

July - August 1942

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Bulletin of the Provisional International Contact Commission

Please Reprint

Contents

THE SOVIET UNION AND THE "SECOND FRONT"

THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

NOTES ON DIALECTICS

THE SOVIET UNION AND THE «SECOND FRONT»

The lies and deceptions of June have changed into the desperate realities of July on the Eastern front. Two months ago Stalinism told the world in boastful tones how we are going "on to Berlin", how the Soviet Union had grasped the offensive and would never relinquish it. The small gains — important and welcome ones — of the winter campaign were dressed in the halo of giant conquests although the U.S.S.R. did not in all that time conquer a single important populated city except Rostov, although its victories were confined to secondary points and the great areas in between cities. Now these gains have melted away before the fierce offensive of the Imperialist German enemy.

Naturally June is already long gone, measured by the lightning speed of modern warfare. For the Revolutionary Marxists to idle in fruitless discussion over these days of danger to the Workers State would be folly. But the lies and deceptions of only two months ago must be remembered, simply because the ingenuities of political hypocrisy, the Stalinist International, are already repeating new and contradictory lies as if the old situation never existed.

Instead of the never-ending offensive to Berlin, we are now being told ever so soberly that the Soviet Union is in its most anxious period. The story now is that unless a "second front" is opened up against Germany in the west, at once, all of humanity stands in danger of going down into the morass of fascism. To defeat fascism — we need a "second front".

What is this "second front"?

Offhand it sounds like a purely military question. The common viewpoint is that a front is a military line on either side of which oceans of men are fighting each other. The common man, fed by the lies of his own bourgeoisie as well as the Stalinist lie-factory, does not understand the inherent relationship between the military and the political. This relationship is intentionally hidden. This concealment thoroughly distorts the specific factors in the "alliance" of the Soviet Union with the Anglo-American imperialists. The approach to the question of the "second front" holds within it the total approach to the whole war.

The second front is, above all, a political front against proletarian revolution, and at the same time a front against Hitler. If you want

to understand why Allied armies have not yet invaded the Continent; if you want to understand the dynamics of prewar appeasement and the present 20 year pact between Britain and the Soviet Union (as well as the agreement with Uncle Sam); you must first start with this above premise. This "second" front is in fact the primary front, from the long term point of view, of the Imperialists on both sides.

THE U.S.S.R. IN DANGER

The failure of total collaboration between the Allies and Russia is thus easily explained; their unity rests on the flimsiness of pure military needs. On the real second front there is basic antagonism. Roosevelt and Churchill are watching that front — the class front — with infinite precision. There can be little doubt that they do not want the Red Armies liquidated; but they are likewise opposed to a victory of the Red Army.

The best "deal" that the capitalist world can hope to strike with the warped Workers State (which under Stalinism is very amenable to capitulation to world capitalism); is a greatly weakened Red Army, still fighting and holding a front, but so weak that Allied Imperialism can strike a political deal which will lay the basis for the undermining of the Workers State and the re-establishment of capitalism. Should the Soviet defeats continue, that day is not too far distant when the Allies will attempt to put a "stable" bourgeois government in power over a greatly reduced Russia.

As the day of new revolutions approach, this front — the corruption and destruction of the base of world revolution — is a major part of the IMPERIALIST second front. But in spite of German gains the Soviet Union still has great strength and prospects of a prolonged continued mass struggle against the Axis.

The German armies have already conquered twice as much territory as was conquered by the Kaiser's armies in the last war. One half of the Soviet raw materials is in enemy hands; and probably one third of its industrial machine or more. The disparity is even greater when you understand that Germany today has the industrial resources of three major and many minor countries that she didn't have in the last war — the resources of France, Italy and Japan. The Soviet Union today faces enemies on both the western and eastern termini of its land. Although it equalled German production before the war, under its present circumstances it is no match for the Nazi mach-

ine. However, the present relations are changing, and class forces in Europe and Asia will alter developments.

It is one of the greatest achievements in all history, this long Soviet defense under such trying and unequal circumstances. That is the cold naked truth. But the present inequality is there. On the purely military front the Soviet Union alone can not defeat Germany. In addition there is Japan to consider. Just as Germany has to eliminate the Russian Bear before proceeding to the British Isles, so Japan must consolidate her Asiatic Empire, free from an enemy in the North, before advancing further into India. The Axis strategy is worldwide, just like that of the Allies. India can be plucked for the asking, once the Russian land bases and the Russian and American armies are defeated. The most likely variant is for an early Japanese thrust into Siberia.

