



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR M. Bruce Lustig

TITLE THE LIFE AND ACTIVITY of Jacob Billikopf,
America's most Distinguished Social Worker
in the TWENTIETH Century as Reflected in his

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [] D.H.L. [] Rabbinic [✓] Collected
Master's [] Prize Essay [] works

1. May circulate []) Not necessary
2. Is restricted [✓] for ___ years.) thesis

RESTRICTION REMOVED

7/17/91
Date

sfb
Initials

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis.

yes no

March 3, 1986
Date

M. Bruce Lustig
Signature of Author

Library
Record

Microfilmed 11/5/86
Date

Emilie Salkes
Signature of Library Staff Member

**The Life and Activity of Jacob Billikopf,
American Jewry's Most Distinguished Social Worker in
the First Half of the Twentieth Century as Reflected in His
Collected Works**

M. Bruce Lustig

**Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
Ordination**

**Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
1986**

**Referee, Dr. Jacob Rader Marcus
Milton and Hattie Kutz Distinguished Service Professor of American
Jewish History**

A Dedication:

*I dedicate this to Dr. Jacob Rader Marcus, who selflessly gave to me the most precious of gifts, Time. The world is supposed to rest on thirty-six righteous. By virtue of their goodness the world exists; they inspire individuals to change the world from what it is... to what it can be. Dr. Marcus is a Lamed Vavnick and I have been honored...blessed to have been in his presence. For the early morning walks, the breakfasts and the late-night talks, I am richer. You have been my teacher, my rabbi and my best friend. You have taught me to be a *בן אדם*, a human being. As we walked through Clifton you taught me the passion for living and shared the wisdom of your life. Your questions...your comments...your jokes...resonate in my being... You shared of yourself.. always nurturing me..with a gentle hand or a tap of a cane...You have given, and I have taken. I can only offer my thanks, my loyalty and my love.*

M. Bruce Lustig
March 3, 1986

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| Digest..... | iii |
| Acknowledgements..... | vii |
| <hr/> <hr/> | |
| Chapter 1: Jacob Billikopf: His Foundation in the Social Work Movement (1883-1907) | 1 |
| Chapter 2: Kansas City: From Midwestern Social Worker to National Prominence (1907-1919) | 31 |
| Chapter 3: Jacob Billikopf in Philadelphia (1919-1933) | 159 |
| Conclusion..... | 210 |
| Endnotes..... | 218 |
| Bibliography..... | 235 |

Digest

Jacob Billikopf (1883-1950), one of America's most distinguished social workers in the first half of the twentieth century, left a distinctive mark on the face of social work in this country. Both Jewish and non-Jewish philosophy and institutions of social justice benefited from Billikopf's incarnation of Maimonidean philanthropic commitment to the American social justice structure. Billikopf was an integral part of both America's response to the needs of the immigrant and refugee and her demand for continued social improvement. As social worker, educator, fund raiser, thinker, organizer, and welfare advocate he contributed to the development of ideas and programs to meet the challenges which occurred in this transitional era in American history.

Billikopf's success seems to have grown from his ability to truly empathize with the suffering and hardship of those he served, always preserving the dignity of the immigrant and refugee. Perhaps that is because he, too, had known the immigrant experience firsthand. Born in Vilna, Lithuania in 1883, he came to the United States in 1896, speaking not a word of English. His schooling began at age thirteen when he entered first grade in Richmond, Virginia. In that one year, he had advanced to the point of completion of the eighth grade. He went on to complete high school and continued his studies first at Richmond College, and then at the University of Chicago. In this educational endeavor, Billikopf faced the common problem of the immigrant, the prejudice that is bestowed on the foreigner. Yet he was able to overcome this for himself, and in his work he would go on to help others overcome the same obstacles.

Billikopf's first job was as director of a settlement house in Cincinnati, but left to do further work in New York in 1905. Later that same year, he was named director

of United Jewish Charities in Milwaukee, where he remained through 1907. He then became the Superintendent of the Federation of Jewish Charities in Kansas City. Billikopf's work in Kansas City, filled with innovations, sensitivity and leadership, took him from anonymity as a midwestern immigrant social worker into national prominence.

In Kansas City, Billikopf was involved in both the Jewish and the secular realms of social work. His unique ability to function gracefully in both worlds served him well, and helped get his programs implemented. In the Jewish community, he was intricately involved in the Galveston Movement, a program initiated by Jacob Schiff with the intent of bringing immigration to the midwest and the southwest. In this program Billikopf was responsible for settling the immigrant, finding him employment and insuring that he was self-sufficient. But Billikopf also initiated programs to serve the immigrant beyond these physical needs; he created institutions with vital services to preserve the well-being of these immigrants. Some of his innovations include: English classes, social classes to assist in the Americanization process, Free Loan Society, Public Bath House and Crafts and Gymnastics classes for children. Billikopf's programmatic philosophy embraced the totality of the immigrant's being.

Although Billikopf was officially attached to Jewish organizations, his work was not restricted to sectarian boundaries. His connection to a Jewish agency gave him a unique opportunity to do wider service. He organized the Kansas City Board of Public Welfare, the first institution of its kind in this country. That board became the paradigm after which other cities would model their boards. Billikopf led the Board to establish the first Municipal Farm and the first Legal Aid Bureau supported by municipal funds. As well, the Board supervised control of Pardons & Paroles, commercial recreation and housing inspection. Billikopf was responsible for the first law in this country which gave aid to widows and orphans out of municipal funds, the Mother's Aid Act of 1911. This as well became the model

throughout the country for this type of legislation. These efforts brought Billikopf national recognition in the field of social justice.

This national prominence and his ability to bridge diverse groups, demonstrated in Kansas City, brought Billikopf an offer to come to New York in 1917 to head the American Jewish Relief Committee of the Joint Distribution Committee. In the years 1917-1919, under Billikopf's supervision, the organization raised \$25, 000, 000 for foreign relief. During his work with the JDC, Billikopf was able to exercise influence in order to change the Jewish community in a positive manner. He was able to serve as a mediator between the diverse groups of German and Russian Jews, enabling them to work together for the first time for a common cause. As well, the methodology of fund-raising that Billikopf established and implemented was very successful and is still in operation today. Similar to his work in Kansas City, Billikopf did not limit himself to the Jewish world. In 1918, he was one of John R. Mott's cabinet of seven directing an effort to raise \$200, 000, 000 for overseas service. Billikopf's work in the JDC brought him into contact with some of the greatest of American Jewish leaders, yet he never took advantage of this position. He consistently refused a salary for his efforts; finally, he received a purse of \$50, 000 in 1919 as a reward for his efforts.

From the JDC, Billikopf moved on to Philadelphia, where he was again asked to exercise his ability to serve diverse groups, as the Executive Director of the Philadelphia Federation of Jewish Charities. In Philadelphia, Billikopf duplicated many of his innovative institutions which had been found useful in Kansas City. He also continued to remain very active in the work of the JDC. One of Billikopf's successes in Philadelphia was helping the community to reconcile its internal struggle over the dilemma of universalism vs. particularism. As well, he was now called upon to use his skills of mediation in the realm of labor arbitration. He served the purpose of assisting the laborer and the employer to meet face-to-face and reconcile differences peacefully. Although this work was cloaked

in the garb of "labor relations," in reality, Billikopf was again the conciliator for the German and Russian Jew as employer and laborer.

In this situation, as in every challenge that Billikopf faced, he sought constructive, rather than reconstructive relief. Always, Billikopf brought innovation to anything in which he became involved. From his earliest work in Galveston to his pre-New Deal unemployment insurance, Billikopf was ahead of the times in his conceptions of social justice. Characteristically, Billikopf was one of the first to alert American Jewry to the approaching horror of Nazi Germany.

Rising from immigrant to national figure, Billikopf never lost sight of his Jewish identity and immigrant roots; he continued to be motivated by his commitment to the highest of Jewish ideals. His career was one of true concern with the individuals he served, whether it be encouraging a child to learn English or raising money for the hungry in Europe. He brought a humanizing factor to the science of social work, bringing the Jewish concept of the preservation of dignity to American philanthropy. Billikopf's imprint upon American society still resonates in the work of social justice today.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Fannie Zelcer and the Archives staff for the support they gave me in my research. They made my experience at the American Jewish Archives one that centered around both scholarship and friendship.

I wish to thank Dr. Marcus, who made this more than a project to learn about history, but also in the process taught me about life.

I wish to thank my family. To list what they have done for me is impossible. Most of all they have given me the love necessary to believe in myself. It was in my home that I was nurtured into an inquisitive and sensitive being. There I learned values which have been my greatest guide. To my father, a thankyou for always asking, "Did you do your best?" To my mother, for giving me an artist's eye and the heart of a Jew. To my brother for teaching me patiently, even to this day. To my Omi, for bringing the light and love of Judaism into my life. She has made me understand the past, and blessed me with her hope for the future. To my Opa, for you I am a Rabbi, not a shoemaker! For Grandpa, I will always cherish books.

To Amy, my deepest love. Your love is a star that dispels the blackness of the night. With you I shall share my life, my dream.

If I had one gift I could give all of these people it would be a tomorrow filled with the love they have brought all my todays.

M. Bruce Lustig
March 3, 1986

Jacob Billikopf: His Foundation in the Social Work Movement

(1883-1907)

By what standards do we judge a man? What criteria do we use to determine what was the value of a man's life? Do we look to his accomplishments? Do we look to his education, his cultural identity, his religious tenets, his principles or his faults? Even if the man stands before us, eager to bare his soul, such standards, such criteria are difficult to determine. All the much more so if the distance between us and that man is bridged only by a remnant, the earthly words which he scribed, or the account of his deeds by others. How a man is remembered in this society is one matter, what his influence is on that society is another.

What follows upon these pages is the story of one man's influence on American society. Although in the course of human history this man's name, Jacob Billikopf, might not be remembered, all that he represents is valued. His accomplishments as the humanizer, the beacon of social justice have become, in fact, woven into the very fabric of our society today.

The face of America changed with every wave of immigration and with the absorption of each refugee community. While these immigrants affected all areas of American life, the changes brought about by their arrival perhaps had their

strongest impact in the form of the institutions that were developed by Americans in order to meet social and welfare needs of the immigrant and refugee. In this country, no single group's endeavors could rival the efforts to meet those needs made by the American Jewish Community.

The immigrant and refugee had to be fed, clothed, educated, integrated into the economic marketplace. In addition to these tangible needs, it was necessary to protect and nurture the spiritual and emotional needs of the immigrant; at the same time that they were given the "americanization" they needed to succeed, their old values and culture had to be respected. It took individuals with vision and commitment to be able to understand and transpose the needs of the individuals, new to these shores, into the vital social institutions which could meet these challenges. A vision of the future and a feeling of compassion for the realities of the present had to be maintained as the bridges were built between the resources of the American Jewish Community, and the needs of the immigrant, the refugee, and the needy.

Jacob Billikopf, one of American Jewry's most distinguished social workers in the first half of the twentieth century, was indeed a skilled builder of such bridges. He served his fellow man by translating the Jewish commitment to Maimonidean principles into the reality of the American Jewish social structure. Jacob Billikopf was an integral part of both America's response to the needs of the immigrant and refugee, and her cry for continued social change. As a social

worker, educator , fund raiser, thinker, organizer and social advocate, he contributed to the development of ideas and programs to meet the challenges which faced America in this transitional era.

Whatever social need was voiced in America, whether it was the immigrant, war relief, the problem of the unemployed, injustice to laborers; wherever there was a need, it was recognized and identified by those directly affected by the pain, and by Jacob Billikopf. He made tangible the response of our inner conscience through the channels of social justice. He believed that charity and social responsibility were human obligations, moral duties. His is an important vantage point from which to view this building era that served to shape the social institutions and social justice involvement of the American Jewish community. Billikopf combined a graceful manner in approaching these immigrants with an ability to put his human understanding into practical action; this enabled him to mold such a special place in history for himself.

Jacob Billikopf brought to his work a unique combination of background, personality, ability and training. He was born June 1, 1883 in Vilna, Russia, the youngest of three sons, the fifth of six children. His father, Louis Bielikov, was a tailor and his mother, Glikla (Katzenelenbogen) Bielikov, worked in a bookshop. His mother's family, a very famous family in Russia, could claim rabbis, scholars and poets to its credit. This was a heritage which Billikopf often claimed proudly. When Billikopf was in his early adolescence 1894/1897 he and part of his family

immigrated to Richmond, Virginia where his older sister had settled. ¹

It was this, his own personal experience, which sensitized Billikopf to the realities of the immigrant world. He knew the strangeness of this new land, the fear, bewilderment, embarrassment which could result. Yet he knew, as well, the warmth that accompanied a friendly gesture to a stranger.

The following is reported about Billikopf's initial arrival to this country . This story was related when Billikopf was asked to come to Richmond in 1925 to speak of his friend the late Judge Turpin of the supreme court of Virginia :

Judge Turpin befriended the lad who at 14 came - homesick and seasick all the way - from his father's tailor shop in Russia. On his way from New York to Richmond while changing cars at Baltimore, he caught his first glimpse of a Negro, mistook the good natured giant for one of the cannibals he had read about in his Russian reader and fled shrieking.

The Judge turned the boy loose in a library stocked with Scott, Dickens and Bulwer-Lytton.

The first Book put in his hands was David Copperfield, which the Judge expounded in a way which made Micawber and Betsey Trotwood seem to be epic figures of our civilization.²

The experience which young Billikopf had with Judge Turpin foreshadows the type of individual he would be as an adult, a human being with the rare charm and friendliness that could turn an odd moment with a stranger into the basis for a life long friendship.

As well, the passion for knowledge demonstrated by that young child as he wondered through Judge Turpin's library never faltered in Billikopf. The young Billikopf was reported to have been an outstanding student. His love for books and thirst for learning were his drive and motivation in his quest to become part and parcel of the American culture. Perhaps there were other motivations which pressured the young immigrant to perform beyond the normal expectations. What type experience was school for a young Russian boy, eleven years of age? Perhaps it is the type of experience filled with the emotions which no record, no written word can express, but which is ever present for each of us in our own school day memories; the memories of the cruelty and embarrassment imposed by children upon the new child or any child who was the slightest bit different with that difference being the sole justification for such treatment. Billikopf attended grammar school in Richmond with his nephew. Billikopf's own recounting gives illumination to the experience of those days:

Some years ago two boys, one six and the other eleven, entered the grammar schools of Richmond, Va., as students. The younger student could speak English as well as could be expected from a child of six, while the other boy, a "greenhorn" from Russia, knew nothing of the English language, which put him at a distinct disadvantage at school. On the first day of school the younger was highly elated at having his uncle, the eleven-year-old boy, of whom he had heard so much, go to school with him.

The joy was short lived however, for soon the six-year-old began to complain of his eleven-year-old uncle's ignorance. His inability to speak English made him seem more or less ridiculous in the childish minds of the pupils, and they laughed whenever an opportunity showed itself. The immigrant, however, didn't seem to mind it, as he was determined to learn; but the younger lad used to come home nearly every day crying and bemoaning the fact he

had an uncle who could not speak English, and who was laughed at by the kids in the class.³

There in the classrooms of the John Marshall Primary School in Richmond, Virginia, the young Billikopf was to get his initiation into the often harsh reality of the immigrant. This first hand experience echoes throughout his career. Billikopf, the settler of thousands of Eastern Jews through the Galveston Movement, was noted for his unique understanding of the immigrant, and his programs were known for their sensitivity to the spiritual and emotional needs of the immigrant. The programs which he developed, the specifics of which will be discussed in later chapters, are nevertheless a direct outgrowth of these childhood experiences.

In many cases Billikopf is described as a driven man, possessed by a passion that seemed to be rooted deep in the essence of this individual. These childhood experiences lend themselves to the understanding of the man. Billikopf was always that "determined individual" with the passion and tenacious character that enabled an "Eastern European Jew" to emerge into the success story which his career indicates. Such determination is exemplified in the fact that some years later, on the very same day that the afore mentioned younger lad was graduating from grammar school, the young Russian immigrant, Jacob Billikopf, was graduating from a post graduate program at the University of Chicago, after having already attended high school and the University of Richmond.⁴ He had entered first grade with his young nephew, and by the end of that same year, he had completed the eighth grade. No matter how self-aggrandizing or inflated

these comments and stories about his early days are, by Billikopf and others, the facts speak for themselves. Having arrived in this country in his adolescence, in only a short number of years Billikopf had graduated with a Ph B from a prestigious university.

Billikopf had to support himself through high school and the University of Richmond. His persistent nature and industrious character provided him with the fortitude necessary to the success of his economic efforts. While at grammar school he worked at the corner grocery store and other mercantile establishments after school and on Saturdays, and when he entered high school he capitalized on a vogue of the time. It was the custom among many people to have the photograph of their sweetheart encased in a little frame of gold or gold plate, and this was worn on the lapel of the coat or was pinned to the shirtwaist. Of course the greater the number of sweethearts, the greater the amount of business young Billikopf did.⁵ Billikopf made money providing these frames.

In time however this fashion died a natural death, and then stereopticon views came into favor. It is reported that young Billikopf saw in the latest fashion another opportunity to make a living, so he gave up the selling of "gold framed" photos and turned to selling stereopticon views. The proceeds from both jobs paid his way through high school and Richmond College, now known as the University of Richmond.⁶

His days struggling to make his way through Richmond College were short in number, for his gift as a writer made the financing of graduate work less of a burden. His article in the college *Messenger* won him a fellowship from the National Council of Jewish Women to the University of Chicago, where he received the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy in 1903.⁷ Although he remained at Richmond College only a year, 1900-1901, it is reported that this institution of higher learning held a special place in Billikopf's affections. According to Maurice Hexter, a fellow social worker and a life long friend, the following was reported:

I have frequently discussed his early days there. It is surprising how profound an impression the College and its men made on him-- more vividly than even the larger universities he later attended or at which he lectured . He has frequently told me of Dr. Samuel C. Mitchell who was at that time on the Faculty , and who has exercised a profound and abiding influence upon him. He has always retained more than the usual college affection and has, I believe, established an annual prize there; I learn also that he is continually donating books to their library. Strange, is it not that, how amidst all his multifarious contacts, he still has this profound affection for his first college, even though he spent but a few years there.⁸

The words of Billikopf's associate are substantiated in the records of his correspondence with Dr. Samuel C. Mitchell. He was indeed in constant contact with his teacher. They wrote on many subjects and although Billikopf had studied history with Professor Mitchell, their letters contained their ideas of a quest for a better world. It is evident that Mitchell's thinking on social justice was ever present in Billikopf's mind. As one example of such exchanges, reflecting their concern with the highest ideals of our society, Mitchell wrote to Billikopf before Billikopf's

visit to the Tuskegee Institute in 1915 :

I am rejoiced that you are going there. It is a place full of inspiration. I feel that we ought to delight in the richness of racial varieties. Instead of wishing all the world made in one mold, let us rejoice that each race has its own aptitudes. We like variety in art. The thing that we most object to is the monotony of Egyptian art. Yesterday in Boston I looked at an excellent collection of precious stone-cameos. Much of the interest in viewing the collection consisted in the fact that every stone was practically of a different hue and different structure.

The Negro is a human being and we must teach him as such. Justice in economics, educational and social relationships, as well as in the courts must be his.⁹

As well as the ideological bond, the personal affections in these two men for each other ran deep. In numerous letters Mitchell would close, " I often recall our days together at Richmond College where you awakened in me the hopes your noble career has so admirably fulfilled."¹⁰ Billikopf received the support of his teacher in most of his endeavors, and he sent article after article , recounting his activities to Mitchell. The Richmond College benefited from this relationship as well.

Billikopf, in 1948, endowed a fund which established an annual prize at the University of Richmond in honor of Samuel C. Mitchell. Billikopf in fact sponsored several prizes in the university for the best work in Political Science and Economics. He did this in 1924, giving a donation of one hundred and seventy five dollars each year to run for three consecutive years. He established in 1924 The Jacob Billikopf Alcove of History, providing the funds for the library to supplement the history section.¹¹ The place which Richmond College held in the esteem of Jacob Billikopf is to be judged by its impact. It is clear that this

experience as well as the early years in the Marshall Primary School and High School had an effect on Billikopf far beyond what their time factor would indicate.

Early experiences were important to the young Billikopf. The friends that he made, the lessons that he learned, the values which his life experience taught him pervaded his thought, his achievements. The concept of the first impression, the way in which one is perceived and treated at first which colors one's idea of the place or the person, was an experience which Billikopf translated into his immigrant work and into his personal contacts.

It was very true for Jacob Billikopf that the experiences that he had in his early life would not only produce great prophetic value for his later work in philanthropy, but some of those early contacts would have great bearing on his career as well. It has been mentioned before that Billikopf lightened his financial burden in his graduate years by utilizing his writing ability. The contest he won which was sponsored by the National Council of Jewish Women was judged by Julian Mack.¹² Mack, an important American Jewish leader, would in time come to be one of the men with whom Billikopf had close working relations.

After those formative years Jacob Billikopf had decided to make his life work the care for his fellow man. He would do it through the channels of social work.

Coming as he did to this country, the victim of oppression in his native land, he early recognized a spiritual meaning in our institutions and is making his life work to instill into those who have arrived from other shores the true

significance of liberty and freedom as distinguished from license and lawlessness."¹³

He started that attempt at the University of Chicago. At the beginning of the twentieth century this was a new and uncharted area. The necessity for social work to be molded into a profession made it appealing to the young Billikopf. He was entering it at a transitional time. At the end of the nineteenth century we find social work pushing for professionalism, facing an imperative need for new methods to deal with old problems. The prevailing philosophy had been one of laissez-faire; the fear was that if the unemployed were given public welfare they would prefer this lazy state to employment. Walter I. Trattner, in his book From Poor Law to Welfare State makes the following point:

The poor were held in contempt in an acquisitive society in which wealth became almost an end in itself. It was not difficult to believe that indigence was simply punishment for the improvident for their lack of industry and morality—the direct consequence of sloth and sinfulness.¹⁴

He points out as well that this interpretation, which confined the poor to a purgatory of personal failure, made them outcasts of society. This was fortified by the pseudo-scientific teaching of Herbert Spencer, the English civil engineer turned philosopher, who coined the phrase "survival of the fittest," and others who applied the Darwinian theory of evolution to social conditions and thought. People of the Spencer school of thought even claimed that it was harmful to create charitable organizations which would care for these people.

Spencerians claimed competition was the law of life, there was no remedy for poverty other than self help. Those who remained poor were the unfit who had to pay the price exacted by "the decree of a large far-seeing benevolence."

Any interference in their behalf, whether undertaken by state or by unwise philanthropists, was not only pointless but hazardous. Protecting the ill-favored in the struggle for existence would only permit them to multiply and could lead to no other result than a disastrous weakening of the species."¹⁵

Trattner also points out that "Social Darwinism" as it was called, an unhappy union between laissez-faire economics and the doctrine of the struggle of the fittest, became the prevailing philosophy of the era. The result of this philosophy, coupled with the Industrial Revolution and the massive waves of immigration, produced increasing numbers of affluent families yet ignored poverty, sickness and social injustice.

There were in the end of the nineteenth century and in the beginnings of the twentieth century a number of organizations which were forming simultaneously in the Jewish and secular communities to alleviate social maladies. States began to establish boards of charities for the improvement of public agencies and institutions, with the first put in to operation in 1863 in Massachusetts.¹⁶ In 1873 the National Conference of Charities and Correction, (now the National Conference of Social Workers,) was founded. A national council of charity officers soon followed.¹⁷ The social settlement movement for the cultural advancement of men and women in depressed slum and tenant areas, first begun in England, followed in this country in 1886.¹⁸ Its leaders were attempting to develop a systematic approach to the problems of poverty and dependency.¹⁹

This attempt to overcome the fallout of the previous conceptual approach to the

poor and indigent created these new institutions. These movements, whether secular or Jewish, had one thing in common, the need for a professional. That is best described by Trattner as follows:

At one time the word profession was a generic term that embraced the ministry, law and medicine. Over the years however, especially in the late nineteenth century, as the generalist was beginning to fade before the mounting complexities of modern existence, other groups -teachers, engineers, geologists, chemists, economists, political scientists, and so on experienced a formative growth toward self-consciousness and efficient organization that resulted in their becoming professions. Before they could do so , however, they had to have a systematic body of knowledge, a monopoly of skill obtained from higher education and training, and a subculture whose members shared a group identity and common values.²⁰

By the end of the nineteenth century, expansion and specialization of agencies created a demand for more specialized training than that provided by the study of the "economic aspects of altruism" then provided in the college sociology classes of the day. These needs had to be met by institutions that could develop the "systematic body of knowledge" to meet the demands of this transitional period. This was a period marked by the ghettos and slums, the white plague, raising crime rates, juvenile delinquency, the lack of provision for sanitation and public health, the social and economic dependency that arose from uncertain employment, low wages, industrial accidents, premature old age and other social hazards. These issues were even further intensified for the immigrant, who had his own specific set of problems to cope with, and people began to realize that neither the previous methods nor simple "good intentions" could solve these

research, professional discipline, and other highly technical and specific skills was essential. This need was met by the formation of several schools in the early twentieth century. As early as 1901, Graham Taylor's Chicago Commons settlement house and the University of Chicago cooperated in offering a special extension course taught by Taylor and Julia Lathrop of Hull House. This course led to the founding of an independent institution, the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, later to become the Chicago School of Social Service.²¹ One institution, founded as early as 1898 and acclaimed to be the country's first school of social work by the New York Charity Organization, was formalized early in the 20th century. In 1904 that school became the New York School of Philanthropy and was directed by Philip W. Ayers. He expanded the program to a full academic year. The school, over time, underwent further changes to meet the pressing needs of American society's social dilemmas and finally evolved into the the New York School of Social Work. Later it became the the Columbia University Graduate School of Social work.

Billikopf, who graduated from the University of Chicago in 1903 and the New York School of Philanthropy in 1905, was indeed a product of the innovative and progressive movement in which he became entwined; the movement which attempted to meet the challenge of turning what had been a organization of volunteer work into one which would be professional in its nature. Jacob Billikopf's entrance into the working world as a social worker in 1904 marked

several other significant changes.

Billikopf was entering into a field that had been dominated, both in secular and Jewish walks of life, by women. Clara Barton, who founded the American Red Cross in 1882, founders of Settlement Houses, notably Jane Addams, who founded Hull House in Chicago in 1889, and Lilian Wald, who founded Hennery Street Settlement in New York City in 1893 are examples of such women.²² The fact that women were the primary workers and innovators in the field of charity organization and philanthropy has its biblical roots in the New Testament. We find the figure Dorcas, a Christian disciple, (Acts 9:36), who is the model for such Christian work. This predominance of women continued throughout the growth of this profession. By the year 1939 there were 37 schools, all members of the American Association of Schools of Social Work, which had been established in 1919. It is reported that enrollment in 1938 exceeded 7000 students, 83% women.²³ Philanthropy offered a unique career opportunity for American women. This predominance of women was not to change as quickly in the secular domain as it was in Jewish circles.

Social work and philanthropy offered a unique career opportunity for another minority in America. That was the Eastern European Jew who was bright enough to sense this opportunity and to integrate himself into this profession. The pursuit of this professional endeavor served the vital function of keeping him out of the sweatshops, as well as providing ample opportunity to advance in an

economic and social setting that was dominated by German Jews. In fact, Eastern European Jews were taking the place of German Jews in this field. This fact, another of the anomalies attached to Billikopf's entering the field, came about for a variety of reasons.

First, the individuals from an Eastern European background who became involved with this field were simply able individuals. They had the ability to master the training that was necessary, and in many cases they became the motivating agents of change and advancement in the entire field of social welfare. Secondly, the primary need of the German Jewish community for social workers at this time was to meet the demands and strains placed on the American Jewish Community by the waves of Eastern European immigration. The German Jews had the training of social servants, social research, and other highly technical skills and the professional discipline which were essential. Yet such training and the good intentions of the German Jews alone could not solve the vast number of problems inherent in the process of immigration and absorption. The young intelligent Eastern European social workers had the distinct advantage of sharing a common language and culture with the immigrants whom they attempted to help. They spoke the common language, Yiddish. Men of the caliber of Billikopf also were versed in Russian, and Billokopf had the further distinction that he could make his way through Hebrew documents and traditional Jewish texts. More important than the trained skills which these Eastern Europeans offered in their work, was the reality that these

young individuals such as Billikopf had gone through this same immigrant experience. The German Jewish leadership realized it would be better both for them and for the immigrant if "their own kind" were to deal with this complex problem.

An additional factor, which Billikopf's coming into this work in 1904 marked, was the fact that he had been trained in an institution which had grown out of a reaction to the rather harsh social welfare philosophy of the previous generation, the afore mentioned reaction to the Social Darwinism of the day. However, this philosophy was still secular in its nature; the principles and the approaches in Jewish work were quite different. They are as old as Judaism itself and were part and parcel of the mindset of Jacob Billikopf. These differences between the view of social work in the secular community and in the Jewish community are best explicated in Lurie's work A Heritage Affirmed :

From the outset, at least one basic distinction existed between the Jewish and the other voluntary systems of welfare. Inadequate or niggardly as some of the assistance given by the Jewish agencies may have been at that time, there was no doubt in the minds of the Jewish welfare leaders that the care of the Jewish poor and underfortunate was the responsibility of the Jewish community and that helping the poor was a basic group responsibility. Centuries-old traditions of communal responsibility meant that individuals in need did not, as the last resort of poverty have to turn to the public almshouse, but could rightfully expect help from other Jews.²⁴

Out of the reaction that America had to secular principles, Billikopf benefited by the chance to become a professional. America as well benefited by having one

of its first innovators in the field bring the strength of the Jewish tradition to his work. Billikopf's perception of the Jewish view of philanthropy had dramatic impact on his work in both the Jewish community and the non- Jewish community . The specifics of this impact are described in detail in the following chapters. What is beneficial to an understanding of that work is to consider what concepts Billikopf drew upon.

It would be impossible, nor is it the goal of this work , to discuss the numerous comments in the teachings of Judaism and in its literature which address social welfare .These are under the greater rubric contained in the Jewish concept of *zedakah* . However, in order to further an understanding of Jacob Billikopf's work, the perspective and the tradition from which he operated, it is necessary to outline the very basics which underlie the concept of *zedakah*.

As it has been mentioned before, the traditions of Jewish social service are derived from the original concept of *zedakah* , which literally translates to "righteousness." Crucial to this conception is that an act of *zedakah* is therefore not an act of grace or of liberality, as in the Christian concept of charity, but rather an act of duty towards one's fellow man. The sources for the concept of *zedakah* are found in the Bible in Deuteronomy chapter 15 verses 7-11:

If there be among you a needy man, one of thy brethren,
within any of thy gates, in thy land which the Lord thy God
giveth thee, thou shalt not harden thy heart, nor shut thy
hand from thy needy brother; but thou shalt surely open
thy hand unto him, and surely lend him sufficient for his
need in that which he wanteth... Thou shalt surely give him,

and thy heart shall not be grieved when thou givest unto him; because that for this thing the Lord thy God will bless thee in all thy work, and all that thou puttest thy hand unto. For the poor shall never cease out of the land (interpreted by Rashi as meaning in those lands where the will of God in not heeded); therefore, I command thee saying: "*Thou shalt surely open thy hand unto thy poor and needy brother in thy land.*"²⁵

For the Jew, the Bible provides the scriptural bases for tenets of his religion, but the day to day laws that are obligatory for the Jew were deduced from that text by the Rabbis. Their interpretation is based on the above text as well as other texts in Psalms and the Prophetic works. Summing up the intention in their interpretation is done well by Israel Chipkin in his article on *Judaism and Social Welfare* :

What the Rabbis are concerned with particularly is the spirit of the giver and the recipient. They expected humility and the attitude of sharing on the part of both, since both rich and poor are children of God to whom all material possessions belong.

From the Psalmist's declaration that the earth "and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein" are the Lord's (Ps.24:1) the rabbis deduced that all wealth belongs to God and that it is obligatory to share with those less fortunate. "Give unto Him of what is His, seeing that thou and what thou has are His(Abot 3.8.)." As a corollary of this teaching, they concluded that poor and rich, being like a child of God, are to regard one another as brothers and that God, Father of both rich and poor wants one to help the other, and this is the way to make the household of love."²⁶

The concepts of the Rabbis were transposed into laws and were codified . One such codification took place in 1565 by Joseph Cairo in his work the *Shulhan Aruch* . This code of law gives the following law describing the nature of the

community's obligations to the poor and the needy, addressing the question of how much should be given to the poor:

How much is to be given to the poor man? Sufficient for his need in that he wanteth. Thus, if he is hungry he should be fed; if he need clothes he should be clothed; if he lacks household utensils, they should be purchased for him; and even if he had been accustomed before he was impoverished to ride on horse back with a slave running before him, he should be furnished with horse and slave. And so each and every one should be supplied with what he needs. If it is fit to give him merely a slice of bread, give him a slice of bread; if it is proper to give him dough, give him dough; if he ought to be provided with lodging, too, provide a bed for him. If it is fit to give him a warm meal, give him a warm meal; if cold lunch, then cold lunch. If he has to be fed like an infant, than he must be fed. If he is unmarried and he comes to take a wife, the community should find him a mate; but first they should rent him a home, prepare him a bed and furnish him with the necessary household utensils, then marry him off. (Article 250, section I, pg 8-9 Fineberg Translation)²⁷

It is the job of a text such as the Talmud and Codes to tell the Jew what he should do in relation to the concept of *zedakah*, but Jewish scholars have consistently commented on how that should be done as well. The most famous commentary is by the twelfth-century scholar Maimonides who described the eight rungs of charity, found in his code *Yad Hahazakah*. These principles are the most basic in *zedakah* and are at the core of Billikopf's method and view of *zedekah* which will be demonstrated in following chapters. The Eight rungs of *zedakah* are as follows:

The Eight kinds of givers: Foremost is he who assists a poor man to become self-supporting by helping him to establish himself in some profitable occupation, and, if necessary, by advancing him the money for that purpose. Second is he who gives secretly, so that he and the

recipient know not each other. Third is he who gives secretly to a poor man whom he knows, but the recipient knows not the giver. Fourth is he who gives to a poor man he does not know, but the poor knows the giver. Fifth is he who gives before he is solicited. Sixth is he who gives after he is solicited. Seventh is he who gives inadequately but with good grace. Eighth is he who gives inadequately and with bad grace." 28a

These biblically rooted ideas, laws, and concepts combine to constitute the classical understanding of the Jewish concept of *zedakah*. It is from this frame of reference which Billikopf drew strength and ideological fortification throughout his innovative career. These explications of the Jewish thought on *zedaka* help draw a clear distinction between the non-Jewish and Jewish views of philanthropy. It is important to appreciate this distinction in order to understand the dimensions of Jacob Billikopf, who left the "new schools" in order to step into the world of Jewish social work as the professional.

After Billikopf finished the program at University of Chicago, but before he furthered his studies at the New York School of Philanthropy, he was given a job in New York City. That position was with the Industrial Removal Office there. The job was a social work position; his pay was \$7 a week.^{28b} Although the monetary aspect of this job was not outstanding for the times, nevertheless the contacts Billikopf made in this office were to be fruitful. In a rather nostalgic letter in 1950 to his distinguished friend Harry Lang of *The Forward* Billikopf himself writes of the importance of the IRO.

May I say, that after I left the University of Chicago, where I did my post-graduate work, I came to New York and resided in the Educational Alliance and the University

Settlement, and my first job was with the Removal Office, then headed by David Bressler and Morris Waldman. The President of the Organization at the time was Cyrus L. Sulzberger.

An account of the Removal Office would be a glowing chapter in the history of Jewish philanthropies in America. It certainly was conducted in a humane manner. Throughout the United States today one will find thousands and thousands of children & grandchildren of those who were originally distributed through the Removal Office²⁹

The Industrial Removal Office was only one part of the organizational machinery that responded to the conditions created by the vast waves of immigrants. These conditions affected both immigrant and the community on whose shores they landed, in this case the American Jewish Community . The late nineteenth century brought with it new waves of pogroms, combined with the expulsion of Jews from Moscow, Kiev and other cities in Russia. The result of this was a belief by world Jewry that the only answer was emigration. The Jewish Colonization Association (ICA) was established in 1891, funded by the Baron Maurice De Hirsch(1831-1896) ,a German Jew. Also under the auspices of of the American Baron de Hirsh Fund, was the Industrial Removal Office, founded in 1901, and established as part of the Jewish Agricultural and Industrial Aid Society. If the Baron de Hirsch institutions throughout the world could be said to share one common ideology , that ideology would be the dispersion of the Jews and the encouragement to settle on the land. Thus in keeping with this ideological quest, the Baron de Hirsch Fund joined with the Jewish Colonization Association to establish a credit institution for the creation and maintenance of agricultural and industrial homesteads . This was known as the Jewish Agricultural and Industrial

Aid Society, founded in 1900. But this alone did not solve the American Jewish phenomenon.³⁰

In the years of heavy immigration to the United States, the majority of the individuals who came to this country came to eastern ports of entry. Most came specifically to the port of New York where over 73% remained. This set the stage for significant problems in the absorption of so many foreigners. The specific objective of the Industrial Removal Office was to relieve this congestion in the cities on the eastern seaboard. The Industrial Removal Office diverted part of the stream of immigration to the interior of the country, where representatives of the organization and related participating committees assisted the immigrants in finding homes and employment. These committees extended throughout the south and west, and were usually organized by the local B'nai B'rith Lodges. The Industrial Removal Office served as a non-profit employment agency. Also the IRO hired traveling representatives who were sent to organize the interior communities ; the communities were usually subventioned by the IRO, to the amount of \$25 for every family and \$10 for every unattached man. The goal of these funds was to settle the immigrants in a community and to further their Americanization. The local committees would keep the main office apprised of how many jobs were available in their cities and towns. The committees would commit themselves to the absorption of so many immigrants per month. The New York office placed ads in the Yiddish newspapers encouraging men with skills to come to the agency for aid in securing employment, trying to match the skills of

an individual with the needs of a community.

In 1907 the Industrial Removal Office became independent of the Jewish Agricultural Society. Its income was derived from the Jewish Colonization Association in Paris and from the contributions of clients toward the expense of transportation; transportation for clients was offered at half-rate prices, through an arrangement made by the IRO with the railroads. As an independent agency it continued to fulfill its objectives. A prime objective was that it remain philanthropic in nature in that it helped those who were unemployed to go to communities where they had a better chance to earn wages and become self-sufficient; A second, sociologically oriented objective was the desire of the IRO to divert immigration to the interior, creating a nucleus around which Jewish communities could form. This would, in turn, attract future newcomers who would come without the assistance of any organization.

The Industrial Removal Office operated till 1922. The last available figures, which end in 1917, record that the IRO distributed 79,000 immigrants.³¹ This figure includes 5000 individuals removed by the Philadelphia and Boston branches alone.

On the basis of an immigration of one and one-half million Jews in the United States between 1901 and 1913, and a distribution -direct and indirect- of 100,000, it appears that the Industrial Removal Office removed between six and seven percent of the total number of the arrivals. The hope of the Industrial Removal Office that every family would attract others appears to have been substantially realized.³²

The degree of success which the Industrial Removal Office achieved was in part due to Jacob Billikopf's first boss, David M. Bressler, a young New York lawyer of Eastern European origin similar to that Billikopf. He was the general manager of the IRO from 1903 till 1916, when he resigned due to the war and the decrease in the flow of immigrants. He was also instrumental in the Galveston Movement, which took its modus operandi from the pattern established by the Industrial Removal Office. Billikopf worked closely with Bressler in both the IRO and The Galveston Movement, as we shall see. Their association was a lasting one, for they also were co-workers in the Joint Distribution Committee's campaigns. Their ongoing association will be examined in later chapters.

The Industrial Removal Office played a vital role in the history of immigration of Jews in America and a role as well in transporting the young Billikopf into the mainstream of social welfare for the American Jewish community. As for its role in immigration, even the United States government was interested in the success of this "removal" idea. The organization was of interest to men such as Franklin Pierce Sargent, Commissioner-General of Immigration, because it did in a voluntary way what the laws could not do. The IRO alone could move the masses of immigrants so that they would be absorbed into the community at large, preventing the dreaded "immigrant colonies." Proof of the fact that the government saw the IRO as an excellent idea was their own formation of similar institutions, paralleling the IRO's organization. The National Labor Bureau of New York and Division of Information of the Department of Commerce and Labor

were created to deal with the problem. The government had to find ways to relieve the congestion in the port areas as well or else close the doors of immigration. For the Jewish community leadership, in light of the 1903 and 1904 pogroms, this was not a desirable alternative.³³

The importance of the Industrial Removal Office for young Billikopf was not only in the fact that it gave him contact with such individuals as Bressler and the notable Jacob Schiff, one of the founders. It gave him an opportunity to work as social worker; it also allowed him to put his personal experience as an immigrant to work for his landmen.

