

upon the terms and conditions of the Armistice and should these be satisfactorily adjusted, he will forthwith send Commissioners to the City of Mexico."¹ Houston, however, was in no hurry to designate his commissioners, and it was not until nearly the end of September that George W. Hockley and Samuel Williams were appointed. Their instructions stated that they were to endeavor to establish a general armistice between Texas and Mexico, which was to continue during the pendency of negotiations with Mexico for a permanent peace, and for such further period as they could agree upon, requiring due notice to be given by either party disposed to resume hostilities to the other, through the British legation, six months previous to any act of hostility. They were also authorized to agree upon the appointment of commissioners to meet at the city of Mexico to negotiate for the adjustment of all existing difficulties between the two countries and the establishment of a permanent peace. Any agreement made by them was to be subject to ratification by the two countries.² It will be noticed that Santa Anna had asked for commissioners "to treat upon the terms of which Mr. Robinson, one of the late Texian prisoners was the Bearer"; while Houston had sent commissioners who were empowered only to fix the terms of an armistice pending negotiations.

The condition of affairs, therefore, in Mexico and Texas in the early summer of 1843—shortly after the time when Webster resigned the office of Secretary of State of the United States—bore a promising appearance of early peace. Hostilities had been suspended, and it was known that the French and English agents, especially Captain Elliot in Texas, were busy trying to bring the contending parties together, a result which, if it should involve a return of Texas to Mexican allegiance, would assuredly prove very distasteful to President Tyler, although it might be entirely in line with Webster's private views.

¹ Jones to Elliot, July 30, 1843; *Tex. Dip. Corr.*, II, 1114.

² G. W. Hill (Secretary of War) to Hockley and Williams, Sept. 26, 1843; Yoakum, II, 415.

CHAPTER XXII

BRITISH PROPOSALS FOR ABOLISHING SLAVERY IN TEXAS

FOR several weeks before Webster actually resigned his office as Secretary of State the prospect of a vacancy had been a subject of common gossip in Washington, and the President and his friends had been considering the choice of a successor. John C. Calhoun was the most conspicuous possibility, and many of Tyler's friends thought he ought to be appointed. But it may well be questioned whether Tyler was ever anxious to have Calhoun in his cabinet, and Calhoun himself was at that time unwilling to take the place. His reasons were the same that induced him to resign his seat in the Senate at the close of the session of 1843, namely, that he wished to devote all his time and strength to securing the presidential nomination in 1844. His advice was that Upshur, the Secretary of the Navy, should be promoted. "I had a conversation with him," wrote Calhoun, "a few days before I left Washington, in which the subject of a possible vacancy of the State Department was adverted to, and in which I stated to him in that event, if the office was tendered to him, I was of impression that he ought to accept."¹

Webster, as well as Calhoun, thought Upshur ought to be appointed Secretary of State. The range of choice he regarded as limited and the President could not do better. "Mr. Upshur is an accomplished lawyer, with some experience abroad, of gentlemanly manners and character, and not at all disposed to create or foment foreign difficulties."²

¹ Calhoun to Green, March 19, 1843; *Amer. Hist. Assn. Rep.* 1899, II, 526. Calhoun left Washington about March 4, 1843.

² Webster to Everett, May 12, 1843; *Webster's Private Corr.*, II, 173. Abel Parker Upshur was a Virginia lawyer, and a man of good abilities

The subject was one to which the President gave long consideration, for its decision involved very serious consequences. Van Zandt, the Texan representative, three weeks before Webster's resignation, had correctly grasped the situation.

"Captain Tyler," he wrote, "is endeavoring to repair his vessel. . . . I think from present appearances Democracy will be seen written upon his flag in big letters when it is hoisted to the masthead. If the Captain succeeds in getting a full crew on board who will be ready to obey orders when the word is given to beat to quarters, I think he will give a broadside that will tell for the lone star."¹

The President, being in no hurry, intrusted the State Department temporarily to the amiable and accomplished Attorney-General, Hugh Swinton Legaré, of South Carolina, who was not only a leading lawyer of his state, but had been for several years in charge of the American legation in Brussels.² Legaré unfortunately only lived for six weeks after taking charge of the State Department, and died rather suddenly at Boston on June 18, 1843, where the President and his cabinet had gone to hear Webster's second Bunker Hill oration;³ and the President then finally turned to Upshur.

