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A Contemporaneous Interpretation of Chung-Shu Lo’s Reply to the UNESCO Human Rights Survey

Li Chen

ABSTRACT

This article uses several neglected primary and secondary sources to present Chinese philosopher Chung-Shu Lo’s life, education, and professional career as well as his related prior writings and contemporaneous thoughts in order to help readers gain a full, unbiased, and substantive understanding of Lo’s claims and arguments in his reply to the UNESCO Survey concerning human rights in the Chinese tradition. It argues that it is crucial to draw on the above-mentioned sources to understand what Lo meant exactly when he proffered only three human rights were universal.

I. INTRODUCTION

The end of the Second World War propelled the idea of human rights into the forefront of international consciousness. Significantly, two movements emerged from the shadow that the War had cast upon human history: the celebrated Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Hu-
man Rights Survey.\(^1\) It is undeniable that Chinese scholars and politicians contributed to both of them. In recent years, there has been a growing body of scholarship detailing various Chinese contributions to these two initiatives immediately after the founding of the United Nations. In 2007, Pierre-Étienne Will laid the groundwork for producing a thorough and highly original research on the Chinese contribution to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR).\(^2\) Will’s research shed light on the Chinese heavyweights who contributed to the drafting of the UDHR, such as P.C. Chang and John C.H. Wu.\(^3\) Chung-Shu Lo, also known as Luo Zhongshu, was also named for his contributions to the human rights discussion through his work with the UNESCO Human Rights Survey.\(^4\) Lo was a member of the UNESCO drafting committee and contributed a written response to the survey. In less than 1500 words, he offered an explanation of the “Chinese tradition in human rights,” presenting his thoughtful ideas about the Chinese conception of human rights. As to the irreducible core of fundamental human rights, he contended that every person in the world is entitled to three universal rights: “(1) the right to live, (2) the right to self-expression and (3) the right to enjoyment.”\(^5\)

Following Will’s work, a rich body of research emerged concerning P.C. Chang’s contribution toward the UDHR. In 2016, Hans Ingvar Roth published an excellently researched book about Chang’s remarkable contribution to the drafting process of the UDHR. In the first part of her book, Roth traced Chang’s early life and professional career and writings to put together a minibiography which became instrumental in explaining Chang’s philosophy behind his ideas at the drafting process. She made excellent use of numerous new and neglected sources relating to Chang’s life and writings to illuminate Chang’s claims and arguments at the drafting conferences.\(^6\) Pinghua Sun also researched and wrote about Chang. In 2017, he published a critically acclaimed book about Chang’s unique contribution to the drafting process of the UDHR from the Chinese perspective.\(^7\) Roth and Sun had

---

3. Chang was the Chinese representative and vice-chairman of the United Nations Human Rights Commission. Wu was also a notable Chinese representative who took part in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) drafting process during Chang’s absence.
5. Goodale, supra note 1, at 194.
both mentioned Lo’s indirect contribution to the UDHR in their books, but neither went into the details as their focus of the study was Chang.⁸

Lo’s contribution to the survey had already garnered some traction among other scholars of human rights.⁹ In the literature concerning the UNESCO Human Rights Survey, Lo’s name was quite well-known. Mark Goodale, in his monumental monograph on the UNESCO Human Rights Survey, argued that

Lo’s response to the UNESCO survey has been among the most misinterpreted by later writers and historians. Instead of reading it to say that a universal declaration of human rights would be antithetical to China’s Confucian tradition, later authors, perhaps all too willing to accept Lo’s own strained attempt to square the circle, have taken it as evidence that Confucianism and Western liberalism rested on the same “core of fundamental principles.”¹⁰

Regrettably, Goodale only managed to find a snippet of information about Lo—that he was a professor of philosophy in China, “but not much is known about his early or later career.”¹¹ This constrained Goodale’s ability to ascertain the substance of Lo’s asserted rights in the reply and offer a fair assessment of them.

In 2020, Sun Shiyan published a commentary on Lo’s human rights philosophy. However, Sun’s commentary did not adopt an approach like one espoused by Roth and Sun did not carefully trace Lo’s early life, professional career, prior writings, and related historical events to shed light on the philosophy behind the protagonist’s claims and arguments.¹²

This article attempts to fill the gap left by Goodale and Sun by using several neglected primary and secondary sources to present Lo’s life, education, and professional career as well as his prior writings and contemporaneous thoughts in order to help readers gain a full, unbiased, and substantive understanding of Lo’s claims and arguments. Lo himself argued that this was the preferred approach for researching past philosophers—“In order to

---

8. Roth, supra note 6, at 246; Sun, Pengchun Chang and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, supra note 7, at 314.
11. Id. at 192
understand the system of thought of a great philosopher, it is always necessary to know the life of that philosopher, his personality, his education, and his social background.”

Lo’s reflections on human rights epitomized the well-educated Chinese philosopher’s perspective, particularly that of the generation of Chinese intellectuals who had received liberal western and Chinese traditional education. Where his contributions to the human rights discussion are concerned, Lo’s reply justly deserves a full-length article for scrutiny, analysis, and discussion.

II. CHUNG-SHU LO’S EARLY LIFE AND EDUCATION

Chung-Shu Lo was born on 3 August 1903, in Wusheng County, Sichuan Province, China. He was the second son of Wei-San Lo, a Christian convert and a modest private school master. The first character of his given name, Zhong, means loyalty; the second character, Shu, means reciprocity. They represented the two cardinal virtues in Confucian philosophy. After graduating from Anglo-Chinese School in Langzhong and a Middle School in Chengdu, Lo matriculated at West China Union University (WCUU) in Chengdu, the capital city of Sichuan province in Southwest China.

WCUU was established in 1910 by the collective efforts of several Protestant, denominational, missionary societies from America, Canada, Great Britain and Ireland. It aimed to extend “the Kingdom of God in West China by means of higher education under Christian auspices.”