NEED REVOLUTIONARY DEFENSE

America and Britain may open up a new battle area in Europe to supplement the other areas in Africa and Asia. Most likely such a front will be small and indecisive. But let us assume it is on such a grand scale that it will turn the tables and assure a military victory. What role will the Soviet Union play in the "peace" that follows? Drained of resources, shorn and bleeding, the Soviet Union under Stalinism can only become a catspaw in the imperialist hands. She would be forced to make political concessions up to and including the open counter-revolution of the capitalist elements — which, of course, would depose Stalinism too.

But what are the other alternatives? So long as Stalin has promised to uphold the status quo for 20 years how can the German soldier, reared in the misery of a post-Versailles world, — how can he think of revolt? The German worker would be willing to fight for peace, but only a peace based on an international socialist order; he is too thoroughly disillusioned with British and American imperialism.

The British and American worker too would react to a call for struggle against misery and oppression, to a clarification of the AIMS, the Socialist aims of the Soviet Union. Only the ending of the war, through the struggle against the war by the workers of all lands, can assure victory to the Soviet Union. Any other "victory" is ephemeral, as fleeting as yesterday's snow. A military victory is only a minor part of the solution.

THE IMPERIALISTS' SECOND FRONT

The Anglo-American imperialists on their part are playing the game correctly. They are fighting their second front battle now, preparing to police the world after the war, preparing to invade the continent just at the moment when Germany is greatly exhausted and revolutions begin to appear on the horizon. At that moment Allied Imperialism can smash a double blow, on both fronts, against the Imperialist enemy and the proletarian enemy.

For the Marxists, just as for the Imperialists, but for two opposite reasons, the military invasion of Europe today is but an incident in the war, by no means as decisive, or even nearly so, as the Stalinists proclaim. The illusion of a "second" front today, built by the C. P. is just as harmful as the optimistic glow

of the "permanent offensive" of two months ago.

WORKERS THE ONLY REAL ALLY

The question of the second front must be placed in its total perspective, the front of class versus class. On that front all the material inequalities of the Soviet Union disappear. Its strength becomes neither national nor geographical. The call to proletarian revolution today by the Soviet Union would disrupt all enemies, create an all powerful army of hundreds of millions that could not be vanquished.

The nationalist program of "socialism in one country" — of which the present 20-year pact is but an extension—can mean only socialism in no country in a very short time. The moment is critical, the answer is clear.

July 29, 1942.

THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

The question of the "Constituent Assembly" is again with us. With India on the verge of gigantic revolutionary developments, and with Europe seething with discontent, the cry for the Constituent is being heard more and more. Bourgeois liberals and opportunists generally, looking at the savage Fascist regimes visualize the re-establishment of the bourgeois democratic parliament; the instrument, they conceive, for this purpose is the Constituent Assembly. The same people, looking at the colonial problem in mechanical terms, cannot conceive of the proletarian revolution in the backward nations, and propose therefore a Constituent to set up the Bourgeois Republic.

No one pretends that the Constituent is anything else than an instrument of "democratic" capitalism; and that instrument fits it perfectly. It is a weapon for forging unity of the oppressed under their bourgeois masters. In that sense, it is a cousin to the People's Front, the Labor Party, "Workers and Farmers" Governments, and other such reformist baggage. The Constituent Assembly is more than a form of political "unity"; it is at the same time a form of state rule.

IDEAL BOURGEOIS INSTRUMENT

And it is a form of state rule ideally suited for bourgeois democracy. It is not accidental

that the Allied powers are today so anxious to have a "Democratic Parliament" or a "Democratic Constituent Assembly" set up in Germany and other parts of Europe. For similar reasons the United States favors a Constituent for India — as a club for wresting control from the British and their savage Indian rule.

The question then is, shall Marxists support the instrument of the "liberal" capitalists?

