

1

A Cross-Cultural View of Jewish Education

Harold S. Himmelfarb

All societies must transfer their cultural heritage – norms, values and skills – to the next generation. In small, preindustrial communities, or folk societies, this is often accomplished by allowing the young to observe, imitate and assist adults in their activities. In this manner children learn language, values, world views and cultural skills. Under these circumstances all adults are teachers, and special settings and times for learning are not necessary. What children are expected to learn is considered ‘relevant’ for themselves and their society because it is tied directly to daily life. Under such circumstances, the problem of ‘learner motivation’ is not severe. With modernization, culture has become more complex and diverse. Social change has become rapid and the transmission of culture has become more problematic. Therefore, modern societies have relegated considerable responsibility for cultural transmission to specialists – teachers, and to specialized institutions – schools (Parelius and Parelius, 1978).

The transmission of culture, teaching the young what we already know, and teaching them to love and revere the established and traditional institutions of society, can be called cultural reproduction. It is the critical obligation of the older generation and the central task of all educational agencies.

However, educational agencies in modern societies are often required to play a role in changing culture. This role can be called cultural production. Higher education, for example, fulfills this role through research. But even primary and secondary schools are expected to diffuse new information, attitudes, values, and ways of viewing the world. Education has been used to teach new values and new habits, particularly during periods of rapid change. Thus, in periods of industrialization and modernization, the schools have been used to foster new ideas and norms which facilitate economic stability. In periods of new political arrangements, such as post-revolution or post-

independence, schools have been used to spread the new ideologies and norms which legitimate and stabilize the new political system (Parelius and Parelius, 1978).

The transmission of culture is more easily accomplished by schools than is social change, because it is reinforced by other socializing agents in society. In this sense, the school becomes the institution delegated by the family and community to transmit the cultural heritage that they themselves would transmit in a less complex environment. Thus, what is taught in school is meaningful to the child because it is meaningful to his family, friends and neighbors, and is familiar to the child's experiences. Cultural reproduction becomes more problematic for those who come from cultural sub-groups (e.g., ethnic, social and socioeconomic groups) whose experiences differ substantially from the dominant culture transmitted in school. The problem becomes even greater when students from these sub-groups see very few adult role models in their communities who have become more advantaged in social or economic ways by learning what is taught in school.

Schools attempting to produce culture, and thereby change society, have a much more difficult task than those trying to transmit a cultural heritage to sub-groups who are foreign to it. In the latter, the dominant societal culture reinforces what is being taught in school. In the former, it is the dominant culture that has to be changed. It is no wonder that schools do a better job at cultural reproduction than at cultural production, and have generally been conservative forces in society rather than agents of change. If, however, the diffusion of new cultural elements receives support from community leaders, and the elements are popularly acceptable, schools can be effective in promoting change.

Central to the problems of Jewish education in the contemporary world is the recognition and articulation of its cultural reproductive and productive tasks. It would seem that the teaching of a two thousand year old tradition would be primarily a task of cultural reproduction. However, the circumstances of modernity have caused such sweeping changes in Jewish communities throughout the world that Jews have become detached from their traditional cultural heritage. Thus, the successful inculcation of Jewish tradition in most Jewish children in most Jewish communities, including Israel, is more a task of cultural production than reproduction. Jewish education is faced with the problem of instilling cultural values and norms that are on the one hand ancient in origin, and on the other hand sufficiently different from the cultural experiences of most Jews to be considered new and to require substantial social change. Educators must be able to distinguish between those aspects of the Jewish culture which are widely practiced and accepted as legitimate traditions to be transferred to the next generation and those which require a change in normative values and behavior. Each requires different educational strategies. The success of the school in both cultural pro-

duction and cultural reproduction is dependent on support and reinforcement from family and community.

Historical Perspectives

Four major trends and events have affected the Jewish people within the last two centuries. All of them, of course, significantly influenced the goals, structure and content of Jewish education, as well as the social composition of Jewish schools.

The Enlightenment and Emancipation

Much has been written about the impact of the Enlightenment and Emancipation periods in Europe and its consequences for Jews and Judaism. There are no exact dates for these periods because they developed over a period of time and at various speeds in different countries. Nevertheless, it is clear that these movements reached their apex during the 19th century.

The *Haskalah* (Enlightenment) was a cultural movement that encouraged Jews to adopt national and scientific modes of thinking and the cultural perspectives, wisdom, and behavior of the modern Western world. Emancipation gave Jews the legal and political status to fulfill the cultural imperatives of Enlightenment. As legal barriers to property ownership, residence, occupational attainment, and education facilities were removed and full or nearly-full rights of citizenship were extended to them, Jews seized every opportunity to advance into the larger societal environment and to break away from the isolation and restrictiveness of traditional Jewish communities. The development of nation-states during this period, which demanded their own allegiance, helped to further undermine the legal authority, autonomy, and legitimacy of the Jewish community and its rabbis, courts, and communal leaders (Katz, 1971). "The state, after all, now regarded the emancipated Jew as an individual, not as a member of a particular national community;...it allowed Jewish affiliation to become optional, while demanding that Jewish identity be religious or at most cultural in content rather than political" (Elazar and Cohen, 1985, p. 212).

Since Emancipation required Jews to relinquish their communal identity and since it was accompanied "by a cultural and economic mobility hitherto unprecedented in either its scope or pace...a thorough re-examination of the nature of the Jewishness of Jews" (Elazar and Cohen, 1985, p. 211) was required. The great dilemma of modern Jewish identity developed: how does one fully integrate into modern society, politically, economically and socially, while at the same time maintaining a distinctive religious or ethnic identity?

This is certainly a dilemma for Diaspora Jews who live as minorities in predominantly Gentile societies, but it is also a dilemma for Jews living in Israel who have adopted to some extent the secular, cosmopolitan, and universalistic values of modern societies.

In one sense, this dilemma can be viewed as a zero-sum game. The more one integrates into modern society, the less distinctively Jewish one becomes (Liebman, 1973). In actuality, it is not played as a zero-sum game, because there are many dimensions to Jewish identity, and changes in one do not necessarily cause changes in the other, although they often do. In terms of one's total Jewishness (if there is such a thing), it can be argued that assimilation in any one sphere reduces Jewish identity. There are about six responses to this dilemma.

Complete Assimilation

A person can resolve such a dilemma by making a clear choice. At one extreme he can choose to completely assimilate into the majority society and withdraw from any activities or involvements that would perpetuate Jewish identity. Many Jews have attempted this alternative, often to find that the host society is not as receptive to Jews in actuality as in theory. Thus, this potential resolution of the dilemma is often not available, as in Nazi Germany or today in the Soviet Union.

Complete Segregation

The alternative at the other end of the integration-identity continuum is complete segregation. This, of course, is not really possible, except for a few individuals who spend almost all of their time in so-called ultra-Orthodox yeshivoth (Talmudic seminaries) of a very select type, cut off from mass media communications and isolated from social contact with non-Jews who are not part of the yeshiva community. Almost anyone else, regardless of piety, must interact somewhat with the modern world for legal and economic reasons. Yet, there are groups of Hasidim who have developed their own residential communities, with their own religious, educational, and even economic infrastructures, who achieve a relatively high degree of segregation.

Zionism can be viewed as an isolationist response to assimilation into the non-Jewish world. The tension between assimilation and Jewish identity is substantially lessened in a society where Jews are the majority because political, economic, and social integration into the modern world does not require the abandonment of Jewish distinctiveness. On the other hand, integration might require the abandonment, or at least the temporary neglect, of certain ritual observances which could hinder the social interaction necessary for advancement in political or economic spheres. In this sense, even aliyah does not completely solve the assimilation-identity dilemma.

Denial

A third response to the dilemma is to deny that there is one. Jews continue to identify as Jews as they see fit and argue that these modes of identification are completely compatible with the norms and values of the societies into which they seek integration. In other words, it is not a zero-sum game, but one can be distinctively Jewish and still be a fully integrated citizen of the modern world and some non-Jewish society. This response has reached its highest level of articulation and persuasion with regard to American Jewry's justification for its loyalties to the State of Israel. While denial does not effectively resolve the dilemma, it has often helped to effectively lessen the tension caused by it.

Compartmentalization

A response that has been attributed primarily to so-called modern-Orthodox Jews, but in fact is engaged in to some extent by all Jews, is compartmentalization. It is a compromise to complete segregation. Here one seeks integration into the political and economic spheres, but maintains relative isolation in the social and personal spheres of life. One dresses, works and fulfills the obligations of citizenship like everyone else in society, but at home and with friends one maintains a distinctively Jewish life-style. This system of compartmentalization has been quite effective in allowing many Jews to keep a balance between integration and assimilation. It is reinforced educationally by the day school system, which maintains a fairly sharp dichotomy between secular and religious studies and does very little in the way of integrating the two in comparison to Catholic schools, for example. The criticism of compartmentalization is that it never confronts the dilemma on an ideological level. It effects certain religious compromises, which are usually denied, and it effects a certain amount of isolation which hinders full integration into the larger society.

Religious Change

Another resolution of the dilemma is to change those aspects of the Jewish religion or identification which most hinder integration. This response is common. In fact, it is so common that it is often viewed as the only viable response. For example, Zvi Adar (1977, p. 24) writes:

Contemporary life in the Jewish world confronts the Jew and his society with two tasks: (1) to integrate and find his place in modern society and culture, and (2) to reshape the nature of Jewish life inside the new framework. The second task has proved much more difficult and complicated.

This response has encouraged Jewish movements of all sorts, some of which attempt to alter the nature of religious practice (e.g., Reform Judaism), and others which attempt to define Jewishness in primarily cultural rather than religious terms (e.g., Yiddishist movements). Cultural changes should be more adaptable to the vicissitudes of modernity because they are not cloaked in sanctity as are religious norms. Those who take Jewish tradition seriously make great efforts to distinguish between cultural customs (*minhag*) and absolute religious laws (*halacha*). The former are often viewed as less binding than the latter. In fact, to some extent the distinction between 'modern' and 'right-wing' Orthodoxy has much to do with the amount of Jewish tradition that is viewed as *minhag* and the amount viewed as *halacha*. The way the scale tips on this matter also has much to do with the extent to which integration into modern society is viewed as necessary and desirable.

