

379
N81
No. 5162

A DESCRIPTIVE ACCOUNT OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS PERTAINING TO THE HISTORY OF UNITED
STATES DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH MEXICO, 1821-1846

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

by

Melody S. Kelly, B.A., M.L.S.

Denton, Texas

May, 1976

Kelly, Melody S. A Descriptive Account of United States Government Documents Pertaining to the History of United States Diplomatic Relations with Mexico, 1821-1846. Master of Arts (History), May, 1976, 187 pp., 3 appendices, 25 titles.

This paper provides a thematic approach to three major United States government document series relating to topics of early United States diplomatic relations with Mexico; treaty negotiations, the Santa Fe trade, the Texas question, and claims. The document series examined are the United States presidential papers, United States Congressional documents, and the National Archives Record Group 59, diplomatic dispatches from United States Ministers to Mexico. Historians must make an evaluation of all documentary evidence available for an accurate assessment of historical events. Inadequate analysis of these major United States document series has limited this necessary assessment in the area of United States-Mexican diplomatic relations, 1821-1846.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. NEGOTIATING THE UNITED STATES - MEXICAN TREATIES OF AMITY, COMMERCE, NAVIGATION, AND BOUNDARY	11
II. NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE SANTA FE TRADE	41
III. THE TEXAS QUESTION	51
IV. CLAIMS	138
V. CONCLUSION	174
APPENDIX A; United States Presidents, Secretaries of State and Diplomats to Mexico	181
APPENDIX B; Mexican Heads of State	183
APPENDIX C; Abbreviations	184
BIBLIOGRAPHY	185

INTRODUCTION

Government documents are the primary evidence of a country's history. Through them the development of policies can be followed from their first hesitant steps to their conclusions. Availability and access place the major limitations on historical research in this vast national resource.

Early United States government documents, congressional, presidential, and diplomatic papers are readily available to the public through the United States Superintendent of Documents and the National Archives and Records Service. Access to these document series is the major obstacle for the historian, and for the researcher in areas other than United States history it is both complex and frustrating. This frustration often leads to dependence on the research of other scholars rather than reliance on the original documentary sources. In the area of United States - Mexican relations prior to the war of 1846, historians rely heavily on the pioneering work of Hubert H. Bancroft, William Manning, and George Rives as guides to relevant United States documents. This places severe limitations on historical revisionism and perpetuates the bias of these early scholars. Lack of access to the corresponding Mexican documents increases the scholar's responsibility to thoroughly examine all pertinent United States documents in order to achieve the widest possible view.

The U.S. Congress in the late nineteenth century first recognized the historical importance of documents and the necessity for a workable method of access. A bill enacted July 27, 1882, called for a "Descriptive Catalogue of all publications made by the authority of the Government of the United States and the preceeding Government of the colonies, bureaus, offices thereof, from July 4, 1776 to March 4, 1881."¹ The implementation of this bill under guide lines set forth by the U.S. Joint Committee on Printing of the Forty-seventh Congress became the responsibility of Ben Perley-Poore. With the assistance of fourteen men, Poore searched for government publications in the Library of Congress, the Senate, the House of Representatives, the seven executive departments and their bureaus, the Department of Agriculture, the Smithsonian Institute, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and in the public library of Boston. No one knew how many documents would be cataloged or the length of time required by the project. Not one of the men employed had experience in cataloging and part of their work proved incompetent and unusable. After patient assimilation, 63,063 books, pamphlets, and documents formed Poore's Descriptive Catalogue of Government Publications of

¹Poore, Ben Perley, Descriptive Catalogue of Government Publications of the United States, September 5, 1774 - March 4, 1881 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1885), p. III.

the United States, September 5, 1774 - March 4, 1881, published by the U.S. Government Printing Office in 1885.²

Poore's catalog, a monumental work, is a quarto volume containing 1,241 pages of entries with an additional 151 pages of index. Arranged chronologically, entries begin with the executive and judicial publications followed by those of Congress for each year. The majority of entries are from the Congress and departmental reports are often entirely missing. Poore's catalog uses two columns per page with each entry giving first a brief descriptive title followed by the author, type of document, document number, congress, session, volume number, date, and pages. Indexing is by the key words appearing in the brief title of each entry, and the citation is to page number only. A search of both columns and the titles of all entries is necessary to find the desired document. Under the topic "Mexico - claims against," seventeen page references appear without any other identifying designator. This index is at best only a rough guide for the researcher. If all entries on a topic are required a column by column chronological search is the only accurate method available.³

A sample entry illustrates the lack of adequate information in the descriptive titles for the documents.

²Ibid, pp. III-IV.

³Ibid, p. 1325.

Petition on communication with Mexico, Inhabitants of Missouri, Executive Papers No. 79, 18th Congress, 2d. session, vol. IV, Oct. 24, 1824, 8 pp.⁴

From this title the researcher might assume the document covers only the problem of a diplomatic dialogue with Mexico, or mail communication. Neither of these assumptions is correct. This document presents supportative evidence for the construction of a road between Missouri and Santa Fe, New Mexico. Within this one document are letters from men engaged in trade with Santa Fe which provide a short history of the trade, names of leaders, numbers, type of goods, and the returns, with the mileage of each route and the need for military escort through Indian territory. This information might easily be overlooked because of its too vague descriptive title.

Other problems arise with information in the sample entry. The generic term "Executive Papers" identifies the document series. No official series of documents exists under this title, nor under those of "State Papers," "House Executive Documents," "Executive Documents," and "Documents" that appear in other entries. The official series title for the Congressional documents are "House Documents," "Senate Document," "House Report," "Senate Report," "House Miscellaneous Document," and "Senate Miscellaneous Document." To determine the true

⁴Ibid, p. 169.

series for "Executive Papers No. 79" a comparison is necessary with the tables of documents in volume one of the Checklist of United States Public Documents, 1798 - 1909. The tables in the Checklist are chronologically by Congress and session with subdivisions for the reports and documents of both houses. The tables provide Congressional serial number, volume number, part number, series title, document or report numbers included in the volumes, and notes. At a glance the tables show whether the Senate or House during the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session issued a fourth volume containing a document number 79. If both houses published a fourth volume with a document 79 then the researcher must examine both documents to determine whether House Document No. 79 or Senate Document No. 79 is correct. In this instance only the House Document No. 79 appears in a fourth volume and now "Executive Papers No. 79" is correctly identified.⁵

The final step in locating House Document No. 79 is to determine the Congressional Serial Set volume number which contains the document. Congressional documents and reports are assembled in volumes beginning with the Fifteenth Congress, 1817, and each book in this series has a designating serial number running consecutively to the present. This numbering system, however, is impossible to apply to the documents of

⁵U.S. Superintendent of Documents, List of Congressional and Departmental Publications, Checklist of United States Public Documents, 1789 - 1909, vol. 1 (1911; Reprint ed. 3, New York: Kraus, 1962), p. 8.

the first fourteen Congresses, because they were not assembled in book form. A special series 01 through 038 designates these materials as American State Papers and allows them to precede documents in the Congressional Serial Set numbering system. The first column in the Checklist indicates the serial set volume number, and in the example of House Document No. 79, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, the table lists volume number 116.⁶

"Presidential papers" pose an even greater problem for the researcher. This category covers every aspect of a president's life, both personal and official. Access to papers of an incumbent president is governed by restrictions that do not apply to those of former presidents. The "public papers" of the president include presidential messages, speeches, Executive Orders, proclamations, and material released by the White House. These papers are in the public domain and accessible to all. The "official papers" of the president or "private papers" include official statements, drafts of speeches, personal notes, position papers, and personal correspondence. These papers relate to the government, but are not totally governmental in origin. Ownership therefore resides with the president. Past presidents were under no obligation to preserve

⁶Ibid.

these "official or private papers" and many have been deliberately destroyed, given away, or lost.

Congress began purchasing these "official papers" before adopting a uniform policy. A separate agreement was made with each owner and the purchased papers stored by the Department of State. The Library of Congress took possession of these papers in 1903, and worked diligently to complete the collection. Access to those papers now owned by the government was the subject of Public Law 85-147, August 16, 1957. The Library of Congress was to

arrange, index, and microfilm the papers of the Presidents in the Library of Congress in order to preserve their contents ..., to make the Presidential Papers more readily available for study and research....⁷

For the papers of the presidents for 1821 to 1845, all are included in this microfilm series except those of John Quincy Adams. The Adams' papers are maintained by the Adams Trust established in 1905, and the Adams family has absolute control over them, including the right to destroy any part of or all of the collection. Congress purchased a portion of the James Monroe papers in 1849, and added others of a personal nature to the Library of Congress in 1892. Andrew Jackson's papers were so badly mutilated and dispersed that one hundred

⁷U.S. General Services Administration, United States Statutes at Large, 87 v. (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958), 71:368.

separate purchases were necessary to form the collection in the Library of Congress. Martin Van Buren pruned his own papers for easy management. Those remaining in his family after his death came to the Library of Congress in 1904 and 1905 through a gift. William H. Harrison served so short a term that only 800 items reside in the Library of Congress collection. The majority of John Tyler's papers burned during the Civil War. Those collected by his son joined the Library of Congress in 1919. James K. Polk managed his papers carefully, and those held by his family were purchased by the Library of Congress in 1903.⁸

Each microfilmed set of presidential papers held by the Library of Congress has an accompanying index. Arrangement, however, is alphabetical by writer or recipient with corresponding columns giving date, series number, number of pages, and addenda. This presents a limited and time consuming method of access. For example, John Q. Adams served as James Monroe's Secretary of State from 1817 to 1824. For the Monroe period under consideration, 1821-1825, 126 letters were exchanged. As examination of each is necessary to determine which, if any, pertain to affairs with Mexico. Thomas H. Benton has seventeen letters listed in the Andrew Jackson

⁸Hirshon, Arnold, "The Scope Accessibility and History of Presidential Papers," Government Publications Review, 1 (Fall, 1974):371-72.

papers for 1828-1844. Many may pertain to Missouri's interest in Texas and the Santa Fe trade. All must be examined. No subject approach is possible.⁹

The problems of access to the presidential papers appear minimal in comparison to those involving the U.S. Department of State's Record Group 59, the "Despatches from the United States Ministers to Mexico, 1823-1906." These documents are on 179 reels of microfilm available from the National Archives and Record Service. Access is through their publication National Archives Microfilm Publications, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974. Pages twenty to twenty-one contain a listing of the periods covered by each reel in this series. Twelve reels contain the dispatches, assorted letters, clippings, and miscellaneous memoranda sent to the Department of State by the ministers and charge d'affaires in Mexico from Joel R. Poinsett through Waddy Thompson. No division by subject is available except indirectly through the footnotes of Bancroft, Manning, and Rives. The material in this dispatch series is invaluable, with each reel holding an average of fifty feet of film.¹⁰

⁹ Ibid. pp. 379-381; U.S. Library of Congress, Index to the James Monroe Papers (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), p.1; U.S. Library of Congress, Index to the Andrew Jackson Papers (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p.7.

¹⁰ National Archives and Records Service, National Archives microfilm publications (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974), pp. 20-21.

The document series discussed above present contrasting views of goals and events in the development and failures of United States - Mexican relations, 1821 to 1846. Each group played a role in the final outcome. Information received from the ministers and charge d' affaires in Mexico influenced policy and opinions formed by the Secretaries of State. The personal desires of each president revealed in their personal papers influenced their foreign policy and the choice of information and legislation presented to Congress. Congressional documents, a motley collection of public memorials influenced by the press, and the private ambitions of members of Congress also brought pressure on the executive. These formed the beginning and end of a continuing circle of political pressure and the resulting events.

This paper proposes to examine the evidence available in each of these three document series pertaining to the negotiations of United States - Mexican treaties, the Santa Fe trade, the Texas question, and United States claims. This topical arrangement will eliminate the problems inherent in the separate indexes for the United States Congressional documents, presidential papers, and the United States diplomatic dispatches from Mexico, 1821 to 1846. Continual reassessment of documentary evidence is mandatory to correct or reaffirm the historical conclusions drawn by others. Each researcher has the obligation to form his own opinions after consulting the evidence.

CHAPTER I

NEGOTIATING THE UNITED STATES-MEXICAN TREATIES OF AMITY, COMMERCE, NAVIGATION, AND BOUNDARY

To regularize relations with the Mexican government as quickly as possible was an important consideration of President James Monroe when he offered the position of Minister Plenipotentiary to Joel R. Poinsett in January, 1825. Three years had elapsed since U.S. recognition of Mexican independence, and the offer of the Minister's position in Mexico was used as a political tool in the elections of 1824. Poinsett hesitated to accept hoping for the coveted position of Secretary of State in the new administration of John Q. Adams. He was disappointed in this ambition when the position went to Henry Clay, and finally accepted the appointment to Mexico on March 6, 1825.

Much valuable time had been lost for building strong ties with Mexico, thus allowing British influence in this new nation to grow unchecked. Secretary of State Henry Clay emphasized in his instructions to the new Minister the importance of concluding a treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation as well as arranging a formal boundary agreement. Poinsett found his commercial negotiations thwarted by a British commercial treaty already concluded when he arrived in Mexico.

May, 1825. Poinsett's instructions called for the principles of perfect reciprocity and free ships made free goods. The British had tentatively agreed to most-favored-nation status and an article that allowed special privileges among the former Spanish colonies. The inexperienced Mexican officials felt more comfortable using a set pattern for negotiating foreign treaties. Having reached an agreement with Britain, they preferred to use an identical one with the U.S. The British agreement to the article in their commercial treaty allowing special privileges among the former Spanish colonies did not harm their own commercial interests, but would serve to separate the United States from the other American nations if Mexico could force its acceptance. Other major points hindering an early agreement were the return of fugitive slaves and the settlement of a boundary.

Mexican law prohibited slavery and the inclusion of article sixteen allowing the return of fugitive U.S. slaves became a much debated issue in the negotiation protocols and later in the Mexican Congress. In this opposition to slavery, Mexico received encouragement from the British. As a new nation the Mexican government was very sensitive to their national honor and territorial integrity. Clay's instructions to Poinsett called for a boundary agreement based on the 1819 treaty with Spain which set the line at the Sabine River. Poinsett argued now was the time for a renewal of the U.S.

claims to land north of the Rio Grande or the Brazos River, and he received authorization to purchase Texas. The inability of Poinsett to reach a satisfactory agreement with Lucas Alamán and Sebastian Camacho, the Mexican Ministers of Foreign Affairs, resulted in an agreement to separate the boundary negotiations from those of commerce in January, 1828. And separating the issues did facilitate a commercial settlement. Poinsett, however, had awakened the Mexican fear of territorial incursions from the north. This suspicion of American motives regarding Texas and later California continued despite changes in the Mexican government from the pro-British monarchical party to the republican party, and later to dictatorial strong men. The "Menace from the North" became a political issue used by each successive administration to unite the people and sustain itself in power.

The successful completion of U.S. negotiations required the efforts of three U.S. administrations, Monroe, Adams, and Jackson. The negotiations became entangled with the personalities of the Ministers and Chargés to Mexico, the complex chaos of Mexican politics and economics, and the Latin American policies of the British. Not until January 12, 1831, was a boundary agreement reached. The treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation was not sent to the U.S. Senate until April 15, 1831. A final implementation of the boundary survey did not occur before the U.S. became involved in the

annexation of Texas ten years later. During this period, the Mexican suspicion of U.S. motives grew and amiable relations faltered and failed.

The chronology of negotiations in the U.S. documents that follows is one of misunderstanding, fear, and mutual distrust.

Ex. Docs., No. 52 (H. Doc. 52), 18th Cong. 2d. sess., 15 Jan., 1825, s.s. 115; "Message from the President of the United States transmitting information...in relation to the Western Boundary of the United States." President James Monroe forwards Secretary of State John Q. Adams's report stating transitions in the Mexican government and the postponement in sending a diplomatic mission to Mexico contributed to the delay in executing article four of the 1819 treaty with Spain.

Henry Clay to Joel R. Poinsett, 25 Mar., 1825, American State Papers; Foreign Affairs, V: 908; VI: 578. Secretary of State Clay emphasizes in these instructions to the new U.S. Minister to Mexico the necessity of concluding treaties of amity, commerce, navigation, and boundary. He suggests that stress in these negotiations be placed on early recognition of Mexico by the U.S., and that the U.S. expected no special privileges for this, but would not accept less than other nations.

Despatch No. 12, Poinsett to Clay, 5 Aug., 1825; received 3 Oct., 1825, Record Group 59, "Despatches from the United States Ministers to Mexico, 1823-1906," National Archives,

Washington, D.C. Poinsett suggests the U.S. negotiate to extend the boundary with Mexico to the Rio Grande, or the Colorado River, or at least the Brazos River and establish hardy settlers on this frontier.¹¹

Despatch No. 18, Poinsett to Clay, 13 Sept., 1825; received [1825], Record Group 59 reports a delay in the commercial treaty negotiations on the principle of perfect reciprocity and Mexico's desire to extend special privileges to the former Spanish colonies. In cipher Poinsett vows not to sign any treaty containing this special privilege clause.

Despatch No. 19, Poinsett to Clay, 20 Sept., 1825; received 4 Nov., 1825, Record Group 59 describes an interview with Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs Lucas Alamán in which Alamán expresses a desire to return the boundary to that set prior to the Louisiana Purchase until a new agreement can be reached. Poinsett argues for the Spanish treaty of 1819 earlier acknowledged by Mexico, and that the U.S. would not give up territory east of the Sabine River or north of the Red and Arkansas Rivers. Poinsett suggested to Clay that an opportune time for a renewal of the U.S. claims to land north of the Rio Grande or at least the Brazos River had been reached.

¹¹Throughout this paper the nineteenth century spelling of "despatch" and "Vera Cruz" will be used, and the government form of dates observed.

Despatch No. 22, Poinsett to Clay, 28 Sept., 1825; received 9 Dec., 1825, Record Group 59 announced Alamán's replacement by Camacho and problems in negotiation of commercial treaty caused by British acceptance of Mexico's special privileges for former Spanish colonies. Poinsett reported his arguments used against this principle in their treaty with Mexico, and Miguel Ramos Arizpe's mediation on this subject between Camacho and himself.

Despatch No. 24, Poinsett to Clay, 12 Oct., 1825; received 7 Jan., 1826, Record Group 59. Poinsett encloses his letter to U.S. Minister Rufus King in London giving the background and arguments used in his negotiations for treaties with Mexico. He gives details on the difficulties of article four and British Minister H.G. Ward's assertion that the British only agreed to this article after viewing the Mexican-Colombian treaty. Poinsett notifies King that this treaty was not ratified and that the British reasons for accepting article four are now void. Poinsett gives King his own personal views on the future British policy in Mexico regarding the commercial treaties.

Clay to Poinsett, 9 Nov., 1825, American State Papers; Foreign Affairs, V: 854-855. Clay's despatch to Poinsett after receipt of Poinsett's Despatch No. 18 asserts U.S. determination not to allow former colonial ties to justify Mexican extension of special privileges to Latin America.

If they insist, then the U.S. will claim those privileges on grounds that the majority of its territory was formerly Spanish. Clay suggests other arguments to use in proving that the U.S. should be considered a vital part of the American nations.

Despatch No. 28, Poinsett to Clay, 25 Nov. 1826; received 4 Feb., 1826, Record Group 59. Poinsett agrees to use the U.S.-Colombian Treaty as an example in the Mexican negotiations. He reports that the U.S. has been exempted from higher duties paid by other exporting countries, and that upon the arrival of the Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs negotiations on the survey of a road to Santa Fe will be reopened.

Despatch No. 31, Poinsett to Clay, 16 Dec., 1825; received 21 Jan., 1826, Record Group 59. Poinsett reports negotiations delayed by illness of Mexican negotiator and holidays. He notes that messages on the British-Mexican treaty have arrived on Mexico and conjectures that they will contain Canning's objections to article four.

Despatch No. 32, Poinsett to Clay, 4 Jan., 1826; received 8 Feb., 1826, Record Group 59 relates in detail the British objections to the treaty with Mexico and Poinsett's estimation of the British treaty's chances for passage by the Mexican congress.

Despatch No. 35, Poinsett to Clay, 1 Feb., 1826; received 21 March, 1826, Record Group 59. Mexican Minister of Foreign

Affairs Camacho will travel to London to conclude the Mexican treaty with Britain. This will further delay the negotiations for a U.S. - Mexican treaty.

Despatch No. 36, Poinsett to Clay, 18 Feb., 1826; received 25 Mar., 1826, Record Group 59 relates the renewal of negotiations for a Mexican-British treaty and the serious illness of Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs Camacho. Poinsett regards this illness as an excuse for further delay in his own negotiations that are approaching conclusion.

Despatch No. 40, Poinsett to Clay, 24 May, 1826; received 16 May, 1826, Record Group 59. Poinsett believes Camacho's illness used only as an excuse for continual delay in negotiations and fears that the treaty cannot be concluded before the end of the Congressional session.

Despatch No. 42, Poinsett to Clay, 30 April, 1826; received 16 June, 1826, Record Group 59. Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs Camacho and Jose Ignacio Esteyan are appointed on 1 May, 1826, for the resumption of negotiations with the U.S.

Despatch No. 46, Poinsett to Clay, 31 May, 1831; received 12 July, 1826, Record Group 59. Negotiations on the commercial treaty are progressing slowly and the principle of reciprocity must be abandoned for that of most-favored-nation. Poinsett offers assurance that the Mexican president will call a special session in August for ratification of the treaty if it is concluded.

Despatch No. 50, Poinsett to Clay, 12 July, 1826; received 4 Sept., 1826, Record Group 59. Poinsett forwards a copy of the commercial treaty just concluded. He gives a complete report on those principles in this treaty that vary from those in the U.S. - Colombian treaty and the influence of the simultaneous British - Mexican - U.S. negotiations on the outcome of each treaty. Poinsett hopes for Mexican ratification in the special session of the Mexican congress in September. General José Terán is appointed to examine the U.S. - Mexican boundary and conduct the survey. His departure is set for October.

Despatch No. 57, Poinsett to Clay, 20 Sept., 1826; received 6 Nov., 1826, Record Group 59 contains a translation of the Mexican President's speech on beginning the extraordinary session of Congress, and his designation of the new tariff and consideration of foreign treaties as topics to be considered.

Despatch No. 61, Poinsett to Clay, 15 Nov., 1826; received 25 Dec., 1826, Record Group 59. Poinsett reports the U.S. - Mexican treaty will be submitted to the Chamber of Deputies, and the the Mexican Congress then in session for two months had not passed a single piece of legislation.

H. Ex. Docs., No. 26 (H. Docs. No. 25) 19th Cong., 2d sess., 28 Dec., 1826, s.s. 150; "Message from the President of the United States transmitting information...relating to certain negotiations with the government of the United Mexican States." President John Q. Adams sends a copy of Secretary

of State Clay's report on activity taken in negotiating a boundary, recovery of runaway slaves from Texas and the recovery of debts from those fugitives in Mexico. Clay refers in the first two topics to the new treaty and believes no obstacles exist in recovery of debts.

Despatch No. 67, Poinsett to Clay, 29 Dec., 1826; received [?, 1827] Record Group 59 answers Clay's inquiries on the restrictions to U.S. shipping by the agreement to the principle of most-favored-nation in the Mexican treaty. Poinsett fears Mexico may insist on a narrower interpretation of this policy than the liberal one he advocates. He provides the Secretary of the Legation with a treaty copy and makes the suggestion that the U.S. wait for the Mexican ratification before making its own decision.

Despatch No. 68, Poinsett to Clay, 17 Jan., 1827; received 24 Feb., 1827, Record Group 59 notes that the U.S. - Mexican treaty will be handled with speed by the Mexican Congress. Poinsett reports that the boundary commission is delayed because it lacks authorization for expenditures necessary to its operation.

Despatch No. 69, Poinsett to Clay, 20 Jan., 1827; received [23 Feb., 1827], Record Group 59 reports that the treaty is still delayed in the Mexican Congress; not from ill will, but from lack of experience.

Message Relative to the Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation with Mexico, 8 Feb., 1827, American State Papers; Foreign Affairs, VI; 578-612. President John Q. Adams sends the treaty with Mexico signed on 10 July, 1827, and encloses all documents pertaining to the negotiations. These documents contain Clay's instructions to Poinsett dated 25 March, 1825, stating objects of his mission and detailed guidelines for negotiating the treaties. Poinsett is encouraged to push for a boundary line further west of the Sabine River if possible. Also enclosed are the protocols of the conference and copies of notes between the plenipotentiaries stating their position on articles in question.

Clay to Poinsett, 15 Mar., 1827, Jackson Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. contains diplomatic instruction No. 21 to Poinsett giving the official U.S. view toward U.S. citizens settling in Texas and the inherent difficulties that will result. Clay emphasizes the need for a boundary settlement that will bring this area into the union, and gives explicit instructions for such negotiations with the amount of compensation to be paid if the Rio Grande or the Colorado River is chosen.

Despatch No. 79, Poinsett to Clay, 17 Mar., 1827; received 20 April, 1827, Record Group 59. Poinsett transmits a copy of the British-Mexican treaty of commerce, amity, and navigation with his report that the Mexican Chamber of Deputies has received a favorable report on the U.S. - Mexican treaty.

Despatch No. 82, Poinsett to Clay, 10 April, 1827; received 8 June, 1827, Record Group 59, contains the Chamber of Deputies' committee report on the U.S. - Mexican treaty. The Chamber has requested the insertion of an article accenting the boundary as that set by the Spanish treaty of 1819. The British treaty passed the Mexican Congress without comment.

Despatch No. 88, Poinsett to Clay, 10 May, 1827; received 8 June, 1827, Record Group 59. Poinsett acknowledges communication of the U.S. Senate resolutions to the Mexican government regarding the treaty and proposals to renew the negotiations. He indicates that the treaty is still in the Chamber and is to be withdrawn by the Executive.

Despatch No. 90, Poinsett to Clay, 10 May, 1827; received 2 July, 1827, Record Group 59. Poinsett in a private letter following this despatch registers his surprise at the decision of the U.S. Senate on the treaty. He explains his motives in accepting the insertion of the additional article proposed by the Mexican plenipotentiaries, and points out the difficulties encountered in negotiating with people who, Poinsett believes, lack good faith and are afraid of deception themselves.

Despatch No. 91, Poinsett to Clay, 5 June, 1827; received 29 July, 1827, Record Group 59 contains a copy of the Mexican President's address at the closing of the congressional session

27 May, 1827. The U.S. treaty has now passed the Senate and is under consideration in the Chamber of Deputies. Good relations exist with the U.S., and a treaty of boundary is to be concluded as soon as possible.

Despatch No. 97, Poinsett to Clay, 10 Aug., 1827; received 14 Nov., 1827, Record Group 59. Poinsett reports his reception by the Mexican President and his assurances that negotiations will resume soon. The President indicates his willingness to drop those parts that previously caused the treaty's rejection by the U.S. Senate. The boundary commissioners are about to leave and Poinsett points out the urgency for negotiations to begin so that if the treaty is concluded, the U.S. commissioners can join those of Mexico in the survey.

Despatch No. 102, Poinsett to Clay, 6 Oct., 1827; received 9 Nov., 1827, Record Group 59 announces that the Mexican Congress passed an appropriation for the boundary commission expenses, but the treasury does not have the funds and the commissioners cannot leave without them. José Ignacio Estevan and Juan José Espinosa have been appointed to negotiate a boundary treaty with Poinsett. Camacho's expected arrival continues to delay the opening of negotiations.

Despatch No. 104, Poinsett to Clay, 24 Oct., 1827; received 10 Dec., 1827, Record Group 59. Poinsett sends correspondence requesting passports for the Mexican boundary commission and

his reply. The request includes a list of men to accompany the commissioners.

Despatch No. 107, Poinsett to Clay, 10 Nov., 1827; received 5 Dec., 1827, Record Group 59. Camacho's illness is given as the reason for not continuing the negotiations. President Victoria expresses his wish that the treaties be concluded as quickly as possible and his willingness to drop the disputed points. Poinsett requests a copy of John Melish's map published in 1818 and cited in the treaty of boundary in 1819. The Mexican government had rejected Poinsett's map published in 1821.

Despatch No. 111, Poinsett to Clay, 12 Dec., 1827; received 4 Feb., 1828, Record Group 59 transmits a copy of the British - Mexican treaty signed 26 Dec., 1826, with the official Mexican Department of State publication, "Primera Secretaria de Estado, Departamento del Exterior, seccion 2^a," by Juan José Espinosa de los Monteros.