Of the 79,000 individuals placed by the Industrial Removal Office who were moved before 1914, 78.1% of them were Russian. This heavy percentage reflected the disproportionate numbers of Russian Jews in this wave of Jewish immigration. This created yet another difficulty in the absorption of immigrants; in the cities and towns of America, two communities of Jews were forming, the Russian immigrant and the German who was here to greet him.³⁴ There was no one Jewish community till the 1920's. This point is emphasized by Dr. Jacob Rader Marcus in his article, *Background for the History of American Jewry* :

In 1920, even though there were over 3,500,000 Jews in this country, one could not speak of a genuine American Jewish Community. Such a community simply did not exist. Instead, there were *two* separate Jewish communities eyeing one another warily--the native, or "German," and the immigrant, or "Russian." No one national American-Jewish community had developed as an organic structure; there was not even one organized *local*

American Jewish community, for practically all Jewish institutions were still autonomous. The sources of conflict between the two large "communities" were many and varied. The East Europeans regarded their usually wealthier and more prestigious coreligionists of German origin with envy; the Germans looked down on the "newcomers" with disdain. The Orthodox and the Reformers distrusted each other, while both looked askance at the religious indifference of the Jewish labor union leaders. The five decades between 1880 and 1930 were filled with conflicts between the elite and the masses, between political conservatives and liberals, democrats and socialists. Immigrants and natives were arrayed against each other. The East Europeans, who wanted one central, all-embracing national American Jewish community--which, if only by sheer weight of numbers, they could hope to control--struggled against the Germans, who wanted decentralization and the right to go their own way--by which they hoped to undermine challenges to their traditional leadership.³⁴

In facing the challenge of this problem Billikopf's greatest attribute became evident. He could bring diverse groups together, serving as the natural bridge between them. He could understand the immigrant, his need, his confusion, while transposing those needs into programs which satisfied the German Jews' need to Americanize these people. For the German Jew, the problem was how to absorb this embarrassment into society, how to break them of their native old country ways (which the German Jews took such pride in having shed themselves.) For the immigrant, the problem was simply how to become an American. For Billikopf the challenge was how to allow both communities to work together, if not to fuse, with dignity. This process started in the workings of the Industrial Removal Office and continued into other areas of social welfare.

Billikopf had been a social worker at the Industrial Removal Office for most of the year of 1903. He got his first chance to work in a settlement house when he was invited to come to Cincinnati. Boris Bogen was then the new director of the United Hebrew Charities of Cincinnati. Bogen was a Russian born Jew who had been a teacher at the Baron de Hirsch Trade School in Woodbine, New Jersey.³⁵

Billikopf did not stay in Cincinnati more than a year at the settlement house, for he was back in New York in 1905 to attend the New York School of Philanthropy. The time he spent in Cincinnati has been lost to historical record. All that we have is a listing of Billikopf's job experiences in Cincinnati and his work as director of the settlement house. However, details of that work are not available. The records of the United Jewish Charity of Cincinnati for 1904-1905 which are housed at the American Jewish Archives in Cincinnati, make no mention of him or reference to him. Similarly, Billikopf worked in Milwaukee from 1905-1907. He was brought to Milwaukee by the beneficiaries of the Hebrew Relief Association. Billikopf was appointed superintendent of the Milwaukee Federation. He was followed by a number of other able men who, as well as Billikopf, used the experience of their work in Milwaukee as a stepping stone to notable careers in social work. The work done in Milwaukee is difficult to document. Swickow and Gartner in their The History of the Jews of Milwaukee, make very brief mention of Billikopf, noting only that he was indeed the first superintendent of the Federation there.

What is significant about the time that Billikopf spent in both Cincinnati and

Milwaukee is that he was working in two of the first seven federations; his activity and influence in these organizations parallels his involvement in and impact on the entire, greater field of Jewish social work. Perhaps it is not important that certain specific facts of Billikopf's work in these positions have gone unrecorded, for what is apparent and actually important is that he exercised influence and change in these organizations.

Billikopf's ability to be successful was based on an aspect of his character which always remained the same, his true understanding of the concept of *zedekah*, righteousness. This affected the manner in which he approached his clients, and his concept of the effect of his work. While living in a world of social work based on Christian "charity," Billikopf's work preserved the distinct quality of Jewish *zedekah*. Billikopf was known for his ability to empathize with the pain of the immigrant without "pitying" them. Having come from the same background as many of his clients, he understood their fears and needs; yet, he went a step further and used this understanding as a tool to find practical solutions. Importantly, he always preserved the dignity of the immigrant.

His success was based on another understanding, the reciprocity of the relationship between society and the immigrant. Billikopf knew that in helping the immigrant, he also helped American society; in this way, the term "social justice" takes on even greater meaning. It is not only advantageous to the one in need to

receive *zedekah* ; all profit from true righteousness. Perhaps Billikopf understood this reciprocity so well because he, too, had such a relationship with society. His perception of social justice allowed him to help society advance; American society allowed him to do his work. He was both a cause of and a product of, the exciting times in which he lived. Having received *zedekah*, he was now willing and very able to give to others, and properly. On the cutting edge of social work as a profession, Billikopf knew how to respond to the call of those in need, while still preserving human dignity. With this understanding, Jacob Billikopf dramatically helped change the face of social work in America.

It will be the focus of this work to look at the first half of Billikopf's career, spanning the years 1907-1933, in the cities of Kansas City, New York and Philadelphia. Through Billikopf's exercise of innovative social change, he acquired national status in the world of social welfare; simultaneously, he brought, by virtue of his involvement in that world, improved institutions and legislation involving sound welfare organizations and institutions.

Kansas City: From Midwestern Social Worker to National Prominence

The year 1907, for Jacob Billikopf, was marked by the request of the Kansas City Federation, one of the first of seven in the United States, asking him to come to be their superintendent of charities. In the late nineteenth century it became evident to the Kansas City community that there was a need for some organization of its charitable societies. There was much duplication of services for the immigrant, the poor and the needy, all having in common poor organization. Much of the activity was centered around the Reform congregation of Kansas City, Temple B'nai Jehudah. For this reason it is not surprising that a group of the Men's General Relief Society, led by William J. Berkowitz, Rabbi Harry Mayer and Gustave Bernheimer, began earnestly to espouse a movement to unify all charity work. The various societies and organizations involved agreed in late 1900 to federate through the incorporation of the United Jewish Charities, which was formalized in March, 1901.³⁶ The United Jewish Charities was formed of the following affiliated societies: The Men's General Relief Society, Kansas City Section, Council of Jewish Women, Women's Charity Association, Bertha E. Haas Shoe Fund, and Sophia Negass Sewing Circle. These societies placed their separately-raised funds into one treasury for dispensation from this common source. This idea, according to an article called "*Mistaken Methods of*

Charity and How to Correct Them," by Rabbi Berkowitz was developed in 1888 by the rabbi.³⁷ The United Jewish Charities, led by its first president William Berkowitz, had close ties with the Industrial Removal Office and through its involvement settled a number of immigrant families. These families, which were settled in Kansas City, served to calm the community's moral conscience in regard to their fellow Jews. These immigrants' needs created a challenge for the community.

News of the eleven days of bloody pogroms in the Russian "Pale of Settlement" in October of 1905 hit the Kansas community very hard. It is reported that the memorial service arranged by Gustave Bernheimer of Temple B'nai Jehudah was a tearful experience for all who attended.

For the community memorial service, held on Sunday evening, December 3, 1905, eight hundred persons were present. All the seats were occupied, the aisle were impassable, many, unable to crowd in the doors were forced away. Rabbi Mayer and Leon Block, past president of B'nai Jehudah, were speakers at the service. They differed in suggesting steps that might ameliorate the condition of the Jews in Russia. ³⁸

Whatever the differences between these approaches, they were set aside to answer the united call to raise funds in the Jewish communities of America to aid the relief of the destitute living victims. Kansas City responded to their fellow Jews in two ways. First they organized an effort to raise funds. This was done by Gustav Bernheimer who helped raise an unprecedented \$14,000 to \$16,000.³⁹ What was unusual about it, according to the *American Israelite*, was this amount

for a city of the size of Kansas City.⁴⁰ The second response to this event was the increased commitment of the community to care for their immigrants and to aid in the settlement of more of them.

Kansas City was to become the single largest center for placement of immigrants first through the IRO and then through the Galveston Movement.⁴¹ In 1905 the already intense challenge of the immigrants in Kansas City was increased by the prospects of more immigrants resulting from the pogroms. By 1906, Alfred Benjamin, then president of the United Jewish Charities, proposed a solution. Mr. Benjamin, upon assuming the presidency of the United Jewish Charities, immediately saw the need for a professional approach in assistance to the immigrants, moving away from the voluntary activities which had characterized much of the early work. This early work had been coordinated by B.A. Feineman who had previously served as part time superintendent of the United Hebrew Charities (1890-1900), and from 1905-1907 the 70 year old served as the first superintendent of the United Jewish Charities. Feineman was of the "old school" and was not what Benjamin felt that the community needed, a professional to run the settlement house and to coordinate the United Jewish Charities. In November of 1906, a mass meeting of the membership of the UJC was held at Temple B'nai Jehudah to secure sufficient funds to retain a person with such professional training; this was to be Mr. Billikopf. Benjamin had successfully persuaded the young social worker to leave his post in Milwaukee and come to Kansas City to be the Superintendent of the United Jewish Charities. The salary he received

was \$1,800 a year.⁴² The needs of Kansas City were as diverse as the talents of young Billikopf. However, the primary concern that Alfred Benjamin had intended for Billikopf was the care of the immigrant population. This situation, in his mind, called for professional experience. This population was growing in the country due to the events of 1905, and in Kansas City by great proportions due to its commitment to the Galveston Movement. Mr. Billikopf's first concern was to fulfill the community's commitment to the Galveston movement, and he was to have a free hand in that endeavor.

It is necessary to briefly describe the Galveston Movement, as Billikopf's work in the movement was so important in shaping his career. The Galveston Movement was created to deal with certain realities of the immigrant situation of the time. There was the issue which was addressed, as well, by the movement's predecessor, the Industrial Removal Office; this was the primary objective of helping to reduce the overcrowded conditions of the Eastern seaboard port cities, to move the immigrant to the less populated areas of the country, aid them in finding work, settlement, and in the Americanization process. The IRO work kept pace with the industrial growth of the country, so that by 1906 they had removed at least 40,000 persons.⁴³ An added realization which motivated the Galveston Movement was that the interior cities were believed to offer a much richer and fuller experience for the immigrant. The competition in the marketplace would be much less, increasing the immigrant's chance for success in America. This belief was held by Jacob Schiff, the founder of this movement. In a description of

the movement written by Jacob Billikopf the following is contained:

"Guide the immigrant", Mr. Schiff used to say, in discussing the project which was so close to his heart. "Open his eyes to the vastness of America, enable him to start in a locality where he will have a normal environment, where the market is not overcrowded, where life, though less swift is fuller, and you will make the immigrant a useful and productive citizen."

From the many conversations I had with him on this subject I know that he was thinking in terms of America first and then of the immigrant and his future, for he was desirous that the Jewish element of its citizenship should measure up to more exacting standards. ⁴⁴

Though similar in certain aims to the IRO, the Galveston Movement was a complete departure from the set policy and actual practice of the IRO. It was the first effort in America to divert immigration from the Eastern seaboard towns to territory west of the Mississippi by creating a port in the South. This problem had concerned Schiff for some time; he had as early as 1891 expressed this to Baron de Hirsch. He had been asked to explore the possibility of Mexico for immigration. In his response he stated the fundamental principle of both the IRO which he founded, and the Galveston Movement: "in the last analysis the United States remains the best field for colonization... especially in the states West of the Rocky Mountains." ⁴⁵

Till the year 1904 the IRO's efforts were directed toward inducing the immigrants to move to the "hinterland." By the end of 1904 Schiff had reached the conclusion that only by rerouting immigration could immigrants be induced to

settle in cities other than New York. With this conviction, Jacob H. Schiff started the process of letters and funds that would become the Galveston Movement. The movement was soon to become important to thousands of immigrants as well as a vital step in the career of Jacob Billikopf.

In 1904 Schiff wrote to Dr. Paul Nathan, then secretary of the *Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden* . He wrote to Germany because these were the ports from which Russian Jews emigrated. He requested in that letter that several ports be considered: "Suitable ports to which emigration could be advantageously directed: Philadelphia, Baltimore, Boston, New Orleans, Charleston, Savannah, and Galveston; also Montreal." ⁴⁶ This request brought no response in 1904. However there were events taking place in Europe, and new contacts in America, which would help bring this plan to fruition.

One of these events was the seventh Zionist Congress, meeting in Basle, Switzerland from July 27 to August 2, 1905. This was the first Congress which met without the leadership and charismatic guidance of Theodore Herzl. His death in 1904 had given rise to many factions holding diverse ideas and ideologies about the formation of a Jewish State. The seventh Zionist Congress found on its agenda the struggle for ideology and power wrapped up in the "Uganda Plan". The British had offered in 1903 a section of Uganda to be used for Jewish colonization. After the defeat of this proposal, several factions walked out of the Congress. One group which left were the Territorialists. They

considered the creation of an autonomus Jewish state to be paramount. Due to the obstacles to autonomy in Palestine they were willing to look elsewhere for a place where the dream of Herzl could be fulfilled. An organization grew out of those individuals who were determined to have this political autonomy.

Advocates of "Uganda" such as Dr. Max E. Mandelstamm and David Jochelmann and the English writer Israel Zangwill met separately in Basle and formed the Jewish Territorial Organization (ITO).

The ITO searched for the land which would be suitable for Jewish colonization through geographical commisions. But this was not a fruitful endeavor and by the year 1906 they were in need of some plan. It was at that rather low point in the existence of the ITO that they lent their attention to a rather interesting offer of one Jacob H. Schiff.

In 1906, Jacob H. Schiff had folowed up on a suggestion by the United States Commissioner-General of Immigration, Franklin Pierce Sargent. Sargent had sought out the famous Schiff because he knew that the philanthropist was concerned with both the problems of festering seaboard towns and the plight of Russian Jews. He suggested that the most effective way to solve these problems be to divert immigration to the U.S. port on the Gulf of Mexico. The suggestion from a high public offical was the catalyst event in America which brought the Galveston plan into realization. Jacob H. Schiff wrote to Israel Zangwill on August 24, 1906, in which he outlined the proposed plan which looked so inviting to the

then desperate men of the ITO: 47

It appears to me that in this existing emergency the Jewish Territorial organization, if for the time being it will occupy itself with something which is immediately practicable and sidetrack its cherished project of finding a separate land of refuge where a Jew can live under autonomous conditions, can be of very great service to the momentous and pressing cause which we all have very much at heart.

What I have in mind is that the Jewish Territorial Organization should take up a project through which it shall become possible to direct the flow of emigration from Russia to Gulf ports of the United States- from where immigrants can readily be distributed over the interior of the country, I am quite certain, in very large numbers... After immigrants have once been landed at New York, Boston, Philadelphia, or Baltimore, they have generally preferred to remain there, and notwithstanding all the efforts for the established removing offices, only a comparatively small number leave these centers - aside from the great cost of transportation from the Atlantic cities to the Far West and North West, which makes removal of large numbers from the East, where the great congestion prevails, to the great "American Hinterland", where a constant demand for labor exists, almost an impossibility. A proper and thoroughly organized movement of Russian emigration, such as I have outlined above, has never been attempted. It has been left more or less- rather more - to agents of the steamship companies to direct emigration, and the consequences show themselves. 48

Thus through a series of correspondence by Jacob Schiff and meetings with various European officials, the Galveston Movement was born. The dealings between the ITO in Europe and the committee in America which organized and implemented the Galveston Movement were not always smooth nor completely cooperative. Some of the complications which ensued were dealt with by Billikopf and others who were the technicians of the movement.

By the year 1907 Jacob H. Schiff had established all the groundwork to get this project going; his half a million dollars and constant concern fortified his dream. He sent to Galveston Morris D. Waldman who acted as a general agent, and who received help from Henry Cohen, the Rabbi of Galveston . There were buildings set up to receive the new arrivals and arrangements made with the communities surrounding the area which were to receive them. The plan was that the immigrants would be kept in Galveston a day or two days and then moved on to the respective cities. Billikopf describes the system:⁴⁹

Due to the organization of Jewish communities by the Industrial Removal Office in New York, a forerunner of the "Galveston movement" there was already in existence , in each of these communities, a responsible committee of leading Jewish citizens, which took charge of the batch of immigrants who came to them via Galveston, furnished them with clothing and lodging , and found jobs for them. The committee also acquainted them with evening-classes and other social service facilities of the city where they would, it was hoped, found new homes, which in turn would become the nucleus for the Jewish homes.

Usually, the paternalism of the local committee ceased after ten days or a fortnight. By this time the the immigrant had been placed.⁵⁰

This minimum interaction between immigrant and American Jew as described here was certainly not the case in Kansas City. The aid which the community extended to the immigrants was far reaching, as will be illustrated by a later discussion of Billikopf's innovations in this area . What is most striking about this statement of Billikopf's is the evidence of an infrastructure which was already

present in the various cities. This infrastructure was set up by men such as Billikopf. This had been one of his responsibilities while at the IRO in New York, and Kansas City wanted an expert such as Billikopf to aid them in their process. Alfred Benjamin, in his presidential address for the Annual Report of the United Jewish Charities for the year 1907-1908 explains the extent of Kansas City's commitment.

No doubt you have heard of the movement to divert immigration from Russia via New York to Galveston, and that Kansas City has agreed to take 20 of those people every sixty days. The idea is to relieve the congestion in New York- where conditions are such as to be serious. Over 150,000 Jewish emigrants arrived in New York from Russia in 1906. It was thought best by your board that this work be handled by a separate committee. The "Immigrants' Employment Bureau" has been formed, and Mr. Julius Davidson elected Chairman- which fact alone assures that the work will be done in the best possible manner. It is our aim to not only find employment for these people, but to take care of them in other ways- to organize classes to teach them the English language- to teach them the duty of citizenship- and to let them see that the country that they are going to make their new home is better than the one they are leaving. We will show them that there is no persecution here on account of religion- that if they become good citizens and obey the laws of the country, their every right will be secure and every liberty protected. We hope in the course of a few years to make these same immigrants subscribers to our fund.⁵¹

It is evident from the address of Alfred Benjamin that Kansas City was committed to the philosophy of Jacob H. Schiff's Galveston movement. Their motivation may have been different than Schiff's original intention; nevertheless they were committed. Equal to the community's commitment to Galveston was Billikopf's determination for its success. That determination manifested itself in two ways:

what he did for the movement per se, and what he did for those who came to his city via Galveston.

What Billikopf did for the Galveston movement was to make its objectives viable.

Billikopf was part of Schiff's organization from the day the first ship landed until the movement ceased in 1914 due to the war.

It was my privilege to be associated with the movement from its inception. I was on the Galveston docks the thrilling July 4th, 1907, thrilling to us on the docks, and thrilling to those on the steamers who realized the significance of the day, when the "S.S. Cassel" arrived with the first Jewish immigrants. There were several hundred men and women in this "pioneer" group. The new immigration-distribution bureau was in the charge of Mr. David M. Bressler and Mr. Morris Waldman, who had been engaged because of their enormous experience with Jewish Immigrants. I was glad of the opportunity to help welcome these newcomers and distribute them. The process of distribution was based, so far as possible, on vocations. Thus, the butchers were diverted to the stock-yard cities such as Kansas City, Fort Worth and Omaha; carpenters to furniture towns, like Grand Rapids and Topeka; tanners to Milwaukee and so on.⁵²

Billikopf was at home with this work and this system. He knew the people on both ends. The New York office was run by his friend David Bressler, and Billikopf knew that the Kansas City community was receptive. Besides, much of this was rewarding work for a former immigrant. Anna Nathan and Harry I Cohen in their book The Man Who stayed In Texas vividly describe the arrival of the S.S. Casselin in a way which highlights the pleasure Billikopf must have received:

The Cassel docked according to schedule. The rabbi (Henry Cohen) immediately set to work collecting his charges from the steerage. He got above deck as soon as possible, hurrying them along with a friendly pat on the back, directing them in fluent staccato yiddish...

They still dressed in woolen smocks, some were booted for snow, and a tall young fellow wore a high crowned Russian hat. They huddled together on deck- men, women and children..

The Rabbi had been busy translating for the authorities. He asked them to wait while the Mayor spoke to the Immigrants...The Mayor said in his even southern drawl, ' I congratulate you folks on coming to a fine country like the United States. I hope you appreciate the privilage of becoming American citizens. And I want to say thatI am proud to be here with my good friend Rabbi Cohen, to greet you personally. I also would like to extend a welcome from the City of Galveston... The Rabbi translated. Then the Mayor shook hands with all the men.

The immigrants huddled in a group again .. the tall young Russian in the high-crowned hat stepped forward suddenly out of the crowd. He began to speak in an English that was halting , guttural , charged with emotion, in contrast to the even matter of fact tones of the Mayor.

'Mr. Mayor,' he said with painstaking effort', in the country which we come from this scene could not happen. The Mayor in the town which we have left would not greet us. The knout(whip) was our greeting. You have clasped our hands. A time may come when your country will need us; we will not hesitate to serve with our blood!"⁵³

The exact number of immigrants which came to Kansas City in the beginning is unclear. It is likely that it was more than the stated 20 every sixty days. Records show certain number of those assigned to Kansas, but others certainly drifted to Kansas. Many were able to make it "by way of Billy" as the caring charismatic figure of Billikopf became synonomous with Kansas City and with Galveston.

What the young social worker was able to accomplish is astounding, as he worked both for his immigrant population and for the movement itself.

As stated before, Galveston, as any organization, was not without problems. It is not even clear if ultimately the movement was a real success. First was the problem which could have been expected, the communications in Europe. Reports in Europe about Galveston made the jobs offered out to be much higher paying than they were; this reality and the difficulties of passage got back to Russia and into the Yiddish papers. The depression of 1907-1908 did not help out either. The only way to combat this was to show the success of the immigrants. Billikopf was instrumental in these efforts. He did surveys of his own immigrants and responded to the charges of difficulties with facts. In a letter to Abraham Cahan, editor of the *Forward*, he had this to say:

Everyone is employed at his respective trade, and but with one exception earns at least nine dollars a week. Is it not gratifying, Mr. Editor, to think that right now, when thousands of people are out of work, when in Kansas City alone there are at least a thousand mechanics idle, that with a few exceptions the Galvestonians should all be employed? You know, Mr. Editor, how very difficult it is to secure employment for some of the above mentioned class even under the most favorable circumstances. Yet within three days of their arrival employment was secured for everyone of them...To say that all the immigrants are contented would be utterly foolish. That dissatisfaction should exist in certain quarters is but natural. Some, for instance, suffer from nostalgia, some had an exaggerated idea of local industrial conditions, some feel that they are underpaid. But those of us who are thoroughly familiar with the industrial conditions in this country must admit that the immigrants who come to Kansas City fare much better than their brothers who settled in Eastern cities, such as New

York and Philadelphia, etc... What is more, Mr Editor, some immigrant in a short time saved as much as a hundred dollars and have sent for various members of their families.. Does the local community interest itself only in the physical welfare of the immigrant? Almost all of them attend night classes provided for them.

And, Mr. Editor, what is true of Kansas City is true, to an extent of other places. ..The writer is not as optimistic as Mr. Zangwill and others who consider this the panacea for all Jewish ills. Far from it. But what the writer does believe is that the movement will, if encouraged by the Yiddish press especially, mitigate in a measure at least some of the existing evils. Instead of hindering the work of the J.T.O. let us support it. Let us rather force upon those already here a greater sense of obligation to the newly arrived, a greater sense of responsibility to their oppressed brothers and sisters.⁵⁴

In a similar effort to encourage the success of the movement Billikopf would send photographs of "before" and "after settlement" to Jacob Schiff and to the office in New York. In a letter to Bressler, October 26th, 1907, Billikopf explains the excitement these photos have stirred:

Dear Bressler :

I am sending you under separate cover three photographs of immigrants; and in about ten days will send you another one of the latest groups. Am spending a lot of money on these photographs and think I will have to charge hereafter. What do you say? I disposed of thirty five already, most of which went abroad. As I wrote Waldman, these photographs will do more for the movement than all the literature you will get on the subject. You ought to see some of the replies the immigrants get from their relatives. Why you will find in them the most enthusiastic expressions. As soon as I get a little time I will translate a dozen or so letters for you and send them to New York.⁵⁵

Bressler responded on October 31, 1907, with the following: " I consider this

excellent material for propaganda and expect to send them to Europe. Please write Waldman to reimburse you to the extent of \$1.00 , as per your request."⁵⁶

Billikopf was not only building the program up by this work, but he as well found favor in the eyes of those who were involved with this endeavor, Cyrus

Sulzberger, Morris Loeb and especially Jacob Schiff. Billikopf writes of sending photographs to Schiff and Schiff's response:

I periodically sent him group-photographs of these immigrants, indicating to what city they had been assigned. More than that, his interest was so keen, that in accordance with his wishes I would note at the bottom of the photograph the name of each individual , his occupation , his job and his starting wage. Six months later , another photograph of his group would go to Mr. Schiff. The second photograph was accompanied by detailed information as to the economic, physical and cultural progress of these individuals.

The contrasts were amazing . I venture to say if these photographs could now be published in parallel columns they would constitute a striking refutation of the claims of the novice "philosopher", that the brunette peoples are an "inferior " strain. Yet at the same time they would be an eloquent tribute to the resilient powers of the Jew, once the crushing weight of oppression and persecution is removed from his back. In the first column would appear groups of haggard, emaciated, frightened creatures, who if they could speak out would utter no word of English and confess ignorance of industrial conditions and opportunities. The second column would show men and women bright-eyed , intelligent, with an air of well being which is characteristic only of those whose present and future is assured.

These were the photographs that made Jacob H. Schiff, lover of humanity, intensely loyal Jew and American , happy and proud- happy in the knowledge that by fostering the "Galveston movement" he was serving the land he

loved with such patriotic ardor.⁵⁷

It is clear from Billikopf's recollection that Schiff got a sense of satisfaction from Billikopf's efforts. It is equally as clear that Billikopf went to great lengths to make known his success and his progress with these immigrants. The publicity that he generated did not hurt the movement nor did it hurt Billikopf's blossoming career.

Billikopf's relations were such with the New York office that he handled more than the creation of propaganda material. He was relied upon to find the solutions for all problems that developed. If Bressler could not settle an individual he would send him to Billikopf. If Rabbi Cohen had problems he would send the person or persons to Jacob Billikopf in Kansas City. Such an example of Billikopf's skill and reliability from New York's perspective are contained in this correspondence between Bressler and Billikopf, dated April 2, 1908.

Dear Mr. Billikopf:-

Three men, Itoists, are leaving New York today for your city, each with your address. They are David Gesuck and Abraham and Naftula Gittman, brothers, and they are tinsmith, pocket book maker and bookbinder respectively. Originally these were to have left Bremen for Galveston, but their train coming in late, the boat left without them and for some reason those in charge of the office in Bremen conceived the brilliant idea to send them to Galveston via New York, rather than keep them over until the next boat. We were naturally notified of their arrival and immediately confiscated their tickets to Galveston, as it would have been the height of folly to send them there only that they might be sent on to their ultimate destinations. After talking the matter over with Waldman, he advised that I send them to you, assuring me that you would make every effort to place them in self-supporting positions. I know you will do this for the sake of the immigrants themselves. You will,

of course, receive an allowance of ten dollars for each man.... in such an event they would have found themselves beautifully stranded and in all likelihood the newspapers would again ring with stories of the inhumane treatment accorded the guileless immigrants by a heartless bureau, (Vide Opatosky), so we are sending them to a more assured future via the Billikopf route.⁵⁸

The famed "Billikopf Route " was becoming well known to the authorities as well as to the immigrant population. When a problem arose threatening any aspect of the movement, hence threatening the chance of a Russian Jew for escape from oppression, for survival in America as an immigrant , Billikopf rose to the challenge.

Such a defense was necessary when large numbers of immigrants were rejected. The doctors examining the potential immigrants seemed to suddenly become much, much stricter in their medical judgements in Galveston. Zangwill reported to Bressler in a letter that if the deportation of the selected immigrants from Galveston is seven times as large as that of Boston, six times as large as that of Philadelphia , six times as large as New York the situation is serious.⁵⁹ Some of the very same individuals who were rejected at Galveston were admitted in New York, which defeated the movement's purpose. The report of such facts in the Yiddish daily did not help to alleviate matters. The cause of the rejection from one port or another was in part the various legislation pertinent to immigration, but was more directly due to the inclination of those who were to directly enforce the law.

In 1907 there was a commission formed on immigration, made up of three senators , three congressmen and three presidential appointees. They were influenced by labor who feared the damage that could be done by waves of immigration , which could lead to an undercutting of wages. Thus many of the lobbying groups sought to tighten immigration standards. Men such as Senator William Dillingham pushed for such legislation as literacy tests for immigrants. The commissioner himself was no friend to immigration, especially to Jewish immigration. That man was Daniel J. Keefe, and he was a staunch restrictionist. He even agreed with a policy that stated that all immigrants who did not have twenty five dollars in their possession should be deported. He justified this claim with the contention that lack of cash meant the likelihood of becoming a public charge. Keefe's policies made it impossible for individuals or organizations such as the Jewish Immigrant Information Bureau (JIIB) to give bond against the immigrants becoming public charges.

To the great advantage of Jewish immigration in Galveston the individual in charge of that district was a tolerable and sensible man, E.H. Holman. Holman was able to see the advantages of immigrants to the economy of Galveston and surrounding areas. . Holman had an agreement with Rabbi Henry Cohen and the JIIB. All individuals who were sent by the JTO were turned over to Rabbi Cohen. As long as Holman was in control the cooperation between authorities and the JIIB was excellent. Immigrants were distributed throughout the southwest.⁶⁰

The real problem developed when Holman was relieved of his duties. Holman had told Louis Greenberg of the Galveston Movement that he was aware that Keefe disliked "Jewish immigration;" this information was in turn passed on to Bressler by Mr. Greenberg.⁶¹ It is not clear if that is why Holman was relieved of his duties. However, at that point the problems began to heighten and affect all involved in this process including Billikopf. The new man in charge of the district was Mr. Alfred Hampton . He was either of the same philosophy as Keefe or he sought to gain a name by becoming the hardline enforcer of immigration policy. The result of his attitude was seen quickly. Of the group that landed in Galveston in February of 1910, seventy- one were deported. Shortly after this devastating change in policy, another group came who were very short on funds .This group was not turned over to the JIIB at all. Rather the exacting Mr. Hampton wanted to pursue the question of the legitimacy of the JIIB to take these people. This in his eyes constituted a breach of an immigration law which had in fact been put into effect on the very day that the first Galveston group had arrived on the S.S. Cassel. This was the Immigration Act of February 20,1907. The relevant provisions of this act were the contract labor laws of section two , four and six.

Section two prohibited immigrants who had "been induced or solicited to immigrate to this country by offers or promises of employment or in consequence of agreement oral, written or printed, express or implied to perform labor in this country of any kind , skilled or unskilled." Section four made it a "misdemeanor " to prepay the transportation or in any way to assist or encourage the importation or migration of any contract or contract laborers into the United States." Section six made it a "violation of section

four of this act to assist or encourage the importation or migration of any alien by promise of employment through advertisements printed or published in any foreign country."⁶²

It was forbidden to bring in foreign labor, nor could jobs be "reserved" for immigrants, as this created "unfair competition." Since Jewish immigration was a result of Russian oppression, the immigrants were by no means being solicited nor induced. However the law itself made the Galveston movement fair game for men such as Keefe and Hampton. In his question of whether or not the JIIB could indeed take charge of this load of immigrants who did not have the proper funds, Hampton got his response from Keefe:

Has the alien an occupation? Is his physical condition such that he can be responsibly expected to labor at it? Has he a particular destination? Is it to a district in which he can reasonably expect to obtain early employment at his occupation? Has he funds sufficient to tide him over till work can be secured? Is he or she destined to a party who is or can be secured? Is he or she destined to a party who is or can be legally responsible for his or her support (in case of woman and child)? How were the funds secured for passage?

Unless these and several other related questions which will readily suggest themselves can be substantially resolved in the alien's favor, the Bureau conceives that the alien has not established beyond a doubt the right to enter. The case should go to the Board of special inquiry.⁶³

The result of this letter of Keefe was that the next ship which was to arrive at Galveston was subjected to the strictest measures. The ship carried 280 Jews, 130 of whom were held over for inquiry.⁶⁴ This put direct pressure on Billikopf, whose responsibility it was to find jobs for these immigrants. The manner in which

he combatted these efforts of discrimination was to have a 100% employment record. Billikopf would keep up with each and every immigrant who was in his charge. The name, sex of the immigrant, marital status, occupation abroad, present employment were all recorded Billikopf included scrupulous notes on each immigrant at the bottom of his list. A sampling of the items is as follows:

No. 1--- Still unemployed -- very difficult to find him
employment (his occupation was listed as Schochet)

No.3&4--- Were placed in temporary jobs due to slack
season in cap making industry.

No. 10&11 -- Both had been sent to New Orleans about
three months ago . We secured them both work at their
trades and for the both we purchased some barbers tools
amounting to \$4.00. (They were listed as tailor and barber)

No. 16-- Arrived here with her four children 10,8,6,and 3 to
join her husband Abraham Finkelstein who came via the
Bureau in 1909 a year ago.⁶⁵

These lists were sent by Billikopf to Schiff and Bressler in order that the claims by such men as Hampton and Keefe could be checked. Billikopf worked very hard at securing these individuals employment, for the unemployed Galvestonian threatened the freedom of future Jews to emigrate. The material supplied to the New York office by Billikopf helped battle these claims for a while. But it was not long till Hampton sent out investigators who would interview the immigrants who had been aided by field agents such as Billikopf. These investigations were in order to establish that the Galveston people in their efforts were indeed in violation of immigration laws.⁶⁶ These investigations made a difficult task even tougher. Billikopf had to contend with the fact that the immigrants he recieved had to be employed. But the investigation made it imperative that the immigrants

who drifted to Kansas City, because they had heard of the reputaiton of the man named "Billy," who took personal interest in each one of his immigrants, be employed as well. This compounded the problem.

Nevertheless Billikopf set out to meet the task by seeking employment for the immigrants outside of Jewish employers. These men would prove that there had been no previous contract. Billikopf, in a letter to Bressler dated January 3, 1910 , outlined other problems as well, and expressed further reasons for using the non-Jewish employment:

...Since July we have received about seventy- five immigrants from Galveston. Some have left for the east, as might have been expected, and neighboring cities; others , again drifted here from cities such as Fort Worth , San Antono and Dallas. With few exceptions , all men and women are employed at their respective trades and are getting along quite well. It is natural , of course that there should be dissatisfaction among some , who were either led to believe or else talked themselves into the belief that they would strike a fortune immediately upon their arrival: but knowing the conditions in other communitis , I feel that they are progressing as well as possible .

While conditions have improved remarkably ,it is very difficult as you know , to obtain employment for new-comers at this time of the year , few positions that are available should be given to the resident unemployed. You are sufficiently familiar with the situation all over the country to appreciate that fact. As for the attitude of the community , I will say , that our contributors have no reason to complain as they are troubled very little in the matter. 95% of our employers are non-Jewish, and it is to them that we appeal for work. Whenever we call upon a Jewish employer for cooperation, we meet with the same difficulties that are encountered everywhere. The Jewish employer, as a rule , wants to impress you with the fact that he is doing a mitzvah whenever he hires a co-religionist

and is performing his full duty to his struggling fellow-man.⁶⁷

As expressed in the letter it was very difficult to combat the belief of the immigrants that they would get better jobs. The investigator would find an immigrant who was unhappy and this would be the evidence which they would use to prove that the JIIB was an evil. In his book, Galveston :The Ellis Island of the West, Bernard Marinbach gives explicit transcript of dialogue between the investigators and immigrants. It is evident from these transcripts that the investigators went to all lengths to prove their point. The transcripts also bear out the afore mentioned claim that Kansas City was the placeto which most immigrants drifted , and Billikopf was the reason.⁶⁸ "In fact , immigrants who had been disappointed in other cities often gravitated to Kansas ,..."to finally receive their first decent job."⁶⁹ Marinbach gives the account of a butcher who had failed at getting a job in his other assigned JIIB city ,Fort Worth:

I was idle two months in Fort Worth. Then I walked 190 miles to Oklahoma City where I got a job in a packing house and made \$8.00 in eight days . Then I quit because of the small pay and came here to Kansas City and Mr. Billikopf sent me here to the Pier Brass work where I been ever since ...I receive ..\$1.75 a day.⁷⁰

The investigator also tried to turn the immigrants' complaint of being underpaid for equal labor into an accusation that the agents like Billikopf were being paid under the table:

Q.Did Mr. Billikopf...obtain employment for you?

A. Yes, he sent me to Mr. Mendelsohn, a tailor and I worked for him for four weeks at \$8 a week. I quit because the foreman abused me.

Q. What did other men receive for similar work?

A. \$10 and \$12 a week. I only received \$8 because I was a greenhorn.

Q. When you arrived did Mr. Billikopf take care of you and give you employment?

A. Yes, (he) boarded me for a week (and) put me to work in the Grand Pants Co. as a baster at \$5 a week. I am still working there.

Q. What do others receive for their work?

A. One boy gets \$13 for the same work I am doing...

Q. Have you given Mr. Billikopf any part of your wages?

A. No!⁷¹

The problem was not with Billikopf; it was with the labor market. The natural proclivity for employers to take advantage of "green" immigrants by paying them less money needed no outside encouragement. Exploitation of new immigrants was a fact of life over which neither Jacob Billikopf nor agents in other cities had any control. This was the situation which Billikopf had to encounter in his daily dealings with immigrants. Over his shoulder lurked the immigration inspectors. Billikopf responded in various ways ; including letters to the Yiddish papers , statistical analyses of the employment market of Kansas and surrounding areas. He took in the difficult cases off the hands of Rabbi Cohen and others; he was as well the source of propaganda for the movement's success. These efforts were all done on his own accord with little reward and what appears to be little support from the New York office. Even though Bressler and Waldman were close friends of Billikopf they seemed to be fairly powerless in acting on these problems. They

did offer words of encouragement. Bressler included the following in a letter to Billikopf on Aug.8,1910, which was in response to Billikopf's letters explaining the progress that all the immigrants were making and his frustration that it was being ignored by the investigators⁷² :

You don't have to go beyond Kansas City for proof of this . Yet you know it, I know it ,but their dog does not seem to know it, or possibly does not want to know it. The rumpus recently raised in Galveston will undoubtedly suggest who the dog is. I believe however that we will come out of the affair much better understood than we seemed to be before the matter was agitated. ⁷³

The incident to which Bressler refers is the above mentioned deportation of 130 Jewish immigrants in July that same year. The letters from New York, numerous as they are, offer no concrete suggestions but rather contain similar empathy which this letter exemplifies. The fact is the New York office either did not really know always what was happening or did not care to share the information. In fact the way in which Billikopf found out in 1914 that the Galveston movement would be ending its services is paradigmatic of their style of sharing information. He found it out by reading it in the American Hebrew of June of that Year. He wrote to Bressler to verify the report: " Is there truth to the statement I just read in the American Hebrew to the effect that the Galveston Bureau will close October 1st?"⁷⁴ It was true, the movement was closing up shop. Bressler explained that the overwhelming physical advantages found in the ports of New York, Boston, Baltimore and Philadelphia routes could not be overcome. The trip to Galveston took twenty to twenty -two days and sometimes even longer . The trips to other

ports took five or six days , or at the most eight days. Bressler also recounted the statistics about the numbers who had been rejected at Galveston, compared to other ports, which have been quoted above from his letter to Zangwill. The point is that the rigid restrictions at Galveston made it a difficult port of entry. Bressler also pointed out that notwithstanding all obstacles, more than ten thousand immigrants had used it as a route of entry since the work began in 1907. He hoped that this would perhaps be enough of an example that some immigrants would seek Galveston on their own volition. He suggested as well that it had been a success because they had proven their original thesis, that the far West offered superior opportunities. ⁷⁵

The success of the Galveston movement can be judged by its number or by its political legislations or by the efforts made by its constituency. It is evident to all that what Billikopf did for the Galveston Movement knew that it was a success . The success of Billikopf and the Galveston Movement lies in what he did for the immigrants in his charge. Even the investigators lurking over his shoulder did not impede his efforts. Something in his being motivated him to provide for the every need of the immigrant. Perhaps pervading his conscience were the impressions of his own boyhood experience as an immigrant.

What Billikopf did for the immigrant population in Kansas City by institution and by personal touch is a tribute to the progressive nature of Jewish social work. Brought to Kansas City for his professional nature, he graced the city with

innovations from the new wellsprings of this social science, while simultaneously imbuing the Jewish and secular welfare elements with his personal philosophy of social work. As an integral part of that philosophy, Billikopf took advantage of every situation which would allow him to be a friend to the immigrant. This personal touch was what most immigrants remembered about the institution. Not its superior programs, but its director who, steeped in other responsibilities, made sure he met each immigrant, made personal trips to Galveston to meet groups of immigrants as they arrived. This quality in his character, which is repeatedly pointed out by his friends, created an atmosphere in which the distance, the strangeness, the foreign alienation of a new place, a new country, disappeared. The success of his programs was in part due to his personal approach. Many settlement houses were stigmatized and lacked attendance; this was not the case of the Kansas City institution which became officially in 1901 the Jewish Educational Institution or more commonly known as "by Billikopf." Its programs were well attended, even overcrowded. In Mid-America's Promise, a collective work about Kansas City, recollections of several of those immigrants who knew Billikopf give testimony to these claims:

Mrs. Bessie Zoglin, for example, recalls that Billikopf was 'an intellect, kind-hearted, a marvelous man who knew how to handle people diplomatically. No one spoke ill of him. He spoke a beautiful Yiddish and took personal interest in all of the immigrants who came to the Jewish Educational Institute for lessons, recreation and economic assistance. He told her 'If you want to become a good American, come to night school and learn English, don't be a greenhorn. Don't remain the old country type. You won't be happy unless you become Americanized.' Harry Sheskin described Billikopf as politically astute. According to Sheskin,

Billikopf made a point of sending personal notes to all of his contacts on their birthdays and wedding anniversaries.' ⁷⁶

As mentioned before, Billikopf brought to Kansas City a concept of *Zedakah*.