From the outset, Lo was passionate about the study of philosophy. As a budding philosopher, he built his foundation by enrolling in a number of compulsory courses with the department of philosophy. Eager to learn, he took several advanced classes in his specialization, including: an advanced


14. This research mainly relies upon unpublished materials located at several places. For Lo’s studies at Oxford and activities in England, this research draws upon his rich student file at St Peter’s College Archives, Oxford University, which includes numerous correspondences and other materials related to his student days at Oxford and subsequent correspondences with the College as an alumnus. The Oxford University Archives hold his various application forms and examiner’s report. Information about his time at the West China Union University from 1939–1940 is available from a folder on him in the United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia Records (RG011-289-4540) at the Special Collections of Yale Divinity School Library. The latter contains a number of his unpublished speeches and other materials used for this article.

15. Chung-Shu Lo, Matriculation Form (1937). (Oxford University Archives).


18. *Id.* at 1–2.
course in logic; the history of philosophy; modern philosophical systems; ethics; Christian ethics; \(^{19}\) and the philosophy of life. \(^{20}\) These courses acquainted him with various schools of philosophy and theories of logic, how problems had arisen historically and the attempts made to deal with them. \(^{21}\) Through his studies, he also explored the origin and development of morality, various theories of the moral life, and the application of ethical theories to contemporary problems. \(^{22}\) Some courses dealt with the practical aspects of philosophy. For example, in the philosophy of life course, he studied the problem of living; he investigated “the ‘will-to-live’, the ability to think, the choice of values, the discovery of what is real, loyalty to an ideal of life, reverence for life.” \(^{23}\) As WCUU was a Christian university, he also received instruction on the Christian answer to ethical problems. \(^{24}\) Specifically, he was mentored by two distinguished professors. First, Charles Rupert Carscallen, the Dean of the faculty of religion, who offered courses on logic, ethics, apologetics, and apostolic literature. \(^{25}\) The second professor was James Livingstone Stewart, who taught psychology, philosophy, and systematic theology. \(^{26}\) Both were graduates of the University of Toronto. Lo’s professors prescribed a mix of textbooks written by Chinese and foreign scholars. For example, they included J. Percy Bruce’s “Elementary Outlines of Logic,” James Edwin Creighton’s “An Introduction to Logic,” and John Dewey and James Hayden Tufts’ “Ethics.” \(^{27}\) Chinese philosopher Feng Yu-lan’s “A Comparative Study of Life Ideals” and Li Erh-Chuoh’s “Collected Essays” were also prescribed study materials. \(^{28}\)

Lo’s outstanding academic performance impressed his professors; he was awarded “First Scholar of his year in Philosophy and Psychology” consecutively from 1924 to 1928. \(^{29}\) He received his Bachelor of Arts degree from the University in June 1928. At the time of his graduation, he was elected as a member of the Phi Tau Phil Society, \(^{30}\) a resounding signal of his enviable scholastic accomplishments and aptitude. Membership in this scholastic honor society was “determined on the basis of scholastic standing upon graduation from college . . . [where] only five percent of any class are eligible for membership, which in any case is to be conferred on men.

\(^{19}\) Id. at 42.
\(^{20}\) Id. at 47–48.
\(^{21}\) Id. at 48.
\(^{22}\) Id. at 47.
\(^{23}\) Id. at 47.
\(^{24}\) Id. at 48.
\(^{25}\) Id. at 14.
\(^{26}\) Id. at 18.
\(^{27}\) Id. at 48.
\(^{28}\) Id. at 47.
\(^{29}\) Western China Diocesan Notes, The West China Missionary News 36 (1926).
\(^{30}\) Phi Tau Phi, Scholastic Honor Society of China 57 (1936).
of exceptional merit only.”31 There were only two inductees to the Society in the 1928 election at his University.32 He appeared to be the top graduate of the arts and sciences program.33

A year later, WCUU sponsored Lo to pursue his advanced studies in Beijing. He had been accepted to undertake a special study in philosophy at Yenching University. Of the institutions established by American missionaries, Yenching University was one of the most renowned.34 It boasted a new graduate division offering a Master’s Program.35 In September 1929, Lo became a graduate student in the department of philosophy at Yenching.36 Professor Hwang Lechung Tsetung, a graduate of the University of Toronto,37 was the head of the department. The teaching faculty included some of China’s rising star philosophers like Feng Yu-lan, Chin Yueh-Lin, and Hsu Pao-Chien,38 all of whom were educated at Columbia University. The department was also comprised of other established scholars like Lucius C. Porter, Chang Tung Sun, and visiting professor Ivor Armstrong Richards, Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge.39

At Yenching, Lo continued to build a strong foundation in philosophy through the study of a myriad of general philosophy modules. The courses he took included the Problems of Philosophy, which entailed a comprehensive study of the salient problems in philosophy and Logical Problems in Contemporary Philosophy, which required him to pursue an advanced study of the logical problems in contemporary philosophy.40 Additionally, it was likely Lo took classes on the philosophy of Kant.41 Professor Hwang, his academic advisor and head of the philosophy department, taught these courses. Lo also took a course on Contemporary Philosophy with Chang Tung Sun, who received his education in Japan.42 In this course, Professor Chang43 sought to “bring out the important problems in contemporary philosophy instead of giving lectures on individual philosophers.”44 Furthermore, Lo also took a course with US-educated psychologist Luh Chih-wei on systematic psychology.45

31. An Honorary Scholarship Society in China, 15 SCHOOL & SOC’Y 333 (1922). This scholastic honor society was established in China to emulate the success of Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi in the United States.
32. Phi Tau Phi, China, supra note 30.
33. Id. The other inductee had graduated from the University’s medical school.
34. See Dwight W. Edwards, Yenching University (1959).
38. Yenching University Bulletin, supra note 36, at 5.
39. Id.
40. Id. at 34.
41. Id. at 35.
42. Id. at 34.
43. Id.
44. Id.
45. Id. at 35.
Significantly, Lo discovered his passion for Greek philosophy, as evinced by his M.A. thesis topic. In his diary, he confessed his admiration for Plato’s philosophy, which explained why on his first trip to Europe, he made a point to visit Athens, the hub of Ancient Greece, to be in spirit with Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. Furthering his interest, Lo took a course on Greek Philosophy. This course offered him an in-depth study of Plato and Aristotle. The Philosophy of Plato course immersed him in the epistemological and metaphysical problems of the famous philosopher’s dialogues, including “Parmenides,” “Theaetetus,” “The Sophist,” and “The Republic.”

