

sue and bones. Cellulose is an inert carbohydrate produced in the cell walls of plants. "Collagen and cellulose casings are newcomers in the artificial casings field," the website explains, but natural casings are "still the preferred choice among discriminating sausage chefs everywhere."

In America, the most popular sausage is the "frankfurter" or "wiener," indispensable to Independence Day celebrations. Many innovations in the original recipe were introduced in the 20th century, including the use of turkey or chicken instead of pork, largely because of increasing health awareness (though poultry-stuffed hot dogs have, on more than one occasion, been traced to outbreaks of salmonella and *E. coli*). Modern ingredients also include a long list of "additives." One additive, though, is original: nitrate, a preservative which gives modern hot dogs a common flavor, color, and texture. Nitrates have been used for centuries to combat botulism.

About 20 years ago, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration commissioned a study by the National Academy of Sciences, which concludes that the only negative result of ingesting nitrate is a digestive-reaction product called "nitrosamines." The benefits far outweigh the detriments of nitrate, which occurs naturally in carrots and green vegetables. Nitrate also helps in blood clotting and healing wounds and burns and is said to boost immunity in combating tumor cells. (On the other hand, before the FDA was established, another common "additive" to several types of meat products, including wieners, was sawdust.)

The origin of the modern-day "weenie" is German or Austrian. "Frankfurter" comes from Frankfurt, Germany, which celebrated the 500th anniversary of the famous sausage's invention a few years ago. The Viennese claim the "wiener" as well as, of course, the Vienna sausage.

The proliferation of hot dogs on the North American continent is generally credited to German immigrant entrepreneurs of the late-19th century. Its emergence as a national dish, however, probably dates from 1902, when the first hot dog was sold at a New York Giants baseball game. Baseball was the national pastime, passionately followed by most Americans. It was easy to extend this nationalistic fervor to hot dogs.

The early Church is said to have declared the eating of sausages sinful, be-

cause of the casing's Luperalian roots. Emperor Constantine the Great also banned the sausage. It may have been a sin as well as attempt to pass sawdust off as meat in the hot dogs of the early 20th century; it was certainly an action worthy of correction by the FDA. The agency's banning of pig blood in red *boudin*, however, is generally deplored in Cajun country.

It would have been much worse, however, if the main ingredient of the delicacy had been condemned: rice, a food that currently feeds much of the world. Rice has had an enormous impact on virtually every society on the globe since its cultivation began at least 12,000 years ago in Asia. It has also had an enormous impact on the politics of United States, including the War Between the States.

South Carolina was the first state with a vibrant rice-based economy. It was also the first to agitate for secession after Abraham Lincoln and his Republican Party came to power. On December 20, 1860, six Georgetown, South Carolina, rice growers met in Charleston with representatives from throughout the state and signed an "Ordinance of Secession." The elite society there was known as the "Rice Culture." The plantation owners declared a "Planters' War for Southern Independence." Other states followed the Rice Culture's lead.

Scholars at the International Rice Research Institute believe rice began spreading across the Himalayas to China two to three million years ago, when migration of fauna across the mountain range was still possible. The animals brought wild rice, depositing it in neat packets of fertilizer. The climate of Central Asia and northern China proved ideal for the cultivation of rice.

In many of the dialects of Asia, the words for "rice" and "food" are synonymous. Hindu and Buddhist holy writings frequently mention rice, and both religions make use of the grain as an offering to the gods. However, rice is not mentioned in either the Old Testament or early Egyptian records.

Archeological evidence has established that rice was an important food in the Mohenjo-Daro culture of the Indus Valley, in what is now western India and Pakistan, as early as 2500 B.C. It was also an important food source in the late Neolithic period of the Yangtze Basin of China. In 1966, pottery shards carbon-dated from at least 4000 B.C. were found in the Korat region of Thailand with imprints of rice grains and husks. Other

plant remains dating from 10,000 B.C. were discovered in Spirit Cave on the Thailand-Myanmar border.