Societal Change

A final response to the dilemma is to change society to accommodate Jewish identity. The great number of Jews who joined the socialist and communist movements in Eastern Europe and elsewhere at the turn of the century sought to make their societies more equitable to all groups, and thus better the lot of oppressed minorities such as Jews. Similarly, in the United States Jews have been great proponents of separation of Church and State because many believe that government entanglement in religious matters is ultimately not beneficial to Jewish identity. American Jews have also been among the main advocates of cultural pluralism, asserting that the ultimate American goal is not the blending of cultural differences into some new American and primarily white Anglo-Saxon Protestant style (melting-pot theory), but rather the maintenance of separate cultural group identities within a framework of shared values. Cultural pluralism in a country where Jews constitute less than 3% of the population has obvious advantages.

Many of the great Jewish movements which arose as responses to the integration-identity dilemma fostered specific educational programs in the Diaspora and Israel to foster their ideologies. Nevertheless, most Jews respond in more than one of the six ways outlined. Even ideological groups which usually respond in one way will turn to other responses if a particular issue warrants it. This flexibility and ideological pliability allowed a degree of Jewish identity among those who might otherwise have abandoned it altogether. Educationally, however, it has created severe problems. Educators have been reluctant to face the Jewish identity dilemma squarely, or to discuss the different responses to it. This has left students with serious questions about the nature of Jewish identity and its importance. Adult views and practices seem ambivalent, inconsistent, and not subject to any rationale. In actuality, realistic responses to the dilemma will necessarily be multifaceted.

Nevertheless, educators must develop programs that reflect the existence of these options and articulate rationales for choosing one over another. We must face the fact that in many modern societies, the option of complete assimilation as an alternative is both viable and attractive to increasing proportions of youth.

Jewish Migration

The second historical trend to have a major impact on world Jewry today has been migration. The great migration of East European Jews during the four decades around the turn of the century altered the geographic distribution of world Jewry. About 3 million Jews left Eastern Europe (primarily Russia and Lithuania), and about 80% of them went to the United States. About 7% went to West European countries (primarily Germany, Britain, France, and the Netherlands), about 3% went to *Eretz Israel* (Palestine), and the others to Canada, Australia, Argentina, and South Africa (Gartner, 1984). In many of these countries, the Jewish populations grew by exponential rates from the early years of these migrations until World War II. Elazar and Cohen (1985) report that between 1900 and 1939 the Jewish population in the United States increased from 1 million to nearly 5 million, in *Eretz Israel* from 50,000 to 450,000, in England from 200,000 to 340,000, in France from 115,000 to 320,000, in Argentina from 30,000 to 275,000, in Canada from 16,000 to 155,000, in Brazil from 2,000 to 52,000, and in South Africa from 25,000 to almost 91,000. Most of these countries experienced a further influx of Jewish immigrants from Europe after World War II and from Asian and African countries after the establishment of the State of Israel.

The relevance of these migration patterns from a historical perspective is two-fold: First, all of today's large Jewish communities experienced their major population expansion during this century. Migration, while strengthening communities with new human resources, also initially taxes their institutional resources and capacities. Efforts are usually first directed toward health, shelter, and occupational needs, relegating education, particularly religious education to a secondary place. Thus, in a very real sense, Jewish educational systems around the world are still quite young, and only within the last two to three decades have most communities attained sufficient stability and economic well-being to focus attention and resources upon their improvement.

Second, the educational systems that developed in most of the large Jewish communities of the world reflected priorities of education and identity then prevalent in Eastern Europe. Although perhaps the structure of institutions was based on European and German models, the curricular and ideological orientations of the schools reflected mainly the East European Jewish

culture. Many of the studies in this volume point to the greater traditionalism that developed in those places which received the largest immigrations of Jews from Eastern Europe. Clearly, their responses to the Jewish identity dilemma were much less prone to either 'complete assimilation' or 'religious change' than their West European counterparts. The development of day schools throughout the Diaspora has been influenced by them, even though the model originated in Germany (Adar, 1977).

A final migration pattern of which we must take note has been the migration of Asian and African Jews from their homelands after the establishment of the State of Israel and during the last three decades. More than one million Jews, primarily from Morocco, Algeria, Iraq, Tunisia, and Iran emigrated to Israel, the United States, France, and other parts of the Diaspora. The severe loss of population greatly affected the remaining Jews in those communities and has made it more difficult for them to maintain proper educational institutions, and to find local Jews to instruct and administer schools. The large emigration from these countries along with the worsening of political and economic conditions has created severe crises in the cultural reproduction of Jewish life there.

The Asian-African, commonly if improperly referred to as Sephardic, migration has also affected the receiving countries. Both Israel and France, in particular, have had great problems in increasing the capacity of their educational institutions to serve the needs of the new immigrants, and in reorienting their traditional European (Ashkenazic) Jewish studies curricula to include the Sephardic culture. The adjustments to these newer migrations are still in process.

The Holocaust

The third important historical event to affect contemporary Jewish life was the destruction of two thirds of European Jewry and over one third of world Jewry by the Nazis during World War II. In addition to the enormous human and material devastation, there was vast cultural destruction. The greatest institutions of Jewish learning were destroyed, and entire communities with their cultural institutions were obliterated - lost forever.

The European communities directly affected by the war have had a tremendous job of rebuilding and picking up the pieces, so-to-speak, as documented in the studies in this volume. The countries which received war refugees were further taxed by the general problems of migration, which sometimes took precedence over religious educational needs.

It is difficult to assess the effect of such a tremendous loss to Jewish education specifically. It is clear that some of the greatest Jewish educational institutions were destroyed and many of the great leaders and teachers of the

Jewish world perished. In addition, there has been a significant shift in the locus of Jewish life in the world. Jewish population concentration has shifted from Europe to North America, and Jewish spiritual leadership has shifted from Europe to Israel. In both the United States and Israel Jewish learning has been rejuvenated, and both countries have created great centers of Jewish scholarship and culture. Schiff (1983) points out that in the United States alone there are about fifty academies of advanced Talmudic study, with a total enrollment of over 10,000 students. He remarks: "It seems safe to say that the student enrollment in America in post-secondary yeshivoh, *mesivtoth* and *kollelim* compares favorably with the number who were enrolled in the great yeshivoh of Eastern Europe in their heyday" (p. 6). How this compares in quality to what was, or to what might have been, is difficult (if not impossible) to estimate.

The State of Israel

The fourth historical phenomenon which has affected all of world Jewry is the return of Jewish sovereignty in the land of Israel after over two thousand years. The establishment of Israel as a place of refuge for oppressed Jews, and as spiritual homeland for all Jews, has had an impressive impact on Jews throughout the world. Coming so close upon the heels of the Holocaust, Israel achieved tremendous military, economic, and cultural successes and gave Jews throughout the world a renewed sense of pride, a greater sense of unity, and a central component of Jewish identity. Moreover, in a very tangible sense, Israel has played an instrumental role in revitalizing Jewish culture through language, art, music and literature; also, Israel has provided educational material, personnel, and finances to Jewish schools throughout the world. The establishment of the State of Israel has allowed us to focus on the needs of Jewish education in a manner that was impossible before, and to consider solutions to problems that would have been inconceivable without it.

The Societal Context of Jewish Schooling

Schools must be understood within the context of the societies in which they are located. The permissiveness or restrictiveness of government policies regarding religious and ethnic minorities in general, and Jews in particular, can affect the desire or need of Jews to establish their own schools. Availability of free non-denominational schools, and the normativeness of private schooling, also affect the extent to which Jews will seek to establish their own school system. Of course, the climate of Jewish-Gentile interaction, the

receptivity of one group toward the other, will affect the desire to intermingle in many spheres of life including education.

The Religious Context

Stephen Sharot (1976), in his excellent comparison of the factors which affected Jewish identity in previous eras and different countries, argues that:

Jewish acculturation was much greater in those societies where the dominant religion was syncretic than in those societies where the dominant religion was insular...syncretic religions were more disposed to pluralism and insular religions were more disposed to monopolism. The greater the tendency of the dominant group to coerce the Jews into accepting the majority religion, the more the Jews emphasized their religio-cultural distinctiveness. The greater the tendency of the dominant group to accept the existence of Judaism, the more likely the Jews would acculturate to the majority or core culture....Where Jews were separated, they were less likely to adopt a non-Jewish religio-culture. Where Jews were not so separated and social contacts with non-Jews were more frequent and intimate, acculturation was far more likely. The extent to which Jews were separated within a society was often related to the dominant group's disposition to monopolism or pluralism. A total monopolistic policy, if successful, would have resulted in the disappearance of the Jews, but successful monopolism was very rare. Even when Jews were forced to convert to Christianity, they often remained unassimilated, and this drove the dominant group to segregate them still further (pp. 34–35).

The above quotation is taken from Sharot's discussion of pre-modern times, but he makes a similar statement with regard to the Church's effect on Jews in the pre-industrial period. Because the Church tried to protect its monopolistic position, it contributed to the segregation of Jews. This had the consequence of protecting the distinctively Jewish religious culture from incursions by the wider Christian society. Such separation lasted in most of Europe until the second half of the eighteenth century, and in Eastern Europe until the 20th. Sharot (1976, pp. 176–177) explains:

As Jews entered gentile society, their religion lost its dominant position in explaining and interpreting the world....The effects on the Jews of the interrelated changes of the economy, political structure, and belief systems of the wider society came at a relatively late stage, but it was

just because of this lag that, when the absorption of the Jews into 'the modern world' did occur, it was an extremely rapid process. In a few decades the separation of the Jews in western and central Europe was broken down, transforming their culture and way of life....For the Jews, the secularising effects of urbanisation and the loss of community were accentuated by problems of identity. Most wished to remain Jewish but they also wished to be accepted into the dominant society, and this appeared possible only if Judaism was restricted to the home and the synagogue and took forms which would meet the demands of Occidental culture.

