

The Nebraska Independent.

Consolidation of The Wealthmakers and The Lincoln Independent.

VOL. XI.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, OCTOBER 19, 1899.

NO. 23.

THE JUDGES

From the Time of Socrates to the Imprisonment of the Miners in Idaho they have shed the Blood of the Innocent.

Every few days we read of some tyrannical act by the judges. They issue an injunction and then send men to prison for months for the violation of their personal orders. They deny to these men the right of trial by jury. They themselves are witness, judge and jury.

Every great statesman we have had in this country has pointed out the danger from judicial usurpation. The following are the words of Charles Sumner:

"Let me here say that I hold judges, and especially the supreme court of the country, in much respect, but I am too familiar with the history of judicial proceedings to regard them with any superstitious reverence. Judges are but men, and in all ages have shown a fair share of frailty. Alas! The worst crimes of history have been perpetrated under their sanction. The blood of martyrs and of patriots, crying from the ground, summons them to judgment.

"It was a judicial tribunal which condemned Socrates to drink the fatal hemlock and which pushed the Savior barefoot over the pavements of Jerusalem, bending beneath His cross. It was a judicial tribunal which, against the testimonies and entreaties of her father, surrendered the fair Virgin as a slave; which arrested the teachings of the great apostle to the gentiles and sent him in bonds from Judea to Rome; which, in the name of the old religion, adjudged the saints and fathers of the Christian church to death in all its most dreadful forms, and which afterwards, in the name of the new religion, enforced the tortures of the inquisition, amid the shrieks and agonies of its victims, while it compelled Galileo to declare, in solemn denial to the great truth he had disclosed, that the earth did not move around the sun.

"It was a judicial tribunal which, in France, during the long reign of her monarchs, lent itself to be the instrument of every tyranny, as during the brief reign of terror it did not hesitate to stand forth the unspitting accessory of the unspitting guillotine. Aye, sir, it was a judicial tribunal in England, surrounded by all forms of law, which sanctioned every despotic caprice of Henry VIII, from the unjust divorce of his queen to the beheading of Sir Thomas More; which litigated the fires of persecution that glowed at Oxford and Smithfield, over the cinders of Latimer, Ridley and John Rogers; which, after elaborate argument, upheld the fatal tyranny of ship money against the patriotic resistance of Hampden; which, in defiance of justice and humanity, sent Sydney and Russell to the block; which persistently enforced the laws of conformity that our puritan fathers persistently refused to obey, and which afterward with Jeffreys on the bench, crimsoned the pages of English history with massacre and murder, even with the blood of innocent women.

"Aye, sir, and it was a judicial tribunal in our country, surrounded by all the forms of law, which hung witches at Salem; which affirmed the constitutionality of the stamp act, while it admonished jurors and the people to obey, and which now, in our day, has lent its sanction to the unutterable atrocity of the fugitive slave law."

TO THE REFORM FORCES

Chairman Edmisten Issues an Address to Populists.

The campaign of 1899 is now on. Three great conventions of delegates representing the three great parties which have fought shoulder to shoulder since 1896 for good government, met recently in Omaha and selected their standard-bearers for the political battle which will rage from now until the 7th day of November. More harmonious conventions of the reform forces never were held on Nebraska soil, and the practical unanimity of opinion expressed by the delegates as to whom these standard-bearers should be, is a marked tribute to their sterling worth, integrity and ability.

Let no man be deceived regarding the importance of the coming election in Nebraska. Its results will be felt for years not only in this state but in the nation as well. Nebraska is the storm-center of political activity and will be such until after the election to the presidency that peerless statesman, William Jennings Bryan, in 1900. All eyes are turned toward Nebraska. An overwhelming victory for the fusion forces means glad tidings of great joy to the friends of good government in other states; and it strikes terror to the hearts of the advocates of imperialism, militarism, monopolies and trusts. It means a victory for the grand, old document, whose undying truths should be stamped indelibly upon the memory of every liberty-loving American citizen. It means the triumph of the principle "equal rights to all, special privileges to none." And it means for Nebraska an untrammeled supreme court, and a seat of learning of increased usefulness to the aspiring, intelligent youth of the state, which will be a source of just pride to all citizens.