The latest figures from the World Health Organization indicate that there are still 800 million hungry people on the planet. Thus, Steinbeck's qualification in *Travels With Charley* may prove to be more valid and compelling than his nostalgia. Today, just as it was 35,000 years ago on the frigid European continent, the real value of cuisine is human survival rather than good taste.

Chris Segura, a journalist, novelist, and short-story writer, writes from his hometown of Abbeville, Louisiana.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

Lincoln and the Death of the Old Republic

by Joseph E. Fallon

Official history venerates Abraham Lincoln as an apostle of American democracy who waged war on the South to preserve the Union and free the slaves. Official history is a lie.

Lincoln was a dictator who destroyed the Old Republic and replaced the federal principles of 1789 with the ideological foundations of today's welfare/warfare state. His administration was characterized by paranoia, a lust for power, and rampant corruption. The magnitude of that paranoia was evidenced by Lincoln's secretary of war, Edwin M. Stanton, who declared that "Every department of the Government was paralyzed by treason." "Traitors" were to be found

in the Senate, in the House of Representatives, in the Cabinet, in the Federal Courts . . . Treason was flagrant in the revenue and in the post-office service, as well as in the Territorial governments and in the judicial reserves.

In his bid for absolute power, Lincoln used "treason" as a pretext to unleash war and shred the Constitution. Freedom of the press was curtailed. The *Chicago Times* was one of over 300 Northern

newspapers suppressed for expressing “incorrect” views. As late as May 18, 1864, Lincoln ordered his military to “arrest and imprison . . . the editors, proprietors and publishers of the *New York World* and the *New York Journal of Commerce*.”

Lincoln suspended *habeas corpus*. He criminalized speech and legalized arbitrary arrests. Twenty thousand political prisoners were held incommunicado and denied legal counsel. Maryland’s legislature was overthrown, and New York City was placed under military occupation.

In his December 1861 lectures in Boston and New York City, Northern abolitionist Wendell Phillips declared that “We live today, every one of us, under martial law. The Secretary of State puts into his bastille, with a warrant as irresponsible as that of Louis XIV, any man whom he pleases.”

Lincoln’s war against the South was not to preserve the Union from treasonous secessionists. Lincoln himself had championed the right of secession. In a speech before Congress on the Mexican-American War, he declared that “Any people anywhere being inclined and having the power have the right to rise up and shake off the existing government, and form a new one that suits them better.”

Nor did Lincoln wage war against the South to emancipate black slaves. In his First Inaugural Address, on March 4, 1861, Lincoln emphatically declared: “I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so.”

On September 11, 1861, Lincoln countermanded General Fremont’s order freeing the slaves in Missouri. And on May 19, 1862, he countermanded General Hunter’s order emancipating the slaves in Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina. On August 22, 1862, Lincoln wrote to Horace Greeley, declaring:

If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that.

With the demise of the Confederacy nowhere in sight, however, Lincoln changed his position on emancipation. On September 13, 1862, Lincoln ex-

plained to a visiting delegation of clergy the purpose of his forthcoming Emancipation Proclamation: “I view this matter as a practical war measure, to be decided on according to the advantages or disadvantages it may offer to the suppression of the rebellion.”

That the Emancipation Proclamation was “a practical war measure” can be seen in the fact that it did not free a single slave within the jurisdiction of the Union. The proclamation only declared that “all persons held as slaves within any State, or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforth, and forever free.” Slavery remained legally protected in those slave states that stayed loyal to the Union—Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, and West Virginia—and in those portions of the Confederacy under Union occupation.

