5 Things Shlach Teaches Us About Imposter Syndrome



Your 18Forty Parsha Guide is a weekly newsletter exploring five major takeaways from the weekly parsha. Receive this newsletter every week in your inbox by subscribing here. Questions or feedback? Email Rivka Bennun Kay at Shabbosreads@18forty.org.

You have probably sat through a meeting where your title said you belonged and your stomach said otherwise, where the people around the table treated your opinion as though it carried weight and you spent the entire hour wondering when they would figure out it didn't. Psychologists call this imposter syndrome, the persistent inability to internalize your own competence, and the Torah has a case study in Parshat Shlach that maps the condition with uncomfortable precision.

The Jewish People ask Moshe to send scouts into Canaan before they enter the land. God consents, though Rashi on Bamidbar 13:2 reads the language of "*shlach lecha*," send for yourself, as a concession rather than a command, as though God were saying, "I already told you the land is good, but if you need to see for yourselves, go ahead." Moshe selects 12 tribal leaders for the mission, and when they return after 40 days, the verse that reveals the most about what happened to them is not a military assessment. "We were like grasshoppers in our own eyes," 10 of the 12 report in Bamidbar 13:33, "and so we were in their eyes."

The spies do not doubt God's power. They doubt themselves as the people God has chosen to carry out the mission, and that self-doubt is so total that it swallows the miracles they had witnessed and the promises they had received. Within hours the camp dissolves into weeping, a generation that stood at Sinai paralyzed at the border of the land they were told to enter. This parsha asks what happens when the gap between who God says you are and who you believe yourself to be becomes so wide that no amount of evidence can close it, and whether faith in God means anything at all if you cannot muster faith in the person God made you.

1. The Grasshopper Complex

The admission "we were like grasshoppers in our own eyes" is honest, because fear in the face of something that dwarfs you is a comprehensible human reaction. But the verse continues, "and so we were in their eyes," and here the ten spies cross from honest fear into something self-inflicted, claiming to know how the Canaanites perceived them without ever having spoken to any of those people. Two of the 12 scouts, Yehoshua and Calev, refuse to join this verdict, and the distance between their response and the majority will determine who enters the land and who dies in the desert.

The Kotzker Rebbe, a 19th-century Hasidic leader, zeroed in on why "and so we were in their eyes" matters more than the admission of fear that precedes it. Feeling small is not the sin. The sin is the certainty that the Canaanites share their self-assessment, because that certainty turned an internal experience of inadequacy into an external fact that no argument and no promise could dislodge. Once you decide that the world confirms your worst view of yourself, you lose the ability to hear anything that contradicts it, including a divine promise that the land is already yours.

Psychologists Pauline Rose Clance and Suzanne Imes identified this dynamic clinically in a 1978 study of high-achieving women who held every credential of competence and could not internalize any of it. Clance and Imes called this the imposter phenomenon, and its defining feature is identical to what the 10 spies did at the border of Canaan, where an internal conviction of inadequacy gets projected outward until the entire environment appears to confirm what was never more than a feeling.

The spies may have seen real challenges in Canaan, but the text gives us only their perception, and the verse the Torah preserves is not a strategic evaluation of enemy strength. What separates the 10 spies' response from ordinary fear is that God had already promised the Israelites this land, and that promise did not depend on their military readiness. Yehoshua and Calev demonstrate what faith strong enough to hold that promise looks like in practice. They walked the same land, saw the same inhabitants, and returned with a different report, because their trust in God's word kept their fear from becoming everything they could see.

Dovid Bashevkin explores this struggle as the distance between who God says you are and who you believe yourself to be. Yehoshua and Calev bridge that distance through faith, but the 10 spies' self-doubt fills the frame until God's promise disappears behind it. When those 10 deliver their grasshopper verdict, the people hear their leaders announce that the nation was not equal to the task God had set for it. Everyone aged 20 and older, except Yehoshua and Calev, would die in the desert without entering the land.

2. The Contagion

The collapse happened overnight. Bamidbar 14:1 records that the entire community raised their voices and wept that night, a transition from scouting report to national grief so fast that no one weighed the spies' assessment against two years of miracles they had witnessed firsthand. Ramban explains why the response was so immediate, reading their strategy as deliberate: Rather than delivering the report to Moshe and waiting for the leadership to process it, the spies went directly into the camp, moving tent to tent in his account, pressing their version of events into the ears of families who had no access to a counter-narrative and no reason to doubt men their own leader had selected for the mission.

