JEWISH IDENTITY AND
JEWISH SCHOOLING

PERRY LONDON, PH.D.
Professor of Education
and
NAAVA FRANK, M.A.
Doctoral Student, Department of Human Development

Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Mass.

. . . in the competition for attention, interest and commitment that makes up the world in which American Jewish children grow up today, capturing hearts and minds is exactly what identity is all about. In its affective aspects, identity has to be modelled and motivated. It can not be ordered, drilled or even habituated. It arises by incentive and inspiration, not by mere exposure. Indeed it is a quality first of the heart, and only then of the mind.

T his paper discusses three questions about the psychology of identity and its relation to Jewish education:

1. First, what is *identity?* What psychological purpose does it serve? How does it develop? How is it transmitted? We propose that identity is the sense of oneself in a social role, that is, as it is related to some group. Identity originates in and reflects a primitive human need for affiliation and for exclusion. It is transmitted via family and many community agencies, such as school, media and neighborhood.

2. Second, what is *Jewish identity?* What is known about it? Why are people interested in it? We tentatively suggest that Jewish identity is the sense of affiliation with the Jewish people. Much is known about its sociology, but little about its psychodynamics within and between in-

dividuals. Contemporary interest in Jewish identity is motivated by concern with promoting Jewish survival and by a concern with the quality of Jewish life and the relationships between Jewish denominations and communities, especially between Israel and the Diaspora.

3. What connection do Jewish schooling practices and curricula have with the promotion of Jewish identity? We believe that today's Jewish schools have ambiguous responsibility for Jewish identity because they do not have an explicit mandate from the community which focuses on identity training as well as on their conventional responsibility for religious literacy. If schools must bear the burden of identity promotion as well as literacy training, a new vision of curriculum may be called for.

DEFINING IDENTITY

Our concept of identity is largely taken from Erik Erikson, who defines it in *Dimensions of a New Identity* as ". . . a sense of being at one with oneself as one grows and develops; and . . . , at the same time, a sense of affinity with a community's sense of being at one with its future as

well as its history—or mythology."[1] Personal identity, in this view, is an individual sense of self that also includes a sense of belonging to a community. Personal identity is thus a function of social identity. You cannot separate them completely or understand one entirely apart from the other.

Everyone, however, including American Jews, has more than one social identity. We are all many social selves at once—Americans, Jews (Protestants, etc.); parents, children, neighbors, breadwinners, club members, and so forth.

THE ORIGINS OF IDENTITY

Erikson argues that personal identity originates in childhood as we start seeking models to emulate and start realizing that our individuality is a variant of a group's characteristics. Erikson does not try to distinguish sharply personal from social identity, however. He sees identity development as a continuing process, with much of its work still going on in adolescence.

Social psychologist Roger Brown presents a more strictly *social* perspective on the origins of identity, which binds it more tightly than Erikson would to group belonging and to invidious comparisons between one's own group and others. Brown believes that the only good explanation of identity is " . . . the theory of social identity developed between 1971 and 1981 by the late Henri Tajfel of the Universtiy of Bristol."[2] The theory, a product of European social psychology, has been studied and tested all over Europe, especially by John Turner and Michael Billig, but also by many others, most of whose studies first appeared in the *European Journal of Social Psychology.*

Tajfel's *theory of social identity* says essentially " . . . that when people are assigned to . . . any group, they immediately, automatically, and almost reflexively think of that group, an in-group for them, as better than the alternative, an out-group for them, and do so basically because they are motivated to achieve and maintain a positive self-image . . ."[3]

One inevitable result of ingroup/out-group thinking is *ethnocentrism*. It is defined by William Graham Sumner in *Folkways* (1906) as "the technical name for the view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything . . . . Each group nourishes its own pride and vanity, boasts itself superior . . . and looks with contempt on outsiders."[4]

Erikson uses the term *pseudospeciation* to mean the same thing as Brown's (Sumner's) ethnocentrism. He agrees too that it has always been with us, ". . . that all through history groups of men have entertained systematic illusions regarding the God-given superiority of their own kind."[5] "The *pseudo* means that, far from perceiving or accepting a human identity based on a common specieshood, different tribes and nations, creeds and classes (and, perchance, political parties) consider themselves to be the one chosen species . . ."[6]

How pervasive is ethnocentrism really? Listen to Roger Brown: "Ethnocentrism is universal and inderadicable." " . . . it has been traced to its source in motives deeply rooted in individual psychology, motives that are primitive and universal (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel and Turner, 1979), and the source is the individual effort to achieve and maintain positive self-esteem. That is an urge so deeply human that we can hardly imagine its absence."[7]

1. Erik H. Erikson, *Dimensions of a New Identity.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 1974, pp. 27–28.

2. Roger Brown, *Social Psychology* New York: Macmillan, Free Press, 1986, p. 550.

3. *Ibid*, p. 551.