The Emancipation Proclamation was an act of military desperation designed to realize two goals. Lincoln hoped, first, to dissuade the British and the French governments from intervening militarily on behalf of the South. As Lincoln noted, the Emancipation Proclamation “would help us in Europe, and convince them that we are incited by something more than ambition.” Second, Lincoln hoped to incite slaves to murder defenseless white women and children on the farms and in the cities of the Confederacy in the expectation that the Confederate army would disintegrate as soldiers abandoned the field to return home to save the lives of their families. Lincoln justified this goal by asserting:

. . . I have a right to take any measure which may best subdue the enemy; nor do I urge objections of a moral nature, in view of possible consequences of insurrection and massacre at the South.

In issuing his Emancipation Proclamation as an incitement for a race war, Lincoln was continuing his policy of violating both the Constitution and international law. Food and medicine had already been declared contraband. Later, Lincoln issued “Instructions for the Government of Armies of the United States in the Field” (General Orders, No. 100, 1863), authorizing starvation and bombardment of Southern women and children.

Since the Emancipation Proclama-

tion was “a practical war measure,” its enforcement was determined by whether it advanced Lincoln’s war effort. As a consequence, when Lincoln’s Army arrived, “freed” Southern slaves often found themselves re-enslaved under the fiction of a one-year work contract. They could suffer a loss of pay or rations for acts of laziness, disobedience, or insolence and had to obtain a pass to leave the plantation. Provost marshals ensured that they displayed “faithful service, respectful deportment, correct discipline and perfect subordination.”

Other “freed” Southern slaves found themselves forced to build installations and fortifications for Lincoln’s Army or were violently conscripted.

In a May 1862 report, Secretary of the Treasury Salmon Chase was advised that

The negroes were sad . . . Sometimes whole plantations, learning what was going on, ran off to the woods for refuge . . . This mode of [enlistment by] violent seizure is repugnant.

As late as February 7, 1865, Lincoln wrote to Lieutenant Colonel Glenn, operating in Kentucky: “Complaint is made to me that you are forcing negroes into the military service, and even torturing them.”

In *The Plundering Generation*, Ludwell H. Johnson summarized the real reasons for Lincoln’s violent opposition to the South’s independence:

Manufacturers feared the loss of American markets to a flood of cheap British goods pouring through a free-trade Confederacy; Northern shippers feared the loss of their monopoly of the coasting trade and their share of the trans-Atlantic carrying trade; merchants feared the loss of the profits they garnered as middlemen between the South and Europe; creditors feared the loss of Southern debts; the Old Northwest feared the loss or curtailment of the Mississippi trade; the Republicans feared the disintegration of their party should it let the South go and bring upon the North all of the consequences just mentioned.

Lincoln waged war on the South, however, to achieve more than preservation of the *status quo*. War was the means to

establish the North's hegemony over the political and economic life of the United States. War offered Lincoln, his party, and Northern special interests a continental empire to exploit. And they did so with ruthless abandon.

In the North, Lincoln's Congress imposed excise taxes on virtually all items; raised the protective tariff to the highest level in the country's history (under the Morrill Act of 1861); issued paper currency (Legal Tender Act of 1862); awarded Northern railroad companies government loans and extensive land grants (Pacific Railway Act of 1862); unilaterally repealed Indian land claims; promoted settlement of Western lands by Northerners (Homestead Act of 1862); effectively "nationalized" the country's financial institutions (National Banking Acts of 1863 and 1864); and furnished Northern businesses with cheap labor (Contract Labor Law of 1864).

In the South, Congress authorized the theft of tens, if not hundreds, of millions of dollars worth of Southern property (Confiscation Acts of 1861 and 1862, Direct Tax Act of 1862, and Captured and Abandoned Property Act of 1863). The cotton, alone, that the North stole has been conservatively valued at \$100 million.

This legalized robbery was in addition to the plundering by Lincoln's Army. In December 1864, Sherman wrote, "I estimate the damage done to the State of Georgia . . . at \$100,000,000; at least \$20,000,000 of which has inured to our advantage, and the remainder is simple waste and destruction."

With Lincoln came the wholesale corruption of the political system. In 1864, Edward Bates, Lincoln's attorney general, lamented that "the demoralizing effect of this civil war is plainly visible in every department of life. The abuse of official powers and thirst for dishonest gain are now so common that they cease to shock."