This is evident in his first report to the Kansas City United Hebrew Charities. His opening words are as follows:

The essential and fundamental principle upon which all methods of benevolence must be based is that which aims at self help. To make the dependent independent, to help without rendering helpless, to relieve distress without destroying self-respect.

This is the principle which the modern administrator of charities must pursue, if he is to conserve the best interests of the poor; and in this my first Annual Rport [*sic*], I am glad to state , that by adhering, as far as possible , to the above principle we succeeded in partially solving some of our most troublesome cases; cases which for years have been a heavy drain on our charities. ⁷⁷

Billikopf more than just began to solve the problems that had drained the community resources. He established programs to meet the problems that he identified and proceeded with his concept of *zedakah* based on the age-old view of charity going back to Maimonides. He had come to Kansas City on January of 1907 and by the January 1st of the following year 1908 when he reported to the community of his progress, the weekly schedule of events listed the following programs which Billikopf had established in the community: Day Nursery - open every day except Saturday, Kindergarten-open every day except Saturday, Industrial school- every Thursday evening, Dancing School for children-Saturday afternoon, Dancing School for adults - Saturday evening, Lectures ,Talks or Concerts-every Sunday, Boys' Club-Wednesday evening, Girls'

Club-Wednesday evening, Gymnasium Classes for Girls- every Monday afternoon, Gymnasium Classes for Boys - every Tuesday evening, Night school- four evenings each week. These events reflected several areas of concern which Billikopf drew to the attention of his board in his 1908 report.

Billikopf outlined for his board what these programs entailed and what services they provided the community. Since the institute's programs encompassed provisions for the immigrant- ages infant to adult-he first discusses the education for the children and then logically moves on to the programs for adults. He begins mention of the Kindergarten. He points out that this was a vital place for these young students to come to because often they came from less attractive homes. This would be their first exposure to the English language and America. He said that the two fine teachers were influences on the 20 young little ones' manners and morals. This program had an enrollment of 35 in just several months. Billikopf believed the sooner the family members came in contact with the new social environment, the easier the family's transition would be.

The day nursery, founded by Miss Binswanger and Billikopf had several functions. Firstly , it aimed to provide the best care of the children who would probably be neglected during the day, because of the necessity of the mother's employment. Logically, it also allowed the mother, who until now had had to stay at home, the freedom to be employed, hence allowing families to become self-supporting. Billikopf reported that a large number of children were , as well,

from the homes of sick mothers. This service was a blessing to all of the people involved. It assured the care of a child and the sanity of the working mother. Billikopf also believed it freed older children who may have been involved with the care of siblings. This in turn allowed the child to concentrate on his/her studies or own absorption process.⁷⁸

A program which would help the young immigrant girls in the process of absorption was the Industrial School for Girls. It gave these young girls a place to go, it forced the mothers to use the child care program for younger siblings. For this program Billikopf got a corps of volunteer teachers. Every Thursday afternoon between fifty and sixty girls congregated in the main building, and received instruction in patch work and other elementary sewing.⁷⁹

With the philosophy that it was not enough only to educate the mind, Billikopf established gymnastics classes for both boys and girls. Billikopf was concerned with the health of these children. He commented in several reports that the Jewish children needed to be stimulated physically. He made this most clear in his 1908 address. This point was no doubt emphasized because at this time Jacob Billikopf and Alfred Benjamin were interested in getting the United Jewish Charities to consolidate the activities of the organization under one roof.⁸⁰ This would facilitate erecting one building which would house all the varied activities. In the efforts to justify the new buildings, one argument was the need for a gymnasium and rooms which would house vital activities. Billikopf articulates his

concerns in his 1908 report:

The value of calisthenics for Jewish children can not be overestimated. I remarked it once before, but will repeat, that while the Jewish children are among, the brightest in our schools, they are as a rule, anemic and undervitalized, and suffer considerably from neurasthenia and other allied diseases. This nervousness of theirs is partially inherited, but mostly results from sedentary habits. Hence, there arises a necessity of laying greater stress on the development of their bodies rather than their minds. Would, though, we were situated, particularly as regards room, that we could introduce in our Institution handicraft classes, which would convert the restless energy of our children into making things. I cannot help feeling that the instinct for construction, the instinct to employ one's hands a in useful way, innate in every normal child , should be recognized and ministered to, especially in the case of Jewish children.⁸¹

The children were not Billikopf's only concern. He sought to educate the adult as well, and later in his first year he organized a night school program for adults. These night classes were conducted under the auspices of the B' nai Brith and the average attendance was between sixty-five and eighty. These immigrants met four nights a week. The first dimension of the program was to concentrate on language. For Americanization it was crucial to have the immigrant be able to function well in the language. It made the transition into the culture easier and helped them get better employment. Billikopf commented often that one of the more inspiring sights one could see at the Jewish Educational Institute was a body of men and women, some of the women with infants in their arms, trying to grapple with the difficulties of English pronunciation. Billikopf had three teachers who ran these classes. However, he personally brought to the Committee on

night schools some modifications which would bring, in his opinion, better results. He divided the classes into six smaller groups, for he believed that better results would be obtained in smaller groups of twelve or fifteen people instead of the thirty or so which had been the norm. He insisted that they change the readers in use which were primarily for children and substitute a text which, although more difficult, had a more common and useful vocabulary.⁸² These are small examples of Billikopf's constant input and supervision of the integral system he had set up.

The goal of his system was to integrate the immigrant into society, elevate the quality of immigrant relief and to create a useful citizen. The responsibility to integrate an individual into a society is a grave one at best. The difficulties are enormous, dealing with complexities and debates as to what is the best of our culture. The process by which one gives up old familiar customs and gains new ones is a process that deals with the core of the individual's identity. These were the type of decisions which Billikopf made. These were the avenues which his programs were to create.

With this understanding, Billikopf developed a method by which he could reach the immigrants. Billikopf's own programs impressed upon them the values, the ideals of the American Jewish community. With any program of Billikopf's the final decision rested with him. What would go into the making of this American product, the new citizen? He took this responsibility very seriously. All of the

aformentioned programs were designed to educate the immigrant, giving him skills and language. These were at least teachable. Billikopf also desired to give that which was intangible, only acquired by exposure, culture and experience. He was very interested that the new immigrant get a positive cultural experience. In an attempt to accomplish this he set up lectures on Sunday afternoon. The aim of these lectures was to educate the immigrant on his new government, and to instill in the immigrant love and admiration for the ideals of that said govenrment. Billikopf reported that these lectures that he arranged through the Council of Jewish Women were so well attended that they had to turn people away for fear of overcrowding; this was true as well of the free concerts that were given in conjunction.

It is quite clear, through a glance at the schedule that the primary intent of the Jewish Educational Institute was to educate in an intellectual manner. Billikopf realized this himself, that he had the immigrant for five nights a week and for the most part for the adult population that was primarily an intellectual affair. This was a problem for Billikopf, for if a philosophy of educating the immigrant was present in his work, it was a philosophy desirous of a more total education. It was not to be onesided or lacking in any manner. He expressed this to his board as well:

I felt that people were coming to our institution five nights a week for purely intellectual pursuits, that an opportunity should be afforded them whereby they could give normal expression to their pent-up social energy. It is human nature to want to have a good time. The rich man has his

club; he has various forms of amusement. The poor man also has his wants, and they must be satisfied; and the institute , among other things, should stand for the purpose of giving the adults as well as the children. a wholesome,good time. Confine yourself to purely intellectual activities, and social energy of the people will find expression in other, less desirable ways.⁸³

To meet this need he instituted Saturday dancing classes , both for adults and for children, under the direction of a Miss Lichtenberg. An average attendance in the winter months was between seventy and eighty-five as reported in 1908.⁸⁴ In his 1911 report this number rose. The report claims that any given Saturday night well over a hundred even 150 were present.⁸⁵ Each immigrant paid a nickel admission; this made Billikopf's program self-sufficient and it also created an amusement fund which could be drawn upon for special events. ⁸⁶

More than to give the immigrant a place to expend his social energies, the dance floor provided a rare opportunity for yet another lesson in Americanization.

Billikopf pointed out that the immigrant adult was " a strongly imitative being and it is but natural that as he comes in contact with his teachers , ladies of culture and refinement , he readily absorbs some of their finesse, some of their polish." ⁸⁷

The education which he presented to the immigrants was vital for their Americanization. But there were other things which needed to be taught in the classes besides the proper pronunciation of words and phrases. The type of dress was different in America , the customs and social etiquette were important as well . Billikopf found that through the medium of classes such as dance and gymastics and various clubs he could remedy the social deficiancies which were present among these new arrivals. Billikopf believed that the best way to

teach this was by example. The fact that the student was in class with a person who could be seen as a role model would initiate this imitating. It was a subtle method of teaching by Billikopf, which moved toward his philosophy of total education. He picked teachers who would be sympathetic to the world of the immigrant. Thus he created the Boys' Club and Girls' Club with this principle in mind. His method was calculated and professional, based on the clear idea of what that finished product, the new American Jew, was to embody. Billikopf's work was sensitive to both sides of the situation, the desires of the German Jewish community and the desires of the immigrant population. He lived on both sides, working with the board who were essentially German Jews, and dealing with the everyday experience of the Russian immigrant. He had the capacity to bridge this gap as well as the gap between Jew and Gentile.

Part of Billikopf's success in this manner was, as stated before, his own immigrant background, and equal to this was his unique personality. However, beyond these facets of his personality and experience he had an understanding of what was necessary to preserve of the "old life" of the immigrant and what was required to change that part of the immigrants' life that was negotiable. He expressed these philosophical views in his addresses and letters to the board. Billikopf believed that there was a common reaction to the changes faced by immigrants coming to these shores; that reaction was to toss off the yoke of their past tradition. Billikopf questioned whether this was motivated by actual desire, or out of a sense of being overwhelmed. He sought to give alternatives to the

immigrant, whom he believed needed a spiritual existence in America as well.

To thoroughly grasp the significance of our aims one must understand the psychology of the Russian Jew, his characteristics and his habits of thought. From the moment the immigrant lands on the shores he is thrown in contact with a set of influences so out of harmony with his previous environment, that his nature undergoes many sudden and abrupt modifications. The shock of freedom throws him into a state of indifference, of nothingness, of intense reaction against his entire past. To him "The Hebrew chanting have no meaning; the symbolism of the ceremonies is lost; his intellect refuses to accept the teachings on which he was brought up. Anatole Leroy Beaulieu, the great French economist, than whom there is no greater diagnostician of Jewish life, aptly put it after his last visit to this country: 'Of all men, the Russian Jew, once rid of his traditional ideals, of his national prejudices, is the most completely freed. No other can compare to him. At contact with aliens, he passes from extreme of the spirit to the extreme of free thinking, from the traditionalism to which the bulk of his brethren cling to the most daring feats of the spirit of innovation.' Thus, in matters of religion he becomes an outspoken iconoclast; in matters of politics he becomes a radical socialist. And it is not to be wondered at considering the restrictions and limitations under which he labored. That this state of mind is but a temporary phase in his evolution is true. Yet it is our duty, both to ourselves and to our coreligionists, to combat, by means of education, the existence of such radical organizations. 88

The method by which Billikopf felt they could best combat these radical tendencies was through Jewish education. Billikopf believed that it was not the natural inclination of the Eastern European Jew to throw away his religion; his entire past environment had embodied that tradition. If that tradition was to remain, and he believed it was vital that it did, there had to be some medium for it. The point which Billikopf often made can be simplified to say that if you strip the Jew of his Jewishness he will replace it with some political or other belief that is

counterproductive to his integration into society. Thus Billikopf had a radical philosophy which sought to avoid this problem, contrary to the prevailing philosophy of the German Jews.

The German Jews saw the tossing off of the religious yoke as a comfort. They believed that the beardless Jew, the Jew who gave up his strange backward customs would be accepted easier into American society. The "less Jewish" Jew would lessen the fear of anti-Semitism, which they felt the strange immigrant brought with him, an infectious bug. Billikopf's strikingly radical philosophy was to purposely Judaicize his immigrants: "Jewish settlement work, if true to its ideals, must concern itself with the problem of Judaicizing its clientele"⁸⁹ In a number of reports he makes a similar point to that which he first articulated in 1908 and then again in 1911 the call for religious sustenance.

As many of you are probably aware, we have been conducting religious services in our institute during the holiday season, and it is on the basis of our experience and observations that I venture to express the hope that the time not be far distant when we will create in our midst a religious center such as the Free Synagogue established on the East Side of New York --a center to which will be drawn our men and women who have freed themselves of traditionalism by which they were surrounded in the old country and, who, at the same time have no sympathy with the advance doctrines of reform....

Any attempt to adjust the immigrant to his environment must start with the fundamental assumption that the shock of this adjustment should be softened to the greatest extent possible. To that end, we must begin by preserving those immigrant institutions that correspond to a fundamental need--moral and spiritual--of the newcomers; those institutions which the immigrant is so eager to keep up, even at great material sacrifice ⁹⁰

While the Board did not always agree with Billikopf's rather radical philosophy, preferring instead to concentrate primary attention on "Americanization" of the immigrants, Mr. Benjamin fully backed him. He also gave Mr. Billikopf a rather free hand in making the original constituent societies follow the policies laid down by the superintendent and board. Billikopf persuaded the board that this spiritual need had to be adequately met if radicalism was to be avoided. It is not so clear that Billikopf's sole motivation for these religious activities was his concern to alleviate radicalism. As will be pointed out further in this chapter in his career in Kansas City he was instrumental in the development of Talmud Torahs and in the implementation of innovative Hebrew programs. This type of work represented his commitment to Jewish education qua Jew. Perhaps the only focus of the services was for purpose of Judaicizing the immigrant. It might have been a conviction that Judaism reduced radicalism.

Billikopf's administering to the needs of the immigrant extended beyond the educational and social aspects which were involved in the integration of the immigrant into society. In conjunction with these efforts Billikopf developed programs to meet the physical needs of his immigrants. Just as education had to be total education, relief in Billikopf's eyes had to be systemic relief. In order to achieve this, it was necessary to find the root of the problem. Billikopf accomplished this objective in the most professional manner. Billikopf did case studies interviewing his clientele to evaluate their needs. Once he isolated a problem he then sought the particular program to resolve it. He was not satisfied

till palliative relief was relaxed with independence, again consistent with his basic concept of *Zedakah* .

These interviews Billikopf conducted provided information which led to the isolation of problems which were internal and external. The external problem was a serious one of hygiene. If the immigrant was to be accepted, he had to be cleansed in the manner which was acceptable to the German Jewish community as well as to the general community. In the early years of 1900 this was not an isolated problem of the immigrants. Billikopf sought to give temporary relief by establishing public bathhouses, and the systemic relief by socializing the immigrant into good hygiene practices. On February 10, a little more than a month after his arrival in Kansas City and a short time before the arrivals of new immigrants from Galveston, Jacob Billikopf established at 1822 Locust Street a bathhouse. He generated the funds for this privately from members of his board, Messrs. Linda, Harzfeld, Davidson and Rothenberg. These people provided funds for the rent of the facility and the five bath tubs which were used. The total of six hundred dollars was the cost for operation from February ,10 till November 11th ,1907. These individuals, also at the suggestion of the superintendent, provided a place for a reading room in which books and magazines were available. Billikopf reported of the \$600 dollars which it cost to maintain the bathhouse for nine months, the receipts were a total of \$308.25.⁹¹ In that time the services had provided 1,800 baths. ⁹² Billikopf sold the success of this project to his board with the following anecdote:

As two boys were leaving the place I overheard one remark to the other: "Say, Sammie isn't this a great place? Are you going to come here again? I am, I an't going to be so foolish and wait five years till I get another bath." " O'gee !" replied his friend, " you didn't take a bath for five years? Ani't you ashamed ? Me and papa took one last Rosh-anan [sv Rosh-Hashana] " And Sammie has certainly been adhering to his resolution. Every Tuesday evening he is found in the bathhouse, and as a rule is the last one to leave.⁹³

This was a much needed service and it was supported enthusiastically. Billikopf also pointed out that the cost of baths in Kansas City were about one half of the equivalent given in Cincinnati.⁹⁴

Billikopf was able to take a project such as the bath house and use it strategically and advantageously in providing answers to other problems that existed. One such example was that he had taken steps to give the caretaker position of the bathhouse to a person who had been one of the institution's heaviest pensioners. Her husband had abandoned her and her six children. Causing her to need such economic relief. Her new position as bath house caretaker, and income made it unnecessary for her to receive aid to the extent she had recieved in the past.⁹⁵ This again was part of Billikopf's efforts to move each and every case towards independence. As results of Billikopf's programs became recognized, there was great demand for such services, even outside of the Jewish community. He turned this particular program into a city wide program and the United Jewish Charities' Bath House project became a public bath house funded by the city. In 1908 the City Council built the first publicly-constructed baths in

Kansas City; the existence of the bath house in Kansas City was a direct result of the work of Jacob Billikopf.⁹⁶ This came to be a familiar pattern; initiation of his innovative programs in the Jewish community followed by creation of a similar program for the entire population.

The interviews of his case studies revealed other problems which needed the immediate attention of the community. The interviews gave Billikopf the impression that the greatest problem that plagued the city was desertion. He studied the problem and gave these various reasons for the destitution of families. He attributed it to three primary causes: illness, no male support, and insufficient earnings. Billikopf claimed that : "The problem though , which affects us primarily, to a larger extent , probably more than other communities our size ,is wife abandonment"⁹⁷ Billikopf reported as well that a greater portion of the United Jewish Charities funds over the past year went to the support of women and children who were deserted by their bread-winners. That evil, he went on to say, is growing everywhere. He reported that of the 10,924 cases handled by the United Hebrew Charities of New York that year, 1,052 were deserted women. This was 10 percent of their assistance. The superintendent claimed it was higher in Kansas City.⁹⁸ The reasons found by Billikopf were numerous however he chose only certain of these to present to the board in his report. In a majority of the cases he claimed the desertions were due to a lack of moral stamina on the part of the deserting husband, and their unwillingness to shoulder marital and parental responsibility. Very often he claimed a man of weak character will desert

his family , happy in the consciousness that the wife and children would only have to apply to the Charity office and receive aid. There were husbands who deserted their wives after the birth of each child, only to return some weeks later. There are others, Billikopf claimed, who simply conceive an infatuation for another woman and leave their family at the mercy of the Charities. Billikopf, in his address to the board, made a plea to aid these individuals and to make sure that the innocent wives were not punished for the irresponsibility of the husband. In efforts to reduce the numbers of desertions, Billikopf helped several of the women bring their offending husbands to justice. After two were found guilty Billikopf used the threat of such publicity as a deterrent and helped reduce incidence of desertion.⁹⁹

The immigrants had a tremendous amount of faith in Billikopf. The following letter was sent by an immigrant woman who wanted the Kansas City Star to run a picture of her husband in order to bring him to justice; the following is transcribed verbatim:

Dear Mrs.X.

I Tink that two letters are enough to write. My money isn't any dirt. What do I spend for stamps anyhow? What is the matter mit you? Are you independent? What is a Society for ? To look at you? You aint such a buty! I want you to put my husband's picture in the papers, Julis Goldberg. Believe me what I spends the two cent stamps for is like noting to you. If you aint going to catch my husband, I will report you by Billikopf. You hear!

yours truly,
Sara Goldberg¹⁰⁰

Billikopf realized that if individuals in need could get the proper legal aid they would be able to handle the problem themselves. He works towards programs that would give the individual in need relief and ultimately independence. In order to facilitate this Billikopf helped establish a Legal Aid Bureau. Six of the most prominent attorneys of Kansas City offered their services free to the Bureau, one each night of the week. The Bureau was formalized in August of 1910, when this concept of Billikopf's was once again turned into a city wide program. The purpose of that Bureau was: "To render legal aid gratuitously, if necessary, to all who appear worthy of there and who are unable to procure assistance elsewhere, and promote measures for their protection."¹⁰¹

The legal aid gave the individual who needed relief another avenue to independence. This was the primary goal of all of Billikopf's programs. This is particularly true of the loan system which was established. Billikopf professed that if some of the individuals could get the aid to start a business they would cease to be a burden to the community and turn instead into an asset. The Jewish community, he felt, should help those individuals who have all the skills to function in business, or those who wish to borrow rather than receive charity. Present in the community was a system by which individuals could get such aid from the community, the Orthodox's Society of Gemilath Chasodim. In 1904 the Gemilath Chasodim Society and the UJC attempted to join forces but they could not bridge their differences.¹⁰² It was suggested that the UJC donate fifty dollars a month to the Gemilath Chasodim, and join their loan boards together. The only condition was the UJC would want to have three board members. Even this

compromise could not be met. The problem was that the Gemilath Chasodim program required two guarantors on loans granted by that organization.

Billikopf's objection to their policy stemmed from the fact that for several years the UJC had been asked to be the second guarantor for those who had no other guarantor.¹⁰³ This required the UJC to repay many loans which were seen by the borrower as a gift. They were committed to loans which they had no power to investigate. As a solution Billikopf set up a system whereby the loan applicant was investigated, and if the loan was seen in his eyes to be one which was likely to be repaid, the individual was referred to the Welfare Loan Agency of the Kansas City Board of Public Welfare. This body, which will be discussed further in this chapter, was able to provide the loan upon a recommendation from a reputable source. Billikopf was a founding member of the board as well as the founder of the Welfare Loan Agency. He wrote to the Board of Public Welfare (BPW) about the need for such an agency. "I feel that you will agree with me that a remedial loan institution enabling poor people to borrow money at a nominal rate of interest and properly conducted, will prove a valuable philanthropic agency."¹⁰⁴

This secular system and the channels it provided were quite valuable to Billikopf and the Jewish community. It allowed Billikopf to bypass the problems he had with the Gemilath Chasodim Society. The Agency started issuing loans on December 1, 1910; all the money for these loans came from one individual, Mr. William Volker.¹⁰⁵ This process was of great value to the Jews in the community

who had not been able to get loans through the Gemilath Chasodim system.

From that December in 1910 until the following December the Agency made loans to 160 Jews, totaling \$4,435, averaging \$39 a loan, and sixty nine percent had already been paid back.¹⁰⁶ Billikopf was very proud of this system and the way the Jews had "made good" on their loans. It seemed to prove his philosophy of self -help which maintained self-respect and nurtured independence. He cited the following case as an example of the system:

To present concretely our scheme of operation , I will cite one typical case. On February 25th, Mr. R applied for assistance claiming that Dr. Wolf advised him to go to San Antonio, where he would probably recover from acute bronchial trouble. As a result of his sickness Mr. R. had to give up his clerical position, paying twenty dollars a week , and during his eight weeks of confinement at home exhausted his savings. He needed at least \$90.00 to cover his transportation to and from San Antonio, in addition to which his wife and three children had to be taken care of during his absence. Mr. R. did not want any charity and, yet, he could not borrow the necessary amount from the Hebrew Free Loan Society because he was unable to find two responsible endorsers. Upon our recommendation and guarantee he secured a loan through the Welfare Loan Agency with the proviso that he should pay back to the society \$10.00 a month beginning April 25th, two months later, thus giving him an opportunity to recover from his sickness and resume his work. On April 25th he made his first payment and since then he has paid off the entire loan. It is clearly apparent that though Mr. R. applied to us at a crucial period in his life, when his health was shattered and his family was in destitute circumstances, yet we made it possible for him to obtain relief in such a manner, as to maintain his pride and self-respect.¹⁰⁷

Billikopf sought help outside of the resources of the Jewish community at other times, for other issues. Sometimes resolution of the problem needed greater funds and broader support than he could attain from within the Jewish

community. Billikopf was able to accomplish many of those programs because of his position in the secular community. This position had been established by virtue of his innovative programs which he had started in the Jewish community ,but because of their results, had been duplicated in the general community; these were the Public Baths and the Legal Aid Services and finally, although it was created to avoid an impasse in the Jewish community, the Welfare Loan Agency.

All of these programs had been sponsored by a group which later became known as the Board of Public Welfare (BPW). It is through this organization that Billikopf's programs reached national prominence and by which he made some of his greatest contributions to the field of social justice. As stated previously, Billikopf was a builder of bridges between diverse groups, and this was again his role in the BPW. He bridged the gap between Jew and Gentile , between the needy and those who could provide relief, between social dilemma and solution. From his arrival in Kansas City the young Billikopf had been involved with civic activities. While in Kansas City Billikopf lived in the home of a newspaper man and was in constant contact with the current events in the city. He became involved in one such event a year after he came to Kansas City. An uproar in the community developed concerning the municipal workhouse, the place to which petty offenders those convicted of misdemeanors were sent. Conditions in the municipal workhouse were deplorable .¹⁰⁸ There was an additional problem that was related and that had to do with the granting of pardons and paroles. At this

time, the power of granting pardons and paroles, exercised by the Mayor at his will and discretion, had developed into a "political football," and was causing considerable furor by 1908. Citizens were angered by the ability of a criminal with political connections to escape his rightful punishment. Wholesale pardons and numerous escapes from the workhouse because of laxity of guards and inefficiency of superintendents were the cause of consistent and vitriolic editorials demanding the cleanup of this situation.¹⁰⁹ The Mayor elected in 1908, Thomas T. Crittenden, Jr., had either taken his oath of office seriously and was desirous of being a good public servant, or the outcry of the people was so great that it forced his hand. Regardless the result was that he set up a commission to study the situation.¹¹⁰ The findings of the commission and other investigations were so caustic that the Mayor saw that it was necessary to implement a suggestion that had been published in several prior investigations. The suggestion was to set up a non-partisan board to investigate and recommend paroles.¹¹¹ In 1908 Mr. Frank P. Walsh, a prominent Kansas City attorney, who later became nationally famous as a corporation lawyer of New York City and a member of the War Labor Board in the First World War, collaborating with Mr. William Volker, a local philanthropist, and Jacob Billikopf, were the individuals who founded and were the core of the first Board of Pardons and Paroles.¹¹²

For her Master's thesis at Washington University at St. Louis, Missouri, Mary Lou Finberg wrote : "History of the Board of Public Welfare" the organization that flowered from the Board of Pardons and Paroles. She included in that work the

evolution of the Board of Pardons and Paroles into the Board of Public welfare. She points out that it was Billikopf who was instrumental in introducing and securing the passage of an ordinance establishing the said board. She includes that original ordinance taken from the first annual report:

Section 1: There is hereby created in and for Kansas City a Board of Pardons and Paroles which shall be composed of three persons, who shall be selected with reference to special fitness for the position.

Section 5 provided: The Board shall have power to inquire into the nature of any case brought before the municipal or police courts of the city, and may recommend that any person convicted thereby shall be pardoned, and shall have full power and authority to place any such convicted person upon probation, either before or after such a person has been placed in any City prison or Work house; shall have full power and authority to establish rules and regulations under which, and specify the conditions upon which any prisoner may be allowed to go on parole outside the buildings and enclosures of any city prison or work house, but to remain on parole in the legal custody and under the control of said Board, and subject at any time to be placed or taken back within the enclosure of said prison or Work House and full power to enforce such rules and regulations and reimprison any convict on parole.¹¹³

This board exerted a great amount of influence in the community, as is evident by these sections of the ordinance. It was for this reason that the Jewish community was very willing to have their superintendent in such a high position. In a letter dated December 23, 1908, Alfred Benjamin, the president of the United Jewish Charities, wrote to Billikopf informing him of the Board's sentiments concerning his involvement. "Regarding your appointment to the Board of Pardons and Paroles, I am gratified to inform you that by unanimous vote your

appointment was endorsed and your request to be permitted to accept this position was granted."¹¹⁴ This vote of confidence was soon to bring many fruits for Kansas City because Billikopf was really the man with the ideas. His ability was to turn solutions to problems into creative programs. A good many of the defects found under the old administration of the Work House were eliminated; important changes were introduced; but the Board soon came to the conclusion that what was desperately needed in the community was a Municipal Farm. Billikopf envisioned a place where the prisoners might work in the open and where their "shattered minds and bodies" might be rehabilitated. He claimed that even with the best of intentions a work house, or jail, or penitentiary, is not conducive to the reformation of folk who, for either external or internal causes, had fallen by the wayside.¹¹⁵ This idea took time to nurture and develop, but by the year 1910 the city council had allotted the money. Two hundred acres, about eight miles southwest of Kansas and two miles from Leeds, Mo. was purchased. Whatever the pains were for Billikopf in selling this idea it paid off. The Municipal Farm was a success and drew much attention, bringing people from various cities and countries to see this innovative means of rehabilitation. One visitor summed it up when he spoke at the City Club in Kansas City. Rabbi Joseph Krauskopf after his moving visit to the Municipal Farm remarked:

It was reserved for a nature-shrine in this city, the city which I spent the first and happiest years of my ministerial life, to kindle my deepest reverence. It was the Leeds Farm. On Saturday last, where I seemed to hear the words that Moses heard in the Sinai Wilderness, 'The Place where on thou stands is Holy Ground.' It is where I had a revelation of a beginning of a reform movement starting in

your midst and spreading from city to city and from land to land, affecting everywhere great moral cures.

I came to see a WORKHOUSE and found myself in a MORAL HOSPITAL. I came to see prisoners and found myself conversing with the fast convalescent moral patients. I came to see wreckages of drunkenness and dissipation and vagrancy, and found myself in the midst of men engaged in uplifting and contenting labor. It was there where I saw for the first time comprehension of society's obligations towards those of its members who are morally sick; a recognition that our criminal classes are, to an overwhelming degree, morally defectives, who require hospital treatment as much as those require it who are physically ill. It was there that I saw applied the only prophylactic for moral disease, viz. , wholesome, stimulating, productive labor, in the free and open, on God's broad acres, under God's sun.¹¹⁶

In 1910 the former Board of Pardons and Paroles was replaced with a new board called the Board of Public Welfare. This was necessary because the vision and project of the board had extended beyond the original charter. The new Board was so elastic in its nature it was possible to add one function after another to its already existing structures. Many of these activities were ideas and programs which Billikopf brought over from his work in the Jewish community. Such new activities included the creation of a Housing Department, Legal Aid Bureau, Supervision of Dance Halls, and other Recreational Facilities; Factory Inspection ; Welfare Loan Agency , the building of the Public Baths. The organizations, coordinated the distribution of relief of the thirty nine city-wide organizations, each with its numerous societies.¹¹⁷

The function of the board paralleled surprisingly with Billikopf's own job at the Jewish Educational Institute, as he sought to bring organization and

professionalism as well as inovative programs to its vast constituents. It was characteristic that no set of rules of activity were made. The various ordinances show that there was little attempt to limit the work of the Board. But rather a certain trend in social welfare was authorized, the details which were left to the judgement of the Board members. As it developed , some of the activites of the Board were not based on strict legal authority, but as a rule they were not challenged. In other instances certain public works were begun and legislation enacted later to legalize the work. ¹¹⁸ One comment which Billikopf made about the way the Board functioned relates to this matter . Billikopf said," And if the occasion would arise as to whether a certain procedure on our part was legal or not, Frank P. Walsh,with a hearty chuckle would say : 'Towith the law. Lets go ahead and do it-- we will take care of the law later.' "¹¹⁹

Billikopf did not have ill-regard for the law, but he felt that there was a law which superceded the limits of civil law, the law of social justice. Billikopf was willing to do whatever he felt was necessary to accomplish his ultimate goal, a society which had within it the avenues of programs and services by which an individual could move from dependency to independence. Just as Billikopf realized that he had to go beyond the confines and resources of the Jewish community to reach his goal of implementing the proper program, soon his ideas and passion for systematic solutions caused him to reach the limits of the Board of Public Welfare . The dilemma which precipitated this need to go beyond the Board of Public Welfare was the case of abandoned women. This problem was not new nor

indigenous to only the Kansas City population. He had made valiant attempts to build programs which would alleviate the problem, including legal aid, better employment, and personal counseling. However, none could stop the inevitable result of abandonment, a woman left with a number of mouths to feed. If she worked, the children would be unattended. If she did not work, the eventual dependency on charity would result in society taking her children away from her and letting her return to the working force; the children would be placed in homes or orphanages. This severing of the mother from the child was diametrically opposed to the principles by which Billikopf operated. He had always sought to give independence. He did not want a solution for one type of dependency to create an even greater dependency. Billikopf knew that taking the child from its family situation would create an undesirable environment. In addition, the child would often be sent to an institution in which it was exposed to "delinquent individuals." The lack of family would create a dependency in those individuals which could not be easily relieved by funds. The scare of being institutionalized was that it took away one's individuality. In response to these feelings, Billikopf sought a system by which individual children who were in families which were affected by a breadwinner's death, illness, incarceration or simple abandonment, would be allowed to remain with their mothers in their own homes. They would receive from the state a pension to allow them to become self-sustaining.

In response to letters from Mr. Carl Campbell and Mr. Martin Fellhauer Jr.,

Billikopf recounts how he and others went about creating such a system which would respond to this need. Mr. Cambell , the Public Relations Director for the City Manager's office who wrote to Billikopf in May of 1945, was preparing a history of the Board of Public Welfare for its 35th anniversary. He wrote to the individuals most instrumental in the Welfare Board. Mr Fellhauer in 1940 was employed by the State Social Security Commission of Missouri and was doing research on the history of the Mother's Aid Act of Missouri. Billikopf recounts how he and juvenile court Judge Potterfield had discussed and created the plan.

The following is from a letter to Mr. Campbell:

How well I recall the week we spent at Elma Hotel, Excelsior Springs, when we developed a program for the care of widows and orphans by means of pensions to be provided by the city or state. It was a novel, and almost startling project. The thought of subsidizing widows and orphans in their own homes out of municipal or state revenue was regarded as socialistic and therefore "entirely dangerous". Nevertheless Judge Porterfield and I, aided by other friends and particularly the Kansas City Star, sponsored in Jefferson City permissive legislation granting Jackson County the right to care for widows and orphans in their own homes, thus maintaining the family intact instead of placing the children in orphanages.

It was on April 7, 1911 that Herbert S. Hadley, one of Missouri's great statesmen, approved the Bill enacting the first legislation of its kind in the country. It was then adopted by Cook County, Illinois and as time went on, Mothers Assistance Fund Legislation was spread through out the country. But, Kansas City was the first community in the United States to initiate such constructive legislation.¹²⁰

In a letter to Fellhauer it becomes clear that Billikopf was involved in a campaign which led to the actual passing of such legislation. Billikopf was responsible for the educational aspect of this effort. He was sent all over the state to speak on

behalf of this effort. He already had a burdensome speaking schedule just filling the requests of various cities to speak about the virtues and successes of the Board of Public Welfare.¹²¹ Fellhauer wished to document the process by which this Bill evolved. He questioned Billikopf, "Was it an original idea of the Kansas City community, did it come from the Jewish Community?" He was led to believe this because all existing references mentioned Billikopf. Fellhauer had been directed to Billikopf. In his response, Billikopf recounts the process by which he helped actualize this legislation.

...then began the educational campaign- the nature and the extent of which would undoubtedly be revealing , if my files had not been destroyed. As a result of our efforts -and it was my privilege to argue the matter before a Senate Committee in Jefferson City- the legislation was passed and the then Governor Herbert S. Hadley signed the Bill.as a result of this legislation , Jackson County was empowered to spend \$12,000.00 for the care of widows and orphans in their own homes. Not an impressive sum, and limited to only one county in Missouri, but enough to focus public attention throughout the country on this important legislation-the first of its kind in the United States.

I don't recall now whether Chicago or New York followed with somewhat similar legislation, but I do know that I carried on voluminous correspondence with various communities throughout the country which were seeking information regarding the Bill.¹²²

The campaign was a success and the group of men spearheaded by Billikopf and Potterfield were able to bring about this innovative legislation which snowballed into a social consciousness throughout the United States. In his capacity as President of the Missouri State Conference on Charities and Corrections, Billikopf addressed the conference in November of 1912. In that

address he includes his own analysis of the application of the Widow's Pension Bill. Billikopf creates a tone which pleads for the professional to begin to look at the long range effects of the programs and solutions which are being bannerred in the name of social justice. He remarks that the world is just beginning to recognize the concept of social and economic justice. He believes it is the responsibility of the social worker to move beyond recognition of the principle and create programs to insure social justice.

Only within recent years has the world recognized to any appricable extent that there is a thing as social and economic justice, to which the deserving and distressed, the sufferer and unfortunate, have as valid a claim as the prisoner at the bar has to the justice which is the protection guaranteed by the law. Heretofore there has been plenty of conventional charity, no lack of alms giving, but in this doling out of charity the idea of a square deal, which is the ideal of social justice, entered only remotely, if at all.¹²³

Billikopf points out that for *zedakah* to be sucessful it needed to be given from a greater awarness of social justice; in addtion it needed to be applied specifically to aid those who had no advocate. Social programs should worry about the widow and the orphan, the child in general. He goes on to claim that it is logical that the next step that the social movement should take is the responsibility for these individuals. They fight a battle which places them, in their disadvantaged state, at the worst of odds. The few who conquered the odds against which they contended saved themselves, while the vast majority have been struck down not only by maligning forces, but also by countless thousands who are not actively cruel but only indifferent. Proper care should be in preventive measures that look beyond the immediate pain and take into consideration the long range aspects

involved. Mostly, it must be care that is not indifferent.

It follows logically that preventive philanthropy, which has supplanted remedial charity as electricity has supplanted kerosene and the motor car the buggy, must begin with the young. If an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, may it not be said that one boy or girl saved means at least a dozen men and women saved, to say nothing of the financial economy affected...The crass stupidity of the race in refusing to begin at the beginning is almost exasperating. Men do not gather grapes from thorns nor figs from thistles; they reap what they sow. The world can not plant indifference and reap good citizenship; it can not plant injustice and reap safety; it can not plant slums and boy gangs and unprotected girlhood and reap public morality.¹²⁴

Billikopf points out later that the "great state of Missouri has no adequate system for caring for the dependent and delinquent child."¹²⁵ Billikopf wanted the other cities in Missouri to take advantage of this new legislation and put it into action.

He describes the way that legislation works in Kansas City.

Kansas City is unique among all the cities of the state by reason of the fact that Jackson County, which is practically Kansas City, is the only county to which the Widow's Pension Bill passed by the last legislature, applies. This magnificent manifestation of the demand for social justice has amply justified the enactment of the law, which applies to widows and women whose husbands are in the state penitentiary. All chance for imposition is eliminated by stringent protections. The children must be living with the mother and the applicant must have lived in the state for two years before securing any allowances. Not more than \$1200 shall be paid from the county funds for any one year. The co-operation of the Provident Association [this was a local social service agency which lent its social workers to the BPW], and the Board of Public Welfare is secured in investigating applications. The allowance can not exceed \$10.00 a month for one child and \$5.00 for each additional child under 14 years of age. In practical operation 47 out of 86 applicants have been granted in the past year. In 8 cases the conditions so improved that the

allowance was withdrawn and in one case it was withdrawn for lack of such improvement. In September of this year nearly \$5000, or less than half the legal maximum was paid out. At present 39 widows are being helped, with an aggregate of 114 children under fourteen and 36 over fourteen years of age. Of the 150 children 95 are in schools, 30 are below school age and 25 are at work.

Some beneficial changes could be made in this law, notably a provision extending its operation to women whose husbands are in insane asylums, and provisions increasing allowance which at present time is too low to insure a proper standard of living. But on the whole the scheme is a noble and inspiring exhibition of social justice having for its purpose, the keeping intact of the family and assisting devoted mothers to support their little ones, half orphaned by death or the crime of the husbands and fathers.¹²⁶

In addition to these measures that he describes, Billikopf sought to aid those individuals who were in the care of an institution and to have them farmed out to families. He wanted to keep the orphaned child apart from the delinquent. He sought such legislation in March of 1912. His campaign with that of Roger Baldwin, a life long friend of Billikopf's and one of the eventual founders of the ACLU, helped establish for the state of Missouri the Board of Children's Guardians. This was established with H.B.[house Bill] 223 drafted by Mr. Eugene Hale, Chairman of the legislative committee, and Roger Baldwin.¹²⁷ Billikopf responded to a draft of the Bill sent to him by Hale. He thought that the Bill was excellent, and believed that it had two great strengths. The first was the fact that it sought to keep dependent children separate from the delinquent children, "... For it is agreed by all child-saving experts that dependent children must by all means be segregated from the delinquent children."¹²⁸ Secondly, Billikopf commented on the basic importance of keeping any child from an institutional setting.

Billikopf, in his letter, quoted from his own speech on the subject of Mother's Aid, a speech that he delivered throughout Missouri as well as in Chicago , New York and other city clubs. He makes two points: institutional life robs the child of individuality, and the "home" provides the only real educational environment, which can be best handled by a mother.

I point out in my City Club speech, any one familiar with the institutional care of children is aware of the fact that even in the best orphan asylums and industrial homes the children are robbed of their individuality and are not given an opportunity to develop independence and self-reliance. Human nature revolts at the attempt to force a multitude of children , made dependent for a variety of causes, into a single channel and to assume that a single method of dealing with them is conducive to their well being. Of course, where the mother is found unfit to care for her children on account of moral depravity of demoralizing surroundings, they should by all means be removed to a proper environment. But where the mother is a good and reputable woman, her children should, under all circumstances, be permitted and in every way encouraged, to remain with her .¹²⁹

His second point is a restatement of the findings of The White House Conference in 1909 on The Care of Dependent Children , which Billikopf attended. That conference claimed : "Home life is the highest and finest product of civilization .It is the molding force of mind and character. Children should not be deprived of it except for urgent and compelling reasons."¹³⁰ The inadequacy of the 1909 conference was that it made no provisions as to how this principle was to be implemented. It was not till 1911 with Potterfeild and Billikopf's legislation that this statement was realized in practice.

