

U

Statement by Referee of Senior Thesis

The Senior dissertation entitled:

"The Life and Works of Joseph Krauskopf"

written by Charles Annes
(name of student)

- 1) may (with revisions) be considered for publication: (☒)
cannot be considered for publication: (☐)
- 2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library: (☒)
may not be loaned by the Library: (☐)

Israel Bettan
(signature of referee)

Israel Bettan
(referee)

March 1, 1954
(date)

mic 5/10/78

THE LIFE and WORKS of JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF

by

Abiba
Charles A Annes

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
Ordination.

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
February, 1954

Referee:
Prof. Israel Bettan

ABSTRACT

The years of Joseph Krauskopf's ministry were years of great transition in American life. Darwinism had shattered the old theology and religion was struggling to find its position in contemporary life. Krauskopf immediately allied himself with the liberals and accepted in a modified form all of the implications of the evolution theory. His concept of God was the traditionally theistic one that God is the First Cause, Lord of nature and history. Thoroughly consistent in his philosophy of Judaism, Krauskopf held that prayer was aspirational in character and that immortality must be accepted, if only on psychological grounds. He was a stern critic of Orthodoxy and its authoritarian doctrines. Krauskopf declared that the mission of Israel, for which Israel must keep its identity, was to protest against the present evils of the world..... sectarianism, injustice, prejudice, irrationalism, chauvinism. Israel had a universal ethic which it must teach throughout the world in the hope that having fulfilled its task of bringing about a universal religion and a united humanity, it could identify itself with the new world. This concept influenced his position on Zionism. The place of the Jew was not in Palestine but throughout the world spreading its gospel of the brotherhood of all men and the fatherhood of one God.

Krauskopf was the sworn enemy of the laissez-faire doctrine of economics. He favored, throughout his ministry, a modified form of capitalism. He was a powerful figure in all agencies working toward the betterment of the position of man. He personally established societies for the improvement of homes, food, education, and employment for the impoverished masses in the slum areas. His great hope was to settle indigent immigrants on agricultural colonies. He established the National Farm School for the specific purpose of moving the immigrant Jew out of the city onto the farm. He was a bitter antagonist of the Spencerian-Sumner school of economics and was a leader in advocating the Ward-Rauschenbusch philosophy of governmental and religious role in society. His pro-German sympathies involved him in many lecture series decrying the immoral position of the United States in

breaking its neutrality pact with the belligerent nations. Krauskopf, though interested in society in general, felt that the individual must be improved before society could be bettered. He, therefore, devoted much of his preaching to individual morality and ethics.

He was first and foremost the protector of the rights of the Jew and was a dominant figure in the field of apologetics and polemics. He did not limit himself to the protection of the Jew but his philosophy of moral behaviour and humanitarianism involved the moral imperative in man's action toward his fellow-man.

I

INTRODUCTION: JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF AS PREACHER

Joseph Krauskopf's dedicated ministry spanned a period of almost four decades. From the year 1885 to the year 1923, his stirring voice, courageous message, and daring dream became part of the lives of thousands upon thousands of men, women, and children, Jewish and non-Jewish.

Biographical sketches and critical evaluations of Krauskopf's ministry are numerous.¹ He was known to the world as a courageous and brilliant preacher, as an untiring social worker, executive, organizer, and leader. His amazing success in everything he undertook lead to the creation of the legend of "Krauskopf luck".² But those who knew him intimately were well aware of the enormous amount of energy and work he devoted to each of his many programs.

In addition to the regular Sabbath services, Krauskopf, upon accepting the call to serve Congregation Knesseth Israel in Philadelphia, established a Sunday service. It is the Sunday Lecture Series that has been preserved. These Sunday Lectures in which Krauskopf took special pride embraced every conceivable subject. Writing primarily in the fields of religion, ethics, and social

science,³ he nevertheless preached vigorously concerning the political scene; could delight and enlighten his congregation concerning extensive journeys which he took through the Orient and the Middle-East;⁴ would, at times, analyze the novel, the play, the poem of the moment, and the great classics of all time.⁵ His was the ability to consume, digest, popularize the most intricate of subject matter and through a spectacular memory use his extensive knowledge in his preaching.

Although Krauskopf had sound knowledge of the Bible and Rabbinic literature, he seldom used either in his Sunday Lecture Series. He was aware of the fact that very few of his congregants were conversant with the Bible and therefore used the Bible rarely, and then only as illustrative material. On very rare occasion, Krauskopf would use a Biblical text and build his sermon from what the text suggested.⁶ His forte was history, and he used his extensive knowledge of history to great advantage in developing the many themes his preaching encompassed.

Had Krauskopf limited his ministry to preaching, he would stand with the immortals in the Reform rabbinate; but this man of supreme ability was also an indefatigable community worker, organizer, and executive.

"Dr. Krauskopf is the one man in the American Rabbinate who does not stop in his ministrations with the mere expression of a wish. He translates wish into will and an address into a call. His vigorous personality is as inexhaustible in persuasiveness as it is in physical strength and ingenious resourcefulness."⁷

There were few movements for the improvement of society which were not blessed with Krauskopf's energy and discretion.⁸ He was a man of vision and faith, with the constructive genius to translate his dreams into realities and the power to enlist others to carry on his constructive work.⁹

Krauskopf conceived of the synagogue as more than a house of prayer. He envisioned it as an institutional center of education and social and philanthropic activities. The synagogue itself must translate creed into deed, piety into righteousness, and spirituality into social service. In accordance with this philosophy, Krauskopf organized a society of "Knowledge-Seekers", ostensibly to study literature, history, and current topics, but in reality to draw the younger generation to the synagogue and make them feel that the temple should be part of their everyday life and thought. In 1888, he was fundamental in organizing the Jewish Publication Society of America; in 1892, he established the "Personal Interest

Society" which did excellent work in personally visiting the needy, in helping and advising them in their domestic problems, thus bringing the personal touch to social service and charitable endeavor; in 1893, he was responsible for the establishment of the Model Dwelling Association which aimed at providing decent homes for the working classes; in 1893-1894, the Model Dwelling Kitchen which provided food for those in immediate need; in 1894-1895, after visiting Russia and viewing a model farm operated near Odessa on which graduates of the Orphan Asylums were taught farming, he founded the National Farm School.¹⁰

No field of endeavor if it would better the life of man was left untouched by Krauskopf. Be it soup kitchen, personal sympathy for those finding life particularly difficult, an opportunity to relieve men and women and children from the degradation of the slum, Krauskopf was invariably the driving force leading the crusade for a better and more noble life.

Krauskopf had little use for the Rabbi who saw his congregation only on a Friday night or a Saturday morning. He could not abide the rabbi who devoted himself to his favorite studies on the grounds that scholarship was the most important function of the rabbi.

"I am far from objecting to people making of the study of Hebrew or any other language a life-occupation. I honor their labor and prize the results of their researches..... providing they keep out of the pulpit. The pulpit of today cannot use bookworms, grammarians, lexicographers, encyclopedists. It must have live men, for it has live work to do. Home and school, factory and shop, capital and labor, civic and national government, all turn to the pulpit of today for their most valuable aid. It must do the work of which all are in need and speak the language all can understand. Instead of being a closet-student, the minister must be out in the world, must mingle with people, must know their virtues and vices, their weaknesses and failings, must know the cares which beset them, the temptations that lure them, he must know from personal diagnosis the sanities and insanities of society, before he can administer the medicine that shall effect the cure.

Oh, the crimes of ministers, who shepherd themselves and suffer their flocks to stray in want of food! And oh the sin of people who belittle the ministrations of those Rabbis who, mindful of their divine calling, and obedient to its demands give it all their heart and soul and mind, all their time and all their labor, even though that often means surrender of literary ambitions, sacrificing of fond dreams of special researches along special lines!

The pulpit is no longer a sine cure, where, in return for a certain salary, the minister mumbles a few prayers a week, or repeats some inane phrases before empty benches, or performs some doctrinal or linguistic gymnastics, and then sinks back into his closet to continue, for another week, the pursuit of his favorite studies. There is today no more responsible place than the pulpit. Words of fire must be spoken there today; burning truths must there be enunciated. Its creed must be the message of deed; its deed a prophecy of the Messianic Age.

There, in the pulpit, is located the moral imperative of the Nation; there the public conscience of the people is made to stand guard. Thence must issue the living streams of domestic and social and national reform. There the powerful must be shown their duty, and the weak their privileges." 11

These are the words of a man, who despite his zeal and great work in the social field was able to write a literary gem every week for his Sunday Lecture Series and turn out books such as: The Evolution and Judaism, (1887), Society and Its Morals, (1900), A Rabbi's Impressions of the Oberammergau Passion-Play, (1901), to list only a few.

In these few paragraphs we have seen in broad lines the scope of Krauskopf's ministry. It is the purpose of this work to examine his preaching and thus see and understand his influence in the society of his time.

Notes to Chapter I

OP = Our Pulpit

1. For biographical surveys see: The American Jewish Yearbook, vol. 26, 1924-1925, pp. 420-447; Herbert D. Allman, A Unique Institution, 1935, pp. 11-15; The Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 7, 1904, pp. 570-571; The Columbia Encyclopedia, 1950, p. 1071; "Dr. Krauskopf in the American Rabbinate", OP, Series 30, Nov. 4, 1917.
2. Abraham Feldman, The American Jewish Yearbook, vol. 26, 1924-1925, p. 420.
3. See notes to: Chapters I, II, III.
4. "Egypt-Old and New", OP, vol. 28, nos. 15-27 (13 sermons), 1915, pp. 122-236; "Palestine-Old and New", OP, vol. 30, nos. 1-11, 1916-1917, pp. 85-202.
5. Joseph Krauskopf, Old Truths in New Books, 1901.
6. "The Election and After", OP, vol. 19, no. 2, Nov. 2, 1905, p. 9; "Broken Treaties", OP, vol. 28, no. 14, Feb. 7, 1915; "The Demands of the Age on the Church", OP, vol. 17, no. 1, Nov. 1, 1903; "The Simple Life", OP, vol. 18, no. 1, Nov. 6, 1904.
7. Louis Grossman, "Dr. Krauskopf in the American Rabbinate", OP, Series 30, Nov. 4, 1917.
8. Jesse Holmes, "Dr. Krauskopf in the American Rabbinate", OP, Series 30, Nov. 4, 1917.
9. Isaac Landman, "Dr. Krauskopf's Constructive Work", OP, vol. 26, no. 15, Feb. 16, 1913.

10. Horace Stern, "Dr. Krauskopf in the American Rabbinate", OP, Series 30, Nov. 4, 1917.
11. "Turn Not Back", OP, vol. 18, no. 4, Nov. 27, 1904, pp. 36-39.

II

THEOLOGY and PHILOSOPHY of JUDAISM

I

Upon entering his ministry the young Krauskopf was confronted with the explosive power of the theory of evolution, the Darwinian hypothesis which placed orthodox religion and theology in the most vulnerable position they had been in since the time of Copernicus' heliocentric theory.

The most important specific consequence of Darwinism was that it collided with the theory of special creation which not only was explicitly taught by the Bible, but also had seemed harmonious with the available biological data. Darwinism substituted a naturalistic view of man's origin and nature, holding that man is first cousin of the anthropoid apes, and that he is descended with them from a common ancestry through a process of natural evolution. This conception, to many who accepted it, not only deprived man of his distinctive dignity as a special creation of God and placed his origin and development under natural law, but also removed one of the prime evidences for the reality of a supernatural Creator possessing the intellectual and

moral qualities characteristic of man. As long as man had been viewed as the object of a special creative act and the highest product of divine power it seemed necessary to attribute to his Author all the distinctive perfections which man at his best exhibits. But when his existence became intelligible as the outcome of purely natural forces, operating according to the same biological laws as the simpler creatures that constitute his ancestry, a wise and good Creator no longer appeared needed to explain the facts.¹

There were two reactions to this revolutionary theory: that of the fundamentalists and that of the liberals. The fundamentalists found it impossible to reconcile the theory of evolution and its view of man with orthodox doctrines which were essential to their point of view. The basic irreconcilability lay in the fact that a literal interpretation of the Bible.....which for the fundamentalists constitutes the way to religious truth... could hardly fail to find in it the doctrine of the special creation of man. Furthermore, acceptance of the theory of evolution seemed to involve abandonment of the infallible revelation of divine truth found in the Bible.

The liberals, however, found it possible to reconcile religion with the theory of evolution. The liberals had become persuaded that modern scientific methods of investigation are essentially valid. Thus, the two major assumptions of the newer science.....that the world is an intelligible order and that the ultimate test of truth is detailed empirical verification.....seemed to them sound. Assuming that the major concern of scientists was not hostility to religion, but rather devotion to truth, they felt that theology was doomed if it opposed either the results or methods of science. The liberals reasoned that though certain readjustments would be necessary in accepting the theory of evolution, the facts and values that are really central in religious experience remain untouched by it and what must be surrendered never was religiously essential at all. We shall see that this is essentially the view which Krauskopf took in his approach to the problem.

Evolution was not flatly inconsistent with belief in God; for it was possible to propound a divine purpose guiding that long natural process culminating in man. It must be noted that for many thinkers, the evolutionary interpretation of religious history supplied an an-

swer to many of the distressing difficulties that the liberals had always felt in the orthodox view.

Considering the entire Bible as a revelation of the one true and eternal God, it was compelled to accept everything in it as expressing the divine Will. This led to uncomfortable if not irreconcilable descriptions of God.....on the one hand, a God of cruelty and vengeance, on the other, of love and mercy. The liberals were led, by their acceptance of the basic truths of empirical science to an investigation of the Bible. They accepted the findings of the Higher Criticism of the Bible, and of the scientific studies of Comparative Religion.²

The effect of Darwinism on religious thinking was, therefore, threefold. Firstly, the theory of organic evolution came into direct conflict with the doctrine of special creation as expressed in the first chapter of Genesis. Secondly, Darwin's hypothesis reduced the omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, personal God of the theological tradition to a remote First Cause, which set the universe in motion, then left it severely alone. Finally, Darwinism, by bolstering the general evolutionary argument, cast serious doubts on the

Scriptural accounts of creation and of miracles, on Biblical chronology, and on the position of man in the world.³

II

The founders of Reform Judaism were deeply affected by nineteenth century liberalism. Men of the caliber of Abraham Geiger, David Einhorn, and Samuel Hirsch reveal their intimate acquaintance with the thought of Hegel and Schleiermacher. They applied the rationalism of their teachers to the basic concepts of Judaism, and evolved a religious platform adapted to the intellectual climate of their day.

To be sure, more conservative points of view found expression in the Reform rabbinate, particularly under the leadership of Max Lillienthal and Isaac Mayer Wise. In the Cleveland Rabbinical Conference of 1855 they were able to exert their influence in the adoption of a thoroughly conservative position with regard to revelation. The Bible was held to be of immediate Divine origin and was to be expounded and practiced according to the Talmudic comments. Despite this opposition, the

more radical element led by David Einhorn and Samuel Hirsch succeeded in 1885 in having the extremist Pittsburgh Platform adopted. The Pittsburgh Platform was the most succinct expression of the theology of the Reform Movement ever to be published to that time, and its effect is still evident in our own day.⁴

The adoption of the Pittsburgh Platform meant recognizing truths in every religion, while holding that Judaism presented the highest conception of the God-idea as taught in the Bible and developed by the Jewish teachers, "in accordance with the moral and philosophical progress of their respective ages". The Bible was accepted as a historical record of the Jewish people and "its mission as the priest of the one God". It held that modern scientific discoveries were not antithetical to the doctrines of Judaism since the Bible reflected "the primitive ideas of its own age, at times clothing its conception of divine Providence and Justice in miraculous narratives". It meant that Reform Judaism accepted as binding only the moral laws of the Bible and maintained only such ceremony as was meaningful in modern civilization. It dispensed with dietary laws, priestly laws, and many if not most ceremonial observan-

ces. It declared once and for all that the mission of Israel was the establishment "of the kingdom of truth, justice, and peace among all men". In effect this meant that Israel was no longer considered a nation, and naturally a return to Palestine, to sacrificial worship, or any of the laws concerning the Jewish state were thereby abrogated. It put an end to speculation on separatism for it openly stated that all faiths could work together in establishing the reign of truth and righteousness among men. The soul was declared immortal; the concepts of bodily resurrection and of Hell and Paradise as abodes for punishment and reward were rejected. Finally, "in the spirit of Mosaic legislation, which strives to regulate the relation between rich and poor," they conceived it to be their duty "to participate in the great task of modern times, to solve, on the basis of justice and righteousness, the problems presented by the contrasts and evils of the present organization of society."

