

AUTHOR Martin P. Beifield, Jr.

TITLE "Joseph Krauskopf: 1887-1903"

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

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

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis.                      ☒

yes                  no

Martin P. Bujield Jr.  
Signature of Author

Microfilmed 7/8/75  
Date

Maria Steiner  
Signature of Library Staff Member

JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF

1887-1903

by

Martin P. Beifield Jr.

Thesis submitted in partial  
fulfillment of the  
requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College - Jewish  
Institute of Religion

1975

Referee, Dr. Jacob R. Marcus

## DIGEST

Joseph Krauskopf was a Radical Reform rabbi who lived at the turn of the twentieth century. Though foreign born, he was educated in America in Fall River, Massachusetts. In 1883, he graduated in the first class of the Hebrew Union College and went to B'nai Jehudah in Kansas City for his first job as a rabbi. He met with great success there and developed a reputation as a social activist and preacher of morality. After unsuccessfully seeking the position of assistant rabbi at Temple Emanuel in New York, he became in 1887 the rabbi at Keneseth Israel in Philadelphia. He succeeded Dr. Samuel Hirsch and remained at Keneseth Israel until his death. His social activism led to his involvement in dozens of organizations, the most noteworthy being the Jewish Publication Society of America and the National Farm School, both of which he founded. He also started the Model Dwelling Association, an unsuccessful attempt to build low-cost housing for the poor in Philadelphia. During the Spanish-American War, he was appointed field agent for the National Relief Commission and inspected United States Army camps and hospitals in the United States and Cuba. In his role as rabbi and advocate of Radical Reform Judaism, he instituted Sunday services, used English as the language of prayer and instruction, and abolished numerous

rituals which he believed were inconsistent with a modern, American religion. Under his guidance, Keneseth Israel became one of the largest congregations in America. In 1903, he became director of the Isaac M. Wise Memorial Fund and later that year was elected president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Krauskopf considered himself to be an heir of prophetic Judaism and, as such, believed in the perfectibility of mankind through ethical living and expressed hope that society would progress to a messianic age. He anticipated the end of religious distinctions with all people united as one brotherhood pursuing their common messianic goal.

This work covers his life from 1887, when he came to Keneseth Israel, to 1903, when he was elected president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. An Historical Introduction. . . . .	1
II. Fall River to Kansas City . . . . .	5
III. The Move to Philadelphia, 1885-1887 . . . . .	14
IV. The Jewish Publication Society. . . . .	31
V. The Model Dwelling Association. . . . .	39
VI. The National Farm School. . . . .	45
VII. The Spanish-American War. . . . .	61
VIII. The Presidency of The Hebrew Union College. . .	67
IX. The Isaac M. Wise Memorial Fund . . . . .	72
X. The Central Conference of American Rabbis . . .	77
XI. Growth and Change at Keneseth Israel. . . . .	85
XII. Other Activities and Personal Notes . . . . .	91
XIII. Sunday Services . . . . .	100
XIV. Zionism . . . . .	110
XV. The Prayer Books. . . . .	116
XVI. Judaism and Christianity. . . . .	122
XVII. Thoughts on Contemporary Issues . . . . .	133
XVIII. Jewish Thinker. . . . .	151
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	168

## CHAPTER I

### AN HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

Life in America, in the period from 1887 to 1903 and even from the time of Joseph Krauskopf's arrival here in 1872, was wild and carefree, sometimes prosperous, sometimes hard, but always exciting. The 1870's witnessed the end of Reconstruction: by 1877 all of the Southern States had been readmitted to the Union and all were again firmly controlled by white supremacists. The 70's played host to a series of extravagant presidential administrations marked by scandal, stock and gold speculation, and a nationwide depression precipitated by the Panic of 1873. Towards the end of the decade, life became more prosperous and with prosperity came big business and scientific progress.

Aided by a transportation revolution which literally filled the country with railroad tracks, the great trust companies exemplified by John D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil Company were formed in the late 70's and early 80's. With laissez-faire the official policy of the federal government, these companies grew unimpeded until the Interstate Commerce Act was passed in 1887 to regulate the railroads and the Sherman Anti-trust Act was passed in 1890 to break up the monopolies. Liberal "Mugwumps" and Grover Cleveland united

to push through the much needed reforms but, helped by a sympathetic President McKinley and an agreeable Supreme Court, the industrial growth continued unabated and unchecked until Theodore Roosevelt became president in 1901.

Yet, this gloom did not pervade all of society. Great strides were made in science: the telephone was invented in 1876 and Edison's incandescent bulb appeared in 1879. Darwin was read by everyone and evolution shook both fundamentalist and liberal religions to their roots. The rapidly expanding railroads brought people and prosperity to the west. They also brought the ranchers' cattle hundreds of miles to the great midwestern markets; the cattle drives of the 1860's and early 70's became romantic memories. Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn were born becoming immortal heroes overnight. The public also sympathized with William Dean Howells' Silas Lapham and Stephen Crane's Maggie . . . both of which rang discordant notes in its conscience. In 1889, John L. Sullivan went seventy-five rounds with Jake Kilrain to become the bare knuckle champion of the world.

There was great conflict however festering beneath the apparent calm and prosperity of the times. The rise of the much needed labor movement underscored and actualized the violence and hatred which was simmering. In 1886, a great strike was called in Chicago by several unions, most notably the Knights of Labor. Though history tends to forget the

Knights and the purpose of the strike, deeply embedded is the Haymarket Square Riot which resulted in many deaths and the end of the Knights. In 1894, the year after the devastating Panic of 1893, Eugene Debs led the national Pullman Strike. Government and business, using violence as its primary tactic, conspired to break the strike and sent Debs, a socialist, to prison.

In the South, "Jim Crow" laws were passed by legislatures and welcomed by the people thus making the 1890's the beginning of one of the grimmest periods in the history of the American Black. Racial bitterness and animosity became as blatant as it had been before 1869 when the Ku Klux Klan was disbanded and moved underground.

As if these social and economic pressures did not put enough strain on the collective conscience of America, President McKinley, already a friend of big business and advocate of laissez faire, brought the country squarely into line with the great international movement of the late nineteenth century: imperialism. In 1898, with some shrewd dealing on the part of some important individuals, the United States embarked on its shortest and, from an expansionist point of view, most successful war.

Populism, the short-lived farmers' rights movement of the 1890's and, ironically, an assassin's bullet in 1901 were all instrumental in creating an awareness of the



contradictions inherent in the past quarter century. By accident Theodore Roosevelt became president in 1901. He was bold, clear-thinking, innovative, and a reformer and would start the process of moving America from its adolescence which characterized the Gilded Age to its maturity as a world leader.

It was in this world that Joseph Krauskopf lived.

## CHAPTER II

### FALL RIVER TO KANSAS CITY

Krauskopf's life, from his arrival in America in 1872, to his coming to Keneseth Israel of Philadelphia in 1887, was one of accomplishment, honor, and distinction. He came to America at the age of fourteen and spent the next three years in Fall River, Massachusetts working as a tea clerk, learning English, and being exposed to literature and refined living in the home of Mary Bridges Canedy Slade, a poet and one of Fall River's leading citizens. It was she, apparently, who influenced Krauskopf to enter the rabbinate. Many years after his ordination Krauskopf said, probably in reference to Slade, "that I am to-day in the ministerial profession is due to a Christian lady."<sup>1</sup> About her feelings for him, Krauskopf said,

when I was about to enter the Hebrew Union College, a noble Christian friend of mine, a very distinguished and scholarly lady [Slade], wrote for me a letter of recommendation. After enumerating all of the virtues she thought I possessed, she concluded with the words: "in short, he is in every respect a good Christian boy. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Joseph Krauskopf, Sunday Lectures, IX:7, 24 November 1895. Hereafter referred to as SL.

2. SL, I:10, 19 February 1888.

Another positive evaluation of Krauskopf's character at this age came from William Reed, the editor of The Fall River

Daily Evening News:

This is to certify that I am well acquainted with Mr. Joseph Krauskopf the bearer of this and know him to be a young man of excellent ability, honorable life and fine aspirations. He wishes to acquire a good education, and having found an opportunity, I heartily commend him to all with whom he may come in contact, and have no doubt I shall hear a very fine report of him in the future.<sup>3</sup>

The impression he created in Fall River was emblematic of the reactions which would follow him throughout his career.

Armed with Reed's letter and Slade's recommendation, Krauskopf enrolled at Hebrew Union College as a member of the school's first class. In 1875, the classes of the College were held in the basement of Bene Israel at Eighth and Mound Streets from 3-5 o'clock each afternoon. Krauskopf, with almost all of his classmates, also attended Hughes High School. He received a Bachelor of Hebrew Literature (B.H.L.) from H.U.C. in 1879, the same year he graduated from Hughes. During the next four years of classes at the College, he also attended McMicken College, the forerunner of the University of Cincinnati, and graduated from both institutions in 1883. Besides Krauskopf, there were three others in the College's first class: David Philipson, Henry Berkowitz, and Israel Aaron.<sup>4</sup>

---

3. Letter of recommendation from William Reed, Fall River, 14 September 1875, in the Krauskopf Collection at the Urban Archives Center of Temple University, Philadelphia. Hereafter referred to as Temple.

4. For a detailed description of life at the Hebrew

The years in Cincinnati were successful ones for Krauskopf. He co-authored three books with his close friend, classmate, and future brother-in-law Henry Berkowitz: Bible Ethics, The First Union Hebrew Reader, and The Second Union Hebrew Reader. He served with distinction as a student rabbi for the High Holidays at Anshai Emeth in Peoria (1881) and at B'nai Israel in Kalamazoo (1882). Both congregations issued complimentary resolutions which attested to his abilities and energy. The Peoria congregation wrote:

. . . it was not to be expected that one so young in years, would be found with so rich a store of Knowledge, judgement and ability. Therefore be it Resolved. That the Congregation Anshai Emeth will follow the Rev. Mr. Krauskopf with its prayers, that his life may be spared to bless the church [sic] and our faith with the gifts and talents, wherewith he has been so abundantly endowed. . . .<sup>5</sup>

No less flattering were the words of the Kalamazoo congregation:

. . . resolved that we as a congregation do hereby tender our sincere thanks to brother Krauskopf for his untiring efforts in our behalf, both, in the matter of reorganising [sic] our sabbath school, establishing our bible class, as well as for the excellent discourses delivered,

Resolved that during the short stay in our midst Bro. Krauskopf has by his ability, culture and gentlemanly deportment shown himself to be possessed of those qualifications which peculiarly fit him for

---

Union College see especially David Philipson, My Life as an American Jew (Cincinnati: John G. Kidd and Son, 1941) and Philipson, "The History of the Hebrew Union College," Hebrew Union College Jubilee Volume, ed. David Philipson (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1925), pp. 1-70.

5. Resolution passed 10 October 1881, Temple.

the great life work, for which he is preparing, and that he may be eminently successful is the belief and wish of his many friends in Kalamazoo.<sup>6</sup>

Krauskopf's reputation continued to grow after ordination. He was sufficiently well known by 1885 that Kaufmann Kohler, one of America's leading rabbis and advocates of Reform Judaism, wrote to him,

I anticipate real pleasure from meeting you [at the Pittsburgh Conference which Kohler organized] for you are the leader of our young rabbis and I expect you to come with practical plans and propositions which will, no doubt, meet with hearty approval.<sup>7</sup>

Whether, in fact, Krauskopf was the "leader" or not is not significant; but to be thought of as such by this prominent figure was quite an accomplishment. Krauskopf did attend the Pittsburgh Conference (held 16-18 November 1885) and served as chairman of the Committee of the Whole on Platform and was elected vice president of the entire conference, both being notable achievements for the twenty-seven year old rabbi.

Not long after ordination, the four graduates must have begun working towards another degree from the College because a Doctor of Divinity (D.D.)<sup>8</sup> was awarded to each one a few years later. There is some dispute as to which person

---

6. Resolutions passed 27 September 1882, Temple.

7. Kaufmann Kohler, New York to Krauskopf, Kansas City, 2 November 1885, Temple.

8. Philipson says that, at that time, the D.D. was a graduate, not honorary degree. (Philipson, "The History of the Hebrew Union College," p. 67)

received the degree first. Both Krauskopf and Philipson have claimed to be the first recipient. Philipson has written that he received his degree in the summer of 1886 while the others, and Joseph Silverman a member of a later class, received theirs in 1887.<sup>9</sup> There is evidence, however, that Krauskopf earned the degree by April, 1886, but did not actually receive the degree until much later because the faculty wanted to confer all of the degrees at once.<sup>10</sup> Perhaps Philipson believed that the others finished their work later than he did; perhaps Philipson did, in fact, have the degree conferred

---

9. Philipson, "The History of the Hebrew Union College," p. 67.

10. The evidence for Krauskopf's assertion is this. H. Zirndorf, Secretary of the Faculty of Hebrew Union College wrote four very revealing letters to Krauskopf, who was then in Kansas City. In the first, dated 29 April 1886, he wrote that the degree would be conferred when Krauskopf came to Cincinnati to get it. This implies that Krauskopf had already fulfilled the requirements for the degree. In the second, dated 3 October 1886, he wrote that all the degrees would be conferred when the others in the class were ready to receive them. There is another letter dated 3 October 1886 written by Zirndorf, as a "friend," as opposed to "secretary of the faculty," in which he says ". . . I am able to add privately that the faculty is actuated by a spirit thoroughly conciliatory towards you." Clearly, something was amiss. The final letter, dated 24 October 1886, implies that Krauskopf was impatient at having to wait for the degree. "Respecting the 'D.D.' affair, all that I can say, is: you take the matter too serious: the faculty harbors towards you much benevolence. . . ." By the end of October, six months after the first communication regarding the degree, the matter is an "affair" and Krauskopf suspects the delay is a result of some ill feelings towards him on the part of the faculty (all the letters, Temple).

One can not help but wonder what we are seeing here. Did Krauskopf have trouble while he was in school? Does this reflect a compulsive competitiveness? Unfortunately,

upon him before the others. It is interesting, however, to see this element of competition between Krauskopf and Philipson. Both men were eminently successful from the day they stepped forth from the college, more so, perhaps, than most of their colleagues. There was sufficient time and reason for a rivalry to develop either when they were in school, or during their swift rises to the top of the American Reform Rabbinate, or while they "reigned" over their congregations. All that as it may, the degrees were conferred and it was one more accomplishment in young Krauskopf's career.

In February of his final year at H.U.C., Krauskopf applied for the job as rabbi of B'nai Jehudah in Kansas City. His application was one of forty-three and his election was by no means a foregone conclusion. Other applicants included Henry Iliowizi and Victor Caro, two older, European educated rabbis and a split developed in the congregation between those who wanted an "American" rabbi and those who wanted a "German" rabbi. In a letter dated 3 March 1883, just three days after Krauskopf's letter of application was sent, B. A. Feineman, the president of B'nai Jehudah, wrote to Krauskopf about the congregation and in reference to these two other applicants said, ". . . neither of the two Gentlemen will be the choice

---

Krauskopf did not keep a diary and there is just not enough other evidence to warrant any conclusions.

of our congregation. . . ."11 On 26 March, Feineman was able to write ". . . long ere this, have you rec'd the cheerful tidings of your successful election as our future Rabbi. . . . Well, my dear friend, the Battle is over, and we are the victors," The results of the election were thirty votes for Krauskopf and twenty for Rabbi Eppstein, the "incumbent" rabbi of the congregation.<sup>12</sup> The congregation would not regret its decision for Krauskopf proved to be an able rabbi. His four years in Kansas City were marked with one distinction after another. His two most notable achievements were the founding of the Poor Man's Free Labor Bureau, whose purpose was "to provide the labor-seeking poor with work"<sup>13</sup> and his appointment by Gov. Thomas Crittenden to the National Conference of Charities and Corrections.

Krauskopf's successes in Kansas City did not go unnoticed in the Reform Jewish world. Good rabbis were offered new jobs and Krauskopf had several opportunities to move. For example, in 1886 he could have gone to Chicago to succeed Bernard Felsenthal at Zion Congregation.<sup>14</sup> Felsenthal had long been a leader in national Reform circles and the man who

---

11. B. A. Feineman, Kansas City to Krauskopf, Cincinnati, 3 March 1883, Temple.

12. Ibid., 26 March 1883.

13. From the letterhead of the organization.

14. Zion Congregation, Chicago to Krauskopf, Kansas City, 13 December 1886, Temple.



succeeded him would step into a prominent and authoritative position. But by then Krauskopf was happy and very successful in Kansas City; his feelings for the people there were strong. He described how he felt about his experience in Kansas City when he refused another job, this one at Emanuel in San Francisco in 1884. Though somewhat early, it is representative of how Krauskopf came to feel about his years in Kansas City.

Had a very flattering call to the Emanuel Congr. of St. [sic] Francisco (Dr. Cohn's grand congr.). . . . Dr. W[ise] would gladly have me accept it for college sake. Yet, if I do, I would be activated purely by money reasons. K.C. congr. is dear to me. The people here have done well by me. They love me and I love them. I am under a three year's engagement. There is a vast difference in salary and yet who knows what K.C. may be able to do in a few years. Its growth is really phenomenal. My salary will be handsomely increased shortly. The matter is still in agitation, but the decision will be for K.C.<sup>15</sup>

He refused both of these jobs. But more would come as Krauskopf's name became better known throughout America. Organized Reform Judaism was young and growing and Krauskopf was fast becoming one of its leading spokesman. Before long, Krauskopf would be torn between his love for Kansas City and the urge for greater achievement and more honor, both of which were available in greater quantities in the East. He would vacillate for over a year, but, ultimately, his moving

---

15. Krauskopf, Kansas City to Max Heller, Chicago, 25 November 1884, Max Heller Collection, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.

to the East would be a matter of, to use Krauskopf's own word,  
"destiny."

CHAPTER III  
THE MOVE TO PHILADELPHIA,  
1885-87

In April, 1885, Krauskopf was contacted by Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel in Philadelphia in regard to a job. Krauskopf was interested enough to make some inquiries as to the precise nature of the position. Alfred T. Jones, a representative of the liberal congregation, informed him that the rabbi which the congregation proposed to hire would be on an equal footing with Samuel Hirsch, the congregation's current and distinguished rabbi.<sup>1</sup> Later that year, Jones wrote to Krauskopf with the information that Keneseth Israel would officially advertise for an assistant rabbi at the salary of three thousand dollars per year.<sup>2</sup> Eventually, owing to Dr. Hirsch's declining health, Keneseth Israel decided to hire a successor, not an assistant to Hirsch. Krauskopf, however, was not interested. Although he said that he was not worthy to be David Einhorn's and Samuel Hirsch's successor, there was another reason for his refusal. It was the custom for rabbis to preach "trial" sermons before a

---

1. Alfred T. Jones, Philadelphia to Krauskopf, Kansas City, 21 April 1885, Temple. This letter elaborates on the contents of an earlier letter which, unfortunately, is not extant.

2. Alfred T. Jones to Krauskopf, 19 October 1885, Temple.

congregation would hire them and this Krauskopf refused to do. He did, however, admit that if "a prominent congr. should elect me without my having applied, or having gone on 'trial'," he would be given his release from his contract with the Kansas City congregation.<sup>3</sup> Discounting Krauskopf's expression of his unworthiness as rhetorical and pro forma, it seems as if Krauskopf, by refusing to go through the established and accepted procedure, is saying that he really is not interested in the position at Keneseth Israel. Nowhere does he use a special attachment or allegiance to Kansas City as his reason for not considering the matter. That omission is noteworthy because it is commonly believed that only his love for Kansas City kept him from coming to Philadelphia in 1886. That he was happy in Kansas City is not disputed but it was for another reason altogether that he declined to apply for the position at Keneseth Israel in 1885 and 1886.

As early as February, 1885, before Keneseth Israel had even decided officially to hire an assistant rabbi, there are indications that Krauskopf was interested in becoming Gustav Gottheil's assistant at New York's Temple Emanuel, the premier reform congregation in America. Philip Cowen, editor of the American Hebrew and member of Emanuel, expressed in two letters to Krauskopf his desire that Krauskopf apply for

---

3. Krauskopf to Alfred T. Jones, 3 May 1886, Temple.

the job at Emanuel<sup>4</sup> and that if Krauskopf were found to be suitable for the job some way would be found to get around Krauskopf's contract with Kansas City.<sup>5</sup> It appears from these letters that Krauskopf was interested in the position but that he saw his contract with Kansas City as standing in the way. Cowen must have overcome Krauskopf's hesitancy to some extent because he continued secretly to pursue Krauskopf's candidacy. By December, 1885, Krauskopf seemed to believe that he would not get the job. In a letter to Cowen, he mentioned "Dr. G[ottheil]'s" desire that his son, Richard, be hired and that the placement process be slowed until such time as that was possible. He continued:

You have strengthened my desire to come, but I am more than ever doubtful as to my ultimate success. Should even merit be on my side, diplomacy and intrigue may defeat me, and I may return to my Congr. with the 'diploma of failure.' If God has destined the place for me I will have it, if it is otherwise decreed, even then, my kind friend, believe me, I shall be everlastingly indebted to you for your kindness towards me, and I shall continue my work in K.C. as conscientiously as before, if I can not be a star in the sky, I shall try to be at least a lamp in the chamber.<sup>6</sup>

Fearful of defeat, Krauskopf wrote to Gottheil that he would not try out for the job but that if elected, which he admitted was impossible without a trial, he would accept

---

4. Philip Cowen, New York to Krauskopf, Kansas City, 5 February 1885, Temple.

5. Ibid., 16 February 1885, Temple.

6. Krauskopf to Philip Cowen, 23 December 1885, Temple.

the position. Using as an excuse his principle of not trying out for jobs, Krauskopf took himself out of consideration for the position he apparently wanted very badly. He wrote to Cowen: "you have proven to me that Dr. G. is a power in his congregation, that my friends dare not come out open for me, they must plan and scheme and plot against the plans and schemes and plots of Dr. G. . . ." <sup>7</sup> That the matter appeared closed is further demonstrated by a consoling remark made by Kaufmann Kohler. ". . . I would simply tell you that whether you still reflect on Temple Emanuel here or not, or in S. Franc. or in neither, your name is mentioned frequently in circles where the Reformer is read." <sup>8</sup>

Despite appearances, and possible defeat, Krauskopf pursued the issue. He scheduled several speaking engagements in New York City--acting like a general moving to the front lines at the critical moment of a battle hoping that his visible presence can rally his troops to victory. He went against the wishes of an older colleague and friend, Solomon Sonneschein, who recognized the overwhelming odds against Krauskopf's success.

It will be a hard road to travel by all means, and unless you have the nerve and pluck of a fighting cock as well as the sagacity and caution of the fox added to your natural and genial temper of the student and pastor, you cannot expect in making that headway which your honest and justified ambition anticipates. <sup>9</sup>

---

7. Ibid., 24 January 1886, Temple.

8. Kaufmann Kohler, New York to Krauskopf, Kansas City, 14 February 1886, Temple.

9. Solomon Sonneschein, St. Louis, to Krauskopf,

Though coming home without a concrete offer, it seems Krauskopf felt that his chances were improved by his trip. Giving a more positive impression than the one conveyed to Philip Cowen in December, he wrote to his dear friend, Max Heller:

As regards the position in New York it is a serious question. "Dr. G." is a power in his congr., he has a strong following, and will be the first power till age unfits him for his work, which means a position of assistant for perhaps ten years or more. The question was put to me unofficially in various forms, I evaded it as much as I could, and did not commit myself in any way. There will be a decision pro or con before long. Dr. G. and his clique will of course try their best for young Richard Gottheil when he returns from Europe.<sup>10</sup>

It is at this juncture that Krauskopf turned down the offer to give a trial sermon at Keneseth Israel. He wanted to go to Emanuel and was even willing to appear there knowing that his lectures were, in reality, trial sermons. Shortly after writing the letter to Keneseth Israel, Krauskopf received discouraging news about the job in New York from two sources. A Mr. Hammerslough of New York wrote to Krauskopf: "I repeat what I have several times told you, that I am of the opinion that the trustees feel it their duty to hear Dr. Gottheil's son before they decide upon anything in connection with the position at the Temple."<sup>11</sup> Philip Cowen wrote: "I

---

Kansas City, 26 March 1886, Temple.

10. Krauskopf, Kansas City to Max Heller, Chicago, 20 April 1886, Max Heller Collection, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.

11. Hammerslough, New York to Krauskopf, Kansas City, 6 May 1886, Temple.

admit that you did not come up to the expectations in all quarters, which is of course no light talk. . . . I believe frankly that you are the man for us." He noted that Krauskopf had not formally applied to the board of Emanuel but should expect an invitation to return in the fall. No decision would be made before then anyway. He hoped that Krauskopf would not commit himself to another congregation before Emanuel reached a final decision.<sup>12</sup> A more negative picture could hardly have been drawn. It is unclear whether he was aware of the news in Cowen's letter before he wrote to Alfred T. Jones. In other words, did he refuse Keneseth Israel because he was still expecting good news from New York or because he was angry at being rejected by Emanuel?

Nevertheless, Keneseth Israel persisted in its efforts to obtain Krauskopf as its Rabbi. In October (1886), the president of the congregation, David Klein, again invited Krauskopf to occupy the pulpit at Keneseth Israel and preach a trial sermon, assuring him confidentially that his election was secured if he came.<sup>13</sup> Krauskopf rejected the offer but his letter contains a reason not heretofore used. He declined, he wrote, because he was happy in Kansas City. If, on the other hand, the congregation would elect him without a trial

---

12. Philip Cowen to Krauskopf, 7 May 1886, Temple.

13. David Klein, Philadelphia to Krauskopf, 28 October 1886, Temple.



he would accept the position.<sup>14</sup> There are probably several reasons for Krauskopf's ambivalence. First of all, Temple Emanuel had still not filled the position of assistant rabbi. Perhaps Krauskopf was still hoping for that job and, while desiring to keep his options open, did not want to commit himself to another congregation until that matter was settled.<sup>15</sup> Secondly, Krauskopf might very well have decided by then that B'nai Jehudah's affection for him and the freedom he exercised there made that job as attractive as one in the East where he would have to compete with the memory of a highly distinguished predecessor. Thirdly, Max Heller, Krauskopf's close friend, had formally applied for the job in Philadelphia, a move which Krauskopf had not actually done. Perhaps Krauskopf did not feel the issue important enough to compete with a friend. On the other hand, he might have felt more qualified than Heller and thus insisted that he not be subject to the rules by which Heller and other applicants were obligated to follow. It is not possible, at this point, to resolve the ambivalence any further.

---

14. Krauskopf to David Klein, ? October 1886, Temple.

15. The board of trustees at Emanuel had reported to the congregation each year since 1885 (when the congregation voted to hire an assistant if and when one could be found) that no progress had been made and that they would continue looking for a rabbi. The matter was finally settled in January, 1888 when the congregation elected Joseph Silverman to be its Junior Rabbi.

