

Critical analysis of Professor LyuJingsheng of Renmin University of China's viewpoint that "Chinese publicists are collectively silent again in the face of the U.S. crackdown on anti-war activities on university campuses"

Wei Meng, Xiaoyin Zhang

^{1,2}*Dhurakij Pundit University, Thailand*

¹*Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, U.K.*

²*Fellow of the Royal Statistical Society, U.K.*

Corresponding Author: Xiaoyin Zhang

Date of Submission: 10-05-2024

Date of Acceptance: 20-05-2024

ABSTRACT: This article critically analyses Professor LyuJingsheng's views on the US crackdown on anti-war on university campuses and the silencing of Chinese publicists. Through in-depth analyses of the content of Professor Lyu's articles, combined with reports from authoritative Internet media, and consideration of relevant laws, cultural traditions and international relations, this paper assesses the logical soundness of Professor Lyu's views. It is found that Professor Lyu's viewpoints are logically flawed, including the lack of evidential support, insufficient consideration of different viewpoints and counter-arguments, logical self-contradiction, the lack of constructive suggestions, and the use of emotive language.

KEYWORDS: critical thinking, Russian-Ukrainian conflict, The question of Palestine

I. INTRODUCTION

In today's globalised world, international political dynamics and academic discussions are interacting more and more closely. Especially when it comes to sensitive international conflicts and geopolitical issues, the views and positions of scholars from different countries and cultures often become the focus of public discussion. Recently, an article by Professor LyuJingsheng, [1] "In the Face of US Crackdown on Anti-War on College Campuses Chinese Publicists Are Collectively

Silent Again!" triggered widespread attention and discussion. In his article, Professor Lu criticised the anti-war movement on US university campuses, the attitude of Chinese public intellectuals, and related international issues, and these points not only concern the logic of academic discussion, but also touch on the boundaries of freedom of speech and academic freedom.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this paper is to critically analyse Professor LyuJingsheng's views, assess their logical soundness, and explore the international issues involved. Through in-depth analyses of the contents of Professor Lyu's articles, combined with reports from authoritative Internet media, as well as consideration of relevant laws, cultural traditions and international relations, this paper adopts the methods of comparative analysis and logical discernment to critique Professor Lyu's views. The study finds that Professor Lyu's viewpoints are logically flawed, including the lack of evidentiary support, the failure to adequately consider different viewpoints and counter-arguments, logical self-contradiction, the lack of constructive suggestions, and the use of emotive language

III. ACCURACY AND AUTHORITY IN CHARACTERISING US UNIVERSITY PROTESTS

After an in-depth analysis of Professor LyuJingsheng's article published in WeChat on 29 April 2024, the author found that the claim that the United States suppresses university protest events lacks sufficient evidence to support it, and there are obvious discrepancies with the information the author has reviewed.

Firstly, the categorisation of protest events is very important. Is it anti-war or anti-Semitic? Was it a peaceful protest or an illegal encroachment on campus? Is it pro-Palestinian or pro-Hamas? Is the title of the article 'US cracks down on university protests' an objective judgement? Is the author's judgement that Chinese publicists 'who usually talk about freedom, democracy and the rule of law, can hardly find the moral high ground they have always had in the Hong Kong riots' objective?

1. The different focus of authoritative media

[2] According to a 29 April 2024 report in China News Weekly, the Occupy movement was co-organised by the Columbia University Apartheid Divestment Coalition (CUAD), Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP) and the 'Jewish Voice for Peace (JVP), to cut Columbia's financial ties with companies that "profit from Israeli apartheid, genocide, and the occupation of Palestine". The students promised to remain on the lawn until the university met their demands.

[3] According to a 24 April 2024 report in the Chinese edition of the Voice of America, some Jewish students at Columbia University say much of the criticism of Israel is anti-Semitic and makes them feel unsafe. U.S. President Joe Biden condemned the anti-Semitic protests, saying he has established a programme to deal with the issue. He also condemned those who do not understand what is currently happening to the Palestinians.

[4] The article also reported that 'the university refused to allow Shai Davidai, an assistant professor at the business school, to enter the school because he refused to comply with the university's policy on counter-protests and tried to hold a pro-Israel counter-protest on the occupied lawn. He repeatedly called the protesting students 'violent maniacs' and 'pro-Hamas terrorists' while also reporting objectively, 'Since the arrest, many student groups and Columbia University affiliated groups have issued statements condemning the university's arrest of the students, calling it a discriminatory enforcement of rules and a restriction of students' freedom of speech.'