Despatch No. 113, Poinsett to Clay, 8 Jan., 1828; received 23 Feb., 1828, Record Group 59 reports the renewal of negotiations and Poinsett's hopes for a prompt and favorable conclusion of the treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation. To remove opposition to the commercial treaty in the Chamber of Deputies involving the boundary disputes, Poinsett arranges to have the two questions of commerce and boundary separated. Poinsett discusses possible boundary lines, their chance of

passage in the Chamber of Deputies, and his acceptance of the treaty of 1819 until it is altered by negotiations.

H. Ex. Docs, No. 61 (H. Doc. 61), 20th Cong., 1st sess., 15 Jan., 1828, s.s. 117; "Message from the President of the United States transmitting information required...respecting the Recovery of Debts in the Mexican States from Persons Absconding from the United States also respecting the Boundary Line between the United States and the Province of Texas." President John Q. Adams sends the report of Secretary of State Clay stating that inquiries have been made into any obstacle preventing the recovery of debts, and that the western boundary negotiations are in progress.

Despatch No. 115, Poinsett to Clay, 7 Feb., 1828; received 10 Mar., 1828, Record Group 59. Poinsett sends copies of the boundary treaty and the protocols of the conferences. He reports progress on the commercial treaty by his efforts to place the U.S. on the same terms as those secured by the British.

Despatch No. 117, Poinsett to Clay, 22 Feb., 1828; received 16 April, 1828, Record Group 59 gives Poinsett's report on compliance with all the alterations suggested by the U.S. Senate in the commercial treaty and encloses two letters between Poinsett and Camacho and Estevan on the principle of "free ships make free goods" in article sixteen.

Despatch No. 118, Poinsett to Clay, 18 Mar., 1828; received [1828], Record Group 59 sends protocols of conferences held at the request of the Mexican plenipotentiaries to explain doubtful points to the Mexican Congress. These points relate to the separation of commercial agreements from those of boundary, the fugitive slave article, the principle of perfect reciprocity, Indian nation incursions, and passports for European Spaniards.

Message Relative to the Treaty of Limits with the United Mexican States, 22 April, 1828, American State Papers: Foreign Affairs, VI; 946. President John Q. Adams sends a copy of the treaty of limits concluded 12 Jan., 1828, to the Senate with the protocols of the negotiations between Poinsett, Camacho, and Estevan.

Despatch No. 124, Poinsett to Clay, 24 April, 1828; received 29 May, 1828, Record Group 59 notifies Clay that the Mexican Chamber has ratified the treaty of limits and the Senate will now take action. The exchange of ratification is now impossible before the required date, and Poinsett blames Minister Camacho for the delay, but indicates that the treaty of commerce will be ratified soon.

Message Relative to the Treaty of Amity, Commerce, and Navigation with the United Mexican States, 24 April, 1828, American State Papers: Foreign Affairs, VI; 952. President

John Q. Adams sends a copy of the treaty concluded 14 Feb., 1828, and copies of the protocols in Spanish and English of the negotiation conferences.

Despatch No. 125, Poinsett to Clay, 26 April, 1828; received 29 May, 1828, Record Group 59 reports the treaty of limits signed 12 Jan., 1828, and ratified by the Mexican Senate. The treaty is not forwarded to Washington as its arrival there would not be possible before the four months exchange period lapses, and the treaty will need to be resubmitted to the U.S. Senate.

Despatch No. 128, Poinsett to Clay, 21 May, 1828; received 21 July 1828, Record Group 59. Poinsett notifies Clay that the Mexican Congress has adjourned without ratifying the U.S. - Mexican treaty. The Mexican Chamber of Deputies rejected the article on fugitive slaves and control of border Indians.

Despatch No. 153, Poinsett to Clay, 22 Oct., 1828; received 1 Dec., 1828, Record Group 59. The Mexican Senate returns to the Chamber of Deputies the U.S. - Mexican treaty rejecting articles 16 through 25, 30, and 32 through 34. This was not unexpected as a Senate majority disliked the U.S. republican institutions, preferring instead monarchical principles. If the treaty can again pass the Chamber by a two-thirds majority, then only one-third approval in the Senate is needed.

Despatch No. 156, Poinsett to Clay, 15 Nov., 1828; received 23 Dec., 1828, Record Group 59. Poinsett sends

translations of extracts from the Mexican Senate's proceedings on the U.S. treaty. The extracts give details for rejecting certain articles and impressions of U.S. motives in making these articles.

Despatch No. 166, Poinsett to Clay, 10 Mar., 1829; received 17 April, 1829, Record Group 59 discusses the negotiations between the U.S. and Mexico on the treaties and gives explanations for the failure to ratify. This information is to inform the new administration of diplomatic events in Mexico.

Despatch No. 173, Poinsett to Martin Van Buren, 15 July, 1829; received [?] Sept., 1829, Record Group 59. President Vicente Guerrero expresses his desire for a special session to cover the commercial treaty delayed by monarchial party opposition. Guerrero assures Poinsett of his determination for close relations with the U.S.

Despatch No. 174, Poinsett to Van Buren, 22 July, 1829; received 22 Sept., 1829, Record Group 59. Poinsett gives a history of the treaty negotiations and the diplomatic climate of the period with explanations for the long periods of delay. He makes specific references to earlier despatches and their enclosures in his attempt to prepare the new administration for further delays that the monarchists have designed to disrupt friendly relations between the U.S. and Mexico.

H. Ex. Docs. 2 (H. Doc. 2), 21st Cong., 1st sess., 8 Dec., 1829, s.s. 195; "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the First Session of the Twenty-first Congress." President Jackson's state of the union message discusses Poinsett's efforts to negotiate and ratify treaties with Mexico. These efforts are ineffectual because of the personal animosity toward Poinsett by members of the Mexican government, (pages 5 - 7).

Despatch No. [?], Anthony Butler to Martin Van Buren, 5 Jan., 1830; received 22 Feb., 1830, Record Group 59 reports Lucas Alamán is again Minister of Foreign Affairs and predicts slow negotiations because of Alamán's hostile attitude toward the U.S. Butler replaces Poinsett in Mexico to conclude negotiations on the treaties.

Despatch No. [?], Butler to Van Buren, 15 April, 1830; received [1830], Record Group 59. Butler promises to conclude treaties with a cession of part or all of Texas if a favorable climate persists and the Mexican government remains stable. Butler reports he will manage these people better than Poinsett and accomplish the impossible, the acquisition of Texas.

Despatch No. [?], Butler to Van Buren, 19 May - 21 May, 1830; received 20 July, 1830, Record Group 59. Negotiations are delayed by editorials in U.S. papers that are unfavorable to Mexico and object to Poinsett's treatment while U.S. Minister

to Mexico. Alamán attempts to withdraw from the negotiations, however Butler dissuades him in the belief that Alamán would continue to control negotiations through his replacement. Enclosed is a copy of the Registro Oficial, 21 May, 1830 and a translation of an editorial that questions the lack of treaties with the U.S. and places the failure of negotiation on Poinsett's activities. Butler attributes the authorship of the editorial to Alamán.

Despatch No. [?], Butler to Van Buren, 29 June, 1830; received 19 Aug., 1830, Record Group 59. The Mexican Congress has opened and Alamán agrees to prevent delays by having amity, commerce, and navigation ratified in Mexico before sending it to the U.S. Butler believes he can gain Alamán's confidence and push the treaties through with the assistance of those men who have earlier blocked Poinsett's efforts.

Despatch No. [?], Butler to Van Buren, 26 Aug., 1830; received 25 Nov., 1830, Record Group 59. The twenty-fourth article of the treaty is now complete. Alamán will place it before the Mexican Congress before October and it may be sent to the U.S. in January. Butler promises to make provisions in the treaty for overland trade with Santa Fe.

Despatch No. [?], Butler to Van Buren, 2 Nov., 1830; received 19 Dec., 1830, Record Group 59 reports that negotiations on the commercial treaty are completed. The only additional article relates to Santa Fe trade and defers details on

regulations and convoys until geographic details are known. Alamán professes the most liberal principles and expresses hopes for ratification.

Despatch No. [?], Butler to Van Buren, 13 Dec., 1830; received [?] Dec., 1830, Record Group 59. The treaty is to be given to selected members of the Mexican Congress by Alamán before it goes to Congress as a body. Alamán anticipates no problem and Butler hopes to send it to Washington in four weeks.

S. Docs., No. 1, 21st Cong., 2d. sess., 6 Dec., 1830, s.s. 203; "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Second Session of the Twenty-first Congress." President Andrew Jackson makes reference to Mexican relations in three paragraphs which express his confidence that relations between the two governments are improved and a commercial agreement is forthcoming. Jackson refers to Mexican claimants, to portions of Arkansas territory under U.S. jurisdiction, and to hopes of a peaceful settlement through a permanent boundary agreement.

Despatch No. 8, Butler to Van Buren, 18 Dec., 1830; received 18 May, 1831, Record Group 59 encloses a synopsis of the treaty concluded on 1 November, 1830, and regrets that this session of the Mexican Congress will be unable to receive the treaty. Butler expresses hope for submission early in January, 1831.

Despatch No. [?], Butler to Van Buren, 21 Jan., 1831; received 27 Mar., 1831, Record Group 59. The U.S. treaty is still before the Mexican government although the Mexican President specifically charges Congress in his opening address to take early action. Butler doubts a decision will be reached before February, even though the Mexican Congress is aware that the U.S. congressional session ends in March.

Despatch No. 9, Butler to Van Buren, 19 Feb., 1831; received 24 April, 1831, Record Group 59. The treaty is not yet laid before Congress. Butler urges Alamán to have a translation ready to present to Congress. On 14 Feb., 1831, Alamán sends a note with a list of changes in the treaty designed to make it more acceptable to Congress. Alamán states on 18 February, 1831, that the treaty would reach Congress that week and plans for Cayetano Montoya to carry the ratified treaty to Washington in April when he receives José María Tornel as Minister to the U.S. Butler encloses his correspondence with Alamán on terminology in the treaty and a printed copy of Vice President Anastasio Bustamante's opening remarks to the Mexican Congress in January, 1831.

Despatch No. 11, Butler to Van Buren, 8 April, 1831; received 31 May, 1831, Record Group 59. Butler regrets that the treaty is not ready to be sent to Washington with Sr. Montoya. Another month may elapse before it is passed by both houses.

Despatch No. 12, Butler to Edward Livingston, 31 May, 1831; received 21 June, 1831, Record Group 59. Only the fugitive slave article is causing trouble for the treaty in the Mexican Congress. A special session of Congress will be called for discussion and passage of the treaty. Butler encloses a printed copy of Bustamante's closing remarks to Congress on 21 May, 1831, and a transcript of article thirty-four relating to fugitive slaves. Butler also requests additional instructions.

Despatch No. 17, Butler to Livingston, 22 July, 1831; received 16 Aug., 1831, Record Group 59 reports that the special session is to begin 1 August, 1831, and that the treaties are first on the agenda. Butler expresses hope for a final approval in August.

Despatch No. 19, Butler to Livingston, 20 Aug., 1831; received 26 Oct., 1831, Record Group 59. The treaty is now in the Chamber of Deputies and Alamán expects passage soon, although the article on "free ships make free goods" may be disputed.

Despatch No. 24, Butler to Livingston, 25 Oct., 1831; received [?, 1831], Record Group 59 sends a copy and translation of the Committee on Foreign Relations's report on the treaty to the Mexican Senate. Alamán believes the Chamber of Deputies will adopt the treaty. The committee's report follows Butler's Despatch No. 25. The treaty has been before the Congress

since 7 April, 1831, and only passed the Chamber of Deputies 14 October, 1831 with objections made to articles three, seven, and thirteen. Butler hopes to send the treaty to Washington in November.

Despatch No. 28, Butler to Livingston, 6 Dec., 1831; received 1 Feb., 1832, Record Group 59. The Chamber of Deputies and the Senate are dead locked over whether to accept or reject article thirty-four. The special session ends in ten days and Butler believes that the treaty opponents will kill it through delay. He agrees to surpress article thirty-four on fugitive slaves if its inclusion will defeat the treaty.

Despatch No. [?], Butler to Livingston, 23 Dec., 1831; received 1832, Record Group 59. Butler sends the commercial treaty as revised and passed by Mexican Congress with the rejection of article thirty-four. He credits his own firm hand in a note to Alamán for passage of the treaty on the last day. Butler maintains that severance of relations was preferable to further humiliating delay and his note to Alamán is enclosed. Butler hopes now for action on Texas.

Despatch No. 29, Butler to Livingston, 24 Dec., 1831; received [Feb., 1832], Record Group 59 gives very detailed explanations of the proceedings in both houses of the Mexican Congress on the treaty and the protocols involyed.

Butler to Jackson, 2 Jan., 1832, Jackson Papers. Butler writes in detail on the treaties just concluded, voicing his

opinions on the need for careful U.S. review of the Boundary treaty concluded by Poinsett before formally approving it. He reviews in detail the ambitions of the administration with regard to Texas, and the problems inherent in accepting outright the earlier boundary set in 1819 with Spain.

Jackson to Butler, 19 April, 1832, Jackson Papers. Jackson explains the inability to separate consideration of boundary treaty from the commercial treaty. The boundary commission must work for a more favorable line and Butler need not be concerned about it.

H. Ex. Docs., No. 225 (H. Doc. 225), 22nd Cong., 1st sess., 1 May, 1832, s.s. 220: "Treaties with Mexico, May 1, 1832." President Jackson officially proclaims the treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation concluded on 15 April, 1831. Included in his message is a bilingual copy of the treaty of limits concluded 12 January, 1838, with the additional articles concluded 5 April, 1831.

Butler to Jackson, 21 June, 1832, Jackson Papers. Butler reports he will enter negotiations when political conditions are more settled. He believes more can be accomplished through Alamán's influence than any other and emphasizes his own ability to influence Alamán to negotiate with him on Texas. He estimates that a treaty will be possible in three months. He requests that the boundary commission insist on the western branch of the Sabine River to prolong negotiations

and allow him more time. Alamán reports that the treaties are ratified and that ratification is exchanged.

Butler to Jackson, 22 Dec., 1832, Jackson Papers. Butler gives a lengthy, heated rebuttal to remarks made by William Slade of Vermont in the House of Representatives attributing the treaties with Mexico to the previous administration. He gives his own estimate of the amount of influence he had on the final versions and places credit with the Jackson administration. Poinsett's difficulties in Mexico and his departure are reviewed in full.

Despatch No. 61, Butler to Henry McLane, 4 Feb., 1834; received [?, 1834], Record Group 59 includes notes made on two numbers of the Phoenix of the 4 and 15 of January, 1834, with number four of the Indicator edited by a priest. Number four of the Indicator discusses U.S. - Mexican relations, particularly the boundary discussions.

Butler to Jackson, 7 Mar., 1834, Jackson Papers. Butler admits that no hope exists for negotiating for Texas under the present Mexican administration and suggests that Jackson be ready to establish the boundary based solely on prior rights. He follows with a detailed account of the historic U.S. right to the disputed territory, Mexico's inability to protect Texas, and her belief that the U.S. is on the brink of civil war, thereby being unable to take Texas. He urges the use of force.

Despatch No. 72, Butler to McLane, 1 July, 1834; received 11 Aug., 1834. Butler acknowledges orders to conclude a boundary treaty and to return with a ratified copy to the U.S. He requests an immediate leave of absence to interview both McLane and Jackson who will then decide whether he should remain in Mexico.

Butler to Jackson, 20 Oct., 1834, Jackson Papers. Butler cautions that if it is necessary for Mexico to ratify the new boundary convention before he brings it to the U.S. then it will be necessary to delay until the Mexican Congress convenes on 1 January, 1835. He again holds out the hope of acquiring Texas and the advisability of his returning to Mexico immediately after he delivers the boundary agreement.

Ex. Docs., No. 2 (H. Doc. 2), 23d Cong., 2d sess., 1 Dec., 1834, s.s. 271; "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Second Session of the Twenty-third Congress." Jackson notes that the appointment of the Mexican boundary commissioners have been delayed by civil war, necessitating an additional article to the pre-existing treaty to make new arrangements for the joint project. This article is soon to be ratified in Mexico.

Despatch No. 85, Butler to John Forsyth, 3 Jan., 1835; received 16 Feb., 1835, Record Group 59 encloses a copy of a letter to Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs Gutiérrez de Estrada stating U.S. willingness to renegotiate the boundary

treaty noting that two previous efforts miscarried because of Mexico's failure to implement their articles.

Despatch No. [?], Butler to Forsyth, 13 Jan., 1835; received [?, 1835], Record Group 59. Butler provides the background on recent negotiations on the treaties, his previous instructions from McLane to return to the U.S. the previous June with the treaty, and his explanations for the delay. He gives a detailed and favorable account of his efforts, and believes that he will return in April with a ratified treaty.

Despatch No. 80 (90), Butler to Forsyth, 31 Mar., 1835; received 30 April, 1835, Record Group 59 reports renewal of the boundary treaty to be completed in a few days, and gives assurance that ratification will be at once and transmitted in accordance with the instructions of January, 1834. Butler assures Forsyth that the U.S. will gain a valuable tract of country which is now either unsettled or under Mexican dominion. He credits this success to a private interview with Miguel Barragán, Minister of Foreign Affairs and gives a detailed account of the negotiations.

Butler to Jackson, 6 June, 1835, Record Group 59. Butler announces his arrival in New York with the boundary treaty and the arrival of a Mexican representative with his copy in New Orleans.

Ex. Docs., No. 2 (H. Doc. 2), 24th Cong., 1st sess., 7 Dec., 1835, s.s. 286; "Message from the President of the

United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the First Session of the Twenty-fourth Congress."

Page six of Jackson's state of the union address reports the extension of the boundary commissioners' ratification and that it will be sent to the Senate for consideration.

Ex. Docs., No. 250 (H. Doc. 250), 24th Cong., 1st sess., 6 May, 1836, s.s. 291; "Boundary with Mexico; Message from the President of the United States upon the Subject of the Treaty of Limits with Mexico." Jackson sends a copy of an additional article to the boundary treaty that sets the time limit of survey and provides instructions for surveyors. The information is for the consideration and action of Congress.

H. Ex. Docs., No. 42 (H. Doc. 42), 25 Cong., 1st sess., 3 Oct. 1837, s.s. 311; "Boundary - United States and Mexico; Message from the President of the United States Transmitting Information Required...Concerning the Boundary Between the United States and the Republic of Mexico." Secretary of State Forsyth sends all communications with Mexico on the boundary and any proposition for cession of territory to the U.S. Dates include 1825 - 1836 and communications involving; U.S. Secretaries of State John Q. Adams, Clay, Van Buren, Livingston, McLane, and Forsyth; Mexican Ministers of Foreign Affairs Alamán, Camacho, Gutiérrez de Estrada, and Barragán; U.S. Minister to Mexico Poinsett and Chargé Butler; Mexican Chargés to the U.S. Torrens, Montoya, and Castillo y Lanza; Mexican

Envoy Extraordinary Alvaro Obregón and Mexican Minister to the U.S. Manuel de Gorostiza. Included are instructions to the U.S. Minister and Charge regarding placement of the boundary and interest in Texas, replies from the Mexican negotiators contained in U.S. despatches, and letters not included in other sources from the Mexican Minister in the U.S. to the U.S. State Department giving the Mexican side of the negotiations. These documents trace the negotiations from Clay's first instructions to Poinsett through Forsyth's and Gorostiza's signing of an agreement to the second additional article of the treaty setting the surveyors' instructions on 18 April, 1836.

CHAPTER II

THE NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE SANTA FE TRADE

Traders along the Santa Fe trail from Missouri to New Mexico came equipped for every hardship; Indians, climate, geography, and troubles with the Mexican customs officials. Their patience and tenacity were equaled by that of the U.S. diplomatic corps in Mexico City whose difficult assignment was to negotiate for favorable tariffs, military protection for the caravans, a surveyed road, and consuls in each of the market centers.

These negotiations began in 1825 at the instigation of Missouri senators lobbying for powerful merchants in their home state. For these Missouri traders, extension of their businesses into the frontier provinces of Mexico was a logical progression. They could supply the needs of this area much more cheaply and with better goods than the Mexican merchants. The Santa Fe trade was also lucrative for both Anglos and Mexicans. For example, an inexpensive investment in simple cotton goods often resulted in over three hundred percent profit in mules and precious metals. On the other hand, Mexican authorities in the northern provinces unofficially welcomed this trade and used it to supplement their income through both legal and illegal methods. Officially, however, the federal government in Mexico City employed every means to

delay and harass this extension of United States economic interests. Mexican fears of boundary incursions stemmed from concern over losing their valuable frontier provinces through economic dependence on the United States. To forstall this, the Mexican government placed trade restrictions on the amount and type of goods allowed into the frontier provinces. They continually increased the customs duties on cotton goods, hoping to protect their own slender industry and increase revenues.

Joel R. Poinsett, United States Minister to Mexico, negotiated over four years for a survey of the Santa Fe Trail, its demarcation, and regulation. The survey was finally authorized, but no markers of any kind were allowed by the Mexican government. Only after Poinsett's own return to Washington in 1829 did the Mexican government make provisions for overland trade with the United States in the commercial treaty of 1830. Delaying tactics by the Mexican government were motivated by fears that apparent pro-American policies would invite criticism and possible charges of unpatriotic practices from opposition parties. Such charges could easily result in loss of power. On the other extreme, the Mexican administrations could not afford to offend their northern neighbor by denying trade privileges with the northern frontier. And to do so would invite the practice of smuggling, loss of revenue, and the possible loss of United States naval assistance in the event of European intervention. The diplomatic tight rope restricted decisive action on the part of

the Mexican negotiators. Delay was their best option. But, this policy left Mexico consistently open to charges of bad faith by the United States negotiators and President. In these negotiations, as in the associated trade and boundary negotiations, chaotic Mexican political conditions in themselves often prevented quick, decisive settlement.

Accordingly, the Santa Fe trade was conducted under difficult conditions and capricious tariff regulations until 1845 when the Mexican government ended all foreign retail trade in Mexico.

Ex. Papers, No. 79 (H. Doc. 79), 18th Cong., 2d. sess., Octo, 1824, s.s. 116; "Petition of Sundry Inhabitants of the State of Missouri upon the Subject of a Communication Between the Internal Provinces of Mexico" This petition recounts the hardships encountered in trade with the provinces of New Biscay, New Mexico, Coaquilla, Sonora, and Sinoloa along routes that must originate on the Mexican Coasts from ports of Vera Cruz and San Blas. The petitioners note that 700 miles of open hospitable country separates Santa Fe from Missouri and Arkansas. They request extension of Indian intercourse to end harrassment, the establishment of roads, stations, agencies, and treaties similar to those enacted between Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio, Natchez, and New Orleans tribes. Included by the petitioners to persuade the Congress to act favorably on this matter is a letter from Alphonso Wetmore dated

August 19, 1824. This letter gives a short history of the Santa Fe trade based on information supplied by Colonel Benjamin Cooper, "an old and very respected inhabitant of this country," (p.5). Wetmore gives the names of leaders, numbers of people involved, goods, profits, and mileage in the Santa Fe trade. He requests a marked road and protection.

S. Docs., No. 7, 18th Cong., 2d. sess., Nov., 1824, s.s. 108; "Answers of August Storrs, of Missouri to Certain Querries Upon the Origin, Present State, and Future Prospect, of Trade and Intercourse Between Missouri and Internal Provinces of Mexico Propounded by the Hon. Mr. Benton." Storrs discusses routes used, amount of return, geography, duties paid, state of Mexican internal trade, and the economy of the Mexican provinces of Sonora, Chihuahua, Durango, and New Mexico. Storrs requests a road be laid out between Ft. Osage and the Arkansas River by means of earth mound markers, a garrison be stationed on the Arkansas River, and consuls be placed in Santa Fe and Chihuahua. Storrs also expresses concern that the garrison on the Arkansas River might interfere with the migration of buffalo and thereby harming the Indians and leading to trouble. He therefore requests treaties be made with all Indians on the route.

Despatch No. 5, Joel R. Poinsett to Henry Clay, 18 June, 1825; received 21 Sept., 1825, Record Group 59, "Despatches from the United States Ministers to Mexico,

1823 - 1906," National Archives, Washington, D.C. Minister Poinsett reports to Secretary of State Clay on conversations with Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs Lucas Alamán on a road from the western U.S. to Santa Fe. Alamán refuses to discuss a trade road until a boundary line is set. Poinsett encloses his note to Alamán telling of the U.S. President's authorization to construct a road to the boundary of the U.S., the appointment of three commissioners to mark the road, and the routes taken by traders from Missouri to Santa Fe.

Despatch No. 6, Poinsett to Clay, 18 July, 1824; received 20 Sept., 1825, Record Group 59. Poinsett reports no answer from Alamán on his note concerning the Santa Fe road dated 11 June, 1825. He encloses his note protesting the exorbitant duties on U.S. cotton.

Despatch No. 7 - 8, Poinsett to Clay, 18 July, 1825; received 20 Sept., 1825, Record Group 59. The problem of a boundary settlement now interferes with the demarcation of a trade route to Santa Fe. Alamán refuses to set limits without more information and sent his views on the Santa Fe road and the treaties pending with the U.S. Poinsett encloses this note for Clay. The Mexican government regards with suspicion any advancement toward Texas and New Mexico.

Despatch No. [9], Poinsett to Clay, 27 July, 1825; received 17 Sept., 1825, Record Group 59, contains Poinsett's reply to Alamán's note on delay of the Santa Fe road. Poinsett

regrets the delay in marking the road and the injury this might have on the rising commerce between the U.S. and New Mexico. He urges the settlement of the commercial treaty and states the U.S. government could not appoint a boundary commission before the spring of 1826. The survey would take at least one year, leaving the question unsettled for two more years. In cipher to Clay, Poinsett offers his opinion that the delay could assist in acquiring Texas. The area is populated by granters and squatters from the U.S., a hard group to govern.

Despatch No. 14, Poinsett to Clay, 17 Aug., 1825; received 19 Sept., 1825, Record Group 59. Poinsett sends Alamán's final note on the Santa Fe road regretting the delay in marking the road, but the consent of the Mexican Congress is necessary before the President can act. He requests the results of the U.S. road commission's demarcation to facilitate locating customs houses.

Despatch No. 33, Poinsett to Clay, 14 Jan., 1826; received 26 Feb., 1826, Record Group 59. The Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs has met with Poinsett to hear his arguments for a Santa Fe road. Nothing was decided.

Despatch No. 34, Poinsett to Clay, 18 Jan., 1826; received 27 Feb., 1826. The question of a Santa Fe road is now sent to the Mexican Congress. If it is delayed there more than three months, Poinsett plans to write the U.S. commissioners who are waiting in Santa Fe.

Despatch No. 45, Poinsett to Clay, 17 May, 1826; received 21 June, 1826, Record Group 59, encloses a translation of a note from the Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs on the Santa Fe road. Poinsett regrets the delay and inconvenience to Commissioner George C. Sibley in Santa Fe. Instructions were sent to Sibley to survey, but not to mark the road. The Chamber of Deputies will decide later on the marking.

Despatch No. 84, Poinsett to Clay, 13 April, 1827; received 6 June, 1827, Record Group 59. The Mexican government resents U.S. citizens trading arms to the Indians and prohibits this in Mexican territory. Many desire to prohibit all trade between Missouri and New Mexico - Texas. Claims against the Indians and bandits in this area add to their motives for trade restriction.

S. Docs., No. 52, 20th Cong., 2d. sess., 3 Jan., 1829, s.s. 181: "Memorial of the Legislature of Missouri." This petition requests protection from raiding Indians for the Santa Fe traders. A lucrative business has been carried on for the past six years in domestic cotton dry goods. They offer suggestions for military protection and Indian control.

S. Docs., No. 46, 21st Cong., 1st sess., 5 Feb., 1830; s.s. 192: "Message from the President of the United StatesRelating to the Protection of the Trade Between Missouri and Mexico." President Jackson sends with his cover statement notes from the Secretary of War on the official reports of

troops assigned to protect caravans on the Santa Fe road in the summer of 1829. These reports include the official report of Major Bennett Riley and a summary of correspondence with a Mexican officer, Joseph Anthony Viscarra on the subject of trade.

Despatch No. [?], Anthony Butler to Martin Van Buren. 26 Aug., 1830; received 25 Nov., 1830, Record Group 59. Butler reports the twenty-fourth article of the commercial treaty complete and he now hopes to make provisions for overland trade with Santa Fe.

