



Research Article

© 2021 Sang et al.
This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Received: 3 June 2021 / Accepted: 19 July 2021 / Published: 5 September 2021

Independent or Annexation: The Texas Issue in the British-American Relations (1836 - 1846)

Nguyen Van Sang*

*The University of Danang – University of Science and Education,
No. 459 Ton Duc Thang, Lien Chieu district,
Da Nang city, Vietnam
Corresponding Author

Le Thanh Nam

*University of Education, Hue University,
34 Le Loi, Hue City, Thua Thien Hue, Vietnam*

Luu Trang

*The University of Danang, University of Science and Education,
No. 459 Ton Duc Thang, Lien Chieu district,
Da Nang city, Vietnam*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2021-0134>

Abstract

This article presents the annexation of Texas in the relations between Great Britain and the United States from 1836 to 1846. The first part presents an overview of the territory, history of exploration and development of Texas from the early stages of history until the formation of the republic in 1836. The next section of the article refers to the interests of Great Britain and the United States in Texas. The final section provides the British-American diplomacy from 1836 to 1846 on the annexation of Texas. On the basis of the exploitation of correspondences, treaties and other material sources, the article contributes to clarifying the Anglo-American relations relating to the annexation of Texas and the expansion history of the United States during the first half of the XIX century.

Keywords: *Annexation, Texas, United States, Great Britain, Mexico, Aberdeen, Elliot*

1. Introduction

The Treaty of Paris (1783) ended the independence war of 13 British colonies in North America (1775-1783). According to the treaty, Great Britain was forced to give up their domination of the 13 colonies, officially recognizing the independence of the United States. After being independent, the external era of the founding period officially began. From the previous historical connection, during the early period of the national establishment, the United States government was particularly interested in

connecting official diplomacy with Britain and France as an independent nation (Sang, 2019b). Implementing that policy, on February 24, 1785, John Adam was assigned to London. John Adam's historical mission was the official event of establishing diplomatic relations between Britain and the United States (Sang, 2019a). In terms of history, the United States and Britain had similarities in blood, language, religion and political principles. These basic foundations provided the basis for the development of relations between the two countries (Pastusiak, 1997). From the founding of the country to the United States became a world power, British-American relations was considered as an important issue. This special relationship should therefore be studied. The US President Andrew Jackson declared, with Britain, we can turn to the era of peace, competition and honour. Everything in the conditions and history of the two countries is calculated (...) to bring beliefs to both that it is their policy to preserve the most intimate relationship (Jackson, 1829). Viscount Castlereagh, British Foreign Minister also acknowledged that friendship with the United States is a great asset (Perkins, 1964), (Perkins, 1985). Jackson and Castlereagh statements above showed that both Great Britain and the United States had an equally important position toward each country in this period. On December 2, 1823, President James Monroe presented the message to Congress to express his views on US foreign policy, which later became known as the Monroe Doctrine. Since the Monroe Doctrine was born, political conflicts between Britain and the United States have been replaced by the search for peaceful solutions and trade development. James Monroe's successors, from John Adams to James Polk continued to seek solutions to build good relations with Britain, especially to prevent political conflicts and territorial disputes, create a peaceful basis for the development of Anglo-American relations. Studying Anglo-American relations on political conflicts and territorial disputes is therefore of great significance.

James Monroe's successors, the US presidents from John Adam to James K. Polk tried to strengthen ties with Britain. The government of these presidents all made great efforts to find solutions to resolve the disputed issues in British-American relations, which was worth noting that the territorial dispute which existed from independence war of the 13 colonies and political conflicts that arose between the two countries in the era of independence. In terms of territorial disputes, the two sides was trying to expand their influence in Oregon sovereignty disputes and the annexation of the Texas republic (Sang, 2019b); (Sang, 2017). Concerning the benefits of the border lands, the two sides also existed profound conflicts, even standing on the edge of a military war involving the Northeastern border determination in Maine and New Brunswick (Sang, 2018a); (Sang & Daszynska, 2020). These new conflicts arising regarding the slave trade and maritime rights intertwined with territorial disputes two countries formed before made political relations and diplomacy between the two countries above become complicated, pushing the two countries many times to face the risk of war outbreak, the case of Aroostook was a typical example (Sang, 2018b); (Sang et al., 2021). However, with the goal of peace and diplomatic effort from both sides, the Treaty of Webster-Ashburton in 1842 was signed. The treaty basically ended disputes in British and American relations, created a peaceful basis for the development of Anglo-American relations, was the foundation for resolving conflicts and disputes related to relations of two countries. Therefore, the study of the issue of political disputes and territory at this period, especially annexation of Texas in the British-American relations has an important and significant role in the study of historical relations between the United States and Great Britain in the second half of the nineteenth century.

2. Literature Review

The British-American relations on border disputes in the first half of the XIX century was a prominent issue of international relations. In the world, in-depth researches on the policies related to relations of territorial conflicts had been studied and reflected in documents very early.

The first group of research works focus on the annexation of Texas in the British-American relations, namely: Britain and the Americas: Culture, Politics, and History (Kaufman, 2005), Relations between United States and Great Britain , 1776-1915 (Green, 2009); Great Britain and the United

States: A History of Anglo-American Relations (1783-1952) (Allen, 1955); The British-American Relations from the Monroe Doctrine to American-Mexican War (1823-1846) (Sang, 2021). The research scope of the works was the relations between Great Britain and the United States in many fields such as politics, economy, military, society in many historical periods. Therefore, an annexation of Texas was briefly presented as an event of the history of relations between the Great Britain and the United States.

In other aspect, the Anglo-American relations in the annexation of Texas is presented in several publications about history of diplomacy, especially a book which titled *Diplomacy of the United States in the XVIII and XIX centuries* (Pastusiak, 1997). The work was considered an in-depth study on issues in the history of American diplomacy in the eighteenth-nineteenth centuries, focusing on diplomatic relations with Britain, Spain, France and Russia. Some of the issues of relations between Great Britain and the United States within the research scope of the project were presented in this work, such as Monroe Doctrine, Webster-Ashburton Treaty, Oregon sovereignty, Texas annexation. However, the book had a subject of studying the history of American diplomacy in the eighteenth and nineteenth century; hence this topic is not the main content of this book. The events, Texas presented in the work were only as an event or a subject matter of the history of US diplomacy. In the other hand, (Moore, 1898) in *History and Digest of the International Arbitrations to which the US has been a party* collected original materials about territorial disputes between the United States and the European powers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In this work, many dispute issues were addressed by historian Moore such as Maine and New Brunswick, Oregon, Texas, California, Hawaii. Although the historical value of the book was very large, it covered a wide range of US disputes with many great powers in the nineteenth century, hence the issue of territorial disputes between two countries in the annexation of Texas had not been studied in depth.