The issue came to a head in November during which the following sequence of events occurred. On 6 November, after receiving another letter from Klein, Krauskopf apparently agreed to preach a trial sermon if firm assurances were given that it would result in his getting the job. This letter, however, reached Klein after Solomon Schindler, a rabbi in Boston, had been invited to speak. Klein explained the conflict and reissued the invitation to preach for another day. This letter was dated 21 November.<sup>16</sup> Meanwhile, Max Heller wrote to Henry Berkowitz for advice concerning the job at Keneseth Israel, a post in which he too was interested. Heller enclosed a very bitter letter he planned to send to Klein accusing him of blatantly misrepresenting Heller's chances for the job. Heller asked Berkowitz if he should send the letter.<sup>17</sup> Berkowitz took up the touchy matter with Krauskopf. Though a reply in Krauskopf's handwriting is not extant, Berkowitz sent this to Heller:<sup>18</sup>

Copy of Krauskopf answer to the Phila. affair.

"I regret much that ever a word was broached to Heller. Nothing may ever come out of the Phila. place for me, he might get ultimately that place yet, why

---

16. The 21 November 1886 letter contains a reference to the 6 November letter written by Krauskopf, Temple.

17. Max Heller, Houston to Henry Berkowitz, Mobile, 12 November 1886, Temple.

18. Henry Berkowitz to Max Heller, 24 November 1886, Max Heller Collection, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.

cause him unnecessarily all this heart-ache. Heller cannot stand it. And by all means, if that letter of his to Klein has not yet been sent, for his own sake let him never send it. He has no right to call that man hypocrite, fraud, liar, deceiver, for that his words mean, and nothing else. He may yet get that place, don't let him ruin every chance that yet remains. Klein is a prominent man, and Heller cannot afford so early in his career to insult him. If he is foolish enough to construe a President's 'forced assurances or promises' into pledges, the fault is Heller's not Klein's.

"Telegraph him, if necessary, to tear that letter into shreds and never think of it again, and if from your conversations with Heller you really think that if I were not in the way, Heller could get that place then I shall at once write to Klein and have him regard my letter to him as unwritten. Tell me frankly and at once, and then I shall write to Heller."

One can easily guess what transpired after this letter was sent because on 3 December Krauskopf wrote a very unambiguous letter to Klein in which he stated clearly that he would not leave Kansas City. Not only was he under contract to B'nai Jehudah but he was perfectly content to remain where he was despite numerous invitations to go elsewhere. He had turned down jobs at Shaare Emet in St. Louis and Sinai in New Orleans. In addition, he wrote, "I refused to entertain the thought of becoming Junior Rabbi at Temple Emanuel of New York[!]" He reaffirmed his principle of not trying out for any congregation and suggested that the position at Keneseth Israel be given to Max Heller.<sup>19</sup> Keneseth Israel, however, did not offer the job to Heller.

---

19. Krauskopf to David Klein, 3 December 1886, Temple.

Faced with these repeated failures to secure a successor to Dr. Hirsch, the Board of Trustees of the congregation altered its hiring policy and sent a committee to Chicago to hear Dr. Samuel Sale. Although it was "favorably impressed" with Sale, he did not pursue the matter. The board then decided to compromise even more and send someone to Kansas City to hear Krauskopf and who, if impressed, was empowered "to make arrangements with him [Krauskopf] for taking the position of Rabbi in our congregation," i.e., to hire him immediately without a trial sermon in Philadelphia.<sup>20</sup> Arnold Kohn, a member of the "Special Committee for Obtaining a Rabbi," was so designated with the added proviso that "if the same [i.e., Krauskopf], in his opinion, be not satisfactory, to go also to Louisville to hear Rev. Mr. [Adolph] Moses. . . . [And] to offer either Gentleman a yearly Salary not exceeding \$6000 and an engagement for 5 years."<sup>21</sup>

Whether or not Krauskopf encouraged Keneseth Israel to send a representative is not known. However, the intervening five months (between Krauskopf's December letter and this trip by Kohn) served, apparently, to dull Krauskopf's enthusiasm for Kansas City, because he accepted Kohn's and Keneseth Israel's

---

20. Minutes of the Special Board of Trustees meeting, 18 May 1887, Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel (Philadelphia) Minute Book (in the files of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati).

21. Minutes of the Special Board of Trustees meeting, 31 May 1887, Keneseth Israel Minute Book.

offer provided he could gain release from his contract with Kansas City. Krauskopf's conditional acceptance was read to the board of Keneseth Israel, accepted, and a motion was passed authorizing Klein to negotiate Krauskopf's release from his contract.<sup>22</sup> By 8 July, Klein was able to notify Krauskopf: "congratulate you heartily on the good result of your Congregation's deliberations, hope to welcome you soon to Keneseth Israel."<sup>23</sup> The board called a special meeting of the congregation for 21 July and there Krauskopf was elected to a five year term at the prearranged salary (two years at \$5000 and three years at \$6000). On the same day, he was officially informed of the results<sup>24</sup> and Krauskopf immediately wrote a letter of acceptance in which he attributed his coming to Philadelphia and Keneseth Israel to "destiny."<sup>25</sup>

Despite the seeming finality of the situation, neither the members of B'nai Jehudah nor, as will become apparent, Krauskopf himself considered his acceptance the end of the matter. The first hint that something was amiss is implied in a personal letter from Klein to Krauskopf in which he said,

Now one word to you my dear doctor, those expressions of feelings of misgiving, dread, or a strange indefinable

---

22. Ibid., 20 June 1887.

23. Telegram from David Klein to Krauskopf, 8 July 1887, Temple.

24. Benny Salinger, the secretary of the board of trustees, wrote the letter, Temple.

25. Jewish Exponent (Philadelphia), I:22, 9 September 1887, p. 1.

Something, these are things which I am surprised that you should allow to disturb your equanimity, let them vanish like a Spider web before the wind. . . .

Klein went on to assure Krauskopf that his move to Keneseth Israel was of great significance.<sup>26</sup>

Klein's letter is not simply a response to doubts in Krauskopf's mind as had been previously thought. The problem, it seems, is that Krauskopf decided to leave Kansas City after encountering resistance to something he was doing or wanted to do there. Otherwise he made it known that he was perfectly happy and would have been glad to remain where he was had there been no opposition to him. The congregation, when it discovered this to be the case, apparently decided to withdraw its resistance to Krauskopf. Thus Krauskopf was in the awkward position of being legally committed to Keneseth Israel but privately committed to staying in Kansas City, where, admittedly, he was quite content. This is all set forth in a very delicately worded letter which Krauskopf wrote to his congregants.<sup>27</sup>

Esteemed Friends,

Inasmuch as my severing my connection with my congr. has suddenly taken a very unexpected turn, and inasmuch as that change is destined to shape my whole future career it is of the greatest importance that my position be clearly understood.

Owing to a general expression of sincere regret by very many people of this city, including not only nearly

---

26. David Klein to Krauskopf, 15 September 1887, Temple.

27. Krauskopf to the Kansas City congregation, 20 September 1887, Temple.

all of the members of my congr. but also non-members and Gentiles, I remarked to Mr. Feineman [the president of B'nai Jehudah], and repeated the remark to a number of other gentlemen, that I was sorry that I was obliged to go, that I had always intended to remain here, and that I never would have decided upon a change had the state of congregational affairs not forced me to such a step; and that such is my love for my first congr. that had I the assurance that my congr. would give me a heartier support in the future and that the congr. of Philad. would peacefully consent to leave me remain with my old congr. I would still be willing to remain where I am.

This is my true positive position in this matter and in this manner must it be explained to the Public. Any other version would not only be not true but might also prove very detrimental to my character.

Very Truly,  
Jos. Krauskopf

It can be assumed that all of this was unknown to the community in Philadelphia which had already purchased and started to decorate his home and was expecting his arrival at any moment.

Klein was not able to solve Krauskopf's dilemma. He received two telegrams from Krauskopf, one on 24 September and one the next day,<sup>28</sup> which put off setting a specific day for his arrival in Philadelphia. On the afternoon of the 25th, the day that he received the second of the aforementioned telegrams, these two telegrams were also sent from Kansas City.

Our congregation, our citizens and surrounding country insist that Rabbi Krauskopf remain among us. A Delegation will be with you in a few days.

Louis Hammerslough

---

28. The text of the telegrams and the replies are found in the Keneseth Israel Minute Book, 2 October 1887.

Great excitement prevails, the Congregation will not let me go and they bring the weight of the whole city to bear upon me, though sold out and packed up I am asked to await the result of a conference between you and a delegation from here.

Jos. Krauskopf

Klein, after consulting with other members of the board, answered each telegram insisting to Hammerslough that Krauskopf must fulfill his agreement and that a delegation will accomplish nothing and expressing astonishment to Krauskopf for his indecision.

The president of the congregation also wrote a lengthy personal letter to Krauskopf in which he used all of his powers to persuade Krauskopf to come.

My dear and Reverend Sir:

Your telegram came like a bolt of lightening and thunder clap out of the clear sky. I could hardly believe my own Eyes in reading your and Mr. Hammerslough's Dispatches, and I asked myself, Is there no honor left among Jewish Rabbis. . . . Rabbis . . . whose duty it is to teach the third commandment in all its bearing that even the word yes or no should be as binding as an oath, what effect would action like that denoted in both telegrams have on the community at large, the confidence in ministers of the Gospel and their whole force and influence would be shattered, this would be the general effect. In regard to our closer relationship, I must say that I am astonished that you should even waver in your determination. We have come up to all requirements obligatory between Gentlemen, and So have you. We have petitioned Congregation B'nai Jehudah to release you from a former Contract, for reasons which were all important to Eastern Reform Judaism and if you yourself acquiesce, to allow you to become the Rabbi of Keneseth Israel Congregation. Your congregation promptly released you according to a letter I hold from B. A. Feineman, Esq., President. Keneseth Israel Congregation elected you unanimously and enthusiastically, you accepted that call, our Congregation made all preparations for your coming among us, and even our members and new acquired Seat renters Sustained the



Board in all our arrangements to beautify our Temple. Even the resignation of our venerable Doctor was accepted, and a handsome residence #1631 Franklin Str. I have rented for you. My dear Dr. under all these circumstances we can not retract an Iota from our Engagement, and we will expect you here as you promised. The telegrams, I have admonished our Board to Keep Entirely Secret, and although we have our Semi annual Congregational meeting tomorrow I will not mention a Syllable to anyone as to the Contents of your last Telegram. Your reputation is so widely known, and your calling too lofty, to allow it to be marred by such contemplated action. I am not surprised at all, that the People in Kansas City are as you say excited at your leaving, and naturally it should be so. You depicted it so in a former letter to me, but you must seriously consider the damaging effect your contemplated action would have on this community. What would Orthodoxy say and with right, of the reliability of Reform and its advocates. At the present state of affairs, I advise you as a friend, do not listen to any offers or negotiations, your excuse is the proper and right one, you have given your word and that is your Bond. Keneseth Israel Congregation is the proper field for you, and I must tell you in all candor Keneseth Israel will not, nor can she release you. Congregation, School, Confirmants [sic] all are awaiting your arrival here. Dr. Hirsch has not taken charge of the school for the Season, and such contemplated action as the Telegram denotes would be a most unfortunate occurrence to our community. I write this letter in an excited state of mind and you will excuse any too harsh words I may have used in answering your telegrams, the contents were so entirely unexpected, and so astonishing that I may have lost my equilibrium. But in closing I will say again, that we expect you here as our Rabbi without any equivocation, and your Position I am positive is secured as long as ever Keneseth Israel is congenial to you and in your own interest, and is in every way preferable to Kansas City. Please wire me as soon as you receive this letter when we can expect you here and let any other consideration vanish in the air before you. With warmest expressions for your welfare and higher regard for yourself. . .

David Klein, Pres.<sup>29</sup>

---

29. Ibid.

The Kansas City congregation, ignoring the warnings that it would be futile to send a delegation, sent Messrs. Hammerslough, Cahn, and Woolman to Philadelphia to secure Krauskopf's release from his contract. Considering Krauskopf's expressed feelings, it is highly unlikely that they would have traveled so great a distance without having Krauskopf's approval. They met with several members of the Board of Trustees who convinced them that Krauskopf had no choice but to fulfill his obligation to come to Keneseth Israel and prevailed upon them to so inform Krauskopf. The letter is noteworthy because it clearly implicates Krauskopf in the plan which was devised to free him from his obligation.

Oct. 5, 1887

Dear Doctor,

We met the committee last night and had a long interview with them. They were respectful but firm. The documents and arguments they had in their side were unanswerable, and besides they had gone so far and done so much, based upon the idea of your coming hither, as to make it absurd and almost impossible for them to recede from their position.

Consequently when we found there to be nothing else for us to do, Mr. Hammerslough went to the Pres't and left word that we concluded to drop the matter. I can't go into details now, except that just as I feared, the trustees regarded your letter, which you gave Mr. H. on the train, as in their favor, and showing a desire to come here etc. They grasped it quietly but eagerly, saying "this is ours."

Mr. Hammerslough, Mr. Cahn, and I believe that the only thing for you to do is to carry out your contract with the Philadelphia people to the letter.

In haste with best wishes, and with kindest regards to Mrs. K., I am

Sincerely yours,  
[?] Woolman<sup>30</sup>

---

30. Woolman, Philadelphia to Krauskopf, 5 October 1887, Temple.

In this inauspicious manner, the controversy surrounding Krauskopf's coming to Keneseth Israel ended. He left Kansas City shortly thereafter and was installed as the third rabbi in the history of Keneseth Israel on Saturday, 23 October 1887. It is interesting that after his arrival the relationship between Krauskopf and the board was excellent. The board never wavered in its support for Krauskopf and it was not long before he made Keneseth Israel one of the leading congregations in America. If Krauskopf continued to harbor doubts about the wisdom of the change he kept them hidden. It is more likely that once he settled into his new position he found the possibilities open to him exhilarating. It is a tribute to Krauskopf that he let very few of them pass by. He seized upon many ideas, his voice rang out clearly on behalf of them, and his energies brought many of them to fruition. Having once believed that he was destined to be only "a lamp in the chamber," Krauskopf found that being rabbi at Keneseth Israel enabled him to fulfill his ambition to be that "star in the sky" he so passionately desired to be.

## CHAPTER IV

### JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY

Krauskopf's first major project at Keneseth Israel, aside from strictly congregational matters, was the formation of a Jewish publication society. As was the case with most of his later projects, his initial public step was to broach the subject from the pulpit. He began by making a traditional distinction between Jews and non-Jews or, to be more precise, by describing what made Jews and Judaism unique.

. . . Higher Will and Wisdom guides our way and shapes our ends. . . . [Jews are] not held together by ties of any fatherland nor decrees by any spiritual chief, that people lives because destiny so orders it, because the world still has need of it, because it has been divinely entrusted with a mission, which has not yet been fully performed.

Traditional distinctions, however, were no longer operative as far as Krauskopf was concerned. He believed that all religions, in their purest form, were basically the same, i.e., that essential principles of each were the brotherhood of man and fatherhood of God. But if it were to lack a mission unique to itself, Judaism would die out. He suggested that Judaism adopt as its particular mission the spreading of truth and knowledge to the rest of mankind. It could not be a passive mission because all religions prayed for the enlightenment

of the world. What would distinguish Judaism from other religions would be its active dissemination of such truth. The best and most logical method to achieve this goal and fulfill Judaism's mission was to organize a publication society through which essential truths could be transmitted to everyone.<sup>1</sup>

Having informed the congregation and other members of the community (his lectures were attended by many Christians) of his plans, Krauskopf turned to the practical details. Fortunately, there already existed a mechanism by which Krauskopf could pursue the idea. One of Krauskopf's new programs at Keneseth Israel was the formation of "The Society of Knowledge Seekers" whose purpose was to draw together from the congregation people interested in pursuing mainly academic Jewish subjects. Meetings were held weekly at first, then monthly and the program generally consisted of a paper read by a member followed by a general discussion. It appears that the group was successful for one can find regular notices in Philadelphia's Jewish Exponent announcing in advance the scheduled program and usually a follow up story on what happened at the gathering. While this group was in its infancy it took upon itself the task of organizing Krauskopf's publication society.

On Thursday evening, 22 December, less than two weeks after Krauskopf's appeal from the pulpit, the Knowledge Seekers approved, in principle, a commitment to raise money to start

---

1. SL, I:1, 11 December 1887.

a publication society.<sup>2</sup> Shortly thereafter they appointed a committee of six (Benny Salinger, Solomon Blumenthal, Solomon Selig, Melvin J. Weinstock, Adolf Eichholz, and Krauskopf<sup>3</sup>) which sent a circular to the president of each congregation in Philadelphia and to the Young Men's Hebrew Association asking them each to appoint committees of three people to meet together at a designated time and place to further the cause of the publication society.<sup>4</sup> At that meeting, which took place on Thursday, 23 February 1888, the delegates formed a select committee, composed of Morris Newburger, Krauskopf, Rev. S. Kaufman, Dr. Solomon Solis-Cohen, Isaac Saller, Adolf Eichholz, and Simon E. Stern to draw up formal and specific plans for the formation of a publication society.<sup>5</sup>

On 29 March, at the suggestion of the smaller, select committee the delegates voted to hold a national convention on 3 June, in Philadelphia, to establish, officially, a publication society.<sup>6</sup> A circular, announcing the aims of the publication society and publicizing the date of the

---

2. Jewish Exponent (Philadelphia), II:12, 30 December 1887, p. 8.

3. Ibid., II:15, 30 January 1888, p. 8.

4. Ibid., II:16, 27 January 1888, p. 8.

5. Ibid., II:21, 2 March 1888, p. 5.

6. Ibid., II:26, 6 April 1888, p. 5.

national convention, was sent around the country. It also appeared in the Jewish Exponent.<sup>7</sup>

To the Jewish Community of America, With the object of Securing Representative Sympathizers to a Call for a Convention to organize an American Jewish Publication Society that shall have for its object:

To familiarize American Jews with

- 1 -- The Ethics of Judaism
- 2 -- The History of the Jewish People
- 3 -- The Writings of Jewish Ministers,

by the publication of books, essays, and such other writings as may from time to time, be deemed advisable, of such a tendency as shall command the support of all parties among Jews.

This was issued to all Jewish Congregations and their ministers so far as these could be learned, and to a few individuals known to be interested. The response was encouraging, and a call has been issued appointing Philadelphia, June 3d, 1888, as the place and time.

As, however, there may be many who would gladly participate, whose addresses are unknown to the Committee having the matter in charge, as it is desired to interest the entire Jewish Community of America, through the Jewish press, this is a general invitation to individuals and to Congregations and Jewish societies, to attend the meeting, or to be represented thereat by delegates or by letter.

The circular was signed by Krauskopf and Solomon Solis-Cohen which was significant in that Krauskopf was the leading spokesman of Reform in Philadelphia and Solis-Cohen was a leading Orthodox layman in Philadelphia. The call demonstrated that, even though the early stages of the work for the publication society had been a Reform undertaking, the actual society would be a broadbased venture satisfying the needs of all segments of the Jewish community.

---

7. Ibid., III:6, 18 May 1888, p. 8.

The meeting on Sunday, 3 June was according to one report<sup>8</sup> extremely chaotic. There were three important items accomplished at the meeting. First, the Jewish Publication Society of America was officially constituted. Second, a star-studded committee was appointed to write a constitution. It included Mayer Sulzberger, Simon Wolf, Marcus Jastrow, Adolph Sanger, Cyrus Adler, Gustav Gottheil, Morris Newberger, Jacob Ezekiel, Benjamin Peixotto, Solomon Solis-Cohen, Kaufmann Kohler, and Krauskopf. Third, an executive committee was elected to operate the society. Morris Newberger was elected president and Krauskopf was elected secretary thus making Keneseth Israel the best represented group on the executive committee, a situation which did not go unnoticed.<sup>9</sup> There was a dispute over the membership of the committee which was to write the constitution. The first committee contained no rabbis at all and they, in a bipartisan effort, raised a furor. The "oversight" was corrected and the committee as finally constituted had more than its share of clergy.<sup>10</sup>

The executive committee started work immediately. Its first important business was to appoint a publications

---

8. Edwin Wolf 2nd, president of the Jewish Publication Society of America, as found in his annual "Report of the President, 1957," American Jewish Yearbook, vol. 60, 1959.

9. Jewish Exponent, III:9, 8 June 1888, p. 8. An editorial criticized the executive committee of not being national in scope. The Exponent had continually supported the formation of a publication society (for example, III:6, 18 May 1888, p. 6). It was not however a friend of Reform Judaism and, as such, could not let the balance of Reform and Orthodoxy on the executive committee pass by without comment.

10. Ibid., III:9, 8 June 1888, p. 6.



committee which would review, select, and commission works for the society to publish. It was decided to elect nine people from a list comprised of the executive committee plus "twenty prominent men."<sup>11</sup> This resulted in the following committee: Marcus Jastrow, Mayer Sulzberger, Simon Stern, Bernard Felsenthal, Henrietta Szold, Cyrus Adler, Abraham S. Isaac, Charles Gross, and Krauskopf. Having accomplished this, it was then necessary to procure memberships and arrange for the publication of its first book. Krauskopf worked tirelessly on both fronts. In the fall of 1888, he spoke about the society from the pulpit. He stressed the value of the society for the future of American Judaism and said that the lack of money was the only obstacle preventing the society from starting its operations. Individuals could join for only three dollars per year and members would receive free every book published during the year.<sup>12</sup> Membership in the Jewish Publication Society grew from 600 members in January, 1889 (all of whom were in Philadelphia) to over 1700 members by May and to over 2200 by September.<sup>13</sup> That summer, Krauskopf went to Europe and personally arranged for the publication of an English translation of Graetz's History of the Jews.<sup>14</sup>

---

11. Ibid., III:14, 13 July 1888, p. 5.

12. SL, II:7, 18 November 1888.

13. Jewish Exponent, IV:16, 25 January 1889, p. 4; V:6, 17 May 1889, p. 5; and V:25, 25 September 1889, p. 6.

14. Ibid., V:19, 16 August 1889, p. 6.

By September, the executive committee could officially report to the public that it had authorized the publication of three volumes of Graetz's History . . . and Outlines of Jewish History by Lady Kate Magnus.<sup>15</sup> Eight months later, in May, 1890, Krauskopf wrote to Mayer Sulzberger,

The first born [Outlines of Jewish History] of the Jewish Publication Society has just reached me. It seems as if all powers had combined to make our first publication a most creditable one.<sup>16</sup>

By its tenth anniversary, it had many works of non-fiction to its credit including the final volumes of Graetz's History . . . and many works of fiction including Zangwell's Children of the Ghetto and Dreamers of the Ghetto.

The Jewish Publication Society's growth continued unabated throughout the 1890's, but after its tenth anniversary it would have to do without the services and energies of the man most responsible for its founding--Krauskopf. Until May, 1898, Krauskopf participated as regularly in the work of the publication committee as his demanding schedule permitted. The chairman of the committee was Mayer Sulzberger, a prominent Philadelphia jurist and trustee of Mikve Israel, the Spanish-Portuguese synagogue. Whether it was a difference of religious philosophy, or a clash between two men with very strong personalities, or something else, the two men did not get along. Over an issue which is now unclear, an argument between

---

15. Ibid., V:25, 25 September 1889, p. 6.

16. Krauskopf to Mayer Sulzberger, Philadelphia, 6 May 1890, Temple.

Krauskopf and Sulzberger occurred on the afternoon of the tenth anniversary dinner and resulted in Krauskopf's abrupt resignation from the publication and executive committees.<sup>17</sup> Krauskopf's participation in the Jewish Publication Society was from that day on largely finished. He did translate the book of Ruth for the Jewish Publication Society's translation of the Bible (1917), but beyond that he had little to do with the Society up to his death in 1923.

---

17. There is so little known about the subject of the argument, that a guess would be useless. That the argument actually took place is about all that most memories recall. It is not, incidentally, mentioned in the society's proceedings. There is an interesting letter from Maurice Jacobs, Philadelphia to Jacob R. Marcus, Cincinnati on the subject. Jacobs said that Krauskopf "crossed swords with Judge Mayer Sulzberger . . . and walked out of the meeting, and resigned as the Secretary of the JPS. . . ." Jacobs enclosed the manuscript of Krauskopf's undelivered address for the tenth anniversary banquet which was held the same day as the meeting, 22 May 1898. The date of the letter is 21 May 1951 (Joseph Krauskopf Collection, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati).

## CHAPTER V

### THE MODEL DWELLING ASSOCIATION

One of the most interesting ideas which Krauskopf explored was the possibility of building low cost housing for the poor. Increased immigration from Eastern Europe taxed the resources of the large, eastern cities. The cities could not handle the masses of people which flocked to America and lacking proper regulation conditions in the poorer sections of the city deteriorated rapidly. Streets were unpaved; sanitation was at best poor, at worst non-existent. As the dwellings became more and more crowded the slums became an easy target for epidemics like yellow fever. Local governments were slow moving and especially reluctant to improve slum conditions because of the vast sums of money required to do adequately what was required. America was still operating under the principles of laissez-faire and Social Darwinism's "survival of the fittest." To commit money to social welfare projects was a violation of natural law.

Krauskopf, motivated by Prophetic Judaism's social awareness and his concern for the dismal plight of his co-religionists, tried to find a way around government inaction. As was usually the case, he used the pulpit to present his position.

Immigrants, he said in June, 1893,<sup>1</sup> were coming faster than cities could receive them. That, coupled with people taking advantage of them, caused slums to be created. It was clear, though, that the United States was so big that slums should not exist. The European solution, recently tried in New York City, to alleviate overcrowded neighborhoods was to establish private corporations which would build low cost housing. The key was to make the venture profitable, thus encouraging, at least theoretically, large scale investment by wealthy men and businesses. Krauskopf estimated that his non-sectarian Model Dwelling Company could pay a four to six percent dividend yearly. Several months later,<sup>2</sup> with economic conditions in the country worsening he made a second plea for support claiming that caution and further deliberation would be counter-productive. The housing situation would not improve by itself, but it might easily get worse.