Hence, let no man underestimate the importance of the election this fall, either from the view point of present results or future effect. Neither let any friend of good government overlook the importance of his vote. No good citizen ever willfully neglects to exercise his sovereign rights and duty to vote—sins of omission are fully as grave at times as sins of commission. DO NOT FAIL TO VOTE.

Let us consider the situation in Ne-

braska. Arrayed on the one hand are the hosts who shout against "dishonest money" and "repudiation" in one breath and in the next clamor for an international agreement whereby all countries may have "dishonest money" and "repudiation." Who cry for a money "good in the markets of the world," and a protective tariff to prevent this money from being used anywhere except at home. Whose national policies and fostering care have resulted in the creation of the most gigantic combinations of capital, commonly known as trusts, whose operations are already a menace to our republic and have become one of the most difficult and perplexing problems ever presented to our statesmen for solution. Who, against the vigorous protests of the trusts and combines, very reluctantly responded to overwhelming public opinion and began a righteous war in the interests of suffering humanity, to stay the hand of a merciless tyrant; then, when success had attended our arms on every hand, at the behest of these same trusts and combines, paid the tyrant \$20,000,000 for a quit-claim deed to a country and its people who for many years had been struggling against this self-same tyrant in an earnest effort to enjoy the blessings of liberty, and have now converted a war begun in righteousness to one of conquest and subjugation. Who, once upon a time, when good men and true were in control, championed an amendment to the national constitution providing that, "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction;" and who now, under the guidance of men hostile to free institutions, have recently perfected a treaty with the sultan of the Sulu islands whereby he acknowledges the sovereignty of the United States, agrees to fly the stars and stripes wherever he goes, and is placed upon the pay roll of the United States at \$5,000 per annum for the support of his harem of twelve wives. Slavery is prevalent in the Sulu islands; yet the republican administration, regardless of the Thirteenth amendment, recognizes the institution of slavery there by stipulating with the sultan that slaves shall be allowed to purchase their own freedom at the usual market price! Can any self-respecting follower of the Great Emancipator allow himself to be thus dragged into the mire by the cohorts of Mark Hanna?

This is a brief statement of undisputed facts regarding the republican party nationally. In Nebraska its record is no better. The executive party, under republican rule, was conducted with little regard for the people, always extravagant in expenditure of the people's money and often downright dishonest. The legislature whenever safely republican, could always be relied upon to enact the rankest class legislation, and to skillfully administer a death blow to any measure which might prove in the least inimical to the interest of quasi-public corporations enjoying special privileges, no matter what the benefit that would accrue to a great majority of the people. And the supreme court—ever a republican body in majority at least—has never failed in recent years, on close questions, to stand against the people and for the great corporations. There are a few bright spots in the picture, however; there have been one or two republican supreme judges in the past who stood for justice to all; but the republican juggernaut was dragged over them and they were relegated to the rear. Laws have been declared unconstitutional by the republican supreme court on the most hair-splitting and trivial technicalities because certain great corporations will it. And the court has so warped and twisted its interpretation of the laws and reversed its own decisions upon the slightest pretext to fit the case at hand, that outside the state Nebraska Reports are regarded as worthy of but scant consideration and of little weight as authority on any important point of law.

Such is, briefly, a sketch of one party in the coming election. Can you, republican voters, blindly follow the lead of corrupt or incompetent men and allow them to do your political thinking? The old party of Abraham Lincoln received a staggering blow at St. Louis in 1896, and the enemies of free government have completely killed it in 1899. There is now no republican party except the silver republican party—but there is a monarchial party, with Mark Hanna as premier: do you care to train with it? Arrayed on the other side stand three allied armies. All have a common object, but each has its distinguished features. There is no disagreement upon the great and vital questions. All believe that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." All honor and revere the Declaration of Independence, the constitution and the flag. All believe in equal rights to all and special privileges to none." All are true republicans because they favor a republican form of government in which the supreme power is lodged in the hands of the people collectively. And all are true populists because they believe in a government of the people; by the people and for the people.

The magnificent record of Silas A. Holcomb appears to every thinking man. His rigid adherence to strict economy, yet not parsimony, in all departments under his control while governor. His conservatism and eminent fairness in every act, both public and private; and above all his honest and undoubted legal ability combine to mark him as an ideal man for a seat on the supreme bench. His nomination, coming as it did in three conventions on the first ballot, is sufficient to show the high esteem with which he is regarded by an intelligent people. Standing, as he does, for the grand truths upon which our republic rests, a man of the people, a friend of the people, his election is an assured fact; yet we appeal to every lover of truth and justice to turn out at the polls on the 6th of November and make his majority greater than 1896—an overwhelming rebuke to the party which has gone daff on commercialism, militarism and imperialism.

