

Some Real Reasons For The War Of Northern Aggression

By Al Benson Jr. On March 8, 2010 at 12:34 AM

By Al Benson Jr.

For much longer than I have been alive we have been getting phony "history" and, therefore, much erroneous comment about what the War of Northern Aggression was all about. I've read reams of screed by so-called "newspaper columnists" who rant and rave that "The South seceded so she could keep her slaves." Hogwash! The South could have kept her slaves had she stayed in the Union. No one was trying to outlaw slavery in Dixie, so that's not what the war was about.

Others have claimed the South committed treason when the Southern states seceded. More hogwash. After keeping Jeff Davis in jail as a political prisoner for two years the North could not come up with enough credible evidence to try him for treason. Even the Yankee politicians admitted among themselves that secession was not treason. And it was not a "civil war" either. A civil war is two opposing factions fighting for the control of one country. The South did not wish to take over Washington--they just wanted to leave in peace and go their own way.

Rev. Steve Wilkins of Auburn Ave. Presbyterian Church in Monroe, Louisiana has noted that: "There were numerous causes of the War (least of all was slavery). The theological declension that occurred during the first half of the 19th century laid the foundation." The North and South had basic theological differences as the South tended toward a revival of the Reformation faith that this country was established on while the North seemed bent on pursuing the rampant apostasy of the Unitarians, spiritualists, feminists, and, yes, Marxists. The theological differences are something that are almost never discussed in "historical circles." Several years ago C. Gregg Singer, who received his PhD. From the University of Pennsylvania wrote an excellent book called *A Theological Interpretation of American History* in which he documented the growing theological differences between the two regions. This is probably the reason least mentioned for the cause of the War. Politically correct "historians" are uncomfortable discussing religion unless it is their own (humanism).

Pastor Wilkins also noted the problem with tariffs--something else the historians would rather not mention, although they will deal with it grudgingly if forced to. We need to force them to. In his book *The South Under Siege 1830-2000* author Frank Conner noted that Northern manufacturers wanted to overprice their goods "...in the firm knowledge that the competing low-priced British goods--with the tariffs added--would then be more expensive than theirs...Second, the Southerners bought most of the manufactured goods imported from Britain, largely because they sold most of their cotton to Britain; thus--by paying the tariff--the Southerners paid most of the costs of running the US government...and all of the Southern states were paying about 85% of the cost of running the federal government. By increasing the tariff rates, the North could force the South to pay most of the costs of the US government's industrialization program--a program which would benefit the North tremendously, and the South not at all." Talking about a little "redistribution of the wealth here? Such a deal! The Yankee Marxist mindset in action!

The North wanted to use Federal funds for their "internal improvements" program, and for subsidies for private businesses. Does this sound familiar? And you thought it started with Bush. These efforts at the corporate adultery of government and big Northern business were often stymied by Southerners in Congress, aided by conservative Northern Democrats, because they were, blatantly unconstitutional. They still are but that doesn't matter anymore.

The Northern view of the country, with Unitarian and socialist influence, was that the central government in Washington should be increasingly more powerful while the states should be satisfied to become mere vassals to the collectivist leviathan. This didn't set well with most Southerners, who held to a strict constructionist view of the Constitution--meaning that the Federal government should deal only with those areas delegated (not surrendered) to it and should stay out of everything else. Such an anachronistic position simply had to be dealt with because the South was holding up the "progress" (which they had paid for) of the rest of the country.

Pastor Wilkins has also noted that: "The more radical element (in the North) were desirous of removing the one barrier to the progressive consolidation of power with the central State authority. The destruction of the South would give them the liberty they needed to establish this change in the structure and philosophy of the national government."

They wanted Lincoln in office then just as they want Obama in office today, because both of these men were (and are) willing to take the leftist position of what government should be doing. Both share the same collectivist mindset and both have sought to take the federal government far to the left of where it ought to be. The Marxist-influenced Lincoln was the same as the Marxist Obama is. Had Lincoln not been successful in his day we probably would not have Obama to deal with today.

Pastor Wilkins summed up by saying that: "Perhaps no war changed out nation like this war--especially in the size, reach, and role of the Federal Government. Behind the army and this massive bureaucracy stood a vastly transformed office of President with authoritarian power over almost every aspect of life in this Union."

I hate to disappoint the court "historians" (not really) but on a list of ten reasons the War was fought, slavery might have been #9 on a good day.

<http://www.cakewalkblogs.com/antiestablishmenthistory/some-real-reasons-war-northern-aggression.aspx>