That strategy exploited something about how fear travels between people. Psychologists Elaine Hatfield, John Cacioppo, and Richard Rapson spent years studying what they called emotional contagion, the process by which your nervous system absorbs someone else's emotional state through vocal tone, facial expression, and proximity before your conscious mind has evaluated whether the emotion is warranted. A person standing in your tent trembling with fear that your children will die does not need to construct a persuasive argument, because the fear itself crosses the gap between their body and yours without passing through rational evaluation.

The obvious question is how a people who stood at Sinai and walked through a split sea could be undone by a scouting report. The body's threat response operates on what is directly in front of you, and what was in front of every family that night was a trusted leader shaking with dread. Rabbi Shais Taub discussed how the pain of masking your real vulnerabilities radiates outward in ways you cannot control, and the 10 spies had been carrying a role they did not believe they deserved since the day Moshe chose them. When the mask broke, what came through was raw inadequacy, and a camp full of people absorbed it the way Hatfield's research predicts, through proximity, before faith had time to intervene. Yehoshua and Calev's faith gave them immunity, but the rest of the nation had no comparable anchor, and by morning the grief had hardened into a collective demand to abandon the mission entirely.

3. The Strategy of Interruption

Before that demand becomes irreversible, Calev attempts something the text nearly buries in a single verse. Bamidbar 13:30 records that Calev "hushed the people toward Moshe" and declared, "We shall surely ascend and take possession of it, for we can indeed do it." The verse sounds like a straightforward display of courage. The Talmud in Sotah 35a preserves a tradition that Calev does something more calculated. He begins by appearing to join the crowd's grievance against Moshe, calling out something to the effect of "Is this all that the son of Amram has done to us?" The listeners, expecting another attack on their leader, fall silent to hear what comes next, and only then does Calev pivot, declaring that Moshe split the sea and brought the manna and that the land was within their reach. Calev gains their attention by meeting them inside their anger before redirecting it. The move depends on understanding that people locked in collective panic cannot process a counter-argument delivered from outside the emotional frame they already occupy.

That insight anticipates what psychologist Aaron T. Beck would formalize 25 centuries later in *Cognitive Therapy and the Emotional Disorders*. Beck's foundational observation is that catastrophic thinking operates as a closed cycle, where the anxious thought generates a feeling that reinforces itself until the person loses access to any other interpretation of reality. The effective therapeutic response is to interrupt that cycle, opening a momentary gap in which the person can consider an alternative. Calev's feigned agreement is precisely this kind of disruption, breaking the seal of the panic long enough to insert a competing conclusion that includes the same God, the same Moshe, and the same evidence the people had been ignoring since the spies returned.

Disruption, though, is only half the work. A person whose catastrophic thinking has been momentarily interrupted still has to choose to step into a different version of the story, and that choice demands tolerating the discomfort of becoming someone you are not yet. Agnes Callard explores this as the problem of aspiration, the process by which a person acquires new values by acting as though those values already matter and discovering, through the practice, that they do. The 10 spies could not aspire to be the people who conquered Canaan because their self-image as grasshoppers had foreclosed the possibility before they could test it. Calev and Yehoshua could aspire because their trust in God's promise gives them exactly the kind of provisional commitment Callard describes: a willingness to act on a future they believe in despite the fact that nothing in their present experience confirmed it.

The honest difficulty is that Calev's intervention fails. The crowd hears him, resume their weeping, and within hours demand new leadership to take them back to Egypt. A strategy so psychologically sophisticated still breaks against a fear that already spread past the reach of rational engagement. Cognitive reframing, Beck's work shows, depends on the person wanting the alternative conclusion to be true. Calev has that want because he trusts God's promise before he ever opens his mouth. The crowd has no equivalent anchor, and without one, even a perfectly executed intervention could not reach people who already decided they were grasshoppers and sealed that verdict against revision.

4. The Seduction of Familiar Pain

The crowd's response moves in a direction that makes no rational sense unless you account for the psychology of trauma. Bamidbar 14:3-4 records that the people do not simply refuse to enter the land. They propose appointing a new leader to take them back to Egypt, the place where their children had been killed and their bodies had been property. A people who had watched God break the most powerful empire on earth to free them now ask to return to the house of slavery. The request follows a recognizable psychological pattern if you read it as the response of people who trust the pain they knew more than the freedom they do not.

Ibn Ezra identifies this dynamic long before modern psychology gave it a name. Writing about why the generation that left Egypt could not fight the Canaanites, Ibn Ezra argues that a person raised in subjugation develops a disposition of submission that does not disappear when the chains come off. The Israelites spent generations learning that survival means compliance and that initiative is punished. Freedom does not erase those reflexes. It only removes the external constraint while leaving the internal architecture of slavery intact, which is why a generation of free people could look at an open border and see only the risk of acting like free people.