Sharot argues, with regard to Communist Eastern Europe, that the secular monopolism of Communist authorities has been much more inclusive than the religious monopolism of the medieval Catholic Church. At first, he points out, the anti-religious campaigns against Jews in Russia were not successful, but after industrialization, urbanization, and other changes associated with the Russian revolution had weakened Jewish religious commitment and the insularity and solidarity of Jewish communities, the suppression of Judaism has been extensive and relatively effective.

Today, in most Jewish communities of the world, there is less pressure upon Jews to conform to the majority religion. Overt antisemitism and discrimination have been generally on the decline since World War II; therefore, there is very little to reinforce Jewish distinctiveness within the larger society, allowing acculturation and assimilation to proceed relatively unhindered. However, receptivity to Jews has also permitted a new openness about Jewish identity. This is manifested, for example, in public support for Israel. Sharot claims that the differences in patterns of religious observance and synagogue affiliation between countries are related to the different forms that secularization has taken in those countries. For example, in the Communist bloc, the lack of Jewish religious institutions, religious functionaries, and educational institutions has made even minimal religious observance rare. In France, the secularization involved an ideological rejection of institutional religion and, therefore, synagogue affiliation and ritual observance has been very low, except among the recent immigrants from Muslim countries. In England and the United States, ideological secularization was not important; therefore both countries have relatively high rates of synagogue affiliation and complete non-observance is much rarer than in France. However, in England, as in most European countries, secularization has meant a decline of institutional religion. In America, religious institutions have grown because they adopt secular functions. Thus, synagogues have become community centers, and often their communal functions have become more important than the religious ones.

The Educational Context

In addition to the religious context of the larger society and its acceptance of Jews, the educational context of the general society has had an impact on Jewish schooling. In Western societies, the availability of public elementary schools for the population generally coincided with the period of mass immigration of Jews from Eastern Europe. In fact, along with the political, economic, and religious opportunities that attracted East European Jews to the United States and England was the greater availability of education for their children. Very few countries tried to eliminate religion from the educational system as fully as the United States. In most countries to which Jews immigrated, government support for denominational schools, which were the earliest schools established in all countries, was the norm. Everywhere governments have attempted to use the educational system as a way of investing in the future productivity of the society. By making schools more accessible to greater numbers, a more educated public would hopefully result in a more productive labor force. In countries where economic conditions prohibited the rapid development of free government-sponsored public schools, states were typically inclined to support already existing denominational schools. In some countries, government-run schools were developed alongside of government-supported denominational schools.

Throughout the world, there has been a move in recent decades to increase educational opportunities for all classes of citizens. Therefore, at least at the elementary school level, and to some extent at the secondary school level, there has been increased consciousness of class differences within existing educational facilities. To equalize educational opportunities, some governments have sought to increase support of government sponsored schools and decrease support of denominationally sponsored schools. Other governments have increased the support given to denominationally sponsored schools, so as to have more control over the educational process by setting standards for teacher hiring and curricular instruction. Thus, increased support for denominational education has brought increasing government control and involvement. In countries with new political regimes, such as Muslim and South American countries, schools have been recognized as important institutions for legitimating the new political systems. Here too, along with government support for denominational schools has come increasing control over the institutions and their educational processes.

A low level of government involvement is found in the setting of minimal standards for teacher hiring and instruction. At moderate levels of government involvement, there is control over student access to educational facilities. Restrictions are often imposed upon students from attending schools of their choice outside their neighborhoods, and a mixture of students from various religious backgrounds are required to attend the same school. At the

maximum level of involvement, there have been cases, e.g. Iran, where the government actually takes over a Jewish school, and changes both its name and its curricular direction. This is a form of educational nationalization which does not reimburse the Jewish community or other denominational bodies for the substantial investment in the schools they have developed.

One of the interesting reactions to these movements for increasing educational quality, or standardizing educational experiences throughout educational systems, has been the development of all-day Jewish schools. In countries as far away and as different from each other as the United States, France, and Argentina, over the last several decades there has been a substantial increase in the proportion of Jewish children who attend Jewish day schools. The authors of the chapters on these countries in this volume all point to the deteriorating conditions of the public schools as a major determinant of this growth. Jews in most countries today have reached fairly high levels of economic standing, and to protect this status, they now view private schooling as a more viable option than they did when economic integration into the society was their goal. This welcome development of increased enrollment in Jewish day schools has however also had a negative consequence: the emphasis on Jewish studies within the schools has decreased. Many Jewish pupils left the public school systems when less privileged children began to attend because they felt that the standards were lowered. Similarly, some felt that the enrollment of previously uninvolved Jews lowered the standards of Jewish study and observance within the day schools. Whereas these students previously would not have attended any Jewish school at all because of the particularistic emphasis and concentration on Jewish subject matter, they now demanded that aspects of the curriculum which they had tried to avoid altogether receive less time and emphasis. This gave rise to new, less religiously-oriented day schools, as the liberal movements suddenly discovered an interest among their constituencies; but it also brought about a reaction by the more observant Jews who established a growing number of new more Orthodox ('right-wing') day schools. This diversity would ordinarily have been welcome as a healthy development, but it occurred at the same time that the school-age population was declining. Thus, it raised serious questions about the long-term viability of so many schools, and particularly schools which for many years filled a critical middle-of-the-road function and were now losing students to the 'right' and 'left'.

Of course, government support for Jewish schools, while important to the development of those schools, is not the only factor affecting the decision to attend all-day schools or supplementary schools. Great Britain and Canada present an interesting comparison. In Great Britain, there is some government support for the majority of Jewish day schools, while in Canada less than half of the day schools receive substantial government support, these

being primarily those in Quebec province, including Montreal. Great Britain, whose Jewish school-age population is larger than Canada's, has a higher percentage of Jewish children who are currently enrolled in Jewish schools (55% and 49%, respectively). Yet, the percentage enrolled in day schools out of all pupils receiving any Jewish education is greater in Canada than in Great Britain (63% and 51%, respectively) (Genuth, DellaPergola and Dubb, 1985).

The authors of the chapters on Great Britain and Canada in this volume have discussed the differences in the natures of these two Jewish communities and their considerations regarding day school and supplementary types of Jewish education. It is clear that the general societal contexts in which Jewish communities find themselves dictate Jewish educational growth and development. However, it is clear that the nature of the Jewish community itself, its immigrant background, ideological propensities, and socioeconomic characteristics also affect its systems.

The Jewish Communal Context of Jewish Schooling

Generation

An important characteristic of the Diaspora today is that in all the sizeable Jewish communities most of the Jews are native-born, and there are no longer large influxes of immigrants from other countries. Moreover, the effects of the tremendous religious and cultural nourishment received by these communities from the immigration of the religious East European Jews in the early 1900s and which continued to some extent until after World War II, will come to an end with the passing of that generation in the next 10–15 years. Despite the apparent growth of the Orthodox minority throughout the world, and especially right-wing Orthodox groups, they will probably not be numerous enough to replace the older generation (Himmelfarb and Loar, 1984). Among Diaspora communities, only the secularized French Jewish community has witnessed a rebirth of religiosity due to the immigration in the past few decades of Jews from North Africa. However, their very rapid integration into French society raises questions about their ability to maintain the traditionalism of their countries of origin. There is likely to be a further decline in religiosity and traditionalism throughout the Diaspora, despite what appears to be a renaissance of Hebraic and Israeli culture. The Jew of the 1980s, in almost all parts of the world, is highly secularized, acculturated and has achieved a high level of socioeconomic mobility and integration into the society in which he lives. Israel has become the principal factor of Jewish identity and the main unifying element among all Jews.

Antisemitism

Perhaps with the exception of the Communist and Muslim countries, antisemitism is less compelling in either hindering or promoting Jewish solidarity, cohesiveness and identity than it was in previous generations. Howard Sachar (1985) states that there is no Western nation today that, at the official governmental level, will allow overt acts of antisemitism. There is also evidence that popular latent attitudes of antisemitism have declined since World War II, at least in the United States (Yankelovich, Skelly, and White, 1981). However, it is a mere forty years since the end of World War II, and it is difficult to know how long tolerance will prevail in a world that has historically persecuted Jews at every opportunity. Indeed, in recent years there has been an unprecedented number of antisemitic reports from the Western mass media, particularly in its coverage of Israeli affairs and an unprecedented (since World War II) number of terrorist attacks on Jewish institutions, particularly in Western Europe. Nevertheless it is probably fair to say that the general climate prevailing in most Diaspora countries does not promote Jewish self-consciousness because of its unacceptance or intolerance of Jews.

Family Patterns

Several societal trends have brought about important changes in family life which also affect the context in which Jewish education takes place.

Professionalization of Women

With the increasing educational mobility of the Jewish community, there has been a concomitant professionalization of Jews. This has extended also to Jewish women and has coincided with greater occupational opportunities for women in general, thanks to the feminist movement of the 1960s and structural and legal changes which occurred as a consequence. Both advantages and disadvantages were created for the context of Jewish education. On the one hand, working women have made dual income families more normative, thereby increasing the overall ability of families to pay for private education, but also creating the need for more hours of childcare during the day. This need has become evident in the worldwide expansion of pre-school enrollment in Jewish institutions. Jewish day schools, with their longer school day, probably also benefitted. On the other hand, professional parents seek greater quality education for their children, which has increased the demands placed upon Jewish schools, particularly with regard to the general studies provided. For those who send their children to supplementary schools, the increased economic ability of parents has also created greater

demands for additional cultural education which competes with religious schooling, such as music, dance, art, and sports lessons. Finally, working women have less time for voluntary charitable activities which were always important for the maintenance of educational institutions, either through direct volunteer efforts, or through indirect efforts to raise community funds that were then distributed to the schools (Johnson, 1976).

