

Re: Public comment on the Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum

In the introductory news release article that accompanied the Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum Draft (hereinafter “ESMC Draft”), I noted that State Superintendent Tony Thurmond made the statement: “There was never any intent from the authors to articulate the draft in ways that would be offensive.”

While there may not be “intent” to be offensive, the drafter’s actions and the ideology presented in the ESMC are nevertheless extremely offensive and are an aggressive, unrestricted and unabashed overrun of religious and philosophical views that contradict conservative principles, as well as any ideology other than the progressive, social-justice ideology.

In reviewing the 300 page sample Course Model, the terminology utilized therein, and the terminology defined in the glossary, I find both the tone and the presentation of the subject matter -- along with the mandatory imposition of this course upon high school seniors in order to graduate -- offensive in numerous ways.

There are many ways that the subject matter of ethnic studies could be presented, but the ESMC Draft clearly presents the subject from a partisan viewpoint with the goal to indoctrinate the student to that viewpoint. The ESMC is replete with examples of the following: identity politics; repeated attempts to promote racism through its denigration based upon focusing on the color of skin (white privilege) with repeated active exercises designed to shame white students; oversteps and slanted and biased ideology.

A simple skim review of the glossary alone evidences word usage that exposes this draft as a manifesto for the “progressive” viewpoint that it is.

And the presentation of ideas within the ESMC Draft further proclaims and propagates this one-sided, partisan viewpoint. For example, (one of many such examples), where biased opinion is presented as fact, is the denouncement of capitalism by couching it with white supremacy and patriarchy (on Page 4 in the Guiding Principles section in the ESMC Draft). I don’t see any mention of the fact that capitalism has done more to raise people out of poverty than any other ideology in world history. So, one-sided ideology?

Neither the drafters of the ESMC nor anyone else for that matter should be allowed a free pass to throw the white supremacists comment out when it is only a miniscule percentage of a large group and to then use the accusation as a shaming tool to silence a group based upon the color of their skin. That is a textbook example of racism, which can be easily seen if one were to substitute another color of skin in place of “white”.

Another example is the topic of the disenfranchisement of the right to vote. But a citizen already has the right to vote which cannot be prohibited: if talking about an identification requirement to ensure that only citizens are voting (especially considering recent circumstances where more votes were cast in a county than the total number of registered voters), voting is just as, if not more, important than buying alcohol. So, what would the teacher, the person of authority over the student, be presenting about disenfranchisement of the right to vote?

It would be one thing to offer this course to a student as an elective if they made a voluntary choice to take it. It is quite another thing to indoctrinate this one-sided viewpoint upon every student without providing them – or their parents -- the option to abstain from taking this course.

Since tax-dollars are being utilized for this course and its inclusion would imply that it has the imprimatur of the State's approval, you have a duty and an obligation to be neutral and representative of all views and not indoctrinating your one-sided view. My Suggestions: (a) provide a responsible and neutral approach that provides both viewpoints which includes necessary relevant, pertinent and facts – without omission or misrepresentation; (b) mandate a sister course presented from a partisan conservative viewpoint to be taken commensurately with this course, or (c) provide the right for school choice so that parents/students can avoid this indoctrination if so desired.

Sincerely,

Bradon Bodnar

cc: One America News

American Conservative Union

Christian Coalition of California

Ben Shapiro

Michael Knowles

Andrew Klavan