursuits of the mind sometimes led young Americans abroad. Poet Joel Barlow and polymath Nathaniel Bowditch followed their intellectual inclinations into the world. In doing so, they unwittingly submitted themselves as candidates for diplomatic roles. Barlow, initially sent to Europe as an agent to sell land in Ohio, stayed to join the literary circles of London and Paris with his wife Ruth and eventually numbered Mary Wollstonecraft among his intimates. Well known and liked by the American ministers in Paris, he found himself appointed by the U.S. government, first as a treaty negotiator with Tripoli and eventually as an envoy to Napoleon. He died in the line of duty in Poland during the French retreat from Moscow.²⁹

As a young man, Nathaniel Bowditch followed the life of a merchant supercargo on vessels to the Pacific and

indulged his interests in navigation and mathematics by writing the *American Practical Navigator*, the quintessential reference book for American naval officers and sailors. His travels connected him with international scientific networks, and the information that he gathered informed American presidents, particularly Thomas Jefferson, about the commercial and political landscape of the new Asian markets.³⁰ For young men of acumen, going abroad in the early years of the Republic often entailed conducting personal business, but it could also mean having to act on behalf of their country.

Less well-educated young men sometimes found themselves caught up in diplomatic disputes and had to scramble to assert their own vital roles on the world stage. American sailors who manned the vessels that skirted the earth navigated rough waters during the early Republic. Often the first Americans that anyone encountered abroad, sailors were what Brian Rouleau refers to as "ambassadors in the forecabin."³¹ People from regions that had yet to learn of the nation's existence formed their initial opinions of the United States from their encounters with sailors, who were often placed in awkward or precarious positions as a result.

Sailors also faced hardship at the hands of foreign entities that did not recognize or abide by American understandings of rights and citizenship.³² Uncertainty about their citizenship left them subject to impressment, which drew them into international disputes. It was because of such international pressures that sailors saw the need to assert their rights as Americans in every port they visited. The American government fought to protect sailors by printing reams of official documents and passports. Sailors also willingly participated in touting their national origins in a world where such declarations—at least with paper backing—were rare.³³

It is easy to understand why the notion of citizenship might have become more problematic when we look at the ethnic makeup of sailors. While many American sailors were white, African Americans and Native Americans also went to sea. Jeffrey Bolster's work deals with the world of African American sailors, but it is only recently that anyone has examined the activities of Native American sailors.³⁴ Nancy Shoemaker makes a great start by considering the work of Native American whalers from New England as both a demographic and geographic shift in American encounters with the world. These men eked out a living at sea and faced the same threats of impressment their white counterparts did. In cases of impressment abroad, the U.S. government accorded them the rights of American citizens—rights the government denied them at home.

Native American participation in foreign relationships also took on conflicting racial implications in the lands that they visited. Problems could emerge, particularly when Native Americans of the East Coast met those of the West. Such encounters brought on a complication of the traditional colonial narrative that marked these whalers as the colonizers as well as the colonized.³⁵ The participation of American racial groups in the diplomatic project further illuminates the haphazard and ad hoc nature of government control over foreign relations. These sailors, ubiquitous cogs in the wheel of maritime labor, are an important new lens of study in American foreign affairs and highlight the vital and socially diverse global influence of such diplomatic characters in the first thirty years of the nation's existence.

We are well on our way to a new diplomatic history of the early Republic that pursues Americans around the

It is easy to understand why the notion of citizenship might have become more problematic when we look at the ethnic makeup of sailors. While many American sailors were white, African Americans and Native Americans also went to sea. Jeffrey Bolster's work deals with the world of African American sailors, but it is only recently that anyone has examined the activities of Native American sailors.

world and creates a more nuanced view of the conduct of American foreign relations. However, it is important to note that many of these monographs consider these thirty years in single chapters or as background for nineteenth-century events. A comprehensive study of these thirty years through the eyes of diplomatic characters still remains to be written. Geographic studies also have some potential new routes to take. For example, both the eastern and western coasts of Africa remain open for study. What role did Americans and the American slave trade play in diplomatic activity on the continent?

Demographically, American women also remain curiously elusive in this story. While not as numerous as men abroad, American women did enter the world. Among them were Joel Barlow's wife, Ruth, and Alexander Hamilton's sister-in-law, Angelica Schuyler. They accompanied spouses, siblings, and children on their travels and formed their own intellectual, familial, and occasionally political networks around the world. I eagerly await discussions of their role in the American diplomatic project.

Far from a modern powerhouse of international influence, the United States relied on a diverse crew of diplomatic characters to project its ideas, identity, politics, and economic aims into the world. From the birth of their nation, these characters participated in the foreign affairs of their country largely without the knowledge of and without direction or pay from the U.S. government. Yet the government harnessed their knowledge and the networks they created for intelligence and personnel when the need arose. It could draw from a global pool of Americans that appeared on vessels in every sea, in the ports of every continent, and in the territories of kings, sachems, chiefs and emperors. These people marked trails and left webs of connections across the world, following, at least initially, the public and private drives for commerce and wealth.