In Abraham Epstein's Insecurity: a Challenge to America, he verifies the fact that this legislation of Billikopf's was indeed the first of its kind in America. In conjunction with this he explains that there was some opposition to the legislation on the part of social workers. In New York and in Pennsylvania both; legislation modeled on the Missouri Bill were opposed by social workers.¹³¹

The New York State Commission deplored the obstinate and often blind opposition of organized charity, and stated that instead of encouraging and promoting the discharge of some of their burdens by the state, private charities have regularly, persistently and almost systematically not only opposed, but fought such legislation as would relieve them of such a burden. The passage of the law in Pennsylvania was vigorously opposed on the floor of the legislaion by a group of prominent social workers who cordially believed that the so-called mother's pension system was wrong in theory and would be pernicious in practice.¹³²

This resistance was the very reason that Billikopf made the type of plea that he did in a presidential address and in his numerous public addresses. This plea was directed at the individuals involved in social welfare, that they would think beyond the the confines of the existing programs to the future of individuals involved--to think not with indifference nor with an attitude which was concerned with the sole protection of their personal organizations, but rather to think in terms of equal social justice for all.

Although the movement for Mother's Aid had been present as early as 1897 when New York senator John F. Hern made an attempt to have public funds made available to the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to children, that attempt and a later similar attempt in 1899 both failed. That failure continued

throughout the decades with organized charity combatting such legislation.¹³³ This changed as Dr. Abraham Epstein points out only with the radical ideals and tenacious work of men like Jacob Billikopf. "Leading social workers appeared before legislatures in opposition to these laws; simultaneously enlightened social workers in Kansas City and Jackson County worked under the leadership of Jacob Billikopf and Roger Baldwin who were fighting valiantly for such legislation."¹³⁴ The impetus for change was the legislation of Missouri in 1911, for shortly after that there were adoptions of the Mother's Aid acts. During the entire decade, there continued rapid and widespread adoption of the law. Epstein points out that by 1919 thirty- nine states and the territories of Alaska and Hawaii had accepted the Mother's Aid Act.¹³⁵

In Fellhauer's original inquiry into the origins of this Mother's Aid Act he asks if the Jewish Educational Institute was practicing such policy prior to the bill. He wanted to know if this was a particularly Jewish idea. Billikopf's response to the letter makes no claim to Jewish originality or motivation of this idea:

Neither Kansas City nor any other Jewish community in the country had any definite plan or program. During my administration as Director of the Federation of Jewish Charities in Kansas City there were many instances where the breadwinner having died, financial provision was made for the care of the widow and orphan, or orphans in their own home.

I should say that the same sort of system prevailed in virtually all Jewish communities, although I should also add that for a period of years there existed in the city of New York an organization which was headed by Mrs. Einstein and which devoted itself exclusively to the

care of widows and orphans by furnishing financial support to them.^{136a}

The organization which Billikopf mentions was the Sisterhood of Personal Service; this was headed by Hannah Bachman Einstein in New York.

Regardless of Billikopf's claim, the question remains: was there a Jewish influence in this work? This question can be answered yes ,if we consider the participation and attitude of Jews who were activists in the Mother's Aid movement.

As stated, Billikopf as well as Hannah Bachman Einstein were at the very roots of this movement. In addition, Sophie Loeb and Judge Aaron Levy were highly involved. This issue was not presented as a Jewish cause; however, no student of Judaism can deny that from the time of the prophets, society has been judged by their treatment of the widow and the orphan. It is difficult to draw clear lines between that which is done out of motivation of "humanitarian principles" and that done out of religious convictions. They are one and the same to the Jew. If one were to look at the surface of the matter, Billikopf's innovations could all be seen in a secular light devoid of any religious convictions, done out of the duty of a good social worker and friend of humankind. One could look at his service to the immigrant population and agree with Billikopf's own claim that his religious programs were created for the sole purpose of keeping the Russian Jew from participation in radicalism. However to take this in toto for all his activities would be a view with disregard for what is an apparent deep commitment to Judaism.

As mentioned above, in Billikopf's writings one finds often his great claim, which was considered radical at the time, " Jewish settlement work, if it is to be true to its ideals, must concern itself with the problem of Judaicizing its clientele." ^{136b} Also of great concern to Billikopf was what was necessary to make our institutions Jewish. This was expressed numerous times in his speeches and in his correspondence. The following is an excerpt from a 1912 letter that Billikopf sent to Jacob Schiff and to David Bressler. It was so exemplary that he sent it in 1925 to Cyrus Adler because then as well this concern disturbed him.

I dwelt in my letter , upon the need for of instituting in Kansas City a modern Hebrew School for the children of the Galvestonians. Even then I recognized that a properly conducted Hebrew school must become an integral part of so called neighborhood-centers and social settlements among Jews. And today more than ever do I feel that neighborhood-centers and social settlements have no raison d'etre unless the dominant note on these institutions is Jewish. Frankly, my chief objection to certain educational agencies in our federation is due to the fact they do not stand for anything specifically Jewish, that a good many of their activities might be given up in view of the fact that public agencies are doing a superior job.¹³⁷

It was not odd that Billikopf would make the argument for such religious services on the basis of what it would avoid rather than what spiritual needs it might fulfill, or what commandment it might fulfill; he had to sell this argument to a board of German Reform Jews who did not base their religious existence on the same type of traditional experience that the Russian Jew did. Billikopf's argumentation most likely had its basis in the rift between German Jews and the Russian Jews, "old" Jew and "new" Jew. Because the German Jew had come from the most

"enlightened Jewish community from the most modern of European states," they gained emancipation and believed that acceptance would be theirs if they could make themselves acceptable. The law in America granted religious and political freedom. Only social acceptance could not be assured. This left open the possibility of anti-semitism, anti-semitism which was in the cultural baggage of the other groups which came to America, if not here already. The corollary of the Enlightenment's promise was that Jews made themselves unacceptable by being different. Since non-Jews were not careful to distinguish German Jew from Eastern European Jews, "old" Jews felt threatened by the new arrivals. Thus, as briefly mentioned earlier, fear of anti-semitism as well as Jewish philanthropic values and communal commitments motivated Jewish agencies working with immigrants; they became especially eager to "Americanize" the newcomers as soon as possible. It was in this context that Billikopf struggled to retain a Jewish dimension in the work he did. However, in his career in Kansas City Billikopf sought other innovations in the Jewish Community which were indeed revealing of his Jewish commitment, such as his entire attitude towards the role of the settlement house in Jewish education. In early letters to his friend in Cincinnati Dr. Boris Bogen, he noted with pride how he had formed a Hebrew School Association. This was financed largely by the Russian Jewish element in the community. The Hebrew school had opened eight classes in the main building and in the branch institute for Hebrew; studies Billikopf claimed they had 200 children in the two schools which meet four afternoons a week.¹³⁸ He reported as well "I am chairman of the educational committee. Thus Rabbi Samuel Cohen

and I are in pretty good control of the situation. The children are in the charge of a young man we brought in from Boston/New York who possesses substantial pedagogic knowledge."¹³⁹ The individual of whom he spoke was Saul Keiman. Billikopf helped him institute one of the most creative and radical pedagogic ideas in the country at its time, the Hebrew program of Ivrit B'Ivrit, Hebrew teaching in Hebrew and not resorting to English for translations of text. This idea was first developed in the U. S. A. in the Principals' Alliance of New York and in Baltimore.¹⁴⁰ Through these avenues as well Billikopf reveals his Jewish commitment.

Just as the religious services and Hebrew schools satisfied the needs of the Russian Jew, so too the vast number of successful programs which facilitated the acceptance of the Russian Jews in the community and into American populations served to satisfy the German Jews. The German Jews were in need of molding the Russian Jew into an acceptable citizen so there would be no reflection on their own status. Although the programs which Billikopf brought to the general community were contributions of a first class nature to the world of social justice, they were also looked at with considerable favor by German Jews. German Jews saw this as a factor of acceptance, for this brought the right type of attention and prestige to the Jewish community. What was ironic was that Billikopf, a Russian Jew was setting the paradigm for acceptance in the non-Jewish community in the eyes of the German Jews.

The status which Billikopf achieved in Kansas City as well as on a national level is impressive. What makes it outstanding is that this was done in such a short time, achieving this all before he was even thirty years of age. Billikopf was born in 1883 and only arrived on these shores in 1897, yet by 1912 he was the president of the state Conference of Charities and Corrections at the age of 29. The stature which was Billikopf's by 1913 was well deserved. He had built it in the most honest of ways through what he had done for the Galveston movement, both for the organization itself as well as for the immigrant population in his charge. Kansas City had become the showplace for the success of the movement. His programs in the Kansas City Jewish community became the vision and paradigm for the entire community. Their innovative nature was only surpassed by their efficiency. There is no greater compliment than to imitate and that is what the general community did by adopting many of Billikopf's programs. His work in formulation of the Board of Public Welfare, the first body of its kind, was so unique, and the interest in it so great that it took him from town to town, state to state, in an effort to express its virtues. This was the beginning of a career as a national figure. He augmented this role as a national figure by giving the country the first model for Mothers' Aid legislation. His campaign to ensure that this legislation was duplicated across the country put him before City Clubs and legislative bodies. These activities furthered the cause of social justice in America while simultaneously increasing Billikopf's notability. In addition to all of these endeavors which affected his status and prestige, Billikopf was also a professor at the University of Missouri, teaching Sociology and Economics. He aided

President Hill in promotion of the University.¹⁴¹ This educational connection brought, on a regular basis, to Billikopf's institution field trips from students of social work. Professor Rolvix Harlan, Ph.D. a Dean of the College wrote from his post at Ottawa, Kansas to Billikopf in 1913 to arrange for such a trip.

Have been interested in your fight in K.C. -keep up the good work. Am planning to bring about 30 of sociology class to K.C. either May 2 or 16- want to drop in at your place-would it be asking too much for you to give them a short address on Board of Public Welfare work in K.C. concerning conditions.¹⁴²

There was yet another aspect of Billikopf which led to such prestige and national acclaim. That was his captivating ability as an orator. He had the ability to take from his experience the most moving of moments and relate them as a anecdotes which would clarify his point. One such anecdote which was included in countless speeches and letters was of Jacob Schiff's visit to the Kansas City settlement house. The story in itself is moving. The fact that it is connected with Schiff makes it even more noteworthy and brought Billikopf recognition by association. The story of "americanization" was related as follows:

One day in 1915 I received a telegram from Mr. Schiff ..apprising me that he desired to visit Kansas City. Mr Schiff and his party arrived in Kansas City on April 12th, 1915. Spending a minimum of time at the hotel , he at once started on a long , and to anyone else a tiresome round. But as we went from house to house, up and down another street, of the poorer sections of the city , he seemed to gain energy , vitality. The sight of these men and women winning out and in the struggle to adjust themselves spiritually and economically to their new enviroment, the contentment, the determination he saw in so many faces gave him tremendous satisfaction.

But his greatest thrill came when, after hours and hours of this grueling, but gratifying labor, he visited a night school, where a large group of immigrants had gathered, after a hard day's work, to grapple with the intricacies of the English language, its accent and construction. The subject this class of immigrants was discussing that evening was "Abraham Lincoln."

How this affected him I can best tell in this way: It had been planned that Mr. Schiff should deliver an address at a meeting of the Missouri Bankers Ass. which had been moved forward a day from its original scheduled date, in order to take advantage of his presence in Kansas City.

Now, those who knew Mr. Schiff, have a vivid recollection of his punctuality for it was one of his marked characteristics. Punctuality was a religion with him.... But to the meeting of the assembled bankers of the state of Missouri, he was late. He was late because he was unable to tear himself away from that class-room-full of immigrants. When he arrived an hour after his scheduled time he took for his text an address he had heard from an immigrant:

'Abraham Lincoln, he said "was dear to us and respected by us during his living, and he is dear to us after his dying. Why? because he was a good soldier and the best leader of his people. When he was President he freed the slaves and for this account he got many friends and many enemies. But Lincoln was not afraid of nothing. Why? Because he was doing all that was right. He was honest and kind to everybody. And a man that does right must not be afraid of nobody... Abraham Lincoln, your body is now under a grave, but your truth will be by us all the time. Sleep sweetly, in your grave. Your spirit will always be with us, as long as American people lives. One of your followers is Joseph Sosin.'" ¹⁴³

Billikopf used this story before numerous groups to tell of how the accomplishments of the immigrants astounded the greatest of men and should be looked on with the awe that Schiff encountered. He goes on to point out in his use of this story that "Americanization was a matter of soul, not of outer

conformity-of clothing of speech, of manners. Love for America , for its institutions , for its ideals - that was Americanization."¹⁴⁴ Billikopf claims that Schiff told the well groomed bankers that day that a man that had such feelings as this immigrant did in his soul was real American. Billikopf professes these immigrants are the ones who came here deliberately, hazarding everything they had , came here to fight their way upward, they were the makers of America-its defenders and champions. ¹⁴⁵ Billikopf makes the following point to prevent any procrustean test, any conformity to conventional standards. Attributing the idea to Schiff, Billikopf claims: "Men have souls; they have individuality , and if you crush that individuality you destroy the soul. Similarly, groups have souls , they have individuality. America gains by the expression of this group-individuality as part of the great human symphony. If we destroy group consciousness, we rob America of the greatest contributions that these groups can make to our beloved land."¹⁴⁶ This statement, although attributed to Schiff, was as true of Billkopf's own philosophy as any statement could be. It was part of his style to fortify his own ideas by placing them in the mouths of these great men.

The reason Billikopf was able to use these great men as footstools to his own success was that indeed he had encountered them all and just as they left their indelible mark upon his being , he had left his own impression upon them. In his work for the Galveston movement he had been in constant contact with Jacob Schiff, informing him of the success of his brainchild. As well he was in contact with his teacher Emil G. Hirsch whom he had come to know during his studies at

Chicago. As described by his former roommate from graduate school in a 1919 article in the *Jewish Monitor* of Fort Worth Texas, George Fox writes:

One of the men who took a more than friendly interest in the young Billikopf was Dr. Emil G. Hirsch, and at his home Sunday after Sunday, Billi came under his influence of this master mind. Only those who have had the good fortune to have studied under Dr. Hirsch can have an idea what this means. Hirsch was almost a father to Billi- and to this day Billikopf makes Dr. Hirsch's home his home when in Chicago.¹⁴⁷

These men and Billikopf's association with them led Billikopf to a very prominent position for a young man of Russian origin. Perhaps the greatest boost to his career came through his friendship with Julius Rosenwald.

Julius Rosenwald , considered the greatest philanthropist of the 20th century only second to Jacob Schiff, was the son of Samuel Rosenwald and Augusta Hammerslough Rosenwald. The Hammerslough family had deep roots in Kansas City. That family connection brought Julius Rosenwald to Kansas City often.¹⁴⁸ That in turn familiarized him with the young progressive social worker, Billikopf. This particular connection with Rosenwald would have the most profound effect on Billikopf's entire career, and will be considered later in this chapter.

It is clear what Jacob Billikopf's accomplishments did for each of the causes with which he was attached. The effects of his accomplishments brought notability to Kansas City, to the Jewish community and to Billikopf himself. What remains to be

seen is what effect notability had on Billikopf. The rise in popularity which accompanied the exposure his ideas were getting certainly made it possible for Billikopf to take advantage of many political opportunities. He had become a powerful man in Kansas City. It appears however that his integrity withstood the aggressive opportunistic dealings of local Kansas City politics. The Board of Public Welfare was specifically set up to be an apolitical group. The necessity for such a board originated out of the byproducts of political favoritism, the selling wholesale of pardons and paroles. Billikopf was put to test in his role on the Board of Public Welfare. In the appointment of Mayor Henry Jost he made it conditional that if Billikopf took his office he would have to move for the resignation of Mr. Halbert. Halbert was the only other individual besides Billikopf who had been connected with BPW since its inception. Billikopf wrote to Rosenwald about this dilemma. Billikopf stood up to the mayor and refused and decided not to serve.¹⁴⁹ Billikopf wrote a letter to the mayor in December of 1915 submitting his resignation; the long involved letter can best be summarized by three points. First, Billikopf was conscious of the desire of the mayor when he was reappointed. Second, that he took the appointment because he believed so strongly in the work of the board and wished to give it continuity. Third, however strong his belief in this work, his loyalty to deserving individuals such as Mr. Halbert outweighed those beliefs. In short, Billikopf was as well expressing in his letter that the board would not be able to function under these political considerations and constraints.¹⁵⁰ His belief was that he could serve best if he remained unattached to any political alignment. Two years earlier he proved this

as well when his friends had suggested that he run for mayor. Again in a letter to Rosenwald Billikopf writes of this and his desire to serve as a citizen.

Entre nous, several of my friends have been good enough to speak to me recently about permitting the use of my name in the forthcoming Mayoralty contest but I discouraged their efforts in my behalf. Firstly, I have had no business experience and secondly, which is the most important reason I felt---this may indicate a lack of modesty on my part --that I have been able to serve my community much more effectively in the capacity of a private citizen than I could have served it had I been clothed with such important official powers as the Mayor is supposed to possess.¹⁵¹

Power in these political arenas did not interest Billikopf at all, evidenced by his refusal of these two reasonable and potentially tempting offers. Billikopf's primary interest still embraced the field of social service.

Equal to the political opportunities that his prestige brought were the offers tendered in his own field. This is where the effect of the success began to influence Billikopf. From his election to the Presidency of the Missouri State Conference of Charity and Corrections in 1911 Billikopf began to look towards new horizons. From that year on, his personal correspondence is filled with letters inquiring of his friends what they thought of his leaving Kansas City. The letters are with several key individuals, all in relation to his decision of what he should do with his career. By the content and nature of most of these letters they would have certainly increased his confidence and buttressed his self-esteem even if the particular advice did not ultimately influence him. These individuals included Julius Rosenwald, to whom he wrote constantly, Rabbi Leon

Harrison, the noted speaker with whom he had become excellent friends, , Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch his tutor and friend, Mary Antin the author, and his peers in the field David Bressler, Boris Bogen and Morris David Waldman. Billikopf was indeed perplexed--was it better to leave and to go to new work or a new type of work ? This was juxtaposed to the security that Kansas City offered. There, Billikopf was a well respected man. These fears and questions resonate in each of his letters. The advice was conflicting. Mary Antin, whom he had met on her tours through the country , invited him to come spend time with her in the East. She wrote him the most enchanting letters: "Don't think for a moment that all the people I meet as I fly about the country are invited to hang on as you are invited." ¹⁵² In her efforts to aid Billikopf in his search for a new place of residence or new "adventure," she introduced him to Congressman Julius Kahn. The nature of the letters indicate that Mary Antin was rather taken with Billikopf. Her reassurance and message was to move on to bigger and better things: "You will be driven by your great gifts of character and specific talent." ¹⁵³ Just as Antin encouraged him to leave the small wilderness of the midwest and adventure into unknown greater territories, which would have put him in greater proximity to her, others, for perhaps similar personal motivations, encouraged Billikopf to remain in Kansas City . The opinions of each were in response to the various job offers which were tendered to Billikopf from 1913 -1916.

These all resulted from the exposure that he got speaking for Mothers' Aid or for the Board of Public Welfare. His first offer came from Lee Kohns of the

Educational Alliance of New York City. Kohns requested in March of 1913 that Billikopf come to New York to interview for the position of director.¹⁵⁴ Billikopf came to New York and interviewed. Although he eventually turned down the offer it became the catalyst for his search. Opportunity was calling and Billikopf, who was already interested in moving on, intensified his pursuit of advice in order to adequately answer the call. To leave or not to leave? Such advice was sought of Rabbi Leon Harrison, but the St. Louis rabbi did not really clarify the situation for Billikopf.

Regarding New York , the chief reason really why I hesitate to recommend you to go to New York , is that I am extremely anxious to get you here. Between you and me, I talked the matter over with Mr. Waldheim yesterday. He admires you immensely, and he agrees with me altogether; but fears we could not afford you.

Frankly speaking , I must say to you that I believe that you belong in New York. You have done your utmost in Kansas City and are invaluable there. But a man of so many various faculties would become equally indispensable in a much greater sphere. And of course New York is the greatest. The opportunities are enormous. And as it is bound to be your ultimate goal , you might just as well arrive without delay.

Of course the personal aspects of this are up to you. In Kansas City you are an important personage, and a respected man, and have many devoted friends and admirers. All this you must weigh. And judge for yourself whether you could create such a position in that modern Babylon.¹⁵⁵

Rabbi Leon Harris was consistent with his encouragement to Billikopf to go beyond the confines of Kansas City to enhance his career. The situation got much more complex as the news of Billikopf spread. In 1914 the city of San

Francisco offered Billikopf a position to be director of their federation. They made it very tempting and made the choice difficult for Billikopf. Rabbi Emil Hirsch, friend and teacher, encouraged Billikopf to go to San Francisco.¹⁵⁶ The situation was getting even more intense as the offers increased in the year 1915. Billikopf was reappointed to the Board of Public Welfare in Kansas City, a victory over the politicalization against which he had struggled. In addition, he had been sought by a Miss Low who represented the interests of a group. This group may have been the B'nai Brith; regardless, the group wanted Billikopf to work on a national Americanization program. These events were commented on by his friend David Bressler, the social worker who had been his superior in the Galveston movement. Bressler sent this Miss Low the following: "Billikopf, in many respects at least as far as personal advantages goes, has about the best job in the country and I doubt very much that he will consider another offer."¹⁵⁷ It is not clear if this was done to free Billikopf from the burden of yet another offer or if this and Bressler's encouragement for Billikopf to take the west coast offer were to rid this aggressive young individual Billikopf from any competition. Bressler points out that Rosenwald was not in agreement with this plan which Miss Low suggested. The sound advice which Bressler gives is that an opinion of a man such as Rosenwald should be considered. Bressler as well comments on the financial limits to the social service field. This he does in conjunction with the advice that if Billikopf should decide to leave this field, Kansas City and its present connections would be of the greatest value to him. ¹⁵⁸

Billikopf took the advice of his elder Bressler and he adhered to the considerations of Rosenwald. It was not Bressler's urging which caused Billikopf to listen carefully to Rosenwald's advice; Billikopf had been writing Rosenwald about the various job offers throughout his career. In fact it was much due to the exposure that Billikopf got through his friend Rosenwald that he received these offers. In December of 1913 Rosenwald arranged for Billikopf to speak at the City Club of Chicago.¹⁵⁹ The success of that talk was mentioned often by Rosenwald and alluded to in many of the offers Billikopf received. Rosenwald and his wife had grown fond of the young charismatic social worker and took personal interest in his career. Rosenwald gave Billikopf some options to consider which would assure him of financial success and freedom to move onward and upward if he so desired. "I would however ask you not to commit yourself in any way without writing me first, since I have certain things in mind which I would like to speak to you about provided you think seriously of making a change."¹⁶⁰

The years 1911-1917 are filled with layers of events and advice and job offers which led Billikopf to the most significant change in his life, the acceptance of a call to New York, to lead the American Jewish War Relief Campaign in 1917. His participation would change the face of American Jewish philanthropy. It is important to understand what led to that offer and why it was made to Billikopf. After due success and immense exposure as mentioned above from the March 1911 Mother's Aid Act, and the November 23, 1912 speech at the Missouri State Conference of Charity and Corrections, it took little more to bring Billikopf to the

minds of men across the country who were all interested in duplicating what had been done by this innovative social worker. Duplication would be easier with the presence of the master himself. But other events as well caused Billikopf's name to be evoked. In October of 1914 the Galveston offices were closing, and the men responsible were moving on to other areas. As early as 1908, Morris David Waldman left the movement to take over the United Jewish Charities of New York. In 1917 he moved over to take a job with the American Jewish War Relief Committee (AJRC). David Bressler, another of Billikopf's distinguished friends and colleagues, was soon to take a place in The American Jewish Committee in 1916, after deciding to leave the social work world and move into business.¹⁶¹ The closing of the Galveston movement freed Billikopf from the national organizational ties he had to Kansas City, at least in the eyes of those outside of Kansas City. On November 16, 1914 Billikopf received the above mentioned offer from Mr. I. W. Hellman of San Francisco.¹⁶² This offer served to concretize an already significantly strong relationship with Julius and Augusta Rosenwald. As intimated above Billikopf received an offer from Rosenwald to work for him.¹⁶³ By 1915 Billikopf was becoming a regular in the Rosenwald home. He writes his good friend Bressler of his constant chats with Rosenwald and his attempts to influence this man's thinking. He writes about the subject of war relief for the Jews of Russia. In 1915 this is reflected in an innocent letter from Billikopf. However, its contents, the dialogue between him and Rosenwald, would soon be one of the very reasons he would be called to work for the AJRC. He recounts his conversation in his January 30th letter to Bressler:

I am thoroughly in accord with what you say in regarding the pitiful and tragic condition of our people abroad and if each Jew in America felt as we do, the American Jewish Relief Committee would have no difficulty in raising its ten million dollars.

....Yes, I exhausted every possible argument with Julius Rosenwald regarding the creation of a distinctive Jewish Relief Fund; but his chief opposition to it seems to rest upon the fear , lest the Russian Government or the Russian people will greatly resent the fact the the Jews are taken care of by their own co-religionists in America whereas their neighbors are neglected. Needless to say that I failed to see any thing in that fear. And here is the strange inconsistency which I called to his attention. In response to a plea which Mr. Brandeis made in Chicago some weeks ago, Rosenwald promised to give a thousand dollars a month during the next twelve to the stricken men and women in Palestine. I said to him;" If your fear holds good in the case of the Russian Government, will not the Turkish officials also resent the creation of a separate Jewish Fund?" adding that one more or less grievance of the Russian Government versus our people matters little at this or any other stage of the game; but Mr. Rosenwald merely replied: "Well,the analogy is unfair ." I do believe that on my next visit with him I shall win him over. But as Dr. Hirsch pointed out to me, the sad feature connected with Mr. Rosenwald's disinclination to sponsor this or that Jewish cause results in general apathy throughout the community.¹⁶⁴

These conversations increased as Billikopf came closer to Rosenwald. His friendship was not limited to Julius. In March of that same year as the above conversation Billikopf received a rather long personal letter from Augusta Rosenwald Julius' wife. Having recently returned from a trip to Tuskegee on which Billikopf had been invited she was concerned for his health. She writes Billikopf in order to persuade him to return to Chicago and remain under their doctors care and in her words: "I shall do all I can to 'mother' you and make you

as comfortable as possible." 165

The friendship with the Rosenwalds had immediate results. In April, through efforts of Rosenwald, Billikopf was reappointed on the Board of Public Welfare. There is no indication of exactly what political device Rosenwald exercised in the case; however Billikopf's letters indicate that he was responsible in some measure. 166 This help may have caused Billikopf to feel a greater attachment to Kansas City himself but it certainly did not deter any of the individuals who were interested in Billikopf's skills from furthering his career by inducing him to leave. The Jewish Community of San Francisco had been gathering their funds in order to engage a man like Billikopf. They brought Billikopf out to speak in San Francisco in May of 1915; he addressed the B'nai Brith Grand Lodge. 167 Shortly after his trip and speech in California, Billikopf was pressured by yet another group of employers. It seems that in the year 1915 a group of individuals wished to create a position of field secretary for Americanization. Billikopf received the offer for such a position. He followed his normal pattern and of course sought advice from Bressler and Rosenwald about such a position. From these letters it seems that the initial job would have been from the B'nai Brith order and that it was a job that was not yet formalized. However the hope was, according to its creators, that this position would encompass all of American Jewry, on the organizational level. The problems with the job as well as its description are deduced from the comparisons of this job given by Schiff, Bressler and Rosenwald, with the San Francisco job. Bressler points out in his letter that it is crucial that this position be

aligned with the American Jewish Committee. He realized that there was no probability in the hope that the factions of American Jewry would be able to unite.¹⁶⁸ For as early as 1915 there is, as pointed out by Dr. Jacob Rader Marcus, the distinguished American Jewish historian, no real monolithic Jewish community. "In 1920, even though there were over 3,500,000 Jews in this country, one could not speak of a genuine American Jewish Community. Such a community simply did not exist."¹⁶⁹ Therefore it was important that this position at least have the backing of the AJC. As to that potential backing Bressler was not so sure that it would be possible:

Provided that there can be an amalgamation, or rather I should say a cooperation, in a manner indicated by me, I would incline to Judge Mack's view as to the possibilities. Otherwise, I can appreciate the force of Mr. Rosenwald's views as stated by you. Whether I agree with him or not is immaterial, in view of the fact that an important influential man like him holds such an unfavorable opinion - right or otherwise - of an organization. And remember, his is not an isolated instance.

There is not the least doubt in my mind that under proper auspices, field secretaryship could develop into a highly important and influential promoter of community interest and effort. Better still, and as a natural development of such work, it could in time be the greatest factor in moulding a national spirit of solidarity among American Jewry - which is sadly lacking at this time despite more or less abortive efforts which have been made in that direction recently.¹⁷⁰

Bressler knew as well as Billikopf that no organizational effort in America was going to be successful unless it had the backing of the powerful American Jewish Committee. It was for this reason that ultimately Billikopf followed the advice of Bressler as reiterated July 6th, 1915. "Confidentially and for your personal guidance, would decline but would not like to be placed in delicate

position of committing myself before officially asked. I adhere views of original letter that position mostly attractive largely because of participation of American Jewish Committee which should be definitely settled ."¹⁷¹ Confirmation of Bressler's good advice came in a letter several days later from Jacob Schiff, whose opinion lead Billikopf to believe that there may not ultimately be the cooperation between the AJC and the B'nai Brith. This link was crucial both for the ultimate success of the program and for Billikopf's initial consideration of the job. Schiff writes the following to Billikopf, July 13, 1915 just six days after Bressler.

The B'nai Brith project is good and should be given practical form, but is not such as will , in my opinion , exert a commanding position and influence, for the Order has never understood, since the Russian immigration set in, how to get a hold upon these teeming Jewish masses, and while great good can yet and is likely to be done by it, it will never gain the actual confidence of any large portion of the Russo-American Jews, who have already established, as you know , their own widespread orders.¹⁷²

By 1916 Billikopf had decided to make some move from Kansas City and in February of that year he informed Mr. Alfred Benjamin, President of the Board of the United Jewish Charities, the man who brought him to Kansas City almost ten years earlier, that he was officially resigning.¹⁷³ Billikopf had at the time three offers: San Francisco, the Americanization committee and one offer as well from his friend Julius Rosenwald. In a letter to Billikopf on February 15th, 1916 Rosenwald tries to provide the greatest flexibility to his friend. He does this by offering Billikopf several alternatives, all at his own personal expense.

...My objective in making you the offer I did was because I felt rather than have you confine yourself to work in San Francisco, I thought you could be of more use in a larger field.

Now the question arises , Do you want to leave Kansas City, and would work as Miss Kellor outlines appeal to you. Personally I believe it offers fine possibility to come into contact with the best people in larger cities in the country. How you will like this work remains to be seen, and to the extent you are taking a risk leaving a position which you have made for yourself and in which you are highly respected by the best people in the community. You are, as I have explained to you before, sacrificing the good-will which you have accumulated.

If, after considering all these matters you still feel that you would like the work in connection with the Americanization Committee, I shall be glad to guarantee you \$5,000 annually for three years. Furthermore, if that work should not be entirely to your liking, I think there would be no trouble in finding work to do in connection with things which I am interested - not that I have any thing definite in mind just now, but things are always coming up, where you could make yourself useful.¹⁷⁴

In addition to Rosenwald's offer, in 1916 there was yet another offer made to Billikopf. The Pittsburgh Jewish community offered him the position of Director of Philanthropies at an initial salary of \$2500 per annum. However, if Billikopf would agree to act as Head Worker of the Settlement as well, it would increase the offer to \$3500 per annum.¹⁷⁵ This offer was turned down not because it was not unreasonable for the work , but rather because Billikopf was far beyond the average salary of his day. In the 1917 United Jewish Charities report which Benjamin gave, he reminds the board that the 10 month leave which the community granted to Billikopf saved the community \$3500, for his salary. ¹⁷⁶ The reason that Billikopf was on leave was because of an offer that he got in

early 1917.

Cyrus L. Sulzberger, the head of the Industrial Removal Office and one of the principal men involved with the Galveston Movement, was in 1917 the official secretary to a rather new organization called the American Jewish Relief Committee (AJRC). This was a committee which grew out of the reaction of American Jewry to the desperate situation of European Jewry. Three empires and a kingdom were involved in World War I which struck the Jews in those lands very hard. Russia, Austria-Hungary, Germany and Romania were all involved in a deadly conflict and out of more than fifteen million Jews in the world, ten million lived in these countries. Within a short time there were five hundred thousand Jewish refugees in the Russian Interior, driven there by czarist armies. During 1915, almost 40 percent of Russian Jewry passed under German control saving them from the brutal treatment of the Russians.¹⁷⁷ In his book on the Joint Distribution Committee, My Brother's Keeper, Yehuda Bauer quotes from an unpublished manuscript by Herman Bernstein found in the JDC library. This manuscript contains similar facts alluded to in many of the pleas for money from men like Magnes and Billikopf during the numerous drives for funds held in those black years of the war. These pleas which included the statements that some eight hundred townships and villages where Jews lived were hit and severely damaged and about eighty thousand Jewish houses were destroyed. As the crisis of the World War and sufferings of Jews increased, American Jewry's call for fund-raising organizations grew as well.

Three groups were founded. The first, founded by the Orthodox, was called the Central Committee for the Relief of Jews Suffering through the War, and was founded on October 14, 1914.¹⁷⁸ The Orthodox Jews could not take this task on alone. They had to get help from other factions of the divergent American Jewish community. The American Jewish Committee, which was formed in 1906, had already responded to some similar needs. In 1914 Jacob Schiff had received a cable from his friend Henry Morgenthau who was serving as Ambassador to Turkey. The cable, sent to the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. requested that \$50,000 be sent to the Jews of Palestine. This was brought to the attention of the AJC by Jacob Schiff. The money was raised by first two individuals of that prestigious committee; Jacob Schiff and Nathan Straus each gave \$12,500 and the AJC voted the rest.¹⁷⁹ The AJC took action this time by calling a meeting on October 25th, 1914 of forty of the nation's Jewish organizations. . In that meeting there was a central committee picked which represented the Central Committee for the Relief of Jews Suffering through the War (the Orthodox Group), the American Jewish Committee (German Jewish aristocracy) and the Socialists, who would in August of 1915 form their own committee, the People's Relief Committee.¹⁸⁰ From these three major factions of the American Jewish community and forty other organizations, a committee of five was selected: Oscar Straus, Louis D. Brandeis, Julian Mack, Harry Fischel and Meyer London. This group selected one hundred prominent Jews from all areas of the country to select officers for a new committee: the American Jewish Relief Committee. Louis

Marshall was Chairperson, Felix Warburg ,treasurer, and Cyrus Sulzberger, secretary.¹⁸¹ Although this was the name of the group that contacted Billikopf, its participating affiliates were different by 1917. This was due to the fact that the Orthodox in 1914 decided to not join with the AJRC in the collection of funds. They pulled out of the AJRC. The Orthodox and a third group, the socialists, who formed the aforementioned People's Relief Committee, collected funds separately. The Orthodox and the American Jewish committees both however participated in another organization which was established to distribute the funds jointly and thus unknown the birth of the the Joint Distribution Committee, formed on November 27, 1914.¹⁸² The Workers joined the Joint Distribution Committee in 1915.

Cyrus Sulzberger contacted Billikopf for the AJRC in January of 1917. What Sulzberger wanted was for the Kansas City social worker to come and direct the campaign for the AJRC. This campaign hoped to raise an unprecedented ten million dollars. No such task had been attempted by the American Jews. There had been around a million dollars raised after the news of the 1905 massacres; however this money came from an outpouring of shocked emotion, not from an organized effort. Billikopf was not at all eager to take on this task and did his best to persuade the interested party that he was indeed not the man for the job. The following is a telegram from Billikopf to Sulzberger dated January 22, 1917 :

Delayed answering your telegram because I wanted to give matter thoughtful consideration. Happy as I would be to assume management of campaign I am afraid that on

account of my limited experiences in raising funds I would not be the right person to undertake this gigantic task. Am therefore reluctantly compelled to decline invitation which I deeply appreciate. Letter with recommendation follows.
Jacob Billikopf¹⁸³

Billikopf was fearful of this offer for he considered himself inadequate at such work. His efforts to discourage his own candidacy were noble. For Billikopf, as demonstrated by his career, was concerned with the ultimate success of the campaign. He wrote to Sulzberger suggesting whom the AJRC should seek, while emphasizing that he was not the man for the particular job. The information in the following letter is repeated over and over again by Billikopf in correspondence between the two men.

From my limited experience with several campaigns to raise funds I have come to the conclusion that such campaigns should be managed by experts- Men who have abundant experience along that line and have developed their machinery with almost scientific exactness.

About two months ago there was initiated in this city a campaign for \$200,000 for a certain hospital which had been before the public a great deal. The consensus of opinion was that it would be impossible to raise \$25,000 considering the fact that there had been at least a dozen appeals for various projects prior to that time. The trustees of the hospital brought in to Kansas City a Mr. Edgar Honey, c/o W. A. Brown, 280 Madison Ave., New York, who had managed similar campaigns throughout the country and under his supervision the entire sum was subscribed within a week's time. I never saw anyone who worked with such mathematical exactness and such lightning-like rapidity as did Mr. Honey. I do not remember at this moment how much he was paid but I am satisfied that without him the hospital, strongly as it is entrenched in the community, could not have brought a fractional response.

...for your consideration confident that under his direction you will come nearer to realizing your objective than with

any other individual than I can think of at this moment.

Trusting that you will appreciate the reason which impelled me to decline your most flattering invitation and with kindest regards .¹⁸⁴

The persistence of Cyrus Sulzberger is almost irrational. In telegram after telegram he insists that Billikopf must come to the aid of the AJRC. Billikopf then received a telegram from David Morris Waldman, his friend and mentor. In fact Waldman was the man who had trained Billikopf in New York while he worked for the Industrial Removal Office in 1905-1906.¹⁸⁵ Waldman telegrams: "Believe War Relief job maximum importance undoubtedly you are best available man"¹⁸⁶ The pressure and persistence of Cyrus Sulzberger coupled with the fact that Waldman, Bressler and others gave him their votes of confidence persuaded Billikopf, but still did not convince him of his own skill. Even in his acceptance, Billikopf reiterated that he still felt that the job could be best handled by Honey, whom he considered an expert.

My board greeted your request reluctantly owing to general feeling that my services here at this time very badly needed account several matters demanding closest personal attention. Consent granted if your committee still insists that my services are imperative and indispensable. After talking over with Mr. Honey am thoroughly convinced that far better results could be obtained through organizer of wide experience like himself. For sake of cause wish you could get such guidance. If still insist upon my coming can not take up work before about fifteenth of February.¹⁸⁷

Cyrus Sulzberger had gotten what he wanted, Jacob Billikopf. Despite the efforts towards resistance, Billkopf was going to New York. According to a letter of February 5th, 1917 from Schiff to Sulzberger, Sulzberger had sent a circular to

all of the Executive Committee of AJC announcing the fact that he had acquired the services of Billikopf.¹⁸⁸ The job frightened a fear for Billikopf. First, their expectations of Billiopf had not been made clear, and logically he was apprehensive. Secondly, Billikopf had told them repeatedly he felt he was inadequate at fund raising, yet for a reason unknown to Billikopf he was being persuaded. It seems he could not tell them no. He wrote to Bressler in hopes of clarifying why the Executive Committee wanted him and what they wanted from him:

Had declined management of campaign because I felt I was not right person to undertake it. Still think so. Sulzberger very interested my board reluctantly granted request. If you think I am undertaking a hopeless task not too late for me to decline Please wire confidentially exact situation.¹⁸⁹

Bressler's response was not encouraging. He pointed out after talking with Magnes that the campaign should largely be in New York, and stated that he believed this could present a problem for a non-New Yorker. As well he believed that the political uncertainty will make things very difficult.¹⁹⁰ So one year after Billikopf had made a decision to leave Kansas City for greener pastures and placed before the United Jewish Charities Board there his resignation he was actually going to leave. But for all intents and purposes he was leaving under coercion. This was not his first choice, it seems it was not even a choice.

The question can be asked-- why Jacob Billikopf? This question seems to have been on the mind of the social worker himself, for after repeated attempts to

convince the executive committee that he was unqualified they still wanted him. What did Billikopf have to offer fund raising? His expertise had been demonstrated in the social justice field. His innovations for the care and integration of the immigrant into American society or his social legislation for the care of the orphan and the widow embodied in his Mother's Aid work, as impressive as any such work was, it was virtually meaningless for the task set before him. These did give him some national prominence. He was obviously an effective speaker. But were these qualities enough to draw the attention of the Executive Board of the American Jewish Committee, did these qualities warrant asking him to lead a campaign? Perhaps it was his character, his unique ability to bring diverse groups together. He might have been seen as the bridge between the German Jewish Aristocracy and the Russian Jewish groups. Was there really any desire from the AJC that these groups come together? Yes, for at this time the "other" groups were outnumbering the German Jews four to one. They knew Billikopf was an able man by his actions and initiatives taken in relation to the Galveston movement. However this does not seem to be enough when one considers that the AJRC had a nation to pick from. They had professionals the likes of Mr. Honey and others who had vast experience at their disposal. Although only speculation, there is another factor which should be considered. The committee had been under pressure to raise its funds. The campaign was in a lull. They had met some resistance for the funds they sought to raise. One person who had resisted was Rosenwald, as outlined above by Billikopf himself in his letter to Bressler. Rosenwald felt that it was improper to give to the Russian

Jews for their government and neighbors would resent this effort. Rosenwald's money would be important to the success of the campaign. Early on, Lee K. Frankel had the idea that it would be important to get one individual to give a large sum which would match the American Jewish community's. The idea was to get an individual to give one hundred thousand dollars for every million raised by American Jewry. This would be the only way to get the campaign out of the rut.¹⁹¹

The logical person to approach Rosenwald was his young friend Jacob Billikopf. The relationship he had with Rosenwald was his most outstanding quality in the eyes of the Executive Committee. In a letter to Benjamin , Billikopf describes the meeting in which the decision for him to approach Rosenwald takes place.

