BRITISH INFLUENCE IN MEXICO 1840-1848

By

JOHN PAUL TYMITZ
//
Bachelor of Arts
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois
1964

Master of Arts
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois
1966

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 1973

BRITISH INFLUENCE IN MEXICO 1840-1848

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank many people who spent their time and energy during the writing of this thesis. For specific acknowledgement I express my gratitude to Professors LeRoy H. Fischer and H. James Henderson, for their time and guidance during my three years at Oklahoma State University. It is a pleasure to thank Professor Harold V. Sare whose erudite suggestions throughout my graduate career have been invaluable. Special thanks must be relayed to Dr. Odie B. Faulk for suggesting this topic to me. His suggestion led to an historian's dream, because I spent two months of research in the English archives. To Dr. Homer L. Knight, special thanks is given for his guidance and help in my graduate career. Finally, I am deeply indebted to Dr. John A. Sylvester whose time, energy, guidance, and editorial comments were invaluable in the final presentation of this thesis. From him I have gained much in the way of wise encouragement and specific techniques which are interwoven in the pages of this work.

I wish to thank the Library at Oklahoma State University, especially the staff on the fourth floor and in the inter-library loan office. A sincere thanks goes to the staff at the Public Record Office and the British Museum, London, England. My time was limited in London, and I greatly appreciated their kind and courteous assistance.

I am grateful to my family: to my mother and father for their never ending encouragement and assistance during my graduate years; to my inlaws for their concern, and the help they gave my family during three hectic hears; and to my children, Jonathan and Scarlet for their mature understanding during my graduate days and the time I was away from them. Finally, but never last in my thoughts, my wife Dixie deserves special recognition for her strength, perseverence, and hard work that enabled me to spend full time on my degree. It was the Dixie Foundation Grant that financed my research, while love and understanding helped bring about its completion. To her and to my children, I dedicate this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

American historiography has not ignored the Mexican War. Indeed, even before it ended writers were speculating as to its causes and its consequences. These causes and consequences have been analyzed variously throughout the 19th and 20th centuries.

The earlier views, patriotic in their tone, praised President Polk and the Democrats for their judicious involvement. As early as 1849, John S. Jenkins, History of the War Between the United States and Mexico, believed that the United States was right in going to war. Accounts current until the turn of the century emphasized that the war was fought to extend slave territory in the United States.[1] This was consistent with the rise of abolitionism in the 1850's and the long lasting impact of the Civil War.

In the twentieth century the slavocracy theory dissipated. The most detailed account of the war emerged in Justin H. Smith's book of 1919, which interpreted the Mexican War as an inevitability caused by (1) the policy of the Mexicans, particularly Santa Anna, and (2) the

---

[1] Wilham Jay, A Review of the Causes and Consequences of the Mexican War (Philadelphia, 1849). See also Abiel Livermore, The War with Mexico Reviewed (Boston, 1850).

annexation of Texas.[2] This was the best researched account and was detached from the emotion over Manifest Destiny in the 1840's and sectionalism in the 1850's and afterward.

Later accounts in an age of world-wide empires and world wars stressed the desire to expand and take land.[3] Often, in our liberal age, these were anti-imperial blaming the United States. Also the economic factor became important in historical interpretation following the Great Depression in the 1930's and the rise of America's world encompassing economy as a result of the Second World War. In his Empire on the Pacific, Norman Graebner argued that economic expansion and the desire for California were the main reasons for war.[4] The current historical interest in statistical analysis has also been used to study the causes of war, the most notable work being Joel Silbey's The Shrine of Party, which analyzed the Congressional voting patterns for the period and concludes that the vote to enter the war was more a political issue than a sectional one.[5]

The most recent of the many works on the war is the book of Seymour V. Connor and Odie B. Faulk, North America Divided: The Mexican War 1846-1848. These authors suggest a prejudicial stance of many historians resulting from a failure to recognize the internal

---

[2]Justin H. Smith, The War with Mexico, Vols. I and II (New York, 1919).

[3]Allan Nevins, Ordeal of Union (New York, 1947). Charles G. Sellers, James K. Polk, Continentalist 1843-1846 (Princeton, N. J., 1966). Otis Singletary, The Mexican War (Chicago, 1960). Frederick Merk, Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History (New York,1963).

[4]Norman Graebner, Empire on the Pacific (New York, 1955).

[5]Joel Silbey, The Shrine of Party (New York, 1967).

political struggle in Mexico and the fact that Mexico was the first to declare war and the first to prepare for wide-spread hostilities.[6]

Peter Harstad and Richard Resh maintain that "domestic politics, the personality of Polk, the designs of merchant groups, and the demand of creditors and claimants all suggest differing interpretations."[7] No conclusive consensus exists among historians as to the definitive causes of the war. Too many historians' premises are based upon the limitations of the times in which they live and their different personalities. These conflicting personality judgments often tend to confuse rather than to confirm the causes.

There is one factor of importance behind the scenes leading to war: the role of Great Britain. As Britain was the traditional balancer of power on the European continent, the same position was open to the British upon this continent. According to Samuel Flagg Bemis, the dean of America's diplomatic historians, Polk went to war because he feared a foreign power, particularly England, would acquire land in North America.[8] Ephraim D. Adams and Jesse Reeves have shown that English activity in California and Texas was quite extensive. Both agree that the English would have welcomed a chance to acquire a part of

---

[6]Seymour V. Connor and Odie B. Faulk, North America Divided: The Mexican War, 1846-1848 (New York, 1971). In this bibliography the authors note that a renewed interest in the war may be evident, since 19 per cent of the works they cite were published during the period 1950-1970. It may be noted that this bibliography is so detailed that it will be an invaluable aid to historians in the future.

[7]Peter Harstad and Richard Resh, "The Causes of the Mexican War, A Note on Changing Interpretation," Arizona and the West, Vol. VI (Winter, 1964).

[8]Samuel Flagg Bemis, The Latin American Policy of the United States (New York, 1943), p. 162.

California and to enlarge their commercial activities with Mexico.[9]

The problem remaining, however, is the extent of England's commitment to Mexico and her preparedness for war. There is no doubt that England was interested in Mexican affairs to the full extent reported by Waddy Thompson, the United States Minister to Mexico; they received fifteen million dollars annually from their commercial investments.[10] Historians have recognized the English position in Mexico and some, notably Justin Smith, believe it had an important place in the events leading to war.

According to Smith, English publications instigated or influenced the aggressive Mexican attitudes by their news stories delineating the disorganized state of the United States' Army. These news editors not only castigated the United States Army but they also inferred that a strong, vigorous and unified war policy could never be achieved for these reasons: the federal system of states being what it was plus the increased tension brought about by the slave issue and the fierce and devisive debates over the tariff.[11]

Adding to the confusion of assessing the amount of British influence in Mexico is the problem of England's ambiguity of purpose. In a number of Foreign Office documents instructions were given to Richard Pakenham and Charles Bankhead, that they were not to suggest, in any way, to the Mexican government that English aid would be

---

[9]E. D. Adams, British Interests and Activities in Texas, 1838-1846 (Austin, 1910). Also Jesse Reeves, American Diplomacy under Tyler and Polk (Baltimore, 1907).

[10]Waddy Thompson, Recollections of Mexico (New York, 1846), p. 236.

[11]Smith, War in Mexico I, pp. 112-113.

expected. Yet, there is evidence of a strong undercurrent of expectations. If, on the one hand, Mexico expected aid from England, which Justin Smith submits,[12] and on the other, England officially denied any aid, a controversy is evident. Further aggravating the Anglo-Mexican confusion was the problem of England's ambiguity of its assessment: English newspapers could have been the instrument of merchants who were eager to see the English more commercially involved in Mexico, or their anti-American attitude or prejudice, still evident in British politics, could have been the motivating factor. In either case, England's vacillation contributed to the general confusion of the issue.

Another historian, Frederick Merk, analyzed this period extensively and concluded that England was not ready to aid Mexico in the war with the United States.[13] Merk unlike many others examines in detail the British feeling prior to and during the Mexican War. He believes that England was not in any position to aid, and that the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Aberdeen, was more interested in peace rather than a war with the United States.[14] Merk does recognize the anti-United States feeling in England as evidenced in their newspapers, but he does not find the same feeling expressed in the Foreign Office.[15]

---

[12]Smith, War in Mexico I, pp. 112-113.

[13]Frederick Merk, The Oregon Question Essays in Anglo-American Diplomacy and Politics (Cambridge, 1967). Frederick Merk, Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History; A Reinterpretation (New York, 1963). Frederick Merk, The Monroe Doctrine and American Expansion, 1843-1849 (New York, 1966).

[14]Merk, The Monroe Doctrine and American Expansion, pp. 161-193.

[15]Ibid.

Merk's thesis is a creditable one and deserves attention, because of the research he did in the Aberdeen and Peel papers.

Admittedly, there was some English influence in Mexico during the period; however, the problem to be considered is the degree and credibility of that influence during the years 1840-1848. The United States newspaper which offered the widest and most undisputed coverage of the controversial period was the New Orleans Daily Picayune. In their eyes, any English acitivity was construed as direct participation or as a manifestation of England's covert plans to establish a protectorate in Mexico. As a counterpart, the London Times expressed the fear of further American expansion. These horns locked, further tension mounted. Much of this tension was due to the political implications of English treaty negotiations in Oregon, which some historians conceive as the impetus for her influence in Mexico; for Britain might have offered aid to Mexico to divert United States attention from Oregon. The settlement of the Oregon boundary dispute cannot be ignored, because it presented or established an air of expectancy within Mexico that prevented the Mexican government from recognizing the independence of Texas.[16]

The major problem in evaluating the English position during the decade seems to be the emphasis placed on the documents by the historians. Smith, after his exhaustive account concluded that aid was possible and that the English Ministers promised the Mexicans aid. He bases this on the air of expectancy in Mexico; while Merk believes that aid was not forthcoming; but that the United States used the fear of

---

[16]Smith, War in Mexico, I, pp. 112-113.

British involvement to strengthen their position prior to the war.[17]

After examining the documents in the Foreign Office the author believes Merk's argument is valid and additional evidence - the Foreign Office correspondence - which Merk did not use further substantiates his case. Smith, on the other hand, did examine the material in the Foreign Office, but still bases his thesis on the air of expectancy, a slight comment, a secret meeting, or a statement from an unofficial British source in Mexico City, who hinted that Mexico could expect aid from England.[18]

Smith concluded that England was ready to help Mexico militarily if the United States annexed Texas. Historians agree with Smith that England came close to aiding the Mexicans prior to annexation, but that aid faded, when annexation became a reality, and the Mexicans failed to recognize Texas. Wilbur D. Jones in his book, Lord Aberdeen and the Americas, agreed with Smith and E. D. Adams that England came close to direct aid in 1845, but due to the Mexican lethargy, and the internal problems in England, Aberdeen's enthusiasm for Mexican aid evaporated as Mexico continued to avoid recognition. Indeed, Aberdeen advised the Mexican government against war with the United States.[19]

Since no conclusive documentary evidence exists as to the definitive causes of the war and the extent of the English involvement; this

---

[17]Smith, War in Mexico I, pp. 112-113.

[18]Merk, Monroe Doctrine and American Expansion, p. 166.

[19]Wilbur D. Jones, Lord Aberdeen and the Americas (Athens, 1958), p.33.

study proposes to analyze and evaluate the official British position as evidenced in all their Foreign Office documents during the years 1840-1848. Secret negotiations or secret plans may have been discussed between Mexico and England, and if they did the Smith thesis will stand up as the most thorough account of the entire period, but as of now they have not been uncovered. And even though a detailed examination of United States-Mexican policy will not be analyzed, it must be recognized in this study, as the ground in the overall English policy toward Texas and Mexico. This span of years has been chosen because it is the belief of the author that from 1840 on, English interest in Mexico accelerated in intensity commensurately with Texas' increase of autonomy as a nation, and the discussion of annexation to the United States.

CHAPTER II

BRITAIN STRIKES A MODERATE COURSE

As Texas sought national autonomy and a place in international affairs, British interest in Mexican affairs escalated. That does not mean that England had no interest in Mexico prior to Texas' independence. The English government and English merchants realized early in the eighteenth century that New Spain offered innumerable commercial possibilities. These began with the Asiento and the Navio de Permiso both in the Treaty of Utrecht (1713). Trade and commerce were so important to the British industrial system that as early as 1826 a treaty of trade and commerce was signed between Britain and newly independent Mexico.[1] This treaty was negotiated by William Huskisson, President of the Committee of Privy Council for Affairs of Trade and Sebastian Camacho, Minister for Foreign Relations of Mexico. It outlined all commercial questions, called for perpetual amity, outlined the rights and privileges of each country's citizens while resident in the other (these rights were ones enjoyed by the native citizens) and also stipulated that foreign residents could not be charged with any taxes, loans, or imposts not charged to the native citizens. The

---

[1]Great Britain, Public Record Office. Foreign Office Treaty Series 93, 59-2, "Treaty of Amity and Commerce and Navigation, December 26, 1826," also Treaties and Conventions between Great Britain and Other Powers," compiled by Lewis Hertslet Vol. III (London, 1841), pp. 247-264.

treaty became the nucleus for English-Mexican relations for the next twenty years.

Commercial concern was not the only reason for a treaty with Mexico. The British were also concerned over America's westward expansion, and the rapid development of industry in the United States. These meant that both countries in the first half of the nineteenth century competed for supremacy in South America, Cuba, Mexico and Texas.[2] This competition played an important part in the affairs of Mexico, as both countries sought to limit the influence of the other.

After several Latin American countries declared their independence England quickly recognized them and established commercial treaties. The rest of Europe under terms of the Holy Alliance were ready to aid Spain in her colonial conflict. England however, under George Canning, the Foreign Secretary, was so interested in establishing markets in South America, that he threatened to use the English navy in support of the colonial governments. The industrial expansion in England demanded new markets and within a short time English chargés d' affaires were dispatched throughout South America to draw up commercial treaties. By 1824 Canning exuberantly declared that "Spanish America is English."[3]

---

[2]A. W. Ward and G. B. Gooch (eds), Cambridge History of British Foreigh Policy, Vol. II 1815-1866 (Cambridge, 1923), p. 254. Also Merk, Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History.

[3]Henry B. Parkes, A History of Mexico (Boston, 1960), p. 190. See also, Harold Temperley, The Foreign Policy of Canning 1822-1827 (Hamden, Conn. 1966), pp. 157-186. Temperley believes that Canning is revered among Latin American historians. His major premise in Latin America was to allow the Latin American nations to work out their own problems, without any interference from Europe or the United States. England would remain a powerful friend and Temperley argues that Canning "obtained a commercial hegemony, and a certain political ascendancy in Latin America."

Mexico was the most important new country, and England's first minister, H. G. Ward, clearly outdistanced other countries so that England enjoyed a commanding lead in commercial relations in Mexico. The German States, France, and eventually the United States shared in that commerce, but for many years England was in the lead. The United States was at a disadvantage since Mexico was afraid that land-hungry citizens of the United States would expand westward and eventually control Mexico. This fear was encouraged by British representatives in Mexico throughout the period 1826-1848.[4]

British investors bought Mexican bonds, and invested heavily in Mexican gold and silver mining, but politics was chaotic, disorganized and constantly involved in revolutions which limited the economic possibilities in Mexico as well as the foreign investments. Within a short time Mexico was in debt to almost all of the European powers, and France eventually blockaded the Mexican ports for failure to pay French claims. England, although worried about investments in Mexico, never resorted to force, but did have problems collecting various claims owed English citizens. Throughout the years Richard Pakenham, the British Minister to Mexico, received orders from Henry John Temple, better known as Viscount Palmerston, who as Foreign Secretary, pressed upon the Mexican government that Her Majesty's Government expected them to live up to their commitments.[5]

---

[4]Temperley, The Foreign Policy of Canning 1822-1829, pp. 164-168.

[5]Great Britain, Public Record Office, Foreign Office Series, 50 Mexico, Vol. 122B, No. 35, "Palmerston to Pakenham, October 14, 1839," (hereafter cited as F.O. 50, Vol. and Number), also F.O. 50 Vol. 126, No. 50, June 22, 1839, "Pakenham to Palmerston." In this dispatch Pakenham reports that a British based company in Mexico repealed an

The revolution of 1835 and 1836 in Texas did not bring an immediate response from the English government, and in fact, even after the declaration of independence was publicized, England informed Texas that they would only trade with her under the stipulations signed in the treaty of 1826. England therefore still considered Texas as a part of the Mexican Republic.[6] British interest was very subdued and even after Texas sent J. Pinckney Henderson as Minister Plenipotentiary to Great Britain, Palmerston refused to recognize the independence of Texas.[7]

Henderson, a wealthy member of an aristocratic family in North Carolina, was trained as a lawyer and arrived in June, 1836. He was only 28 years old but had served as a colonel in a North Carolina militia and therefore was chosen as a brigadier general in the Texas army. After being appointed brigadier general, he returned to North Carolina, raised a company of men, and then returned to Texas.

---

earlier court decision over its property, and the Mexican court handed down a favorable decision which Pakenham believed was an "honorable exception to the usual course of such proceedings." See also F.O. 50 Vol. 133 No. 23 "Palmerston to Pakenham, May 14, 1840."

[6] Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, edited by George P. Garrison in Annual Report of The American Historical Association, 1908. Hereafter cited as Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas: Two volumes, "Palmerston to Henderson, April 6, 1838," p. 857, and April 11, 1838, p. 859. Also "Henderson to R. A. Irion, January 5, 1839," p. 839. Also F.O. 50 Vol. 132 No. 42, "Palmerston to Pakenham, October 5, 1839," Palmerston enclosed a letter written to a Texas citizen, George Weymouth, in which he states that Texas had not been recognized as a separate state; also in F.O. 50 Vol. 132 No. 68, "Palmerston to Pakenham, December 23, 1839."

Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, "Henderson to Irion, April 12, 1838, II," pp. 853-869, also F.O. 50 Vol. 132 No. 48, "Palmerston to Pakenham, October 14, 1839," p. 82; Rupert N. Richardson, Texas The Lone Star State (New York, 1943), p. 159.

Following independence, Sam Houston appointed Henderson as Secretary of State when Stephen F. Austin died. Henderson was very capable in this position and many believed he was the best person in the Republic to seek British recognition in 1837. He remained in England for three years, and later went to France. He returned to his home and was very important in the final negotiations for annexation in 1844 and 1845. In 1846 he was chosen as the first governor of Texas.[8]

In England, however, Henderson faced many difficulties, because Palmerston had several reasons for not recognizing Texas. First, the anti-slavery feeling in England brought an immediate response from the British Anti-Slavery Society which sent several letters to Palmerston against recognition. They felt that slavery would run rampant in Texas, especially since there were no controls from the Mexican government.[9] Secondly, the British were unwilling to recognize the state of Texas because of the millions of dollars already invested in Mexico, and finally, the Foreign Office resisted recognition because they felt that Texas would soon be a member of the United States.[10]

The British stand against slavery played an important part in the discussion of the recognition of Texas not only in England but also

---

[8] Dictionary of American Biography, Vol. VIII, pp. 526-527.

[9] Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, "Irion to Henderson, Houston, May 20, 1838," II, p. 861. F.O 50 Vol. 132 No. 42, "Letter addressed to Palmerston from British Anti-Slave Society, September 28, 1839," --Texas was viciously taken from the Mexicans, primarily to establish another slave state which Great Britain should not recognize.

[10] Richardson, Texas The Lone Star State, p. 159.

in the United States. While anti-slave forces in England bombarded the Foreign Office with proposals against the recognition of Texas, pro-slavery protagonists in the United States sought recognition of Texas and, if possible, admission to the Union as a territory. Southern representatives in Congress supported recognition because they were afraid that slavery would be abolished in Texas under the umbrella of British support and recognition.[11] As long as the United States continued to discuss the issue, Palmerston refused to give Henderson a concrete answer, and many times the Texan was left waiting at Palmerston's office, while the Foreign Secretary either ignored a meeting or failed to show because of other appointments.[12] Henderson became so flustered and upset by October, 1839, that he demanded an audience and a firm reply from Palmerston within four days or he threatened to leave England and discuss recognition with other European powers, particularly France and the Netherlands.[13] Palmerston did not comply, and Henderson left England, and achieved some success when he signed a treaty of commerce and recognition with France.

---

[11] Congressional Globe, April 23, 1838, Vol. 6 No. 20, p. 307. See also Cong. Globe, Vol. 6 No. 20 for John C. Calhoun's speech to the Senate in favor of Texas' recognition and later admission to the United States.

[12] Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, "Henderson to Palmerston, London, February 12, 1838," II, p. 854. In this letter Henderson mentions the fact that Palmerston failed to keep an appointment and that he would like to make another appointment. See also F.O. 50 Vol. 132 No. 48 "Palmerston to Pakenham, October 14, 1839," p. 88.

[13] Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, "Henderson to Palmerston, London, April 11, 1838. Also F.O. 50 Vol. 132 No. 49, Letter from Henderson to Palmerston, found in dispatch to Pakenham dated October 14, 1839, pp. 105-106. F.O. 50 Vol. 132 No. 49, "Henderson to Palmerston, London, April 11, 1838," p. 860.

While Henderson sought recognition in Europe, Texas' President Sam Houston sent delegates to Washington, D.C. in hopes of annexation by the United States. The United States, like England, did not immediately recognize the independence of Texas. In December, 1836, President Jackson emphasized in a message to Congress, that the issue of recognition must be handled with extreme care, because an immediate recognition could have been interpretated as grounds for war by the Mexican government. The United States could only recognize Texas, if Mexico or one of the other great powers recognized her or until enough time lapsed whereby Texas could prove her ability to maintain a separate sovereignty.[14]

Jackson's remarks, however led to an open discussion in both houses, over Texas. After lengthy debate both Houses of Congress passed a resolution favoring recognition of Texas. As a result, Jackson in a "midnight appointment" named Alcée la Branche, of Louisiana to be chargé d' affaires to the Republic of Texas.[15]

Recognition achieved, it was Houston's hope and the hope of Texans and Southern sympathizers in the United States to see annexation become a reality. Led by the Southern representatives, annexation became an issue. The Tennessee legislature endorsed annexation and sent a resolution to that effect to the federal House of Representatives on April 16, 1838.[16] The Tennessee resolution was tabled by a vote of

---

[14]J. D. Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, Vol. 14, pp. 1487-1488. Also Congressional Globe, 24th Cong. 2nd Session, Vol. 14, pp. 108-109.

[15]Ibid., p. 1501

[16]Cong. Globe, 25th Cong. 2nd Session, p. 307.

107 to 75. Though buried in the House the issue surfaced in the Senate with the speech of William C. Preston of South Carolina on April 24, 1838 calling for the annexation of Texas to the United States.

Preston believed that Texas deserved a place in the Union, and that even if slavery existed in Texas the condition of the slave would be improved and there would be no increase in the number of slaves.[17] Preston's speech did little more than increase the determination by Northerners that Texas should not be part of the United States primarily because of the slave issue. The question became so heated that neither side would compromise and the resolutions to annex Texas were by-passed, ignored, and eventually tabled by the 25th Congress.[18]

Lamar, upset with these dilatory procedures in the United States, withdrew the Texas request to join the United States and sent another agent, James Hamilton, to Europe to negotiate a loan with a European country.[19] James Hamilton, a South Carolinian, was commissioned in 1839 to sell a five million dollar bond issue in Europe. He was educated as a lawyer, and was governor of South Carolina in 1830, and a principal leader in the nullification controversy of 1832. He gave financial support to the Texas revolution, and Houston offered the command of the Texas army to him in 1837. He declined, but after

---

[17] Cong. Globe, Appendix, pp. 555-558.

[18] Cong. Globe, 25th Cong. 2nd Session, p. 177.

[19] Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas. "Irion to to Henderson, Houston, June 1, 1838," p. 863. Also "Webb to Henderson, May 20, 1838," p. 867.

Lamar's election he agreed to travel to Europe in hopes of obtaining the "five million dollar loan." Hamilton had an influence on President Lamar, and it was Hamilton's suggestion that precipitated the effort to sell the bonds to European governments. He realized that if Texas was not annexed to the United States it would need money to maintain its independence, and an army against a possible attack by Mexico.

While Texas sought aid, and England remained evasive, the British Minister, Richard Pakenham, capitalized on the events and used the tool of English recognition as a lever to advance the economic position of England in Mexico. Sir Richard Pakenham, an accomplished diplomat, was the second cousin of Sir Edward Michael Pakenham, who had died commanding the British forces at the famous battle at New Orleans in 1815. Sir Richard left school to join the Foreign Office and was first assigned as an attaché to his uncle at The Hague. In January, 1824, he was appointed Secretary of the Legation in Switzerland, and two years later took the same job in Mexico. He remained in Mexico for nine years, and finally was appointed Minister Plenipotentiary in March, 1835. In this position he was instrumental in negotiating with Mexico the treaty for the abolition of the slave trade, and later used his offices in an effort to reconcile the differences between France and Mexico during the "Pastry War." In 1843 Pakenham was made a Privy Counsellor and the next day, December 14, 1843, he was appointed Envoy Extraordinary, and Minister Plenipotentiary to the United States. There he was involved in the Texas question, the Oregon dispute, in that he served as negotiator, and finally he was in the United States during the Mexican War.[20]

---

[20] Dictionary of American Biography, Vol. V, p. 876.

While Palmerston wrestled with recognition in 1839, Pakenham was concerned over the formation of a "Society for the Encouragement of National Industry," which had as its main objective the establishment of a textile industry in Mexico which could capitalize on the large cotton production in Mexico and severely damage the British trade in Mexico. To aid these factories the Mexican Congress debated a bill which would increase the tariff on all British cotton goods.[21] Pakenham, concerned for his country's interest, immediately sent a confidential memo to the Mexican Government, stating that if the tariff passed England would either recognize Texas or recover from Mexico the vast sums of money owed to them or if necessary both would be carried out by the English Government.[22]

The British threat was heeded and the tariff never passed, but the problem over British interests in Mexico still existed. As a result, Pakenham requested specific instructions from the Foreign Office which would awaken the Mexican Government to the importance of British trade and commerce in Mexico. Palmerston concurred in the action taken by Pakenham, and suggested that he constantly impress upon the Mexican Government the importance of British trade, and the necessity of maintaining friendly relations between the two countries. Palmerston's policy was vindicated as British trade increased during the years 1838 1839, and Pakenham boasted that the amount of British goods traded in

---

[21] F.O. 50 Vol. 126 No. 51, "Pakenham to Palmerston, June 22, 1839," p. 36.

[22] "Confidential Memorandum for the Consideration of the Government of Mexico, April 28, 1839." Found in F.O. 50 Vol. 123 No. 31, "Pakenham to Palmerston, May 11, 1839."

Mexico in 1839 was twice as much as all the other countries trading in Mexico for that year.

Reports from the western ports of Mexico alone show that in 1838 $1,700,000 in duties was collected which was the largest freight ever from this area, and offered proof according to Pakenham that the mining and commercial operations in that area could reap rich rewards. Indeed the amount of money collected the following year jumped to $2,387,880. Pakenham also reported that the number of English vessels trading in Mexico far surpassed other nations but the true significance of that comes from the fact that English ships usually carried a cargo three times that of other nations. Almost all the manufactured goods imported into Mexico were made in England. Another source, Albert M. Gilliam, Travels in Mexico (Aberdeen, 1847), claimed that British investment in Mexican mines and bonds was about $90,000,000.[23]

As trade and commerce increased, so too did British interest in the Mexican-Texan conflict. Realizing that a peaceful and content Mexico meant an increased profit for British merchants, Pakenham became involved in the dispute between the two countries. He worked as an intermediary for Mexican and Texan agents who were attempting to negotiate a settlement. Texas, upset with the slow policies of the United States and desirous of aid from European sources decided to solve the problem above, and sent overtures to the Mexican Government to solve the four-year old dispute.

---

[23]These figures were found in F.O. 50 Vol. 125 No. 40. "Pakenham to Palmerston, June 3, 1839," p. 26, and F.O 50 Vol. 134 No. 14, "Pakenham to Palmerston, February 9, 1840,"and F.O. 50 Vol. 24 No. 8 "Pakenham to Palmerston, January 25, 1841," p. 40.

England was a prime objective for Texans seeking foreign recognition, and the Foreign Office was flooded with letters from Texas emphasizing the advantages which England could gain from a recognition of Texas independence. Most of the letters received by Palmerston itemized the reasons why recognition was necessary. First, Texas was four times the size of Great Britain and Ireland. Second, Texas had the finest soil and climate in the world. Third, Texas could be an excellent commercial depot, from which items could be shipped to Mexico, South America, and the United States.

All of these factors combined meant that Texas not only would become a fine commercial ally, it would in time become the most strategic British ally in the world. In the event of war with the United States, Texas' importance would be invaluable.

Probably the most important argument in these letters to the Foreign Office centered on the important agricultural cotton crop. Properly managed thousands of British citizens could move to Texas, invest in cotton production and before long Texas cotton could enter England free of duty. Once Texas cotton entered free there could be a move by Southern states in the Union to join Texas and as a result the power of the United States would end, since 60 million dollars of the 95 million dollars exported by the United States in 1838 came from cotton.[24] The cotton income gone, America would no longer be a viable competitor.

---

[24]Letter to James McHenry from Martin Adamson, April 26, 1839, found in F.O. 50 Vol. 131 No. 26, April 27, 1839. Also a letter from Samuel N. Williams to Robert Lee Dawson, December 1, 1838. Williams' letter is presented to Palmerston to enlighten the Foreign Secretary to the history of Texas, and Williams as Secretary of State to Austin,

Palmerston, impressed with the diplomatic success of Henderson in France and Hamilton in the Netherlands,[25] was ready to discuss recognition. In 1840, he began serious discussions with Hamilton for a treaty of commerce and a treaty prohibiting the slave trade. During the negotiations Palmerston demanded that the end of the African slave trade had to be a condition for recognition; Texas agreed because of the necessity of English recognition and the possibility of English loans.

When Palmerston began official discussions of the problem of recognition, Pakenham became more involved in the negotiations of solving the Texan-Mexican conflict. Early in 1839 Texas sent Secretary of State Barnard E. Bee to Mexico, with the authority to offer the Mexican Government as much as five million dollars if it would recognize Texas' independence and the border of the Rio Bravo del Norte (Rio Grande).[26] Bee, a native of South Carolina, was a member of the first Texas Cabinet and President Houston's Secretary of War. He had

---

was considered qualified to assess the importance of Texas, and also the benefits that England could attain by recognizing its independence. Williams' letter contained the reasons for English recognition.

[25]Hamilton found the European leaders, and eventually Palmerston receptive, since it no longer appeared that Texas would be annexed to the United States.

[26]F.O. 50 Vol. 126 No. 74, "Pakenham to Palmerston, September 12, 1839," pp. 180-186, and F.O. 50 Vol. 134 No. 2, "Pakenham to Palmerston December 12, 1839," pp. 5-7. In both of these dispatches Pakenham reports that he had communicated with Mr. Bee in New Orleans and hoped a cessation of hostilities would be possible, while Bee was given his orders in Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, "Commission of Barnard E. Bee as Agent of Texas to Mexico, February 20, 1839, II, p. 431.

accompanied Santa Anna after the battle at San Jacinto, and was the obvious choice to remind Santa Anna of his promise to recognize Texas.

The Texas agent in the United States discussed the matter with John Forsyth, the United States Secretary of State in President Van Buren's Administration. As a result Powhatan Ellis, the United States Minister in Mexico, was instructed to act as a mediator in any Mexican-Texan negotiations. Sensing some competition from the United States, Pakenham went beyond the role of a neutral bystander. He stepped into the Texas-Mexican situation and became a liaison between the two parties. He corresponded with several agents in New Orleans and was given the assurance that Colonel Bee would first seek a cessation of hostilities with the Mexicans, and eventually pay a substantial sum to Mexico for recognition. After receiving this news, he suggested to the Texas agents that Mexico would probably lend a willing ear to a cessation of hostilities, but if Texas proposed full sovereignty as a condition for peace, or even worse, a demand for the boundary at the Rio Grande, the Mexicans would never accept and any attempt at peaceful negotiations would be futile.[27]

Indeed, these Texan proposals were bold, but they did impress upon the English agents that Texas was trying to establish itself within the international sphere of nations. As Texas continued to

---

[27] F.O. 50 Vol. 126 No. 74, "Pakenham to Palmerston, September 12, 1839," pp. 180-186, and F.O. 50 Vol. 134 No. 2, "Pakenham to Palmerston December 12, 1839," pp. 5-7. In both of these dispatches Pakenham reports that he had communicated with Mr. Bee in New Orleans and hoped a cessation of hostilities would be possible, while Bee was given his orders in Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, "Commission of Barnard E. Bee as Agent of Texas to Mexico, February 20, 1839," II, p. 431. Bee was given specific orders that Rio Grande was to be the border.

press for these proposals England became more involved and began to use its good offices to influence Mexico of the necessity of a peaceful settlement. Indeed the English realized that a peaceful settlement would also insure a greater opportunity for British trade and investments, in both countries.