4. *Ibid*, p. 533.

5. Erikson, 1974, *op. cit.*, p.27.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 28.

7. Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 534.

The universal need to be an in-group member has been demonstrated repeatedly by social psychologists. Thirty or more experiments in this area have shown that, becoming a member of a group, any group, itself creates ethnocentrism, even if group membership involves little more than labelling and assignment on a random basis, as in the "color wars" at children's camps; also, mere membership feeling of being "blue" team or "red" team produces positive in-group stereotypes and negative out-group stereotypes.[8] Regardless of the experimental method used to index in-group favoritism, " . . . all the indices considered together . . . make it clear that a real in-group preference is established by categorization alone." People like the in-group better, judge its work more favorably, attribute more good deeds to it and bad deeds to the out-group, and have a more lasting memory of the in-group as good. "So you see it is really a rather mysterious effect: a 'pull' or force to favor the in-group, without usually even knowing you are doing it."[9]

The only mitigating finding of these studies to comfort those of us who yearn for mutual tolerance and respect among human groups is that ethnocentrism is not by itself hostile to the outgroup. "The dominant`. . . . situation . . . has been in-group favoritism but not all-out, unqualified in-group favoritism."[10] "One of the most consistent and psychologically telling results in all this research is the preference for a maximal in-group advantage over the out-group . . . It is above all the social *comparison* between the groups that matters to subjects."[11] On the other hand, the need to be fair " . . . has always also had a significant effect, mitigating favoritism. What has not appeared is generosity to the out-group."[12]

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL PURPOSE OF IDENTITY

The psychological function of identity, evidently, is that, under most circumstances, it allows one to maintain a favorable *self image*. *Self image* is a compound of one's personal identity and one's many social identities.

Tajfel's theory of social identity says you can improve self image by boosting *either* personal or social identity. In-group pride is the profit one gets from ethnocentrism. It " . . . is good for the individual pride of all the persons whose culture is being affirmed."[13] In experiments where people are assigned at random to different groups, it has been found that merely expressing preference for one's new in-group over an alternative out-group *automatically* boosts people's self-esteem. "Positive social identities influence self-esteem, . . . and that is about all there is to say about them."[14]

INDIVIDUAL IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT

In *Identity and the Life Cycle*, Erikson quotes Freud's long held view (1914 and 1938) that the superego is forced on the child by the influence of criticism, first by parents and later on by educators, "milieu" and "public opinion": "Surrounded by such mighty disapproval, the child's original state of naive self-love is said to be compromised. He looks for models by which to measure himself, and seeks happiness in trying to resemble them. Where he succeeds he achieves *self-esteem*."[15] " . . . what is operation (in the superego) is not only the personal qualities of these parents but also everything that produced a determining effect upon themselves, the tastes and standards of the social class in which they live and the characteristics and

---

8. *Ibid.*, p. 544.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 546.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 548.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 550.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 548.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 551.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 560.
15. *Erikson*, 1974, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

traditions of the race from which they spring."[16]

Erikson summarizes: "Child training . . . is the method by which a group's basic ways of organizing experience (its group identity, as we called it) is transmitted . . . The growing child must derive a vitalizing sense of reality from the awarness that his individual way of mastering experience . . . is a successful variant of a group identity and is in accord with its space-time and life plan."[17]

To summarize the psychology of identity, as it can be understood from Brown's social psychology and Erikson's individual development: Personal identity is the sense of self as an individual and as part of a group interdependently. It originates in the primitive need everyone has for a positive self-image, that is, the need to see ourselves in a favorable light. The most important source of such self approval is the feeling that we belong to a group which has admirable characteristics. That feeling almost inevitably develops as a result of mere membership in any group.