Meanwhile, Krauskopf began working with people in the community. His plan, as he conceived it, was to build a "model" tenement. He wrote letters asking for money each time repeating that the Model Dwelling Company was an investment not a charity. For example, he wrote to Hon. George D. McCreary:

We desire to erect a building that shall give to the poor man of the slums, all the necessary comforts and accommodations, at the lowest possible rental to him, and at an

---

1. SL, VI:11, 8 January 1893.

2. SL, VI:22, 16 April 1893.

equitable dividend to the subscribers of the Stock. . . .  
We desire to organize a Stock Company, and dispose of  
the shares among the public at large.<sup>3</sup>

Earlier that year, Keneseth Israel was one of the many groups which formed the Conference of Moral Workers, a group pledged to rid Philadelphia of its slums. It was supported by virtually every charitable organization in the city. Walter Vrooman, a spirited, newly arrived Christian minister in the city, was the leading force behind the Conference.<sup>4</sup> In February, a rally for Krauskopf's Model Dwelling Company was held at Keneseth Israel and Vrooman perceived that an alliance between himself and Krauskopf could achieve success for both.<sup>5</sup> On 20 March 1893, Krauskopf made an important but probably fatal move for the future of his endeavor: he joined forces with the Conference.<sup>6</sup> The Conference announced the establishment of the Model Dwelling Association of Philadelphia with a working capital of \$100,000 divided into 2,000 shares of stock each valued at fifty dollars. It designated 17 April as the day for a major organizational and fund raising meeting.<sup>7</sup>

In the week prior to this meeting, the Model Dwelling Association formed a Committee on Organization composed of

---

3. Krauskopf to Hon. George D. McCreary, 13 March 1893, Temple.

4. Harlen B. Phillips, "A War on Philadelphia's Slums: Walter Vrooman and the Conference of Moral Workers, 1893," The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, vol. LXXVI, no. 1 (January, 1952), p. 51.

5. Ibid., p. 56.

6. Ibid., p. 57.

7. Ibid., p. 58.

Krauskopf, John P. Croasdale, Rev. Frederick A. Bisbee, Charles W. Caryl, Simon B. Fleisher, M. H. Lichton, Rev. R. I. Nichols, and W. W. Longstreth. This committee resolved that the Association be operated by a Board of Directors composed of fifteen people "of whom three at least shall be women." It went on to enumerate the purposes of the Association namely, to build housing for the poor and to promote legislation for improved sewage facilities, street cleaning, garbage removal, and parks.<sup>8</sup>

The meeting took place as scheduled at the Y.M.C.A., but it was very poorly attended. Only four clergymen attended out of the seven hundred invited.<sup>9</sup> This dissolved the momentum of the movement and it was never able to recover. It has been suggested<sup>10</sup> that the refusal of the Christian clergy to work with Krauskopf was responsible for its failure and this may very well have been the case. There were other causes: Vrooman was exposed as a fraud and subsequently resigned, the local Christian press criticized the new breed of activist ministers, and the Philadelphia papers hid the pervasiveness of the slum conditions.<sup>11</sup>

---

8. Jewish Exponent (Philadelphia), XIII:2, 14 April 1893, p. 6.

9. Ibid., XIII:3, 21 April 1893, p. 2.

10. Phillips, p. 58.

11. Ibid., p. 59.

Despite this setback, Krauskopf continued to work for the Association and found considerable support in the Jewish community.<sup>12</sup> There are undated lists of subscribers, undoubtedly from 1893 however, which show a total of nearly 1200 shares sold which represents an investment of just under \$60,000.<sup>13</sup> In fact, among the dozens of letters about the project, there is one which reported that \$70,000 had been raised.<sup>14</sup> Krauskopf was almost able to bring the project to fruition. In October, 1894, he wrote to Kaufmann Kohler that the "Model Dwelling" was about to be built.<sup>15</sup> But it was not to happen. Lack of long term support, both financial and moral, proved too great for even Krauskopf's tireless efforts to overcome.

The Model Dwelling Association was not a total failure. One important lesson which was learned was that virtually insurmountable difficulties faced private enterprise when it tried alone to contribute to the social welfare. Eventually, most civic improvements had to be funded by public money. The concept of a welfare state with deficit spending by the government was decades away but, in the mid to late 1890's, in

---

12. Krauskopf to J. P. Craosdale, 22 April 1893, Temple, in which Krauskopf said that 90% of the investors were Jewish.

13. All of the lists are at Temple.

14. Krauskopf to Isaac Gimbél, 31 May 1893, Temple.

15. Krauskopf to Kaufmann Kohler, 17 October 1894, Temple.



response to a loud and continual public outcry, the city of Philadelphia committed itself to improved sanitation and modest urban renewal for its slum areas.<sup>16</sup>

---

16. Phillips, p. 61.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE NATIONAL FARM SCHOOL

Without any doubt, Krauskopf is best remembered for his National Farm School. "His" in the literal sense of the word. He conceived of it, he planned it, he traveled around America in behalf of it, he was its president for over twenty-five years, he devoted considerable time to its daily operation, and he spent a large part of his own money on it. Krauskopf looked upon the Farm School as the harbinger of a new way of life for the Jews in the United States. He believed that the benefits of life on a farm would lure the teeming masses of Eastern European Jews out of the ghettos and provide them all with a fulfilling and prosperous existence. The National Farm School was opened to provide technical leaders for their communities. The Farm School was almost an instant success. Money came in an adequate, though not plentiful supply and students enrolled, went through the program, graduated as agriculturalists trained to teach the fundamentals of farming, and earned fine reputations in the agricultural world. The story of the school's founding and early progress is fascinating.

The idea for the establishment of the National Farm School came as a result of a trip to Russia which Krauskopf

took in the summer of 1894. He wanted to go to Russia to approach the Tsarist regime with a plan to recolonize the Russian Jews. The problem was that they were coming to the United States in increasingly large numbers and created alarming conditions in the cities on the east coast. Kraus<sup>2</sup>kopf believed that he could convince the Russian government to keep them in Russia and to settle them in the interior of the country as farmers. He was operating with two assumptions. First, the Jews would prefer to stay in their mother country if possible. Second, the United States was unable to absorb the immigrants.

Getting to Russia, however, was not as easy as it seemed. Krauskopf traveled to Washington in the spring of 1894 at the advice of Oscar Straus.<sup>1</sup> The purpose was to secure the necessary papers for his trip in person rather than through the mail. He met with unqualified failure. The Russian minister in Washington refused to grant him a visa and, when Secretary of State Walter Gresham cabled Andrew White, the American ambassador in St. Petersburg, to intercede on Krauskopf's behalf, the Russian government likewise refused.<sup>2</sup> The reason for the refusal was clear: Krauskopf was Jewish and since Russian Jews were denied freedom of movement within Russia, all Jews were denied that freedom.

---

1. Krauskopf to Isidore Straus, Washington, 11 April 1894, Temple.

2. Krauskopf to Lewis Abraham, 19 May 1894, Temple.

Krauskopf, insisting on his rights as an American citizen as guaranteed by a Russian-American Treaty which permitted Americans access to Russia, applied for a passport and indicated his determination to go to Russia even without a visa.<sup>3</sup>

On Memorial Day, 1894, Krauskopf made all of this public in an address before the Grand Army of the Republic. The lecture was covered by the press and they picked up Krauskopf's cause.<sup>4</sup> Isidor Rayner, a member of the United States House of Representatives, even introduced a resolution to the effect that if an American citizen were denied permission to enter Russia, the treaty should be abrogated.<sup>5</sup>

Krauskopf was troubled by all of the publicity. He was uncertain whether it would aid him in getting admitted to Russia. He expressed these sentiments in a letter to Oscar Straus. "Will I get into Russia? Sometimes I think I will, but oftener [sic] I will not. . . ."<sup>6</sup> Straus replied that Krauskopf's trip was "impractical" but valuable if it enabled Krauskopf to get a better understanding of the

---

3. Krauskopf to Walter Gresham, Washington, 19 May 1894, Temple.

4. Krauskopf to Henry M. Goldfogle, Washington, 7 April 1902, Temple.

5. Krauskopf to Isidor Rayner, Washington, 4 June 1894, Temple.

6. Krauskopf to Oscar Straus, New York City, 5 June 1894, Temple.

conditions of the Jews in Russia, or if it led to the renunciation of the treaty which Straus felt was not advantageous to America. His fear was that continued adverse publicity might further endanger the already precarious situation of the Jews in Russia.<sup>7</sup>

Armed with letters of introduction to Ambassador White by Straus and Gresham, Krauskopf left the United States on the steamer Adler on Saturday, 16 June, planning to meet the Rev. Russell Conwell (a prominent Christian clergyman in Philadelphia and founder of Temple University) in Copenhagen.<sup>8</sup> Together they gained admission to Russia without any difficulty and received permission to travel freely.<sup>9</sup> Krauskopf said much later that he was allowed to enter because of the real fear on the part of the Russians that the United States-Russian treaty would be abrogated if they refused.<sup>10</sup>

With the assistance of Andrew White, Krauskopf was able to speak with Ministers Witte and Pobedonostsev. To the former, he formally petitioned on behalf of the Russian Jews:

To His Excellency, the Minister of Finance of the Russian Government.

Esteemed Sir:- Mindful of the friendship existing

---

7. Oscar Straus to Krauskopf, 6 June 1894, Temple.

8. Krauskopf to Isidor Rayner, Washington, 4 June 1894, Temple.

9. Krauskopf to Baron de Hirsch, 20 October 1894, Temple.

10. Krauskopf to [?] Grossman, 16 June 1902, Temple.

between the Government of Russia and that of the United States, and between the people of both these countries; And mindful also of the suffering now existing among American laborers, caused by a congestion of the labor market through unceasing immigration of laborers from foreign countries, and largely from the Jewish Pale of Settlement of Russia;

And touched by the suffering now existing among the Jewish population in the overcrowded Pale of Settlement, who are coming to our shores in the vain hope of bettering their condition, or are appealing to us from abroad for aid:

I, Dr. Jos. Krauskopf, an American citizen, speaking in the name of many thousands of American citizens of Jewish and non-Jewish confessions, respectfully petition (through the kindness of the American Legation at St. Petersburg) the Honorable Government of Russia to aid us in our desire somewhat to relieve the congestion of the American labor market, and also to render permanent aid to some of the suffering Jews within the Pale of Settlement, by graciously granting us a tract of arable and cultivable land, on which competent organizers and skillful agricultural masters may gradually settle, at our expense, numbers of Jewish families of the Pale of Settlement, for the sole purpose of making them self-supporting tillers of the soil, and honorable citizens of your esteemed country. Trusting that this humble petition, offered in the spirit of the purest humanity, may merit your careful and favorable consideration I beg leave to sign myself,

Your most obedient servant,  
Dr. Jos. Krauskopf.

St. Petersburg, July 16th, 1894.<sup>11</sup>

White also gave him a letter of introduction to Leo Tolstoy. He met with the famous author who advised Krauskopf to visit the Jewish agricultural settlement and the agricultural school near Odessa. He also learned that Tolstoy saw no future for the Jews in Russia. Rather, he said they should immigrate to America and carry out their agricultural dreams there. The idea that the Jews should pursue

---

<sup>11</sup>. Krauskopf to Baron de Hirsch, 20 October 1894, Temple.

farming in America on a large scale lay dormant in Krauskopf's mind until it became obvious that both his trip to Russia had not achieved its intended goal and the future of the Russian Jew was, as Tolstoy predicted, in the United States.<sup>12</sup>

For quite some time after he returned from the trip, Krauskopf still hoped for a favorable disposition of his petition. On one occasion he wrote, "it almost seems as if the Russian government is going to do something to ameliorate her treatment of her Jews."<sup>13</sup> Around the same time he also wrote:

Though I can not as yet give a favorable report of the real object of my visit to Russia, still the unanimous opinion is that I have been successful far beyond even the fondest expectations of my most enthusiastic friends.<sup>14</sup>

Krauskopf expressed disapproval of the more popular plan to resettle the Russian Jews in other countries. Ambassador White and his successor, Breckinridge, were both optimistic and Krauskopf expected to return to Russia shortly with further ideas.

---

12. For an interesting article on the visit with Tolstoy, see Leon Bramson, "A Visit to Tolstoy at Yasnaya Polyana," trans. Moshe Spiegol, Jewish Exponent (Philadelphia), 28 December 1973, pp. 23, 27-28.

13. Krauskopf to Nathan Straus, 15 September 1894, Temple.

14. Krauskopf to Professor N. I. Baxt, St. Petersburg, Russia, 21 September 1894, Temple.

In this same letter, Krauskopf also said that he intended to open a model farm in America patterned after the Jewish farm near Odessa. As the possibility for success of his recolonization plan dimmed, he diverted more and more energy towards the setting up of this farm. As might be expected, he discussed the issue from the pulpit. He gave two fundamental reasons for the formation of an agricultural school. First, agriculture was a profession of the Jews since earliest times. As long as Jews lived in Palestine they were farmers. There was a positive value in being a farmer, in being close to the land. By returning to this noble profession Jews would be returning to an ideal held by their ancestors.<sup>15</sup> Second, the cities were becoming too crowded. It was impractical to think that all the immigrants could be incorporated into the labor market; many were already unemployed and starving. To survive they had to turn to other professions and agriculture was a worthy one.<sup>16</sup>

In January, 1896, for ten thousand dollars, Krauskopf bought 122 acres of Judge Watson's farm outside Doylestown, Pennsylvania to be the home of his school.<sup>17</sup> By giving lectures all over the country he raised an additional fifteen thousand dollars which was used to build a school building,

---

15. Krauskopf, SL, VIII:28, 28 April 1895.

16. Ibid., X:6, 22 November 1896; see also "To Make Farmers," The Ledger (Philadelphia), 20 January 1897.

17. "To Make Farmers."



refurbish the structures already standing on the farm, and purchase the equipment and materials necessary to operate a farming school.<sup>18</sup> The National Farm School was opened on 13 June 1897<sup>19</sup> and dedicated on 20 June.<sup>20</sup> The dedication ceremonies, which were covered by the press, were attended by several hundred people brought to Doylestown by a train from the city. Krauskopf, in the major address at the ceremonies, said, in part:

Here a new chapter is to be opened in the eventful history of our people. Here an end is to be put to the eighteen hundred years of forced abstention from agricultural pursuits.

Here a beginning is to be made of the training that shall gradually wean the Israelite from the most exclusive pursuit into which his persecutors have driven him, and restore him to the noble calling of agriculture, which his ancestors followed with joy and blessing, when still a free and happy people in their own land.

Let the Jew become a tiller instead of a trader. Let him draw with his own hand food from the soil and lay it at mankind's feet. . . .<sup>21</sup>

If volume of correspondence is indicative, Krauskopf devoted a great deal of time to the daily operations of the school. There are literally hundreds of letters in Krauskopf's personal files to the superintendent of the Farm School about matters both important and insignificant. Krauskopf was

---

18. "To Teach Practical Farming," a newspaper article, source unknown, 13 June 1897. The article is located in Temple.

19. Ibid.

20. "To Teach Boys to Farm," The Record (Philadelphia), 21 June 1897.

21. "To Teach Boys to Farm."

concerned with the school's image, with the quality of students, with attendance at classes and services (he and other Philadelphia Reform rabbis led Sabbath afternoon services each week), ad infinitum.

There is one particular episode which is worth mentioning because it reflects the school's (and probably Krauskopf's) attitude toward Orthodox students. Shortly before Passover in 1900, Krauskopf received a letter from a pupil of the Farm School which said that although the school did not observe the Sabbath, he wanted permission to observe Passover for eight days. It seems that the pupil's father was Orthodox and did not know that the students could not celebrate the Sabbath. He would surely have to be told, the student continued, if Krauskopf would not allow the pupil to celebrate Passover in the manner planned by the father.<sup>22</sup> There is nothing which tells how this specific matter was resolved but there is a letter in November from the same pupil which said, "after due deliberation, I have decided not to return to the National Farm School."<sup>23</sup> One gets a slightly different perspective of Krauskopf's feelings on this subject from a letter Krauskopf wrote to John Washburn, the school's superintendent.

I will leave to you the final disposition in the matter of the Passover vacation in such boys as you think

---

22. Maurice E. Weintraub, Doylestown, Pennsylvania to Krauskopf, 1 April 1900, Temple.

23. Weintraub, Brooklyn to Krauskopf, 27 November 1900, Temple.

deserving. We do not want to interfere with any one's religious convictions, but it does not seem right that an agricultural school should give vacation at this season of the year when every day and hour counts. Boys should take their vacation when the regular vacation time is given. . . .<sup>24</sup>

It appears that Krauskopf's objections to celebrating Jewish holidays is that such celebrations would not be in keeping with the needs of an agricultural school. Yet, one can not help but wonder if incidents such as this one give more insight into Krauskopf's feelings toward Orthodoxy than toward the proper functioning of an agricultural school.

Aside from interest in the daily operations of the school, Krauskopf also spent a great deal of time raising money for the Farm School. One popular method of his was to go on speaking tours around the country. He spoke well and would always attract a large audience wherever he went. He also solicited funds through the mail by means of a pamphlet which gave information about the school and a covering letter which further explained why he thought that the Farm School was an institution deserving of public support. These letters mostly made the same points that Krauskopf made in his pulpit appeals: agriculture was the answer to crowded cities and the hope for Jewish immigrants; the rise in disease and immorality in the slums was alarming; for only one dollar per day per student, a Jewish boy could be trained to lead an agricultural colony.

---

24. Krauskopf to John Washburn, undated, Temple.

It is difficult to measure the success of these efforts. Sometimes one gets the impression that the school needed money desperately. Yet, the school expanded when it was necessary and found the money to meet the cost. However, money was never so plentiful that Krauskopf was relieved of the pressure to keep the supply flowing. He and the board of the Farm School were constantly looking for "big money" i.e., support from the many multimillionaire philanthropists who lived in the 1890's. Krauskopf hounded these men for the school's benefit and had considerable success with two of them; Jacob Schiff and Andrew Carnegie.

Jacob Schiff was an important source of money from two points of view. First, he himself was extremely wealthy and was usually liberal with his donations to causes he believed worthy. Second, he was a director of the Hirsch Fund, a vast sum of money designated by the de Hirsch family to aid Jewish colonization all over the world. The Hirsch Fund was administered by the Baron de Hirsch Committee of the Jewish Colonization Association. It was logical, therefore, for Krauskopf to approach Schiff for aid.

Apparently, Schiff gave two hundred and fifty dollars to the Farm School when it was organized and Krauskopf used his expressed support, as well as that of others, as publicity to raise additional funds.<sup>25</sup> (The year before,

---

25. Krauskopf, Letter to the editor, American Hebrew (New York), [?] July 1899.

when Krauskopf had originally come to Schiff and his other wealthy New York friends, Schiff declined to contribute on the grounds that he did not want his name to be used as publicity for the National Farm School. Schiff wrote then:

If, as you say, New York has as yet done next to nothing toward helping the good cause which you are promoting in your National Farm School, its wealthy men have no doubt their good reasons for their action, or rather inaction. This, at least is the case in my own instance.<sup>26)</sup>

In 1899, Krauskopf appealed to the Hirsch Fund for financial support, a move which precipitated a break in communications with and support from Schiff. The Hirsch Committee would not support the Farm School because it was already supporting an agricultural colony in Woodbine, New Jersey, which, the trustees of the fund believed, was similar in purpose to the National Farm School. Schiff, as a representative of the fund wrote to Krauskopf:

they [the trustees] could see no justification for another farm or agricultural school within thirty or forty miles of the Woodbine school, which is partly supported by the Jewish Colonization Association.

He then went on to express his personal agreement with the trustees decision.<sup>27</sup> Unfortunately, Krauskopf's reply is not known, but it clearly angered Schiff who wrote:

I cannot but repeat that it really pains me to feel that you thought it morally right to use my name in an endeavor to get contributions for your farm school

---

26. Jacob H. Schiff, New York to Krauskopf, 16 January 1896, Temple.

27. Ibid., 3 July 1899.

from the public after having just been distinctly told, that I could not advise the Jewish Colonization Association to support your school, because I did not think there was any necessity for its continued existence.<sup>28</sup>

Schiff also carried the issue to the Jewish Press sending letters which were highly critical of Krauskopf to the Jewish Exponent and the American Hebrew.

Krauskopf was obviously hurt not only by Schiff's words but also by his tactics. He too, however, could play that game and a reply appeared in the American Hebrew shortly thereafter.<sup>29</sup> It was masterfully written. He quoted the letter which Schiff had sent him in 1897 when he contributed the two hundred and fifty dollars to the school. Krauskopf had publicized Schiff's support in two consecutive yearly catalogues and in a current prospectus, all of which had been sent to Schiff. To none of this had Schiff ever objected. Krauskopf went on to say, in an effort to answer the objections of the Hirsch Fund, that anyone who visited both the Woodbine Colony and the National Farm School would know that they were different and that the National Farm School was worthy of the Fund's support.

Krauskopf also wrote a private, four page reply to Schiff in which he repeated much of what appeared in the newspaper. He added two remarks which could never have

---

28. Ibid., 20 July 1899.

29. Krauskopf, Letter to the editor, American Hebrew, [?] July 1899.

helped his cause but probably helped assuage his own anger. He said, first of all, that Schiff had been invited to the National Farm School any number of times and that perhaps he might not feel so negative about the school if he came to see it. Secondly, though the trustees had not seen fit to give money to the school, the Baroness de Hirsch thought they should.<sup>30</sup>

Eventually, Schiff's opposition was overcome and relations between Krauskopf and Schiff improved tremendously. In 1905, the National Farm School undertook a fifty thousand dollar fund raising drive and Schiff agreed to donate \$2,500 to the school when an additional \$25,000 had been raised separately.<sup>31</sup> His money was actually given even before the larger sum was raised.<sup>32</sup>

During that same fund raising drive, Andrew Carnegie gave \$12,500 after \$37,500 had already been collected, thus making the enterprise a complete success.<sup>33</sup>

There were many other people who supported the National Farm School without any of the hesitation which Schiff showed. Their feelings were, in all likelihood, greatly appreciated by Krauskopf. Krauskopf enjoyed a good relationship with

---

30. Krauskopf to Schiff, 21 July 1899, Temple.

31. Schiff to Krauskopf, 9 April 1905, Temple.

32. Krauskopf to Schiff, 6 June 1905, Temple.

33. Krauskopf to Louis Seasongood, Cincinnati, 10 July 1905, Temple.

Secretary of Agriculture James Wilson. Wilson, who spoke at the Farm School's graduation in 1901, wrote to Krauskopf, "I am very much interested in the growth of your school and will do anything within my power to help it."<sup>34</sup> Joseph Silverman, the rabbi of Temple Emanuel, also had good things to say: "your National Farm School will succeed and will be the best of all the things you have done thus far."<sup>35</sup> Stephen S. Wise wrote the following when he could not attend the school's dedication:

Your enterprise in inaugurating this plan and your zeal in bringing it to a successful outcome merit the highest praise, and I earnestly pray for your sake and the good of the cause . . . that God's blessing may rest upon you. . . .<sup>36</sup>

In those first days, the National Farm School was successful. Many students graduated to fine jobs, some even with the United States Department of Agriculture. Ironically, despite the continued achievements of the school, Krauskopf's judgement as to where the future of American Jewish life lay was radically wrong. Jews remained in the cities, oblivious to Krauskopf's enticements that a utopian-like existence awaited them on the farm. To this day, Jewish farmers are few. But likewise to this day, the National Farm School, now

---

34. James Wilson, Washington to Krauskopf, 9 September 1899, Temple.

35. Joseph Silverman, New York to Krauskopf, 10 March 1896, Temple.

36. Stephen S. Wise, New York to Krauskopf, 13 June 1897, Temple.



called the Delaware Valley College of Agriculture and Sciences, is still in operation graduating highly qualified agriculturalists. Though never having a stricly Jewish enrollment (Krauskopf established the school as non-sectarian), there are practically no Jewish students there now. Yet, some Jewish organizations still support the institution as a tribute to Krauskopf's memory.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

Krauskopf's prestige grew considerably in the 1890's. Frequently he was a voice for social welfare when none other was heard. He championed many causes from the pulpit and he worked on committees to support his convictions. His face appeared all over Philadelphia wherever meetings were held to aid the city's poor, political refugees, Jewish immigrants, and any number of secular and Jewish charities. His commitment to the ideals of his religion brought respect from many sources. His ceaseless loyalty to America was one of his ideals and during the Spanish-American War he was asked by President McKinley to serve his country in a special capacity.

There are several ways to approach Krauskopf's attitude toward the Spanish-American War. Least profitable is from a strictly political perspective. Krauskopf was not a political individual. He rarely criticized political policies from the pulpit. Often, he did express an almost blind approval of what presidents said and did. His approval was indicative of a commonly held belief in the American Jewish community. Simply stated it is that America was a moral entity whose interests corresponded to whatever was best for the down-trodden and underprivileged. America was thought to be a

beacon of truth for the rest of the world. Forged from a struggle for independence by the hand of God, America was imbued with the lofty principles of the Bible and the Declaration of Independence. It was everything for everybody and it was always right. Without question, it was always right.

On the eve of the Spanish-American War, before the outbreak of hostilities became a foregone conclusion, Krauskopf stated, "the propagation of Religion was the mission of Israel. . . . The propagation of Peace is the mission, perhaps the sublimest of all missions, of the United States."<sup>1</sup> Krauskopf was a deeply religious man and saw America as having a religious mission. It is from this perspective that Krauskopf's feelings become clear. The war, once entered into, was a religious issue with significant theological overtones. If Krauskopf saw the economic implications of a "free" Cuba or the political implications of an American dominated Caribbean and Pacific, he did not express any negative feelings. The war was God's punishment for the atrocities committed by Spain: for the Inquisition, for Cortez, for Pizarro, for Cuba, and most recently, for the Maine. "It is," he said, "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."<sup>2</sup> It is inconceivable to think that Krauskopf relished

---

1. Krauskopf, SL, XI:22, 20 March 1898.

2. Ibid., XI:26, 1 May 1898; also XII:16, 29 January 1899.

the advent of the war or the death of Spanish soldiers. He was sickened by the atrocities of war and was put into a position to help alleviate the sufferings of, at least, American soldiers and their families.

On 25 April 1898, the National Relief Commission was formed expressly for service in the Spanish-American War. The preamble of the commission's constitution says that its members desired

to lighten the burdens and relieve the sufferings of the men of the Army and Navy in the service of the United States of America, in its war with Spain, and to assist them in bearing the burdens of such service. . . .<sup>3</sup>

Its purpose, as stated in Article I, section II of the constitution was

. . . to aid the United States government in caring for its soldiers, sailors, marines, and others who may be disabled by sickness or wounds, and to relieve their families if need should require. And also to aid chaplains, . . . to contribute to the health and comfort of the men on duty, to afford assistance and support, as may be required, to surgeons and nurses in the healing and care of the sick and wounded, and to aid in the administration of religious consolation with due regard to the preferences and convictions of all, to keep the men in close contact with home and its refining and helpful influences; by extending facilities for ready communication with relatives and friends, to facilitate the identification of those who may die in the service, and to aid kindred and friends in procuring the remains for burial.<sup>4</sup>

Krauskopf was appointed to the executive committee of the National Relief Commission and was one of nine "field and

---

3. National Relief Commission, Report of the Executive Committee of the National Relief Commission (Philadelphia: National Relief Commission, 1899), p. 16.