Historians use this global geography to trace the creativity of merchants and commercial actors as they negotiated new regions of the world and reoriented east-facing, European modes of activity. Perspectives shift south and west to shine light on and study new oceanic and continental spaces. The individual activities of these travelers harnessed political, social, and commercial relationships, but other Americans also sailed on these merchant vessels, following personal inclinations for adventure, intellect, and fortune. Even the transnational institutions of the U.S. government were subject to the whims and movements of individual initiatives. The movements of these diplomatic characters further highlight the limited influence of the U.S. government in the conduct of foreign relations, but they also illuminate the wide variety of individuals who participated in making the United States a recognized nation among nations.

Notes:

1. Eliga Gould, in *Among the Powers of the Earth: The American Revolution and the Making of a New World Empire* (Cambridge, MA, 2012), charts the nature of the young American nation not as an isolated and neutral republic but as one inexorably caught up in the laws and activities of other nations.
2. <https://founders.archives.gov/>.
3. Konstantin Dierks, Nancy Shoemaker, Emily Conroy-Krutz, Rachel Tamar Van, and Courtney Fullilove, "Globalizing the Early American Republic," *Diplomatic History* 42, no.1 (January 2018).
4. A discussion of the early Republic similar to the one in *Diplomatic History* appears in Emily Conroy-Krutz et al., "Interchange: Globalization and Its Limits between the American Revolution and the Civil War," *Journal of American History* 103, no. 2 (September 2016). While both forums point to earlier examples, they mostly focus on discussions of the early to mid-nineteenth century rather than the immediate aftermath of the Revolution.
5. Philip Morgan and Jack Greene, *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal* (Oxford, UK, 2009), 36.
6. Nancy Shoemaker, "The Extraterritorial United States to

1860," *Diplomatic History* 42, no. 1 (January 2018): 36–54. For a discussion of how an increase in publishing maps and geographic handbooks supported a revolution in Americans' understanding of the world that they entered, see Martin Brückner, *The Geographic Revolution in Early America: Maps, Literacy, and National Identity* (Chapel Hill, NC, 2006).

7. Paul Gilje, "Commerce and Conquest in Early American Foreign Relations, 1750–1850," *Journal of the Early Republic* 37, no. 4 (Winter 2017).
8. Kariann Akemi Yokota, *Unbecoming British: How Revolutionary America Became a Postcolonial Nation* (Oxford, UK, 2014). Yokota takes on a similar geographic reorientation of the United States in her study of how Americans used culture and objects to seek new refinement and worldliness. See also Yokota's "Transatlantic and Transpacific Connections in Early American History," *Pacific Historical Review* 83, no. 2 (May 2014).
9. James Fichter, *So Great a Proffit: How the East Indies Trade Transformed Anglo-American Capitalism* (Cambridge, MA, 2010).
10. Dane Morrison, *True Yankees: The South Seas and the Discovery of American Identity* (Baltimore, MD, 2014). See also Kendall Johnson, *The New Middle Kingdom: China and the Early American Romance of Free Trade* (Baltimore, MD, 2017); and Eric Jay Dolin, *When America First Met China: An Exotic History of Tea, Drugs, and Money in the Age of Sail* (New York, 2012).
11. John Haddad, *America's First Adventure in China: Trade, Treaties, Opium and Salvation* (Philadelphia, PA, 2013).
12. Haddad, *America's First Adventure*, 8.
13. Michael Block, "New England Merchants, the China Trade, and the Origins of California" (PhD diss., University of Southern California, 2011); Dael Norwood, "Trading in Liberty: The Politics of the American China Trade, c. 1784–1862" (PhD diss., Princeton University, 2012). See also Gregory Cushman, *Guano and the Opening of the Pacific World: A Global Ecological History* (Cambridge, UK, 2013); and David Igler, *The Great Ocean: Pacific Worlds from Captain Cook to the Gold Rush* (Oxford, UK, 2013).
14. Kevin McDonald, *Pirates, Merchants, Settlers, and Slaves: Colonial America and the Indo-Atlantic World* (Oakland, CA, 2015). Rosemarie Zagari provides a strong historiographic case study of America-India relations in the second half of "The Significance of the 'Global Turn' for the Early American Republic: Globalization in the Age of Nation-Building," *Journal of the Early Republic* 31, no. 1 (Spring 2011).
15. David Narrett, *Adventurism and Empire: The Struggle for Mastery in the Louisiana-Florida Borderlands, 1762–1803* (Chapel Hill, NC, 2015); Andrew McMichael, *Atlantic Loyalties: Americans in Spanish West Florida, 1785–1810* (Athens, GA, 2009); Matthew J. Clavin, *Aiming for Pensacola: Fugitive Slaves on the Atlantic and Southern Frontiers* (Cambridge, MA, 2015).
16. David Head, *Privateers of the Americas: Spanish American Privateering from the United States in the Early Republic* (Athens, GA, 2015); Peter Andreas, *Smuggler Nation: How Illicit Trade Made America* (Oxford, UK, 2013).
17. Tyson Reeder, *Commerce and Liberation: Early America, Brazil and Luso-Atlantic Trade in the Age of Revolution* (PhD diss., University of California, Davis, 2016).
18. James Alexander Dun, *Dangerous Neighbors: Making the Haitian Revolution in Early America* (Philadelphia, PA, 2016). For a broad survey of American attitudes towards revolution and unrest in the Atlantic South, see Caitlin Fitz, *Our Sister Republics: The United States in the Age of Revolutions* (New York, 2016).
19. Ronald Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White: John Adams, Toussaint Louverture, and Their Atlantic World Alliance* (Athens, GA, 2014).
20. Paul Mapp, *The Elusive West and the Contest for Empire* (Chapel Hill, NC, 2011); and Alan Taylor, *American Revolutions, A Continental History, 1750–1804* (New York, 2016).
21. Andrew Nichols, *Engines of Diplomacy: Indian Trading Factories and the Negotiation of American Empire* (Chapel Hill, NC, 2016).
22. Brooke Blower, "Nation of Outposts: Forts, Factories, Bases, and the Making of American Power," *Diplomatic History* 41, no. 3 (June 2017): 439–59.
23. John Reda, *From Furs to Farms: The Transformation of the Mississippi Valley, 1762–1825* (DeKalb, IL, 2016); Patrick Bottiger, *The Borderland of Fear: Vincennes, Prophetstown, and the Invasion of the Miami Homeland* (Lincoln, NE, 2016).
24. Bernadette Whelan, *American Government in Ireland, 1790–1913: A History of the U.S. Consular Service* (Manchester, UK, 2010); Brett Goodin, "The Business, Personality, and Discretionary Power of American Consuls in North Africa, 1797–1805," *Huntington*