Despatch No. [7], Butler to Van Buren, 2 Nov., 1830; received 19 Dec., 1830, Record Group 59. A new article is added to the commercial treaty allowing the Santa Fe trade, but it defers details on regulations and convoys until more geographical details are known.

Despatch No. 11, Butler to Van Buren, 8 April, 1831; 31 May, 1831, Record Group 59. Butler earlier requested U.S. troops to convoy the annual caravan from Missouri to Santa Fe as far as Rio Colorado, but the Mexican Congress must pass on this. As soon as permission is received Santa Fe will be informed and may relay it to the U.S. troops in Arkansas.

S. Docs., No. 90, 22d Cong., 1st sess., 8 Feb., 1832, s.s. 213: "Message from the President of the United States in Compliance with a Resolution of the Senate Concerning the Fur Trade, and Inland Trade to Mexico." A cover note from President Jackson transmits a report of the Secretary of War

giving information on numbers and names of Americans killed or robbed while fur trading or caravanning to Santa Fe. Secretary Cass's report includes information from the Superintendent of Indian Affairs headed, "Second Branch of Inquiry - The Condition of the Inland Trade of Mexico." This information provides instructions on dealing with hostile Indians, and tribal names of those groups along the road.

Ex. Docs., No. 2 (H. Doc. 2), 22d Cong., 2d sess., 4 Dec., 1832, s.s. 233: "Message of the President of the United States." President Jackson in his state of the union message notes the termination of the civil struggle in Mexico will greatly benefit U.S. trade, that even now is daily increasing with the Santa Fe caravans under government protection (pp. 5 - 7).

S. Docs., No. 400, 24th Cong., 1st sess., 14 June, 1836, s.s. 283: "Message from the President of the United States ...on the Subject of Depredations by the Mexicans on the Property of Messrs. Chouteau and Demun." Secretary of State Forsyth sends correspondence relating to the claims of Chouteau and Demun for seizure of their lawfully licensed caravans in Santa Fe in 1817. This correspondence provides information of trade activities for this period and the risks involved in trading with the Mexican frontier provinces.

S. Docs., No. 424, 24th Cong., 1st sess., 2 July, 1836, s.s. 284: "In the Senate of the United States Mr. Clay Made

the Following Report; Committee on Foreign Relations... Transmitting a Report of the Secretary of State, In Regard to Depredations Committed Upon the Person's and Property of Messrs. Chouteau and Demun." The Committee report considers the attacks made upon lawful citizens pursuing Santa Fe trade a violation of U.S. jurisdiction and soil. The committee demands redress be made to the merchants.

H. Rpt., No. 540, 26th Cong., 1st sess., 12 May, 1840, s.s. 372; "To Establish Ports of Entry in Arkansas and Missouri...to Accompany Bill No. 441." The report requests ports be made on the Red and Arkansas Rivers to allow the advantages enjoyed by sea trade to inland trade with Santa Fe. A note is made that the majority of the goods from the U.S. are cotton products exchanged for Mexican gold and silver.

S. Docs., No. 1, 28th Cong., 1st sess., 5 Dec., 1843, s.s. 431; "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the First Session of the Twenty-eighth Congress." President Tyler reports on the Mexican decree of 23 September, 1843, prohibiting foreigners from engaging in retail trade in Mexico. The Santa Fe trade has been ended by petition of the Mexican government (pp. 6 - 8, 25 - 43).

CHAPTER III

THE TEXAS QUESTION

The Texas question loomed as a dark specter on the horizon of United States - Mexican diplomatic relations from the beginning of treaty negotiations in 1825. United States claims against Mexico would later share in importance as a major cause for hostilities between the two countries, but claims never captured the imagination of the American populace as did Texas.

Joel R. Poinsett, United States Minister, first suggested to President John Q. Adams that a more favorable boundary than that set by the 1819 treaty with Spain might be negotiated. Poinsett expressed the thoughts of many Americans that the Texas territory originally belonged within the Louisiana Purchase. These Americans desired a reannexation of this area to the United States. Mexico, as early as the Edwards revolt of 1827, regarded the United States interest in Texas with suspicion. Indeed, many Mexican government officials believed the United States to be guilty of complicity in the uprising. Andrew Jackson firmly believed Texas to be necessary for the United States' security, and that the area had been unwisely lost by the treaty of 1819. Upon taking office, Jackson instructed Poinsett to negotiate what he termed a "retrocession" of United States territory. Jackson was supported in his opinions by an old friend Anthony Butler.

Butler had recently traveled in Texas and had written to Jackson of its paradise-like qualities. He suggested a five-part plan for United States negotiators to use in its acquisition. Jackson accepted the Butler plan and sent its author to Mexico as Poinsett's assistant in the negotiations. The Mexican newspapers quickly reported Butler's arrival and the amount of money offered for the purchase of Texas. Poinsett's activities in Mexican politics forced his recall in 1829, leaving Butler as the principal negotiator for the United States. Unfortunately for future United States - Mexican relations, Anthony Butler was unscrupulous and did not possess the subtlety necessary for diplomacy. He continued to report near success in Texas negotiations to President Jackson even though the cession of national territory was prohibited by Mexican law. His heavy handed intrigues did little to improve the Mexican trust of the United States. A year prior to the Texas revolution, Butler suggested bribery as a means to obtain the desired result in his negotiations. Even with this breach of diplomatic ethics Jackson did not immediately recall Butler. Jackson was cautious enough to maintain an official policy of neutrality during the Mexican - Texas conflict of 1836. This policy of neutrality was wisely continued by his successors Martin Van Buren and John Tyler. Unfortunately many United States citizens did not concur and publicly professed sympathy for their Anglo relatives who were fighting the barbaric Mexican army under Santa Anna. Volunteer

companies and money were sent by many cities to assist the Texans. Mexico's Minister to the United States, Gorostiza, protested these acts as violation of American neutrality and finally severed relations when United States General E.P. Gaines crossed the Sabine River.

The ten years of Texas independence did little to improve United States - Mexican relations. The United States Congress received memorials both for and against Texas annexation. Many citizens petitioned for redress of injuries committed against their friends and relatives taken with the Texas Santa Fe Expedition and imprisoned in Mexico City. As public feeling against Mexico increased, the nation notified the United States that any attempt to annex Texas would be considered as an act of war.

Texas became a hot political issue in both countries. Any Mexican government that considered recognition of Texas independence or the acceptance of compensation from the United States for its annexation was guilty of treason. Regaining Texas had become a symbol of Mexican nationalism. Suffering at home from economic chaos, her vast frontier lands were the last vestige of Mexico's once bright promise. A war for national honor was the only option available to the Mexican government if the United States persisted in its demands for annexation.

In the United States, President John Tyler shared Jackson's desires for Texas. He discounted Mexico's threats of

war as having any influence on the annexation of Texas, for Texas was an independent nation recognized by many major powers, and Mexico could no longer dictate her future. In the United States, many domestic considerations influenced the annexation movement. The extension of slavery into any new state entering the union had become a major political issue and Texas became an important factor in this ongoing debate during the presidential elections of 1844. Neutrality toward annexation was not politically possible. James K. Polk, an expansionist, believed Texas to be a portion of the Louisiana Purchase and favored the immediate reannexation of the area to the United States. More moderate candidates failed and Polk won the election. Much of the country was prepared to accept Texas as a state despite Mexico's threats.

On July 4, 1845, a Texas convention accepted the annexation treaty offered by the Tyler - Polk administrations. United States troops moved across disputed territory to the north bank of the Rio Grande allegedly to protect the new state against Mexican aggression.

In Mexico the cautious Paredes government could not prevent the war movement. To Mexico, the United States' annexation of the Mexican province of Texas constituted an act of war. Mexican troops were then moved to the south bank of the Rio Grande. With opposing armies facing each other across the river, fighting began.

The United States documents that follow chronicle the diplomatic activities between the United States and Mexico on the Texas question, prior to the commencement of hostilities in the spring of 1846.

Despatch No. [9], Joel R. Poinsett to Henry Clay, 27 July, 1825; received 17 Sept., 1825, Record Group 59, "Despatches from the United States ministers to Mexico 1823 - 1906," National Archives, Washington, D.C. Joel R. Poinsett, U.S. Minister to Mexico, believes there is apprehension in Mexico over U.S. designs for the country north of the Rio Grande. In cipher he expresses his belief that a delay in a boundary treaty will work in the U.S. favor for acquiring Texas. The area is being populated by grantees and squatters from the U.S., a population hard to govern.

Despatch No. 12, Poinsett to Clay, 5 Aug., 1825; received 3 Oct., 1825, Record Group 59. Poinsett proposes the extension of the U.S. boundary to the Rio Grande, or the Colorado River, or at least to the Brazos River, and the placement of hardy settlers in this region.

Despatch No. 19, Poinsett to Clay, 20 Sept., 1825; received 4 November, 1825, Record Group 59. Lucas Alamán, Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs, expresses his preference for the boundary set prior to the Louisiana Purchase. Poinsett, however, argues for that boundary set by the U.S. treaty with Spain in 1819, already agreed upon by Mexico. He does agree

to negotiate a new treaty, but not to give up any land east of the Sabine River, or north of the Red and Arkansas Rivers. Poinsett believes that this is an opportunity to gain the lands north of the Rio Grande.

H. Ex. Docs., No. 25 (H. Doc. 25), 19th Cong., 2d sess., 28 Dec., 1826, s.s. 150; "Message from the President of the United States Transmitting Information...Relating to Certain Negotiations with the Government of the United Mexican States." President John Q. Adams reports that obstacles in the province of Texas hindering the recovery of debts from fugitives have not been substantiated.

Despatch No. 74, Poinsett to Clay, 21 Feb., 1827; received 7 April, 1827, Record Group 59, reports news of the Edwards revolt in Texas using Nacogdoches as their headquarters. Agreements have been made by the Edwards group with the Indians. Some members of the Mexican Chamber of Deputies suspect the U.S. of complicity. Poinsett believes the cause of discontent in Texas is the talk of freeing all the slaves. He does not regard Mexico as capable of stopping an uprising of Indians and Whites, and regards the Mexican's uncompromising nature as vainness.

Clay to Poinsett, 15 Mar., 1827, Jackson Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. A copy of the diplomatic instructions to Poinsett, this document gives the official U.S. view of her citizens settling in Texas on Mexican land grants. Clay expresses concern over the inevitable

difficulties inherent in this Anglo-colonization and the need for a boundary settlement. He gives explicit instructions on negotiating the boundary treaty and the amount of compensation to be paid if the Rio Grande or Colorado River is settled upon.

Despatch No. 72, Poinsett to Clay, 7 Feb., 1827; received 22 Mar., 1827, Record Group 59. Poinsett sends a note from Minister of Foreign Affairs Juan José Espinosa on the aggression committed by persons residing in the U.S. on the Mexican town of Nacogdoches was his own reply. The incident included the capture and confinement of the alcalde and head of the town's militia by Anglos, who released them only after learning of the approach of a superior Mexican force. Poinsett agrees to request the U.S. government to prevent further incursions.

Despatch No. 77, Poinsett to Clay, 8 Mar., 1827; received 10 May, 1827, Record Group 59. General Manuel Rincón with 1,000 men are to leave Vera Cruz for Matagorda to end the insurrection in Texas. This company is to be met by 10,000 interior troops. The Mexican Congress voted one-half million dollars for their expenses. This show of force is to discourage further uprisings. The Mexican President expresses confidence in the neutrality of the U.S. and wishes the U.S. President would state his disapproval of the insurrection.

Despatch No. 113, Poinsett to Clay, 8 Jan., 1828; received 23 Feb., 1828, Record Group 59. The Mexican Chamber

of Deputies earlier passed a resolution not to accept a boundary unless it recognized those limits set by the Treaty of 1819 between the U.S. and Spain. Poinsett believes altering the boundary to the Rio Grande as suggested by Clay would bring opposition, even with the prospect of renumeration. Selling national land is prohibited by the Mexican constitution, but if later negotiations set the boundary at the Rio Grande it would be legal. To prevent further delay in a boundary treaty, Poinsett agrees to those set by the Treaty of 1819.

Message relative to the treaty of limits with the United Mexican States, American State Papers: Foreign, V: 946. President Adams sends a copy of the boundary treaty concluded 12 January, 1828 and the protocols of the negotiations between Sebastian Camacho, Juan I. Esteva, and Poinsett.

Despatch No. 121, Poinsett to Clay, 23 April, 1828; received [1828], Record Group 59. U.S. vessels trading with Matagorda, Texas and other Texas ports are affected by a decision of the Mexican government to end the practice allowing duty free importation of articles consumed by the Texans. Poinsett asks for time to inform U.S. shippers, but his request is refused because the trade has always been illegal for foreigners. All foreign vessels in the unopened Texas ports will be regarded as smugglers.

Despatch No. 136, Poinsett to Clay, 14 July, 1828; received 19 Sept., 1828, Record Group 59, contains correspondence between Poinsett and Minister of Foreign Affairs Juan de Dios

Cañedo on American citizens advancing into Texas near Nacogdoches.

Despatch No. 138, Poinsett to Clay, 15 July, 1828; received 19 Sept. 1828. Poinsett forwards correspondence on ships trading with Texas ports that are closed to lawful commerce.

Despatch No. 175, Poinsett to Van Buren, 2 Aug., 1829; received 6 Oct., 1829, Record Group 59. Poinsett sends his correspondence with the Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs on the rumored hostile preparations in the U.S. for an invasion of Mexican territory in Texas. Poinsett candidly assesses the Mexican government's conduct of diplomatic relations as "absolutely ridiculous, and ought only to excite compassion" ([p.1]). He reports the Mexican belief that all foreigners covet Mexico and regard it as a country favored above all others. These fears are excited by a Mexican agent in Texas, General Manuel de Mier y Teran, who dislikes Americans. Poinsett quotes extensively from a letter of General Teran's assessing the Texas situation and graphically describing U.S. designs to acquire Texas. Poinsett reassures Minister José María Bocanegra of the neutrality of the U.S.

Anthony Butler to Martin Van Buren, [11 Aug., 1829], Van Buren Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Butler presents his seven-part argument for acquiring Texas and setting the Nueces River as the desired boundary in

negotiations by the U.S. Minister to Mexico. He gives as advantages to Mexico in setting upon the Nueces River as the boundary, the gaining of needed monies, a more easily defended frontier that is closer to Mexico City, and relief from the Indian problem. He gives his own estimate of the legality of Mexico's claim of the Sabine as the boundary and suggests that an able U.S. Minister could play upon Mexican suspicions to favorable advantage. He encloses a description of Texas geography, climate, and economy.

Andrew Jackson to Van Buren, 12 Aug., 1829, Van Buren Papers. Jackson is pleased by Anthony Butler's documents and letter relating to Texas and is anxious to meet with him and Van Buren. He states that the U.S. places the top offer for Texas at five millions and his own personal belief that God never intended for the branches of the Mississippi River and its valley to be divided by two nations.

[Jackson to Van Buren, 13 Aug., 1829,] Van Buren Papers. Jackson gives the guidelines for Poinsett to follow in negotiating for Texas and the contingencies to follow if events change. He believes now is an advantageous time to negotiate as the Mexican government is unstable and in need of money. Poinsett is to negotiate first for the Rio Grande, and then the Nueces Rivers as boundaries. Jackson expresses his opinion that the U.S. surrendered this territory earlier under the Treaty of 1819. He emphasizes the vital nature of

this area to U.S. security and the danger of having Mexican settlements so close to the U.S. border.

Jackson to Van Buren, 13 Aug., 1829, Van Buren Papers. Jackson sends his five-part inducement to be presented to Mexico for selling Texas to the U.S. His argument is very similar to that Butler stated in his letter to Van Buren on 11 August, 1829. Jackson instructs Van Buren to inform Poinsett that he is to open negotiations on Texas under these guidelines, and to offer up to five million dollars as the purchase price. The amount will be paid in cash at a few days notice.

Jackson to Van Buren, 14 Aug., 1829, Van Buren Papers. Jackson refers to his note of 13 August, 1829, and his instructions for Poinsett on the Texas negotiations. He states the U.S. will not be bound by any grants made in Texas that have not already been complied with by the recipients.

Jackson to Van Buren, [15 Aug., 1829], Van Buren Papers. Jackson considers the present time as the best opportunity to extend the boundary of Louisiana to the Nueces River and north beyond the Rocky Mountains, adding the country watered by the Red River. This would leave room for Indians and free Negroes to be settled on the Columbia River. He believes men must look only at the prosperity to come from the purchase of Texas, and not at the sectional jealousies of politicians that will be aroused by its acquisition. He discusses the

advantages of uniting the Gulf, Atlantic, and Pacific while cutting off forever Canada from the Gulf, thereby ending British intrigue.

Despatch No. 179, Poinsett to Van Buren, 22 Aug., 1829; received 6 Oct. 1829, Record Group 59. Poinsett reports the renewal of inquiries into the reported troop movements on the border of Texas and Coahuila. Poinsett considers the manner of these inquiries to be insolent. He blames this continual harassment on men whose sole purpose is to disrupt U.S.-Mexican relations. Bocanegra assures Poinsett that he made these inquiries only at the insistence of the Senate and would urge prompt action on the treaties with the U.S.

Van Buren memo, 25 Aug., 1829, Van Buren Papers. Van Buren's working outline for the Texas negotiations gives arguments to be used and the advantages to having either the Nueces, Brazos, or Trinity Rivers as the boundary. He also gives the advantages and disadvantages to the earlier settlement with Spain in 1819. He makes note of Poinsett's argument to wait as Texas is now being settled by U.S. citizens whom the Mexican government will not be able to control.

Van Buren to Poinsett, 25 Aug., 1829, Van Buren Papers. Van Buren's copy of his Diplomatic Instruction No. 30 to Poinsett gives the details for conducting negotiations for as much of Texas as possible and those boundary lines acceptable to the U.S. Poinsett is allowed to use his own

discretion in altering the boundary line to the advantage of the U.S. The U.S. objects to the present boundary because two streams preportedly run into the Sabine Bay thereby causing confusion. This diplomatic instruction is to be delivered by Anthony Butler who will provide information on Texas and be under Poinsett's direction in the negotiations.

Jackson to Poinsett and Butler, 25 Aug., 1829, Van Buren Papers. This is Van Buren's copy of Jackson's formal commission to Poinsett and Butler to negotiate a new boundary treaty with Mexico.

[Thomas Ritchie] to Van Buren, [Sept., 1829], Van Buren Papers. Thomas Ritchie urges the acquisition of Texas referring to the U.S. acquisition of the Floridas. He encloses a newspaper clipping that gives an account of the Austin grant in Texas, the British interest in Texas as security for a five-million-dollar loan, and a proposition by the Mexican government to use Texas as security for a loan from the U.S.

Butler to Van Buren, 10 Jan., 1830; received 22 Feb., 1830, Record Group 59. Butler sends a translation of El Sol 9 January, 1830, that states Butler's true mission is the purchase of Texas and the amount offered. Also enclosed is a copy of the newspaper.

Despatch No. 3, Butler to Van Buren, 9 Mar., 1830; received [?, 1830], Record Group 59. Butler encloses a copy of Alamán's report and plan for Texas security. He believes

that had this plan not been modified by the Congress, Texas would now be a part of the U.S. through a revolt of her people. The modified plan will not disturb Texas. Butler maintains that negotiations for Texas were hurt by Poinsett and the British interests, and he believes Texas cannot be acquired through treaty. Alamán recognizes that the U.S. could claim Texas during the boundary negotiations and Butler makes no statement on U.S. intentions, preferring to let them imagine what they wish.

Despatch No. [?], Butler to Van Buren, 15 April, 1830; received [1830], Record Group 59. Butler reports he will conclude treaties of commerce and boundary with a cession of part or all of Texas if a favorable climate persists and the government remains stable. Butler promises to manage these people better than Poinsett and accomplish the impossible, the acquisition of Texas.

Despatch [?], Butler to Van Buren, 19 May, 1830; received 20 July, 1830, Record Group 59. Butler receives approval to mount a move for Texas at his discretion. Butler believes Alamán to be the key to any negotiations and the deciding factor in the Mexican government.

Butler to [Jackson], 25 May, 1831, received [1831], Record Group 59. Butler answers charges of neglecting to send despatches and neglecting the purchase of Texas. He gives the climate in Mexico regarding any move toward acquiring Texas. He had used his own discretion in delaying any

official mention of Texas. He relates in cipher the harsh reaction to the rumor Vicente Guerrero had favored selling Texas. He denies that Alamán is involved in land grants, but reports Lorenzo de Zavala is; and that Zavala declared before leaving for Texas that he would revolutionize that area. The U.S. newspapers have not allowed the Texas question to subside and Mexico remains alert to U.S. interest.

General Terán requested more troops in Texas, but the Mexican government will not concentrate so large a force under one man.

Butler to Jackson, 23 June, 1831, Jackson Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Butler reports the difficulties inherent in negotiations for Texas and the negative political effect such discussions had on public confidence in President Vicente Guerrero.

Despatch No. 18, Butler to Edward Livingston, 11 Aug., 1831; received [1831], Record Group 59. Following Alamán's return to Mexico City after a tour of the southwestern states, there has been no opportunity for discussing Texas. Butler hopes for such an opportunity in the next few weeks.

Jackson to Butler, 17 Aug., 1831, Jackson Papers. Jackson sends his regrets regarding the possible violent change in the Mexican government. He urges the need for haste in concluding the commercial treaty during the present Congress and the boundary agreement as early as possible. The purchase price of Texas is not to exceed five million dollars.

Butler to Jackson, 2 Jan., 1832, Jackson Papers. Butler writes in detail on the treaties just concluded, voicing his opinion on the need for the U.S. to review the boundary treaty concluded by Poinsett before approving it. He reviews the Texas ambitions of the administration and the problems inherent in accepting outright the earlier boundary set in 1819. He restates the argument that Texas territory already belongs to the U.S. He requests he be given the rank of envoy extraordinary to facilitate the negotiations for Texas. He also suggests the Mexicans feel slighted at his status of chargé.

Butler to Jackson, 27 Feb., 1832, Jackson Papers. Butler reports the government is sustained by a loan of six-hundred-million dollars from Mexican capitalists, but a second loan is not available. Butler plans to offer to supply their needs up to five million dollars, implying the sale of Texas.

Jackson to Butler, 19 April, 1832, Jackson Papers. Jackson discusses the inability to separate consideration of the boundary treaty from the commercial agreement. The boundary commission will work for a more favorable line. Butler is told that he need not be concerned about it.

Butler to Jackson, 21 June, 1832, Jackson Papers. Butler reports he will enter negotiations when political conditions are more settled. He implies he knows the way to influence Alamán to negotiate with him on Texas. He requests that the

boundary commission insist on the western branch of the Sabine River to prolong negotiations and give him more time.

Despatch No. 32, Butler to Livingston, 16 July, 1832; received 4 Oct., 1832, Record Group 59. He encloses the minutes of conversations with Alamán on 2 July and 10 July, 1832 on the boundary issue. The question of whether portions of Texas are a part of the U.S. territory is raised, as well as doubt of the U.S. government's authority to transfer such territory to Mexico without compensation, which it appears Mexico could not pay. In Butler's opinion, making Texas a part of the U.S. would eliminate many problems for Mexico.

Butler to Jackson, 18 July, 1832, Jackson Papers. Santa Anna's forces control all ports from Matamoras to Vera Cruz cutting completely the Mexican government's revenue. This will aid Butler in the approaching negotiations. He converses with Alamán on the Texas purchase, and Alamán was more receptive than expected. Butler hints part of the five million dollars for the Texas purchase will be used to facilitate negotiations.

Butler to [Jackson], 12 Aug., 1832, Jackson Papers. Alamán's illness suspends the Texas negotiations for two weeks, and now the political climate has changed. The Texas negotiations must wait. Butler reports being on friendly terms with each of the men considered for the position of Minister of Foreign Affairs. He believes three more months with Alamán in office would have brought the sale of Texas. The empty Mexican treasury may yet bring about the sale of

Texas, but the sum offered by the U.S. may be too small. Butler states his own desire is to reside in Texas, but not while it is under Mexican rule.

Butler to Jackson, 30 Aug., 1832, Jackson Papers. Francis Fagoaga will be the new Minister of Foreign Affairs. Butler will first ascertain Fagoaga's opinion on the boundary before broaching the acquisition of Texas. He is pleased at the appointment and gives a glowing character sketch of the new Minister. Butler reports the rumor of an encounter between Texas citizens and Mexican troops stationed in the province. The civilians defeated a larger number of troops. Texas is said to have pronounced for Santa Anna.

Butler to Jackson, 9 Oct., 1832, Jackson Papers. The Texas negotiations are completely suspended by the political and military events. The loss of Alamán seriously hurts the negotiations.

Butler to Livingston, 10 Feb., 1833, received 20 May, 1833, Record Group 59. Butler reports being approached unofficially on a possible loan from the U.S. government or from private capital. If approached officially, he will reply that a loan might be made with Texas as security. Butler believes default is certain and Texas will be easily transferred. The loan could be made up to the proposed purchase price. The only difficulty in this plan is that Santa Anna recently made large land grants to friends for speculation in the New York market, and he could oppose the possible transfer.

Despatch No. 44, Butler to Livingston, 16 Mar., 1833; received 23 April, 1833, Record Group 59, enclosed is a letter from Bernardo González, who was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs in December 1832. The letter dated 14 February, 1833, states that the Mexican commissioners to assist in the boundary survey will be appointed shortly. Also included is another letter from González dated 2 March, 1833, requesting the U.S. to prevent its citizens from assisting the secession activities of North American colonists in the Department of Bejar from the State of Coahuila.

Butler to Jackson, 3 June, 1833; received [?, 1833], Record Group 59. In a letter enclosed with Despatch No. 48, Butler reports the troops intended to end the disturbances in Texas may be needed in the capital. Many feel that Mexico City will pronounce for Santa Anna.

Despatch No. 49, Butler to Louis McLane, 26 July, 1833; received 2 Sept., 1833, Record Group 59. No answer has been given to inquiries on the Texas question. The U.S. is daily misrepresented to the Mexican government as having views hostile to the territorial integrity of the nation.

Sam Houston to Jackson, 30 July, 1833, Jackson Papers. Texas has a constitution based on five principles and has sent it to the national Congress for adoption. Texas will accept nothing less than a constitution and just laws. Now that Mexico has repealed the anti-Anglo immigration laws, Houston believes Texas will flourish and become the most desirable place on earth.

Despatch No. 50, Butler to McLane, 5 Aug., 1833; received 25 Sept., 1833, Record Group 59. The Mexican cabinet is now considering the memorial for Texas statehood and its separation from Coahuila. They have three alternatives; Texas statehood, subjugation of the province by force, or loss of Texas to the U.S. Butler expects Texas to be offered to the U.S.

Butler to Jackson, 26 Sept., 1833, Jackson Papers. No hope exists for gaining a more western boundary under the present administration. Mexican troops have fallen back of the Guadalupe River after the last uprising in Ft. Felasco and Anahuac by the Texans. Butler suggests that the U.S. establish a garrison at Nacogdoches and force a boundary settlement by right of possession. He expects the Texans to resist a partition by Mexico and the U.S. and to insist upon annexation to the U.S. with the Neches River as the boundary. Butler gives his own arguments for the Neches River as the boundary, and comments on the grandiose view the Mexicans have of their own strength.

Butler to Jackson, 2 Oct., 1833, Jackson Papers. Butler compares his suggestion for the occupation of Texas with the U.S. occupation of the Floridas. He believes Jackson will concur. He discusses the details of his plan, troop size, necessary buildings, and the transportation of supplies. He believes the Texans would welcome the troops and assist in building suitable garrisons. Two Texas agents are in Mexico seeking to make Texas a separate state. If they fail, Butler

believes they will declare Texas independent. He gives the details of current political feeling in Texas. He also encloses a sketch of the Nacogdoches area with comments on the geography and the river, which is historically the true boundary.

Butler to Jackson, 28 Oct., 1833, Jackson Papers.

Butler reports that for a bribe of one-half million dollars Texas could be acquired, if the money were placed in the right hands. He gives the details of a conversation with a high government official who approached him with this deal. Butler requests explicit instructions from Jackson.

Jackson to Butler, 27 Nov., 1833, Jackson Papers.

Jackson chastises Butler for the bribery suggestion and for committing it to the mails. He denies ever authorizing Butler to use the money to facilitate an agreement with Mexico. The purpose of Butler's mission was to arrange a boundary for the mutual benefit of both countries and to provide a lasting peace. He explains in detail how the five million dollars was intended to be used. Jackson cautions Butler not to over step his authority.