Apart from completing these courses, he had to write a thesis “to show his ability in doing research work and his thorough knowledge and originality in his specialized field.” Hwang supervised Lo’s research on “The Logical Problems in Plato,” culminating in a thesis of 117 pages. After passing the final examination of written tests in philosophy and an oral examination of his thesis by a committee, Lo became the third student in the history of the University to receive a graduate degree in philosophy. At Yenching, he distinguished himself as the “first scholar of his year in philosophy and psychology” consecutively from 1929 to 1931. Yenching University awarded him a Master of Arts degree in philosophy in 1931.

III. LAUNCHING HIS ACADEMIC CAREER AT WCUU

Following his M.A. degree, Lo immediately returned to WCUU as an instructor in the department of philosophy. After over a year’s work, he was promoted to the position of assistant professor. In 1935, he became an associate professor. He gradually took on significant administrative duties at the University, first as Secretary of the College of Arts, then Dean of

47. Id.
49. Yenching University Directory, supra note 36, at 34.
50. Id. at 36.
51. Lo Zhong Shu, The Logical Problems in Plato (1931) (unpublished M.A. thesis, Yenching University, Department of Philosophy). This thesis is now housed at Peking University Library.
52. Yenching University Directory, supra note 36, at 7.
54. Chung-Shu Lo’s Application for admission as a Probationer-Student for the Degree of Bachelor of Letters (20 July 1937) (Ref. FA 4/7/2/7) (Oxford University Archives).
55. Yenching University, List of Graduates of Graduate Yuan 1922–1935, supra note 53.
57. West China Union University Annual Announcement, 1933–1934, at 58 (1933).
59. West China Union University Annual Announcement, 1933–1934, supra note 57, at 89.
Studies, and finally Dean of the College of Arts. With Lo’s educational background and accomplishments, he quickly became part of the core teaching faculty in the academic year 1933–34. In that year, he taught seven courses, including Introduction to Philosophy, Philosophy of Plato, Philosophy of Aristotle, Readings in Philosophy, Ethical Systems, Elementary Logic, and Advanced Logic. In subsequent years, he started to helm new courses on Philosophy of Mozi, Philosophy of Kant, General Psychology, and Philosophy of Logicians. The last course demonstrated his focus on Eastern and Western philosophy; specifically, he attempted to critically examine the works of ancient Chinese logicians with reference to their Western peers. Having gained a mastery of the courses at Yenching, he continued to inspire the next generation of budding philosophers by covering the very ideas Yenching imbued him with through his courses.

In 1937, Lo got wind of a special lectureship opportunity at Oxford University. The University had advertised a new position of Spalding Lectureship in Chinese Philosophy and Religion. He applied for this coveted position but to no avail. However, Lo’s chance to engage in his scholarly pursuits and deliver public lectures in the city of dreaming spires would come soon. After six years of dedicated service to WCUU, the Church Missionary Society of England (C.M.S.), one of the University’s sponsoring mission societies, offered him the funding to pursue additional studies in England.

IV. FURTHER STUDIES AT OXFORD


63. Id. at 59
64. Id.
66. Id. at 58.
67. Id. at 59.
69. St. Peter’s College Archives, Oxford University, Student File Chung-Shu Lo (1937), Letter from E.R. Hughes to Christopher Maude Chavasse (18 July 1937) 9St Peter’s College Archives, Oxford University).
70. Id. Letter from J. Gurney Barclay to Christopher Maude Chavasse (16 June 1937) (St Peter’s College Archives, Oxford University).
Church.71 More importantly, he gained admission to Oxford University. Lo was fortunate to have Reverend Frank Albert Smalley to help him navigate the intricate process. Smalley was an Oxford graduate and a missionary educator from C.M.S at WCUU.72 On 13 July 1937 Lo formally applied to St. Peter’s Hall, Oxford, for admission. His unique academic qualifications were foreign to Oxford. However, he had strong testimonials; his sponsor put in a good word for him with Christopher Maude Chavasse, Master of St Peter’s Hall, Oxford.

Joseph Gurney Barclay of the C.M.S., described Lo as follows:

Unlike most of our visitors he is not ordained, or even an ordinand; but he is a Philosopher of high grade. . . . He is a man with such considerable prospects that the C.M.S. thought it worthwhile to spend money on him in the hope of conveying to him some benefit (especially a spiritual one) by his visit to England.73

Similarly, Oxford’s resident Chinese philosophy expert, Reverend Ernest Richard Hughes, Reader in Chinese Religion and Philosophy, spoke favorably of and recommended Lo’s acceptance:

Yenching [University] stands high in university circles in China, and if Mr Lo went to America he would be accepted as a student for a doctorate, since he has the Yenching M.A. I know Yenching well and can guarantee it. The West China Union University I know less of, but as Mr. Lo was a candidate for the Spalding Lectureship in this University and was one of the three finally selected candidates from which the choice was made. I have been into his record and writings pretty carefully.74

For his studies at Oxford, Lo initially proposed to research “Comparative study of ethical conceptions as taught by Greek and Chinese philosophers.”75 The Faculty Board of Literae Humaniores approved his application in October 1937 and invited Henry Habberley Price, Wykeham Professor of Logic and Fellow of New College, to supervise his work.76 Price was a Welsh philosopher known for his research on the philosophy of perception. After a short while, the University arranged for Herbert James Paton, a Scottish philosopher with substantial expertise in Kantian philosophy, to supervise Lo.77 This was most likely caused by his change of subject to “knowledge

73. St Peter’s College Archives, Oxford University, Student File Chung-Shu Lo (1937), Letter from J. Gurney Barclay to Christopher Maude Chavasse (14 June 1937).
74. Id. Letter from E.R. Hughes to Christopher Maude Chavasse, supra note 69.
75. Chung-Shu Lo’s Application Bachelor of Letters, supra note 54.
76. Id.
77. Chung-Shu Lo’s Student Index Card (Oxford University Archives).
and morality." Paton was White’s Professor of Moral Philosophy and a Fellow of Corpus Christi College. 