[5] The term 'repression' has been interpreted in various ways. In the Ci Hai dictionary, it is defined as 'suppression'. However, in the European Multilingual Dictionary, it is defined as 'an act of power or authority to arrest individuals or to suppress people's ideas or communication'. This definition emphasises the emotional dimension of 'repression', i.e. the suppression of human rights. In the field of academic freedom, 'repression' is often used to describe the suppression of dissent or ideas. However, a distinction needs to be made between legitimate efforts to maintain campus safety and the violent suppression of free speech. Professor Lyu's article on 'repression' and 'suppression' is somewhat ambiguous, leaving the reader wondering whether 'repression' refers to legitimate efforts to maintain campus safety or the violent suppression of free speech. Free Speech. The lack of concrete examples and reliable sources only adds to the confusion.

In contrast, organisations such as the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), the National Coalition Against Censorship (NCAC), and the Foundation for Freedom in Education (FIRE) have been active in the defence of free speech and academic freedom, including anti-war activism.[6] The ACLU is particularly noteworthy for consistently defending the rights of students and faculty to participate in anti-war protests, stressing the First Amendment's protection of free speech. U.S. Secretary of State Antony Blinken stated, 'It is a hallmark of our democracy that our citizens have the right to express their views, concerns, and anger.' The United States has a long tradition of protecting individual liberties and promoting freedom of expression, which includes the right to criticise government policies, as evidenced by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the First Amendment, which respectively prohibit discrimination on the basis of multiple identities and guarantee freedom of expression. Blinken also criticised the students for their silence on Hamas. However, his statements reflect the methodology of materialistic dialectics, which is consistent with the basic principles of Marxist philosophy. While we cannot say that Blinken is a Marxist in this regard, his usage to analyse the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is interesting.

The concept of freedom of speech is often misunderstood, especially between the United States and China. While freedom of expression is fundamental to a democratic society, it does not mean that individuals can spread false information, spread rumours or create conflict without evidence. In fact, freedom of speech is not a licence granted

to people to spread stigmatisation or spread hate speech. In the case of the recent protests at Columbia University, it is important to distinguish between fact and fiction. The protests were sparked by the university's decision to invite a speaker who had made anti-Semitic remarks. While some students and faculty members criticised the University's decision, others saw it as a necessary step to promote free speech. In this context, freedom of expression is not absolute, but needs to be balanced with other values such as respect for others, tolerance and the protection of minority rights. In this context, it is important to distinguish between legitimate protests and hate speech. In this article, the author, Professor Lui King-shing, argues that the protests at Columbia University are part of the anti-Semitic movement in the United States. However, this argument is based on a misunderstanding of the concept of free speech and the nature of protests. The protests were not driven solely by the anti-Semitism movement, but by a desire for the university to determine and promote free speech.

Above all, freedom of expression is the foundation of a democratic society, but it must be exercised in a responsible and respectful manner. It is important to distinguish between fact and fiction and to take the challenge of freedom of expression seriously.

Academics have generated a heated debate on Professor LyuJingsheng's views. However, more detailed analyses have shown some logical errors in his arguments. The purpose of this critique is to provide constructive feedback to improve the quality of academic discussion.

Firstly, Professor LyuJingsheng's criticisms of China's public intellectuals are often superficial and fail to capture the complexity of this group. His assertion that Chinese intellectuals tend to be silent or defensive in the face of challenges in the West ignores those who are brave enough to speak out and actively criticise. For example, during the Hong Kong riots, many of our intellectuals were the first to condemn and criticise the riots through the authoritative media, so are we part of China's public intellectuals? Whether Prof LyuJingsheng expressed his position during the Hong Kong riots, we have not seen! What do you mean by the collective silence of China's public intellectuals? When was public knowledge as a neutral term made into a term with emotional overtones? This makes us wonder whether Prof LUI King-shing is using the topic to play on his claptrap, grabbing people's attention and generalising?

Secondly, Prof LyuJingsheng seems to have failed to provide sufficient factual basis when he made certain assertions. For example, his accusations of ignoring the tragedy in the Gaza Strip and exaggerating information about the disaster in the country lack concrete examples and thus appear insufficient. In fact, many Chinese intellectuals have a clear position on the conflict in the Gaza Strip, and their criticisms are not unwarranted.

Thirdly, in analysing the positions of Chinese intellectuals, Professor LyuJingsheng sometimes fails to adequately weigh different viewpoints and possible counter-arguments. The positions of Chinese intellectuals on Ukraine and Israel-Palestine that he points out fail to fully reflect the wide range of criticisms made by Chinese intellectuals, as well as the international political and historical factors behind them.