Despatch No. 61, Butler to McLane, 4 Feb., 1834; received [1834], Record Group 59. Butler sends a copy of a pamphlet published in July by José María Tornel, former Minister of Washington. Along with giving a very favorable account of his own activities while in Washington, Tornel manages to discuss the Texas ambitions of the U.S. and of

Senator Thomas H. Benton in an unfavorable manner. Also enclosed is issue number four of the Indicator that discusses U.S. and Mexican relations, particularly the boundary issue. This pamphlet gives an accurate statement of the Mexican view of U.S. intentions in Texas.

Butler to Jackson, 6 Feb., 1834, Jackson Papers. Butler acknowledges Jackson's letter of 27 November, 1833. He asserts that contrary to U.S. customs, Mexico accepts bribery casually and gives a commentary on the acceptance of bribery in Mexican life. Butler offers his own argument that a more western boundary would benefit both countries and explains how he used this argument in conversation with a Mexican senator. The senator stated the President of Mexico would need a bribe of two-hundred thousand dollars. This Butler asserts is the basis for his belief that in order to affect a treaty for Texas bribery is necessary. He again urges the occupation of the disputed territory.

Butler to Jackson, 7 Mar., 1834, Jackson Papers. Butler reports no hope exists for negotiating the purchase of Texas under the present administration. He suggests that Jackson be ready to establish the boundary based solely on right. He gives his own version of the United States' historic right to the territory. In conversations with Mexican officials he reports learning that the Mexicans do not fear the U.S. taking Texas as they are on the brink of civil war over the slavery question. He urges Jackson to use force.

Despatch No. 70, Butler to McLane, 19 May, 1834; received [1834], Record Group 59. A change in the form of the Mexican government is imminent. Pronunciamientos for Santa Anna and a centralized government have been made in many states. Butler favors this change believing that Santa Anna is unequalled in Mexican politics and will further U.S. interests in Texas. He gives a glowing character analysis of Santa Anna.

Butler to Jackson, 6 June, 1834, Jackson Papers. Butler reports on the current political situation and his intimate relationship with Santa Anna. He speculates that if he had but one hour alone in conversation with Jackson he could return to Mexico and be much more useful than is now possible.

Despatch No. 72, Butler to McLane, 1 July, 1834; received 11 Aug., 1834, Record Group 59. Acknowledging orders to return to Washington as quickly as possible with a ratified copy of a boundary treaty, Butler requests an immediate leave of absence to interview both McLane and Jackson. They can then decide whether he should return to Mexico.

Butler to Jackson, 2 July, 1834, Jackson Papers. Butler asks whether he is to return with the treaty on temporary leave to Washington or is he being relieved of duty. He attempts to vindicate his conduct to Jackson.

Despatch No. 73, Butler to McLane, 13 July, 1834; received 25 Aug., 1834, Record Group 59. Butler accepts the charge to

work for the release of Colonel Stephen F. Austin of Texas. He reports no one could harm Austin not even in a Mexico City prison. Everyone expects his release daily, and in the intervening period his confinement is very relaxed. Butler personally does not believe Austin merits either assistance or sympathy from the U.S. government. He regards Austin as one of the bitterest enemies of the U.S. in Mexico and believes he has done more to embarrass negotiations for Texas than any other individual. Butler reports that Austin seems determined to prove his loyalty to the Mexican government by heaping abuse upon the U.S. and the Protestant religion.

Despatch No. 83, Butler to McLane, 20 Oct., 1834; received 25 Nov., 1834, Record Group 59. The contest continues between the Yorkinos and Escoseses Masons for influence over Santa Anna. Butler believes the U.S. would benefit from the Escoseses in power. His personal friends and associates are members of this party. Should the cabinet positions be filled by Escoseses, Butler would be able to conclude the negotiations more satisfactorily, particularly that of Texas. Never before have prospects been so good for U.S. negotiations and Mexican tranquility.

Butler to Jackson, 20 Oct., 1834, Jackson Papers. Butler cautions Jackson on the necessary delay in bringing a ratified boundary treaty to Washington. He again holds out the hope for a Texas acquisition and the advisability of his return to Mexico. Alamán has returned to the capital and is

more popular than before. Butler asserts their old intimacy grows and they have had many talks on Texas. Alamán will cooperate in a settlement of Texas on the U.S.

Butler to Jackson, 21 Nov., 1834, Jackson Papers. Butler optimistically reports on the advancement of his friends in the Mexican government. The treasury is very low, but Santa Anna continues to increase the size of the military. He notes that merchants refuse to make a personal loan to the Mexican government. Butler intimates that he and Alamán worked out a fiscal plan for Mexico. Alamán will soon become head of Santa Anna's government, and he is in agreement with Butler on Texas.

Butler to Jackson, 24 Dec., 1834, Jackson Papers. Butler announces Gutiérrez de Estrada has become Minister of Foreign Affairs rather than Alamán. Butler, however, claims intimacy with him and that his appointment is actually better than that of Alamán's for purposes of negotiation on Texas.

Butler to John Forsyth, 17 June, 1835; received 20 June, 1835, Record Group 59. Butler, while in Washington, writes Secretary of State Forsyth at great length giving him facts and opinions on a subject of great interest, the acquisition of Texas. He believes the time has come when Texas can be obtained along with California and New Mexico. He reviews his past instructions on Texas and the attempts to negotiate with the Bustamante and Santa Anna regimes. Butler encloses his correspondence wherein bribery is mentioned as

as a method to acquire Texas. A note initialed "A.J.", possibly those of Andrew Jackson, dated 22 June, 1835, comments on Butler's bribery suggestion.

Despatch No. 1, 2d. series, Butler to Forsyth, 28 Nov., 1834; received 3 Feb., 1836, Record Group 59. Butler acknowledges the receipt of instruction No. 94 ordering him to return to the U.S. on 1 December, 1835, but expresses his desire to continue his negotiations which he believes can be successfully completed. He mentions a letter to Jackson in which he asks for more time considering the vital nature of his activities, and he asks for confirmation of his instructions in the event his negotiations extend past 1 December, 1835.

Ex. Docs., No. 2 (H. Doc. 2), 24th Cong. 1st sess., 7 Dec., 1835, s.s. 447: "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the First Session of the Twenty-fourth Congress." President Jackson comments on the extension of time to the boundary commissioners and the concern caused by recent events in Mexico. He authorizes instructions to all U.S. District Attorneys to prosecute anyone who violates U.S. neutrality. Mexico is to be notified that U.S. territory must be respected by both parties in Texas.

Butler to Jackson, 19 Dec., 1835, Jackson Papers. Butler reports the violent reaction in Mexico over the Texas revolution. Santa Anna makes undignified boasts of his plans for subduing Texas and swears that not one inch of Texas will be

separated from Mexico. Santa Anna also swears that the U.S. will never cross the Sabine River. Butler also reports on Santa Anna's meeting with the foreign diplomats and his claim that the U.S. instigated the Texas revolt. Butler speculates that after two months, Santa Anna may change his mind about Texas and be willing to negotiate a boundary west of the Neches River.

Despatch No. 2, 2d. series, Butler to Forsyth, 27 Dec., 1835; received 3 Feb., 1836, Record Group 59. Butler acknowledges his instructions to return to the U.S., but refers again to his letter to Jackson in October that stated his determination to return only when his objectives were obtained. Butler prefers to believe that Jackson would relax his instructions after reading the October letter. Butler corrects Forsyth's misinformation on the location of San Francisco Bay which is contained in diplomatic instructions. He very carefully demonstrates greater knowledge than the Secretary of State on this subject and promises to exert his efforts for the attainment of the bay. Following this despatch is a printed copy of the periodical Suplemento al Rejenerado, number 99. The lead article is entitled "Defensa del Jeneral Santa Anna Presidente de la República Mejicana."

Despatch No. 3, 2d. series, Butler to Forsyth, 31 Dec., 1835; received 3 Feb., 1836, Record Group 59. Butler reports the execution of twenty-eight men abandoned by General Mexia at Tampico Viejo. Eleven of these men were U.S.

citizens. An enclosed report from the U.S. consul at Tampico states that the men admitted to desertion from Mexia, but had enlisted for Texas not realizing they would go to Tampico. The report includes a list of persons who were shot giving name, age, place of residence, and next of kin. Butler encloses two pamphlets, "Segunda parte: El pueblo Mexicano proclama a Santa-Anna por supremo dictador," and "O Anarquía O Retroceso y Siempre Pronunciamientos." The last pamphlet has a note written in 1832 by Gutiérrez de Estrada.

Butler to Forsyth, 15 Jan., 1836; received 26 Feb., 1836, Record Group 59. Butler acknowledges the receipt of his instructions and the notification of the appointment of his successor. He states that his own desires coincide with those of Jackson, and that only interest in Texas would induce him to remain longer than the Secretary desired. He offers his explanation for the failure of the Texas negotiations and expresses dissatisfaction at his treatment by Forsyth. Butler also states that upon taking leave of Jackson in Washington no mention was made of a definite termination date for his appointment. A marginal note signed "A.J." disputes Butler's statement. Butler gives information on Santa Anna's march to Texas and the current state of Mexican politics. He forwards copies of two declarations from the Mexican government forbidding foreigners to bring arms and ammunition into Mexican territory, and the closing of Galveston and Matagorda, Texas to shipping.

Butler to Forsyth, 2 Feb., 1836, Record Group 59.

Butler encloses a note from the Minister of Foreign Affairs, José Monasterio declaring all vessels flying the Texas flag will be treated as pirates, and another note declaring all Texas vessels flying a flag of the same colors as the United States, but with a cross and the 1824 insignia are likewise to be treated as pirates.

Butler to Forsyth, 8 Feb., 1836; received 18 Mar., 1836, Record Group 59. Butler sends an extract from El Diario del Gobiersno for 7 February, 1836, that attacks the U.S. for allowing Texas vessels to enter New Orleans and for giving assistance to the Texans. The Mexicans threaten to close their ports to U.S. vessels because so many Texas ships fly the U.S. flag until they are close enough to attack and then hoist the Texas flag.

Butler to Forsyth, 23 Mar., 1836; received 6 April, 1836, Record Group 59. Mexico has received information that Santa Anna will force Texas to submit. The latest rumor has General Martin Perfecto de Cos with the main army nearing San Felipe in the Austin settlement. Both political parties in the capital speak of success, but none venture to predict the outcome. Butler reports that the vice-president has died and Santa Anna will be recalled from Texas.

Stephen F. Austin to Jackson, 15 April, 1836, Jackson Papers. Austin writes an impassioned plea for fellow Americans to join with Texas against the barbaric Mexican army

in a national war for republican principles. He asks for a resolution of Congress and financial support against Santa Anna's seven thousand troops.

Butler to Forsyth, 20 April, 1836; received 7 June, 1836, Record Group 59. Butler encloses the proclamation closing Texas ports dated 10 February, 1836, the notice that Barragán will be replaced by José Corro as President ad interim, the notice of Barragan's funeral 3 March, 1836, and his own correspondence with Monasterio on the reported movement by U.S. troops toward Mexican territory, dated 9 March, 1836.

S. Docs., No. 374, 24th Cong., 1st sess., 27 April, 1836, s.s.: 283; "Resolution Passed at a Meeting of the Citizens of Burke County, North Carolina in Favor of Recognizing the Independence of Texas." These citizens characterize the Mexicans as waging a war of extermination against the Texans who love liberty and freedom of religion. They can not sanction indifference to the struggle and the Mexican faithlessness in her agreement with the people she invited to settle Texas.

Ex. Docs., No. 256, (H. Doc. 256), 24th Cong., 1st sess., 14 May, 1836, s.s. 291; "Correspondence with the Government of Mexico; Message from the President of the United States Transmitting Reports from the Secretaries of State and War in Compliance with a Resolution of the House of Representatives..." This document contains all the State Department instructions to Butler in Mexico, all correspondence between the two

governments, and department files pertinent to Texas. The writers involved are Secretary of State Forsyth, Chargé Butler, Minister Monasterio, Mexican Chargé Juan Castillo y Lanzas, Envoy Extraordinary Gorostinza, and U.S. District Attorneys William Brown, Lewis Sanders, and Richard Gaines. Secretary of War, Lewis Cass, sends his department files of instructions to General E.P. Gaines, commander of U.S. troops on the Louisiana-Texas border, N. Cannon, Governor of Tennessee, C.C. Clay, Governor of Alabama, and E.D. White, Governor of Louisiana. The incident that prompts the request for the documents is General Gaines' incursion across the Sabine River. The Mexican government protests this act and the raising of volunteer armies in the U.S. to assist the Texas rebellion.

Despatch No. 1 Powhatan Ellis to Forsyth, 30 April, 1836; received 28 July, 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis reports that upon his arrival in Mexico City he learned through rumors that Santa Anna is encountering great difficulties in subduing Texas. The government is silent on army affairs.

Butler to Forsyth, 8 May, 1836; received 18 June, 1836, Record Group 59. Butler sends a copy of El Diario de Gobierno, 7 May, 1836, containing a paragraph stating that Mexican troops will march through Texas to the Sabine River and thus settle the boundary question. Before leaving for Texas Santa Anna stated that he would settle the U.S. designs on Texas by setting a boundary line with cannon. Butler believes that this proves his advice to Jackson on setting

the boundary without participation from Mexico.

S. Docs., No. 365, 24th Cong., 1st sess., 9 May, 1836, s.s. 283: "Memorial of Sundry Individuals of Philadelphia, Praying the Interposition of the United States in the Cause of Texas." These citizens regard the recent revolt in Mexico as an usurpation of power by a military despot and cause enough for Texas independence. They call for intervention to end the raging conflict, and to promote U.S. interests.

Despatch No. 2, Ellis to Forsyth, 19 May, 1836; received 28 July, 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis reports on the unquiet atmosphere at the Mexican palace and the news of Santa Anna's capture as reported in El Diario de Gobierno. The President ad interim calls for the citizens and soldiers to rescue Santa Anna. The Congress is resolved to continue the war against Texas, but this action would endanger the life of Santa Anna. The U.S. is blamed for involvement in Texas and many talk of breaking relations. Ellis fears a new political revolution worse than any previous civil war in Mexico. He believes that only a victory by the liberals and a return to the constitution of 1824 will save Mexico.

S. Docs., No. 384, 24th Cong., 1st sess., 24 May, 1836, s.s. 283: "Proceedings of a Meeting of the Citizens of Washington in Favor of Recognition of the Independence of Texas." These citizens regard the denial of the Texas republican constitution by the Mexican government as a just cause for independence. Santa Anna in his move against Texas,

has waged an indiscriminate massacre. The Texas victory should be recognized by the U.S. and independence secured.

Santa Anna to David G. Burnet, 25 May, 1836, Jackson Papers. Jackson's copies of Santa Anna's agreement with Texas contains the ten article public statement and the six article secret agreement to work for Texas recognition in Mexico.

Santa Anna to the Texas Troops, 1 June, 1836, Jackson Papers, Santa Anna's farewell address requests the Texas troops to rely on his sincerity and not to regret their generosity to him.

S. Docs., No. 418, 24th Cong., 1st sess., 11 June, 1836, s.s. 284: "Proceedings of the Citizens of Nashville, Tennessee in Favor of Recognizing the Independence of Texas." Following a laudatory history of Anglo immigration to Texas, this memorial discusses the Mexican constitutional background from 1824 to 1834, and the history of the Texas revolution. These citizens stress Mexico's inability to reconquer Texas and the stability of the Texas government. They urge the U.S. to recognize Texas.

S. Docs., No. 406, 24th Cong., 1st sess., 18 June, 1836, s.s. 284: "In the Senate of the United States...Mr. Clay Made the Following Report; Committee on Foreign Relations, to Whom Were Referred Resolutions...Sundry Memorials and Other Proceedings...Recommending Recognition of the Independence of Texas...Now Beg Leave to Submit to the Senate the Following Report and Resolution." The report gives the U.S. criteria

for recognition of newly-created governments and those that change their form of government. It states the U.S. official position toward the Mexico - Texas problem, stressing the need for prudence in recognition. The committee stresses the lack of accurate knowledge of conditions in Texas. It wishes to delay recognition until Mexico recognizes the independence of Texas, but the U.S. will not delay indefinitely. The committee report reviews the modes of recognition available and the powers of the President in each case.

Sen. Docs., No. 415, 24 Cong., 1st sess., 23 June, 1836, s.s. 284: "Message from the President of the United States in Compliance with a Resolution of the Senate, Relating to Conditions of Texas." The Secretary of State, to whom the resolution was referred, sends copies of papers addressed to the State Department by agents of the Texas republic. No answers have been given. These papers include nine items from G.C. Childress, R. Hamilton, S.P. Carson, D.G. Burnett, Robert Triplett, T.J. Rusk, and Sam Houston. Among these items are copies of the Texas declaration of independence, the Constitution of the Texas Republic dated 19 March, 1836 and 10 June, 1836, with Houston's official report of San Jacinto, 25 April, 1836.

S. Docs., No. 416, 24th Cong., 1st sess., 24 June, 1836, s.s. 284: "Memorial of Sundry Inhabitants of Opelousas, Louisiana in Favor of Acknowledging the Independence of Texas." These citizens give their view of the progress and justification of the Texas independence movement. Their belief is that Texas independence is assured.

Despatch No. 6, Ellis to Forsyth, 25 June, 1836, received 28 July, 1836, Record Group 59. In cipher Ellis reports that Mexico is resolved against Texas. Large numbers of men are being impressed into the army. Mexico has asked Britain for aid in subjugating Texas. A two million dollar forced loan is now planned to finance the campaign.

Ellis to Forsyth, 25 June, 1836; received 28 July, 1836, Record Group 59. In cipher Ellis reports his concern over possible British involvement with Mexico in Texas. He questions the wisdom of the U.S. allowing the creation of a British sphere of commercial influence on the United States' borders.

Santa Anna to Jackson, 4 July, 1836, Jackson Papers. Santa Anna writes of his defeat and capitulation agreement with Houston. He refers to orders given to General Vicente Filisola to return across the Rio Grande and the arrangement for his own return to Mexico. He relates the events that prevented his immediate return to Mexico and the resulting advance of Mexican troops toward Texas. He requests Jackson to use his influence in Texas to see the original agreement carried out and prevent the high feelings on both sides from commencing hostilities again.

H. Rpt. No. 854, 24th Cong., 1st sess., 4 July, 1836; s.s. 295; "Independence of Texas." The Foreign Affairs Committee reports that the independence of Texas will be

acknowledged after all data available is assimilated and the true nature of conditions in Texas is ascertained.

Despatch No. 9, Ellis to Forsyth, 16 July, 1836; received 26 Aug., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis reports that all government instructions on Texas he expected to find in the legation files are missing along with those on the Mexican country of the northwest.

Manuel E. de Gorostiza to Jackson, 27 July, 1836, Jackson Papers. Mexican Minister to Washington, Gorostiza, gives the official Mexican view of any movement by U.S. troops across the Sabine River as a violation of the treaties with Mexico. Gorostiza protests any planned move by General Gaines into Texas to prevent rumored Indian attacks. He will break relations and return to Mexico if it becomes necessary.

Butler to Forsyth, [1836]; received 28 July, 1836, Record Group 59. Butler gives an account of his challenge to José María Tornel over a newspaper account of General Gaines' activities in Texas. He encloses his letter of challenge, and a note from the man who delivered his note giving Tornel's reaction. Also included in this letter is an account of the Mexican version of the Alamo battle, its losses, and fortification. Butler contrasts this with what he considers a more accurate version. He also forwards a pamphlet published after Santa Anna's capture to illustrate the mood in Mexico and Santa Anna's true character. The pamphlet is titled "Proceso de General Santa Anna," 1836.

Gorostiza to Jackson, 28 July, 1836, Jackson Papers.

Gorostiza refers to reports in the Globe that are at variance to good U.S. - Mexican relations. He protests such articles.

Thomas Porter to Jackson, 30 July, 1836, Jackson Papers. Adjutant General Porter forwards his own letter and the published executive order of the Governor of Tennessee calling for a regiment of volunteers to be readied to join General Gaines on the western frontier.

A. Dickins to Gorostiza, 1 Aug., 1836, Jackson Papers. Dickins, Acting Secretary of State, reassures Gorostiza of the friendly feeling of the U.S. for Mexico and explains Gaines' orders. He qualifies those circumstances that might require Gaines to cross the Sabine River. A note added to this letter by Jackson indicates his belief that the U.S. has the right to move into disputed territory until the boundary is set at the eastern or western branch of the Sabine River. If the eastern one is set, then the U.S. troops will withdraw.

Dickins to Gorostiza, 1 Aug., 1836, Jackson Papers. Dickins answers Gorostiza's protest of editorials in the Globe by stating that the newspaper is not the official organ of the government and has freedom of the press.

Despatch No. 13, Ellis to Forsyth, 3 Aug., 1836; received 8 Sept., 1836, Record Group 59. In cipher Ellis reports that the Mexican Minister to Britain is to ask assistance in halting the extension of slavery. If the aid is offered, the Minister is to press for further assistance to halt slavery in Texas.

Cannon to Jackson, 4 Aug., 1836, Jackson Papers.

Governor Cannon of Tennessee is uncertain how to proceed. He requests assurance of his orders before raising the regiment of militia requested by General Gaines.

[Jackson] to Cannon, 5 Aug., 1836, Jackson Papers.

Jackson reminds Cannon of U.S. neutrality toward the Texas - Mexico conflict and the necessity to prevent any incident that might give Mexico grounds for suspecting U.S. involvement in Texas. He regrets that armed Tennessee militia volunteers have been called into service. He gives an explanation of General Gaines' orders and the continuation of the policy of neutrality. Jackson cannot sanction Gaines' actions and he will authorize payment of the expenses incurred.

Jackson to Dickins, 17 Aug., 1836, Jackson Papers.

Jackson acknowledges receipt of Gorostiza's notes of 27 and 28 July. He encloses to Dickins Governor Cannon's letter and his own reply. He emphasizes to Dickins the neutrality of the U.S. in the Texas - Mexico conflict.

Despatch No. 14, Ellis to Forsyth, 20 Aug., 1836; received 29 Sept. 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis forwards a copy of the Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs' inquiry into the movement by General Gaines on Nacogdoches. Ellis is unaware of the action and will avoid any discussion until he is advised from Washington.

Ellis to Forsyth and Jackson, 26 Aug., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis recounts his journey to Mexico and the conditions upon his arrival in April, 1836. He assesses Santa Anna's popularity then and now in August, 1836. Public opinion is against Santa Anna and for the continued war with Texas. Many in the army regard Texas as lost. More troops are being impressed for General Nicolás Bravo's march to the north. Mexico believes the Texas war was promoted by the U.S. and this belief unites all parties.

Jackson to Houston, 4 Sept., 1836, Jackson Papers. Jackson acknowledges Houston's letter and notifies him that the Mexican government disavows any act by Santa Anna after his capture. The U.S. cannot mediate unless both parties concur. He emphasizes the policy of strict neutrality that the U.S. must observe. Jackson notifies Houston that if Mexico does not contain hostile Indians, the U.S. must do it for her.

Despatch No. 22, Ellis to Forsyth, 4 Oct., 1836; received 17 Nov., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis forwards documents giving the Mexican view of the Texas blockade of Matamoros proclaimed by President D.G. Burnet. He also encloses a copy of this proclamation dated 21 July, 1836.

Despatch No. 27, Ellis to Forsyth, 11 Oct., 1836; received 17 Nov., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis reports Mexico is tranquil although some excitement still exists over Texas. An army of 4,000 to 5,000 men will march from the

capital to rendezvous at Matamoros. He gives a description of the Army and their inability to beat the Anglos or even arrive at Matamoros. Mexican opinion is split over whether Bravo will take command of the campaign.

Despatch No. 33, Ellis to Forsyth, 26 Oct., 1836; received 28 Dec., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis reports that 4,000 troops destined for Texas left the capital. Bravo and Valencia left to take command. Valencia stated that the whole army would be 12,480 men exclusive of impressed convicts. They are confident of success, but up to 30,000 troops could be raised. It is rumored that the army may establish a cordon of posts from Matamoros into Texas and use guerrilla warfare. In cipher Ellis notes that the soldiers are panicky and the government is disappointed in its hopes for British aid.

Ellis to Forsyth, 11 Nov., 1836; received 25 Dec., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis reports one regiment of Mexican troops on the march to Texas became disruptive between Mexico City and San Luis Potosí, but they were pacified. He expresses his opinion that the Mexican troops are very inferior to those under Santa Anna in the first campaign.

Houston to Jackson, 20 Nov., 1836, Jackson Papers. Houston commends Santa Anna to Jackson and encloses a letter of introduction.

S. Docs., No. 1, 24th Cong., 2d sess., 5 Dec., 1836, s.s. 297: "Message from the President of the United States

to the Two Houses of Congress on the Commencement of the Second Session of the Twenty-fourth Congress." Jackson characterizes the United States' conduct on the Texas - Mexico conflict as similar to that during the earlier Spain-Mexico conflict. The strong feelings of U.S. citizens is not enough to sway the rational approach to the Texas question. The known desire of Texas to join the union gives rise to doubts about U.S. involvement in the conflict. The Mexican ministry was terminated because General Gaines crossed into Texas - Mexican territory as far as Nacogdoches in the belief that Indian conduct warranted it. Jackson hopes that Mexico will take a less emotional view of this necessary precaution because Mexico cannot restrict the Indian movements as required by treaty (pp. 4-5). Jackson explains that the discretionary authority of General Gaines to cross the Sabine River to Nacogdoches to protect the frontier was exercised. The succeeding officer has received orders to withdraw unless conditions dictate otherwise (p.19). In the correspondence accompanying the annual message Jackson includes that between the State Department and the Mexican Minister Gorostiza dated 14 May, 1836 through 20 October, 1836. This correspondence covers the controversy surrounding General Gaines' discretionary order to cross the Sabine River. These letters give evidence of conditions in Texas and U.S. citizens' sympathy for the Texas cause (pp. 26-105). An accompanying report of the Secretary of War provides a table illustrating the troop position and distribution on the western frontier (p. 1467).

Austin to A.J. Donelson, 14 Dec., 1836, Jackson Papers. Austin reports sending W.H. Wharton as Minister to the U.S. and gives the details of Texas establishing a government separate from Mexico. He does not doubt that the U.S. will negotiate Texas independence and agree to annex Texas. He gives his own reasons why Texas is vital to the union, and the principles behind his own use of the colonization contracts. He justifies his break with Mexico by accusing Mexico of a breach of faith with Texas. He informs Jackson of the powers given to Wharton regarding annexation and a character sketch of his abilities.

S. Docs., No. 20, 24th Cong., 2d. sess., 21 Dec., 1836, s.s. 297; "Message from the President of the United States Relative to the Political, Military, and Civil Conditions of Texas." Jackson gives his reply to resolutions in the House and Senate, stating Texas independence should be recognized when adequate information is available. Jackson believes the practice of caution in recognition should be followed and he gives his own objections to hasty recognition. Jackson includes for Congressional information extracts from reports of Presidential agents in Texas on the size, location, and morale of the Texas army, a history of Texas grievances against Mexican colonization laws, an account of the organization of the Texas government, the fate of Santa Anna, boundary claims, population statistics, military plans against Mexico, copies of loans, and Texas diplomatic relations with Mexico.

S. Docs., No. 84, 24th Cong., 2d sess., 18 Jan., 1837, s.s. 298: "Message from the President of the United States Transmitting His Correspondence with General Santa Anna, President of the Republic of Mexico in Compliance with a Resolution of the Senate...." Jackson forwards a copy of Santa Anna's letter dated 4 July, 1836 and his reply dated 4 September, 1836. Santa Anna's letter gives an account of the convention signed with Texas and his attempts to return to Mexico and fulfill his part of the agreement. He urges Jackson to use his influence to suggest moderation to the Texas populace allowing him to return to Mexico and prevent further encounters between Texan and Mexican troops. Jackson's reply informs Santa Anna that the Mexican Minister reports that Mexican law does not acknowledge any agreements Santa Anna made while captive thus preventing Santa Anna's interference in Mexican policy without the approval of the Mexican government.

