

---

Subject: Re: if the south won the civil war

Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Mon, 22 Oct 2007 02:30:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

sadukar09 wrote on Sun, 21 October 2007 17:39 Most likely because he ask stupid questions. (see what he posted earlier too if you don't believe me )

The south had less factories to produce the stuff needed for the war. It also had less population, the North Navy was also doing a blockage. So in NO WAY South would've EVER won.

Dude, read "How Few Remain", it shows how close the South was in winning the war at certain points in the conflict. The drop of a package by a Confederate messenger let McClellan see Lee's order of battle before Antietam allowing him to put resources where they needed to thus ending Lee's first invasion of the North. But if the message was picked up by Confederates instead of Union soldiers the whole tide of history could have been turned.

The points you just stated sound almost word for word what I am being taught in my college history class. But just because you have more resources and men does not make you an automatic victor, history has proven it time and time again. (the Graeco-Persian Wars, Vietnam, Afghanistan, Germania) Its more about a country's will and determination to pull the trigger than it is about the quantity of triggers there are to pull.

In my opinion the South lost by a small margin because of the political loses it suffered in the battles of Antietam and Gettysburg. These battles made Europe turn away from helping the South and allowed Lincoln to recover his image and popularity and thus to continue the war.

---