As a student, Lo interacted with a diverse group of people, particularly through collegiate dinners and common room discussions. He had the opportunity to dine with not only fellow philosophers but also scientists, theologians, and “scholars of economics, law or any other branches of studies.” He discussed with them in the common room, “problems of general interest and also gain[ed] some knowledge from each other’s special line of study.” This unique experience greatly strengthened his belief in the importance of a holistic education. To Lo, “[t]he social and intellectual fellowship in the colleges [was] very inspiring.”

Lo worked tirelessly on his research, and his potential did not go unnoticed; his supervisor Paton noted in a talk with Master Chavasse about his progress, “Lo is doing good work, and will in time produce a thesis worthy of a B.Litt. degree.” Furthermore, Lo was “on a good line of thought and has the capability to produce the original work necessary for the B.Litt. degree.” However, his supervisor added that he “must have time . . . to get accustomed to English ways of thinking and expressing ideas.” In fact, Lo was overwhelmed by personal stress in conducting his research under the time limit and financial constraints. Chavasse provided excellent pastoral care and invited Hughes to counsel Lo to help him deal with challenges encountered in the thesis writing. Chavasse gained the impression that Lo’s greatest obstacle seemed to be with presenting his philosophical thoughts “in a Western form”—to be precise, “the basis of his trouble is the difficulty he finds of expressing his Chinese thoughts in Western language.” Lo’s supervisor helped Lo with “the subject matter and especially Western Philosophy.” However, the great amount of stress Lo faced persisted. Chavasse thus decided to arrange the transfer of supervision from Patton to Hughes. In Chavasse’s view, Lo’s “real trouble is that he finds it very hard to translate his Chinese philosophical thought into English phraseology.”

78. Id.
79. Oxford University Calendar 1937 89 (1937).
81. Id. at 4–5.
82. Id. at 5.
83. St Peter’s College Archives, Oxford University, Student File Chung-Shu Lo (1937), Letter from Chavasse to Barclay (24 Feb. 1938).
84. Id.
85. Id.
86. Id.
87. Id. Letter from Chavasse to Barclay (20 May 1938).
88. Id. Letter from Chavasse to H.M. Margoliouth (20 May 1938).
89. Id. Letter from Chavasse to Barclay (7 Oct. 1938).
To deal with the problem, it would be necessary for Lo to seek special help. Fortunately, Hughes step forward to offer help. As an old hand at Chinese philosophy, he had a good understanding of “Chinese ways of thinking and forms of thought . . . [and was] a real relief to Mr. Lo if he could have someone who thoroughly understands his difficulty in the matter of presentation to guide him along the right paths.”

Compounding the problem was Lo’s ambitious choice of a “vast” research subject, especially when he had only two years in England and limited funding. Originally, Lo planned to produce his magnum opus contrasting “Chinese philosophy with Classical Philosophy; [but was] hampered, for one thing, by his small knowledge of the Greek language.” His previous study of Greek philosophy in China did not require exposure to the Greek text and materials. Lo confirmed this: “So far, very few Chinese scholars, certainly none of whom I know, can read philosophical works in Greek and Latin intelligently.” If he had adequate time and funding to work on the thesis, Hughes believed Lo would “produce something which is really worthwhile.” It became evident that Lo had to cut down on the formidable scope of his research if he was still keen to complete the thesis before heading home. In February 1939, with Hughes’s advice and support, he applied to the University to amend this research topic from “knowledge and morality” to “A study of the moral philosophy of Hsuntze [Xunzi] with special reference to the relation between knowledge and morality.” Lo stated the reason for the change of the subject: “To narrow the field of study to a specific Chinese philosopher and also to avoid the problem of knowledge of Greek as originally planned on making a comparative study of the Greek philosophers with the Chinese.”

Hughes’s timely and critical intervention paved the way for Lo to steer his research toward a fruitful end in slightly over two years. The final thesis was completed by 24 October 1939 and sent to examiners’ review in early November. The University appointed Alexander Dunlop Lindsay, philosopher and Master of Balliol College, and Hughes as examiners. On 24 November, these two examiners conducted a viva voce of the thesis and topics related to philosophy. The examiners perused the thesis, which was primarily an
exegesis of Hsuntze’s philosophy and were pleased with his efforts to bring out “the distinctive features of Hsuntze’s thought by contrasting it with other systems which were current in his day.” They pointed out “some defects in his treatment” of the theme. Finally, they happily concluded: “Mr. Lo has made a real contribution to knowledge by bringing together passages in Hsuntze and other philosophers, the connection of which has not been previously pointed out. A considerable part of the interest of the thesis lies in his statement of Hsuntze’s relating of morality to knowledge and in the comparison which Mr. Lo makes in this connection with Plato and Aristotle.” Through his discussions and analyses, Lo showed “an adequate knowledge of Greek philosophy though he was perhaps too intent on pointing out similarities to do justice to the differences.”

This favorable verdict ensured that Lo would receive his degree in person at the next convocation on 16 December 1939. Lo did not stop here. Before completing his thesis, in May 1939, he inquired with Chavasse about the possibility of working for the Doctor of Philosophy degree remotely after returning to China. In December 1939, Lo was accepted as a candidate for the degree to work on a research project entitled “A Study of Post-Han Chinese Theories of Human Nature” under the supervision of Hughes.