In the light of the development of Reform Judaism, therefore, the problem of evolution was not so difficult as it was for many of the Protestant creeds. Evolution did not preclude creation; it implied it. The purpose and design in life was not eliminated, but rather led to

a higher conception of God. Reform Jewish theology was not concerned to defend the belief in miracles based on a literal construction of Biblical passages. Quite to the contrary, the concept of evolution gave the more liberal rabbis a sound basis for defending their points of view.

III

In the winter of 1886-1887, Krauskopf delivered a series of popular lectures at his temple under the general title, Evolution and Judaism. In the preface Krauskopf explicitly states that he has the "needs and capacities of the LAYMAN always in view." The purport of the series was to "help to enlarge the LAYMAN's knowledge, thereby "linking him to a rational faith" and enabling him to "realize fully the object of religion."

The bibliography gives us an insight into Krauskopf's tremendous intellectual ability for assimilating materials, for it is a veritable "Who's Who" of the scientific and religious giants of his day. Matthew Arnold, H.W. Beecher, Charles Darwin, John Fiske, Ernest Haeckel, Thomas Huxley, Hermann Lotze, James McCosh, Moses S. Wine, Herbert Spencer, John Tyndall, Isaac Mayer

Wise, are only a few of the great minds represented in Krauskopf's search for an answer to the problem.

The first sermon dealt with the two great forces constantly at work in nature: the dynamic and the static. These two forces are also present in religion and have been operative in religion from its very beginning.

"Their power extends still farther. They rule not only Matter but also Spirit; they control not only our physical nature but also our psychical modes. We need but trace the gradual unfolding of the religious conceptions of the human race..... which is the earliest of man's intellectual strivings.....to prove their supreme sway over the spirit's domains. From the very dawn of time, when man first began to think, when he first set his intellect to work to ferret out the origin of things, to peer through the veil of mystery, to postulate an adequate theory of creation and its Creator, and of man and his destiny, to formulate beliefs and articles of creed, down to this very day, the dynamic and static forces have ever been active in the domains of religion; there have always been the progressives and retarding forces, the force pushing forward and onward, and the force keeping in check, holding on, conservative, pulling back, impeding, development. Each age has seen new beliefs and new theories and new solutions spring into life, which exercised a spell over the intellects and the hearts, broadened the conceptions of men and impelled the more impetuous and the more courageous forward and onward to still broader conceptions, and to still more startling conclusions, and each age has had, simultaneously with its progressive spirit, the checking influence of the conservative, the cautious, the circum-

spect. Each succeeding age again, witnesses a wonderful change, the dynamic force of the preceding age becomes the static force of the succeeding, while the preceding static force ceases altogether; in other words, the progressive belief of one age becomes the conservative doctrines of the next, while the conservative teaching of the preceding generation is inadequate to the spiritual wants of the next generation."

From the above quotation alone, we can see that Krauskopf had a definitely evolutionary philosophy of religion; but with one important reservation: the need was for controlled change. Our civilization would ruin itself, man would be carried swiftly back to his primitive state, were there no static force to act as a balance against the dynamic. Beginning with the premise that men differ in intellect, he insists that there be varying degrees of religious development, for religious ideas can only lead to ethical living when they are meaningful to the believer.

"Religious precepts must be vividly realized to exercise a guiding influence upon conduct. Thinkable, but unknowable and unimaginable abstractions may satisfy the religious craving of the highly intellectual, but the untutored must have creeds which they can grasp and vividly picture to themselves. And so each age, made up of the intellectual and the untutored, has exponents of the mental status of the past and of the coming age. The one is in harmony with the Religion of the Past, and the other with the Religion of the Future.

While the one is eagerly pressing forward, the other applies the static break, it prevents the forward course from being too rapid, and the gap between the two from becoming too wide, and at the same time affords those still more behind, the opportunity for reaching up. Where these two forces are equal in strength and equally active, religion is in a very healthy state. Where the one acquires supremacy over the other, religion suffers."⁶

Finally, Krauskopf asserts that "pure Judaism stands unshaken by pure Evolution."⁷ For certainly evolution can only account for gradual succession; it cannot account for Origin.

"It (evolution) is forced to confess the existence of some Power behind matter and force, which has brought them into existence and has given them their eternal properties and laws, and that Power, Judaism names the Final, Creating, Intelligent Cause, and worships as its God. Hence, there is nothing to be feared from evolution.....it comes to purify and to strengthen, for a faith based upon fairly demonstrable scientific facts will ever have greater validity than that which rests wholly upon demonstrable metaphysical abstractions."⁸

Krauskopf's acceptance of a modified evolution is clearly seen in his concept of God.

"We name his God. His place is the Universe. His essence permeates its every atom, dead or living. We have seen him under micros-

cope and through telescope and with the naked eye. We have seen Him wherever we saw law, order, reason, resign, purpose, forthought, adaptation, provision, life, thought, emotion, aspiration.....We have ~~have~~ seen him breathe into matter the possibility of progressive life, into brain the possibility of progressive thought, into heart the possibility of progressive morality, into soul the possibility of worship. He is the Knowable and the Known. He is the Lawgiver, He the Creator."⁹

Far from being antithetical, science has enabled man to know God. From a Personal, Man-Magnified, God-concept, man has passed to an Incorporeal, Unthinkable Ultimate who reveals Himself in the eternal and immutable laws of nature as the Creative Cause, an Intelligence, a Power-Supreme.¹⁰

Even in his series of lectures on Evolution and Judaism, the young Krauskopf had difficulty in presenting a consistent conception of God. At one moment in his thinking, God was a remote control, operating through the laws of nature which He had established;¹¹ at another Krauskopf states that natural law is not merely God-created; it is God.

".....this sum of Supreme Governing Power, Supreme Will, Supreme Intelligence is named by evolutionists 'Natural Law'; by theologians it is called 'God'"¹²

Krauskopf had succeeded in making religion and science agree upon one God-concept. But in the process, Krauskopf was developing not one but two concepts of God: as the creator of natural law; and as natural law itself. His inconsistency was to be even greater. For despite his insistence on scientific analysis of the existence of God, Krauskopf could not be satisfied with a God found only in nature or in natural law. Just as there is law in nature, so there is a moral law, and just as one suffers by transgressing the law of nature, so one suffers by transgressing the moral law.¹³ As God has instilled ^{into} man ~~with~~ reason to know that he must not touch fire, nor stand in the way of a bullet; so has He given man reason to know right from wrong and has given him the free will to choose between the two. Moreover, God has given man a conscience to draw him toward the right and from the wrong.¹⁴

Krauskopf's conception of God may not have been philosophically the most consistent but it was the honest searching of a brilliant and devoted mind. Caught in the dilemma of his age, Krauskopf struggled to bring the scientific method into the study of theology, to find God empirically, to quell the doubts of his liberal congregation and undoubtedly to quell his own

doubts. He found a way: God was the Origin, the Creator of the universe, yet was also a personal force in the lives of the individual man. He had not been totally depersonalized, for within man was the spark of the divine.¹⁵

In direct conjunction with his God-idea, Krauskopf faced the problem of theodicy. There is evil in the world, but it is not God-created evil. Man is responsible for all the evils that face him in his world. God has imbued man with Reason and Free Will, and it is man's constant failure to use these powers that leads to the evil present in our world. "There is not an evil in the world which man cannot control, if he would only choose so to do."¹⁶ Krauskopf had outlined in detail the scope of God's work which was, in effect, to assure that "the stars never left their course, the sun never ceased to shine, nor the rain to descend".¹⁷ The evil in the world was not of God's doing; it was man's. It was when man violated the moral laws of the universe that evil entered his life.¹⁸

"While it is true: that the existence of evil brought man to God, it is no less true: that the continued conception of God as an Evil-Dispenser, of a God, who delights in human misery, and makes use

of suffering as one of his agencies to accomplish his ends, has driven many a man from God. It was natural and even logical for primitive man to identify evil with God, when he saw and enjoyed but little good on earth. It was absurd to continue associating evil with God when the maturer mind has learned to trace some of the evils to natural and conquerable origins, had learned to recognize beneficial influences in former hostile powers, had become conscious of the abundant good that existed in this world and of the abundance more within the reach of man, had grasped the idea that the purpose of life was happiness and not misery."¹⁹

The views expressed by Krauskopf concerning his conception of God and the problem of Theodicy naturally influenced his attitude toward prayer. He could not accept the concept of prayer that turned God into a constant worker of miracles, making Him set aside the eternal and immutable laws of nature because of one's personal and special entreaty.²⁰ Krauskopf violently denounced "the substitution of prayer for medicine in cases of sickness" and deplored the use of "loud-praying preachers instead of expert doctors.....reducing man to an idle beggar instead of making him a noble striver."²¹

The prayers of form and fashion, of duty or compulsion, of charm and talisman, prescribed by custom, by society,

"the unreverential and unmeaningful and unnecessary prayers, the Political-Convention Prayer, the Exhibition Prayer", Krauskopf opposed violently.²² The concept of prayer that irritated Krauskopf more than any other was the prayer "that makes men appear before God not only with their entreaties but also with their superior knowledge which enables them to assure God: how much better they could manage this world than He does... They tell God where and what the evil is and how He shall remove it."²³

Krauskopf saw prayer as the result of man's being overawed by the grandeur of the Universe and its Creator. Grateful for the many blessing lavished upon him, contemplating their source, man could but turn to God in thanksgiving and in praise.²⁴ It was this prayer that enabled man to lead a more noble life.

"I believe in the prayer that is the resultant of the mingling of the human soul with the soul divine, that after a complete absorption in the Divinity of God, after an intelligent contemplation of His sacred attributes, returns cleansed of worldliness, laden with spirituality, conscious of shortcomings, prepared to see better, to think clearer, to live nobler."²⁵

IV

One of the most cherished concepts in Krauskopf's theology was his belief in Immortality. Being dedicated to scientific proof and empirical investigation, he had some difficulty with harmonizing the traditional belief of immortality with his own scientific point of view. Reform Judaism had rejected bodily resurrection as being a thought not central to Judaism. The Pittsburgh Platform did, however, assert the doctrine of immortality of the soul.

Krauskopf asserted that the Hereafter, Immortality, was a very difficult concept to understand, much more difficult to prove. However, "to reach a conclusion that a Hereafter is an impossibility because reason is perfectly silent is unnatural."²⁶ Though we know nothing of the hereafter or of the possibility of immortality, we are increasing our knowledge in all fields and the answer to this perplexing problem will arise sooner or later. Already, science whispers: "Matter may perish but life is immortal."²⁷ Knowledge of immortality was merely incomplete and no negative conclusions were to be drawn from this lack of information.

Krauskopf repeated time and time again that although

philosophy had not been able to furnish conclusive proof for a belief in immortality, neither had science disproved it. On the contrary, science in its probing in the realm of life and soul, was awed as it stood in front of the mystery of mysteries. From time immemorial man has dared to believe "in the deathlessness of life, in life's elevation to a higher sphere for higher work";²⁸ and the scientists far from causing doubt have strengthened this belief. There are those who doubt, but Krauskopf is not among them.

"Believe it who will, believe it who can, I will not, I cannot. God is, and he is just and being just He will not build up so magnificent a piece of work as man, endow him so admirably, breathe the highest aspirations into his soul, stamp the impress of His divine origin upon his mind, and then puff him into nothingness as children do their soap-bubbles. He will not create so marvelous, so infinite a universe as this only for the brute that cannot appreciate it nor its Maker, and for man, who the moment he catches the first faint glimpse of the all-pervading, over-awing majesty, has the light extinguished before him, never to be rekindled anymore.

I am not unmindful of the difficulties that beset this belief. I know the mystery remains the same as before. I know I have not offered ocular demonstration nor mathematical proof. I know that my arguments in favor of the Immortality-Doctrine are based on inference only, still though inference, they are reasonable, and quite assuring to me, and I trust to you."

Above all, Krauskopf found reason to advocate the belief in immortality in the basic human need for such faith.³⁰ As much as possible, he had attempted to put Immortality on a sound scientific basis; then on a philosophical basis; finally upon a psychological basis. Science had not disproven Immortality, rather it would in the future bring more and more proof to bear on the validity of our belief. Philosophy had not completely proven immortality, but by inference we could assume the validity of our belief. Psychology declared that immortality was a basic need of man providing him with hope and courage and that only "evil could come of unsettling man's hope of immortality."³¹

V.

Krauskopf was the mortal foe of orthodoxy, whether Jewish or Christian. For him, liberal Judaism was the one religion which had escaped the pitfalls which made other religions defective. It had, from its beginning, freed itself from mysticism, from authoritarianism, from unrational behaviour. Reform Judaism had discarded the Shulchan Aruch as binding and scorned Kabbalism as a work which had "metamorphosed a once living and

productive religion into a dead and barren ceremonialism."³² It viewed the Talmud as a literary production which had little application to modern life. A work which included the "most beautiful aphorisms of truth and maxims of ethics; a veritable Moral Philosophy", but also "some of the most absurd notions ever conceived by human brain."³³ Liberal Judaism had avoided dogma and creed and was concerned, as the Jewish Prophets had been, with the conduct of life in accordance with the highest ethical and moral ideals. "Liberal Judaism was not creed; it was deed".³⁴

Krauskopf contended that Liberal Judaism, being an optimistic religion, was the direct antithesis of Christianity. The Christian had his doctrines of Original Sin, Total Depravity, Vicarious Atonement, Hell and Damnation to keep him in constant dread and alarm; he fled society, domestic happiness, and worldly vocation.³⁵ Judaism had none of these doctrines. Judaism had only one central doctrine: "One Common God, one Common Good, one Common Brotherhood."³⁶

Krauskopf, the strong advocate of Reform Judaism was not loath to attack his Orthodox brethren. He referred to the advocates of Orthodoxy as reactionaries who wished to make mediaevalism, romanticism, and pseudo-

mysticism take the place of good plain common American-Jewish sense.³⁷ As in nature, so too in religion, there were two forces at play: the static, which was the restraining and conservative element, and the dynamic or progressive force. Krauskopf would not even consider orthodoxy as a static force. Orthodoxy was completely obsolete; a force attempting to push Judaism back into "a ghetto of formalism and medievalism, mysticism and romanticism."³⁸

By the year 1904, the large immigrations of East-European Jews had begun to make their presence felt by an insistence on the validity of their orthodoxy and a concomitant attack on liberal or Reform Judaism. Krauskopf was merciless in his attack.

"With little achievements of its own, in its two-hundred year history in the United States, with little else back of it than failure and desertion, neglect and apathy, it has grown suddenly arrogant, and in certain quarters, insolent, and largely because it obtained from a few well-meaning people, who are far from orthodox, large means for operating a galvanic battery that shall give American Orthodoxy a semblance of mediaeval ghetto-life. It would seize within its grasp the Jewish Publication Society, the Jewish Encyclopedia, the Jewish press, though the supporters of these are, for the most part, reformers."³⁹

Krauskopf continues by quoting Zangwill's vitriolic definition of Orthodoxy:

"Orthodoxy is inextricably entangled with ritual observance; and ceremonial religion is of the ancient world, not of the modern.....it creates hypocrites and Pharisees.....We must make broad our platform, not our phylacteries."40

In direct relation to his attack on orthodoxy, Krauskopf defended his form of Judaism, Reform Judaism, and in defending Reform Judaism, honored the founder, Isaac Mayer Wise:

"Wherever you see Judaism honored and the Jew proud of his faith and people, wherever you see Judaism made attractive and intelligent not only to Jew but to Gentile as well, wherever you see prejudice of Jew and Gentile against each other slowly passing away by reason of a better understanding and appreciation of each other.....there you see, for the most part, the work of Rev. Isaac Mayer Wise."41

True religion meant honestly living in accordance with the standards of the religion and the only religion which made this possible for the American Jew was Liberal Judaism. Liberal Judaism, said, Krauskopf, would continue its growth and development despite those reactionaries who belittled Reform Judaism and its Rabbis

because they have accomplished so much with "the aid of a language other than Hebrew, with the assistance of books, other than the Shulchan Aruch, and by means of forms and liturgies other than those in vogue^{us} in the ancient orient or in the medieval ghetto."⁴²

Krauskopf argued throughout his ministry that wherever Jews were found discarding their Judaism, it was not because of an outside attraction, but a repulsion from within. However, where Judaism was fostered in a rational form and in a liberal spirit, obedient to the modern tendency of reform and progress in all things, then the same people who would have discarded it, were found to be its most zealous advocates.⁴³

With this conception of reform and progress came an acceptance of the most radical of Biblical criticisms.⁴⁴

"As a work of human hands it (the Bible) suffers from the limitations of all that is human. To look for perfection in a collection of writings of many different minds and of many different times, that has come down to us from the hoary past, largely by oral tradition, that has suffered from mistranslation and yet more from misinterpretation, of which much is patched and pieced, much fragmentary, much prehistoric, much antedating the birth of exact knowledge and of empirical science, to expect to find perfection in a literature such as that is absurd.