The most typical works highly appreciated by historians in study on the subject of territorial disputes between Great Britain and the United States which relating to Texas's annexation were original documents. These document are presented about the diplomatic correspondences between both countries concerning keep Texas as an independent state or a annexation of Texas into the United States, such as: *British Diplomatic Correspondence Concerning the Republic of Texas, 1838-1846* (Adam, 1917); *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas* (Garrison, 1911). These books are collections of letters of Great Britain and the United States which shown the oppions of both sides about Texas problem. Therefore, these provide the original history of relations between the two countries on the matter of the annexation of Texas. However, the works mentioned above do not present a systematic and comprehensive view of the relationship between Great Britain and the United States related to the annexation of Texas. In addition, the annexation of Texas in the British-American relations are also the result of many monographs. These works have analysed British or American attitudes, views or actions on the Texas issue. Typical are monographs such as *Britain and the Annexation of Texas, with Particular Reference to the Slavery Question (1836-1845)* (Nelson, 1964); *The Diplomatic Relations of England and the Republic of Texas* (Worley, 1905); *The Annexation of Texas* (Smith, 1911). These monographs have approached from the section on the point of view of each side. By part-based approach, the works analysed one or several events in the history of territorial and sovereignty disputes between Great Britain and the United States, while missing many important issues in the territorial dispute process between the both countries at this period.

3. Methodology

The research is conducted using two basic methods as historical and logical methods. The above methods are used to evaluate historical materials, analyse and interpret historical events in a historical process. In addition, the article also uses other methods such as analysis, synthesis, comparison, correlation, statistics and description to complete the study.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 *The establishment of the republic of Texas*

Texas has an area of about 274,366 square miles, including all or part of the territory of the states of Colorado, New Mexico and Texas today.

In a long time, the French and Spanish made their efforts to make the process of colonization with respect to Texas land. In 1763, with the Treaty of Paris, France ceded Louisiana to Spain and officially abandoned the claim of sovereignty over Texas. While dominating in Texas, the Spanish almost established colonial lands in San Antonio, La Bahia, and Nacogdoches. These lands were only sparse areas. The area between Nacogdoches and San Antonio was a completely wild area and the western area of San Antonio was almost uninhabited (Louis, 1924). The immigrants here were mostly evangelical pastors for the Indians, part of the military forces to maintain the control of the Spanish authorities and some Spanish wealthy plantation owners living around this area (Mowat, 1925). The number of Spanish immigrants was not numerous, because they did not have any intention for long-term occupation with respect to Texas. In 1820, the population of Texas was about 20,000 people, mostly Indians. The population of white-skin man in 1780 was estimated at about 1500 people, increased by about 3,000 people by the year 1800, but dropped to less than 1,500 people in 1820 (Baker, 1873). Spanish government also tried to expand its territory, but this expansion encountered conflicts with the tribes of Indians. After Adam-Onis Treaty (1819), the Spanish government started to allow Americans to come to Texas for settlement to develop this area into a prosperous country. With this policy of the Spanish government, Moses Austin with 300 families from the United States migrated to Texas. In December 1820, Austin came to San Antonio to present the plan on establishing a colonial land in Texas and received the consent of the Spanish government (Wharton, 1922). In the land having the permission, they established settlements for planting cotton, sugarcane and cereals. However, Moses Austin died some time later (Pastusiak, 1997).

Under the domination of the Spanish government, the people of Mexico carried out the struggles. The struggles this time were subject to the impact of the Napoleonic war and revolution broken out in Spain in January 1820 led by Rafael de Riego (Chapman, 1918). The first struggle of Texas inhabitants took place on September 16, 1810 under the leadership of the priest Miguel Hidalgo (Maillard, 2011). This struggle quickly failed a short time later. However, with the persistent struggle, in 1821 Mexico gained independence from Spain and in 1823 Mexico declared its independence, established the republic. Texas at this time was organized as a province of Mexico: "The Mexican nation is forever free and independent of the Spanish government, and every other power (...) The parts of this Federation, are the States and territories as follows: The State of the Chiapas, Chihuahua, Coahuila and Texas, Durango, Guanajuato, Mexico" (The Constitution of the Mexican United States in 1824, 1824). According to this organization, every issue of Texas was determined by a governor appointed by a viceroy of Mexico (Clark, 1907). Like the Spanish government, after independence, Mexico continued to implement policies to encourage immigrants to come to Texas: "All those foreigners who in virtue of the general law of the 18th August, 1824, by which security for their property and persons is offered in all the territory of the Mexican Nation, may be desirous of establishing themselves in any of the towns of Coahuila and Texas, are hereby permitted; that State invites and proposes to them so to do" (Law for Promoting Colonization in the State of Coahuila and Texas, March 24, 182, 1825). The Government promised to grant 177 acres of land to each person for agricultural production if they settled in Texas (Maillard, 2011). The policy on encouraging immigration and the news on land in Texas stimulated the interest of the immigrants from the states of Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia and other southern states migrated here (Baker, 1873). The flow of immigrants from the United States in Texas therefore increased rapidly. By the end of 1831, the total number of American settlers in Texas increased to 5665 (Pastusiak, 1997). The rise of immigrants forced the Mexican Congress in 1824 to issue regulations on banning immigrants from settling in the area nearly 25 miles from the coast. However, the flow of migrants from the United States to Texas

kept rising. According to estimates, by the year 1836, the number of white-skin Americans residing in Texas was about 30,000 people and 5,000 black slaves (Bemis, 1951), this figure was greater than the total number of Spanish settlers in Texas 300 years ago.

Reacting to waves of migrants to Texas, the Mexican government issued policies to prevent this situation. Under the impact of those policies, Texas inhabitants conducted the struggle to claim for an independent state, separate from the state Coahuila-Texas. From April 1834, when the Santa Ana took the lead, the conflict between Texas and the government of Mexico increased. The armed conflicts between the Mexican army and Texas inhabitants took place in Gonzales and San Antonio. In this situation, a meeting was convened on November 3, 1835 at San Felipe de Austin to declare "Declaration of the People of Texas", asserting the independence of Texas, and not acknowledging the domination of the Mexican government over Texas: "That they do not acknowledge that the present authorities of the nominal Mexican Republic have the right to govern within the limits of Texas" (Declaration of the People of Texas, in General Convention Assembled in 1835, 1835). On March 2, 1836, the interim government announced the establishment of the Republic of Texas independent from Mexico: "The people of Texas do now constitute a free, sovereign, and independent republic, and are fully invested with all the rights and attributes which properly belong to independent states" (The Texas Declaration of Independence: March 2, 1836, 1836).