Marriage and Fertility

Along with the tendency toward more years of education, there has been concomitant postponement of marriage and childbearing. In most countries for which we have data, Jews tend to marry later and have fewer children than the population at large (Schmelz, 1981; DellaPergola, 1983; Schmelz and DellaPergola, 1983). Data from the United States and Canada indicate that between 1970 and 1980 there was a very substantial increase in the proportion of Jews remaining single throughout their early adult years, nor do we yet know whether, in fact, most of these people will ever marry. If they do, they will probably have fewer children than those who married earlier, although there is some debate about that (Goldscheider and Zuckerman, 1984). Fertility rates of the Jews are low throughout the world. Israel is the only country whose Jewish population is growing due to natural increase and, according to DellaPergola and Schmelz (this volume), the fertility rate in other countries is below the level which allows for generational replacement. When attrition due to intermarriage and general assimilation are taken into account, Schmelz and DellaPergola estimate that the lower fertility rate of Jews will by the year 2000 result in a school-age population in the Diaspora that is less than two thirds or even less than half of its size in 1965. Obviously, such a dramatic decline in the number of Jewish children will affect Jewish school systems and will necessitate a severe contraction of professional personnel and facilities unless a substantial increase in the rate of enrollment in Jewish schools occurs. As the Jewish populations in the various Diaspora countries begin to decline, their ability to maintain educational and other Jewish institutions will probably decline as well.

Intermarriage

One important indicator of Jewish acceptance in society at large has been a world-wide increase in Jewish mixed marriages (DellaPergola, 1976). Since World War II, the number of marriages of Jews to non-Jews has risen significantly, and in recent years has reached somewhere between 25 and 50% of newly wed Jews in Jewish communities throughout the world. This is affecting the size of the Jewish population. On the average, fewer children are born to intermarried couples, and among those born, fewer than half identify themselves as Jews. Moreover, intermarriage raises additional challenges for promoting Jewish identity, particularly in light of considerable research evi-

dence indicating an interaction between the Jewishness of family background and Jewish schooling (Cohen 1974; Himmelfarb, 1974).

Divorce

Along with the other changes in family life already mentioned, there has been a substantial increase in divorce and the number of single-parent families (especially in the United States). Studies show that single parent families are less likely to be associated with Jewish institutions or to enroll their children in Jewish schools.

In sum, the changes in the generational, educational, occupational, social and familial characteristics of Jews are determining the decisions of Jewish educators and planners throughout the world. These changes effect which, and how many, students are taught, and will effect their interest and motivation to learn.

The Structure of Jewish Education

Transplantation of European Education

It has often been claimed that Jews transplanted the educational systems to which they had been accustomed in Europe into their new communities. Essentially this is true, particularly when one considers the diversity of ideological and curricular approaches that developed in single communities. However, it must be noted that there are only a limited variety of structural arrangements that Jewish schooling can assume. Most of them were already in use in Europe in the 19th century, and were attempted at the turn of the century in the countries that received large waves of immigration.

Given the necessity of providing secular education for Jewish children (a requirement not taken for granted until the mid-19th century in many countries, and even much later in others), then the essential question is where to include Jewish education. Broadly, there are three options:

- teach Jewish studies in the same school with secular studies by establishing all-day schools under Jewish sponsorship;
- teach Jewish studies in supplementary schools outside secular school hours;
- teach Jewish studies during 'released time' from secular schools.

Each of these options also appeared in a variety of mutations, especially supplementary education where choices were made between a private tutor in the home (*Melamed*), a private-enterprise school, usually in the tutor's home (Heder), a communally or congregationally sponsored school meeting several times a week (Talmud Torah), or a school meeting only once a week (Sunday school). Sunday School became the dominant choice of the Reform

movement in the United States, probably modeled on the prevalent form of Protestant religious education there (Gartner, 1969).

Moreover, within a given structure there was considerable diversity regarding curricula and orientation, based on differing views of Jewish identity. For example, the Enlightenment in Eastern Europe led to three major educational responses which were structured as all-day schools: Yiddish-Socialist education, Zionist-Hebrew cultural education, and religious (Orthodox) education. These three ideological orientations later appeared also in countries outside Eastern Europe (Adar, 1977). In the United States, they were taught in supplementary schools, but in South and Central America, they appeared mainly in all-day schools. Yiddish-Socialist education, as a formal option to religious education, was stronger in the United States than the Zionist-Hebrew cultural orientation. Yet, it began to decline in the 1930s and has now almost disappeared. Jewish education in the United States has developed mainly along religious lines (e.g. Reform, Conservative and Orthodox) with variations in the degree of Hebrew language and Israeli culture taught. Jewish nationalist identity as an alternative rather than as a supplement to Jewish religious identity has never been a strong factor in the United States.

Generally, where public non-denominational education was not available for new immigrants in Diaspora communities, such as in the very early settlement of Jews in the United States and England, Jews established their own day schools. Where or when non-denominational public schools were made available, Jews chose to attend those schools and establish supplementary schools for Jewish education. It is interesting that everywhere they went the East European immigrants established supplementary forms of Jewish education, *heders* and *Talmudei Torah*. This seems to be testimony to their great zeal for acceptance and integration into the wider society, but it became a major obstacle as proponents of day schools became more vocal and began to demand greater community support for their schools. The day school movement, which gained momentum primarily after World War II, struggled everywhere (except in Muslim countries) with the existing Jewish establishment because they were viewed as rejecting the invitation of host nations to full citizenship and participation.

Growth of Day Schools

The aftermath of World War II created conditions that were conducive to the development of day schools. First, the Holocaust called into question integrationist and assimilationist ideologies. Second, it created a need for heightened Jewish awareness and solidarity, and education was viewed as a means to this end. Third, there was new immigration before, during and after

the war to various Diaspora countries. These immigrants included Orthodox rabbinical leaders with the stature and following to build intensive Jewish educational institutions. Fourth, in the following decades, immigrants from North Africa and the Middle East made their way to various Diaspora communities, primarily France, and they were more tradition-oriented than were the Jews already living in the countries to which they immigrated, thus adding to a more receptive atmosphere within the Jewish community for day schools. Fifth, the relative prosperity attained by Jews in most of the Diaspora, outside of Europe (until the 1960s) and the Muslim countries, enabled them to establish and support full-time Jewish education.

Finally, and this is a remarkable phenomenon in its pervasiveness, the declining conditions of the public school system made private schooling a more attractive alternative. This was true in countries as disparate as the United States, France and Argentina, where Jewish all-day schools gained popularity. The movements in these countries to expand and equalize educational opportunities for all classes of citizens have brought about a perceived deterioration in the standards and quality of the public education available.

The great growth of day schools in recent decades should not be viewed necessarily as an achievement of the organized Jewish community, but rather more as a product of the tireless efforts of a few devoted individuals in each community, as several authors in this volume have noted. The Jewish communities in Asia and North Africa are the exception to this rule, since international Jewish educational organizations, such as the Alliance Israélite Universelle, have played critical roles in establishing, staffing and maintaining Jewish day schools there.

The term 'day school' implies much more homogeneity and intensity of Jewish studies than is actually true in most cases. In North America, day schools spend around 15 to 20 hours a week on Jewish studies, while in South Africa, Australia, and most of the Latin American and West European countries, only 7 to 10 hours a week are spent on these studies. There are some schools, e.g., ORT schools, where the amount of time spent on Jewish studies is only 2 or 3 hours a week, the equivalent of Sunday schools. There are other day schools whose Jewishness is only specious. For example, there are day schools in Turkey whose directors are appointed by the government and are not Jewish, and the more extreme case of the 'Jewish' boys' school and 'Jewish' girls' school in New Delhi, each with over a thousand students of whom less than five were Jews.

By the early 1980s, nearly 40% of all Diaspora Jewish school enrollment was in day schools. This was more than a 25% increase in about 15 years. Outside of the United States the percentage is nearly 69% (Dubb, 1984). This is a truly significant accomplishment in such a short time and a remarkable reversal from previous generations.

'Part-time' Jewish schooling has also advanced. In most regions of the world, part-time Jewish schooling averages 3–4 hours of Jewish studies per week, particularly when Sunday schools and released time programs are included with weekday afternoon school statistics. However, in Argentina supplementary schools include a full afternoon of study – an average of 14–16 hours a week – more than the typical day school in most Diaspora communities outside of North America. Thus, despite common belief, we see that a supplementary school can sometimes give more hours of Jewish studies than a day school. Efforts must be made to increase and improve the Jewish studies content of all types of Jewish schools. While it is hoped that the expansion of day schools indicates progress in this direction, other indicators to monitor quality and quantity must also be used.

The phenomenon of *Talmudei Torah*, which remain dominant in the United States and very pervasive throughout Europe and Australia, is perhaps even more remarkable than the growth of the day school movement. Historians have seen the large proportion of enrollment to supplementary schools as an indicator of the minimal Jewish identification extant among Diaspora Jews. Instead, it must be noted that such a part-time school system is probably unique among religious and ethnic groups throughout the world. Other groups have established day schools and Sunday schools, but none of them have established an extensive system of supplementary schools which meet several times a week for several hours a day. These schools are testimony to the seriousness with which Jews both integrate into the dominant society in their respective country, and simultaneously try to preserve their Jewish identities. Unfortunately, the educational strategy adopted to achieve the latter goal is not as efficient as the strategy adopted for the former.

Jewish Schooling for Girls

Formal Jewish education for females has been one of the big changes of the 20th century. In Eastern Europe, very few girls were sent to religious schools. Indeed, they were more likely to receive secular/vocational training, and any Jewish schooling that existed for them was very basic and elementary. As the conditions of Jewish life changed, young girls could no longer receive sufficient training from the home or community alone and the tendency grew to send them to Jewish schools. However, in most countries girls are still less likely to attend Jewish schools for as many years as boys, and in the United States are less likely to attend intensive forms of Jewish schooling (DellaPergola and Genuth, 1983). They are often excluded from Talmudic study and other subjects. These gender differences are not as pronounced among liberal (Reform) Jews. *Yeshivoth* have never admitted women for study, and non-Orthodox denominations have only recently begun to admit

them for rabbinical training. Sanua (1964) states that girls enjoy their Jewish studies more than boys and are more observant of Jewish practices. Since Jewish school teachers are mostly females it is imperative that women get the best Jewish education possible. The fact that so many Jewish females get a formal Jewish education today is a great accomplishment, but considerable efforts must yet be made before gender equity is achieved.