It (the Bible) never intended to serve as a text-book on science. It never anticipated that its attempted solutions of problems of the universe, problems of the origin and destiny of man, problems of good and evil, problems of here and hereafter, would be accepted as axiomatic truths. It never anticipated that some of its allegorical, figurative, oriental poetry would be translated into occidental prose and accepted in a literal sense".45

Krauskopf's attitude toward ritual and ceremonial was essentially that of the most radical element in Reform Judaism. Elaborate ceremonialism was repugnant to his nature. It was not only unessential to religion, but even a hindrance. In the powerful oratory that typified Krauskopf's great pulpit ability, he said:

"Relegate your systems and theories and speculations to your lecture rooms, and your forms and ceremonies to your drawing-rooms. They have no place in the Church.....Duty, Justice and Humanity, Love, Hope and Charity, these have their legitimate place there. See you not how these contentions about baptism with water or in water, about hats on during services or hats off, about shoes and wigs on or off, about with or without communion wine or prayer-scarf, are turning men's attention away from the real import of religion, are thinning and decimating the churches and are making far too many of those that remain mere repeaters of creeds, slaves to forms, instead of performers of godly-deeds? Know ye not that thousands of forms and ceremonies, which, at one time, were

regarded indispensable, have been laid aside, and Religion, pure and simple, instead of dying has become all the more alive for their removal? See you not, how this undue emphasis upon empty and meaningless forms and ceremonies separate people, multiply factional churches and interpose insurmountable obstacles to the brotherhood of man? See you not how forms make schisms and schisms make isms? Let the people have humanity in their heart, justice in their tongue, love in their eye, charity in their hand, and they have the whole of religion; Gods, and sons of gods, saints and prophets, never had more; pietists and literalists, formalists and ceremonialists, never had as much." 46

Krauskopf's plea for more and more reform ⁴⁷ had left him with a problem. He had made religion an ethical regime but he had to find a reason for organized religion, for organized services and temple worship. He did find a reason for formal worship and ceremonial, but in a peculiar manner. His belief that men had different intellectual capacities and therefore different religious needs led him to the point of view that although cultured minds were sometimes "aroused to stammer words of praise and thanksgiving in the presence of over-awing phenomena of nature, the masses needed the consecrated places, the sacred environments, the accessories of imposing architecture, inspiring art, uplifting music, picturesque vestments, stately ceremonials." 48

Ceremonial was not in itself an evil; it was the substitution of ceremonial for religion that was the evil.⁴⁹

Krauskopf's insistence that religion must be in accordance with the lives of the people led him to institute the Sunday Service. It is not surprising to note that of all the reforms instituted by Krauskopf, this one met the greatest resistance not only from the more conservative element in Judaism, but from his fellow Reform rabbis. In the conference of 1904, when Krauskopf spoke in favor of the Sunday Service, the opposition voiced the opinion that his words had no validity because the success of his Sunday Service was due to his own oratorical powers and personal magnetism.⁵⁰ In 1911, in reviewing twenty-five years of Sunday Lectures, Krauskopf stated:

"The Sunday Service has not only strengthened our Saturday Service but it has also greatly intensified our loyalty to Judaism. It has enabled thousands, who owing to business exactions, could not attend the Saturday Service, to come here on Sunday to worship and be instructed. It has enabled non-Jews to come here and learn what the Jew is, and what Judaism stands for. It has necessitated the building of this magnificent Temple.....it has necessitated the publishing of more than a million copies of our Sunday discourses which have circulated far and wide in our country and abroad, and have brought to many a heart and mind a different concep-

tion of Jews and Judaism than they had before." ⁵¹

Among the many reforms which Krauskopf innovated and sponsored were the change of the day of confirmation to Simchath Torah, ⁵² the limitation of preaching to the English language, the shortening of the Yom-Kippur Day services, the abandonment of circumcision as a religious rite, and the reinstitution of the Seder in the home. ⁵³

In 1888, Krauskopf compiled a Service Ritual to supplement existing prayer-books with appropriate materials for his Sunday Service. It had thirty different services to avoid monotony, and was entirely ⁱⁿ English with the exception of a single Hebrew sentence in each service to give it a peculiarly Jewish note. In place of the Kaddish, Krauskopf substituted Biblical verses of a consoling nature. The prayers were largely original; the hymns of a universalistic nature, composed by the most renowned writers of the day. ⁵⁴

VI

One of the central doctrines in Krauskopf's philosophy of Judaism was the mission of Israel. He held that the mystery of the continued existence of the Jew through his long and often painful history could be explained only on the basis that "God had chosen the Jew to spread abroad his moral law. For this task, He endowed him with special intellectual and moral gifts. For it, he preserved him, despite a world in arms against him."⁵⁵

For Krauskopf the object of Judaism was the "continuous development of the highest and best within its followers, until the God-like is reached."⁵⁶ The duty of the Israelite was to mingle freely with other people, to make his moral law that of all the world, his lofty God-concept, that of every other faith and his form of worship intelligible and attractive to all peoples. The purpose of religion was not, argued Krauskopf, to separate man, but rather to link man in a common brotherhood.⁵⁷

Krauskopf's belief that the mission of Israel was to promote brotherhood by mingling freely with other peoples and rejecting all beliefs, customs and observances different from those of the people living around him greatly influenced his attitude toward Zionism.⁵⁸

Krauskopf had traveled through Russia and had seen the cruel destruction of the property of the Jews, and the wholesale slaughter of Jewish men, women and children. A solution had to be found but it was not to be found in the doctrines of Herzl or Nordau or Zangwill. Rather in the teachings of Geiger, Einhorn, and Wise would relief from oppression come. The Jew had to throw off the yoke of the Shalchan Aruch, free himself from the religious ceremonial and ritual that separated him from his fellow-man, worship as he wished in his synagogues but live and strive as other people in the outside world.

"Instead of entreating Emperor or Czar, Sultan or Pope for the opening of the land of Palestine on which both Christian and Moham- edan have sacred claims, let him plead with them for a more cordial and fraternal relationship of non-Jew toward Jew, even as he pleads with Jew for a more cordial and fraternal relationship towards non-Jew. Let him do this, and there will be no need of Zionism nor of any other ism." 59

The mission of Israel, Krauskopf preached, could not be limited to one people or one land no matter what the prevailing circumstances.

Throughout his ministry, Krauskopf ascended the pulpit to hurl vitriolic statements in the face of those religions and the proponents of those religions who claimed to have found the "true way to God". Any denomination that claimed to be the chosen of God, the sole depository of God's truth, the only soul-saving, world-redeeming doctrine; that held that all other doctrines were either false or sinful or both; that its Redeemer the only and true savior; that was pledged to go into the world and eradicate, by argument or by force, all other religions was anathema to Krauskopf.⁶⁰

The church had remained medieval. Its concern was too much with the Hereafter, with abstractions, with miracles, with worship of God, with creed, and with pulpulistic speculations, rather than with the Here, the real, with service to man, with deed, with the solving of problems within reach in relation to the needs and welfare of society.⁶¹

Krauskopf held that all religions had the same purpose and goal; were, in essence, one.

"Stripped of myth, the Old Testament becomes the history that is distinguished, the Code of Ethics that is sublime. Stripped of Myth, the New Testament becomes a history equally as distinguished and a code of

ethics equally as sublime. Both the Old and the New Testament stripped of their Myths, and the Sacred Literature of the Jews and Christians is one, one their history, one their God. Stripped of their Myths, a Jew and Christian are brethren and their religion.....the religion of Humanity."62

Krauskopf, caught in the optimistic spirit of his age, saw the eventual merging of all religions into one great religion. 63 Krauskopf's term for a co-religionist is one that was accepted by the most radical of liberals. For Krauskopf, a co-religionist was one "who had faith in God, believed in right, pursued it with all his might, no matter what his ancestry, no matter what his sectarian creed, who his mediator, how long or short his confession."64

Krauskopf's hope that in the near future all religions would merge, coupled with his deep antagonism for sectarianism, was expressed most forcefully in a sermon delivered in 1895. This sermon is Krauskopf's ultimate declaration of universalism and his ultimate attempt to guide religion, especially Judaism, in the path it must take to bring about this messianic goal. It is the sermon of a young, impressionable rabbi and we can accept its message as a purely idealistic vision. In this message we see an attempt at justifying the most radical

reforms of liberal Judaism. In effect it meant an almost complete decimation of all customs and ceremonies peculiar to Judaism. Any festival, any rite, which was distinctively associated with the national aspect of Judaism must be eliminated. Restrictions on intermarriage must be done away with for the common good:

"Furthermore, both Israelite and Christian must freely lend and take, one from the other. Each must complement the other's deficiencies, and each must accept the other's advantages. The Christian must accept and follow the religious and ethical precepts of the Old Testament, the Israelite those of the New Testament. The Christian must accept and observe the Sabbath of the Israelites; the Israelites must accept and observe the day which four-hundred millions of Christians have consecrated for its observance. The Christian must accept the Jewish mode of observing the New Year; the Israelite must accept the day set for it by our modern calendar." 65

In essence this was total capitulation to Christianity. But one must keep in mind that Krauskopf was speaking to Jews who were almost totally assimilated into the American way of life, Jews who were closer to their Christian neighbors than to their Orthodox brethren, Jews threatened by the mass immigration of East-European Jews who were flooding their cities and settling in impoverished ghettos, thus threatening the social security of

the well-established, well-integrated, Americanized Jews.

VII

Despite the inspired attempts by scholars like Fiske⁶⁶ to reconcile religion to the theory of evolution, the many difficulties involved led inevitably to the bankruptcy of theology. Although theology and theological speculations were on the decline, religion was enjoying a very prosperous era. Religion and religionists had turned their attention from theology to sociology. The new "raison d'etre" for religion was social justice. The fundamentalists concentrated on such obvious social problems as intemperance and vice; the more liberal churches raised awkward questions concerning the ultimate responsibility for the maintenance of these and other immoral institutions. So liberal religion turned its attention to the slums, political corruption, the labor question, the responsibilities of wealth, the evils of the cartel and corporation.

Liberal Judaism was not loath to follow its Christian neighbors in this social trend. Henry Berkowitz, an associate of Krauskopf spoke of "the coming religion": a

religion manifested in the removal of the emphasis from theology to sociology. The chief concern of "the coming religion will be the development of character, the ennoblement of life, the equitable adjustment of human relationships, the conquest of disease, poverty, and vice."⁶⁷

Krauskopf maintained the function of religion to be no longer the dogmatic spokesman of theological concepts; it was to be a vibrant force in the moral and ethical life of the community.⁶⁸ The need for religion was great. The founding fathers had been successful in their struggles to establish a new land because of their great reverence for religion and of their moral behaviour which followed from this faith. Washington believed, preached Krauskopf, that of all things tributary to political prosperity and to public and private happiness, religion is of the foremost importance; for without religion patriotism, honest citizenship, awe of law, regard for sacredness of the oath, justice and right, are impossibilities. The social vices, and the corruption of society in his day, argued Krauskopf, was caused by a lack of religious commitment. Unless people once again realized the importance of the church, the evils of society were bound to grow worse until human life would

be held worthless and a decent soul would not dare to walk the streets of the city.⁶⁹

"Religion has become a tabooed subject in thousands of our households. Grace at meals is not thought of; children's night prayer is ceasing.....prayerbook prayers to be offered by the minister at the bequest of betrothed or newly-wedded couples, for newly born children are never asked for.....only in time of dire illness.....then is there a recognition of God.

Even in our pulpits, the presence of God is made unwelcome. Preachers knowing of the unpopularity of religious subjects are fast replacing them by catchy, racy, spicy, sensational themes.

The consequences are plain enough. Roguery festers openly and uncontrolled on the very surface of political and commercial life. Vice has entree into the boudoirs of even our so-called best society. Divorce courts have never been so busy; penitentiaries have never been so full; insane asylums, never so crowded."⁷⁰

Krauskopf held that religion had often failed to do its duty. It had failed in France when it had not come to the defense of Zola; in Germany, by blessing the army going to China; in Russia, by not condemning the Kishe-neff massacre.....this was the failure of religion.....this and no more.⁷¹

For Krauskopf the "raison d'etre" for religion was to make men adhere to the ethical standard. This described the need society and its individuals had for religion. This the reason for faith.....happiness, peace, safety and progress. Refute religion and you invite revolutionary ideologies and the rule of power over the rule of right.⁷²

NOTES to CHAPTER II

1. Edwin Burt, Types of Religious Philosophy, pp. 301-302.
2. Ibid., pp. 308ff.
3. Joseph Blau, "An American-Jewish View of the Evolution Controversy", HUCA, 1947, vol. 29, p. 619.
4. David Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism, pp. 491-492.
5. Joseph Krauskopf, Evolution and Judaism, 1887, pp. 4-5.
6. Ibid., pp. 8-9.
7. Ibid., p. 14.
8. Ibid., pp. 14-15.
9. "Religion in the Laboratory", Jan. 26, 1890, p. 11.
10. see the following sermons: "Shifting But Not Drifting", OP, vol. 3, no. 27, May 27, 1890, p. 8; "Cans't Thou by Searching Find Out God?", OP, vol. 17, no. 4, Nov. 22, 1903, p. 29; Joseph Krauskopf, Evolution and Judaism, 1887, pp. 243-244.
11. Joseph Krauskopf, Evolution and Judaism, 1887, pp. 84-85.
12. Ibid., p. 103.
13. "God's Police", OP, vol. 35, no. 22, 1922, pp. 166-167.

14. "Finding Fault with God", OP, vol. 33, no. 7, Dec. 14, 1919, p. 55.
15. "Thus Saith the Lord", OP, vol. 33, no. 16, Feb. 15, 1920, p. 136.
16. "Finding Fault with God", OP, vol. 33, no. 7, Dec. 14, 1919, p. 57; see also: "Is God or Man Unjust", OP, vol. 17, no. 3, Nov. 15, 1903.
17. Ibid., p. 62.
18. "Thus Saith the Lord", OP, vol. 33, no. 16, Feb. 15, 1920, p. 136.
19. "Ancient and Modern Saints", OP, vol. 3, no. 26, May 20, 1890.
20. "A Child's Prayer", OP, vol. 3, no. 6, Dec. 1, 1889, p. 5.
21. Ibid., p. 6.
22. Ibid., p. 6.
23. Ibid., p. 7.
24. Ibid., p. 9.
25. "The Place of Prayer in the Service", OP, vol. 9, no. 11, Dec. 22, 1895, p. 7.
26. Joseph Krauskopf, Evolution and Judaism, 1887, p. 257.
27. Ibid. p. 262.

28. "More Beyond", OP, vol. 19, no. 22, April 1, 1906.
29. "After Death What?" , Dec. 14, 1890, p. 12.
30. "Quote the Raven, 'Nevermore'", OP, vol. 16, no. 4, Nov. 23, 1902, p. 32.
31. Ibid., p. 38.
32. "The Kabbalistic Age", Jan. 13, 1889, p. 9.
33. "The Rabbinical Age", Jan. 6, 1889, p. 7.
34. "The Prophetic Age", Dec. 23, 1888, p. 11.
35. "Purim and Lent", OP, vol. 3, no. 20, March 9, 1890, pp. 6-7.
36. "The Three Foes of Judaism", Jan. 29, 1888, p. 3.
37. "Memorial Service of I.M. Wise", OP, vol. 20, no. 20, March 24, 1907, p. 3.
38. Ibid., p. 4.
39. "Turn Not Back", OP, vol. 18, no. 3, Nov. 20, 1904, p. 28.
40. Ibid. p. 22.
41. Ibid. p. 26.
42. "Turn Not Back", OP, vol. 18, no. 4, Nov. 27, 1904, p. 37.