Colonel Bee, the first Texan agent, was not successful in his attempt to negotiate a peace with Mexico. In fact, he never visited Mexico City. His successor, James Treat, although he never succeeeded in signing a treaty spent ten months in Mexico under orders to handle confidentially all questions that pertained to a treaty with Mexico. Treat was not a Texan, he was from New York, but he was sympathetic to the Texan cause, and more importantly, he knew a contact close to Santa Anna. Hamilton and the Texan Secretary of State, had met Treat and learned that Treat had received a letter from a friend in Mexico, who intimated that Santa Anna was ready to conclude a peaceful settlement of the Texas dispute. Naturally, then Treat was the obvious choice to replace Bee.[28]

Treat's arrival in Mexico becomes even more important, because it marked the beginning of overt English involvement in the Mexican situation. Even before Treat met with Mexican officials he saw Pakenham and asked for British mediation. Besides mediation, Treat requested

---

[28] George L. Rives, The United States and Mexico (New York, 1913), Vol. 11, p. 529. Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, "Bee to Webb, Vera Cruz, May 24, 1839," II, p. 447, also "Burnet to Treat, Houston, August 9, 1839," pp. 470-472. These letters all relate to the necessity of appointing James Treat as special envoy to Mexico.

that England guarantee any peace signed between Mexico and Texas.[29] Palmerston after receiving news of this offer instructed Pakenham that he approved of his language, "but instruct you that Great Britain cannot guarantee any arrangement between Mexico and Texas.[30] Pakenham replied that Her Majesty's Government hoped for a peace but at this point he believed, as he expressed to Bee earlier, that a cessation of hostilities had to be the first step in any agreement. Any guarantee, he emphasized, would have to come from the Foreign Office and would be very unlikely. Treat informs Pakenham that Burnet wanted an amicable settlement, and that he was under orders to meet with a properly appointed agent from Mexico. Treat's mission was given the full support of both the Texas President (Lamar) and the Texas Congress, which passed a resolution granting Lamar the authority to appoint a commission whenever he felt it necessary to enter into an amicable negotiation with any person properly accredited by the Mexican Government.[31] Once Treat reached Mexico City he met with the Mexican Secretary of State Cañedo and laid before him the Texas' plan for peace. "The recognition of Treat marked a breakthrough," Pakenham

---

[29]Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, "Treat to Lamar, Mexico, February 8, 1840," II, pp. 560-562. Also F.O. 50 Vol. 134 No. 20, "Pakenham to Palmerston, February 9, 1840," pp. 170-175.

[30]F.O. 50 Vol. 133 No. 24, "Palmerston to Pakenham, May 14, 1840," p. 73.

[31]Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, "Burnet to Treat, Houston, August 9, 1839," p. 471. Treat informs Pakenham that Burnet wanted an amicable settlement, and that he was under orders to meet with a properly appointed agent from Mexico. F.O. 50 Vol. 134 No. 20, "Pakenham to Palmerston, February 9, 1840," p. 172.

stated, and believed the issue was negotiable, at least the Mexicans were willing to talk.[32]

Cañedo stalled for time; an habitual trait of the Mexicans, throughout the period according to the British ministers. Even though Mexico procrastinated, Pakenham remained optimistic and constantly persuaded Treat to remain in Mexico and continue discussions for peace. In March, 1840, Treat was officially recognized by the Mexican Government as the Confidential Agent of the Government of Texas, and for the first time it seemed that Mexico was ready to discuss the problem. Throughout the period Treat remained optimistic and along with Pakenham did not press the issue because they realized the delicate problems Cañedo faced in his discussions with government leaders.[33]

Politically, Texas was a delicate issue within Mexican politics, and Cañedo, afraid that he would be criticized for negotiating with a State in the midst of revolution, presented the problem to the Mexican Congress. The resolution as introduced by Cañedo called for a cessation of hostilities, but even met forceful opposition in Congress led by Manuel Eduardo de Corostiza. He, along with others in Congress,

---

[32]Treat was introduced to Cañedo by Pakenham who arranged the first meeting between the two. Treat however was instructed to negotiate the boundary (Rio Grande) and that a "full, unequivocal unconditional acknowledgement of the absolute independence of Texas is a sine qua non, beyond and exclusive of which, you will not discuss a single proposition." Found in Burnet's instructions to Treat, August 8, 1830, in Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, II, p. 470.

[33]Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, "Treat to Lamar, Mexico, March 27, 1840," II, p. 587. Mr. Treat was able to meet with Cañedo and did discover that Mexico would assent to an armistice but not a recognition of Texas. Also F.O. 50 Vol. 134 No. 42 "Pakenham to Palmerston, April 30, 1840," p. 156.

would not accede to any accommodation with Texas as an independent country, and successfully led a move to send the issue to committee for discussion, which in Mexican politics meant the issue was dead.[34]

The British government pressed Pakenham to work for an armistice which would at least end the killing along the borders.[35] Treat accepted Pakenham's approach because under his orders he was to seek a truce for one to three years, terminable at the pleasure of either party, if negotiations for a peace treaty failed.[36]

It is possible that Mexico was only stalling for time, in order to increase the size of its army and hopefully attack and re-claim Texas. But while Mexico stalled Texas acquired a substantial Navy and regularly patrolled the Gulf of Mexico. Texas, so concerned with her boundaries, even instructed Treat that as long as negotiations remained open, the Navy would never attack Vera Cruz, but if negotiations failed, and a marked increase in the Mexican Army was evident, Texas had no recourse but to defend her honor and her interests.[37]

Treat continued to press for a Treaty and even requested Pakenham to present another memo to the Mexican Government. If the memo was

---

[34]F.O. 50 Vol. 134 No. 63, "Pakenham to Palmerston, July 5, 1840," p. 202. See also, Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, pp. 579-646.

[35]F.O. 50 Vol. 134 No. 63, "Pakenham to Palmerston, July 5, 1840," p. 202.

[36]Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, "Treat to Lipscomb, Mexico, August 21, 1840," II, pp. 684-488.

[37]F.O. 50 Vol. 137 No. 82, "Pakenham to Palmerston, August 22, 1840," p. 82. Also Richardson, Texas The Lone Star State, p. 156. Also Justin Smith, The Annexation of Texas (New York, 1911), p. 168. Also Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, "Memorandum to Mexican Government," II, pp. 688-689.

ignored he would be forced to leave for Texas. The memo stipulated that the Texas Government would accept an armistice, but the border would have to be the Rio Bravo del Norte. The Mexicans immediately replied that this was unsatisfactory and would not in any way accept that river as the border. Treat's mission therefore ended, but Pakenham intervened, and persuaded Treat to remain one more week, because he feared as soon as Treat left, full scale war would erupt.

Pakenham in a final attempt to bring a settlement met with the Mexican Minister of War, Almonte, and the Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs, Cañedo,[38] the topic being the proposed armistice and the Texan proposals. The major problem which both sides could not agree upon centered on the proposed boundary. The Mexicans, dead set against any armistice with the Rio Grande as the line, demanded that the boundary be established at the river San Antonio, which was one hundred and fifty miles north of the Rio Grande. Pakenham, as a result, was unable to convince the Mexicans that an armistice was necessary, and when he reported to Palmerston he emphasized that Mexico was solidly against any boundary, at the Rio Grande, while Texas refused to accept the San Antonio. Therefore, both governments, Texas and Mexico, could only blame themselves for failure because neither gave any sign of compromise.[39]

---

[38]F.O. 50 Vol. 138 No. 89, "Pakenham to Palmerston, October 7, 1840," p. 56.

[39]F.O. 50 Vol. 139 No. 96, "Pakenham to Palmerston, October 26, 1840, p. 67. Diplomatic Correspondence of Texas, "Treat to Pakenham remained in touch throughout the period in hopes of settling the problem," pp. 704-726.

Treat's mission definitely ended, but Pakenham again attempted to maintain peace in a final interview with Treat before he left for Texas. He emphasized and received assurances from Treat that Texan troops would not go beyond the Rio Grande unless it was absolutely necessary. Pakenham convinced Treat that Texas had to continue a policy of forbearance, because any attack would only encourage a huge drive in Mexico, to reconquer Texas, and negate any chances for a peaceful settlement. If Texas remained quiet and passive, it was doubtful according to Pakenham, no matter how vociferous the Mexicans were, that they would ever seriously undertake an expedition against Texas. Treat agreed with Pakenham and assured him that such a proposal would be presented to the President of Texas.[40]

Pakenham, being actively involved in Mexican-Texan relations, had suggested in August, 1840 that Her Majesty's Government appoint a consul in Texas, because British interests in Texas required that protection, and the necessity of peace between Texas and Mexico would be aided by a British minister in Texas who could work in cooperation with his Mexican counterpart.[41] While Pakenham became more and more involved in the Mexican-Texan controversy, the Foreign Office slowly realized that the recognition of Texas and a commercial treaty was necessary to protect British interests. The increase in the number of

---

[40]F.O. 50 Vol. 138 No. 97, "Pakenham to Palmerston, October 26, 1840," also No. 107, December 19, 1840, and No. 108, December 19, 1840. All of these dispatches outline Pakenham's actions prior to Treat's withdrawal. Diplomatic Correspondence of The Republic of Texas, "Pakenham to Treat, Mexico, November 5, 1840," II.

[41]F.O. 50 Vol. 137 No. 77, "Pakenham to Palmerston, August 22, 1840," p. 35.

ships in the Texas Navy frightened many British merchants who were afraid of possible seizures by Texan ships. One such case concerned the British ship the Little Penn which had been taken by Texan officials. Pakenham tried to solve the problem but was stymied in his attempt because he was the Mexican Minister, not a Minister to Texas. Thus, Texas' bold diplomatic moves in 1838 and 1839 impressed Palmerston, and probably were a factor in the decision to finally consider the recognition of Texas in 1840.

In November, 1840 Palmerston reported to Pakenham that negotiations had led to three treaties between England and Texas. The first treaty was a treaty of commerce and navigation and contained the ordinary provisions found in commercial treaties. The second was a "Convention" which obligated Great Britain to mediate the problems between Mexico and Texas, and the third was a treaty for the suppression of the African slave trade. The latter was so important to Palmerston that he insisted on the ratification of the three at the same time. Texas immediately accepted the first two, but debated the third until January, 1842, when the Texan Senate finally agreed and the formal ratifications were exchanged in London on June 28, 1842.

These three treaties ironed out by Hamilton and Palmerston, not only laid the foundation for British-Texas policy, but also opened the door to a British-Mexican policy that remained intact for eight years. English involvement in Mexico grew until the outbreak of war with the United States in 1846. Mexico, of course, disapproved of England's action, and anti-British feeling was evident throughout the Mexican press.

Palmerston outlined his reasons for signing the treaties with Texas in a letter to Tomás Murphy, the Mexican Chargé d' affaires in London, and in a confidential memo sent to Pakenham. Palmerston realized that it was quite natural for the Government of Mexico to want to reconquer Texas but:

> The experiences of the last five years ought, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, convince the Government of Mexico that such hope has now become visionary. The population and military resources of Texas, and its defensive means of all kinds are increasing every year, while means of Mexico to invade and conquer Texas have been augmented. Texas already has a naval force superior to that of Mexico and a continuance of hostilities between the two states would lead probably to an immediate blockade of some of the principal Atlantic ports of Mexico and would thus inflict upon Mexico great inconvenience and embarrassment which Mexico would have no means of retorting.[42]

To the Mexicans these reasons were a betrayal and for two years various political factions referred to this action as a direct violation of the Anglo-Mexican treaty of 1826. Since that treaty was one of Amity, Commerce and Navigation, Mexico believed that Great Britain did not have the right to interfere, in what they considered a civil strife, and an internal matter. Texas to the Mexicans was still part of the Mexican nation, and even though they were at odds, Texas eventaully would resume her rightful position in the Republic.

News of the British plans did not reach Mexico until January, 1841. Once recognized, a wide-scale newspaper campaign aimed at the intrigue of the English Government and the outright betrayal of the

---

[42]F.O. 50 Vol. 140 No. 7, "Palmerston to Pakenham, November 25, 1840," pp. 33-35.

Mexican Government, spread throughout the major cities of Mexico.[43] These newspaper articles brought a complete breakdown of British-Mexican relations. The leading journal in Mexico City, Precursor, which was also the voice of the government in power, led the attack against what it considered to be Palmerston's betrayal.[44]

The Mexicans believed that the British wanted to check the westward expansion of the United States, and in the eyes of many Mexicans, Mexico was only a tool that was being used by the English whenever their interests suited them.

England recognized Texas according to the Mexicans because of her commercial self-interest. The slave issue, which England championed was insignificant. If England wanted to see slavery abolished, the Mexicans argued, she would do more than just sign a treaty to suspend the slave trade. Slavery would flourish in Texas and the slave trade with states in the United States would continue. To the Mexicans England was relaxing her principles in order to insure her commercial interests. It is interesting to recognize that these criticisms by Mexican newspapers, will later be reiterated by United States editors when the United States begins to fear British influence in Texas and Mexico in 1844 and 1845. Due to this widespread criticism from the Mexican Press, Pakenham spent most of his time refuting these stories against the British government. He was upset with their tone and constantly argued that they were not true. One article printed almost

---

[43]Articles were found in The Precursor, El Siglo Diez y Nueve, and Diario.

[44]The Precursor articles sparked the most attention, and Pakenham referred to them constantly in 1841.

verbatim a copy of a confidential memo, that Pakenham had sent to the Mexican Government. In that memo, Pakenham explained English reasons for the Texas negotiation. All of the reasons which Palmerston had given earlier to Consul Murphy were included in Pakenham's memo.

Of the three reasons, the Mexican Government violently opposed the British suggestion that Mexico could not mount and successfully reconquer Texas. The article, Pakenham believed was written by Señor Juan Almonte, the Minister of War, who outlined Mexico's plans, and also stressed the size of the army and the new revenues collected by the government which would lead to a successful attack against Texas, and a victory that would return Texas to her rightful place in the Republic of Mexico. The chances for that were slim, according to Pakenham, but more importantly, he was violently opposed to the use of his confidential memo, which he believed violated his good offices.[45]

Any attempt to settle the Mexican-Texan controversy proved futile as a result. Sebastian D. Camacho, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, highly respected by many in Mexico according to Pakenham, was incapable of settling any foreign problem since the government under Bustamente was totally disorganized and corrupt.

It was at this point that Pakenham conferred with the new Texan agent, James Webb, in order to carry forward proposals outlined in the three treaties. Camacho, however, reported that Mexico could not acknowledge the sovereignty of Texas and as a result, any hope of a peaceful settlement was hopeless.

---

[45]F.O. 50 Vol. 144 No. 25, "Pakenham to Palmerston, February 26, 1841," p. 168.

Fortunately, for Texas, according to Pakenham, the political situation in Mexico was so chaotic and confused that another revolution was in the making; a revolution which Pakenham believed would bring a more favorable government and one that would settle peacefully the Texas question. The revolution was led by General Valencia in the capital, Santa Anna in Vera Cruz, and General Mariano Paredes in the North.

After Mexico became independent in 1820 it went through several political stages. Under Iturbide, Mexico experimented with a monarchy, but that fell in 1824, when a Constitution was adopted and was patterned after the United States Constitution. Thus, Mexico entered a period of Federalism. This weakened and after Texas declared her independence a Centralist government was established. As a result, Mexican politics in the 1840's was chaotic and disorganized as Federalists and Centralists vied for power.

One name that constantly was heard in Mexico during the period was Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna. Santa Anna was in and out of power from 1828 through 1855. He was able to capture the attention of the people and several times drove foreign troops from Mexican soil. In 1829 Spanish troops taking advantage of the political chaos in Mexico landed at Tampico. They came down with yellow fever shortly after the invasion and were forced to surrender to Santa Anna. The war in Texas caused him some embarrassment, but in 1839, when he drove the French out, he regained his stature and was in and out of the Presidency from 1840-1945.

After the French were assured they would receive their debts, Anastasio Bustamente was head of the government. The revolt led by

the liberal generals, called for the return of federalism and the Constitution of 1824. Bustamente in an attempt to consolidate power and maintain the presidency, called for the restoration of the Constitution of 1824, but it was to no avail because Santa Anna led his forces to Mexico City.[46]

This revolution, although the British stressed that they were not involved, saw foreign citizens attacked by the Bustamente government because he believed that foreigners instigated and financed the revolt.[47] One newspaper article, believed that the revolution was the result of foreign influence to satisfy particular goals, while Mexican independence was thrown to the wind. An editorial in the Precursor stated "that revolution was begun to convert the Mexican into imbecile slaves of a foreign domination."[48] Although the English during the revolt professed their neutrality, it was obvious that Pakenham wanted a new government because during the revolt English trade received a shot in the arm from legislation and decrees passed by the Bustamente government. Additional duties on all foreign merchandise were dropped, along with internal regulation of trade in the country.

The revolution, therefore, produced measures favorable to the British commerce, which would have never passed even if Pakenham had sent thousands of proposals and petitions to Congress or the President.

---

[46]For a detailed discussion of the period see H. B. Parkes, A History of Mexico, W. H. Calcott, Santa Anna (Norman, Oklahoma, 1936), and Justin Smith, The War with Mexico (New York, 1919).

[47]F.O. 50 Vol. 147 No. 98, "Pakenham to Palmerston, October 9, 1841," p. 64.

[48]Ibid., p. 66.

Bustamente's government needed money, and by reducing tariffs they were also able to increase the size of the Treasury. Pakenham also realized that if Bustamente succeeded he would reverse himself and these laws would all be revoked. Pakenham therefore favored the rebel cause because of liberal policies expressed by them with regard to the foreign element in Mexico. These leaders, called for the establishment of religious toleration, and also and much more important to the English, foreigners would be allowed to acquire real property. The latter, according to Pakenham, would not only aid England, it would also prove beneficial to the Mexicans because they were in need of industry and capital.[49]

Santa Anna and Paredes were able to march triumphantly into Mexico City on October 6, 1841, and Santa Anna was the "de facto" ruler. Santa Anna's rise to power was treated with great respect by Pakenham and in his reports to the Foreign Office, he mentioned that when Santa Anna came to power in 1828 and 1832 he had a great deal of opposition which was not evident in 1841. Success was rapid, troops came from all over Mexico, while civil authorities throughout the country swore allegiance to their new leader. Santa Anna remained in power for three years and controlled Mexican politics with an iron hand.[50]

After his triumphant entry, he suggested names for the Assembly

---

[49]F.O. 50 Vol. 147 No. 93, "Pakenham to Palmerston, September 11, 1841," p. 1.

[50]F.O. 50 Vol. 148 No. 93, "Pakenham to Palmerston, October 9, 1841," p. 1. G. L. Rives, The United States and Mexico 1831-1848. 11 vols. (New York, 1913), pp. 539-540. Pakenham expressed the feeling that Santa Anna had a broad base of support, which Rives believes is true, but also Rives mentions that Santa Anna already had expressed a willingness to recognize Texas.

of Notables, these individuals given the high honor of choosing the next President, immediately appointed Santa Anna as Provisional President by a vote of 39 to 5.[51] He had a wide knowledge of his people, and was able to masterfully increase the bankrupt treasury with skill. He reduced taxes on real estate to appease certain elements, while he persuaded English bondholders to accept small cash payments which pacified the English creditors along with many Mexicans who were against a total repayment. His most important source of money, the church, objected to certain laws, but for the most part accepted his proposals and the treasury was saved.[52] Many objected to Santa Anna's programs and corrupt practices but for the most part, Pakenham and the English Government accepted him as the Mexican leader and thought that his government might solve many foreign problems.

Santa Anna may have ruled as a dictator but this did not bother Pakenham, who believed that Mexico was not ready for a democratic representative form of government and that the form of government was not that important, because as he saw it, "there was no need for a constitution but for a person properly qualified to administer it when formed.[53] Santa Anna displayed a benevolent policy toward Great Britain, and he allowed foreigners to buy property. The Foreign Office, hoping for more concessions sent orders to Pakenham, which called for a

---

[51]F.O. 50 Vol. 147 No. 93, "Pakenham to Palmerston, October 9, 1841," p. 101. See also Waddy Thompson, Recollections of Mexico (New York, 1847).

[52]Rives, The United States and Mexico, p. 541.

[53]F.O. 50 Vol. 147 No. 116, "Pakenham to Palmerston, November 8, 1841," p. 187.

restitution of the 10 per cent duty on all foreign merchandise, the full naturalization of foreigners, and above all a re-opening of the talks for the negotiation of a peaceful settlement of the Texas-Mexico question. In discussions with the new Foreign Minister Manuel Gomez Pedraza, Pakenham reported that he recognized a sincere willingness to at least discuss these problems, and that the general disposition of the new government toward foreigners was favorable.[54]

Anti-British feelings were evident prior to the revolution, as mentioned earlier, but England did extend her good offices to Mexico and Texas in settling their problems. These offers of mediation and general counsel were not acted upon by the Bustamente Government. In fact at one time Pakenham was accused of accepting a bribe and an offer of land from Texas, with the condition that he would persuade the Mexicans to recognize Texas and settle the boundary dispute. Pakenham, of course, denied the charge and more than likely he was innocent of complicity with Texas, but these suspicions hampered any move on his part to effect a successful peace treaty.[55] The change in government, which he had approved, brought an immediate response, that the possibility of opening talks existed now that Santa Anna was in control.

Pakenham believed that once Santa Anna established a sound government, England could begin serious discussions over the Texas problem

---

[54]F.O. 50 Vol. 147 No. 115, "Pakenham to Palmerston, November 8, 1841," p. 179.

[55]F.O. 50 Vol. 145 No. 64, "Pakenham to Palmerston, July 8, 1841," p. 319.

and above all, Britain could offer mediation in the dispute. But most people knew that Article II of the second British-Texan treaty stated:

> . . . if by any means of the mediation of Her Britannic Majesty an unlimited truce between Mexico and Texas within thirty days after the present convention shall have been communicated to the Mexican Government by Her Britannic Majesty's mission at Mexico and if within six months from the day on which that communication shall have been made and in such case the Republick [sic] of Texas will take upon itself a position amounting to one million pounds sterling of the capital of the Foreign debt contracted by the Republick of Mexico before the 1st of January, 1935.[56]

This article, once the treaty was finally ratified, was the high point of British influence over the Texan-Mexican imbroglio from 1840-1848.

Although the British were interested in Mexican affairs, and did become commercially involved prior to the period, they did not take an active interest in Mexican politics, nor did they offer suggestions to the Mexican Government. The advent of Texas independence, marked the beginning, subdued and low key at first, of active British influence in the Mexican state of affairs. The necessity for a treaty with Texas, the desire to see United States' westward expansion checked, a deep conviction for peace, and the peaceful settlement of problems, outlined the British policy of active involvement in Mexico, from 1840 to 1842. One discovers in analyzing the Foreign Office documents, that England reiterated her offer of mediation throughout the period, but at the same time reminded the Mexicans that they could not expect direct aid from her in any war.

---

[56]F.O. 50 Vol. 152 No. 26, "Aberdeen to Pakenham, July 1, 1842," pp. 58-68.

Due to the revolutions within Mexico attempts at peacefully solving the Mexican-Texan dispute proved futile. Once Santa Anna took command, and even though one would think he would close his ears to any peace with Texas, England diligently proposed a peaceful settlement and above all the recognition by Mexico of Texan independence.

The English throughout the period offered numerous plans and proposals to the Mexican Government in hopes of persuading them to recognize the independence of Texas. These suggestions were proposed by Lord Palmerston and also Henry Gordon-Hamilton, the Fourth Earl of Aberdeen, who took office in 1841 as Foreign Secretary. Aberdeen remained in office for five years (1841-1846). He concurred in Palmerston's plan for Texas. He accepted the treaties, which were still not ratified, and he reiterated the necessity of a peaceful settlement of the Mexican-Texan conflict. It was his belief that Mexico had to realize the importance of a peaceful relationship with Texas, likewise Mexico must be warned of the possible United States intervention, and finally the loss of British trade.

British policy was formed around these proposals, and for eight years, England emphasized their advantages and disadvantages. Bustamente's government refused to accept English interference and openly criticized the English negotiation with Texas. Under Santa Anna although corruption ran rampant, and plans for reconquest of Texas were heard everyday, the British Ministers were able to at least talk about mediation. Talk was cheap but dearer still was the Mexican talk about war and reconquest.

CHAPTER III

WITH A CHANGE OF MINISTRY MORE MODERATION

The recognition of Texas and the negotiation of commercial treaties marked the beginning of English-Texan relations, but it also provoked a new policy in Mexico. Palmerston realized that recognition was necessary, and that Texas provided a new outlet for British manufactured goods, but that trade was threatened because of renewed attempts by Mexico to reconquer Texas. Palmerston concluded that any attempt at reconquest was futile, but he did instruct the British Ministers to offer their good offices as mediators.[1] However, if Texas and Mexico solved their problems a strong independent nation like Texas would block further United States' expansion and England could gain from the lucrative trade in Texas cotton, which probably was the reason for Palmerston's recognition of Texas in the first place.[2]

Palmerston continued to suggest his plans for peace and he advised Mexico that any attempt at reconquest would fail and never

---

[1]Texas asked for British mediation as early as 1839, when James Hamilton requested aid from Richard Pakenham. See Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas "Hamilton to Fox, May 20, 1839," p. 867. Pakenham also believed Mexico wanted British assistance because of a letter he received from Comacho, found in F.O. 50 Vol. 145, No. 56, "Letter from Avila Comacho to Richard Pakenham, June 8, 1841," p. 246, finally Palmerston made clear his policy in a letter to Tomas Murphy, see F.O. 50 Vol. 140, "Palmerston to Tomas Murphy, November 25, 1840," p. 35.

[2]A. W. Ward and G. B. Gooch (eds), Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy, pp. 254-256.

succeed.[3] The English desire to mediate was a futile attempt since treaties signed by England and Texas were not finally ratified until 1842 and the fact that Mexico was in the process of a revolution, which presented problems not only for foreign affairs but also for domestic issues. As a result, Palmerston's policy never got off the ground. He recognized Texas but was unable to assist in the Mexican-Texan conflict due to a political change in 1841 that brought in the Conservative Peel, and marked the end of Palmerston's reign as Foreign Secretary and brought into the position Earl of Aberdeen.

Aberdeen was not a stranger to the Foreign Office because he had been Foreign Secretary under the Duke of Wellington in 1828-1830, and had been involved in foreign matters during the Napoleonic years. Even though Palmerston was a capable Foreign Secretary and was admired by many for his bold policies in defense of English interests, he left behind many problems. Aberdeen, therefore, faced the problems in France, the United States, South America, Mexico and Texas.[4]

As Foreign Secretary, Aberdeen became the architect for British foreign policies during the Peel administration. Under Wellington in 1830, Aberdeen remained passive and the Duke, whom he considered much more qualified, handled most foreign problems. Under Peel, he was relaxed, Peel was an equal, a lifelong friend, and above all, Peel was

---

[3] F.O. 50 Vol. 126 No. 56, "Pakenham to Palmerston, August 1, 1839," p. 33 and F.O. 50 Vol. 126 No. 36, "Palmerston to Pakenham, November 25, 1840," pp. 115, 116, and F.O. 50 Vol. 140, "Palmerston to Tomas Murphy, November 25, 1840," p. 35.

[4] Wilbur D. Jones, Lord Aberdeen and the Americas, p. 2 and Arthur Gordon, The Earl of Aberdeen (London, 1893), pp. 152-153, and Algernon Cecil, Queen Victoria and Her Prime Ministers, p. 32.

limited in his understanding of foreign problems, so Aberdeen energetically assumed the leading role in handling British foreign problems during the years 1841-1845.[5]

In that position Aberdeen displayed a sincere conviction and desire to settle peacefully the foreign problem of England. He enjoyed his work and his son reported that he enjoyed, and considered these years as the happiest and most successful of his entire life.[6] As Foreign Secretary, Aberdeen was mainly concerned with the settlement of problems with the French Government. He also faced the problem of boundary negotiations with the United States and the relations of Mexico and Texas.

While Aberdeen was Foreign Secretary under Wellington he had established diplomatic relations with France and thereby recognized Louis Philippe. During Palmerston's tenure in office relations with France had been strained and Aberdeen immediately after assuming office tried to mend the wounds brought about during the Palmerston years. Actually nothing major occurred during those years, but Palmerston believed so much in the British Empire that he ignored France in any

---

[5]Aberdeen Papers. Correspondence and Papers, official and private of George Gordon, afterwards (1818) Hamilton-Gordon, 4th Earl of Aberdeen, K.G.K.T., Prime Minister (b. 1784- d. 1860). British Museum, London, Series 43039-43358. "Correspondence with Prime Ministers 1827-1860" series 43056-53072. In these volumes, one discovers a mutual friendship between Peel and Aberdeen, and also the former's acceptance of Aberdeen's policy. See also Francis Balfour, The Life of George (Fourth Earl of Aberdeen (London, 1874) 11 vols., p. 103 and Arthur Gordon, The Earl of Aberdeen, p. 155.

[6]Arthur Gordon, The Earl of Aberdeen, p. 155. Other authors also believe that Aberdeen enjoyed his years in the Foreign Office. See Wilbur Jones, Lord Aberdeen and the Americas, p. 84, and Algerson Cecil, Queen Victoria and Her Prime Ministers, p. 38.

important foreign matters on the international scene.

Aberdeen immediately established an "entente cordiale" with France and was proud of the fact that during the 1840's England and France were able to work together in matters of international importance. Their "entente cordiale" almost led to a joint declaration of support of Mexico during the Mexican-Texan conflict.[7]

Aberdeen was also successful in his negotiations with the United States. Boundary disputes erupted in Maine and Oregon. In the first he was able to successfully present a program which culminated in the Webster-Ashburton Treaty in 1842, and in the latter Aberdeen presented a treaty which was accepted with no amendments by the United States Senate for the boundaries in Oregon. Finally, and probably third on his list, Aberdeen presented a policy to Mexico, which he believed would settle the Texas question and prevent a war. This desire to maintain peace is evident throughout Aberdeen's life, and "if Aberdeen, himself, had been asked to designate his best quality, he would undoubtedly have answered that it was his love of peace."[8]

When Aberdeen took office in 1841 he concurred in Palmerston's program in Mexico and Texas. He believed that it was in the interest of Great Britain to recognize the independence of Texas and also to establish commercial relations with that independent state. He also

---

[7]Aberdeen Papers, "Correspondence with Francois Pierre Guizot November 1843-October, 1960." Vol. XCVI, series No. 43, 134. Peel and Guizot were close friends which made Aberdeen's job much easier, and there was an attempt, which will be discussed later, to participate in a joint guarantee of the Mexican-Texan conflict.

[8]Arthur Gordon, The Earl of Aberdeen, p. 154.

believed that Great Britain, as a mediator, could settle the Mexican-Texas conflict. Finally, he accepted the fact, as did Palmerston, that any attempt by Mexico to reconquer Texas would prove futile and in the long run, a failure. On July 1, 1842 Aberdeen outlined his belief that Palmerston's policy in Mexico was correct and that England wanted the Mexicans to recognize Texas, because any war with Texas would have been disastrous.[9] It was in this spirit that Aberdeen entered the Foreign Office. Aberdeen presented a program for peace. He realized that British relations, political and commercial, with Texas and Mexico depended entirely on a peaceful resolution of their differences.[10]

For the first two years of Aberdeen's term as Foreign Secretary he presented the idea of mediation. In the three treaties negotiated by Palmerston England agreed to offer her offices as a mediator in negotiations of peace between Mexico and Texas.[11] That offer was presented to the Mexican Government in 1841. It was refused by the Mexican Government, but as Pakenham outlined since the ratification of the treaties were not final the refusal of the Mexican Government was

---

[9]F.O. 50 Vol. 152 No. 26, "Aberdeen to Pakenham, July 1, 1842, pp. 58-68.

[10]Wilbur D. Jones in his Lord Aberdeen and the Americas, believes that Aberdeen's policy not only called for peace between Mexico and Texas, it also called for the mutual cooperation of France and England, which would serve as a wedge in the Franco-American friendship, p. 35.

[11]Ernest Wallace and David M. Vigness(eds), Documents of Texas History (Austin, 1960), pp. 135-138. Also Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, "Hamilton to Lipscomb, December 3, 1840," p. 919, and Jaspar Ridley, Lord Palmerston (New York, 1971), p. 267.

not important because fresh overtures would be necessary when the treaties were ratified.[12]

The treaties were not ratified until July of 1842. The Texans wanted the first which called for commercial agreements, while England demanded the last, which meant the second (the most important one for this study) which stipulated that England would serve as a mediator, could not be cited and used by the British Ministers during the years 1840-1842, had to be postponed for two years and final ratification.[13]

Once these treaties were finally ratified, Aberdeen sent special instructions to Pakenham. He outlined in those instructions that due to the peculiar political circumstances of the years, 1840 and 1841,[14] he had not been able to offer mediation to Mexico. Since that treaty was complete and Mexico had a stable government, Pakenham made a

---

[12]F.O. 50 Vol. 142 No. 40, "Palmerston to Pakenham, August 16, 1841," pp. 98-99.

[13]Charles Webster, The Foreign Policy of Palmerston 1830-1841 (London, 1951), pp. 990-994. W. Baring Pemberton, Lord Palmerston (London, 1954); Brian Connell, Regina V. Palmerston, The Correspondence Between Queen Victoria and Her Foreign Ministers 1817-1865 (London, 1962), and Jasper Ridley, Lord Palmerston, p. 267 and Joseph W. Schmitz, Texan Statecraft 1836-38, p. 150. Palmerston's decision that all three treaties had to be ratified before any went into effect, was fortunate, because Hamilton realized the sensitivity of the Texans over the slave issue. Therefore he did not send the third treaty until he was able to prepare a defense for it and emphasize that the other two were more important than the third. For further discussion of Palmerston's anti-slave feelings see, Charles Webster, The Foreign Policy of Palmerston 1830-1841 (London, 1951), pp. 490-494, W. Baring Pemberton, Lord Palmerston (London, 1954), p. 160, Brian Connell, Regina V. Palmerston, The Correspondence Between Queen Victoria and Her Foreign Ministers, 1837-1865 (London, 1962), p. 220, and Jasper Ridley, Lord Palmerston, p. 267.