4.2 *Interests of Great Britain and the United States in the annexation of Texas*

Mexico claimed not to recognize the republic, so Texas had to seek recognition of independence from other powers, including most notably from Great Britain and the United States. On the side of Great Britain and the United States, these two countries also actively carried out the settlement of the issue of Texas (Mowat, 1925). The annexation of Texas, or keeping Texas as an independent nation since this moment became the concern in the relationship between Great Britain and the United States.

Great Britain was concerned about the republic of Texas early. In May 1836, Mr. Barlow Hoy in his letter sent to British Foreign Minister presented the issues related to slavery and the slave trade in Texas, the relationship between slavery in Texas with the United States and the need to form the relationship between Great Britain and Texas. Many people expressed surprise that Great Britain was seeking benefits in the annexation of Texas. Why did Great Britain connect its interests with a province just gaining independence from Mexico. In fact, Texas was a land so far from Great Britain, not a British colony, and had only a few economic benefits. Even, many British people had to pose the question "Where is Texas?", "It is owned by whom?" And "What is the value of it?". British people also surprised and kept skeptical about the benefits that they got in Texas in the late nineteenth century (Robert, 1964). However, why did Great Britain want to keep Texas independent? Why did Great Britain prevent the annexation of Texas into the United States?

In view of the London government, the existence of an independent republic of Texas would create a border preventing the expansion to the southward of the United States. This existence would also ensure the safety of the systems of nations under the influence of Great Britain in Latin America. This was mentioned in the first debates on the issue of the Texas of British House of Commons on August 5 1836. People engaged in the discussion mentioned policy of invasion of the United States and expressed concern about the impact of this policy on Great Britain. They also discussed the benefits that the United States would receive in the Southwest and the Gulf of Mexico if the annexation of Texas succeeded (Worley, 1905). Because after Spain was defeated in the war with France, the Spanish colonies in America revolted. Taking advantage of this situation, Great Britain quickly established its commercial interests in the area. If the United States implemented the annexation of Texas, this would directly cause threat to British interests in Latin America, primarily Mexico. Mr. Barlow Hoy in a speech in front of the House of Commons, said: "If the United States should be suffered to wrest Texas from Mexico, and to take possession of it? Would not Cuba and the other Spanish possessions in the Gulf of Mexico then soon fall a prey to the United States?" (*Slavery in Texas, 05 August 1836, 1836*). Barlow Hoy also raised Great Britain's vital interests in Mexico,

pointed out a large number of British investments in Mexico, the dangers of the annexation of Texas in the United States for the benefit and the withdrawal of debts, the government was proposed to consider its long-term benefits in the region, even as he proposed the idea that the British royal navy helped Mexico recover Texas (*Slavery in Texas*, 05 August 1836, 1836). Therefore, to protect their immediate interests in Mexico and in Latin America before the territorial expansion of the United States, Great Britain needed to keep the independence of Texas.

There is a fact that, since 1823 Monroe Doctrine and obvious mission theory were widely transmitted as the basis for the expansion of the United States territory. After several successful acquisitions with France and Spain, Oregon and Texas were seen as the next targets in the expansion of the United States territory. Many people believe that this expansion would be suspended and that Texas would be the stop (Robert, 1964). Therefore, when Great Britain kept Texas independent, this would create a buffer zone to prevent the expansion of the America to the Southward, challenge the Monroe Doctrine and obvious mission of the United States to protect the interests of Great Britain: "Again, we are told that Britain ought not to allow the United States to expand their territory. Why? Will the extension do Britain any harm?" (*Telegraph and Texas Register*, November 2, 1836, 1836). This prevention also came from Great Britain's worries about the fate of its colonies in Canada. In fact, this worry had its basis when, in the war of 1812, the United States forces attacked in Canada and at this moment similar signs appeared. Specifically, in the Caroline scandal in 1837 in Canada, immediately volunteered forces from the United States quick helped Canada to fight against Great Britain (Adam, 1912). If the annexation of Texas succeeded, the interference of United States in Canada could happen.

Furthermore, the characteristic of agriculture in Texas was promoting cotton cultivation. In Texas, there were many famous cotton growing areas on both sides of the East-West, Brasovia was an example (Coffin, 1847). Texas was a major source of cotton for the world market followed by the United States. Great Britain itself was well aware of this potential: "Lord Palmerston is aware, that the principal article which Texas now has for exportation, is cotton. This material is at this time ready in that country for market" (Garrison, 1911). Meanwhile, the southern states of the United States were subject to the monopoly of cotton production, so they set a very high cotton price and supplies could be interrupted if the relationship between Great Britain and the United States deteriorated. Therefore, the British government hoped that the development of growing cotton in Texas would be a place for providing cotton for the mills of Britain, break the monopoly of the United States, and reduce the dependence of Great Britain on source of cotton yarn imported from the United States. J. Hamilton in his letter to the Minister Plenipotentiary of Great Britain in Washington wrote: "If Great Britain having her supply of cotton insured to her from the fertile plains of Texas (destined to be the greatest cotton country in the world) exempt from the caprice of your relations with the United States" (Garrison, 1911). Texas was not only a source of raw materials but also the market for consuming the industrial products of Great Britain. These goods might be brought into the Texas market with a much lower tax rate than exporting to the United States market: "To be an immense consumer of the products and Manufactures of Great Britain (...) She will not only supply her immeasurably increasing population with British goods, but likewise both the adjoining provinces of Mexico, and a large portion of the Valley of the Mississippi, through the navigation of the Trinity and Sabine Rivers" (Garrison, 1911). In another aspect, Britain also passed the free exchange of trade with Texas to force the United States to remove tariff barriers for goods imported from Great Britain, increase trade benefits of Great Britain in America.

