

craftsmen in certain industries, notably in Poland. The skilled Jewish mechanics were displaced by unskilled Polish peasants. Industrial competition has developed into race antagonism: Polish operatives resist the admission of Jewish workers to the factories. Again emigration offers the only relief to the Jewish mechanic displaced by the machine.

The economic causes of Jewish immigration determine, according to the author, not only its sex and age composition, but also the proportion of returning to incoming immigrants: the bulk of the gentile immigrants from southern and eastern Europe being peasants, many of them naturally gravitate to their homesteads; emigration to the United States is with them only a means to raise some money for the improvement of their home farms. Regarding their sojourn in the United States as merely a temporary absence from home, they naturally leave their families at home. The Jewish emigrant, on the contrary, being a wage-earner or a tradesman, carries his earning capacity with him and can have no object in returning to his home country—hence the more permanent character of Jewish immigration.

While it cannot be denied that the immigration of Russian Jews, like that of other races, is the product of economic factors, it seems that Dr. Hersch insufficiently emphasizes the political aspect of these factors. It is a fact, noted by the author himself, that in recent years the migration of Russian peasants from European Russia to the vacant government lands in Siberia has reached nearly a million per year. These new settlements would offer an ample field for the surplus of Jewish mechanics and traders now crowded together in the pale of Jewish settlement. It is the law of the empire that bars them from migrating eastward and directs their movement westward, to the United States.

The author has pursued a purely theoretical aim: to find an answer to the questions engaging the attention of European students of Jewish emigration. His work, however, has a great practical value for the American student and statesman interested in the subject of immigration. It is to be hoped that the book will be made accessible to the American public in an English translation.

ISAAC A. HOURWICH

NEW YORK CITY

---

*The Amalgamated Wood Workers' International Union of America.* By FREDERICK SHIPP DEIBLER. Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, 1912. Pp. 211. 40 cents.

This doctoral dissertation is an intensive study in social mechanics. "In this study an endeavor has been made to trace the history of a trade

union, and to show, in so far as it is possible, the connection between the problems of organized labor and the evolution of the industry itself." The proper avenue of approach was chosen. There was selected for investigation a labor organization that has developed in an industry fundamentally affected by far-reaching changes in industrial methods, whose different organizations have in consequence been goaded into an unusually long and disastrous series of jurisdictional disputes. Dr. Deibler has written a careful and exhaustive discussion which will be read by only a few. The trenchant criticisms of Professor Patten in his address as president of the American Economic Association may not inaptly be applied to Professor Deibler's work. Nevertheless, a valuable service has been rendered to students of labor problems.

The evolution of the woodworking industry and the early organizations among woodworkers are discussed in the introductory portion of the monograph. The second part considers the formation, structure, and policies of the Amalgamated Wood Workers' Union. The most significant chapter relates to the jurisdictional difficulties in the woodworking industry.

Originally, there were two distinct groups of woodworkers engaged in the remanufacture of lumber—house carpenters and cabinet-makers. The latter were employed in factories or workshops and did a sort of work which was somewhat finer and more highly skilled than the house carpenters. These two groups of workers did not enter into competition with each other or have any jurisdictional disputes with each other until after the introduction of the revolving planer in the forties. After that period, some of the work of the old house carpenter was gradually absorbed by factories—the making of sash, blinds, doors, etc. Presently a new group of woodworkers appeared—the machine woodworkers. The work which the house carpenter of the first half of the nineteenth century did at the place where the house was constructed is now in no small measure performed in factories with the aid of various woodworking machines. The carpenter of today is chiefly an assembler of machine-made products.

The cabinet- or furniture-makers first felt the competition of this new type of woodworkers. The carpenters did not take interest in the machine woodworkers until after 1885. Then they began to realize that certain forms of the traditional work of the house carpenter were slipping from their grasp. The logical line of cleavage in the woodworking industry is drawn at the door of the factory. The problem of the organized carpenters differs materially from that of the machine woodworkers.