V. VISIONARY PROMOTER OF CROSS-CULTURAL EDUCATION, EXCHANGE, AND WORLD PEACE

Lo was a philosopher with broad interests and a keenness to network with the circle of philosophers. He was also an avid promoter of cross-cultural education and cooperation. In July 1937, he attended the ninth International Congress on Philosophy in Paris. Afterwards, Lo participated in a discussion at the Geneva School of International Studies. His intervention at the forum echoed his belief in cross-cultural exchange; when a European student quoted a verse of Kipling to justify his assertion that he could not understand the situation of Far East—“East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet.” Lo quickly took on the discussant and

97. Degree of Bachelor of Letters, Board of the Faculty of Oriental Studies, C. S. Lo’s Report of the Examiners (24 Nov. 1939) (Ref. FA 4/14/2/2) (Oxford University Archives).
98. Chung-Shu Lo’s Student Index Card, supra note 77.
99. St Peter’s College Archives, Oxford University, Student File Chung-Shu Lo (1937), Letter from Chavasse to H.M. Margoliouth (15 May 1939).
100. Id. Letter of Notice from University of Oxford to C.S. Lo, (5 Dec. 1939).
101. Yi Yun Luo & Yao Zhen Luo, supra note 46, at 89.
sharply refuted the ill-conceived statement. Lo laid bare an internationalist bent and contended that “West is no longer West and East is no longer East, and that they are meeting at every point. If a European or an American fails to understand the East, and if a Chinese fails to understand the West.” Lo argued this was due to “one’s prejudices, indifferences, narrow-mindedness and mental sluggishness.”

Lo was a visionary thinker; he tirelessly advocated for an enduring vision of cultural cooperation between China and foreign countries. He emphasized the importance of closer cross-cultural cooperation between nations because he believed that perpetual world peace is built “upon understanding and mutual appreciation between the peoples of all races and different types of culture.” During his Oxford studies, he gave talks at Oxford, Cambridge, and other institutions of higher education to promote his vision and ideas for global education and exchange. He was convinced that the ongoing wars proved the inexorable need to promote mutual understanding between nations and people. He argued that “The eternal values without national distinctions, and the perpetual peace which is to prevail over the whole world are what we all desire to have and what we all have to work for.”

He had an unfailing faith in cultural cooperation because it was “the most far-reaching approach . . . [a]ll the cultural values developed by the different peoples of the world are the common heritage of mankind. Every effort to make the cultural values, created by the geniuses of different nations in the past, intelligible and vital to our present-day life, is a desirable thing.” Additionally, he underlined the importance of studying and understanding world history because

[T]he present is connected with the past. . . . Better understanding of the past will certainly guide us toward better adjustment to the present situation; and better understanding of other peoples will certainly lead to mutual appreciation and mutual respect, and therefore to better cooperation between nations in other aspects of international life.

While Lo emphasized the fruits of international exchange and cooperation, he was also aware that it was a giant task to ensure such understanding would take root beyond surface-level compromise—“It is easy to cooperate in a superficial manner. But it takes time to make the fundamental ideas and mental outlook of one nation intelligible to other peoples.”

103. Id.
104. Lo, A Plea for Co-operation, supra note 93, at 4.
105. Id.
106. Chung-Shu Lo, Some Ideas on Cultural Co-Operation 2 (1939) (talk to some senior members of the University) (15 Nov. 1939). (Yale Divinity School Library) The United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia Records (RG11), Folder on Chung-Shu Lo (RG011-289-4540), Special Collections, Yale Divinity School Library.
107. Id.
108. Id. at 2–3.
To this end, Lo deeply felt that he had a clear and realistic plan to realize his vision. He reached out to many academics, scientists in British universities as well as those in France, the Netherlands, Germany, Italy, America and India. Lo visited or corresponded with some leading minds of the time and garnered their support. The list of luminaries who favorably responded includes John Dewey, Albert Einstein, Max Planck, Rabindranath Tagore, Hans Adolf Eduard Driesch, Benedetto Croce, Bertrand Russell. He looked forward to the end of the war and the dawn of a new era when “we may have a new world order, where truth, justice, liberty and happiness will prevail.” He was intensely interested in finding ways to create conditions for the new world order to succeed and to avoid the tragedies of the wars.

A central theme of Lo’s vision was his strong opposition to the “utilitarian view of education” and “materialistic view of civilization.” He believed this “was one of the great dangers of the world of the present day, and especially for China.” He proffered the view that if college students were only interested in acquiring some technical know-how and professional skills for the purposes of making a living and reaping the benefits of material wealth, “there will be no advancement of science and culture.” Rather, his envisioned goal of a University was one which brought people from diverse cultures and nations in pursuit of truth—“It brings together the higher types of mind, belonging to different nations, to study and discuss freely, and to investigate and undertake research disinterestedly, for the sake of getting truth.” In his talks, he displayed his dissatisfaction with the state of China’s educational sector. Many took the view that a significant reason China fell victim to imperialism and aggression was due to her lack of scientific achievement. As such, to strengthen her position in the world,
“China was keen on science, especially applied science.”\textsuperscript{120} This led to a sorry state of affairs in China. “The spirit which seeks knowledge for purely intellectual satisfaction is lacking.”\textsuperscript{121} Lo warned that if China continued down this utilitarian path, and “If the materialistic view of civilization and the utilitarian view of education are not countered with a movement of humanism, China might completely lose her rich heritage and eventually become a nation as dangerous as the present aggressive nations, which we are fighting to subdue.”\textsuperscript{122}

Lo’s solution was for both the Chinese and Western worlds to embark on a meaningful exchange and study of each other’s cultures. China would launch an ambitious educational program which went to the “root of Western Culture, namely, the spiritual heritage which is derived from the Greeks and Christianity.”\textsuperscript{123} Likewise, the West would make a similar effort to “study Chinese Culture seriously, both sides will benefit.”\textsuperscript{124} He was well-aware of the disparity in recognition between Chinese culture and Western culture; he incisively noted that China was more serious in “assimilating Western Culture . . . than you are in respect of Chinese Culture in the Western world.”\textsuperscript{125} Still, he expressed a fervent hope that “the time may come that in European and American Universities, the students in philosophy, history, art, or other cultural subjects will not only follow the cultural development of the Western world, but also the corresponding development in China, just as Chinese students who are taking up the study of their own culture pay equal or even more attention to that of Western Culture.”\textsuperscript{126} Lo believed that the free choice of cultural values of different types of culture and the inter-penetration of the better element of the culture of the West and of the East will not only lead to better understanding, and therefore better cooperation, of the Western and Eastern nations, but the life of the individuals of each nation will also be greatly enriched.\textsuperscript{127}