The new Secretary of State was well known to be in favor of annexing Texas. Indeed, Webster asserted, five years later, that when Upshur entered the cabinet he had "something like a passion" for accomplishing that object.⁴ Van Zandt, the Texan minister in Washington, wrote privately,

and good character. When he first entered the cabinet he was a judge of the Virginia courts. His administration of the Navy Department had been business-like and efficient, although critics of the administration thought he was too anxious for a big navy.

¹ Van Zandt to Jones, April 19, 1843; Jones, 222.

² "Il y a parmi les nouveaux membres du cabinet un M. Legaré qui parle bien français, qui est aimable et remplacera avantageusement M. Webster."—(Bacourt, *Souvenirs d'un Diplomate*, 327.)

³ Adams's cheerful opinions on this occasion, in which he characterizes Daniel Webster as "a heartless traitor to the cause of human freedom," and comments on the desecration of the solemnity by the "pilgrimage of John Tyler and his Cabinet of slave-drivers," are to be found in *Memoirs*, XI, 383.

⁴ Webster's speech in the Senate, March 23, 1848; Webster's *Works*, V, 286.

when rumors of Webster's retirement first began to circulate, that it was likely Upshur would take his place. "If he does, it will be one of the best appointments for us. His whole soul is with us. He is an able man and has the nerve to act."¹ But weeks passed and Upshur took no steps toward a negotiation with Texas, restrained, it would seem, by the President, who thought the time had not yet come. What finally induced the President to give Upshur permission to act was the language used by Lord Aberdeen in respect to certain proposals looking to the abolition of slavery in Texas.

Strictly speaking, the British government never took any official steps in that direction, although the subject was for some time under a sort of unofficial discussion.² Captain Elliot, who had arrived in Texas in the summer of 1842, began sending a series of personal letters in the autumn of that year to Addington, the Under-Secretary of Foreign Affairs in England, in which he developed a plan of his own for Texas. There was to be a revision of the Constitution, doing away with "the folly of a yearly elected Legislature and other liberality of the rhodomontade school"; abolishing slavery and all political disabilities of colored people; establishing an educational test for voters; and making "perfectly free trade a fundamental principle." The northern states of Mexico would, he thought, be glad to unite with a nation built upon such a foundation, and the northeastern states of the American Union would not be sorry "to see the power of the South and West effectually limited, and a bound marked beyond which Slavery could not advance."³ That a project so purely visionary could have

¹ Van Zandt to Jones, March 15, 1843; Jones, 213.

² In 1837 a British agent who visited Texas reported that the existence of slavery might be done away with if it were made a condition in a treaty with some influential power. Another suggested, in 1840, that the abolition of slavery might be made a condition of recognition. See "British Correspondence Concerning Texas," edited by E. D. Adams, *Tex. Hist. Quar.*, XV, 216, 225, 238. The suggestions, however, were not adopted by Lord Palmerston, although British public opinion would undoubtedly have favored any effort to abolish slavery in Texas.

³ Elliot to Addington, Nov. 15, 1842; *S. W. Hist. Quar.*, XVI, 76.

had any support from men like Houston or his cabinet is incredible. No convention of Texans at any period of its history would have considered such a constitution for a moment, although Elliot seems to have had abiding faith in the possibility of carrying out his plan.¹ Money lent by Great Britain to put an end to slavery in Texas, he wrote, would give quite as profitable returns as money spent in fortresses on the Canadian border.²

But although Houston certainly took no part in these efforts for the abolition of slavery, he kept continually urging upon Elliot the importance of action by Great Britain to induce Mexico to acknowledge Texan independence, lest a worse thing should happen. On January 24, 1843, he wrote that the subject of annexation to the United States was being much discussed in Texas, and that the whole of the United States was fast becoming a unit in favor of that policy, which would ultimately result in their acquiring not only Texas, but the Bay of San Francisco. "To defeat this policy it is only necessary for Lord Aberdeen to say to Santa Anna, 'Sir, Mexico must recognize the independence of Texas.' Santa Anna would be glad of such a pretext."³ Elliot was strongly impressed with the force of this argument, which was quite in line with what Van Zandt was reporting of his interviews with the President and other public men in Washington,⁴ and he therefore wrote to the Foreign Office, insisting on the danger of annexation unless peace were made "in some brief space of time."⁵

All this left Aberdeen cold. He evidently did not then consider that there was any immediate danger of annexation—as indeed there was none—so long as Webster remained at the head of the Department of State, and he

¹ Same to same, Dec. 11, 1842; *ibid.*, 85.