[14]Pakenham presented the idea of English mediation as early as 1840 and 1841, but the revolutions led by Santa Anna prevented any response from the Mexican government.

formal offer of Her Majesty's good offices. Pakenham was instructed to point out to the Mexican Government, "That it is the earnest desire of Her Majesty's Government to see peace permanently established between Mexico and Texas."[15]

Peace was necessary, Aberdeen stated, "because of the support Texas would get from the people [of the United States], not the Government of the United States, and the unlimited means available to her." He went on to say:

> Her Majesty's Government also recognizes many difficulties that Mexico would meet if she attempted to recover the possession of the area. Even if the army was successful, fresh troops would constantly have to be pushed into Texas, and the struggle, either successful or unsuccessful, would be disadvantageous to the Mexican system.[16]

If Mexico recognized Texas, she would not have an enemy to her North, but a friend, and a populous and powerful nation would be interposed between Mexico and the United States. Texas would become an ally to the Mexicans, either against the United States, or against those states near Texas which might secede from the United States. By following this proposal Mexico would be spared from a war, while commercial ties with Texas would grow. Aberdeen concluded in his instructions to Pakenham that, "Her Majesty's and the enlightened heads [Santa Anna] of that government disposed to listen with a willing ear to a friendly counsel sincerely offered."[17]

---

[15]F.O. 50 Vol. 152 No. 26, "Aberdeen to Pakenham, July 1, 1842," pp. 58-68.

[16]Ibid., p. 59.

[17]Ibid., p. 68.

These proposals were sent in July, 1842 and they form the nucleus for British-Mexican relations during Aberdeen's term as Foreign Secretary, indeed during the entire period 1840-1848. England had no desire to colonize Texas. She had no desire to further any controls or take control of the Mexican system. She hoped for a peace between Mexico and Texas and in that hope suggested programs of peace.

These suggestions and these proposals offered by Aberdeen caused great consternation in the United States. In the eyes of some, these suggestions were considered a direct interference, and they proved that Great Britain wanted control in Texas, Mexico, and probably California. However, the official British position throughout the period shows that Great Britain wanted Texas to become a successful independent nation, which would insure British commercial interests in Mexico and Texas.

These offers and suggestions confidentially sent or transmitted to the Mexican Government might have been construed as overt English aid in the Mexican nation, but the evidence points in another direction. The conferences between the British Ministers and the Mexican Government caused some American respresentatives to fear British influence. It is possible that during the discussions Mexican officials misunderstood the British position, and it is also possible that some British citizens offered aid to the Mexican nation during the struggle, but it does not seem probable in light of the correspondence from the Foreign Office.

Great Britain was not ready to directly aid the Mexican nation during the period 1840-1848. Several times Aberdeen instructed the British Minister to state emphatically that Great Britain would not at

any time come to the aid of the Mexican nation.[18] Aberdeen also instructed Pakenham to remind Mexico that if the United States were to enter the picture, it would be impossible to maintain any hope of success, and as long as Mexico continued to fight Texas she had to contend with the United States either directly or indirectly.

The British Government by September, 1842 tried to logically explain the difficulties that Mexico would encounter in another struggle with Texas. The proximity of the United States increased aid for the Texan cause while the distance of Texas from Mexico City worked to the Mexican disadvantage in terms of supply and communications. Mexico did have a suitable army, but as Aberdeen emphasized a victory which would involve immense hardship would drive the Texans to the United States in search of aid and even annexation.

While counseling the Mexican officials, Aberdeen made it clear that Her Majesty's good offices would always be open to aid in a reconciliation of the Mexican-Texan conflict. The British Ministers were constantly instructed to use their good offices wherever possible, but also reminded that in the event of an armed conflict Great Britain had to remain "strictly neutral."[19]

Both Charles Elliot, the English chargé d' affaires in Texas, and Richard Pakenham reiterated the British position and constantly offered their offices and their positions as mediators in the conflict.

---

[18] F.O. 50 Vol. 152 No. 34, "Aberdeen to Pakenham, September 15, 1842," p. 86, and Merk, Monroe Doctrine and American Expansionism, p. 31. Merk cites Aberdeen's letters in the British Museum as his source.

[19] F.O. 50 Vol. 152 No. 34, "Aberdeen to Pakenham, September 15, 1842," p. 86.

Even though England made these statements and emphasized that they would not aid Mexico in any military encounter with Texas or the United States, certain events in 1842 led many people in the United States to conclude that England was directly involved in Mexican affairs.

Early in 1842 in a circular for the diplomatic corps, Waddy Thompson, the United States Minister in Mexico City reported first, that an agent of Mexico was in England negotiating for the sale of the mortgage of Upper California for a loan of $15,000,000 and that two large steam frigates were set to sail from England for Mexico with English crews and English officers. These ships were to be deployed in the war against Texas and one of these ships was to be actually commanded by an officer in the British Navy who retained his commission in that Navy and received a furlough to enable him, with the consent of his government, to take that commission.[20]

Thompson believed that this was direct intervention and he asked whether "England would be allowed to engage in a war on this continent?"[21] Thompson further reported that General Santa Anna talked freely of war with the United States and Texas and said that within a few days he would receive affirmation of aid from England. These reports could not be taken lightly, according to Thompson, because English influence in Mexico was very pronounced.

Furthermore, all of the principal commercial houses were English, and the principal mines were in the hands of English companies. This

---

[20]Dispatches from United States Ministers to Mexico 1823-1906, National Archives and Research Service, Washington, D.C. "Copy of a Circular for the Diplomatic Corps, July 30, 1842," pp. 68-69.

[21]Ibid.

commercial interest averaged around $15,000,000 annually for the British treasury. A trade which Thompson believed the United States could enjoy if the Texas question was solved. The Mexicans at that particular time, according to Thompson, hated the United States and were very bitter in their outlook. Great preparations were in process for an invasion of Texas and that invasion could come, according to Thompson, as early as the fall of 1843 if funds were obtained, which Thompson believed would come from England. Thompson's observations however, aroused antagonism in the United States.

It must be noted that Waddy Thompson was an ardent supporter of annexation. He introduced the question of annexation in the House of Representatives in August, 1837. Thompson also changed his mind about English interference when he returned from Mexico in his work, Recollections, he stressed the English commercial involvement in Mexico, but concluded that England's interests in Mexico were not enough to bring about direct aid in any Mexican War.

That England desired a port in California cannot be denied, plus the accusation over the steam frigates from England to Mexico could not be denied. Many British merchants and citizens were interested in California. They were afraid that an unfriendly power would control the valuable Pacific ports, which would hurt British commerce. California, however, would become more important later.

Regarding the two ships being built and outfitted in English harbors, England admitted that they were being built for the Mexican Government. As a result, Texas accused England of being directly involved in Mexican affairs. Aberdeen in discussions with the Texas chargé d' affaires in London, pointed out that these ships, the

"Quadelupe" and "Monterrey," were being built under a contract with the Lizardi and Company, business firm. He emphasized that these ships were not being outfitted for war.

Indeed, he instructed the British Minister in Texas and informed the Texas chargé d' affaires in London that orders were sent to Lizardi and Company that these ships could not be outfitted with guns and ammunition. Aberdeen conducted a thorough examination of British law and searched the British archives for a precedent in the case; finding none he made the ruling that declined authorization to arm vessels, but continued by saying:

> . . . although arming of vessels by private individuals in British ports is prohibited by law there is no such prohibition against the purchase or export of arms by private individuals. The trade in arms is free, although the placing of those arms in a position of offense on board of ships is prohibited.[22]

These ships were not the property of the Mexican Government and would not become the property of the Mexican Government until they were transferred to that government in Vera Cruz. Nevertheless, Texas and the United States were still alarmed.

As to the British sailors and British officers on board, Aberdeen in several discussions with Ashbel Smith, the Texas chargé d' affaires, related that these English sailors were no longer in the service of

---

[22]F.O. 50 Vol. 152 No. 47, "Aberdeen to Pakenham, July 15, 1842," p. 92. For further discussion of the affair see Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Third Series Vol. LXV, from July 12-August 12, 1842 (London, 1842), pp. 964-965. Also see F.O. 50 Vol. 154 No. 79, August 29, 1842, p. 304; F.O. 50 Vol. 155 No. 82, "Ward to Aberdeen, September 10, 1842," F.O. 50 Vol. 154 No. 4, "Aberdeen to Pakenham, July 7, 1842," pp. 186-189; F.O. 50 Vol. 157 No. 2, "Aberdeen to Murphy, May 31, 1842," p. 38; F.O. 50 Vol. 157, "From Admiralty, October 27, 1842," pp. 90-91; and F.O. 50 Vol. 155 No. 82, "Ward to Aberdeen, September 10, 1842," pp. 10-13.

the British Navy, that they had given up their commissions in the British Navy and that they had resigned in order to assume a more lucrative position on board these Mexican steam frigates.[23] British officers mentioned in the Thompson report were on leave from the British Navy, but they were given express orders from Aberdeen's office through the Admiralty that they could not take commissions with the Mexican Navy without losing all their rights as British citizens. Aberdeen further argued that he considered it inexpedient for British officers to take command of Mexican ships because of the state of affairs between Great Britain and Texas.

He allowed the leaves of absence to continue as long as the ships were unarmed. If they were armed these sailors had to consider their leaves of absence as cancelled and must give up their respective employments. The officers involved in this, Thomas Cleveland and Charles Charleswood, both were on board the Guadelupe when the Admiralty in 1842 ordered them to return to England as soon as Pakenham and Aberdeen discovered that the Guadelupe and the Monterrey were armed ships of war. Smith protested that the mere recall of the officers still fell far short of the policy of strict neutrality, but Smith, however, does concede that the constant attempt by Aberdeen to offer mediation to the Mexican government, does represent a sincere attempt to carry out the policy outlined in the Second Treaty.[24]

---

[23] Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, "Smith to Jones, May 17, 1842," p. 957. Also "Smith to Jones, June 3, 1842," p. 960; "Smith to Jones, July 3, 1842," p. 972 amd "Smith to Jones, August 13, 1842," p. 999.

[24] Ibid., "Smith to Jones, October 17, 1842," p. 1028.

The ships were delivered to the Mexican Government, as Pakenham reported, and their appearance in the Gulf of Mexico did strengthen the Mexican position and furthered the Mexican cause in their struggle with Texas. The incident, however, did little to aid the English cause, and her hope for a peaceful settlement of the Mexican-Texan conflict.

Texas threatened to blockade the Mexican coast after they heard of the two ships in England. Pakenham believed that a blockade was possible, but with the addition of the two ships that threat diminished and the trade would remain free and open. Aberdeen probably realized this and as a result never acted harshly on the construction of the ships. In fact he mentioned to Smith that if Mexico can contract for the ships, the Texans also had that privilege.

Likewise, the ships caused a great stir in the United States. Newspaper articles, particularly in The Daily Picayune, stressed that England was not directly involved in the Mexican-Texan difficulty and that England was directly aiding the Mexican cause.[25] If England wanted to militarily aid Mexico in her struggle with Texas, it seems doubtful that she would continue her efforts for an unconditional recognition of Texan independence.

Aberdeen faced another problem in 1842, with the rise of Santa Anna. After successfully defeating the Bustamente government, Santa Anna ruled with an iron hand, and in order to maintain power, Santa Anna increased the size of the army, and the number of recruits in three months increased by 18,000 which meant that he could boast of an

---

[25]Daily Picayune, November 27, 1842, p. 2.

army of 30,000 men. The reasons for the increase, Santa Anna argued, were for the long march on Texas and Yucatan.

Yucatan, like Texas, was isolated from Mexican affairs due to the distance from Mexico City. During the revolutions of 1840 and 1841, Yucatan had declared its independence, and Santa Anna promised to reconquer both areas. Yucatan agreed to rejoin Mexico in a Treaty signed in 1841, but it was able to retain its own sovereignty. Santa Anna ignored the treaty, and sent 1500 men to reconquer the area.[26]

Santa Anna planned to be independent of any constitutional congress and with a large army he could dissolve Congress whenever it suited his purpose and rule as a dictator. These military maneuvers complicated the problem as Mexico prepared for war. European guns were purchased and mounted at the castle of San Juan de Ulloa. San Juan de Ulloa, was the fortress in the Vera Cruz harbor, and it presented a barrier against any foreign invasion. During the French invasion in 1839 the fort fell, so Santa Anna took steps to refortify the fort in 1842.

Pakenham reminded the British Foreign Office, that even the strongest guns and the largest guns in Europe could not defend the Mexican nation because other things were required besides a mere armament and huge weaponry. Unless a corresponding improvement was noticeable in the state of military science and discipline in Mexico it was a vain hope that the Mexicans could protect themselves with these huge caliber guns.

---

[26]W. H. Calcott, Santa Anna, p. 178.

[27]F.O. 50 Vol. 153 No. 29, "Pakenham to Aberdeen, April 7, 1842," p. 221.

Santa Anna led several attacks against Texas and in March of 1842, he moved against San Antonio and Corpus Christi, but in both cases he retreated south of the Rio Grande River.[28] These raids were carried out because Mexican officials were afraid that the Texans were already tired of their independence and they would gladly annex themselves to the United States.[29] Annexation could not be tolerated by most Mexicans and only reaffirmed their desire to see Texas reconquered by the Mexican Army.

While Santa Anna realigned his forces and carried on border raids in Texas, newspapers in the United States suggested that Mexico was not only being encouraged in a war against Texas but also a hostile policy against the United States. In fact, The Daily Picayune, in an editorial openly accused the British of encouraging a war between Mexico and the United States. England, according to the article, guaranteed a loan of $6,000,000 with the condition that a war of extermination be carried on by that government.

Pakenham was perplexed by the article, especially since he had been instrumental in aiding the American Minister in his quest to satisfy American claims and demands. These claims were met and Thompson officially thanked Pakenham for his assistance in settling the claims. Yet, Pakenham did recognize an anti-American feeling in Mexico and went on to say:

---

[28]George L. Rives, The United States and Mexico, p. 485.

[29]F.O. 50 Vol. 153 No. 29, "Pakenham to Aberdeen, April 7, 1842," p. 221.

> The feeling of the Mexican Government towards the United States is at this moment certainly not friendly on account of the sympathy manifested in that country in favor of Texas, and because the government seems to be convinced that in the event of active hostilities with Texas the United States would afford to the Texans every possible assistance short of an open rupture with Mexico.
>
> Under these circumstances I am satisfied that with the least encouragement of expectation of support from England the Mexican Government would set the United States at defiance, which conviction makes it necessary for me to observe great caution in my language with the members of that government whenever the subject of their relations with the United States be brought forward.[30]
>
> [Underlining is my own]

Pakenham did report that a petition by the Mexican Government was made for a loan in England. The loan was to be for $30,000,000, half paid in bonds and half in money, and the interest on the loan was to be paid by duty on articles of cottom manufacture which were at that time prohibited in Mexico. The loan was to be guaranteed by the British Government, but Mexico had to enter into a solemn agreement for repayment. When this loan was first suggested, Pakenham believed it deserved some attention, since new trade in cotton manufacture would aid English trade.

Mexico, by adopting such a policy, erased a manufacturing system that was totally unsuited in Mexico, and the Mexican bonds in England could be repaid from interest from the new loan. Exports from Mexico to England would have increased by $2,000,000 annually, plus capitalists and investors could reap a good profit in England by supplying the money.

The problem, once the project was announced in Mexico, came from

---

[30]F.O. 50 Vol. 154 No. 57, "Pakenham to Aberdeen, June 21, 1842," pp. 86-87.

Mexican citizens who immediately argued that the loan placed Mexico as a tributary to England. Pakenham stated that if the transaction had taken place the money probably would have been used against Texas. Thus, British money would have been used against the policy of moderation and peace which they were advocating.

The problems over border raids between the two caused great concern on the part of the English because President Santa Anna constantly talked of reconquering Texas which hurt the cause of peace. In June of 1842, Santa Anna spoke to the constituent assembly and in that speech he stated:

> The colossus [The United States] has placed one foot on Texas and nothing but an energetic and individual government can check his further advance. We will change strength for weakness, union for division, harmony for discord. My earliest attention is directed toward the territory of Texas which has been usurped with a view to facilitate further usurpations. The Army is now preparing itself for this noble enterprise and on this day, ever memorable of the national representatives, I take pleasure in laying before them the wish of my government, the desire of the army, and the wish of the people.[31]

Talk such as this hindered the English government and as Mexico threatened to blockade the Texas coast, English commerce was threatened.

Pakenham received news of the British-Texan treaties ratification in August of 1842. It offered to the Mexican Government Her Majesty's mediation. The Mexican Foreign Minister was quiet about mediation with Texas. He did say that in the event of any country recognizing the independence of Texas a strict policy will be adopted by the Mexican Government. As a result, Pakenham believed in August of 1842 that

---

[31]F.O. 50 Vol. 154 No. 57, "Pakenham to Aberdeen, June 21, 1842," p. 160.

mediation would not come. At the end of his dispatch on August 28, 1842, he said, "The Mexican Government continues to give out, that in the course of the approaching winter preparations already in progress for an invasion of Texas will be completed and that early in the following spring the campaign will be opened."[32]

The antagonism between Texas and Mexico negated any attempt at mediation. While Mexico under Santa Anna fanned the fires of war, Texas maintained a large army and several raids were carried out by Texan volunteers who wanted to maintain the Rio Grande River as their southern borders. One of the most publicized raids was carried out by the Texas army against Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Since Mexico was divided between centralist and federalist supporters, and since there was in the Texas revolution itself a rebellion against centralist ideas, President Lamar believed, with good reason, that the bulk of the population in Santa Fe, New Mexico were opposed to the centralist forces in Mexico City and that these citizens would welcome a chance to separate from that oppression.[33]

---

[32]Ibid.

[33]Mirabeau B. Lamar, born in Georgia of a distinguished family of statesmen and military men. He had served in the Georgia state legislature and ran unsuccessfully for Congress. He was also an editor of the Columbus Enquirer. His wife died in 1830. It was a great tragedy for him, and in 1835 he sold his newspaper and went to Texas.

Initially, he hoped just to visit Texas, but on his arrival, he threw himself into the life of the Mexican province. He was one of the first to urge that Texas declare its independence from Mexico. After the news of the Alamo and of Goliad, Lamar joined Houston's army as a private.

At the battle of San Jacinto Lamar personally, through his actions, saved the cavalry, who at that time were surrounded by the enemy. Lamar was then commissioned a colonel and was placed in charge of the Texas cavalry. With the cavalry he was instrumental in a charge on Santa Anna during that important battle at San Jacinto. Lamar,

Lamar also hoped to establish lines of commerce and political alliance with the citizens of Santa Fe. In 1839 he had been given the authorization to open a trade with the Mexicans on the Rio Grande. With this resolution he decided that it encompassed not only the citizens along the Rio Grande but also the settlements in New Mexico. He advocated an expedition to Santa Fe primarily for purposes of trade, and because the value of any commerce between Santa Fe and Texas would be immense. In 1840 he urged citizens to seriously think about an expedition to Santa Fe. In 1841 he issued a call for volunteers. The purpose of the expedition was to open trade and entice the Mexicans into an alliance with Texas or even to become a part of the Texas nation.[34]

In reality, the expedition itself was military. The problem, however, was that Manuel Armijo, the governor of New Mexico, was able to stop the advance party. One member of that advance party turned

---

himself was against the release of Santa Anna after the battle, and demanded the execution of Santa Anna.

The President, Edward G. Burnet, later appointed Lamar as major general of the Texas Army and commander-in-chief. The Texas army at that time was in a hectic position, and when Lamar arrived to take command, he was asked at an informal meeting of the officers not to take command as major general. Lamar later put the question to his troops, and they voted 15 to 1 against his taking command. Lamar remained, somewhat uncertain as to his plans. He again asked his officers their opinion, and on the following day he retired. The army was still in a confused state, and Lamar was forced to resign and leave the camp.

Later Lamar was elected President, and for three years, his administration was perhaps the most important one in the young republic's history. He advocated greater European alliances, but while he gained stature in world affairs, the domestic problems in Texas were multiplied.

[34]Joseph Schmitz, Texan Statecraft, pp. 170-171.

traitor. Armijo, being an astute general, used Captain William G. Lewis, and he convinced the rest of the Texans to lay down their arms without firing a shot.[35]

The Mexicans were able to take as prisoners the entire expedition, and Armijo ordered that they be sent to Mexico City. They tried to convince Armijo that the expedition was peaceable, but Armijo would not listen. The prisoners were handed over to the Mexican officials at Perote Castle, a small castle outside Mexico City, which became the prisoner-of-war camp. Some of the Texan prisoners from the Texas-Santa Fe expedition, were able to escape; others died from yellow fever and exposure while being held captive in Mexico. The harsh treatment given these prisoners sparked a great deal of response from the foreign diplomats in Mexico City.

Pakenham approached the question of this expedition very cautiously. His first response was to ask whether any British subjects were arrested in the expedition.[36] If so, he was then tactful, because he wanted to investigate and find out if the situation was entirely peaceful and whether or not the Texan citizens went on the trip to hurt or destroy Mexican property.

In a discussion regarding the prisoners of war held at Perote Castle, Pakenham and Duff Green asked Santa Anna to pardon and release the prisoners. General James Hamilton, who was still in Europe attempting to negotiate the $4,000,000 loan to Texas, was concerned

---

[35]Joseph Schmitz, Texan Statecraft, pp. 170-171.

[36]F.O. 50 Vol. 152 No. 13, "Aberdeen to Pakenham, May 2, 1842," and F.O. 50 Vol. 142 No. 17, "Pakenham to Aberdeen, February 17, 1842," p. 149.

about the prisoners of war and in a letter to Richard Pakenham expressed his interest in the prisoners and asked that Pakenham deliver a confidential letter to General Santa Anna.[37]

In this confidential memo, Hamilton stated,

> I take the liberty of proposing to Your Excellency, if you think it consistent with the honor and interest of Mexico, that a treaty of peace and limitation should be entered into with Texas upon the basis of an indemnification of $5,000,000, together with $200,000 which will be secretly placed at the hands of the Mexican government.[38]

Hamilton was ready to bribe Santa Anna into a treaty of peace and limitation, a bribe which had precedent, and was not beyond the means of any expectation of hope, since Santa Anna in the past was known to enter into such agreements. The problem was that this note was presented by Richard Pakenham.

Pakenham, when he heard of the contents of the note, was very upset and extended his extreme apologies to President Santa Anna, and asked that Santa Anna limit his discussion with Hamilton, and also denied any knowledge of the contents of the letter.[39] Santa Anna, after receiving the note, seemed to take it almost as a joke and said he would forward an answer at a later date. That answer never came, and Pakenham was very glad that it did not, but the incident caused some concern, not only in England but in the United States, because it

---

[37]F.O. 50 Vol. 152 No. 18, "Pakenham to Aberdeen, February 17, 1842," p. 143. See also London Times, April 22, 1842, p. 5.

[38]F.O. 50 Vol. 153 No. 18, "Pakenham to Aberdeen, February 17, 1842," p. 143.

[39]Ibid.

seemed to further suggest that Great Britain was influencing Mexican policy toward Texas and the United States.

Pakenham in several letters to the British Foreign Office, reiterated his ignorance with regard to the content of Hamilton's letters. He delivered them purely because he felt that Hamilton might be able to settle the question of the prisoners of war held at Perote Castle.

Meanwhile, Texas was very concerned over the statements by Santa Anna that Mexico would reconquer their lost territory. The government was in the process of establishing a sizable army, which they hoped would compel the Mexicans to acknowledge their independence and maintain peace.[40]

Interestingly, Texas was concerned about the English involvement, because many Texans became so proud of their military achievements that they argued that the only way the Republic of Texas could maintain itself would be if England interfered.[41] Otherwise, Texas would attack and conquer the Mexican nation. These threats from the Texan government probably were mere statements of propaganda on the part of Texan citizens, because in reality Texas suffered from confusion, governmental problems, lack of money, and a general disruption and dissatisfaction within their army.[42] Neither Texas nor Mexico was in a position to

---

[40]F.O. 50 Vol. 153 No. 18, "Pakenham to Aberdeen, February, 17, 1842," p. 143.

[41]London Times, June 15, 1842, p. 6.

[42]Joseph Schmitz, Texan Statecraft, p. 174.

hurt the other much. Both limited themselves to small attacks along the frontier in 1841 and 1842.

Mexico seemed content to make a few scattered moves in order to prove to her citizens that Texas would be reconquered. In September of 1842 she moved on San Antonio where 18 Mexicans were wounded, one killed, and 62 prisoners taken. Mexico could not attack in a full scale offensive so she harassed and alarmed the citizens on the frontier, while she maintained at home the idea that war was still in process.[43]

At the end of the year 1842 Texas troops crossed the Rio Grande River and committed acts of violence and sacked the city of Laredo and dissension within the forces prevented actual victory. The troops, 700 in all, were under the leadership of General Alexander Somervell. It had been his orders to harass the enemy, and, if necessary, follow them across the Rio Grande River, if he thought it was advisable. The Mexican troops, however, were really unable to combat Somervell, but did put up a staunch defense at Laredo.

During the month of December, 1842, Somervell and his troops marched up and down the valley near Laredo in an attempt to break any Mexican attack or any Mexican force. However, Somervell then ordered his forces back to Texas to be disbanded.

Some of his tropps, however, did not want to go back yet, and a group of about300 organized themselves under the command of William S. Fisher. Fisher and his men, although they were engaged in outright mutiny, moved across the Rio Grande and down river to the small town

---

[43]Joseph M. Nance, After San Jacinto (Austin, 1963), pp. 481-498.

of Mier. They were able to take from the town supplies and money. They took as hostages the local priest and the alcalde, and then withdrew across the river to make camp. During this time the centralist Mexican general, Pedro Ampudia, slipped into the town of Mier with about 2,000 men. Fisher, realizing that the town was being reinforced, decided to attack.

With a force of about 261, he began the attack on December 26. The Texans, though outnumbered, put up a good fight and the battle went on into the night and began again the next morning. During the battle the Mexican forces under Ampudia were almost broken, and he sent up the white flag. He demanded the surrender of the Texans, as prisoners of war, and in hopeless desperation the Texans, outnumbered by about 15 to 1, decided to capitulate.

If the Texans had not surrendered, the Mexican forces might have surrendered themselves because the Mexican forces lost about 600 men to only 30 for the Texans. If Texas had held out just a little longer, the huge victory would have been taken by the Texans at this particular battle. The prisoners were taken, and Ampudia had promised to give them all consideration possible, but as soon as the Texans laid down their arms they were immediately sentenced to be executed. Ampudia did commute their sentence to imprisonment, and they were marched to Matamoros, and from there to Mexico City.

These prisoners in 1843 were able to overthrow their guards and escape, most of them scattering in any possible way in the hope to recross the Rio Grande River. Many of them lost their way; some of them died from starvation and exposure, but they were finally forced to surrender again, many individually and others in groups. The final

toll was 176 surrendered and recaptured by the Mexican forces. Santa Anna immediately ordered that all 176 be executed.

At this time the British minister, Pakenham, decided to intervene and argued that this action would definitely bring constant criticism from the rest of the foreign governments throughout the world. Santa Anna commuted the sentence and stated that he would not execute all 176 prisoners, but would execute one out of ten. Seventeen, therefore, were ordered to be executed. The 17 men to be executed were chosen at a small village known as Salado, and the determination of who was to be executed was carried out by mixing 17 black beans into a pot with 159 white beans. Then each prisoner filed past the jar, reaching in to pick a bean. The 17 men were led into a courtyard; all were blindfolded and all shot.

This execution startled the civilized world and there was a great deal of resentment against the Mexican forces and further evidence of Santa Anna's butchery, which inflamed the Texas citizens. The remainder of the prisoners were taken to Perote Castle, where they remained in cells along with many of the prisoners previously taken in 1841. Some were able to escape, others died of starvation and disease, and not until September 16, 1844, were the prisoners released by Santa Anna under the pressure of foreign diplomats, particularly the British minister.[44]

This particular military encounter did spark a great deal of enthusiasm, however, in Mexico. The Mexicans were assured now that

---

[44]F.O. 50 Vol. 161 No. 13, "Pakenham to Aberdeen, February 24, 1843," p. 40.

they could defeat Texas. They felt that this military encounter proved that Texas was weak and disunited and Mexico could, if possible, win a military victory. Mexico as a result would not entertain any accommodation with Texas.

After the failure of the Texas-Santa Fe expedition and the Mier tragedy, President Lamar attempted once more to bring about a peaceful settlement with the Mexican nation. He appointed James Webb, his Secretary of State, as a special agent to Mexico with the express orders of trying to bring about a peaceful treaty between Texas and Mexico. In that treaty Webb was to argue, as Barnard Bee and James Treat had argued earlier, for a complete recognition of Texas, and was not to give up the Rio Grande as the boundary. Webb sailed to Vera Cruz, but was not able to land. He asked Pakenham to intervene and come to his aid. Pakenham, however, was not able to discuss the matter with the Mexican Government, and in 1843 it seemed as if mediation was hopeless and any peacemission by Texas was impossible.

By 1843, Texan representatives in England, and the British Ministers all agreed that mediation was not possible. The Mexicans under Santa Anna rejected all the British suggestions, and it was necessary according to Aberdeen to seek other methods to solve the conflict between the two.

England's policy as outlined in the second treaty in 1842, did not materialize, due to the constant border raids of the two and the fact that James Webb was not allowed to land or even to discuss any of the problems between Mexico and Texas. By the end of 1842 the

problem had reached an impasse and new proposals were necessary before any mediation would succeed. By 1843 England had to reassess her plans for a peaceful Mexican-Texan frontier.

CHAPTER IV

MORE OF THE SAME MODERATION URGED BY BRITAIN AT FULL SPEED

In March, 1843 Santa Anna again assumed the Presidency. As always, his administration and conduct caused great consternation in Mexico, and presented many problems for the foreign diplomats in Mexico City. The military victory at Mier prompted many in Mexico to call for war, while Texas agents, especially James Webb, called for war since Mexico refused to discuss a peaceful arrangement.[1]

In March, 1843 Richard Pakenham left Mexico City on a leave of absence and William Ward the chargé d' affaires, took over until the arrival of Thomas Doyle. Before leaving Pakenham had a special meeting with Santa Anna, and discussed the state of affairs in Mexico. Santa Anna hinted that he was willing to negotiate an armistice with Texas but that he wanted Great Britain to supervise the negotiations. Pakenham considered this a breakthrough and he wanted to iron out details with Santa Anna before he returned home in March, 1843. Santa Anna became ill, however, and even Thomas Doyle, Pakenham's replacement

---

[1] F.O. 50 Vol. 161 No. 8, "Pakenham to Aberdeen, February 26, 1843," p. 40. The Mexicans by 1843 believed that if they judiciously planned an attack against Texas, they could reconquer the area. Also F.O. 50 Vol. 161 No. 14, "Pakenham to Aberdeen, March 22, 1843," p. 80.

was unable to meet with him until May 24, 1843, a month and a half after his arrival in Mexico City.[2]

In their discussion, Santa Anna stated that he was not adverse to buying a settlement from Texas, and that he would send his terms to the President of Texas through a Texas prisoner of war, James Robinson.[3] Finally, and most important, Santa Anna said that he would accept an armistice and a peace if Texas acknowledged the sovereignty of Mexico.[4]

Doyle believed that Santa Anna was serious, and immediately corresponded with Charles Elliot, the English chargé d' affaires in Texas. Doyle and Elliot, without instructions from the Foreign Office pressed for an armistice and an end to the hostilities along the border.[5]

Doyle knew that England wanted an armistice. Since Santa Anna said that he wanted an armistice, Doyle went ahead with plans for negotiations. This activitiy started more rumors in the United States, when it was discovered that the British Ministers were actively involved in negotiations. Indeed, Santa Anna stipulated that the armistice could not end until one of the British Ministers was informed of such action.

---

[2]F.O. 50 Vol. 161 No. 20, "Pakenham to Aberdeen, March 23, 1843," p. 126. In this dispatch Pakenham reports his meeting with Santa Anna, but also his failure to follow it through due to Santa Anna's illness. Ward, the temporary replacement, also reports the illness in F.O. 50 Vol. 161 No. 1 "Ward to Aberdeen, March 25, 1843," p. 142. Finally Doyle after his arrival on April 5, reports that he was unable to meet Santa Anna in F.O. 50 Vol. 161 No. 1, "Doyle to Aberdeen, April 24, 1843," p. 151.

[3]F.O. 50 Vol. 162 No. 24, "Doyle to Aberdeen, May 25, 1843," pp. 96-101 and Wilfred Calcott, Santa Anna, p. 190.

[4]F.O. 50 Vol. 162 No. 24 "Doyle to Aberdeen, May 25, 1843," p. 96.

[5]Ibid., p. 97.

The Foreign Office expressed some concern over the energetic actions by the ministers, but the fact that Santa Anna had expressed a desire to talk overshadowed the British Minister's unwarranted action.[6]

Santa Anna gave Adrien Wall, a French soldier of fortune, full power to negotiate an armistice with the Texas delegates. That Armistice contained four stipulations. First, the armistice would last as long as there was a chance of peace between the two. Second, while there were negotiations all fighting would end. Third, during the negotiations both armies would stay in camp, but if citizens crossed the borders the truce was not broken. Finally, the two Texan agents responsible for drawing up the armistice would be recognized as being empowered to conclude the peace negotiations.[7]

The armistice was drawn up by Don Antonio Maria Jauregue and Colonel Manvel Maria Laderas, while Texas was represented by G. W. Hackley and S. M. Williams. The latter two were given the responsibility of negotiating a treaty once the Armistice went into effect.