The convention did a noble work in naming J. L. Teeters and Edison Rich as nominees for regent of the state university. No better selection could have been made. Both gentlemen are eminently fitted for the position. Mr. Teeters is a prominent business man of Lincoln, a graduate of the Iowa university, and Mr. Rich is a lawyer of good practice in Omaha, and a graduate of our state university; and both are well acquainted with the needs of a great educational institution. Both of them are keenly alive to the importance of inculcating in the rising generation a hearty appreciation of the eternal principles of right and truth, a love of country and our institutions. Both are earnest advocates of industrial education and they will infuse enough new blood into the board of regents to make it an ideal body—one which will zealously guard every interest of this great institution of learning.

Arise and gird on your armor. Be vigilant, courageous and strong. Be Americans—patriotic, liberty loving Americans—even at the risk of being called "old fashioned." Bestir yourselves. The enemies of our republic are wise as serpents, but the right shall prevail.

E. W. NELSON, J. H. EDMISTEN, Chairman State Central Committee Peoples' Independent party of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska, September 2, 1899.

BRYAN ON GREENBACKS.
How Capital Added House to House, Field to Field and Gathered to Itself the Wealth of All the Land.

The advocates of the gold standard have a double purpose: First—they desire to make gold the only legal tender for the payment of debts, public and private. I have discussed this question on former occasions and pointed out that the necessary effect of such a law would be to create a greater demand for gold, which would then be the only money legally available for the payment of debts, and thus aid the money owning class and injure the wealth-producing class.

The second purpose of the advocates of the gold standard is to make bank notes the only credit money.

In response to your invitation I beg to submit a few arguments in support of the greenback as against the bank note. The greenback is issued by the government, and the volume of such money is determined by the people, acting through their representatives. The supreme court has held that such a money can be made a legal tender. When a man has greenbacks in his pocket he has money which is available for the payment of his debts; if he has bank notes, his money is only good when the creditor is willing to accept the money.

During the war, when gold and silver were at a premium, bank notes circulated on a level with greenbacks, and were never worth any more; the reason being that national bank notes are payable in lawful money, and the greenback being lawful money (and at that time the cheapest money) was used by the banks for the redemption of bank notes. It is interesting now to hear these same bankers, who redeemed bank notes in paper when gold and silver were at a premium of over 100 per cent, talk about the dishonesty of a debtor, whether the debtor be an individual or the government, who would redeem his obligations in anything but the dearest money.

The bank note has been good good because it had behind it the bonds and the greenbacks issued by the government. If the greenback is good enough to stand behind the bank note, it is good enough to stand alone without and bank note in front of it.

A national bank currency is objectionable because it is gross favoritism extended to a few. A bill reported by the house committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures in the last congress provided: First—That the treasurer of the United States pay out gold coin in redemption of greenbacks and treasury notes; second, that the secretary of the treasury have authority to issue gold bonds, drawing not more than three per cent, to secure the gold to maintain gold redemption; third, that national banks be allowed to deposit bonds and receive bank notes up to the par value of the bonds so deposited; fourth, that the tax on national banks be reduced. If this plan goes into operation, the difference in its effect upon the individual and the national bank may be stated as follows: The greenbacks are to be retired and bonds issued. This will mean an increase in taxes to pay the interest upon the bonds. The individual who enjoys no special privileges will find his taxes increased, while the national bank, that enjoys special privileges, will find its tax diminished. Second—If the individual buys a bond at par, he will lose the use of his money and must content himself with the three per cent interest. If a national bank invests its capital in bonds at par it can deposit the bonds and secure bank notes to the face value of the bonds, thus securing a return of its investment, and in addition to that it can draw three per cent interest upon the bonds. In other words, the individual parts with his money and draws interest while the national bank gets its money back and draws interest besides. The individual must eat his cake or keep it. The national bank both eats his cake and keeps it. This is favoritism that ought not to be tolerated in a government which recognizes the doctrine of equality before the law. The moment the government begins to confer special privileges those in a position to profit by favoritism begin to clamor for legislation immediately in their interest, and as a result the instrumentalities of government are used for private gain and the true purpose of government forgotten.