Informal Jewish Education

When Jews lived in relatively isolated or insulated Jewish communities, Jewish identification was not a problem. Therefore, Jewish schools could concentrate on the single goal of transmitting knowledge. However, as Jews began to disperse and integrate into the wider society, Jewish identification became a major concern and Jewish socialization gained priority over Jewish education. That is, the production of knowledgeable Jews became secondary to the production of identifying Jews. Today this is a major difference between Jewish education in Israel and in the Diaspora. In Israel, the major goal is to add knowledge to an identification that already exists from the experience of everyday life. In the Diaspora, there is a need to create the experience to which knowledge can be related.

Schools are better at transmitting knowledge than they are at transmitting experience. The Jewish world has been particularly innovative in creating other educational media for transmitting Jewish experience, the most prominent being youth movements, summer camps, study tours of Israel and recreational centers.

Many youth movements in Western countries began as outgrowths of youth movements in Europe. Most were Zionistic in orientation, with different groups reflecting the ideologies of the supporting movements. Some groups, however, reflected other ideologies prevalent at the time, e.g., Yiddish-culture groups, socialist, communist, etc. Others were simply attempts to create Jewish alternatives to non-Jewish youth groups, such as the Jewish scouts. In communities which are unabashedly Zionist in orientation, e.g., Latin American countries, South Africa, the great majority of those movements remain Zionist. Where Jewish identity is viewed in more religious terms, alternatives to Zionist youth movements have developed. For example, in the United States today, some of the largest youth movements are affiliated with the denominational bodies of the Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox movements. In addition, the *Chabad* and the right-wing Orthodox, *Agudat Yisrael* have also developed a network of youth groups throughout the country.

One cannot discount the indigenous groups that have developed in most countries which are not ideologically aligned, but were established to provide

Jewish fellowships and culture in an informal educational environment. The American-based B'nai B'rith Youth Organization is perhaps the largest of this kind in the world. Although there are also various forms of Jewish college student groups, they do not enroll a significant portion of the Jewish students.

It is difficult to assess the quantitative importance of Jewish youth groups. There are no reliable estimates of how many persons are affected by these groups, nor has their impact been systematically investigated. A recent study of the Jewish population in Greater Paris found a positive relationship between past activity in Jewish youth movements and current levels of adult Jewishness (Bensimon and DellaPergola, 1984). Himmelfarb (1974) found that Jewish adults in Chicago who had participated in Jewish organizations during their college years were more likely to be Jewishly involved as adults on all of the nine measures of Jewish identification used in the study. This was true even after parental religiosity and other self-selection factors were taken into account. College-age participation was most strongly correlated with adult Jewish organizational involvement and Jewish intellectual and artistic cultural involvements.

Most youth organizations attempt to reinforce their programs with intensive Jewish living experiences in summer camps. Camps, of course, are not sponsored only by youth organizations, but also by Jewish community centers, synagogues, schools and private entrepreneurs. Some observers (e.g., Ackerman, 1969) claim that camps are much more effective than schools in promoting Jewish identification. However, the little research that has been done in this area indicates that their effectiveness is dependent on reinforcement by Jewish schooling or other experiences during the year (Himmelfarb, 1985).

Organized study-tours of Israel are a recent innovation in informal Jewish education. Since much of Diaspora Jewish identification today is related to the State of Israel, studying and touring the country should increase Jewish identification. The many different programs offered for students vary in length of time, content and setting (e.g., universities, yeshivoth, teachers' institutions, kibbutzim, etc.). In fact, some youth movements are now providing their summer camp programs for older high school students in Israel. Research evidence indicates that these programs have a positive effect on their participants, particularly on their knowledge of Hebrew and identification with the State of Israel. Religiosity is not necessarily increased. Like any summer camp experience, the impact of study-tours seems to be dependent on reinforcement from subsequent educational programs.

Jewish recreational centers provide an opportunity for Jews to socialize with other Jews. In Latin American countries, Jewish sport clubs are very prominent and, though less exclusive, fill a role somewhat similar to private Jewish country clubs in the United States. Jewish community centers in the

United States provide Jewish cultural programming as well as recreational facilities, and have been attempting to increase the quantity and quality of such programs in recent years. This broader model of cultural and recreational centers is being adopted and developed in Europe today.

Several implications can be drawn regarding informal Jewish education:

1. Informal Jewish education is a more demographically limited form of Jewish socialization than Jewish schools since it reaches a significantly smaller proportion of the eligible population. This is probably due to its voluntary nature. While attendance at Jewish schools is also voluntary, and this is one of the major constraints of Jewish education in the Diaspora, there are social pressures from family and friends which impel parents to send their children to Jewish schools at least for bar/bat mitzvah preparation. These social pressures do not exist with regard to youth group participation, summer camping, or trips to Israel. Indeed, the last two are viewed as luxuries, and youth groups are viewed as a service, which one may or may not want. Thus, because of the high degree of self-selection into these activities, most of those who are strongly affected by the programs have already been affected by previous experiences at home and in school. For example, Geula Solomon (this volume) points out that in Australia, the day schools have become primary recruiting grounds for Zionist youth groups.

2. Participation in youth groups seems to be dependent on the extent of ideological tension, conflict, and fervor in society usually created by severe social crises, e.g., war in Israel, or antisemitism at home. Fortunately, for most Jews, except perhaps those in the Soviet Union and in Muslim countries, current events have not yet reached crisis proportion.

3. The influence of summer camps and trips to Israel is intensive while it lasts, but is generally short-lived. That is why a number of studies point to the necessity of continuing with post-camp or post-Israel activities to reinforce what has been learned there. Schools, in contrast, reinforce themselves by meeting over longer periods of time, but usually do not provide a total living experience. Among the three major informal educational activities considered here, only youth groups have the potential for self-reinforcement over a long period of time, but because of their voluntary nature, participants are a very select few.

4. When taken by themselves, informal Jewish educational programs have a low impact on Jewish identity both because of the necessity for follow-up reinforcing activities, and the limited self-selected participation. Himmelfarb (1974, 1985) has found, as have other researchers, that youth groups, camps, and trips to Israel must be viewed as useful supplements to year-round Jewish educational programs, but not as surrogates for schools. They can not substitute for a good formal education, but rather can reinforce and enrich such education.

5. Most existing programs deal primarily with the elementary and high school age groups. However, research suggests that more time and effort ought to be directed toward the college-age population. In the college years, adult identification patterns are established, and these guide the choice of a spouse who will either facilitate or inhibit Jewish religio-ethnic involvement. This age group will determine the identification patterns of future generations of Jewish youth, and therefore, young adult and college student programming ought to be intensified. Since Jews, wherever allowed, are highly socially mobile, they attend colleges and universities in higher proportions than the rest of the population. In fact, it is estimated that about 80% of American Jews attend college at some time – a higher percentage than ever attend Jewish schools. Certainly, college campuses create potential pools of Jews for recruitment to various forms of Jewish education.

Adult Education

Most communities offer a variety of adult education programs in synagogues, social-philanthropic organizations, federations, community centers, schools, etc. These programs assume a great variety of formats such as occasional lectures, discussion groups, certificate or degree granting courses, or performances and exhibits by Jewish artists. In addition, some larger communities have Jewish radio and television programs. Self-improvement courses have proliferated in recent years; they may be little more than traditional texts translated and annotated, or correspondence courses for home study, or they might be as technologically sophisticated as cassette home libraries or 'Dial-a-Shiur' (dial-a-lesson), a daily telephone subscription service. Whatever the format, there has undoubtedly been a great burgeoning of adult educational initiatives in the last decade. Many of the programs are new and their effectiveness in other than marketing terms cannot be assessed. Nevertheless, the fact that there is a market for translated texts and the various other educational services shows that both the interest and the need exist.

At least two formal adult programs ought to be mentioned as important developments. First, there has been a regeneration of *yeshivoth gedoloth* (post-secondary Talmudic and rabbinic academies) since World War II (Helmreich, 1982). Some of these are transplanted European yeshivot that were destroyed. However, most of them, especially the smaller ones, developed indigenously and cater to selected segments of Orthodox Jews, sometimes followers of a particular *Rav* or *Rebbe*. Israel and the United States have been the major countries where this expansion has taken place, but yeshivoth have also been established in Europe, Australia, Argentina, and South Africa. While such institutions primarily cater to the Orthodox, a significant number have been especially established to serve students from non-

Orthodox backgrounds – including *Ba'alei Teshuva* ('Returnees to the faith', i.e. newly observant Jews) (Kovacs, 1977; Aviad, 1983).

The growth of *yeshivoth gedoloth* is significant for two reasons: first, they are the training ground for future rabbis and teachers (primarily day school teachers) in the communities. They produce *talmidei chachamim* (Talmud scholars), the traditional scholarly elite that was depleted by the Holocaust. Second, the *yeshivoth* have had a significant impact on the communities in which they are located, and even beyond. They are the primary source of the renewed Orthodox influence since World War II and have headed the movement to the right within the Orthodox community that has been a world-wide phenomenon. They have encouraged the growth of day schools, and these have in turn provided students for the *yeshivoth*. The *yeshivoth* have high standards of Jewish learning and observance and have thereby strengthened traditionalism within the public Jewish organizational establishment.

A second wide-spread phenomenon of the last decade and a half has been a proliferation of Jewish studies programs on university campuses throughout Israel and the Diaspora. In the United States in particular, there has been a tremendous growth of such programs in well over 300 colleges and universities. New faculty positions have continued to open, even at a time when students generally sought more vocationally oriented studies such as business or engineering. The amount of research publications and scholarly activity that have been generated by this development is probably unprecedented in Jewish history (Davis, 1975; Davis, 1986).

The place of university-based Jewish studies in the Jewish educational system is controversial. Unlike other Jewish educational programs, the primary goal is not to enhance Jewish identity, but rather to critically examine Jewish civilization. Yet, it is unlikely that students who, in college, study Hebrew language and literature, Jewish history, philosophy and sociology, at a high intellectual level, will not be enriched by the experience and find their Jewish identities reinforced in some manner. Of the thousands of students who take courses in these areas, very few actually major in Jewish studies or a related area. Yet, there is evidence that many of those who do major eventually decide to receive graduate training toward some Jewish professional career, e.g. federation work, social work, community center work, the rabbinate, etc.. Many others choose careers outside the Jewish community, but become active lay leaders of Jewish voluntary organizations. Thus, these Jewish Studies programs have become an indirect training ground for future professionals and leaders of the Jewish community. The production of a knowledgeable cadre of leaders is critically important, particularly as Jews now move into a generation devoid of persons with rich Jewish backgrounds.