The sense of identity is transmitted to children initially by their parents, who teach them by approving children's efforts to imitate the roles which parents model and by disapproving children's failure to comply. Parental influences are themselves chiefly derived from the standards of the large social group to which parents belong, so the assimilation of these standards seems natural to everyone. The family of early childhood, moreover, is a small replica of the larger social organization in important ways. It is the primary in-group of most children, and the place where they learn that they are favored creatures by virtue of the mere fact of belonging to "our crowd" rather than "theirs." But there are many other agencies of identity formation as well: school and community, information media and street experience, also play their roles in identity formation, directly and indirectly, by instruction, by role modeling, by increasing children's awareness of what there is to want and *who one must be* to get it, and doubtless by other means as well. And identity formation continues well into adolescence, if not throughout the life cycle.

Neither of the last two phenomena is well understood. Among the "other agencies" of identity formation, schooling especially has *not* been studied in this connection, though the importance both of direct instruction and of "school culture" in identity development is commonly assumed. The developmental nature of identity is likewise assumed more than it is studied. Tajfel's theory, however, and all the research supporting in-group feeling as the basis of identity, is not developmental at all. It says nothing of when in-group feeling appears during development nor when and how it is amenable to education and change. Both questions must be addressed to understand fully the relation of identity to schooling.

JEWISH IDENTITY

Jewish identity is one of several social identities of Jewish people (American, Israeli, professional, etc. are others). It is interesting scientifically because it involves both religious and ethnic characteristics conspicuously, and sometimes conflictfully, more than some other social identities do. Simon Herman, for instance, takes the controversial position that: "The Jewishness of even nonreligious Jews cannot be completely divorced from its religious associations. Although the term is used as a matter of convenience, there is strictly speaking, no 'secular' Jewishness."[18]

---

16. *Ibid.*, p. 20.

17. Erik H. Erikson, *Identity and the Life Cycle.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company Inc., 1980, pp. 20–21.

18. Simon N. Herman, *Jewish Identity: A Social Psychological Perspective.* Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1977.

Jewish identity is especially interesting to Jews because, in both their religious and ethnic roles, Jews are an intensely social and ethnocentric people who tend to feel that group preservation is a vital condition of a satisfactory life. Jewish religious tradition is group centered in many of its most important rituals, first in the family, then in the synagogue and community. It has always been this way. As an ethnic group, moreover, even when religious interests are not involved, Jews are well known to seek the company of other Jews, and to want their children to marry other Jews and be part of the Jewish community.[19]

The goal of much interest in Jewish identity today is promoting Jewish communal survival—through involvement in Jewish community life; immersion in Jewish culture and religion; affiliation (identification) with the State of Israel and the Jewish people around the world; reducing intermarriage; and transmitting Jewish attitudes, value, and practices across generations. These specifics speak to the quality of Jewish life, of course, as well as to community survival per se. Their roles as instruments specifically of community survival, however, while always important, have emerged even more sharply since the 1950s, when the Jewish community was concerned more with "integration" than with "survival."[20]

RESEARCH ON JEWISH IDENTITY

Most research on Jewish identity has addressed sociological topics, such as the relation of ritual observance and communal involvement to Jewish ingroup marriage, divorce and education; informal social ties with other Jews (friends, neighbors, mates); attitudes toward Israel; doctrinal belief; or charity giving. Most of them through 1981 have been well and critically summarized by Harold Himmelfarb.[21] Less research has been devoted to the *psychology* of Jewish identity than to Jewish affiliation or involvement. So, there has been little study of Jewish families, of child rearing, or of other topics which directly address identity.

Religious Denomination and Ritual Observance: In general, identifying oneself as Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, etc., seems to be the best overall indicator of Jewish identification, that is, with participation in Jewish religious and communal life.[22]

Almost all measures of Jewish ritual observance, however, decline as the population moves farther from the immigrant generation,[23] though some conflicting evidence suggests a reversal back in the direction of increased observance by the third or fourth post-immigration generation.[24] Exceptions to the pattern of declining observance occur for certain home rituals if:

1. it is the kind of ritual that can be redefined in modern terms;

2. it does not demand social isolation from gentiles or the adoption of a unique life style;

3. it accords with the religious culture of the general community and provides a "Jewish" alternative when one seems to be needed;

4. it is centered on the child; and

19. Sidney Goldstein and Calvin Goldscheider, - *Jewish Americans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

20. Harold S. Himmelfarb, "Research on American Jewish Identity and Identification: Progress, Pitfalls, and Prospects," in Marshall Sklare, (Ed), *Understanding American Jewry*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books, Rutgers, 1982.

21. *Ibid.*

22. *Ibid.*, p. 72.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 73.