Lo’s grand vision and concrete ideas of promoting cross-cultural cooperation won the support of some of the most distinguished Oxford scholars and senior academic administrators who not only attended his talks but also endorsed his proposal in public. They eventually formed a committee to incrementally affect some of these ideas between Britain and China in
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collaboration with Lo.\textsuperscript{128} Eager to garner a wide base of support for this ambitious cross-cultural cooperation scheme, Lo campaigned extensively. In early December 1939, he visited Cambridge University to give a talk on the topic at the invitation of Vice-Chancellor Ernest Alfred Benians.\textsuperscript{129} Through the talk, Lo won over several eminent Cambridge scholars, who declared their support for the collaboration and formed a similar committee to team up with Lo.\textsuperscript{130}

\section*{VI. CONTEMPORANEOUS INTERPRETATION OF LO’S REPLY TO THE SURVEY}

Lo journeyed home in January 1940 amidst the height of the war and launched into his teaching and administrative duties at WCUU. Back on home ground, he established the East and West Cultural Association together with a group of university professors and like-minded individuals who shared his passion for promoting international cooperation and understanding.\textsuperscript{131} He also translated and published one part of Frank Thilly’s “A History of Philosophy” in 1942, which became widely read.\textsuperscript{132} While working as a scholar and a senior academic administrator at WCUU, in 1947, after the war, the Chinese government appointed Lo as a consultant in philosophy at UNESCO.\textsuperscript{133} It was then, working at UNESCO, that an opportunity came his way for him to take part in the “Drafting Committee of UNESCO on the Rights of Man”\textsuperscript{134}; Manuel Cabrera Macia, a Mexican scholar and diplomat, was unable to accept the arrangement. Lo rose to the challenge in his stead.

This part of the article will focus on Lo’s reply to the well-known survey. His response was notable because of all responses collected, “Nearly 45
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percent of the replies” were dominated by the United States and the United Kingdom.135 When the replies from Western Europe, South Africa, Australia and Canada were included, they amounted to over 80 percent of all the replies.136 Of the rest, there were only four replies from Asia: three from India and one from China by Lo.

First, it appears Lo was not an unreserved universalist. He acknowledged that the contents of human rights would differ across the world: “A declaration on the Rights of Man for the entire world should be . . . fundamental yet elastic, so that it may be interpreted to suit the needs of peoples in different circumstances.”137 He contended that every person in the world is entitled to three fundamental rights “(1) the right to live, (2) the right to self-expression and (3) the right to enjoyment.”138

What were his conceptions of these three rights? In under 1500 words, Lo concisely fleshed out his ideas of these rights. The brevity of his arguments has led to several interpretations of his work. Some scholars interpreted his articulation of human rights as a philosophical argument to say that “universal rights exist, but are so limited as to be virtually meaningless in practice.”139 One scholar’s view epitomized the impression Lo’s elaboration gave to readers: Lo’s articulation of fundamental rights sounded as “it owes less to Confucius than to Jefferson—the ‘right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness’—but it still leaves out a lot we would include in any conception of human rights today.”140

This article argues that it is crucial to draw on Lo’s life, education, contemporaneous records, remarks, and other historical materials to shed light on what Lo meant exactly when he proffered the three aforementioned rights to be universal.

A. The Right to Live

Lo stated that “The world is big enough for everybody to live in, yet many are deprived of a proper dwelling place. The natural resources of the earth, used according to the scientific knowledge at our disposal, should provide plentifully for all the people to live comfortably, yet . . . are not made accessible to all those who need them.”141 He proposed that “Each individual should be allowed to have his proper share in society as well as to make
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his proper contribution to it, and no individual should be allowed to have more than his share or to live idly at the expense of others.”

Lo’s assertion that the world had an abundance of resources stemmed from his firm view that scientific inventions “had reduced the world to such a size that no matter where we live on the earth we are practically all neighbours,” a sentiment reflected in the old Confucian aphorism that “within the four seas, all are brothers.”

By breaking down geographical barriers, any perceived differences between people were similarly minimized. People were thus entitled to the same right to live.

Furthermore, scientific progress had enormously contributed to the “increase of wealth by scientific means of production has led us all to live in a world of plenty, if we can practice a just system of sharing and cooperation.” Despite this, inequality of distribution still existed. Lo argued that what stood in the way of realizing a vision of fair distribution was narrow-minded nationalism — “Yet our education is still propagating those false ideas of narrow nationalism and is making artificial barriers between nations and peoples, creating a wrong mentality in facing the prosperous new and hopeful age in which we live.” Notably, Lo’s views were an echo of the Confucian ideals he subscribed to, which emphasized: “the practice of one’s duty to the family, the community, the State, and indeed the world at large.”

It is argued Lo’s proposition of “the right to live” should be interpreted in light of China’s then political climate. Massive economic inequality, widespread corruption, and maladministration were rampant in China, which greatly pained Lo. He argued, “We want China to have not only political democracy but also economic democracy. Bureaucratic capital must be eliminated, and political status must not be allowed to be used for economic gains.” He was convinced that “a truly democratic political system must achieve full political freedom for the people and economic equality for the people.”
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B. The Right to Self-Expression

Lo’s second proposition was the right to “live with the sense of dignity and self-reliance . . . each individual should have the fullest degree of self-expression. Social progress depends on each individual’s freedom of expression.”

Lo placed great importance on the freedom of expression for its ability to counter misinformation and propaganda. Lo had been preoccupied with ways to establish perpetual peace in the world; he was deep in thought about “how justice, goodwill and good faith can prevail among the nations, and how the peoples of every country can be free from fear and want and can enjoy the fundamental human rights.” He took the view that war came about because warmongers and their supporters were brought up in an atmosphere steeped in a “narrow view of nationalism.” The fundamental evil, “which often leads to armed conflicts between nations, is short-sighted nationalism.” Lo’s objection was not with people of each nation taking pride in their own culture and contributions to humanity’s progress. Instead, he “strongly condemn[s] that type of education which twists the facts and creates legends for the glorification of their own country, which confines the interest, attention and affection of their citizens to their own nation, and which cultivates the sense of duty toward their own people only.”