Careful consideration can serve to fortify this hypothesis:

I thought you might want to know something more in detail regarding the Rosenwald offer. On Saturday last, a meeting of a limited group of people was held at the house of Mr. Cyrus L. Sulzberger and, in the course of our conference, a suggestion which at the time appeared impossible of execution was offered to this effect: That the only way to get the war relief campaign out of its rut and to focus public attention upon it, is to obtain from one or two sources some initial offer as this: One hundred thousand dollars for every million to be raised up to ten. It was felt that an offer of this character would dramatize the movement and put heart not only in the committee which was becoming despondent , but in the workers throughout the country at large.

Quite naturally the two men thought of were Mr. Schiff and Mr. Rosenwald. The former was out of consideration because- and this is not for publication- an enormous amount of pressure was brought to bear upon him to give

two hundred and fifty thousand dollars at the last Carnegie Hall meeting which he refused to do. Julius Rosenwald was second choice. Dr. Frankel suggested that I should carry the message to Garcia, insisting that, in his judgement, I was the only one who could get Mr. Rosenwald to see the imperative necessity of making such an offer. I must confess that my nerve failed me and I suggested that Dr. Magnes should go along with me. Dr. Magnes to work on Rosenwald and I with Mrs. Rosenwald.

On Saturday night I called Mr. Rosenwald up over the long distance in Washington, trying to make engagement for Dr. Magnes and myself. He was quite insistent to know the nature of the mission, and I told him that we were preparing to initiate a campaign and wanted his advice along technical lines, but not revealing the true purpose. In response to which he said: " You fellows cannot tell me anything about the conditions abroad, and, furthermore, it is a physical impossibility for me to do another piece of work. It is a waste of time for you to take a trip ; but if you are insistent , I shall of course be glad to see you. However , I want to impress upon Dr. Magnes, (and he said this with considerable emphasis) that I am not going to have him bring any pressure upon me for more funds. I like Magnes, but if he does not want to have a break with me, he should not ask me for money." I immediately called up Mr. Sulzberger and Frankel, and they said: " Then you must go alone." Dr. Frankel added: You made a blunder in insisting upon having Dr. Magnes accompany you, and it was a tactical error for you to have called up Mr. Rosenwald over the phone arranging a date with him. You should have taken a train to Washington and unceremoniously reported at the New Willard for breakfast. But you must go by all means." 192

On March 3rd the executive committee of the AJRC sent Billikopf to accomplish his mission. It was a task that Billikopf felt was destined to failure. Besides the phone call to Rosenwald ,considered by all to be a blunder, he had seen Rosenwald just a few days earlier, stopping to announce his new job on his way to New York. The reaction the announcent of his new job received from

Rosenwald filled Billikopf with trepidation. Rosenwald pleaded with Billikopf not to undertake the task; Rosenwald did not believe in sectarian campaigns , and he thought that Billikopf's efforts were doomed to failure.¹⁹³ Billikopf also claims that on that night on his way to New York Rosenwald repeatedly asked him a question he asked himself " What have you got to do with fund collecting? You are a social worker. You are even a diplomat, a statesman. But money raising is a profession in itself and you do not belong in it!" ¹⁹⁴ Here was Billikopf on his way to try exploit the expertise Rosenwald thought were not in him, being coerced into trying his skills out on Rosenwald. Billikopf nevertheless left for Washington on his sacred mission.

Billikopf has published several versions of that dramatic day in his life when the future of the Jews of Europe were in the hands of his ability to present their case. Some of these accounts make him out to be the homileician of the decade, possibly the century, but all of them recount the fact that in the final analysis, Billikopf was simple and straight -forward in his approach to the subject . Also recorded is the aspect of Rosenwald's selflessness; the greatness of Rosenwald's character would stimulate the success of the campaign. The least flowery of these accounts and perhaps the most accurate if only because it is the first account , takes place four days after the actual event . Billikopf tells the story to Alfred Benjamin.

I met the Rosenwalds at the New Willard at the breakfast table Monday morning. Mr. Charles Eisenman, president of the Federated Charities of Cleveland and a friend of

ours, whispered to me that he knew of the conversation that I had over the long distance the previous evening and asked me to reveal to him my mission. I did so and Eiseman turned to me and said ; "I have always considered you an intelligent fellow, but I am beginning to question your sanity. It is true that Mr. Rosenwald is a wealthy man ; but don't you think you're asking too much of him to carry the burden of the entire American Jewry?"

Well to make a long matter short, I was with the Rosenwalds the entire day , but did not get an opportunity to reveal to Mr. Rosenwald till 11:40 that night , and my train was to leave at 12:10. I will digress just a moment to say that in the course of the day I unburdened myself to Mrs. Rosenwald, and with a broad expansive smile on her face she said to me 'what would happen if he threw you out the window? ' To which I replied:'If I am doomed to such a fate, I wish you would at least move down to the first floor of the hotel so that the damage won't be great. But please ask him to be merciful to me because I cannot afford at the initial stage to get a shock from which I am not likely to recover.'

Between 11:40 and 12:30,(I had missed two trains and forfeited two Pullman sleepers) I talked to Mr. Rosenwald in as passionate a manner as I think one human being can talk to another. After I described the need for having him make the offer such as I outlined, I added that during our seven or eight years of friendship, I had never before asked him for a contribution to any cause, although I had been importuned to do so again and again; there were at least a dozen projects floating in my mind for which I would like to get funds; that I had made up my mind never to appeal to him for any money because I did not want our friendship marred in any possible way; but as this was an extraordinary situation , I hoped that he would respond, etc., etc.

I know J.R. pretty intimately for a number of years and I have seen him in all sorts of moods, but never so reflective as during those moments. He asked me specifically what I wanted. I told him, and he said : "All right! If I were you, I would get a taxi and try to catch the next train . Go ahead!"¹⁹⁵

This was the task which launched Billikopf's career into the world of fund raising. Entering as an amateur just as he had entered the field of social work, here too he would leave his mark. No other American Jew has been associated with so many successful endeavors to raise such unprecedented amounts of contributions. Billikopf's millions may have very well been surpassed in modern day campaigns. They have today the distinct technological advantages of mass media , easier modes of transportaion and other luxuries not available to Billikopf; however the basic patterns today's campaigns follow were set into motion and perfected by this amateur, Jacob Billikopf.

Billikopf resisted this work for his lack of knowledge. Perhaps the committee saw his rare potential, Billikopf's personality and inventive intuition. However his connection with Rosenwald made , for the ultimate success of his work.

Jacob Billikopf's name was henceforth synonomous with the acquisition of funds. From that train trip east in February 1917, until his death, he was American Jewry's conscience in the quest to raise money for worthy causes. His skills were honed as the primary fundraiser for the JDC from 1917-1919 and as a consultant from 1919 till 1930's. He was involved in every campaign to some capacity throughout the history of the JDC. In addition this reputation as the great fundraiser haunted him. Every town and city across America wished to insure the success of their campaign with the guidance of Jacob Billikopf. The list includes campaigns for local federations of every kind , YMHA campaigns in countless

cities, Jewish Hospitals, educational institutions the likes of Howard University, Swarthmore, Richmond Va., to name only a handful, as well as for the Graphic Survey which was of special interest to Billikopf, and Rosenwald's "child," the Tuskegee Institute. Billikopf was as well the man who was contacted when there was a notable Jewish scholar who needed to be underwritten for a year in order to do scholarly work. Billikopf worked to raise funds for the scholars' sustenance; in turn, America reaped the fruits of the scholarly endeavors. All this flowed from Billikopf's activities in the earliest years of the JDC's campaign efforts.

What Billikopf did for the campaigns is now almost second nature to American Jewry's machinery, which sets its national wheels in motion each year for various causes. That machinery and the methodology it uses were developed during these vital and crucial years of relief work. Billikopf created new ideas with each campaign in order to keep them organized, alive and vital. Although the idea of a 10% gift to start off the ten million dollar campaign was attributed to Dr. Frankel, it was Billikopf who made it work.¹⁹⁶ He did this not only by getting the initial gift from Rosenwald but by inspiring thousands of "10% givers" across America. He managed to inspire at least one in each community. This was one of the first of his campaign ideas. But each campaign came with its unique twist. First Billikopf set up a network across the nation. Between April 17 and June 1, 1917, Billikopf and his aids contacted about 1,419 communities.¹⁹⁷ These contacts were with the the key men to whom he would appeal, first for money and then for aid in organizing the drive in that city. If his staff's resources did not reveal knowledge

of someone in that town, Billikopf would look through Bradstreet credit rating and write to individuals based on the name and business. This was very effective and yet sometimes it also evoked an interesting response. In the campaign of 1920, Billikopf sent one of his masterful form letters to Annieston, Alabama . The form letter would quote from a speech by Rabbi Leon Harrison or the likes. This speech told of the plight of the starved and desolate Jews of Europe and then would be followed Billikopf's plea to the individual to share this request with his townsmen and to respond appropriately. This was in hopes of encouraging the town to set up a committee and a drive. In this one case he wrote to a Mr. Jonah Weil in Annieston, Alabama , whose name was taken from the Bradstreet credit rating. Mr. Jonah Weil Wrote back and had this to say: " I regret I am not a hebrew, but this money is included because your cause is so stirring. You might want to contact Mr. Columbus Smith, head of the Hebrew Congregation."¹⁹⁸ Jonah Wiel sent \$250 dollars. Billikopf took advantage of the non-Jewish interest as well.

One of his methods for creating excitement and aiding in the informing of the non-Jewish population of the cause was to have the governors of many states issue proclamations on behalf of the Jewish War Relief Campaign.¹⁹⁹ Other states declared a special day noting the fact of Jewish suffering in Europe. As a result there was tremendous participation in the campaign efforts by sympathetic non-Jews. An example of just how far reaching and moving was the campaign of 1917 can be seen as expressed in the following letter received by Herbert Lehman, on the executive committee of the campaign.²⁰⁰ The letter is from a

missionary among American Indians in Bacone , Oklahoma, J. S. Murrow 82 years of age.

Dear Sir ,
I am not a Jew - I am a worn out Christian -indian
Missionary -a Baptist-Your God is my God ..your father my
Father your people are my masters people- your brethren
are my brethren. My means are small -but my heart
rejoices because of the privilege of sending the enclosed
one hundred dollars for the relief of the suffering and
starving Jews in Europe. ²⁰¹

Between April 15, 1917 and June, the campaign had raised practically six and one half million dollars throughout the country, more than had been raised in the previous two years.²⁰² Billikopf and his machinery were able to do this in spite of the other campaigns which were in progress constantly. There were the Red Cross , YMCA, Liberty bonds and numerous other campaigns which were all in competition. Billikopf's success in fund raising caused other campaigns such as Red Cross to set their national goals higher. If the Jews, such a small percentage of the country, could raise such funds we must be able to do better ourselves. Then there was resistance to separate campaigns altogether and some of this resistance came from the highest of authorities. Newton Baker wrote to Billikopf from the war department in 1918. Billikopf had written to Baker to explain that the effects of the war on Jews were unique and that it was necessary to channel money to those who were most affected. Baker responds:

I am sure it is unnecessary for me to say that I appreciate the gravity of the problem presented by the Jews in several countries where they have been oppressed, discriminated against and deprived of the ordinary political and economic rights of citizenship. They do form a class apart

who have, at least in some places, been singled out for persecution and, therefore, present an unusual case of need for relief, assistance and protection until they can be assured economic and political equality of opportunity.

The feeling that I have about the matter is that we ought not permit American relief to be enfeebled by multiplied appeals and scattered agencies. I think the heart of America is ready to relieve suffering and want everywhere, but that this fine impulse will be distracted if multiplied agencies urge separate and special grounds for relief of particular classes. As a matter of fact, I was told yesterday that there are 109 separate organizations, societies and agencies already asking approval of independent campaigns for funds, each of them having as its object the relief of a certain class and each case being worthy in principle and in its appeal.

It seems to me far better to have some central vehicle to carry American good will to oppressed people everywhere, and not to divide the responsibility of the single agency chosen by exonerating it from the need of taking care of special classes by making special provisions for them. In other words, if the latitude of the relief work done by the Red Cross is not deemed adequate in the particular case under consideration we ought to broaden the work of the Red Cross rather than set up an independent agency. ²⁰³

Billikopf responded in his own fashion to the claim of Newton Baker. Although Billikopf and Baker were diametrically opposed on this issue, Billikopf did take the advice of Baker to some degree. In his year end report for 1918 to the Joint Distribution Committee Billikopf closed with a particular plea for consolidation of sorts. A plea for consolidation not of the type Baker foresaw, one fund for one nation under the auspices of the Red Cross, but rather a consolidation of the Jewish committees.

Before I close I wish to present a bit of constructive criticism which I regard as of the greatest importance and urgency. The organization of the fund-raising agencies for the

Jewish War Relief purposes at this time presents a unique and peculiar situation. Whereas the distributing agency is concentrated in the Joint Distribution Committee, the agencies which provide the funds for distribution are not at all centralized, and in fact they work-perhaps with out intending so-at cross purposes. The greatest difficulty is occasioned by the awkwardness of having three distinct committees soliciting funds for the same cause simultaneously. There are in fact not three but four offices, The American Jewish Relief Committee, The Central Relief Committee, The Jewish Peoples' Relief Committee and the Chicago Jewish Relief Committee. All which exist for the same purpose, that of raising funds to be distributed by the Joint Distribution Committee.

I need not dilate upon the obvious waste involved in this duplication and triplication of effort-waste in maintaining three or four separate offices, in preparing and distributing separate publicity, in employing separate field workers, and so on. The avoidable expense involved in such inefficient methods is considerable.

....But the criticism goes deeper even than that waste in administration and loss in returns. The existence of several committees jeopardizes in many instances the entire position of our cause. 204

Billikopf had defended the cause countless times for a number of reasons but the most difficult to defend was the situation in which a city had been hit back to back by different committees for separate funds. It created an awkward and simply bad situation. There had been agreements made by the various committees where and when campaigns would be held. This duplication was affecting the good will of the communities involved. After a large campaign in St. Paul, a campaign which was to be the only such campaign in that city another committee came in on the coattails of the first and asked business men to give 10% of their earnings of one day to Jewish War Sufferers. The representative in that community wrote

to Billikopf the following: "It is my opinion that the people here are at sea and do not know what committee is authorized to make collections. They feel in doubt about some of the the agencies."²⁰⁵ Billikopf was under the strong impression that the future of Jewish War Relief in St. Paul was seriously menaced by this embarrassing situation. St. Paul was by no means an isolated example; Billikopf fielded hundreds of such complaints. Further on in that same year's end report Billikopf makes the following recommendation in response to these problems.

The indictment of the existing system, however, goes deeper than that of waste in administration, loss in returns, and the danger of crippling the force of our campaigns. Immeasurably more important than the monetary loss, which is manifest, and which is inevitable- is the spiritual loss to American Jewry. It may be that for theological or nationalist purposes it is necessary and valuable to have separatist groups in American Jewry. But we are engaged in raising money for starving people. Our cause is simple and humanitarian; it does not appeal to one group more than another. It presents absolutely no issue. What ever differences exist, here at least all groups should be able to meet for a common purpose. Any issue which is made out of this single and common cause is not a real but fictitious issue.

One would imagine that in the work too of rescuing our afflicted people we should forget whether we are German or Russian Jews, Orthodox or Reformed[sic], Zionist or Anti-Zionist.²⁰⁶

This was Billikopf's plea to unite as one the American Jewish community, instead of using an opportunity to create divergency. The tendency of that period was to emphasize, not reconcile the disruptive forces in American Jewry. This appeal was the first effort in the American Jewish community to create a united Jewish appeal. which came into existence in the 1930's.²⁰⁷ Billikopf's efforts were the

pioneering attempts to achieve a united American Jewish appeal. The JDC machinery which Billikopf set up was the only united campaign apparatus in existence. His efforts to improve that apparatus were the foundations for the organization of the future. National appeals by UJA and other groups to this day use many of the techniques which Billikopf perfected over the years, but created primarily between 1917 and 1919.

Beyond the tremendous effort for consolidation which Billikopf presented in 1918, he had already refined many skills which made his work for the JDC so successful. These methods enabled the JDC to collect from its inception till 1941 over \$113,000,000.²⁰⁸ As mentioned before Billikopf would send out letters to the 1,400 cities which contained very moving sections of speeches. These were given by the group of men who became the core of the Keynote speakers who Billikopf sent around the country to start off the particular campaigns. Billikopf would arrange with one of his captains, picked for his influence in the community, to have a small gathering or a dinner several nights before the community gathered en masse and one of his speakers would make an appeal to that group. Usually during these meetings in 1917 a "10% giver" would emerge. Then at the gathering of the community there would be a speech by one of the prestigious key note speakers. This group included Judah Magnes, the Leader of the Society for Advancement of Judaism and an ordained Reform Rabbi who served various congregations in New York city from 1902-1922. It also claimed Louis Marshall, the brilliant constitutional lawyer and head of the American Jewish Committee ,

the parent organization of the AJRC, from 1906 till his death in 1929. Marshall is considered one of the most important American Jewish leaders of this century. As well as Marshall, many of the other members of the executive committee such as Judge Mack or Herbert Lehman or Jacob Loeb would speak on various occasions. The most quoted text was from the very famous homoilitician Rabbi Leon Harrison. Rabbi Harison had given one of the first speeches connected with the Drives in Carnegie Hall. He had been an intimate friend of Billikopf's since his work at his St. Louis congregation. Billikopf used his speech to be part of the above mentioned letter campaigns.

As we sit down to our comfortable meals, we recall the army of famished little Jewish children in the battle zone, that have no bread to eat, that are growing thinner every day, that soon will breathe their last. Here in America we can sustain ourselves. Think of the ravaged borderlands where our brethren are huddled together by the millions; driven from their homes, wandering in the highways and byways- without shelter without food. They stand silently before us, this vast army of starving Jews, asking us for food for bread to eat. Will you give them the bread they are asking? Will you give it to them - because they are starving men and women ? This is not charity. This is your duty!!²⁰⁹

None of the speakers ever hit the trail as hard as the executive director, Jaocb Billikopf. His travel schedules were vigorous, covering thousands of miles and countless towns. In a letter to Mr. Adolph Lewisohn of New York, an important contributor to the 1922 campaign, Billikopf gives an example of his typical trip for the drives. "I just returned from a five week strenuous trip, covering about 20 cities in the south, middle and far west, where I spoke in behalf of our cause , where I succeeded in raising nearly \$2,000,000.00."²¹⁰ Billikopf, who was on the road

often during these years, had to keep a staff of well trained and trusted men in his New York offices, men who could handle the constant work which was demanded of them in such a task.

The names among that staff will be familiar because they are names of fellow students and social workers who were an integral part of the Galveston movement or from another period of Billikopf's life. Billikopf employed Dr. Boris Bogen, his former superior in Cincinnati. Bogen contacted the various men in Federations across the country to help organize the drives. Bogen was later sent to Russia to supervise the relief programs. David Bressler and Morris Waldman, both long time friends of Billikopf, were also on the staff. In addition Billikopf drew from his experience in Missouri, especially at the University of Missouri at Columbia. Billikopf brought to his staff a very talented individual, Albert Lewin. Lewin had been an English instructor at the University of Missouri and had become a very good personal friend of Billikopf's. Lewin was a brilliant individual whose talents could have been put to numerous ends. Lewin, with an M.A. in English from Harvard, was the assistant director of the AJRC. It would not be suprising if Lewin was not the source of many of the creative ideas which charaterized these campaigns. The letters between Lewin and Billikopf in the years following the primary JDC work revealed the creativity which Lewin could inspire. Perhaps this quality which aided Lewin to become one of the innovators in the motion picture industry is what kept him at Billikopf's side during this work.²¹¹ Billikopf had created a staff which was familiar with relief work and

which could draw upon the best skills in the social justice movement of that day.

However, his occupation was now that of fund raiser. Billikopf had worked hard to acquire the appropriate skills for such a task; having worked so hard to possess them himself, he was now able to recognize them in others. In 1917 Billikopf found an individual who had all the necessary skills, a man who was a money raiser par excellence. This was David Brown of Detroit. Billikopf in 1917 as one of his innovations had created state wide campaign efforts.²¹² Brown was the Michigan state chairman for the \$10,000,000 AJRC campaign. "Michigan led the country in the amount of money raised per capita."²¹³ Billikopf at the beginning of the New York campaign of 1917 suggested to Jacob Schiff, the chair of that campaign, to bring David Brown in to direct that particular campaign. Mr. Schiff sent for Mr. Brown and in less than ten days after the campaign started, there had been raised over \$5,250,000- the largest sum that had ever been raised in one campaign in the city of New York.²¹⁴ In later years Billikopf claimed to have been responsible for harnessing David Brown to the national task. In 1921 Louis Marshall had called the Jewish leaders of United States and Canada together at the Standard Club in Chicago. It was there that Billikopf orchestrated the placing of David Brown in the role of national Director of the 1921-1922 campaign.²¹⁵ The Joint Distribution Committee had submitted a budget of \$14,000,000 and it had been accepted by those present at the conference. The following story is told of that dramatic moment in which they chose a person to raise that sum:

I {Billikopf} if I am not mistaken, made a brief address proposing his name to the conference. General Abel Davis was in the chair, and as I sat down Brown got up to address the chair, but the chair refused to recognize Brown. Louis Marshall seconded my proposal followed by Julius Rosenwald , Felix Warburg and many others, as though it had been prearranged , Brown all the time trying to secure permission to speak, which was granted after the motion had been made and carried.

Then what followed I believe to be one of the more dramatic events in Jewish social history. Brown, after a word of thanks, for the intended compliment, stated that he was sorry but he could not accept as he and Mrs. Brown were leaving for the south of Italy. While he was on his feet telling why it would be impossible for him to accept the chairmanship, Marshall and Julius Rosenwald left the room, they got Mrs. Brown on the long distance in Detroit, explained the situation and she agreed to give up the trip to Italy. Brown was then called to the telephone talked to Mrs. Brown...David A. Brown accepted the Chairmanship of the \$14,000,000 campaign of 1921-1922.²¹⁶

Brown was the cornerstone in the fund raising process and Billikopf's own staff. Billikopf had surrounded himself with the best he could find in the field. As a result he could operate in accordance with the most creative and innovative procedures that fund raising had seen. Billikopf tried every angle to keep the campaigns vital, using whatever resource he could find, be it human, monetary or spiritual. Such ideas as "Every Dollar for Relief" were byproducts of this creative staff. Billikopf secured private funds to cover the cost of administration.²¹⁷ This was done to ensure everyone that the dollars they were giving would go directly into relief. On one occasion Billikopf took the liberty to use the Western Union pass of Jacob Schiff to send telegrams to all of the nation's key people. The almost eight hundred word telegrams came as a shock to Schiff, a Board member

at Western Union. Schiff instructed Billikopf to inform them that they would be paid for, however to explain that they were for the AJRC. The charges were eventually dropped.²¹⁸ Billikopf was a very exact and even shrewd operator. He did what it took to keep operating costs to a bare minimum. In every campaign there is the problem of collecting that which is pledged. Billikopf took a hard line on his collection policy. This is the primary factor in the high ratio in pledge to collection which he maintained. What follows is an example of the attitude Billikopf had towards those who did not fulfill their pledged obligations:

Your committee should write him another courteous, but vigorously worded letter, and if he fails to respond, threaten to sue him. You have nothing to lose, as he no longer lives in Kansas City, and something to gain. I shall be pleased to send affidavits, reporting the conversations I had with him on the subject. I have known the Kansas City courts to enforce a pledge of this character, as though they were business arrangements.²¹⁹

As strenuous as it was for Billikopf and others to organize the campaigns, plan the programs, arrange for speakers and collect money, none was so difficult as keeping the spirit for relief work vital year after year. Once the war ended the need for relief grew even greater and the request for funds was getting harder to make. Before, this had already been stimulated by the continuing war and by each political event which increased the desperation of the Jews of Europe. Billikopf met that challenge head on with the already mentioned innovative gimmicks which he created for the campaigns. By the year 1921 the signs of saturation were beginning to show themselves in the campaigns. The story was the same, the millions of dollars raised were not enough to solve the problems.

The American Jewish Community needed some new stimulus to understanding the necessity of these vital funds. Billikopf had an idea which would help alleviate the problem. Having seen the destruction and poverty first hand himself on investigative trips taken in 1919, Billikopf knew the power of seeing. Coming from the "show me " state, Billikopf had that philosophy in mind. He wrote to Bogen in Russia to see what he thought about the idea of putting together a commission.²²⁰ Billikopf's analysis was that people needed the impact of first hand accounts in order to feel motivated to give. He sought to put together a group of 20 to 25 of the most outstanding men of the American Jewish Community. He wanted to show them what was being done in Europe, how the money was being spent, how much more was still needed. Billikopf knew from his own experience that this helped sustain a cause. His own literature, which went out to communities following a visit, contained this type of appeal concentrating on his own first hand experience. He also knew from experience that it was very effective. In his literature following one of his visits to Baltimore, the following statement was included; it is exemplary of the type of effect Billikopf felt could be generated by first hand experience through a commission.

If every man and woman in Baltimore could have heard Jacob Billikopf tell the story of Poland and her Jewish sufferers, as he told the workers of the Jewish War Relief Campaign at the Phoenix Club last Tuesday night, there would be no question as to how much Baltimore would subscribe. The only doubt would be how many times the quota would be over subscribed. And yet, Mr. Billikopf admitted that he could not and would not tell all that he knew. As he said: " When I try to set down in black-and-white the things that I have seen I literally go to pieces emotionally." What he did tell was heartrending enough. He told of Vilna, the Jerusalem of Poland, with its

Jewish population reduced from 90,000 to 43,000. He told of children 2 to 5 years who never learned to walk. He told of 18,000 men, women and children standing in line for hours and hours for their one meal a day-- a bowl of soup and a bit of black bread. He told of 300 patients in the Vilna hospital dying of typhus. He told of the pitiful little pair of children --brother and sister --whom he encountered late one night, crying because they had had no place to sleep five nights. 221

Billikopf presented the plan of a commission to Louis Marshall later that year.

The plan was the subject of correspondence for a year or more between Louis Marshall and Julius Rosenwald. Billikopf writes of the fear of bankruptcy of

American Jewry's spirit for giving :

Unless we make adequate preparations now, later on when we are able to extend our efforts without hindrance to the Ukraine and to Soviet Russia, we shall be completely overwhelmed by the stupendous tasks confronting us. With the situation as it is now, already taxing our resources to the utmost, how shall we find ourselves when the horizon of our work is extended? We may confidently expect an enormous expansion of our obligations, and this inevitable expansion is accompanied by rapid depletion of our funds, so that at the time of most critical need, we are not unlikely to find ourselves totally bankrupt.

The prospect is nothing less than alarming. For it must be clear to the most casual observer that the spectacular campaign methods which proved so effective formerly are now thoroughly unpopular. I believe that a false impression has always been entertained of the facility with which relief funds have been obtained. It has never been a simple or easy task -that of providing the \$35,000,000 which the Joint Distribution Committee has to date expended. It was not an easy task even in the days when a national patriotic fervor provided the opportunity for the use of intensive campaign methods.it was this national enthusiasm that enabled us to capitalize governors' and mayors' proclamations. But public opinion is now approaching the point of disgust and discouragement over fundraising campaigns. 222

This then was the situation which Billikopf felt American Jewry faced: enormous obligations rapidly expanding , a corresponding rapid depletion of the resources, and at the same time the almost total collapse of the methods of raising funds which till that time had been most effective.

His plan to meet these circumstances was to send abroad a commission. Billikopf wanted to send experts in the fields of industry and business, men such as David A. Brown of Detroit, Nat Stone of Milwaukee, Mortimer Fleischhaker of San Fransisco, Sidney Pritz of Cincinnati.²²³ It was men of this type that had been prominently identified with the fund-raising efforts in the beginning. Billikopf says that they are now not involved: "Many of them are now disaffected ; their morale is disintegrating under the pressure of adverse public opinion. Without the enthusiastic leadership of these men and others like them only negligible sums can be secured; with their leadership and co-operation we may hope for some approach to a duplication of their past efforts."²²⁴ Billikopf was very open and straightforward to Marshall about the state of affairs. He pleaded with Marshall for some action to be taken. Billikopf stressed that: "they {members of the commission} must be taken inside our work, they would have to participate actively in it, it will become their work, and they will be nuclei for the dissemination of a new vitality."²²⁶ The plan never really materialized untill 1926. It was near impossible for Billikopf to find a suitable leader of the commission. Billikopf had approached Lee K. Frankel to lead the commission, but

he could not get a leave from the insurance company at which he was employed. He approached Sol Lowenstein and others of his class, but faced the disappointment of rejection from each. It was difficult to convince anyone to travel to these countries which had been war zones. However even though the commission did not materialize immediately, Marshall and Rosenwald heard and understood the urgency and implications of what Billikopf was professing and they agreed. Mentioned above is Billikopf's account of how he brought David Brown, the bright business man, into the national campaign of 1921-1922. Only after hearing Billikopf's arguments can one understand the sudden desire for a business man, not a social worker, in that position. In light of Billikopf's correspondence on this subject to Marshall and Rosenwald, it does not seem odd at all that Marshall and Rosenwald would have gone to the extent of calling Brown's wife to ensure his acceptance.

Billikopf had given them fair warning of what the JDC could expect if they did not make such a move. Billikopf wrote : " Social workers have neither the prestige nor the authority necessary. Their comments are now utterly without force - they have worn threadbare by reiteration."²²⁷ What was crucial was that Billikopf recognized the state of affairs in the realm of campaigning. He knew both how desperate the situation was and how distant it was from the lives of the American Jews. Bogen wrote to Billikopf after the plan had been accepted by the executive committee: "I take for granted that this is the plan which you wrote to me about some time ago, and which at the time seemed somewhat premature, but

things move very rapidly and conditions have changed."²²⁸

It was true that the conditions had changed and it was very true that the attitude of America was changing. There was both a dissatisfaction and a tension about what should be done to save these people. Should money be given for aid in Russia? Should the money go to Russia if it was in competition with the development of Palestine? The situation intensified as the Joint Distribution Committee began to liquidate the programs for aid in Russia in 1923. The Agro-Joint would soon take the place of the present system with a move towards colonization. The official competition between Russia and Palestine would be in its primary stage, as they both competed over funding from American Jewry. To add to the difficulties, the actions of the JDC as well came under criticism. Just as Billikopf worked to keep the campaigns vital, he also worked in defense of the organization. He became at times the spokesperson for the JDC and its AJRC activities. The most publicized of these attacks, against which Billikopf defended the JDC, was from a Mr. Max Steuer. Mr. Steuer was a prominent New York lawyer with a national reputation. In the year 1927, after returning from a trip to Europe where he attended a World Minority Conference as a delegate of the American Jewish Congress, Steuer attacked the JDC; he claimed that the JDC had lost a great deal of the funds which were raised for the purpose of relief.²²⁹ He claimed that the JDC had lost 40% of its funds through manipulations of exchanges. He also claimed that the work of the JDC did not have the focus it should. Further, he claimed that the JDC was a failure because it only dealt with

temporary relief.²³⁰ Steuer put his attacks in the press in order to tell America's Jews about the failure of the JDC. Steuer had taken the complaints of several Polish Jews up with the JDC. In articles which appeared in Jewish papers and journals across the country, Steuer claimed that all that the JDC had done was place a bandage on an open wound. The JDC was defended by its members. In particular the defense came from Louis Marshall. He wrote to the press in response : 'Marshall Asks Steuer For Proof' read the lead article in the September 13, 1927 issue of the New York World.²³¹ Marshall refuted the charges that the monies collected and distributed before 1925 were not judiciously spent. In that same New York World article Marshall claims to be mystified by the charge and the intensity by which Steuer is conducting his attacks. " Responsible members of the organization declare themselves completely mystified at the manner by which Mr. Steuer has conducted his attack and advanced a theory that he was acting for some small group which was opposed to the policies of the present administration of the committee."²³²

Motivation of the attack could have been one of many reasons, even personal ones. For example Steuer was allied with the Democratic Party machine, even known as the "Tammany lawyer." His political views were in direct opposition to the political views of Marshall.²³³ Of equal significance was his eastern European background and the possibility that he could have been rejected by the members of the JDC. Regardless of the reason behind the attack, the defense was taken up not only by Marshall but by Billikopf as well. Jacob Billikopf wrote an open letter to Max D. Steuer in September 30 of 1927. That letter appeared in

various journals and Jewish newspapers throughout the country. The defense that Billikopf presented was two fold. First it pointed out that any person who spoke to any number of Polish Jews post war in Poland would get the sound advice of what should have been done. If you asked 15 people you would get 15 different opinions. Billikopf's point: there was so much need that you could not possibly meet everyone's agenda. It was a mistake to judge the work there on the basis of what needs were not met. It was better to look at what immediate needs were met and to understand that certain issues were chosen because they were matters of life and death. This matter lead into his defense of the second criticism of Steuer, which was that the JDC made no attempt at constructive relief. This type of relief would be viewed as more permanent relief. Billikopf responds to Steuer based on his own visit of 1919 and 1926 and claims:

" Being from Missouri, I wanted "to be shown" how all the monies had been spent in behalf of our unfortunate co-religionist . To my tasks as an investigator I brought fifteen years of rich and varied experience in almost every phase of Jewish and non-Jewish social endeavor. What did I find? While monies were largely spent for elementary creature wants; while no "constructive work" was done -- it would have been the height of folly to have attempted anything constructive under the then chaotic conditions.

234

Billikopf goes on to point out that the amount of relief which was done for the amount of money that was spent was outstanding. In addition to the direct relief, there was an effort to provide temporary relief; this was done through the sending over of specialists in the field, such as Dr. Bogen and others who were able to help the Jewish communities help themselves organize. He points out that in the

case of the JDC they spent less than the city of Philadelphia did on her poor and the city has much less to show for its own money spent.²³⁵ What is true of Philadelphia he claimed was true of most American Jewish communities. He brought home this point with the following statistic: "Think of it---nearly 15,000 orphans are being taken care of in that country {Poland} alone- many more than are to be found in all our American -Jewish orphanages, and expenditures of millions."²³⁶ Finally in his rebuking of Steuer he made the claim that :

" If the JDC had limited itself to the problem of child care alone we would have justified our existence! What of the trade schools, prophylactic medical service, education of tens of thousands of children? And if thousands of dollars(a small fraction of the entire allotment) were spent on soup kitchens, what of that?

Suppose the JDC had built and equipped a dozen factories . There was no market for manufactured articles. Germany refused to have any dealing with Poland. Russia and Poland had reached an impasse- a complicated international tangle which the JDC could not solve.The markets which Lodz and Bialystock had enjoyed were gone. Should the JDC have allowed some thirty or forty thousand Jews of Lodz and an equal number in Bialystock to starve?²³⁷

The title of the article in which most of these quotes appear speaks for itself: "Billikopf Closes Steuer Incident," and this is what he did through his collection and presentation of the facts. Billikopf successfully upheld the reputation of the JDC. Such activity was not odd nor out of character for Billikopf, to defend that which he believed was part and parcel of his being. We have thus far seen this commitment in relationship to his work with the Galveston movement, defending the movement in the Jewish press; as well, in Kansas City, Billikopf defended the

Board of Public Welfare's right to exist and remain non-political, and now the JDC. The claim that Billikopf was simply the creator of ideas and implementor of programs ignores a valuable asset of his character. The asset was his ability to be an advocate and spokesman for those causes. It is inevitable that such social movements, like those to which Billikopf attached himself, would be laden with controversy. These organizations were often pulling at the snags in the fabric of the community's moral character, yet Billikopf, never avoiding the light of controversy, was willing to defend each and every social cause he advocated.

Although things were changing rapidly in Billikopf's career, moving from the confines of work in Kansas City to the responsibility of the national obligations, one thing was ever constant, Billikopf's attitude about *Zedekah*. Billikopf believed there was a vital spiritual byproduct in these campaigns, in the same way as he saw their power to unify the American Jewish community beyond its factionalism. It is evident that he believed these fundraising campaigns played a vital and significant role in maintenance of Jewish identity. American Jewry felt good about giving, Jewish about giving. The byproduct of giving was a community which was spiritually nurtured and proud of its heritage and humanitarian efforts. He writes this in an article called "The Treasure Chest of American Jewry" for the Menorah Journal in February of 1918. Billikopf believed that America would get something vital in return for their efforts to save Russian Jewry. They would receive a sense of how important cultural and spiritual Judaism is by working to save it.²³⁸

Billikopf believed that American Jews needed the relief work to awaken the

spiritually void land of America. Billikopf saw the educational value of this work for American Jewry. A check was a stepping stone to Jewish awareness. That awareness could lead to a more Jewish existence- If Russian Jews are worth saving , maybe American Jewish cultural life was worth saving as well.

Billikopf, in this article as well as in his Presidential message before the National Association of Jewish Social Workers in Pittsburgh, Pa. on June 3, 1917, stresses the symbiotic nature of the relief work. He points out that it would be wrong to ignore the effects that this work will have on the American Jewish community. Although he believed that the spiritual effect was the most important, he points out other byproducts this work will have on the American Jewish Community. At the national convention of Jewish Social Workers in June of 1917 he mentions that one such byproduct would be the sharpening of social workers' skills in the areas of philanthropy.²³⁹ Billikopf was quite aware of the fact that all American Jewish philanthropy, that is to say all American monies for American purposes would only be collected successfully riding in on the coattails of fundraising either for a European crisis or for Palestine.

In light of such an understanding it was imperative that the social workers know how to approach a campaign. They were, for the most part, the people that Billikopf had in his 1,419 American cities that he could reach. Therefore in his address he gave the most common excuses which would be given to them in their collection efforts and as well he gave "the answers." For example : " The first

and principle objection that will be raised is that there is no use in giving money to our fund when there is a grave question as to whether it can safely be distributed abroad."²⁴⁰ He continues with the answer to this question as well as other questions and their proper responses. Here he is developing a methodology and campaign machinery which would indeed be a valuable asset, and it is indeed the very same fundraising method of today. Billikopf understood that he had to prepare the social worker to be the advocate, the educated voice, to speak to any resistance. The skills which he stressed that these men learn to use in their own Federations or charity organizations for the sake of relief work are the very skills which kept the valuable programs of the American Jewish community afloat. A second reward which would come from such relief work has been mentioned numerous times by Billikopf and in fact was used as one of the his campaign motivations, the manner in which the non-Jew would see the Jew. Billikopf had created situations in which the Jew and the non-Jew were working side by side to raise monies for the less fortunate, the hungry, the sick, the homeless. First he paralleled the moral imperative found in our Jewish teachings of the concept of *Zedakah*, with the relief work and made it the great Jewish cause of the century. He then connected this with the patriotic duties of a citizen and made this an American cause. This approach was vital to the image of the Jew. Through this work he simultaneously raised the self-esteem of the American Jew and brought the philosophic concept of *Zedakah* to the non-Jew. Billkopf worked hard to raise the esteem of the Jew in America.

One direct way in which Billikopf accomplished this objective was through involvement in the United War campaign. As mentioned previously, there was tremendous pressure exerted on Jews to join in a united campaign. Newton Baker was determined to have that campaign be the Red Cross. However, it became evident that there was a need for a separate united campaign to raise the type of money which these destitute peoples needed. It was seen as part of America's responsibility. This was actualized in 1918 from October till June, in the United War Work Campaign. Dr. John R. Mott was the General Director of the United War Work Campaign. This campaign generated a committee of one hundred individuals across the country who were to help raise tremendous sums of money. In addition, Mott had a cabinet of five nationally prominent war welfare leaders. These men were to organize different sectors of the population to create this united campaign. Jacob Billikopf was one of those five prestigious men whom the nation saw as having the ability to draw diverse groups together and help raise the money for this common cause. These funds were to be for war work, soldiers, sailors, marines and other overseas services.²⁴¹ This campaign eventually raised \$170,000,000 for overseas services.²⁴² Billikopf headed up the Jewish sector of this campaign. He drew together his resources in the 1,419 cities and his various contacts and their committees. Billikopf divided the country up into sections of north, south, east and west. Each of these became a department. Then each state was assigned to a "Department" and each individual city was assigned to a state chairperson who in turn answered to a Department chairperson.²⁴³ This individual in charge of a state was given a list

of people to contact. The state of Maryland was in the Eastern Department; Billikopf's letter to Mr. Julius Levy who was in charge of that state will serve as an example of what type of integrated network Billikopf had developed by 1918.