The Jewish population outside of Israel is rapidly aging, the largest segment now being between 25 and 40 years old. Thus, the need for adult education programs becomes obvious. However, the education of adults is not

likely to have a long-range impact on the Jewish community unless it can be passed on. Therefore, adult education should not concentrate on adults per se, but on that age group that can have an impact on their children. It is 'parent education' that is the critical mandate of adult educators who are concerned about the future of Jewish life. Research has shown, however, that it is very difficult to get parents involved in adult education for any sustained period of time (Rose, 1974; Goldmeier, 1975). After all, people in this age group are in the midst of career-building and child-rearing, and being so busy, they value their leisure time. Therefore, more must be done using new technologies: video-tape courses, special television programs, adult games, computer programs, and other techniques for the individual pursuit of knowledge. The social structures which reinforce self-study must also be developed (Heilman, 1983), e.g. discussion groups, retreats, etc. The *Dor Hemshech* (Generation of Continuity) programs developed by the World Zionist Organization and established in Latin American communities, might be an appropriate model for adaptation elsewhere to fill the need for social reinforcement in adult education.

Major Issues in Diaspora Jewish Education Today

Among the many problems of Jewish education that have already been mentioned, two problems are universal:

- obtaining qualified teachers; and
- maintaining student enrollment at the secondary school level.

Teachers

One has only to browse through this volume to see that securing qualified teachers has always been a problem in the Diaspora and it is a serious one today. Where there is no secondary Jewish education, the problem may be due to the lack of persons with sufficient Jewish education and training. However, even in countries with developed Jewish high school systems, the problem persists. In fact, Jewish teacher training institutes in most countries are having difficulty recruiting enough students to maintain themselves. In the United States, most have had to become general colleges of Jewish studies in order to survive. They offer higher level Jewish education to a broad age-range of adults, and have relegated teacher training and certification to a secondary role. Stanley Abramovitch (this volume) reports that four institutions for teacher training in England, Switzerland, Belgium, and Italy together produce a total of only 12 to 18 graduates a year.

The problem persists for reasons that have been enumerated by several authors in this volume. Many of these reasons are universal to the teaching profession, whether or not in a Jewish school. First, teaching is poorly remunerated as compared to other white-collar professions. Second, it is primarily a female occupation with very few men because of its low pay, and because working with children is considered women's work. There is always a larger proportion of male teachers at the secondary level, where teaching is subject oriented, than at the kindergarten and primary levels, where it is child oriented. Third, the above two factors combine to reduce the social status of teaching. Nevertheless, because it is intellectual, teaching still ranks near the top third of occupations in prestige within industrial countries. Fourth, as a profession it tends to be mobility-blocked (Lortie, 1975). There are few gradations of status to which a teacher can advance. Thus, while one typically obtains a higher salary by teaching for more years, seniority does not usually bestow more status, privilege or responsibility. The chief avenue for mobility is to move into school administration, which is very different work, and has been overwhelmingly dominated by men.

Another reason that teaching has been more attractive to women than to men is that women often view their salaries as supplementary rather than primary family income. In addition, teaching offers women a work schedule that coincides with their children's school and vacations. It has also been an occupation that is relatively easy to leave and re-enter without much loss of promotion, or obsolescence of skills. Teachers find it relatively easy to interrupt their careers for child-bearing or rearing purposes. Teaching personnel is on the average young and has a high turnover rate, a fact which gives most students relatively inexperienced teachers.

These universal problems of the teaching profession are often exacerbated in Jewish schools when salaries, fringe benefits, and job security are even lower than in the public school system (as in the United States); and the ambivalence of Jewish identity among the students often reduces their motivation to concentrate on Jewish studies. However, salary parity with competing schools, while important, will not solve the problem of recruitment. In fact, where appropriate parity has been achieved for day school teachers (e.g., Australia, South Africa, and several provinces in Canada), the problem of recruiting qualified teachers still persists. The relatively high socioeconomic status of Jews in most Diaspora countries leads an even smaller percentage of them into teaching than from the population at large. Moreover, in some countries, such as the United States, expanded opportunities for women in other professions during the last decade and a half have caused a severe drop in the number and academic qualifications of those entering the field of education. Young Jewish women, who tend to be more advanced academically than non-Jewish women, are probably even less likely to seek careers in teaching as other opportunities become increasingly available.

All of these problems are much more severe with regard to supplementary schools which suffer greatly from the part-time, and thus secondary nature of supplementary Jewish education. There is no full-time commitment on the part of anyone in the system (parent, student, or teacher), except, perhaps, a full-salaried administrator. Most of the teachers in supplementary schools work on a temporary basis, e.g. while their children are small, or while they or their spouses attend university. Both the part-time and temporary nature of the work makes it difficult to demand much prior or in-service training. Thus, the required teacher qualifications are compromised and minimized considerably.

Clearly, Israel has become the major source for providing qualified Jewish school personnel for the Diaspora. By formally sending *shlichim* (emissaries) to be administrators and teachers in the schools and by offering various teacher training courses and seminars, Israel is attempting quite valiantly to alleviate this major problem of Jewish education. In addition, many communities have benefitted from Israelis who are there temporarily for one reason or another, primarily for post-graduate training, who find it economically worthwhile to teach part-time in a Jewish school. Many critics have voiced concern about the inability of all Israeli teachers to relate to Diaspora children (Chanover, 1967; Levine, 1978), because of differences in cultural background. The practice of using non-*shaliah* Israeli teachers has been even more severely criticized. They are untrained pedagogically, and are often untraditional in religious practice, thus creating both cultural and ideological problems. Nevertheless, many schools have found these teachers to be the best available alternative because of their knowledge of Hebrew language and their familiarity with Jewish history and holiday customs.

Even with Israeli backup, it is unrealistic to assume that the personnel problem of Jewish schools in the Diaspora will be easily solved. Since conditions prevail that make teaching relatively unattractive, it is unlikely that Jewish schools which hire local residents will be able to demand much prior training. Thus, more efforts must be made to further in-service training. It is not practical to expect large numbers of teachers from any country to attend seminars in Israel for a significant period of time. It is also not clear whether Israeli institutions or personnel could handle the entire burden. Therefore, in-service training must be brought to those who do not go abroad. With the low cost availability of videotape production, training films can be created by the very best teachers, professors, and specialists in the world and distributed internationally in appropriate languages.

It is somewhat surprising that the United States with its great Jewish studies and educational expertise has not been called upon for help with this personnel problem. It is not inconceivable that the idea of *shlichut* (a teaching mission) to a foreign country would attract some knowledgeable young American Jewish couples to Jewish education in a way that day schools in New

York City or Omaha, Nebraska, for example, cannot. They might also be able to adapt to the cultural differences in some of the countries faster than Israelis.

Beyond this patchwork approach, Jewish schools need to take a lead in changing some of the structural characteristics of teaching as an occupation, which make it unattractive. In the United States today, many states are adopting teacher staffing systems in public schools that create a few more gradations of title, privilege, and responsibility (e.g., the master teacher, who trains and supervises others), and systems of merit bonuses for good teaching. Jewish schools, particularly where unattached to the pay scale of the larger educational system in the community, should be able to initiate such a reward system to make teaching more attractive. For supplementary schools, more multi-function positions could be created to develop the equivalent of full-time jobs (e.g., hiring one person to fill the tasks of an afternoon school teacher, a youth group leader, and a Jewish center Judaica specialist).

For all teachers, but especially for those who teach full-time in a day school, there is a need for summer employment opportunities. The relatively low pay of teaching would be substantially enhanced if it included another two months of salary. Teachers normally are paid an adequate salary for nine months, but must live on it for twelve months! This makes it necessary for many of them to seek summer employment. Such employment is often found in menial, low-status jobs, like factory labor, or seasonal work like gardening or roofing. If summer employment in Jewish educational, religious, or communal service were offered to Jewish school teachers, more persons might be attracted to the occupation.

High School Drop-outs

Nearly everywhere in the Diaspora, most Jewish education is on the elementary level. There is a very high drop-out rate from Jewish schools in the early teen years after bar/bat mitzvah, or after finishing primary school. The most recent data indicate that day school enrollment was almost 31% lower at the secondary than at the primary level. An even more dramatic decrease of 70% was evident after bar/bat mitzvah in the supplementary schools (Genuth, DellaPergola and Dubb, 1985). Of course, this type of comparison across school levels at the same time is not a very accurate estimate of the drop-out rate because of differences in the actual size of birth-cohorts, and the non-availability of secondary level Jewish education in some places. Nevertheless, differences are so large that a substantial portion must be due to dropping out. Anyone familiar with Jewish education in the Diaspora knows that this drop-out problem is extensive; it may not have been readily apparent how universal it is.

A possible exception seems to be France, where enrollment at the secondary school level is higher than at the primary level (see Auron and Lazare, this volume; Himmelfarb and DellaPergola, 1982). This peculiar situation is partly due to the age composition of the North African immigrants of the 1950s and 1960s. Indeed, the overall percentage of school-age children enrolled in Jewish schools in France (22%–26%) is substantially lower than other Diaspora countries (DellaPergola and Schmelz, this volume). However, special efforts were actually made in France to strengthen Jewish day schools at the post-primary level.

Given the earlier description of problems within the teaching profession, one might be tempted to say: “No wonder the drop-out rate is so high!” Yet, I suspect that it is not due to poor teaching, but rather to the fact that Jewish schooling plays such a secondary role in students’ lives; many see it as a necessity for training and they drop out as soon as that training is over, or when more rigorous secondary level education begins to encroach upon their spare time.