4. Ibid., p. 17.

traveling agents." Most notable of the services which Krauskopf rendered was going to Cuba with Rev. Henry McCook, another field and traveling agent, to inspect the United States Army hospitals and camps. They left from New York on 19 July 1898 aboard the Resolute and arrived in Santiago on 25 July, after an overnight stop at Guantanamo Bay.<sup>5</sup> They found the hospital in Santiago in very poor condition. Men were lying on the floor, many were without clothing, and many were suffering from calenture and yellow fever. The Red Cross was hampered in its efforts because of poor facilities in the port. Eventually, an agreement was arranged by Krauskopf and McCook for smaller ships to meet the larger Red Cross supply vessels in the harbor and to bring the supplies into the docks. Krauskopf personally contacted and arranged for Nathan Straus to donate a much needed ice plant to General Shafter in Santiago. The plant made 14,000 tons of ice and 20,000 gallons of water daily! It was shipped from New York a mere two weeks after Krauskopf contacted Straus.<sup>6</sup>

The two clergymen left Santiago for a camp situated farther inland and found conditions there equally deplorable. Krauskopf met several Jewish soldiers including Sam Greenwald of Prescott, Arizona and Sam Goldberg of Albuquerque, both of

---

5. A report of the visit is in the National Relief Commission's Report, pp. 81-87 and in an undated article from the Inquirer (Philadelphia) found in the Krauskopf Collection, Urban Archives Center, Temple University (Temple).

6. National Relief Commission's Report . . ., Pp. 35, 190-191.

whom distinguished themselves in battle. He also met Theodore Roosevelt and eight Jewish Rough Riders.

When Krauskopf returned to the United States he summed up his experiences:

And now that I am home again, after an absence of three weeks, during which all communications with home had been cut off, I am glad that I have been in Cuba, that I have seen what I saw, but infinitely happier am I to be back again in our blessed United States, which I sincerely pray may long be spared another such war as this.<sup>7</sup>

The activities of Krauskopf and the other field agents (all of whom served without pay and covered their own expenses) were not limited to this one trip to Cuba. They each traveled extensively throughout the southern part of the United States visiting other camps and hospitals, setting up various kinds of facilities, and caring for the spiritual needs of the people they met. Krauskopf inspected posts in Jacksonville, Fernandina, Tampa, Key West, Miami, Camp Wikoff, and Camp Alger.<sup>8</sup> These trips were not without their hazards. On a boat trip between Key West and Biscayne Bay, Krauskopf was stranded on a coral reef for thirty hours.<sup>9</sup> Closer to home, Krauskopf also visited the camp at Montauk Point which he found "in a state of great confusion."<sup>10</sup>

---

7. Ibid., p. 87.

8. Ibid., p. 64.

9. Ibid., p. 77 (letter from Krauskopf to M. S. French, Philadelphia, 30 June 1898).

10. Ibid., p. 166.

History has preserved many of the romantic aspects of this war. Books give a vivid description of the swash-buckling Colonel Teddy Roosevelt and his Rough Riders. Krauskopf, his theological justification of the war notwithstanding, was aware of the harsh realities of war. Sensitive to these horrors and combating the romanticism of the war, he wrote to his children:

I tell you soldiering in mid-summer, in a hot country like this, is no fun. Some of the boys are suffering greatly, some are very sick, and a number of them have died. War is a horrible evil, and we all should pray that there should be no more of it in any part of the world.<sup>11</sup>

---

11. Krauskopf, Fort Tampa City, Florida to Madeline, Manfred, Eleanor, and Harold Krauskopf, Philadelphia, 24 June 1898, Temple.

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE PRESIDENCY OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

In March, 1900, Isaac Mayer Wise died. Wise was Krauskopf's teacher and the leader of American Reform Judaism. At the time of his death he was president of the Hebrew Union College, an institution which he founded and from which Krauskopf graduated in 1883. Not long after his death, the Board of Governors of the College began the difficult task of replacing him. This process took three years and among the candidates considered, at one point or another, was Krauskopf.

There are two questions to answer regarding Krauskopf's candidacy. First, was he interested in being president of the Hebrew Union College? Second, was he ever actually offered the position?

In the spring of 1900, several people recommended to the officials of the College that Krauskopf be offered the presidency. One was able to assure Bernard Bettman, a member of the Board of Governors, that Krauskopf would accept it.

I have the confidential but positive and reliable information that if offered to him, Dr. Krauskopf will accept the position at one half the salary he is now receiving as a Rabbi and that he will entirely give up his immediate profession as a Minister to devote himself wholly to the work of the College.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. [?] to Bernard Bettman, Cincinnati, 16 May 1900, Temple.



At the same time, however, Krauskopf himself was saying something entirely different. In a letter dated 25 May 1900, he wrote to S. Marcus:

. . . while I appreciate the honor you desire to confer upon me, I cannot but feel that if you knew my limitations for such a distinguished office you would be less zealous in your advocacy. . . . The Future success of the college is of infinitely greater concern to me than the honor that would accrue to me if there were a likelihood of my being chosen for the office. . . .<sup>2</sup>

The letter is very polite but also clear in its intention.

It does appear likely, though, that under certain circumstances and for a certain period of time, Krauskopf was indeed interested in becoming president. Moses Jacobson, of Chicago, wrote to Krauskopf later that same year about Dr. Emil Hirsch's failure to support Krauskopf's candidacy for the presidency. The letter assumed that Krauskopf knew about and approved the attempt to get Hirsch's support.

I wrote you my last letter immediately after leaving Dr. Hirsch from whom I had obtained a positive promise to advocate your candidacy in the Reform Advocate. For some reason or other which I can not fathom he has failed to fulfill that promise though in various conversations I have had with him on the subject since he does not seem hostile to the proposition.<sup>3</sup>

About ten days later, there is another letter from Jacobson implying that Krauskopf was interested in being president but only under two circumstances. He would do no private campaigning and he had to be the unanimous choice of the Board of Governors.

---

2. Krauskopf to S. Marcus, Chicago, 25 May 1900, Temple.

3. Moses Jacobson, Chicago to Krauskopf, 5 December 1900, Temple.

It is my conviction that with due effort the honor can be yours. But even the opportunity to do good work at a sacrifice will never be given anybody unless there be on his part something of an effort to secure it. . . . The office will seek the man only if the proper man allow himself in the proper circles to be known as willing to assume the responsibility. . . . The offer, I am persuaded, can be secured for you but not in the spontaneous and unanimous way you think it ought to come.<sup>4</sup>

This letter must be seen in the light of another letter by Jacobson<sup>5</sup> in which he hoped Krauskopf could be "persuaded" to take the presidency if it were offered. Apparently, even if Krauskopf's preconditions were met it was not absolutely certain that he would accept the post.

The following winter, support for Krauskopf's candidacy appeared in an editorial in the Jewish Chronicle of Mobile, Alabama.<sup>6</sup> By this time, however, the situation had changed. The Jewish Exponent of Philadelphia approached Krauskopf after the editorial appeared and Krauskopf firmly declared that he was not interested in the presidency.

In a talk with a representative of the Jewish Exponent on the subject of the suggestion contained in the foregoing [editorial in the Chronicle], the Rev. Dr. Krauskopf said that this was by no means the first intimation which had been made to him to assume the presidency of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. Last summer he

---

4. Ibid., 14 December 1900.

5. Ibid., 19 February 1901. There are other letters with the same information as these i.e., that Krauskopf's name had been mentioned and that he should accept if the post were offered, etc. See for example, Charles Fleischer, Boston to Krauskopf, 2 January and 5 January 1901, Temple.

6. Jewish Chronicle, III:17, 21 February 1902, p. 6. Interestingly, the editor of the Chronicle was Moses Jacobson!

had been approached by some of the leading spirits of the college with a view towards securing his consent to assume leadership of the college, made vacant by the death of its founder, the Rev. Dr. Isaac M. Wise. Dr. Krauskopf said then, and repeats the statement now, that he has no intention of leaving his present sphere of activity, which he looks upon as his life work. He feels flattered by the proposals and inducements held out to him to guide the destinies of the college from which he was the first graduate, but cannot see his way to giving up the work he is doing at Keneseth Israel, even for the more important and remunerative post in Cincinnati.<sup>7</sup>

That the issue was closed is further proved by an exchange of letters which took place in March, 1902 between Krauskopf and Leo Wise, the editor of the Cincinnati based American Israelite. Between February and April there were more editorials in the Chronicle and Jewish Messenger about Krauskopf's candidacy.<sup>8</sup> As a result of all this publicity, a rumor developed that Wise was one of the "leading spirits" mentioned in the interview with the Exponent who offered the presidency to Krauskopf.

A report has gotten abroad in some way, that the offer of the Presidency of the Hebrew Union College, which in your recent interview you stated had been made to you, came through me. Will you kindly take some pains to correct this, as it places me in rather an absurd attitude. As you are quite well aware, I am in just as good a position to offer you the Presidency of the

---

7. "Dr. Krauskopf and the Hebrew Union College," Jewish Exponent, XXXIV:19, 28 February 1902, p. 2. Note that Krauskopf referred to the financial benefits of the post whereas the unknown author of May, 1900 (in note 1) referred to the opposite.

8. Jewish Messenger, ed. Abram S. Isaacs, XCI:11, 14 March 1902, p. 6; Jewish Chronicle, III:20, 14 March 1902, pp. 6-7; III:24, 11 April 1902, p. 7; and III:28, 9 May 1902, p. 7.

United States as that of the College, and I cannot imagine where this foolish story could have originated.<sup>9</sup>

Krauskopf's response indicated that there was no possibility of his becoming president of the College and that because of a long term commitment to Keneseth Israel he was not even free to accept it. In his own words he said:

. . . I am not the man for that distinguished position, flattering though it is to be thought of in connection with it. . . . I would not be free to accept it even if it were officially offered and I were fit for it. . . . My life's work is here in Philadelphia.<sup>10</sup>

Be it for his own reasons or for other, unknown reasons, Krauskopf was not on the list of possible candidates which was sent confidentially by Moses Gries, the president of the Hebrew Union College Alumni, to the College's graduates in January, 1903.<sup>11</sup>

It seems, therefore, that Krauskopf was not interested in the presidency of the College except for a short period of time. Furthermore, even during that particular period he was not interested enough to work for it in his own behalf.

In answer to the second question, i.e., was he even offered the post, it is clear that while some people wanted him to be president and some worked in support of his candidacy, there is no evidence whatsoever to indicate that Krauskopf was actually offered the presidency of the Hebrew Union College.

---

9. Leo Wise, Cincinnati to Krauskopf, 11 March 1902, Krauskopf Collection, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.

10. Krauskopf to Wise, 13 March 1902, Temple.

11. Moses J. Gries to the graduates of the Hebrew Union College, 28 January 1903, Temple.

## CHAPTER IX

### THE ISAAC M. WISE MEMORIAL FUND

Shortly after Isaac M. Wise's death, the alumni of the College decided to raise a \$500,000 endowment fund in his memory. The fund raising drive floundered for several years; through May, 1902 it had collected only about \$110,000. In March of the following year Krauskopf was summoned to a meeting in Cincinnati of the executive board of the Isaac M. Wise Memorial Fund National Committee and asked to become the director-general of the fund.<sup>1</sup> The fund had raised only \$40,000 from May, 1902 to March, 1903 and it was hoped that Krauskopf could raise the remaining \$350,000 before Kaufmann Kohler, the College's new president, was inaugurated later that year.

There was one limitation placed upon Krauskopf's efforts: he was asked not to try to raise money in New York City.<sup>2</sup> It seems that sometime in the spring of 1902, Adolph Ochs hosted a luncheon in New York for several wealthy and prominent New York Jews who, in one way or another, expressed

---

1. Krauskopf was not happy with this new responsibility. In fact, he wrote to Rudolf Grossman on 3 May 1903 (Temple) that "it [the director-generalship] was literally forced upon me. . . ." It is possible that he agreed only because Henry Berkowitz agreed to help.

2. Krauskopf to Jacob H. Schiff, 16 April 1903, Isaac M. Wise Memorial Fund Collection, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.

a conviction that if \$400,000 could be raised outside of New York City, the remaining funds could easily be gotten within the city. The executive board of the Wise Memorial Fund wanted Krauskopf to accept this and commence his drive elsewhere. Exactly what was promised or not promised at the meeting led to an interesting exchange of letters between March and June, 1903 and involved several notable Jewish figures.

The confusion was precipitated by a letter from Krauskopf to Adolph Ochs on 19 March asking him about the specific nature of Jacob Schiff's "pledge."

Was it understood that the sum of \$100,000 was to come from Mr. Schiff and his immediate circle, or did the sum represent the amount which he thought he and the local committee could obtain by a canvas of the entire city?<sup>3</sup>

Ochs replied that Schiff had said he would try to raise the \$100,000 once the rest had been secured. But Ochs also assured Krauskopf that it would be a "very easy task" for Schiff and that the money would be raised.<sup>4</sup>

Schiff was not pleased that his remarks at the luncheon had been made public. He wrote to Lipman Levy, the secretary of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and requested that no additional, unauthorized statements be made under

---

3. Krauskopf to Adolph Ochs, 19 March 1903, Wise Memorial Fund Collection.

4. Ochs to Krauskopf, 20 March 1903, Wise Memorial Fund Collection.

Schiff's name.<sup>5</sup> He did not deny that he ever made such a statement. In April, however, he wrote to Krauskopf and said something entirely different, namely, that he had never made any promise to raise the \$100,000.<sup>6</sup> Krauskopf immediately responded, saying in part: ". . . that not a word hereafter would be said by this Executive office, of such a promise having been made by Mr. Jacob H. Schiff."<sup>7</sup> Krauskopf did not say that he considered Schiff's promise as never having been given; he merely said that he would not publicize it. This "oversight" must have been noticed by Schiff because he then wrote to Adolph Ochs and completely denied that he had ever promised anything.

I had however no intention whatsoever either to pledge myself to raise this fund or to promise to give the whole or a larger part of it myself, as at that time I had already made a subscription of \$5,000 . . . and it takes a great stretch of imagination and almost an intention to say something which was entirely unjustified, when statements are being persistently made that I had pledged myself to raise, or promised to give, \$100,000.<sup>8</sup>

Schiff's anger upset Krauskopf. He wanted relations between Schiff and himself to be good because regardless of what had transpired at the luncheon, he still wanted the

---

5. Schiff to Lipman Levy, Cincinnati, 23 March 1903, Wise Memorial Fund Collection. It must be assumed that Krauskopf told Levy about Ochs' letter and that Levy, in turn, publicized it.

6. Schiff to Krauskopf, 15 April 1903, Wise Memorial Fund Collection.

7. Krauskopf to Schiff, 16 April 1903, Wise Memorial Fund Collection.

8. Schiff to Ochs, 20 April 1903, Wise Memorial Fund Collection.

philanthropist's help in raising that \$100,000.<sup>9</sup> Krauskopf knew that promise or no promise, Schiff could raise the money if he devoted his energies to it. If, on the other hand, Schiff was unhappy with Krauskopf or the Fund then no pledge previously made would obligate him. To improve his position, Krauskopf needed to make it clear to Schiff that it had been the people in Cincinnati who told him about the so-called "pledge" and that Krauskopf himself was innocent of any wrongdoing. To that end, he had Max May, who was a member of the Wise Memorial Fund executive committee and who was at the now infamous luncheon, apologize to Schiff about the entire matter and absolve Krauskopf from responsibility.<sup>10</sup>

Ochs also wrote to Schiff about Krauskopf (it was Ochs in the first place who confirmed that Schiff promised to raise the money) in an effort to mollify Schiff.

Dr. Krauskopf has taken hold of the work with great energy and enthusiasm, and I am confident that no fault will lie with him or those associated with him if the fund is not now raised. I have no criticism to make of Dr. Krauskopf for his methods; on the contrary I am in entire sympathy with him and appreciative of the great task he has on hand.<sup>11</sup>

It is most peculiar that the same confusion and false expectations were repeated in a correspondence weeks later between Krauskopf and Louis Marshall. Marshall had also

---

9. Krauskopf to Ochs, 21 April 1903, Wise Memorial Fund Collection.

10. Max May to Schiff, 23 April 1903, Wise Memorial Fund Collection.

11. Ochs to Schiff, 24 April 1903, Wise Memorial Fund Collection.



attended the luncheon. For some reason, Krauskopf asked Marshall about his pledge to raise the money and received the identical response he got from Schiff.<sup>12</sup>

Progress on the \$400,000 was very slow. In November, 1903, Krauskopf was prompted to write: "the Wise Fund at present is worrying me considerably, as it seems so difficult to arouse interest again. But we must persevere and in the end we hope to succeed."<sup>13</sup> In June, 1903, a total of \$237,915 had been raised and by the end of the year (when this study ends) an amount just over \$300,000 had been pledged.<sup>14</sup> However, the Fund's momentum was lost and the hope of completing the endowment fund before Kohler's inauguration could not be fulfilled. In fact, the Fund's ledger books<sup>15</sup> indicated that by 1905, only \$396,720.85 (and less than \$50,000 from New York) had been pledged--still far short of the half million dollar goals.

---

12. The pertinent letters are from Louis Marshall, New York to Krauskopf, 28 May 1903; Krauskopf to Marshall, 2 June 1903; and Marshall to Krauskopf, 15 June 1903; all letters from the Wise Memorial Fund Collection.

13. Krauskopf to Joseph Stolz, 12 November 1903, Temple.

14. Krauskopf to Charles Stix, 12 November 1903, Temple. This means that Krauskopf raised \$150,000 in the first nine months after he assumed leadership of the fund.

15. The ledger books are in the Wise Memorial Fund Collection.

## CHAPTER X

### THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS

One measure of an individual's success is the honor accorded him by his peers. To be sure, the respect and love of the people whom a rabbi serves is probably his greatest professional joy. Yet, to be found worthy of one's colleagues' respect is a significant achievement. In 1903, at the height of his congregational career, Krauskopf was elected president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the organization to which virtually every Reform rabbi in America belonged. It was a recognition which Krauskopf certainly deserved. The highlights of Krauskopf's administration are beyond the scope of this work; the issues of the CCAR and Krauskopf's participation in its proceedings before 1903 are not.

The conference was founded in 1889 by Isaac M. Wise and was the final part of the triumvirate of American Reform Jewish institutions to be formed. The first was the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, started in 1873, and the second was the Hebrew Union College, which opened two years later. Both of these institutions were, for all practical purposes, founded by Wise. The Conference was not meant to be solely a Reform enterprise. In the constitution, adopted at the Conference's first annual convention, it states that

all rabbis are eligible for membership and that the business of the Conference was "all matters relating to Judaism, its literature and its welfare."<sup>1</sup> In reality, it was the Reform rabbinate which supported the Conference and it was Reform Judaism which the Conference espoused.

At the time of its founding, Krauskopf had already been in Philadelphia for several years. There is no evidence in Krauskopf's own files that he had anything to do with its organization. It is, perhaps, worth noting that Krauskopf's name does not appear in the proceedings of the Conference until the fifth annual convention,<sup>2</sup> that he is not listed as a member until the seventh annual convention,<sup>3</sup> and that he did not attend a meeting until the ninth annual convention.<sup>4</sup> Krauskopf's absence is a mystery. Perhaps he was, in fact, a member and his name was just not listed. There is nothing in the Conference's proceedings to which he would have objected nor is any mention made of his absence.

The early years of the Conference, before Krauskopf participated, were busy ones. The Conference took positive

---

1. From the CCAR constitution, adopted in July, 1890 at the first annual convention, as reported in the Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook (CCAR), vol. I (1890-1891), p. 24.

2. He sent a telegram of greeting from St. Petersburg, Russia, CCAR, vol. IV (1892-1894), p. 65.

3. CCAR, vol. VI (1895-1896), pp. 172-177.

4. The ninth annual convention was held in Atlantic City, N.J. in July, 1898.

action on the Pittsburgh Platform which had been written in 1885 and in whose deliberations Krauskopf actively engaged; recognized the need and expressed approval of Sunday services; recommended the establishment of missions for Jewish poor;<sup>5</sup> rejected circumcision as a requirement for conversion; gave sanction to cremation as a legitimate, Jewish method of disposing of the dead; adopted a rabbinic code of ethics;<sup>6</sup> and agreed that post-Biblical literature was not legally binding upon Reform Jews.<sup>7</sup> From a practical point of view, the most significant action which the Conference took, prior to Krauskopf's participation, was the adoption of the Union Prayer Book.<sup>8</sup>

In July, 1898, Krauskopf attended the ninth annual convention which was held in Atlantic City. It coincided with the summer that Krauskopf worked as a field agent for the National Relief Commission. Krauskopf reported to the convention that supplies were badly needed in hospitals and army camps, and that they could be sent through the offices of the National Relief Commission. The Conference sent copies of services and excerpts from Psalms and Proverbs to the Commission and expressed a desire that Jewish chaplains be appointed. Krauskopf was included on a committee designed to secure the

---

5. CCAR, vol. I (1890-1891).

6. CCAR, vol. III (1892-1893).

7. CCAR, vol. V (1894-1895).

8. CCAR, vol. IV (1892-1894).

latter. That year, the Conference passed a resolution supporting the United States' war effort.<sup>9</sup>

The following year, Krauskopf delivered a paper before the convention entitled "How Can We Enlist Our Young Men in the Service of the Congregation?" He suggested that the clue to increased participation by young people was their parents. The younger people stayed away because their parents did not encourage them and, therefore, Krauskopf concluded, an effort should be made to reach them first.<sup>10</sup>

The twelfth annual convention was held in Philadelphia in July, 1901 and Krauskopf played an active part in its proceedings. The convention convened at Keneseth Israel and Krauskopf gave the opening address. He noted several issues which he felt needed attention and hoped would be considered by the Conference: (1) there was an overabundance of synagogues and many unhealthy rivalries between them; (2) the time had come for congregations to accept routinely applications for membership by individuals, not just by families; (3) the pastoral role of the rabbi needed clarification; (4) there was a need for the Conference to make a statement about the relationship between Judaism and Jews; and, finally, (5) was it proper for non-Jews to affiliate with a Jewish congregation

---

9. Ibid., pp. 48, 52-53, 55.

10. CCAR, vol. IX (1899-1900), pp. 147-160.

and be buried in a Jewish cemetery?<sup>11</sup> Most of the points were not acted upon!

One of the perplexing problems of the day was how to cope with unaffiliated Jews. Krauskopf was a member of a committee, called the "Committee on the Non-affiliated with Congregations," which reported to the convention on the subject. Its position was to decry the large numbers of unaffiliated Jews and to advise congregations not to rent High Holiday seats because this encouraged people to identify minimally with the congregation. It added that children should not be forced to suffer for their parents' behavior and should be allowed to use congregational facilities even if their parents did not join the congregation.<sup>12</sup>

Partially in response to Krauskopf's opening remarks, he was appointed to a committee to deal with the question of how Jesus and Judaism were related. This was an important issue for many of the more radical rabbis who believed that Jesus' teachings were in the mainstream of Jewish tradition and that the notion of his divinity was an irrational concept perpetuated by Christianity. The Conference committee, while it acknowledged that Jesus' teachings were not incompatible with Judaism, stopped short of embracing Jesus as an important figure in Jewish history. This latter step would probably

---

11. CCAR, vol. XI (1901-1902), pp. 16-17.

12. Ibid., pp. 73-74.

have pleased the more radical rabbis including, presumably, Krauskopf. The committee said that Jesus' teachings "cannot form part of nor be incorporated in any official statement or declaration of Jewish belief."<sup>13</sup>

At the close of the convention, Krauskopf was elected first vice-president on the Conference.

Krauskopf was involved in two important issues at the next convention held in May, 1902 in New Orleans. First, he gave another report for the Committee on the Non-affiliated with Congregations, which centered on a plan adopted in Philadelphia to deal with this issue. A Union of Jewish Congregations of Philadelphia was organized by the "uptown" synagogues: Keneseth Israel, Adath Jeshurun, Beth Israel, Mikve Israel, and Rodeph Shalom. The primary purpose of the Union was to convince all of the Jews in Philadelphia to affiliate with a congregation. The Philadelphia Rabbinical Association, of which Krauskopf was chairman and which helped organize the Union, sent out an open letter to the Jews of the city which said, in part, "it is the duty of every Jew in this city to belong to a congregation. No matter how little financial support he can give, his gift will be as welcome as that of the richest." Krauskopf and the committee urged that the rabbis in each city set up similar organizations.<sup>14</sup>

---

13. Ibid., p. 86.

14. CCAR., vol. XII (1902-1903), pp. 76-88.

The second issue was a discussion of the Sabbath.<sup>15</sup> The Conference had passed, several years before, a resolution approving the use of Sunday services. There was an on going and lively debate on the topic in the Conference for many years. There were no real winners. Those who believed in and conducted Sunday services usually met with tremendous success; eventually, however, the Sunday services were eliminated at most of the congregations by later rabbis. There were many points in the debate and in 1902 the anti-Sunday services forces stressed the historical and religious arguments in favor of Saturday. Krauskopf, representing the pro-Sunday services side, participated in the discussion:

Ladies and Gentlemen, permit me to say that I am a Sunday Service man, and that I am proud to be one. I wish, at the same time, to say that I am a Saturday Service man, and equally as proud of that. I am a Saturday service man twelve months of the year,<sup>16</sup> in addition to being a Sunday service man seven months in the year.

He went on to say that it was a question of habit and preference, not religion. Sunday services were simply Krauskopf's and Keneseth Israel's individual response to what had been a complete lack of Sabbath observance at Keneseth Israel before Krauskopf arrived. In fact, the success of his Sunday services, Krauskopf claimed, was also drawing greater numbers of people

---

15. For a detailed analysis of Krauskopf's views on the issue, see Chapter XIII.

16. Krauskopf did not, however, attend Saturday services in the summer. He was usually traveling or at the seashore.



to Saturday services. There was no reason, he concluded, for a congregation not to have both services.<sup>17</sup>

In July, 1903, Krauskopf did not attend the convention which was held in Detroit. This did not deter the Conference from electing him president for the year 1903-1904. (He was re-elected the following year for a second, one year term.) The official letter informing Krauskopf of his election was sent to him on 4 September 1903 by William Rosenau, the corresponding secretary of the Conference. Krauskopf's letter of acceptance shows his humor, modesty, and the seriousness with which he approached this and other tasks:

My dear Rosenau: ---

You certainly deserve a good scolding for having loaded on me the additional burden of the Presidency of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. The very office I sought to avoid by going to Europe you have most skillfully managed to secure for me. But for you the office would never had come to me.

I greatly appreciate your kindness, nevertheless I feel that my very many other duties cannot but prevent me from giving the Presidency of the Conference the amount of thought and labor that it deserves. However, I know that I shall have your and Guttmacher's [the recording secretary] hearty cooperation and together we will do the very best we can to make of the Conference more than a mere perfunctory organization.<sup>18</sup>

---

17. CCAR, vol. XII (1902-1903), pp. 137-139. The entire discussion can be found on pp. 126-139.

18. Krauskopf's letter is dated 9 September 1903; both letters are in the Central Conference of American Rabbis Collection, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.