There is another objection to national bank currency, namely: That the national banks are given control over the volume of credit money. Power to issue money should never be entrusted to private individuals or private corporations. Jefferson was an opponent of banks of issue, and in one of his letters declared that his opposition was so persistent that he had been denounced as a maniac by those bankers who desired to secure this privilege from the government. Benton, in summing up the work of Jackson, gave emphasis to his fight with the national bank, and compared his work with the work of Cicero, saying that, when he destroyed the bank conspiracy, he saved America as Cicero had saved Rome, by overthrowing the conspiracy of Catalina.

Wendell Phillips has so well described the danger of allowing private individuals to control the volume of money that I quote from a speech made by him a few years before his death: "In other words, it was the currency which, rightly arranged, opened a nation's well springs, found work for willing hands to do, and filled them with a just return, while honest capital, daily larger and more secure, ministered to a glad prosperity. Or it was currency, wickedly and selfishly juggled, that made merchants bankrupt and starved labor into discontent and slavery, while capital added house to house and field to field; and gathered into its miserly hands all the wealth left in a ruined land."

The first question, therefore, in an industrial nation is, Where ought control of the currency to rest? In whose hands can this almost omnipotent power be trusted? Every writer of political economy, from Aristotle to Adam Smith, allows that a change in the currency alters the price of every ounce and yard of merchandise and every foot of land. Whom can we trust with this despotism? At present the banks and the money kings wield this power. They own the yardstick, and can make it longer or shorter, as they please. They own every pound of weight, and can make it heavier or lighter, as they choose. This explains the riddle, so mysterious to common people, that those who trade in money always grow rich, even while those who trade in other things go into bankruptcy.

The third objection to national banks of issue is, that the moment the national bank is permitted to issue money, that moment it becomes, for pecuniary reasons, the enemy of any government paper.

The banks are now urging that the issue of paper money is a function of the government, and that the government ought to go out of the banking business. Our answer is, that the issue of money is a function of government, and that the banks ought to go out of the governing business. The government cannot afford to build up a strong financial interest hostile to the exercise, by the government, of the right to issue and control both the metallic and paper money of the nation.

CHAPLAIN MAILEY'S RECORD
What Induced Him to Champion Imperialism, and how he Grasped the "Chance of His Life."

The populists undertook to make a campaign upon principles, but the republicans would not have it that way. They determined to make it a campaign of slander and mud-slinging. Innumerable documents have been in the hands of the populists all the time—letters of the most damaging kind and letters that were not confidential, because they were not written to private individuals but to officers of the state government, and intended to change or influence the public policy of the state—but our managers have insisted that they should not be used. They have said, "make this fight on principles and undoubted official records." This is a fight in which republicans, including Morton, have abandoned all decency and all pretence of honor, and it is about time that the populist managers abandoned their extremely high sense of honor and used all the legitimate means at hand to expose the criminals who are again trying to get control of the state government.

A letter written to the governor of this state and addressed, both on the envelope and the letter itself, to the governor, is not a private letter. It is a public document, and any citizen has a perfect right to see it. Silas A. Holcomb's sense of honor, is all well enough between gentlemen, but when it comes to fighting the scoundrels who stole a million dollars from this state, and demoralized the whole public service until men were around over the country declaring that all men were thieves and it would make no difference who was elected to office, he should consider that it is a different matter. The letters written to Governor Holcomb and addressed to him as governor, by Chaplain Mailey should be given to the public and no high sense of honor should prevent it. Such a man should be prevented from securing the position of the sacred office of chaplain in the regular army. If it is not your son who will be sick and dying in a tropical island, it will be some one's son, and a different man from Chaplain Mailey should be there to administer comfort and send his dying messages to mother and sister.

Notwithstanding that the populists have refused to publish any of this matter—sticking to their plan of "making a clean campaign," some facts are being printed in the weekly press of the state.

