

From: Joshua Glucoft
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2019 10:22 PM
To: Ethnic Studies Kenneth McDonald
Subject: Public Input Regarding 2020 Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum

Hello,

I've reviewed Chapters 1-4 of the Draft 2020 Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum, and I'm writing to question whether the materials fairly represent the difficult situation in Israel and the general position of the Jewish people.

The Glossary is a case in point. The definition of "BDS" alleges that Israel is not complying with "international law," but it does not state which international laws Israel is allegedly violating. The definition further suggests that Palestinians are living under "apartheid conditions," but it does not explain what South African apartheid was nor how the current situation in Israel/Palestine is allegedly similar. And the definition also suggests that BDS seeks to "hold Israel accountable for its actions," but it does not state exactly what "actions" need to be redressed. There is nothing wrong per se with defining BDS in the glossary, but the description does not provide nearly enough context to allow students to make informed decisions for themselves about whether the factual and ideological underpinnings of BDS are justified.

It is difficult not to construe the Glossary's definition of BDS as lopsided when the Glossary does not define anti-Semitism but does define so many other related terms, including homophobia, transphobia, xenophobia, and Islamophobia. Why is anti-Semitism any less worthy of the spotlight than these other terms?

I support the spirit of the course, but as it currently stands, I think there are some issues that need to be further worked out. There are two sides to (almost) every story, and as these materials currently stand, only one is being told with respect to Israel/Palestine and the Jewish people.

Regards,
Joshua Glucoft