In 1939 we wrote in the Draft Program of the Revolutionary Workers League: "In fascist or countries of extreme reaction the advancing of the slogan (for a Constituent Assembly) by the reformists and "liberals" is a historical anachronism serving no revolutionary purpose. Bourgeois democracy (which must not be confused with democratic demands) is no solution for the problem of Fascism, although the bourgeoisie can revive it for short periods to head off the class struggle. It cannot solve the problems of the working class. The masses are already far beyond such stage. The attempt to establish a Constituent Assembly in Fascist countries can lead only to still further disillusionment and demoralization within the masses. We fight at all times — especially under Fascism — for democratic rights, for the social revolution; we fight against the 'democratic stage of national revolution or its establishment'".

That analysis is still, in our thinking, 100% correct.

IN THE BACKWARD COUNTRIES

The matter is not so simple, however, when we come to the backward colonial countries, countries such as India, for instance. Here the bourgeois (national) revolution has NOT YET TAKEN PLACE. Abstractly and "historically" — speaking in a vacuum divorced of the specific gravity of present imperialism — the bourgeois revolution and its Constituent Assembly would be a big step forward for these nations. Unfortunately, however — speaking now concretely — modern imperialism has spread its tentacles to the four corners of the globe. Colonial powers can no longer play an independent role.

Even in the backward countries, we do not have before us two revolutions, first the bourgeois democratic revolution — and THEN the proletarian revolution. If such were true, the Constituent Assembly would have a real historical role. But history has passed beyond this, because capitalism as a whole, on a world scale, is in decay, even though backward parts are breaking out in still birth. Only the proletarian revolution and its agrarian and national **phase**, is on the order of the day.

Whatever "independence" is vouchsafed the backward countries, is merely based on the friction among the imperialists; it is merely a SEMBLANCE of independence. With the present world crisis — so sharp that it has led to the greatest mass murder in history — it is sheer folly to think of developing the means of production and the economy of the backward countries.

The sign of the times is "organized scarcity," not increased production, although "organized scarcity" is based on increased WAR production. Whatever "advances" there are in economy can only be for war (destructive) purposes. Once the war is over, and post-war adjustments take place, there will be more idle men, idle machines, and idle money than at any time in all capitalist history, IF capitalism survives. Very obviously the weak colonial powers will not share in any "revival", under such circumstances.

IMPERIALISM AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION

The problems of the national phase of the revolution in India, such as land to the peasants, etc., are indissolubly linked up with the

banking world which, in the era of imperialism, not only controls the land but the landowners as well. No one but a utopian could, under such circumstances, conceive of even the slightest possibility of solving a single problem of the bourgeois revolution anywhere on earth, and particularly in the colonial and semi-colonial nations.

The Constituent Assembly, therefore, sets itself out to accomplish an impossible task. It can only serve as another instrument of confusion and disorientation of the masses, of reaction.

For a Marxist to call for such an Assembly at this time, **anywhere**, is to call for reaction. The Revolutionary Workers League and the International Contact Commission are categorically and absolutely opposed to the **organization** of a Constituent Assembly.

Nevertheless, under certain circumstances we may call for the CONVOCATION of such an assembly, once the movement has made great progress (despite us), and once it has involved a major section of the oppressed masses. Then the slogan for CONVOCATION OF THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY, as advocated by Lenin in 1917, becomes purely an **auxiliary tactic** to expose the bourgeois democrats and opportunists, who are powerless to act, who are incapable even of granting a single important progressive demand. Such a slogan is meaningless dribble, unless it is auxiliary to the main slogan "For Workers Councils", "For Workers and Peasants Councils", and for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

RUSSIA, SPAIN, INDIA

In 1917 when the Social-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks were promising the Russian peasant all sorts of reforms, once the Constituent Assembly was called together, and at the same time were delaying the convocation of the Assembly — before they knew they were impotent to act — under these circumstances the call for the CONVOCATION of the Constituent was an effective tactic for exposing the enemy.

On the other hand in Spain, 1936-39, such a slogan would have been reactionary because there was no movement for a Constituent Assembly and the democratic phase of the Spanish Revolution has long since progressed beyond that stage.