The Schuyler, Neb., Quill and the Bellwood, Neb., Gazette threw some light on the recent "commission" to imperialism of James Mailey, former chaplain of the First Nebraska. Dr. I. W. Hewitt of Bellwood, Neb., received a letter from Mailey under date of April 23, 1899. In this letter Mailey forwarded his flop and provided a hint at the consideration thereof. The letter is as follows:

"Manila, P. I., April 29.—Dear Doctor: I am not in a position where I dare to express my thoughts about this war; but when I get my shoulder straps off I expect to say some things. If I am not mistaken I have the chance of my life; but whether or not I'll take it remains to be seen.

JAMES MAILEY, Chaplain First Nebraska. The Bellwood Gazette, commenting on this letter, says:

"Everybody with an ounce of judgment now that Mailey has got his shoulder straps off, can see that he has embraced 'the chance of his life.' It is reported that Mailey has been promised a chaplaincy in the regular army as an inducement for his change of heart.

Several interesting stories are coming to light concerning Mailey and they do not place him in an enviable light.

Under date of Manila, October 6, 1898, J. G. Long, a member of the First Nebraska hospital corps, wrote a letter from which the following is taken: Major Stotsenberg has been promoted to colonel. Colonel Bratt sent in his resignation some time ago. Colonel Stotsenberg is a soldier by education and since his connection with the regiment has won the confidence of the men. Last Monday we lost another of our boys by death from dysentery. Private Larson, of company K, Larson was a very nice young man of excellent habits. He enlisted from Wahoo, Neb., but his parents live in Illinois. He died at the general hospital, after having been there some five days. Our chaplain, Captain Mailey, has been putting in most of his time exploring the city, taking pictures and gathering material avowedly for a lecture tour when he gets home.

On your voyage over he expressed himself freely as not in sympathy with the Spanish-American war. Now, like a good Christian, he is turning an evil into good. Having exhausted the objects of interest in Manila, he departed for Hong Kong and Japan, there to collect an additional stock of merchandise. It is to be hoped that he may put it on the market at a good price. Meanwhile Chaplain Hunter, of the Pennsylvania, kindly regiments speaks the works of sympathy and condolence as we lay them to rest in a strange land! At the general hospital there are over 100 of them, who, day and night, see little but the attendants and bare walls. A word of hope and consolation would be more than welcome. But they have to forget, as our chaplain is too busy, gathering material for sensational sermons and lectures.

J. G. LONG.

HAULS DOWN THE FLAG

McKinley Does it and Raises the Cross of St. George on American Territory in Alaska.

Editor Independent—The United States has had two friends in Europe and traditional enemy, the former are France and Russia, the latter is Great Britain. As friends they were friends in need, and such are friends indeed. There is no necessity to speak of what France has done, and as to Russia, the war is yet fresh in the minds of the people when, during the draft riots in New York in 1863, her fleet followed the British fleet into the harbor of New York, cleared the decks and told Albion "hands off!" During the four years that the rebel lines lasted, England was all the time our foe, not only reorganizing the confederate states as an independent nation, but giving aid and comfort in all and every particular. The rebellion would have been disposed of in one year had it not been for England.

Just now she has a war on her own account in the Transvaal; both Russia and France sympathize with the Transvaal and the United States owing so much to them—we cease to be neutral even and take sides with Great Britain to the fullest extent by authorizing the American consul to the Transvaal to become the protector of British interests in the two republics of South Africa. This would be highly appropriate under ordinary circumstances, but in this case, President McKinley has added insult to injury for he is well aware that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the United States is for the Boers and against England.

When in 1870 Grant allowed the minister at Paris to protect German interests, he did so in accordance with public opinion in this country, with our consent so to speak; but in the present case the president has defied public opinion and the press of Russia is indignant at his action. Knowing how Russia, France and Germany felt in the premises, it would have been the proper thing to have felt the pulse at St. Petersburg, Paris and Berlin before granting the request of the Court of St. James.

It is not improbable that foreign complications between Great Britain and some of the European powers may spring up before the war in the Transvaal is over, more particularly in the case of Russia. What then? We shall find ourselves estranged in European politics to such an extent that our protection of British interests in the Transvaal may endanger our relations with the whole of Europe, but more particularly with Russia; and such is the diplomacy of McKinley. A democratic president dared Great Britain in behalf of the Monroe doctrine; a republican president cringes the servile knee to Great Britain! England was making preposterous claims against Venezuela and Cleveland stopped it. England is making preposterous claims in South Africa, she declares a proposed arbitration, and McKinley helps her out of a very deep hole by saying: "Who touches an Englishman must account to me!"