43. "Where in Israel has Failed", Nov. 10, 1895, pp. 7-8.
44. "If Moses Were to Attend Synagogue", OP, vol. 22, no. 13, Jan. 31, 1909, p. 80; see also: "The Mosaic Faith", Dec. 16, 1888; "Who Wrote the Pentateuch?", OP, vol. 5, no. 2, Nov. 1, 1891.
45. "Thus Saith the Lord", OP, vol. 33, no. 16, Feb. 15, 1920, p. 136.
46. "Religions Die-Religions Live", OP, vol. 7, no. 1, Oct. 1, 1893, p. 8.
47. "Westward not Eastward", Oct. 19, 1890, pp. 8-9; see also: "Fondling the Dead, Neglecting the Living", OP, vol. 21, no. 2, Nov. 10, 1907; "Chanukah Lights and the Christmas Tree", OP, vol. 13, no. 9, Dec. 10, 1899, pp. 1-2, 7, 10; "Sword in One Hand, Trowel in the Other", OP, vol. 21, no. 2, Nov. 3, 1907.
48. "Past and Present Purpose of Church", OP, vol. 6, no. 2, Oct. 30, 1892, p. 5; see also: "The Place of Prayer in the Service", OP, vol. 9, no. 11, Dec. 22, 1895, pp. 7-8.
49. "The Place of Ceremony in the Service", OP, vol. 9, no. 15, Jan. 19, 1896, pp. 2, 4, 8; "The Place of Music in the Service", OP, vol. 9, no. 14, Jan. 15, 1896, p. 7.
50. CCAR Yearbook, vol. 9, 1904, pp. 22-29.
51. "A Plea for Labor and a Plea for Rest", OP, vol. 24, no. 25, May 30, 1911, p. 192.
52. "A Change of Confirmation Day", CCAR Yearbook, vol. 23, April 16, 1912, pp. 8-9.

53. "Westward, Not Eastward, Oct. 19, 1890, pp. 8-9;
see also: "The Seder Evening", OP, vol. 18, no. 23,
April 16, 1905, p. 185.
54. Beryl Harold Levy, Reform Judaism in America, p. 10.
55. "Godless Jews and Christless Christians", OP, vol. 36,
no. 2, Nov. 20, 1922, p. 42.
56. Joseph Krauskopf, Evolution and Judaism, 1887, p. 309.
57. "If Moses Were to Attend Synagogue", OP, vol. 22,
no. 13, Jan. 31, 1909, p. 87.
58. "The Dream of the Zionist", OP, Series 30, May 29,
1917, p. 199.
59. "A Cure for Anti-Semitism", OP, vol. 18, no. 6, Dec.
11, 1904, p. 55.
60. "Are We Better than the Heathen?", OP, vol. 3, no. 9,
Dec. 22, 1889, p. 4; see also: "The Hunger for Bro-
therhood", OP, vol. 22, no. 21, March 28, 1909, p. 134.
61. "What of the Future of the Church?", OP, vol. 31,
no. 2, Nov. 11, 1917, p. 26.
62. "In the New Testament", OP, vol. 3, no. 16, Feb. 9,
1890, p. 11.
63. "Religious Believers and Irreligious Believers", OP,
vol. 3, no. 22, March 23, 1890, p. 5.
64. "When Churches Will Be at Peace", OP, Series 30,
Nov. 26, 1916, p. 28.

65. "How Israelites and Christians Might Succeed Together", OP, vol. 9, no. 9, Dec. 8, 1895, p. 7; see also: "Thy People Shall Be My People", OP, vol. 10, no. 4, Nov. 8, 1896; "Theologies Many, Religions One", OP, vol. 5, no. 1, Oct. 25, 1891.
66. Henry S. Commager, The American Mind, Chapter 4.
67. "The Coming Religion", OP, vol. 26, no. 2, Nov. 17, 1912, p. 5.
68. "Society and Its Morals", OP, vol. 13, no. 20, March 4, 1900, p. 2.
69. "Seeing Evil, I Yet Have Faith", OP, vol. 19, no. 1, Nov. 5, 1905, p. 5; see also: "Society vs. Religion", OP, vol. 19, no. 13, Jan. 28, 1906, p. 88; "Bible and Flag-Sheetanchors of our Nation", OP, vol. 29, no. 5, Dec. 12, 1915, pp. 21-26; "Does Religion Pay?", OP, vol. 18, no. 12, Jan. 29, 1905; "Some Questions in Morals", OP, vol. 18, no. 25, March 30, 1905, pp. 197, 201-202; "Wither Are We Drifting?", OP, vol. 35, no. 13, Oct. 2, 1921, p. 109; "Back to Washington", OP, vol. 35, no. 16, Feb. 19, 1922, p. 126; "When the Nation was Young", OP, vol. 35, no. 19, March 12, 1922, p. 147.
70. "Who is God, that I should hear Him?" OP, vol. 11, no. 17, Dec. 5, 1897, pp. 6-7.
71. "The Demand of the Age on the Church", OP, vol. 17, no. 1, Nov. 1, 1903.
72. see the following sermons: "The Great Hunger", OP, vol. 31, no. 14, Oct. 3, 1919; "Is the Young Man Safe?" OP, Series 30, Nov. 12, 1916; "Blessed Are They That Believe", OP, vol. 20, no. 8, Dec. 23, 1906; "Has God Forsaken Man?", OP, vol. 31, no. 6, Dec. 2, 1917; "The Choir Invisible", OP, vol. 13, no. 1, Oct. 15, 1899; "Blue Goggles", OP, vol. 36, no. 1, Nov. 13, 1922; "The Fall of the Mighty", OP, vol. 34, no. 15, Feb. 21, 1921.

III

HIS SOCIAL MESSAGE

I

Joseph Krauskopf's thirty-eight years in the active rabbinate, from 1885 to 1923 were a period of intense change in American life. A new America was being formed. Firmly established institutions, deeply cherished conceptions, an entire way of life waned and disappeared under the powerful impact of new social forces and revolutionary intellectual discoveries. An America in repose was becoming an America in transition.

"Bigger and Faster" was the new watch-word of the day. Exploitation of natural resources: forest, mineral range and farm land, by larger and larger corporations; the transfer of political and economic control from country to city; the concentration of manufacture, communication, transportation, and banking in trusts, monopolies, and cartels; the concomitant emergence of labor troubles, agricultural problems, slums, corruption in politics and business, the maldistribution of wealth involving class conflict, and the fashioning of new legal and political weapons gave the impression that America was undergoing a period of utter bewilderment and distraction rather

than a period of great prosperity. The vast display of economic, political and intellectual energy was creating as much discontent as satisfaction. This should have been an age of self-confidence for the past was reassuring and the future limitless, yet the mood of optimism, which had for so long inspired the conduct and stimulated the energies of the men of America, was succeeded by a mood of skepticism which inspired confusion and stimulated doubt.¹

During the latter half of the nineteenth century, industrialism had advanced with mighty strides in the United States. The Rockefellers, the Carnegies, the Morgans, the Vanderbilts found justification for the creation of their immense business empires in "social Darwinism." The overwhelming effect which Darwinian thought had had in science and religion found its counterpart in economics. Herbert Spencer had combined the doctrines of laissez-faire with the Darwinian conception of "survival of the fittest" and his thinking was accepted as a rationale for the operations of the industrial titans. Spencerianism condemned socialism and trade-unionism on the score that such aberrations clasped rigid fetters on the natural process of economic life. The greatest advocate of Spencerianism was William Gra-

ham Sumner, an Episcopalian rector turned sociologist. "He elevated laissez faire into a social and economic law and assigned it the same standing as the law of gravity."² Sumner proposed an entirely new moral system in which competition became a virtue and regulation a vice. Thus were all restraints on individual power and greed removed leaving society and man in the hands of evolution. It is not difficult to imagine what this doctrine of laissez-faire-survival of the fittest meant in terms of the lives of the people.

On one side of the tracks lived "society": the Vanderbilts with a home of 110 rooms, 45 baths, and a garage capable of holding 100 automobiles; the Morgans with a steam yacht capable of crossing any ocean; the Rockwells with a home for each season of the year; the Martins with their \$369,200 (roughly equivalent to one million dollars today) ball given during the grievous depression of 1897. The life of the society girl was not a strenuous one: riding, tennis, in the morning; lunch on a magnificent yacht; polo in the afternoon; dinner-parties; perhaps a ball in the evening. The wealthy found no expense too great to satisfy their "artistic" longings. Artisans were brought from China, India, and Europe, to construct special houses; servants might num-

ber fifty or sixty; and life was conducted as though the world had been created for the amusement of those who could afford it. Social climbing became the national sport if not the religious desire of the nouveaux riches.³ Admission to one of Mrs. Astor's dinner parties was more desirable than admission to Heaven and much more difficult to obtain.

On the other side of the tracks lived a people who labored over machines twelve to fourteen hours a day for three to four dollars a week. Children of twelve were required to work from five in the morning to eight in the evening with barely enough time off to gobble some miserable scrap of bread twice a day. This life went on for six days a week, in ill-lighted, ill-ventilated factories. These people did not know the meaning of recreation or education; even sunlight was a rare event in their lives. These individuals were doomed to their position in life.

The vision that there was gold around the corner, the Horatio Alger success stories, had become blurred. There was no more west to run to when labor conditions became intolerable. There was little hope of raising wages for throughout the century America had been importing

cheap labor from Europe. First the Irish, the ditch diggers, levee-builders, mill workers who would and did labor eighty-four hours a week for inadequate wages. Then as the Irish improved their condition, the Italians arrived. Then the Jews and Slavs from Eastern Europe poured into the country.

What of governmental interference? Spencer and Sumner had taken care of that. Laissez-faire, the survival of the fittest, social darwinism, "a man's business is his own, these, coupled with the power and wealth of a Morgan whose wealth was almost supporting the government, was enough to keep government interference at a very low ebb.

Between the wealthy and the poverty-stricken was a vast populace known as the middle class. These people lived comfortably, accepting the dictates of "society", admiring the tycoons on Wall Street, and scorning the working classes. These were the people who attended churches faithfully, saved their money, had fewer servants than the extremely wealthy but treated them in the same way, and were perfectly content with the status quo. This was the "backbone of America".⁴

But these "dog-eat-dog", "survival-of-the-fittest" doc-

trines which had lead to poverty, slum areas, class conflicts , and maldistribution of wealth were not to go unchallenged. Lester Frank ward led the new opposition to Social Darwinism. Laissez faire, Ward argued, was incoherent, insincere, not at all consistent with the law of man. He understood that laissez faire was a rationalization for big business. His attachment to the government made it impossible for him to accept the curious theory that a peculiar iniquity attached to governmental activities from which the comparable activities of corporations were miraculously free. Big business claimed that survival of the fittest, free competition was the natural law of life; yet the Rockafellers, the Morgans, were doing all within their power to eliminate competition and install monopoly.

Ward was one of the first advocates of social regulation. He believed that true liberty could flourish only where the state undertook: to establish equality of opportunity and of bargaining power, to insure economic security, and to lift up the general level of intelligence. This, he argued could be done only through wise legislation.

The work of Ward, the writings of Bellamy, the depression of 1897 with its traumatic effect on the middle-class thinking and security, the subsequent rise of the

Populist party, the advent of a Bryan who declared that democracy could not endure if the livelihood of the vast mass of people continued to be controlled by the moneyed element: these, and the gradual rise of a more powerful government, were the elements which were to bring further change to a changing America.

Religion was in the process of transition. Secularization was the dominant force in liberal religion. The church recognized its social duties and obligations. It began to examine the problems of labor, slums, predatory wealth, political corruption, and the power of the corporation. There arose a young Christian clergyman who was to have a decided effect on the role that religion was to play in society. Walter Rauschenbusch wrote in 1907, Christianity and the Social Crisis. This was a powerful indictment of capitalism not merely as anti-social but as anti-Christian. Rauschenbusch accused capitalism of stunting the physical growth of men and women and of corrupting social and political life. He called boldly for a revolution in economy as well as in morals. He held that no "ism" which would replace capitalism could cause more injustice, physical suffering, or heartache than the process by which capitalism had come to power. Liberal religion rallied around this social

reformer. No longer were liberals ready to wait for the Messianic Age.....they would hasten its arrival!

Rauschenbusch and his thought had been anticipated by the Reform rabbinate. In 1885, the Pittsburg Platform was drawn up. Point Eight of the declaration stated: "We deem it our duty to participate in the great task of modern times, to solve, on the basis of justice and righteousness, the problems presented by the contrasts and evils of the present organization of society." The vice-president of the conference and one of the men most responsible for the drawing up of the Pittsburg platform was Joseph Krauskopf. He was the one man in the Reform rabbinate who was to carry out this social program to its fruition. Although the prosperous professional and business men who dominated most Reform synagogues managed to keep Point Eight de-emphasized, they did not entirely succeed. As early as 1905, the central body of Reform Judaism had an influential committee which, under a succession of names, continued to define the mission of Judaism in a way basically similar to Rauschenbusch's concept of Protestantism.⁵

The moral life of America had been greatly affected by the profound changes taking place in religion and society.

The fabulously wealthy lived amoral lives. Drinking, promiscuity, gambling, thoughtless marriage were the order of the day. In the slum areas, a driven people lived a similar life on a much lower economic level. The divorce courts were filled with the cases of those who went to the trouble of formally ending marriage; for others, desertion was the answer to unworkable marriage. The home had lost all sanctity; life any semblance of morality. Only in the middle class were the conventions of the past adhered to. The middle class merchants and professional men faced life as they had faced it before the great transition in America.⁶

It was with these social problems that a young Krauskopf had to cope. These problems made up the bulk of his preaching and of his active duty in the ranks of the social reformers. Krauskopf was influenced and in turn influenced a Rauschenbusch, a Parker, a Phillips.....as liberal Christianity began to see its mission as one to humanize society rather than insure salvation in the world to come:

"We cannot join economic inequality and political equality," Rauschenbusch argued, much in the manner of Henry George. "Progress slackens when a single class appropriates the social results of the common labor, and

fortifies its evil rights by unfair laws!..
...such was the condition of America and
it had been sanctified by dogmatizing the
laws of God into support of 'an unregen-
erate economic system.' The truth was
that Christianity affirmed no unchanging
economic system. 'Translate the evolu-
tionary themes into religious faith, and
you have the doctrine of the Kingdom of
God,' Rauschenbush declared in a sentence
that was quoted and paraphrased across
Protestant America."⁷

As Christianity began to address itself to the problems
of society; so did Reform Judaism turn to a similar mis-
sion.

With the growth of slums, poverty, insecurity, the long
hours, the low pay, the misery and hopelessness came an
intolerance. Immigrants became suspect because they
meant longer hours and less pay. For the first time in
America the cry of "foreigner" became common. There had
always been rivalry among men of different origins but
with the turn of the century words like "wop" and "kike"
permanently entered the American language. People be-
gan to trace their ancestry and took great pride in es-
tablishing that a progenitor had piloted the Mayflower.
The wealth of an individual or his poverty were not the
only lines to divide men socially.....there were wealthy
Americans, and poor Americans and wealthy foreigners and
poor foreigners. An anti-immigrant felling swept the

country. Even the progressive element could not entirely disavow an anti-immigrant policy.

"The progressives did not entirely drop Populism's anti-immigrant feeling. One of the country's best-known progressive spokesmen, the sociologist, Edward A. Ross, publicly denounced, 'The lower class of Jews of Eastern Europe (who) reach here moral cripples, their souls warped and dwarfed.' Many of these Jews Ross went on, had a 'monstrous and repulsive love of gain.....The East European Hebrews feel no reverence for law as such and are willing to break any ordinance they find in their way. '"⁸

One of the most urgent and difficult problems facing Krauskopf was to explain the Jew to the Jew and to the Gentile-American. America was undergoing the "big change". Education was fast becoming the hope of the liberal in improving general conditions and thus education became a political and religious football. The most liberal ministers, led by men like Krauskopf, fought desperately to improve the educational facilities of the nation and to keep sectarianism out of the schools. Woman was coming into her own. In social welfare agencies she would soon become indispensable. This was the America in transition which confronted Joseph Krauskopf upon ordination from the Hebrew Union College. This was the America in transition over which Krauskopf was to

ponder, speak and act.

II

The Jews had entered America in successive waves of immigration. Krauskopf's Philadelphia congregation was composed of American-Jews of German immigration who had emigrated to America in the 1840's. The congregation he faced, therefore, was made up of Jews who had been successfully assimilated into American culture: Jews who were American in dress, speech, and habit. They had been extremely successful, for the most part, economically, and since there were very few Jews in America the sting of anti-Semitism was not known to them. They were acceptable in society not as Jews, but as successful Americans of the Mosaic faith.

With the coming of the East European Jews in the 80's and 90's, however, the position of the Jew in America changed radically. Having been driven from Europe by the most horrible cruelty known to man in his history, East-European Jews came to America impoverished, often physically ill, and with a vision of limitless possibility and grandeur before their eyes.

Behind them in Europe lay the Kisheneff massacres, the Dreyfus cases, poverty, misery, oppression and death. In America they were to find the slums, the sweatshops, a milder form of anti-Semitism stemming both from Gentile and German-Jewish sources. Having known the insecurity of poverty, they worked and struggled and fought for economic security in the "land of freedom". So frenzied were their efforts that they incurred the distrust and hatred of their fellow workers and tenement neighbors; and when fortunate enough to be successful, they were confronted by the snobbishness not only of the wealthy Gentile but of the radically different, American-born Jew.