In India today, there is no great **mass** movement comparable to 1917 for a Constituent As-

semi-ly. There is no need either to call for the ORGANIZATION of such a body, or the CONVOCA-TION of it. Both are reactionary. If in the future, despite the efforts of the Marxists and militants to organize soviets, the movement for a Constituent Assembly does sweep the countryside, then it MAY (depending on the given concrete situation) become necessary to call for the CONVOCA-TION of this bourgeois anachronism. But we are opposed at all times and under all circumstances to the ORGANIZ-ATION either of the Constituent Assemblies or their second, third and fourth cousins, the Labor Party, People's Fronts, Workers and Farmers (capitalist) governments.

The foregoing is presented by way of elaboration of our position, which we have stated time and again. However, since some of our muddle-headed "critics", who do not understand the actual principle and tactical aspects of the problem, have seized on some weak or erroneous formulations appearing in our recent material to muddy the waters, we shall further clarify the question.

In the RWL Program, we state: "In such (backward) countries the proletariat can advance the demand for the Constituent Assembly as a PURELY AUXILIARY slogan. That slogan was tenable in Russia in 1917. It is false, however, in Spain 1936-39."

To make this correct point more clear, we should add the words: "CONVOCA-TION of the Constituent Assembly." We are never for its organization.

In the "International News" of May 1942, in the article "Social Forces in the Indian Revolution," there appeared an erroneous formulation, which we gladly correct here.

"All talk about a 'workers and peasants state' or 'democratic dictatorship of proletariat and peasantry, is vain," the article states; "for the basic reason that the peasantry is incapable of pursuing an independent role."

The BASIC question is thus stated succinctly and correctly. There can be no revolution in India except a PROLETARIAN revolution.

From there, however, the paragraph goes on: "This leads to the modification to which we referred earlier. Under the conditions of a revolutionary situation the former slogan of the constituent assembly (as an **auxiliary** to the struggle for workers and peasants councils) now becomes a reactionary slogan capable only of meeting the political needs of the Indian bourgeoisie and American finance capital."

BASIC POSITION CLEAR

Here again, the basic thought — the need for soviets, and the reactionary character of a Constituent Assembly — is clearly pointed out. But there is confusion on the question of whether the slogan was correct in the past, even though it is incorrect now. This must be altered to state that the call for the organization of a Constituent Assembly is wrong at ALL times. Furthermore at present to call for the CONVOCA-TION of a Constituent Assembly in India would be an important tactical blunder.

We again repeat our position on the question so that there can be no misunderstanding: We are opposed at all times and under all circumstances to the organization of a Constituent Assembly. We may under certain circumstances, however, call for the CONVOCA-TION of such an assembly, once major sections of the oppressed masses are set in motion for the assembly.

Our May 1942 article states that because the democratic dictatorship is outdated historically — **therefore** we reject the call for the assembly now. The conclusion does not flow from this premise. From this premise, as stated before, we reject the ORGANIZATION of the Constituent Assembly. The question of participation or boycott of its elections and convocation, is a tactical question based upon the concrete situation.

NOTES ON DIALECTICS

In the present period it is a welcome relief to read a new book or a new pamphlet dealing with and defending dialectical materialism, at a time when most of the material presented on the subject consists of polemics against dialectics. Yet the critics have been unable to dislodge even a fragment from the system of dialectics. One of the recent outlines in behalf of dialectics is presented by William Warde of the Cannon Trotskyites. Even though this pamphlet is written by Warde, it is the Cannon Trotskyite outline of dialectics, and they stand responsible. It is unfortunate for the Cannonite political leadership that they had no one who could correctly edit this outline.

Let us consider some of the shortcomings of this outline. In the first place, if one writes an OUTLINE on dialectics, it should at least give the fundamentals of the theoretical structure of dialectics, even though it does not give details, or does give important but secondary aspects. But this outline fails to accomplish this simple task. Rather it gives PART of the structure of dialectics, and at the same time isolates several points and presents details. For example, much space is devoted to Formal logic and the Hegelian revolution in logic. Above all, the outline only deals in passing with the fundamental question of "quantity-quality" changes, and the negation of the negation.

Of the three basic laws of dialectics, it deals extensively only with the problem of contradictions, but even this, as we will show, is expounded in a false, mechanical presentation. As to the other two aspects of dialectics, they are given either from a Hegelian standpoint, or through mechanical explanations. If it is recognized that the outline is not clear upon the general laws of dialectics,— and we may add that there are more than the three basic ones of which we have spoken above—then it can easily be understood why Warde presents dialectics as a philosophy.