In 1818, Great Britain was the first country to denounce slavery (*Copy of the Treaty with Spain for Preventing the Slave Trade*, 23rd September, 1817, 1818). After this event, Great Britain also called struggle to abolish slavery in many countries and regions around the world. Therefore, Great Britain was very interested in the question of slavery in Texas. In 1829, Great Britain signed a treaty with Mexico to abolish slavery and slave trade in this country. However, with the statement of separating from Mexico in 1836, the treaty between Great Britain and Mexico on the slavery issue for Texas was no longer valid: "If the Mexican government should prevail in the present war in Texas, he had no

doubt that the laws of Mexico against the slave-trade would be carried into effect, but that the case might be different if the other side should succeed" (*Slavery in Texas, 05 August 1836, 1836*). At this time, Texas had two options, either to become an independent nation to maintain slavery, or to become a state of slavery belonging to the territory of the United States. Tendency to become a state of the United States was agreed by most of the leaders of Texas. David Burnet in his letter to James Collinsworth and Peter W. Grayson, two representatives of the Texas government in Washington instructed that, the slavery in Texas must be maintained as a condition of talks on annexation in the United States: "That slavery shall be allowed in Texas, of persons of African derivation and that all persons of that description now in Texas and held as Slaves shall be respected as the property of their respective owners" (Garrison, 1911). If Texas was merged into the United States, the efforts to abolish gradually slavery of Great Britain primarily failed: "The independence of Texas once established, that province would soon be added to the federal union of North America (...) if Texas were added to the union, the basis of the connexion would be to establish slavery, and the slave-trade, permanently, in that province" (*Slavery in Texas, 05 August 1836, 1836*). In the future, the concern of Great Britain was that Texas would become a mirror for Mexico and Latin America to return to slavery, which Great Britain made great effort to abolish. Great Britain wanted to maintain an independent Texas to avoid this difficult scenario. When Texas gained independence, Great Britain regarded the elimination of slavery in Texas as a condition for recognition of independence, or through the help to gradually convince the Texas Government to abolish slavery. Furthermore, the elimination of slavery in Texas would impact positively on the southern states of the United States, which have close ties to Texas, to promote the fight against slavery here.

Unlike Britain, right at the beginning, the United States goal for Texas was not uniform, even was divided with two views in both South and North. The northern states thought that Texas was a state of slavery, the successful annexation would strengthen the Southern forces, increase the number of states with slavery in the United States, this would lose legislative dominance of the North in Congress (Robert, 1964): "The annexation of Texas would give a preponderance in the Senate in favour of the South, and thereby, afford an ample security against the encroachments of the North, in the representative branch of the Government" (Garrison, 1911). Meanwhile, the southern states had strong support for the annexation, because in addition to strengthening their position, there were a few other reasons. Texas immigrants mainly came from southern states of the United States. Most Texas inhabitants had origins or relation to the United States. After the revolt in Texas, many Americans saw the struggle of the people of Texas as their main struggle (Pastusiak, 1997). In states such as New York, Pennsylvania, many actions took place to express solidarity with the struggle of Texas. Here was also as place for the activities of recruiting volunteers to join the struggle, as well as raising money to support the struggle of people of Texas. They wanted Texas, upon gaining the independence, to merge as the friends returning to the United States. Moreover, originating from southern plantations, people of Texas had experience in farming. Based on this and climatic conditions similar to the southern United States, Texas inhabitants developed cotton and sugar plantations. If Texas gained independence, it would develop into a competitor with the southern states: "Again this government cannot and will not consent to see an independent slave holding community existing contiguous consuming as they will the manufactories of Europe alone and presenting a formidable rivalry to the cotton and sugar growing interest of Louisiana and Mississippi and the whole South" (Great Britain Foreign Office, 1858). In addition, the growing commercial relations between Texas and Great Britain, Texas in the future would break the United States monopoly on the supply of cotton to Great Britain and tariff barriers that the United States has imposed on the goods of Great Britain. Therefore, Texas would reduce the economic and commercial benefits that the United States owned without merging.

Because Texas declared it as an independent state with the existence of slavery, the question of slavery in Texas received a huge interest of the United States. When Texas offered the request for recognition of independence and for admission to the United States, the arguments about the necessity of the annexation of Texas appeared in many southern states, such as Joseph N. Bryan of

Tennessee state, Morris of Ohio, Preston of South Carolina, and Mr. Clay. They all expressed their sympathy with the recognition and annexation of Texas (Smith, 1911). John Calhoun in a speech on May 16, 1836 in front of the Senate proposed the recognition and annexation of Texas immediately. He regarded the annexation as a matter of survival. He also said that Great Britain and France were fighting to abolish slavery in Texas, and if that happened, it would impact the society of the United States (Jenkins, 1857). The southern states believed that if Texas was not merged into the United States and continued to be influenced by Great Britain, Texas in turn would also abolish slavery. A free country on the Southwestern border of the United States would be the place of refuge for slaves escaped from the southern states, would cheer for the uprising of slaves struggle in the South, and would be a storage of unlawful goods imported into the United States. Moreover, the existence of an independent nation, elimination of slavery having the borders with the Southern states would threaten the existence of the social structure here. With the help of Great Britain and France, these countries could expand the boundaries including the Western territory stretching to the Pacific (Turner, 1935). Therefore, the annexation of Texas in the United States was necessary to ensure safety and the future of the United States southern states.

If for Great Britain, commercial factors were considered important to keep Texas independent, prevented the annexation, for the United States, commercial interests are equally meaningful, especially in the southern states. The southern states wanted Texas to merge quickly into the territory of the United States. They said that Great Britain wanted Texas to be a nation dependent on trade while Texas supplied raw cotton and became a place for consuming British products (Jenkins, 1857). Therefore, Great Britain would do everything to control and dominate Texas. Then Great Britain might try to entice the southern states to their economic interests. Once holding the monopoly in controlling sources of raw cotton, Great Britain could build a series of cotton production plants right here. Meanwhile, the products manufactured in Texas would be larger in terms of quantity and lower in terms of prices than Great Britain that Texas could buy through the United States (Garrison, 1911). The result was that the cotton products of the Southern United States were difficult to compete with products made by British producers in Texas. Therefore, the southern states were in favour of the annexation of Texas in order to avoid this.

In addition, another reason for the United States to be interested in Texas is the fear of British intervention. Before the British action against Texas, Andrew Jackson feared that Great Britain would soon intervene in Texas. Since 1837, the rumors were that Mexico would sell Texas to Great Britain to remove up loans up to US\$ 68 million. These rumors were confirmed by M. Johnes, the United States ambassador to Mexico. He also said that the proposal of selling Texas seemed to be passed by the Mexican Congress (Worley, 1905). That made the United States fears for Great Britain's ambitions increase. Why did the United States worry about British intervention in the annexation of Texas? A series of historical events in the relations between the United States and Great Britain in the previous stages answer this problem. The causes for booming American Revolution, the war in 1812, the border dispute between Great Britain and the United States in the Maine and New Brunswick, disputes in matter of Oregon and Canada in 1837. With the previous history, there was no reason by what Great Britain would not intervene in Texas when it had most relevant interests in Mexico and Latin America. If Great Britain could master Mexico, California, Texas and Cuba, Great Britain would control the Gulf of Mexico, Mississippi and trade in the Pacific. If this intention of Great Britain became a reality, the United States would be very vulnerable if there was a war with Great Britain. Andrew Jackson believed that, if Texas gained independence, it would quickly become a province of Great Britain, certainly would form a defense treaty with Great Britain and engage in a war with the United States (Robert, 1964).