Actually, there is some evidence from early studies in the United States (Dushkin, 1918; Edidin, 1929) that the drop-outs are not simply a consequence of bar mitzvah, but they present a problem throughout the school years which only reaches its peak around bar mitzvah age. Edidin (1929), for example, found that the proportion of students who dropped out of Jewish schools in Chicago was as great at ages 9 and 10 as at ages 12 and 13 (32% and 31%, respectively). In fact, another 22% had left the schools at even earlier ages. Rubel’s article on Argentina (this volume) shows a similar trend. Only 77% of the students enrolled in the third grade in 1978 were in the 7th grade five years later. Only 68% of the 7th grade enrollment was enrolled in the first year of high school the following year and only about two-thirds of them will finish in a Jewish high school. In all, about 35% of those who were in Jewish schools in Argentina in the third grade were still enrolled during the last year of high school. Indeed, this low figure is probably considerably higher than in the United States and many other countries because in Argentina the figures deal almost exclusively with day school students. Dubb’s estimates indicate that day school students are more than twice as likely as supplementary school students to continue to the secondary level. Thus, as the proportion of students in Jewish day schools increases, and as more Jewish high schools become available, we might expect an increase in the rate to secondary level Jewish education.

Children who drop out of Jewish schools after bar/bat mitzvah tend to come from homes that are not very Jewishly involved. For them, bar/bat mitzvah is both the chief reason for Hebrew school attendance and the appropriate point of termination (Jacoby, 1970; Selig, 1972). It is the normativeness of bar/bat mitzvah termination that needs to be changed. Schools, synagogues, and communal institutions must take it upon themselves to

encourage Jewish school continuation at the secondary level in personal encounters and in structural ways.

On the personal level, rabbis, teachers and principals must assume the tasks encouraging at least a few students each year, who would not otherwise do so, to continue their Jewish studies. On the structural level, graduation, confirmation, and other forms of completion should be postponed for a year or more where possible. Moreover, each appropriate Jewish institution, e.g., school, synagogue, or cultural organization, should offer first year high school scholarships to students who would otherwise not attend. The number of scholarships awarded by a single institution could possibly be matched by a community-wide fund. A similar plan should be adopted to encourage a few supplementary school pupils to transfer to day schools, and those attending high schools to progress to post-high school programs. In these ways, the Jewish religious, educational, and organizational establishment could convey the message that extensive – rather than just elementary – Jewish education is the approved norm. It would undoubtedly take many years and, perhaps, a small miracle, to change the existing norm; but, in fact, substantial changes in the intensification of Jewish education have taken place worldwide in only the last three decades, and this too was beyond expectations.

The old Talmudic saying regarding Torah learning: “*Mitoch shelo l'shma ba l'shma*” (Learning not for its own sake will eventually lead to learning for its own sake) can be applied to high school level Jewish education. In a sense, it gives us license to find other enticements to Jewish schools besides the Jewish education offered. One recurrent theme of the studies in this volume is the importance of high standards of secular education for encouraging enrollment in Jewish schools particularly at the high school level. In those countries where parents believe that Jewish high schools compare favorably with available alternatives in regard to the secular education offered and the preparation given for college entrance exams, there is a greater continuation rate in the Jewish high school. Thus, the creation of top quality Jewish high schools ought to be given priority in communal planning. Perhaps regionally based residential prep schools could be established, offering a snob appeal that seems to be important to some groups of parents (e.g., Kelman, 1979). This would require considerable planning and investment on the part of the community.

Until now, the establishment of high schools in many places has resulted from efforts in the opposite direction. That is, small groups of parents who wanted a particular type of Jewish education for their children, usually Orthodox or ultra-Orthodox, would join together with some benefactors and establish a small school. These parents stressed a more intensive Jewish education for their children, sometimes at the expense of a good secular background. The suggestion here is that high schools be established whose main appeal would be their superior secular programs, and the Jewish studies pro-

gram would be only secondary, or as some might perceive it, a necessary evil. The social problems which exist even in good suburban secular high schools today, e.g., sex, drugs, etc., might make such Jewish high schools more attractive.

International Jewish Educational Organizations

A new area of focus in the social sciences today views the world, particularly its economy, as a 'World System' (Wallerstein, 1974; 1980). The argument is that true social systems are self-contained or self-sufficient, having at least the potential for self-sufficiency, even if this is not actually practiced. The interdependence of nations today, indeed for the last 500 years, according to Wallerstein (1974), with regard to their economic functions, has created a world economic system with ramifications to the political, social, and other levels, which some scholars view as systems in their own right (Boulding, 1985).

Considering the interdependence of Jewish educational systems around the world today, particularly with regard to financial, personnel, and educational resources, it might be helpful to view Diaspora Jewish education as a type of 'World System'. Ernest Stock's article (this volume) points to the valiant efforts being made by numerous organizations to improve the quality of Jewish education in Diaspora countries. The work of the World Zionist Organization and the American Joint Distribution Committee is the most comprehensive, and the work of universities in Israel, particularly the Melton Center for Jewish Education in the Diaspora at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, is the newest and most innovative. Yet, there are many other organizations internationally involved with Jewish education whose tasks are not well-defined, divided, or coordinated. Although these organizations seem to have reached a *modus operandi* that allows them all to continue with their important work and achieve significant results, Stock believes that there is considerably more room for joint effort, elimination of duplication, and general overall coordination. Groups and the individuals involved with them may be more ready to forge a coordinated body at this time than they were previously, and perhaps the lessons of previous attempts can be instructive for any new effort.

On the other hand, there are some obvious advantages to the recipients of the services of these organizations if they can apply to have their needs met at more than one address. Wallerstein (1974, p. 347) writes that the world system is "made up of the conflicting forces which hold it together by tension, and tear it apart as each group seeks eternally to remold it to its advantage." On the other hand, he points out that "prior to the modern era, world economics were highly unstable structures which tended either to be con-

verted into empires or to disintegrate” (p. 348). Clearly, it is the realistic fear of ‘imperialism’ that prevents more centralized coordination of functions by Jewish educational organizations. Whether the mechanisms can be developed to reduce such tendencies is debatable. In any case, the matter deserves serious discussion, and should be placed on the agenda of Jewish education.

Research

The lack of research in the area of Jewish education around the world is astonishing. Even fairly centralized systems collect data only on enrollment and budgets. Without greater investment in basic and applied research on educational processes and problems it will be difficult to improve educational efforts. Policies should not be made in the absence of accurate information and on the basis of conjecture and personal influence. Incentives need to be created for local researchers to conduct studies which are pertinent to local systems. This could be done through an international research fund, or by making other forms of international aid contingent upon the development of local research, with valid self-evaluation included in budgets of newly funded projects.

Soviet Jewry

Much of the discussion in this overview and in the other comparative chapters of this volume have for the most part excluded consideration of Eastern European (Communist-bloc) countries, especially the Soviet Union. Jewish communities exist in such different restrictive conditions in those countries that they must be considered separately. In the Soviet Union, there is virtually no formal Jewish education. Nevertheless, the magnitude of the problem, in world terms, demands that it not be ignored. Around 12% of the Jewish school-age children of the Diaspora live in the Soviet Union. Even if only a third of them were interested in learning about their Jewish heritage, we would be talking about nearly 50,000 children – more than the number of Jewish school-age children in Australia, Brazil, South Africa, or Argentina, and close to the number in Canada (Himmelfarb and DellaPergola, 1982).

Leon Shapiro (1984) writes about an increase in Jewish cultural activities in the Soviet Union in the early 1980s – Yiddish publications, Yiddish being taught at one of the universities, Yiddish dramatical theater and music, art exhibits on Jewish themes, and occasional organized seminars dealing with Jewish subjects. In 1982, he reports, there were some 60 groups studying Hebrew. Yet, in mid-1985, press reports tell of stepped up harassment, arrests, and violence against Hebrew teachers there; and as is well known,

Jewish emigration has been cut down to a trickle for the past several years. On the other hand, at this writing, there are also press reports of Soviet initiated negotiations to restore diplomatic relations with Israel.

Given the malevolent capriciousness of Soviet policy, it seems as if there is little that world Jewry can plan to do to ameliorate the situation. Nevertheless, it is important that whatever is possible should be done. Publicity concerning the plight of Soviet Jews must become louder. Demands for their right to emigrate must increase, and educational materials must be made available to the few who dare to study and teach about their Jewish heritage. We do not know when the perspective of Soviet officials might change and they will deem it in their own best political interests to allow Jews more freedom of religion and emigration. However, through continuous cultural nourishment from outside, world Jewry can help assure that when those days come, there will be a core of Soviet Jews ready to lead and teach their brethren. Then, hopefully, the 'Jews of Silence' can be included once again in our discussion of Jewish education around the world.

Summary and Conclusions

It is the thesis of this essay, indeed this volume, that Jewish education policies must stem from a thorough understanding of the social context in which Jewish educational systems find themselves. This includes the larger society and its educational system, and the educational needs and resources of the local Jewish community. Nevertheless, some dominant social and educational trends that have been pervasive in Jewish communities worldwide can be noted.

Since the enlightenment and emancipation, Diaspora Jews have sought various solutions to the dilemma of maintaining a separate Jewish identity while seeking full integration into the larger society. The years of Jewish emigration from Western and Eastern Europe witnessed large-scale attempts by Jews and by the institutions they founded, to first facilitate social integration, and only subsequently the maintenance of Jewish identity. In those societies where general education was nondenominational and allowed Jewish participation, Jews eagerly attended school with other children. They sought to solve their Jewish identity problems with supplementary schooling.

Where Jews were allowed to participate, and often even where that participation encountered major obstacles, they achieved quite rapid educational, occupational and economic integration and mobility. A reversal in priorities in regard to the social integration-Jewish identity dilemma has been caused by socioeconomic mobility, increased distance from the shtetl and from the ghetto generation of immigrant Jews, heightened Jewish identity and the altered structure of Jewish life resulting from the Holocaust and the establish-

ment of the State of Israel, as well as from the post-World War II decline in antisemitism. Unfortunately, that reversal is occurring slowly and is severely hampered by the diminished richness of Jewish cultural life in general, and in particular, by dramatic changes in Jewish family life, e.g., decreased fertility and increased divorce, intermarriage, and female employment. Indeed, it has been suggested that the cultural heritage, norms and values, which are taught in Jewish education are so new to students' realities that the task might be considered one of cultural production rather than cultural reproduction. Therefore, the success of such education requires the cultivation of family and community reinforcement.

