



IT'S EASIER TO FOOL PEOPLE THAN CONVINCING THEM THAT THEY HAVE BEEN FOOLED...MARK TWAIN

Slavery was a long-established but an aged and decrepit institution clearly in its death throes, so what was the real driving force behind the Civil War?

After all, thousands of slaves had already been freed in the South before the War. And on the eve of the Industrial Revolution, Slavery, even in the antebellum South, had much less to do with the Civil War than a growing financial concern in the North over the prospect of massive decreases in tariff revenue from a South eager to go it alone. "Save the Union," went the slogan, but it could have been "Save the Union's Cash Cow." the attitude these days on the part of a society whose opinions on history (if considered at all) have largely been formed by Hollywood movie studios. At the time, however, many foreign nations knew very well that the invasion of the South at Fort Sumter in 1861 was certainly not motivated by the North's moral indignation over Slavery.

The sticking point in all this, of course, is the certain double standard whereby America's secession from British rule must be considered by all patriots as a divinely ordained event in the history of all mankind while the South's effort to do essentially the same with respect to Northern rule must be forever regarded a defiant act of diabolical rebellion. Where is the logic? There is none, which is why most Americans simply accept the federal government's official version of the facts, and conclude that the Civil War must have been a consequence of the North's keen sense of moral outrage in the face of grotesque human rights violations in the South.