24. Silberman, Charles E., *A Certain People* (New York: Summit Books, 1985).

5. it is performed annually or infrequently.[25]

Community: as common sense would argue, the community in which one lives affects Jewish identity in several ways. There is more intermarriage in communities where Jews are a smaller part of the population,[26] especially in the Midwest and South.[27] Jews in smaller communities are more likely to join synagogues and voluntary organizations, and Jews living in the Midwest are most likely to attend synagogues and observe the Sabbath and holidays.[28]

Life cycle: Marriage and children tend to involve people more in Jewish life. Jewish identity in adults tends to reach a peak between ages forty and sixty, with the main peak for adults around the time their children are Bar and Bat Mitzvah.[29] The life cycle effect is more dramatic for the young, single and childless, a combination of which produces very low levels of religious involvement. Those young and married, but without children and middle-aged single, without children, also have fairly low levels of Jewish identification. Life cycle phases will probably appear more important as trends toward remaining single, postponing marriage, and having fewer children increase.[30]

Defense: Jewish identity increases when Jews are attacked. The Holocaust, wars in Israel, the Munich massacre, Soviet Jews, Ethiopian Jews, United Nations resolu-

tions that Zionism is racism, and other anti-Semitic events, all have the same effect as Kurt Lewin put it, of creating in Jews a sense of group belongingness based on an "interdependence of fate." There is little evidence that such effects last, however. There is no documentation to show, for instance, that involvement other than contributions increased after each of Israel's wars. No one knows how long their impact lasted.[31]

Family Influences: The role of family dynamics in identity formation must be vital. If identity is a function of perceptions of one's "in-group" vis-a-vis the rest of the world, the family is the primary in-group for almost everyone. In the case of Jewish identity, family studies are also important because the family is the primary conveyor of Jewish religion.

One of the most consistent findings is that of the positive relationship between one's own Jewish identification and that of one's parents.[32] Parental influence is both direct and indirect. Parents directly and deliberately transmit values. Parents indirectly affect adult identity by channeling children into environments where identity is formed, such as schools.[33]

The highest rates of intermarriage are from homes with doubtful or mixed feelings of Jewishness rather than lack of Jewish feeling.[34] Apostasy in college students is correlated with poor parent-child relationships.[35] Perceived parental support and control, on the other hand,

---

25. Marshall Sklare and Joseph Greenbaum, *Jewish Identity and the Suburban Frontier.* New York: Basic Books, 1967, p. 57.

26. Rosenthal, Erich, "Studies of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States," *American Jewish Yearbook 64* (1863): 3–53.

27. Bernard Lazerwitz, "Christian-Jewish Marriages and Conversions," *Jewish Social Studies* (1979).

28. Bernard Lazerwitz, "The Community Variable in Jewish Identification," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 16 (December 1977a), pp. 361–69.

29. Sklare and Greenbaum, *op. cit.*

30. Himmelfarb, 1982, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

31. *Ibid.*, p. 76.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 77.

33. Himmelfarb, Harold S., "The Impact of Religious Schooling: The Effects of Jewish Education on Adult Religious Involvement." (Ph.D. diss, University of Chicago, 1974).

34. Fred Massarik and Alvin Chenkin, "Explorations in Intermarriage," *American Jewish Yearbook 1973*, pp. 292–306.

35. David Caplovitz and Fred Sherrow, *The Religious Drop Outs: Apostasy among College Graduates.* Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage, 1977.

are related to adolescent religiosity.[36]

Little is known about parental socialization methods and about the qualities of family life that promote identification.[37] The relationship of home environment and Jewish identification is unstudied, as is parental absence due to divorce or maternal employment.[38] But it is likely that the latter places a heavier burden on the schools.

Spouse: Some studies have shown a substantial impact of one's spouse on adult Jewish identification.[39] Spouse's ritual observance before marriage is the best single predictor of most types of adult Jewish identity. It also found that spouses create substantial "conversion" effects, changing a person from the way he (more than she) was raised and schooled.[40] Women are a little more likely to influence their husband's religiosity than vice versa. This is important in survival terms because most intermarriages (about 2/3) are of Jewish men to non-Jewish women. Intermarriage may heighten Jewish identification, however, in families where the spouse converts.[41]

Peer influence: Peer influence has an important impact on Jewish identity. Where peer and parental influences are contradictory, peers are often more influential.[42] Adolescent peers are important religious influences on both the younger and older generations of adult Jewish men studied. One study, however, found parents to be more influential than peers.[43]