Fourthly, Professor LyuJingsheng's criticisms appear contradictory in some respects, and this contradiction may cause confusion among readers. The inconsistency of his position in criticising intellectuals for their silence on Western countries and demanding their neutrality in international affairs undermines the persuasiveness of his argument.

Fifth, although Professor LyuJingsheng's criticism reveals some shortcomings in the handling of international issues by Chinese public intellectuals, it lacks concrete suggestions for improvement. In addition, the criticisms in the article may be influenced by the author's own position, and this potential bias may affect the objectivity of the article.

Finally, the use of emotive language in the article, such as 'silent' and 'pretentious', may stir up the reader's emotions, but it may also overshadow the arguments based on facts and logic. The use of such language may influence the reader's rational judgement, making the persuasive power of the article depend on emotional resonance rather than solid arguments.

In summary, although Professor LyuJingsheng's views touch on some important issues, there are some potential problems with logic. In order to improve the quality of academic discussions, we need more comprehensive fact gathering, more objective analyses and finer arguments. Criticism should be constructive, not only pointing out problems but also suggesting ways to solve them. In this way, we can promote more in-depth and fruitful discussions in academia.

IV. A DISCUSSION OF THE NATURE OF THE RUSSO-UKRAINIAN WAR IN LYU JINGSHENG'S ARGUMENTS

[7] The conflict between Russia and Ukraine is a complex and sensitive issue that requires an in-depth understanding of various factors. From a legal perspective, the United Nations defines 'aggression' as 'the use of force by one State against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of another State'.

In the case of Ukraine, Russia's actions have been widely criticised as a violation of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity. The annexation of Crimea was widely recognised as a violation of Ukraine's sovereignty in 2014, and the conflict in eastern Ukraine has led to serious human rights problems and displacement. From a political perspective, Russia's behaviour was also seen as a threat to Ukraine's political independence. The presence of Russian troops in Eastern Ukraine has weakened Ukraine's ability to control its own territory, creating fear and uncertainty for Ukrainian citizens. From an international law perspective, Russia's actions have been widely criticised as a violation of the principles of the UN Charter. The use of force against another state is a violation of sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of another state.

In summary, the conflict between Russia and Ukraine is a complex and multifaceted issue that requires an in-depth understanding of various factors. We need to analyse this issue from a critical and multifaceted perspective, taking into account the positions of all interested parties.

V. IDENTIFYING THE PALESTINIAN STATEHOOD ISSUES IN THE ARGUMENTS OF LYU JINGSHENG

Let us start with a basic fact: Palestine, when the United Nations adopted resolution 181 in November 1947, planned to establish an Arab State and a Jewish State in the Palestinian areas. The area of the Arab State to be established in the Palestinian areas was 11,500 square kilometres. However, the Arab state could not be established due to the opposition of the majority of Arab countries to the resolution at the time. On 14 May 1948, the Jews declared the establishment of the State of Israel, and the following day, 15 May, the First Middle East War broke out, in which Israel occupied most of the territory of the Arab state as stipulated in the UN General Assembly Resolution 181. [8] On 5 June 1967, the Third Middle East War broke out, in which Israel occupied all the territories of the Arab states stipulated in UNGA

Resolution 181 and other Arab states' territories such as the Sinai Peninsula in Egypt and the Golan Heights in Syria. At the time the Israelis entered and declared the State of Israel, Palestine was not yet an independent state. And the Palestinian-Israeli war began not with Israel but with the Arab coalition, which was defeated. The complex form of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict today is rooted in the legacy of history.

We need to use the basic principles of historical materialism as a basis for analysis. The problem cannot be resolved in favour of Palestine, but rather within the framework of the United Nations. And the student movement itself can only cause disruption and destruction of the educational order in the host country. Columbia University with whom the business dealings are conducted in accordance with the law, in the absence of legal basis, it is difficult to obtain support for the students' claims, the legitimacy of the activities is questionable. As a student staying in the United States learning is the first priority, if your protest affects the normal teaching order of the university, then it is within reason to be cleared, the matter is not about freedom of speech, but the issue of disruption to the teaching order. This is similar in nature to the then Hong Kong riots in which Hong Kong university students took part in the riots.

Palestinian statehood is a complex and controversial issue that requires a deep understanding of various factors. The Palestinian people have a long history of struggle to achieve autonomy and independence. The establishment of a Palestinian State is a crucial step towards that goal. From a legal point of view, the Palestinian State has been recognised by many States and international organisations, including the United Nations. The Palestinian National Authority is recognised as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and is acknowledged as a sovereign State. However, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a complex and multifaceted issue that cannot be reduced to a question of statehood. The conflict is rooted in a history of colonialism, occupation and expulsion, and requires a deeper understanding of various factors.