On the side of Texas, President David Burnet upon gaining independence appointed Collinworth and Grayson as the representatives to Washington to ask the United States to recognize the independence and learn about the terms necessary for the annexation to the Union (Garrison, 1911). In late 1836, Texas requested for joining the United States territory. This event caused different reactions within the Andrew Jackson administration. Although President Jackson supported the

annexation but he was also very careful (Pastusiak, 1997). The Jackson government feared that, Texas was still in war with Mexico, the annexation of Texas would make war between the United States and Mexico explode (Benton, 1856a). Meanwhile, Jackson himself faced accusations by members of Whig party. They said that Jackson and Houston colluded with each other to merge into a state according to the tendency of Democratic Party into the United States. They considered Texas revolution as part of conspiracy of the slave owners who were looking to seize power through winning more territory with the existence of slavery (DeConde, 1978). Meanwhile, in the North, the movement on abolishing slavery was growing strongly. They feared that accepting one more state with slavery would lose political balance between states with slavery in the South and states without slavery in the North. In addition, Jackson himself and the United States public acknowledged that Texas inhabitants were not homogeneous in components, incapable of managing their problems, the annexation would result in adverse impacts on the United States (Bailey, 1958). David B. Edward described: "The emigrants from the lower sections of the United States, and elsewhere, prefer the level parts of Texas; and those from the highlands, the rolling or mountainous parts: while at the same time each division has its peculiar benefits and its serious evils" (Edward, 1836). Under pressure from many sides, President Jackson rejected the proposal of Texas. However, on March 3, 1837, one day before the end of term, Jackson recognized the independence of the Republic of Texas. People of Texas saw this as a first step toward the annexation, because they believed the North would soon accept the annexation in order to avoid the collapse of the United States (Garrison, 1911). On August 4, 1837, Memucan Hunt, Texas envoy in Washington forwarded to the Van Buren administration the intention of merging, but was refused.

During that time, along with the request for recognition and annexation into the United States, Texas also expressed its wish to receive recognition of independence from Great Britain. R.A. Irion in a directive to J. Pinckney Henderson on June 25, 1837 stated: "The recognition of the independence of the Republic of Texas being the immediate and most important object of your mission you will proceed with the least possible delay to London, for the purpose of submitting this subject to the consideration of His Majesty's Government" (Garrison, 1911). Great Britain initially feared that Texas would soon be merged into the United States. However, in March 1837, the United States only submitted the recognition of independence of Texas but refused the annexation. Before the attitude and views of the United States toward Texas, Great Britain therefore did not hurry in recognizing Texas as an independent nation. Great Britain did not want its own interests in Mexico to be hurt, so it tried to extend the recognition so that Mexico could have the time to be re-merged into Texas. Great Britain gave the view that Great Britain only recognized Texas when Texas received the recognition from Mexico (Garrison, 1911). In addition, Great Britain at this time had to deal with the rebellion in Canada in 1837, so it did not want to recognize Texas immediately. Thus, both Great Britain and the United States at this time cared their private interests and the issue of Canada, but did not care too much about the annexation or keeping Texas independent as in the first place.

After failure to convince the United States on the proposal of annexation, Texas adopted a new policy. In October 1838, President Houston withdrew the proposal of the annexation into the United States and continued to exist in the form of an independent state (Green, 2009). At first, the Republic of Texas faced many difficulties. Texas, despite declaring independence, still was in a war with Mexico; Budget was almost empty, heavily indebted and the threat of aggression back from Mexico. The above situation forced the government of Texas to stand before the choices, which were to continue to seek the annexation into the United States, or to seek re-recognition from the European powers, negotiate the trade agreements and borrow money to serve economic development. This objective was mentioned in the letter of R.A Irion to J. Pinckney Henderson, Ambassador of Texas in Great Britain and France: "It is the desire of the President that you will make the necessary inquiries relative to a Loan, and advise this Government whether it can be effected in Europe" (Great Britain Foreign Office, 1858). The diplomatic representatives of the government of Texas were sent to Europe to negotiate. The treaties were signed respectively with France (1839), the Netherlands (1840) and Great Britain (1840). The Texas government hoped that the expansion of relations with European countries would arouse the intention of accepting the annexation of the United States.

4.3 *The British-American Diplomacy in the Annexation of Texas*

Before the formation of a new relationship between Texas with European countries, especially the relationship with Great Britain, John Tyler once becoming a president of the United States on April 4, 1841 expressed his concern about the issue of Texas, especially after receiving advice from his friend Henry A. Wise on merging Texas as soon as possible. Then, Tyler wrote to Secretary of State, Daniel Webster to ask advice for the annexation of Texas (Smith, 1911). In addition, the rumors of Mexico's Texas recapturing with funding from Great Britain made J. Tyler increasingly anxious. If Texas was conquered by Mexico, the issue of slavery in Texas would also be deleted. The worry of the United States was increasing by a report related to Great Britain's increasing its impact in order to implement the elimination of slavery in Texas. Abel P. Upshur, the United States Secretary of State believed that it was a conspiracy being groomed and British secret for the elimination of slavery in the United States, to protect the cotton and sugar industry in the East and West Indian from competition (Green, 2009). That meant that Great Britain, by all means, was trying to abolish slavery in Texas and prevent the negotiations, treaties on the annexation of Texas into US territory. In correspondences sent to the United States concerning the issue of Texas, Great Britain admitted its ambitions for the elimination of slavery around the world but denied any "secret plans" for its impact in Texas or Mexico (Green, 2009). Thus, the birth of treaty between Great Britain and Texas in late 1840 made the United States believe it. The positive signals about the relationship between Texas, Great Britain, France, threats from the impact of this relationship in Texas and the news about the re-annexation of Texas into Mexico awakened the United States government to restore the intention of annexation of Texas.

