

Dear truth about IB,

From the perspective of a Cambridge student, IBers are really getting more and more judgemental every year. I loved the site's analyzation about the connotation of the word, "rigorous", the most used word in IB's marketing campaigns. I would appreciate it if you could also take a stand on the concepts of "education" and "globalization" on the site, and I mean no pressure in that, as I know the site is busy and has a lot of things to do-but just if you have some time to kill, you know. IBers are really pressing it on others that if you're not a "global citizen", do not do "community service", or do not study a second language in this "global age", or do not take a "broad range of subjects" or are not "well-rounded", you don't have a proper "education". Like last time, I give permission for (though neither would I ask truthaboutib to do so) any of my comments are posted on your website. It is an honour to defend the rest of the world against IB's philosophical belligerency.

As far as I'm concerned, there is no philosopher, in the history of the study of ethics, who ever dared proclaim that to be ethical or intellectual, one has to be a global citizen-(in fact I am filled with skepticism as to whether such a term even existed before the adoption of IB). Firstly there is the fact there couldn't be such a thing by definition. One could have an interest in other cultures (although I don't see why even that is academically mandatory in IB, and why an interest in culture and globalization exceeds the need for an interest in philosophy, art, music or any other academic discipline, and as far as I'm concerned cultural studies and strategic policy studies only constitute a tiny range of university degrees.), but citizens have rights, priveleges, and responsibilities. I couldn't just do IB and expect to run to US without being labelled as an illegal immigrant, then press the excuse that I'm a "world citizen" so US has to accept me. That is a ridiculous assumption to begin with.

The second problem is the compulsory study of a second language. IBers seem to implicitly demand that just because that we have airplanes and electromagnetic railways in this era, and ships to travel across oceans, that it is crucial, for personal convenience, to study a second language. The unjustified deduction from that is that just because travel has become easier, the rates of long-term settlement requiring 2nd language capabilities will rise in the same proportion, which is a dishonest lie to say the least. The IBers ignore the fact that 80% of people (in fact probably far more) still reside in their own nations unless for short holidays, and that you can survive in nearly the whole EU just by speaking English-though with some inconvenience. And in light of this fact, 100% of IBers are forced to study a second language for the sake of, at most, 15% or so who will ever come to need it. In addition to that, it is common for schools to let disabled kids off PE, and there would probably be public uproar if the schools didn't, but conversely, I don't see why cruel IB is justified in not letting dyslexics off second languages. Presumably because, as many IB proponents say, "you don't have to be in IB". That is partially true, in the case of NZ and UK, where there are few IB schools, and the ones that are, are not prescribed to a public school zone. But that is not the same for USA

The third problem is IB's ethical dilemma, not of community service, but of forced community service in the name of "contribution to society", interpreted by me as some UN propaganda that somehow every one of us is indebted to the rest of society. If Cambridge students had been forced into community service, we would have filed cases to the Human Rights Commission already. IB's community service guidelines specify an approximated 3 hours a week for this, and this 3 hours, used by the poor to find jobs, could easily amount to a \$60 loss in labour worth per week, to community service. I am most upset with the IB notion that we are "indebted to society" for technology, culture, and contribution of certain individuals within society, and are thus obligated to pay them back. We are not. Culture is not a contribution an individual owes to the rest of the community around them. Culture is a way of life and a way of entertainment shaped in different extents, by everyone in every single era of history. Neither does an individual owe the rest of society because "society gave them technology". Advances in technology and the arts are funded by all of our taxes (dare I digress, that unfortunately in the US, IB is illegally funded by all of US citizens' taxes too) and thus no individual is indebted to the rest of society in that way. While there are individual benefactors in society who have given much wealth to society, whether intellectual or monetary, without expectation of one's gift being returned, neither does that obligate the rest of us to do the same. That is like saying if I put \$2 into a charity donation, everyone else is obligated to do the same. The final philosophical conundrum in IB's assumption that community service is justified because "we are indebted to society" is the foolish notion that, suppose A is indebted to B,C,D...and so on, and the same with B, C, and D, each letter representing an individual (with the rest of the letters representing the rest of society), and they are all indebted to each other, then a reasonable mind might be expected to ask, who is the receiver of all this debt, if each and everyone is indebted? Ultimately no one-which is why IB's assumption doesn't make sense. Again IBers will say "you don't have to go to IB schools" but it's not that easy. Some areas in some parts of the world simply have no other choices rather than IB schools per school zone, for the inhabitants of that area, unless one can afford private schools.