Ex. Docs., No. 105 (H. Doc. 105), 24th Cong., 2d. sess., 25 Jan., 1837. s.s. 303: "Mexico and Texas; Message from the President of the United States Transmitting the Information Required...Upon the Subject of the Conditions of the Political Relations Between the United States and Mexico; Also the Condition of Texas." The Secretary of State sends extracts from the correspondence of Ellis, Forsyth, Monasterio, U.S. Consul George Robertson, General Gregorio Gómez, Lieutenant Thomas Osborn, U.S. Consul Henry Perrine and U.S. Consul

M. Burrough dated March, 1836 through January, 1837. The seventy-one items cover incidents between U.S. and Mexican vessels, U.S. claims, and Forsyth's account to Ellis of Gorostiza's departure from Washington following the publication of diplomatic correspondence in a pamphlet. The correspondence ends with Ellis announcing his departure date from Mexico.

S. Docs., No. 172, 24th Cong., 2d. sess., 13 Feb., 1837, s.s. 298: "Memorial of a Number of Citizens of the District of Columbia, Praying Recognition of the Independence of Texas." These citizens call for action not more delay on recognizing Texas.

H. Rpt. No. 240, 24th Cong., 2d. sess., 18 Feb., 1837, s.s. 396: Independence of Texas. "The House Foreign Affairs Committee Reports on the President's Message and Sundry Memorials." They conclude that the independence of Texas should be recognized and the Committee on Ways and Means directed to include expenses for government agents to Texas in the bill for civil and diplomatic expenses.

Forsyth to Martin Van Buren, 21 July, 1837, Van Buren Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Forsyth reports on a visit by Santa Anna and that his object for speaking with the President and the President-elect is the reconciliation of the Mexican government with Texas. Forsyth believes Santa Anna's true object is to learn everything he can discover and use it to return himself to power in Mexico. Santa Anna offers the possibility of a cession or readjustment of the

U.S. - Mexican boundary to give Texas to the U.S. Forsyth warns Van Buren that Santa Anna may visit him.

Robert Greenhow to Forsyth, 28 June, 1837, Record Group 59. Greenhow, a special agent, gives his assessment of the Mexican army at Matamoros, the country side, and general conditions of the area. In apparent response to a question, he gives a detailed account of the economy of south Texas, the principle ports, and transportation methods.

W.L. Parrott to Forsyth, 29 July, 1837; received 21 Aug., 1837, Record Group 59. Parrott a former U.S. Consul in Mexico City writes his impressions of Mexico, following his tour of the northwestern states. He covers Santa Anna's political movements, Texas, the possibility of Mexico selling Texas to the British, and the possibility of foreign intervention over claims in Mexico.

Greenhow to Forsyth, 12 Aug., 1837; received 21 Aug., 1837, Record Group 59. Greenhow makes a report on his mission to Mexico City and his interview with the Minister of Foreign Affairs Luis Gonzaga Cuevas and President Bustamante. Their discussion covers claims, recognition of Texas independence by the U.S., U.S. neutrality in the Texas - Mexico conflict, Mexican Minister Gorostiza's publication of diplomatic correspondence before his departure from Washington, and U.S. desire for a formal apology by the Mexican government. Greenhow gives his indepth assessment of Mexican politics and their inability to mount an invasion of Texas.

Greenhow to Forsyth, 12 Aug., 1837; received 30 Nov., 1837, Record Group 59. This is a more complete report of his mission to Mexico City than his previous letter dated 12 August, 1837. Greenhow forwards all correspondence with President Bustamante and Gonzaga Cuevas.

J. Paulding to Van Buren, 22 Sept., 1837, Van Buren Papers. Paulding, a prominent literary and political figure, discusses the political issues involved in accepting the possibility of a request by Texas for admission to the union. Texas would strengthen the southern delegation in Congress. He encourages Van Buren by stating that the Louisiana Purchase and the acquisition of Florida set precedents for presidential power to acquire territory. He believes that Texas could be a threat to U.S. peace if Britain gains control of it. Texas, in Paulding's opinion, is necessary to U.S. safety.

Ex. Docs., No. 40 (H. Doc. No. 40), 25th Cong., 1st sess., 30 Sept., 1837, s.s. 311: "Annexation of Texas to the United States: Message from the President of the United States... Respecting an Annexation of Texas." The Secretary of State reports with supporting documents the correspondence with Texas on annexation. The documents include letters from Memucan Hunt, Texas envoy to Washington, on the Texas desire to enter the union. Forsyth's response states the official position on recognition and the consequences of annexation while Mexico and Texas are still at war.

S. Docs. No. 1, 25th Cong., 1st sess., 5 Dec., 1837, s.s. 314: "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Twenty-fifth Congress." President Van Buren relates neglect of U.S. claims by Mexico with supporting documents from the Secretary of State. Among the claims Van Buren includes the conduct of Gorostiza in publishing diplomatic correspondence (pp. 6-8, 29-36). The report of the Secretary of State accompanying the President's message includes José Monasterio's official objection to U.S. recognition of Texas as reported in the New Orleans Bee, 13 March, 1837 (p. 143).

C.J. Ingersoll to Van Buren, 24 Oct., 1837, Van Buren Papers. Ingersoll, a prominent Pennsylvania politician, discusses the coming political importance of the Canadian and Texas boundaries in relation to the abolition movement.

José Tornel to Van Buren, 5 Jan., 1839, Van Buren Papers. Tornel reports his desire to conduct open and frank relations with the U.S. ending the existing difficulties. He reminds Van Buren of their association while he was Mexican Minister to Washington and Van Buren was Secretary of State.

Ex. Docs., No. 75 (H. Docs. No. 75), 25th Cong., 2d. sess., 8 Jan., 1838, s.s. 323: "Capture of the Mexican Brig Urrea: Message from the President of the United States... respecting the Capture and Restoration of the Mexican Brig of War Urrea." Van Buren sends all information from the Departments of State and Navy on the U.S. sloop of War

Natchez and the Mexican brig Urrea in April, 1837. The incident resulted from confusion over the closing by Mexico of the Texas ports.

W.S. Fulton to Forsyth, 13 Feb., 1838, Jackson Papers. Fulton, upon the request of the House of Representatives, reports on his activities for President Jackson investigating rumors that Sam Houston was recruiting and training volunteers in Arkansas for use against Mexico in 1830. This recruitment was in violation of U.S. neutrality. Fulton reports that he investigated and found no such evidence.

Ex. Docs., No. 190 (H. Doc. No. 190), 25th Cong., 2d. sess., 26 Feb., 1838, s.s. 327: "Gorostiza Pamphlet; Message from the President of the United States Transmitting a Copy and Translation of a Pamphlet in the Spanish Language, Printed and Circulated by the Late Minister from Mexico Before His Departure from the United States." The Gorostiza pamphlet gives the Mexican view of the French and United States claims to Texas as part of the Louisiana Territory. In reciting incidents of U.S. violation of Spanish and Mexican territory and the long boundary negotiations, Gorostiza includes pertinent correspondence and thirty-four documents as supportive evidence.

Ex. Docs., No. 351 (H. Doc. 351), 25th Cong., 2d. sess., 26 April, 1838, s.s. 330; "United States and Mexico; Message from the President of the United States Transmitting...

a Report of the Secretary of State upon Existing Relations Between the United States and Mexico." The resolution calls for all documents, correspondence, and instructions to the U.S. Minister to Mexico since the signing of the treaty of 1828, and the correspondence between the U.S. and Mexican governments with all instructions to General Gaines not previously given to the House. The subject of these documents is U.S. claims and the Mexican agreement to arbitration if the U.S. remains neutral in Texas.

Ex. Docs., No. 360 (H. Doc. 360), 25th Cong., 2d. sess., 2 May, 1838, s.s. 330: "Steamboat Columbia: Message from the President of the United States Transmitting a Further Report upon the Subject of an Attack upon the Steamboat Columbia." The Secretary of State sends the Mexican correspondence on the alledged attack by Mexican ships on the U.S. steamboat in Texas waters. Enclosed is the Mexican brig of War Iturbide's report.

Ex. Docs., No. 409 (H. Doc. 409), 25th Cong., 2d. sess., 30 May, 1838, s.s. 330: "Texas: Message from the President of the United States...Respecting the Annexation of Texas to the United States." The President reports all correspondence was previously reported to the House. No action has been taken since the decision was made earlier not to consider annexation at this time.

Ex. Docs., No. 2 (H. Doc. 2), 25th Cong., 3d. sess., 3 Dec., 1838, s.s. 344: "Message from the President of the

United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Third Session of the Twenty-fifth Congress." President Van Buren in his opening remarks reports the Texas border with the U.S. is settled and their request for annexation withdrawn. He includes in his message a copy of the boundary convention signed 25 April, 1838 and the letter from Anson Jones withdrawing the Texas offer of annexation dated 12 October, 1838.

Ellis to Van Buren, 1 Sept., 1839, Van Buren Papers. Ellis reports that the Texas question will not be acted upon by the executive or legislative branches. Santa Anna's resolution for the pacification of Texas was submitted while he held office, but was not well received. To avoid misunderstanding, Ellis will explain the Texas policy of the U.S. to the Mexican administration at the first possible opportunity.

Despatch No. 9, Ellis to Forsyth, 16 Nov., 18, 1839, Record Group 59. In cipher Ellis reports that 1,500 Texas troops entered Mexico with the purpose of attacking Matamoros. The Mexicans will muster 4,000 troops to cover the frontier and repel further incursions. All this is rumored, but accepted as accurate by Ellis. The war with Texas is popular in Mexico and all factions will unite against a Texas invasion.

H. Docs., No. 2 26th Cong., 1st sess., 2 Dec., 1839, s.s. 363: "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the First Session of the Twenty-sixth Congress." Following a

report on the progress of a claims arbitration with Mexico, the President reports that the Texas boundary will be set by a joint commission.

Despatch No. 14, Ellis to Forsyth, 9 Mar., 1840; received April, 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis reports the arrival in December, 1839, of James Treat in Mexico as a Texas agent. Treat did not reveal his true mission to Ellis until after many meetings with him. Treat later relates that his mission is to bring about an adjustment in Texas - Mexico relations and implies that the U.S. has offered to mediate. Ellis denies any U.S. involvement and will abstain from contact with Treat until further orders arrive from Washington.

Despatch No. 25, Ellis to Forsyth, 11 June, 1840; received 10 July, 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis shares the rumor that Richard Packenham, British Minister to Mexico, sent a note to the Mexican government that if Texas is not reconquered the British will soon recognize independence. Britain offers to mediate between Texas and Mexico.

Despatch No. 27, Ellis to Forsyth, 6 July, 1840; received Aug., 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis reports on his inquiry into the fate of David Crockett at the fall of the Alamo in Texas. He denies the reports that Crockett is confined in the mines at Guadalajara. He confirms the report that he died at the Alamo based on information from a distinguished Mexican soldier who stated that no prisoners were taken. He encloses a copy of his letter to John Crockett refuting the

report of William White. Ellis regrets the death of his friend.

Despatch No. 33, Ellis to Forsyth, 20 Aug., 1840; received 26 Sept., 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis encloses documents from the U.S. consul at Tampico on Mexican - Texan relations and the current Mexican policy toward Texas. The document dated 6 August, 1840, is a statement of praise from General Mariano Arista to the Indian tribes for uniting to attack the Texans. Ellis also forwards a statement by the Secretary of War giving information from General Urrea on the arrest of William Hallett and Zalman Hull in Matamoros on 17 February, 1840 for giving aid to the Texans. The arrest occurred in the house of the U.S. consul.

Despatch No. 36, Ellis to Forsyth, 17 Oct., 1840; received 25 Nov., 1840, Record Group 59. The consul at Vera Cruz reports Texas vessels are cruising outside the harbor causing the Mexican government to order a small squadron into the area. Seven hundred Texans entered Mexico, joining with an equal number of Federalists led by José María Molano. This group is taking possession of the capital of Tamaulipas and is expected to march on Tampico or San Luis Potosí.

Santa Anna to Jackson, 31 Oct., 1840, Jackson Papers. Santa Anna responds to Jackson's inquiry into the fate of Thomas Brown after his capture on the Texas frontier and his imprisonment at Matamoros. Santa Anna sends a copy of the Minister of War's report.

Despatch No. 49, Ellis to Daniel Webster, 9 Dec., 1841; received 15 Jan., 1842. Ellis encloses correspondence on the case of U.S. citizens in the service of Texas captured on the Texas border by Mexicans and imprisoned at Saltillo. He also sends correspondence on Berryman O. Stout who was among a group captured on the Texas border.

Despatch No. 51, Ellis to Webster, 16 Dec., 1841; received 15 Jan., 1842, Record Group 59. Ellis reports the arrival of the Texan "Santa Fe Expedition" in Chihuahua on their way to Mexico with a military escort of 250 men. He quotes from El Siglo XIX of 14 December, 1841, on the fate of three of these men on the march. The prisoners are expected in the capital in two or three weeks. Ellis asks for confirmation of his belief that he cannot interfere on behalf of those U.S. citizens now serving in Texas.

H. Docs., No. 42, 27th Cong., 2d. sess., 6 Jan., 1842, s.s. 402: "American Citizens Arrested by Mexicans: Resolution of the Legislature of Kentucky in Relation to Certain American Citizens Captured by a Military Force of Mexico." Kentucky protests the treatment of the Texas expedition during their journey to Mexico City and the arrest of U.S. citizens with valid passports to Santa Fe. They request vigorous action by the U.S. government.

H. Docs., 49, 27th Cong., 2d. sess., 18 Jan., 1842, s.s. 402: "American Citizens Captured Near Santa Fe: Message from the President of the United States...in Relation to the

American Citizens Captured near Santa Fe." President John Tyler forwards the report of Secretary of State Daniel Webster on the steps taken by the State Department on behalf of several U.S. citizens captured with the Texans in Santa Fe. Webster's report includes details on the fate of several individuals and the circumstances surrounding their involvement with the Texans.

Despatch No. 53, Ellis to Webster, 22 Jan., 1842; received 21 Feb., 1842, Record Group 59. Ellis reports that three Texans were not shot on the road to Mexico City as stated in El Siglo XIX, 14 December, 1841.

Despatch No. 54, Ellis to Webster, 27 Jan., 1842; received 5 Mar., 1842, Record Group 59. Ellis sends his correspondence with Minister of Foreign Affairs José María Bocanegra on the incident involving the forced removal of the Mexican commissioners from the U.S. ship Louisa to the Texas ship Austin and their detention for two days before release. Ellis also reports the release of Franklin Coombs taken by mistake among the "Santa Fe Expedition."

Despatch No. 55, Ellis to Webster, 17 Feb., 1842; received [1842], Record Group 59. Ellis forwards correspondence with the captain of the Louisa on the alledged offense to the U.S. flag by the Texas brig Austin. He also makes a full report on his exertions on behalf of the "Santa Fe Expedition" giving a history of their capture, their fate upon arrival in the capital, and the effect of his demands for the

release of those U.S. citizens innocently associated with the expedition. He reviews the laws that possibly cover the offenses committed by the expedition and encloses extensive documents and correspondence on the Texans. Included among these documents and correspondence is a complete list of the men in the "Santa Fe Expedition" divided by national origin and occupation.

Despatch No. 57, Ellis to Webster, 26 Feb., 1842; received 22 Mar., 1842, Record Group 59. Ellis sends all correspondence on the detainment of George Wilkins Kendall with the Texas expedition, and letters from the Puebla prisoners who claim U.S. protection. Ellis believes it is the Mexican policy to delay releasing the U.S. citizens as long as possible. He leaves it to Webster to determine the extent this treatment will be allowed to continue.

H. Docs., No. 154, 27th Cong., 2d. sess., 24 Mar., 1842, s.s. 403: "John T. Howard: Resolution of the Legislature of Maryland Relating to John T. Howard, a Prisoner in Mexico." The Maryland legislature refers to the "Santa Fe Expedition" as traders, and Howard as a Maryland citizen. They request immediate action to secure his release.

Despatch No. 59, Ellis to Webster, 9 April, 1842; received [1842], Record Group 59. Ellis discusses the steps taken in individual cases to secure the release of the members of the "Santa Fe Expedition," and forwards all

correspondence as instructed by the State Department. He gives the fate of the expedition through April, 1842.

S. Docs., No. 199, 27th Cong., 2d. sess., 12 April, 1842, s.s. 397: "Message from the President of the United States Communicating...Copies of the Proceedings of the Commissioners Appointed to Run the Boundary Line Between the United States and the Republic of Texas." President Tyler sends correspondence, field notes, and maps on the boundary line.

Despatch No. 60, Ellis to Webster, 28 April, 1842; received 30 May, 1842, Record Group 59. Ellis gives a full report on the renewed efforts that resulted in the release of several Americans taken with the "Santa Fe Expedition," and the transfer of ill prisoners to hospital. He encloses a transcript of his meeting with Santa Anna on the U.S. prisoners. Santa Anna promises to release U.S. prisoners after U.S. war ships leave Vera Cruz. It is rumored that Santa Anna will discharge the Texas prisoners on a blanket parole in the summer. Ellis regrets the bad press his efforts received in the U.S. He draws 2,500 dollars from the legation account to defray the transportation cost of those prisoners already released who wish to return to the U.S. Waddy Thompson has now arrived to relieve Ellis of his position.

Despatch No. 1, Waddy Thompson to Webster, 29 April, 1842; received [1842], Record Group 59. Thompson reports his arrival in Mexico City and his subsequent visits with the U.S. prisoners. He assures the Secretary of State of his genuine

concern for the well being of these men. He recounts his interview with Santa Anna, remarking that Santa Anna's innate intelligence leads him to value the good feeling of the U.S. Thompson gives his own version of Ellis' final negotiations for the U.S. citizens among the Texan prisoners and his own role in their release. He expresses his opinion that Santa Anna's government would cede Texas and California as the only compensation available for U.S. claims. In his opinion, Mexico must not be judged by their actions in Texas. Mexicans are a kind people, but granting no quarter in battle is their heritage. The sympathy of Mexico City is with the Texas prisoners. He encloses his correspondence with Minister of Foreign Affairs Bocanegra on the U.S. prisoners.

Thompson to Webster, 30 April, 1842, Record Group 59. Thompson states that the Texas prisoners are to be released, but they are not provided with the means of returning home. He requests that a U.S. revenue cutter return to Vera Cruz to assist them.

Despatch No. 2, Thompson to Webster, 6 June, 1842; received 7 July, 1842, Record Group 59. Thompson encloses Bocanegra's circular addressed to the diplomatic corps protesting U.S. citizens giving aid to Texas without hindrance from the U.S. government, and his own reply to Bocanegra also circulated to the diplomatic corps. In his reply Thompson asserts the right of each citizen to their own opinions and the laws ending their citizenship if they join Texas.

S. Docs., No. 325, 27th Cong., 2d. sess., 15 June, 1842, s.s. 398: "Message from the President of the United States Communicating...Copies of Correspondence with the Government of Mexico." Along with the diplomatic correspondence from Ellis and Thompson, Webster includes his own instructions regarding the Texas "Santa Fe Expedition." These instructions cover in great detail the circumstances surrounding the capture of U.S. citizens, their names, occupations, and reasons for going to Texas. Stress is placed on the U.S. policy toward Mexico and Texas to justify U.S. recognition of Texas.

Thompson to Webster, 20 June, 1842, Record Group 59. The Texas prisoners are released through the generosity of Santa Anna. Upon leaving prison, the Texans were received with joy by the Mexican people. Thompson restates all action taken to obtain their release and the assistance he received from various officials. He also discusses the general feeling among the diplomatic corps regarding U.S. actions on behalf of prisoners, and that of Mexico against the U.S. Thompson believes the hostile feelings toward the U.S. are used to create a climate of war that will strengthen Santa Anna's power. All correspondence with Minister of War Tornel and Minister of Foreign Affairs Bocanegra is included.

H. Docs., No. 266, 27th Cong., 2d. sess., 14 July, 1842, s.s. 405: "Message from the President of the United States Transmitting Copies of Papers Upon the Subject of Relations Between the United States and the Mexican Republic."

Secretary of State Webster again furnishes all correspondence on the Texas "Santa Fe Expedition" and the imprisonment of U.S. citizens in Mexico City.

Despatch No. 4, Thompson to Webster, 30 July, 1842; received 20 Sept., 1842, Record Group 59. Thompson forwards a copy of the circular by the Minister of Foreign affairs sent to the diplomatic corps in response to Thompson's rebuttal of Bocanegra's earlier circular on U.S. violation of neutrality. He also sends a copy of his second rebuttal to be published if further instructions do not arrive to change the situation. Two steamboats with English crews are reportedly sailing for Mexico and will be used against Texas. Santa Anna talks openly of war with the U.S. with Mexico aided by Britain. Thompson believes that but for the Texas war, the U.S. could acquire part of the fifteen million dollar annual commerce Britain maintains with Mexico. Preparations are being made for a fall invasion of Texas. Thompson finds that the Mexicans hate the U.S. "...with the hatred of a Spaniard, bitter and unchangeable (p.4)." The Texas prisoners have now left Vera Cruz.

H. Docs., No. 2, 27th Cong., 2d. sess., 11 Aug., 1842, s.s. 401: "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Third Session of the Twenty-seventh Congress." In his state of the union message, President Tyler announces the release of the Texas "Santa Fe Expedition." He mentions the Mexican

complaints of U.S. citizens assisting Texas during the late war between Texas and Mexico (pp. 5-6). In the supplementary documents from the Secretary of State, Webster supplies copies of correspondence between Thompson, Bocanegra and the diplomatic corps in Mexico (pp. 144-145).

Thompson to Webster, 8 Nov., 1842, Record Group 59. Thompson does not agree with Webster's censure of his actions in advancing funds by which the Texas expedition may return home. He presents to Webster his justification for his actions.

Jackson to Van Buren, 12 Feb., 1843, Van Buren Papers. Jackson discusses the early negotiations with Spain in 1819 for the Louisiana boundary to fix the line at the Rio Grande. These previous negotiations influenced his instructions to the U.S. Ministers in Mexico for a retro-cession of Texas. He regrets the inadvertent cession of U.S. territory, but this is in the past. Now Texas can only be a question for annexation, and Jackson gives his own views on the military importance of Texas and the British threat.

Thompson to Webster, 16 Feb., 1843; received 10 April, 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson sends a copy of the capitulation agreement signed by the Texans surrendering at Nier. He reports that five men taken with the "Santa Fe Expedition" were ordered to be shot. Other Texans have been sent to southern Mexico for work on road gangs, while those Texans taken in San Antonio are now imprisoned. He asks for verification of his instruction that allow interference by the U.S.

to prevent cruel treatment of war prisoners and force the observance of capitulation agreements.

Jackson to Santa Anna, 27 Feb., 1843, Jackson Papers. Jackson asks for the release of one of the men taken by General Pedro de Ampudia at Mier. Jackson protests the failure of Ampudia to observe the capitulation agreement.

Despatch No. 15, Thompson to Webster, 14 Mar., 1843; received 11 April, 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson relates the details of his conversation with Minister of Foreign Affairs Bocanegra on the treatment of the Texas prisoners of war. Bocanegra resents any U.S. interference in Mexico's treatment of rebellious states not subject to the laws of nations. He reports the rumored attempt of escape by Texas prisoners sent to work on Mexican roads. Thompson forwards correspondence from Santa Anna in response to Jackson's personal letter requesting the release of a man taken with the Texans at Mier.

Santa Anna to Jackson, [Mar., 1843], Jackson Papers. Santa Anna answers Jackson's request for release of one of the Texas prisoners. He states the serious charges against them, and his own opinion of Texas independence and the Texan's continued hostility.

Thompson to Webster, 11 April, 1843; received 18 May, 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson reports that seventeen Texans have been shot while others remain in prison and are subjected to great cruelty. He will refrain from official

action on their behalf until he receives new instructions.

C.K. Gleason to Jackson, 4 May, 1843, Jackson Papers. Gleason, residing in a Mexico City prison, sends his account of the men taken at Mier and Santa Anna's order of execution. This order was later reduced to every tenth man. Gleason gives the details of the Texas prisoners' escape attempt and their subsequent capture. He requests financial assistance to relieve his own suffering in prison.

Henry Gilpin to Van Buren, 4 May, 1843, Van Buren Papers. Gilpin reports information received in Philadelphia that the Texas government has announced a British offer to mediate between Texas and Mexico. The British assure Texas of Mexican recognition of its independence if slavery is abolished. Texas has decided to apply for admission to the U.S., and if this is not accepted, to accept the British offer.

Thompson to Webster, 16 May, 1843; received 20 June, 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson hopes the Texans will be released on 15 June. No more Texans will be released upon personal requests because those liberated in the "Santa Fe Expedition" have since marched again on Mexico. He encloses his correspondence with Bocanegra on Mexico's decision not to respect the person of foreign consuls residing in Texas.

Thompson to Louis McLane, 24 June, 1843; received 19 July, 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson sends a clipping of the Mexican decree that all Texas prisoners taken hereafter will be shot.

Thompson to McLane, 15 July, 1843; received 16 Aug., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson sends his correspondence with Bocanegra on the anticipated negotiations to end the war with Texas. He expresses the opinion that little hope exists for this event unless Texas is willing to abolish slavery and rejoin Mexico.

Thompson to McLane, 5 Aug., 1843; received 8 Sept., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson forwards his correspondence with Bocanegra on a new "Santa Fe Expedition." Bocanegra attributes this renewed attempt on Mexican territory entirely to U.S. citizens, for Houston has pledged that Texas will end hostilities. Mexico demands reparations for damages. Thompson doubts that U.S. citizens participated, but reserves his judgment until all reports arrive.

Thompson to Abel P. Upshur, 25 Aug., 1843; received 17 Oct., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson reports on further correspondence with Bocanegra on the character of the new "Santa Fe Expedition." Mexico's belief in the continued involvement of U.S. citizens in the Texas rebellion only adds to her complaints against the U.S. Thompson refutes Bocanegra's charges with a report that the expedition was apprehended by U.S. troops outside Mexican territory and that no invasion actually took place. Thompson fears Upshur will not think his reply strong enough.

Thompson to Upshur, 28 Sept., 1843; received 3 Nov., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson reports on the outcome of an

incident involving a British flag carried by one of the Texans taken at Mier. The British minister now demands his passports because of Mexico's failure to apologize for the disrespect by Mexican soldiers for the flag at Mier.

Thompson to Upshur, 30 Sept., 1843; received 3 Nov., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson reports information on the activities of a Mexican agent, Santos Flores, to arouse the Creek Indians against the Texans. He will allude to this information in a personal interview with Bocanegra.

Thompson to Upshur, 2 Oct., 1843; received 21 Nov., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson explains Mexico's reasons for the decree that all invaders will be shot. He also questions Upshur's instructions that the U.S. Minister does not have the right to chastise Mexico for treatment of war prisoners. He refers to Webster's earlier instructions of 5 April, 1842, arguing that neutral governments have the right to intercede in such cases. The reported armistice between Texas and Mexico is officially a secret in Mexico, but news of it is carried in U.S. newspapers. Thompson judges this as only a delaying tactic by Santa Anna until his much-planned invasion of Yucatan is complete.

William Roane to Van Buren, 27 Oct., 1843, Van Buren Papers. Roane, a former Virginia Senator, writes on the persistency of the Calhounites in making the Texas question a political issue. He questions Van Buren's position on Texas and gives his own reasons for opposing annexation. Roane

implies that Van Buren's views on Texas could be a vital factor in the upcoming presidential election.

Thompson to Upshur, 20 Nov., 1843; received 22 Dec., 1843, Record Group 59. The Texas prisoners are expected to be released shortly. Thompson suggests the possibility of a conflict between Britain and Mexico. The anticipated negotiations between Texas and Mexico warrant the positioning of a U.S. war ship at Vera Cruz to transport information quickly.

S. Docs., No. 1, 28th Cong., 1st. sess., 5 Dec., 1843, s.s. 431: "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the First Session of the Twenty-eight Congress." President Tyler includes despatches from the U.S. minister in Mexico with correspondence from the Mexican Minister in Washington in his discussion of relations with Mexico. The Mexican government has announced its intentions to declare war if the U.S. discusses annexation of Texas. Tyler argues that the U.S. will not be swayed by threats. Texas is independent and the Mexican war against Texas is only a series of barbaric incursions (pp. 6-8). He forwards to Congress correspondence on this matter between Bocanegra, Thompson, Almonte and Upshur (pp. 23-43).

Depatch No. 37, Thompson to Upshur., 4 Jan., 1844; received 2 Feb., 1844, Record Group 59. Thompson sends a copy of his note addressed to the diplomatic corps in Mexico

in response to Bocanegra's publication of correspondence with him on Texas annexation. Thompson resents Bocanegra not publishing all the pertinent notes.