Most research on people who change religions shows that they are lonely, sometimes on drugs, or seeking self-definition in some way. If they find friends among religious groups, they are likely to adopt their norms.[44]

JEWISH SCHOOLS, CURRICULA AND IDENTITY TRAINING

The impact of schools on identity has been studied to some extent. Years of Jewish schooling have increased with each generation since immigration, but the amount of time spent in classrooms has decreased.[45] Numerous studies have shown that there is a low to moderate correlation between amount of Jewish schooling and adult Jewish identity, even when parental and other inputs are controlled for.[46] Schooling may have greatest impact on those from very religious homes, but the evidence is mixed.[47]

The number of hours of Jewish schooling does not have a clear effect on adult identity.[48] There is a minimum threshold below which Jewish schooling does not

36. Andrew J. Weigert and Darwin L. Thomas, "Parental Support, Control and Adolescent Religiosity: An Extension of Previous Research," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* II (December 1972), pp. 389–93.

37. Himmelfarb, 1982, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

38. Harold S. Himmelfarb, "Fertility Trends and Their Effects on Jewish Education." In *Zero Population Growth and the Jewish Community: A Symposium*, Analysis no. 60. Washington D.C.: Institute for Jewish Policy Planning and Research of the Synagogue Council of America, November-December, 1976.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 79.

40. Harold S. Himmelfarb, "The Interaction Effects of Parents, Spouse and Schooling: Comparing the Impact of Jewish and Catholic Schools, *Sociological Quarterly* 18 (Autumn 1977): pp. 464–77.

41. Himmelfarb, 1982, *op. cit.*, p. 79

42. Bernard C. Rosen, *Adolescence and Religion.* Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1965.

43. Arnold Dashefsky and Howard Shapiro, *Ethnic Identification Among American Jews: Socialization and Social Structure.* Lexington, Mass.: Lexington, 1974.

44. Himmelfarb, 1982, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

45. Geoffrey E. Bock, "The Jewish Schooling of American Jews: A Study of Non-Cognitive Educational Effects" (Ph.D. diss.). Cambridge: Harvard University, 1976.

46. Himmelfarb, 1982, *op. cit.*

47. Steven Cohen, "The Impact of Jewish Education on Religious Identification and Practice," *Jewish Social Studies* 36 (July-October 1974). pp. 316–26; and Himmelfarb, 1977, *op. cit.*

48. Himmelfarb, 1982, *op. cit.* p. 79.

have any effect on adult Jewish identity (1,000 hours in one study[49] and 3,000 in another[50]), and there are plateaus beyond which additional schooling has no impact.[51] Different schools affect different aspects of Jewish identity differently, and no controlled study shows that any one approach to Jewish instruction is more effective than another.[52] (Ibid, p.79).

Other settings for Religious Socialization: The Jewish community sponsors several alternatives to formal Jewish education: youth groups, summer camps, trips to Israel and, more recently, weekend retreats. Some such programs show positive short-run effects, and there are many favorable participant accounts.[53] But assessment of the impact of Ramah Camps on teenage religious behavior of Conservative Hebrew high school students in New York and Los Angeles shows that family religious background and location have a greater impact than Jewish camp experience. Ramah camps showed slightly more impact than other camps. Jewish behavior learned in camp is not carried over to the city unless the city environment reinforces it.[54]

PROBLEM OF JEWISH SCHOOLS WITH IDENTITY TRAINING

Modern Jewish educators are in a peculiar position with respect to identity training: They know it is important. They want sensibly to promote it in their work. But they are not quite certain either what identity is or how the curricula of the schools are supposed to boost it. They are entitled to some confusion — the responsibility for identity training has never before fallen so heavily on Jewish schools. It has always been managed chiefly via family, synagogue and community, where it was traditionally implemented without having to be defined and studied. Today, however, though it is plain to everyone that those beleaguered agencies are faltering in this role, still there has been no clear and explicit mandate from Jewish community leaders assigning identity training to schools.

By default, today's Jewish school, whether afternoon, Sunday, or day school, carries a bigger proportion of the burden of Jewish identity training than in the past. Physical mobility, the decentralization of Jewish residency, and the fragility of Jewish family life, among other things, have weakened the ability of traditional family, synagogue, and community centers to play the forceful roles they once did. But schools have not been told how to shoulder this burden or even, for that matter, that the promotion of identity is one of their major responsibilities.