## CHAPTER XI

### GROWTH AND CHANGE AT KENESETH ISRAEL

During the years between 1887 and 1903, Keneseth Israel experienced extensive physical growth and made significant changes in the congregational ritual and practice. All of this can conveniently be divided into three categories: changes in the physical size and location of Keneseth Israel, changes in ritual, and changes in the religious school.

#### I

When Krauskopf arrived in Philadelphia, Keneseth Israel was located on Sixth Street above Brown. Membership in the congregation was two hundred and fifty<sup>1</sup> and the seating capacity of the Temple was 1150.<sup>2</sup> Membership, however, grew considerably after Krauskopf became rabbi and by 1889 there were already four hundred members.<sup>3</sup> It was clear that the old Temple was inadequate for the demands of the growing congregation and so, in April, 1888, the congregation began discussing the feasibility of building a new Temple.<sup>4</sup> Approximately

---

1. Jewish Exponent (Philadelphia), I:20, 26 August 1887, p. 8.

2. Ibid., IV:25, 29 March 1889, p. 6.

3. Ibid., V:3, 26 April 1889, p. 5.

4. Minutes of the General Congregational Meeting, 6 April 1888, Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel Minute Book. Hereafter referred to as RCKI.

two years later, a site on Broad Street above Columbia Avenue was purchased.<sup>5</sup> In demographic terms, the site was ideal because a study done by the board of trustees showed the Temple would be located slightly north (and in the direction of the population growth) of the center of where the congregation's members lived.<sup>6</sup> Plans for the new Temple proceeded steadily and uneventfully. The cornerstone was laid 19 October 1891 and the new Temple, known later simply as "Broad and Columbia," was dedicated 9-11 September 1892. At the ceremonies Krauskopf said, "its very style of architecture calls unto me aloud for renaissance, for rebirth, for newer, truer, broader life than has ever been lived before."<sup>7</sup> The Temple, built for \$200,000,<sup>8</sup> had 1640 seats.

Congregational life became so busy during this period that it was necessary to hire a second rabbi. On 24 April 1893, Keneseth Ismael installed J. Leonard Levy as Krauskopf's assistant, a position he ably filled until going to Pittsburgh in 1901.

---

5. Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, 7 June 1890, RCKI.

6. Minutes of the Special Congregational Meeting, 26 May 1890, RCKI.

7. Excerpts about the dedication clipped from the Jewish Exponent, 16 September 1892, p. 7, and found in Temple.

8. Minutes of the General Congregational Meeting, 26 October 1892, RCKI.

It is difficult to determine the exact size of the congregation's membership. In those days, there was a distinction made between "members" and "seatholders" and the latter apparently outnumbered the former by a considerable degree. Nevertheless, Krauskopf, himself, probably gave a fairly accurate (though possibly slightly exaggerated) idea of the relative size of Keneseth Israel when he wrote, in 1903, that it was the largest congregation in America.<sup>9</sup>

## II

Changes were made in the congregation's liturgy as soon as Krauskopf became rabbi. First, the language used in the service was immediately changed from German to English.<sup>10</sup> Samuel Hirsch, Krauskopf's predecessor, spoke and conducted services in German. Secondly, Sunday services were instituted in addition to Saturday morning services. They were held each week from the fall, starting after the Holidays, to the spring, ending usually in May. The service consisted of a short prayer book service and a lecture by Krauskopf (or by Levy during those years he was the assistant).<sup>11</sup> Krauskopf wrote two prayer books, one for the Sabbath and one for the Sunday services.

---

9. Krauskopf to Rev. Clinton Baltzell Adams, Philadelphia, 3 December 1903, Temple.

10. Howard W. Fineshriber, Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel: Its First 100 Years, 1847-1947 (Philadelphia: Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel, 1950), p. 19.

11. The congregation was informed that Sunday services would start by the president at the General Congregational

Two other important changes were made during the period in the congregation's practice. Both stemmed from Krauskopf's and Keneseth Israel's belief that religion was "rational" and "scientific" and should rid itself of all beliefs and customs alien to a modern individual's thinking. Stressing that the ceremonies no longer had any religious significance, the congregation abolished Bar Mitzvah in April, 1888<sup>12</sup> and the blowing of the shofar in September, 1889.<sup>13</sup>

### III

One of Krauskopf's duties was to be superintendent of the religious school. The size of the school grew during this period both because the membership of the congregation increased and because Krauskopf added grade levels to the school. In 1888, there were two hundred and thirty-five students in the school,<sup>14</sup> and 1892 there were four hundred,<sup>15</sup> in 1893 there were four hundred and seventy,<sup>16</sup> and in 1900

---

Meeting, 25 September 1887, RCKI.

12. Minutes of the General Congregational Meeting, 6 April 1888, RCKI.

13. Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, 11 September 1889, RCKI.

14. Minutes of the General Congregational Meeting, 6 April 1888, RCKI.

15. Minutes of the General Congregation Meeting, 26 October 1892, RCKI.

16. Minutes of the Special Board of Trustees Meeting, 17 December 1893, RCKI.

there were five hundred and twenty-three.<sup>17</sup> In 1901, the congregation held two Confirmation services to accommodate a class of fifty-two students.<sup>18</sup> When the congregation abolished Bar Mitzvah, it instituted Confirmation to replace it and Krauskopf added a post-Confirmation class in 1889 for students between fourteen and seventeen years of age.<sup>19</sup>

The curriculum also underwent revision and modernization. Teachers were assigned to teach different grades, not just one particular class as they had done before. Krauskopf also hired public school teachers to improve the quality of teaching in the school. The school was divided into two branches. On Saturday and Sunday, the religious branch was held. The subjects were Bible, history, ethics, and Hebrew. All of these classes were taught completely in English. On Monday and Thursday afternoon, German was taught.<sup>20</sup> In 1891, Hebrew was moved from the weekend to Monday, German instruction was confined to Thursday, and both of these classes were

---

17. Minutes of the General Congregational Meeting, 5 April 1900, RCKI.

18. 1901 Confirmation Program, Temple.

19. Minutes of the General Congregational Meeting, 29 September 1889, RCKI. It is, therefore, unclear at what age children were confirmed. It would seem that if post-confirmation was for children 14-17 years old, then they were confirmed at age 13. However, the congregational yearbooks give the distinct impression that confirmation was at age 15 or 16.

20. Minutes of the Special Board of Trustees, 15 November 1887, RCKI.

made optional.<sup>21</sup> In 1893, the study of German was abolished completely.<sup>22</sup> Eventually, Saturday classes were eliminated and a slightly longer session was held on Sunday afternoon.<sup>23</sup>

---

21. Minutes of the General Congregational Meeting, 18 October 1891, RCKI.

22. Minutes of the General Congregational Meeting, 12 October 1893, RCKI. Interestingly enough, out of the three hundred and sixty-two students in the school in April, 1893, nineteen were studying Hebrew and ninety-four were studying German. (Minutes of the General Congregational Meeting, 27 April 1893, RCKI.)

23. Minutes of the General Congregational Meeting, 30 October 1895, RCKI.

## CHAPTER XII

### OTHER ACTIVITIES AND PERSONAL NOTES

There is no doubt that Krauskopf was an extremely busy man. Of all the activities mentioned thus far, Krauskopf spent most of his non-congregational time working on the Farm School. It is deceiving, however, to think of Krauskopf's life as divided among congregational duties, outside activities, and personal life. In reality, all of these parts of his life were related to each other. Being rabbi at Keneseth Israel meant not only writing sermons and running the religious school, but also being active in the community. As such, there is a long list of organizations in which Krauskopf participated in some form or another.

Already mentioned was the Knowledge Seekers, the group which helped start the Jewish Publication Society. It met regularly and, if not out of the city, Krauskopf was usually in attendance. In 1888, he became a director of the Alliance Israelite Universelle, a French based organization which supported and defended Jewish causes in many lands. As European anti-semitism increased in the 1890's the Alliance played a large role in keeping the public informed of what was happening and giving direct relief to individual Jews. This took a great deal of money and



Keneseth Israel, probably at Krauskopf's urging, was a leading supporter of the Alliance in the Philadelphia area.

In 1890, Krauskopf began clamoring for a new direction in social welfare. The crime in the cities' slums was appalling and, Krauskopf asserted, in contradiction to the accepted theory, that it was the slums which created the crime and immorality not vice versa. That being the case, it was useless, Krauskopf believed, to expect any improvement in the social situation unless the environment of the people was changed. He said:

We see the remedy. It does not lie in Prayer-Meetings, in Tract and Bible-Distribution, in eloquent Charity-sermons, nor in Alms-giving. These have all their value, and unquestionably ward off much vice and check much crime. But they are, at best, only palliatives, a radical and permanent cure they do not effect. At times they even increase the danger by effecting a temporary incrustation over the sore spot, while the festering wound beneath eats its way toward the vital centers. . . . Change the environment of your vicious and criminal classes, and your problem is solved. This is the cure, the only, the radical, the permanent, the scientific cure.<sup>1</sup>

In addition to pressing for a rebuilding of the slums, Krauskopf suggested that people form a "Personal Interest Society" and bring, through direct service, a better and healthier way of life to the city's poor.

What we need is a Personal Interest Society, every member of which shall . . . . hold himself responsible for the well-being of one poor family . . . and consecrate himself to promoting its well-being, not by

---

1. Krauskopf, SL, IV:5, 16 November 1890.

dispensing money or its equivalent . . . but by  
awakening tastes and habits of industry, thrift,  
economy, cleanliness, neatness. . . .<sup>2</sup>

The society was set up but the degree of its success (or failure) is unknown. It clearly did not result in the elimination of the city's poor, yet it might very well have heightened the sensitivities of a number of the members of the society and improved the lot of some of the less privileged people in Philadelphia.

There were other groups. In March, 1893, Krauskopf helped organize the Liberal Ministers' Conference of Philadelphia. In 1899, he was appointed a commissioner to represent the United States at the Paris Exposition. The following year he was made a special representative of the Secretary of Agriculture and asked to report on agricultural schools and agricultural conditions in Europe. In 1901, Krauskopf helped start the Board of Jewish Ministers of Philadelphia. He was a director or board member of many organizations and institutions including the Philadelphia Federation of Jewish Charities. If he was not a founder or director of an organization, he probably delivered an address before it. Krauskopf spoke at dedications, regular meetings, anniversary affairs, and on occasions specially designated for appearances by him. The longer he was in Philadelphia and the more well known he became, the more lectures he delivered in places outside the sanctuary at Broad and Columbia. His speaking engagements were not confined

---

2. SL, V:17, 4 February 1892.

to local groups. In addition to his lecture tours around the country in behalf of the Farm School and the Jewish Publication Society, he was also a frequent visitor to other pulpits for Sabbath or Sunday services. It was a custom for rabbis to exchange pulpits for a weekend and Krauskopf spoke at many of the major synagogues on the east coast under this arrangement.

Because of Krauskopf's vocal support of Reform Judaism and outspoken character generally, he was not beloved by all of his colleagues--Reform or Orthodox. Nor was Krauskopf friendly towards those who expressed any disagreement with him. A few examples will indicate the somewhat low level of tolerance which sometimes characterized the relations between Krauskopf and the other rabbis and, in one case, a newspaper.

The newspaper was the Jewish Exponent, the local Jewish paper in Philadelphia. From the time it first appeared in 1887, the Exponent had shown a distinct preference for traditional Judaism. Because Krauskopf was a Reform rabbi, the editorial position of the paper was frequently at odds with him.<sup>3</sup> On his tenth anniversary at Keneseth Israel, the

---

3. For example: (1) Jewish Exponent VI:5, 8 November 1889, p. 4. An editorial criticized Krauskopf's plea for unity in Judaism on the grounds that no unity could exist when people like Krauskopf were changing the heart of Judaism; (2) VIII:3, 24 October 1890, p. 4. An editorial criticized Krauskopf's attitude toward Hebrew in the service; and (3) V:2, 19 April 1889, p. 4. In an editorial about I. M. Wise's seventieth birthday celebration, it said, "there was heard but one discordant note. That was struck by the orator of the

paper expressed the hope that an "era of good feeling" might begin. It took notice of Krauskopf's successes but could not let the opportunity pass without showing its true feelings.

We trust that in the future he may record greater and more substantial success than the past has displayed. That among the achievements of the congregation may be included worshippers made more devout, a deeper love of Judaism; the observances of its precepts and institutions, notably the Sabbath; the thorough acquaintance with our sacred Scriptures and an understanding of their spirit; the upbuilding of a generation inspired by faith in God, and whose lives shall be pervaded with the spirit of their religion.<sup>4</sup>

In 1895, Krauskopf's brother-in-law, Henry Berkowitz, became the first Reform rabbi at Rodeph Shalom, a large, old Philadelphia congregation. Berkowitz's predecessor was the eminent Marcus Jastrow who was noted not only for his scholarship but also for his devotion to tradition. In 1888, Jastrow delivered a sermon in response to one Krauskopf had delivered on the Pharisees. The academic merits of each argument are not important; what is significant is that Jastrow felt compelled to respond publically to Krauskopf. His language was anything but conciliatory.

Polemics are distasteful to me, and improper in the pulpit . . . but when prominence is given to disparaging and erroneous views [Krauskopf's] concerning

---

occasion, Dr. Krauskopf. . . . Into this harmonious assemblage, Dr. Krauskopf hurled the apple of discord by defaming the memory of the dead, and the character and motives of the living who opposed Dr. Wise."

4. "Keneseth Israel's Jubilee and Dr. Krauskopf's Ministry," an editorial in the Exponent, [?] October 1897.

our ancestors [the Pharisees] at a certain period in Jewish history, it is necessary to speak. . . .<sup>5</sup>

Sabato Morais, probably the most prominent Orthodox rabbi in Philadelphia, also criticized Krauskopf about this same lecture.<sup>6</sup> On other occasions, Morais expressed his opposition to Krauskopf and Keneseth Israel. He attacked Keneseth Israel and Reform Judaism on Kol Nidre in 1889,<sup>7</sup> declined an invitation to participate in the cornerstone laying ceremony of Keneseth Israel's new Temple in 1891,<sup>8</sup> and declined to speak at the dedication of Keneseth Israel's library in 1892.<sup>9</sup> Krauskopf's feelings about Morais were expressed in a letter to David Philipson:

He attacked me so bitterly in one of his papers. . . . He might have saved himself that trouble. It will do him no good. He has had over thirty years time in this city to educate the people to his way of thinking. He has failed. He must now give others a chance to see what they can do.<sup>10</sup>

There were also some Reform rabbis who were negatively disposed toward Krauskopf and usually these feelings were reciprocated. The most interesting case among these rabbis is

---

5. Jewish Exponent, II:13, 6 January 1888, p. 9.

6. Ibid., p. 10.

7. Ibid., VI:1, 11 October 1889, p. 5.

8. This is expressed in an undated letter to Krauskopf, Temple.

9. Sabato Morais to Krauskopf, 16 October 1892, Temple.

10. Krauskopf to Philipson, 24 October 1890, Temple.

Kaufmann Kohler.<sup>11</sup> Their disagreement extended at least to 1888 when Kohler wrote a highly critical analysis of an article by Krauskopf on the history of the Jews in America.<sup>12</sup> Krauskopf had devoted a good portion of his essay in praise of Isaac M. Wise. Kohler was an Easterner and far more radical than Wise was. Frequently, the two men clashed. Kohler accused Krauskopf of "falsification of history" and even said, "there is but one I. M. Wise, and Dr. Joseph Krauskopf is his prophet." Kohler clearly expressed the feeling that Krauskopf's purpose had not been to write history but to extol Wise. In a paragraph which also made light of Wise's scholarship, Kohler wrote, "And I regret to state that Rabbi Krauskopf, as historian, imitates his master to a degree which prognosticates little good for his otherwise promising future."

Years passed and Krauskopf became one of the nation's leading rabbis and Kohler, after an illustrious career in New York, ironically was elected president of the Hebrew Union College. The main address at the inauguration was given by Emil G. Hirsch,<sup>13</sup> a rabbi whose negative feelings about Wise

---

11. It should be remembered that Kohler, in 1885, had written very complimentary things about Krauskopf.

12. Krauskopf's article was "Fifty Years of Judaism In America," American Jews' Annual (1888), pp. 165-195; and Kohler's remarks were "Some Plain and Telling Words Regarding Rev. Joseph Krauskopf," The American Hebrew (New York), 30 December 1887 and 6 January 1888, pp. 131-132, 147-148.

13. Emil G. Hirsch was the son of Samuel Hirsch, Krauskopf's predecessor.

and the College had been vitriolic at times. Krauskopf, then president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, was relegated to a minor part in the ceremonies. He was outraged by the insult and wrote: "The suspected has happened. The Hebrew Union College is doomed to become a Kohler-Hirsch institution. All the Wise pupils will be expected to do hereafter is to raise the money."<sup>14</sup>

A few words need to be said about some of the more private and personal aspects of Krauskopf's life. Among all of the organizations and activities which occupied his professional life, it is hard to imagine Krauskopf as a human being. Behind his moustache, goatee, clerical collar, and deep voice was a husband and father of four children. He was married twice. On 31 October 1883, he married Rose Berkowitz, the sister of his best friend. The wedding was part of a double ceremony conducted by Isaac M. Wise. (The other couple was Henry Berkowitz and Flora Brunn.) Rose died in January, 1893 and her loss was felt deeply by Krauskopf. His feelings were reflected in his weekly lectures which were shorter and less enthusiastic than usual. It is interesting that although he was in mourning, he continued to carry on with his professional responsibilities. He married again on 27 August 1896. His second wife was Sybil Feineman, a woman he had met while he was rabbi in Kansas City.

---

14. Krauskopf to William Rosenau, 29 September 1903, Temple.

The Krauskopfs lived very comfortably. He was paid very well and enjoyed long term security even in his early years at Keneseth Israel. When the congregation built the new Temple, Krauskopf's contract was re-negotiated and his salary substantially increased. Beginning in 1892, he received \$7,000 for one year, \$8,000 for three years, and \$10,000 for the next six years.

One of Krauskopf's passions was traveling. He received a full three months vacation each summer and frequently used it to tour either the western part of America or Europe. He spent part of the summer of 1889 in Europe and his itinerary is a commentary both on Krauskopf's energy and on the times.

Guided by the experience I made this summer, I should suggest the following tour--an excellent and profitable one--when the time to be spent abroad is as short as that of mine this summer: Cunard steamer to Queenstown; thence to Dublin, Belfast, Glasgow, Scottish Highlands, Edinburgh, Stratford-on-Avon, London, Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Antwerp, Brussels, Cologne, Rhein, Niederwald, Wiesbaden, Frankford-am-Main, Hamberg, Worms, Heidelberg, Baden-Baden, Stuttgart, Nürnberg, Bayreuth, Carlsbad, Leipzig, Berlin, Dresden, Prague, Vienna, Pesth, Salzburg, Prien, Munich, Bregenz, Ragaz, Constanz, Schaffhausen, Lucerne (Riga excursion), Interloken (Meiringen-Grendelwald excursions), Geneva, Paris, Havre, French Line home. Traveling first class on steamer and boats, second class on trains, stopping in first class hotels, the trip can be nicely made for about one thousand dollars, --providing of course, no presents are bought.<sup>15</sup>

Fortunately, he went on this trip alone. As usual, Rose Krauskopf took the children to the Jersey shore for the summer.

---

15. Jewish Exponent, VI:5, 8 November 1889, p. 1.



## CHAPTER XIII

### SUNDAY SERVICES

One of the reasons why Krauskopf is such an important figure in American Reform Judaism is because he was an outstanding, articulate spokesman of Radical Reform Judaism.<sup>1</sup> A distinctive feature of this very pragmatic and modernistic movement was Sunday services.<sup>2</sup> In some cases they replaced Saturday services; in others, they were in addition to Saturday services. In almost every instance they were better attended than the traditional<sup>3</sup> Sabbath services. This high degree of acceptance on the part of congregations made Sunday services a relatively common occurrence in the more left-wing synagogues.

It is difficult to date the beginning of the movement to institute Sunday services. Samuel Holdheim was the only rabbi in Germany to conduct them. He began in the 1840's. Rabbis in America began to talk earnestly about Sunday services much later. Kaufmann Kohler delivered a famous lecture in

---

1. A thorough analysis of Krauskopf's Radical Reform Judaism is found in Chapter XVIII.

2. Sunday services were routinely conducted in English; Usually, Sabbath services were in German.

3. "Traditional" in the sense of usual and accepted, not "Orthodox."

favor of Sunday services in 1888<sup>4</sup> but there were other rabbis who spoke out in favor of the change earlier and two who were already conducting them.

At Shavuot services in 1887, Samuel Hirsch suggested that Keneseth Israel re-introduce Sunday services.<sup>5</sup> Hirsch had led Sunday services a few years before but they were discontinued because of his inadequate English. Hirsch was retiring and the congregation had hired an English speaking rabbi to replace him. It was a perfect opportunity, Hirsch asserted, to try the services again. Krauskopf was in favor of the innovation and Sunday services, with an address by Krauskopf as the feature of the service, were first held on 23 October 1887.

It should be clear from the start that Krauskopf did not have to be urged to hold Sunday services. He was, by the time he came to Philadelphia, identified with the radical wing of Reform Judaism. The reason that Krauskopf did not have Sunday services while he was in Kansas City was not because he was opposed to them. He delivered a sermon on the subject in 1886 and described the issue as a conflict between laymen and rabbis. Laymen wanted Sunday services because it

---

4. See Kaufmann Kohler, A Living Faith (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1948), pp. 19-31. He said, in this lecture, that he had been a supporter of Sunday services for eighteen years. Kohler repudiated his position several years later.

5. Jewish Exponent, I:8, 3 June 1887, p. 9.

was easier for them to attend services on that day. Rabbis hesitated because of their adherence to what they believed was the cornerstone of Judaism: the Biblical commandment to observe the Saturday Sabbath. The laymen, however, were using the one tactic against which the rabbis had no recourse. They were merely staying away from the synagogue. Krauskopf believed that the rabbinic position was futile and he, at least in theory, abandoned it.

. . . Despite my own oft-expressed preference for the maintenance of the Saturday, despite my enthusiasm for consistency and adherence to principle, justice compels me to acknowledge that in the light of the modern canons of reasoning, the arguments of the pew in favor of a Sabbath transfer are even more powerful than those advanced by the pulpit against it.

Krauskopf said that the present Saturday Sabbath observance was a "farce" and should be changed. It was not logical to resist the change on legal (halachic) grounds because there was no qualitative difference between this change and any other departure from Orthodoxy which Reform Judaism had already instituted. Krauskopf concluded, "the question between Saturday or Sunday is the question between the life and death of Israel. Choose."<sup>6</sup>

Despite Krauskopf's theoretical preferences, there were no Sunday services at Kansas City. Krauskopf said that the issue was too controversial and potentially disruptive

---

6. Joseph Krauskopf, "Shall the Jews Observe Saturday or Sunday as their Sabbath," address in the Kansas City Journal, 19 March 1886.

to pursue.<sup>7</sup> It might have gone deeper than that. Krauskopf was motivated to leave Kansas City because of the congregation's resistance to his program. Although Krauskopf never specified the nature of the resistance, this issue might have been important enough to encourage Krauskopf to look for a more accommodating setting.

As soon as Krauskopf was ensconced at Keneseth Israel, he used his Sunday lectures to staunchly defend and explain the need for the change which was, by then, a fait accompli. Krauskopf never questioned the need for a Sabbath. In America where people worked six and sometimes seven days a week, a day of rest was necessary for survival. The need, he asserted, for a day each week for "spiritual elevation and physical recreation" was universally accepted.<sup>8</sup> It was true that the Saturday Sabbath was an ancient tradition. Krauskopf traced it to pre-Mosaic times.<sup>9</sup> But it was the notion of a weekly day of rest, not the specific day itself which was essential to Judaism. It was irrelevant on which day one rested.<sup>10</sup> One of the reasons why Saturday was maintained by the Jews, Krauskopf said, was to differentiate between themselves and the Christians. However, the antagonism which existed between

---

7. The American Israelite (Cincinnati), 1 July 1887.

8. SL, I:20, 29 April 1888.

9. SL, XII:14, 15 January 1899.

10. SL, I:20, 29 April 1888; XII:14, 15 January 1899.

the two groups was largely a thing of the past and, therefore, the Jews might securely celebrate Sunday as their Sabbath if it were easier for them.<sup>11</sup>

Once the need to observe the Sabbath on Saturday was eliminated, the question became for Krauskopf, on which day might it be best observed? Saturday was a day of work for most Jews in America. It simply was not possible for them either to attend services or to rest on Saturday.<sup>12</sup> A second possibility was Friday night but this, too, was unacceptable. No one, Krauskopf said, could argue that people who worked all day Friday and all day Saturday, but went to services Friday night were really observing the Sabbath. Holding Friday night services was the worst solution because it deprived the people of any opportunity to observe the Sabbath meaningfully. Change made sense only if it were rational and services on Friday night were not.<sup>13</sup>

The logical day left was Sunday.

Only a cruel monster, not a God, could punish a man for preferring to worship his God and to rest from his labors on the first day of the week, to profaning both the Saturday and the Sunday, and every other day of the week, with slavish toil.<sup>14</sup>

Krauskopf suggested that a Sunday service was a change warranted by the changing times. Judaism had to be resilient;

---

11. SL, I:20, 29 April 1888.

12. SL, V:21, 13 March 1892.

13. SL, I:20, 29 April 1888; III:27, 27 April 1890.

14. SL, V:20, 13 March 1892.

when the world changed, Judaism ought to change with it. This was the rational way of operating.<sup>15</sup>

As if the practical considerations were not sufficient, Krauskopf also presented a defense of the Sunday Sabbath based upon the calendar. According to the solar calendar, Krauskopf theorized, Sunday corresponded to Saturday on the lunar calendar. It was preferable, therefore, to celebrate the Sunday Sabbath.<sup>16</sup> Fortunately, he did not emphasize this argument.

As might be imagined, there was much opposition to Sunday services and Krauskopf replied to all of the criticism. There were, primarily, three objections to Sunday services. First, opponents said that it was merely a cheap attempt to appeal to the masses. Krauskopf rejected this peremptorily.