One of the major outgrowths of anti-Semitism in Europe was the birth of political Zionism. Disheartened by his failure to be accepted in the countries of Europe, the Jew had turned his hope on Palestine the land of his origin. The issue of Zionism split American Jewry into two violently opposed camps. The East-European Jew enthusiastically embraced Zionism; the thoroughly Americanized, Reform Jew of German descent violently opposed Zionism.

This, in short was the general scene that Krauskopf confronted in his ministry. His work was cut out for him

and he set upon it with a decisivness that was characteristic of his entire ministry.

III

Joseph Krauskopf entered his ministry at a time when the great industrialization of America under a "laissez-faire" economy was bearing its most bitter fruits. He was a bitter opponent of the economic doctrines which were being advocated by Spencer and his prophet, Sumner. Throughout his ministry he attacked the evils which this "freedom" had brought to American society.⁹

"Political corruption is a serious evil, but it is not the only one for which the laissez faire spirit of the American people is responsible.

Because of this apathy we suffer polluted drinking water to enter our homes, diseased meats and milk to be sold as food, all manners of adulterated food to poison our system. Daily we read the harrowing accounts of the slaughter of the innocent, through preventable diseases, avoidable accidents, collisions, explosions, fraudulent architecture, improper exits, unprovided fire-escapes, exposed electrical wires, and others.

There is apathy concerning the social evils. Despite the vastness of our area, and the abundance of our produce,

the cry for bread, for shelter, for work, is loud in our land, and the spectacle of the misery in the wretched filthy, over-crowded poor-quarters of our larger cities is fast rivaling in horribleness any which much poorer and much more crowded Europe can display." 10

Krauskopf was no stranger in the tenement districts of Philadelphia. He was not a man to stand in the pulpit and merely exhort his congregants to pour funds into various charities. He saw the inequities of his society firsthand. Sweatshops, slums, and the vice and crime of these areas aroused his anger. He proposed to "make sweatshops unlawful, and child-labor criminal; to emancipate the working woman from the thralldom of slavery, and free her from the temptations that beset her; to increase the hours of rest, and add to the number of the working' man's holidays. "11

Thus in 1892, he organized the Personal Interest Society, a prototype of the social service agencies which have become prevalent since his day. In 1893, he was instrumental in establishing the Model Dwelling Association in an effort to rid his city of the tenement districts.

Krauskopf's social thinking was in consonance with that of Ward, Henry George and Walter Rauschenbusch. He could

not abide the injustice of equality in politics but not in labor. The disparity between the very poor and the very rich was not unavoidable. The government and the church had a duty to perform:

At no time in the past did either the government or church look upon poverty as a preventable and curable disease, and set itself to work to effect its extermination. At no time in the past did either the one or the other seek to trace the origin of the scourge to any other source than divine dispensation. Had they done so, they would have stumbled upon base, grasping conscienceless greed as the source of nine-tenths of all our poverties."12

Krauskopf firmly believed and unflinchingly stated that selfishness and greed were the sole reasons for poverty and misery in America. There were those to whom the laboring man was but a human machine, a slave, existing for the sole purpose of having all the labor of which he was capable pressed out of him at the lowest possible wage and for the longest possible hours. When no longer able to produce, this slave was flung aside to become a victim of starvation, or an inmate of a charitable institution. The possessors of wealth were for the most part unscrupulous men who by corrupting politics, bribing legislators, and manipulating stock, debauched everything their hands touched. All this solely for the purpose of

obtaining more wealth.¹³

But Krauskopf was not a hot-headed radical who could see only the evils of the wealthy classes. He viewed with a jaundiced eye the violent attempts of labor to equalize matters. The early attempts of labor to unionize were met with the practiced hand of professional thugs hired by the manufacturers and owners. The early strikes were always accompanied by violence and bloodshed. The demands of the union were exhorbitant. Krauskopf, as much as he disliked the tactics of the wealthy, could not side with the revolutionary union organizers. He did not "approve of the attempt by the laboring class to unionize completely and win control of the national economy."¹⁴ There was a solution to the problem of the inequity between management and labor:

"If Democracy means anything it means the right of the laboring people to unionize their forces, the right to decent wages, the right to decent hours and places of labor, the right to a decent hearing when difficulties arise between them and their employers, the right to an equitable adjustment of these difficulties. And it also means the right of the employer to employ whom he pleases, when he pleases, for how long he pleases, at a wage in consonance with the laws of justice, with the conditions of the market, and with the laborers desert, the right to demand that a contract entered into between him-

self and his employee shall be regarded as binding upon the latter as it is upon himself."¹⁵

This was not his only solution. There were much more practical measures that must be taken immediately. Krausopf was not a man to talk in vague generalities. He studied the conditions of the society and then turned to past history and current events in other nations to find a solution that would be equitable. He began to advocate industrial insurance for sickness, accident, old age. He urged that the "Ellienfeld System" be attempted in America. This system, used successfully in Europe, proposed that a city be divided on an economic basis into philanthropic districts, wards, and precincts just as they were divided for political purposes. Committees composed of respected and capable citizens would investigate the social problems of the city, find jobs for the unemployed, afford immediate relief to the destitute, and most of all, stamp out ill will. Relief stations and home shelters to provide food and clothing, for short periods of time, to those in need would be established under governmental supervision.¹⁶ This proposal by Krausopf meant governmental intrusion into economic life; and his action, which was not an isolated one, meant the certain death of the "Laissez-faire", "survival of the fit-

test"school of economics.

The evils of society and the reforms necessary were legion. Early in his ministry Krauskopf turned his attention to the problems of the individual rather than to society as a whole. He believed that a great moral movement could proceed only from the individual, and through the individual to the mass.¹⁷ Man had to begin to feel responsible for his fellow if society was to improve.

"Our penal and corrective and eleemosynary institutions are full to bursting with our criminal and defected and diseased classes; for them who directly or indirectly are responsible for it, we have palaces and distinctions and smiles. And so it will continue until school and church and public opinion will be honest enough and independent enough to create a conscience, and sufficiently strong to bring the wronged and wrong-doer face to face as criminal and juror, and ask the guiltless to cast the first stone."¹⁸

Society could not continue to exist under the present conditions. Krauskopf was incensed with the selfishness of the wealthy. He could not abide the egoism of the fortunate and his voice was often raised in vitriolic denunciation of their conduct. He fearlessly attacked every position in society and under the cold logic of his

analysis many a congregant stirred uneasily. He vividly portrayed society as it was, omitting none of its sordidness. His pet hatred was the "so-called Fashionable" society. His disdain of the men and women, sound of mind and body, empowered by nature and education to assist in the uplift of the human family, who wasted their time in bed, on dress, entertainment, and ~~extravagance~~, while others worked endless hours in attic rooms and sweatshops, struggling to sustain a family on a crust of bread, was made evident from the pulpit.¹⁹

The utter callousness of the men and women of "fashionable society" was intolerable to Krauskopf. Their immortality meant the certain death of society. The home was beginning to lose its sanctity; marriage was losing its meaning. The well-to-do man was partially guilty for he was beginning to make the club his major interest. His wife was equally guilty for her love for independence and self-direction were leading her to many pursuits and driving her from the art of homemaking. The woman "who finds domestic labor irksome and degrading, who is interested only in personal display and self-indulgence, running from extravagance to extravagance, from dissipation to dissipation, from recklessness to recklessness

until marriage spells for her and her husband financial and physical and moral ruin"²⁰ were anathema to Krauskopf.

Krauskopf began a series of lectures on the homely virtues of the individual.²¹ He extolled and praised simple living. It was time for his congregants to denounce the extravagant luxuries about them, to turn to their duties as parent, husband and moral citizen in their community. The tyranny of society was that it held man ~~in its~~ ^{it is} grasp despite his own conscience. The fops, parasites, the merely wealthy could not exist without the labor of "the common man", yet it was they who set the standards of behaviour, dress, and culture.²² The elite "four-hundred" were responsible for a decline of intellectual interest, a total surrender to physical pleasure, and the corroding of society. It was the society woman who made sport of religion, who classed the Bible with juvenile literature. She confined herself to the light novel and magazine of the day, never holding a deep thought or carrying on an intellectual discussion. For her, and through her, "shallowness passed as virtue, unbelief as wisdom, frivolity as esprit, and extravagance as good taste."²³

This attitude toward life was expressed in the current

writing. Krauskopf felt that he must combat the new school of writing that chose for its subject matter the immoral, the indecent, the degenerate, and the corrupt. The "Fleshy School" of writing was odious to him and he went so far as to propose censorship.²⁴

Krauskopf held that man must find a balance between his private life and his social life.²⁵ Man must find peace within himself and his place in his society, for in his haste to please self and others, he indulged in excesses which were neither pleasing to himself nor to those about him; excesses which were "but a torture to self and a source of envy, hatred and malice, slander in others."²⁶ The answer, to Krauskopf, lay in the proper acceptance of the role of the home and the family. The evils of society were a direct outgrowth of the rejection of the home and the responsibilities of family life.²⁷

"Woe to the home in which society life has a higher claim than parenthood, in which the desire to outdo and outstrip in license even the unmarried, to be anywhere, to be everywhere, day and night, except in the home.....parents dead to their home, deaf to children's appeal, blind to children's possibilities, and even though they are the most conspicuous at the opera, balls, and receptions, the most regular and active at the club, they are but breathing coffins.....their heart within them, their conscience, their moral nature is dead."²⁸

Fatherhood, Krauskopf preached, was a most responsible undertaking. The father was the one to whom the child looked for comradeship, courage, and guidance and purpose in life. The father had the responsibility of showing genuine interest in his children rather than in his club.²⁹ As for the role of the woman in the home, Krauskopf hewed a straight and narrow path. He realized that woman was coming into her own in society, that she had the right to vote, to choose marriage or a career; but she could not choose both marriage and a social or business career. Her primary duty was to marriage and the care of the home and children. She was the guardian of virtue and modesty and purity.³⁰ Krauskopf gave woman her due share of respect for her work in society and in religious institutions. He acknowledged that woman had been of great help to ministers, encouraging them to do what they had never believed themselves capable of doing. Woman was instrumental in the Sabbath School and in personal charity service; but her primary concern must be the home and the upbringing of moral and decent and happy children.³¹ Progress in life could not be evaluated solely in terms of technological advancement, but rather in moral development.³²

"The citing of Corrupt Pre-natal Influences must be a warning to parents so to live that future generations may not curse them for having given them life. The citing of Corrupt Home Influences must stimulate parents to make home the sweetest, purest, happiest spot on earth. The citing of corrupt literature must induce parents to keep a careful watch over the books their children read, over the plays they see, over the associates they keep, over their public and private habits and pastimes." 33

One of Krauskopf's most cherished beliefs was that devotion to the simple life, the simple virtues, the home and parenthood could and would elevate civilization to a height of morality never before achieved. This was the cure he proposed for the ills that beset our society.

IV

In the last two decades of the nineteenth century, education had become the hope of the liberals. The only way to escape the laissez-faire economy which in effect allowed large capital to suppress the laboring masses was through mass education. The public school system of America came under the close scrutiny of liberal clergymen. Krauskopf was very interested in understand-

ing the school system and ferreting out its evils. He held that the public school system was the basis of American Democracy. As long as the public school was safe, the American way of life was safe.³⁴ The public school system was beset by two evils. Firstly, the teachers had become the tools of the state's political machinery. The salary paid to the school teacher was shamefully low. This unwise economy was crippling the school and through the school, the child.³⁵ Secondly, the public school system was being threatened by the rise of the private school. The wealthy were sending their children to selected schools, and thus the entire meaning of democracy was being thwarted.

The ridiculously low pay of teachers and the consequent hiring of poorly trained teachers necessarily had a harmful effect on children. The poorly equipped teacher neither could nor wished to understand the individual problems of children, and often inflicted tortures more cruel than those of the Inquisition on helpless innocents disabling them for the rest of their lives. It was the duty of the state and the parent, Krauskopf urged, to take cognizance of this evil and correct it quickly and decisively. His love and understanding of children and their problems are clear when we read:

"When the nursery child is physically out of order, the specialist, the physician is sent for to set it right. When the nursery child is psychically out of order, the most serious of all nursery disorders, of all human disorders, the sending for a specialist is not even remotely thought of. Those who would never think of mending the clock or easy chair, proceed without the slightest fear or concern without the slightest preparation or knowledge, to set aright a psychical disorder, the most difficult, the most subtle of all disorders.....one that requires the profoundest, the wisest, the most experienced of all specialists, the physicaian of the soul." 36

Krauskopf held that these disorders, the warping of the soul of the child, were prevalent because of the neglect of the public school and the teachers to which we entrusted our children.

As Krauskopf insisted upon the separation of church and state, so did he insist upon separation between church and public school. The fundamentalist Protestant clergy was slowly succeeding in having its religious doctrines taught in the schools. Since most of the teachers were religiously affiliated to fundamentalist churches, this did not prove difficult. If anything angered Krauskopf, it was the encroachment of a religious faith upon public domain. He argued that the illegal liberties which the Protestants were taking were certain to grow into total

intolerance of all other beliefs and that one day every non-Protestant child would be told either to leave or to conform.³⁷

He based his arguments upon American history. Recalling the heroic struggles of the colonial fathers for separation between church and state, he spoke feelingly about their great desire to allow to every citizen, regardless of his faith, the right to believe as he chose and the freedom not to contribute toward the support of other men's creeds or to listen to devotional exercises which were not in accordance with his own creed.³⁸

"Having recalled these fundamental truths in the history of the United States, enter one of our public schools. You will see children of tax-paying citizens obliged to listen to the reading of a Bible of a particular, religious sect, which Bible a considerable portion of the pupils are taught in their homes, or in their respective religious schools, as not representing the whole truth, or as not representing the truth at all. You will hear children asked to sing hymns containing doctrinal teachings of a particular religious sect, in which doctrines a considerable number of the pupils are taught by their respective churches not to believe."³⁹

There was a need, an important need, for religious teaching, but the place for this teaching was in the religious

school not in the public school. It was the duty of each sect to teach its adherents the demands of the faith; it was the duty of the public school to refrain from advocating any particular faith or teaching any particular doctrine.⁴⁰

V

The problems of peace and war were problems that had not been considered in America since the advent of the Civil War. The hope of everlasting peace to be quite realistic until the last five years of the nineteenth century. In 1898, the United States stumbled into a war with Spain. Krauskopf was intensely interested in the problems of diplomacy and understanding between nations. He had the unshakeable belief that the United States would never engage in an unjust war. He reassured his congregation that the command to go to war would never be given by the President unless every avenue for an honorable settlement with Spain had been hopelessly barred.⁴¹ He was personally certain that war would not be waged. On the surface his prophecy seemed quite plausible. Spain had conceded to the wishes of the United States. Spain had recalled its General Weyler and had granted to

autonomy to Cuba. There was little reason to suppose that some compromise would not be reached without war.

But Krauskopf was mistaken. The sensationalist press, Hearst and Pulitzer and America embarked on an imperialistic war. It is in this political sphere that we see how a great man must be limited by his age. There is little doubt today that the United States undertook to fight Spain because of the "yellow press" and because American investment in Cuban sugar, plantations and mills agitated for war.⁴² Yet, Krauskopf insisted that America was at war, not for the sake of national aggrandizement, nor for a display of military skill, "but wholly for the sake of peace among nations, for the sake of good-will among men."⁴³

That a man of the stature of Krauskopf could be so blindly patriotic seems unbelievable, yet these are his words:

"It is God's will, not ours, that our army is mobilized and that our navy stands ready to belch forth death and destruction upon Havana and its people.....I am convinced that it is the will of God and not our own free choice, that we are standing today arrayed against each other.....that cruel war has at length been determined upon by Providence, as a final and effective measure for the suppression of Spanish atrocity.....The United States has been divinely chosen to establish the Dominion of Peace on American soil."⁴⁴

Words such as these, coupled with his fame for organization led to his being appointed Special Field Commissioner of the National Relief Commission to study the relief conditions in the various camps of the United States Army.

It was not until 1914, however, that Krauskopf began to devote much of his preaching to the relation of morality to neutrality and the various problems concerning disarmament.

In 1914, America, unbelievably had to face the fact that war had broken out in Europe. The immediate effect on America, however, was felt only in industry. The munitions manufacturers of the United States had limitless markets; all kinds of goods were manufactured and shipped to the Allies. The United States favored the Allies, partially because most foreign interests held by America were in Allied territory, and partially because the great English navy made shipment to the Central Powers unprofitable if not impossible. Popular sentiment was with the Allied powers who were engaged in fighting the "HUN".