IS DIALECTICS A PHILOSOPHY?

Warde says, "Dialectical materialism is the last link in the chain of historical forms of philosophy, just like socialism is the last link in the chain of historical forms of social organizations." ". . . dialectical materialism is the final expression of philosophy."

He also states, "Is dialectical materialism a philosophy or a science? It is both and neither."

And further in the same outline he states: "Dialectical materialism exists only in the medium of science." Thus Warde says that dialectical materialism is (1) a philosophy, (2) a science, (3) both, (4) neither. This kind of presentation of dialectics is just the meat that Eastman, Hook and others of their tribe live on. You cannot blame these enemies of dialectics for making fun of us with such a presentation. Perhaps Warde thinks he has presented a dialectical explanation of dialectics with its "contradictions"? In reality, Warde only presents **his own** mental confusion and contradictions.

If Warde had stated that Dialectical Materialism has been forced to take up all systems of philosophy, just as the materialist philosophies fought against all religions, and in the process laid bare the unscientific base of ALL philosophical systems, it would have been positive. Instead he says it is the last of the philosophies. It takes science (not just another philosophy) to expose the real roots of philosophy. And that science is dialectical materialism, which is a reflection of the dialectical process of nature. Marx and Engels have both revealed their opposition to ALL Philosophies on more than one occasion.

DEWEY'S PHILOSOPHY IN A LEFT FORM

Let us consider further the question of the character of dialectics — whether it is a science or philosophy, or both, as Warde states. Warde sees dialectics as a transition, as a blending, as a "going over to" further scientific development — as more knowledge is obtained. This mechanical and false concept about reality, only brings confusion into the concept

of contradiction and dialectics. This is not the process of contradictions. This is the Hegelian, and if you please, also Dewey concept of contradictions, even though Dewey rejects Hegel. Although Warde, in words categorically rejects Dewey, he nevertheless carries a lot of his ideological baggage.

"Insofar as it (dialectics, H. O.) fills the gap between sciences with speculative ideas, which may turn out to be one sided or false with the further advance of knowledge, it plays the role of the old philosophies." Not only does Warde list dialectics as "sloppy" philosophy in this quotation, but nowhere in the outline does he make clear the distinction between RELATIVE scientific ideas based upon FACTS and investigation (even though the whole problem could not be analyzed at the given stage of investigation, due to the STATE OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT and the general scientific understanding) and on the other hand, so-called "scientific" theories, hypothesis, speculations, working "tools" that have nothing in common with FACTUAL DEVELOPMENT.

But Warde continues. He says, "But it (dialectics, H.O.) seeks to promote the development of rational, social and logical science to a point where it will itself be abolished as a general philosophy in favor of genuine science" (P.9) In the first place "dialectics" will not transform a general philosophy into a genuine science. ALL philosophy is unscientific, the very concept and basic premise on which philosophy rests, is unscientific. Science must deal with the DIFFERENT FORMS OF MATTER IN MOTION and explain, upon the basis of facts, the inner laws of these processes. The Warde equation of blending of philosophy as science is false.

SCIENCE VS. PHILOSOPHY

The theory of knowledge, and the method of reasoning are not questions of speculation for philosophy. These problems fall into the category of science — and Dialectical Materialism gives the answer. When religion was driven from the high places of learning, driven out of the front door—it returned through the backdoor in the form of philosophy. Science must drive both out of man's mental make-up.

But this education cannot be conducted by the fascists' methods of open force, or the bourgeois democratic methods of "sugar coated" concealed force or the Stalinist bureaucracy's

methods of bribery and force, or the "left" and centrist method of trying to reconcile capitalist contents with working class forms. Not only in the political field of action do the Trotskyite centrists accomplish this sleight-of-hand trick, they also accomplish it in the field of dialectics. But where the Burnham "wing" ridicules dialectics, and the Shachtman wing sneers at it, the Cannon wing presents it in false content and eclectic form. Warde's contribution in the field of science is the same confusion and opportunism that the "political" leaders present in politics. It provides a left cover for Dewey's concealed idealist concepts in the field of science just as the Trotskyist centrist line provides a left cover for the petty bourgeois democrats in the field of politics.