From the side of Great Britain, after a period of delay and indecision, on June 28, 1842, Great Britain approved the treaty of friendship and trade with the Republic of Texas. Prior to that, Great Britain appointed Captain Charles Elliot as an ambassador in charge of foreign affairs in Texas. Elliot was an experienced diplomat during the opium wars in China and he particularly concerned about the elimination of slavery. Only a short time after arriving in Texas, on December 16, Elliot wrote to H.U. Addington, a friend of him to present the draft of a support plan of Great Britain for Texas to form an independent state of Texas and ensure the long-term interests of Great Britain (Adam, 1910). He also mentioned the compensation for the slave owners in Texas by the British currency to abolish slavery and the slave trade: "Neither do I doubt that a sufficient loan could be readily raised in England to enable this government to compensate the present slave holders, upon the frank and full adoption of such a system as I have spoken of" (Adam, 1917). He believed that his plan would be accepted and implemented. However, then he did not send it to Aderbeen because he thought that this time was not really appropriate. On December 28, 1842, in another letter written to Addington, Elliot mentioned this plan explicitly and definitely, because he was concerned about the annexation of Texas into the United States from the analysis of President Tyler's message before the Parliament (Adam, 1917). In fact, when Houston took the information about the United States' willingness for annexation, Van Zandt was dispatched to Washington to discuss with J. Tyler about the annexation mentioned before but the government of J. Tyler refused. According to The United States, this time was inappropriate because they are in the process of negotiations of Webster-Ashburton treaty with Great Britain and the relationship between the United States - Mexico at that time was not good. The annexation of Texas would worsen this relationship and further the relationship with Great Britain.

Failure in the proposal of merging into the United States and proposal of tripartite conciliation, Houston continued to approach Elliot to seek the help of Great Britain. Houston presented with Elliot that Texas desired to establish peace with Mexico and received the recognition of the independence from Mexico (Adam, 1917). Elliot wrote a letter urging the British Embassy in Mexico to approach the Mexican government to discuss a peace plan with Texas. This action of Great Britain added further reasons for Tyler to believe that Great Britain had intervening action in the Texas, especially in the elimination of slavery in this country. While the United States government worried about the attitude and actions of Great Britain, at that moment, the southern states were no longer

concerned about the annexation of Texas as before. Even, they also said that the annexation of Texas would be harmful to the old slave states because a large number of slaves would migrate to large tracts of land in Texas. Internal divisions in the United States helped Great Britain find opportunities for the establishment of a free and independent Texas. In the situation of internal divisions of the United States, on January 23, 1843, Thomas Gilmer - a representative from the state of Virginia published a letter referred to the US's Texas annexation before the elimination of slavery of Great Britain here. The United States was urged to act early before Great Britain had a profound impact on Texas inhabitants. This letter had a great impact on American public opinion: "This letter was a clap of thunder in a clear sky. There was nothing in the political horizon to announce or portend it" (Benton, 1856b). Only two days later, in a secret letter of Ashbel Smith, Ambassador of Texas to Great Britain sent to Van Zandt, Ambassador of Texas in Washington stating the growing interest of Great Britain to the issue of Texas (Garrison, 1911). This letter later leaked and had to hand over to Americans (Pastusiak, 1997). The letter also mentioned the formation of an independent state of Texas with the assurance of Great Britain: "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 great" (Garrison, 1911). A. Smith confirmed that the existence of an independent Texas and slavery would be vital for the United States: "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 [...] a free Anglo Saxon State on their southern border and sustained by England, their history would soon be written" (Garrison, 1911). This information could make the United States to accelerate the annexation against the intention of Great Britain in Texas.

In February 1843, Santa Anna, President of Mexico accepted the Robison plan (Adam, 1910). With this plan, Texas would be recognized by Mexico and vice versa Mexico would have a part of sovereignty in Texas. If Texas was recognized by Mexico, this meant that Texas would also abolish slavery because under Mexican law, slavery was not allowed to exist. Santa Anna took the initiative to propose to Elliot and Doyle - British representatives in Texas and Mexican to actively get involved in the impact for Houston to accept this plan. This event, along with the events that happened earlier with the participation of Great Britain caused shock in the United States public opinion on the issue of Texas. The United States suspected the role of Great Britain in this matter but could not have enough evidence to conclude as well as call for the support of the United States in supporting the annexation: "Many Americans, especially President Tyler and his cabinet, were sure of British interference in Texas, but there was still no conclusive proof that could be used against the British, proof that would completely arouse the sentiment of the people for annexation" (Robert, 1964). In the minds of those who supported the annexation in the United States, the Robison plan between Mexico and Texas seemed infeasible. However, on June 15, 1843, President Houston called for Santa Anna for a ceasefire and until July 7, the two sides reached a ceasefire. Once achieved this, Anson Jones acted on behalf of Houston to instruct Van Zandt to stop the annexation with the United States (Garrison, 1911). The sudden change of attitude could be a conspiracy of Houston. But it was enough for the US to worry the deeper intervention of Great Britain into the issue of Texas.

In fact, the agreement reached between Mexico and Texas created a great motivation for Great Britain. Aberdeen wrote to Doyle and also sent a copy of this letter to Elliot in Texas. In the letter, he expressed hope and expectation that Mexico would recognize the independence of Texas (Adam, 1917). Although the United States did not know about the two letters of Aberdeen, A. Upshur, who advocated strongly the annexation, said that Texas had to be merged in order to prevent the intentions of Great Britain. To do that, the United States must convince the Texas to open a negotiation again. However, A. Upshur could not do anything because Van Zandt, Texas ambassador in Washington was instructed not to have any further actions until having the next directive of President Houston. In the letter to William S. Murphy, the United States ambassador in Texas, A. Upshur mentioned that Aberdeen had approved a project to abolish slavery in Texas, the importance of Texas to the United States. He also instructed W. Murphy to find out specifically about the actual situation happening between Mexico and Texas and confirmed that the issue of slavery in Texas

decided the existence or the collapse of the United States (Manning, 1839).

Meanwhile, in August 18, at the British Parliament, debates took place between Mr. Brougham and Aberdeen relating to the benefit of Great Britain for annexation of Texas. He wanted to know the importance of Texas to Great Britain and asked Aberdeen to provide proof documents on the actions that Great Britain conducted in Texas. He said that if the elimination of slavery in Texas was successful, slavery in the Southern United States could be eliminated. However, Aberdeen refused to provide the relevant documents. The refusal of Aberdeen reinforced confidence in the United States that Great Britain made concrete action in implementing the elimination of slavery in Texas.