. . . We publically declare that Divine Services [on Sunday] have by no means been instituted for the benefit of what certain people are pleased to call "the masses," but that they are intended for all, for the learned as much as for the ignorant, for the high as much as for the low, for the busy as much as for the idle, that all have need to have at least once a week their characters cleansed, within the church [sic], from debasing week-day defilement, their conscience awakened, their emotions stirred. . . .<sup>17</sup>

Second, some people believed that Sunday services were harmful to and against the nature of Judaism. Krauskopf believed that for the same reason Reform Judaism had made other changes in Jewish observance, it was also justified in making

---

15. SL, III:27, 27 April 1890.

16. SL, XII:14, 15 January 1899.

17. SL, XV:1, 20 October 1901.

this change. The basis for change was "rationality." For Krauskopf, it was only rational to change Judaism to fit the demands of the day. In fact, one essential characteristic of Judaism throughout the ages was its changeability. By instituting Sunday services, Reform Judaism was actually being faithful to the true spirit of Judaism.<sup>18</sup>

Third, and most serious, was the assertion that Sunday services were a concession to a Christian society and would lead to the complete assimilation of the Jews into Christianity. Krauskopf did not object to borrowing something from Christianity. He said, "Christianity has taken much from us; it is no humiliation to take something good from it." Krauskopf did not fear that Jews would become Christians. Actually, he suspected that the opposite might happen. ". . . Sunday services in the synagogue will attract Christianity towards Judaism, instead of Judaism towards Christianity."<sup>20</sup>

There was an objection raised from an unexpected source but one with which Krauskopf did not have to contend. Samuel Hirsch objected to the Sunday services. They were not, apparently, the way he would have done them.<sup>21</sup> The board of trustees supported Krauskopf and told Hirsch that it would

---

18. SL, I:20, 29 April 1888; V:28, 1 May 1892; and XV:25, 20 April 1902.

19. SL, V:21, 13 March 1892.

20. SL, I:20, 29 April 1888.

21. David Klein to Krauskopf, 3 November 1887, Temple.

not interfere with Krauskopf on matters of ritual.<sup>22</sup> The matter was ended when Hirsch announced that he was leaving Philadelphia.<sup>23</sup>

Sunday services at Keneseth Israel were enormously successful. The congregation, apathetic to Hirsch, responded vigorously to the innovation. Krauskopf denied that he, personally, was responsible for their success. He attributed it to the "times."<sup>24</sup> But it was to hear Krauskopf that the people came. At the end of one year, Krauskopf could say that the Temple was filled each Sunday. This meant that 1150 people attended the lectures weekly. Contrary to what his opponents predicted, Saturday service attendance also increased.<sup>25</sup> Krauskopf said that the Temple was at least fifty percent filled on Saturday.<sup>26</sup> After the new Temple was built in 1892, 1600 people flocked to Broad and Columbia each week.

---

22. Minutes of the Special Board of Trustees Meeting, 6 December 1887, RCKI.

23. Minutes of the Board of Trustees meeting, 9 February 1888, RCKI.

24. SL, III:27, 27 April 1890.

25. It should be noted that both Saturday and Sunday services were held at Keneseth Israel and Krauskopf preached at both. Some Reform Temples abolished Saturday services altogether but this Krauskopf did not do. Nor did he believe that Sunday should take precedence over Saturday. Krauskopf did not, therefore, advocate the so-called "Sabbath transfer" which replaced the Saturday Sabbath with Sunday.

26. SL, I:20, 29 April 1888. The increased attendance was noted by Krauskopf repeatedly. See, for example, III:27, 27 April 1890; V:28, 1 May 1892.



Clearly, fears that Jews would become Christians did not materialize.

Krauskopf evaluated the success of the Sunday services periodically. Invariably, he made positive remarks. He felt that the services were valuable to both Jews and non-Jews:

Many who strayed from the faith of their fathers have been attracted back to their spiritual homes by these Sunday Services, and have remained there, faithful and helpful, ever since. . . .

No figures can tell, no measures estimate, what numbers of hatreds and prejudices have there been put to flight by these Sunday services, what centuries-hardened barriers have there been torn down, what weights of ignorance have been lifted, what numbers of non-Jewish hearts have been made to beat in fraternal unison with ours . . . ? Reform Judaism of the Twentieth Century seems to fill a void in large numbers of non-Jewish hearts that can no longer be sated with the theology and mythology of nineteen centuries ago.<sup>27</sup>

Undoubtedly, much of this is true. Those rabbis who instituted Sunday services were clearly responding to an authentic need on the part of the American (Reform) Jewish community. And the people did respond. Temples were filled and participation in other facets of congregational life increased. Yet, in many cases, it was the dynamic rabbis who made the change to Sunday services. This is true, at least, in Krauskopf's case. That Sunday services at Keneseth Israel were successful was in no small measure because of Krauskopf's abilities. His voice, his message brought the people back to the synagogue. It is very possible that Krauskopf would have revitalized Keneseth Israel even without Sunday services. It

---

27. SL, XIV:27, 28 April 1901.

is, of course, impossible to know. What is clear, however, is that he was enormously successful with them. They continued all throughout Krauskopf's life. They were discontinued in 1941 to facilitate renovations in the sanctuary. However, by then, to use Krauskopf's terminology, the "times" had changed again. The late Friday evening services, instituted temporarily in 1941, were never halted and they eventually became the congregation's major Sabbath service.

## CHAPTER XIV

### ZIONISM

A newly emerging but important issue in Krauskopf's day was Zionism. The movement was still young when Krauskopf graduated from the Hebrew Union College but grew rapidly and steadily all during the 1880's and 1890's. It is commonly believed that Krauskopf, as well as most of his contemporaries, were anti-Zionists but this description, at least as it applies to Krauskopf, is misleading. Krauskopf's public remarks<sup>1</sup> on Zionism during this period (1887-1903) reveal a sophisticated position which reflects one of the subtle differences between Krauskopf's "Radical" Reform Judaism and the "Classical" Reform Judaism of his heirs. It is the latter which is more properly called anti-Zionistic.

It has already been seen that a devotion to America which bordered on chauvinism was a basic part of Krauskopf's life. His idealization of America as the universal symbol of freedom led him to hope that all countries might one day be to their people what America was to Americans. Conversely, he also hoped that all oppressed people might enjoy the

---

1. There were four public statements: three from the pulpit at Keneseth Israel and one at the sixteenth council of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (1898). It should be remembered that the Pittsburgh Platform, adopted in 1885, took the position that Judaism was a religion not a nationality and that Krauskopf, as an active participant in the proceedings, probably approved of this plank.

freedom which he enjoyed in America. His preference was for people to find their liberation within their own countries, but he was wise enough to understand that some people, particularly the oppressed Jews of Eastern Europe, were a unique case requiring a special solution.

In 1893, in a lecture perfectly consistent with Krauskopf's hopes for all oppressed people he made a plea for home rule in Ireland.<sup>2</sup> The English, Krauskopf said, usurped the God-given rights of the Irish by depriving them of their independence. Krauskopf likened the struggle of the Irish to the struggle of the suffering Jews.

What sounds could be more inspiring to the wronged sons of Israel than those rousing appeals for the rights of the sons of Erin, that rang out like trumpet-blasts from the platform of our Academy of Music [at a rally for supporters of the "Home-Rule" movement], and that re-echoed in the thunderous applause from pit to dome! What hopes--faint yet irrepressible--are not awakened in every loyal Jewish heart by such sights and sounds as those of Monday last, that some day there may yet be a recognition by the peoples of the earth of Israel's God-given rights to its native Palestinian soil, and an earnest effort on their part to restore the scattered exiles to the sacred land of their sires.

Taken out of context, this sounds like a normative, Zionistic speech which anyone in the movement might have delivered in the early years of the Jewish colonization of Palestine.

Nothing could have been further from Krauskopf's mind. The key word in the excerpt is "exiles." Restoration to Palestine, Krauskopf said, was the hope of Jewish "exiles." Krauskopf

---

2. SL, VI:19, 26 March 1893.

did not consider himself nor any American Jew, an exile. But he did consider the oppressed Jews of Eastern Europe "exiles." All "loyal" Jews, i.e., Americans, hoped that these Jews might be able to immigrate to Palestine.

This position was made explicit in a lecture Krauskopf delivered several years later.<sup>3</sup> The United States Congress had just passed a restrictive immigration law aimed, obviously, at the Russian Jews. This was regrettable, Krauskopf said, because Congress equated the illiteracy of the immigrants with ignorance and this was not a fair judgement. What was needed was better regulation of immigration so that the illiterate exiles might become educated. Krauskopf compared the nationless Russian Jews to Philip Nolan--"the man without a country." The only solution left was to resettle them in Palestine as farmers.

Again, taken out of context, this lecture is also very Zionist. A Zionist ideal was for the Jewish people to work the soil of their own country. The key word, however, in Krauskopf's scheme is "farmers." His dream was for Jews everywhere to pursue agriculture. If, because of restrictive immigration laws, the Russian Jews could not join their brethren on farms in America, they should build their own in Palestine. Krauskopf said:

---

3. SL, X:12, 3 January 1897.

Touching and poetic . . . is their [i.e., Orthodox Jews'] hope of the final restoration of Israel to their native land, and sincerely . . . we may wish that the hope might now be realized, at least for those, who are treated as despised aliens and persecuted outcasts in foreign lands.<sup>4</sup>

Krauskopf's position thus far is clear. Oppressed Jews of foreign countries should be resettled in Palestine so that they might pursue agriculture. Still adhering to the concept of Judaism as a religion, Krauskopf did not suggest that Palestine become a Jewish state. Rather, it should be a haven where outcast and persecuted Jews could live safely as farmers.

The enduring reality of Zionism was confirmed by the first Zionist Congress, held in Basel in 1897. Krauskopf found much to agree with and little to criticize. He said, "it was beyond doubt the most remarkable gathering in the whole history of Israel. . . . And what was more remarkable still . . . not the slightest clashing of religious opinion occurred."<sup>5</sup> Krauskopf clung to that part of the Congress which stressed the establishment of a thriving, Jewish, agricultural community "with its accompanying handicraftsmen, industrialists, and men-following professions"<sup>6</sup> in Palestine. He opposed, again on the grounds that Judaism was a religion, the formation of a Jewish state. The attempt, Krauskopf

---

4. SL, X:12, 3 January 1897.

5. SL, XI:9, 19 December 1897.

6. Ibid.

believed, would fail and would waste money which could be diverted to other Jewish agricultural colonies around the world.<sup>7</sup>

Despite Krauskopf's hopes, the political element of Zionism became its fundamental principle. Krauskopf could not accept this and, on this point, was united with most of his fellow American Reform rabbis. In 1898, Krauskopf was part of a three man committee on Zionism<sup>8</sup> at the sixteenth council of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. The position unanimously adopted by the council is the famous "America is my Zion" statement:

While we are aware of and deplore the abject conditions to which many of our brethren are subjected in foreign lands, and which have naturally, but unfortunately, aroused in some of them a yearning for a reestablishment in Zion, yet we delegates of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in convention assembled, in view of the active propaganda being made at present for the so-called Zionistic movement, deem it proper and necessary to put ourselves on record as follows:

We are unalterably opposed to political Zionism. The Jews are not a nation, but a religious community. Zion was a precious possession of the past, the early home of our faith, where our prophets uttered their world-subduing thoughts, and our psalmists sang their world-enchanting hymns. As such it is a holy memory, but it is not the hope of our future. America is our Zion. Here, in the home of religious liberty, we have aided in founding this new Zion, the fruition of the beginning laid in the old. The mission of Judaism is spiritual, not political. Its aim is not to establish a state, but to spread the truths of religion and humanity throughout the world.

---

7. Ibid.

8. The other members were David Philipson and Simon Wolf. See the Proceedings of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, vol. V, 1898-1903, pp. 3981, 4002.

This is the archetype of the anti-Zionist position in "Classical" Reform Judaism. It is also representative of Krauskopf's feelings. Yet, this statement must be seen in the context of Krauskopf's previous lectures. There was a motion defeated at the meeting to eliminate the word "political" from the statement. The council, therefore, went on record as opposing "political" Zionism and this Krauskopf had always opposed. However, he never retracted the hopes he expressed in the 1890's.<sup>9</sup> His sympathy for the Russian Jews and his recognition that Palestine was an ideal place for their settlement can hardly be called "anti-Zionist" in its traditional usage.

---

9. As a result of a trip to Palestine in 1914, Krauskopf became more sympathetic to "political" Zionism. (Abraham Feldman, "Joseph Krauskopf," American Jewish Yearbook, vol. XXVI (1924-25), p. 445).



CHAPTER XV  
THE PRAYER BOOKS

Krauskopf wrote two prayer books for use at Keneseth Israel. In 1888, he published The Service Ritual for Sunday services and, in 1892, he published The Service Manual for Sabbath, weekday, and festival services. Each prayer book is so unlike either the Orthodox liturgy or the Union Prayer Book that a comparison between them is virtually impossible. In the Preface to The Service Manual, Krauskopf wrote that that "the fixed Order of Worship has been departed from . . . but merely in form. The spirit of the traditional service has been sacredly preserved." It is not perfectly clear that this description is correct. An argument could easily be made in either direction. Basically, whether or not one sees the prayer books as having a "traditional" spirit depends upon where emphases are placed and upon the framework with which they are considered.

If Jewish worship is conceived of as being an experience solely for Jews and expressive of the needs of all Jews, then Krauskopf's prayer books could not be described as Jewish worship. If, on the other hand, Jewish worship is an expression of the different needs felt by Jews living at different times, then the prayer books are authentically Jewish.

Since so much else of what Krauskopf said and believed was a function of a particular and rather well-defined moment in history it is logical and consistent to view his prayer books from the perspective of the latter framework.

The Service Manual begins with two standard services: an evening and morning service. These were repeated at each evening or morning service during the year (except on Sunday). The evening service consisted of the following parts:

- (a) an introductory organ piece;
- (b) the "invocation" which is a general prayer about the day just ended;
- (c) two short excerpts from the Psalms, one done by the choir and one by the congregation;
- (d) the "adoration" which proclaimed the greatness of God as the creator, redeemer, and protector of man;
- (e) a second short interlude for the choir and congregation;
- (f) a "thanksgiving" for God's protection and love;
- (g) the "call to worship" said responsively by the choir and congregation;
- (h) the "supplication" which expressed man's unworthiness, sinfulness, and hopes for an improved life;
- (i) two short excerpts from the Prophets, one by the choir and one by the congregation;
- (j) the "consecration" which reaffirmed man's mission to pursue brotherhood and peace in the world;

(k) a prayer said standing and responsively between the choir and the congregation which included the Shema and short excerpts from other parts of the traditional liturgy;

(l) the sermon;

(m) the mourners' service which included an expression of a spiritual afterlife and the Kaddish;

(n) a closing hymn by the choir; and

(o) the benediction.

The order of the morning service was the same until (k).

Between (k) and (l) were:

(k-1) the "aspiration" a prayer for peace based upon the Prophets; and

(k-2) the "exhortation" or the Torah service.<sup>1</sup>

The contents of the prayers in the morning service are different although they tend to repeat the same themes. Each service is about ten pages long.

The nature of the prayers is very universalistic and humanitarian. Though filled with excerpts from the traditional liturgy and the Bible almost all references to "Israel" have

---

1. The Torah was taken out of the ark and held up to the congregation during this part of the service. It was returned to the ark without its being read. This was followed by an English Scriptural reading. There has been some speculation that there was no Torah in the ark at Keneseth Israel, but this is clearly untrue. In 1902, Krauskopf wrote to A. L. Fribourg, Sioux City, Iowa (Temple), and said that there was to his knowledge only two rabbis who had no Torahs in the ark: Emil G. Hirsch in Chicago and Moses Gries in Cleveland.

been omitted. Those remaining are practically all in translations (e.g., the Shema and Kaddish). Yet universalism and humanitarianism are not alien to Orthodox prayers. It is the particularism of the Siddur that is missing from Krauskopf's prayers. There is virtually no Hebrew; one wonders if any of it besides, possibly, the Shema and Kaddish was spoken. Some of the prayers are introduced by Hebrew sentences which correspond to prayers in the Orthodox prayer book. However the contents of the prayers in Krauskopf's services do not, generally, correspond to the contents of the Hebrew prayers.

In addition to the two standard services, there were supplemental services to be inserted into the standard services for each holiday and the Sabbath. There is a special additional service for each festival and twelve different insertions, each with a different theme, for the Sabbath. The themes are virtue, retribution, the Sabbath, the Bible, industry, duty, the value of a good name, the greatness of man, ethical behavior, education, charity, mind and matter, and adversity. This part of the service is about four pages long.

The Service Ritual, the prayer book for Sunday services, has thirty short (perhaps ten pages in length) services, approximately one for each week during the year when there was a Sunday service. These services consisted of original prayers; excerpts from Jewish and non-Jewish literature; a lecture; and a mourners' service with the Kaddish. Occasionally, there were some short passages in Hebrew all of which were translated.

There is certainly nothing which is non-Jewish in spirit in either prayer book (even though The Service Ritual contains readings by non-Jews). Still, there is also very little that a Jewish visitor to Keneseth Israel would have recognized as "Jewish" in the service. There are very few of the traditional, liturgical landmarks which appear even in the Union Prayer Book. Aside from a few scattered lines, all of the translations which seem to come from Hebrew originals were paraphrased so freely as to make comparison ludicrous.

Krauskopf was accurate in saying that the themes of his prayer books were also in the traditional prayer book. What he failed to admit, but probably knew, was that the impression created by his services was not at all similar to that of the traditional liturgy. The latter is particularistic enough so that one leaves the traditional service with the distinct feeling that one has had an experience for Jews qua Jews. The feeling one gets from Krauskopf's services is that they were written and compiled for all people and appealing to everyone's yearnings for a happier, more ethical, and more meaningful life. It is likely that Krauskopf did write the books attempting to do just that. To be fair to Krauskopf, he earnestly believed that the universalism inherent in Judaism was its essence. Therefore, in terms of his philosophy, his services were essentially Jewish. If they appealed to non-Jews, and it seemed they did, that only

served to illustrate another of Krauskopf's theories, namely, that the essence of Christianity is the universalism and humanitarianism of Judaism.

## CHAPTER XVI

### JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY

America has always been a Christian country. This was no less true at the turn of the century than it had ever been. However, conscious attempts at religious tolerance characterized some periods more than others. Not infrequently these periods coincided with economic stability and progress. Such were the years during which Krauskopf lived in Philadelphia. Encouraged by a community receptive to his words, Krauskopf preached about religious brotherhood, the similarities between Judaism and Christianity, and the Jewishness of Jesus. Krauskopf's interest in creating harmony bordered on being an obsession. For example, he wore a clerical collar. The image he presented was not so much the "rabbi" but the "clergyman;" his concerns, the collar implied, were not only Jewish but universal; the rabbi on Broad Street, Krauskopf was saying, ministered not only to Jews but to everyone. Krauskopf's ecumenism was sincere. He was not motivated by self-hatred or even the vague humanism which led some Jews (and some rabbis) away from Judaism into Unitarianism or Ethical Culture.

His belief grew out of his definition of Judaism and reflected his Radical Reform philosophy. Judaism was, simply,

a religion. It was not, Krauskopf believed, a race, a nation, an ethnic conglomeration, or an ill-defined "group." It was a religion which had a set of beliefs to which its members adhered. To be a Jew required a conscious decision; one was not merely born a Jew.<sup>1</sup> The goal of all religions, including Judaism, was the attainment of a messianic age in which all distinctions creating conflict between people would cease. It was a matter of logic that although there might be many ways to achieve this end, one path was probably the most effective. If this particular means could be found, was it not rational, Krauskopf asked, for all people, Jews and Christians alike, to pursue their messianic hopes through the same vehicle? Krauskopf believed that the vehicle was a combination of the essential principles of Judaism and Christianity. Religious distinctions would be valid only until people were ready and willing to adopt the new Universal Faith.

Krauskopf was not unaware of history, however, and did not ignore the historical reality of Christian prejudice towards the Jew. The prejudice would have to cease before the long awaited goal was achieved. Krauskopf worked energetically to increase Jewish tolerance; his quest for the Christian acceptance of the Jews, denied for two millenia, was likewise passionate. Within the same man, therefore, worked these two forces: the Jewish, religious, and universal

---

1. SL, I:10, 19 February 1888.



hope for a messianic age and the Jewish, particularistic demand for acceptance by and equality in the Christian society. The two forces appeared again and again in Krauskopf's lectures and over the years a decided ambivalence and ambiguity in terms of the future characterized his position.

There are four major divisions in Krauskopf's position on Judaism and Christianity: first, Jesus, his teachings, and the age in which he lived; second, the historical relationship between the Church and the Jews; third, the present day relationship between the Jews and the Christians; the fourth, possibilities for the future.

Krauskopf went to great lengths<sup>2</sup> to try to prove that Jesus was a human being, that the prophets did not predict his life, and that the New Testament was filled with myths and untruths perpetuated by Jesus' early followers and the Church. Jesus, according to Krauskopf, was a man of his time. Palestine was a depressed society and people longed for some form of salvation. Some expected it after death, others in this world; some strove for it peacefully, others violently. The Galilee was the locus for the radical movements and Jesus' teachings typified one of the peaceful, otherworldly philosophies which emerged from the district.<sup>3</sup> Little is known about

---

2. See for example: SL, I:15, 25 March 1888; II:13, 30 December 1888; III:16, 9 February 1890; IV:12, 11 January 1891; V:10, 27 December 1891; VI:9, 25 December 1892; VI:10, 1 January 1893; XIV:23, 31 March 1901; XIV:24, 7 April 1901.

3. SL, IV:12, 11 January 1891.

his life. He was born in Nazareth; his father was Joseph, a carpenter; his mother was Mary; he had four brothers and one sister; he was Jewish; he was influenced by John the Baptist and became an itinerant preacher; he aroused messianic expectations in his followers who believed that he was the messiah; and he was killed as a political subversive by the Romans. All of his teachings were "Rabbinic" and anything non-Jewish was traceable to the period after his death. He was clearly a man of exceptional character who early in his life was probably an Essene. His followers were far more radical than he was and eventually "their delusions deluded him."<sup>4</sup>

Everything else about Jesus, Krauskopf said, was untrue and/or mythological. He was not the Christ because he fulfilled no messianic requirements or expectations. The Jews did not crucify him; the contradictions between the Gospel accounts and Jewish law and custom proved this conclusively. Nor did the prophets predict his coming. The Jewish prophets did not predict the future and could not, therefore, have predicted Jesus. Furthermore, Krauskopf said,

. . . the so-called Messianic prophecies of the Isaiahs have contemporaneous meanings and local applications, or are the fond dreams of enthusiastic or ecstatic minds, that they never could, and never did, apply to events that transpired hundreds of years later, that it is only by torturing texts, and by doing violence to the genius of the Hebrew language, that the words or writings of

---

4. SL, XIV:24, 7 April 1901.

the Isaiahs can be forced into the prophecies of Gospel texts.<sup>5</sup>

The "historical" Jesus was Jewish, humanitarian, loving, ethical, desirous of serving mankind, and an inspiring figure worthy of respect by Jews and Christians. He was deserving of respect but not, Krauskopf believed, deserving of adoration. He was a notable person, but not divine.

Misconceptions and deliberate falsehoods about Jesus, his life, and the Jews were created and maintained by Jesus' followers after his death and were further elaborated by the Church. Eventually, Krauskopf said, these caused the Jews extraordinary suffering.<sup>6</sup> Christian ignorance and intolerance pervaded all contacts with Jews for centuries. Only recently had Christianity begun to admit that it had treated the Jews unfairly. Unfortunately, the transition from hatred to brotherhood was far from accomplished and the Jews must still be on guard against prejudice and discrimination.

Krauskopf was extremely bitter about contemporary Christian intolerance. He characterized his age as "rational" and was understandably angered that Christians, by holding tenaciously to superstitions and myths which added to bigotry, did not conform to the idealistic teachings of Jesus.

---

5. SL, VI:9, 25 December 1892.

6. See for example: SL, I:15, 25 March 1888; IV:14, 25 January 1891; IV:15, 1 February 1891; V:10, 27 December 1891; VI:9, 25 December 1892; VII:29, 15 April 1894; XIV:18, 22 February 1901; XIV:25, 14 April 1901; and many others.

Christianity has not yet commenced to live up even to the purely human of the teachings of Christ. It teaches doing to others as it would be done by, and yet treats others as it would not like to be treated; it speaks of the duty of loving the enemy, and does not even love the friend.<sup>7</sup>

The origins of this unchristian Christianity was traced by Krauskopf to the time when early Christians ceased being a community of followers of Jesus and established a formal institution.

From the day that the Christian community changed to an ecclesia, Christians ceased to be followers of the Jewish Jesus, and became, barring honorable exceptions, idolators of the Pagan Christ. . . . They who called themselves Christians became the Anti-Christ.<sup>8</sup>

A distressing example of contemporary Christian intolerance was the continued attempt by some Christian ministers to convert the Jews. Krauskopf was vehemently opposed to this on the grounds, first, that as long as Christians needed to be converted to a purer Christianity, the Christian ministers should leave the Jews alone; and second, that there was nothing worthwhile in Christianity that the Jews did not already have in Judaism.<sup>9</sup> In 1889, the Jewish Exponent carried an advertisement for a service at a Christian church whose purpose was to convert Jews. Krauskopf saw the advertisement and appeared at the church.

---

7. SL, XIV:24, 7 April 1901.

8. SL, IX:7, 24 November 1895.

9. SL, II:22, 10 March 1889 and IV:15, 1 February 1891.

With a copy of the Jewish Exponent in my pocket I went to Grace Church. My visit was not a case of "I came, I saw, I conquered," by the overpowering argument and fiery eloquence of the Rev. W. F. Nichols D.D. The audience numbered not 100, and the number of Jews, as far as I could discern, numbered two--our sexton and myself. As I stood before Rev. W. F. Nichols I saw before me the picture of Balaam blessing Israel. Indulge not vain hopes, ye hungerers after Jewish souls. The people that has hewn its name wherever the highest civilization abides has a higher destiny than being swallowed by an inferior creed.<sup>10</sup>

Another example of Christian intolerance to which Krauskopf objected was the passion play at Oberammergau. He attended a performance of the play in 1900 and delivered a series of sermons<sup>11</sup> on the experience refuting, point by point, the lies promulgated by the play.

The present, however, was not devoid of hope. Krauskopf saw many opportunities for dialogue between Jews and Christians. Convinced that Jews as well as Christians had to compromise if there was to be fellowship between them, Krauskopf proposed that a new holiday, called Martyr's Day, be celebrated in the spring.<sup>12</sup> The purpose of the holiday was to commemorate all religious martyrs. It would contain

---

10. SL, II:22, 10 March 1899; Jewish Exponent, IV:23, 15 March 1889. Krauskopf, incidentally, criticized the Exponent for carrying the advertisement. The Rev. W. F. Nichols was later involved with Krauskopf on a committee of the unsuccessful Model Dwelling Association.

11. SL, XIV:14-24, 27 January - 7 April 1901. The series was published separately as A Rabbi's Impressions of the Oberammergau Passion Play (Philadelphia: Edward Stern and Co., 1901).