The Foreign Office was glad to hear of Santa Anna's change of heart because negotiations were now possible, but Aberdeen was still concerned over the sovereignty issue, and he reemphasized in his instructions to Doyle:

> . . . assuming the propositions to have been made in perfect sincerity, that as the independence of Texas, although not formally recognized, is thereby, to all intents and purposes, virtually admitted, it would be much wiser and more conducive to the true interest of Mexico, if the Mexican government

---

[6]W. D. Jones, Lord Aberdeen and the Americas, p. 34. F.O. 50 Vol. 163 No. 51, "Doyle to Aberdeen, July 30, 1843," pp. 64-69.

[7]London Times, May 15, 1844, p. 8.

> instead of clinging to the vain shadow of a mere nominal sovereignty or seeking to satisfy a barren point of honnour [sic] would go one step further, and determine to acknowledge at once the entire independence of Texas.[8]

If Mexico acknowledged the independence of Texas, Mexico might reap the benefits of greater concessions from the Texans. Aberdeen true to his British interests, probably wanted recognition because he saw a chance for the abolition of slavery in Texas. If Texas was recognized, and if a boundary was delineated, by Mexico, the Texans in response might unilaterally abolish slavery and benefit all mankind.[9]

The British representatives, Elliot in Texas, and Doyle in Mexico, worked diligently during the armistice discussions. Elliot was convinced that Texas wanted to maintain her independence, and the surest way to that goal was a calm and peaceful border with Mexico. Elliot therefore stressed the importance of negotiations, and the hope of compromise which meant that Mexico would recognize independence. Doyle on the other hand, recognized the need for an armistice, but was not certain whether Santa Anna really wanted peace or was stalling for time.

Aberdeen was also concerned about the actions of the Santa Anna government, and the sincerity of their programs. Doyle was confronted with case after case of Mexican chicanery and outright corruption which led to a severe anti-Mexican feeling among the British delegation in

---

[8] F.O. 50 Vol. 160 No. 10, "Aberdeen to Doyle, July 1, 1843," pp. 75-78.

[9] Ibid. Also Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. On August 18, 1843, Lord Brogham believed that if Mexico recognized independence, Texas would abolish slavery, and present a good example to the United States and E. D. Adams, British Interests and Activities in Texas 1836-1848, p. 39.

Mexico City.[10]

Shortly after Santa Anna took office he called for a new tax on all ore deposits, gold, and silver exported from the country. Needing money desperately he called for the collection of these monies immediately, and confidentially told the American Minister, Waddy Thompson, that the revenue from these taxes would be used in a war against England.[11]

At the same time Santa Anna requested aid from the United States if England made a move to acquire California. These rumors were transmitted to the British ministers who considered them as outrageous manifestations of the Mexican political system.[12] A war on England was mentioned to alleviate the huge English debt in Mexico, while California became a prime topic for British adventurers in Mexico but never a serious matter for Aberdeen and the Foreign Office.

The California question played a part in the minds of government leaders, during the Mexican-Texan dispute. Some historians notably Jesse Reeves in American Diplomacy under Polk and Tyler believed that the United States went to war because of California. English designs and ambitions in the area were questioned, and even though British merchants and speculators wanted a Pacific port, there is no evidence that the Foreign Office ever contemplated any aggressive action in

---

[10]F.O. 50 Vol. 165 No. 79, "Doyle to Aberdeen, October 30, 1843," p. 15.

[11]Dispatches from Mexico, "Waddy Thompson to A. P. Upshur, November 1, 1843," p. 48, and F.O. 50 Vol. 164 No. 75, "Doyle to Aberdeen, September 29, 1843," pp. 198-255.

[12]F.O. 50 Vol. 164 No. 75, "Doyle to Aberdeen, September 29, 1843," pp. 198-255.

California. Mexico did attempt to sell it but that proposal came too late because Peel and Aberdeen both were against any English involvement in the area.[13]

Santa Anna's government was full of corruption, and hundreds of stories originated during his years in office. These stories hindered any objective analysis of the period. Doyle did report that the difficulties in Mexico were caused primarily because of the disorganized state of the Treasury. The government went out of its way to seize money, and considered paying back that money as a minor detail.[14]

Money was essential to the Santa Anna government, because he increased the size of the army, and needed new revenues to pay the salaries of his troops. He purchased new cannons from Europe and placed them at the castle of San Juan de Ulloa, just as he had done when he came to power in 1841.[15] After enlarging the army and bolstering the defenses of Mexico, Santa Anna attacked the political system in Mexico City and established his office as the most powerful in Mexico with a Congress that served as an advisory body.[16]

---

[13] Aberdeen Papers, "Correspondence with Sir Robert Peel," "Peel to Aberdeen, October 3, 1845," pp. 7-10. Peel's unwillingness to pursue a bold policy in California is expressed in this letter, while the British merchants proposal is discussed in F.O. 50 Vol. 179 No. 3, "Aberdeen to Barrow, December 31, 1843," p. 10.

[14] F.O. 50 Vol. 164 No. 75, "Doyle to Aberdeen, September 29, 1843," pp. 198-244. See also U. S. Cong. Senate Documents, 28th Cong. 1st Sess. "Thompson to de Bocanegra, September 24, 1843," Document 1, p.30, and Wilfred Calcott, Santa Anna, pp. 190-191.

[15] W. Calcott, Santa Anna, p. 191.

[16] Wilfred Calcott, Santa Anna, p. 196; F.O. 50 Vol. 164 No. 75, "Doyle to Aberdeen, September 29, 1843," pp. 22-23.

These dictatorial maneuvers, although added to the confusion, during the period did not upset the foreign diplomats in Mexico. Representative government in Mexico, to foreign diplomats, only added to the confusion and disorder. Under a single leader the chances for improved trade, better tariff rates, and simpler commercial decrees, were much better if the foreign delegates concentrated their actions on one man or an elite group of men in Mexico City.[17] In fact most British merchants realized that a tariff was necessary. They only objected to the number of changes in the tariff laws after each Mexican revolution.

Doyle's concern for Mexican corruption and trickery reached an impasse in 1843, when Santa Anna's government embarrassed the British delegation by displaying a British flag as a trophy of war during a gala public dinner in Mexico City.[18] Doyle regarded the incident as an unfriendly act, and defiantly led his British delegation from the dinner, asking for a public apology and the return of the flag. Santa Anna refused, and he further infuriated the acting British Minister by opening the castle to the public, while the flag remained in place.[19] Doyle angered over the event, ceased all diplomatic relations with Mexico, until a public apology was given and the flag returned to his office.[20]

---

[17] F.O. 50 Vol. 165 No. 80, "Doyle to Aberdeen, October 30, 1843," pp. 22-23.

[18] W. D. Jones, Lord Aberdeen and the Americas, p. 32.

[19] Ibid.

[20] F.O. 50 Vol. 165 No. 78, "Doyle to Aberdeen, October 30, 1843," pp. 3-5, and Daily Picayune, January 17, 1844, p. 2.

Santa Anna never gave Doyle the satisfaction of an apology, and Aberdeen objected to Doyle's brash and uncalled for cessation of relations, especially over such a minor issue. Doyle was instructed to relax in his energetic diplomacy and await the arrival of Pakenham's replacement, Charles Bankhead.[21]

Shortly after the flag incident Santa Anna resigned and appointed General Valentin Canalizo as President ad-interim. Santa Anna again cited his health, and also the necessity of protecting the national interest along the Gulf Coast as a reason for his resignation. He retreated, therefore to his country home at Magno de Clavo, a small villa, 12 miles south of Vera Cruz.[22]

Santa Anna was still in tune with the Mexican political system. He realized that federalist and centralist forces were battling for power during his reign, so as was his custom, he absented himself from the government, appointed his successor, and then retreated to his home, where he could wait out the period of unrest and eventually return to power.[23]

Canalizo immediately faced a predicament. The treasury was empty, and the public sentiment was unleashed against the government.

---

[21]F.O. 50 Vol. 170 No. 10, "Aberdeen to Doyle, December 1, 1843," p. 6; Aberdeen scolds Doyle for his uncalled for decision; Doyle expressed his apology in F.O. 50 Vol. 171 No. 15, "Doyle to Aberdeen, January 29, 1844," p. 72. See also W. D. Jones, Lord Aberdeen and the Americas, p. 32.

[22]Wilfred Calcott, Santa Anna, pp. 189-202. Doña Ines, Santa Anna's wife died on August 23, 1843, and this along with the strain of the Presidency forced him to retire temporarily. Many, as Calcott pointed out, thought he needed time to "scheme and plot."

[23]Ibid.

Opposition grew, and even the passage of a law to exclude Americans from California failed to unite support for the Canalizo government.[24]

As a result Congress called for the return of Santa Anna, who hesitated at first claiming his health prevented the move, but he did not decline the offer, and was able to return in 1844, with the largest public following of his career. Santa Anna within a year, had led the country into bankruptcy by stealing taxes. Nevertheless, Santa Anna was admired by many. Foreign visitors commented about his personal charm and strong sense of leadership. Even Waddy Thompson felt that Santa Anna was misrepresented.[25]

Meanwhile, as Charles Bankhead became British Minister to Mexico, Pakenham was appointed to Washington, D.C. Pakenham assumed the task of assessing the Texas question and he served as British negotiator in the dispute over the Oregon boundary. Bankhead's arrival in Mexico was also looked upon as important. He was greeted with out of the ordinary pageantry, cannons fired and the elite in Mexican politics greeted him. He also visited Santa Anna at his private home, Magno de Clavo.

During that audience Santa Anna emphasized his desire to maintain peace with England, and he displayed his intentions by returning the

---

[24]F.O. 50 Vol. 165 No. 119, "Doyle to Aberdeen, December 30, 1843," p. 340. The United States Representative, Waddy Thompson, was unaware of the law for several months, and the reason for its passage puzzled Doyle. Canalizo did face many problems, and the move to sway public opinion in his favor by the decree is not hard to believe, since a strong anti-American feeling already existed in Mexico.

[25]Madame Calderon de la Barca in her Life in Mexico, considered Santa Anna as the most prestigious of all Mexican leaders, p. 345.

controversial flag that Doyle had used as an excuse for the severance of diplomatic relations.[26] Bankhead, however, was not impressed, and in his first report to Aberdeen he stressed, "I need hardly tell your Lordship that Santa Anna is as little remarkable for the sincerity of his professions as he is for the steadiness of his political views."[27]

Bankhead's initial work centered on the Mexican-Texan armistice. He learned on his arrival that the armistice had been accepted and that the delegations from both countries were meeting in Mexico City to negotiate the end of the Mexican-Texan conflict.[28] After eight years of border raids and diplomatic accusations, Bankhead believed that the settlement was possible, and that a stable, peaceful relationship would result.

Bankhead's optimism was shortlived because just as the talks began in Mexico City, the annexation of Texas re-emerged as the number one political question in the United States. Earlier annexation debates evoked a bitter sectional conflict in the United States, and Sam Houston took back the Texan proposals for annexation.[29] Mirabeau Lamar, Houston's successor ignored annexation, and energetically sought and attained recognition, and commercial treaties from England, France and the Netherlands. As a result, Texas established a viable independent Republic and the annexation question assumed a minor role. Not until

---

[26]F.O. 50 Vol. 171 No. 1, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, March 31, 1844," pp. 3-5.

[27]Ibid., p. 4.

[28]F.O. 50 Vol. 173 No. 8, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, March 3, 1844," pp. 18-20.

[29]Rupert N. Richardson, Texas, The Lone Star State, p. 326.

1843, did the question of annexation become an important topic. In December, 1843, President John Tyler in a message to Congress, emphasized the importance of Texas and the threat of European involvement in North America.[30]

Based on correspondence from Edward Everett, the United States envoy in London, President Tyler believed that England was supporting the Texan cause, while she stressed the need for the total abolition of slavery in the independent state of Texas.[31]

In his message he openly warned Europe and England, even though he never mentioned them by name.[32] That Tyler was referring to England was known to all and the result was an immediate response from Aberdeen, who openly denied the charge that England sought any gain in Texas or Mexico.

Aberdeen shocked by the speech, immediately sent orders to Richard Pakenham in Washington, D.C., stating "that many errors and many misrepresentations existed over Her Majesty's feeling with regard to Texas." The British Foreign Secretary wanted to clear up matters. Thus, he sent duplicate messages to all British Ministers and instructed them to convey the British position in Texas to their respective countries.[33] Setting the record straight he outlined the

---

[30]U. S. Congress, Cong. Globe, 28th Cong. 1st Sess. "Message of the President to the Senate and House of Representatives," December 5, 1843, pp. 6-9.

[31]W. D. Jones, Lord Aberdeen and the Americas, p. 32. G. L. Rives, The United States and Mexico I, pp. 555-584. Smith, Annexation of Texas, p. 132 and Robert Seager, and Tyler, Too (New York, 1963), p. 216.

[32]U. S. Congress, Cong. Globe, 28th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 7.

[33]F.O. 5 (America) Vol. 390 No. 9, "Aberdeen to Pakenham, December 26, 1843," p. 139.

British position in Texas as follows:

1. Great Britain has recognized the independence of Texas.

2. Since doing it, England wants to see Texan independence firmly established, especially by Mexico.

3. There was absolutely no self-interest in Texas.

4. Recognition by Mexico was conducive to Both countries, and both countries would benefit. England, therefore, tried to persuade the Mexicans to accept independence.

5. No ulterior designs exist either in the area or with regard to Texas.

6. We wish to see slavery ended in most areas of the world, and this can be seen in our treaties with nations throughout the world.

7. We will counsel, but we will not compel or control either Mexico or Texas.

8. Our objectives are purely economical and commercial.

9. We will not act directly or indirectly in any political way.[34]

Tyler believed that Great Britain had interfered in the discussion of annexation, and he argued that this interference was unjustified. Texas as an independent power had every right to annex itself to the United States, and England had no right to influence that decision. Tyler's arguments infuriated the British Foreign Office, and provoked wide editorial comment from the English press, exemplified by the article in the London Times:

> On this point British policy has been at once so cautious and so open that Mr. Tyler's message conveys a most unwarrantable aspersion on Her Majesty's government. Lord Aberdeen's dispatch to Pakenham on the 26th of December, 1843, states in the most precise and explicit terms that Great Britain aspires to no dominant influence in Texas, that she presumes not to use any undue authority over

---

[34] F.O. 5 (America) Vol. 390 No. 9, "Aberdeen to Pakenham, December 26, 1843," pp. 140-142.

> foreign states in her opposition to slavery, and that with reference to the slaveholding states of the Union, she has even treated them with the same respect and forbearance as the other members of the federal community. The answer, the public official answer, of the President to this most temperate assurance is an assumption that the designs of England are such as to justify him in his work of plunder and the extraordinary injustice of this measure is, if possible, surpassed by the matchless impudence of the arguments used in defense of it.[35]

Meanwhile, Santa Anna, delighted that England and the United States were in disagreement, made plans for an invasion of Texas. More than likely he assumed that England would assist him in his struggle to restore Texas to its rightful place in the Mexican Republic.[36]

Aberdeen found it hard to believe that

> . . . under the present circumstances of the relations between Mexico and the United States and with the full knowledge of all that had lately taken place in the United States with regard to the annexation of Texas that General Santa Anna could ever have entertained a serious intention of attempting in such a manner the reconquest of Texas.[37]

He continued by saying "that this would be equivalent to a deliberate challenge to the United States and could scarcely be doubted that such a challenge would be forthwith accepted by the United States."[38] Nothing could be gained, but everything lost, by engaging in such a wild undertaking.

---

[35] London Times, May 18, 1844, p. 5.

[36] Wilfred Calcott, Santa Anna, p. 190.

[37] F.O. 50 Vol. 172 No. 30, "Aberdeen to Bankhead, September 30, 1844," pp. 73-79.

[38] Ibid.

After considering the position of Mexico with relation to both the United States and Texas, and having taken into account all that had passed with regard to the proposed annexation of Texas to the United States, the British Government was of the opinion that the only rational policy for Mexico was to acknowledge without delay or hesitation the full independence of Texas. Recognition appeared to be more promising in 1844 than when it was first recommended in 1840. There was no danger to Mexico from Texas as an independent state.

On the contrary, Aberdeen reasoned, Mexico and Texas could unite in bonds of amity, but if Texas was part of the United States, the most serious dangers would accrue to Mexico. Mexico already witnessed the problem of her neighbor to the north; the loss of Texas was in fact ascribable to the contiguity to the United States, which alone gave rise to the gradual encroachment of lawless United States citizens who merely had to cross the frontier between their country and the Mexican provinces, settle anywhere upon the Texan soil unsettled by Mexican citizens and without any opposition from the Mexican government.

If Texas was annexed to the United States, the program of encroachment would be repeated by the outlying and adventurous population of the United States, pressing forward with that restless and roving propensity which characterized them, implanting themselves within the undefined and unguarded limits of the Mexican territory. If Mexico continued to refuse to acknowledge the sovereignty of Texas and allowed the events to continue as they were, they would not find any state of peace or tranquillity. In other words, an unceasing and hopeless state of hostility would be established between them and the United States.

According to Aberdeen, if Mexico recognized Texas as a sovereign state, Texas would in all probability end discussions of annexation. They would not throw away their independence if they realized and were assured of a peaceful condition along the Mexican-Texan frontier. Secure on their Mexican border, the Texans would seek to consolidate their independence, and improve their internal condition, extend their commerce, and establish friendly relations with other nations of the world. To the English this was the only policy open to Santa Anna, and in offering this advice England sought only the good of Mexico.

Bankhead was also instructed to clearly point out that if the President, contrary to the English hopes and beliefs, was to take the rash step of invading Texas, and by doing it find himself involved in difficulties with other countries, "he must not look for support of Great Britain aiding him to extricate himself from those difficulties."[39]

Santa Anna, nevertheless, wanted to reconquer Texas and alleviate the embarrassment of San Jacinto. England, perplexed and concerned over Santa Anna's threats of war, decided to formulate a new plan for the peaceful settlement of the Mexican-Texan conflict. The new plan was outlined in a confidential dispatch from the Foreign Office on June 3, 1844.

The annexation proposal forced Aberdeen to re-examine his plan and his proposals to the Mexicans and the Texans. He did not want to see Texas as part of the United States because he felt that the balance

---

[39]F.O. 50 Vol. 172 No. 30, "Aberdeen to Bankhead, September 30, 1844," p. 79.

of power would be at stake on the world scene if Texas or any other part of Mexico became part of the United States.[40] At first he believed that annexation could be prevented if Texas was recognized by Mexico. Mexico however was reluctant to grant recognition without some assurances from England that her territory would be safe.

Aberdeen, although he wanted recognition, also realized that England could not unilaterally guarantee any agreement between the two.[41] Furthermore, the economic crisis in England and the debate over the Corn Laws prevented any unanimous foreign policy, especially if that policy threatened the trade with the United States.[42] Most English merchants wanted to do business with America and even though English journals stirred the anti-United States feeling in England, the English economically were not prepared for a war with any power.

Aberdeen persisted in his endeavor to maintain the independence of Texas, and decided to test the entente cordiale with France.[43] He began serious discussions with Francois Guizot, the French Foreign Minister, aimed at a joint agreement between the two to mediate the

---

[40] W. D. Jones, Lord Aberdeen and the Americas, p. 33. Jones believes that Aberdeen was afraid of the United States' power, and with Texas she would have increased her size and potential.

[41] Aberdeen Papers, "Correspondence with Sir Robert Peel," "Peel to Aberdeen, February 23, 1845," Vol. 36 43064, pp. 178-181.

[42] Peel's Papers, "General Correspondence," Peel received a report in 1843 that trade with the United States was cut in half during the depression years 1836-1841 and he wanted to discuss within the cabinet methods of restoring that lucrative trade.

[43] Aberdeen Papers, Vol. XCVI (43134), "Correspondence with Francois Pierre Guizot, November 1843-October 1860."

Mexican-Texan conflict, but even more important he wanted Britain and France to guarantee any agreement reached by Mexico and Texas.[44]

The discussions were carried out and a slight ray of hope existed for the success of such a plan. As soon as discussions with Guizot were begun, Aberdeen informed the Mexican minister in London, Tomás Murphy that a possible solution to the problem was in the making. Both men worked on a memorandum that would stipulate English policy toward Mexico and Texas, that memo also stated "that England and France would go to the last extremity."[45]

Not only did Aberdeen discuss the matter with Murphy, he immediately sent instructions to Bankhead, which stressed the hope that Mexican recognition of Texas would come, and once it was official, the English and the French would guarantee the agreement and would prevent any foreign encroachment into Mexico or Texas.[46]

Aberdeen's desire to end the Mexican-Texan dispute and his belief that Texas had to remain independent, led him to this bold diplomatic maneuver in 1844. His diplomacy has been analyzed by many including Justin Smith, E. D. Adams, and W. D. Jones, and all agree that Aberdeen's language, especially in the memo to Murphy that England "would go to the last extremity" was the strongest language and the

---

[44] Aberdeen Papers, Vol. CCXXXVII, 43, 275 "Lord Aberdeen to Lord Cowley, January 24, 1845; F.O. 50 Vol. 174 No. 16 "Confidential" "Aberdeen to Bankhead, July 22, 1844," pp. 33-37.

[45] F.O. 50 Vol. 174, "Aberdeen to Murphy, July 1, 1844," p. 6. See also Smith, Annexation of Texas, pp. 387-388.

[46] F.O. 50 Vol. 174, "Aberdeen to Murphy, July 1, 1844, p. 6.

boldest policy outlined by the English in the 1840's.

Smith argued that England was ready for war. Adams concurred except that he re-emphasized Aberdeen's personal aversion to war. W. D. Jones also suggests that war was possible, but that it did not fit into the picture with regard to Aberdeen's desire for peace.[47]

Whether or not it meant that England was ready to militarily aid Texas or Mexico is speculative. Aberdeen's language without a doubt was strong, and possibly Aberdeen was thinking of military aid, but no matter how much one analyzes the documents the only conclusion that could be formulated centers around the fact that England never prepared for a war, nor did Aberdeen call for a military budget, and finally the French dragged their feet and prevented any immediate action by the English Foreign Office. The Foreign Office was also worried because they realized that any strong British move would definitely kill any chance for Henry Clay in the Presidential race of 1844.

Aberdeen informed Bankhead of all transactions and the memo with Murphy, mainly because Murphy would and did report to the Santa Anna government his discussions with the English. Bankhead was again instructed to seek Mexican recognition, but Aberdeen's hope for peace received another blow when Santa Anna decided to present the Murphy memo to a secret session of Congress for their consideration.[48]

---

[47]Smith, Annexation of Texas, p. 388. E. D. Adams, British Interests and Activities in Texas 1838-1846, pp. 171-172, and W. D. Jones, Lord Aberdeen and the Americas, p. 36.

[48]F.O. 50 Vol. 175 No. 66, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, August 29, 1844," p. 208.

Bankhead then did not lose a moment in sending his friend Don Rafael to Tacubaya with a message for the President. Bankhead emphasized the extreme inprudence and want of good faith in giving publicity to what was still in embryo status, and also the embarrassment he would create in any further arrangement of the question. In fact, that action might bring the total abandonment of any of Her Majesty's proposals. Bankhead insisted that the communication not be presented to Congress. Santa Anna agreed to withdraw the memo.

But his action caused Bankhead to report again.

> I regret to lay before your Lordship an illustration of the total want of good faith which exists in the government of this country. General Santa Anna's sole object in making publick [sic] the contents of this confidential communication was to induce the Congress without further delay to grant the supplies already urgently asked for by the government, for in a conversation he said to a deputy, 'I shall send this communication to the Congress, show them that England will stand by us, and they must now give the money.' And he added to Don Rafael, 'The English government says that we must either conquer Texas or grant its independence. What will Congress say to this?'[49]

Probably the real object of Santa Anna's intended communication to Congress was to use the communication, so that Congress would grant the supplies which he asked for and also to obtain some graft. Bankhead went on to say "so intense is . . . [Santa Anna's] love of money, that he was willing to endanger the success of a plan for the future benefit of the country, rather than by delay to retard the operation of his scheme of a temporary financial contribution."[50]

---

[49] F.O. 50 Vol. 175 No. 66, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, August 29, 1844," p. 208.

[50] Ibid.

Aberdeen concurred in the swift action taken by Bankhead to dissuade Santa Anna from sending the Murphy Memo to Congress.[51] Aberdeen realized that any publicity would have hindered his chances for success, and also would have aided the proponents of Texas annexation in the United States.[52] Aberdeen was also amazed that Santa Anna still talked of reconquest, and he instructed Bankhead to emphasize that annexation was dangerous, but that danger could be avoided if recognition was freely given. Aberdeen was frustrated over the fact that a joint declaration was not possible, but he continued to offer his advice and later sought French approval for the joint "moral influence" of the two in the Mexican controversy.

Santa Anna ignored the British pleas, and he sent 6,000 soldiers to Galveston and 8,000 to San Luis Potosí. However, the rains in October, 1844 prevented further troop movements, and Santa Anna was content to drill and discipline his troops in preparation for war with Texas. Tyler earlier argued that any Mexican troop movement into Texas would not be tolerated during the discussion of annexation, but Mexico was confident and was in a collision course with the United States. Santa Anna continued his bold maneuvers and asked Congress for an immediate vote of $10,000,000 and an Inciativa (or petition) which if passed would confer extraordinary powers in the presidency.[53]

---

[51] F.O. 50 Vol. 172 No. 34, "Aberdeen to Bankhead, October 13, 1844," p. 88.

[52] Aberdeen Papers, Vol. XXII (43,060) "Correspondence with Duke of Wellington," March 1, 1844, pp. 370-375.

[53] F.O. 60 Vol. 175 No. 53, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, July 3, 1844," pp. 137-140.

If the Congress declined the Inciativa, Pakenham believed that Santa Anna would announce his retirement to his country house and wash his hands of the whole affair. Bankhead, however, believed that he would only go to Puebla and then maybe to the Castle at Perote, and at the Castle he would be invited back to Mexico by a Pronunciamento, which would be made by the garrison at Perote. He would then assume extraordinary powers and settle the question of money as he saw fit without the aid of Congress.[54]

The threat of a revolt and the takeover by Santa Anna did not bother the people of Mexico. There was no rival capable of giving any competition. And for many, there would be personal benefits from Santa Anna's leadership and the dissolution of the Congress.

The Mexican government in 1844 was in a terrible state. There had been a new law to gain $4,000,000 with a tax of 20% on all households, 15% on properties, 6% on tenants of houses, and a tax on landed property. All were necessary because of the projected campaign against Texas. Twenty-two million dollars was necessary in any war effort, but, as Bankhead reported, "Not a farthing was yet raised."[55]

Mexico was able to recruit men; approximately 32,000 arrived daily, but most of these recruits arrived chained together, because the desertion rate was so high. There was a large contract for 30,000 suits of clothing and tents for as many men. There was also another contract for 40,000 pounds for supply of arms and ammunition, which many said would come from England. Whether or not the money could be

---

[54]F.O. 60 Vol. 175 No. 53, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, July 3, 1844," pp. 137-140.

[55]Ibid.

raised in taxes was hard to say, because forced loans were hard to deal with, and the ordinary resources of the Mexican government were not enough.

In an annual statement in 1843 the Minister of Finance stated that the revenue in 1842 was $30,000,000. The expenses around $28,000,000, which meant that there was little left in the Treasury. Most of the federal or government employees' paychecks were all in arrears, and public credit was at the lowest in the history of the Mexican state.[56] This financial crisis developed from the most bare-faced corruption in every branch of the Mexican government. Even with the corruption Mexican politicians were able to maintain control because of the strong anti-American feeling in Mexico, and the great national desire to reconquer Texas.

To the Mexicans, American adventurers were responsible for the Texas revolution, and unless Texas was reconquered those same American adventurers would move on Mexico. These accusations were refuted by the United States minister, Duff Green, in a letter to the Mexican Secretary of State, José Bocanegra. Green argued that the natives or citizens of the United States went to Texas upon invitation and under the laws of Spain and Mexico. They left their country. They carried with them their families, their fortunes, and settled in Texas, not with a view of usurpation, but upon the invitation of Mexico and for the Mexicans' benefit. They gave up their rights as citizens of the United States, and they actually became colonists of Mexico. They went

---

[56]Wilfred Calcott, Santa Anna, pp. 203-214.

to Texas under a confederated form of government, and when a consolidated government was substituted, they declared their independence. Many natives of the United States went to their assistance, but this was nothing new in American history. Many doubtless left the United States for Texas for the purposes of gain, but most of those who went to her assistance were led there by the same spirit which rallied Commodore Porter and other countrymen of the undersigned round the standard of Mexico in her contest with Spain.[57]

Green went on to say that in international law a nation has the right to take an immediate place in the great society of nations if it makes its own laws. "Mexico says that Texas has no right to her independence, but why? Because she is a revolted colony." Green answered, "The argument was unfortunate, and it was certainly the first time that the undersigned has even heard it advanced on the American continent, and by a republican minister."[58]

Continuing, Green said that Mexico had the right to throw off her dependence upon Spain; the United States had the right to do the same with regard to England. Both were revolted colonies, one of Spain, the other of Great Britain. "The right to independence was too clear to need any argument to support it."[59] It is not only unnecessary but

---

[57] Senate Executive Documents, 28th Cong. 2nd Sess. "Correspondence with Mexico," Dec. 1, Vol. 1, pp. 53-89. Dispatches from United States Ministers to Mexico 1823-1906, Vol. XII, "Green to Bocanegra, July 4, 1844; also found in F.O. 50 Vol. 175 No. 52, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, July 31, 1844," pp. 121-124.

[58] Dispatches from United States Ministers to Mexico 1823-1906, Vol. XII, "Green to Bocanegra, July 4, 1844.

[59] Ibid.

improper for a representative of one of the American Republics, all of which were originally revolted colonies, to undertake to refute an argument which denies anyone's right to independence and which calls this right an usurpation.

Texas' right was as clear as the noonday sun. It needed only to be stated to be admitted and Green expected that a Mexican minister would be the last to call it in question, for it was already a settled question, settled by the example of his own country and of Mexico. The Mexican argument reduced to absurdity, would hold that the United States in declaring their independence, usurped the dominions of the King of England, and that Hidalgo, Morelos, and Iturbide, in achieving the independence of Mexico, violated the divine rights of the King of Spain and usurped his territory. Thus, according to Green, Texas was free to decide its own future. President Tyler had already agreed.

If a foreign power interfered, it was the United States' duty and right to prevent such an action. England, however, disagreed with Green and Bankhead answered that annexation was being pushed by the political machinations of Tyler's party and that pressure was being put on Texas to accept that proposal.[60] England wanted to stop annexation; her tactic was not a military control but a plan whereby Mexico would recognize the independence of Texas. England proposed the recognition of Texas as early as 1839-1840. Mediation and recognition were proposed several times but by 1844, due to the discussion of annexation in the United States' Congress, England was ready to jointly discuss an

---

[60] London Times, July 1, 1844, p. 5 and August 14, 1844, p. 4.

English-French guarantee for a Mexican-Texan peace.

England and France were in the process of settling the details in the Mexican-Texan conflict. Aberdeen and Guizot agreed that an independent Texas would benefit their interests and also restrain the westward expansion of the United States. Mexico did not go along with the major powers because Santa Anna persisted in his plans to attack Texas. Nevertheless, he faced many difficulties because the Congress refused to act on the Inciativa making him a dictator and the Congress did not appropriate the $10,000,000 for the army.

Santa Anna was so upset that he announced his intention of retiring. He could then return to Jalapa, where a large army was quartered, and eventually the people would call for his return. Again, revolution was in the offing. Several British citizens thought that Santa Anna would work the emotional trick and proclaim the impossibility of reconquering Texas, because of the lukewarm spirit of Congress.[61] Bankhead still believed that even with all of his boasts of the invasion of Texas and the promise to restore the glory of Mexico, Santa Anna was not against a realistic proposal for the limited or more extended acknowledgement of the Texas independence.[62]

But, matters became more complex as the United States Government openly made plans to annex Texas. This took much tact on Bankhead's part:

---

[61] London Times, August 10, 1844, p. 6.

[62] F.O. 50 Vol. 174 No. 53, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, August 14, 1844," p. 40.

> When the news first arrived here of the intention of the United States towards Texas, I thought it best for the moment not to urge as I had hitherto done, the question of independence, for with the remnant of Spanish pride and obstinacy still belonging to this people, I felt I could do no good by discussing it with them. I have, however, on every occasion since continued to press upon the Mexican government that their sole hope of preserving a frontier of strength to the United States is to be found in giving that element to Texas by acknowledging her independence.[63]

Bankhead further reported that the expedition to Galveston, which was to be led by the President himself, was also delayed, and it did not look at that time like there would be any march, maybe not even until March, 1845. General Canalizo was in command of the Corps at San Luis Potosí, and even in that area operations could not possibly have been carried out until October, 1844. The army of the west was in utter chaos, and the town of Matamoros was without supplies, which meant the possibility of any army maintaining in combat outside of Mexico was slim.

The recruitment of the army was still carried on in the most unscrupulous manner. The system was so defective and arbitrary that even if a corps of men left their respective headquarters the desertion rate would be half of the men. Thus, no expedition could reach Texas. Mexico was in no position to carry on an offensive against the former province.[64]

As a result, Bankhead thought that Mexico would have to eventually acknowledge Texas' independence. Manuel Rejón, the Foreign Secretary,

---

[63]F.O. 50 Vol. 174 No. 53, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, August 14, 1844," p. 40.

[64]Smith, War with Mexico I, p. 86 and Calcott, Santa Anna, p. 205.

reported that Mexico could not originate any such plan, but he would at least listen to any proposition from Great Britain and France, especially from the former power with a view to the settlement of the question upon the basis of independence. Rejón wanted to present a bold front to Texas. Bankhead considered that a mere display of pride and not really a serious thought entertained by the government, because members of the government who wanted to settle the question met with Bankhead in Mexico City.