The consecutive events on attitude and actions of Great Britain towards the issue of Texas forced A. Upshur to contact the Van Zandt on October 16, 1843 to resume the negotiations on the annexation. A. Upshur said that this was the most favorable time for the annexation. The United States was ready to accept the annexation of Texas into the United States and would not have any other objections: "The subject of the annexation of Texas to United States, by treaty, has engaged the serious attention of this government, as well as of a large portion of our people (...) I cannot, as you will readily see, offer any positive assurance that measure would be acceptable to all branches of this government" (Manning, 1839). Meanwhile, the news about the impact of Great Britain in Texas made the U.S supporters of the annexation call for the immediate annexation. However, the plan of merging into the United States was refused by Houston. Houston admitted that, with the help of major powers like Great Britain, France, the benefits of Texas and peace with Mexico was about to achieve results. If Texas was merged into the United States, the powers would stop the reconciliation. At this point, Texas was left alone in the struggle for the recognition of the sovereignty (Garrison, 1911). Houston actions and reactions from the United States public opinion made Aberdeen worried. He said that British efforts were to keep Texas independent and to abolish slavery, but in fact, these actions accelerated the annexation of Texas into the United States rather than hindered the annexation. Aberdeen confirmed that Great Britain had no intention of political impact on the United States, but was only interested in trade and the elimination of slavery in Texas.

Before the refusal of Texas, A. Upshur continued the efforts to reopen negotiation with Texas. The United States made commitments on willingness to offer military support during negotiation of the treaties. This action of the United States gave Great Britain a basis for concern. This negotiation was interrupted because on January 28, 1844, A. Upshur died on the Princeton warship. President J. Tyler immediately appointed John C. Calhoun, whose ideology supported the annexation, as Minister of Foreign Affairs to continue negotiating the treaty on annexation of Texas. Once appointed, John Calhoun announced to British representative in Washington named Mr. Pakenham that the United States had signed a treaty on annexation of Texas. This treaty was signed on April 12, 1844 and would be approved by the Senate 10 days later (Pastusiak, 1997). J. Calhoun wrote to Pakenham to give the view that the United States supported the goal of abolishing slavery within the British colonies, but opposed to Great Britain on putting the pressure to eliminating slavery in Texas and said that that time was inappropriate as the Texas almost achieved to consent in the annexation into the United States. Mr. Pakenham in reply to J. Calhoun on April 19, 1844 confirmed that Great Britain only wanted to abolish slavery in Texas, had no intention of creating the alarms for the United States: "Great Britain has also formally disclaimed the desire to establish in Texas any dominant influence; and, with respect to slavery, she is not conscious of having acted in a sense to case just alarm to the United States" (Bemis, 1951). In reply to Mr. Pakenham, J. Calhoun frankly pointed out that Great Britain should stay out of its internal affairs (Bemis, 1951). After this letter, on June 3, 1844, Aberdeen sent a letter to Mr. Pakenham to placate American public opinion on the elimination of slavery. Accordingly, Britain would not interfere in slavery either directly, or through Mexico or in any other forms. However, at that time the United States was in the US presidential election, so there were many objections to the annexation of Texas. Treaty on the annexation of Texas therefore was rejected by the Senate with a vote of 16-35 (Perkins, 1985).

During the presidential election campaign in the United States, Great Britain's attitude to the issue of merging Texas had important implications. While Great Britain urged Mexico to recognize

the independence of Texas, in the United State, Great Britain's attitude to Texas was rumored by the public opinion to accelerate the annexation. Mr. Pakenham gave advice to Aberdeen that the annexation could be relieved rather than prevented it and waited after the Presidential election. Pakenham hoped that, Henry Clay, who opposed to the annexation of Texas would win the election, the annexation would be resolved more calmly (Adam, 1910).

In 1844, both Great Britain and the United States were waiting for the results of presidential election. The results of this election were crucial to the annexation of Texas. Presidential candidate representing the Whig Party, Henry Clay opposed the annexation of Texas, saying that it would lead to a war with Mexico. While the Democratic Party declared that their background of election policies was merging Texas and Oregon. James K. Polk was chosen as the Presidential candidate of the Democratic Party because he had the thought of expanding territory, supporting the annexation and the belief in the obvious mission theory (Pastusiak, 1997). The issue of Texas had a significance in the election campaign and contributed to the victory of James K. Polk because supporters of the annexation believed that the victory of J. Polk would accelerate the annexation of Texas (McCormac, 1922). J. Polk's victory in the election was almost crucial to the annexation of Texas. Meanwhile, in July 1844, France refused to intervene in the issue of Texas because of the thought that France's commercial interests would be more secure if Texas belonged to the United States rather than Great Britain. At that time, Great Britain realized that Great Britain itself could neither prevent the issue of annexation, nor conduct a war with the United States. By the end of 1844, Aberdeen basically accepted the failure in preventing the United States from merging into Texas. However, this acceptance was only temporary, because in January 1845, Aberdeen further announced that Mexico was ready to recognize Texas. In January 23, Aberdeen wrote to Elliot to instruct the intermediate activity to connect Great Britain, France and Mexico relating to the issue of Texas (Adam, 1917). Eliot's efforts to get a treaty of Mexico on the recognition of Texas was refused by the Texas Senate staff. Also at this time, on December 29, 1845, President James K. Polk approved resolutions of the Parliament accepting the annexation of Texas into the United States. On February 27, 1846, Texas was formally merged into the United States (Smith, 1911). The conflict between the United States and Great Britain on the issue of annexation of Texas officially ended. Texas became part of the United States after more than 9 years of existence as an independent nation.

5. Conclusion

The success in the annexation of Texas into the United States bankrupted the conspiracy of Great Britain in forming a buffer country to prevent the expansion of the territory of the United States, creating favourable opportunities for the United States to resolve the issue of Oregon territory with Great Britain in 1846. At the same time, this event was also a victory of the United States before abolitionists of Great Britain, protected the interests of the southern states of the United States. Besides, the annexation of Texas into the United States had many different meanings. This event expanded the United States territory to the Southwest with the fertile land to serve agricultural production, met the land needs of elite slave owners in the Southern United States. However, the Texas event also increased the conflict between North and South of the United States concerning the issue of slavery. Consequently, the long conflicts which could not be resolved were the causes of civil war in the United States (1861-1865). In addition, this event also increased the conflict between the United States and Mexico. After this event, Mexico announcement relating to the severance of diplomatic relationship and along with California event caused a war between the United States and Mexico (1846-1848).

6. Acknowledgment

This research is funded by Vietnam National Foundation for Science and Technology Development (NAFOSTED) under grant number 601.02-2020.303.