" In order to facilitate your work, I am enclosing the names of the chairmen of the Jewish Welfare Branches in Maryland. The aid of these individuals and their fellow officers should be enlisted in your drives. { These names were from his list of 1,419 } I am enclosing a list of towns in Maryland, with the names of prominent Jews, who have in the past been more or less active in connection with our Jewish Relief Work; the names of Rabbis and women prominent in National Council of Jewish Women . However, you and Mr. J. Epstein { who was Eastern Department Chairperson } are at liberty in the light of your greater knowledge of conditions in Maryland, to make such substitutions as you deem advisable. You are to have all possible latitude in the selection of Jewish representatives in the district, County and Local Campaigns Center where such Jewish representatives have not already been chosen by officials of the United CampaignI should think it advisable that you and Mr. Epstein issue a call of a conference of leading Jewish citizens in the entire state, including one representative from each Jewish Community; this conference should be held in Baltimore, Md., and at this gathering it should be impressed upon the Jewish leaders in the state that they must cooperate whole-heartedly with their local United Drive Committee from the standpoint of large patriotic motives, as well as their duty to the Jewish People.²⁴⁴

Billikopf, as said before, created an opportunity through the United Works Campaign to allow the Jews to show not only their organization but as well their commitment. In each and every letter Billikopf sent out, to a town chairperson, state or regional department head, he made one claim: the members should take the opportunity and "show the non-Jews just what we can do." The following was in each and every letter: " I am interested in not only helping devise ways and

means of conducting the National Campaign, but primarily in mobilizing the Jewish resources through the country, so that we may obtain 100% participation in terms of services and money on the part of Jews everywhere. At the conclusion of the Campaign on November 18th, we want to have it said that the value of the contribution of our people in money and effort was far beyond the actual sum which will have been allotted to us by Agreement."²⁴⁵ Thus Billikopf took an opportunity for the Jews to be Or La'goyim, a light unto the nations. Through this united effort the prestige of Jews was raised in the eyes of the nation, but most importantly, in their own eyes.

Billikopf realized that there was a greater byproduct of this campaign, more than the grand sums of money which had been collected, more than the methodology which was developed which would give Jewish professionals access to the vital purse of the American Jewish public, and even more than the dose of self-esteem the Jew received in showing the non-Jew his compassion and generosity.

Billikopf saw something much stronger, much more important. He saw a process in two phases, which he called: " The Burning -Away of Differences and Prejudice"²⁴⁶ and second " The Repayment in Spiritual Coin" ²⁴⁷ He expressed these phases dramatically as follows:

The great appeal to Jewish humanity and the common-hearted response from all sections and classes of Jews has burned away over night many a difference and prejudice between various groups of Jews that had seemed so deep-seated that they would never be overridden in this generation. Russian Jew and German Jew, so-called reform and orthodox, Zionist and anti-Zionist, surprised

themselves in working together for the same cause equally dear to them all. Or rather they did not surprise themselves; they hardly thought of this unprecedented thing at all; they simply worked together and forgot for a while their different manners and inflections. For once the superficial and theoretical differences did not matter-except perhaps that they may have added point to their friendly competition for results between individuals and groups of workers. How marvelously easy and beneficent has been this coming together, this new mutual respect of the different classes and type of Jews that before so misunderstood one another. What all preaching and wishing could not accomplish, this campaign has accomplished in so notable a measure for the unification and elevation of American Jewry.²⁴⁸

This echoed the dream that Billikopf had taken with him into this campaign. This goal of achieving a united Jewry was a belief that he professed from his earliest days in Kansas City. But even this profound accomplishment was secondary to Billikopf himself in relationship to the other phase which this campaign created. This was an attitude about *Zedakah*, an attitude which had been part and parcel to everything Billikopf did in his social justice career. He sought to bring meaning to Rabbi Harrison's message : "They have no bread-- shall we not give it to them." Billikopf believed that each individual had a gift to bear. In this light one had to understand, even if it was in the oddest way, that the Eastern European Jew who recieved the fruit of the collected money, had as well a gift to bear. Billikopf recognized that gift as being the opportunity for American Jewry to give. Working from the purest of Maimonidean principles, Billikopf knew that America was receiving by giving. He outlines his thinking to this effect in the following:

But this new spirit of unity and spiritual elevation in American Jewry will not spend itself in charity alone, enormous as will be the gain of charity. The new Jewish spirit is bound to express itself also in an unexampled

devotion to Jewish education and the spreading of Jewish aspirations. If our terribly stricken fellow Jews abroad are hungry for bread, our Jewish people here who have plenty of bread cannot live by bread alone.

Such an awakened and strengthened Jewish consciousness will be the greatest reward to all who have given in the cause of relief. Men have given without the remotest thought of reward -only to give for the alleviation of suffering. Yet many a man has already received wonderful payment back for his money. Think of a man (his name is legion) who stood far away from his race before, one of those who had never reflected about his Jewishness--except perhaps by way of resentment or self-pity or even self-contempt, being ignorant of the history and culture of the stock from which he sprang. He resented being identified with the ghetto and with the people faraway whom he thought of as ghetto Jews. He was not one of them. He even disliked them. In a word, his inherited Jewishness was low and sterile. Then this appeal to offer relief. The call of a people's suffering strikes a chord in his heart. He springs instinctively to the rescue like the loyal generous man he is. He not only gives himself, but persuades his friends to give. A new thing comes into his life, a bond of sympathy between him and his brother Jew in Poland and Palestine. It surges upon him that after all there is the tie of blood and brotherhood between them. Soon his conception becomes something profounder, spiritualized. All but unconsciously he begins to understand the greater truth. He and they are one historic people, a people with an unparalleled storehouse of spiritual and cultural treasure. It is they who have this wealth that he is so poor in. It is they who are giving him the consciousness, the understanding, the possession of this wealth. So without having looked for payment at all, meaning only to give, the American Jew receives payment speedily in wealth whose value cannot be calculated in dollars and cents. The spiritual treasure chest of all American Jewry is permanently and wonderfully enriched.²⁴⁹

On February 22, 1917, Jacob Billikopf boarded a train to go east to take on a task that seemed impossible. He wrote about that particular evening to Mary Lou

Fenberg, saying: "I recall the date so vividly, particularly that of February 22, 1917, because at the request of Judge Van Valkenburg I addressed, in the Federal Court House, several hundred persons who had become citizens, and immediately after the exercise I left for the east."²⁵⁰ This was an appropriate last act for Jacob Billikopf in Kansas City, for he had been the voice of those immigrants, the creative force in securing them the rights and programs that would make their integration into this country a viable one. Just as he had changed the way in which the immigrant was perceived and dealt with, so too would he change the manner in which American Jewry viewed and participated in philanthropy. Just as his work with the Board of Public Welfare in Kansas City was an endeavor of pride to the entire Jewish community, so too his work with Mr. John Mott became the pride of the Jews of this nation.

These accomplishments did not pass unnoticed. Billikopf's was a contribution far too important to remain unrecognized. In 1919, his good friend, David Brown of Michigan, was working on behalf of Billikopf's future. Billikopf had become obsessed, according to Brown, with the fact that he would take no salary for his work. This stemmed from some problems with his expense accounts. Brown wrote to Schiff about this:

Last year at about this time I was having many confidential talks with Billie, and felt somewhat flattered that he made a confidant of me-As you know no doubt the question of refunding to the Jewish War Relief the salary that he had been allowed him became an obsession with him. He told me the story, some slight criticism of office expense, which penetrated his consciousness to the extent of making him

very unhappy. He felt that if he was to continue in the work and retain his self respect, it would be absolutely necessary for him to be independent of financial help from the American Jewish Relief committee. ²⁵¹

Whatever the specifics which Brown addressed in his letter to Schiff, the result was that Billikopf refused the salary that he was offered. He became a "dollar a year" man. This was of concern to his friends, especially David Brown who knew better than most what it was to raise the type of money which Billikopf raised. Brown spoke of Billikopf's sensitive nature, that he was not really able to do what his heart and emotions were telling him to. "He is such a sensitive nature that, that which the average man would consider of little importance, would sink deep into his soul. His desire to render service as other men do without reward of any nature make him resent any suggestion of help- the fact is he is a poor man, and when he gives of himself and his meager means, his giving is out of all proportion, doesn't seem to strike him." ²⁵² Brown continued to praise Billikopf for his every deed during the years 1917-1918, and to claim that the war work would not have been possible without his guidance, inspiration and genius. Brown suggested that the American Jewish community owed this man something in gratitude for all he had enabled them to accomplish. Brown wrote the following to Schiff:

" But what about the days to come for our friend Billikopf? Is he to render more service and then back to his work as a social worker, a little older, a little poorer and a little less able to fight the physical defects that always develop in a nervous, energetic nature such as his--or are we who have worked with him and learned to appreciate his genius, yes, and to love him, going to take such steps that will properly compensate him for the great service he has rendered, not

only to his brethren in stricken Europe, but to our people here who have been made to feel their Jewishness as never before?²⁵³

This letter and its provocative statements became the catalyst for the greatest gift Billikopf could imagine, a gift that in a way would change his future and secure his livelihood for the rest of his life. On March of 1919, at the home of Mr. Henry Morgenthau, a testimonial was offered to Jacob Billikopf.²⁵⁴ Three men spoke to Billikopf's talents and accomplishments--Jacob Schiff, Henry Morgenthau and Justice Irving Lehman. Jacob Schiff told of how Billikopf had been a boy when he met him in connection with the Galveston movement.²⁵⁵ Morgenthau and Lehman both told of his efforts which resulted in the machinery for mobilizing the American Jewish Community. But just as Billikopf had claimed that words spoke only partially to any cause, and that the real test was when someone could dig deep into their pocket, these men passed the test. At the testimonial they presented Billikopf with a check for \$50,000.²⁵⁶ This was an unbelievable amount when one considers that Billikopf himself, one of the best paid people in his field, had left Kansas City at a salary of \$3,500. In 1919, with an approximate interest rate of 6%, Billikopf's annual interest would have been \$3000. This would have been an ample amount to live off of and live well without ever touching the principal. Hundreds of newspapers ran the story of the great gift for the man who taught America to give. Billikopf gave a prepared speech that morning. He claimed that he could only use such a text for he feared becoming emotionally tongue-tied.²⁵⁷ Billikopf in his address reiterated his own commitment to the concept of *Zedakah* as he expressed his thanks:

I wish to make an announcement which I hope you will not regard as gratuitous or irrelevant. This fund which you have so generously presented to me is given without condition. You and other contributors are unconcerned as to which use I will put this money. After much thought, however, I have concluded that I cannot in conscience do other than devote the interest upon the principal, or the major portion of it, to furthering the causes. This gift has grown out of my work soliciting funds for others less fortunate than myself. So long as I am capable of caring for my modest wants and so long as my health will permit me to carry on my work as I have carried it on hitherto, I shall devote the interest upon this fund to such causes as are in harmony with the spirit of the work we have just accomplished.²⁵⁸

Such a claim was not uncharacteristic nor was it likely that Billikopf would not carry out such a claim. It is equally of character that these men would create such a fund for Billikopf. For he had been in the presence of and worked hand in hand with some of the richest men in America. He was not looked down upon nor was he treated with anything but the greatest admiration. He was, for the most part, good and intimate friends with these prominent men. There are countless invitations to dinners and parties that clutter his personal files, and letters of advice on the most personal of matters. These are all addressed to "my dear Billikopf" or the affectionate "Billie". What is uncharacteristic is the fact that an Eastern European Jew who came to these shores only some twenty-two years earlier, was to receive, at the age of only 36, not merely such an honor but such acceptance. Jacob Billikopf had risen from the docks of Galveston, meeting immigrants as an immigrant social worker from Kansas City, to national prominence in just ten short years. His daily associations were with the most

prominent men in American Jewry and some of the most influential men in world Jewry. Schiff, Rosenwald , Warburg, Adler and Marshall were all in his daily correspondence and all close enough to have his suggestions whispered into their ears. From 1919 on, Jacob Billikopf's role in American Jewry was advisor. He had moved himself from the harness of campaign life into the capacity of consultant. He was in a valuable and unique vantage point, having access to all sides. His was a position that could be powerful or dangerous if misused. Having such access he was sure to generate some tensions, even some fearful enemies.

In a recent book, Cyrus Adler's Selected Letters, editor Ira Robinson has collected some evidence to the effect of Billikopf's activity. This evidence demonstrates how powerful Billikopf was perceived to be. It perhaps accounts for a sudden change of his roles following these listed events. In 1919 Billikopf left on a trip to Europe, going with several other members of the American Jewish Committee . During that particular time Adler is of the opinion that Billikopf misuses his power and enters into political activities which was not well accepted. Adler expresses concern over Billikopf's European activity in his Paris, June 20,1919 letter to Dr. Schiff.

I know you understand my not communicating direct with you is not due to lack of affection. We are in a peculiar atmosphere here and discretion is the better part of valor....the immediate object of my writing is with regard to Mr. Billikopf. You are probably acquainted with his stay in Holland, his visit to Paris and later to Poland and Lithuania and now his return to Paris where he has been about a

week .Billikopf has blossomed into a politician of the first water. Polish, Irish, Greek, any kind of politics have become his field. He has intervened with the Morgenthau affair of a mission to Poland which every very well informed person considers most unfortunate; what is worse he's mixed in with the Polish Treaty and has greatly disconcerted Mr. Marshall to whom by common consent even the Eastern European have left the direct negotiations. In other words he has been most meddlesome and even not intentionally may be in the position of a double crosser. Pardon the direct language. We are very plain spoken over here when the occasion requires.

My object of writing is this: when Mr. Billikopf gets back, if he is still in his present state of excitement, he may give vent to some interviews and speeches which will be cabled back here and do great mischief. It is so much easier to tear down than to build up. You and Mr. Warburg and Mr. Rosenwald, if necessary , ought to impose upon Mr. Billikopf absolute silence on every point of that but relief work. He should be told not to open his mouth on the political situation ...²⁵⁹

What is of interest here is not so much what did Billikopf actually do, but rather Cyrus Adler's perception of Billikopf. Adler saw Billikopf as having the accessibility and potential to do damage in international politics. Adler was so fearful he instructs Schiff to control him. What is impressive is when one considers that after such a short time the young social worker from Missouri was perceived to be, if not actually able, to exercise such influence.

This marks the rise of Jacob Billikopf from anonymity as an immigrant midwestern social worker to a national and even international figure. He starts the process by sparking a social conscience in American social work with his creation of such groups as the Board of Public Welfare and such legislation as the Mother's Aid act. He finished, having set up the greatest philanthropic

machinery in Jewry. Wherever he walked during the decade of 1907 -1917, his footprints were always ones of charismatic innovations .

Billikopf In Philadelphia 1919-1933

By the year 1919 Jacob Billikopf had achieved national prominence through his work with the American Jewish Relief Committee. His stature was augmented by the exposure that he received through association with great men. Billikopf shared the dais with men like Jacob Schiff, Herbert Lehman, Judge Mack and Louis Marshall. Although his own accomplishments were worthy beyond the praise he received, one can not discount the effect which association with such men had on his career. It has been demonstrated that this association gave opportunity for Billikopf to have access both to knowledge of the inner circle of American Jewish leadership and to give voice to his own opinion -exercising influence. It was a privilege to be in such a position of power. Billikopf used this privilege, whether it be in the attempt to have a "Commission " established in 1920, or to stress one of his suggestions urging the cooperation between factions in the American Jewish Community, for what he considered the best solution or policy. As with any situation, there are numerous facets from which it can be viewed. Thus Cyrus Adler feared the misuse of such power by Billikopf; hence Adler's urgent plea to Schiff to control the social worker turned politician. It is also clear that this access to the great men had direct influence on his career. Billikopf had moved a step above the normative Jewish professional into association with the elite of American Jewish life. It is an obvious question: did that access, influence or power necessitate keeping him under control as Adler suggested,

or did it call for keeping him in a position from which he could best exercise such access, influence and power. In the year 1919 both polarities of possibilities existed in the minds of these important men in their individual opinions of Jacob Billikopf. Some felt he had served his purpose and raised the funds needed and there was now no real need for his involvement; there were others of this elite group who were concerned that Billikopf be in a position in which he could be involved as he was needed. Such varied opinions account for the difficulty and complexity of Billikopf's career move after his involvement in relief work. It can be viewed as moving him off the scene or as setting him up in a position from which he could spring to action. In reality, the position which Billikopf occupied from 1919 till his death was such a position that it allowed him to vacillate between these two positions.

Upon return to America from a trip to Europe, Billikopf took vacation in the familiar surroundings of Kansas City , Missouri. There he had to decide what would become of his career: would he return to his "hometown" or would he seek employment in one of the new avenues opened to him in his work that had spanned the country. While Billikopf was staying with his friend, Alfred Benjamin, he was contacted by the city of Philadelphia with a request for him to become the Executive Director of Federation. This offer was involved in a tremendous struggle in the "city of brotherly love." The struggle was one of 18 years by men such as Cyrus Adler and Jacob Gimbel who wanted to have the agencies of Philadelphia unite, calling for the Russian and German Jews to work together

under one umbrella. The history of this struggle is traced in a chapter in Jewish Life in Philadelphia edited by Murray Friedman called "German Jews vs. Russian Jews in Philadelphia Philanthropy" by Philip Rosen. Rosen writes the following:

It took 18 years for the board of Federation to accept what Jacob Gimbel and Cyrus Adler had urged -to invite all charities into the Federation. In the spring of 1919, Federation expanded its constituency to include 39 instead of 14 agencies, for which it allocated \$436,206. It amended its bylaws to permit directors and officers of agencies to serve on the board which expanded from 12 to 40. This expansion brought in some of the organizations founded by Russian Jews. Most important of these organizations was the Talmud Torah Association, Mt. Sinai Hospital, the Hebrew Sheltering Home and Old Age Home.

The expanded federation brought in a dynamic social worker born in Eastern Europe as executive director, Jacob Billikopf, quite an innovation considering that for 18 years the board and its agencies operated by voluntary efforts of dedicated lay people who contributed the lion's share of their time and a great deal of their money to the philanthropic work.²⁶⁰

This transition for Philadelphia resulted in the need for a very talented individual who could span the chasm between Russian and German Jew. Billikopf had such a reputation; plus he had the exceptional organizational ability necessary for handling the increase to include 39 organizations. This new challenge was far less demanding than keeping up with 1,419 individual campaigns spread across the United States.

The acquisition of his services took place in the following manner. Mr. Louis Wolf, then acting as spokesperson for the new board in Philadelphia made overtures to

Billikopf, beginning in 1919. The first contact to Billikopf was independent of the entire board. September, 15, 1919 Wolf sent the following communication to Billikopf:

" My Dear Billy: Am sending you the communication with request that you made that I write you in reference to the position here. Of course, this is semi-official and is done after talking with some influential members of our Board.

Trust you will give matter your consideration and let me here from you as soon as possible. With Kindest regards and hoping to see you soon , I remain.
Louis Wolf²⁶¹

Upon his return from Europe Billikopf was faced again with career decisions. He was in a similar situation to that of 1917 when he was flooded with multiple job offers. However there was a major difference between the two situations. In 1917 he was faced with the question of leaving social work completely. Social work had been the only type of work he had ever done. Secondly, in 1917 he questioned what type of sacrifice it would have been to leave Kansas City, the place where according to Rosenwald he had " accumulated such good will," for another city where he would be an unknown. Now in 1919 as he faced again the decision to leave social work, the circumstances however were all together different. Billikopf had achieved national acclaim. He no longer needed the reassurance of his capabilities concerning work outside of the field of social work. By virtue of his JDC work, he had proven to himself as well as to the nation that he could take on the most rigorous and difficult of tasks. Now his choice was to remain in social work or to move to some other, more lucrative field. His

friends Lee K. Frankel and David Bressler had moved from the field of social work into the secular business world . Lee K. Frankel had become an insurance executive. Billikopf faced these choices with much more financial leverage than before, for he had the \$50,000 gift at his disposal. He had as well the friendship of the greatest men in the American Jewish community. These relations were to his advantage whether he choose to remain in social work or to enter into the secular world of business. Billikopf would certainly not disappoint these American Jewish leaders if he left the world of social work for a job in the secular domain. He had done his portion, and no one could ever doubt his commitment to the causes of social justice. On one level Billikopf would be replicating these important mens' approach to Jewish involvement, one of volunteering rather than earning money as a professional. Perhaps such a situation would have made the Eastern European Jew, Jacob Billikopf, even more acceptable to the German Jewish crowd. Whatever the motives were for taking a position outside of the field of social work might have been, for Billikopf the question arose primarily beacuse of the number of offers which were tendered him . Job offers poured in both from within the Kansas City community and from outside that community. Again his close friends Schiff and Rosenwald extended offers as well, as did his good friends in Kansas City. Jacob Schiff had offered him a banking position with his firm, Kuhn, Loeb and Co. About this attractive offer, Billikopf sought advice from his Kansas City friend, Mr. Mohr. Mohr had been involved with the Kansas City Board of Pardons and Parole. He advises Billikopf in the following letter, dated February 5th,1919.

On the subject(banking offer) I cannot arrive at any conclusion, for I never associated you with anything in that line; it was always with that, which tended to uplift humanity.

I can only repeat what I stated to you, that I cannot associate the thought of failure, with whatever you decide to take hold of, even though it is something foreign to what you have been doing, still your great work, just being finished is along the very lines open to you now, with this difference, that it will be in a measure common place, as compared with the great things you accomplished, financially. Of course you will in a measure be pocketing yourself, by connecting yourself with a local bank and should you become dissatisfied you would have to climb again, in order to regain the lofty position you now have. Weigh all these matters Billie; if you were an older man, it would not be as dangerous for it would be in a sense, a retiring from a strenuous life work, with the consciousness of having played your part and played it well. ²⁶²

What Mohr stressed about Billikopf cutting himself off from the work that was familiar was an important point, a point that obviously influenced Billikopf. It has been alluded to in Chapter One that the social concerns of Billikopf were not just part of his job, they were living issues which he attached himself to with the greatest of passion. Again Billikopf refused the enticements of the business world, with the same strength of commitment that enabled him to resist the political offer to run for mayor of Kansas City as well as numerous other attractive and lucrative business offers.

Philadelphia's desire to have Billikopf become their director greatly aided his decision process to remain in the field of social work. Here was a grand community , one of the oldest and most prestigious in American Jewry, begging

him to come serve them. The job in Philadelphia would allow Billikopf to stay involved with many of the same high caliber individuals to whom he had grown accustomed. So having been contacted by Philadelphia in September of 1919, Billikopf wired back to Mr. Louis Wolf: " On my return received many additional business and social service offers none of which am considering seriously. Realizing vast opportunities for large constructive work in Philadelphia am most sympathetically inclined to your offer as I must make final decision during stay here; will you not have your board make offer final ." ²⁶³ Billikopf needed to know if Philadelphia was serious and if Wolf spoke for more than a few individuals in the community. The answer that Billikopf received was impressive and it demonstrated just how much the Philadelphia community wanted the famous social worker for their agency. Louis Wolf simply wired Billikopf back the following: " The Board authorized me to make offer ten thousand dollars; providing conditions are satisfactory to you; wire when you will be here. Louis Wolf" ²⁶⁴

Billikopf accepted the offer without qualifications.

Such an offer is exemplary of Jacob Billikopf's success. Having arrived in this country in 1897, having been here for only twenty two years, Billikopf is offered this outstanding salary. This was an exceptional salary for a man of Billikopf's background and educational level, yet a just reward for his skills. To provide perspective on just how outstanding this salary was for that period the following letter will be insightful. In 1921 one of the many problems Bilikopf faced in

Philadelphia was the battle for Jewish education. Education was one of Billikopf's primary concerns; he had gone to great lengths to help establish the Talmud Torahs of Kansas City. He went to even greater lengths in Philadelphia to create an interest in Jewish education to sustain those institutions. However it was felt by many that it was best to separate the principle of education from that of charity. Louis Marshall was one of the individuals who believed that these two principles should be separated. Marshall was concerned about the situation in New York which paralleled that of Philadelphia. Billikopf was a little less convinced of total separation, for he knew that Talmud Torahs would lose almost all their fundings. Billikopf had written to Marshall in 1921 to suggest that Dr. Rosen be brought in to run the Talmud

Torahs of Philadelphia. The following is Marshall's reply:

What you have said about the Talmud Torah situation is quite in line with the conclusion that I arrived at some time ago. In the long run it is not good for Federation or for the Jewish educational institutions that they shall be conducted by one and the same management. Federations deals with works of charity and benevolence in a rather restricted sense. Talmud torahs and other kindred institutions are purely of the religious character. The men who are interested in one are not likely to be interested in the other. At least one interest is always sure to predominate. As soon as conditions are more settled here I am quite sure that an independent Federation of educational institutions will have to be established. The two can work in concert so as to avoid conflict and friction in respect to the collection of funds. In the administration of their monies, however, they must deal with thier own peculiar problems.

I think it wise that your own Federation to have decided in favor of placing the Talmud Torahs in charge of an expert. I do not know Rosen, of whom you speak. I take it for

granted you have obtained Dr. Benderly's views concerning him. I think that the salary of \$5000 is rather too large. When one considers that Chancellor Day, after twenty-seven years of the most marvelous service rendered by any single individual in the education field, is receiving only \$7500 as the Chancellor of a great university, with ten colleges and six schools, a faculty of 500 and a student body of 6,000 a more modest compensation for such services as you had in mind would be indicated. ²⁶⁵

The aforementioned letter reveals several interesting points about Billikopf's Philadelphia career. First, the comments by Marshall give perspective as to how outstanding Billikopf's salary of \$10,000 was for that day. Billikopf was offered more than Chancellor Day was receiving for his position and Day had a far better education. Billikopf was receiving almost a 300% increase from his former position in Kansas City as director where he received \$3,500 a year. Only in America could such an event take place for an Eastern European Jew who had only been on these shores for twenty two years.

The question can be legitimately asked-- why Jacob Billikopf and why the amount of money which he received. An obvious answer is that the community felt it needed his specific skills and as well they knew they had to pay for those skills. This was especially due to the fact that they had to compete with jobs which paid just as well in the business world which had already been offered to him. Yet there is another factor which accounts for his getting the job and the high salary . That factor was the company which Billikopf had been keeping for the last several years. Billikopf was rubbing shoulders with men who were among the notables of notables in American Jewish life. As evident by this letter to Marshall, he was very

intimate with the most important men. He was intimate with Julius Rosenwald, Judge Mack, Jacob Schiff and his son-in-law Felix Warburg, not to mention Cyrus Adler, Myer Sulzberger, Cyrus Sulzberger, Herbert Lehman, Judah Magnes and Nathan Straus. The Billikopf collection is teeming with letters from all these men. His association was not just in the restricted area of relief work or even social justice. Billikopf provided advice and received advice on every subject imaginable. However, Billikopf was in most cases treated as a personal friend by all of these men. A great number of these letters start out "Billie" and their topics range from the most minute trivia of which is the better restaurant in New York, to the most political of issues. But these men influenced Billikopf in his personal life as his friend, and they exercised influence on his career. The gift of \$50,000 which Billikopf received in 1919 does a tremendous amount for one's position in life.

Billikopf was accepted to a greater degree than one would consider in light of his Eastern European origins. Billikopf was included in every aspect of the lives of these men. Billikopf was consistently included in the social lives of these individuals. Louis Marshall was particularly affectionate towards Billikopf. There are numerous letters which show that their relationship up until 1919 was a good one and one full of social exchanges. In 1918 Billikopf received the following invitation from Marshall:

Dear Billikopf:

A dress suit at Knollwood! Why man are you mad? If your

tryin' your wit, the joke is quite sad, In these diggins, you
know, them togs is taboo, Who smuggles them in, surely
gets ballyhoo. A husky game-warden, at our gate doth
stand, Who searches guests' baggage for such
contraband. If he finds it, 'tis cast to where pearls most
abound; With sech-like attire, don't dare come around.
Don't bring patent-leathers nor pumps howe'er neat, In this
camp ours, we can't use tenderfeet. Bring a rain-coat for
safety, if one you've got, but good appetite's best - of that
bring alot.

Very truly yours,
{Signed} Louis Marshall²⁶⁶

The letter above stemmed from the fact that Billikopf had come to the Knollwood on Saranac Lake in formal attire. The fact that Marshall that could joke with Billikopf reflects the status of the relationship between the two men. Billikopf spent a lot of time with Louis Marshall. This association was very important to his career. Marshall was a very important man. Billikopf was in the Marshall home enough to come in contact with Marshall's young daughter Ruth Marshall. Billikopf became interested. In 1919, in an article written about Billikopf's achievements and the \$50,000 gift in honor of his work, "What New York Thinks of Jacob Billikopf," Billikopf scratched: "I want to know what Ruth thinks of Jacob Billikopf." ²⁶⁷ Billikopf spent enough time with the Marshall family to get to know and fall in love with the young Barnard college sophomore. This time spent together created a relationship that would lead to marriage. Jacob Billikopf married the Barnard junior on February 23, 1920. Ruth Marshall was 20 years of age. Billikopf was then 37 years old. This marriage was the real test of Billikopf's acceptance in the German Jewish crowd. Although the relationship between Billikopf and all of the Marshalls appears to have been stable in the hundreds of

letter written to Ruth Marshall by her father after her marriage, Billikopf is only mentioned once. Louis Marshall did indeed write to his daughter, discussing everyday concerns and parent/child issues; however one thing that is lacking is any mention of her husband.²⁶⁸ The dynamics between the Marshall family and Jacob Billikopf seem to have been fine, as Billikopf was in contact with all of Ruth's brothers and they were friendly to Billikopf. They all corresponded casually between one another. It is difficult to determine from the available material what the members of the Marshall family really thought of Jacob Billikopf. It is clear however that Ruth Marshall was not a well person most of her life, and that the Marshall family's devotion to sister and daughter was primary. Such was the devotion that it would have overruled any distaste for Billikopf. One here must pass judgement by what is not said. There seems to be a void of any material pertaining to Jacob Billikopf in all of Ruth Marshall's incoming letters from her family. Billikopf, on the other hand, was devoted to Ruth and, without question, to Louis Marshall. Regardless of the dynamics of the family's relationship, from 1920 on Jacob Billikopf was not only seen for his abilities which he had demonstrated by deed, but as well he was now the son-in-law of Louis Marshall. Billikopf's contacts were essential to his career; though they quite possibly helped him get his job, he only had the contacts because he had already proven himself to these men.

In addition the letter from Marshall about the Talmud Torahs exemplifies what type of innovations Billikopf made for the Philadelphia community. Regardless of

Billikopf's new family connections, Billikopf provided a valuable service to the community of Philadelphia. The expectation of Billikopf in Philadelphia was primarily to organize and to supervise the 39 organizations within the Federation. That task in itself presented Billikopf with a multifaceted challenge. Billikopf attempted to avoid a problem which he knew well from his work in Kansas City, the problem of duplication of services. In his eyes this was a tremendous waste and such inefficiency meant that services that were needed could not be provided. The charity organizations in Philadelphia had been run independent of each other. As such they had been appealing for funds independent of one another. Such independence fostered an attitude within each charity organization that it was righteously responsible for achieving all the goals of charity work. This philosophical approach, which grew out of independent and autonomous action by each group, made it difficult to implement the consolidation and specialization that Billikopf knew would remedy many of the existing problems in Philadelphia's charity organizations. He believed this consolidation would diminish much of the duplication and simultaneously provide greater service .

A transformation and reorganization of these thirty-nine organizations was difficult at best, for such consolidation necessitated cooperation between them. It has been intimated that within Philadelphia there was tension between the Russian and German Jews. The tension was exacerbated when organizations which were part of one group or the other were approached to give up control of

services. It was viewed as an attempt to usurp their power. In addition, Philadelphia had the tradition of each organization and /or institution raising its own funds. This fortified the autonomy , making it an uphill battle for Billikopf to achieve a centralized control of these organizations based on cooperation. Billikopf saw two preliminary needs in the community which would aid him in achieving his goal for central organization of Philadelphia's agencies. First, he realized he had to have an objective source of information. It was unhelpful to have studies tainted by special interest. Secondly, Billikopf believed to avoid special interest and the counter-productive attitude created by independent fundraising, it was necessary to have an annual campaign. Such a campaign would solve many problems.

The first of these preliminary steps was achieved with less resistance. Billikopf's own experience and method made it almost natural to accept his opinion as an expert. However Billikopf did not rely upon his reputation alone. He took grave steps to insure that information was presented in an informed and objective manner. With the aid of the School of Social Research in New York, Billikopf evaluated many of the problems of the Philadelphia community. In most cases Billikopf's authority to request a particular change was based on such information.

The second preliminary step to achieve centralization met much greater resistance. The idea of having an annual campaign in Philadelphia was met with

strong opposition. Two of the greatest men in opposition to the annual campaign were Rabbi Joseph Krauskopf and Cyrus Adler. This came to a head in the Philadelphia community in 1922. In a Federation report delivered on September 28, 1922, Billikopf made several suggestions about the structure of the federation. As well he made the strong suggestion that an annual campaign be instituted. He sent a copy of this report to Rabbi Krauskopf. The following is Krauskopf's reaction to the idea of a fixed annual campaign, dated November 20, 1922.

I read every word of your Report, copy of which you sent me, some of it twice. I regard it as one of the finest messages of the kind that has ever come to my notice, and one that could only have been written by a master on the subject, and one as rich in experience as you are.

I fully share your criticism of certain money-raising methods, which you mention.

I am, however, not enthusiastic on the subject of annual drives. They will work for two or three years, and then will probably fail for lack of workers and enthusiasm.

I believe that in the synagogues, some of which have a large weekly attendance, we possess an agency that could and should be made use of for propaganda purposes. I believe that Federation ought to have in its employ a good speaker (man or woman), whose duty it shall be to occupy each pulpit in turn, all year round, and tell in each, of the different activities of the Federation.²⁶⁹

Billikopf responded to Krauskopf's suggestion in a positive manner. He requested time upon his pulpit. "I wonder if between now and our campaign you

could give me the opportunity to occupy your pulpit some Sunday morning and interpret the work of Federation? In the past I have spoken in practically every pulpit except yours and I promise not to disgrace it."²⁷⁰ Billikopf was always ready to seize an opportunity which he felt would further his cause. He did just that at the famous Rabbi's pulpit, although it took a while before the offer was extended to Billikopf. However, when it was extended, it was a rather trusting offer. Billikopf spoke in Congregation Keneseth Israel on Yom Kippur day. This event was reported upon by the Jewish World on September 30, 1923. Norman Ginsburg praises Billikopf for his honesty and his courage in his address which was entitled "Spiritual Reawakening." Attention should be heeded to the anti-reform nature of this article, following. It gives insight to how Billikopf was viewed in his attempt to spread the "good word" about Federation. The Reform Jews recieved a fine sermon and welcomed Billikopf. But to the anti-reform groups, which were synonomous with the anti-German groups, Billikopf's words were perceived as a "tongue lashing." Such an ability to please both sides was perhaps Billikopf's key to success.

The congregation of Keneseth Israel is strictly reform. It is made up of some of the city's most prominent and influential Jews. Men of affairs and affluence who have raised thier children punctiliously along reform Jewish principles, most of whom probably never have seen the inside of a real Jewish "Schul," most of whom know very little about orthodox Jewish customs and rituals which are so dear and vital to the great masses of Jews.

These were the kind of men and women who made up the major portion of the audience which Jacob Billikopf faced last Yom Kippur day. Faced them with the avowed purpose of talking to them of a "spiritual reawakening;" of such an

awakening which would make them familiar with an integral part of the revered Jewish customs and rituals which are so full of meaning; the very symbols of our race; which have been handed down to us through-out the ages; these pillars of our Judaism which have endured these thousand of years , not because of "reform congregations" but despite them.

This was the substance of the sermon which Jacob Billikopf delivered that day to an audience which was unquestionably one which by its very practice could not be in sympathy with his thoughts. Had a less capable, less fearless, speaker than Jacob Billikopf attempted the same thing, we doubt if he would have succeeded. We doubt whether he would have received the undivided attention of his audience, because we know what he had to say was not what they wanted to hear.

We repeat that the quality which we admire most in Jacob Billikopf is his undaunted courage. We look upon him as one of the true leaders of our Jewish Community, and we respect him as such.²⁷¹

This article exemplifies the tension between the factions in almost every community. Somehow Billikopf was able to function on a level which kept both factions satisfied. He had the personality which obviously made each group feel as if he was one of "their's." It is obvious that he was accepted to a great extent by the ruling class of German Jews for they hired him and they socialized with him. However Billikopf also had the respect of the Russian Jews as well. Not only is this evident by the aforementioned article, but also it is substantiated by comments similar to that of Jacob Gutman, one of the few Russian born Jews to be part of the high circles of the Jewish Federation of Charities.

Jacob Billikopf was a brilliant man who knew how to unite communities around federated organizations. He was one of the first to hire trained social workers, for example, and press the concept of doing our own planning and

budgeting. He also had a strong Lithuanian accent.²⁷²

However the Russian Jews interpreted Billikopf's sermon in Krauskopf's pulpit, it did not change the intention of his speaking there. Billikopf wanted to build support for his idea of annual campaigns. In addition to Krauskopf's objection, a much more serious one came from Cyrus Adler the president of Dropsie College who was an active member of the Federation Board. Adler objected strongly to the idea of an annual campaign as well as several other of Billikopf's innovations presented in his September 1922 report.

To the annual campaign, Adler said, " Please understand I recognize the necessity for a campaign in 1923, but I am not at all prepared to commit myself to the theory of an annual campaign."²⁷³ Adler believes this idea of a annual campaign is a trap and that they should come only as needed. He compares them to the old Hebrew Charity Ball and the Mt. Sinai Ball, which had valuable social features, but lost their effectiveness as years passed. Billikopf responded to Adler with the following justification for the annual campaign.

I have spoken at such great length regarding the need of an annual campaign that I have very little to add to a discussion of the subject. I merely wish to call your attention to the following excerpt from a letter written by Mr. William J Norton, head of the community fund in Detroit, and undoubtedly one of the clearest thinkers in the country on community organization.

"The federation campaign is simply the application of modern organized salesmanship, planned and developed throughout the year culminating in a single week. Its chief virtue as a method of financing charity is three fold. First, it enables social service to command for a short time the

effective services of thousands of volunteer salesmen, thereby multiplying enormously the number of soliciting hours previously devoted to charity. Second it enables social services to organize these soliciting hours economically so that tens of thousands of persons are asked to give who could not possibly be reached by another method. And third, it creates more widespread friendly interest in philanthropy, by far, than any other scheme today."²⁷⁴

Billikopf's primary reason for having such a campaign was to reduce the amount of separatism which was a byproduct of the individually run fund raisers. Billikopf had suggested a rotation of offices on the Board, as a way to increase involvement. However Billkopf's suggestion was another way to reduce that separatism. Adler called it unAmerican: "Rotation of office is a political term and has to a certain extent been considered one of the evils in the American system. It was the backbone of that theory and practice which required , that when Democrats carried the Presidency, every Republican in every branch of the services, including fourth-class postmasters and spittoon-cleaners in the Departments should be changed."²⁷⁵ What was it that Adler so objected to and for which Billikopf fought so hard? For Adler, it was the preservation of power and ownership of the Federation. Adler was clear about this in his response to Billikopf addressing the problem of lack of participation in Federation. Adler writes: "I am wondering whether the evil that you point out is not to some extent a result of the almost complete substitution of the paid worker for the volunteer."²⁷⁶ One must read between the lines and understand that Adler is working to preserve a power base which had been in existence for the life of the Philadelphia community. Billikopf, on the other hand, felt tied by the present

situation and sought to change it in order to achieve his goals of a more efficient agency. Billikopf writes : "I do not, by any means, regard the rotation of offices as even a partial panacea for some of the ills from which we suffer, and while I may not be prepared to dogmatize on this feature of my report, I feel that some steps should be taken with the view of avoiding the farcical elections which the federation and its constituent organizations have from year to year."²⁷⁷ Although Adler was a thorn in Billikopf's side most of his career, Billikopf managed to make progress in his Federation work in Philadelphia. By 1921 Billikopf had already increased the size of the organization from 39 to 50.²⁷⁸ In Billikopf's 1921 year end report of the Federation of Jewish Charities, he made the following claim:

I am happy to be in the position to declare that every one of the fifty-three institutions that are affiliated with the Philadelphia Federation of Jewish Charities received sufficient funds for all of its current activities, and not a single affiliated institution had to curtail any of its activities in the least degree, nor turn a deaf ear to the supplications of even one deserving unfortunate because of lack of money. ²⁷⁹

This was quite a claim, for Billikopf in a short time had built up the concept of Federation by making it work. He sold the community on the idea by making sure that his constituent organizations had security. Fund raising was a talent which Billikopf knew how to use in order to secure the interest of these groups. It is amazing that he was able to accomplish such success in Philadelphia for he was at the same time during 1921 on the road constantly for the JDC campaigns. Billikopf reported just how successful his Philadelphia efforts were: "The gross

expenditures of the fifty-three institutions in 1921 amounted to \$1,541,779.06, the federation having contributed nearly one million dollars towards that sum." 280 The remainder was given by the state, endowments, and institutional receipts. This was a spectacular accomplishment. Even more impressive are the innovations that were already starting to be boasted about after only two years of Billikopf at the helm.