Bankhead acknowledged to the various representatives of the Mexican Council that Great Britain wanted to see the question settled on an honorable and amicable principle.[65] In reply to Rejón he reported that Great Britain and France were ready to discuss and ready to talk of a possible guarantee or a joint discussion of the problem of peace. Annexation was not evident, even though the United States discussed it. The fact that Texas had agents in Mexico negated the idea that the Texan nation would be immediately annexed to the United States.[66]

Charles Elliot, the British Minister in Texas, believed that the Texan agents were warmly received in Mexico and were trying to negotiate a peace. He told to the government in Texas under express orders from the British Foreign Office that by remaining independent, Texas would gain tremendously, and England would do all she could to mediate the problems between Mexico and Texas. England still objected to the American designs against Texas. The British told the Texans that their

---

[65]F.O. 50 Vol. 175 No. 73, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, August 29, 1844," p. 253.

[66]London Times, July 16, 1844, p. 5.

only concern and only hope was for a recognition by Mexico. News that the United States considered England as totally involved irritated newspaper editors in London, and in the London Times one editorial stated that the project of annexation took its origin as we frequently had observed in the electionary intrigues of Mr. Tyler's party rather than in any serious apprehensions of foreign influence or any profound system of national policy.[67]

The London Times also backed the Mexicans against the Americans. The Times said that if Mexico had to resort to arms because of United States' designs, Mexico might possibly bring about a reconquest of Texas. They cited the requisition for $5,000,000 and recruitment of 40,000 men, Santa Anna's determination to take the field, and finally, Mexico's long military history. Mexican politicians were more than likely impressed with articles in the London papers, and may have been emboldened in their stand for reconquest.

One article in the Times said:

> We, England, recognize Texas as an independent state. We wish her to remain so, but if she be unworthy of the destiny to which she once aspired, we had far rather she were reunited to the free population of the Mexican Republic than classed among the slaveholding states of the Union, who already regard her with more terror and jealousy than they will acknowledge, since they impute to Great Britain those fears which are really excited by the future resources and freer institutions of Texas itself.[68]

Later, in another article printed in the London Times, Santa Anna was described as a noble, generous, and gallant general. He was an

---

[67] London Times, July 1, 1844, p. 3. See also F.O. 7 (Texas) "Aberdeen to Elliot, June 2, 1844," p. 88.

[68] London Times, August 15, 1844, p. 4.

able statesman, and a man capable of the noblest actions and the most chivalrous generosity.[69] Here was the misleading hint of British support.

Santa Anna, nevertheless, was full of surprises and in September, 1844, in the midst of his fight with Congress to finance a Texas campaign, he requested a leave of absence because of ill health. General Valentin Canalizo was selected to fill his shoes, but Canalizo was the personal choice of Santa Anna and as a result Santa Anna still ran the government from behind the throne. Congress challenged the new president but there was no suppression of Congress. The democratic Constitution of 1824 still stood.

Preparations continued for the campaigns in Texas, even though Santa Anna had left office, and the official word from the government was an all-out attack on Texas was in the process. The troops were not ready to cross the Rio Grande, according to Bankhead, and there was an element in Congress that was against any with Texas.[70]

The United States continued to worry Mexico over annexation, and on October 10, 1844, General Duff Green arrived with special instructions for the United States Minister, Wilson Shannon. Green and Shannon told Mexico that Texas had a right to decide whether or not it should be annexed to the United States. The Mexican Secretary of State, Manual Rejón announced for the last 20 years the United States had been

---

[69] London Times, September 14, 1844, p. 6.

[70] F.O. 50 Vol. 176 No. 85, "Bankhead to Aberdeen," September 29, 1844," pp. 170-172.

angling for the annexation of Texas.[71] Rejón's note was very moderate and free from the bombastic style which generally characterized such official correspondence of the Mexican government. Shannon, however, accepted it as an all-out attack on the United States, and demanded that Rejón apologize.[72]

This exchange prompted Bankhead to report in November, 1844, that the government of the United States was trying to pick a quarrel with Mexico.[73] The Mexican government tried to line up Bankhead on its side in the dispute with the United States but he refused, and reported to the Foreign Office:

> I cease not, however, to recommend a recognition of the independence of Texas as the only means of producing peace, and I am not without hope that I may succeed, but the initiative will be expected from us, and France, and any moderate suggestions from your Lordship will, I think, be listened to.[74]

In the midst of all these discussions there was a Pronunciamento at Guadalajara by General Mariano Paredes.[75] General Santa Anna was given the responsibility of leading the army to put down Paredes' revolt.

Bankhead then met with Santa Anna and discussed the problems over British claims and also the serious problem in Texas. It was during

---

[71] Dispatches from United States Ministers in Mexico 1823-1906 Vol. XII, "Rejón to Shannon, November 8, 1844."

[72] Ibid., "Shannon to Rejon, November 12, 1844."

[73] F.O. 50 Vol. 176 No. 94, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, November 12, 1844," p. 78.

[74] Ibid.

[75] F.O. 50 Vol. 177 No. 102, "Confidential, Bankhead to Aberdeen, November 12, 1844," p. 53.

this discussion that Santa Anna stated "out of deference to the British government he would forego any intention . . . of invading Texas."[76] Not only was Santa Anna ready to end hostilities with Texas, he was to the surprise of Bankhead, ready to discuss the conditions upon which Mexico would consent to acknowledge the independence of Texas.[77]

Santa Anna's conditions were what the British had been working for up to this late hour. Regarding the all important matter of the boundary, Santa agreed to the Rio Grande River.

But, there were some difficult conditions for the British to meet. Santa Anna wanted:

> The guarantee of England and France united that under no pretext whatever shall the Texans ever pass the boundaries marked out, the same nations shall also guarantee to Mexico the Californias, New Mexico, and the other points of the northern frontier bordering on the United States, according to a treaty, to be drawn up for that purpose. If the United States carried into effect the annexation of Texas to the North American Union, England and France will assist Mexico in the contest . . . .[78]

Santa Anna requested any counsel Aberdeen might think fit to offer for the benefit of the Mexican nation and out of deference to the British government he would suspend any intention of invading Texas.

Bankhead, in examining the conditions drawn up by Santa Anna, mentioned that the crucial reference to France and England's guarantee was entirely up to Her Majesty's government. He also refrained from

---

[76] F.O. 50 Vol. 177 No. 102, "Confidential, Bankhead to Aberdeen, November 24, 1844," p. 78.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Ibid.

any counsel on the possibility of any problem with the United States. The British minister was glad that Santa Anna was willing to stop border raids until a treaty could be worked out with Texas.

These proposals therefore were a beginning but Bankhead in no way committed the British government. Mexico, he felt, was yielding as much as they could, and he doubted that further modifications could be obtained in any negotiations. He pressed for secrecy with regard to this matter, and Santa Anna promised to accede to his request and not even allow any of his ministers or members of the Cabinet to hear or see any of the proposals.[79]

Bankhead's discussion with Santa Anna, however, never got off the ground because of the revolution in December, 1844. President Canalizo had issued a law or a presidential decree on December 6, 1844, which suspended the future meetings of Congress and required the officers of the government and the army to subscribe to this decree. It was definitely unconstitutional, and it brought about an extreme danger for Canalizo's government and Santa Anna. Santa Anna's popularity suffered as a result of this, and arrangements were made by his enemies and the people who had been injured during his regime to overthrow it, and if possible, to regain their prestige and stature within Mexican politics.[80]

The revolt was carried on with the greatest of secrecy to insure the support of the Mexican army. The rebels were well organized

---

[79]F.O. 50 Vol. 177 No. 102, "Confidential, Bankhead to Aberdeen, November 24, 1844," p. 78.

[80]Wilfred Calcott, Santa Anna, p. 207.

because within a half hour after the President issued his decree a new Pronunciamento was issued. Canalizo must have been shocked because he had just sent a note to Santa Anna that everything was in hand and that he was about to drive Congress out of the convent of San Francisco.[81] At this point, President Canalizo's troops deserted him, placed themselves on the side of Congress, and General José Herrera seized the palace and deposed the President.

The Senate immediately nominated Herrera as President, ad interim. That same evening Congress resumed their ordinary meetings and discussed the propriety of going in a body to ask for the spiritual aid of the "Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe," the protectoress of Mexico, whose spirit was housed in a chapel near Mexico City. The revolution itself was a very bloodless one, and it was, to say the least, carried out with every precaution to prevent the interruption of public tranquillity.[82]

The population of the small barrios, the poor districts of Mexico City, were out during the revolution, but they contented themselves with crying, "death to the lame man."[83] They broke two statues which had been erected in honor of General Santa Anna, and a group of people created some havoc when they went to the cemetery of Santa Paula and dug up Santa Anna's leg, and dragged it through the streets of Mexico City until it finally was rescued by an officer and conveyed to

---

[81] Wilfred Calcott, Santa Anna, p. 207.

[82] Ibid., p. 208.

[83] Ibid.

a secure place.[84] Santa Anna's power was, for all practical purposes, at an end, and for the first time in many years his influence was in total eclipse. He would make a comeback but not until the war against the United States.[85]

The revolution of 1844 was distinguishable, however, from those that had preceded it in Mexico, mainly because of the favorable public sentiment. The public supported and even joined the revolt, whereas in former revolutions and on similar occasions the revolution was carried out entirely by the military.[86] The expectations ran high and many felt the new government would succeed but to those well acquainted with the political character of Mexican politics, the possibility of any government lasting seemed remote. There were too many people in Mexican politics who were poles apart and it was hard to put anything lasting together.

Already there was a coalition of opposites. One faction, the Escoses, or Spanish and Church Party, disliked foreigners and usually attached themselves to the idea of centralization, running the whole country from Mexico City. The other part, composed of Yorkinos, was the party favorable to the idea of federalism, or what is known in the United States as "states' rights." This latter party was inclined more toward aiding the foreign element in Mexico and Mexico City. They were

---

[84]The much discussed leg was lost in the French attack at Vera Cruz in 1839, and after Santa Anna's return to power he brought the leg with him, and a massive funeral with all the pomp and circumstance took place in Mexico City in honor of their leader.

[85]Calcott, Santa Anna, p. 210, and Bancroft, History of Mexico, p. 443.

[86]Calcott, Santa Anna, p. 210.

liberal in their commercial decrees and negotiations with foreign nations. The system of federation, however, had been abolished in 1834, and many believed it was impractical in the Mexican nation. The confusion of making and enforcing contradictory laws and regulations produced what was close to anarchy throughout Mexico.[87]

However, it was believed by many in Mexico and was observed by most of the foreigners that getting rid of Santa Anna was a big step forward, especially for the federalists. Many hoped for the end of graft.[88] The new government also professed high regard for Great Britain. They stated their determination to cement and do justice to the relations which existed between the two countries. There was little discussion over the question of Texas, but it was believed that this new government would be reasonable and realistic.

Bankhead wanted the new government to accept the proposals advocated by Santa Anna in December, 1844. However, he believed the new government might place France in a more prominent position in any transaction.

Aberdeen was perplexed over the news of the 1844 Revolution, especially because it came right at the time Santa Anna disclosed an eagerness to solve the Mexican-Texan conflict. Aberdeen, after hearing of Santa Anna's proposals, immediately sent a messenger with a copy of his proposals. He asked Guizot to send instructions to the French chargé d' affaires in Texas, so that he and Elliot could jointly show

---

[87]Justin Smith, The War With Mexico, Vol. I, pp. 55-56.

[88]Ibid., p. 57.

Texas that they viewed the entire problem as a unit. France agreed and said that they would send a note to their minister, and Aberdeen reported to Bankhead that since Santa Anna was out of power, the discussion should not end, and he should not admit that the proposal or the suggestion was dead.

Aberdeen also told Bankhead that due to the problems of communication and the lack of knowledge he possessed, that he, Bankhead, had the right to use his own judgement; but that the communication which he received from President Santa Anna was to be considered a formal and valid act of the Mexican government, and as such would be the basis of further official negotiations.[89] The British were moving to save the situation for themselves, Mexico, and Texas in spite of Mexican politics.

Santa Anna valiantly tried to maintain control, and with a force of 12,000, which at that time was superior to any in Mexico, he marched toward Mexico City. He never attacked, spent time at Puebla, and then returned to Vera Cruz. In Vera Cruz he asked Congress if he could embark for a foreign country with full pension and a rank of general for the rest of his life. The government denied his request, and said he was to place himself at their disposal.

Santa Anna then fled, but was later captured. He again asked to retire and placed his property and all of his belongings at the disposal of the government in order to meet his demands. He was brought later to the Castle at Perote to decide on his fate, and even though he

---

[89]F.O. 50 Vol. 183 No. 6, "Aberdeen to Bankhead, February 1, 1845," p. 11.

was very unpopular at that time in Mexico City, the government decided to spare his life.[90] They were puzzled as to what to do with him. The country was quiet, the new ministers were confident and united, but foreign diplomats were concerned over the direction of the new government.

Bankhead believed even after the revolution that Santa Anna was the only one able to head Mexico but unfortunately, Santa Anna had failed to listen to astute advisers within his Cabinet. General Paredes, who started the revolt, and whose career would have been cut short if Santa Anna had acted quickly enough, arrived in Mexico City and was named Commandant-General of the army, with a force of 22,000 strong. On January 29, 1845, Bankhead reported that the new government's language was moderate. There was an army of 22,000 men at the disposal of the government, but Bankhead believed in January of 1845 that war with Texas was unpalatable, both with the officers and the soldiers.

If war should come, there were 20,000 men who could be sent to Texas. This was a huge army for those times. Finally Bankhead reported that he received assurances that no plans existed for a war or a hostile action in Texas.[91] Señor Cuevas, the Foreign Minister, had access to Counsel Murphy's memorandum and Bankhead gave him a copy of Santa Anna's proposal which outlined Mexican conditions for the recognition of Texas. Cuevas passed these letters on and told Bankhead

---

[90]Bancroft, History of Mexico, p. 443.

[91]F.O. 50 Vol. 184 No. 7, "Confidential, Bankhead to Aberdeen, January 29, 1845," pp. 39-47.

that Mexico was gratified to England for its interest in the area and that the Mexican President wanted to maintain a strong and friendly relationship with Great Britain.

Since the new government was on shaky ground, Cuevas could not discuss the Texas question, but he did add he could not obtain a recognition of Texas from Congress without some assurance that the plan had previously received the sanction and support of the British and French governments. He felt no doubt that, armed with such an assurance, the influence possessed by the present government in the Congress would be successfully employed in obtaining recognition.[92]

Bankhead agreed that recognition not guaranteed by England and France was impossible and that if recognition was not guaranteed, the United States would go their merry way. He also believed that the United States would adjourn as early as March without annexing Texas to the United States, so there was time for some reflection and some consideration of the matter with regard to British-French involvement in Mexican affairs. Bankhead's prediction, however, proved false. News reached Mexico that the House of Representatives passed the annexation bill just before adjournment.[93]

Cuevas immediately sought advice from Bankhead and asked what policy Mexico should follow. Bankhead advised him that caution and moderation were the only paths Mexico could follow, because the United States Senate still had to act. The Senate in March, 1844 had

---

[92]F.O. 50 Vol. 184 No. 7, "Confidential, Bankhead to Aberdeen, January 29, 1845," pp. 39-47.

[93]F.O. 50 Vol. 184 No. 19, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, March 1, 1845," pp. 173-175.

overwhelmingly defeated annexation and perhaps they would do it again only a year later. Cuevas failed to follow his advice and newspaper articles appeared in Mexico, which blustered about the honor and rights of Mexico and the necessity of sending a strong force to sustain the Mexican rights in Texas. When asked by Cuevas for his opinion of an article, Bankhead frankly stated that he disapproved of it, that a strong language would increase irritation, that the boast of an army to a frontier was ridiculous since it could not be fulfilled, even if the Senate passed the bill, it was a far better path for Mexico to make a solemn protest to her allies against the measure, hoping for some counsel and support from England and France.[94]

Bankhead went on to say:

> . . . it was useless to put off a discussion of Texas' independence at this time. Each day that Mexico delayed only aided the annexation movement in the United States. These delays were also reasons why, the friends of Mexico could not come forward to assist her in her struggle, and as proof of that Great Britain, her first and steady ally, has been compelled to retreat, what in an earlier period she was willing to do for her.[95]

Justin Smith, the most noted historian on the Mexican war concluded that Mexico expected English aid. Some of that expectation may have come from this dispatch. Bankhead implied that England was ready at one time to go beyond mediation. That it might have come during the discussions between England and France over a combined mediation.

---

[94]F.O. 50 Vol. 184 No. 19, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, March 1, 1845," pp. 173-175.

[95]Ibid., p. 175.

Cuevas repeated that the simple plan to recognize Texas without any assurance from England and France would be rejected immediately. He said if assurances were given, victory would be his result. Bankhead replied, England could probably only give moral assistance. Whatever may have been the case earlier, it was not possible now. Moral assistance could be granted, but he did not know what France would do. He then told Cuevas that he did not know the British position and would have to wait for new orders. Thus, the Mexicans were now out on a limb.

Those orders arrived in May of 1845 and did not rescue the Mexicans. Aberdeen, after learning about the action of the United States Congress to annex Texas, asked France to join with Britain to bring accommodation between Mexico and Texas. Both would offer mediation to assist Mexico and Texas in adjusting their differences, but "the free recognition of Mexico of the independence of Texas must be the condition for such mediation."[96] However, Britain was unwilling to go beyond moral influence to force or enforce any agreements between the two countries. The French agreed to these proposals initiated by the British Foreign Office. Bankhead was instructed to move quickly, and press the need for full recognition because "without unfettered recognition, nothing will be gained, and Texas will annex itself to the United States. But, with recognition, Texas will, it is believed, remain independent, and a barrier will be established for Mexican security."[97]

---

[96]F.O. 50 Vol. 183 No. 15, "Aberdeen to Bankhead, May 1, 1845," pp. 137-142.

[97]Ibid., p. 142.

The British knew that the United States would object to English interference. Thus, Bankhead was instructed to tell the United States minister that the British Foreign Office was not hostile to the United States. The British Government was only offering a practical policy for Mexico. If Mexico refused the Anglo-French mediation, and annexation took place, Great Britain and France would absolve themselves from being mediators. France and England, in other words, were willing to mediate the frontier problems of Texas and Mexico, but not the United States and Mexico.[98] The fate of Mexico was sealed.

The annexation moves on the part of the United States terrified the Mexicans. Recovering from a revolution and in the process of establishing a new government, Mexico went into shock. Moderation and cool thinking were out. The new government was acting too late. When Mexico received word of the United States Senate's action, President Herrera decided that Mexico would resist the acquisition of Texas by the United States.

The British feared that even with their limited means the Mexicans might commit an overt act, which would bring war. Bankhead therefore urged moderation, and emphasized to the Mexican government that the question was still a Mexican-Texan matter and not yet with the United States. Bankhead and the French minister, Baron de Cyprey, met with Cuevas on March 22, 1845. Their purpose was to find out the Mexican government's position.

---

[98]F.O. 50 Vol. 184 No. 31, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, March 31, 1845," p. 229.

Cuevas told them that orders had been given to troops to hold themselves in readiness, and to strengthen the corps at Matamoros. He said there was no hostile act intended. The French and English ministers were relieved. With regard to the United States, both ministers urged Mexico to use caution and moderation in all letters sent to the United States. The French minister even asked for a declaration in writing of Mexico's intention with regard to Texas. Cuevas then protested the United States' action and showed the note to both Bankhead and Cyprey. Both considered the note moderate and very cautious.

At the same meeting the French minister and the British minister suggested sending a secret agent to Texas, who would receive any declaration from the Texas president. He would place himself in the confidential communication with Captain Elliot. This might head off the move for annexation. Even though the United States had passed the annexation act, it did not become legal until Texas accepted it and voted to join the Union. However, the Mexicans later turned down this suggestion for the secret agent.

The pace was picking up. The British and French constantly urged immediate action, especially since the United States had already acted, but the Mexican ministers always turned a deaf ear. Procrastination therefore, was the reason for most of the difficulty the Mexicans faced during the first few months of 1845.

Until annexation became a fact, England and France instructed their ministers to continue in pursuit of an amicable settlement between Mexico and the Republic of Texas. Captain Elliot in Texas discussed Mexican recognition with President Anson Jones. Elliot and

Jones agreed that if Mexico recognized Texas, there would be a possibility that Texas would reject the annexation proposal.[99] In reporting Jones' proposal, Elliot noted that Mexico must recognize the independence of Texas and leave Texas alone.

Frantically, Bankhead hoped he could persuade Elliot to get some concessions from Texas, so that a settlement could come quickly. He pointed out that the problem was still one which involved Mexico and Texas, not the United States.

But the United States was bearing down. In April, 1845 an American naval squadron arrived off Vera Cruz, and their appearance sent chills throughout the country. Bankhead thought there was no real significance to the American naval move, but part of the United States policy was to show strength. The United States minister, however, was trying to persuade the Mexicans that the only reason Great Britain was interested in Texas was in the hope of buying the area at a later date.

Back in Texas, Elliot discussed the possibility of Texan independence, and President Jones reported that Texas would not annex itself to any other power. Bankhead and the French minister, Cyprey, were waiting in Mexico City for this and a council of ministers was immediately convened and the Texan proposals discussed. However, a problem in negotiation immediately arose in Mexico, because in the Mexican constitution an article existed which forbade the executive from entertaining any proposition that alienates any portion of

---

[99]"Charles Elliot to Anson Jones, January 10, 1845," in Correspondence of Anson Jones, p. 102.

territory. Congressional authority, therefore, was necessary. Bankhead and the French minister then instructed Cuevas to address an Inciativa to Congress.[100] This initiative petition would ask for authority to enter into a negotiation with Texas.

The paper was drawn up under the tutelage of Bankhead and Saligny; both read the paper and made suggestions as to its content, and when it was read to Congress it was favorably received.[101] Cuevas believed the measure would pass, but Bankhead was afraid that the present governmental leaders lacked the moral courage and the resolution needed at this particular time. The slightest opposition would cause delay and concern on the part of the government, and Bankhead constantly had to point out the immediacy of the problem and the crisis in which Mexico was placed. Bankhead and the French minister reiterated their belief that if Texas joined the Union, the United States would continue southward until all of Mexico was taken.[102]

The Mexican Congress eventually agreed to allow the President to enter into negotiations with Texas, but the Congress naturally reserved the right to approve the agreement.[103] Bankhead and Cyprey breathed easier but not for long. The news of this negotiation prompted immediate replies from Federalists who denounced the Texas

---

[100] F.O. 50 Vol. 185 No. 45, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, April 29, 1845," pp. 71-79.

[101] Ibid., p. 74.

[102] Ibid., p. 79.

[103] Daily Picayune, July 16, 1845, p. 2 and F.O. 50 Vol. 185 No. 48, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, May 20, 1845."

question and criticized the Herrera government for selling out to English gold. They tried to impress upon the people England's efforts in this matter were a cloak only for their ambitious plots.

Given this immediate response by Cuevas' opposition, Bankhead was again called in to discuss the problem, and again, both Bankhead and the French minister had to urge and persuade Cuevas to remain in office, because he wanted to resign as soon as he heard of the opposition. The Mexicans continued to delay negotiations while Cuevas received constant encouragement from Bankhead and Saligny.

The conditions set by the Texans were simple--recognition of their independence and further details to be negotiated or arbitrated.[104]

As soon as these proposals were known, Bankhead and Elliot called full speed ahead for negotiations. Mexico accepted, but with one reservation aimed at stopping the United States:

> It is understood that besides the four preliminary articles proposed by Texas, there are other essential and important points which are also to be included in the negotiations, and that if this negotiation is not realized on account of circumstances, or because Texas, influenced by the law passed in the United States on annexation, should consent thereto, either directly or indirectly, then the answer which under this date is given to Texas by the undersigned minister for foreign affairs shall be considered as null and void. (signed) Louis G. Cuevas.[105]

Captain Elliot became so involved in the proposal that in April of 1845 he secretly proceeded to Mexico with the plans for a Mexican-Texan negotiation. England approved of the diligent work that Elliot

---

[104]F.O. 50 Vol. 185 No. 48, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, May 20, 1845," pp. 107-114.

[105]Daily Picayune, July 16, 1845, p. 2.

carried on with regard to the problems of peace between the two, but Aberdeen and the Foreign Office did not approve of Elliot's secret mission to Mexico. Even Prime Minister Peel emphasized that this secrecy could give rise to erroneous notices and false interpretations of English motives and English intentions, especially on the part of the United States.[106] The policy of Great Britain, always, Aberdeen replied, was clear and open and never required concealment. England wanted Texas' independence and felt that Mexico would gain by it, but "there was no specific British interest apart from the general interest of peace and good will."[107] Elliot was reprimanded for his action and told that he jeopardized the entire negotiation.

Mexico finally agreed to recognize the independence of Texas, but it was too late. In June, 1845 Texas considered both annexation and the Mexican proposal, and on June 16, 1845 the Texans accepted annexation by the United States and rejected the Mexican proposal unanimously.[108]

Ready for the bad news, Cuevas reported that if Texas accepted annexation, the Mexican nation would immediately send 15,000 men to the Rio Bravo, and on the slightest pretext carry on war with Texas. These statements came even after Bankhead warned the Mexican ministers

---

[106] Aberdeen Papers, Vol. XXVII, 43065 "Correspondence with Sir Robert Peel," "Peel to Aberdeen, May 12, 1845," pp. 209-210.

[107] F.O. 50 Vol. 183 No. 10, "Aberdeen to Elliot, June 2, 1845," p. 10.

[108] Seymour Connor, Adventure in Glory (Austin, 1956), p. 234.

that "it is perfectly clear that the United States seeks but a very slight pretext to engage your country in a state of hostility.[109]

Texas, therefore, became part of the United States. The Texas Ninth Congress approved of a convention to meet in Austin on July 4, an appropriate date, and at that convention there would be a proper and public acceptance of annexation, plus the convention would draft a Constitution for the State of Texas.[110] On July 4 that convention met and adopted the ordinance of annexation at their very first meeting, and for two months wrote a Constitution for Texas.

Later in 1845 the annexation ordinance was submitted to a popular vote; however, the outcome was certain, and the turnout at the polls was light. Four thousand two hundred and fifty-four people voted for annexation; 297 opposed it; while 4,174 voted for the new Texas State Constitution and 312 voted against it. The constitution was immediately forwarded to President Polk and on December 29, 1845, Texas became the 30th state in the Union.

For the Mexicans, the worst had happened, and worse was yet to come. England had used every means available short of direct involvement. But, they were unwilling to lay anything else on the line. The Americans were and so were the Mexicans. The moderation urged by England failed to stop the war. But, America's move was precipated because of her fear of English involvement. Was that fear justified or was it a myth?

---

[109]F.O. 50 Vol. 185 No. 70, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, June 29, 1945," p. 249.

[110]Connor, Adventure in Glory, p. 235.

CHAPTER V

AMERICA SEES BRITAIN AS IMMODERATE AND MEDDLING AND THE SHOWDOWN

For three years England tried to persuade Mexico that the best policy for her was an immediate recognition of the independence of Texas. That independence vanished in June, 1845, when Texas accepted the United States' treaty of annexation. In the United States, annexation was necessary because several prominent Americans were afraid that England would gain a foothold in Texas. Andrew Jackson, Lewis Cass, James K. Polk, John Tyler, and John C. Calhoun are some of the leading politicians who were concerned about English motives and actions in Mexico and Texas. Representative C. J. Ingersoll, Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Relations, said that, "English and French meddling in Central and South America is so extensive that those European masters seem to consider America their possession, to be regulated as they deal with Portugal, Belgium, and Turkey . . . ."[1]

Annexation, however, was not a new topic and as early as 1836, Texas in a popular vote sought to be a part of the United States. It was proposed to the United States Congress in 1837, but it was blocked from further discussion by a filibuster by John Quincy Adams.

---

[1] F.O. 5 (America) Vol. 407 No. 87 "Pakenham to Aberdeen, July 25, 1844," p. 81.

President Houston, upset with politics in the United States, withdrew the offer, and a Texas Congress ratified his action in 1839.[2] Therefore, there was no further discussion of annexation until President Tyler in 1843 brought the matter up again for consideration.

Tyler after Harrison's death cautiously approached the question of annexation. He realized that his Secretary of State Daniel Webster was against annexation, and he did not want to hurt Webster's chances for a successful treaty with England over the Maine boundary. Once the Webster-Ashburton treaty was ratified, Tyler decided to press for the annexation of Texas. Webster unable to work in that atmosphere resigned in 1843, and left the door open for Tyler's new Secretary Abel P. Upshur to begin serious discussions of annexation.[3]

As a result, Secretary of State A. P. Upshur conferred with Isaac Van Zandt, the Texas minister in Washington, and gave him a letter which called for the annexation of Texas.[4] By 1843, Tyler believed that the United States would accept the measure and that both branches of Congress would agree to a treaty of annexation if it was drawn up and presented in proper form.[5]

The United States was afraid of English influence in Mexico and throughout the period rumors erupted that England had ulterior motives

---

[2]Joseph Schmitz, Texan Statecraft, p. 62.

[3]See Allan L. Benson, Daniel Webster (New York, 1929), pp. 238-239 and Claude M. Fuess, Daniel Webster, 11 vols. Vol. 11, pp. 91-129, and Daniel Webster (New York, 1902), pp. 255-283.

[4]Smith, Annexation of Texas, p. 147, and "Upshur to Van Zandt, October, 1843," in Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, p. 888.

[5]Smith, Annexation of Texas, p. 147.

in Texas. However, Aberdeen outlined as early as December, 1843, the English position in Texas and Mexico.[6] He advocated peace, but the diplomatic activity of the British ministers in Mexico and Texas convinced many that England was secretly supporting Texas.

President Polk, after his election, also referred to problems in Texas and Mexico which were instigated and caused by European intrigues. He never mentioned England, but the English ministers in Washington and Mexico were unanimous in their feeling that Polk was referring to England. In Polk's inaugural address he said, "They [the United States and Texas] are independent powers, competent to contract, and foreign nations have no right to interfere with them, or to take exceptions to their reunion."[7] That Polk was referring to England was obvious, and Pakenham took exception to the speech.

United States citizens in Mexico who witnessed the activity of Charles Bankhead and the French minister, Baron de Cyprey, were convinced that England desired more than just a peaceful reconciliation between the two republics. They were concerned because of Bankhead's constant involvement in Mexican politics. Many reported that the Mexican Foreign Minister spent many hours in private consultations with Charles Bankhead.

Charles Bankhead conferred with the Mexican government on a routine basis but in his reports he emphasized that he never

---

[6]F.O. 5 (America) Vol. 390 No. 9, "Aberdeen to Pakenham , December 26, 1843," p. 138, and Aberdeen Papers, Vol. XXVII, 43063 - "Aberdeen to Peel, December 9, 1843," p. 111.

[7]U. S. Congress, Congressional Globe, 28th Cong. 2nd Sess. Vol. XIV, "President Polk's Inaugural Address," p. 399. Also London Times, January 8, 1845, p. 6.

compromised his position and never offered direct assistance to the Mexican nation. His urgent appeal was for the recognition of Texas by Mexico.

Many thought England would come to the direct aid of Mexico in any struggle with the United States. The Picayune was the most concerned newspaper, and any English involvement was construed as direct assistance and given front page coverage.[8] Several other papers, in Richmond, Atlanta, and Philadelphia were instrumental in publicizing English activity in Mexico and Texas. Others warned the Mexicans that England was stringing them along until they were able to gain a foothold in the Northwestern boundary dispute.[9] Many American citizens monitored England's involvement in North and South America, and were concerned because English commercial interests in South America, particularly Mexico, were quite extensive. Joel Poinsett after he arrived in Mexico in 1826, was astounded, and probably jealous, when he discovered that H. G. Ward, the British minister, had already negotiated a commercial treaty. Waddy Thompson later reported that England engaged an annual trade of fifteen to twenty million dollars. Added to this the British interests in Mexican mining valued at $50,000,000 and also the purchase of Mexican bonds far surpassed the rest of the world in commercial investments in Mexico.

England not only maintained a lucrative trade in the area, she also enjoyed the favor of most Mexican politicians and was received warmly by most Mexican citizens. When Mexico needed assistance, she

---

[8] Daily Picayune, March 27, 1845.

[9] Daily Picayune, March 28, 1845, p. 2.

usually turned to the British Minister.

The English influence dated back to the early days of independence when George Canning went out of his way to assist the newly emerging countries of South America. Canning, in the eyes of Latin Americans, was the single most important individual in recognizing the Latin countries. As a result, Mexican politicians turned to the British ministers.[10] Richard Pakenham was instrumental in settling the dispute with France in 1839, and the settlement of French claims. When Texas separated from the Mexicans England offered her advice, and even went so far as to seek a joint agreement with France to insure Mexican tranquillity.

This involvement and influence in Mexico, coupled with the Americans' natural distrust of English activity, led to many rumors about English desires and designs on the North American continent. When Texas was finally annexed to the Union and Mexico reacted with a call to arms, it was only natural for those who already suspected England to surmise that England would come to the aid of Mexico in any war with the United States.

Aberdeen and later Palmerston, who returned to the Foreign Office in 1846, steadfastly adhered to a policy of neutrality and only offered her good counsel to Mexico during the period 1840-1848. Why did the United States suspect England of aid? Where and how did all of these stories originate?

In analyzing this problem, one must reassess, and re-examine the English position prior to annexation. England steadfastly supported

---

[10]Richardson, Texas The Lone Star State, p. 26.