Despatch No. 40, Thompson to Upshur, 2 Feb., 1844; received 13 Mar., 1844, Record Group 59. The Texas armistice is ended. Thompson regards the armistice as a tool of Santa Anna's who realizes that Texas cannot be retaken. Thompson believes that Mexico would rather see Texas taken by any power other than Britain.

James K. Polk to Jackson, 22 Feb., 1844, Jackson Papers. Polk forwards a letter requesting Jackson's intercession with Santa Anna on behalf of a prisoner taken with the Texans.

Polk to Jackson, 15 Mar., 1844, Jackson Papers. Polk requests Jackson's intercession on behalf of a prisoner taken with the Texans.

Ritchie to Van Buren. 20 Mar., 1844, Van Buren Papers. Ritchie passes on the opinion of a Congressman that the move instigated by Jackson for Texas annexation by treaty may succeed, but must not become a party issue. Van Buren will be re-elected unless he goes against the annexation of Texas. Ritchie requests Van Buren not to respond to this issue as Van Buren is in serious political trouble.

Silas Wright to Van Buren, 22 Mar., 1844, Van Buren Papers. Wright, a New York Senator, discusses the rumors that a treaty of annexation is being brought before the Senate. He questions the authority of either the Senate or the President.

to originate such a treaty. He gives his own opinion on the vital questions that annexation of Texas would raise.

Leonard Sims to Jackson, 26 Mar., 1844, Jackson Papers. Sims, a Representative from Missouri, asks Jackson's aid on behalf of a Missouri citizen taken prisoner in Texas in December, 1842, who is now a prisoner at Perote.

Jim Perry to Van Buren, 29 Mar., 1844, Van Buren Papers. Perry reports on the alarm of Cincinnati citizens at the annexation of Texas and their resolve to question each presidential candidate on the subject. Perry regards the support of Texas annexation as political suicide in the northern states. He cautions Van Buren on his answer to the Texas question.

Henry Collien to Jackson, 30 Mar., 1844, Jackson Papers. Collien requests Jackson's intercession for a doctor taken with the Texans at Mier, who is now a prisoner at Perote.

Citizens to Carroll County, Kentucky to Van Buren, 1 April, 1844, Van Buren Papers. These citizens note the importance of the Texas question on the presidential election and request Van Buren's views on the issue. They enclose a copy of a resolution of a meeting of citizens in favor of reacquiring Texas.

Benjamin Butler to Van Buren, 6 April, 1844, Van Buren Papers. Butler, a prominent Massachusetts politician, reports in detail to Van Buren on his views of the Texas question and the legal considerations of a treaty of annexation. He

remarks on whether Texas should be a state or territory and the possible danger of war with Mexico. He gives Van Buren the feeling on Texas in Congress.

Jabez Hammond to Van Buren, 7 April, 1844, Van Buren Papers. Hammond, a former Massachusetts Senator, argues against annexation and discusses the slavery question in relation to Texas. He could not support a candidate who favored Texas.

W.D. Miller to Jackson, 7 April, 1844, Jackson Papers. Miller speculates on the passage of an annexation treaty in this session of Congress. He discusses the political consequences of annexation to Clay and Van Buren factions and the strength of both in the Senate. If the treaty is rejected Texas can no longer look to the U.S.

Despatch No. 1, Ben Green to John Calhoun, 8 April, 1844; received 11 May, 1844, Record Group 59. Chargé Green reports that Santa Anna has repeatedly stated that Mexico needs a foreign war to develop her resources. War would allow him to resume dictatorial powers or even imperial power.

George Himes to Jackson, 9 April, 1844, Jackson Papers. Himes asks Jackson's intercession for a man taken among the Texans at Mier.

T.H. Tucker to Van Buren, 12 April, 1844, Van Buren Papers. Tucker, a House member, reports on the rumors in Washington of a Texas treaty in the Senate and the effect that Van Buren's silence is having on the issue. He asks Van Buren

to publish his views on Texas and end political intrigue.

Jackson to Amos Kendall, 12 April, 1844, Jackson Papers. Jackson expresses his belief that without Texas the western boundaries in a war with Britain would not be secure. If Texas is not annexed now, Britain may gain possession. Indians could easily be roused by Britain and the whole frontier go up in flames.

Santa Anna to Jackson, 17 April, 1844, Jackson Papers. Santa Anna acknowledges Jackson's letter interceding for a prisoner among the Texans at Perote.

Van Buren to W.H. Hammet, 20 April, 1844, Van Buren Papers. Van Buren's extensive draft of his views on the Texas question answers an inquiry by Hammet. The final form of this draft appears in the Globe. Van Buren covers freely his views on the constitutional question of annexation, the possibility of war with Mexico, the history of the Texas question, and the inducements for annexation. This letter and its publication in the Globe will severely effect Van Buren's election bid.

S. Docs., No. 341, 28th Cong., 1st sess., 22 April, 1844, s.s. 435; "Proceedings of the Senate and Documents Relative to Texas, From Which the Injunction of Secrecy Has Been Removed." This document opens with the journal of the Senate calling for release of documents on the Texas negotiations. These documents are divided into ten groups; the president's message accompanying the Texas treaty to the Senate, extracts from the correspondence between Webster and the Texas legation,

letters on Britain's interest in Texas, the instructions to Chargé Green following the signing of the treaty, statistics on Texas, instructions to Thompson in Mexico, correspondence on military preparations for a move into Texas, a copy of the Texas armistice with Mexico, and a copy of the President's annual message with accompanying documents.

James K. Polk to S.P. Chase, 23 April, 1844, Polk Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Polk's draft of his response to the citizens of Cincinnati answers their questions relative to his position on the Texas issue. He reviews the past boundary negotiations with Spain and France. He concludes that Texas could have been acquired much earlier and is now destined to be a part of the U.S. through reannexation.

Despatch No. 3, Green to Calhoun, 25 April, 1844, Record Group 59. The U.S. newspaper coverage of the annexation question keeps Mexico alert to U.S. intentions. Mexico will not make a decision on the claims convention until the Texas question is settled.

Jackson to the Editor of The Union, 13 May, 1844, Jackson Papers. Jackson places his own views past and present on the Texas question before the public in the light of Van Buren's statement of 20 April, 1844. Jackson regards Van Buren's cautious letter as based on limited information and without consideration of interference in Texas by foreign powers.

Jackson to [Van Buren], 14 May, 1844, Van Buren Papers. Jackson expresses his belief, based on the best Texas sources, that if Texas is rejected by the U.S. she is lost forever and will seek aid from Britain. He discusses the political considerations in the south and southwest on Texas.

Benjamin Green to Calhoun, 30 May, 1844; received [1844], Record Group 59. Green reports Mexico is still delaying on the claims protocols until after the Texas question is decided in the U.S. Senate. Green encloses his note to Bocanegra officially informing the Mexican government that the Texas annexation treaty is before the Senate. Green requests negotiations to settle any differences growing out of the Texas annexation, particularly those of boundary. Bocanegra's long reply to Green's note covers the Mexican position on Texas and her views of U.S. motives. He reminds the U.S. of a statement made 23 August, 1843, that annexation would be considered an act of war against Mexico.

Green to Calhoun, 7 June, 1844; received 12 July, 1844, Record Group 59. Green reports that Bocanegra sent copies of his note announcing the consideration of Texas annexation in the U.S. Senate to the diplomatic corps. Mexico is confident that the Senate will reject the treaty and therefore acts beligerently to gain support at home and abroad. Santa Anna declares his intention to retake Texas, but he would not dare to send another general where he himself has failed. It is rumored that 1,000 men are moving north to the Texas border.

Despatch No. [7], Green to Calhoun, 15 June, 1844, Record Group 59. Green encloses his correspondence with Bocanegra on the renegotiation of a boundary following the annexation of Texas. The Mexican government believes that in the earlier treaty with the U.S. a pledge was made to protect Mexican territorial integrity and its possession of Texas. Green objects to the military order which regards any person found within a league's distance of the left bank of the Rio Grande as a traitor. The Mexican government would now prefer British presence in Texas to that of the U.S. Santa Anna is unwilling to take the responsibility for a tax raise that would enable him to march on Texas again.

Green to Calhoun, 17 June, 1844; received 17 July, 1844, Record Group 59. Green speculates on Santa Anna's Texas policy and the rumors that Mexican agents are in London to negotiate a sale of Texas to Britain. Santa Anna may invade Texas and hold it for ninety days to facilitate the sale to Britain. The majority of the men in the Mexican Foreign Office recognize that Texas is lost.

Despatch No. 8, Green to Calhoun, 24 June, 1844; received 16 July, 1844, Record Group 59. Green reports the clergy is definitely against a war with Texas which they would have to finance. He encloses his correspondence on the right of the U.S. to negotiate with the Texans, and the movement of U.S. troops into Texas. Bocanegra states that such action would constitute an act of war.

Despatch No. 9, Green to Calhoun, 28 June, 1844; received [1844], Record Group 59. The correspondence enclosed carries on Green's discussion with Bocanegra on whether Texas is a rebel colony or an independent nation.

Despatch No. 10, Green to Calhoun, 14 July, 1844; received 25 Aug., 1844, Record Group 59. Green recounts Santa Anna's use of slander toward the U.S. to regain extra dictatorial powers. Mexico now blames the U.S. for all her troubles. He encloses further correspondence with Bocanegra. Green will not send his final note on annexation until work of the Senate's action reaches Mexico.

Despatch No. 17, Green to Calhoun, 20 Aug., 1844; received 28 Sept. 1844, Record Group 59. Manuel Rejón replaces Bocanegra as Minister of Foreign Affairs. The invasion of Texas is planned by sea and will be a war of extermination launched from Galveston.

Despatch No. 2, Wilson Shannon to Calhoun, 21 Sept., 1844; received 4 Nov., 1844, Record Group 59. Shannon reports his friendly reception by Santa Anna and the professions of good will toward the U.S. Shannon has received a promise of the release of the Texas prisoners as a personal favor from Santa Anna. He encloses a complete list of the 120 men to be released on 16 September according to Santa Anna's promise. Santa Anna continues to increase the size of the military. Publicly he announces that this force is to be used against

Texas, but privately many believe that the army will be used for Santa Anna's personal ambitions.

Despatch No. 3, Shannon to Calhoun, 28 Oct., 1844, Record Group 59. Shannon sends a lengthy commentary on Mexican preparations for war with Texas. Shannon discourages any belief that Texas can be acquired with Mexico's consent. Time and new circumstances must be allowed to dissipate these feelings before any portion of the Mexican territory can be acquired by negotiation. This will not be soon, for hostility to the U.S. is the result of years of propaganda and fear of U.S. encroachment.

Despatch No. 3, Shannon to Calhoun, 28 Oct., 1844, Record Group 59. Shannon following Calhoun's orders informs Rejón of U.S. dissatisfaction at Mexico's determination to renew hostilities against Texas. Shannon cannot anticipate when he will receive a reply. Both political parties are in agreement on the Texas issue. Texas, however, does not unite the parties' efforts. Mexico's design is to conquer Texas. Failing in that, she would see Texas apart of Britain and a barrier against further U.S. encroachments. This fear of U.S. incursions has been a part of government policy for many years, limiting the settlement in Mexico's four northern provinces.

Despatch No. 4, Shannon to Calhoun, 12 Nov., 1844; received 13 Dec., 1844, Record Group 59. Shannon encloses Rejón's reply to his note on U.S. disapproval of Mexico's

hostile preparations against Texas. Shannon regards the wording of Rejón's reply so grossly offensive that he, acting on his own, would have demanded his passports. He informed the Mexican government that if the offensive notes were not withdrawn, he would break official intercourse until instructions arrive from Washington. Shannon believes that forbearance is equated with weakness in the Mexican mind. Therefore strong action is necessary.

Despatch No. 5, Shannon to Calhoun, 30 Nov., 1844, Record Group 59. Shannon sends further correspondence with Rejón on the annexation of Texas.

Despatch No. 6, Shannon to Calhoun, 9 Dec., 1844; received 25 Jan., 1845, Record Group 59. A revolution has prostrated Santa Anna's government. If it is successful, the revolutionary party pledges itself to repeal the forced loan law for raising funds for the Texas campaign.

John Niles to Van Buren, 30 Dec., 1844, Van Buren Papers. Niles, a Connecticut Senator, gives a sketch of the Texas question's importance to the new administration and the influence it will have on its formation. The growing belief in Congress is that Texas cannot be acquired as a territory through an act of Congress because this violates the treaty making power. Niles expresses his belief that Congress can admit Texas as a state, or that Congress can resolve for the President to negotiate for its acquisition by treaty. The

Thomas H. Benton plan requiring Mexican approval for Texas admittance to the Union is no longer feasible.

Despatch No. 8, Shannon to Calhoun, 16 Jan., 1845, received 24 Feb., 1845, Record Group 59. Santa Anna is beaten by the revolutionary party. The new administration may be willing to adjust the Texas question on the best terms possible. If this is possible, Shannon believes that the annexation of Texas would end the question forever and new negotiations on a boundary could begin.

Preston King to Van Buren, 14 Feb., 1845, Van Buren Papers. King, a New York Congressman, gives news on the Texas question and the possible outcome in the Congress on various plans to acquire Texas. The British influence and the ambitions of Texas politicians may form a serious obstacle to be overcome by negotiation. King regards public opinion as favorable to annexation in both the U.S. and Texas. Slavery in Texas may cause the fall of the Democratic party in every northern state in the elections.

Tyler to an Editor on Texas Annexation, n.d., Tyler Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Tyler answers questions on Texas annexation and who should be credited with acquiring the new state. Tyler writes candidly of Upshur's role in the annexation of Texas and the influence that European interest had in prompting the move for annexation. Tyler states that the only doubt he felt in annexation was the timing, and the problem of leaving a critical situation

he created to his successor. Only after consultation with the Cabinet and President-elect Polk was the decision made. Although this fragment of Tyler's draft is not dated, evidence in the content could place its date as 1848.

Despatch No. 9, Shannon to James Buchanan, 26 April, 1845, Record Group 59. Reports in Mexico indicate that the U.S. Congress has passed a joint resolution to annex Texas and the President is expected to sign it. The Mexican Congress has acted to suspend the Treaty of 1831, close all Mexican ports to the U.S., and set a specified time for all U.S. merchants to leave Mexican territory. Shannon will receive his passports or suspend official intercourse. These actions will go into effect when official word is received confirming U.S. action. Mexico believes that Britain will support her warlike attitude.

Despatch No. 10, Shannon to Buchanan, 6 April, 1845; received 28 April, 1845, Record Group 59. Shannon encloses a note from Mexican officials severing diplomatic relations and his own reply to this situation. Shannon believes there is no amicable way to settle differences with Mexico. All parties in Mexico are for war. No action will be taken until the arrival of the Mexican Minister from Washington. The troops marching to Texas cannot arrive there before October. Britain is working to persuade Texas to reject annexation. She would bring Mexico to agree to independence and to Texas' existing boundaries.

W. Parrott to Buchanan, 18 April, 1845, Record Group 59. Special Agent Parrott speculates on the true state of opinion in Mexico on the Texas question. He reports that the news of the Mexican and British proposal to Texas has strengthened the movement to re-establish the Constitution of 1824. To declare war and then find the funds to conduct it is the planned move. If the present administration follows its course to end the Texas question, the opposition will use it as an excuse to overthrow the government for disposing of national territory. Shannon will not be able to communicate with the Mexican government except to announce annexation and collect his passports.

Parrott to Buchanan, 19 April, 1845; received 28 May, 1845, Record Group 59. Agent Parrott reports that none in Vera Cruz believe that Texas will agree to annexation.

Parrott to Buchanan, 26 April, 1845; received 28 May, 1845, Record Group 59. Parrott reports public opinion will accept nothing less than war with the U.S. The Mexican Congress is now deciding whether to conclude a treaty with Texas.

Polk to Jackson, 27 April, 1845, Jackson Papers. Polk is satisfied that President Jones of Texas is opposed to annexation. The British and French influence in Texas has had its effect. Information sources say the vast majority in Texas favor annexation, and if Jones delays the people will move on their own. Precautions are being taken against Mexican reaction. A strong naval force is now near Vera Cruz.

A. Yell to Polk, 5 May, 1845, Polk Papers. Archibal Yell, Arkansas Congressman, reports his arrival with Major A.J. Donelson in Galveston. He gives his assessment of the Texas affair and reports the annexation question is now before the Texas Congress.

A.J. Donelson to Polk, 14 May, 1845, Polk Papers. Donelson, U.S. Chargé to Texas, reports that the atmosphere in Texas is favorable to annexation on those terms set by the U.S.

Parrott to Buchanan, 22 May, 1845; received 23 June, 1845, Record Group 59. Parrott reports that the Mexican Congress has passed a resolution giving the government power to treat with Texas. A Mexican Senate report declares that Mexico will resist any attempt by the U.S. to annex the Mexican province of Texas. All await the action of the Texas convention.

Parrott to Buchanan, 29 May, 1845; received 23 June, 1845, Record Group 59. Parrott cannot approach the Minister of Foreign Affairs on the subject of his true mission because of British influence in the government. No change is expected in policy until after the Texas convention acts. If Texas prefers to treat with Mexico, then diplomatic relations with the U.S. may be restored. If Texas chooses annexation, Mexico could declare war.

Parrott to Buchanan, 23 June, 1845; received 23 June, 1845, Record Group 59. The opposition papers are calling for the Mexican Congress at the close of this session to save the national honor and revenge the outrages committed

by the U.S. in Texas. Mexico is unable to deal with Texas alone. Parrott believes they will never be able to win a war with Texas now under U.S. protection.

C. Wickliffe to Polk, 3 June, 1845, Polk Papers.

Wickliffe, a prominent Kentucky politician and diplomatic agent, offers suggestions on the best troop placements and supply routes for the U.S. military to use on the Rio Grande and Texas coast. He questions whether the U.S. military would have the right to move the Mexicans from the east bank of the Rio Grande.

Polk to Houston, 6 June, 1845, Polk Papers. Polk expresses his wish for Texas to become part of the union and accept the U.S. terms for annexation. The pro-Texas faction now has a majority in Congress and will accept Texas.

Parrott to Buchanan, 10 June, 1845, Record Group 59.

Parrott gives the details of the Mexican President's address at the close of the regular Congressional session. The major emphasis is on Texas and the government's vow to uphold the national honor should Texas accept annexation. This address is followed by that of the President of the Chamber of Deputies. He also emphasizes the Texas problem as the most important issue of the moment. He discusses the possible negotiations with Texas to prevent annexation. Mexico hopes that the U.S. will end in war with Britain over the Oregon territory. Parrott encloses a copy of a Senate report denouncing the U.S. move to annex Texas as against the spirit

of the treaties.

Polk to Donelson, 12 June, 1845, Polk Papers. Polk refers to reports from Donelson and Wickliffe that state large numbers of Mexican troops are massing for an invasion. Polk will defend Texas at all costs. He orders troops to march to the mouth of the Sabine River and report to Donelson. U.S. ships are ordered to move into Galveston harbor. Polk will regard Texas as a part of the U.S. the moment the convention ratifies the annexation agreement. He gives Donelson instructions in the event an invasion occurs.

Parrott to Buchanan, 17 June, 1845, Record Group 59. Texas President Anson Jones' proclamation designating 4 July, 1845, as the date for a decision on annexation is now published in the Mexican press. Parrott believes that this administration will not declare war on the U.S. even if Texas is annexed unless popular opinion demands it. Mexico does not have the resources to carry out a war. The administration cannot re-establish relations with the U.S. until after the Texas question is settled.

Shannon to Buchanan, 23 June, 1845; received 25 June, 1845, Record Group 59. Upon arriving in New York, Shannon reports on conditions in Mexico at his departure. Mexico believes that Texas will not annex itself to the U.S., but accept British protection and Mexican recognition. Further war preparations are suspended until Texas acts.

Parrott to Buchanan, 5 July, 1845; received 1 Sept., 1845, Record Group 59. The Mexican government is now considering

a declaration of war as the only possible means to preserve her present position if Texas is annexed to the U.S.

Parrott gives his own opinion that if such a declaration is made, the U.S. should take decisive action. Parrott cannot believe that Mexico would actually declare war.

Parrott to Buchanan, 15 July, 1845; received 1 Sept., 1845, Record Group 59. Parrott provides details on the restrictions placed on the new law authorizing the President to raise an army of militia to defend Mexican independence. Editorials are more warlike and the government may be forced to defend the national honor through war over Texas.

Polk to A.O.P. Nicholson, 20 July, 1845, Polk Papers. Polk writes of receiving the news that Texas has ratified the resolution for annexation. Now U.S. naval and land forces are in position to defend national territory. He does not anticipate a declaration of war from Mexico after the show of force in the Gulf by the U.S. navy.

Parrott to Buchanan, 22 July, 1845; received 1 Sept., 1845, Record Group 59. Parrott reports that word of the Texas decision reached Mexico on 15 July, 1845 from New Orleans. On 16 July the Cabinet agreed that a declaration of war would be made against the U.S. Parrott is asked to leave Mexico within three days. Parrott has not yet received his passports. The declaration states that upon receiving official word of U.S. troops occupying Texas a state of war will exist between Mexico and the U.S. Troops are moving north and Parrott

suspects that they will make a quick raid on Texas inhabitants, declare a victory, and then sue for peace.

Parrott to Buchanan, 30 July, 1845; received 25 Aug., 1845, Record Group 59. The government council disapproves of the cabinet's pronouncing a declaration of war against the U.S. The Council believes that an open declaration is unnecessary as the U.S. by annexation has broken diplomatic relations despite warnings from Mexico. Now all forces will concentrate on the border. The Mexican navy will transport men toward Galveston and the border.

R. Jones to Polk, 9 Aug., 1845, Polk Papers. Jones sends statistical memorandum on the size of troops now enroute to Texas to join General Zachary Taylor.

Parrott to Buchanan, 26 Aug., 1845, Record Group 59. Parrott following his assessment of the Mexican political climate informs Buchanan that an envoy from the U.S. would be received by the Mexican government.

Parrott to Buchanan, 3 Sept., 1845; received 10 Oct., 1845, Record Group 59. The initiative of war is tabled in the Mexican Chamber of Deputies. Although the military preparations are made, Parrot believes that the actual possibility of war is slim. Public opinion will be allowed to quiet down slowly. It is rumored that the last cabinet has extended overtures to the U.S.

Parrott to Buchanan, 4 Sept., 1845; received 11 Oct., 1845, Record Group 59. Parrott again reassures Buchanan that despite Mexico's hostile attitude, it will not give the U.S. an excuse

for a right of conquest by its own actions. The status quo will be observed until October or November when word from Britain can be received.

John Slidell to Buchanan, 19 Nov., 1845, Record Group 59. Slidell accepts his appointment as the new Minister to Mexico and acknowledges his receipt of instructions.

Despatch No. 2, Slidell to Buchanan, 30 Nov., 1845, Record Group 59. Slidell questions his instructions regarding the rights of Texas to Santa Fe if the boundary is set at the Rio Grande from its mouth to El Paso. He quotes the passage needing clarification.

S. Docs., No. 1, 29th Cong., 1st sess., 2 Dec., 1845, s.s. 470; "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress, at the Commencement of the Twenty-ninth Congress." Polk reports on the departure of the Mexican Minister from Washington and the hostile attitude and preparations by the Mexican government following the Texas decision favoring annexation. He also reports on U.S. military preparations on the Mexican border, the appointment of Slidell as the new minister to Mexico, and a history of the U.S. claims (pp.5-7).

John D. Sloat to Slidell, 10 Dec., 1845, Record Group 59. Slidell learns that a naval force large enough to protect the U.S. citizens in Mexico is off the coast at Mazatlán awaiting his orders.

Despatch No. 3, Slidell to Buchanan, 17 Dec., 1845, received 12 Jan., 1846, Record Group 59. Manuel de la Peña y

Peña the Minister of Foreign Affairs expresses great surprise at the quick response to their mention of a U.S. envoy. The Council of Government was not consulted by the President on the question of renewing relations with the U.S. Slidell sends correspondence on his reception by the Mexican government, along with copies of current newspapers carrying news of Texas.

Despatch No. 4, Slidell to Buchanan, 27 Dec., 1845, Record Group 59. Slidell writes of his efforts to meet with the Mexican government and what he considers their gross falsification of the correspondence leading up to his appointment. He announces his intentions to await further instructions from Washington in Jalapa. Slidell believes that the current administration will reconsider his reception, and if it does not, the next administration may be more willing to negotiate with the U.S.

Despatch [7], Slidell to Buchanan, 14 Jan., 1846; received Feb., 1846, Record Group 59. Slidell describes the recent revolt in Mexico and the request by the Mexican government that for his own safety he remain in Mexico City. Slidell regards this request as an excuse to delay a final break with the U.S.

Despatch No. 8, Slidell to Buchanan, 6 Feb., 1846, Record Group 59. Slidell reports Mexico is awaiting a settlement of the U.S. - Britain Oregon question before making a move regarding relations with the U.S. If war between the British and the U.S. is averted then Mexico will find an excuse for renewing relations with the U.S. Slidell forwards all

correspondence with the Mexican government that if a satisfactory boundary could be arranged their financial problems might be relieved.

Despatch No. 9, Slidell to Buchanan, 17 Feb., 1845, Record Group 59. Slidell reports on events in Mexico and his approval of the move of General Taylor to the north bank of the Rio Grande.

Despatch No. 10, Slidell to Buchanan, 1 Mar., 1846, Record Group 59. Slidell asks for instructions to submit the question of his reception to the Mexican government for final decision. A copy is enclosed of his proposed note with Consul Black's instructions to inform the Mexican government that if an affirmative reply is not received by 5 March, Slidell will request his passports. Slidell reports that the political and popular climate against the U.S. increases daily.

Slidell to Buchanan, 15 Mar., 1846, Record Group 59. Slidell announces the reply of the Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs to his note of 1 March, 1846. He now awaits the return of his passports and encloses to Buchanan the negative answer of the Mexican government.

Despatch No. 13, Slidell to Buchanan, 2 April, 1846, Record Group 59. Slidell encloses Minister of Foreign Affairs Castillo y Lanzas' note accompanying his passports. He gives further details of his offer of pecuniary assistance to Mexico if an agreeable boundary for Texas could be set. Mexico has now published a manifesto stating that no aggression against the U.S. will be taken until it is considered by the

Congress. The administration, however, is authorized to repel attack. Slidell believes that the movement of U.S. troops to the Rio Grande could be used as an excuse for commencing hostilities by Mexico. President Paredes cannot politically afford to send a large military force to face Taylor at this time.

H. Ex. Docs., No. 196 (H. Doc. 196), 29th Cong., 1st sess., 11 May, 1846, s.s. 485; "Hostilities by Mexico; Message from the President Relative to an Invasion and Commencement of Hostilities by Mexico." Polk covers in detail the origin and failure of Slidell's mission to Mexico, an account of U.S. troop placements in Texas following the Texas resolution for annexation, and the belligerent attitude of Mexican General Ampudia at Matamoros. General Ampudia has now crossed the Rio Grande and commenced hostilities. Polk calls on Congress to promptly recognize the state of war and give him authorization to pursue it to conclusion. He sends all correspondence between U.S. diplomats and the Mexican government, and the orders to U.S. military in Texas. An index to the seventeen sets of documents appears on page seven.

CHAPTER IV

CLAIMS

Although popularized history focuses on the Texas question as the major cause of the United States - Mexican war of 1846, the claims issue should be given equal consideration. Claims of American citizens against Mexico predated Mexican independence by five years. Messrs. Chouteau and Demun owners of a confiscated Santa Fe caravan, had filed a claim for damages against Mexico in 1816. And, the unsettled conditions in Mexico following independence greatly increased foreign claims against the new government.

Joel R. Poinsett, first United States Minister to Mexico, received instructions in 1825 to inquire about the processes for redress of American claims in Mexico. He learned that legal recourse in Mexican courts was available to all foreigners who held sufficient proof of injustice, but Poinsett accomplished little by way of satisfactory results on a claims settlement. Negotiations for the boundary and commercial treaties held diplomatic priority. Not until these agreements were ratified in 1831 did the Jackson administration press the claims issue. Minister Powhatan Ellis, replacing Chargé Anthony Butler, in 1835, received specific instructions to pressure Mexico for a claims settlement. This was largely in response to the demands of American citizens who insisted on Congressional action. Ellis pursued his duties vigorously. He reported to

Secretary of State John Forsyth that despite all his efforts, claims were ignored, postponed, and forgotten. Ellis recommended a hard line policy on the claims issue as the effective method to bring results, and throughout his first year in Mexico, Ellis continued to press for decisive action against Mexico. Year after year depredations against American citizens, consuls, and the flag continued. Anthony Butler earlier had suggested that bribery and other corrupt practices were the only means to bring a favorable legal settlement in Mexico. And, Secretary of State Forsyth explained to the United States Congress that unsettled political and economic conditions in Mexico prevented a claims settlement. In October, 1836, after much harassment, Ellis demanded his passports because Mexico had not shown good faith in claims negotiations.