Among Jews and non-Jews alike, traditional responsibility for identity training, as for most character education, has fallen on family and community, with schools in the role of support, reinforcement and refinement of the skills of intellect and wit which are needed to support character development.[55] In Jewish culture, the chief responsibility of schools used to be almost entirely that of providing the tools of literacy which underlie the fullest participation in Jewish religious life.

It was only reasonable, therefore, for

49. Bock, *op. cit.*

50. Harold S. Himmelfarb and R. Michael Loar, "National Trends in Jewish Ethnicity: A Test of the Polarization Hypothesis." Paper presented at colloquim on Jewish Population Movements. (Ramat Gan, Israel: Bar Ilan University, June 1979).

51. Himmelfarb, 1982, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

52. *Ibid.*

53. *Ibid.*, p. 80.

54. Sheldon Arthur Dorph, "A Model for Jewish Education in America: Guidelines for Restructuring of Conservative Congregational Education" (Ph.D. diss.). New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1976.

55. Perry London, "Character Education and Clinical Intervention: A Paradigm Shift for U.S. Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan* (May 1987). pp. 667–674.

the traditional Jewish school curriculum to concentrate, as it always has, on technical literacy and training in classical Jewish texts. The main business of Jewish schooling, on the whole, has been training children in the intellectual activities which are central to "Jewish living." The assumption they worked on, if any, was that the practice would follow from the knowledge. Even school exercises in prayer, Passover seders, and the like, have been rationalized as much for their effects on children's "knowledge" of these rituals and the texts involved as for the emotional or sentimental "identification" they produce. In modern America, such an essentially intellectualist attitude no longer serves the needs of most Jewish children because the base of group identity which must underlie it is weak. Teaching of texts, in this connection, may fall on deaf ears because the underlying support systems are no longer providing the *Jewish identity* which would ordinarily come outside the school and make Jewish schooling meaningful. The family is likely to be fragmented or ignorant of Jewish things or indifferent to them, or all the above. The community is physically diffuse and provides highly effective competition with Jewish interests. And the school, even when it has financial and personnel resources, does not have the time to capture the hearts and minds of children.

The ideal of the Jewish school as chiefly (and sufficiently) a literacy training center is based on the half inchoate myth of the East European shtetl as a well integrated, mutually supportive Jewish community, steeped in religious and cultural traditions lovingly transmitted across generations through the benign practices of stable families and homogeneous neighbors. It is an idyll of *Fiddler on the Roof* with *aleph bet*.

We may reasonably doubt whether Jewish family or community organization was ever so idyllic or so effective as the myth suggests. But we may be certain that the difficult conditions in which most Jews lived, lacking much knowledge of the outside world or access to it, made it unnecessary to cram formal Jewish education into the cracks of a busy and seductive life style, let alone to define or separate concepts like literacy and identity or the intellectual and affective aspects of education. With bodies largely captive, hearts and minds went largely unexamined.

But in the competition for attention, interest and commitment that makes up the world in which American Jewish children grow up today, capturing hearts and minds is exactly what identity is all about. In its affective aspects, identity has to be modelled and motivated. It cannot be ordered, drilled, or even habituated. It arises by incentive and inspiration, not by mere exposure. Indeed, it is a quality first of the heart, and only then of the mind.

Jewish schools tend to get children after their early identities are formed, to lose them before adolescence, and to have too little time with them in between. That they can accomplish anything, under the circumstances, sometimes seems miraculous.

But if they are to undertake seriously the responsibility for promoting identity, then they must consider the need for a new "curricular vision," so to speak, of how to interlock inspiration and emotional appeal with the intellectual contents they wish to teach. Doing this cannot be easy because it requires clinical and social-psychological, if not entertainment skills that educators have not previously had to study or exploit. In addition, the realistic constraints of time and resources create the risk that, where identity training and literacy training do not overlap, they may compete for priority in the school curriculum. In such a situation, some schools may decide that, for their children, identity training takes priority on the grounds that literacy training cannot succeed without it. Whether synagogue and school boards, facing the same situation, will come to the same conclusion is another question. Some parents, desperately concerned about their children's future as Jews, already have

reached that conclusion, sometimes begging educators to "make them happy Jews, not scholars."

The objectives of identity training, in any case, are clear. The task of promoting it, however, is difficult and complicated by the demands of literacy training, but it is not impossible. Perhaps there are lessons to be learned from other religious or ethnic subgroups of American or other open societies which face the same problem. Perhaps we must invent our own devices entirely. If this mission is to be done, in any case, it may take such a vision to do it.