Krauskopf was undeniably pro-German in his sympathies. This was not unusual in the Reform rabbinate. The only

outstanding rabbi who was pro-Ally before America entered the war was David Philipson.⁴⁵ Krauskopf was most prolific in his dedication to neutrality and in urging the United States to remain unarmed.⁴⁶

"What degree of civilization may we claim for our raising loud cries of indignation at Germany for violating the neutrality of Belgium when we ourselves violate the the neutrality pledged to the belligerent nations at the outbreak of the war, by furnishing money and means to some of the belligerent nations to help them in their warfare against their opponents?"⁴⁷

Krauskopf argued that there were times when the law-abiding citizen must fearlessly denounce his government when that government erred in its policy. Extreme chauvinism was the greatest evil of society. Militarism was the cause of the present conflict, and militarism was just as evident in England as in Germany. Krauskopf cited Shaw to show that the guilt for war was as much with England as with Germany. Where Germany had spent huge sums of money building up an army, England had expended similar sums in enlarging its navy. England had a driving ambition to make itself unconquerable on land by gaining supreme control of the sea. Krauskopf held that England had recognized at the outbreak of the war its long awaited opportunity to subdue once and for all its most for-

midable trade rival, Germany.⁴⁸

Yet, in spite of the president's appeal that Americans prove themselves impartial in thought and action; that press, pulpit, and platform say nothing and do nothing that might be construed as a preference of one of the belligerents over the other; Krauskopf heatedly pointed out that any casual glance at American papers or magazines would immediately show partiality. The vast shipments of arms and ammunition and other war equipment to the allies exclusively, pointed to this total discrimination and partiality.⁴⁹

Krauskopf's argument was a moral one. Neutrality meant just that. American partiality was as much a broken treaty as Germany's entering Belgium.⁵⁰ It was the moral responsibility of the American citizen to object to this violation of neutrality.

"If yet other proofs you would have that battles may be fought at home, whose victories will confer greater distinction upon the victors than any that have been won in bloody war, you need but think of President Wilson's neutrality declaration at the outbreak of the present world-war, and our nation's uninterrupted violation of it from that day to this."⁵¹

Krauskopf soon had to give up his fight for honest neutrality and turn his attention to convincing his people that armament was the greatest mistake the United States could possibly make. He pleaded non-armament on two bases. Firstly, the only pro-armament factions were intimately connected with the armament industry which would stand to make huge profit in continued warfare;⁵² secondly, the delusion of imminent warfare and consequent preparations for war would inevitably lead the United States into armed combat.⁵³ Krauskopf was uncompromising in his denunciation of the armament manufacturers:

"Someday the inside history of the past year and one-half will be written. It will reveal a hideous conspiracy, hatched by financial interests, with no other end in view than dragging us into war, for the benefit of certain belligerent nations abroad, and certain conscienceless money-sharks at home."⁵⁴

Krauskopf bitterly hated the militarism which was sweeping the United States. He maintained that the militarists were war-mongers, and that as long as they were present, so long would there be war. There was literally nothing that Krauskopf would not say or do to keep America out of war and to defend the position of the Central Powers. When, in 1916, anti-German feeling was at its

highest point, Krauskopf spoke of the many contributions which Americans of German origin had made to our country. Within a moral and ethical frame of reference, he protested the liberty allowed those who "toasted England and wished it victory"; while German sympathizers were not allowed to "say any good word for the German Emperor."⁵⁵

Once again Krauskopf and his message was doomed to failure. The United States was swept into war and with the Allied powers emerged victorious. Krauskopf turned his attention to the quest of an equitable peace. From the moment the United States entered the war until the successful end of hostilities, he remained silent; never uttering a word about America's role in the battle. With the signing of the armistice, however, Krauskopf saw great possibilities for everlasting peace and he proceeded to preach a message of forgiveness and brotherhood.⁵⁶

He became a strong advocate of complete disarmament, the International Court, the emancipation of subject nations, the suppression of secret diplomacy, the denial of individuals and individual nations of the right to manufacture war arms, and a constitutional law which would make a vote of the people necessary for a nation to engage in

warfare.⁵⁷ The United States had waged a war, but "not for military glory or territorial aggrandizement, rather for the establishment of the supremacy of Democracy over Autocracy. The main issue was from the very first a war to the death against despotism, absolutism, militarism, feudalism, imperialism, and all the accursed isms of dark and cruel ages that survived unto our day. Had Germany won the war, her victory would have meant the spread of autocracy over all the world."⁵⁸ These are strange words considering what Krauskopf had said in the years 1914-1916.

Krauskopf again exhibited his unwavering trust in the United States. A war had been waged, he held, that must change the world. The world had been made safe for democracy. The American had placed himself at his country's call and had fought and died on foreign soil to end selfish nationalism, bitter race-hatred, and brutal lust for power.⁵⁹ Krauskopf put his faith in Wilson and the fourteen points which he proposed. Wilson, for Krauskopf, became the Apostle of peace and righteousness, the opponent of militarism, imperialism, hatred, revenge, injustice; in short, the proponent of everything Krauskopf held dear.⁶⁰

In the last years of his ministry, Krauskopf was again

to be disillusioned. Wilson proved no match for Clemenceau and Lloyd George, nor did he find adequate support for his policy in his own country. Wilson's plans for an equitable peace were distorted and finally destroyed. Wilson himself found his position no longer tenable and the greed of France and England soon became the greed of the United States. Krauskopf saw his fond dreams for an equitable and lasting peace destroyed. His utter disillusionment is evident in a sermon he preached in March, 1922:

"Why should anyone put faith in the words of diplomats when he contrasts the words of Lloyd George spoken in Parliament on the day on which England entered the World War: 'As the Lord Liveth, England does not seek a yard of territory; we are in this war from motives of purest chivalry, to defend the weak,' with his grabbing at the Paris Peace Conference more than 400,000 square miles? Why should anyone put faith in the words even of statesmen, when he recalls the promise made by former President Wilson to the German people to the effect that, if they would overthrow their autocratic government and lay down their arms, Peace Terms would be made with them in accordance with the spirit and letter of his Fourteen points. The German people did as they were told.....but not one of the promises made to them was kept. Wilson's Fourteen Points were not even brought before the Paris Peace Conference for consideration. Terms were imposed upon the conquered so cruel that the like of them has never been known in history, terms impossible of execution, terms so drastic that they breath^{ed} war instead of peace, world-ruin instead of world-reconstruction." 61

Krauskopf may have been politically naive, or so bound to Germany that he lost sight ^{of} the real issues involved in the war, but he proved himself right in his last prediction. For the most frightening aspect of Krauskopf's complete dismay with the settlement of the peace is that his prophetic words proved to be true, and twenty-five years later the world was once again embroiled in a devastating war.

Notes to Chapter III

1. Henry S. Commager, The American Mind, pp. 44-50.
2. Ibid., pp. 201-203.
3. Charles Beard, The Rise of American Civilization, vol. 2, pp. 383-411.
4. Frederick L. Allen, The Big Change, Chapters 2 and 3.
5. Eric F. Goldman, Rendezvous with Destiny, pp. 105-115.
6. Frederick L. Allen, The Big Change, p. 13.
7. Eric F. Goldman, Rendezvous with Destiny, pp. 107-109.
8. Edward A. Ross, The Old World in the New, pp. 150-154, as quoted in Eric F. Goldman, Rendezvous with Destiny, p. 77.
9. see the following sermons: "Life-A Tragedy to Them that Feel", OP, vol. 20, no. 16, Feb. 24, 1907; "The Aristocrat", OP, vol. 25, no. 15, March 3, 1912; "Nurseries of Crime", OP, vol. 3, no. 7, Dec. 8, 1889; "The High Cost of Living", OP, vol. 31, no. 7, Dec. 16, 1917; "The Common People", OP, vol. 25, nos. 18, 19, March 24, 31, 1912; "Egoism", OP, vol. 17, no. 17, Feb. 21, 1904; "Our Democracy in Peril", OP, vol. 33, no. 2, Nov. 9, 1919.
10. "American Apathy", Nov. 23, 1890, p. 8.
11. "Life-A Tragedy to Them that Feel", OP, vol. 20, no. 16, Feb. 24, 1907, p. 126.

12. "The Common People", OP, vol. 25, no. 19, March 31, 1912, p. 148.
13. "Our Democracy in Peril", OP, vol. 33, no. 2, Nov. 9, 1919, p. 17.
14. Ibid., p. 19.
15. Ibid., p. 21.
16. "The Common People", OP, vol. 25, no. 19, March 31, 1912, p. 152.
17. "Society and Its Morals-Individual Morality", OP, vol. 13, no. 14, Jan. 21, 1900, p. 3.
18. Joseph Krauskopf, Old Teachings in New Books, pp. 31-32.
19. Joseph Krauskopf, Some Isms of Today, 1904, p. 7.
20. "The Club vs. the Home", OP, vol. 19, no. 2, Jan. 21, 1906, p. 77.
21. see the following sermons: "The Simple Life", OP, vol. 18, no. 1, Nov. 6, 1904; "Blessed Are They That Forget", OP, vol. 20, no. 7, Dec. 16, 1906; "Remember the Weekday to Keep it Holy", OP, vol. 18, no. 2, Nov. 13, 1904; "Society and its Morals-Social Morality", OP, vol. 13, no. 18, Feb. 18, 1900; "Society and its Morals-Domestic Morality", OP, vol. 13, no. 16, Feb. 4, 1900; "Far From the Madding Crowd", OP, vol. 11, no. 24, April 17, 1898; "Blessed Be They That Remember", OP, vol. 20, no. 6, Dec. 9, 1906; "Complaints and Remedies", OP, vol. 18, no. 8, Feb. 1, 1905; "Still Throbs the Heart", OP, vol. 18, no. 10, Jan. 15, 1905; "A Mother's Love", OP, Series 7, Jan. 7, 1894; "A Father's Love", OP, Series 7, Jan. 21, 1894; "Woman's Power for Good and Evil", OP, vol. 34, no. 3, Nov. 21, 1920; "The National Council of Jewish Women", OP, vol. 9, no. 27, April 12, 1896; "Too Much

and Too Little Parent, OP, vol. 29, no. 19, May 2, 1916; "Who Will Be Civilized?", OP, vol. 28, no. 4, Nov. 29, 1914; "As the Twig is Bent", OP, vol. 25, no. 4, Nov. 26, 1911; "Start the Child Right", OP, vol. 25, no. 3, Nov. 19, 1911; "Ghosts I Have Met", OP, vol. 25, no. 2, Nov. 12, 1911; "The Responsibility of Motherhood", OP, vol. 22, no. 20, March 21, 1909; "The Responsibility of Fatherhood", OP, vol. 22, no. 19, March 14, 1909; "The Wealth of the Poor", OP, vol. 19, no. 15, Feb. 15, 1906.

22. "The Common People", OP, vol. 25, no. 17, March 17, 1912, pp. 129-131.
23. "Ghosts I Have Met", OP, vol. 25, no. 2, Nov. 12, 1911.
24. "Sermons in Books", OP, vol. 36, no. 5, Dec. 11, 1922, pp. 57-62; see also: "The Last of the Old Stars Irving and Jefferson", OP, vol. 19, no. 3, Nov. 19, 1905, p. 223.
25. "Far From the Madding Crowd", OP, vol. 11, no. 24, April 17, 1898.
26. "Society, Its Morals-Social Morality", OP, vol. 13, no. 18, Feb. 18, 1900, p. 8.
27. "The Simple Life", OP, vol. 18, no. 1, Nov. 6, 1904.
28. "Society and Its Morals-Domestic Morality", OP, vol. 13, no. 16, Feb. 4, 1900, p. 7.
29. "The Responsibility of Fatherhood", OP, vol. 22, no. 19, March 14, 1909, pp. 118-120.
30. "Woman's Power for Good or Evil", OP, vol. 34, no. 3, Nov. 21, 1920, pp. 47-52.

31. "The National Council of Jewish Women", OP, vol. 9, no. 27, April 12, 1896, p. 6.
32. "Who Will Be Civilized?", OP, vol. 28, nos. 4, 5, Nov. 29, Dec. 6, 1914.
33. "Nurseries of Crime", OP, vol. 3, no. 7, Dec. 8, 1889, p. 11.
34. "The Private vs. The Public School", OP, vol. 19, no. 11, Jan. 14, 1906.
35. see the following sermons: "Abused Benefactors", March 24, 1889; "Public School Teachers and Their Pay", OP, vol. 32, no. 20, March 30, 1919.
36. "Our Wrongs to Our Little Ones", OP, vol. 14, no. 6, Nov. 25, 1900, p. 7.
37. "Religion in the Public Schools", OP, vol. 8, no. 10, Dec. 23, 1894.
38. "Sectarianism in Public Institutions", OP, vol. 20, no. 3, Nov. 18, 1906.
39. Ibid., p. 23.
40. "What Shall our Children Believe?", OP, vol. 17, no. 15, Feb. 7, 1904.
41. "Beating Flowshares into Swords", OP, vol. 11, no. 22, March 20, 1898, p. 6.
42. Merle Curti, The Growth of American Thought, pp. 669-673; Charles Beard, The Rise of American Civilization, vol. 2, pp. 367-373.

43. "A Time of War and A Time of Peace", OP, vol. 11, no. 26, May 1, 1898, p. 1.
44. Ibid., p. 3.
45. David Philipson, My Life as an American Jew, pp. 265-268.
46. see the following sermons: "Who Are the Civilized", OP, vol. 28, no. 1, Nov. 8, 1914; "Who Will Be Civilized", OP, vol. 28, no. 3, Nov. 22, 1914; "Patriotism vs. Humanitarianism", OP, vol. 28, nos. 7, 8, 9, Dec. 20, 27, 1914, Jan. 3, 1915; "Militarism vs. Arbitration", OP, vol. 28, no. 12, Jan. 24, 1915; "Rights and Wrongs of Neutrals", OP, vol. 28, no. 13, Jan. 31, 1915; "Broken Treaties", OP, vol. 28, no. 14, Feb. 7, 1915; "To The Front", OP, vol. 29, no. 1, Nov. 14, 1915; "Bethlehem, Judea and Bethlehem, Penn.", OP, vol. 29, no. 7, Dec. 26, 1915; "To Prepare or Not to Prepare", OP, vol. 29, no. 9, Jan. 9, 1916; "To Prepare or Not to Prepare, III", OP, vol. 29, no. 11, Jan. 30, 1916; "Americanism Waning-The Old Time American", OP, vol. 29, no. 16, March 12, 1916; "Americanism Waning-The German American Citizen", OP, vol. 29, no. 18, March 26, 1916.
47. "Who Will Be Civilized?", OP, vol. 28, no. 3, Nov. 22, 1914, p. 26.
48. "Patriotism vs. Humanitarianism, III", OP, vol. 28, no. 9, Jan. 3, 1915, pp. 75-76.
49. "Rights and Wrongs of Neutrals", OP, vol. 28, no. 13, Jan 31, 1915, pp. 106-107.
50. "Broken Treaties", OP, vol. 28, no. 14, Feb. 27, 1915, pp. 112-119.
51. "To The Front", OP, vol. 29, no. 1, Nov. 14, 1915, p. 7.

52. "Bethlehem, Judea and Bethlehem, Penn.", OP, vol. 29, no. 7, Dec. 26, 1915, pp. 42-45.
53. "To Prepare Or Not To Prepare", OP, vol. 29, no. 9, Jan. 9, 1916, pp. 47-49.
54. "Americanism Waning-The Old Time American", OP, vol. 29, no. 16, March 12, 1916, p. 109.
55. "Americanism Waning-The German-American Citizen", OP, vol. 29, no. 18, March 26, 1916, p. 123.
56. "A Time to Hate and a Time to Love", OP, vol. 32, no. 7, Dec. 29, 1918.
57. "If War is to Be No More", OP, vol. 31, no. 9, Dec. 30, 1917.
58. "Our Democracy in Peril", OP, vol. 33, no. 2, Nov. 14, 1919, p. 15.
59. "Light Ahead", OP, vol. 31, no. 10, Jan. 6, 1918.
60. "Who Forges the Sword Wields It", OP, vol. 35, no. 1, Feb. 19, 1922.
61. "More Scraps of Paper", OP, vol. 35, no. 20, March 19, 1922, p. 153; see also: "Romain Rolland's 'Clerambault'", OP, vol. 35, no. 3, Nov. 20, 1921; "For World War or For World Peace?", OP, vol. 33, nos. 23, 24, 26, March 28, April 4, 8, 1920.