Following Ellis' departure from Mexico, Jackson noted in an address to Congress, February 6, 1837, that United States claims justified war. But one last effort would be made to bring a peaceful settlement. A special agent Robert Greenhow received instructions to inform Mexico of severe consequences in the event claims continued to be ignored. Congressional inquiries into the current state of claims against Mexico multiplied as pressure from citizens increased. As tensions mounted, an arbitration commission headed by a representative of the King of Prussia was agreed upon in April, 1839. With the hope of a claims settlement, President Martin Van Buren resumed diplomatic relations and returned Ellis to Mexico.

Mexico delayed ratification of the arbitration convention one year. Not until April, 1840, did the United States Congress appropriate funds for her arbitration commissioners. Commissioners of the two countries met in August, 1840, and began work on American claims. The Mexican commissioners' apparent attempt to delay the proceedings increased American distrust of Mexican intentions, and even after the claims commission awarded payment to United States citizens the Mexican government for economic reasons failed to comply with the decision.

Under the Tyler administration, Waddy Thompson, United States Minister to Mexico, received instructions to negotiate claims settlements on those not covered by the arbitration convention. Thompson echoed the advice of his predecessors, Butler, Ellis, and Greenhow. Coercion was the only tool that would bring a settlement. He advised the quick acceptance of a Mexican payment plan on those claims awarded by the arbitration commission. The United States accepted this plan of installments, but only two were paid in the allotted time, for Mexico was again experiencing revolution and economic chaos. Any Mexican administration that agreed to settle claims by sending specie out of the country would quickly lose power. The Texas question further deteriorated relations between the two countries, in that war with the United States over annexation of Texas would negate the necessity of Mexican payments on claims.

President James K. Polk sent John Slidell as the new

Minister to Mexico in hopes of restoring diplomatic relations between the two countries in November, 1845. This effort to facilitate the settlement of United States claims failed. Slidell was not officially received by the Mexican government. Texas had agreed to annexation and Mexico was preparing for war.

In his address to the United States Congress at the commencement of hostilities with Mexico, James K. Polk counted the Mexican failure to adjust claims among the reasons for war.

Despatch No. 29, Joel R. Poinsett to Henry Clay, 1 Dec., 1825; received 14 Jan., 1826, Record Group 59. "Despatches from the United States Ministers to Mexico, 1828 to 1906," National Archives, Washington, D.C. Poinsett following his appointment to Mexico, reports that delays in receipt of claims and memorials from the U.S. adversely affect his ability to investigate them. He encloses his correspondence with the Mexican government on U.S. claims.

Despatch No. 40, Poinsett to Clay, 24 Mar., 1826; received 16 May, 1826, Record Group 59. Poinsett encloses a letter to C.J. Ingersole reporting the successful termination of his claim.

Despatch No. 47, Poinsett to Clay, 17 June, 1836, Record Group 59. Poinsett acknowledges the receipt of the documents pertaining to the claim of Jethro Mitchell. He reports on the delays in settling this claim, but he is hopeful of success during the next session of the Mexican Congress.

Despatch No. 52, Poinsett to Clay, 12 July, 1826; received 5 Sept., 1826, Record Group 59. Poinsett transmits correspondence marked "A," "B," "C," on the seizure of the American ship Fair American. Poinsett believes this case exposes the illegal activities of customs officials in Refugio. Enclosure "D" refers to the seizure of the American brig Cato and the schooner Leda in Vera Cruz.

Despatch No. 54, Poinsett to Clay, 26 Aug., 1826; received 3 Oct., 1826, Record Group 59. Poinsett reports that he will pursue the case of the American brig Liberty, but he anticipates the usual delays in settling the claim. He requests that insurance companies and supercargoes be more careful of how they abandon vessels and cargoes after being seized in Mexican ports. American smuggling is the justification for Mexico's suspicion of all American shipping.

Despatch No. 60, Poinsett to Clay, 21 Oct., 1826; received 24 Dec., 1826, Record Group 59. Poinsett reports the detainment and release of the brig Delight at Lisal. Poinsett is continuing his protest of the regulations requiring the issuance of cargo certificates illegal. No answer has been received on the seizure of the Fair American for lacking these certificates. Poinsett encloses his letter of protest to the Mexican government on the seizure of the brig Delight.

Despatch No. 62, Poinsett to Clay, 13 Dec., 1826, Record Group 59. Poinsett has received no answer to his letter of protest on the seizure of the American. The ship's

cargo is safe from auction by the interference of the Mexican Secretary of the Treasury. Poinsett encloses a copy of his letter of 24 October, 1826, to the Mexican government on the ship America, forced by damage to put into San Blas for repairs. Her original destination is listed as Lima, Peru, and the Mexican government justifies the seizure on the grounds that the ship carried prohibited goods.

Despatch No. 64, Poinsett to Clay, 23 Dec., 1836, Record Group 59. Poinsett encloses two letters to the Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs on the seizure of two American vessels at Vera Cruz, and the sale of the cargo of the brig Delight at Lisal. No answer has been received on the sale of the cargo of the Fair American. He protests strongly on these illegal acts.

Despatch No. 75, Poinsett to Clay, 7 Mar., 1827; received 10 May, 1827, Record Group 59. Poinsett transmits copies of correspondence relating to the settlement of the claim of Howlands brothers for the illegal seizure of a valuable package at Alvarado. Poinsett reports on his actions on behalf of the Howlands in the Mexican courts.

Poinsett to Clay, 13 April, 1827; received 6 June, 1827, Record Group 59. Poinsett states in a private letter the Mexican policy toward Indians and their attacks on citizens and foreigners. These attacks are regarded as committed by bandits. This viewpoint affects the claims of Thomas Eaton and Jacob Wilson for property taken by the Comanches. By making claims against bandits who the Mexican government

cannot control, the U.S. is giving cause for Mexico prohibiting all trade on the frontier to prevent further claims.

Despatch No. 106, Poinsett to Clay, 9 Nov., 1827; Record Group 59. Poinsett sends correspondence on the capture of the ships Liberty and Superior. The Mexican government states the owners may sue the officers capturing the ships if they view their actions as illegal. Poinsett regards the Mexican courts as slow and expensive. He cannot take further action on these cases until a suit is filed and judged.

Despatch No. 120, Poinsett to Clay, 15 Mar., 1828; received 22 April, 1828, Record Group 59. Learning of a U.S. House resolution stating a disbelief in equal justice in the Mexican courts for foreigners, Poinsett made inquiries. The Minister of Foreign Affairs states that all courts are open to foreigners recovering claims and debts. When proof is presented of any injustice the Mexican government will take the proper steps for redress.

Despatch No. 139, Poinsett to Clay, 15 July, 1828; received 19 Sept., 1828, Record Group 59. Poinsett forwards correspondence on the detention of weapons belonging to U.S. citizens.

Despatch No. 190, Poinsett to Martin Van Buren, 11 Nov., 1829; received 27 Dec., 1829, Record Group 59. Poinsett sends correspondence relating to the confiscation of the U.S. schooner Rebecca Eliza in Tampico after Mexico's defeat of Spanish forces. The schooner's cargo consists of supplies for the Spanish troops.

Anthony Butler to Andrew Jackson, 9 Oct., 1832, Jackson Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Butler remarks that soon a foreign government will teach the Mexicans that abuses to foreigners and their property will not be tolerated.

Despatch No. 63, Butler to McLane, 2 Mar., 1834; received 19 June, 1834, Record Group 59. Butler reports no progress on U.S. claims and that outrages against U.S. citizens continue. The treaty between the U.S. and Mexico is repeatedly violated by state officials. Bribery and corruption are the only means to bring a favorable termination of any legal affair.

Ex. Docs., No. 61 (H. Doc. 61), 23d Cong., 2d sess., 5 Jan., 1835, s.s. 272; "Message from the President of the United States Transmitting Information in Relation to Claims Upon the Government of Mexico." President Jackson forwards a report from Secretary of State John Forsyth. Forsyth reports that various representations have been presented to Mexican government, but the unsettled conditions of that country prevent action on the claims. The U.S. Minister hopes that the new Congress meeting in January will enable the successful settlement of these claims.

Butler to John Forsyth, 23 June, 1835; received 25 July, 1835, Record Group 59. Butler gives his account of the attempt to recover the schooner Topaz seized by Mexico in 1832 and employed in the Mexican service.

Butler to Forsyth, 26 Jan., 1836; received 29 Feb., 1836, Record Group 59. Butler writes an impassioned report on the execution of U.S. citizens at Tampico. He places the blame

on Santa Anna's uncontrollable nature and questions Forsyth on whether a favorable opportunity might not present itself to teach these barbaric people a lesson. He encloses documents from the U.S. Consul at Tampico on the executions and a declaration of the prisoners prior to their death.

Butler to Forsyth, 8 Feb., 1836; received 18 Mar., 1836, Record Group 59. Butler refers to articles and editorials in El Nacional, a paper reportedly owned by General José María Tornel. These editorials question the legality of U.S. claims against Mexico. Butler calls upon Forsyth for decisive action to force Mexico to give satisfaction for her many wrongs. He predicts that the plunder of U.S. citizens will continue until this is done.

Despatch No. 3, Pohatan Ellis to Forsyth, 28 May, 1836; received 28 July, 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis believes that the United States' forbearance with claims against Mexico causes Mexico to view the U.S. as afraid to take action. The claims made by the U.S. legation are ignored, postponed, and forgotten. He suggests that a hard line policy on claims be adopted by the U.S.

S. Docs., No. 400, 24th Cong., 1st sess., 14 June, 1836, s.s. 283; "Message from the President of the United States ...on the Subject of Depredations by the Mexicans on the Property of Messrs. Chouteau and Demun." Secretary of State Forsyth sends all correspondence on the Chouteau and Demun claims with the Mexican government. The Santa Fe caravan of these traders was seized by New Mexican troops in 1817.

Despatch No. 5, Ellis to Forsyth, 23 June, 1836, received 26 Aug., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis encloses copies of his correspondence on the capture of the U.S. ship Hannah Elizabeth by the Mexican ship General Bravo, and the imprisonment of the captain, crew, and passengers. Ellis believes outrages against U.S. citizens are committed because these acts are not punished.

S. Docs., No. 425, 24th Cong., 1st sess., 2 July, 1836, s.s. 284: "In the Senate of the United States Mr. Clay Made the Following Report; Committee on Foreign Relations...Transmitting a Report of the Secretary of State, in Regard to Depredations Committed Upon the Persons and Property of Messrs. Chouteau and Demun...Beg Leave to Report." The Senate committee considers the seizure of this Santa Fe caravan unjustifiable and demands that redress be obtained. The committee instructs the U.S. Minister in Mexico to demand redress and press the issue with the Mexican government.

Despatch No. 8, Ellis to Forsyth, 12 July, 1836; received 26 Aug., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis reports the arrival of a U.S. squadron off Santa Anna de Tamaulipas which demands satisfaction for an insult to the American Consul and the U.S. schooner Jefferson by the capture of a Lieutenant Osborne and his crew. He encloses all correspondence on the incident.

Ellis to Forsyth and Jackson, 26 Aug., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis reporting on the unsettled conditions in Mexico and their depressed economy, states that the settlement of U.S. claims is hopeless, and he recounts the wrongs done to U.S. citizens.

Despatch No. 22, Ellis to Forsyth, 4 Oct., 1836; received 17 Nov., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis sends his correspondence with the acting Minister of Foreign Affairs on the outrages committed on the U.S. Consul at Matamoros. He does not expect action and requests that this incident be added to the list of complaints against Mexico.

Despatch No. 23, Ellis to Forsyth, 5 Oct., 1836; received 17 Nov., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis sends word on the claims of the schooner Pelir D. and that of the wrecked brig Auroa. Pertinent correspondence is enclosed. He does not regard the Mexican courts as honest and just.

Despatch No. 25, Ellis to Forsyth, 11 Oct., 1836; received 17 Nov., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis regards the policy of Mexico as one of deliberate harassment and illegal injuries inflicted on all foreigners in Mexico. Ellis will follow his instructions and impress upon the Mexican government the advantage of better treatment of U.S. merchants. Ellis does not expect favorable results. He encloses correspondence on the case of the ship Northampton out of New York and which is stranded near Tabasco.

Despatch No. 29, Ellis to Forsyth, 15 Oct., 1836; received 24 Nov., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis sends correspondence with the Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs Monasterio on the outrages against the U.S. flag at Vera Cruz. He hopes the President will notice the continuation of Mexican atrocities.

Despatch No. 32, Ellis to Forsyth, 25 Oct., 1836, received 28 Dec., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis refers to the failure of the Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs to answer his letter on the necessity of Mexico changing her policy toward the United States' just claims. He encloses his second letter to Monasterio and the Minister's reply. Ellis vows to demand his passports if no further answer is received.

Despatch No. 34, Ellis to Forsyth, 29 Oct., 1836, received 28 Dec., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis forwards all documents and correspondence on the outrage committed to the U.S. flag at Vera Cruz involving the seizure of the U.S. brig Fourth of July. This incident is referred to in Despatch No. 29.

Despatch No. [37], Ellis to Forsyth, 3 Nov., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis reports receipt of an answer to his note to the Minister of Foreign Affairs on the adjustment of U.S. claims and injuries to the U.S. flag. He considers the answer highly unsatisfactory and unless something else occurs he will demand his passports in three or four days.

Despatch No. [39], Ellis to Forsyth, 10 Nov., 1836, received 25 Dec., 1836, Record Group 59. Ellis sends a copy of his note dated 4 November, 1836, to Minister of Foreign Affairs Monasterio demanding satisfaction and adjustment of injuries as previously requested in his notes of 26 October, 1836, and 20 September, 1826. Ellis in his note gives a two-week time limit for a meeting, after which he will request his passports. Ellis predicts he will be in Washington by the end of January.

Despatch No. 40, Ellis to Forsyth, 6 Dec., 1836; received [16 Feb., 1837], Record Group 59. Ellis forwards all correspondence on the seizure of eight seamen in Vera Cruz from the U.S. sloop of war Natchez.

Despatch No. 42, Ellis to Forsyth, 21 Dec., 1836; received 22 Jan., 1837, Record Group 59. Ellis has received no reply to his request for passports. He will leave without them if they are not sent within his specified time limit. In cipher Ellis states that he is confident that only strong action by the U.S. Congress will bring Mexico to adjust the controversy over claims.

Despatch No. 43, Ellis to Forsyth, 22 Dec., 1836; received 1 Feb., 1837, Record Group 59. Ellis forwards the majority of his correspondence with Minister Monasterio that led to his demand for passports. The correspondence covers the cases of the Northampton, John Baldwin, the schooner Brazoria, the Leggett claim, the Hannah Elizabeth, and the Paragon incident.

Ex. Docs., No. 105, (H.Doc. 105), 24th Cong., 2d. sess., 25 Jan., 1837, s.s. 303; "Mexico and Texas; Message from the President of the United States Transmitting the Information Required by a Resolution of the House of Representatives Upon the Subject of the Conditions of the Political Relations Between the United States and Mexico; Also the Condition of Texas." Secretary of State Forsyth forwards correspondence on the incidents of the Jefferson, the Hannah Elizabeth, and outrages committed on U.S. citizens and consuls in Mexico. Ellis' actions leading up to his demand for passports are also discussed.

Ellis to Forsyth, 5 Feb., 1837; received 5 Feb., 1837, Record Group 59. Ellis, now in Washington, sends documents lately arrived from Mexico on the disposition of the crew of the Natchez in Vera Cruz as witnessed by the U.S. Consul M. Burrough.

S. Docs., No. 160, 24th Cong., 2d. sess., 6 Feb., 1837, s.s. 298: "Message from the President of the United States on the Subject of the Present State of our Relations with Mexico." Jackson states that the U.S. claims against Mexico and the Mexican insults to the U.S. envoys and citizens justify war, but generous nations should avoid this outcome. Jackson asks for the use of the navy for reprisals against Mexico. He encloses documents to sway the Congress to favor his decision. The eighty-one documents included are on the U.S. claims against Mexico giving names, dates, property seized, the amount, and remarks on the nature of each claim covering the period 1816 through 1836.

H. Rpt. No. 281, 24th Cong., 2d. sess., s.s. 306: "Mexico." The House Committee on Foreign Affairs reports that the United States' relations with Mexico have always been based on good feelings, but Mexico continually allows injury to U.S. property and insults to her flag to go unredressed. The Committee believes that Mexico is taking deliberate advantage of the limited power of the U.S. executive to declare war. The committee concurs with the President that ample cause exists for taking action against Mexico, but it requests one more notice be made to Mexico in the most solemn form in order to

impress upon Mexico the gravity of the situation and the necessity for a show of good faith.

Robert Greenhow to Forsyth, 12 Aug., 1837; received 21 Aug., 1827, Record Group 59. Greenhow reports on his mission to Mexico and his interview with Minister of Foreign Affairs Luis Gonzaga Cuevas. Greenhow informs the Mexican government of the necessity of liquidating U.S. claims. He brings with him upon his return to the U.S., two copies of the Mexican government's reply to United States' inquiries on claims.

Greenhow writes a more complete report on his mission to Mexico than his earlier letter of 12 August, 1837. He forwards all correspondence with President Anastacio Bustamante and Minister Gonzaga Cuevas on U.S. claims.

S. Docs., No. 1, 25th Cong., 1st sess., 5 Dec., 1837, s.s. 314; "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Twenty-fifth Congress." President Van Buren in his state of the union address relates the Mexican neglect of U.S. claims and his predecessor's request that a final notice be given to Mexico and reprisals be taken if claims are not settled (pp.6-8). Van Buren provides all documents available on U.S. claims and the demand for redress (pp.29-163).

S. Docs., No. 14, 25th Cong., 2d. sess., 12 Dec., 1837, s.s. 314; "Message from the President of the United States in Compliance with a Resolution of the Senate 13 October, 1837, Relative to Claims of American Citizens Upon the Government of

Mexico." Secretary of State Forsyth sends a copy of the communications with the Mexican Minister dated 11 Dec., 1837, giving all information available on the U.S. claims not contained in S. Docs., No. 1, 25th Cong., 2d. sess.

Ex. Docs., No. 351 (H. Doc. 351), 25th Cong., 2d. sess., 26 April, 1838, s.s. 330; "United States and Mexico; Message from the President of the United States Transmitting...a Report of the Secretary of State Upon Existing Relations Between the United States and Mexico." Forsyth forwards sixteen documents dated 11 December, 1833 through 25 April, 1838. The subject of the correspondence is U.S. claims and among the documents is a copy of Mexico's acceptance of arbitration of U.S. claims if the U.S. will remain neutral regarding Texas.

New York Society for Peace to Van Buren, 6 June, 1838, Van Buren Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. The Society commends Van Buren for the U.S. and Mexico agreeing to submit their claims to arbitration. This is a more honorable policy than a conquest of Mexico by arms.

Ex. Docs. (H. Docs. 197), No. 197, 25th Cong., 3d. sess., 16 Feb., 1839, s.s. 347; "Claims on Mexico; Petition of Certain Inhabitants of New Orleans on Mexican Spoilations Upon American Commerce." These citizens protest against outrages by the Mexican government on New Orleans merchants. They believe the French method of force is better than the negotiations of the U.S. Private letters from Mexico indicate that Mexico will not ratify the arbitration treaty. Coercion

is the only answer.

Ex. Docs., No. 252 (H. Doc. 252), 25th Cong., 3d. sess., 27 Feb., 1839, s.s.: "Mexico; Message from the President of the United States Transmitting Information on the Subject of Existing Relations Between the United States and Mexico." The Secretary of State reports on events since the annual message to Congress. The time limit has expired without ratification of the arbitration convention by Mexico and the exchange of ratification. He sends copies of correspondence on this subject dated July, 1838 through February, 1839. Following the correspondence is a copy of the convention.

Despatch No. 2, Ellis to Forsyth, 27 July, 1839; received 12 Sept., 1839, Record Group 59. Ellis reports that Manuel de Gorostiza, formerly Minister to Washington replaces Juan de Dios Canedo as Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Gorostiza will present the treaty of arbitration to the Mexican Congress for approval 28 July, 1839.

Ellis to Forsyth, 1 Sept., 1839, Van Buren Papers. Ellis reports that the Mexican Congress has not yet ratified the arbitration treaty signed 11 April, 1839 in Washington. He has not yet pushed for a settlement of those claims not covered by this arbitration agreement.

Ellis to Van Buren, 20 Sept., 1839, Van Buren Papers. Ellis reports that the treaty of arbitration signed 11 April, 1839, in Washington is now submitted by the Mexican President to the Congress for ratification. He cannot predict the outcome.

Despatch No. 4, Ellis to Forsyth, 21 Sept. 1839; received 9 Nov., 1839, Record Group 59. Ellis sends documents in the case of John Young against Welsh and Company of Jalapa and the decision of the Judicial Tribunals in Vera Cruz. Also enclosed are the documents on the case of Captain Driscoll of the brig Ann Eliza out of Baltimore. Ellis has not pressed the Mexican government for a quick settlement of U.S. claims. He awaits the final payment by Mexico of the French indemnity to avoid the wrong impression of U.S. intentions. The last payment is to be 20 September. The arbitration convention signed 11 April, 1839, is presented to the Chamber of Deputies by the President who will exert pressure to pass it as quickly as possible, despite inevitable opposition.

Despatch No. 9, Ellis to Forsyth, 14 Nov., 1839; received 20 Jan., 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis sends all correspondence with the Mexican government on reclamations in all cases not covered by the terms of the convention signed on 11 April, 1839. The convention is not ratified, but remains in the Chamber.

H. Docs., No. 2, 26th Cong., 1st. sess., 2 Dec., 1839, s.s. 363: "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the First Session of the Twenty-sixth Congress." President Van Buren reports that the arbitration convention is not ratified. The Mexican President believes that the proposed arbitrator, the King of Prussia, would not accept the office. The U.S. agrees to a new convention and sends Ellis to Mexico to resume diplomatic relations and facilitate payments to U.S. citizens.

Despatch No. 10, Ellis to Forsyth, 7 Dec., 1839, Record Group 59. Ellis reports that the treaty of arbitration has passed the Chamber of Deputies and will probably pass the Senate.

Despatch No. 11, Ellis to Forsyth, 11 Jan., 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis reports that the Mexican Senate has passed the treaty of arbitration. He encloses Minister of Foreign Affairs Cañedo's note telling of its passage.

Despatch No. 12, Ellis to Forsyth, 14 Jan., 1840; received Feb., 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis reports Mexico has announced ratification of the arbitration treaty. He encloses Cañedo's note.

Despatch No. 15, Ellis to Forsyth, 10 Mar., 1840; received April, 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis encloses correspondence with Cañedo on the method of exchanging ratification of the arbitration treaty. Ellis relates events up to this exchange of notes. He is fearful that the time limit for ratification will expire.

Despatch No. 16, Ellis to Forsyth, 10 Mar., 1840; received April, 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis announces that John Black, Vice-Consul at Mexico City, will bring the ratified treaty back to Washington. He encloses the letter of commission.

Despatch No. 17, Ellis to Forsyth, 28 Mar., 1840; received 22 April, 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis is optimistic that Black will arrive in Washington before the time limit for the ratification expires. He sends correspondence on the problem of distressed ships taking refuge in Mexican ports without

giving proper notice and without receiving authorization to do so.

H. Rpt., No. 505, 26th Cong., 1st sess., 30 April, 1840, s.s. 371; "Rep. No. 505; Convention with Mexico, to Accompany H.R. 403." This report authorizes the funds for two U.S. commissioners to meet with two Mexican commissioners and an arbiter appointed by the King of Prussia, or the Queen of England, or the King of the Netherlands to settle the U.S. claims against Mexico.

Despatch No. 24, Ellis to Forsyth, 9 June, 1840; received July, 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis reports on events in Upper California where 80 to 100 foreigners were ordered arrested and imprisoned for a journey to Mexico City. Ellis encloses all documents and reports relating to this incident. He also sends a list of the U.S. citizens arrested in Upper California giving their names, occupations, place of residency, and value of their property left in California.

Despatch No. 25, Ellis to Forsyth, 11 June, 1840; received 10 July, 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis reports receipt of the ratification of the arbitration treaty. Fernando Castillo and Sebastián Camacho are to be the Mexican commissioners. They will not leave for Washington until 1 July, 1840.

Despatch No. 26, Ellis to Forsyth, 2 July, 1840; received Aug., 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis reports that Camacho has refused the appointment as commissioner and will be replaced by Joaquín Velázquez de León. The U.S. citizens arrested in Upper California are now imprisoned in Tepic. The British

Vice-Consul Eustace Barron took statements from each man and Ellis encloses this document along with eye witness accounts.

Despatch No. 28, Ellis to Forsyth, 9 July, 1840; received Aug., 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis forwards new testimony from the captain and crew of the Mexican brig Joven Guipuzcoa that transported the California prisoners to Tepic.

Despatch No. 32, Ellis to Forsyth, 20 Aug., 1840; received 26 Sept., 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis reports further testimony on the arrest of foreigners in Upper California that resulted in his demand for their release. He forwards all pertinent documents.

Despatch No. 33, Ellis to Forsyth, 20 Aug., 1840; received 26 Sept., 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis receives a most unsatisfactory response from Cañedo on his inquiry of those claims not covered by the arbitration treaty. He encloses Cañedo's answer.

Despatch No. 35, Ellis to Forsyth, 1 Oct., 1840; received 21 Nov., 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis is advised that the prisoners at Tepic will be released without compensation and in a destitute condition. José Castro is given blame for outrages committed on the prisoners and is requested to face charges. But all the witnesses, the prisoners, are ordered out of the country. Ellis encloses a letter from the Tepic prisoners who plead with Ellis to releave their suffering and letters on the detainment of José Castro for trial.

Despatch No. 36, Ellis to Forsyth, 17 Oct., 1840; received 25 Nov., 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis reports his strong protest of the manner in which the Tepic prisoners were released

and of their wretched condition. He sends the reply of the Minister of the Interior allowing the Tepic prisoners to return to California or settle elsewhere in Mexico. The discussions on their compensation are not yet finished. Ellis awaits a complete inventory of their lost property before settling the claim.

Despatch No. 38, Ellis to Forsyth, 30 Nov., 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis sends all vouchers relating to claims that are before the arbitration convention. He suggests that the Attorney General prepare a statement on each case. His numbered list of cases is all that remains with this despatch.

S. Docs., No. 1, 26th Cong., 2d. sess., 5 Dec., 1840, s.s. 374; "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress, at the Commencement of the Second Session of the Twenty-sixth Congress." President Van Buren reports that the claims commission met in August and any claim not covered by the commission is now under negotiation through the U.S. Minister to Mexico (p.5).

Despatch No. 39, Ellis to Forsyth, 11 Dec., 1840, Record Group 59. Ellis forwards all correspondence relating to his instructions to inform the Mexican minister of the sum due, and the method of payment for her portion of the arbitration convention. Ellis encloses the Mexican Minister's reply. He sends the final understanding regarding the Tepic prisoners and their compensation. Mexico fully reserves the right of reclamation of property lost by the prisoners.

Despatch No. 41, Ellis to Forsyth, 25 Feb., 1841; received 10 April, 1841, Record Group 59. Ellis reports that the Mexican government has not fully complied with the arrangements for the Tepic prisoners. The U.S. Consul at San Blas states that the men are still held for trial and are to be transferred to Guadalajara.

Despatch No. 41, Ellis to Forsyth, 1 April, 1841; received 12 May, 1841, Record Group 59. Ellis reports the acquittal of the Tepic prisoners at their trial in Guadalajara and the application of the compensation agreement with them.

H. Docs., No. 51, 27th Cong., 1st sess., 12 Aug., 1841, s.s. 392: "Claims on Mexico; Memorial of Claimants on Mexico." The claimants discuss the method and time of payment by Mexico on claims authorized by the commission. They request the government's assistance and clarification for immediate remuneration. The Secretary of the Treasury replies that he can issue certificates for authorization of payment after the commission ends. The arbitration convention's wording implies immediate payment. Extracts of the convention agreement pertinent to the claimants' argument are included.