In conclusion, Palestinian statehood is a complex and controversial issue that requires a deep understanding of various factors. We need to analyse the issue from a critical and multifaceted perspective, taking into account the positions of all relevant parties.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper critically analyses Professor LyuJingsheng of Renmin University of China's

views on the U.S. suppression of the anti-war movement on university campuses and the collective silence of China's public intellectuals, and reveals the logical flaws and potential problems in his argument. Our findings indicate that Professor Lui's views are questionable in the following areas:

1. Simplified criticism of Chinese public intellectuals: Professor Lyu's criticism of Chinese public intellectuals is too generalised and fails to take into full consideration the diversity and complexity within this group. In fact, many Chinese intellectuals hold critical positions on international issues and actively participate in public discussions.
2. Lack of evidential support: Professor Lyu failed to provide sufficient factual basis for some of his assertions, which led to a lack of persuasiveness in his views.
3. Insufficient consideration of different viewpoints and counter-arguments: In analysing the position of Chinese intellectuals, Professor Lyu fails to fully reflect the wide range of criticisms from Chinese intellectuals as well as the international political and historical factors behind them.
4. Logical contradictions: Professor Lyu's criticisms appear to be self-contradictory in some aspects, and such contradictions may weaken the persuasiveness of his arguments.
5. Lack of constructive suggestions: Although Professor Lyu's criticism reveals some shortcomings in the handling of international issues by Chinese public intellectuals, it lacks concrete suggestions for improvement.
6. The use of emotive language: The emotive language used in the article may stimulate the reader's emotions, but it may also overshadow the arguments based on facts and logic.

By critically analysing Professor Lyu's views, we believe that academic discussion should be based on comprehensive fact gathering, objective analysis and fine argumentation. In addition, academic discussion is not only a contest of logic and evidence, but also an exchange of emotions and empathy. In analysing international issues, a more humane, emotional and multi-dimensional perspective should be adopted in order to promote a deeper understanding and empathy for those affected by conflicts.

In the end, we believe that Professor Lyu's article, although touching on some important issues, has some potential problems in logic. In order to improve the quality of academic discussions, we need more comprehensive fact gathering, more objective analyses and finer arguments. At the same time, criticism should be constructive, not

only pointing out problems but also suggesting ways to solve them. In this way, we can promote more in-depth and fruitful discussions in the academic community, and expect the academic community to be more open and tolerant, accepting differences and jointly pushing the boundaries of knowledge.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Lyu, Jingsheng. "Lu Jingsheng: In the Face of the United States' Crackdown on Anti-War Activities on University Campuses, the Chinese Public Has Been Collectively Silent Again." Kunlunce, April 29, 2024. <https://www.kunlunce.com/e/wap/show2022.php?bclassid=0&classid=176&id=177379>.
- [2]. China Newsweek. "Hundreds of Students Arrested, Why the 'Israeli-Palestinian Conflict' Intensified at Columbia University." sina news, April 23, 2024. https://news.sina.com.cn/w/2024-04-24/doc-inaswtpc1364151.shtml?cre=tianyi&mod=pc&loc=2&r=0&rfunc=6&tj=cxvertical_pc_hp&tr=12.
- [3]. voachinese. "As the Protests Continued, Columbia University Canceled Classes and the Campus Was Tense." voachinese, April 23, 2024. <https://www.voachinese.com/a/columbia-s-ongoing-protests-cause-cancelled-classes-and-increased-tensions-20240423/7582012.html>.
- [4]. voachinese. "As the Protests Continued, Columbia University Canceled Classes and the Campus Was Tense." voachinese, April 23, 2024. <https://www.voachinese.com/a/columbia-s-ongoing-protests-cause-cancelled-classes-and-increased-tensions-20240423/7582012.html>.
- [5]. Cihai. Xianggang, Jiulong: ZhonghuaShuju, 1979.
- [6]. voachinese. "Campus Demonstrations across the United States Have Increased, and Brinken Has Criticized the Protests to Protesting Students' 'Silent.'" voa, April 27, 2024. <https://www.voachinese.com/a/blinken-criticizes-protesting-students-silence-on-amas-20240426/7587288.html>.
- [7]. U.N. "Definition of Aggression (1974)." United Nations, December 14, 1974. <https://www.un.org/zh/documents/treaty/A-RES-3314%28XXIX%29>.