Being a Chinese, I was once subject to a cultural attack from an IBer, saying that "dumb Chinese like me" was why the great empire Maco Polo once described, fall to utter ruins because of "lack of appreciation of globalization" in the form that IB promotes. I gave him a prompt refutation about the difference between being the acceptable standard of not being interested in others' cultures, or not studying others' languages, to what China did in the 1800s Qing Dynasty, shutting down foreign research and closing in upon international trade, thus losing all the lucrative benefits of a free market economy and technology transfer. Of course, Britain eventually penetrated trade forcibly, in the Opium War, but the reason China lost that war was because of its previous disdain of international trade, which weakened it. Conversely, I told him, at China's worst, we have not worshipped UN as a deity like IB does, and we do not blindly promote the theory of anthropogenic global warming before the scientific debate is over, just for the sake of fitting in science with IB's UN indoctrination. Sure, it might be said that China does the same for Mao as IB does for the UN, but at least Mao saved China from the 8 nation alliance and the Japanese, and whatever bad economic policies he had, beat the exploitation of slave labour in the

warlord era of China which he overthrew with his own hand. What did UN do to be qualified with such intense worship from IB? Prevent wars? Really? Their organizational inefficiency means that their floorcleaners earn a lucrative wage, while just because there hasn't been a WW3, doesn't mean that proves the efficiency of the UN in promoting peace, if we consider the Korean War, Vietnam, Afghanistan, Iraq, Sino-Vietnam war, Invasion of Cambodia, Chiang Kai Shek's mass slaughter of natives in Taiwan.

Another notion of IB is that you have to take a massive range of subjects to be considered "educated". I have searched in many of the world's dictionaries and read many books on education, such as John Taylor Gatto's "Weapons of Mass Destruction". John Taylor Gatto says that although one may define for oneself the standards tangible standards in which to achieve "education", that varies from person to person and is subjective judgement and approximation at most. The dictionaries generalize education as intellectual accomplishment, sometimes followed by an emphasis on the development of fluid intelligence, But nowhere do I see any dictionary forcing "education" to include a set number, and set types, of subjects one must take to be an intellectual. If we take IB's idea that anyone who is not "well rounded" is not educated, America's founding fathers and the generation that followed had all been well known for homeschooling, and for much specialization at very early ages. Aristotle probably didn't know anything about science, nor could Socrates paint or speak two languages. If we take IB's definition of education as being "well rounded", then almost all great specialists in the ancient world would fail to qualify as educated, including Newton and Einstein, who were both no good at languages. Of course IBers would come back to the point that this is the "21st century" and somehow that makes it essential for people to learn all sorts of extra subjects to keep up with the "indisciplinary exchange" and "globalization". I have already dealt with the rates of travel and percentages of foreign settlement, but as for "interdisciplinary change", it is ludicrous that while the majority of us can still survive in this world perfectly with a single major in uni, IB says that we must take 6 subjects, a TOK course, forced community service, and a 3000 word thesis, again to indoctrinate us on the importance of "globalization" (although globalization plays a really minor role in the realm of diplomacy and strategic relations and ethics in the sense IB promotes it).

Of globalization, something that surprises me is that although IB may really ram it into students' head with the latest of wishy-washy religious propaganda, climate change propaganda, AID propaganda, propaganda against Christianity, propaganda against America, mother earth propaganda (somehow I deeply suspect it is related to New Age or Pantheism), IBers are really no better at what really matters in the age of "globalization"-they are no better at picking out the latest worldwide technological trends, diplomatic theories, economic opportunities for international trade, or the latest trends in design. IBers often justify their ideas by claiming it is the 21st century and we all need to "globalize" like them. Do we? This is not an age in which we have to actively travel to other nations to bring back technology, nor an age in which we purposefully ignore other nations' achievements-scholars cooperate internationally in universities, when one nation does something everyone else receives notice of it soon after, and new

art trends and diplomatic policies can easily be brought in and out of a nation by simple trade. Which leads to my alternative conclusion-globalization is pretty much an automatic process now, and much easier than it used to be-and we do not need IB to push for students to the point that they are tired nearly to death-(many near suicidal attempts heard in IB blogs) to recognize this illusive "IB dream", should I call it, of globalization.

In conclusion, and in a joke-like form that is not totally serious (just like the former section: Is IB A Cult-in case IB gives me death threats because I've heard you've got them before too), perhaps Christian conspiracists about New Agers' involvement in IB's tremendous growth despite its various forms of delusional propaganda, does make sense. After all, how else could the most controversial education system advance so rapidly in the world, had it not been the help of Satan and the Beast in the Book of Revelation, whose aim is to bring forth the one-world government that is prophecied to bring about the abomination of nations?

Simon Wang, Cambridge Student, New Zealand.

P.S. Thanks Mrs. McLoughlin. I am ever-grateful for last year's chance to defend Cambridge against IB on your site, and that piece has literally shut the mouths of many IBers in NZ who browsed upon it. I also want to say that I am enjoying the flexibility of Cambridge International Examinations very much. I and many of my friends, at 17 this year, made it into New Zealand universities with Cambridge qualifications, and are doing well despite having little to no study at high school, thanks to the straightforward nature of Cambridge exams, (which can be split into half A levels called AS levels) whereas the hard working IBers have to wait until they're 18 (unless they take the whole IB course a year earlier than most), because their IB diplomas won't be given until they've passed their 3HLs.

copyright © 2013 Truth About IB