In the case of the former, competition between different localities is of little importance and wage scales may differ in different localities. With the machine woodworkers, on the contrary, it is necessary to equalize so far as possible the wage rates paid by competing firms. Nevertheless, the carpenters held that whatever forms of work had been theirs before the coming of the machines should still be placed under their jurisdiction. They refused to "allow a dual form of organization to exist" in this trade. The carpenters began to organize the machine workers.

In 1889, the jurisdictional struggle between the carpenters and the furniture workers, both affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, reached the convention of that body. A year later a new union of machine woodworkers was organized and, after some opposition on the part of the carpenters, it was admitted to the American Federation of Labor. In 1895, the furniture workers and the machine woodworkers united to form the Amalgamated Union. Year after year, since 1895, in the convention of the American Federation of Labor, the difficulties between the Amalgamated Union and the carpenters have been considered. The rulings were usually favorable to the former; but the carpenters steadfastly refused to relinquish their hold upon the factory workers. And, as the years passed, the carpenters increased in numbers and influence while the Amalgamated Union declined. Since Dr. Deibler's work was completed, the American Federation of Labor has reversed its policy. The Amalgamated Union was ordered to amalgamate with the carpenters.

This bitter struggle between two rival unions "has created a division in the organized forces in the industry, and has resulted in discrediting the movement in the eyes of employers. . . . There has been an enormous waste of energy that should have been devoted to the improvement of the working conditions of the men who have had to support the financial burden of the fight. The course of the carpenters must be condemned for arbitrarily taking a stand, and fighting for this until the bitter end."

From the standpoint of the reviewer it seems that, on the part of the carpenters, this jurisdictional contest was an effort to gain control of the machines which were invading their trade. Unlike the linotype or the molding machine, the woodworking machines did not perform their work where the carpenters did theirs, and the machines were often owned and operated by employers other than those who hired the carpenters. Since the furniture workers and the machine woodworkers were organized, the struggle became primarily a jurisdictional dispute between them

and the carpenters rather than a contest between employers and the unions. This long dispute between two affiliated unions is an excellent example of the vacillating, never-cross-the-bridge-until-you-reach-it policy in jurisdictional struggles which has ever characterized the American Federation of Labor—temporize, recommend, and finally gracefully bow to the most powerful national union. It likewise gives an interesting sidelight upon the strength of the American Federation of Labor.

FRANK L. CARLTON

ALBION COLLEGE

---

*Pan-Germanism.* By ROLAND G. USHER. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1913. 8vo, pp. vii+313. \$1.75 net.

Pan-Germanism is, in the author's own words, a defensive movement for Germany's self-preservation and also an offensive movement directed against England. Its aim is to create a mighty empire, by constructing a great confederation of states including Germany, Austria, Hungary, the Balkan States, and Turkey, and by depriving England of her possessions in the Mediterranean and in Asia. The author outlines the chances for and against such a scheme, and is inclined to question its success.

Pan-Germanism is a popular phrase in English-speaking countries and, without doubt, theories like Usher's are seemingly justified by certain articles in minor German newspapers and by the tone of certain pamphlets largely written or inspired by retired colonels and generals who picked up the pen after age and infirmity had forced them to unbuckle the sword. Lately a leading article of the *Berliner Tageblatt* defined German imperialism as the conquest of the world's markets by German goods. This statement shows Germany's aims in a very different light; and if we look at the work of responsible German statesmen since the Franco-German war, we cannot fail to see that Germany has not moved in the direction of territorial aggrandizement but has decidedly preferred commercial expansion. Her true intentions are not voiced by men like General von Bernhardt or the sensation-monger Maximilian Harden, but by the editorials of such leading newspapers as the *Berliner Tageblatt*, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, *Kölnische Zeitung*, and others. It would be very difficult to support Usher's theory from such sources.

Pan-Germanism and pan-Slavism, like pan-Islamism, pan-African-