IV

APOLOGETICS and POLEMICS

I

The last two decades of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth century presented American Jewry with a new and serious problem. Anti-Semitism in Europe had reached a new high point. The Dreyfus case in France and the pogroms in Russia were influencing tens of thousands of Jews to leave Europe and make a new home in the land of freedom, America. The Dreyfus case had so impressed a German-Jewish newspaper correspondent that he had formulated the idea of Zionism and the possibility of a Jewish State in Palestine. This ideal was to have far-reaching effect and become a major issue in the life of the American Jew. The Russian pogroms, culminating with the horrible Kisheneff massacre, had brought multitudes of impoverished Jews to America.....Jews who settled in the slum areas forming their own ghettos; Jews who labored in sweat-shops and often became public charges because of ill-health; Jews who brought with them their European customs and ceremonies; Jews who were a definite problem to the well-assimilated American Jews of German origin. The Reform Jew found himself in a peculiar position in his beloved America. Formerly he had been fully accepted; had become

well-Americanized; had achieved prosperity and position in society. Now, he found it necessary to apologize for his "brethren" to whom he felt no kinship and in some way to prove to the Gentile that this new arrival was an altogether different species who must be differentiated from himself, an American of Mosaic faith. Krauskopf, the spokesman of the Reform Jew found much work to be done in this field of apologetics. He found it his duty to explain his people and this "new" people to the non-Jewish world and he found it necessary to enlighten the Reform Jew on what his religion was and what it meant.

Ever a man of decisive action, Krauskopf immediately went to the source of the problem. In 1894, he went to Russia to survey the Jewish position and consider possible remedies. Krauskopf's dislike for Russia was immediately intensified when he found difficulty in gaining entry. In 1832 the United States and Russia had made a treaty which granted free entry to tourists and business men in either country. Russia had broken its treaty by barring American Jews from its territory. It was only after diplomatic exchanges between Washington and Moscow that Krauskopf gained entry to Russia.¹

Once in Russia, Krauskopf attempted, by personal appeal

to the Czar, to bring about a change in the attitude of the government toward the Jews, so that it might be possible for the Jews to remain unmolested in their native land.² Upon inspection, Krauskopf came to the conclusion that such a solution was impossible. The following years proved him correct. The Russian Jews were pushed into the Pale of Settlement without work, room or food. They were denied education and forced into conversion. Remaining in Russia meant death at the hands of barbarians.³ The East-European Jew could find haven only in the United States. Krauskopf, therefore, realistically limited his attention to settlement of these immigrants and to winning acceptance for them in the eyes of America.

Krauskopf clearly saw that the immigrant Jew must not be allowed to settle in the already congested areas of the eastern coast.⁴ Krauskopf was a proud Jew and he keenly felt the evil effect which slum-ghetto life was having on the immigrant Jew. For the first time in history the Jews were suffering from lung disease; Jews were becoming criminals; and the moral standards of the Jewish woman were declining.⁵ American Jews and non-Jews were alike afraid that this great immigration was growing beyond the power of control; that despite millions of dol-

lars expended in charity, despite hospitals and orphanages, the immigrants would become a quantitatively impossible public charge. Such consideration, and the fear that the immigrant, in his terror and want, would force the American laborer to accept lower wages and longer hours, propelled Krauskopf into a huge undertaking.

During Krauskopf's journey in Russia, he met Count Leo Tolstoi. Together, they visited the Jewish Agricultural School at Odessa, where Tolstoi pointed out the success of the Jews in agricultural pursuits. Krauskopf came to the conclusion that the only possible remedy against pauperization by reason of the congestion and the physical and moral degeneracy of the cities was the establishing of agricultural colonies, not only in America but throughout the world.

"I was greatly aided in arriving at this conclusion by a discussion of the Jewish question with Count Tolstoi. 'Make a bread-producer of the Jew', said he to me, 'and you will produce a change in the world's attitude toward the Jew.....you have freedom in the United States, and the most fertile soil on the face of the earth. Why have you suffered your large cities to become congested with foreigners? Why have you suffered ghettos to spring up in your free America? Why have you suffered sweatshops to curse the life of the immigrant Jew, and to poison the

public mind against the immigrant? Repair the wrong while yet you may. Relieve your congestion by colonization. Start Farm Schools all over your broad lands. Bring back the Jew to his original pursuits, and he will once again become of the blessers and of the blessed of the earth."⁶

On April 10, 1896, the National Farm School was incorporated. Krauskopf devoted much of his time to its development. He undertook lecture tours to provide funds for the school, speaking endlessly of the great need there was for such an institution and of many more like it. Although the impetus for the school had originally come from the necessity to find general acceptance for the immigrant Jew, Krauskopf began to see its larger possibilities. One had merely to turn to the city slums to see hundreds of thousands of men and women and children morally and physically rotting, although health awaited them in the country close by. Millions of dollars were being expended annually to support these people, who might have earned millions of dollars in agricultural pursuits. He expressed amazement at the "liberals" who seemed to be shutting their eyes to the "hotbeds of discontent in city sweatshops and cries of misery in city slum-districts."⁷ The answer to the problems of poverty and misery, of unemployment and labor difficulties lay

in agricultural pursuit. Europe was in need of American produce, and America could provide for this need.

"Such is my conviction, else the National Farm School would never have been founded, and would never have been kept alive to this day, in the face of endless opposition and discouragement. Such is my conviction else the National Farm School would not have sent eight young men out into the world, successfully and honorably following their chosen vocation as practical and scientific agriculturists, who otherwise might have wasted away in city slums. "8

Throughout his Ministry Krauskopf worked for the National Farm School seeing it grow and produce what he considered much needed agriculturists. Throughout the year he devoted a portion of his lectures to the financial support of the National Farm School.⁹

II

Despite the heroic efforts of Krauskopf to place immigrant Jews in agricultural areas, and remove them from the cities where they but added to the labor crisis, pride and prejudice were becoming deeply entrenched in Americans. Knowing the serious plight of European Jewry and their need for refuge in the United States, Krauskopf did

everything within his power to change anti-Semitic opinion. In answer to the cries that the country was being Europeanized by vast masses of illiterate, undesirable, unassimilated, non-Protestants, Krauskopf appealed to man's lowest instinct: Greed:

"To be sure, most of the immigrants are poor. Instead of finding fault, the restrictionists ought to thank God that immigrants are poor. The foreigner's poverty makes possible the natives' wealth. But for his poverty, most of our coal mines and mills and factories would stand idle, sewers would remain unbuilt, streets uncleaned, homes unserved, farms uncultivated. To bar our gates to foreigners because of poverty would mean barring, at the same time, the natives' door to prosperity."¹⁰

One imagines that these words must have cost Krauskopf dearly. But they indicate the devotion he had to justice and to his people.

Krauskopf although principally interested in anti-Semitism was well aware of the larger evil of prejudice in general. In 1908, he delivered a series of sermons which he entitled: "Prejudice--Its Genesis and Exodus".¹¹ In this series Krauskopf analyzed the social, religious, national and economic reasons for prejudice and then offered solutions to this social evil.

In the year 1900 Krauskopf was laying the blame for the low estate of the Negro squarely on white society. The Negro had been forced into idleness, driven into the slums, denied membership in churches, refused store or office room, and then accused of being by nature and instinct a criminal. Krauskopf took the white man to task and accused him of "every bestiality and debauchery of the Negro with only himself to blame.....not a society that has thrown him into the mud and then called him dirty."¹² Krauskopf pictured the Negro as being by disposition: "kindly, affectionate and loyal, capable of self control; with a strong religious instinct, brave and patriotic, eager for education."¹³

Krauskopf's demands of the white man were quite simple. He wanted like opportunity for the negro in education, work and wages. He placed his demands on a moral basis:

"We shall not escape the consequences of our injustice. God is long suffering, but God is also just. We cannot long do evil to others, or suffer it to be done, without in the end, suffering it ourselves; when we fasten one end of a chain around a brother's neck, the other end will inevitably fasten itself around our own."¹⁴

Although Krauskopf devoted himself to the problem of prejudice in general,¹⁵ he felt that his foremost duty was

to combat anti-Semitism. He first attacked the problem by working with the Jews themselves, to make them more attractive to their Christian neighbors. The vast masses of immigrants recently come to the United States had brought with them their European Judaism. By virtue of their large numbers they were fast submerging Reform Jewry. They were snug in their beliefs, persisted in using Yiddish, and clamored loudly for Zionism, which to the American frequently meant that the Jew was neither identifying with his new land nor interested in its welfare. Krauskopf insisted that this type of Jew must be transformed quickly in order to safeguard the interests of the Americanized Jew. He suggested branch synagogues and religious schools in the ghettos in order to teach the foreign element what they must accept.¹⁶

Another solution offered by Krauskopf was the National Farm School program and the transformation of the immigrant Jews from industrial to agricultural pursuits.

"These colonies, once settled on the fertile bosom of our broad land, the reproach will be removed from the house of Israel, and anti-Semitism will be robbed of its bitterest charge."¹⁷

The need for protecting the Americanized Jew greatly affected Krauskopf's view on Zionism. The appeal of the

Jew for justice, Krauskopf argued, must be on a moral basis. The Statue of Liberty promised haven to all persecuted. Americans could not prohibit the "landing of that handful of unfortunate poor, whom overcrowded and poverty-ridden Europe could not support. It is not exclusion nor restriction that the Immigrant Question wants but thoughtful guidance and wise regulations."¹⁸

The problems that tortured Krauskopf's mind and soul more than any other concerned his stand on the Zionist issue. He did not see Zionism as the solution to the problem of anti-Semitism.¹⁹ He fully understood the problems that the Jewish people faced. He realized the dangers that political Zionism held for American Jews. He believed that the immediate answer to the problems of the the Jews was not political Zionism, whose principles, he felt, were untenable, but rather the colonization of Jews in areas throughout the world. This kind of "zionism" was meaningful to him.

In 1897 Krauskopf clearly stated his position. He had traveled through the Russian Pale and along the Galician border and had seen, thought only as a tourist, the deep sorrow of the Jew. He could not join with the heartless scurrilous, well-fed writers and rabbis who treated the problem of Zionism with contempt.²⁰ Yet he could not ac-

cept political Zionism.

"Am I really a Zionist? If my belief that the solution of the Jewish question lies in relieving the many congested centres of Jewish population, (1) by turning the thousands of Jews.....of those countries where they enjoy equal rights.....from the over-crowded and debasing petty-trading and sweatshop pursuits of the cities to agricultural callings in the country, thereby bettering the condition and strengthening the position of those who remain and of those who are transplanted; (2) by settling the millions of Jews.....of those countries where they are not wanted.....as agriculturists in Palestine, if for economic or other reasons, they find no other or nearer country open to them; (3) by establishing the hundreds of thousands of Jews.....of those countries where though tolerated, there is no room or employment for them, especially the Jews of strong Orthodox and oriental proclivities.....as agriculturists in Zion, the land of their sires.....if, moreover, my belief that with Israel's return to the agricultural and industrial pursuit of the Zionists of old there would be an end to the fearful physical and moral and mental decay, into which the almost exclusive trading and sweatshop pursuits, enforced and voluntary, have degenerated the Jew.....then am I a Zionist and proud to be one."21

At the turn of the century, Krauskopf felt that the most immediate solution of the problem of Jewish settlement was not Palestine, but the English offer of a portion of its East African possessions as the refuge for persecuted Jews. This idea appealed to Krauskopf because its accept-

ance would mean a lessening of the political phases of Zionism while solving many of the problems which it confronted.²²

Krauskopf opposed political Zionism partly because he felt that it was not practical, but more because to him the Jews were the adherents of a creed, and not a race or nation. "Their mission is among the nations rather than in a nation of their own."²³ Krauskopf, however, did not entertain the fear of certain anti-Zionists that a return of some Jews to Palestine would reflect on the patriotism of other Jews who continued to live in the land of their choice. In this, he was almost alone in the Reform rabbinate.²⁴

Krauskopf clearly saw that anti-Semitism was not caused solely by religious differences. "In matters of religion the cultured American Gentile is generally indifferent."²⁵ It was in social requirements that the gentile was very particular. It was in this sphere that these newly arrived Jews were most guilty of sin. They were ill-mannered, vulgar, loud, ostentatious, obsessed by money and they thrust themselves into places where they were not wanted.²⁶ This evil had to be quickly corrected or the position of the Jew in America would be

seriously and permanently impaired. The Jew, being a small minority, was in the limelight and must be better than his fellow-gentile if he was to gain good will and considerate treatment.²⁷

In accordance with his views that anti-semitism must be combated first by making the Jew more acceptable to his neighbors, Krauskopf began to infuse ^{into} his congregants ~~with~~ the basic tenets of Reform. The Reform Jew had broken away from the beliefs and practices of his ancestors. His concept of right and wrong was different. His God was no longer a tribal God of Israel alone; he did not hold that Palestine was the only land sacred in the eyes of God; his services could no longer be a hybrid mixture of Orientalism and Occidentalism, of Kabbalism and Rationalism.²⁸

The Jew had to be made aware of what his religion said concerning the problems of the day; problems such as Judaism's stand on the position of Jesus. The first step was logically, the establishment of a Jewish Publication Society that would bring to Jews literature informing them on a multitude of religious and social questions. To Krauskopf, the most natural step was to organize such an institution. On June 3, 1888, the Jewish Publication

Society of America was born. This society was to place books on history, religion, and Jewish literature in the homes of Jews throughout the United States. This society was to supply the material with which Jewish children could obtain religious education; to acquaint the adult with the real differences that prevailed between Jew and Christian, thus enabling him to see what common ground there was between the two faiths.²⁹

III

Krauskopf was not, however, entirely an apologist. He saw the many faults of the Christians in their views of Jews and Judaism and his sharp tongue lashed out at the Christian time after time. One of the most vexing problems was the Christian contention that the Jews had crucified the Son of God and therefore must be hated. Krauskopf attacked this view on a scientific and historical basis.³⁰

"Their pessimistic view displays little knowledge of the theological cataclysms that have shaken Christology to its very foundations, ever since Darwin and Spencer, and their co-laborers made their advent, ever since the mythologies and dogmas of the New Testament fell under the dissolving influences of modern criticism and science."³¹

Krauskopf used biblical criticism with a devastating effect on fundamental Christianity which insisted that the Jew must accept Jesus. He analyzed the Christian belief in Christ. The Christians believed that (1) Christ was miraculously born; (2) performed miracles; (3) was marvelously wise, having direct revelations from God in heaven; (4) at the moment of his death the entire universe was upset; (5) his death was part of the divine plan; (6) he descended into hell to redeem ^{the} damned; (7) his was a vicarious atonement for the sins of man. But when asked where in the New Testament this dogma was found, the Christian was hard put for an answer.³²

"We see from a comparison between the gospels of St. Mark and St. John, that the older the story of Jesus, the simpler it is, the freer from super-natural, the friendlier to the Jew; and that the further removed the story is from the lifetime of Jesus, the more elaborate, complicated, ecclesiastical, Christological, it becomes, and the more hostile it grows towards the Jew."³³

Nor would Krauskopf stand for defamation of the synagogue. When in 1919, Sargent's infamous painting "the Synagogue" was placed in the Boston Public Library, Krauskopf became enraged and demanded that it be taken down, for the constitution of a free America explicitly forbade the placing of scurrilous, prejudicial material in a public

place.³⁴

At the turn of the century, an epidemic of passion plays broke out over the face of Europe. Krauskopf attended the infamous Passion Play held at Oberammergau and his outburst from the pulpit was vitriolic in its denunciation of this un-Christian drama:

"It being un-Christian to preach and teach and enact even a true story, if by it passions are aroused and prejudices engendered, what shall we say when that is done, day after day, year after year, century after century, in church and in school, in press and on stage, with a story that is false, all false, and that leads to results most painful to the Jew, and most injurious to the promotion of peace and good will?"³⁵

The passion play at Polna also aroused Krauskopf to make a plea to the Christian world to stop plays of that nature.³⁶

With the birth of the twentieth century, anti-Semitism reached unprecedented heights. The Jew was being attacked as owning most of the wealth not only of the United States but the entire world; he was suspected of attempting to gain control of the world; and most seriously, his loyalty and patriotism was constantly challenged. Krauskopf met each challenge with a rational and reasonable

reply. He believed that the Jew was neither race, nation nor denomination, but rather a combination of the three.³⁷ He accepted the cry that the Jew was clannish but he replied that this was not by choice. Society with its prejudice forced the Jew to travel in his own social circle. He was discriminated against in the army, in schools and in hotels; he was defamed in the literature of the day, and once rejected, on the basis of Jewishness, he refused to subject himself to further abuse.³⁸

The Jew must remain a Jew though conversion to Christianity would be to his advantage. For the Jew could not accept Jesus as the Messiah, born of human mother and God; nor could he believe in the suspension of the immutable laws of nature, nor in the cruelty of his ancestors. Besides, Christianity without Christology became Judaism.³⁹ Krauskopf suspected the motives of those Jews who had converted to Christianity:

"Remembering that a man's religious belief is often the heritage of generations of ancestry, interwoven with his fibre, therefore, not easily cast aside, and seeing that, religiously and ethically, Judaism and Christianity are the same, that when they differ it is only in a few moot theological points, which are entirely dispensable for leading a true and pure life

on earth, it becomes evident, that when we see apostasies from Judaism to Christianity, we cannot attribute such conversion to some sudden dawning of a light that never dawned before.....I believe that these conversions are due to other motives than those of conviction, either to persuasion or to force or to policy. If not due to any of these, then I believe them due to some aberration of the mind, or to sheer desperation, in consequence of persecution or fanatical narrowness, within the fold."⁴⁰

Krauskopf, in a series of lectures, discussed converts from Judaism through the ages to show how some force other than religion impelled these conversions.⁴¹ This was true of converts from Judaism, but converts to Judaism had an entirely different reason. A convert to Judaism was never one forced to convert. Rather he was attracted to "its simple grandeur of doctrine, nobility of heart and soul and mind which it fostered, by the divine halo which it sheds about the rights and liberties of the individual"⁴², despite obstacle, disadvantage, and contempt.