² Same to same, Dec. 16, 1842; *ibid.*, 92.

³ Houston to Elliot, Jan. 24, 1843; *ibid.*, 198. To the American representative in Texas Houston wrote, about the same time, that the idea of annexation was well received in Texas, and that if it became a political question in the United States both parties "would seize hold of [it] or grasp at the handle."—(Houston to Eve, Feb. 17, 1843; *Tex. Dip. Corr.*, II, 128.)

⁴ Van Zandt to Terrell, Dec. 23, 1842; *ibid.*, I, 633.

⁵ Elliot to Aberdeen, Jan. 28, 1843; Elliot to Addington, March 26, 1843; *S. W. Hist. Quar.*, XVI, 189, 200.

probably was very little interested at that time in the subject. He therefore contented himself by the purely perfunctory statement to Elliot that—

"Her Majesty's Government do not think it necessary to give you any Instructions at the present moment on that subject, further than to desire that you will assure the President of the continued interest which the British Government takes in the prosperity and independence of the State of Texas: and of their full determination to persevere in employing their endeavours, whenever they see a reasonable hope of success, to bring about an adjustment of the differences still existing between Mexico and Texas, of which they so much lament the continuance."¹

The activity of Elliot was by this time a matter of common talk in Texas. William S. Murphy, who had been appointed chargé d'affaires of the United States in place of Eve, whose course had not been satisfactory to his government,² landed at Galveston on the third of June, and two days later he wrote that, according to general report, Houston was completely under British influence and opposed to annexation, although the people were favorable.³ The rumors which reached Murphy probably went so far as to assert that Houston and the British government were planning abolition, although Elliot, in conversation with Houston, positively asserted that the subject of slavery in Texas had never been mentioned to him in any despatch from his government or by word of mouth.⁴ But if instructions had not been sent to Elliot upon this subject they were sent, as we shall see, to Doyle in Mexico.

What knowledge Houston had of Elliot's private and personal opinions in respect to slavery is not known, for if he had any such knowledge he kept it to himself. Murphy, who saw Houston for the first time in the latter part of June, wrote that he could not find out what was going on, though he was sure some important negotiations were on

¹ Aberdeen to Elliot, May 18, 1843; *ibid.*, 308.

² Webster to Eve, April 3, 1843; *State Dept. MSS.* Eve died at Galveston on June 9, 1843, as he was about to embark for home.

³ Murphy to Upshur, June 5, 1843; *ibid.*

⁴ Elliot to Aberdeen, June 8, 1843; *S. W. Hist. Quar.*, XVI, 319.

foot. "What steps are in progress, I know not, nor can I know until they shall develop themselves to the world. England may at this time be setting on foot a negotiation of vast consequence to the United States, and in all probability such is the case." Captain Elliot, as Murphy reported, was known to be an open advocate of Santa Anna's propositions, made through Robinson, which the people of Texas had unanimously scorned; and though the President's views were not known, the next Congress would show a vast majority in both houses "in favor of active measures to coerce Mexico into an acknowledgment of the Independence of Texas."¹ Two days later Murphy wrote again to say that the friendly policy of the United States toward the republic of Texas seemed to have been greatly misunderstood throughout the country, as well by the government as the people, and that he had heard the assertion made that Texas could not look to the United States for countenance and support in any emergency, but that her whole hope rested upon the friendly offices of England and France.²

A similar vague feeling of suspicion and distrust of British activities in Texas was manifest in all the reports which reached the newspapers of the United States. The press generally had no doubt that something was going on in which the British agents had an active share; but what the British government was trying to do seemed to be wholly uncertain. The general impression in the American press was that Texas, in despair of ever entering the Union, was ready to deliver herself, bound hand and foot, to Great Britain; that Great Britain would insist on abolishing slavery; and that the real reason of British interest in the subject was that she hoped to raise up a great cotton-growing country which should prove a rival to the United States.³

Ashbel Smith, after he had been in Europe six months, thought that he understood the true motives of the British

¹ Murphy to Legaré, July 6, 1843; *State Dept. MSS.*

² Same to same, July 8, 1843; H. R. Doc. 271, 28 Cong., 1 sess., 72.

