

From: Sam Wineburg

Sent: Monday, August 12, 2019 8:06 PM

To: Ethnic Studies; Tom Adams; Nancy McTygue; Michelle Herczog

Subject: COMMENT, ETHNIC STUDIES FRAMEWORK

Dear Committee Members,

I write as the Executive Director of the Stanford History Education Group, the largest provider of free, inquiry-based curriculum in California. I write with grave concerns about the proposed Ethnic Studies framework.

I find the following characterization of the BDS movement disingenuous, one-sided, and unfair: **“a global social movement that currently aims to establish freedom for Palestinians living under apartheid conditions. Inspired by tactics employed during the South African anti-apartheid movement, the Palestinian-led movement calls for the boycott, divestment, and sanctioning of the Israeli government until it complies with International law.”**

The Framework's portrayal of BDS is only one of its many faces--the one that is most palatable to outsiders. It's more radical aspects require a few more clicks. But *do* click. Its other faces are easily found.

The movement has never unambiguously acknowledged *Israel's right to exist* as a sovereign state in the Middle East. For many in the BDS movement, the slogan from "The River to the Sea" means a single state from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea that would dissolve the Jewish homeland and effectively erase the State of Israel. That, too, is a core element of BDS.

The SHEG curriculum, which now has 9 million downloads, has succeeded by presenting multiple viewpoints on contentious issues. This is what history, ethnic studies and the social studies curriculum in total should be doing.

At present, the Ethnic Studies framework is one-sided and biased. If preserved as is, California students will be the losers.

Thank you for considering my remarks.

Respectfully submitted, Sam Wineburg
Margaret Jacks Professor of Education and History (by courtesy)
Stanford University