Texan independence. As a result, England adopted a policy which she believed would guarantee that independence. England sought Mexican recognition of Texas, but many politicians in the United States were afraid that England had ulterior motives. President Tyler, after receiving information from the United States' minister in London, Edward Everett, that Great Britain had designs on Texas, decided to present a treaty to Congress for the annexation of Texas. This treaty, although many favored annexation, was written because the United States was afraid of English designs in Mexico and Texas.

After Webster resigned Upshur discussed annexation with the Texan minister, Van Zandt. Upshur was stymied however, because Texas wanted the United States to send more troops into Texas during the negotiations in order to prevent a Mexican attack. Upshur hesitated and it was not until his untimely death as a result of a cannon explosion aboard the U.S.S. Princeton and the appointment of John C. Calhoun as Secretary of State, that the formation of a treaty became a reality.

James Pinckney Henderson and John C. Calhoun drew up the treaty, but in June, 1844, the United States Senate rejected the treaty by a vote of 35 to 16, more than two-thirds against.[11] Even though the treaty was not ratified, it did begin the discussion of the merits and demerits of annexation and, above all, the extent of British influence on the American continent.

Several prominent Americans believed that annexation was necessary because of British interest in the area. Andrew Jackson argued that

---

[11]U. S. Congress, Congressional Globe, 28th Cong. 1st Sess. Vol. XIII, p. 698, June 8, 1844.

militarily, Texas was very important to the United States.[12] Great Britain already had treaties with Texas and he believed that Great Britain never made a move that would not have some military advantage. Militarily, according to Jackson, important to Great Britain because she could enter into an alliance with Texas, send approximately 20,000 to 30,000 troops into Texas, declare war over the northwestern boundary dispute, control the entire Mississippi Valley, incite the slaves, and capture New Orleans. Meanwhile, she could move into Canada, and with the cooperation of the Texan army, spread "ruin and havoc from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico."

Another prominent politician, Lewis Cass, believed that Mexico had given up Texas, and annexation was necessary, not only because of its contiguity to the United States but also from a military point of view.[13] If Texas was taken by a European enemy, the whole southwestern border of the United States would be laid open to the depredations on the part of an enemy. English involvement in the area was the main reason for Cass supporting annexation.

On a trip to England he read an article in Frazer's Magazine which called for war against the United States.[14] A war that could be won, by organizing and training, with the aid of British troops and an army of runaway slaves in the West Indies. Once this force was organized, it would be landed on the southern coast of the United States. These

---

[12] Daily Picayune, March 29, p. 3.

[13] Ibid.

[14] London Times, October 23, 1844, p. 4. Cass at that time was United States minister to France and he kept in constant touch with the French and their feelings toward annexation.

black soldiers would carry on operations, gain the support of black slaves in the South, and the result would be total chaos in the United States and a complete collapse of the southern states in the Union.

If Texas were independent or under England's thumb, it would fit beautifully into this picture, because it could become the depot for border raids and army excursions into the Southern states, and the entire war could be rationalized by British officials as one of "philanthropic enterprise," and the complete emancipation of slavery in the United States.

President Tyler also played on the fear of English involvement and in a message to the House May 16, 1844, he reiterated Jackson's plea "that the present golden moment to obtain Texas must not be lost, or Texas might from necessity be thrown into the arms of England and be forever lost to the United States."[15] Tyler also was upset after the Senate rejected the treaty and in another message to the House on June 11, 1844, in which he called for prompt action because he was assured from letters of Edward Everett that instructions were already sent by the Texas government to enter into a treaty both offensive and defensive with Great Britain.[16]

English reaction to the stories was prompt and to the point. Aberdeen, as stated earlier, instructed Pakenham to explicitly point out that England had no desire to control Mexico or Texas. The Foreign Office refrained from refuting most of the stories, because they

---

[15] Messages and Papers of the Presidents, Vol. V, p. 2172.

[16] U. S. Congress, Congressional Globe, 28th Cong. 1st Sess. Vol. XIII, p. 709.

considered them preposterous. Nevertheless English journalists accepted the challenge and the London Times, after reading Jackson's reasons for annexation, considered them absurd, and emphatically stated that if a war came with the United States, there would be no reason to attack the uncivilized areas of Texas and Oregon.[17]

To think that Texas and Oregon would become the principal military stations was ridiculous according to the London Times. There were far greater advantages in England's hands--command of the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence Seaway, Halifax, Bermuda, most of the West Indian Islands, and above all, the terrific war cry of Negro emancipation, also the London Times pointed out that the whole coast of the United States is defenseless, and to argue that the annexation of Texas would insure America's independence is beyond reason. Finally the editorial emphasized that the project of annexation took its origin in the electioneering intrigues of President Tyler's party rather than in any serious apprehensions of foreign influence.[18]

The concern for English activity was also enhanced during the Calhoun-Henderson negotiations in Washington. Henderson emphasized in his discussions with Calhoun that if the United States Senate failed to support the treaty he was under instructions to set sail for England to sign a treaty which would for all practical purposes, place Texas in the British empire. Henderson further argued that Texas no longer could preserve itself as an independent nation and if the United States refused, he would have to turn to England.

---

[17] London Times, October 23, 1844, p. 4.

[18] Ibid.

Indeed, Texas faced many political and economic problems during her ten-year period as an independent nation. Jackson agreed with Henderson and argued that Texas would be driven into the hands of a foreign power if annexation failed.[19] Many politicians, as evidenced by the Senate vote, were not in favor of the treaty. The North-South split in Congress prevented full support, along with the concern by many that annexation would lead to a war with Mexico, and probably a foreign power.

Henry Clay said it best in a speech to the Senate:

> . . . that I consider the annexation of Texas at this time without the consent of Mexico as a measure compromising the national character and involving us certainly in a war with Mexico, and probably with other foreign powers, dangerous to the integrity of the Union, inexpedient in the present financial condition of the country, and not called for by any general expression of public opinion.[20]

The treaty failed, but the important concern and discussion over European interference in Texas, primarily England, set the stage for further discussion of Texas' annexation and also set the stage for inevitable war between the United States and Mexico.

The Daily Picayune, the New Orleans paper, throughout 1844 and 1845, mentioned the possibility of English aid to Mexico in a war with the United States. In July, 1844, the correspondent from the New York Journal of Commerce reported that he had traveled with an English gentleman from New Orleans, who had lived in Texas for five years. He discovered that the Englishman was a personal friend of Captain Elliot,

---

[19] Daily Picayune, April 2, 1844, p. 2.

[20] Daily Picayune, May 5, 1844, p. 3.

the British chargé d' affaires.[21] During their conversations the Englishman unwittingly revealed a piece of British diplomacy. According to his account, the Foreign Office advised Mexico that under no circumstances were they to acknowledge the independence of Texas.[22] They were to maintain an armistice with her as long as possible, but if annexation became a reality, Mexico was to go to war, and England would back her in the conflict.[23]

News stories such as this reinforced the idea that England was planning a move in Mexico and Texas. When Santa Anna returned to power, and began active hostilities along the border it was believed that he was receiving support from England. The Richmond Enquirer, in September, 1844, reported that an agency in England financially supported Santa Anna with a loan of $4,000,000 and supplies of arms and ammunition.[24]

In December, 1844, the American press reported that a strong move was afoot to give Santa Anna absolute power in Mexico. More alarming was the belief that Bankhead was heading up the move. According to the report, Bankhead even instructed English merchants not to pay any duties to the opponent of Santa Anna during the revolution of 1844, and if they paid taxes to Santa Anna's enemies, Bankhead could not adopt any measures to compel a repayment on the part of these agencies.[25]

---

[21] New York Journal of Commerce, July 15, 1844, p. 2.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Richmond Enquirer, September 13, 1844, found in Daily Picayune, September 21, 1844, p. 2.

[25] Daily Picayune, December 4, 1844, p. 2.

The story went on to say that people interested in manufacturing in Mexico made a proposal to Santa Anna and agreed to pay him $3,000,000 as an indemnity for abolishing the protective tariff. If the protective tariff was abolished, a loan of $12,000,000 would be negotiated in London and guaranteed by the British government.[26]

The problem in analyzing this story and many others like it, was the fact that there usually was an element of truth in them. Bankhead did instruct British merchants not to pay tariffs levied by insurgent groups. It had been the pattern in revolutions, and Mexico had more than her share, for the rebels to occupy a port city, collect the tariffs, and finance their revolt. If the foreign element paid the tariff, the government in power would charge their government for aiding a rebel cause. Rather than being implicated in such a charge, Bankhead tried to alleviate it before it happened.

Bankhead also believed that despite all of his faults, Santa Anna was the most capable leader in Mexico and he respected the Mexican leader. This respect was construed as aid to Mexico when Bankhead issued statements complimentary to Santa Anna.

Likewise, the Mexican government was always seeking financial assistance in Europe and these loans were with private investors and not the European governments. Also, Bankhead may have encouraged lower tariffs but that was his job as most foreign representatives worked to enhance the trade of their respective countries.[27] In The Philadelphia

---

[26]Daily Picayune, December 4, 1844, p. 2.

[27]F.O. 50 Vol. 175 No. 96, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, November 12, 1844," p. 3.

Ledger, Robert J. Walker, a Senator from Mississippi, and forthcoming Secretary of the Treasury in Polk's administration, added to the problem of assessing English activity in Mexico and Texas when he reported that:

> Captain Elliot was instructed by his government to propose and guarantee that independence of Texas from Mexico and more important he was to tell Texas that Her Majesty's government would appropriate 100,000 pounds, or $500,000 per year for ten years to defray the current expenses of government, and also make $5,000,000 available provided that Texas would abandon her annexation proposal with the United States and enter into a commercial treaty with the British government admitting goods free of duty and agreeing to a charge of 20 per cent ad valorem on goods from all other countries.[28]

The Daily Picayune, in December, 1844, criticized the English for their involvement in Texan politics and told them to mind their own business.[29] After learning of the election of "Mr. Annexation Polk" the Times stated that Polk expected to take Texas and Oregon. The Times agreed that in neither of these "should the United States expect this country [England] to acquiesce." The annexation of Texas would involve a disturbance of the settled regions of the American continent, in which all chief European powers would be more or less interested.[30]

Yet, "Mr. Annexation Polk" continued on in a headlong adoption of both the Texas annexation and probably some attempt to take all of Oregon. These questions certainly were in the minds of most American politicians and they were pushed to a point "that demands the most

---

[28] Daily Picayune, December 11, 1844, p. 1.

[29] Ibid., December 27, 1844, p. 2.

[30] London Times, January 31, 1845, p. 4.

serious attention to them by England.[31] The London Times went so far as to tell the United States to abide by their Constitution.

The treaty-making power, England reminded the United States, required the assent of Texas, and the Constitution required that two-thirds of the Senate concur, so any attempt to carry such a measure through by just a bare majority in both houses, which is sufficient to sanction just ordinary laws would violate one of the most important principles of the United States' Constitution.[32]

Since England was strongly against the annexation of Texas by the United States it is not surprising that she immedately contacted France in hopes of jointly stopping annexation before Texas accepted it officially. Her ministers in Mexico finally convinced the Mexicans of the importance of an independent Texas, while her minister in Texas, Charles Elliot persuaded President Anson Jones to refrain from calling Congress to accept or reject the annexation treaty until after Mexico presented her proposal for Texan recognition and a mutual settlement of the boundary dispute.[33]

To the Americans this was interference, and it precipitated a wide-spread belief throughout the United States that England was secretly ready to support Mexico in a war with the United States. After annexation Englishmen in Mexico City accused the United States of aggression, because the United States took advantage of the

---

[31] London Times, January 31, 1845, p. 4.

[32] Ibid., March 22, 1845, p. 4.

[33] F.O. 75 (Texas) Vol. 13 No. 3, "Secret, Elliot to Aberdeen, April 2, 1845," pp. 112-135. Also see Peel Papers, Vol. CCCXXXV, 40 515 "General Correspondence, Peel to Aberdeen, May 12, 1845," pp. 209-210. Peel criticizes Elliot's action in this dispatch.

of the impoverished condition of Mexican politics and satisfied their insatiable demand for territory.[34]

Several British newspaper men traveled to Mexico and most were concerned over the California question, but they failed to stimulate any policy statement from the Foreign Office. They believed that England could not remain indifferent, and had to interfere or be prepared to see the mining districts of California under American rule.

Many American citizens and settlers were moving into Upper California, and once Texas was annexed, it appeared that California would be next. That action had to be prevented because the Bay at San Francisco was one of the finest in the world, and under United States authority it could jeopardize English shipping on the Pacific.[35]

Not only were some of the British concerned over California but the United States demand for the Rio Grande as the boundary was insidious. In the treaty of 1819 with Spain the Nueces River was the border, and throughout Texan history it was the border that separated Texas from Mexico. If the United States succeeded it would not be long before the United States took all of Santa Fe, parts of Chihuahua, and even parts of Tamauplias.[36] The United States was moving westward with a new mode of conquest.[37] England was being duped, according to the London Times, and in order to protect British shipping interest

---

[34] London Times, September 9, 1845, p. 6. These stories were precipitated by strong anti-American feelings, and also jealous merchants who feared a loss of trade.

[35] London Times, April 1, 1845, p. 6.

[36] Ibid.

[37] E. D. Adams, English Interests in Texas, p. 136.

England should purchase parts of California.

When the Americans and Texans joined, the Mexicans began to get ready for war. Some Englishmen believed that the war, if it came, would not be a war of the United States but of a party in the United States, which barely possessed a majority, and identified itself with everything that was most odious to a large and enlightened minority in the best states of the Union.[38] The dissatisfaction of the states of New England or New York or of Ohio in having to meet the calls of a war for what they considered an atrocious aggression on a neighboring territory and for, above all, the encouragement of slavery, which they had long since expelled from their own soil, would hurt them militarily.[39]

Also, the military establishment in the United States was well adapted to the objects set up and contemplated by its founders. A militia animated by patriotic unanimity, might be able to repel a foreign enemy if they were to invade the United States, but as England knew, an offensive and a defensive war were two different things.[40]

Charles Elliot contributed to the Mexican cause by analyzing the American army: "They [American Army] could not resist artillery and cavalry in a country suited to those arms, they are not amenable to discipline, they plunder the peasantry, they are without steadiness

---

[38] London Times, April 15, 1845, p. 6.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Smith, War With Mexico I, pp. 102-116.

under reverses, they cannot march on foot." The weekly Britannia said about the situation "America, as an aggressive power, is one of the weakest in the world . . . fit for nothing but to fight Indians."[41]

In the United States the regular army in 1842 amounted to 9,012 men. They were employed in garrisons along the coast and in that respect they had to remain there, but could 9,000 men undertake field operations? Even if they took an army to Texas they would need at least 20,000 to 25,000 men. A force that large could be raised from the population of southern states, but only be equipped and maintained at the cost of the whole Union. How could the United States bear the burden of this cause? How could they extract loans from the capitalists of Europe? Or even new taxes to meet the war expenditures? Any invasion and any conquest of a vast region by a state which was without an army, without credit, was really, according to the English press, a novelty in the history of nations.[42]

It was true that the United States several times brought men together in Indian war, but it was an immense task to support the operations of a regular war. The English went on to say that Mexico would be completely united in repelling the attack. Strange as it might appear according to English correspondents, the war would be exceedingly popular in Mexico. The Mexican people would rise up en masse, and with just ordinary ability on the part of the generals they would be able to present a formidable resistance to any American

---

[41]Both found in Smith, War With Mexico I, p. 105.

[42]Ibid., p. 109.

force, which could, if possible, enter the country.[43]

The Mexicans were not only impressed by feelings in England, they were also swayed by Texans who were convinced that annexation to the United States was not an open and shut case. Americans who went to Texas did not convert Texans into Americans. They were still Texans at heart and proud of it. "What," argued many Texans, "were the advantages of annexing it to the Union? They offer to take all we are worth except our debt. They promise a high tariff, but all duties levied by custom houses will go to Washington, D.C."[44]

Many pointed out that they came to Texas in the first place to get rid of and replace all of the restrictions that existed in the American Union, and their hope was to speculate on the future prosperity of the Texas Republic. Even if the majority of American settlers who went to Texas for the purpose of seizing that territory and annexing it to the United States, those settlers will have no scruples in betraying the one any more than the other. Englishmen therefore, hoped that the Texans would be guided by their own immediate interests rather than by any political consideration.

As the British saw it, the United States might be annexing Texas as an ally but also the United States might be conveniently avoiding a rivalry with Texas as another independent country. The latter was the view of Jackson when he was President.[45] If Texas remained independent,

---

[43] London Times, April 18, 1845, p. 2.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, Vol. V, p. 2172.

and if a treaty was established between Mexico and Texas, with or without the mediation or guarantee of European powers, the only means left for American annexation would be direct force which would be open violation of international rights. Texas, according to the London Times, should be an independent nation, and Texas felt that England should take a proper perspective and a proper view of what is going on. England needed to maintain some influence within the area.

American propaganda, however, attacked the French and English for their move to block annexation. The Daily Picayune said that this was just like a declaration of war.[46] It particularly was against Elliot's trip to Mexico.

On the other hand, English attempts to block annexation and English newspaper accounts which displayed a sharp anti-American feeling prompted many Mexicans to assume that if the government declared war, and attacked Texas, England, France, and Spain would immediately rush to their aid, quite possibly they would send troops, and the Mexican Cabinet could be gratified and have the simple task of sitting back and writing manifestos and issuing proclamations.[47] They emphasized that England already displayed an immense interest in Texas and if it should be of any advantage to England to have a war with the United States, Mexico would declare war and England would follow immediately.[48]

---

[46]Daily Picayune, October 22, 1844. The Elliot trip to Mexico was attacked vociferously by Tyler and Polk.

[47]La Reforma, January 31, 1845, p. 2 and El Tiempo, March 26, 1845.

[48]Smith, War With Mexico I, p. 116.

Some Americans believed that Mexico was bound to England and in the hands of the English businessmen.[49] War revenues of silver and gold would be sifted by English agents so that a portion could be set aside for the claims of British merchants. The same American source alleged that the revenues of Mexican customhouses were controlled by British agents and

> . . . the Mexicans are not free from the inspection and control of Great Britain, and when it shall suit the purpose of this haughty power to exact the penalty of her bond, the exhaustless wealth of the mines in Mexico, the broad and fertile acres of California and its invaluable harbors, will fall an easy prey to British rapacity, should there be more to interpose.[50]

Many were concerned that England had her eye on California because of its ports on the Pacific to protect her navy and merchant ships. England possibly wanted to connect the Atlantic and the Pacific, which could be done through Tehuantepec, the narrow waistband of Mexico.

Santa Anna wanted a canal in Tehuantepec but the difficulties with Yucatan prevented any concrete discussions. Concern was expressed by the editor of the Daily Picayune in December, 1845, over the sale by Señor Garay of his right to build a canal to British capitalists. The sale price was $50,000. The English, it was reported, already had $25,000,000 on hand for the construction of a canal. If a canal was built many in the United States were afraid that it would be detrimental to trade. The canal question became a major diplomatic problem for England and the United States and this was finally solved in 1850 when

---

[49] Daily Picayune, September 27, 1845, p. 2.

[50] Ibid.

the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was signed, pledging both not to have exclusive control, fortification or territorial dominion over any trans-isthmian canal in Central America.

The Philadelphia Ledger reported that Great Britain was the greatest enemy of the United States, and Mexico as an independent nation, should not be a mere back parlor for British designs against United States commerce, manufacturing, and political system. Mexico had become a fulcrum upon which the English could place their levers for raising havoc with the United States. Hence, it must be annihilated as an independent power. The Mexican nation was in a state of anarchy, and California, upper and lower, were orphans in the Mexican nation, they were ready to jump to the British constitution for asylum. "How far would the United States go?"[51]

The problem for many in the United States was, if England worked as diligently and hard to prevent the annexation of Texas to the United States, would England aid the Mexican nation in any struggle or war with the United States? Many were sure that England would do so. American politicians believed that England set her desires and designs on California and Oregon. It is true that many of these stories were magnified out of proportion in newspapers on both sides of the Atlantic. The London Times considered annexation as an overt act on the part of the United States to oppress an independent power, while newspapers in the United States considered any English assistance as direct interference and a threat to the peace and tranquillity of the United States.

---

[51]Reported in London Times, April 26, 1845, p. 6.

Many Mexicans realized that in a conflict with the United States California could be lost. What to do with California occupied the minds of most Mexican politicians. Some agreed with their Ministers in Madrid, and wanted to sell it immediately to England, while others felt a strong army could be established in the area. Bankhead was asked to aid their cause, but he only agreed to allow an English ship to carry $100,000 for the Mexican officials in California. Otherwise he remained a silent listener. Mexico did not offer to sell California to England in 1845 but they did listen to a plan suggested by Erwin C. Mackintosh, the British consul in Vera Cruz, and later Monterrey.

Mackintosh offered Mexico $10,000,000 for the commercial colonization of the California province.[52] In return Mexico would agree that all imports and exports to both upper and lower California would be free of duty for twenty years. Mexico would also give up her right to lands, mines, fishing privileges, and the navigation of all rivers. In other words, Mexico would give up California for twenty years. All civil and military personnel would be paid by the colonizers. An army of 2,000 men could be established and these men would be paid by the various commercial interests in the area.[53]

During that 20 year period he estimated that 500,000 European colonists would emigrate to California and after 20 years the land would be given back to the Mexicans.[54] The plan, according to Bankhead,

---

[52]F.O. 50 Vol. 186 No. 74, "Confidential - Bankhead to Aberdeen, July 30, 1845," pp. 28-30.

[53]Ibid.

[64]Ibid.

had many merits because it brought into the Mexican treasury a sizable amount of money, money that was a necessity in the disorganized state of Mexican finances, and above all, it freed Mexico from any worries with regard to the protection and control of an area that would attract thousands of American settlers and create another problem like Texas.[55]

Although the plan never materialized it did cause alarm in the United States. California remained a problem throughout the period, because English merchants interested in protecting their trade lobbied for control of the California ports, while Aberdeen and Peel remained unresponsive to the call for the purchase of California.

Aberdeen was still concerned over the Mexicans who favored going to war, and he instructed Bankhead to suggest that Mexico refrain from any attack until the Texan convention acted. Both men realized that the emotional appeal for war could destroy the Mexican system.[56] Congress, however, agreed to support a large army, and passed laws to finance the war, while Cuevas, the Mexican Secretary of State was instructed to ask for English assistance. Bankhead did not reply and forwarded the request to Aberdeen. However, Bankhead did advise the Mexicans to harass the enemy, and not to meet them in open battle. This suggestion, although it was a small one, could have added to the overall feeling of expectation in Mexico for some English assistance.[57]

---

[55] Aberdeen Papers, Vol. XXVII, 43065, "Aberdeen to Peel, October 3, 1845," p. 7.

[56] F.O. 50 Vol. 186 No. 78, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, July 30, 1845," p. 80.

[57] Ibid., p. 84.

He emphasized that throughout the early part of July he was particularly careful because Cuevas was looking for the slightest hope of assistance from the English people.[58]

Meanwhile in Mexican politics President Herrera who was formerly elected President in January, 1845 and a new ministry was formed with the appointment of Señor Manuel de la Peña y Peña.[59] Herrera remained in office for one year and during that year Charles Bankhead met with the President (Herrera) and Peña y Peña and discussed a possible settlement with the United States and accepted the latter's proposal to negotiate a peace.[60]

The Mexicans thus sought to reach some accommodation with the Americans and wanted the British to use their good offices.

Peña y Peña asked Bankhead to write, unofficially, to Pakenham about the American agent being sent to Mexico. Peña y Peña confided that Mexico could not prosper as a nation until they made peace with the United States. He suggested that $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 be paid to Mexico for the unprofitable and nominal sovereignty of Texas.[61]

---

[58]F.O. 50 Vol. 186 No. 78, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, July 3o, 1845," p. 80.

[59]Ibid., No. 84, pp. 110-112.

[60]For further information on Bankhead's interviews with Peña y Peña, and the Mexican desire to negotiate a peace with the United States, see F.O. 50 Vol. 187 No. 101, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, October 18, 1845," p. 7; F.O. 50 Vol. 187 No. 104, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, October 30, 1845," pp. 94-98; F.O. 50 Vol. 187 No. 113, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, November 29, 1845," pp. 201-218 and Aberdeen Papers, Vol. XXVIII 43065, "Peel to Aberdeen, November 14, 1845," pp. 101-104.

[61]F.O. 50 Vol. 187 No. 113, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, November 29, 1845," pp. 201-218.

Bankhead's discussions with Peña y Peña bothered many American politicians and in a note to Peña y Peña the American consul stated that "they believed the exercise of foreign influence in the Mexican-Texan problem stymied any attempt at agreement between the two."[62] The foreign influence obviously was England.

Peña y Peña and Bankhead met several times and the Mexicans finally asked if England would support Mexico in a fight for her territory.[63] Peña y Peña already knew the answer to that question but he needed an official response, because many groups in Mexico and in Congress believed that their differences with the United States could be settled in battle, since Great Britain, France, and Spain were ready if asked to aid the Mexican cause.[64] Peña y Peña wanted to show Congress that these ideas were only illusions, and the Mexicans had to seek the best terms possible with the United States. He realized that England, France, and Spain could not answer or justify the hopes of the opposition party. With an open statement from England that they would not aid the Mexican cause, his hand would be strengthened, and there would be a need to bring about a reconciliation between Mexico and the United States.

Bankhead told Peña y Peña that he was correct, and that Great Britain could not actively aid the Mexican cause.[65] He reiterated the

---

[62]F.O. 50 Vol. 187 No. 113, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, November 29, 1845," pp. 201-218.

[63]Ibid.

[64]Ibid.

[65]Ibid., p. 210.

fact that the British were interested in the prosperity of Mexico, and that Britain would use all of the most friendly efforts she could and on every proper occasion to promote that end. Bankhead, however, was reluctant to state this in an official communique because it would strengthen the hand of the United States, and they would realize that all they had to fear was Mexico itself.[66] England did not want to aid the Mexican cause but at the same time they did not want to open the door to United States aggression.

Bankhead warned the Mexicans that the election of 1844 in the United States solved the Texas question, and unless Mexico did something in California, that problem would be solved in the election of 1848.[67] Peña y Peña therefore had to go it alone. He wanted to settle the problem with the United States, but he could not get English aid because Aberdeen did not want to recognize annexation. On the other hand, he could not get unified support from Mexican politicians in Congress because they believed England would aid them in a war with the United States. Herrera's government was in trouble.

They faced the inevitable situation of war or peace with the United States, but could not receive any assistance either domestically or from a foreign power to carry out either plan. Domestically opposition developed under Generals Paredes, Tornel, and Valencia. They called for a new government due to the apathetic situation under Herrera. It was also rumored that if these three led a revolt

---

[66]F.O. 50 Vol. 187 No. 117, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, November 29, 1845," p. 226, and W. D. Jones, Lord Aberdeen and the Americas, p. 38.

[67]Ibid.

Santa Anna would return in less than six months.[68] Just as these generals began their revolts, reports drifted into Mexico City that United States forces were building bridges to begin a march on Matamoros.

General Paredes, who was at Matamoras, sent messages to Mexico City which called for supplies, and money to defend against any attack. Peña y Peña read Paredes' reports to Congress and money was appropriated, but the news of the United States advance was not true. Paredes had invented the threat of the United States attack in order to gain money from Congress for his revolution, and as a result he was financed by the government he was going to overthrow.[69]

Paredes announced his Pronunciamento in November at San Luis Potosí, and set up an executive council or junta of five generals for the purpose of administering the government.[70] The executive council would rule until a convention could meet to establish a more popular and reasonable government. In December, 1845, Paredes advanced on Mexico City, and published his governmental manifesto. It was well written and showed a deep understanding of Mexican problems and Mexican government. Within the manifesto he chastised the Herrera government for its inactivity.

The major problem according to Paredes was the lack of prosperity, in Mexican business and economic life. Paredes supported centralism

---

[68] Calcott, Santa Anna, p. 228.

[69] Smith, War With Mexico I, pp. 54-56.

[70] Ibid.

even if it meant the establishment of a royal family. Rumors persisted in Mexico throughout the 1840's but they surfaced under Paredes that a monarchy should be set up. Bankhead and Pakenham were in agreement that a strong central government was necessary, even if that government called for a royal official. "A monarchy," Bankhead was quoted as saying, "would be the most efficacious check that could be opposed to the encroachment of the United States."[71] The monarchial question remained a viable alternative to anarchy. Paredes had the support of the clergy and some of the influential members of the Mexican citizenry especially the upper classes who had the money to support a revolution and to support a new government.

During the revolution, Bankhead had the opportunity by accident to discuss Mexican problems with Paredes' compatriots Tornel and Valencia.[72] They came to Bankhead's house on December 30 to avoid being arrested by the Herrera government. During the night, Bankhead discussed Mexican plans with Tornel, who was not a politician, but was the most accomplished military talent in Mexico with the possible exception of Santa Anna. Tornel, upset with Herrera's government wanted to reconquer Texas.[73] He also believed that if the elite corps of the Mexican troops were sent into Texas they could defeat any United States force that could be brought against them, and a combined interference might take place for the purpose of establishing a frontier

---

[71] Daily Picayune, December 30, 1845, and September 23, 1845, also London Times, October 22, 1845.

[72] F.O. 50 Vol. 187 No. 125 "Confidential--Bankhead to Aberdeen, December 30, 1845," pp. 303-309.

[73] Ibid., p. 307.

to shelter Mexico from further encroachments.

Bankhead expressed his belief that the army did not have a chance of defeating the United States forces. He argued that Peña y Peña was pursuing the only position possible in the affairs between Mexico and the United States. Bankhead also considered it "lamentable" if a new government adopted a plan to reconquer Texas.[74]

During their discussion Tornel said that the Mexican people were pinning their hopes on Great Britain and even France to help them stop America.[75]

Bankhead refrained from making any comment on the expediency of European interference in the affairs of Mexico, or on the probable disposition of Great Britain to accede to the wishes of the Mexican government and people. Bankhead replied that Her Majesty's government could offer her good offices. Bankhead also believed that if the Mexicans expected aid they would not treat any United States proposal with great disrespect, knowing that their ally would not get them out of any trouble "their own absurdity might lead them."[76] Bankhead, therefore, remained quiet, since Tornel could become a member of Paredes' government and any promise made on his part would be taken seriously by the Paredes' government. It was during this revolt that John Slidell arrived in Mexico and sent his credentials to the Secretary of State Peña y Peña.

---

[74]F.O. 50 Vol. 187 No. 125, "Confidential--Bankhead to Aberdeen, December 30, 1845," p. 308.

[75]Ibid.

[76]Ibid., p. 309.

Slidell's mission received a great deal of publisity. President Polk as soon as he heard of Herrera's interest in discussing peace, promptly nominated Slidell as minister. The Mexicans were willing to accept a commissioner but not a minister. If Slidell was accepted as a minister Herrera would have admitted that nothing was wrong and he was reopening diplomatic intercourse. Herrera wanted to negotiate, but if he failed to champion Mexican national honor, the Paredes' government would have been assured of success.

Paredes took control of the government and Slidell returned to Vera Cruz to await further orders. Once Paredes was in command Slidell's mission was doomed. Negotiation failed, and Mexico faced the challenge of war. The means of peace were exhausted and Mexico had no other choice than that of war against the United States. The Slidell mission aided the Paredes revolt because he used it to emphasize that Herrera was selling out and that he would champion the Mexican cause and reconquer Texas.

Bankhead's diplomatic discussions with Peña y Peña and several of the revolutionaries were approved by Aberdeen's office.[77] Aberdeen also concurred in Bankhead's discussions with Tornel, but he wanted more information on the monarchial question. The Spanish minister in London had reported to Aberdeen that General Paredes was in favor of a monarchy in Mexico. The news surprised Aberdeen, and he requested Bankhead to report all details with regard to a monarchy and the chances of a monarchy in Mexico. In reply Bankhead emphasized that El Tiempo, the government newspaper in Mexico City, suggested the son

---

[77]F.O. 50 Vol. 194 No. 5, "Aberdeen to Bankhead, February 28, 1846," p. 11.

of Archduke Charles, who would be acceptable to the clergy.[78]

The paper also reported that quite possibly Don Francis Paule was leaving Spain, traveling to Cuba and then to Mexico, and would be the best possible choice for a Mexican monarch. The French minister who was in favor of a monarchy also felt that whoever was placed on the throne had to receive the moral and physical support of Europe.[79]

The Picayune reported that "Isabella is to marry the Prince of the House of Saxe-Coburg, while her sister, the Infanta, is to be given to the Duke of Pontpensier, one of Louis Philippe's sons. A French fleet and army in conjunction with what forces - land and sea - Spain can raise backed by an English fleet that is to see that nothing wrong is done, will escort the latter couple to America, and place them nolens volens on The Throne of Mexico. England for her assistance will get Cuba.[80]

This discussion of a monarchy ran throughout Paredes' administration, but Paredes never made a public statement in favor of monarchy. After Paredes defeated Herrera, he was elected President ad interim, and immediately appointed a ministry headed up by Don José Maria de Castille Illagos.[81] Don José only remained in office a short time and did not handle many foreign problems during the short period. Paredes

---

[78] El Tiempo, July 6, 1846, p. 2.

[79] F.O. 50 Vol. 194 No. 8, "Aberdeen to Bankhead, March 31, 1846," p, 17.

[80] Daily Picayune, December 30, 1845, p. 2.

[81] F.O. 50 Vol. 195 No. 1, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, January 1, 1846," pp. 3-11.

also issued a call for an extraordinary Congress to write a constitution, and 160 members were chosen from persons who paid direct taxes, persons involved in the agriculture, the commercial, the mining, manufacturing and public administration. They were to continue in session for six months and present a constitution.