³ McMaster's *History*, VII, 316-318.

government. Writing to Van Zandt, he said that one of the things it desired was the right of search over all vessels suspected of slave-trading, which the United States had stubbornly refused to grant. The next motive was a fear that Texas might be annexed to the American Union, which would be undesirable for commercial reasons, as the English wished Texas to remain a consumer of their manufactures, not subject to the tariff restrictions of the United States. Another was that Texas would interpose a barrier to the encroachments of the United States upon Mexico. Still another point was involved in the question of slavery.

"It is the purpose of some persons in England to procure the abolition of Slavery in Texas. They propose to accomplish this end by friendly negotiation and by the concession of what will be deemed equivalents. I believe the equivalents contemplated are a guarantee by Great Britain of the Independence of Texas—discriminating duties in favor of Texian products and perhaps a negotiation of a loan, or some means by which the finances of Texas can be readjusted. They estimate the number of Slaves in Texas at 12,000 and would consider the payment for them in full, as a small sum for the advantages they anticipate from the establishment of a free State on the Southern borders of the Slave holding States of the American Union. . . .

"Rely on it, as certain, that in England it is intended to make an effort, and that some things are already in train to accomplish if possible the abolition of slavery in Texas. And might not Texas exhausted as just described, listen in a moment of folly to such overtures of the British Govt?

"In the meantime, rely on it we have nothing to expect from the continued offer of British mediation to Mexico on its *present basis*. As little have we to expect from the good offices of France, although sincerely and faithfully employed, so long as they are separately exerted as at the present time.

"The independence of Texas and the existence of Slavery in Texas is a question of life or death to the slave holding states of the American Union. Hemmed in between the free states on their northern border, and a free Anglo Saxon State on their southern border and sustained by England, their history would soon be written. *The Establishment of a free state on the territory of Texas is a darling wish of England for which scarcely any price would be regarded as too [sic] great. The bargain once struck what remedy remains to the south?*"¹

¹ Smith to Van Zandt, Jan. 25, 1843; *Tex. Dip. Corr.*, II, 1105-1106. Italics in original.

That Van Zandt showed this letter about in Washington, or at least expressed himself in the terms which Smith had used, is of course most probable. At any rate, stories of the intentions of England in relation to the abolition of slavery in Texas were everywhere rife in the summer of 1843, when Upshur entered upon the duties of the State Department,¹ and it was only a short time after he took office that he began to receive what he regarded as strong confirmation of the most injurious rumors respecting the abolitionist activities of the British government. Their dealings with a man in whom he saw a secret agent of the Texan authorities were what principally excited his alarm.

Stephen Pearl Andrews, the supposed agent, was a young man, thirty-one years old, born in Massachusetts, educated at Amherst, and afterward a resident of New Orleans.² In 1839 he migrated from New Orleans to Galveston, where he proved highly successful in the practice of his profession. He had become an active and militant abolitionist, and, according to his own account, had converted a number of slave-holders in Texas by showing them that if free labor were encouraged the value of their lands would increase. It was his plan to have the Constitution of Texas amended so as to abolish slavery, and the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society was to be asked to raise the money to buy and free the slaves. Elliot, the British minister, it was reported, believed that such action would secure not only the warm support of his government, but the money with which to accomplish emancipation.³ It seems to be quite clear that it was Andrews who enlisted Captain Elliot's interest and persuaded him to write to Addington, in London, favoring these schemes.

In the spring of 1843 Andrews set out for England to attend the World's Convention of Abolitionists, under the auspices of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,

¹ His commission as Secretary of State was dated July 24, 1843.

² In his old age he became a resident of New York, where he attained some unpleasant notoriety. He was an expert stenographer, and became identified with various "advanced" causes.

³ Niles's Reg. (July 8, 1843), LXIV, 293.

which was held at London between the thirteenth and twentieth of June; but before going he called on John Quincy Adams, in company with Lewis Tappan.