References

- Adam, E. D. (1910). *British Interests and Activities in Texas, 1838-1846*. The Texas State Historical Association.
- Adam, E. D. (1912). Lord Ashburton and the Treaty of Washington. *The American Historical Review*, 17(4), 764–782.
- Adam, E. D. (1917). *British Diplomatic Correspondence Concerning the Republic of Texas, 1838-1846*. Texas State Historical Association.
- Allen, H. C. (1955). *Great Britain and the United States: A History of Anglo-American Relations (1783-1952)*. St. Martin's Press.
- Bailey, T. A. (1958). *A Diplomatic History of the American People*. Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Baker, C. W. D. (1873). *A Brief History of Texas*. A. S. Barnes & Company.
- Bemis, S. F. (1951). *A Diplomatic History of the United States*. Henry Holt and Company.
- Benton, T. (1856a). *Proposed Annexation of Texas: Mr. Preston's Motion and Speech: Extracts, [in:] Thirty Years View: A History of the Working of the American Government for Thirty Years. From 1820 to 1850*.
- Benton, T. (1856b). *Thirty Years View: A History of the Working of the American Government for Thirty Years. From 1820 to 1850 (Vol. 2)*. Kessinger Publishing.
- Chapman, C. E. (1918). *A History of Spain*. The Macmillan Company.
- Clark, C. R. (1907). The Beginnings of Texas, 1684-1718. *Bulletin of the University of Texas*.
- Coffin, A. F. (1847). *A New History of Texas*. G. Conelin.
- Copy of the Treaty with Spain for preventing the Slave trade, 23rd September, 1817.* (1818). <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1818/jan/28/copy-of-the-treaty-with-spain-for>
- Declaration of the People of Texas, in General Convention Assembled in 1835.* (1835). <https://tarltonapps.law.utexas.edu/constitutions/dpt1835>
- DeConde, A. (1978). *A History of American Foreign Policy, Vol I: Growth to World Power 1700 -1914*. Charles Scribner Sons.
- Edward, D. B. (1836). *The History of Texas: The Emigrant's and Politian's Guide to the character, climate, soil and productions of that country: Geographically arranged from personal observation and experience*. J. A. James & Co.
- Garrison, G. (1911). *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas (Vol. 3)*. Palala Press.
- Great Britain Foreign Office. (1858). *British and Foreign State Papers, 1840-1842 (Vol. 30)*. Great Britain Foreign Office.
- Green, J. M. (2009). *Relations between United States and Great Britain, 1776-1915*. University of Michigan Library.
- Jackson, A. (1829). *First Annual Message*. <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/first-annual-message-3>
- Jenkins, J. S. (1857). *The Life of John Caldwell Calhoun*. Alden & Beardsley.
- Kaufman, W. (2005). *Britain and the Americas: Culture, Politics, and History*. ABC-CLIO.
- Law for Promoting Colonization in the State of Coahuila and Texas, March 24, 182.* (1825). <http://www.texaslaveryproject.org/sources/LawsOfTexas/display.php?f=TSP0133.xml>
- Louis, W. J. (1924). *History of Texas. From Wilderness to Commonwealth (Vol. 1)*. Wortham-Molyneaux Co.
- Maillard, N. D. (2011). *The History of the Republic of Texas. From the discovery of the country to the present time*. Nabu Press.
- Manning, W. R. (1839). *Diplomatic correspondence of the United States Inter-American Affairs, 1831-1860 (Vol. 12)*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Mccormac, E. I. (1922). *James K. Polk. A Political Biography*. University of California Press.
- Mooroe, J. B. (1898). *History and Digest of the International Arbitrations to which the US has been a party*. Government Printing Office.
- Mowat, R. B. (1925). *The Diplomatic Relations of Great Britain and the United States*. Longmans, Green & Co.
- Nelson, R. E. (1964). *Britain and the Annexation of Texas, with Particular Reference to the Slavery Question (1836-1845)*. 1964.
- Pastusiak, L. (1997). *Diplomacy of the United States in the XVIII and XIX centuries*. Adam Marszałek.
- Perkins, B. (1964). *Castlereagh and Adams: England and the United States, 1812-1823*. University of California Press.
- Perkins, B. (1985). *The Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations: Vol. I: The Creation of a Republican Empire, 1776-1865*. Cambridge University Press.
- Robert, E. N. (1964). *Britain and the annexation of Texas, with particular reference to the slavery question (1836-1845)*. The University of Montana.
- Sang, N. V. (2017). The question of Oregon in British-American relations, 1818–1846. *Koło Historii*, 21, 43–58.
- Sang, N. V. (2018a). The British-American Diplomacy in Searching for the Northeast Boundary in Maine and New Brunswick, 1820-1846. *Annals of the University of Craiova. History*, 2(34), 35–48.
- Sang, N. V. (2018b). The Caroline Affair and the Diplomatic Crisis between Great Britain and the United States, 1837–1841. *Prawo i Polityka*, 8, 73–83.

- Sang, N. V. (2019a). The Reconstruction of the British—American relations: From the American Revolutionary War to the War of 1812. *UED Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities and Education*, 9(05), 50–58.
- Sang, N. V. (2019b). *The Relations between the United States and Great Britain from Monroe doctrine to the American-Mexican war, 1823-1846*. University of Lodz.
- Sang, N. V. (2021). *The British-American Relations from the Monroe Doctrine to American-Mexican War (1823-1846) [Quan hệ Anh-Mỹ từ học thuyết Monroe đến chiến tranh Mỹ—Mexico, (1823-1846)]*. The gioi.
- Sang, N. V., & Daszynska, J. A. (2020). The problem of the abolition of slavery and maritime rights on U.S. vessels with regards to British-American relations in the first half of the 19th century. *Przełqd Nauk Historycznych/Review of Historical Sciences*, 19(02), 105–139.
- Sang, N. V., Trang, L., & Phuong, N. T. M. (2021). Aroostook War in the British-American Diplomacy in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century. *World Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 7(1), 18–22.
- Slavery in Texas, 05 August 1836*. (1836). <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1836/aug/05/slavery-in-texas>
- Smith, J. H. (1911). *The Annexation of Texas*. The Baker and Taylor Co. *Telegraph and Texas Register*, November 2, 1836. (1836). <http://www.texasslaveryproject.org/sources/TTR/display.php?f=TSP0120.xml>
- The Constitution of the Mexican United States in 1824*. (1824). <http://www.tamu.edu/faculty/ccbn/dewitt/consti1824.htm>
- The Texas Declaration of Independence: March 2, 1836*. (1836). http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/texdec.asp
- Turner, F. J. (1935). *The United States, 1830-1850: The nation and its sections*. Henry Holt and Company.
- Wharton, C. R. (1922). *The Republic of Texas. A Brief of Texas from the First American Colonies in 1821 to Annexation*. Nabu Press.
- Worley, L. J. (1905). The Diplomatic Relations of England and the Republic of Texas. *The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association*, 9(1), 1–40.