As Henry S. Olcott, special investigator for the U.S. War and Navy Departments, revealed in *The War's Carnival of Fraud* (1878), "at least twenty, if not twenty-five, percent of the entire expenditures of the government during the Rebellion, were tainted with fraud." Later estimates put the level of fraud involving Army contracts at 50 percent.

Such institutional corruption defines the post-constitutional America that Lincoln created. The destruction of the Old Republic ensured the entrenchment of a permanent kleptocracy. That is Lin-

coln's legacy. Since 1861, the United States has had a government of special interests, by special interests, and for special interests, dedicated to the proposition that their power and profits "shall not perish from the earth."

Joseph E. Fallon writes from Rye, New York.

COMMUNITY

Buy Local

by Steve Berg

There seems to be a common theme in modern libertarian thought that stresses the merits of giant corporate enterprises, claiming that they are infinitely superior to smaller, less capitalized, local businesses. One article that I read extolled the virtues of chain bookstores *versus* their benighted independent "competition." My interest here is personal: I work part-time at the last remaining local independent bookstore in DeKalb, Illinois, which is now going out of business. When I realized that I needed a break from my research, could use some additional spending money, and wanted to enjoy the company of intelligent, literate people, my first choice was to work at my favorite bookstore. Now, a major bookstore chain has moved here, and the city has announced that the new store will get government subsidies through a special taxing district. My employer has never been subsidized.

I have been a customer at this local bookstore virtually since it first opened its doors. I have also happily spent my meager funds in the other locally owned and operated stores and restaurants that have graced my favorite town for many years. I realize, of course, that the independent merchants do not offer the huge selection found at the chain stores. Local vendors' prices are generally higher as well. So how is it that I, a seasoned graduate of the Mises University, am so obtuse as to choose not to optimize my utility by buying my goodies at the lowest possible price?

With all due respect to those tainted by Jacobinism, who think that "Economic Man" is an actual human being and a role model for us all, I perceive that there are other costs associated with focusing

merely on the stated prices for goods and services. For example: A relative of mine lives in a small, rural Iowa town. He is increasingly concerned about the declining viability of its downtown business district. Yet, whenever there is some shopping to be done, he hops into his luxury car and speeds to the Wal-Mart in a nearby town. My father has chided him for this. If he does not patronize local merchants, how can he expect locally owned businesses to survive, much less prosper?

Supporting local businesses is a value, as is buying for the lowest possible price. I have noticed that, despite my rigorous professional training in value-free public administration, my fellow municipal bureaucrats still believe that keeping a town prosperous is a worthy goal, even if only to keep the income stream from sales taxes flowing into the municipal coffers. Economic Man believes that the lowest possible purchase price optimizes the utility of everyone. If this means that local endeavors fall by the wayside and are crushed by larger corporations, then, by the iron laws of Business Darwinism, that is just fine and dandy.

Community Man, however, takes a different view. He recognizes that money spent at a chain store tends to leave town as fast as most bank robbers. Local merchants may be a greedy lot, but they have roots in the community and a vested interest in its overall health. Management personnel at chain stores, on the other hand, are transferred frequently. I suspect that this is done deliberately so that the seeds of community never manage to sprout in them and they develop loyalty to their corporate masters, not to their neighbors in the places they briefly live during their transitory careers. For these managers, the towns and cities where they reside during their travels tend to blur together.

While traveling in central Texas a few years back, I was bypassing Dallas-Fort Worth on the interstate highway. Suddenly, it struck me: The place looked vaguely familiar. How could this be? I had not driven there before. Then it became obvious: The billboards along the highway, the architecture of the buildings, and even the landscaping all looked the same there as they do in northern California, urban Colorado, eastern Massachusetts, the lower Hudson Valley in New York, or the Yuppie Belt surrounding Chicago.

During my thankfully brief fling with