"Mr. Lewis Tappan and Mr. Andrews visited me this morning," Adams noted in his diary on May 31, 1843. "Mr. Tappan had with him the New Orleans Bee of the 15th and 16th May, containing several long articles sounding the trumpet of alarm at the symptoms recently manifested in Texas of a strong party with a fixed design to abolish slavery. The Bee has the name of Henry Clay on its first page, nominated as its candidate for the Presidency, but its groans at the prospect of abolition in Texas are agonizing. Mr. Andrews . . . says he knows that the Texan President, Houston, is in favor of abolition. He is now about to embark in the steamer Caledonia, to-morrow, for England, with a view to obtain the aid of the British Government to the cause. . . . I bade him God speed, and told him that I believed the freedom of this country and of all mankind depended upon the direct, formal, open, and avowed interference of Great Britain to accomplish the abolition of slavery in Texas; but that I distrusted the sincerity of the present British Administration in the anti-slavery cause."¹

Andrews and Tappan in due time reached London and attended the convention and other meetings. As a spectator of the proceedings Ashbel Smith also attended, and he reported to the Texan State Department that the convention—

"gave the subject of abolition in Texas a very full consideration, deem it of great importance, will spare no efforts to accomplish it, and count confidently on the co-operation of the British Government. I was present at this meeting of the Convention and heard Texas described as the hiding place of dishonesty, as the refuge of unprincipled villains, swindlers and criminals escaped from the hands of justice in other countries; and that to this general character our population presented only occasional or rare exceptions."²

A committee from the convention waited on Lord Aberdeen, and reported that he had promised that the British government would guarantee the interest of a loan to Texas if it were raised and applied for the sole purpose of purchas-

¹ *Memoirs*, XI, 379.

² Smith to Jones, July 2, 1843; *Tex. Dip. Corr.*, II, 1100. Further details as to Andrews and his visit to England will be found in J. H. Smith's *Annexation of Texas*, 112-117.

ing and emancipating slaves, on condition, of course, that the introduction of slaves should thenceforward be prohibited. Lord Aberdeen subsequently denied having made any such promise, and what he did say to the committee must remain to some extent uncertain. The probabilities are that he listened to their suggestions, gave them some vague assurances of interest in their projects, and promised careful consideration. It is quite clear that he had no conception of the importance which would be attached to his words in Texas and the United States.

Andrews remained in London for some time after the close of the convention, and had interviews with a number of more or less important people, all of whom he represented to Smith as being extremely eager to bring about abolition in Texas. Among them were Lords Aberdeen, Brougham, and Morpeth (afterward the Earl of Carlisle). Andrews got Smith to introduce him as a citizen of Texas to Addington, of the Foreign Office, which, says Smith, "I consented to do, the introduction being in no degree official as I stated to Mr. Addington, and as this course puts me fairly in possession of the abolition schemes which had already been presented to the British Government." Smith was careful to explain to Addington that Andrews's coming to London was wholly unauthorized by the government or citizens of Texas, and that there was no disposition to agitate the subject, either on the part of the government or of "any respectable portion" of the citizens of Texas; and he also expressed his own "utter dissent" from all the proceedings in London which had abolition in view.¹

Tappan, in person, and Andrews, by letter, reported to Adams the results of their visit to England, and furnished him with a full report of the proceedings of the convention. Andrews wrote that he was encouraged in the hope of accomplishing, with the aid of British influence, the abolition of slavery in Texas; but Adams could see nothing to remove the deep distrust which he felt of British policy with regard to slavery in Texas and the Southern states.

¹Smith to Jones, July 31, 1843; *Tex. Dip. Corr.*, II, 1116.

"Her interest," he wrote, "is to sustain and cherish slavery there, and there is too much reason to surmise that in the conflict between policy and principle slavery will bear off the palm."¹

The views which Adams entertained in regard to British policy were strikingly different from those which were entertained by the leaders of opinion in the South.

On July 20 Smith, who was a good deal troubled at the stories that were in circulation, called on Lord Aberdeen and told him he had heard that representations would be sent to Texas to the effect that her Majesty's government would provide means, in some way, for reimbursing slaveholders in the event of abolition, and he inquired what ground there was for these assertions.

"His Lordship replied in effect, that it is the well known policy and wish of the British Government to abolish slavery everywhere; that its abolition in Texas is deemed very desirable and he spoke to this point at some little length, as connected with British policy and British interests and in reference to the United States. He added, that there was no disposition on the part of the British Govt to interfere improperly on this subject, and that they would not give the Texian Govt cause to complain; 'he was not prepared to say whether the British Govt would consent hereafter to make such compensation to Texas as would enable the Slaveholders to abolish slavery, the object is deemed so important perhaps they might, though he could not say certainly.' . . .