Despite the problems of the cultural milieu in which Jewish education must operate it is important to recognize that it has had some major accomplishments. Jewish schooling for females has become almost as universal as for males; the growth of the day school movement has resulted in a large percentage (in some countries, the majority) of Jewish children participating in full-time Jewish education, and the expansion of post-high school Jewish studies in yeshivoth and universities has been truly phenomenal. Some programs of informal or experiential Jewish education have proven efficacious in promoting Jewish identification, but the number of Jewish children who participate in these programs is much more limited than in formal schooling. The same can be said for adult and parent education programs – an immediate need as a large segment of the Jewish population is now in its child-rearing years.

Although the problems of Jewish education are numerous and complex, several of them seem especially important when viewed from a global perspective:

1. There is a great need to improve Jewish-subject teaching. Innovative ways of recruiting and maintaining qualified teachers must be found. These include material and social incentives such as: the creation of multi-task full-time positions, higher salaries, improved fringe benefits, (insurance, retirement, sabbaticals, etc.), job security, more opportunities for job mobility, and greater social recognition. In-service training must be encouraged, particularly at the local level where more teachers can participate. Opportunities for visiting-teacher positions (*shlichut*) can be encouraged on a world-wide basis, and must not be limited to Israeli teachers.

2. Continuation rates to secondary Jewish schools are very low. Jewish education in the Diaspora is mostly on the elementary level. Jewish educational programs should be restructured, and great efforts at all levels are needed to continue studies after bar/bat mitzvah age. Individual institutions and communal agencies should establish scholarship funds to promote post-bar and bat mitzvah school enrollment. The development of Jewish high schools (perhaps on a regional basis) with outstanding secular studies programs can also be an enrollment incentive. In addition, the channeling of

adolescents into informal Jewish education programs (e.g., youth groups, camps, Israel trips) might be helpful in providing some high school level Jewish educational experiences.

3. Jewish education in the Soviet Union must be placed high on the list of priorities. The magnitude of the problem in terms of the number of Jewish children and the almost complete lack of Jewish educational opportunities, has great significance for the Jewish people as a whole. World-wide efforts to encourage the Soviet government to open its doors to Jewish emigration need to continue, but equally vigorous efforts must be made to encourage the Soviet government to allow those citizens who remain in the USSR to receive religious and ethnic education.

4. The establishment of the State of Israel has created a center for world Judaism. The technological changes in travel and communication have created more opportunities for international cooperation and exchange. We live in a world of interdependence and this has affected the organizational and fund-raising activities of Jewish communities. Thus, despite differences in local needs, we can identify problems of universal concern, and perhaps solutions that have the potential for fairly universal application. Therefore, it is time for greater coordination among those organizations involved in international Jewish educational activities.

5. Finally, there is a universal need for scientific research on Jewish education. If we are to improve Jewish education, policies must be based on accurate information. School systems must be encouraged to experiment with new ideas to further Jewish education, but they must also scientifically document and evaluate what they have done so that others can benefit from these innovations.

Not logic alone, but logic supplemented by the social sciences becomes the instrument of advance.

(Benjamin N. Cardozo, *Growth of the Law*, 1924)

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to gratefully acknowledge funds received for travel and student assistance from the Melton Center for Jewish Studies at The Ohio State University in support of the research for this article. He also wishes to express his gratitude to Sabine Himmelfarb for editorial comments on this manuscript.

References

- Ackerman, W.I. (1969). "Jewish Education for What?" *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 70. pp. 3-36.
- Adar, Z. (1977). *Jewish Education in Israel and in the United States*. Hamakor Press, Jerusalem.
- Aviad, J. (1983). *Return to Judaism: Religious Renewal in Israel*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Bensimon, D. and DellaPergola, S. (1984). *La population juive de France: socio-démographie et identité*. Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem and Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris. (Jewish Population Studies, no. 17). 436 pp.
- Boulding, K.E. (1985). *The World as a Total System*. Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Chanover, H. (1967). "Israelis Teaching in American Jewish Schools: Findings of an Exploratory Survey" in: Janowsky, O.F. (ed.). *The Education of American Teachers*. Beacon Press, Boston.
- Cohen, S.M. (1974). "The Impact of Jewish Education on Religious Identification and Practice". *Jewish Social Studies*, Vol. 36, no. 3/4. pp. 316-326.
- Davis, M. (1975). "Jewish Studies in Universities: Alternate Approaches in Different Parts of the World." *Forum*, Vol. 23, Spring. pp. 83-96.
- Davis, M. (1986). "On University Teaching of Contemporary Jewish Civilization". *Judaism*, Vol. 35, no. 2. pp. 170-182.
- DellaPergola, S. (1976). "Demographic Perspectives of Mixed Marriage". *Encyclopaedia Judaica Yearbook, 1976*. Keter, Jerusalem.
- DellaPergola, S. (1983). "Contemporary Jewish Fertility: An Overview" in: Schmelz, U.O., Glikson, P. and DellaPergola, S. (eds.). *Papers in Jewish Demography 1981*. Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. (Jewish Population Studies, No. 16). pp. 215-238.
- DellaPergola, S. and Genuth, N. (1983). *Jewish Education Attained in Diaspora Communities: Data for 1970s*. Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. (Project for Jewish Educational Statistics, Research Report No. 2). 74 pp.
- Dubb, A. (1984). "First International Census of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora". Paper presented at the International Research Conference on Jewish Education. The Hebrew University, Jerusalem.
- Dushkin, A.M. (1918). *Jewish Education in New York City*. Department of Research, Bureau of Jewish Education, New York.
- Edidin, B.M. (1929). "Elimination in Chicago Schools". *Jewish Education*, Vol. 1. pp. 118-120.
- Elazar, D.J. and Cohen, S.A. (1985). *The Jewish Polity: Jewish Political Organization from Biblical Times to the Present*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Gartner, L.P. (1969). *Jewish Education in the United States: A Documentary History*. Teacher's College Press, New York.

Gartner, L.P. (1984). *The Great Jewish Migration 1881-1914: Myths and Realities*. Kaplan Center Papers, University of Cape Town.

Genuth, N., DellaPergola, S. and Dubb, A.A. (1985). *First Census of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora 1981/2-1982/3: International Summary*. Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. (Project for Jewish Educational Statistics, Research Report No. 3). 138 pp.

Goldmeier, H. (1975). *An Evaluation of the Parent Education Program of the United Synagogue of Three Sites in New England*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge.

Goldscheider, C. and Zuckerman, A.S. (1984). *The Transformation of the Jews*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Heilman, C. (1983). *The People of the Book: Drama, Fellowship, and Religion*. University of Press, Chicago.

Helmreich, W. (1982). *The World of the Yeshiva: An Intimate Portrait of Orthodox Jewry*. Free Press, New York.

Himmelfarb, H.S. (1974). *The Impact of Religious Schooling: The Effects of Jewish Education Upon Adult Religious Involvement*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.

Himmelfarb, H.S. (1985). "The Effects of Informal Jewish Education on Jewish Identification". Paper presented at the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem.

Himmelfarb, H.S. and DellaPergola, S. (1982). *Enrollment in Jewish Schools in the Diaspora, Late 1970s*. Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. (Project for Jewish Educational Statistics, Research Report No. 1). 97 pp.

Himmelfarb, H.S. and Loar, R.M. (1984). "National Trends in Jewish Ethnicity". *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, Vol. 23, no. 2. pp. 140-154.

Jacoby, E. (1970). *Continuation and Dropout in Conservative Congregational Schools*. Bureau of Jewish Education, Los Angeles.

Johnson, G.E. (1976). "The Impact of Family Formation Patterns on Jewish Community Involvement". *Analysis*, no. 60. Institute for Jewish Policy Planning and Research, Washington, D.C.

Katz, J. (1971). *Tradition and Crisis: Jewish Society at the End of the Middle Ages*. Schocken, New York.

Kelman, S.L. (1979). "Parent Motivations for Enrolling a Child in a Non-Orthodox Jewish Day School". *Jewish Education*, Vol. 47, no. 1. pp. 44-48.

Kovacs, M.L. (1977). *The Dynamics of Commitment: The Process of Resocialization of Ba'alei Teshuva, Jewish Students in Pursuit of their Jewish Identity, at the Rabbinical College of America*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Union Graduate School-Midwest.

- Levine, A.M. (1978). *Influence of Different Cultural Backgrounds on Teacher-Pupil Interaction and Teacher Attitudes of Israeli and American Teachers in Jewish Education*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Liebman, C.S. (1973). *The Ambivalent American Jew: Politics, Religion, and Family in American Jewish Life*. The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia.
- Lortie, D.C. (1975). *School Teacher: A Sociological Study*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Parelius, A.P. and Parelius, R.J. (1978). *The Sociology of Education*. Prentice-Hill, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Rose, I.B. (1974). *A Clientele Analysis of Participants in Synagogue Adult Jewish Education*. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, New York.
- Sachar, H.M. (1985). *Diaspora*. Harper and Row, New York.
- Sanua, V.D. (1964). "The Relationship Between Jewish Education and Jewish Identification". *Jewish Education*, Vol. 35. pp. 37-50.
- Schmelz, U.O. (1981). "Jewish Survival: The Demographic Factors". *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 81. pp. 61-120.
- Schmelz, U.O. and DellaPergola, S. (1983). "The Demographic Consequences of U.S. Jewish Population Trends". *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 83. pp. 141-187.
- Schiff, A.I. (1983). "On the Status of All-Day Jewish Education". *Jewish Education*, Vol. 51. pp. 2-7.
- Selig, S. (1972). *Profiling Withdrawals from a Jewish Supplementary School*. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit.
- Shapiro, L. (1984). "Soviet Union". *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 84. pp. 212-223.
- Sharot, S. (1976). *Judaism: A Sociology*. Holmes and Meier, New York.
- Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. Academic Press, New York.
- Wallerstein, I. (1980). *The Modern World-System II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European and World-Economy, 1600-1750*. Academic Press, New York.
- Yankelovich, Skelly and White, Inc. (1981). *Anti-Semitism in the United States*. American Jewish Committee, New York.