

“Lincoln won the war.” assess this statement

He won the war because

He was clever

He was neutral

He lost the war because

Resources won the war

He was slow to act against southern secession

Lincoln won the war because of his cleverness and neutrality, but some may argue that it was, in actuality, Northern resources won the war and he was slow to act meaningfully against southern aggressors, and caused much unnecessary bloodshed.

The most important reason that Lincoln truly “won” the war is because he was clever. Throughout the entirety of the civil war, Lincoln specifically referred to the South as a “belligerence” and didn’t use the word “blockade” when discussing the eventual Anaconda plan: which would work by surrounding the South (by land and sea) with infantry to “strangle” the South; this exemplifies the clever nature of Lincoln, whether it be by the pen or the sword, he was willing to go to nearly unnatural lengths to secure the eventual unification of the United States of America. Additionally, Lincoln also utilized his presidential powers to sign off a “war document” that turned out to be the Emancipation Proclamation, which would’ve gone against the constitution if it was passed during a time of peace. This highlights the clever nature of Lincoln; it could be referred to as a “moral ambiguity”, something that the South completely lacked and Lincoln took full advantage of to win the war. When weighing the importance of Lincoln’s cunning nature as a war strategist and presidential leader, no other factor, whether it be wealth or strength, could outlast the cleverness of Lincoln in winning the war.

Second to Lincolns clever nature, the neutrality of Lincoln is a less important designation of what won the war. When dealing with the British, Lincoln was fully aware that the British were sending supplies to the South (as well as the North), but neglected to do anything about it simply to cull any possible conflict that would arise in the case that he did step in. The South had very little industrialization compared to the North, so the slow supplying of weapons and supplies from the British made up for that deficit. Upon examining these statements, it can be revealed that the passive nature (not to be confused with ignorance) of Abraham Lincoln caused as little casualties as possible (on both sides) and ultimately ended with the success of the North. Furthermore, Lincoln didn’t directly oppose slavery; a standpoint that garnered much controversy, but, he cited the Constitution in his reasoning, saying that it would go against the Constitution to abolish slavery without amending it first. Upon examination, it can be inferred from the prior statement, that Lincoln meticulously planned his agenda around the idea that the final goal of the war was ultimately unity, not division; by doing so, he won both the physical and the moral war. When weighing the importance of Lincoln’s neutrality in terms of winning the war, it was clearly a large portion of his victory, but not nearly as important as his clever nature.

However, one could argue the idea that Lincoln truly didn't win the war. The upmost important reason that Lincoln didn't win the war, is because the Northern resources enormously outweighed any potential infringement that the South could ever hope to cause in defending their beliefs. Lincolns army, the Union, was far larger (in terms of infantry) than the south, not only in terms of able-bodied men, but industrialization as well. Lincolns part in the war was vastly overshadowed by quantitative prowess alone, which exemplifies the prior by documenting the false moral superiority imposed by the North, something that meant nothing when discussing soldiers and steel. Additionally, Lincolns side had a much higher global domestic export profit than the South, with that, the prior plan of the North to stockpile cotton; something that inevitably crippled the South as it was their main export in terms of goods. The previous facts investigate the correlation between Northern resources and their capacity to win the war, something that is vastly important when deciphering the true "winners" of the war, which inevitably fall to resources. When gauging the importance of Northern resources, the correlation is quite clear: Northern steel annihilated Southern esteem and values, in this case the pen was not mightier than the sword, for the sword transformed into a musket with a rifled barrel.

As a less important denomination, Lincoln didn't truly win the war simply because the South was able to secede and bloodshed was allowed to occur. Before the process of the Civil War even began, there was a event known as the Nashville Convention: something that called together representatives from the southern states and discussed possible intentions of secession. Presently speaking, South Carolina was the first state to seceded after a series of local electoral representatives came together and voted on the process of secession, which resulted in 169-0 for secession of South Carolina. The prior factual evidence alludes to the moral viewpoint, (something that Lincoln is very familiar with) that he lost the war before it even started; one could argue that the allowance of conflict, and ultimately, the Civil War showed that there were no "winners". The mass number of casualties resulting from the numerous battles (Antietam, Gettysburg, etc.) is evidence that both sides truly lost, for those fallen soldiers couldn't care less as to the outcome of the war; the United States was permanently dealt a devastating blow. When weighing the importance of the winning of the war, the topic of Lincolns non-existent interruption of the secession showed his true colors: one that was willing to let people die for something that wouldn't conclude until years after.