When Paredes assumed the Presidency, Bankhead was afraid that war was imminent with Texas and the United States because Paredes promised in his revolutionary manifesto to reconquer Texas. However, preparations for war were not immediately undertaken, and Bankhead finally surmised that Paredes was watching with interest the negotiations over the Oregon boundary. He realized that any war between England and the United States would aid the Mexican cause.[82]

Mexico on its own would face many difficulties in a war with the United States. England emphasized that the march from Mexico City to the Nueces River was 600 miles, and even if it were possible the logistics of supplying such an army created immense odds against a Mexican victory. The Mexicans therefore waited. England's friendly feeling toward Mexico was well-known in Mexico, and many still anticipated English support, even though Bankhead suggested caution and prudence to the Mexican politicians.[83]

Bankhead was afraid that anything he said would be taken wrong so he avowed an entire ignorance of the views of Her Majesty's government

---

[82]F.O. 50 Vol. 194 No. 14, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, January 20, 1845," pp. 185-187.

[83]Ibid., p. 187.

and therefore gave no opinion or even surmised one.[84] Pleading total ignorance, Bankhead was able to lend a willing ear without ever telling Mexico that England would come to her aid. He mentioned several times that England was always ready to offer her good offices and her proposals in any attempt to maintain peace in Mexico. He never stated, and never gave cause for an all-out Mexican war against the United States, with English support.

Paredes persisted in his quest to gain insight into the English beliefs and English views. In an indirect communication, Paredes wanted a secret interview with Bankhead to talk about the present state of affairs in Mexico.[85] There is no doubt that Paredes kept the pressure on Bankhead, because he wanted English aid.

Bankhead felt this pressure and to the indirect and secret invitation of General Paredes he stated "that whenever His Excellency wanted to invite him to an audience, he would not lose a moment's notice in availing himself, but he was unable to take a position as to deprive himself of the power of asking for such an honor."[86] He met Paredes a few days later at a dinner party, when Paredes, walking past him, whispered to him, "I do hope your government does not mean to allow us to be eaten up."[87]

---

[84] F.O. 50 Vol. 194 No. 14, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, January 30, 1845," p. 187.

[85] F.O. 50 Vol. 195 No. 28, "Confidential--Bankhead to Aberdeen, February 27, 1846," pp. 306-309.

[86] Ibid.

[87] Ibid., p. 308.

Bankhead replied that whatever Paredes said would be conveyed to the Foreign Office, but he did not have instructions whatever beyond those already known to the Mexican government. Paredes replied "Hablaremos"[88] ("we will talk about it"). Paredes did not give up.

In fact, on March 8, 1866, he visited Bankhead and was accompanied by his Secretary of State. He made a few complimentary remarks with reference to England, and he asked what instructions Bankhead possessed with regard to the present position of Mexico with regard to the United States. Bankhead reported what went on before and assured him that he possessed no further instructions that were applicable to the present crisis. Paredes continued to express that he needed to know to what extent Mexico might count upon the assistance of England in her present perilous condition. He wasted no time in outlining the difficulties in which his country found itself. He proclaimed the necessity of some foreign assistance--Britain and France--to preserve Mexican national interest, menaced as it was on all sides by the United States.[89]

He asked Bankhead to send as soon as possible his views to England for the consideration of Her Majesty's government, and also stated that he hoped that Bankhead could furnish him with instructions which would enable him to advise and to act upon all contingencies. After this interview Bankhead reported that any chance of peace between Mexico and the United States was impossible.

---

[88] F.O. 50 Vol. 195 No. 28, "Confidential - Bankhead to Aberdeen, February 27, 1846," pp. 306-309.

[89] F.O. 50 Vol. 196 No. 31, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, March 10, 1846," p. 9.

Paredes would not accept any Minister from the United States if he were sent with ordinary full powers. The only discussion Mexico would agree to centered on the Texas question and the border. If Paredes recognized the Minister he would acknowledge Texas as a part of the United States and there could be no discussion on that basis.

Bankhead informed Paredes that there was a general expression of good will for Mexico in the British Foreign Office. Nevertheless, he did not make any remark or in any degree compromise in the adoption of a course which they think proper to follow with reference to the present unfortunate position of Mexico. He recommended caution and prudence, and he offered the Secretary of State the suggestion that Mexico make a counteroffer to Slidell which would bring a delay, and buy the Mexicans some time, while Slidell sent the counteroffer to the United States Department.[90]

Bankhead then used the opportunity to discuss with Paredes his opinion with regard to the monarchy. Paredes stated, that until Congress acted, he could not influence them with his opinion, but Bankhead had a feeling that Paredes wanted a monarchal system of government. "The friends of monarchy may succeed," according to Bankhead, "and if they do, it would add to the prosperity of the country." Old Spaniards in Mexico were against it, because they knew that if it failed, their interests would be sacrificed in a revolt. Paredes was concerned, and did try to pursue the issue in 1846.

In a secret dispatch, Bankhead said the following:

---

[90]F.O. 50 Vol. 196 No. 31, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, March 10, 1846," p. 9.

> I have this instant learnt that a gentleman who is about to proceed to England was sent for the night before by the President, who informed him that he intended to unburden himself to me during his visit that morning without reference to his minister, but that he found that I received his overtures with some coldness. His Excellency seems to have forgotten that he was accompanied by the Minister of Foreign Relations. General Paredes wished this gentleman to take upon himself the task of special envoy of submitting to your Lordship, and I believe to Monsieur Guizot, (but I am not sure), his confidential opinions and wishes upon the present state of the country and especially with regard to monarchy, that he meant to carry that question through the party favorable to such an alliance. They have settled everything with Spain, but that he was already opposed to that concession and was determined to throw the destiny of his country to the arms of England.[91]

The person to whom General Paredes made this offer declined to accept it. His object in visiting England was really a commercial one, although of great importance. The coldness imputed to Bankhead came from his disinclination to promise English aid and a promise Bankhead could not give without express orders from the Foreign Office. Paredes was upset because he believed that the only possible path for Mexico in 1846 was to throw herself at the mercy of England in any dispute with the United States.[92]

England, however, still upset with the procrastination of the Mexican nation over Texas refused any aid. While Paredes sought English aid, he also sought aid in establishing the Mexican army along the northern frontier. The movement of the United States army and navy caused Mexico to do the same. Paredes ordered his army to take up

---

[91]F.O. 50 Vol. 196 No. 34, "Secret--Bankhead to Aberdeen, March 10, 1846," pp. 22-25.

[92]Ibid.

positions on the southern bank of the Rio Grande, but not to cross the river. If war was to come, it must be started by the United States.

Paredes also promised that he would live up to the Plan de San Luis Potosí and maintain popular representatives and a republican form of government. Orders were sent to General Mejía not to cross the Rio Grande, and he was to remain on the south bank of Matamoros. Paredes, however, still believed English aid would come and he met again with Bankhead by going to Bankhead's office which was a very rare event in diplomatic circles and caused rumors to fly in diplomatic channels that England was ready to give aid.

Bankhead still had not received any word from his government and Paredes again repeated that his only hope was in the assistance of England and France, especially Britain.[93] Bankhead was cautious because he knew that if he gave the slightest hint that England would come to the aid of Mexico, war would come and England would be placed in a very difficult position.

Mexico was in a state of chaos, and the only chance for European aid, according to Bankhead, was if a monarchy was established in Mexico. No matter who was chosen to fill the position, he or she would need military assistance from Europe to maintain a monarchy. Even Paredes expressed the belief that whoever holds the reins of power must be supplied with money, not only to aid him on his arrival but as a means of staying in power.[94]

---

[93]F.O. 50 Vol. 196 No. 34, "Secret--Bankhead to Aberdeen, March 10, 1846," pp. 22-25.

[94]F.O. 50 Vol. 196 No. 42, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, March 30, 1846," pp. 155-157.

If Congress called for a monarchy Paredes argued he would not oppose the individual sentiments and the feelings of the country, whether the ruler came from France, Germany, Italy, or Spain. He then expressed a fervent hope that England and France again would devise some means which could check the grasping ambition of the United States and protect the Mexican nation. Paredes then reminded Britain that if California was lost, it would eventually be a serious blow to the interests of Great Britain. If it fell, the Americans would hope to get possession of New Mexico, Nuevo Leon, and Coahuila.

Bankhead agreed with Paredes and he entertained no doubt that the knowledge of the first shot being fired on the northern frontier would be the signal for the occupation of California.[95] But Bankhead never compromised the English position. He only recognized the utter hopelessness in Mexico and in a dispatch on April 29, 1846, he stated:

> It will suffice for me to state to your Lordship my humble but sincere opinion that without some aid from without, the extinction of the existence of this country as an independent state is near at hand. It was too late to lay the blame upon this or upon that ruler. All I fear have furnished their quota of incapacity or want of honesty, and here is to be traced the present position of what might in other hands have become one of the most flourishing countries in the world. If nothing is done to relieve it from its present most critical state, I cannot indulge the hope that it will long survive the inroads that have been made and are making upon its existence.[96]

---

[95] F.O. 50 Vol. 196 No. 43, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, March 30, 1846," p. 159.

[96] Ibid.

Bankhead continued to suggest that the best policy for Mexico was caution and moderation. He did not want Mexico to fire the first shot. He hoped sincerely that the Mexican government would follow his advice, although he believed that it was very difficult to preserve a defensive attitude with the enemy at its gates, and the almost certainty of a simultaneous attack from the navy at Vera Cruz. The United States squadron at Vera Cruz consisted of three heavy frigates, three sloops of war, and two brigs. Throughout April Bankhead was concerned over the blockade at Vera Cruz, the constant threat of attack at Matamoras, and the constant fears moves on the part of the Mexican nation to increase the size of their army and also increase taxes to finance their war effort.

Mexico was faced with a dilemma. Frantic in her desire to gain European aid, she was faced with the difficulty of fighting a war against a huge enemy full of wealth and capable of mounting a huge offensive. The Mexicans were not, and should not be considered, free of all blame. They argued for and stated as early as 1845 when annexation took place that once Texas became a part of the United States, war existed between Mexico and the United States.

Great Britain, however, was not ready to enter that war. Aberdeen wanted peace. He did not want, no matter how economically or commercially involved, the British were in the Mexican nation to involve Great Britain in a war with the United States. The English advice and counsel was ignored, and once war erupted in 1846 England did not become involved.

Mexico hoped, probably more than anyone in the world, that the United States and England would not solve their problems over the

Oregon boundary. Tempers were hot, but a compromise was agreed to. If they had been brought to war, it would have aided the Mexican cause. England, in order to gain the upper hand, would have probably supplied Mexico with troops and aid to establish another front in a war with the United States. That war did not come; England saw her hope was in a peaceful relationship with the world, and her interests in Mexico were not that great.

England had more to lose in a war with the United States than she did by protecting her commercial interests in Mexico. The London Times although it hated the United States, did agree that war in defense of Mexico would be ridiculous. [This source is more than a year before the Mexican War of May, 1846].

> . . . but whilst we express our reprobation of this action of the United States which proves beyond everything else the extinction of public virtue and moderation in that country, we are bound to acknowledge that the interest of Mexico are not so closely identified with out own, and the result of the annexation of Texas is not so prejudicial as to the welfare of England or her dependencies, as to constitute a just cause for war. Texas not casus belli, but Oregon is different because an attack there is against our own territory and our own citizens.[97]

Once England signed a treaty over Oregon there was no reason to aid Mexico, but she did try to aid both the United States and Mexico in some peaceful reconciliation of their conflict. Throughout the war England tried to mediate the problems, but at no time during the war did she offer the Mexicans any aid.

---

[97] London Times, March 31, 1845, p. 2. See also London Times, June 1, 1846.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

England refrained from any act of involvement in the United States-Mexican War. Throughout the 1840's England presented programs of peace for the Mexican nation. British ministers in Mexico City urged caution and moderation as the best policy for Mexico after the annexation of Texas to the United States. This moderation and caution, according to Aberdeen, was necessary because the United States wanted an excuse for an offensive war against Mexico. England was afraid that the United States might control Mexico and eventually Central America. The British ministers faced problems and difficulties in suggesting such a progam, mainly because of the chaotic and disorganized state of Mexican politics.

For example, within the space of ten months, from January to October, 1846, Mexico had three presidents, three different cabinets, and three revolutions. Revolutions that drained not only the economy of the nation, but its vitality and stamina.[1] These revolutions prevented Mexico from establishing a concrete foreign policy in Texas, and

---

[1]The list of Presidents for the short period include José Herrera, Mariano Paredes, Gomez Farias, and finally the return of Santa Anna. See Bancroft, History of Mexico; Parkes, A History of Mexico; Smith, War with Mexico; finally, Madame Calderon de la Barca in her Life in Mexico. Each author examines this critical period in Mexican history.

the United States. José Herrera's government began a discussion of a possible settlement to the United States-Mexican problem, but once Herrera's government actively pursued peace with the United States, an opposition force developed under Paredes, and the result was a revolution which promised the reconquest of Texas.

Paredes, faced with many difficulties, actively sought British aid in his struggle with the United States. Paredes was forced out of power by Santa Anna, who returned to Mexico, and sought past fame and glory by leading the Mexican army against the United States in 1846 and 1847.

England refrained from any active involvement. Aberdeen continued his program of peace for England. He left the Foreign Office in 1846, and Viscount Palerston returned. Palmerston, as Aberdeen did in 1841, accepted his predecessors' program and continued to suggest that English offices be used to aid in a peaceful settlement between the United States and Mexico.

England, therefore, continued a program established as early as 1839-1840--a program that involved the use of good offices to counsel and suggest to Mexico plans for peace. English influence in Mexico faltered as one would expect during the United States-Mexican War. As the United States gained momentum, and as Mexico lost in many military encounters, England as a neutral had to go along with America's peace proposals, especially after the Americans had occupied the nation's capital. Militarily, the United States gained an impressive victory in the United States-Mexican War.

British diplomats, however, were not inactive. They aided General Winfield Scott toward the end of the war, when they were asked

to transmit various proposals and letters to the Mexican government for the purpose of peace. Also, when Nicholas Trist arrived in Mexico he requested the assistance of the British Minister.[2] Bankhead was anxious to see peace and gladly accepted the responsibility of conveying messages and letters between the Mexicans and the Americans. England only suggested programs of moderation and caution and hopefully a program to establish a justifiable peace for the Mexican nation. England realized that Mexico had to sue for peace, because the chances for victory had quickly evaporated. Many in England wanted programs of stability established as soon as the war ended.

English merchants and commercial houses wanted the war to end because they were fed up with the dilatory tactics of Mexican officials who were not willing to pay British claims and who were at a moment's notice ready to raise taxes or the tariff in hopes of maintaining an army against the United States. It seemed evident that England by 1846-1847 was content to allow the United States to make its move across the North American continent.

Already, Britain had avoided war with the United States in the boundary dispute in Oregon, even though the British had shouted for a war. Their arguments centered around the expansion and outright offensive moves on the part of American settlers in the Oregon territory.

Aberdeen, however, believed that war was unnecessary and his plan for a peaceful settlement of the problem was accepted by the United

---

[2]F.O. 50 Vol. 210 No. 61, "Bankhead to Palmerston, June 26, 1847," pp. 1-75.

States in 1845.[3] He believed that the United States wanted a treaty before Palmerston stepped in. Also the United States may have anticipated better relations with England after the British Corn Laws were repealed, allowing greater imports of food from America. Finally, Aberdeen was once quoted "that he desired peace for peace's sake," while he (referring to Palmerston) desired war for war's sake."[4] Aberdeen considered the Oregon treaty his most important work as Foreign Secretary.

He had avoided war and in a letter of Queen Victoria, he outlined his belief that the Treaty assured England of peace. Aberdeen emphasized to the Queen that the convention was accepted "precisely in the form in which it was transmitted by Lord Aberdeen to Mr. Pakenham. The Queen in reply mentioned the sincere satisfaction of the settlement, but regretted the retirement of Aberdeen. Prince Albert in his note stated "that England was fortunate because Aberdeen was able to complete this work triumphantly."[5]

On June 1, 1846, almost a month after the war had started, England categorically denied any aid to General Paredes. Aberdeen, in instructions to Charles Bankhead, outlined English policy over the three-year period 1843-1846. He emphasized in five dispatches to

---

[3]For a discussion of Aberdeen's feelings see F.O. 5 (America) Vols. 403-410 in 1844 and Vols. 423-444 in 1845.

[4]Algernon Cecil, Queen Victoria and Her Prime Ministers, p. 85.

[5]Aberdeen Papers, Vol. VIII, "Correspondence with Queen Victoria and the Prince Consort," May, 1846-February, 1853. Queen to Aberdeen, June 29, 1846," p. 73. Also "Prince Albert to Aberdeen, June 30, 1846," p. 77.

Bankhead during the year 1844 that English aid was impossible.[6] His sentiments and intentions remained unchanged.

England throughout the period wanted the recognition of Texan independence and no direct aid to the Mexican cause. Further, Aberdeen pointed out the recent events in Mexico did not allow his government any reasonable gound for departing from that policy.[7]

Aberdeen was upset over the fact that the military revolutions came at the very moment when Mexico needed unity and concord and a strong ground in order to maintain a strong front against the imminent danger from the United States. Because of these revolutions England did not participate in any quarrel between Mexico and the United States. He also stressed:

> It is moreover obvious that were Great Britain to interfere in that quarrel, she would involve herself in a war with the United States, and not only that, but she must necessarily play the part, not merely of an auxilliary but of a principal in such a war, that is, she would find herself engaged in a war with a nation with which she would have no personal cause or quarrel in behalf of a nation and government which she had repeatedly warned in the most friendly and urgent manner of their danger, and which solely in consequence of their willful contempt of that warning, have at plunged headlong down the precipice from which the British government spared no efforts to save them.[8]

---

[6]F.O. 50 Vol. 172 No. 30, September 30, 1844; F.O. 50 Vol. 172 No. 34, October 1, 1844; F.O. 50 Vol. 172 No. 49, December 31, 1844; F.O. 50 Vol. 174 No. 16, June 3, 1844; "Confidential" F.O. 50 Vol. 175 No. 53, July 13, 1855, all of these dispatches were from Aberdeen to Bankhead, and they all categorically denied aid to Mexico, as in No. 30 "he (Santa Anna) must not look for the support of Great Britain in aiding him to extricate himself from these difficulties."

[7]F.O. 50 Vol. 194 No. 15, "Aberdeen to Bankhead, June 1, 1846," p. 33.

[8]Ibid.

These ideas were presented not out of a desire to slap the hand of the Mexican officials, but to point out to President Paredes, who was the chief magistrate, the reasons why Great Britain could not come forward and support the Mexicans against the United States. In fact, Aberdeen stated "these proposals should be presented personally to President Paredes," and then to emphasize his lack of confidence, Aberdeen added," if he is still the chief magistrate in Mexico."[9]

After stating explicitly that England could not aid the Mexican government in any physical nature, Aberdeen suggested that Bankhead courteously express Her Majesty's desire for peace, and assure the Mexicans that the English government would work to save Mexico, "so far as it may be possible by friendly interposition from the fatal consequences of the policy which her successive governments have for many years past, been so unfortunately induced to pursue towards Texas and the United States."[10] In other words, the door was not completely shut. England wanted to, as much as possible, assist the Mexicans in their struggle with the United States. Her program prior to the war had been one of counseling and suggesting to the Mexican government program for peace. Bankhead throughout the war counseled, and suggested to the Mexican government that caution and moderation would be the best

---

[9]F.O. 50 Vol. 172 No. 30, September 30, 1844; F.O. 50 Vol. 172 No. 34, October 1, 1844; F.O. 50 Vol. 172 No. 49, December 31, 1844; F.O. 50 Vol. 174 No. 16, June 3, 1844; "Confidential" F.O. 50 Vol. 175 No. 53, July 13, 1844; all of these dispatches were from Aberdeen to Bankhead, and they all categorically denied aid to Mexico, as in No. 30 "he (Santa Anna) must not look for the support of Great Britain in aiding him to extricate himself from these difficulties."

[10]Aberdeen wanted Paredes to understand completely the British position, and it seems he was categorically against any aid to Mexico.

course, with a possibility of British mediation.[11]

Paredes was desperate, and he even called for the establishment of a monarchy in Mexico. He wanted a monarchy because he realized that any sovereign would need foreign forces and foreign money for support.[12]

The British Foreign Office, however, could not support any monarchial plan due to the many difficulties inside Mexico. The concept of a foreign prince and a monarchy was not new in Mexican politics. It had been suggested by Don Gutierrez Estrada, the Foreign Secretary under the Bustamente government. For several years he sent letters to England, France, and Spain, and had letters printed in several Mexican newspapers stating the advantages of a monarchy in Mexico.

Spain probably was more involved and more concerned over the idea of a monarch in Mexico, principally because it was suggested that a Spanish prince take power and take control of Mexico. Therefore, Bermandez Castro, the Spanish minister in Mexico, constantly sought the English opinion over the matter of a monarchial form of government.

Not only was Paredes willing to discuss the possibility of a monarchy; he was also pressed hard enough to discuss the sale of California, now occupied by the United States. He mentioned several times to Bankhead the advantages of the territory. He re-emphasized the Indian and Chinese positions, and the fact that trade along the

---

[11]F.O. 50 Vol. 198 No. 103, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, June 9, 1846," p. 144.

[12]La Reforma, February 3, 1846, p. 68; also February, 19, 1846, p. 130; April 9, 1846, p. 3 and April 15, 1846, p. 2. Several other Mexican newspapers, principally El Tiempo ran stories on the possibility of a monarchy.

coast of America would be advantageous to Great Britain. He even wanted to permit England to take military possession of the area, and finally offered to sell California to the English. Bankhead in his discussion with Paredes over California stated that he did not know what the English position would be in such an important proposition.

The Foreign Office instructed Bankhead that England could not enter into a treaty for the acquisition of California. Aberdeen and, later, Palmerston, both agreed that because of the hostilities between the United States and Mexico it seemed evident that Mexico had lost command of the area and could not carry out a treaty even if one were arranged.[13] Likewise, Palmerston told Pakenham that he could assure the United States that Great Britain had no designs on California and that Paredes' offer to sell California had come too late since it was doubtful whether or not the Mexicans controlled the area.

Paredes tried everything. He called for an English loan, and when that failed he agreed to sell California. News of the California sale brought about further unrest in Mexico and on May 7, 1846, a Pronunciamento against the Paredes government was published in Mazatlán. The plan called for the return of Santa Anna, and it sparked another uprising in Guadalajara.

Mexico was again in a state of political chaos and even though the revolt in May was unsuccessful it created a tension that was evident throughout the months of May, June, and July. Paredes in June spoke to

---

[13] F.O. 50 Vol. 195 No. 4, "Palmerston to Bankhead, August 1, 1846;" also Palmerston Letter Books, "Letter books of Henry John Temple, Third Viscount Palmerston," 177 vols., British Museum, 48417-48589, Vol. CLIX "To and From the United States," "Palmerston to Pakenham, June 29, 1846."

Congress and traced the history of his administration. He stated to the Congress the need for extraordinary powers, and asked for the suppression of the freedom of the press. He called for the energies of his country in support of the national dignity and honor, and suggested to Congress the expediency of a declaration of war against the United States. Paredes, as others before him, turned to the national honor and policy of the Mexican people to maintain control.[14] Paredes wanted to be both President and also Commander-in-Chief of the army. Mexicans in the United States and in Mexico were somewhat perplexed over a war. Some felt that the disastrous effects of the war meant that some reconciliation had to be made with the United States. However, they recognized that if a reconciliation took place Mexico would lose a tremendous amount of territory.[15]

General Paredes was officially elected President on June 12, 1846, and General Nicholas Bravo was chosen Vice-President. Paredes was able to gain the support of the members of Congress, who believed that with Paredes in power their chances of changing the Mexican system of government were improved. The war continued, and on June 16 two propositions were presented to the Mexican Congress. One requested that Paredes be given a leave of absence to take command of the Army of the North. The other asked for extraordinary means for carrying on a state of warfare. These new laws called for more taxes to supply the army in the north. Congress agreed; Paredes was given a leave of

---

[14]Smith, War With Mexico I, p. 104.

[15]F.O. 50 Vol. 198 No. 77, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, June 29, 1846," pp. 284-289.

absence to take command of the Army of the North. The other asked for extraordinary means for carrying on a state of warfare. These new laws called for more taxes to supply the army of the north. Congress agreed; Paredes was given a leave of absence, and Bravo was sworn in as President ad interim.

Paredes as Commander-in Chief could lead the armies and also put down revolutions if they arose, plus with Bravo in office, the chances for accepting some offer from the United States were easier. Many in Congress probably favored a peaceful relationship, but there were those who lacked the courage to do anything about it, mainly because the pride in the Mexican nation was damaged by the loss of Texas and the eventual attack across the Rio Grande.

United States propaganda spread throughout the northern states of Mexico, and newspaper articles requested Mexican citizens to throw off the yoke of the central Mexican government, establish separate states, and seek some type of protection from the United States. In Matamoras there was hope that the republic of the Rio Grande could be established and made up of the states of Tamaulipas, Nuevo Leon, Coahuila, New Mexico, Durango, and Chihuahua. Once these states were united, they could propose independence, seek protection from the United States, and defy the world,[17] but Taylor refused to assist them prior to the war.

United States propaganda also emphasized that the war started because of British intrigues. The Republic of Rio Grande, a newspaper

---

[16]F.O. 50 Vol. 198 No. 77, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, June 29, 1846," pp. 284-289.

[17]Ibid.

in Matamoras stated:

> But rash as these ephemereal dictators of Mexico City are, we know that they have not the temerity to plunge into war with the United States without encouragement from some powerful government, and the present angry relations between England and the United States leaves at no loss to surmise the quarter whence the encouragement comes. The policy of this interference may be very judicious on the part of Great Britain, but it is for you, the people, who are to be affected by it, to consider how far it is dictated by a generous regard for the prosperity of Mexico. When has England shown herself your friend? Was it in lending your government four or five times the amount of the loans which her subjects had advanced you in condemned arms and military equipment drawn from the refuse of her arsenals, and for which she remunerated herself in the full face of your bonds with heavy interest, secured upon your public domain, at merely nominal rates; in the control of your custom-houses and in the monopoly of all the remnants of your once flourishing trade?[18]

These tactics which were used in wars throughout history, were not necessary in Mexico. The problems in Mexican government were, according to Bankhead, insurmountable. The government could in no way continue a war with the United States, so Bankhead suggested that Paredes discuss with the United States counsul some means for peace. Paredes, however, threw out the proposal, and, as Bankhead said, "like most of his countrymen, destitute of moral courage to carry out such a measure and hence the necessity of the offer originating in the United States.[19]

Constantly, Mexico floundered for some type of a unified and strong proposal in its war against the United States. General Tornel again and again called on Congress to re-establish proposals for the

---

[18]Found in F.O. 50 Vol. 197 No. 77, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, June 9, 1846," p. 144.

[19]F.O. 50 Vol. 197 No. 89, "Bankhead to Aberdeen, June 29, 1846," p. 148.

defense of the Mexican nation. In one decree discussed in Congress he argued that the Mexican government, by virtue of its desire to defend its nation should repel the aggression of the United States of America. The republic was in a chaotic state of affairs, and England tried to suggest programs for peace, while Mexico grasped for straws by July, 1846. After receiving the Foreign Office statement that no aid would come from England and that the only aid would be the friendly interposition of the Foreign Office, General Paredes received information from the Mexican chargé d' affaires in London that Great Britain was ready to offer her mediation.[20]

Newspapers in Mexico City saw British mediation as the only hope for the Mexican nation. Bankhead, however, could not offer British mediation. Paredes was handcuffed in any discussion of peace with the United States, because he had come to power advocating war. Bravo, as President, might accept the overtures of the United States, and quite possibly discussion for a peaceful reconciliation between the two could begin.

Bankhead's hands were tied in trying to suggest programs and policies to the Mexican government, because after Congress approved of Bravo's appointment to the Presidency, the Cabinet under Paredes resigned, and for several weeks Mexico did not have a Cabinet.[21] Paredes finally issued a statement regarding the problem with the United States and the boundary question.

---

[20] Aberdeen Papers, Vol. XXVII 43065, "Aberdeen to Peel, June 3, 1846," p. 131.

[21] F.O. 50 Vol. 198 No. 107, "Bankhead to Palmerston, July 30, 1846," p. 201.

Texas had been part of New Spain since the Spanish-American Treaty of 1819. The border between Texas and the rest of the province was the Nueces River and as a result the Nueces River could be the only boundary in any settlement with the United States. He did leave the matter open for discussion when he stated "the Mexican government will not refuse to receive or to listen to propositions of peace, although they will accept only those which shall be compatible with the national honor or which have for their basis the security of the territory of the Republick [sic]."[22]

The Mexican government faced a dilemma, they realized that since the United States and England had settled the Oregon question, that England would not come to the aid of the Mexican government. They realized that Mexico needed a unified government. Bankhead believed the Bravo government was now ready to decide on the present dispute.

Bravo's government, however, did not have a chance to solve any disputes or aid the Mexican political system in any way, because in August, 1846, a new revolution took place in favor of Santa Anna and the Federalists. The movement had been in preparation for quite some time and was successful. The revolt xucceeded because of the vacillation of Paredes. He lacked the moral courage to fight for a monarchy which might have established a stable government in Mexico.

After his fall no one was at that time capable of winning or controlling the Mexican nation, and Gomez Farias, who at that time was

---

[22]F.O. 50 Vol. 198 No. 107, "Bankhead to Palmerston, July 30, 1846," p. 201.

chief of the Federalist Party, became a temporary leader. When Paredes fell, on August 4, General Mariano Salas became Acting President, and took command of the Ciudadela and called for federalism and Santa Anna. Since Gomez Farias was the leading Federalist he assumed an important leadership role.[23]

No government, however, was established until the return of the ever-important Santa Anna. In fact, the revolt in Verz Cruz was not a revolt against Paredes or the government, but primarily a revolt to control the city and the state so that Santa Anna could return to his home.[24] By contrast, the outbreak in Mexico City carried the Federalist banner. Two irreconcilable forces - Santa Anna and the Federalists - came in together and fell apart because Santa Anna, the ever popular Mexican leader, was in favor of dictatorial power, while federalism believed in the concept of states' rights and greater participation by the provinces of Mexico.

The country only plunged further into disgrace and misfortune, and it seemed that personal aggrandizement and self-interest were more the primary motives of the revolution than the cause of the Mexican nation against the United States. Santa Anna as a leader might, according to Bankhead, who throughout his tenure in Mexico City respected Santa Anna, bring the people of Mexico together. But if Santa Anna refused leadership, the possibility of extreme anarchy throughout

---

[23]Calcott, Santa Anna, p. 236.

[24]Smith, War With Mexico I, p. 218.

Mexico reigned supreme.[25]

Soon after the revolution began, it was announced that California had fallen to the United States. Bankhead had always believed in California's value and he wanted the Foreign Office to do something. He suggested programs, but none of them were acted upon by the British government. The misgovernment and the internal strife in Mexico did much to aid the United States in their struggle in California, and as a result, what would prove to be one of the most valuable possessions in the world was taken by the United States.

Other states immediately joined the revolution: Puebla, Jalapa, Vera Cruz, but no one moved. No one made pronouncements or outlined programs or policies. They were waiting for Santa Anna.

The only proposal suggested by the provisional government of Gomez Farias was that the federal Constitution of 1824 be established and remain until Congress met on December 6, 1846, to decide on a better form of government. Mexico was a long way from a better form of government. The problems in government, the total disorganization of the army, the call for Santa Anna, the decree by the provisional government for the Constitution of 1824 (which stated that a standing army is not allowed in Mexico), the public response against Santa Anna, all added to the confusion and disorganization of the Mexican nation. Nowhere in the history of the Mexican nation was there such a total disorganization, and this chaos could not have come at a better time for the United States, because in all the confusion and disorganization the

---

[25]F.O. 50 Vol. 198 No. 108, "Bankhead to Palmerston, August 4, 1846," p. 203.

chief benefactor throughout the period was the United States Army.[26]

Santa Anna finally arrived at Vera Cruz on a steamer flying under English colors from Havana on August 16, 1846. Many thought that the blockading force would not permit Santa Anna's entrance but he had a letter addressed to the American commandant at Vera Cruz, which allowed his landing. He was given free admission to the port, which prompted many reports that Santa Anna had reached a secret agreement with the United States authorities for establishing the boundaries between the two.[27]

He arrived in Mexico City on September 14, and after his arrival he publicly declared his feelings with regard to the present political situation in Mexico. In an interview with Bankhead he stated that it was necessary to submit to the voice of the people, and adopt the institutions by which the United States rose to their present prosperous and civilized state, and definitely insured the success of his aspirations for his countrymen. Santa Anna, of all people, was calling for federalism.[28]

He insisted that he would abolish all laws which at the present time embarrassed the commerce with foreign nations. He wanted tariffs for protection, not revenue.[29] Santa Anna also suggested new immigration laws and the toleration of all religions. These statements

---

[26]Smith, War With Mexico I, p. 218.

[27]See Smith, War With Mexico I, p. 220. Also Parkes, History of Mexico, and Rives, The United States and Mexico.

[28]F.O. 50 Vol. 198 No. 120, "Bankhead to Palmerston, August 29, 1846," pp. 335-340.

[29]Ibid.

shocked and surprised Bankhead, but he still did not give them much credence. He felt that Santa Anna was making them out of political expediency in hopes for his future as the Mexican leader. Santa Anna knew the people, and he made some inroads into establishing his power.

Gomez Farias was out and Santa Anna's appointee, Señor Haro, who served under Santa Anna in 1834, was placed in that position. Santa Anna then stated he would return to the north to meet the enemies and regain the territory lost. Many were concerned, however, that some type of a secret agreement was evident between the United States and Mexico. A small revolution broke out at San Luis Potosí, but Santa Anna's army quickly put it down.