Library Quarterly 80, no. 4 (Winter 2017). Nicole Phelps's book, *U.S.-Habsburg Relations from 1815 to the Paris Peace Conference: Sovereignty Transformed* (Cambridge, UK, 2013), though outside of the temporal purview of this essay, is a useful exploration of the U.S. consular service in Europe during the nineteenth century. For a broader European look at consuls that also includes a small American sample see Ferry de Goey, *Consuls and the Institution of Global Capitalism, 1783–1914* (London, 2014).

25. Nicole Phelps, *Researching the US Consular Service: An Historian at Work*. <http://blog.uvm.edu/nphelps/>.

26. Jean Bauer, *The Early American Foreign Service Database*. <http://www.eafsd.org>.

27. George Daughan, *The Shining Sea: David Porter and the Epic Voyage of the U.S.S. Essex During the War of 1812* (New York, 2013).

28. Jonathon Dull, *American Naval History, 1607–1865: Overcoming the Colonial Legacy* (Lincoln, NE, 2012); and George Daughan, *If by Sea: The Forging of the American Navy—From the American Revolution to the War of 1812* (New York, 2008). Also See Lawrence Peskin, *Captives and Countrymen: Barbary Slavery and the American Public, 1785–1816* (Baltimore, MD, 2009) for the role of the U.S. Navy and its officers in the Barbary Wars.

29. Richard Buel, Jr. *Joel Barlow: American Citizen in a Revolutionary World* (Baltimore, MD, 2011). See also Peter Hill, *Joel Barlow: American Diplomat and Nation Builder* (Lincoln, NE, 2012).

30. Tamara Plakins Thornton, *Nathaniel Bowditch and the Power of Numbers: How A Nineteenth-Century Man of Business, Science, and the Sea Changed American Life* (Chapel Hill, NC, 2016).

31. Brian Rouleau, *With Sails Whitening Every Sea: Mariners and the Making of an American Maritime Empire* (Ithaca, NY, 2015).

32. Paul Gilje, *Free Trade and Sailors' Rights in the War of 1812* (Cambridge, UK, 2013).

33. Nathan Perl-Rosenthal, *Citizen Sailors: Becoming American in the Age of Revolution* (Cambridge, MA, 2015); Matthew Taylor Raffety, *The Republic Afloat: Law, Honor and Citizenship in Maritime America* (Chicago, 2013).

34. Jeffrey Bolster, *Black Jacks: African American Seamen in the Age of Sail* (Cambridge, MA, 1998); and, more recently, Bolster, "Letters by African American Sailors, 1799–1814," *William and Mary Quarterly* 64, no. 1 (Jan. 2007): 167–82.

35. Nancy Shoemaker, *Native American Whalers and the World: Indigenous Encounters and the Contingency of Race* (Chapel Hill, NC, 2015).

In the next issue of *Passport*

- **A roundtable on John Thompson, *Great Power Rising***
- **The historiography of science and the Cold War**
- **Christopher Nichols on TED talks**

And much more!