12. Martyr's Day was celebrated on at least five occasions: SL, I:16, 1 April 1888; III:24, 6 April 1890;

none of the "irrational" myths or pagan overtones of Passover and Easter. Freed from the superstitions which divided them, Jews and Christians might join in celebrating a cause shared by both.

Krauskopf also believed that Unitarianism was proof that the two religions were actually coming closer together. "With everyyyear," he said, "we observe a nearer approach of Christianity towards Judaism. . . . In fact, in Unitarianism Christianity has already crossed the borderland of Judaism."<sup>13</sup> What attracted Krauskopf to Unitarianism was its emphasis on ethics. He was, apparently, willing to overlook basic doctrinal differences in order to foster religious cooperation. Sometimes this tendency to overlook differences went so far as to lead Krauskopf to deny that Judaism was unique and the name worth preserving. This manifesto, expressed several times by Krauskopf,<sup>14</sup> was set forth clearly in a lecture entitled "How Israelites and Christians Might Succeed Together!"<sup>15</sup>

---

VII:20, 2 April 1893; VII:27, 1 April 1894; X:27, 18 April 1897. Despite Krauskopf's implication that Martyr's Day would supercede Passover (and Easter), he did not suggest that Jews stop celebrating Passover. In fact, in the years closer to the turn of the century he lectured on the universal value of Passover's freedom theme. See SL, XII:24, 26 March 1899; XVI:22, 12 April 1903.

13. SL, II:22, 10 March 1889. See also SL, I:10, 19 February 1888.

14. See for example: SL, III:16, 9 February 1890; III:20, 9 March 1890; IV:21, 22 March 1891; VIII:2, 28 October 1894; XII:2, 23 October 1898.

15. SL, IX:9, 8 December 1895.

Our duty then is clear. It is the reestablishment of religion in the spirit in which Moses and the Nabis [prophets] and Jesus had established it, and which the Church had disestablished. And the reestablishment of that religion means the reuniting of the Israelite with the Christian. . . . As to the Christian . . . he must abandon every creed, and dogma, every rite, ceremony and festival, that deifies or celebrates or commemorates Christ, the Pagan, as distinguished from Jesus, the Israelite. He must abandon the word Christian. . . . As to the Israelite, he, too, must neither hope nor seek to make the name of Judaism to stand for the name of the Faith Universal. . . . Together with the name, the Israelite must put aside all those boastful claims of special choice of, and favor with God that are as unwarranted as they are offensive. . . . I have endeavored to trace for you the lines along which The Faith Universal might be inaugurated. It is within the range of possibility. It only requires the laying aside of paganism, the casting aside of particularisms and prejudices. What remains is religion pure and simple. What remains is religion in the spirit of Moses and the Nabis and Jesus.

He was severely criticized for this assimilationist position by Emil Hirsch who told Krauskopf that his position was erroneous.

The insistence upon the name involves a vital principle. I differ absolutely from you in holding the label Judaism to be a misnomer. It was Judaism and no other force that originated the prophetic visions and gave them vitality by incarnating them into institutions. Granted that the prophets lived at an age when Judaism was not yet! The union between prophetism and nationalism which Judaism (Ezra) represents was the salvation of the prophetic ideas for the world. The Unitarians will not concede this. They insist on calling our original contributions to the world's stock of religious views--humanitarian and universal, for which Judaism may claim no credit, while always emphasizing the ritual and temporary elements of our scheme as the original and therefore worthless and specifically Jewish factors. You have gone a great way in meeting and adopting this erroneous view.<sup>16</sup>

---

16. Emil G. Hirsch, Chicago to Krauskopf, 1 January 1896, Temple.

Hirsch was absolutely correct on this point. It would be distressing to think that Krauskopf indeed failed to see the link between prophetic and modern Judaism. One must suspect that, in this case, his messianic dreams overshadowed his ability to think clearly.

There is another problem with Krauskopf's position in Christianity besides this one. He expressed awareness of the historical persecution of the Jews by the church and the continued Christian prejudice against the Jews in modern times. Krauskopf pleaded, in a sense, for a cessation of this irrational behavior; Christians ought to admit that their hatred was based upon ignorance. He hoped that once Christianity freed itself from the sins committed by church fathers centuries before, Judaism and Christianity could co-exist, helping people to live the high ethical lives both believed were ideal.

Krauskopf was also committed to a vision for the future which transcended modern religious identities. He believed that Judaism and Christianity when stripped of their oriental and particularistic customs were basically the same, rational, and universalistic religion combining the purest elements of Mosaic and prophetic morality. Jesus was an outstanding exponent of this system. This faith could lead all mankind to salvation and Krauskopf hoped for the day when all people would accept it.



It is hard to reconcile his passionate defense of Judaism with his all-consuming universalistic vision. Perhaps it is best not to. Krauskopf was a defender of Jewish rights and an advocate of certain particularistic elements in Judaism; he was also a messianic dreamer. In his lifetime, he pursued both goals simultaneously although probably never fully aware of the inconsistencies into which they sometimes led him. In some cases they never clashed; in his position on Judaism and Christianity, however, the two were juxtaposed in sharp contrast.

CHAPTER XVII  
THOUGHTS ON CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

Implicit in Krauskopf's ministry was an involvement in the important, contemporary issues of his time. Considering himself in the tradition of Israel's prophets, he carried a commitment to the welfare of society and the dignity of the individual. Jeremiah told the exiles "to seek the peace of the city" in which they lived because through it they would find peace. The notion that Jewish survival was intimately related to the stability of the society in which Jews lived was vital and essential to Krauskopf. To divorce itself from issues affecting the city, nation, or world was tantamount to suicide. A healthy society in which the fundamental worth of the individual was respected was protection against the discrimination, persecution, and stagnation which plagued the Jews throughout history. Requisite to a meaningful Jewish identity, Krauskopf believed, was a willingness to contribute to the growth of such a society and to the preservation of institutions and principles already working towards that end. A stable and prosperous society was thus a means and an end. It was the utopian existence for which Judaism yearned, the goal at which energies had been directed for centuries; it was also the environment in which Jews were guaranteed security and survival.

There were several implications of this philosophy. First, since Judaism was committed to attaining the ideal society, it was worth preserving. Second, it was necessary to teach and emphasize those elements of Judaism most concerned with improving social conditions. Third, the Jewish community had to be cognizant of issues in the secular society which affected not only Jewish security specifically but also the well being of society generally. It was his duty, Krauskopf believed, to keep them so informed and to remind them that in the peace of Philadelphia and America they, too, would find peace.

It is no small wonder that the majority of Krauskopf's lectures were devoted to contemporary issues. It is impossible to discuss or even list all of the issues with which he was concerned; they numbered in the hundreds. Hopefully, a sampling can transmit the pervasiveness which characterized his vision.

Krauskopf discussed two political subjects, the first was war and the second was church-state relations. Krauskopf said that war had been a necessity in the days when the church dominated governments. This was because the church had considered itself the sole depository of truth. Whether or not the church still held to that doctrine was irrelevant because it no longer wielded the political power it once did.<sup>1</sup> This

---

1. SL, III:23, 30 March 1890.

difference led Krauskopf to believe that people might conquer and eliminate war. The Spanish-American War temporarily jolted Krauskopf's hopes. Endeavoring to keep his faith in America and mankind intact, Krauskopf preferred to think that the war was God's doing.<sup>2</sup> Under this condition, war became a necessary evil which America was obligated to bear. This was, of course, little more than a rationalization; it was however, a necessary one for Krauskopf who desired to maintain his ideal that war might be overcome. It was only by accident that Krauskopf lived at an otherwise peaceful time and this probably served to bolster his hopes. Although various parts of the world were embroiled in fighting, the United States, between 1865 and 1917 (with the exception of the few months in 1898) was largely free from military strife. It is thus partially understandable that Krauskopf believed that America held some kind of key to peace and likewise understandable that he had difficulty accepting America's eventual involvement in World War I.

The second political issue was church-state relations. Krauskopf believed in the separation of church and state not only on constitutional grounds but also because both church and state had distinct purposes which were best served by a rigid separation of the two. Religion taught ethics, and

---

2. SL, XI:22, 20 March 1898; see Chapter VII for Krauskopf's attitude towards and participation in the Spanish-American War.

government provided for the safety, protection, and welfare of its members.

The church is the institution in which the people are constantly to learn such lessons of right conduct, as shall enable the state to secure the ends for which it was organized.<sup>3</sup>

There were several religious matters in which the state meddled. For example, a government enforced Sabbath was counterproductive, Krauskopf asserted. If everything were closed by law one day a week, people would be unable to pursue most recreational activities. Krauskopf saw the influence of the Christian church here. It wanted the people to come to church each week and hoped to force them by preventing them from doing anything else.<sup>4</sup> Krauskopf was also worried about religion in the schools because, invariably, it was Christianity which was taught. He suggested that Christians who wanted their children to learn about their religion should send them to parochial schools. Jewish children, subjected to Christian programs and Bible readings would be ridiculed if they objected or refused to participate. They might also be persecuted because much Christian education still described Jews as Christ-killers. Krauskopf's advice to his congregation was to support the National Religious

---

3. SL, I:18, 15 April 1888.

4. SL, II:10, 9 December 1888.

Liberty Association which actively opposed attempts to legislate religious education in the public schools.<sup>5</sup>

Another category about which Krauskopf lectured was socio-economic issues. He dispensed advice for improving the conditions in which laborers were forced to work; he also supported the continuation of the capitalist-industrialist system which concentrated wealth in the upper classes. Recognizing the harshness and competitiveness of the emerging industrial society he proposed a "Ten Commandments of Commercial and Industrial Life;" first, relieve overpopulated labor markets; second, regulate the settlement of workers; third, end the sweatshop system; fourth, reduce the number of middlemen in the commercial process; fifth, establish suburban industrial and agricultural parks; sixth, teach tailors how to farm; seventh, shorten hours and improve working conditions; eighth, give workers an additional afternoon off each week; ninth, stimulate investment to prevent poverty; and tenth, "lessen your extravagances and restrain your greeds."<sup>6</sup> Laborers rightfully deserved leisure time, savings, education for their children, and a system by which they could express their grievances. While it was true that some strikes were unjust and the violence attending them was deplorable the unions represented a far less evil than corporate monopolies. The

---

5. SL, III:19, 2 March 1890; VIII:10, 23 December 1894.

6. SL, XV:19, 9 March 1902.

government should help secure their rights and towards that end should appoint a Secretary of Labor to serve in the cabinet.

The system, however, could not work without the capitalists. They and their money, Krauskopf said, were responsible for the advancement of knowledge, culture,<sup>8</sup> shipping, trains, mining, bridges, labor-saving machines, churches, schools, libraries, museums, theatres, hospitals, street lights, parks, and "every blessing of civilization."<sup>9</sup> It was important that people accumulate wealth legally and not at the expense of others.

Wealth has been attained, and is still attainable, without haste and knavery. It is done by making self sacrifices, and not by sacrificing others. It was done by faithful industry, by strict integrity, by avoiding debts and gambling and speculating, by making the best of every opportunity, by exercising good business-judgement, by careful economy and frugality, by curbing all unreasonable extravagances in the business and in the household.<sup>10</sup>

The accumulation of money was not, however, beneficial in itself. The wealthy were obligated to put their money back into society in such a way so as to improve the quality of everyone's life.<sup>11</sup> The business world, Krauskopf reminded his congregation, was a fierce struggle; not everyone would

---

7. SL, V:16, 7 February 1892.

8. SL, II:9, 2 December 1888.

9. SL, XII:8, 4 December 1898.

10. SL, III:10, 29 December 1889.

11. SL, III:10, 29 December 1889; IV:4, 9 November 1890;

succeed like Rockefeller or Carnegie. The competition could bring out the worst in a person's character:

All commerce, as well as every commercial profession that greedily seeks for money--or for its equivalent in name or fame--is a struggle for existence, in which only the fittest survive. But unfortunately, the "fittest" are only too often the unfittest morally. . . .<sup>12</sup>

An unfortunate product of an industrial society is poverty and poor living conditions. The latter, Krauskopf believed, was more easily solved than the former. Sanitation and cleanliness, already a concern for the Jew, should be taught in schools. The city should institute a more effective program for food inspection and street maintenance and the federal government could demonstrate its commitment by making public health a cabinet level concern. Solving poor living conditions was largely a mechanical problem;<sup>13</sup> ending poverty was more complex because Krauskopf thought that the method being tried was actually creating more poverty than it alleviated. Most people donated money to charity and this, in turn, was doled out to the poor. Krauskopf said that this system was poverty-creating because it neither eliminated the causes of poverty nor enabled the recipient to help himself. ". . . Charity, that has not for its direct aim the prevention and cure of social ills, perpetuates them, and thereby becomes

---

VI:15, 19 February 1893; XII:28, 23 April 1899; XVI:8, 29 December 1902.

12. SL, XV:18, 2 March 1902.

13. SL, II:19, 10 February 1889.



a sin. . . ."14 The solution was for the government to provide employment through a system of public works projects. This would eliminate the embarrassment of taking money from others; give the poor person an income and its by-products--confidence and self respectability; and cost the public less money than was required to maintain the vast, inefficient network of private charities.<sup>15</sup> There was also a need for direct, personal aid to the poor. The government, while it might produce employment, could not change attitudes. People working individually with other people might, and to that end Krauskopf organized the Personal Interest Society.<sup>16</sup>

The third category which Krauskopf discussed can be loosely identified as social issues. In many cases, his lectures reflected a keen insight into the nature of his congregants and the society in which they lived. Some of his observations were time bound and thus have significant historical value; others were more universally applicable and conjure the admiration which occasional flashes of genius deserve. Naturally, some merely reflect Krauskopf's peculiarities.

Krauskopf was an opponent of prohibition. Alcohol was not, he said, an evil. It not only had a ceremonial value for Jews but also helped digestion. Drinking, in moderation, fulfilled an instinctual human need for stimulation; it was

---

14. SL, XV:24, 13 April 1902.

15. SL, XV:24, 13 April 1902; II:3, 21 October 1888; VIII:4, 11 November 1894.

16. See Chapter XII.

harmful only when consumed in excess. Prohibition would not eliminate excessive drinking. In fact, the prohibition of anything done excessively rarely cured the problem. Instead, one should support legislation to regulate the production, inspection, and intake of liquor. Meanwhile, people ought to be more careful and judicious with their drinking.<sup>17</sup>

In several lectures, Krauskopf lamented the increase in crime. His remarks were amazingly perceptive. The problem was that neither the penal system nor society, generally, were getting to the origins of crime. It was of questionable value to punish a person, Krauskopf said, if the circumstances which caused the person to commit the crime were not corrected. For example, the state did little to improve the home life of criminals; to discourage sensationalist literature; to provide job training; to regulate immigration; to improve living conditions in the slums; or to soften the inequities of class distinctions.<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, the penalties for crimes were cruel and ineffective. Most offensive was capital punishment. Contrary to what some people believed, electric chairs and gallows, which were touted as humane methods of capital punishment, were no different, qualitatively, than medieval torture chambers. If the purpose of capital punishment, Krauskopf reasoned, was to be a deterrent, it was illogical

---

17. SL, II:20, 17 February 1889.

18. SL, III:7, 8 December 1889.

to make it more humane. A primary motive for crime is the need for publicity and attention; the publicity given to executions might actually attract more people than it deterred.

Our inflicting the death penalty, therefore, since it benefits neither the murdered, nor the murderer, nor deters others from the crime, has simply the gratification of a revengeful spirit as its object, and we have little reason to complain of the vindictiveness of lynchers, when they but do in an undisguised manner what we do under the sanctimonious cloak of Law, and . . . they, for the most part, do under the impulse of intense excitement and blinding passion what we do in all calmness, with deliberation, and in cold blood.<sup>19</sup>

Prison was no more effective. It, too, was merely an expression of revenge. It even failed to prepare criminals to re-enter society when their prison terms were finished.

". . . As a Corrector the prison is a hopeless failure, and that it is a failure is largely due to the fact, that the element of love is almost wholly wanting in our prison discipline. . . ."20

The years around the turn of the century were difficult for the American Black. Krauskopf believed that the white man was "blinded by racial antipathy." Blacks were not inferior nor were they criminal; they were the victims of prejudice. ". . . The Negro," Krauskopf said, "has been far more successful in raising himself from the degradation of slavery than has the white man been in delivering himself from the shackles of racial prejudices, that are as unreasonable as they are

---

19. SL, V:23, 27 March 1892.

20. SL, IV:22, 29 March 1891.

crushing. . . ." The Jew ought to be acutely sensitive to any form of discrimination and was obligated to work in behalf of racial equality.<sup>21</sup>

The 1890's were active days for the feminist movement; its influence spread into many areas of life. On the movement and on the place of women in society, Krauskopf demonstrated an inconsistency of thinking which was probably characteristic of many of his contemporaries. Women, Krauskopf said, had a right to an education, professional jobs, and respect in society. They had endured discrimination too long and, at last, demanded and were finding their rightful place: "The Nineteenth Century may title itself: 'The Emancipator of Woman,' but the real truth is that the woman of the Nineteenth Century had to emancipate it before it could emancipate her."<sup>22</sup> A woman, however, had a distinctive sphere in society: religion, the home, and philanthropy. She was given this role by God and, even though she might desire to contribute to society in other ways, she should not overlook her sacred duties. "Hers is the mission, divinely given, to foster the welfare and the happiness of the race, to ennoble, to stamp upon society a love for all that is true and good and beautiful."<sup>23</sup> A man was obligated to provide financially for his family; a woman's philosophy was different:

---

21. SL, XIII:26, 15 April 1900.

22. SL, V:13, 17 January 1892; III:1, 27 October 1889.

23. SL, II:4, 28 October 1888; V:14, 24 January 1882.

As helpmate, to lessen her husband's burdens by prudent economy. As wife, to make their homes the most attractive spot for him on all the earth. As mother, to make of her family table an altar, and of her husband and herself priest and priestess of God. As a member of society, to make the needs of suffering humanity her own and all her family's concern. As a daughter of God, to keep her soul reverent, her heart sanctified, her hand active in the service of the Lord. As an aspirant for the Life Beyond, to keep herself in readiness, whenever the call should come, and enter it prepared for the fuller light and larger duties.<sup>24</sup>

Work was slavery and a man should not force a woman to leave her home which was, after all, her natural sphere. The education she deserved should train her to be a dutiful wife, a good mother, and a protector of morality.<sup>25</sup>

While Krauskopf did advocate greater self-determination and opportunity for women, it would be unfair to conclude that this actually represented his attitude. The evidence overwhelmingly indicates that he preferred to see women no farther away from home than at a meeting of a charitable organization and that she was naturally endowed with purity, honesty, nobility, and the love of children.

The need for better public education was one of Krauskopf's concerns. He believed that schools were badly neglected and that there were few good teachers. More money had to be appropriated and compulsory education adopted if the public schools were to become the vital institution in American society

---

24. SL, XV:20, 16 March 1902.

25. SL, V:14, 24 January 1902; VIII:14, 20 January 1895; IX:27, 12 April 1896; et al.

which their advocates hoped. Without the former, capable teachers and materials would be lacking; without the latter, children would be left in the streets with little to occupy their time except crime. Krauskopf said that pressure should be applied on the state legislature to pass laws effecting both goals.<sup>26</sup>

Despite the many problems which existed in America, Krauskopf was firmly convinced that the state of human affairs had progressed to the highest level of development ever achieved in history. "The morality of our social life leaves much to wish for, it is true, but where and when has society occupied a more elevated plane of morality than we occupy at present in the United States?"<sup>27</sup> Contemporary society was the product of the "dreams and advocacies" of the great minds of history: Moses, Jesus, Isaiah, Buddha, Fourier, Marx, Tolstoy, Henry George, and Edward Bellamy.<sup>28</sup> This optimism was characteristic of Krauskopf and enabled him to find some positive element in even the most depressing situation. Despite any apparent hopelessness, Krauskopf maintained a vision of an improved future.

The fourth and final category of contemporary issues about which Krauskopf lectured, is comprised of those which

---

26. SL, II:24, 24 March 1889; VI:17, 12 March 1893.

27. SL, V:11, 3 January 1892.

28. SL, XV:19, 15 December 1901.

had a direct influence on Jews and Judaism. A recurring problem for Jews is the effect of assimilation on the Jewish community. As such, intermarriage is always of vital interest to both laymen and rabbis. Krauskopf's position on this was clear. People who intermarried should be accepted but intermarriages, generally, should be discouraged because such unions tended to be unsuccessful. Prohibitions against intermarriage, Krauskopf told his congregation, were most strict during periods of religious turmoil or conflict. When Jews lived harmoniously with their neighbors, the strictures were usually relaxed and intermarriages increased. In the present age, Krauskopf said, since Judaism encouraged universal brotherhood, it was contradictory to prohibit intermarriage. However, the reality of the situation was the same as it always had been; intermarriages still failed more frequently than did marriages between people of the same religion.<sup>29</sup>

The problem was that most people whose intermarriages failed had not resolved their differences prior to marriage. Differences in religion were not insurmountable; in fact, Krauskopf asserted, that Jews and Christians who thought alike and came from similar backgrounds could have secure, happy marriages.<sup>30</sup> If children and young people were taught the responsibilities of marriage while they were in school they

---

29. SL, II:21, 3 March 1889.

30. SL, IX:9, 8 December 1895.

would recognize the gravity of the decision to marry. Then if they chose to intermarry, they should be welcomed by their families and synagogues.<sup>31</sup>

Krauskopf observed the anti-semitism which was appearing with ever increasing regularity in Europe. He described the passion play at Oberammergau and the ritual murder trial at Polna as destructive and libelous. "One cannot but wonder what is more to be marvelled at: this neverending tragic role of the Jew or the non-Jewish world's insatiable passion for it?"<sup>32</sup> He both praised and criticized Secretary of State John Hay's protest to the American diplomats in Europe about the treatment of the Jews in Roumania. Hay was to be commended

---

31. SL, II:21, 3 March 1889. Krauskopf said in this lecture (and in IX:9, December 1895) that conversion should not be required for the non-Jew. However, there is some evidence that Krauskopf only performed intermarriages if the non-Jew converted (thus making it a Jewish marriage). In 1892, Krauskopf was authorized by the president of Keneseth Israel to marry a certain couple only if the woman converted to Judaism (Philip Lewin to Krauskopf, 9 May 1892, Temple). The following year Krauskopf wrote on two occasions about the importance of conversion in such marriages and, interestingly enough, the simplicity of what was involved. One case involved a Jewish woman and a non-Jewish man; "If the gentleman in question desires to secure her permanent happiness he will cheerfully make the sacrifice, which consists in nothing more than a little acquaintance with the Jewish creed by [sic] a Rabbi and a declaration before such a Rabbi, that he regards himself as an Israelite, and will follow its religion. Further than this I require nothing," i.e., no circumcision or ritual immersion. (Krauskopf to ?, 24 February 1893, Temple). The other case involved a Jewish man and a non-Jewish woman. Krauskopf advised that the woman "gain a little insight into the fundamental principles of Judaism" and, before two witnesses, declare that she is Jewish, i.e., without ritual immersion (Krauskopf to Henry Herskovits, 16 March 1893, Temple).

32. SL, XIII:7, 26 November 1899.



for the humanitarian statements in behalf of the persecuted Jews. Krauskopf, however, was very displeased because Hay did not condemn the Roumanian government specifically for encouraging the anti-semitism and because he did not suggest that the Jews immigrate to America.

He was most eloquent in his feelings about the Dreyfus case. He maintained Dreyfus' innocence and attributed his conviction to the anti-semitism which was engulfing France. Krauskopf's consolation was that God would protect the Jews as He had always done.

Ceasar [sic] has his Brutus; Charles I, his Cromwell; George III, his Washington; Marat, his Corday; Napoleon, his Wellington; and confidently, almost prophetically . . . France shall yet pay the penalty for her cruelty to Dreyfus, for her wrong to the Jew, for her injustice to Zola.<sup>33</sup>

Krauskopf also feared that the anti-semitism would also engulf Emile Zola, Dreyfus' defender.<sup>34</sup> By the time Zola died, he had replaced Dreyfus as the symbol of the injustice. There was no limit to Krauskopf's praise and admiration for Zola. He regretted that Zola never received the official honor which he deserved for his tireless efforts in Dreyfus' behalf. Although France failed to recognize his greatness, the Jew, Krauskopf said, would never forget him: "as long as Jews shall exist,

---

33. SL, XI:18, 20 February 1898.

34. SL, XI:16, 6 February 1898.

wherever Jews shall be found, there will the name of Zola be spoken in gratitude and praise."<sup>35</sup>

Less dangerous, but in some ways more troublesome than European anti-semitism, was the immigration problem in America. Krauskopf was disturbed at the legislative and popular prejudice against foreigners. He said, "the voice against the foreigner is again loud in the land. The old Know-Nothing party is not yet dead."<sup>36</sup> Immigration restriction was unfair to people who needed to come to America to be free; it was also unfair to America which would be deprived of needed labor and the cultural advantages of a more pluralistic society. Krauskopf's answer was regulation: allow the immigrants to come but provide them with tools and job training; send them to less populous areas; and provide them with education and healthy living conditions.<sup>37</sup>

Despite this openmindedness, Krauskopf was highly critical of the crime and immorality which was rampant among the Jewish immigrants. It disproved the notion that Jews were free of these undesirable traits. Consistent with his character, however, Krauskopf had a modest solution! "It is not alms they need, but opportunity. . . . It is not charity they require but a chance to work out their own salvation, as they have amply shown, they are well able to do, once we shall give them the

---

35. SL, XVI:1, 2 November 1902.

36. SL, III:25, 13 April 1890.

37. Ibid.

right start." The "right start" was a cottage in the suburbs with six to eight rooms, a small plot of land with a vegetable garden, industrial parks nearby, and public transportation into the city.<sup>38</sup> Krauskopf forgot to include shopping centers and multi-car garages but, under the circumstances, he can hardly be faulted for his lack of insight.

---

38. SL, XIV:12, 6 January 1901.

## CHAPTER XVIII

### JEWISH THINKER

Because of his many congregational responsibilities, his obligations to the National Farm School, and his commitments to other organizations and causes in which he was involved, Krauskopf must have had little time for philosophical and theological speculation. The image which Krauskopf projected of a socially aware and active rabbi is inconsistent with the brooding, reflective manner characteristic of a thinker. One even suspects that Krauskopf felt uncomfortable engaging in abstractions; it is likely he considered it unproductive. For an individual as interested as Krauskopf was in concrete projects and measurable results, the intangible rewards of theoretical analysis were probably unsatisfactory.