One such case was the Welfare Society which had been the United Hebrew Charities. This group was in tremendous trouble when it joined the Federation. It was, according to the report of 1921, in the humiliating condition of having to bargain with the poor on how much it could afford to give them in relief. Under Billikopf it moved from palliative relief to reconstructive work. Billikopf wanted the Welfare Society to restore independence to the family. Two years prior to Billikopf's direction as advisor they had an income of \$45,000 and in 1921 they spent \$175,000.²⁸¹ Billikopf also listed in his report the improvements at Eagleville. This was a health care institution which primarily worked with tuberculosis cases. Billikopf had created a vocational therapy program at Eagleville which was concerned with the productivity of the patients after release. He created workshops in the institution which were to aid the patients to slowly regain their strength so they could return as useful members of society. He created a social service department which was to faithfully and zealously follow these patients home and to work, to help make the difficult transition less difficult.²⁸² Billikopf's motto in this work is not an unfamiliar one: "Our patients should be

busy with useful, creative work, which maintains their self-respect and occupies their mind instead of permitting them to sink into the depths of idleness and demoralization."²⁸³ The familiar call for self-respect of the individual, if anything can be considered so, was Billikopf's trade mark. Billikopf in addition to these progressive activities, had a particular interest in education. Besides the constant work he did throughout his career raising private funds for the scholar and the underprivileged student, Billikopf was committed to the principles of the Talmud Torah. As mentioned above, Billikopf had brought in an expert to run and manage the Talmud Torahs. This innovation allowed them to increase their attendance by 50%.²⁸⁴

It is remarkable to what extent Billikopf modeled his innovations for the Philadelphia community after his own work in Kansas City. He created in Philadelphia two programs which were the identical replications of his innovative programs in Kansas City. First, in Kansas City he created the Alfred Benjamin Medical Annex which was in accordance with Billikopf's philosophy of preventive efforts. Thus keeping with that same spirit he created the Community Health Center in Philadelphia, dedicated to keeping people from falling ill. It attracted state-wide attention. The Health Center, Billikopf reported, cared for 4000 individuals in the year 1921. Nearly 800 cases of malnutrition were discovered and 200 cases of incipient tuberculosis were detected in people who hadn't the least suspicion that they were affected.²⁸⁵ In addition there were other advances in the area of medical care reported in 1921. Billikopf had been instrumental in

the development of two additions to the medical facilities in Philadelphia. One was the Mastbaum Pavillion at Eagleville costing \$100,000, and at Mt. Sinai, there was a \$175,000 addition, practically doubling its bed capacity.²⁸⁶ Billikopf was consistent in his approach to work in the relief area, always keeping his golden rule ; the Maimonidean principle of the best gift was the gift which allowed the individual to help himself. To this end were Billikopf's efforts to create loan associations. These loan agencies were able to facilitate such work and used the Miamonidean principle as a guide. Just as Billikopf had sold the idea in Kansas City he did so in Philadelphia. The idea was primarily taken up by Jules Mastbaum. Billikopf made it clear to Mastbaum that there were indeed individuals who had nothing more than their pride left. A responsible community, Billikopf believed, would insure that that pride remained intact. Billikopf realized that there existed a type of people that would never apply for relief to a relief society, because they would rather starve than accept a dole. This inspired Jules Mastbaum to orginize the Federated Loan Society , with a capital of \$100,000. By 1921 some 1200 families had applied for aid and had been cared for to the extent of quarter of a million dollars. Billikopf claimed all loans were being paid back on a regular schedule.²⁸⁷ Billikopf described the organization in words which he had used some years earlier to talk about the creation of the free loan society as part of the Board of Public Welfare in Kansas City. Billikopf discribed this new institution in these familiar words: "Hundreds of families have been made independent and their self-respect preserved. Without this organization many would have succumbed to their misery. Many would have lost their moral

stamina."²⁸⁸

In summary the events of the first two years of Billikopf's work in Philadelphia were rather remarkable. This is especially so when one reflects on the fact that at this same time Billikopf was highly involved in hundreds of campaigns across the country. If these campaigns were not directly related to the JDC, they were from a request by one of Billikopf's captains in his JDC work. He was on the road raising funds for hospitals, for schools, YMHA's and every other conceivable Jewish cause. Despite that commitment, Billikopf was able to fortify the Federation, at least in its programmatic areas. As evident by the exchanges between him and Adler, for Billikopf to nurture a situation of autonomy, similar to that he had in Kansas City, was still a long way off in Philadelphia. Although Billikopf and Adler were at odds on almost every innovative suggestion made by Billikopf, they did agree on some issues. One particular issue was their mutual resistance to the idea of a Community Chest.

In the year 1920 the concept of working for a united city-wide Welfare Federation was ever present in Philadelphia. The hope was that all philanthropy organizations would belong to one centrally funded Welfare Federation. Billikopf and Adler both were of the opinion that it would destroy the Jewish Federation. Billikopf made very strong efforts to avoid such a merger of the two organizations, the already established Federation of Jewish Charities and the newly formed Welfare Federation. It was a difficult situation for Billikopf for he was

unable to really express his opinion openly on the situation. For he knew that if the resolution to merge were passed it would be very difficult for him to be seen in a good light in a new organization if the community knew he was opposed.

Billikopf approached the problem of this merger in the manner that has been alluded to in the beginning of this chapter. Billikopf tried to present himself as the expert with a professional insight. He accomplished this by creating committees to study the feasibility and effect of entering in such a federation. This was not an isolated situation for Philadelphia. Across the country many communities were in the process of either rejecting or accepting the new wave of community wide Federations. In some communities, the greater Federation evolved before the Jewish Federation and this created a problem in Billikopf's eyes. For if they joined the organization there was no real specific Jewish organizational body. This made it difficult to have a united Jewish community. The concept of a Community Federation was without question in the eyes of both Billikopf and Adler detrimental to the building of a united Jewish community. Billikopf stated often in his various reports that to join such an organization was equal to barring the orthodox organizations from working with the Jewish Federation forever. Both Billikopf and Adler had independently had been very active in efforts to have the Federation serve as the amalgamator of the Jewish community.

As mentioned above, it was Adler who had worked for eighteen years to achieve a unification, to create the 1919 Federation. He was not willing to jeopardize it for the sake of the general community. However the pressure exerted to join this

organization was tremendous. This issue really touched the root of differences between these factions. There were Jews who believed that the most important aspect was not how joining the Welfare Federation would affect the Jewish organizations but rather how not joining would affect them. There were Jews who believed that it was the American thing to do in the name of community spirit. It was the American way to drop all differences and jump into the "melting pot." Billikopf studied the situation carefully and sent out some rather powerful memorandums during the years of the struggle and as well contacted other communities to see in what direction they were going. He was concerned about the future of the concept of Jewish Federation. He wrote such a letter to Rabbi Solomon Foster in Newark, New Jersey. Rabbi Foster's community had by-passed the concept of a specific Jewish Federation and gone straight into a community wide program. Billikopf, after reading a report on the Newark community, tried to persuade Foster of the danger of joining such an organization. Billikopf wrote the following to Foster:

After reading the report I am in deep conviction that Jewish charities should not merge at this time in your communal federation, but should proceed to organize a Jewish Federation in the real sense of the word, and only after the latter had functioned properly for a number of years, then consider the adviseability of affecting a merger. To me- and I am sure that I speak for every prominent Jewish social worker who has had to deal with community organization - the fiscal side of federation is purely a means towards an end and not an end in itself. The big, outstanding features are the strengthening of the efficiency of each institution coordinating them in a harmonious whole, and developing the finer social, ethical and spiritual values among our people.

If you were to view the entire subject from purely a fiscal end, then I am sure your Jewish hospital and orphanage and other activities would make no mistake by going into the larger community federation, but from a social and educational viewpoint, a very serious mistake will be made to participate in the movement at this inopportune time. In fact, men like Mr. Marshall, Dr. Adler, Justice Irving Lehman, Judge Mack and others, question altogether the wisdom, from a Jewish point of view, of our giving up our identity- even in Cleveland, Cincinnati, Kansas City and other places, where up to the present moment the Federation has proven an effective force.²⁸⁹

Billikopf's statements to Foster are typical of the type of the views that he had on the subject. Billikopf was interested in preserving the autonomy of his organization. Why should Billikopf be so eager to share the decision-making process of spending his one and a half million dollar budget. Billikopf had enough resistance internally with the Jews on his board-- what good would it do to complicate things by adding the non -Jews to this process? This practical reason was seldom mentioned in this battle between those who professed the ideals of Jewish particularism and those who professed universalism, hungry for the acceptance which came with assimilation. Two important documents which Billikopf prepared on this subject were read by his friend Maurice Hexter. Hexter, the Executive Director of the Federation of Jewish Charities in Boston, was one of the most brilliant social workers in America. Hexter was the man whom the JDC sent to Mexico and Palestine to study the feasibility of Jewish settlement. He was the master of surveys and studies. Billikopf depended on Hexter for his support and guidance. Billikopf sent a Memorandum on the subject "Concerning Inclusion of Jewish Federation in Community Chests" to Hexter in February of

1921. The following are excerpts from this long report which points out some consistent themes in the argumentation of Billikopf against involvement in Community Chest.

It is wise to stop and ask the question "quo vadis?" The question is to be approached primarily by the Jews as Americans and secondly as Jews, at the same time drawing upon the experience implicit in the Federation movement experienced by Jewish communities since 1895 as well as reference to certain sociological principles having been tested and found valuable since Comte. Although we must approach the questions as Americans, we may not be unmindful of the fact that social service agencies established by Jewish communities comprise the expression of Judaism in social action, and as such, form just as integral a part of the life of the Jew as does the synagogue itself. The attempt being presently made in current doctrines of Americanization which are formulated with the idea of developing an "American race," do not take into account inherent group differentiation.

...Durkheims' contribution ("Regales de la Methode Sociologique, and de la Division du Travail Social") was the elaboration of the concept of organic solidarity based on division of labor and consciousness of supplementary differences though having antecedents in Comte and Bain and supplements in a much needed way the concept of consciousness of kind, the corner stone of Gidding's system, Macdougall likewise, in his "Group Mind" shows the function of small groups in developing a large social life.

Bearing in mind the above facts, what are the specific arguments against entering such unions? The history of the federation movement amongst the Jews shows in unmistakeable terms, the fact although initially only financial agencies, eventually they must become controlling bodies. That same history shows, likewise in unmistakable terms, that standardization downward occurs more frequently than upward.

In addition we are of the opinion that the unusually high type of men now who are now executives of large

federations would be loath to accept such a position which would essentially be lower in rank than others. Furthermore, while we should view this matter primarily as Americans, we may not be mindful of the fact that those we minister to may not view it similarly. The poor and needy would feel that the funds are from a non-Jewish source and gradually smaller organizations would spring up in the orthodox community which would replace the work of the presently established agencies and by that very process defeat the end to be achieved by these unions.

The Jewish community spends proportionately a much larger sum of money upon its agencies than does the general community. In order to maintain it, therefore, we should have to draw from the Community Chest a much larger sum of money than that which we are proportionately entitled, thus leading to bad feelings as is the case in at least two communities where Jewish Federations have entered.

...The difficulty of getting various orthodox agencies now outside the scope of existing federations to come into such a union is paramount. In all of the cities presently in Community Chest that condition actually exists, so that essentially what would occur is that the federation of agencies in which the older Jews are interested would be in Community Chest and those agencies operated by our co-religionists more recently arrived in America would be outside and thus, in fact emphasize and stress and make public that cleavage.

...The argument has been advanced that entering Community Chest will remove anti-semitism. We believe that far from removing it, it will stress it because of that fact brought out above.²⁹⁰

Billikopf in this particular study was looking at eight cities that had recently been included: Louisville, Cincinnati, St. Paul, Indianapolis, Cleveland, Columbus, Toledo and Detroit.²⁹¹ In the year 1923 Billikopf did a study of the Detroit community's involvement in Community Chest and the ramifications on the Jewish Federation. This report was turned into a paper for the National

Conference of Jewish Charities and delivered June of 1923.²⁹² Billikopf covered the topic in a very thorough manner. His exact points are duplicated in Jewish Community Organization in the U.S. by Maurice J. Karpf in his 1938 book; he deals with six basic questions that faced the Jewish communities of America in their decision making process. The content of these questions and points are the same as Billikopf used in his analysis some fifteen years earlier.

1. What is the effect of community chest affiliation on anti-Semitism, either existing or potential?
2. Another problem along the same lines arises from possibility of the Jewish community receiving more from the chest than Jewish contributors give to it(Billikopf questioned the converse.)
3. A third problem relates to the effect which community chest affiliation has on Jewish leadership.
4. A similar problem, what is the influence upon Jewish contributors. How will the Jewish standards influence the non- Jewish standards?
5. How will being involved in community chest effect the growth of Jewish agencies?
6. Does community chest support of Jewish agencies not tend to weaken Jewish interest in and identification with the Jewish agencies problems?²⁹³

The trend of the Community Chest was growing and it was part and parcel of the drive to be part of the American scene. It represented a pull in the community toward being more American, more accepted. The expectation from this group of their federation leader was for this leader to show the non-Jewish community how good the Jews were, how involved and necessary they were to the

community. As the federation leader, Billikopf was to be a shining example of the committed social action oriented Jew. On the the other hand there was a pull which was reflected by a group who saw the role of their federation director to be the sole representative for Jewish interests, to be the facilitator of Jewish causes and the social engineer who could resolve particular problems among Jews who were in need of relief; to be the builder of Jewish identity in and among Jews.

These two almost diametrically opposed expectations were growing, each pulling at Billikopf. Organizationally the pull towards Community Chest eventually won out, not only in Philadelphia but in many cities across the nation. By 1938, according to Karpf, 140 cities had Community Chests and 83 of these, almost 60%, included Jewish Agencies. Out of 80 cities having the two organizations, Community Chest and Jewish Federation, 52 or 65% of the federations were in the chest.²⁹⁴ In 1923 Philadelphia made that move as well and in it the federation became part of the Community Chest. Thus, from that time forth, Billikopf became a strong part of that organization and a greater amount of his time as well was devoted to concerns of the general community. Billikopf had plenty of experience in this work from his years as a vital voice in shaping the policies of the Kansas City Board of Public Welfare. Soon Billikopf was writing on every subject that was of interest to the general community. He wrote on the housing situation in Philadelphia. Billikopf had delivered a paper on this subject in 1920, shortly after his arrival in Philadelphia. His study was called "Every Child in Philadelphia : Where he Lives and What he Lives On; " this was

prepared for the All Philadelphia Conference of Social Work held in March of 1920.²⁹⁵ After the increased emphases of being involved in the secular community, Billikopf made sure this important study was reprinted and distributed. He did this through his connections with the *Survey Graphic*, a periodical for which he had often raised funds and on whose board he had served. Billikopf also took on the task of seeking better conditions for those Philadelphians who had housing, but who, in Billikopf's eyes were being treated unfairly. He raised quite a few eyebrows with his June 24, 1923 article "Twenty City Miles are Without Sewers," which appeared in the *Public Ledger* of Philadelphia. Billikopf points out in his article that millions are spent in the name of relief for the poor and the needy, however that is useless unless there is an attempt to better the conditions under which they live. He writes the following:

Annually millions of dollars are spent in Philadelphia by philanthropic organizations and public welfare groups for the amelioration of the condition of the sick and the needy, for elevating the moral tone of those who have been spiritually vanquished in the struggle against poverty. Philadelphia has earned an enviable reputation throughout the land as a public spirited city because of its efforts to ameliorate the condition of the poor, the fallen, the handicapped.

Notwithstanding the vast sum it expends every year for a multitude of philanthropic and cultural enterprises, Philadelphia fails to deal adequately with the immediate environment of those whom it seeks to help to better living, both physically and spiritually. It does not pay attention to the housing conditions and thus makes more difficult, more costly its philanthropic efforts.²⁹⁶

Billikopf was comfortable with this role as the spokesperson for the causes of

social justice in the community of Philadelphia. However the merger into the Community Chest may have created an immediate need for increased involvement in general community concerns, but it did not lessen nor alleviate Billikopf's concern for the specifically Jewish needs nor did such a merger solve any of the problems between these two groups who had different visions of the Jewish Community, its functions and values.

Billikopf managed to keep both groups happy because he was capable of meeting both of their divergent needs. He vacillated between the concerns of the general community and being the active voice for Jewish concerns.

The above activities were just part of the numerous issues that Billikopf was involved in during his time in Philadelphia. His activities helping to fortify Jewish causes continued, for his commitment to Jewish causes and concerns had not disappeared. Billikopf was, however, increasingly more visible in the general causes, and simultaneously highly active in insuring that Jewish concerns were looked after. First Billikopf was always active in the role of Jewish educator and in the years 1923 when it became evident that the Joint Distribution Committee was going to hold its supposedly last national campaign, Billikopf proposed that the machinery that he had developed for relief work be used to raise money for Jewish needs in America. He wrote his important article: "Mobilize American Jewish Forces for American Jewish Purposes," which appeared in the *The Jewish Advocate* on Friday, September 21, 1923. Billikopf

made the following claims: It would be a waste to take this machinery that reaches into over 1200 communities and let it lie dormant. Billikopf wanted to keep up the campaigns to raise necessary funds for American Jewish purposes. The effort had already been made to break down the barriers between the different groups of Jews. He believed that American Jews had been taught how to give and that it was good for them. He also believed that it was therapeutic to give. (See quotes above 246-249 from "Tresure Chest of American Jewry). He believed that American Jews needed some cause to unite them into action, a higher purpose which would make it an imperative to be involved Jewishly. He saw a potential in putting American Jewry on her feet by strengthening American Jewish institutions. He claims the folowing in his article: "But the main point is that we must have something to do which will lift us out of ourselves and sustain our interest in the great Jewish problems, especially now that relief campaigns are over....we need to remobilize for purposes of obtaining support for National Jewish Philanthropies, educational and religious institutions and agencies."²⁹⁷

Billikopf fortified his argument for such a move with these points. First he claimed that he was not advocating that American Jewish causes be in competition with Palestine, which was also seeking to raise funds. He said that Palestine had Keren Hayesod and American Jewry had no central organization which could raise the funds it needs. Next he pointed out the "need". He claims that " the combined budgets of: the Hebrew Union College, the Jewish Theological Seminary, the Institute of Jewish Religion, the Isaac Elchanon Yeshiba, the

Chautauqua Society, the Menorah Society, the Jewish Publication Society, the Baltimore Hebrew College, the Boston Teacher Training School, Gratz College, the Jewish Historical Society, the Religious Work of the National Council of Jewish Women, the Temple Sisterhoods, The Bureau of Jewish Education, the Young Judaea, Bureau of Jewish Social Research, and the Americanization work of the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society is about \$1,000,000.²⁹⁸ He in addition pointed out that according to a recent study done by the Bureau of Jewish Social Research, anywhere from 28% to 45% of their monies were spent to raise money.²⁹⁹ Billikopf had a plan that would allow the funds to be administered by representatives of all institutions, in which all shades of opinion would be represented. He also stressed that the autonomy of each of the institutions must be preserved. The point was made by Billikopf that we need to turn to look at our needs and we must do whatever necessary to make American Jewry strong.³⁰⁰ He closes with this powerful statement which indeed shows Billikopf's continued concern for the "Jewish" element of American life.

What should concern us is that in every city only a small fraction of our boys and girls are getting a Jewish education of any sort; That everyone of our institutions of higher learning is in a precarious condition; that whereas the 500,000 Jews of Germany adequately maintained prior to the war several seminaries and Rabbinical schools, we the 3,500,000 Jews of America, permit the leading theological schools we have continually to face bankruptcy!³⁰¹

This type of position of Billikopf should provide adequate evidence of his commitment to the Jewishness of our people in America. Billikopf showed this

concern in other ways in his activities while he was in Philadelphia.

Billikopf knew well that it was not only imperative that Jews maintain their Jewish institutions to protect the future of Judaism but he as well knew that there had to be committed Jews in responsible positions who could and would look after Jewish interests. Billikopf was aware that for the Jews to be safe and strong they had to have a powerful lobby. That meant they had to have concerned Jews in powerful and influential positions. Billikopf himself was a political advocate for the Jews. Such activity started early for Billikopf; it dates back to 1915-1916 when he worked on behalf of Louis Brandeis. Billikopf was part of a furious telegram campaign in Kansas City sending out requests for people to write to government officials and President Wilson himself in support of Brandeis' nomination. His work with Mott for the united campaign was also done in the spirit of keeping the image of the Jew visible, as well as being able to exercise a political lobby. No effort was more persuasive than the efforts on behalf of Herbert Lehman in his various campaigns. Billikopf knew Lehman from his work in 1917 for the AJRC. Billikopf worked with a small circle of Jewish leaders of which Lehman was an integral part. Billikopf was very close to Lehman because Lehman had been the chairperson of the Committee for Reconstruction. Billikopf was an intimate friend and was always involved in the Lehman campaigns. He either raised funds or served as an advisor.

The reality of being so close to Lehman was both an advantage and

disadvantage. Billikopf used his personality to float between diverse groups and was accepted with so many different factions. He floated between Zionist and Non-Zionist, Democrat and Republican, between Russian Jew and German Jew. He was at times put in an awkward position because of his access to these powerful people and the consequent political power that came along.

This political access and power was at once a disadvantage and an advantage to Billikopf. Though he was able to achieve certain goals because of his leverage, he was also called upon to do certain difficult tasks. At times he was asked to be essentially a "go-between" between disputing parties. His personality, as mentioned before, enabled him to help span differences, between individuals as well as between communities. As well, Billikopf knew that if he did not comply with the demands upon him, some of his power would be threatened.

Once such instance was the case of Judge Mack's disapproval of Herbert Lehman's aspirations to become governor of New York. Apparently, Lehman wanted to seek the Governorship of New York in 1928. However, Judge Mack felt that politically, it would be disastrous to nominate a Jew for that office at that time. However because of his own position of a judge, he did not want to express this opinion publicly and taint himself with political involvement. Hence, he sought the help of Jacob Billikopf, expressed in the following letter:

I had a long talk with Walter Lippman yesterday ...Lippmann is absolutely clear that it would be a most terrible mistake to nominate any Jew for Governor this year...Lippmann felt

very strongly that Lehman and the other Jewish candidates ought to be urged by those who have Jewish interests deep at heart to take themselves out of the Governorship race without question, but on the other hand, he felt equally strongly that it would be highly desirable for the party to nominate, and for Lehman to accept, the Lieutenant Governorship.

Inasmuch as I do not want to be put in the position, solely because of my judicial position, of seeming even to be engaged in political work, especially in local New York State political work, I think it would be better for you to report all this to Herbert Lehman than for me to do so.³⁰²

Billikopf, one with "Jewish interests deep at heart," was, in Mack's mind, the man to go to Lehman. Billikopf did this, fulfilling this role as go-between. Yet Billikopf also worked, in a sense, in Lehman's behalf; the style in which he did this is characteristic of the way in which Billikopf attempted to use his power. As well as being a go-between at times, Billikopf also attempted to influence certain situations from "behind the scenes," feeling that he might be more successful from this more subtle, less public, perspective.

One such situation was the Harvard controversy of 1922. It was rumored that the president of Harvard, A. Lawrence Lowell, had instituted restrictions on the admission of Jewish students. Billikopf feared that this would not only harm those attempting admission at Harvard, but that it would set a trend of anti-semitism at universities throughout the country. Billikopf took action in his characteristic manner to defend the Jewish students and their right to attend Harvard. He came up with the idea of doing a study cataloguing the success rates of Jewish graduates from Harvard University. He approached his friend Maurice Hexter, to

assist him in this project. In a letter describing the undertaking, he writes:

The thought in mind is that if some sort of "case-analysis" could be made of about 100 or 150 Jewish young men who matriculated say during the period of 1910-1915 (whether they stayed one year or a full term) and it could be demonstrated that they have "made good" in the finer sense of that much abused phrase, it would be a very useful bit of work.

I feel that since you are yourself a Harvard graduate you could handle such a "case-analysis" which I believe would reveal facts strongly contradicting recent assertions concerning the undesirability of Jewish students. Of course this would have to be done very quietly and its public use would depend upon the results obtained. I would cheerfully underwrite the cost of such a survey and extend further personal cooperation as may be necessary. ³⁰³

Billikopf was once again the advocate for the Jews. One of the reasons for his special vehemence in this situation was the climate of the times in the country. Billikopf wanted to defend the name of Russian immigrants. He specifically told Hexter, in reference to the study: "By the way, we will want to know how many of those concerning whom you will make inquiry were born in Russia or of Russian Jewish parentage."³⁰⁴

The climate of the times was such that a good defense of Jewish immigrants was especially important. There was much anti-immigrant, anti-Russian feeling, which had been mounting in the country due to the war. The historical basis of this had its roots in the sedition act of 1918. This act made it a felony to interfere in the war effort, to insult the government, the constitution or the armed forces. It made it illegal to "by word or act favor the cause of the German Empire or its allies in the

present war, or by word or act to oppose the cause of the United States."³⁰⁵

Obviously, foreign nationals were under suspicion for this type of "crime," and Jewish immigrants were no exception.

In the same atmosphere, a man by the name of Mitchell Palmer entered into President Wilson's cabinet as Attorney General of the United States. His administration became known as that of the famous "Palmer Raids," in which mass arrests of political and labor agitators were made. People suspected of being "subversives" and "alien radicals" were often deported. Through the early 1920's, this type of action and sentiment continued to run its course in the political and social channels of the country.³⁰⁶ This had its obvious effects on Russian Jews, disadvantaged by both nationality and religion.

Billikopf realized that in this atmosphere he had to speak out strongly and publicly for certain things. One of these was the Reed Act of 1924, an act proposing the restriction of immigration. Billikopf came before a Senatorial committee to protest the proposed plan, which was to substitute for the Johnson bill. His speech took place on March 21, 1924.

Billikopf first defended the claims that immigrants were necessarily radicals by discussing his Galveston experience.

Out of that entire group we failed to find a single one who remained an extreme radical...the moral is obvious. The moment the immigrant enters our night schools and acquires the rudiments of the English language; the moment he acquires a little competence; the moment he

sends his children to school; the moment his boy goes to the high school or university, which privileges were denied him and his children in his own country; the moment he pays a small amount of money, be it only \$50 or \$100 , as a part payment on a little house---that moment all his radicalism evaporates and he becomes a full-fledged and law-abiding member of the community...If "Americanism" involves birth in this country, or ability to speak the English language without the trace of an accent, which I am sorry to say I cannot do, then I am afraid that many of us never will become Americans; but, if Americanism implies the spiritual adjustment to everything that is finest and everything that is precious in our American life, then I would say that the immigrant in the main does become a good American; that the immigrant has made a notable contribution to our civilization.³⁰⁷

Billikopf begins to mention here his own identification with the immigrants, as an advocate and as an immigrant himself. This perhaps was strategic on his part, to put himself as an example of a good Jewish American. As well, it demonstrates his own obvious pride in the Russian immigrants and his personal investment in the position of Jewish immigrants in America. He continues, giving some of his own biography:

Let me illustrate. My mother is an aged person. She cannot speak a word of the English language. Unfortunately she came here at an age when the acquisition of a new language was very difficult. She is un-American in that she does not conform to the latest style of dress. She is un-American in that her table manners are not perfect. But spiritually she is intensely American, because she has slaved all her life to give several of her children a collegiate education; because she has striven to make of them useful men and women. Only recently I received a letter from her pleading with me to pursue the non-lucrative work in which I am engaged, a work in the interest of those less fortunate than ourselves--the work of social service---and that I should not confine my efforts to any particular group or nationality. And there are tens of thousands like my mother in this country.

I have a brother nearly 55 years of age whom I have not seen for about twenty years. I thought he was killed during the massacres in Russia. He came to this country four months ago, arriving at Ellis Island. Having suffered untold agonies, he was uncouth looking; his exterior was against him. Judging him by his externals you would naturally suppose that he was not the kind of a man to become Americanized...In the last four months my brother has acquired the English language with such rapidity that I beg of you to read a letter which I am prepared to send you, a fifteen-page letter, written in exquisite English and in which he gives his analysis and reaction to things American. I challenge any one, be he a Phi Beta Kappa of Harvard or Princeton, to express himself as freely and soulfully as my brother did regarding things American. In his letter my brother quoted from the writings of Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt in his appreciation of what America means to him. And I beg you to accept my assurance that there are tens of thousands of such immigrants, who by the alchemy of freedom and opportunity which they found in this country, have become useful and productive citizens of this great and glorious republic.³⁰⁸

In Billikopf's description of his brother a few important points are demonstrated.

The first is that as his brother could not be judged by externals, neither could the immigrant in general. The immigrant deserved to be judged on his Americanism not by his accent or stature, but rather by his attitude and love for America.

Secondly, as he did in telling his mother's story, Billikopf tells his brother's story only as an example of the "tens of thousands" just like him. In this way, he bolsters his cause. As well, he tells a story of one of those others who have become "useful and productive citizens." He tells of a speech he made for the purpose of raising funds for foreign relief.

When I concluded my appeal in behalf of the anaemic, underfed children in the Ukraine and elsewhere, Mr. Junkman, in broken English, but in a voice full of emotion,

got up and made this statement: 'I came to the United States about fifteen years ago. I am the father of seven children. My oldest child was a boy. When the war broke out, I said to him, 'My son, I want you to enlist and fight for the United States. This country has been wondrous to us.' And he did enlist. He gave up his life on the battlefields of Flanders.

This morning I received from Washington a check for \$250, which is the first payment towards the insurance which was carried on my son's life. I am not going to keep this money'--and by the way, Senator Reed, this will appeal to you as one who is deeply interested in the bonus bill---'I will not keep this \$250. Nothing in the world can compensate me for the loss of my son. I will give it to you to give to others who are less fortunate than myself. Nor do I propose to keep a single penny of the additional money that will come to me.' I wonder whether this immigrant, who looked as though he might need financial aid, is a menace to America.³⁰⁹

In his speech, Billikopf as well refuted claims about the Yiddish newspaperers, denying any Communist leanings in the writings. He was ready to speak in behalf of individuals, the community, and even his own family. In his dedication and personal commitment, Billikopf took a public and possibly unpopular stance. His personality gave him the dedication and the tenacity, and his position gave him the access to the proper channels. In this way, he was able to be such a strong advocate of Jewish concerns.

Billikopf's affection for the Russian immigrants did show an underlying affinity as well for his native country. He fought to convince the political world that Russia was not becoming Communist. Though historically he was incorrect, at the time this was still a demonstration of his willingness to take a public stance on

something he valued. He spoke before the Philadelphia Foreign Policy Association on January 8, 1927. His speech was on the subject of "Impressions of Russia." This speech was reprinted in the annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. This was a debate with Pitirin Sorokin, banished former secretary of Kerensky. In an article reporting on the event:

Sorokin listened with growing impatience while Mr. Billikopf told of his observations during a visit to Russia last summer. Mr. Billikopf said nine-tenths of the people of Russia are better off than they were before the Bolshevik revolution. He said the whole trend in Russia today is away from communism and toward a modified brand of capitalism.

He said transportation is almost back to par, "industrial development is proceeding with extraordinary rapidity" and the Russians are "anxious to get their house in order and introduce American industrial efficiency."³¹⁰

Sorokin of course, vehemently disagreed with Billikopf's statements about the conditions of the masses and the government in Russia.

Another newspaper account of the debate makes another point clear, that Billikopf's motivations for speaking on this were not only political, but grew from his own deep connection to his heritage.

Sorokin took exception to the statements made by the first speaker, Jacob Billikopf, well-known leader of philanthropic causes and at present head of the Jewish welfare campaign. Mr. Billikopf, with Stanley Folz, a local attorney, spent a short time in Russia recently, but his information was not based on that little trip. He is a born Russian.

The picture Mr. Billikopf gave of Russia would lead anyone to believe that conditions are much improved there, and that fact that the soil of Russia has been unlocked out of the hands of a grasping royalty and nobility, giving nourishment

to 30,000 Jewish families, or 150,000 individuals, with urban traditions of centuries, but now returning to the agricultural life of their fathers in the patriarchal days of Israel, seemed to please the big audience, including prominent educators and jurists.³¹¹

Again, Sorokin disputed what Billikopf said, and as history has shown, Billikopf was wrong. But what is more important is to see what quality of his character is demonstrated by these speeches. Billikopf was willing to speak on behalf of Russia for a number of reasons. One is that at that time, American Jews had been pouring money into Russian relief for Jews there; Billikopf obviously wanted to show that this money was not being given for "un-American" causes. Secondly, it was important to show this in order to again defend Russian immigrants from the accusations of being Communists, especially in light of the social climate. Ironically, by being so strongly outspoken in his opinions, Billikopf may have hurt his image in this regard. His true feelings and attachment to Russia became evident, and though he was not at all a Communist sympathizer, his claims in defense of Bolshevism could have easily been misinterpreted. In any case, what is again seen is his willingness and ability to speak out convincingly on a matter of personal and community concern, even when his position could have been unpopular. This extended into the secular world as well, and Billikopf became involved in causes which bridged his position from the Jewish world into the secular world.

The synthesis of his work in the Jewish and secular worlds was his work as arbitrator. He became an arbitrator for the clothing industry, of which most, but not

all, of the work force was Jewish. He became here the representative of the Jewish world in the secular world, while still in a sense serving a large Jewish constituency at the same time as serving non-Jews. In a sense, he showed to the secular world the face of Jewish *zedekah*.

Billikopf was not chosen for his particular skills in labor arbitration but rather for who he was and what he represented. Billikopf was seen as the man who rose above special interests, a man with whom justice and fairness were priorities. He was seen as one who was trusted by both management and labor, trusted by Eastern European Jew as well as German Jew. The clothing industry was quite progressive in its attempt to resolve differences. It was agreed in a meeting at the Hotel McAlpine that four principles would be carried out by labor and management. One of these principles being "in a case that employers and Union should fail to agree on any dispute that came up, the question or dispute should be referred to a trial board consisting of one member from each organization and a permanent umpire to be known as an 'impartial chairman.' Two weeks were set from the date of the execution of this agreement for the selection of a chairman, and, failing in this, it was agreed that the advisory board appointed by Governor Smith should name one."³¹² During that two week period efforts were made to have Billikopf accept the position. First he was approached in Philadelphia; however he was unable to give an answer at that time. Shortly after this first attempt Billikopf wired from Knollwood, Saranac Lake N.Y. where he was the guest of his father-in-law, Louis Marshall, that he would accept the temporary

position for a few weeks of the summer. He said he would start August 8, 1924.

313 Billikopf met with the officials of the various organizations representing management and labor. For management, Julius Levey was president of the New York Clothing manufacture's Exchange (N.Y.C.M.E.). When Julius Levey could not be present C.D. Jaffee who was on the board of the N.Y.C.M.E. took over the responsibility. In addition the attorney for N.Y.C.M.E. was present at the meetings. Representing the contractor's interests was Hyman Sussman. Representing the New York Men's Clothing Association was Philip Cohen. Representing labor was President of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America Sidney Hillman. 314 At this meeting in Union Square in New York Billikopf made the following statement expressing his optimistic hopes and his goals for such work:

I feel confident that if the parties to the new clothing agreement in this market are willing to get together and sit around a table in a spirit of cooperation with a view to settling difficulties, there will be no trouble solving labor matters.

I am certain that the leaders on both sides have the highest regard for each other, and I believe that a spirit of cooperation is worth more than any amount of legal machinery for settling disputes.

I hope my service will be prophylactic rather than remedial. I believe that a Doctor should keep his patients well rather than attempt to cure them after they are ill. 315

Billikopf was indeed eminently qualified for the position. His record as social worker showed he was interested in the pursuit of social justice. Labor settlement was not enough; provisions had to be made to secure the welfare of the workers. Billikopf was committed to this work not only for the sake of social

justice but other motivations made him both committed and acceptable. As impartial chairman Billikopf was looking out for the welfare primarily of Jewish workers of Eastern European background and the interest of employers who were primarily German Jews. This situation presented no more of a perplexity than many of the other similar situations where he had been the mediator between the two groups. This in fact was more open and direct, Billikopf did not have to float between sides here, they sat at a table in front of him. Billikopf brought to labor relations constructive innovations. Billikopf's first suggestion was the implementation of unemployment insurance. Billikopf knew that the problem which workmen feared were the weeks of unemployment with no compensation. Billikopf, modeling after similar work in Chicago several months earlier, designed an unemployment insurance plan. This innovation was to create a fund for the payment of unemployment support. The fund was to be made of 1 and 1/2% wages and payroll to be paid each month.³¹⁶ The fund was to be chaired by Billikopf. The employers were to pay 1 and 1/2% of the net union labor payroll, an item that could amount to \$1,500,000 a year. ³¹⁷

Billikopf continued in his work with labor relations from 1924 till 1932 when he gave up the work in New York for similar work in Philadelphia. During his tenure he was able to aid in the implementation of many of the New Deal-like programs years ahead of their time. He was able to receive concessions from both labor and employer all without strikes or violence. In 1929 Billikopf was honored by both the Almalgamated Clothing and the New York Clothing Manufacturers'

Exchange for his five years of service. At that time Billikopf's record was remarkable. At the dinner it was reported by Boris Maruchess, labor manager for the Exchange, that in the time Mr. Billikopf had been in his position, of 5,765 cases only 440 had to be put before him for final arbitration. That meant that only 7.23 % were unresolved by his skills between the two parties.³¹⁸ This record is exemplary of this period of Billikopf's career. He was able more than any other man to reach a state of active cooperation between diverse groups. This is best expressed in an article by Louis Rich written in 1930 in honor of Billikopf's accomplishments. Rich sees Billikopf's accomplishments in a light that is significant to the student of history. He sees Billikopf as the bridge between East and West, between German and Russian Jew.

One of our self grown statesmen is credited with the assertion made some time ago that there is no bridge leading from Washington to Pinsk. By that he meant to emphasize what appeared to him the lack of understanding, to say nothing of the like-mindedness, manifest between the Jews of the West and those of the East; and he intended it as a reproach to the former. The man responsible for the dictum is by origin an Eastern European Jew himself, and is not a resident of this country. Whatever one may think of his observation, made incidentally from the vantage point of a limited ideal, there is no doubt that the observer has overlooked some prominent features of the Jewish-American terrain. One of the things he has failed to notice is that while there may be no bridge connecting Washington with Pinsk there is certainly a shuttle between, say Wilno and the West as it is represented by the nerve center of America.

It is just a shuttle as has appeared time and again to weave the threads of Jewish life into the durable fabric that it is. And this shuttle is a human one, embodied in the personality of a man of our own day. For centuries the web of fate of the Jews has been widening and spreading from

one nation to another and from one country to another to become an inseparable part of the cloth of destiny enwrapping all mankind. Here in America the Jews have achieved their utmost in becoming part and parcel of the life around them. And it is such men as the one I have in mind that have paved the way for cooperation not only among the Jews themselves, but with the rest of America, as well as with the world at large.

...Jacob Billikopf a Russian born Jew, has done his greatest work with the money of the German Jews, for the benefit mostly of Eastern Jews. He is a sort of liaison officer between the two most important wings of American Jewry. And he himself is a result of two forces working at an angle to each other: the keenness and enthusiasm of the Russian Jew and the practical wisdom and deliberateness of the German Jew. In his opinion, life in this country, the huge shifting of classes that is constantly going on and obliterating the lines of differentiation between East and West.³¹⁹

What Rich points out about Billikopf is not only true of his labor career but his entire career. Billikopf, who was brought to Philadelphia in order to span the differences between Russian and German Jew, did this and more. He was so successful that again he moved himself into national prominence by virtue of his skills. His ability to preserve the Jewish identity of his work and his community was admirable.

At the beginning of his Philadelphia career, Billikopf reorganized the community's social services and implemented many of the programs that he had created in Kansas City. His efforts to alleviate duplication of services and centralize the control of the agencies were successful. A by-product of these efforts took the form of the advances he made in creating a more cooperative working

atmosphere between the Russian and German Jews. The activity which exemplifies these efforts and illuminates his endeavor is the labor relations work. However, in all of Billikopf's activities, which were often strained by the divergent pulls of universalism or particularism, he managed to satisfy both opposing schools of thought. Both groups of individuals would feel they had been dealt with fairly and had not given up their most important values. Billikopf brought to Philadelphia, the "city of brotherly love," the practical application of this esteemed virtue, justifying the city's idealized name.

Conclusion

This work has surveyed the activities of Jacob Billikopf as reflected in his collected papers. It has shown the development of one of the finest social work careers in America. Billikopf served both Jews and non-Jews. No geography nor religious barrier could impede his persistence to resolve the problems that faced his fellow human beings. If one word were picked to describe this man's contribution to society it would have to be the "Humanizer." Jacob Billikopf was always essentially that-in his approach to life, and especially in his varied activities in the field of social service. To him statistics were not mere figures. Each figure covers a human destiny; and it is that human aspect which he concerned himself with first and which directed his judgement. This is why when looking through the files of Jacob Billikopf one will rarely if ever find a ready made statistical classification or table. In his work in Kansas City and Philadelphia and as Impartial Chairman for the Clothing Industry of New York, Billikopf compiled his own statistics. These were based as much on personal experience as on his social-economic theoretical knowledge. Billikopf, despite his scientific inclinations and trained social worker mind, hated canned classifications. This was counter to the most human of America's social worker's beliefs. His physical contact with others and with life was so great that he could not index his emotions. After many years of social work Billikopf was still capable of being moved; and that gave him the power to move others.

Billikopf believed profoundly in every cause that he took up. He did not have the skills to do otherwise. Billikopf's drive was a commitment to his truest beliefs. He took on jobs when everyone advised that they were doomed to failure. He refused to take positions which offered more money and at times more prestige. But no job could offer Billikopf any more dignity nor self respect than those jobs he took on. For each one was the realization, the acting out of a belief that was part and parcel of his being. A cause had to be in Billikopf's mind, heart, and soul. This attitude accounted for his credibility and his success as well.

His experience as a youngster of fourteen coming from his native Vilna to America stayed with him all his life. It is reflected in Billikopf's sensitivity to the needs of the immigrant. After a phenomenally rapid education in Richmond, Virginia, public schools which was followed by courses at University of Richmond, and other graduate work, Billikopf plunged into charity organizational work. The days at Richmond were very special for Billikopf and throughout his life he kept in contact with many men with whom he had initial contact during his school years, notably Emil G. Hirsch and George Fox. Billikopf received in 1928 an honorary Doctorate of Law from the University of Virginia. This meant more to Billikopf than any other honor. He had special affection for this place where he began the transition from immigrant to "Social Statesman," as he was called by Louis Rich and numerous others. The formal statement made by President Boatwright of the University of Richmond on conferring the degree of Doctor of Law on Jacob Billikopf, sums up Billikopf's character in words which though

lyrical, nevertheless give in the most succinct form all the reasons why Billikopf attained such distinction.