"Lord Aberdeen also stated that despatches had been recently sent to Mr. Doyle the British Chargé d'Affaires at Mexico, instructing him to renew the tender of British Mediation based on the abolition of slavery in Texas, and declaring that abolition would be a *great moral triumph for Mexico*. Your Department will not fail to remark that this despatch to Mr. Doyle appears to introduce a new and important condition into 'mediation.' . . .

"The British Government greatly desire the abolition of slavery in Texas as a part of their general policy in reference to their colonial and commercial interests and mainly in reference to its future influence on slavery in the United States."²

¹*Memoirs*, XI, 407.

²Smith to Jones, July 31, 1843; *Tex. Dip. Corr.*, II, 1116. Extracts from this letter, embracing the above passages, were sent to Calhoun by the Texan authorities, but when is uncertain.—(*Am. Hist. Assn. Rep.* 1899, II, 867.)

The day after the date of the despatch just quoted Ashbel Smith addressed a note to Aberdeen, which was intended, first, to make a record of the conversation of June 20 and, second, to "place on record the explicit disapproval by the Texan government of all proceedings having for their object the abolition of slavery in Texas."¹ And on the following day, August 2, Smith wrote a private letter to Anson Jones, the Texan Secretary of State, in which he said it was difficult to convey a correct idea of the course of conduct of the British government in relation to slavery in America. He did not wish to attribute to that government any sinister or covert purposes in Texas, but he believed that if money was necessary they would give it out of consideration for the interests of their own country, and in entire disregard of its influence on the prosperity of Texas. The abolition of slavery was the open and avowed policy of Great Britain everywhere, which they pursued in favor of their own commerce, manufactures, and colonial interests. He did not think they had any hostile or unfriendly feelings, but, on the contrary, "as much practical good-will for us as may be consistent with the vigorous perseverance in their abolition policy"; but he could not speak in terms of commendation of Mr. S. P. Andrews's friends, who were chiefly violent abolitionists, unfriendly to Texas and unscrupulous in the means they employed to accomplish their ends.²

On receiving these despatches the Texan Secretary of State wrote back that in reference to "the efforts making in Great Britain for the abolition of Slavery in Texas" it was only necessary to say that the government desired to be kept fully advised.

"The subject as you are already aware and as you have very properly stated to Lord Aberdeen, cannot nor will not be entertained in any shape by this government."³

With this emphatic declaration of the policy of Texas the movement begun by Stephen Pearl Andrews really came

¹ Smith to Aberdeen, Aug. 1, 1843; Niles's *Reg.*, LXVI, 97.

² Smith to Jones, Aug. 2, 1843; Jones, 236.

³ Jones to Smith, Sept. 30, 1843; *Tex. Dip. Corr.*, II, 1141.

to an end, although an echo of it persisted in Aberdeen's correspondence with Mexico, and the results upon the policy of the United States were extremely important.

The instructions to the British chargé in Mexico upon this subject, to which Aberdeen had referred in his conversation with Ashbel Smith, related primarily to the Robinson plan of settlement between Mexico and Texas. This plan Aberdeen thought did not go far enough, and Mexico's best policy would be to make a complete and full acknowledgment of Texan independence at once. He then, for the first time, brought up officially the question of abolition, which he proposed as the price that Texas was to pay for recognized independence. "It may deserve consideration," he wrote, "whether the abolition of slavery in Texas would not be a greater triumph, and more honourable to Mexico, than the retention of any sovereignty merely nominal." Of course the source of Aberdeen's inspiration is obvious. It was to be found in the suggestions made by the anti-slavery convention.¹

This was made entirely clear by the instructions sent to Doyle by the next packet. A proposition, he was told, had been made by "the Tappan Committee" that Great Britain should "advance a loan to Texas to be applied to the purchase and emancipation of Texas slaves." A copy of the letter from the Foreign Office to the committee, declining to make the proposed loan, was enclosed with the instructions.