There never was such a villainous and (Continued on Page Eight.)

DESCRIPTIVE PHRASES

A Scholar Shows how They are Used to Deceive the People and Cover up Plans to rob

The following extracts are from "The Scholar in Social Service," by Rev. George C. Larimer in Coming Age.

"The press has lately given currency to statement that 'living constitutions grow, and when they cease to grow they are no longer living.' It is understood that this representation is put forth to cover and justify certain questionable movements and methods on the part of the present government. With the cause of the statement we have nothing to do, whether the administration has acted wisely or not is totally apart from the principle involved in this position. The author of this declaration means that infringements of an existing constitution and deviations from its mandates are features of its growth. If they do not mean this, then there is no point to their declaration; and if they do not mean this, they are undermining the authority of law and are preparing the way for anarchy. The English constitution has grown, but not by ignoring and repudiating itself or by suppressing Magna Charta. It has grown by extending its privileges, as under Gladstone's premiership, to the people and by a more liberal interpretation and by a wider application of its provisions. So, also, ours grew when the first amendment on liberty of thought and of worship was adopted, and when the fifteenth amendment enlarged the freedom of the negro; but it is only dwarfed, stunted and marred when it is set aside in the interest of some passing policy. But it may be said that constitutional guarantees, in times of war may have to be suspended. This I nothing doubt. What I object to is the mischievous looseness which calls such to act 'a growth of the constitution,' which misleads and which opens the way for astute and unscrupulous statement to rob the people of their rights under the cover of constitutional growth.

Another bit of sophistical juggling, that has gone far toward perpetuating social ills, we have in the assumption that business has developed itself under certain so-called "laws of trade," which, like the laws of Meades and Persians change not, and which, like those of nature are sacred and irreversible. Two or three men combine to corner the market or several corporations enter into a trust and opportunities for employment are diminished and they assume an attitude of benignant virtue, intending that the "laws of trade" and not themselves must be blamed for the result. They are like David who had Uriah placed in the front of the battle, where he would be slain, and who then moralized that "the sword devours one as well as another." I hold that this obscuration of truth should be exposed, and that it should be plainly shown that these manipulators are deranging and defying the laws of trade, not honoring them. The prime cause for existing industrial troubles is to be found in the willful and often times illegal interference with these laws, and there will never be any marked improvement until a different line of action is adopted.

Educated men and women should also confront the misapprehensions that exist concerning the need and the power of charity in modern life. It may seem ungracious for one in my position to speak a word that may sound as a discouragement to the exercise of this practical grace. Nevertheless, I am constrained to express the view that too much attention is being given to its development and too little to the cultivation of that by which it should be superceded, namely, justice, whenever industrial conditions are injurious, and when working people suffer from commercial greed, an equivalent or compensation is usually sought in munificent alms giving. At various periods in the world's history this phenomenon has occurred. In proportion as justice between man and man has declined, that form of charity which consists in giving money has been more quickened. In Paris, London, New York and Boston eleemosynary institutions abound. Against these various economic writers have raised their voices, as it is manifest to the trade intellect that uncontrolled and almost excessive gratuitous tend very largely to pauperism of the community. Personally, I believe that a great deal that passes for charity is simply an organized effort to repress discontent and to reconcile multitudes of people with the unhappy conditions of their lot. I, for one, do not call that charity which is essentially mechanical, and which turns a man's soul inside out and pries to the innermost secret of his nature before a dove is bestowed. Charity is not merely relief from a passing evil, but such a relief as shall tend to quicken all that is best in madhood and womanhood. To accomplish such an end, something more is needed than an agent with a note book, prying into the life and creating the impression that human sympathy is certainly remote if not altogether absent from the gift. Of course, charity is needed. We do not underrate its value, but the scholar should insist on what his own reading must have taught him—that the one thing pre-eminently lacking today is justice, and the one thing that would cure many of the evils that now assail our social life would be the restoration of justice, not merely in events of law, but in the ordinary dealings between man and man.

We'll rally round the flag, boys, And shoot them down again; They're shouting the battle cry of freedom. We'll rally round the flag, boys, And shoot them down again, They're shouting the battle cry of freedom.

We'll rally round the flag, boys, And shoot them down again; They're shouting the battle cry of freedom.