Nevertheless, one can discern a philosophical framework within which Krauskopf, consciously or unconsciously, operated. Nowhere did Krauskopf present it thoroughly or systematically; the medium of a philosophical treatise was foreign to him. It must be culled from various lectures given throughout his career. Nor was Krauskopf always consistent in his thought, a fault which probably went unnoticed by him. Because he tended to give short, concise descriptions of certain concepts as they arose in contexts other than formal

treatments of his philosophy, his inconsistencies become more understandable, though not excusable. A listener to or reader of his lectures is confronted with the problem of determining which of the conflicting statements reflected Krauskopf's true feeling. One alternative is to conclude that his philosophy was so muddled that there was no coherent framework. Yet, certain themes reappear continually and, from these, one can describe a "philosophy" which encompassed Krauskopf's concepts of God, man, and Judaism. The philosophy is usually called "Radical Reform Judaism." Elements of the philosophy have been considered as they arose earlier in this work. Krauskopf was not its only exponent but he was one of its foremost figures.

I

It is impossible to know what theology Krauskopf grew up with and brought out of the Hebrew Union College. It can be assumed that Krauskopf believed in God but assumptions beyond that are difficult to make because his theology as he expressed it towards the end of his years in Kansas City<sup>1</sup> and at Keneseth Israel was heavily dependent upon and affected by Darwin's theory of evolution and the corollaries propounded by

---

1. In 1887, Krauskopf published Evolution and Judaism (a collection of lectures given in Kansas City), in which he attempted to reconcile evolution (in its various forms and implications) and Judaism. To a certain extent, this is a systematic study of Krauskopf's theology. Unfortunately, because it is a compilation of weekly lectures, each is a self-sufficient unit and Krauskopf, while consistent within each unit, was, incredibly, not consistent throughout.

Spencer, Huxley, and other evolutionists in the decades following its publication.<sup>2</sup>

Krauskopf proved the existence of God in two ways. The first proof assumes the existence of a Natural Law in the Darwinian use of the term. Krauskopf correctly pointed out that the Natural Law, which Darwin described as governing the universe, was an "effect" not a "cause."<sup>3</sup> Since the Natural Law has intelligently governed the universe from the time of its creation, and since each effect must have a cause greater than itself, the Natural Law was created by a supremely intelligent first cause, which Krauskopf and the theistic evolutionists with which he identified called "God." Besides this cosmological proof for the existence of God, Krauskopf also accepted the teleological argument which posits the existence of God based on the orderliness of the universe.<sup>4</sup>

---

2. There is some literature on Krauskopf, Reform Judaism, and Evolution. See: Joseph L. Blau, "An American Jewish View of the Evolution Controversy," Hebrew Union College Annual, vol. XX (1947), pp. 617-634; Lawrence A. Block, "Dialogues with Darwinism," CCAR Journal, vol. VIII, no. 1 (April, 1960), pp. 34-41; and Ely E. Pilchik, "Of Adam and Darwin," CCAR Journal, vol. VII, no. 3 (October, 1959), pp. 37-39.

3. Joseph Krauskopf, Evolution and Judaism (Cincinnati: The Bloch Publishing Co.), 1887, p. 261. Hereafter referred to as EJ.

4. SL, I:7, 29 January 1888; III:6, 1 December 1889; EJ, p. 84. Unfortunately, this is one point on which Krauskopf was inconsistent. Elsewhere in EJ (p. 102), he equates Darwin's Natural Law with the God of the theistic evolutionists. Material evolution said that the Natural Law (which was co-eternal with the universe) had creative power to evolve primal matter (also co-eternal with the universe). Krauskopf

Knowledge that God is the supremely intelligent first cause and designer of the universe says nothing about God's essence and Krauskopf was an admitted agnostic vis-à-vis God's essence.

What He is we know not, nor whence He came, nor what His essence. But that He is we do know. We see Him in the creation of this universe, in the life, in the mind, in the morality, in the harmony and design, in the forethought and provision, in the power, and love, that abound therein.<sup>5</sup>

Krauskopf's use of the terms infinite, incorporeal, omnipotent, and the like may, therefore, be logically described as "accidents" not "characteristics" of God. This is not, however, Krauskopf's distinction; it is unlikely that Krauskopf's concept was that complex.

God, Krauskopf believed, created not only the Natural Law but also "primal matter." The Natural Law was the force which creatively evolved the primal matter into all organic and inorganic life, including man. God did not, as the Bible claimed, create man specially.<sup>6</sup> This notion is in perfect agreement with Darwin. Krauskopf said,

It [theistic evolution] tries to prove that all organic existences, traced backward, converge until finally they

---

defined God as that force with creative power. There is no way to reconcile the two positions. Either, God was the creative power or God created the power; it can not be both ways. The definition accepted here is that God created the Natural Law. The reason is that Krauskopf repeated this definition in EJ frequently and used it in his lectures at Keneseth Israel.

5. SL, IV:2, 26 October 1890. In philosophical terms, Krauskopf was an essential agnostic.

6. EJ, p. 113.

meet in one common starting point in the primal God-created protoplasm. . . .<sup>7</sup>

and, further,

Theistic Evolution attempts to prove that the past has given rise to the present by the simple process of development according to God-Created Natural Law. . . .<sup>8</sup>

Since the Natural Law governed everything in the universe and since the Natural Law represented and testified to God's supremely creative power and intelligence, Krauskopf said that God was present and active in the universe. Krauskopf specifically rejected the normative, Rabbinic and Orthodox God who made Himself known in the world by the miraculous intervention in and suspension of nature.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, because the divinely created Natural Law is continually at work molding and evolving the universe (growth and decay are examples of this), God was likewise the sustainer of the universe.<sup>10</sup>

## II

In the same way that the physical world was characterized by development according to law, Krauskopf believed that civilization and mankind were evolving according to law. "I believe," Krauskopf said, "in the progression of the human race, and not in its degeneracy."<sup>11</sup> Mankind was progressing towards perfection and the movement was inexorable. "The age

---

7. EJ, p. 85.

8. EJ, p. 84.

9. SL, III:6, 1 December 1889; II:1, 7 October 1888.

10. EJ, p. 243.

11. EJ, p. 171.



of our fathers, better than that of our grandfathers, gave birth to us, and we, morally, intellectually, socially and religiously their superiors, shall give birth to a race superior to our own."<sup>12</sup> Happiness was the highest goal in society and was achieved when a person lived an ethical life. Human perfection, characterized by right living, led directly to the harmony and brotherhood which would characterize a perfect civilization. It was towards this goal that people strove, it was the attainment of this goal for which man was created. People were endowed with rationality and free will each of which could advance or impede progress according to the degree to which these tools were used.

Krauskopf believed it was the responsibility of religion to teach its members how to achieve happiness, i.e., to teach the components of an ethical life. Lectures about what comprised a good life were, by far, more numerous than any other single subject. Krauskopf assumed that it was necessary for him to detail explicitly the elements of ethical behavior and to list specifically the outlines of a good life.

There were many things which went into the definition of ethical behavior. Krauskopf was both general and specific.

Virtue is derived from the word that means manliness, strength, courage,--not that brutal courage that conquers by means of animal force, but that spiritual courage that dares and battles and triumphs with the weapons of conscience, reason, and will. It is the

---

12. EJ, p. 227.

courage to pursue the right because it is right, and not because it is politic.<sup>13</sup>

A person had to exercise self control, patience, independence, industry, integrity, forgiveness, orderliness, love, respect, honesty, friendliness, hope, reverence, moderation, et al. Pride, anger, excess, envy, selfishness, while all part of life, had to be controlled and turned to good use. A person had to be no less than perfect! Krauskopf's lectures were filled with aphorisms about character development and good living:

If happiness you seek, seek it in the approval of thy conscience, in the noble deeds of thy hands, in the pure thoughts of thy mind, in the bosom of thy happy home, in the love of thy trusted friend.<sup>14</sup>

Skepticism is often but the gateway that leads from error to truth, or from a lower to higher faith.<sup>15</sup>

It is the domestic hearth that can burn out the corruption of society by first burning it out of the individual members that constitute the family.<sup>16</sup>

The ability to suffer and bear adversity was, Krauskopf said, an important part of a strong character. It was through suffering and pain that one could best appreciate life. Krauskopf said that "it is from the bitterness of sorrow that the sweetness of joy is born; it is the keenness of suffering that whips the mind out of its stagnancy, and lashes thought

---

13. SL, XVI:15, 8 February 1903.

14. SL, VI:16, 26 February 1893.

15. SL, VI:4, 13 November 1892.

16. SL, XIII:16, 4 February 1900.

and deed to progress."<sup>17</sup> It was argued by Krauskopf that suffering was a necessary and integral part of life.

. . . The fact nevertheless remains that much of it [suffering] is beyond man's control, and is manifestly needed in the economy of civilization for the purpose of bringing out, of unfolding, of developing, that which is noblest and best in the human mind and heart and soul.<sup>18</sup>

Krauskopf was an advisor, castigator, exhorter, and pastor. Optimism and urgency were the tones which he used most frequently. He was optimistic because society was progressing despite all of the apparent adversity which still existed. He was urgent because society was so close to its long-awaited goal.

Mankind is under the law of evolution. We are rising Godward, are leaving the brute more and more behind. . . . Yes, we are better than we were, and will be better than we are. How much and how soon, that is a matter entirely dependent on us.<sup>19</sup>

Regardless of the practical outcome during one's lifetime, one need not be concerned that his strivings for a virtuous existence were futile. A basic component of Krauskopf's philosophy was spiritual immortality and this reward awaited all who lived an ethical life on earth. Krauskopf's concept of immortality, like so much else of his philosophy, was partially derived from evolutionary doctrines.

In a universe, in which all is under the direction of supreme design and purpose, what wisdom would there be

---

17. SL, XII:6, 20 November 1898.

18. SL, IV:3, 2 November 1890.

19. SL, XVI:6, 7 December 1902.

in creating millions of human beings . . . if man's only reward be rottenness and annihilation in the grave?<sup>20</sup>

Man was free not to believe in an afterlife because, Krauskopf admitted, there was no proof that one existed. He insisted, however, that the opposite--that death ended all existence--was equally without proof. "I grant you," Krauskopf said, "that the belief in life's sunrise elsewhere after its sunset here is unproven, but, I pray you, tell me is the soul's annihilation in the grave not equally unproven?"<sup>21</sup> Even though it could not be proven rationally, Krauskopf believed it was necessary psychologically to believe in the immortality of the soul.

Better to close the eyes of our departed dear ones softly, peacefully, resignedly, hopefully, in the belief that those closed eyes and hushed lips will speak love to us again when the night is past, and the morning dawns, and their slumber is over, than amidst piercing shrieks that those whom we loved, and who loved us, are lost to us forever. Better to look upon the coffin of the material as the cradle of the spiritual, and to turn away from the grave with a sweet "Auf Wiedersehen" (to meet again) upon our lips, than to see nought else there than darkness and corruption and the hungry worm.<sup>22</sup>

Krauskopf's purpose was not to denigrate the value of life in this world. His reply to those who could not accept immortality was to "make of this life, on this earth, a heaven."<sup>23</sup>

---

20. SL, XVI:5, 30 November 1902.

21. SL, VII:5, 29 October 1893.

22. SL, IV:9, 14 December 1890.

23. SL, VII:5, 29 October 1893.

It is peculiar that with his optimistic view of the perfectibility of man, Krauskopf still found it necessary to believe in spiritual immortality. He did imply several times that self awareness of one's virtues ought to be sufficient reward for living an ethical life; it seems, however, that it was not. The concept probably derives from one of two sources. It might have been a subconscious recognition on his part that the messianic goal about which he urgently spoke was a futile dream. If an ethical life did not produce an ethical society, and unfortunately it did not, why live that way? If there was no tangible reward for virtue, Krauskopf was compelled to suggest an intangible one. Immortality of the soul is that basic concept which provided that reward. Though individuals might not produce the messianic age by their virtue, Krauskopf was saying, they might confidently await the spiritual reward for their sacrifices. Eternal life, even eternal spiritual life, was a worthy reward for a person's noble attempts to pursue an ethical life on earth.

Immortality might also be more closely related to Krauskopf's commitment to theistic evolution than was suggested before. There could be no better expression of the inherent progression towards perfection which characterized inorganic and organic life, than for man to achieve spiritual immortality. It represented freedom from and transcendence of the matter with which he was made. Life on earth was the penultimate level of evolutionary development. It was the highest possible

existence which combined spiritual and physical matter. The ultimate level in the evolutionary process was the pure existence of the spiritual world which one entered after death.

### III

Krauskopf's philosophy of Judaism reflects a tension between universalism and particularism. There was, he said, a specific goal towards which all religions were directed-- universal peace and brotherhood. The Judaism of the prophets originally stressed that goal. Rabbinic and Orthodox Judaism became obsessed with the means with which the goal might be achieved and, in so doing, created a mass of superstitious laws and customs which diverted the energies of the Jew away from the goal so completely as to make practicing the rituals of Judaism more important than the goal. Krauskopf's Radical Reform<sup>24</sup> reordered the priorities of the Jew and reemphasized the goal rather than the ceremonies. This explains the abolition of many rituals at Keneseth Israel and the abundance of lectures on universalism, brotherhood, and ethics. Krauskopf's description of the ethical life was for all people not just for Jews. The universal religion would be practiced by all people not just Jews. Krauskopf maintained that the universalism and humanitarianism were the goals for which Jews had

---

24. Krauskopf did not use the words "Radical Reform." He usually said either "Judaism, pure and simple" or "Reform Judaism."

to strive and the goals for which all people had to strive. Universal brotherhood based on an ethical life was a responsibility held equally by all people. In this regard Jews were just like any other people.

Krauskopf believed that his lectures on social issues and ethics were Jewish, i.e., Jewish universal. As was shown before, Jews had to be concerned with contemporary social issues to survive as people; they also had to live the same ethical lives as others in order to attain the common, universal goal. The universalism of these lectures was expressed as a function of the secular society. There were, however, a series of lectures which expressed the universalism as a function of Judaism. Krauskopf's most complete and succinct statement of Judaism's universalism was in a lecture which explained what about Judaism was so attractive to converts throughout history.

Judaism rests upon the pillar of One God, One Humanity, One Law. The commandments: "Thou shalt love thy fellow-man as thyself," "What is hateful to thee do not to another," constitute the essence of its teachings concerning the DUTIES OF MAN TO HIS FELLOWMAN. The commandments to keep a weekly Sabbath, to honor parents, not to murder, not to commit lewdness, not to steal, not to bear false witness, not to covet, constitute the essence of its teachings concerning man's DOMESTIC and SOCIAL duties. The doctrines that a Supreme Being created and governs the Universe, that the life of man is the gift of God, and therefore sacred, that the soul is His endowment, a part of His being, therefore, divine and immortal, that man's duty on earth is to unfold and to ennoble the godlike within him, which can best be done by worshipping and reverencing God, by engaging the hand and the heart in deeds of love and kindness and charity, and the mind in the pursuit of knowledge, constitutes

the essence of its SPIRITUAL teachings. The federation of all peoples into one brotherhood, under the fatherhood of One God, and under the sway of universal peace and good will and enlightenment, constitutes its constant AIM AND EFFORT.<sup>25</sup>

At the same time Krauskopf preached universalism, he also preached particularism. To the Jews, as members of a pluralistic society whose American identity was more important than their Jewish identity, he preached Judaism's universalism and the concepts which Jews held in common with the Christians. To the Jews as members of an "uptown" congregation; to the Jews embarrassed by the coarse, uneducated immigrants; and to the Jewish immigrants who were searching for a more modern identity, Krauskopf preached the authenticity of Radical Reform. As an exponent of a new (regardless of how old in spirit Krauskopf claimed it to be) form of Judaism, Krauskopf was obligated to account for his assertion that his particular concept of Judaism was the correct one. To that end, he analyzed the differences between Radical Reform and Orthodoxy and tried to prove that the former was more consistent with the rational, scientific spirit of the age.

It was clear, according to Krauskopf, that only radical Reform represented true and pure Judaism. In his opinion, Orthodoxy was, at best, medieval and superstitious; at worst, Pharisaic and hopelessly entangled in irrelevant legalisms. In one lecture Krauskopf said "the Shulchan Aruch may justly claim the lion's share in the great work of

---

25. SL, IV:11, 4 January 1891.



metamorphosing a once living and productive religion into a dead and barren ceremonialism.<sup>26</sup> Elsewhere he said that Orthodoxy could not succeed because it was "against the law of intellectual development."<sup>27</sup>

Orthodoxy resisted change and became unresponsive to the needs of the people. Reform Judaism was created as a religion for the modern, enlightened Jew but it, too, was no longer adequate. It was theoretical at a time when people needed something concrete; it was inconsistent; it practiced "Torah idolatry;" it was provincial; and it created further divisions among Jews rather than eliminating them. "Let us be consistent . . ." Krauskopf said, "a patchwork never constitutes a religious system. A religion that is not sound throughout will never attract the rational. New doctrines upon old absurdities will hold as long as new patches will on old shreds."<sup>28</sup> An aware, responsive, modern Judaism would use only English in prayer and instruction, would introduce singing and dancing into its religious school curriculum, would concentrate on ethical instruction, would read selections from all of Jewish literature at services, would celebrate holidays according to their spirit and not according to the number of hours in the synagogue, and would welcome all people into its

---

26. SL, II:15, 13 January 1889.

27. SL, I:7, 29 January 1888.

28. SL, II:17, 27 January 1889.

community.<sup>29</sup> The future of Judaism could only be served by practicing pure Judaism, "the Judaism, that has for its roots: right-thinking, right living, right doing, and for its blossom and flower, the love and worship of the One God, and for its blessed fruitage, the love of man regardless of race creed or nationality."<sup>30</sup>

Both elements were crucial to Krauskopf's philosophy: the Jewish universal because it was the shared goal of all people and the Jewish particularism because it was that means to the goal which was modern, rational, and scientific.

It is now that the tension between the particular and the universal in Krauskopf's philosophy can best be understood. It was through the particularism that he hoped to achieve his universalism. Krauskopf was devoted to Radical Reform Judaism because its essential goal was the attainment of the messianic age for which he longed. The ceremony, the education, the worship, which characterized Radical Reform emphasized this goal above even the movement's survival.

Despite its decided emphasis on brotherhood and ethical living, concepts which one supposes would have had a lasting appeal, Radical Reform failed to endure. Krauskopf said,

Let us not be misled by the sentimentality, which thinks it wrong to lay a ceremony or a belief aside which our parents prized. There was a time when that very belief of our parents supplanted one, which their parents prized,

---

29. SL, I:9, 12 February 1888.

30. SL, IV:26, 26 April 1891.

just as the time will come, when our descendents will supplant the very belief which we prize to-day.<sup>31</sup>

As Krauskopf predicted, the particularistic elements of Radical Reform have virtually all disappeared. Bar Mitzvah, the shofar, and Hebrew have all returned; Israel, once a peripheral part of American Reform, has become central. Krauskopf's passionate striving for universal brotherhood has been obliterated by contemporary Reform Judaism. Even the Temple at Broad and Columbia is gone--the victim of a fire in the early 1970's.

Krauskopf's assertion that Judaism had to respond to the needs of the people explains Radical Reform's success and failure. Radical Reform solved a difficult problem for the established American Jewish community which existed at the turn of the century: how to be Americans, how to share common goals with their non-Jewish neighbors and still be committed Jews. By incorporating universal goals in its particular structure, Radical Reform provided many Jews with a meaningful and significant identity. It was this which constituted its success.

However, Radical Reform, by its nature, was not prepared to cope with the different needs of a new generation of Jews. It was aimed at solving the needs of a particular people and thus was admittedly confined to a particular time in history. It was destined to disappear when a new Judaism emerged to meet the changing structure and needs of the

---

31. SL, II:17, 27 January 1889.

American Jewish community. This lack of resiliency was its failure.

One should not, however, confuse an evaluation of Radical Reform Judaism with the success or failure of Krauskopf, personally. It was Krauskopf who founded the Jewish Publication Society of America and the National Farm School, it was to hear Krauskopf that vast numbers of people came to Keneseth Israel each week, and it was Krauskopf who made Keneseth Israel a vibrant and responsive congregation. While there might be legitimate question as to the success of the Radical Reform movement, there is none whatsoever with regard to Krauskopf, himself.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### PUBLISHED BY KRAUSKOPF

Krauskopf, Joseph. Evolution and Judaism. Cincinnati: The Bloch Publishing Co., 1887.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Fifty Years of Judaism in America," American Jews' Annual (1888), 165-195.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Jewish Pilgrim Fathers," Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, XIV (1906): 121-130.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Jews and Moors in Spain. Kansas City: M. Berkowitz and Co., 1887.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Mourner's Service. Philadelphia: Oscar Klonower, 1895.

\_\_\_\_\_. The School Service. Philadelphia: Oscar Klonower, 1894.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Service Manual. Philadelphia: Edward Stern and Co., 1892.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Service Ritual. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1888.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Shall the Jews Observe Saturday or Sunday as their Sabbath," address, Kansas City Journal, 19 June 1886.

\_\_\_\_\_. Sunday Lectures, also called Our Pulpit, Series I-XVI, Philadelphia: Oscar Klonower, 1887-1903.

### UNPUBLISHED SOURCES

Hebrew Union College file, Boxes 2374-2375b, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.

Heller, Max. The Max Heller Collection, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.

Isaac M. Wise Memorial Fund, Hebrew Union College file,  
American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.

Krauskopf, Joseph. Joseph Krauskopf Collection, American  
Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.

\_\_\_\_\_. Joseph Krauskopf Collection, Urban Archives  
Center, Temple University (Philadelphia).

\_\_\_\_\_. Nearprint box: Biographies, American Jewish  
Archives, Cincinnati.

#### PUBLISHED SOURCES

The American Israelite. Cincinnati, 1886-1887.

Blau, Joseph L. "An American Jewish View of the Evolution  
Controversy," Hebrew Union College Annual, XX (1947):  
617-634.

Block, Lawrence A. "Dialogues with Darwinism," CCAR Journal,  
VIII, No. 1 (April, 1960):34-41.

Blood, William W. Apostle of Reason. Philadelphia: Dorrance,  
1973.

Bramson, Leon. "A Visit to Tolstoy at Yasnaya Polyana,"  
trans. Moshe Spiegol, Jewish Exponent (Philadelphia),  
28 December 1973, 23, 27, and 28.

Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook. Cincinnati,  
I-XIII, 1891-1903.

Clymer, Kenton J. "Anti-Semitism in the Late Nineteenth  
Century: The Case of John Hay," American Jewish  
Historical Quarterly, LX, No. 4 (June, 1971):344-354.

de Sola Pool, David. "Joseph Krauskopf," Dictionary of  
American Biography, X:500-501.

Feldman, Abraham J. "Joseph Krauskopf," American Jewish  
Yearbook, XXVI (1924-1925):420-447.

Fineshriber, Howard W. Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel:  
Its First One Hundred Years, 1847-1947. Philadelphia:  
Privately printed, 1950.

Fineshriber, William B. "Joseph Krauskopf," Universal Jewish  
Encyclopedia, VI:466-467.

Goldsmith, Milton. "Joseph Krauskopf," The Jewish Encyclopedia, VII: 570-571.

Goldstein, Jerrold. "Reform Rabbis and the Progressive Movement," Master's thesis, University of Minnesota, 1967.

"The Great Man of the West," editorial in The American Hebrew (New York), 30 December 1887, 130.

Hallmark, Harrydale. "A Woman's Impressions of Famous Preachers in Philadelphia Pulpits," Sunday Press (Philadelphia), 8 June 1902.

"Hebrew Union College," editorial in The Jewish Messenger (New York), 14 March 1902, 6.

"Israel's Mission," editorial in The American Hebrew (New York), 23 December 1887, 114.

The Jewish Chronicle. Montgomery and Mobile, Alabama, February - May, 1902.

The Jewish Exponent. Philadelphia, 1887-1903.

Kittler, Glenn D. "Joseph Krauskopf: The Harvest of Brotherhood," Issues, XIII (Fall/Winter, 1964): 36-40.

Kohler, Kaufmann. A Living Faith. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1948.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Some Plain and Telling Words Regarding Rev. Joseph Krauskopf," The American Hebrew (New York), 30 December 1887 and 6 January 1888, 131-132, 147-148.

"Kohler on Krauskopf," editorial in The American Hebrew (New York), 6 January 1888, 146.

"Krauskopf, Joseph." Who Was Who in America, I: 692.

Mayer, Harry H. "The Kansas City Experiment With Reform Judaism: The First Eighty Years: Congregation B'nai Jehuda," unpublished paper, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, 1953.

Michener, James A. "More Than an Enlightened Rabbi," Jewish Exponent (Philadelphia), 25 January 1974, 31.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. The Oxford History of the American People. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

"National Relief Commission," pamphlet published by the  
National Relief Commission, 1898.

National Relief Commission. Report of the Executive Committee,  
1898-1899, in the files of the Krauskopf Collection,  
Urban Archives Center, Temple University (Philadelphia).

Philipson, David. "The History of the Hebrew Union College,"  
Hebrew Union College Jubilee Volume, ed. David  
Philipson, Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1925,  
1-70.

\_\_\_\_\_. My Life As An American Jew. Cincinnati: John G.  
Kidd and Son, 1941.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Reform Movement in Judaism. Reissue of the  
newly revised edition, Ktav, 1967.

Phillips, Harlen B. "A War on Philadelphia's Slums: Walter  
Vrooman and the Conference of Moral Workers, 1893,"  
The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography,  
LXXVI, No. 1 (January, 1952): 47-62.

Pilchik, Ely E. "Of Adam and Darwin," CCAR Journal, VII, No. 3  
(October, 1959): 37-39.

Plaut, W. Gunther. The Growth of Reform Judaism. New York:  
World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1965.

The Press. Philadelphia, 6 December 1887.

Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, I-X,  
New York: American Jewish Historical Society, 1892-1902.

"Rabbi Krauskopf, The Man, His Words and His Ideals," The  
Record (Philadelphia), 16 February 1908.

Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel (Philadelphia) Congregational  
Minute Book, 1887-1901, in the American Jewish Archives,  
Cincinnati (Manuscript).

Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel (Philadelphia) Congregational  
Yearbooks, I-15, 1889-1890 to 1903-1904.

"Report of the Jewish Publication Society of America," American  
Jewish Yearbook, LX (1959): 370-385.

Schreiber, Dr. E. Letter to the editor, Occident, 10 February  
1885.

The Sun (New York). 13 July 1896.



Szold, Henrietta. Letter to the editor, The American Hebrew (New York), 30 December 1887, 132.

Temple Emanuel (New York). Board of Trustees Minute Book, 1885-1888, in the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati (Manuscript).

Temple Emanuel (New York). Congregational Minute Book, 1885-1888, in the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati (Manuscript).

Timkin, Sefton D. "Joseph Krauskopf," Encyclopedia Judaica, X: 1246-1247.

"To Make Farmers," The Ledger (Philadelphia), 20 January 1897.

"To Teach Boys to Farm," The Record (Philadelphia), 21 June 1897.

"To Teach Practical Farming," a newspaper article, 13 June 1897.

Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Proceedings. Cincinnati, V, 1898-1903.