Freedom of expression was greatly treasured by Lo because he blamed the following for perpetuating wars: “false ideas of Nazism, Fascism, Samuraism and militarism, which caused the peoples of the Axis powers to follow blindly their national leaders.” In Lo’s view, policies suppressing freedom of speech would result in the loss of a vital counterweight to misinformation.

When Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek visited Chengdu in 1946, he had a meeting with Lo and five other people to solicit their opinion about the state of affairs. Lo gave his frank view—“[he] emphasized that the people feel subordinated to a powerful few and that the people must develop and exercise a sense of responsibility [to reassert control].” On another occasion, Lo argued that the absence of freedom of speech and a sound judicial system in China induced government officials to violate the law for personal gains. This was the root cause of the gaping economic inequality. The above thoughts articulated by Lo explain why he took the view that the future of China lay “with political freedom as well as economic equality.”
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In addition, freedom of expression was important for the realization of Lo’s globalist, perpetual peace vision through education. In 1945, Lo proposed that university teachers were under great responsibility to “enlighten the public and to educate people to a farsightedness in matters of international relations.” \(^{158}\) He deemed this to be of fundamental importance because unless “people are educated with an international outlook rather than with a merely national outlook, conflicts between nations are bound to occur.” \(^{159}\) He argued that “international education is the fundamental approach in building up world peace.” \(^{160}\) defining international education as “a system of education which aims at giving people a thorough and impartial understanding of human affairs and activities as a whole . . . which will impart the ideas of mutual understanding and appreciation between peoples and nations.” \(^{161}\) Lo was optimistic that this new system of education could broaden people’s views and help them “gain a proper perspective of the new world and a right attitude to the abundance around us.” \(^{162}\) Lo firmly stated that regardless of whether we were living in totalitarian or democratic states, “education has got to be on a different basis and it is only such a change which can assure us of world peace in the future.” \(^{163}\) He boldly predicted that “Unless we determine to orientate our minds in a new direction, the catastrophe which we are attempting to avoid will be bound to come. The disaster of a third world war, many times more terrible than that which we have only recently experienced will be inevitable.” \(^{164}\)

For this reason, Lo believed that educators, scholars, scientists and leaders in other walks of life should “have free contacts and free exchange of ideas and ideals with leading nationals in various countries of the world. Proper understanding between the leading classes of people will provide the basis of a sound understanding between nations and peoples. This does not mean, of course, that we can neglect the natural contacts between ordinary peoples.” \(^{165}\)

Significantly, Lo’s views were fueled by the then-ruling government’s pervasive political culture and practice in suppressing freedom of expression. On one occasion, when he discussed the evils of the ruling party’s governance flaws with Generalissimo Chiang, Lo stressed the importance of the right to free expression, stating, “We need a free press, and the privilege of free discussion more than anything else. Our Association cannot print its own paper for arrest and imprisonment would surely follow.” \(^{166}\)
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Lo was openly critical of the government’s repressive policies on the freedom of expression while dealing with national crises. In a meeting with the visiting American General George Marshall in November 1946, Lo expressly opined that “all the liberal elements must join together and have an established organ to express their ideas. This organ could serve the purpose of working up public opinion and give the people hope for a truly democratic life.”

In one influential opinion piece published in 1945, Lo argued that

What is most needed at this time is absolute freedom of speech. There must be absolute freedom of speech before we can fully contribute to the country with all our wisdom; there must be absolute freedom of speech before we can create a fair public opinion; there must be absolute freedom of speech before we can attack social corruption and blow-whistle on political corruption without fear; there must be absolute freedom of speech before we can have progress in thought and academic development.

Undoubtedly, Lo recognized the limits of free speech: “By absolute freedom of speech, I do not mean irresponsible speech, but unfettered speech.” However, it was more important that the core tenet of his arguments was directly addressed; the then-ruling government was severely plagued by the shocking magnitude of official corruption, and Lo believed freedom of expression was a critical instrument to fight endemic corruption. He declared that “For a government not to be corrupt and to be free of corruption, it must not be afraid of the people’s censure. To be an official in a democratic state, one must be prepared to be scolded.” He also called upon the government to exercise “political leniency and tolerance”; to “accommodate dissidents and not be afraid of the media attack and unfavorable public opinion.”

Lo expressed the view that if the political landscape was overrun by corruption, and the authoritarian government denied people the right to express their opinions freely, the country would head down a disastrous path of ruin—“so that the people dare not speak when the people are furious, this state of affairs is bound to lead to a revolution, and people will sit in judgment of that regime and people will bring the regime to its demise.”

Although this right may seem to suggest a possible extension to include a right to rebellion, Lo’s thoughts on the issue carried more nuance than
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was interpreted by later scholars.\textsuperscript{174} As established above, the main thrust of Lo’s argument on the right to self-expression lay with performing checks and balances on the government. However, he also appeared to constrain the extent of such checks. While visiting Great Britain in 1947, he came across a letter to the editor from one Chinese physics student Tzu Hung-Yuan of the University of Manchester.\textsuperscript{175} In commenting on the political status quo in China, Tzu took a position unfavorable to the ruling regime.\textsuperscript{176} Lo penned a response for the same newspaper. He defended the government and argued the Chinese people, not unlike the English, “are essentially democratic, with the normal background necessary for the development of democratic government.”\textsuperscript{177} He appeared to oppose the use of rebellion to seek radical changes and argued that “If the present government is not democratic, then the Chinese people could make reforms from within and within the framework of a Constitution. This seems to me a better way to meet the difficulties in China, because the other method advocated by the Communists—armed rebellion—will increase the suffering of the Chinese people.”\textsuperscript{178}