This was not the only time that Christianity came out second best in the comparisons Krauskopf continually drew. One of the most masterful examples was Krauskopf's interpretation of "Cyrano de Bergerac". He held that Cyrano was the Jew; of inner beauty in mind and soul.

Christian was the Christian, whose outward form was very fair. In the history of civilization it was the blending of the Jewish spirit and the Christian form which conquered the heart of Humanity. (Roxane). Yet, it is the Jewish heart and soul and mind that win, even though Christian secures the prize; for in those few moments when he tries to win the heart of humanity by himself, without the aid of the Jewish soul, he fails dismally.

"Whatever Humanity has loved as sublimely grand and glorious and divine has all been Jewish. It is the Jew who reached the heart of Humanity through the Christian. Western civilization all itself Christian, and yet is Jewish to the core. The God it worships, the Christ it seeks to imitate, the Bible it cherishes as its most sacred treasure, the Psalms it sings, the Prophets it reads, the Beatitudes it repeats, the Sabbath it observes, the Decalogue it follows, the moral law it makes the basis of social and political life, all these are the outpourings of the Jews heart and soul and mind. And unlike Cy-rano, the Jew will ultimately be recognized by humanity before it is too late.....the Jew will ultimately receive the laurel of his own spotless achievement." 43

The scurrilous anti-Semitic propaganda which Henry Ford printed in Dearborn was passed over the Krauskopf in his most devastating and crushing manner: "It is not for the cobbler to criticize ought else but the shoe" 44

The equally dangerous assumption that Jews were universally wealthy was proven a fallacy by Krauskopf. He admitted that centuries of compulsory engagement in trading pursuits had developed in many Jews a superior skill in trading and in finance, but this trait was an acquired one, not a natural one. He had little difficulty in pointing out ~~that~~ the great wealth in the United States was not in the hands of Jews, for the Rockefellers, the Astors, the Russel Sages, the Carnegies, the Fricks, ~~the Krupps~~, the Vanderbilts, the Goulds, the Flaglers, the Morgans, the Wanamakers, the Hydes, the Rhodes, the Wideners and Elkins were none of them Jewish.⁴⁵

As for the Patriotism of the Jew, Krauskopf could not understand how it could for one moment be doubted.⁴⁶ Though the Jew, throughout history, had never received what the average citizen must receive to be patriotic... ..equality, guarantee of inalienable human rights, liberty of conscience, peaceful relationships with his fellow citizens, irrespective of creed or race.....the Jew had always been loyal to the country in which he lived, whether that country had been Germany, Austria, England, France, Russia or the United States.⁴⁷

"While others, enduring but an infinitesimal part of their (the Jews) suffer-

ings, inaugurate Reigns of Terror..... the Jew permits himself to be spat upon, to be trampled underfoot, patiently he endures, heroically he suffers, he continues the Patriot, heaps benefits upon the people that degrade him and blesses that hand that smites him. The Patriotism of the Jew is to me his highest virtue."48

If anti-Semitic feeling could be transformed into pro-Jewish sentiment by the use of rational argument and proof, Krauskopf was the man to do it. He fought as a brave Jew inspiring other Jews to be equally brave. He accepted his Judaism proudly and invited his fellow-Jew to do likewise. Throughout his career, he was always faithful to the creed he formulated for himself in the early years of his rabbinate:

"Searching in my deepest depth for my belief, I find this to be an honest statement of my creed: I believe in the love of man and in the love of God. I believe in service human and in service divine. I believe in labor as manly and in duty as Godly. While proudly acknowledging my Israelitish descent, and my and the civilized world's indebtedness to Judaism, and while eager to maintain my historical identity with that people and faith, still I believe that all people are my brethren, and that my God is all peoples' God. I believe in extending the hand of religious fellowship to all who believe as I believe, no matter what their descent or what their prior creed, and the hand of social fellowship to all who think and act as I do, no matter what their creed or con-

dition. I believe in doing as I would be done by. I believe in obedience to the laws of God as written in our hearts, to the laws of nature as inscribed in the universe, to the laws of man as enjoined in the codes and scriptures. I believe that all men have a right to social and intellectual and moral and religious freedom. I believe in a weekly Sabbath for rest, recreation and worship. I believe that it is all men's duty to acquire knowledge, and to foster it, to love progress and to further it. I believe in the inviolability of life and property, in the sanctity of the home and of the family-ties. I believe that the good of all Bibles may be accepted, and that the evil of all scriptures may be rejected. I believe that the good example and precepts of all religious teachers may be followed, no matter what their race or nationality, and that their evil example and precepts must be shunned, even if they are of our own faith or folk. I believe that virtue and sin will ultimately meet with their reward. I believe in the supremacy of reason over faith, of inquiry over credulity. I believe in forms and ceremonies, when they are accessories to awe and reverence, when they stimulate the mind to right thinking, and the heart to right feeling, and the hand to right doing. I believe that ignorance is a curse and should be extirpated, that tyranny is a crime and should be eradicated, that fanaticism is a vice and should be uprooted, that war is a mortal sin, and should be expunged. I believe that happiness is for the highest good, and that peace and goodwill are the best means for its attainment."

49

Notes to Chapter IV

1. "Peace, Peace, But There is No Peace", OP, Series 7, Feb. 20, 1894; "The Parting of the Ways Between the United States of America and Russia", OP, vol. 25, no. 6, Dec. 10, 1911.
2. "Russia and Her Jews", OP, vol. 4, no. 7, Nov. 30, 1890; "Patriotism verses Humanitarianism--Tolstoi and Patriotism", OP, vol. 28, no. 7, Dec. 20, 1914.
3. "Much Profession-Little Practice", OP, vol. 19, no. 5, Dec. 3, 1905; "Pobledonostzeff-The Russian Grand Inquisitor", OP, vol. 20, nos. 23, 24, 25, 1907; "The Ukranian Pogroms", OP, vol. 33, no. 6, Dec. 7, 1919.
4. "What To Do With the Russian Refugee", OP, vol. 19, no. 7, Dec. 17, 1905.
5. "The Wail of the Modern Ghetto", OP, vol. 14, no. 10, Dec. 23, 1900.
6. "The Problem of the Ghetto", OP, vol. 18, no. 11, Jan. 10, 1904, p. 75.
7. Joseph Krauskopf, Old Truths in New Books, Dec. 15, 1901.
8. Ibid., p. 57.
9. see the following sermons: "Model Dwellings for the Poor", OP, vol. 6, no. 11, Jan. 8, 1893; "To Farm is To Arm", OP, vol. 31, no. 18, March 3, 1918; "Is Jefferson's Prophecy Fulfilling?", Oct. 23, 1921; "Solving the Food Problem", OP, vol. 34, no. 12, Oct. 3, 1920.
10. "Americanism Waning-The Immigrant", OP, vol. 29, no. 17, March 19, 1916, p. 116.

11. see the following sermons: "Prejudice Ascribed to Social, Religious, National, Economic Differences"; "Prejudice, How it can be Cured by Christian, Jew"; OP, vol. 21, nos. 15-20, 1908.
12. "Society and Its Morals", OP, vol. 13, no. 26, April 15, 1900, p. 7.
13. Ibid., p. 8.
14. "Americanism Waning-The American Negro", OP, vol. 29, no. 21, May 16, 1916, p. 154.
15. "Americanism Waning-The Japanese", OP, vol. 29, no. 20, May 9, 1916.
16. "The Alumni of K.I.", OP, vol. 22, no. 25, May 18, 1909, pp. 165-167.
17. "Whoso tilleth his land shall have bread", OP, vol. 10, no. 6, Nov. 22, 1896, pp. 5-6.
18. "Native Against Foreigner", OP, vol. 3, no. 25, May 13, 1890, p. 11.
19. "A Cure for anti-Semitism", OP, vol. 18, no. 6, Dec. 11, 1904, pp. 55-56.
20. "Noble Impulses are Speechless Prophets", OP, vol. 11, no. 9, Dec. 19, 1907, pp. 6-7.
21. Ibid., pp. 5-6; see also: "The People Without a Country", OP, vol. 10, no. 12, Jan. 3, 1897, p. 8; "Not All Israelites Are of Israel", OP, vol. 26, nos. 12, 13, 1913, pp. 52-53.
22. "Zionism as a Cure of Anti-Semitism", OP, vol. 18, no. 6, Dec. 11, 1904, pp. 49-55.

23. "The Dream of the Zionist", OP, vol. 30, May 29, 1917, pp. 198-202.
24. Ibid., pp. 199-200; see also; David Philipson, My Life as an American Jew, pp. 156-157.
25. "Set Thy House in Order", OP, vol. 36, no. 17, March 5, 1923, p. 9.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid. p. 10.
28. "Removal of the Leaven", April 21, 1889, pp. 3-6.
29. "The People of the Book", Nov. 18, 1888.
30. see the following sermons: "The Christ That Would Be Crucified Today", OP, vol. 19, no. 24, April 15, 1906, pp. 150-156; "The Wandering Jew", OP, vol. 35, no. 11, 1922; "Not Guilty-saith the Jew", OP vol. 22, no. 24, May 11, 1909; "Between Palm Sunday and Easter", OP, vol. 25, no. 21, May 14, 1912.
31. "The Optimistic Spirit of Passover", OP, vol: 22, no. 23, April 6, 1909, p. 144.
32. Joseph Krauskopf, Jesus, Man or God?, 1911; see also: "Did Isaiah Prophecy Jesus?" OP, vol. 6, no. 9, Dec . 25, 1892; "Did Other Prophets Prophesy Jesus?", OP vol. 6, no. 10, Jan. 1, 1893; "From Jesus the Man to Jesus Christ the Deity", OP, vol. 21, nos. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12,; vol. 21, no. 21, no. 3, "The Jews and Jesus"; 21.9, "Hillel and Jesus"; 21.10, "Philo and Jesus"; 21.11, "Paul and Jesus"; 21.12, "The Gentile and Jesus", 1908.
33. Ibid., p. 8.

34. "Sargent's 'The Synagogue'", OP, vol. 33, no. 4, Nov. 23, 1919.
35. "A Rabbi's Impression of the Oberammergau Passion Play", OP, vol. 14, no. 24, April 8, 1901, p. 4.
36. "The Passion Play at Polna", OP, vol. 13, no. 7, Nov. 26, 1899.
37. "The Evolution of the Jew", OP, vol. 16, no. 20, March 15, 1903; "Israel-a Nation, Race, or People?", OP, vol. 18, nos. 16, 17, Feb. 26, March 5, 1905.
38. "Pride in Being a Jew", OP, vol. 33, no. 19, March 7, 1920; "As Others See Us", OP, vol. 26, no. 8, Dec. 29, 1912.
39. "Why We Are Not Christians", OP, vol. 20, no. 21, March 31, 1907.
40. "Jewish Converts and Perverts", Jan. 4, 1891, pp. 10-12.
41. see the following sermons: "Spinoza-Not a Convert nor a Pervert", Feb. 8, 1891; "Borne and Heine-Perverts through Christian Intolerance", Feb. 22, 1891; "Isaac Disraeli- A Pervert through Jewish Intolerance", March 9, 1891; "Benjamin Disraeli-A Convert and yet Jewish", March 15, 1891.
42. "Jewish Converts and Perverts", Jan. 4, 1891, p. 9.
43. "Cyrano de Bergerac-The Story of the Jew", OP, vol. 12, no. 26, April 9, 1899, pp. 5-6.
44. "Henry Ford-A Condemnation", OP, vol. 34, no. 4, 1921, p. 33.

45. "The Fallacy of 'Rich as a Jew'", OP, vol. 19, no. 6, Dec. 10, 1905, pp. 41-45.
46. see the following sermons: "Patriotism vs. Humanitarianism: Jew and Patriotism", OP, vol. 28, no. 11, Jan. 17, 1915; "The Jewish Pilgrim Fathers", OP, vol. 19, no. 4, Nov. 26, 1905; "Some Ideals of the Jew", OP, vol. 20, nos. 18, 19, March 10, 17, 1907; "The Loyalty of the Jew", OP, vol. 31, no. 15, Feb. 10, 1918; "The Jew as Patriot", OP, vol. 3, no. 8, Dec. 15, 1889; "Need of Americanizing Americans", OP, vol. 35, no. 18, 1922; "Consecration of the Temple Service Flag", OP, vol. 31, no. 4, Nov. 25, 1917; p. 40; "Esther, An Old Story-Yet Ever New", OP, vol. 19, no. 18, March 11, 1906.
47. "Patriotism vs. Humanitarianism-Jew and Patriotism", OP, vol. 28, no. 11, Jan. 17, 1915, p. 85.
48. "The Jew as Patriot", OP, vol. 3, no. 8, Dec. 15, 1889, pp. 7-8.
49. "My Creed", OP, vol. 8, no. 2, Sept. 28, 1894, p. 3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Our Pulpit, vol. 1-37, Philadelphia, Penn., 1887-1923.

Krauskopf, Joseph, Evolution and Judaism, Bloch Publishing Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, 1886-1887.

Krauskopf, Joseph, Jesus--Man or God? , Leo Wise Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, 1911.

Krauskopf, Joseph, Kiddush, Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel, Philadelphia Penn., 1907.

Krauskopf, Joseph, Old Truths in New Books, Oscar Klonower, Philadelphia, Penn. 1901.

Krauskopf, Joseph, The Seven Ages of Man, Oscar Klonower, Philadelphia, Penn. , 1902.

Krauskopf, Joseph, Some Isms of To-day, Oscar Klonower, Philadelphia, Penn., 1904.

Krauskopf, Joseph, Gleanings from our Vineyard, Oscar Klonower, Philadelphia, Penn. 1896.

Manhattan CCA R?

Secondary Sources

Allen, Frederick Lewis, The Big Change: America Transforms Itself 1900-1950, Harper and Bros., New York, 1952.

Allman, Herbert D., A Unique Institution: The Story of the National Farm School, JPS of America, Philadelphia, 1935.

American Jewish Yearbook, vol. 26, 1924-1925.

Bailey, Thomas A., A Diplomatic History of the American People, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1946.

Beard, Charles and Mary, The Rise of American Civilization, The Macmillan co., New York, 1949.

Blau, Joseph, "An American Jewish View of the Evolution Controversy", HUCA, vol. XX, pp. 617-634.

Burt, Edwin A., Types of Religious Philosophy, Harper and Bros., New York, 1951.

Central Conference of American Rabbis Year Book, vols. 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 22, 26, 27.

Commager, Henry Steele, The American Mind: An Interpretation of American Thought and Character since the 1880's, New Haven, 1950.

Curti, Merle, The Growth of American Thought, Harper and Bros., New York, 1943.

Goldman, Eric F., Rendezvous with Destiny, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1952.

Janowsky, Oscar I., The American Jew: A Composite Portrait, Harper and Bros., New York, 1942.

Levy, BH., Reform Judaism in America, New York, 1933.

Philipson, David, The Reform Movement in Judaism, The Macmillan Co., London, 1907.

Philipson, David, My Life as an American Jew, Kidd and Son, Inc. Cincinnati, Ohio, 1941.