Warde's statement that socialism is the last link in the chain of social organizations, is also erroneous. Marxists consider socialism as a stage toward communism when we refer to Social Organization. Marxists do not consider socialism as the "last link". In relation to one cycle of development, **communism**, is **A** last link, but not **THE** last link, because in the dialectical process this "end" is a new beginning of a new cycle — if mankind is still here on this planet.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE

One can easily improve on Warde's definition of religion, but we have no space to deal with all the points. In regard to science he says, "All science is based upon the recognition of the lawfulness of nature, based upon the interdependence of all things existing in nature. The conceptual expression of this lawfulness in nature is the principle of causality." Speaking of dialectics as a bridge (?) between philosophy and science he says, "Insofar as it destroys and negates the remaining religious elements in philosophy by extending the principle of causality into nature and society, it is scientific." In other words, if dialectics extends the principle of causality into nature and society, it is scientific—and one can also conclude, thereby such action makes philosophy scientific (?). Nowhere in a further discussion on dialectics does Warde list the PRINCIPLE OF CAUSALITY as a basic proposition of the system of dialectics. Yet, according to the above quotation, the most important task of dialectics is to extend the principle of causality.

WHAT DIALECTICS EXPLAINS

This is a completely false presentation of the "task" of dialectics and of the principles of dialectics. Warde has carried over some of his bourgeois concepts in "science" as he has in dialectical "philosophy". The question of cause and effect and its relation to dialectics has been dealt with on more than one occasion by Marx, Engels and Lenin. They do not present the question in this lopsided manner as Warde does. For the dialectician, the unfolding of the theoretical structure carries with it a dialectical explanation of causality—not as a PRINCIPLE set apart from the system as presented by Warde, but as an integral part of contradiction in development, in objective reality, independent of our minds.

Lenin states in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* that the real difference between the different schools of epistemology on the question of causal connection is, "whether the source of our cognition of these connections is natural objective law, or the properties of our reason, its innate faculties of knowing certain *a priori* truth, and so forth." Of course, Warde will reply, "I agree with Lenin". But one does not write an outline of dialectics and present two principles—one on causality (not mentioned directly as a "law" of dialectics) and the other "law" of dialectics—the nature of contradictions.

CONTRADICTION AND DIALECTICS

Warde writes a 52 page outline and only has space enough in the pamphlet to present the "First Law of Dialectics", the nature of contradiction. Again, we do not intend to cover this in detail, nor at present argue on certain shortcomings on the question of contradictions. We merely want to state here that an outline should present an outline of the LAWS of dialectics. (The R.W.L. outline on *Dialectical Materialism* published in 1937, takes up these questions.)

ONCE MORE, SCIENCE

Warde labels some things science that should not be labeled as such, and fails to speak of science when he should. We have already pointed out his jumble on what dialectics is. But he **is able** to make a precise statement on Logics. He says, "Logic then is the science of the laws and the forms of thought." This is what **Warde** says, not Warde quoting learned men of the past. Engels says, "The dialectic is nothing more than the science of the general laws of motion and development of nature, society and thought." If Engels is correct then Warde is wrong. Not only must Dialecticians cast aside the careless use of the word philosophy in speaking of dialectics; they must also speak of dialectics **in opposition** to logics as mutually exclusive SYSTEMS of the laws and forms of thought. Otherwise it is like a doctor practicing witch-craft.

Warde has not made up his mind on the question of dialectics. Is it a science or philosophy, both or neither? Engels not only answered that question long ago, but goes beyond that. In speaking of the application of dialectics to social development he says in *Anti-Duhring* (p. 33) "These two great discoveries, the materialist conception of history and the revelation of the secret of capitalist production by means of surplus value, we owe to Marx. With these discoveries socialism becomes a science, . . ." Here Engels is using the word, socialism to mean the theoretical system of Marxism, the application of the dialectic method to social development and the class struggle. Of course, what Engels speaks of here is only a PART of the question of dialectics. But Warde still has a long way to travel to a scientific position.

(Continued Next Issue)

Volume 4, No. 6

Price 5 cents — 50 cents a year

Issued by the R. W. L. for the International
Contact Commission.

Affiliates

Central Committee of the Red Front
of Germany

Revolutionary Workers League of U. S.
Leninist League of Scotland

Mail address of publishers

Demos Press, Office
708 N. CLARK ST.
Chicago, Illinois

Printed in the United States

Voluntary Labor