NYU social psychologist John T. Jost has spent decades studying why people defend systems that harm them. In his 2018 paper "A Quarter Century of System Justification Theory," Jost documents a counterintuitive finding repeated across dozens of studies. People who benefit least from an existing order are often the most committed to preserving it, because the psychological cost of admitting the system was wrong exceeds the ongoing cost of living inside it. The Israelites at the border of Canaan face exactly this calculation. Entering the land means accepting that the slave identity they had carried for generations is no longer who they are, and grieving for every year spent inside a system that never deserved their loyalty. Going back to Egypt is the less painful option, because it does not require them to become someone new.

Rachel Yehuda has studied how trauma encodes itself not just in memory but in biology, reshaping stress responses across generations in ways the descendants experience as instinct rather than inheritance. Through Yehuda's research, the Israelites' reflexive retreat reads as something other than cowardice or failure of faith. It is the activation of survival responses calibrated to a life of slavery that had ended but whose imprint had not. The instincts that had kept their parents alive in Egypt now keep their children frozen at the threshold of a land that demands they act as free people. No amount of miracles could override programming that feels, to the people carrying it, like the voice of common sense telling them to go home.

5. Faith as Reclaimed Agency

Against that tide of inherited fear, Yehoshua and Calev tear their clothing and address the assembly one final time. Bamidbar 14:9 records their words: “Do not rebel against God, and do not fear the people of the land, for they are our bread. Their shade has departed from them, and God is with us. Do not fear them.” The people respond by threatening to stone them. What makes the appeal worth reading closely is not its effectiveness but its structure. Yehoshua and Calev’s speech makes two arguments in rapid succession, one about the obstacle in front of them and one about the God behind them. Understanding both is necessary to see why their faith holds while the rest of the nation’s collapses.

The first argument addresses the inhabitants of the land. The Torah uses “Canaan” as an umbrella term for all seven nations occupying the territory, including the Hittites, Amorites, Perizzites, and others, and the spies’ terror encompasses all of them. Ramban reads “their shade has departed from them” as a declaration that these nations’ time in the land had run out. God had promised the land to Avraham’s descendants and told Avraham explicitly that the conquest would be delayed because “the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet complete.” These nations had never held a covenant with God for possession of the land. They occupied territory promised to Israel, and their continued presence depended on a threshold of conduct that God had set. In Ramban’s reading, Yehooshua and Calev are declaring that the threshold had been crossed and the delay is over.

The second argument, “God is with us,” shifts from the condition of the enemy to the capacity of the Israelites, and this is where the speech connects to the self-doubt that had paralyzed the nation since the spies returned. Psychologist Albert Bandura’s foundational 1977 paper on self-efficacy argues that what determines whether a person attempts a difficult task is not their objective capability but their belief in their own capacity to succeed. The 10 spies may believe, abstractly, that God could deliver the land. What they lack is the belief that they are the people through whom God would do it. Yehoshua and Calev’s confidence comes from a different source than personal bravery. They believe they can act because God has chosen them to act, and God’s promise to Avraham is the ground they stand on.

Dara Horn explores a version of this argument through the lens of Jewish continuity, the insistence across centuries of persecution that Jewish life is worth continuing even when every external signal says otherwise. That insistence is not optimism and not denial. It is the decision to act as though the future you were promised is real, even when the present offers no confirmation. And it means letting that decision rather than the evidence dictate what you do next. Yehoshua and Calev make exactly that decision at the border of Canaan. The 10 spies saw the giants and concluded that the mission was impossible. Yehoshua and Calev saw the same giants and concluded that a nation living on borrowed time in a land promised to Avraham's descendants was not the obstacle the spies imagined. The difference between the two groups is whether they trust that God's covenantal promise applies to them personally, and whether that trust is strong enough to reorganize everything they see.

Questions for Reflection

1. **When have you projected your own sense of inadequacy onto how you assume others see you, and what would change if you treated that assumption as a feeling rather than a fact?**
2. **The Israelites preferred the familiarity of Egypt to the uncertainty of Canaan. What is the "Egypt" in your life, the situation you know is wrong but return to because the alternative demands becoming someone you are not yet?**
3. **Yehoshua and Calev's faith did not eliminate the giants or make the conquest easy. It gave them a reason to act despite everything they could see. When has trusting a commitment or a promise given you the capacity to move forward in a situation where the evidence alone would have stopped you?**

This project is made possible with support from the Simchat Torah Challenge and UJA-Federation of New York. Learn more about the Simchat Torah Challenge and get involved at their website.