Jacob Billikopf, keen and sympathetic student of human relationships, friend of underprivileged men, skillful healer of economic racial maladies, builder of highways to industrial and international peace, modern Piper of Hamelin whose witching music charms eager coins from countless purses to assuage the suffering of a continent.³²⁰

The President alludes to Billikopf's rich career in Cincinnati, Milwaukee, Kansas City and Philadelphia. His social service work everywhere revealed a strong, daring, original thinking personality. He refused to be bound by tradition, or to be hampered by accepted routine. There was in him the research worker who looked for the cause, and who sees a symptom in every phenomenon. He wanted to find out things for himself, which was why he took so many trips to Russia and Germany to see the situation for himself. Although he was involved in organizational work, which could have easily allowed him to become lost in the bureaucracy, that was not part of his nature. Just as he needed to see first hand the sufferings of his people and wanted others to see them also at first hand, he became personally involved in countless individuals' lives.

Whether it was to encourage a child new to these shores to take English lessons, or to find a specific job for a needy family, Billikopf's personal interest and touch became the catalyst for social justice. For example, Billikopf wrote literally hundreds of letters to statesmen and to JDC workers in Europe in order to aid in

the emigration of specific individuals. He wrote on behalf of his own brother to Senator George Wharton Pepper. This was a plea for assistance in achieving his own brother's release from Russia.³²¹ Similarly, Billikopf was the first of the JDC executives to suggest compensation for men who fell ill while working for the JDC in Europe. His personal attachment to the individuals he served influenced not only his own work, but the concept of social justice in America. The following is an eloquent description of Billikopf by Louis Rich:

The man I refer to is Jacob Billikopf, the social statesman, the philosophical human welfare worker, the practical economist and the advocate for constitutional government in industry.

... Few individuals are identified with so many different and widely diffused activities as is Jacob Billikopf. Chemistry frequently makes use of what is known as a catalytic agent. This agent is one which assists the chemical action without itself entering into it; its mere presence brings about a desired reaction. Mr. Billikopf has been a social catalytic agent for years. He has been bringing about action between the most diverse social elements and spurring on the creation of entirely new social forces out of mutually antagonistic ingredients. The compound product, the result of interactions of seemingly incompatible principles, is often not even a conscious goal with him. It is simply the inevitable outcome of his efforts.

A social worker by training and occupation, Mr. Billikopf sees present day philanthropic work as mainly pathological in origin. It aims merely to alleviate an anomalous, i.e. diseased social condition. Whereas his vision of the work of the work should be from the very start constructive and not reconstructive or remedial; it should be an act of social self-help toward a clearly understood and universally desired common ideal. In other words instead of seeking a method of treating a disease after it has already set in, the object of social welfare work should be to prevent the very appearance of disease. Facts of social and economic life give substance to this

belief. He is thinking what is in store for the Jewish worker and other workers who are increasingly becoming the victims of technological unemployment. He is considering the fate of those who have reached a certain age and no longer accepted by employers. He has in mind our social casualties, our human scrap-heaps, our misfits.

But yet Jacob Billikopf has an implicit faith in human nature, in the power of reason and its ability to cope with any problem that may arise. It is only necessary, he thinks, to recognize the principles of rationality in social order and tolerance in human relations, to strive for the most sensible and reasonable cooperation of individuals for the good of each and the benefit of the community as a whole. ³²²

This attitude, as well as its intrinsic goodness, aided him in becoming a national figure early. In Kansas City, the state authorities entrusted him with special social research work affecting the entire population. The result was the creation and implementation of the first Mother's Aid Act. Then, he proposed the reform of municipal free-loan organizations, of state service bureaus, of a pension system for the aged, of state supervision of orphans, and of public welfare bureaus for the entire state. These efforts marked him as an expert and created a sensation throughout the country. This was to be followed by the creation of machinery for JDC by Billikopf, which still exists today in its fundraising techniques.

Yet even with all these career successes, Billikopf never lost that aspect of his personality which enabled him to see the suffering of others. He was always able to see someone's pain on an individual level, and in this manner, to reach out and aid those in need. There is a Chasidic saying which, although Billikopf himself may not have known it, he certainly lived its words:

If you want to raise a man from mud and filth, do not think it

is enough to keep standing on top and reaching down to him a helping hand.

You must go all the way down yourself, down into the mud and filth. Then take hold of him with strong hands and pull him and yourself out into the light.³²³

---Hasidic rabbi

Solomon ben Meir

ha-Levi of Karlin

This was exemplified in Billikopf's increasing involvement with the situation of his fellow Jews in Europe. In 1933 he took a trip to Germany where he learned of the plight of the Jews. He made every effort from that trip on to alert the American Jewish community to what he saw as the inevitable and horrible outcome in Germany. On October 18, 1933, he made a plea to the Executive board of the JDC. He made four main points which he felt were necessary for American Jewry if it was to alleviate the pain of their brethren in Europe. First, Billikopf suggested that the JDC establish campaigns and assured the board that the funds would not go to the German government. Secondly, he urged that America make every effort to open the doors for German refugees. Third, he pleaded that all information known about the situation in Germany should be made known to the public in order to involve non-Jews in possible fund-raising. The fourth point was that the JDC needed to send advisors to Europe and he suggested Maurice Hexter.³²⁴ Previous to his plea at the JDC, Billikopf had sent a detailed letter describing the situation in Germany to Governor Lehman, in hopes that Lehman would carry the letter to President Roosevelt. Billikopf sent hundreds of these letters to important and influential individuals across the country, in hope that these men would exercise their power and take action. October 30, 1933, Billikopf made a trip to

Washington with others to visit William Philipson, under-secretary of state. 325

Billikopf became involved in this effort and eventually was the National Co-coordinator for the Committee to Aid German Refugees. Once again, Billikopf had recognized an urgent situation and the need for action; he had motivated others to become involved, but more importantly, in characteristic style, he continued to be the one who would directly transpose need into action.

Jacob Billikopf's name is not a well known name in the annals of American history. Yet he influenced our American society. Jacob Billikopf left an indelible mark on American life. His own personal life story is really the paradigm for the era which he helped to shape in his creative way. Billikopf first transformed himself through education and hard work into a valuable asset to society. Wherever he was commissioned he created programs to aid the immigrant. Billikopf never attempted to strip the immigrant of what he brought with him to America, his values, beliefs and feelings. No, Billikopf sought rather to impress these on America. He stamped the personality of America on the immigrant and the personality of the immigrant on America in a symphonia of rich values and beliefs. Billikopf transposed these, as a conductor, from one key into another, using his judgement to enrich the sound but making sure never to lose the value of a note. This can be seen especially in his taking the most Jewish of concepts, *zedakah*, and overlaying it on the American concept of philanthropy. All of these efforts were part of his acting as the transitional agent, conciliator for the American Jew. He was the nexus between the the German Jew, the Russian Jew

and the new American Jew.

Jacob Billikopf coped with the diversity of the Jews of America. There were two conflicting pulls, one of assimilation and one of separatism. There was clearly the Jew who wanted nothing more than to be American. This Jew would shed himself of all old world customs or anything that would impede this important change. This Jew strove for universalism. However strong this pull was, another equally strong pull existed with the view that a key to survival here in America was to hold on to the traditions of our people. The particularistic view said Judaism had to be strong, and Jews had to concern themselves with their own problems. No real community, no real sense of consensus existed between the two polarities. At least three distinct views existed, the assimilationist, the separatist and the American. Jacob Billikopf supplied the impetus for a more united Jewish community that let divergent views exist in a confluence. This confluence still exists today. He gave them cause to unite; his work throughout his career made such a confluence possible. His JDC work did more to make an "American Jewry" than any single factor in American Jewish history. Jacob Billikopf gave form and richness to that concept of American Jew, both from inside the leadership of American Jewry and to the non-Jewish world which eagerly watched as this vibrant and essential part of her society developed. Billikopf made that development both Jewish and American. If a man, then, must be judged by the traces of what has been left behind, Billikopf's name must be engraved in American history as a true humanizer, a true conciliator of life.

Endnotes

¹Dictionary of American Biography. Supplement 4, (1946). "Billikopf." In following notes, this work will be identified as "DAB."

²Jacob Billikopf Papers, Box 35/10, citing Philadelphia Ledger, February 10, 1925. The Billikopf Papers are Manuscript Collection #13 in the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio. In following notes, box numbers only will be given.

³Billikopf Papers, Box 36/2, citing Richmond Times, July 10, 1928.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷(DAB).

⁸M. Hexter, N.Y., To Manly O. Hudson, Boston, January 28, 1926, Box 12/14.

⁹S. Mitchell, Richmond, To Billikopf, Phila., June, 1915, Box 20/3.

¹⁰S. Mitchell, Richmond, Virginia, To Billikopf, Phila., April 30, 1930, Box 20/30.

¹¹S. Mitchell, Richmond, Virginia, To Billikopf, Phila., July 22, 1923, Box 20/3.

¹²Billikopf Papers, Julian Mack, Box 18/3.

¹³Billikopf Papers, Box 35, citing Kansas City Star, 1915.

¹⁴Walter I. Trattner, From Poor Law To Welfare State, (N.Y. 1974), 80.

¹⁵Ibid., 81.

¹⁶Harry L. Lurie, A Heritage Affirmed, (Phila., 1961), 39.

¹⁷Dictionary of American History, vol. 5, s.v. "Social Work." In following notes, this work will be cited as "DAH."

- ¹⁸Lurie, A Heritage Affirmed, 39.
- ¹⁹*Ibid.*, 35.
- ²⁰Trattner, From Poor Law To Welfare State, 191.
- ²¹*Ibid.*, 200.
- ²²DAH, vol. 5, s.v. "Philanthropy and Benovelence."
- ²³*Ibid.*, s.v. "Social Work."
- ²⁴Lurie, A Heritage Affirmed, 36.
- ²⁵Deuteronomy 15:7-11.
- ²⁶Israel S. Chipkin, "Judaism and Social Welfare," in Louis Finkelstein (ed.) The Jews. Their History, Culture and Religion, 3rd edition, (Phila., 1960), 2:1064.
- ²⁷Herman D. Stein, "Jewish Social Work in the United States," in American Jewish Year Book, 57:6.
- ^{28a}Chipkin, The Jews. Their History, Culture and Religion, p. 2:1066.
- ^{28b}Box 36/2, citing Richmond Times, June 10, 1928.
- ²⁹Billikopf, Phila., To Harry Lang, N.Y., June 14, 1950, Box 15/3.
- ³⁰see Bernard Marinbach, Galveston: Ellis Island of the West (Albany, 1983), 3-5, 13, 15, 35, 50-51, 132, 159, 178-179, 190, 194; Maurice J. Karpf, Jewish Community Organization in United States, (N.Y., 1938), 5-9; Joseph P. Shultz (ed.) Mid-America's Promise: A Profile of Kansas City Jewry (Kansas City, 1982), 254 ff; Rose Margolis Brodsky, "Industrial Removal Office," Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, (UJE) 563-564; Harry L. Lurie, A Heritage Affirmed, (Phila., 1961), 64-65. In following notes, the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia will be cited as "UJE."
- ³¹Maurice S. Karpf, Jewish Community Organization in the United States (N.Y., 1938), 5.
- ³²Samuel Joseph, History Baron de Hirsch Fund (Phila., 1935), 204.
- ³³Marinbach, Galveston, p. 5.
- ³⁴Jacob Rader Marcus, "Background for the History of American Jewry,"

in The American Jew: A Reappraisal, ed. Oscar I. Janowsky (Phila., 1967), 9.

³⁵Boris D. Bogen, Born A Jew, (N.Y., 1930), 72-83.

³⁶Morris I. Sosland, "The Great Migration and First Federation," Nov. 29, 1966, AJA s.v. Galveston.

³⁷Frank J. Adler, Roots in a Moving Stream (Kansas City, 1972), 112.

³⁸*Ibid.*, 113.

³⁹*Ibid.*, 112.

⁴⁰Billikopf Papers, Box 35/1, citing American Israelite, Dec. 14, 1905.

⁴¹Marinbach, Galveston, 178-179.

⁴²Sosland, "The Great Migration and First Federation," 19;
Schultz, Mid-America's Promise: A Profile of Kansas City Jewry, 214.

⁴³Leo Shpall, "The Galveston Experiment," 2. AJA s.v. Galveston.

⁴⁴Jacob Billikopf, "The Galveston Movement," Box 35/1.

⁴⁵Samuel Joseph, History of Baron de Hirsch Fund (Phila., 1935), 41.

⁴⁶Marinbach, Galveston, 4, citing Schiff Papers, Box 20, Dec. 28th, 1904.

⁴⁷Billikopf, "The Galveston Movement," Box 35/1; Marinbach, Galveston, 50; Shpall, "The Galveston Experiment," 2; Cyrus Adler, Jacob Schiff His Life & Letters (Garden City, 1928), 96.

⁴⁸Adler, Jacob Schiff His Life & Letters, 98-99.

⁴⁹Marinbach, Galveston, 13-35.

⁵⁰Billikopf, "The Galveston Movement," 4-5, Box 35/1.

⁵¹Alfred Benjamin, "Annual Report Kansas City United Jewish Charities," 5-7, Box 35/1.

⁵²Billikopf, "Galveston Movement," 3-5, Box 35/1.

⁵³Anne Nathan and Henry I. Cohen, The Man Who Stayed in Texas (N.Y., 1941), 55.

- ⁵⁴Shpall, "The Galveston Experiment," 6.
- ⁵⁵Galveston Papers, in American Jewish Historical Society Collection, citing Billikopf To Bressler (N.Y.), Oct. 26, 1907.
- ⁵⁶Ibid., Bressler, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, Oct. 31, 1907.
- ⁵⁷Billikopf, "The Galveston Movement," 8, Box 35/1.
- ⁵⁸Bressler, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, April 2, 1908, Box 35/1.
- ⁵⁹Shpall, "The Galveston Experiment," 6.
- ⁶⁰Marinbach, Galveston, 13-87.
- ⁶¹Ibid., 59.
- ⁶²Ibid., 87.
- ⁶³Ibid., 62.
- ⁶⁴Ibid., 62.
- ⁶⁵Billikopf, Kansas City, To Bressler, N.Y., July 1, 1910, Box 3/12.
- ⁶⁶Marinbach, Galveston, 82.
- ⁶⁷Billikopf, Kansas City, To David Bressler, N.Y., Jan. 3, 1910, Box 3/12.
- ⁶⁸Marinbach, Galveston, 81-82.
- ⁶⁹Ibid., 81.
- ⁷⁰Ibid., 81-82.
- ⁷¹Ibid., 85.
- ⁷²Billikopf, Kansas City, To David Bressler, N.Y., July 1, 1910, Box 3/12.
- ⁷³Bressler, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, Aug., 8, 1910, Box 3/12.
- ⁷⁴Billikopf, Kansas City, To Bressler, N.Y., June 1, 1914, Box 3/12.
- ⁷⁵Bressler, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, June 4, 1914, Box 3/12.

- ⁷⁶Schultz, Mid-America's Promise: A Profile of Kansas City Jewry, 216.
- ⁷⁷Billikopf, "United Jewish Charities Report for 1918," 7-10, Box 35/1.
- ⁷⁸Ibid., 4.
- ⁷⁹Ibid., 11.
- ⁸⁰Ibid., 12,
- ⁸¹Ibid., 10.
- ⁸²Ibid., 10.
- ⁸³Ibid., 16.
- ⁸⁴Ibid., 16.
- ⁸⁵Billikopf, United Jewish Charities Report 1911, 3, Box 35/1.
- ⁸⁶Billikopf, United Jewish Charities Report 1908, 3, Box 35/1.
- ⁸⁷Ibid., 16.
- ⁸⁸Ibid., 17-18.
- ⁸⁹Shultz, Mid-America's Promise: A Profile of Kansas City Jewry, 217.
- ⁹⁰Ibid., 217, c.v.: "1908 United Jewish Charities Report"; Sosland, 17, c.v.: "1911 United Jewish Charities Report."
- ⁹¹Billikopf, "United Jewish Charities Annual Report 1908," 18-19, Box 35/1.
- ⁹²Shultz, Mid-America's Promise: Profile of Kansas City Jewry, 220.
- ⁹³Billikopf, "United Jewish Charities Annual Report 1908," 18-19.
- ⁹⁴Ibid., 20.
- ⁹⁵Ibid., 20.
- ⁹⁶Mary Lou Fenberg, History of Public Welfare Department of Kansas City (St. Louis, 1948), 117.

- ⁹⁷Billikopf, "United Jewish Charities Report 1907-8," 10, Box 35/1.
- ⁹⁸Ibid., 11.
- ⁹⁹Ibid., 12-30.
- ¹⁰⁰Sara Goldberg, Kansas City, To Kansas City STAR, Box 14/2.
- ¹⁰¹Fenberg, History of Public Welfare Department of Kansas City, 60.
- ¹⁰²Shultz, Mid-America's Promise: A Profile of Kansas City Jewry, 217.
- ¹⁰³Ibid., 216-217.
- ¹⁰⁴Fenberg, History of Public Welfare Department of Kansas City, 66.
- ¹⁰⁵Ibid., 67.
- ¹⁰⁶Billikopf, Phila., To Miss Mary Lou Fenberg, Kansas City, March 14, 1941, 3, Box 7/6; Shultz, Mid-America's Promise: A Profile of Kansas City Jewry, 256.
- ¹⁰⁷Shultz, Mid-America's Promise: A Profile of Kansas City Jewry, 218, c.v. Billikopf's 1911 United Jewish Charity Report.
- ¹⁰⁸Fenberg, History of Public Welfare Department of Kansas City, 8.
- ¹⁰⁹Billikopf, Phila., To Miss Mary Lou Fenberg, Kansas City, March 14, 1941, Box 7/6.
- ¹¹⁰Fenberg, History of Public Welfare Department of Kansas City, 8-30.
- ¹¹¹Ibid., 9.
- ¹¹²Ibid., 10.
- ¹¹³Ibid., 25.
- ¹¹⁴Alfred Benjamin, Kansas City, To Jacob Billikopf, Dec. 23, 1908, Box 2/3.
- ¹¹⁵Billikopf, Phila., To Mary Lou Fenberg, Kansas City, March 14, 1945, Box 7/6.
- ¹¹⁶Billikopf, Phila., To Mr. Campbell, Kansas City, May 17, 1945, 2-3, Box

14/2.

¹¹⁷Fenberg, History of Public Welfare Department of Kansas City,
122-132.

¹¹⁸*Ibid.*, 135.

¹¹⁹Billikopf, Phila., To Mary Lou Fenberg, Kansas City, March 14, 1945,
5, Box 7/6.

¹²⁰Billikopf, Phila., To Carl Campbell, Kansas City, 5, May 17, 1945, Box
14.2.

¹²¹Billikopf, Phila., To Martin Fellhauer, St. Louis, Aug. 30, 1940, 30, Box
14.2.

¹²²*Ibid.*, 30.

¹²³*Ibid.*, 30.

¹²⁴*Ibid.*, 30.

¹²⁵Billikopf, "Presidential Address Missouri State Conference on
Corrections and Charity," Nov. 23, 1912, 31, Box 35/1.

¹²⁶*Ibid.*, 31.

¹²⁷Billikopf, Kansas City, To Eugene Hale, Jefferson City, March 21,
1912, Box 14/2.

¹²⁸*Ibid.*

¹²⁹*Ibid.*

¹³⁰Abraham Epstein, Insecurity: A Challenge To America (N.Y., 1933),
625-627.

¹³¹*Ibid.*, 640.

¹³²*Ibid.*, 624.

¹³³*Ibid.*, 627.

¹³⁴*Ibid.*, 627.

- 135Ibid., 629.
- 136aBillikopf, Phila., To Martin Fellhauer, St. Louis, Aug. 20, 1940, Box 14/2.
- 136bShultz, Mid-America's Promise: A Profile of Kansas City Jewry, 217.
- 137Billikopf, Phila., To Cyrus Adler, Phila., May 25, 1925, Box 1/5.
- 138Billikopf, Kansas City, To Boris Bogen, Cincinnati, Dec. 30, 1912, Box 3/3.
- 139Ibid.
- 140Shultz, Mid-America's Promise: A Profile of Kansas City Jewry, 58.
- 141Dr. Rose Hill, Columbia, Mo., To Billikopf, Kansas City, Nov. 16, 1911, Joint Collections University of Missouri Western Historical Manuscript Collection - Columbia and State Historical Society of Missouri Manuscripts, Collection 2582/1054.
- 142Rolvix Harlan, Ph.D., Ottawa, Kansas, To Billikopf, Kansas City, April 28, 1913, Box 11/4.
- 143Billikopf, "The Galveston Movement," 8-10, Box 35/1.
- 144Ibid., 12.
- 145Ibid., 12.
- 146Ibid., 12-15.
- 147George Fox, "Jacob Billikopf: An Appreciation," Jewish Monitor, Ft. Worth, Texas, March 7, 1919, Box 35/3.
- 148Adler, Roots in a Moving Stream, 10.
- 149Billikopf, Kansas City, To Mayor Just, Dec. 21, 1915, Box 14/2.
- 150Ibid.
- 151Billikopf, Kansas City, To Julius Rosenwald, Chicago, Nov. 14, 1913, Box 25/14.
- 152Mary Antin, New Hampshire, To Billikopf, Kansas City, June 24, 1915, Box 1/2.

- 153Ibid.
- 154Lee Kohns, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, March 15, 1913, Box 14/15.
- 155Rabbi Leon Harrison, St. Louis, To Billikopf, Nov. 30, 1914, Box 1/1.
- 156Dr. Emil G. Hirsch, Chicago, To Billikopf, Nov. 16, 1914, Box 12/4.
- 157Bressler, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, July 1, 1915, Box 3/12.
- 158Bressler, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, July 6, 1915, Box 3/12.
- 159Julius Rosenwald, Chicago, To Billikopf, Kansas City, Dec. 3, 1913, Box 25/4.
- 160Ibid.
- 161Marinbach, Galveston. 148.
- 162Bressler, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, July 1, 1915, Box 3/12.
- 163Julius Rosenwald, Chicago, To Billikopf, Kansas City, Dec. 9, 1914, Box 25/4.
- 164Billikopf, Kansas City, To Bressler, N.Y., Jan. 30, 1915, Box 3/12.
- 165Augusta Rosenwald, Chicago, To Billikopf, March 6, 1915, Box 25/4.
- 166Julius Rosenwald, Chicago, To Billikopf, Kansas City, April 23, 1915, Box 25/4.
- 167Billikopf, "Jacob Billikopf: Grand Lodge B'Nai Brith Independent Order," July 1, 1915, Box 3/12.
- 168Bressler, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, July 1, 1915, Box 3/12.
- 169Marcus, "Background for History of American Jewry," in The American Jew: a Reappraisal, ed. Oscar Janowsky, 9.
- 170Bressler, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, July 1, 1915, Box 3/12.
- 171Bressler, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, July 6, 1915, Box 3/12.
- 172Jacob Schiff, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, July 13, 1915, Box 26/8.

¹⁷³Billikopf, Kansas City, To Alfred Benjamin, Kansas City, Feb. 8, 1916, Box 2/3.

¹⁷⁴Julius Rosenwald, Chicago, To Billikopf, Feb. 15, 1916, Box 25/4.

¹⁷⁵Aaron Cohen, Pittsburgh, To Billikopf, Kansas City, March 31, 1916, Box 4/19.

¹⁷⁶Alfred Benjamin, "Presidential Report 1917, Board of Kansas City United Jewish Charities," Dec., 1917, Box 3/2.

¹⁷⁷Robert M. Seltzer, Jewish People and Jewish Thought (N.Y., 1980), 647-ff.

¹⁷⁸"The Joint Distribution Committee," UJE.

¹⁷⁹Yehuda Bauer, My Brother's Keeper. (Phila., 1974), 3-18.

¹⁸⁰"The Joint Distribution Committee," UJE.

¹⁸¹"American Jewish Relief Committee," UJE.

¹⁸²"The Joint Distribution Committee," UJE.

¹⁸³Billikopf, Kansas City, To Cyrus Sulzberger, Jan. 22, 1917, Box 35/3.

¹⁸⁴Cyrus Sulzberger, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, Jan. 22, 1917, Box 35/3.

¹⁸⁵Morris David Waldman, Nor by Power (N.Y., 1953), 454.

¹⁸⁶Morris Waldman, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, Jan. 23, 1917, Box 35/3.

¹⁸⁷Billikopf, Kansas City, To Cyrus Sulzberger, Jan. 30, 1917, Box 35/3.

¹⁸⁸Jacob Schiff, N.Y., To Cyrus Sulzberger, Feb. 5, 1917, Box 3/12.

¹⁸⁹Billikopf, Kansas City, To David Bressler, N.Y., Feb. 8, 1917, Box 3/12.

¹⁹⁰David Bressler, N.Y., To Billikopf, Kansas City, Feb. 9, 1917, Box 3/12.

¹⁹¹Billikopf, N.Y., To Alfred Benjamin, Kansas City, March 8, 1917, Box 2/3.

¹⁹²*ibid.*

- 193 Billikopf, N.Y., To Alfred Benjamin, Kansas City, Jan. 7, 1918, Box 2/3.
- 194 Billikopf, "Julius Rosenwald's Gift of a Million To War Suffers Fund," citing: Reform Advocate, Jan. 23, 1932, Box 35/3.
- 195 Billikopf, N.Y., To Alfred Benjamin, Kansas City, March 8, 1917, Box 2/3.
- 196 Robert Morris and Michael Freund, Trends and Issues in Jewish Social Welfare in the United States 1899-1952. (Phila., 1966) 141-143.
- 197 Ibid.
- 198 Billikopf, N.Y., To Henry Morgenthau, N.Y., April 29, 1938, Box 20/8.
- 199 "Testimonial Address To Jacob Billikopf," March 16, 1919, Box 35/4.
- 200 J.S. Murrow, Atoka, Oklahoma, To Herbert Lehman, N.Y., April 20, 1917, Box 35/4.
- 201 Ibid.
- 202 Morris and Freund, Trends and Issues in Jewish Social Welfare in United States 1899-1952. 141-143.
- 203 Newton Baker, War Department, To Billikopf, N.Y., Dec. 18, 1918, Box 1/13.
- 204 Billikopf, "The American Jewish Relief Committee A Resume of the Year's Work of 1918," 8-10, Box 35/3.
- 205 Ibid., 9.
- 206 Ibid., 10-12.
- 207 Lurie, A Heritage Affirmed. 39-58, 93-104, 169, 289-290.
- 208 "The Joint Distribution Committee," UJE.
- 209 Billikopf, N.Y., To Kansas City Community, Jan. 20, 1917, Box 14/2.
- 210 Billikopf, N.Y., To Albert Lewisohn, N.Y., Feb. 21, 1922, Box 15/11.
- 211 Albert Lewisohn, N.Y., To Billikopf, N.Y./Phila., 1920-1950, Box 16/9.

²¹²Billikopf, "The American Jewish Relief Committee A Resume of the Year's Work 1918," 4, Box 35/3.

²¹³Billikopf, "Facts and History about a Movement and a Personality," citing: American ORT Journal, Dec. 1935, Box 35/3.

²¹⁴Ibid., 4.

²¹⁵Ibid.

²¹⁶Ibid.

²¹⁷"1918 Honor Roll Jewish War Relief Campaign," Box 35/3.

²¹⁸Jacob Schiff, N.Y., To Billikopf, N.Y., June 1917, Box 26/8.

²¹⁹Billikopf, N.Y., To Walter H. Neubaur, Kansas City, April 28, 1922, Box 14/2.

²²⁰Billikopf, N.Y., To Boris Bogen, Moscow, May 1920, Box 3/3.

²²¹"Jewish War Relief Campaign," Baltimore Times, 1922, Box 35/3.

²²²Billikopf, Phila., To Louis Marshall, N.Y., Jan. 28, 1921, Box 19/1.

²²³Ibid.

²²⁴Ibid.

²²⁵Ibid.

²²⁶Ibid.

²²⁷Ibid.

²²⁸Boris Bogen, Moscow, To Billikopf, Phila., June 1921, Box 3/3.

²²⁹"Max David Stever," UJE.

²³⁰"Marshall Asks Stever For Proof," citing: N.Y. World, Sept. 13, 1927, Box 35/3.

²³¹Ibid.

²³²Ibid.

- 233"Max David Stever," UJE.
- 234Ibid.
- 235Ibid.
- 236Ibid.
- 237Ibid.
- 238Billikopf, "Treasure-Chest of American Jewry," Menorah Journal, Feb. 1918, Box 35/3.
- 239Billikopf, "Presidential Message: National Association of Jewish Social Workers," 6, June 3, 1917, Box 35/3.
- 240Ibid., 7.
- 241"Jews of America Give Millions To Aid Needy of Europe -- What One Man Did in Great Movement," Cleveland Plain Dealer, May 18, 1918, 1, 5, Box 35/3.
- 242Billikopf, Phila., To Robert Cuddihy, N.Y., Dec. 9, 1926, Box 5/9.
- 243Billikopf, N.Y., To Mr. Julius Levy, Baltimore, Oct. 3, 1918, Box 15/7.
- 244Ibid.
- 245Ibid.
- 246Billikopf, "Treasure-Chest of America Jewry," Menorah Journal, Feb. 1918, 30, Box 35/5.
- 247Ibid., 31.
- 248Ibid., 33.
- 249Ibid., 33-35.
- 250Billikopf, Phila., To Mary Lou Fenberg, Kansas City, March 14, 1941, Box 7/6.
- 251David A. Brown, Detroit, To Jacob Schiff, N.Y., Dec. 14, 1918, Box 3/16.
- 252Ibid., 3.

- 253 Ibid., 2.
- 254 "Testimonial Addresses To Jacob Billikopf," March 16, 1919, Box 35/4.
- 255 Ibid., 1.
- 256 "A Fine Gift," New York Times, March 28, 1919, Box 35/5.
- 257 "Testimonial Addresses to Jacob Billikopf," March 16, 1919, Box 35/4.
- 258 Ibid.
- 259 Ira Robinson, Cyrus Adler Selected Letters (Phila., 1985), Vol. I, 372.
- 260 Philip Rosen, "German Jew Vs. Russian Jew in Philadelphia Philanthropy," in Jewish Life in Philadelphia 1830-1940, ed. Murray Friedman (Phila., 1983), 198-212.
- 261 Louis Wolf, Phila., To Billikopf, Kansas City, Sept. 15, 1919, Box 23/10.
- 262 L.G. Mohr, Kansas, To Billikopf, February 5, 1919, Box 35/3.
- 263 Billikopf, Kansas City, To Louis Wolf, Phila., Sept. 23, 1919, Box 23/10.
- 264 Louis Wolf, Phila., To Billikopf, Kansas City, Sept. 29, 1919, Box 23/10.
- 265 Louis Marshall, N.Y., To Billikopf, Phila., June 11, 1921, Box 19/1.
- 266 Louis Marshall, Knollwood, To Billikopf, Phila., 1918, Box 19/1.
- 267 "What New York Thinks of Jacob Billikopf," New York Times, March 20, 1919, Box 35/1.
- 268 Louis Marshall, N.Y., To Ruth Marshall, Phila., 1919-1929, Box 1/14.
- 269 Rabbi Joseph Krauskopf, Phila., To Billikopf, Phila., Nov. 20, 1922, Box 14/19.
- 270 Billikopf, Phila., To Rabbi Krauskopf, Phila., Nov. 21, 1922, Box 14/19.
- 271 Billikopf, Papers, Box 14/19, citing Jewish World, vol. X - No. 3738, Sept. 30, 1923.

- 272Friedman, Jewish Life in Philadelphia. 1830-1940, 204.
- 273Cyrus Adler, Phila., To Billikopf, Phila., Oct. 13, 1923, Box 1/5.
- 274Billikopf, Phila., To Cyrus Adler, Phila., Oct. 18, 1922, Box 1/5.
- 275Cyrus Adler, Phila., To Billikopf, Phila., Oct. 13, 1923, Box 1/5.
- 276Ibid.
- 277Billikopf, Phila., To Cyrus Adler, Phila., Oct. 18, 1923, Box 1/5.
- 278Billikopf, "What Mr. Billikopf Said at the Federation Meeting," Sept. 1921, Box 23/10.
- 279Ibid., 1.
- 280Ibid., 3.
- 281Ibid., 3.
- 282Ibid., 4.
- 283Ibid.
- 284Ibid.
- 285Ibid.
- 286Ibid.
- 287Ibid.
- 288Ibid.
- 289Billikopf, Phila., To Rabbi Solomon Foster, Newark, N.J., Nov. 21, 1922, Box 7/17.
- 290Billikopf, "Preliminary Memorandum Concerning Inclusion of Jewish Federation in Community Chest," Feb. 8, 1921, Box 11/10.
- 291Ibid.
- 292Maurice Hexter, Boston, To Billikopf, Phila., March 17, 1922, Box 11/10.

- 293 Karpf, Jewish Community Organization in United States, 108-116.
- 294 Ibid., 126.
- 295 Billikopf, "Every Child in Philadelphia: Where He Lives and What He Lives On," Survey Graphic, April 1925, Box 35/10.
- 296 Billikopf, "Twenty City Miles are Without Sewers," Philadelphia Public Ledger, June 24, 1923, Box 35/7.
- 297 Billikopf, "Mobilization of American Jewish Forces for American Jewish Purposes," The Jewish Advocate, Sept. 21, 1923.
- 298 Ibid., 12.
- 299 Ibid.
- 300 Ibid.
- 301 Ibid.
- 302 Judge Julian Mack, N.Y., To Billikopf, Phila., Aug. 27, 1928, Box 18/2.
- 303 Billikopf, Phila., To Maurice Hexter, Boston, Aug. 25, 1922, Box 11/10.
- 304 Billikopf, Phila., To Maurice Hexter, Boston, Sept. 11, 1922, Box 11/10.
- 305 Richard B. Morris, ed., Encyclopedia of American History, (1970), 331.
- 306 DAB, vol. 6, s.v. "Palmer."
- 307 "Jacob Billikopf and Judge Lewis Protest Immigration Plan," Jewish Exponent, March 21, 1924, Box 35/5.
- 308 Ibid.
- 309 Ibid.
- 310 "Kerensky's Ex-Aide 'Breaks Up' Speech," Near-print, AJAR, Jan. 9, 1927, Box 35/14.
- 311 "Soviet Rule is Damned and Praised at Meeting," Philadelphia Ledger, Jan. 9, 1927, Box 35/4.

312"Jacob Billikopf Assumes Position as Umpire of Garment Trade," Jewish World, Aug. 6, 1924, Box 36/5.

313Ibid.

314"Garment Men Plan Work Insurance," New York Times, Sept. 16, 1924, Box 36/5.

315"Billikopf Here, is Welcomed by Clothing Trade," Daily News Record, Aug. 10, 1924, Box 36/5.

316" Garment Men Plan Work Insurance," New York Times, Sept. 16, 1924, Box 36/5.

317"The Jewish Industry," Chicago Courier, July 8, 1928, Box 35/6.

318"Impartial Arbiter Gets Few Disputes, Maruchess, Shows," Daily News Record, March 23, 1928, Box 36/5.

319Louis Rich, "Billikopf Social Statesman," June 1930, Box 36/5.

320A.H. Fromenson, "Jacob Billikopf-Friend of the Underpriveleged," N.Y., June 1930, Box 7/19.

321Billikopf, Phila., To Senator George Wharton Pepper, Washington, March 21, 1926, Box 23/4.

322Louis Rich, "Billikopf Social Statesman, " June 1930, Box 36/5.

323Francine Klagsburn, ed., Voices Of Wisdom (N.Y. 1980), 331.

324"Joint Distribution Committee Minutes," October 18, 1933, Box 12/18.

325"Memorandum of Washington Trip," October 30, 1933, Box 18/3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, Cyrus. Jacob H. Schiff: His Life and Letters. New York, 1928.
- Adler, Frank J. Roots in a Moving Stream: A Centennial History of Congregation B'nai Jehudah of Kansas City. Kansas City, Missouri, 1972.
- American Jewish Yearbook. vols. 7, 12, 14, 15, 18, 30, 41. Philadelphia.
- Bauer, Yehuda. My Brother's Keeper A History of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee 1929-1939. Philadelphia, 1974.
- Billikopf, Jacob. The American Jewish Relief Committee: A Resume of the Year's Work 1918. New York, 1918.
- Billikopf, Jacob. "The Social Duty to the Unemployed," Annals American Academy of Political Science. 1931.
- Bogen, Boris D. Born A Jew. New York, 1930.
- Bogen, Boris D. Jewish Philanthropy: An Exposition of Principles and Methods of Jewish Social Services in the United States. New York, 1917.
- Burnett, Mary Clare. "Training for Social Work," Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences. 1929, vols. 13, 14.
- Cheyney, Alice S. Nature and Scope of Social Work. New York, 1926.
- Chipkin, Israel. "Judaism and Social Welfare." In The Jews: Their History, Culture and Religion, p. 1043 ff. Edited by Louis Finkelstein. New York, 1960.
- Cronbach, Abraham. "What Makes Jewish Social Work Jewish? Historical Aspects," Jewish Social Service Quarterly, Vol. VII, No. 1, September 1930, pp. 3-5.
- Devine, Edward T. Social Work. New York, 1922.
- Dillard, Irving. "Jacob Billikopf." In Dictionary of American Biography. Supplement Four 1946-1950, pg. 79. Edited by John Garraty and Edward T. James, New York, 1974.

- Duker, Abraham G. "Structure of the American Jewish Community." In The American Jew: A Composite Portrait, p. 134 ff. Edited by Oscar I. Janowsky. New York, 1942.
- Epstein, Abraham. Insecurity A Challenge to America. New York, 1933.
- Faulkner, Harold Underwood. The Quest for Social Justice 1848-1914. New York, 1931.
- Fenberg, Mary Lou. History of Public Welfare Department of Kansas City. St. Louis, 1948.
- Freund, Michael. "The Community Chest & Its Influence on the Jewish Community," Jewish Social Service Quarterly, vol. VII, No. 2, December 1930, 30-37.
- Friedman, Murray, ed. Jewish Life in Philadelphia, 1830-1940. Philadelphia, 1983.
- The Jacob Billikopf Papers (1857; 1893-1950). Manuscript Collection Number 13, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio. 38 boxes, including over 500 correspondents, numerous articles, addresses and personal items.
- Janowsky, Oscar I, ed. The American Jew: A Reappraisal. Philadelphia, 1967.
- Jewish Exponent (Philadelphia) 5 January 1951.
- Joseph, Samuel. History of the Baron de Hirsch Fund. Philadelphia, 1935.
- Kallen, Horace M. "Can Judaism Survive in the United States?," The Menorah Journal, vol. XI, April 1925, 101-113.
- Karpf, Maurice J. Jewish Community Organization in the United States. New York, 1938.
- Kellogg, Paul U. "Jacob Billikopf." Survey, February 1951, p. 51.
- Klein, Philip. "Social Work." Encyclopaedia of Social Science, 1949, vols. 13-14.
- Lurie, Harry L. A Heritage Affirmed: The Jewish Federation in America. Philadelphia, 1961.
- Marinbach, Bernard. Galveston: Ellis Island of the West. Albany, 1983.
- Morris, Richard B., ed., Encyclopedia of American History. New York, 1970.

- Morris, Robert and Freund, Michael. Trends and Issues in Jewish Social Welfare in the United States, 1899-1952. Philadelphia, 1966.
- Nathan, Annie and Cohen, Henry I. The Man Who Stayed in Texas. New York, 1941.
- New York Herald Tribune, 1 January 1951.
- New York Times, 1 January 1951, p. L 17.
- Philadelphia Bulletin, 1 January 1951.
- Philadelphia Enquirer, 1 January 1951.
- Reznikoff, Charles, ed. Louis Marshall Champion of Liberty: Selected Papers and Addresses. Philadelphia, 1957.
- Robinson, Ira, ed. Cyrus Adler Selected Letters. Philadelphia, 1985.
- Schneiderman, Harry. "Jewish War Relief Work," American Jewish Yearbook, 5678, 1917-1918, pp 194-226.
- Seltzer, Robert N. Jewish People & Jewish Thought. New York, 1980.
- Shultz, Joseph P. Mid-America's Promise: A Profile of Kansas City Jewry. Kansas, 1982.
- Slosson, Preston William. The Great Crusade and After: 1914-1918. New York, 1930.
- Stein, Herman D. "Jewish Social Work in the United States," American Jewish Yearbook, New York, 1956.
- Strong, Joseph. "Social Service," The Americana, vol. xiv.
- Susland, Morris I. "The Great Immigration & First Federation," November 29, 1966, Near-print, AJAR.
- Trattner, Walter I. From Poor Law to Welfare State. New York, 1974.
- Waldman, Morris D. Nor By Power. New York, 1953.
- Waldman, Morris D. "The Galveston Movement," Jewish Social Service Quarterly, vol. IV, No. 3, March 1928, 197-206.
- Wecter, Dixon. The Age of the Great Depression: 1929-1941. New York, 1948.

Who Was Who in America 1897-1960. vol. 3.

Who's Who in American Jewry. (1926). v. 1.

Who's Who in American Jewry. (1938-39). v. 3.