H. Docs., No. 57, 27th Cong., 1st sess., 19 Aug., 1841, s.s. 392: "Francis A. Dickins-Awards Under the Treaty with Mexico; Memorial of Francis A. Dickins Relating to Awards Under the Treaty with Mexico." Dickins carries forward the argument for immediate payment introduced in H. Doc., No. 51, 27th Congress, 1st session. He asks Congress to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to award payment before the end

of sessions of the claims commission. He gives an account of the bureaucratic paper work encountered by the claimants.

Despatch No. 50, Ellis to Forsyth, 14 Dec., 1841; received 15 Jan., 1842, Record Group 59. Ellis sends correspondence on the confiscation of the brig George Washington at Vera Cruz.

Waddy Thompson to [John Tyler], 9 May, 1842, Record Group 59. Thompson reports that procrastination is the policy of Mexico on the U.S. claims and that only strong action will change their response.

S. Docs., No. 320, 27th Cong., 2d. sess., 13 June, 1842, s.s. 398; "Message from the President of the United States Communicating in Compliance with a Resolution of the Senate, Information Touching the Proceedings Under the Convention of the 11th of April, 1839, Between the United States and the Mexican Republic." Secretary of State Daniel Webster notes in his preface to the documents that the U.S. Commissioners were given no diplomatic instructions, for thier office is considered judicial. If the Mexican Commissioners view their duties otherwise the State Department is unaware of their official orders. The documents forwarded for inspection by the Senate include all diplomatic correspondence between the State Department and citizens making claims against Mexico, and all records of the commissions' activities with tables of the claims.

H. Docs., No. 269, 27th Cong., 2d. sess., 21 July, 1842, s.s. 405; "Aaron Leggett; Memorial of Aaron Leggett, of the State of New York in Relation to Claims on the Republic of

Mexico." Leggett presents his view of the commission and the legality of the commission to determine when, how much, and the mode of payment to be made by the Mexican government. He gives a complete history of his efforts to receive full restitution from the Mexican government.

Despatch No. 4, Thompson to Webster, 30 July, 1840; received 20 Sept., 1842, Record Group 59. Thompson believes that now is the time to press for claims as Mexico would like to neutralize the U.S. when the invasion of Texas is begun.

S. Docs., No. 411, 27th Cong., 2d. sess., 10 Aug., 1842, s.s. 399; "In the Senate of the United States, 10 Aug., 1842, Mr. Rives Submitted the Following Report..." William Rives, Virginia Senator, reports on the complaints of claimants J. Baldwin, W.S. Parrott, G.L. Thompson, A. Leggett, and others with numerous supportive documents from the State Department.

H. Docs., No. 2, 27th Cong., 3d. sess., 11 Aug., 1842, s.s. 418; "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Third Session of the Twenty-seventh Congress." President Tyler notes in his state of the union address the progress of claims against Mexico, giving the total amount of indemnities awarded, the amount outstanding, and the amount undecided by the arbiter. He has instructed the U.S. Minister in Mexico to demand payment of the outstanding claims and those authorized by the arbitration commission. (pp.144-155).

Despatch No. 5, Thompson to Webster, 16 Aug., 1842; received 22 Oct., 1842, Record Group 59. Thompson reports the details of his conversation with José María Bocanegra on U.S. claims and gives Bocanegra's excuse for the delay. Thompson reports telling the Minister that the U.S. does not fear a war against Mexico because Mexico cannot effectively wage a war against the U.S. He suggests to Webster that all claims discussions be held in Mexico to avoid excuses by the Mexican Commissioners that they lack all pertinent correspondence.

H. Rpt., No. 1096, 27th Cong., 2d. sess., 27 Aug., 1842, s.s. 411; "Rep. No. 1096; Claims on Mexico." This is a report to the President on the subject of the U.S. citizens' claims against Mexico.

Thompson to Webster, 8 Nov., 1842, Record Group 59. Thompson gives a lengthy report of his discussions with the Mexican government on their lack of compliance with the claims payments under the arbitration treaty of 1839. He encloses all documents and correspondence on the subject with a tentative payment agreement subject to U.S. government's approval. Thompson provides his own assessment of the agreement and urges Webster to reply immediately.

Thompson to Webster, 12 Nov., 1842, Record Group 59. Thompson questions the U.S. government's preference in method for settling outstanding claims not covered by the arbitration convention of 1839. Thompson believes that nothing will come of negotiations, and since the President does not favor another tribunal, outright coercion is the only solution. He requests

guidelines for an arbitration agreement if that is the President's decision, and he believes it must be concluded before the Mexican Congress adjourns.

Thompson to Webster, 30 Nov., 1842; 11 Jan., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson again questions Webster on the course to pursue on claims not settled by the arbitration convention of 1839. He questions the justification for coercion in cases that are exaggerated by the claimants and not worth the risk. He states again that negotiations will not work with Mexico without coercion, therefore another method is needed. He divides the outstanding claims into four groups and discusses the merits of each.

H. Docs., No. 2, 27th Cong., 3d. sess., 7 Dec., 1842, s.s. 418; "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Third Session of the Twenty-seventh Congress." President John Tyler reports on the termination of the claims commission and the amount left outstanding. He instructs the U.S. Minister to Mexico to demand payment and the contingencies to follow if the demand is not met.

B. Mayer to Webster, 9 Dec., 1842; Dec., 1842, Record Group 59. Mayer, Secretary of the U.S. Legation, presents his own views of Bocanegra's payment plan for the U.S. claims. Mayer differs with Thompson on the acceptability of this plan and provides statistics of Mexican indebtedness to support his argument. Mayer urges immediate action to secure payment before another revolution occurs.

Thompson to Webster, 28 Dec., 1842; received 24 Jan., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson forwards Bocanegra's note dealing with the invasion of California by U.S. squadron. Thompson is concerned that this unfortunate incident will be used by Mexico to cancel all U.S. claims.

Thompson to Webster, Jan., 1843; received 14 Feb., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson complains of the delay in receiving instructions to settle the claims according to Bocanegra's six-clause proposition. He believes it is very important that these claims be settled before the adjournment of this Mexican Congressional session. An adjournment would give Mexico another year to delay. Thompson believes that Mayer has overstepped his position by writing the Secretary of State on diplomatic issues.

Thompson to Webster, 5 Jan., 1843; received 18 Feb., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson sends a copy of his reply to Bocanegra on the unfortunate invasion of California by a U.S. squadron. He states that he used his note as a opportunity to cite the numerous abuses suffered by U.S. citizens. He justifies the harsh tone of his note by arguing that it will prevent unending reparations.

Thompson to Webster, 15 Jan., 1843; received 18 Feb., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson sends a clipping from El Diario de Gobierno on the recent events in California. The editor appears satisfied with the explanations offered by the U.S. Minister.

Thompson to Webster, 31 Jan., 1843; received 26 Feb., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson reports that he will reach a claims settlement for those left unfinished by the arbitration convention of 1839. All will be settled within one week of receipt of Webster's approval of Bocanegra's plan. Thompson anticipates difficulty settling those claims not covered by this arbitration agreement.

H. Docs., No. 166, 27th Cong., 3d. sess., 18 Feb., 1843, s.s. 422; "Taking Possession of Monterey; Message from the President of the United States in reply to the Resolution of the House of Representatives... Calling for Information in Relation to the Taking Possession of Monterey by Commodore Thomas Jones." The inquiry includes all correspondence of Commodore Jones since he took command of the Pacific squadron. Emphasis is placed on his communications of the invasion of California.

Thompson to Webster, 16 May, 1843; received 20 June, 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson reports that Mexico made the first claims payment on time, but two U.S. agents presented themselves to take charge. One agent was appointed by Thompson in Mexico City and the other came from the U.S. Thompson encloses all documents and correspondence relating to this confusion of credentials.

Thompson to Webster, 18 May, 1843; received 16 June, 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson reports a Mexican decree on readjusting the amount of revenue marked for the public debt.

Thompson reviews the earlier allotment arrangement and the Mexican government's inability to pay more.

Thompson to McLane, 5 Aug., 1843; received 8 Sept., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson forwards Bocanegra's note on the readiness of the second payment of Mexican indemnities.

Thompson to Abel P. Upshur, 28 Sept., 1843; received 3 Nov., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson believes there is little hope for settling the claims not covered by the Bocanegra arrangement of January, 1843. He regrets that he was not allowed to include these claims at that time.

Thompson to Upshur, 2 Oct., 1843; received 21 Nov., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson gives his personal objections to negotiating a new claims convention for those claims not covered under the earlier agreements.

Thompson to Upshur, 3 Oct., 1843; 21 Nov., 1843; Record Group 59. Thompson reports his interviews with Santa Anna on the new claims agreement. This interview confirms Thompson's belief that procrastination is a part of Mexican policy.

Thompson to Upshur, 14 Oct., 1843; received 21 Nov., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson forwards correspondence on a new claims convention. He has hope of success because Mexico will desire U.S. Intervention if her expected confrontation with Britain occurs.

Despatch No. 31, Thompson to Upshur, 29 Oct., 1843; received 7 Dec., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson reports he may conclude a new claims convention in one week. The agreement will contain the important features desired by the State.

Department. In Thompson's view only the possibility of a war with Britain pushes Mexico toward this agreement.

Thompson to Upshur, 20 Nov., 1843; received 22 Dec., 1843, Record Group 59. Thompson reports signing the new claims convention. He provides a point by point assessment of its advantages to the U.S.

H. Docs., No. 80, 28th Cong., 1st sess. 22 Jan., 1844, s.s. 442: "Mexican Indemnity; Letter from the Secretary of Treasury Transmitting a Report Showing the Amount of Money Received from the Mexican Government Under the Treaty of Indemnity; the Amount of Cost of Transportation of the Same to the United States." J.C. Spencer, Secretary of the Treasury, provides a table showing monies paid, monies subtracted for transportation, and the total amount placed in the Bank of America as of 21 October, 1842.

Despatch No. 40, Thompson to Upshur, 2 Feb., 1844; received 12 Mar., 1844, Record Group 59. Thompson reports that one-half of the next claims payment is ready.

Despatch No. 41, Thompson to Upshur, 10 Feb., 1844; received 25 Mar., 1844, Record Group 59. Thompson sends his correspondence with Bocanegra on the prohibition of retail trade to foreigners. Thompson regards this restriction as a greater outrage than all previous injuries to U.S. citizens. He suggests very strong action is necessary to prevent the implementation of this decree. If the U.S. allows Mexico to seize retail merchandise of U.S. citizens, Thompson believes there is little hope for a claims agreement that would cover

these items at their true value.

Despatch No. 1, Benjamin Green to John C. Calhoun, 8 April, 1844; received 11 May, 1844, Record Group 59. Chargé Green reports on his efforts to persuade the Mexican government to discuss a new claims convention. He encloses his correspondence with Bocanegra on this subject. Green surmises that the Mexican government cannot willingly negotiate on the claims and arrange payments to foreigners without loss of popularity and possibly their power. Mexico's financial condition is desperate and any move to send monies out of the country would bring down the government. Green rejects a conciliatory attitude suggesting that only stern, positive action will bring results. Payment of the next installment may be delayed or not paid at all. The treasury is empty and preparations are made for a possible forced loan.

Despatch No. 3, Green to Calhoun, 25 April, 1844, Record Group 59. Green reports no action has taken place on a new claims convention. He will take no decisive action until the arrival of the new U.S. Minister.

Despatch No. 4, Green to Calhoun, 16 May, 1844; received 26 June, 1844, Record Group 59. Green reports that no monies have been paid on the claims installment. The delay is from the anticipated U.S. annexation of Texas. Mexico regards this as an excuse for nonpayment.

Despatch No. 10, Green to Calhoun, 14 July, 1844; received 25 Aug., 1844, Record Group 59. Green reports that Santa Anna blames the unjust claims of the U.S. for the forced

loan imposed on the Mexican people.

Despatch No. 2, Wilson Shannon to Calhoun, 21 Sept., 1844, received 4 Nov., 1844, Record Group 59. Shannon reports that the payment of the installment on the Mexican indemnity has finally been made. He believes that payments in the future will be on time.

Despatch No. 4, Shannon to Calhoun, 12 Nov., 1844, Record Group 59. Shannon receives the claims agreement signed 20 Nov., 1843, and the delays Mexico uses to prevent its implementation. Shannon believes that no action will be taken as long as Mexico believes there is no threat of war. If these claims are postponed a few years, all hope of recovery will be lost. The payment on the claims installment, due under the convention of January, 1843, is denied by Mexico.

S. Docs., No. 81, 28th Cong., 2d. sess., 3 Feb., 1845, s.s. 450: "Message from the President of the United States Communicating Information in Relation to the Indemnities Stipulated to be Paid Pursuant to the Convention of the 30th January, 1843." President Tyler forwards a report of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State on the arrangements made for the payment of U.S. claims, the Mexican delays, and the confusion over authorization of the U.S. agent to receive the monies. All pertinent correspondence is included.

Despatch No. 12, Shannon to James Buchanan, 2 July, 1845, received 2 July, 1845, Record Group 59. Shannon upon his

return to Washington, places before the administration facts the Mexican failure to pay the fourth and fifth installments on the U.S. claims. He vindicates his own conduct and that of other U.S. officials charged with the installment transaction.

W.J. Parrott to Buchanan, 18 Oct., 1845, Record Group 59. Parrott, U.S. agent in Mexico, reports that he will leave for Washington, bringing a copy of the receipt given by Emilio Voss as U.S. agent for the April and July indemnity installments. A copy of the receipt is enclosed.

S. Docs., No. 1, 29th Cong., 1st sess., 2 Dec., 1845, s.s. 470; "Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress, at the Commencement of the Twenty-ninth Congress." President James K. Polk reports on the departure of the Mexican Minister from Washington. He gives a history of Mexican indemnities and their failure to pay them. Polk assesses the current relations between the U.S. and Mexico.

Despatch No. 6, John Slidell to Buchanan, 10 Jan., 1846, Record Group 59. Slidell responds to inquiries for more information on the alleged payment of the April and July installment on the Mexican indemnity. He forwards all correspondence available on the subject.

S. Docs., No. 85, 29th Cong., 1st sess., 26 Jan., 1846, s.s. 473; "Memorial of James Causten, Asking Payment by the U.S. of Several Installments Accured or Accuring to the Respective Claimants Under the Conventions with Mexico."

Causten presents the claimants' detailed objections to the U.S. - Mexican arbitration commission and the mode of payment for the indemnity. Accompanying his statement is a copy of a certificate issued to each claimant by the commission.

S. Docs., No. 112, 29th Cong., 1st sess., 2 Feb., 1846, s.s. 473; "Memorial of Louisa Livingston and Other Praying Payment of the Award Made in their Favor by the Commissioners Under the Convention with Mexico." Livingston presents a succinct account of the mismanagement of the Mexican payment, and demands that the U.S. government pay the claimants. The claimants will not accept Mexican paper or specie.

S. Docs., No. 116, 29th Cong., 1st sess., 4 Feb., 1846, s.s. 473, "Memorial of Clavin J. Keith, Administrator of Samuel Elkins Deceased and Legal Representative of Nathaniel Cox, Deceased, Praying the Adjustment and Payment of the Award Made in Their Favor by the Convention with Mexico." Keith relates the measures taken by the claimants to receive payment for loans made to Mexico during the struggle for independence. He demands the U.S. government intervene in this matter.

H. Ex. Docs., No. 133 (H. Doc. 133), 29th Cong., 1st sess., 18 Feb., 1846, s.s. 483: "Mexican Indemnity; Message from the President of the United States Transmitting a Report of the Secretary of State Relative to the Mexican Indemnity...." Secretary of State Buchanan sends copies of correspondence on the payment of the fourth and fifth installments for

April and July. Buchanan states the measure taken by the Treasury to clarify the misunderstanding. The correspondence covers the period of November, 1845, through January, 1846.

H. Ex. Docs., No. 196 (H. Doc. 196), 29th Cong., 1st sess., 11 May, 1846, s.s. 485; "Hostilities by Mexico; Message from the President Relative to an Invasion and Commencement of Hostilities by Mexico." Polk discusses in detail the purpose and failure of Slidell's diplomatic mission to Mexico. He calls upon the Congress to promptly recognize the existence of war with Mexico and provide him with the authorization to pursue the war to its conclusion. Accompanying his address are copies of the correspondence between the U.S. and Mexico, September, 1845 through April, 1846, on those subjects of disagreement between the two countries. A complete index appears on page 7.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Having reviewed the historical evidence in these three major United States document series pertaining to early United States-Mexican relations, certain trends become evident. Mexico and the United States pursued national goals that were in opposition from their earliest negotiations involving commercial and boundary problems. During the first twenty-five years of independence, Mexico attempted to form a national identity while protecting herself from territorial and economic encroachment by foreign powers. Throughout this same period, the United States experienced both commercial and territorial expansion which ultimately brought her into direct conflict with Mexico. The Texas territory became the rallying point and a tangible symbol of many disagreements between the two nations.

President James Monroe in 1825 appointed Joel R. Poinsett as United States Minister to Mexico. His instructions were to conclude as quickly as possible a favorable commercial and boundary agreement. The four-year delay between official recognition of Mexico and the appointment of the American minister allowed Mexico's enthusiasm for the United States to cool. The commencement of boundary negotiations did nothing to rekindle the enthusiasm. Poinsett questioned whether the United States should seek an extension of the boundary to the

Rio Grande or allow the 1819 boundary treaty with Spain to stand. This earlier agreement marked the western boundary of the Louisiana territory at the Sabine River and discounted American claims to the Texas territory. Unfortunately for international relations, many Americans believed their government had unwisely agreed to a cession of territory to Spain and that the Rio Grande was the true boundary. This belief later gained popularity as more Americans immigrated into the Texas territory. These settlers failed to be assimilated into Mexican society, and many wrote to their relatives of the attractiveness of Texas and their own wish that it be reunited with the United States. Too often the national goals of the government in Mexico City did not coincide with those of the Texans, and the unstable Mexican administrations steadily lost their power to enforce law in the frontier territories.¹²

For his own part, the Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lucas Alamán, suggested to Joel Poinsett at the beginning of their negotiations that until a formal agreement could be arranged it might be best to return to the boundary in existence prior to the Louisiana Purchase. Mexico was not ready to relinquish territory to any foreign government.

¹²Despatch No. 12, Joel R. Poinsett to Henry Clay, 5 August, 1825, Record Group 59, "Despatches from the United States Ministers to Mexico, 1823-1906," National Archives, Washington, D.C.

Poinsett's suggestion of the Rio Grande as a more acceptable boundary aroused Mexican suspicion of American motives and professions of friendship. Following the misadventures of Poinsett in Mexican politics and his recall in 1839, President Andrew Jackson appointed Anthony Butler as United States Chargé in Mexico with instructions to conclude the treaty agreements made by Poinsett. Butler stimulated Jackson's desire for the reannexation of Texas by his tantalizing reports of the near completion of successful negotiation. Through his heavy handed intrigues he reinforced Mexico's suspicions and contributed to the climate of distrust.¹³

Economic and political chaos plagued Mexico during these first twenty-five years of independence and damaged her hopes for a place among the leading world powers. The one constant symbol of her potential was Mexico's vast physical size. Each successive government whether centralist or federalist vowed to maintain Mexico's territorial integrity. The known desires of the United States for Texas quickly became a political tool used by Mexican generals and politicians to arouse the Mexican people against each successive administration. The barest hint of territorial cession was usually enough to produce a change in leadership. Later, much to Mexico's detriment any move toward the recognition of Texas independence was used in this same fashion. Mexico could not accept the

¹³Despatch No. 19, Poinsett to Clay, 20 September, 1825, Record Group 59.

independence of the Lone Star Republic and blamed the United States for the revolution which had created it. For a proud and destitute country, rich only in land, the loss of territory by the United States was the ultimate insult. A war to retain national territory and honor appeared to be the only recourse that remained to the Mexican government. Political survival and popular pressure served to dictate this decision.

In the United States, political pressures made Texas an unavoidable issue. Beginning with the Jackson administration, popular memorials to Congress for the annexation of Texas increased. The official policy of each administration was one of neutrality toward the Texas - Mexican conflict. Unofficially, many Americans followed a policy of active interference. The administrations of Van Buren and Tyler sought to prevent a complete break with Mexico over Texas. This policy of delay served both to avoid sectional pressures at home and to facilitate the settlement of Mexican indebtedness. The presidential election of 1844 ended this delaying policy. Texas became an issue on which neutrality toward annexation meant political death. James K. Polk, an expansionist who favored Jackson's views on reannexation, was elected. Annexation passed the United States Congress when presented as in issue of national security and commercial importance. Mexico severed relations with the United States March 23, 1845, following the American extension of an annexation treaty to Texas.

Texas was not, of course, the only issue of contention between the two countries. To arouse both nations to war more than territorial disputes were necessary. Economic considerations also played their part in the deterioration of relations between the two countries, for Mexico's cycle of revolutions depleted her treasury, thereby forcing each new government to make foreign loans at outrageous rates of interest. Foreign indebtedness and financial weakness destroyed Mexico's prospects for economic development, and her protective tariff, designed to protect Mexican industry, had little to protect. Chronic instability led to the loss of foreign property as successive political factions sought new sources of revenue to finance revolutions. The situation led to massive foreign claims against the already bankrupt treasury. The Jackson administration did not press American claims against Mexico because treaty negotiations were not complete. Under Van Buren's administration, Ministers to Mexico received instructions to press for settlement of claims. After much delay and difficult negotiations an arbitration agreement was concluded. The arbitration commission settled many claims, but many more remained. Unfortunately, economic conditions in Mexico were no better than before, and she quickly fell behind in making installment payments. United States merchants, awaiting payment for years, petitioned Congress to use force if necessary to obtain redress. President

John Tyler in a message to Congress stated that the delay in payment on the Mexican indemnity justified war, but that one final effort would be made for a peaceful settlement. These commercial claims against Mexico succeeded in arousing the anger of American merchantile interests against Mexico as the Texas question had not.¹⁴

For the Mexican people the foreign claims served to reinforce xenophobia. Each administration explained the destitute treasury by blaming the foreign claims on the limited Mexican revenues. Mexico's economic ills were attributed to foreign economic encroachment. To correct this problem foreign merchants were forbidden to engage in retail trade. This new solution only increased Mexico's poverty and foreign dissatisfaction. By 1846, the climate of animosity toward all foreigners particularly American, increased to such an extent that the more moderate Mariano Paredes administration could not withstand the pressures for war.

The document series examined by this paper were chosen for their representation of both Congressional and Executive views. More historical evidence remains hidden in the Presidential Papers than is possible to include in this review. The combined efforts of many are necessary to exhaust this valuable resource. Other United States document series require complete exploration before all aspects of early United States

¹⁴U.S. Congress, Senate, Document, No. 1, 28th Cong., 1st sess., 5 December, 1843, pp. 6 - 8.

Mexican relations are known. The more important of these are the "Despatches from United States Ministers in Texas, 1836 - 1845," "Diplomatic Instructions of the Department of State, 1801 - 1905," and "Records of the Department of State, Communications from Special Agents, 1794 - 1906." All are available to the historian through the United States National Archives and Records Service.

APPENDIX A

DATE	PRESIDENT	SECRETARY OF STATE	DIPLOMAT
1821	James Monroe	John Q. Adams	<u> </u>
1825 Mar.	John Q. Adams	Henry Clay	Joel R. Poinsett Minister
1829 Mar.	"	James Hamilton	"
1829 Mar.	Andrew Jackson	Martin Van Buren	"
1830 Jan.	"	"	Anthon Butler Chargé
1831 May	"	Edward Livingston	"
1833 May	"	Louis McLane	"
1834 June	Martin Van Buren	James Forsyth	"
1836 Jan.	"	"	Powhatan Ellis Chargé
1839 Feb.	"	"	Powhatan Ellis Minister
1841 Mar. 3	"	J.L. Martin Chief Clerk	<u> </u>
1841 Mar. 5	William Harrison	Daniel Webster	<u> </u>
1841 Mar. 5	John Tyler	"	<u> </u>
1842 Feb.	"	"	Waddy Thompson Minister
1843 May	"	Hugh Legaré Ad interim	"
1843 June	"	William Derrick Chief Clerk	"

DATE	PRESIDENT	SECRETARY OF STATE	DIPLOMAT
1843 June	John Tyler	Abel P. Upshur ad interim	Waddy Thompson Minister
1844 Feb.	"	John Nelson ad interim	"
1844 April	"	"	Wilson Shannon Minister
1844 Mar.	"	John Calhoun	"
1845 Mar.	James K. Polk	James Buchanan	"
1845 Nov.	"	"	John Slidell Minister

APPENDIX B

DATE	MEXICAN HEAD OF STATE	TITLE
1822	Agustín de Iturbide	Emperor
1824	Guadalupe Victoria	President
1829	Gómez Pedraza - Vicente Guerrero	President
1830	Anastasio Bustamante	Dictator
1832, Dec.	Gómez Pedraza	President
1833, April	Antonio López de Santa Anna	President
1833, April	V. Gómez Farfás, Vice Pres.	President ad interim
1834	Antonio López de Santa Anna	Dictator
1835	Miguel Barragán	President ad interim
1836	José Justo Corro	President ad interim
1837	Anastasio Bustamante	President
1841	Antonio López de Santa Anna	Dictator
1842	Nicolás Bravo, Vice Pres.	President ad interim
1843	Antonio López de Santa Anna	President
1845	Mariano Paredes	President
1846	V. Gómez Farfás	President
1846	Antonio López de Santa Anna	President

APPENDIX C

ABBREVIATION

DEFINITION

Cong.

Congress

Ex. Docs.

Executive documents

H. Docs.

House documents

H. Rpts.

House reports

No.

Number

S. Docs.

Senate documents

s.s.

Serial set

sess.

Session

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Unpublished Collections and Manuscripts

Washington, D.C. Library of Congress. Andrew Jackson Papers.
On microfilm at North Texas State University Library.

_____. James K. Polk Papers.
On microfilm at North Texas State University Library.

_____. James Monroe Papers.
On microfilm at North Texas State University Library.

_____. John Tyler Papers.
On microfilm at North Texas State University Library.

_____. Martin Van Buren Papers.
On microfilm at North Texas State University Library.

_____. William Henry Harrison Papers.
On microfilm at North Texas State University Library.

Washington, D.C. National Archives. Record Group 59. "Despatches from the United States Ministers to Mexico, 1823-1906." On microfilm at North Texas State University Library.

Public Documents

U.S. Congress. House Documents. 17th Cong., 1st sess.,
December 3, 1821 - 29th Cong., 1st sess., August 10, 1846.

U.S. Congress. House Reports. 17th Cong., 1st sess.,
December 3, 1821 - 29th Cong., 1st sess., August 10, 1846.

U.S. Congress. Senate Documents. 17th Cong., 1st sess.,
December 3, 1821 - 29th Cong., 1st sess., August 10, 1846.

U.S. Congress. Senate Reports. 17th Cong., 1st sess.,
December 3, 1821 - 29th Cong., 1st sess., August 10, 1846.

U.S. Statutes at Large. vol. 71. Washington; U.S. Government
Printing Office, 1958.

Secondary Works

Bibliographies and Indexes

National Archives and Records Service. National Archives Microfilm Publications. Washington; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Poore, Ben Perley. Descriptive Catalogue of Government Publications of the United States, September 5, 1774 - March 4, 1881. Washington; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1885.

U.S. Library of Congress. Index to the Andrew Jackson Papers. Washington; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

_____. Index to the James K. Polk Papers. Washington; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

_____. Index to the James Monroe Papers. Washington; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

_____. Index to the John Tyler Papers. Washington; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

_____. Index to the Martin Van Buren Papers. Washington; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1910.

_____. Index to the William Henry Harrison Papers. Washington; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960.

U.S. Superintendent of Documents. Lists of Congressional and Departmental Publications, Checklist of United States Public Documents, 1789 - 1909. 1 vol. 3d ed. 1911. Reprint. New York; Kraus, 1962.

Monographs

Bancroft, Hubert Howe. The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft. vol. 5. San Francisco; A.L. Bancroft, 1882.

Manning, William Ray. Early Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and Mexico. Baltimore; Johns Hopkins, 1916.

Rives, George. The United States and Mexico, 1821-1848. 2 vols. New York; C. Scribner's, 1913.

Articles

Hirshon, Arnold, "The Scope, Accessibility, and History of Presidential Papers." Government Publications Review 1 (Fall, 1974): 363-90.