Bankhead later learned that the secret arrangements between Santa Anna and the United States were true. He discovered that a man in Havana by the name of Atocha had been a resident of New Orleans, attached himself to Santa Anna. He also was a resident of Mexico, but had left in 1844. Since he was a citizen of the United States he placed a huge claim on Mexico. He went to Havana with Santa Anna and then eventually to New Orleans.

The reason Bankhead believed that some deal was evident between the United States and Mexico was that a short time before Santa Anna left Cuba, Atocha arrived with a confidential message from Washington, and then returned to Pensacola with another note before he left for Vera Cruz with a letter of security, Carta Seguridad. He arrived in Jalapa, discussed politics with some officials there and then left Mexico for the United States.[30]

---

[30]F.O. 50 Vol. 198 No. 121. "Bankhead to Palmerston, August 29, 1846," p. 345.

Atocha probably had some information, but Santa Anna and Rejón, who was Foreign Minister under Santa Anna, stoutly denied any arrangement with the United States. Many Mexicans did not believe that Santa Anna had made a deal because he marched with 1500 dragoons and 800 infantry to aid the Army of the North. Later, a story in the New York Herald outlined the arrangement between General Santa Anna and the United States Commissioners at Havana. Several copies of this story were sent to Mexico City, and were immediately confiscated by the government.

Bankhead did not get a chance to read them, but he did fear that a promise was made by Santa Anna to agree to the Rio Grande as the border, and to the possession of all of California.[31] Even if an arrangement was made, Santa Anna ignored it, as was his nature, and began a war against the United States. The war, however, proved disastrous to Mexico as Monterrey fell along with several other important cities.

England considered the possibility of offering British mediation to handle and settle the problems of the war. Just before Aberdeen left office in June, 1846, he instructed Bankhead to offer mediation.[32]

Parliament was discussing whether or not England was going to aid the Mexican cause. On the floor of Parliament Lord Bentinck outlined the past history of the Mexican nation. He said that the public debt of Mexico to England amounted to a sum somewhere around 10,200,000

---

[31]F.O. 50 Vol. 198 No. 121, "Bankhead to Palmerston, August 29, 1846," p. 345.

[32]F.O. 50 Vol. 194 No. 20, "Aberdeen to Bankhead, June 26, 1846," p. 49. Aberdeen officially resigned on July 14, 1846.

pounds, and he believed that a war between the United States and Mexico was extremely injurious to British relations with Mexico, plus, very injurious to English commercial interests. He also believed that "should that war end in a conquest and the subjugation of Mexico to the United States, the problem of the debt due Britain by Mexico will not be paid, just as the one due Britain by the United States was not paid."[33] He wanted to know whether or not Great Britain had offered mediation. Bentinck wanted a justificable peace for Mexico and believed that the United States was the aggressor, an aggression that would seriously hurt English commercial interests.[34]

Palmerston replied that the Foreign Office had been concerned over the transactions between the United States, Mexico and Texas. He, too, was bothered by the conflict between the two but, as he pointed out to Parliament, because of the discussions over the Oregon territory, Great Britain could not offer mediation in 1845 because if the discussion over Oregon had ended in a rupture between the two, England could not have been an objective mediator in any disagreement between the United States and Mexico.[35]

If, after the Oregon Treaty the United States and Mexico were disposed to accept the mediation of Great Britain, that mediation would

---

[33] Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 88, August 25, 1846, p. 979.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid. Also F.O. 5 (America) Vol. 461, "F. D. Powles, Chairman of South American and Mexican Association, to Aberdeen, June 2, 1846," p. 20. Powles wanted Great Britain to mediate the problem, first to protect their interests in the area, and second, to end bloodshed in the area. In another letter, June 4, 1846, William Rodgers, of the same organization, called for British mediation.

be frankly offered and tendered. As Palmerston ended his speech, Benjamin Disraeli rose to discuss the problem, and emphasized that the British merchants were deeply interested in the fate of Mexico. The great public debt was not as important to Disraeli, but the mercantile interests of the British in Mexico was the overriding issue. The British merchants were actually concerned whether or not the Mexican government could remain in power.[36]

Disraeli stressed that the British government had acted wrongly in regard to the Oregon treaty. He stated "that the merchants want to know whether or not England was going to preserve the political integrity of Mexico."[37] Disraeli, probably one of the most vociferous with regard to the Mexican question, asked several important questions with regard to the Mexican problem. If Mexico was totally incapable of self-government, as he believed, and if all the means of diplomacy failed, which he said is quite evident if one examined the history from 1839, what would the English do? What will the English policy be?

He argued there is a course, but he wondered whether or not the English would pursue it. He went on

> . . . Will you act as you have acted to other states under similar circumstances? Will you protect Mexico? Will you come forward and in combination with the great powers most interested in the affairs of Mexico establish a protectorate for that country? Give them ten years of tranquillity, and I believe it will not be lost on that people. The merchants of England want these questions answered. They know what protests may be offered against anything like interference. But they are practical men

---

[36]Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 88, August 24, 1846, p. 988.

[37]Ibid., p. 989.

> and know that at this moment the principle of interference is the only principle, and that you are carrying it out where your stake is not half so valuable, where your interests are not so vast, and where, I may be permitted to add, your political relations are not so important. It is by acting as you have acted in the past that you can secure the independence of Mexico.[38]

Above all, Disraeli did not want the United States to take the area. He said it is not merely the 20 to 30 millions of dollars of debt nor the increased number of consumers for our commerce, "but if the principle on which the citizens of the United States are now acting be not arrested in a determined spirit, you may rely on it that your North American Empire [i.e., Canada] is in peril and will, I believe, be lost."[39]

Disraeli was calling for outright aid and outright protection, but he was in the minority. Even though Disraeli was in the minority his reaction prompted the British Foreign Office to consider some assistance.

The response in Parliament and the call for English assistance prompted the Foreign Office to present the mediation proposal again. Palmerston sent instructions to Bankhead and later to Doyle that England would assist the Mexicans with mediation in their war against the United States. Palmerston realized that mediation could only succeed if both parties agreed, so he sent similar instructions to

---

[38] Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 88, August 24, 1866, p. 992.

[39] Ibid., 993.

Richard Pakenham in Washington.[40]

Bankhead was concerned when he received his orders because Mexico was in the midst of revolution and he decided to withhold the mediation plan until Santa Anna's government took control.[41] Palmerston agreed, and told Bankhead to use his good judgement with regard to offering that mediation.

Santa Anna assumed control and appointed Manuel Rejón as Minister of Foreign Affairs. Once it was realized that Señor Rejón was in charge of Mexican affairs, Bankhead on August 31, 1846 offered the Mexican government the mediation plan for settling the differences between the Republic of Mexico and the United States.[42]

Rejón, to Bankhead's surprise, rebuked the offer, and said "Mexico cannot be convinced of her inability to compete with her neighbors. Self-conceit and a strong patriotic feeling is the reason for our refusal."[43] Bankhead was taken back by the refusal, but he did not drop the idea, because he felt given the unstable situation in Mexican government and the ministry, the offer may have success with another minister.

Bankhead was upset with the political maneuvering of the Santa Anna government and he did not see any benefit to the Mexican nation

---

[40] F.O. 5 Vol. 445 No. 8, "Palmerston to Pakenham, August 15, 1846," p. 92 and F.O. 50 Vol. 206 No. 7, "Palmerston to Bankhead, August 15, 1846," p. 84.

[41] F.O. 50 Vol. 198 No. 122, "Bankhead to Palmerston, August 29, 1846," p. 352.

[42] F.O. 50 Vol. 198 No. 130, "Bankhead to Palmerston, September 7, 1846," p. 50.

[43] Ibid.

from the General's return. Santa Anna would eventually establish the same system of spoliation that had characterized his other governments in the past and did not in any way bring about a successful and unified Mexican nation.

Money was of prime concern to the Mexican nation. There were decrees issued for forced loans of $2,000,000 with the property of the church as security for the loans. Most of the money went to Santa Anna, while the government resources and the capital suffered, but the complete lack of money was probably the best chance that existed for an early termination of the war.[44] It was also learned that a $20,000,000 loan was being negotiated in London, and that church property would again back it up. The English investors were approached, but declined the loan, but it did provoke concern in the United States that England was involved in the Mexican cause.

In December, 1846, Rejón was out and Don José Remírez was appointed as Minister of Foreign Affairs.[45] Bankhead immediately discussed foreign policy with Ramirez, and on December 28, 1846 offered British mediation to the new cabinet member. Bankhead also informed the Mexican that the British Foreign Office wanted Mexico to bring about some type of reconciliation and the establishment of peace.[46]

---

[44] F.O. 50 Vol. 201 No. 167, "Bankhead to Palmerston, November 29, 1846," pp. 50-54.

[45] F.O. 50 Vol. 201 No. 181, "Bankhead to Palmerston, December 30, 1846," pp. 204-205.

[46] F.O. 50 Vol. 201 No. 184, "Bankhead to Palmerston, December 30, 1846," pp. 268-270.

Ramírez never rejected mediation, but when Bankhead heard that a tax was placed on all citizens including British subjects, for the war, he took it as rejection. Mexico evidently wanted to fight on. Bankhead objected to the tax, although Palmerston later pointed out that the British citizens were not exempt from such a tax and had to pay.[47]

Bankhead faced problem after problem in arguing and discussing mediation. In January, 1847, after a month, Señor Ramírez resigned, which gave Bankhead another chance to offer British mediation. Bankhead believed that he could aid in the peace effort because there were many in the Mexican Congress who wanted to end the war because of the great American gains in the field.[48] These individuals were looking to the British government as a friend and ally in case the United States brought forward unreasonable demands. In other words, if the United States tried to gain more than what was considered legal within the international framework, the Mexican people wanted some assurances that Great Britian would assist them.

As long as Mexico continued to hold out, however, the British hands were tied, and Bankhead again involved himself in the political events of Mexico and urged the party in Congress favorable to peace to combine in their efforts, for some peaceful arrangement with the United States. Many Mexican politicians realized that the United States was not receptive to British mediation but they found in a

---

[47]F.O. 50 Vol. 207 No. 5, "Palmerston to Bankhead, January 28, 1847," p. 19.

[48]F.O. 50 Vol. 208 No. 6, "Bankhead to Palmerston, January 29, 1847," p. 140.

passage of President Polk's annual message to Congress that the United States manifested some desire to receive the good offers of Her Majesty's government in order to render a direct line of communication between Mexico and the United States and one which would not completely break the national honor and dignity of the Mexican nation.[49]

Bankhead, therefore, continued to press for mediation, but without a foreign minister and without a Cabinet, Bankhead got nowhere.[50] His only hope was to discuss the matter with Santa Anna, which was almost impossible, since Santa Anna was constantly at the head of his troops. Santa Anna still believed he could win and he continued in his struggle, but after Buena Vista he asked for a leave of absence, citing his old excuse, ill health.[51]

Shortly after Santa Anna's resignation another revolution broke out in Mexico City. Congress immediately sent a note to Santa Anna to take control of the country and return as President of the Republic. Once again Santa Anna recognized the political climate and took advantage of it, he resigned, a revolution erupted, and then he was recalled as the savior of Mexico. On March 21, 1847 he sent notes to the two sides to stop all hostilities, and on March 22, he was sworn in before Congress as President.

Those who were aligned to the clergy were allowed to keep their arms, while orders were sent out to disarm the 2,000 people in rebel

---

[49]F.O. 50 Vol. 208 No. 6, "Bankhead to Palmerston, January 28, 1847," p. 140.

[50]Ibid.

[51]F.O. 50 Vol. 208 Separate - "Bankhead to Palmerston, March 2, 1857," p. 229.

camps throughout Mexico. For the first time a degree of tranquillity and stability was established in Mexico City.[52]

Santa Anna's views, however, were still cloudy and unknown. He announced his intention to abide by the Constitution of 1824, but he still displayed tactics which were dictatorial in nature. He lost in battle at Buena Vista, his troops dispersed, his predicted great victory ended in defeat, but even in defeat he won, because he was invited to Mexico City to assume the reins of government. His name again was chanted throughout the streets as "the savior of the country."[53]

Foreign interests thought that he realized the plight of the Mexican nation and that the interest of his country was more important than his own personal interest. They wanted to influence Santa Anna, and in a discussion, Bankhead as a spokesman for the diplomatic corps, stated that the foreign nations of Europe looked forward to the early re-establishment of the relations with the United States, an event which is everyday more imperative.[54]

Santa Anna was unable to discuss such a proposal because the news from Vera Cruz was an all-out American attack, which prompted him to take full control of the operations against the enemy at Vera Cruz. Vera Cruz fell, and Santa Anna immediately moved his 10,000 men to try

---

[52]F.O. 50 Vol. 209 No. 34, "Bankhead to Palmerston, April 1, 1847," pp. 80-84.

[53]Ibid.

[54]F.O. 50 Vol. 209 No. 33, "Bankhead to Palmerston, April 1, 1847," p. 78.

to control the area around Jalapa. General Scott, after Vera Cruz, then began his move, first at Jalapa, then to Cerro Gordo, and eventually it was believed that he would move after receiving reinforcements on to Puebla and Mexico City.[55]

Bankhead believed that Scott would probably be well received on his march, and he believed that there are many people in Mexico City who consider the arrival of the American commander the surest way of gaining protection and peace. He considered it very lamentable that in a country like this "which abounds in all of its resources and with a population so easily governed, they should so easily acquiesce in the arrival of an invader, rather than submit to a continued maladministration under Santa Anna."[56]

Many Mexicans were positive that the war could not be continued, but there still was a lack of moral courage in Mexico, to admit it, plus the war cry became a political question and anyone who openly avowed peace was branded as a traitor.[57] Santa Anna travelled to Oajaca, where he set up headquarters. Confusion and chaos reigned throughout the period, and Bankhead continued to meet each new minister to suggest the early negotiation of peace with the United States government. He was unsuccessful. He offered mediation but it never materialized.

---

[55]F.O. 50 Vol. 209 No. 42, "Bankhead to Palmerston, April 30, 1847," pp. 110-134.

[56]Ibid., pp. 130-131.

[57]Ibid., p. 134.

Meanwhile Santa Anna left Oajaca. He established a front at Puebla and an army of approximately 4,000 men, but General Worth, the United States commander, arrived on May 19, and drove the Mexicans back into their capital.[58] Santa Anna then arrived, fired all of the generals who opposed him and announced his plan to meet the enemy with a force of 15,000 men.

Where he would get 15,000 men was a question most could not answer, and his future looked dim. By May, 1847, his prestige had fallen and his chances of entering into a peaceful relationship with the American general were small. Furthermore, in coming to the capital he placed himself in a very critical military position. He resigned from the Presidency, but continued as military leader.[59]

When Santa Anna entered Mexico City Bankhead realized that defeat was near. He wanted and had offered to mediate the dispute but that offer was never accepted. Therefore, when Nicholas Trist, the United States special minister arrived for the discussion of a treaty, Bankhead offered his assistance. He was asked to deliver a note to the Mexican government, and told Trist he would do all in his power to gain the favorable reply of the Mexican government.[60]

Bankhead realized that the Mexican Congress favored peace so he sent a note to the new Foreign Secretary, Domingo Ibarra. Congress agreed to discuss peace, but no one in Congress had the moral courage

---

[58]F.O. 50 Vol. 209 No. 59, "Bankhead to Palmerston, May 27, 1847," pp. 279-282.

[59]F.O. 50 Vol. 209 No. 60, "Bankhead to Palmerston, May 29, 1847," p. 284.

[60]F.O. 50 Vol. 210 No. 67, "Bankhead to Palmerston, June 29, 1847," pp. 120-122.

to support a resolution which would have given Congress the authority to discuss peace. As a result neither governmental power in Mexico accepted the American proposal for treaty discussions.[61] Bankhead again was limited in his authority because of the rapid turnover in the cabinet, which limited any chances for peace.

General Scott, impatient, sent word his army would march on August 1 and 2, and he arrived in Mexico City on August 4th. The military encounter brought great tragedy and at midnight on the 4th, Pachero, the new Foreign Minister, met with Bankhead and requested that Bankhead use his good offices to save the city from being sacked by American forces.[62]

Bankhead did not accept the Minister of Foreign Affairs' proposal. He believed that since the assistance of Great Britain was only partially admitted by the United States government, towards bringing the war to an end, and since the Mexican government never did condescend to give any answer to the British government's offer of mediation, he would refuse to accede to Pachero's request.

England throughout the war maintained her neutrality, but her ministers did try to assist in a peaceful reconciliation between the two. That assistance was impossible, first because of the United States victories, and secondly, both countries would have had to accept the British offer of mediation. The Mexicans, who had more to lose refused the mediation offer, thus proving the power of face and

---

[61] F.O. 50 Vol. 210 No. 67, "Bankhead to Palmerston, June 29, 1847," pp. 120-122.

[62] F.O. 50 Vol. 211 No. 76, "Bankhead to Palmerston, August 21, 1847," pp. 1-10.

pride. While the United States, on the other hand, thanked the British government for their concern and their desire to aid in the negotiation of a peace treaty. The United States listened to Pakenham's offer, but never answered him. Britain was simply a bystander, accepting as inevitable the manifest rise of American power.

There were elements within the English political system that wanted to aid Mexico but the Foreign Office realized that any aid to Mexico was foolish. Britain would not be a balancer of power on the North American continent as it was traditionally in Europe. The British wanted peace, they counseled for peace, and they remained at peace. Great Britain did not have to outfit an army or establish a naval blockade or become actively involved in any of the military struggles.

As the war progressed, and as the United States gained the upper hand, English influence in Mexico slowly evaporated. By the end of the war, English ministers contented themselves with delivering letters, and aiding the United States officials in the negotiation of the Treaty of Guadulupe Hidalgo. Their influence was overshadowed by the total defeat of the Mexican nation and the United States, as was her right as a victor in war, establishing a Treaty of Peace. By 1847 and 1848 the British ministers were content to carry out the everyday duties of their office, and emphasize to the Mexican nation, after the war, that British claims had to be met.

By 1847-1848 England had no desire to extend her influence in North America. The Oregon boundary settled, England seemed content to allow American expansion to continue. Aberdeen was so proud of the treaty that he said when he retired from the Foreign Office " . . . I am not aware that we leave any question behind us which is likely to

grow into a serious quarrel with the United States."[63]

The repeal of the Corn Laws, which opened markets for American farmers, the Mexican War which was underway, and the fear of Palmerston's anti-American attitude may have influenced Polk when he accepted Aberdeen's proposal in 1846.[64] The British likewise wanted a peaceful settlement. Even Palmerston who criticized the Webster-Ashburton treaty, believed after he took office in 1846 that the Oregon settlement was "equally favorable to both parties."[65]

By 1847 England realized that British interests in America did not necessitate a war. The trouble in Canada, India, and the revolutions in Europe occupied the minds of British politicians, and relations with the United States and Mexico took a back seat.

Canada throughout the period was in open conflict over British rule. The long-standing Canada Act of 1791 was the cause of Canadian unrest. It split the country into two provinces, Upper Canada (Ontario) inhabited by the English, and Lower Canada (Quebec) inhabited by the French. Each province was given an elected assembly, but just as in the thirteen colonies, quarrels erupted between governors and assemblies. The racial jealousy in Lower Canada added to the problem and open rebellion erupted in 1837.

The Canadian unrest led to the special study mission of Lord Durham, and his report became the most important document on colonial policy in English history. Briefly Durham called for a union of Upper

---

[63]W. Jones, Lord Aberdeen and the Americas, p. 82.

[64]Ibid.

[65]Herbert Bell, Lord Palmerston, I, p. 370.

and Lower Canada under one legislative body, while a governor appointed by the British cabinet would only act on issues strictly imperial in nature. Durham's report led to responsible government for Canada and laid the foundation for dominion status which came in 1867.[66]

Likewise England faced difficulties in another colony when native unrest erupted in India. The Indian Mutiny did not occur until 1857, and the India Act was passed in 1858, but the unrest and unconcern began in the 1840's.

In 1848 Lord Dalhousie became the Governor-General of India. During his reign the map of India was redrawn and England extended its control of the area. Wars were fought in Punjab and Burma and ill-will among the Indians emerged. In one battle alone in January, 1849 the British suffered 2,338 killed or wounded.[67] Indian wars and rebellions occupied the minds of British politicians throughout the 1850's and when Dalhousie left India in 1856, he left behind an uneasiness that eventually led to the Indian Mutiny in 1857.[68]

Palmerston also faced the problem of unrest and revolution on the continent. The revolutions sparked an intense desire in England to strengthen their national defense. France was always a thorn in the side of Britain and when Louis Napoleon made his moves Palmerston

---

[66]For further study see John George Durham, Lord Durham's Report on the Affairs of British North America, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1912); also Stanley Ryerson, Unequal Union (New York, 1968); and Albert B. Corey, The Crises of 1830-1842 in Canadian-American Relations (New Haven, 1941).

[67]John A. Marriott, The English in India, (Oxford, 1932), p. 151.

[68]Michael Edwards, British India 1772-1947 (New York, 1968), p. 31. Also Thomas Metcalf, The Aftermath of Revolt (Princeton, 1964), pp. 44-45.

recognized his government, but for the first time Palmerston was out of touch with public opinion. Fearing a second Napoleon and a Grand Army, England began to appropriate more money for armaments and coastal fortifications.[69]

These events and the scars of the political battle over the Corn Laws in England cannot be examined in detail but they must be recognized before anyone can understand the British policy in North America.

Mexico due to her poor political leadership was lost, Texas was now a part of the United States, and California, although British merchants dreamed of a port on the Pacific, would only cause more problems for the British Empire. Interference was not warranted, because vital British interest was not jeopardized. The American expansion was accepted and British interests, mainly economic, dictated a cordial peaceful relationship with the United States.

---

[69] J. Ridley, Lord Palmerston, p. 401.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Public Documents

Great Britain

Aberdeen Papers (B.M. Add. 43039-43358). British Museum.

Broadlands Papers (B.M. Add. 48417-48489). British Museum.

Peel Papers (B.M. Add. 40181-40618). British Museum.

Seven-Letter Books of Henry John Temple 1833-1850 (B.M. Add. 49963-49969.

British and Foreign State Papers 1842-1843, Vol. XXXI. London: James Ridgeway and Sons, 1858.

British and Foreign State Papers 1844-1845, Vol. XXXIII. London: Harrison and Sons, 1859.

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (3rd Series) Vols. XVIII, XLV, LXXXVIII, LXXXIX, XCIII.

Foreign Office Papers. Public Record Office.

Admiralty Papers. Public Record Office.

United States

Dispatches from United States Ministers to Mexico 1823-1906. Washington: National Archive and Record Service, 1955.

United States House of Representatives.
Executive Document Number 266, 27th Congress, 2nd Session. Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1841.
Executive Document Number 2, 28th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: Blair and Reeves, 1843.
Executive Document Number 19, 28th Congress, 2nd Session. Washington: Blair and Reeves, 1844.

United States Senate.
Executive Document Number 325, 27th Congress, 2nd Session. Washington: Thomas Allen, 1841.
Executive Document Number 1, 28th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1843.
Executive Document Number 1, 27th Congress, 3rd Session. Washington: Thomas Allen, 1842.

Messages and Papers of the Presidents. Compiled by James D. Richardson. Vols. V-VII. New York: Bureau of National Literature, 1897.

Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States: Inter-American Affairs 1831-1860, edited by William R. Manning. "Great Britain," Vol. VII, "Mexico," Vols. VIII and IX.

Congressional Globe, Vols. IX-XVIII.

Texas

Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas. Edited by George D. Garrison in Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 2 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1911.

Documents of Texas History edited by Ernest Wallace and David M. Vigness. Austin: The Steck Company, 1960

Mexico

The Mexican Side of the Revolution by the chief Participants, General Antonio López de Santa Anna, D. Ramon Martinez Caro, General Vincente Filisola, General José Urrea, General José María Tornel. Translated with notes by Carlos E. Castañeda. Dallas: P. L. Turner Company, 1928.

Newspapers

London Times. Published in London, England.

Daily Picayune. Published in New Orleans, Louisiana.

El Siglo Diez y Nueve.

La Reforma.

El Tiempo.

Precursor.

Books

Adams, Ephraim D. British Interests and Activities in Texas 1838-1846. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1910.

Balfour, Lady Francis. The Life of George, Fourth Earl of Aberdeen. London: Hodder and Stroughton, 2 vols. 1923.

Bancroft, Hubert H. History of Mexico. New York: The Bancroft Company, 1914.

Bartlett, C. J. Great Britain and Sea Power 1815-1853. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Bell, Herbert, C.F. Lord Palmerston 2 vols. Hamden Connecticut: Archon. 1966. First published in 1936.

Bemis, Samuel Flagg. The Latin American Policy of the United States. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1943.

Bustamente, Carlos María de. El Nuevo Bernal Díaz del Castillo; o sea, Historia de la Invasion de los Anglo-Americanos en Mexico. Mexico: Secretaría de Educación Publica, 1949.

Calcott, Wilfred. Santa Anna: The Story of an Enigma Who Once was Mexico. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1936.

Chitwood, Oliver P. John Tyler Champion of the South. New York: Appleton Century Company, 1939.

Connell, Brian. Regina vs. Palmerston: The Correspondence Between Queen Victoria and Her Foreign and Prime Ministers, 1837-1865. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1961.

Connor, Syemour V. Adventure in Glory. Austin: Steck-Vaughn Company, 1964.

Connor, Syemour V. and Odie B. Faulk. North America Divided: The Mexican War 1846-1848. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Corey, Albert Bickmore. The Crises of 1830-1842 in Canadian-American Relations. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.

Cotner, Thomas E. (ed). Essays in Mexican History. Austin: Institute of Latin American Studies, 1958.

Crane, W. C. Life and Literary Remains of Sam Houston. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company, 1885.

De la Barca, Mme. Calderon. Life in Mexico During a Residence of Two Years in that Country. New York: Dutton and Company, 1931.

Durham, John George Lambton. Lord Durham's Report on the Affairs of British North America. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.

Edwardes, Micahel. British India 1772-1947: A Survey of the Nature and Effects of Alien Rule. New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1968.

Fuess, Claude M. Daniel Webster. 2 vols. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1930.

Gilliam, Albert M. Travels in Mexico. Aberdeen: George Clark and Son, 1847.

Gooch, G. B. and Ward, A. W. Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy 1815-1866, Vol. 11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923.

Gordon, Arthur. The Earl of Aberdeen. London: Sampson Low Marston and Company, 1893.

Graebner, Norman (ed). Manifest Destiny. New York: Bobbs-Merril Company, 1968.

Halvey, Elie. The Age of Peel and Cobden. New York: Peter Smith, 1948.

Holst, H. von. John C. Calhoun. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1882.

Jenkins, John S. History of the War Between the United States and Mexico. New York: Derby and Miller, 1849.

Jones, Anson. Memoranda and Official Correspondence Relating to the Republic of Texas, Its History and Annexation. Chicago: Rio Grande Press, 1966. First Published in New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1859.

Jones, Wilbur Devereux. Lord Aberdeen and the Americas. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1958.

Lewis, Walker, ed. Speak for Yourself Daniel. The Life of Webster in His Own Words. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.

Livermore, Abiel. The War With Mexico Reviewed. Boston: American Peace Society, 1850.

Macknight, Thomas. Thirty Years of Foreign Policy: A History of the Secretaryships of The Earl of Aberdeen and Viscount Palmerston. London: Longmans Brown Green and Longmans. 1855.

Marriott, Sir John A. R. The English in India: A Problem of Politics. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932.

Martin, Kingsley. The Triumph of Lord Palmerston. A Study of Public Opinion in England before the Crimean War. London: Hutchinson and Company, 1963.

McCormac, Eugene I. James K. Polk, A Political Biography. New York: Russell and Russel, 1965. First published, 1922.

Metcalf, Thomas R. The Aftermath of Revolt in India 1857-1870. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.

Merk, Frederick. Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Merk, Frederick. The Monroe Doctrine and American Expansionism, 1843-1949. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.

Merk, Frederick (ed.). The Oregon Question: Essays in Anglo-American Diplomacy and Politics. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Morgan, Robert J. A Whig Embattled. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1954.

Nance, Joseph M. After San Jacinto: The Texas-Mexican Frontier, 1836-1841. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1963.

Nevins, Allan. Ordeal of Union. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947.

Parkes, Henry Namford. A History of Mexico. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1938.

Peña y Reyes, Antonio de la. Lord Aberdeen, Texas y California. Colección de documentos precedida de una introducción. Mexico: Publicaciones de la Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, 1925.

Pemberton, W. Baring. Lord Palmerston. London: Batchworth Press, 1954.

Reeves, Jess. American Diplomacy under Tyler and Polk. Baltimore: Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1907.

Richardson, Rupert N. Texas: The Lone Star State. New York: Prentice Hall, 1943.

Ridley, Jasper. Lord Palmerston. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1971.

Rippy, J. Fred. Latin America in World Politics. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1928.

Rives, George Lockhart. The United States and Mexico 1821-1848. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Ryerson, Stanley B. Unequal Union: Confederation and Roots of Conflict in Canada 1815-1873. New York: International Publishers, 1968.

Schmitz, Joseph W. Texan Statecraft. San Antonion: The Naylor Company, 1941.

Seager, Robert. and Tyler, too: A Biography of John and Julia Tyler. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.

Sellers, Charles G. James K. Polk: Jacksonian 1795-1843. Princeton: N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Sellers, Charles G. James K. Polk, Continentalist 1843-1846. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Silbey, Joel. The Shrine of Party. New York: Random House, 1967.

Singletary, Otis. The Mexican War. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Smith, Justin H. The War with Mexico. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan and Company, 1919.

Smith, Justin H. The Annexation of Texas. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1941.

Starr, Frederick. Mexico and the United States. Chicago: The Bible House, 1914.

Temperly, Harold. The Foreign Policy of Canning. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon, 1966.

Thompson, Waddy. Recollections of Mexico. New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1846.

Webster, Sir Charles. The Foreign Policy of Palmerston 1830-1841. 2 vols. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1951.

Wiltse, Charles M. John C. Calhoun, Sectionalist 1840-1850. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1951.

Zabre, Alfonso Teja. Guide to the History of Mexico: A Modern Interpretation. New York: Pemberton Press, 1969.

Articles

Adams, Ephraim D. "English Interest in Annexation of California," American Historical Review, Vol. XIV (July, 1909), pp. 744-763.

Boucher, Chauncey. "Re That Aggressive Slaveocracy," Mississippi Historical Review, Vol. VIII (1921), pp. 13-80.

Bourne, Edward G. "The United States and Mexico 1847-48," American Historical Review, Vol. V (April, 1900), pp. 491-502.

Garrison, George P. "The First Stages of the Movement for the Annexation of Texas," American Historical Review, Vol. X (October, 1904), pp. 72-92.

McLemore, R. A. "Influence of French Diplomatic Policy on the Annexation of Texas," Southern Historical Quarterly, Vol. XLIII (1940), pp. 344-355.

Merk, Frederick. "British Government Propaganda and Oregon Treaty," American Historical Review, Vol. XL (1934), pp. 38-62.

Merk, Frederick. "British Party Politics and the Oregon Treaty," American Historical Review, Vol. XXXVII (1932), pp. 653-677.

Rippy, J. F. "British Role in the Early Relations of the United States and Mexico." Hispanic American Historical Review, Vol. VII (1927), pp. 2-24.

Rives, George L. "Mexican Diplomacy on Eve of War with United States," American Historical Review, Vol. XVIII (1913), pp. 215-294.

Scott, L. M. "Oregon, Texas, and California, 1846," Oregon Historical Quarterly, XXXVI (1935), pp. 154-62.

Smith, Justin. "America's Role in Mexico." American Historical Review, Vol. XXIII (1918), pp. 289-302.

Smith, Justin. "Mexican Recognition of Texas." American Historical Review, Vol. XVI (1910), pp. 36-55.

Smith, Justin. "Great Britain and our War of 1846-1848." Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings, Vol. XLVII (1914), pp. 451-462.

Spell, Lota M. "The Anglo-Saxon Press in Mexico 1846-1848." American Historical Review, Vol. XXXVIII (1932), pp. 462-478.

Wiltse, Ernest A. "The British Vice Consuls in California and the Events of 1846." California Historical Society Quarterly, Vol. X (1931), pp. 99-128.

VITA

John Paul Tymitz

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: BRITISH INFLUENCE IN MEXICO 1840-1848

Major Field: History

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Chicago, Illinois, December 6, 1941, the son of John and Helen Tymitz; married Dixie N. Knight Neyland, November 27, 1968; two children, Robert Jonathan Lee Neyland, born November 22, 1961 and Illia Erin Scarlet Shaneen O. Neyland, born June 2, 1964.

Education: Graduated from Rufus M. Hitch elementary school, Chicago, Illinois in June, 1956; graduated from William H. Taft High School, Chicago, Illinois, 1960. Received Associate of Arts degree from Wilbur Wright Junior College, Chicago, Illinois, in June, 1962; received Bachelor of Arts degree from Southern Illinois University in June, 1964, and a Master of Arts in History in June, 1966; enrolled in a doctoral program at the University of Nebraska 1966-1967; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1973.

Professional Experience: Graduate Teaching Assistant, Southern Illinois University, 1964-1966; graduate teaching assistant University of Nebraska, 1966-1967; Instructor of History at Central State University, Edmond, Oklahoma, 1967-1970; promoted to Assistant Professor of History in 1970. Visiting Assistant Professor of History, World Campus Afloat, Fall, 1972; graduate teaching assistant, Oklahoma State University, Spring, 1973.