"You will perceive," Aberdeen continued, "that Mr. Tappan is informed in that letter that if the State of Texas should confer entire emancipation on all persons within its territory, and make that decision permanent and irrevocable, H. M. Govt. would not fail to press that circumstance upon the consideration of the Mexican Government as a strong additional reason for the acknowledgment by Mexico of the independence of Texas. . . . It might be a point well worthy of the favourable consideration of the Mexican Govt., whether it would not be wiser and more consonant to their true interests, and even to their dignity, to waive the vain and objectionable consideration of nominal supremacy over Texas which they have included in the

¹ Aberdeen to Doyle, July 1, 1843; E. D. Adams, 130.

propositions submitted by them through Mr. Robinson to the Govt. of Texas, and rather to substitute for it that of the absolute abolition of the principle of slavery."¹

Santa Anna, however, cannot have cared anything about negro slavery as an abstract proposition. He had indeed expressed himself, according to Houston's not very trustworthy recollection, as thinking that it would be of great advantage to Mexico to introduce slave labor, thus enabling her to produce cotton, sugar, and coffee for export.² Certainly he and his associates would never have dreamed of surrendering the Mexican claim upon Texas in exchange for so barren an advantage as the abolition of slavery in that country, and Aberdeen's well-meant suggestion led to nothing.

At about the same time that Stephen Pearl Andrews visited England an American traveller of a very different description was also there. This was Duff Green, commonly known as "General" Green, presumably from a militia appointment in Missouri. He was a native of Kentucky, and had served as a private in the War of 1812. After that he had been a school-teacher, had kept a country-store, had been a surveyor in Missouri, a member of the legislature of that state, a member of the bar, and finally the editor of a St. Louis newspaper. In 1826 he bought an unimportant newspaper in Washington—the *Telegraph*—which for several years he continued to edit as a Jackson organ, and which seems to have proved ultimately unsuccessful. At the same time he became a resident of Maryland.

In the spring of 1843 Green was in London, and at the request of Delane, of the London *Times*, wrote a series of letters for that newspaper. According to his own account, he became acquainted while in London with Cobden, Peel, Aberdeen, Palmerston, Lord John Russell, and other influential persons. He was also constantly writing to Calhoun, to Everett (the American minister in London), to Webster, to the President of the United States, and to various other

¹ Same to same, July 31, 1843; *ibid.*, 138.

² Yoakum, II, 556.

official people whom he undertook to advise as to how they should manage public affairs.

Some time in July, 1843, he wrote to Upshur that a Mr. Andrews had been deputed by the abolitionists in Texas to negotiate with the British government, that Andrews had seen Lord Aberdeen and submitted a plan for organizing a company in England which was to advance a sum sufficient to pay for the slaves in Texas, and was to receive in payment Texan lands, and "that Lord Aberdeen has agreed that the British Government will guaranty the payment of the interest upon this loan, upon condition that the Texan government will abolish slavery."¹

To Calhoun Green wrote that, as he was informed, Lord Aberdeen had told Ashbel Smith "that the British Govt. deem it so important to prevent the annexation of Texas to the United States that they were disposed to support the loan if it should be required to prevent annexation."² Green did not accurately report Smith's interview with Aberdeen, but the statements he sent produced a great effect upon the action of the government of the United States.

The moment Green's letter came into Upshur's hands he proceeded to take it as a text for instructions to Murphy in Texas. Upshur wrote that he had every reason to confide in the correctness of the statements made, and that there seemed no doubt as to the object in view, and none that the English government had offered its co-operation. If the proposal to abolish slavery in Texas had in fact engaged the attention of the British government, and the co-operation of that government in the plan had been pledged, it possessed an importance which demanded serious attention. It could

¹ The original of this letter was never produced. An extract only is printed in H. R. Doc. 271, 28 Cong., 1 sess., 18. The statements here attributed to Andrews correspond closely with those which Ashbel Smith reported him as making.—(*Tex. Dip. Corr.*, II, 1100.) Aberdeen, however, told Everett that when the proposals in respect to a loan were submitted to him, "he had given them no countenance whatever," and that he had at once rejected the suggestion.—(Everett to Upshur, Nov. 3, 1843; H. R. Doc. 271, 28 Cong., 1 sess., 39.)

² Green to Calhoun, Aug. 2, 1843; *Am. Hist. Assn. Rep.* 1899, II, 846. The letter is wrongly dated as of 1842.