C. The Right to Enjoyment

As to his third proposition, Lo expounded—“By ‘enjoyment’ I refer to the inner aspect of the life of the individual. Our life should be not only materially adequate and socially free but also inwardly enjoyable. . . . The mental satisfaction of the inner life leads to peace of mind, and the peace of mind of the individual is a necessary condition of the peace of the world.”\textsuperscript{179} He added, “Other forms of enjoyment are aesthetic, intellectual, cultural and religious. Although not everyone can find enjoyment in the mystical experiences of religion, religion is a form of enjoyment for the inner life of many.”\textsuperscript{180}

What he articulated above accorded well with his numerous former pronouncements. Lo had expressed a view that it is essential that people from all over the world “place spiritual values before economic and material values.”\textsuperscript{181} Moreover, he opined that if “political leaders and scholars of each nation can have a wide outlook and a deep insight into the affairs of the world, the perpetual peace which we all desire can be established.”\textsuperscript{182} Arguably,
Lo’s conception of the right to enjoyment can be related to the materialistic culture being propagated in China then. He lamented that Chinese people entertained misguided perceptions of the value of Western culture; many thought Western culture to be synonymous with “material civilization” and “motor civilization.” 183 They embraced the view that if China could quickly become an industrialized nation like the Western powers, “China will be strong and the people will be happy.” 184 While Lo understood that “material wealth of the nation should be greatly increased by scientific methods in order to raise the general standard of living,” he disagreed that a desire for material wealth should be taken to its extreme. 185 Lo worried that China would focus on “scientific application too much and neglect the study of pure science and other branches of cultural studies, there will be no advance of science and culture.” 186 Lo acknowledged that the study of pure science was developing in China but “the tendency to stress the materialistic outlook of Western Culture and the practical use of sciences make any branch of study which seems to be of no immediate use less and less attractive to students in Chinese universities.” 187 He strongly encouraged a “broad view of life,” 188 and vocally condemned the “materialistic outlook of life.” 189

Alfred Edward Taylor, the famed British idealist philosopher, once invited Lo to speak to a Socialist Club at the University of Edinburgh. He spoke on the theme “how it is possible to create a new social order based on the principle of social justice which will encourage the development of personal values and individual freedom.” 190 After the talk, some club members thought him of being “too idealistic,” and some others attempted to convince him of the “soundness of materialism.” 191 Lo replied that he “wished human life was so simple that it could be explained by materialism and the theory of economic determination.” 192 He was clearly intent on working to eradicate the “materialistic outlook of life and the utilitarian view of education.” 193

As a Chinese philosopher of Christian faith, he called for religious tolerance. He believed that “Christian Universities in China are the centers through which to work for the cause of promoting perpetual peace. With their staffs of Westerners and Chinese living and working together not only for higher education, but for the special type of higher education which places
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spiritual values and the development of sound character before everything else.\textsuperscript{194} His school of philosophy persuaded him to be tolerant and receptive of different approaches.

Despite his immersion in Western education throughout his educational career at mission schools in China and England, he was an enthusiastic promoter of classical Chinese education and traditional Chinese values. Lo took the position that the unique value of Chinese classical education lies in their sound basis. Chinese thought is never dissociated from life. A system of thought is a way of life. In spite of the fact that there are different types of thought which are opposed to each other, they all aim at a harmonious life, a life in harmony with one's fellow human beings and also in harmony with nature. Learning or study is regarded as one way of self-cultivation rather than as a purely intellectual pursuit.\textsuperscript{195}

Lo believed that both Chinese and Western values could co-exist, stating

\begin{quote}
I feel strongly that while we urgently need all the scientific and modern education of the West, it should not entirely supplant the tradition of Chinese education in which the character of our people is rooted. It is a tragic thing to see that, in the keenness to adopt the new education of the West, there is a tendency among the Chinese to discard practically all the values of our traditional system of education.\textsuperscript{196}
\end{quote}

Lo further propounded that “permanent peace can only be established when each nation tries to make its special contribution to the World, and to understand and cooperate with every other, so as to assimilate the highest values.”\textsuperscript{197}

\section*{VII. CONCLUSION}

It is crucial to see Lo’s articulation of human rights in its contemporaneous context and to acknowledge the strengths and limitations of his short essay in articulating his conception of human rights. His identification of these three fundamental rights must be understood in light of his background; these insights were synthesized from the vantage point of a Chinese philosopher who has experienced both the Chinese and Western worlds through his education, career, and political environments at home and abroad. For instance, Lo’s thoughts on human rights cannot be accurately interpreted or addressed without reference to his elaboration on democracy. He took the position that true democracy “means to fully live by reason, to pay heed to
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the collective interest, to abide by the law, to respect the opinions of others, to respect one's own freedom and the freedom of others, to live in tolerance with others, and to obey the majoritarian decisions."\textsuperscript{198}

Furthermore, the brevity of his reply to the survey could not possibly allow him to elaborate on his thoughts in detail. This has led to some misunderstandings on the part of readers. Lo too had been acutely aware that "The ideas of a philosopher might be misinterpreted, mis-judged or even be condemned for no other reason than a misunderstanding of the meaning of the terms used or failure to grasp the main theme of the ideas."\textsuperscript{199} This article hopes to provide a glimpse into his life based on his educational records, speeches, writings, and world and Chinese political situations in their historical contexts to give a contemporaneous interpretation of his three asserted fundamental rights.

Ultimately, Lo's views arose from a place of hope. He had a grand vision that people of every country should not confine their interest to their own country and instead "develop a sense of common civilization and a world outlook."\textsuperscript{200} Closer to home, he was optimistic about the role that Chinese people could play in this grand scheme:

As you know, the Chinese are a peace-loving people, and I can assure you that, after we get through the present struggle, and win our national independence and liberty, we shall also do our best to contribute to world peace, and play our part to improve the international situation, so that the world may become a happy home for every person to work cheerfully, to think creatively, and to enjoy life fully."\textsuperscript{201}

Lo's numerous writings have made it manifest that he was convinced that human rights are closely related to the preservation of world peace, an ideal dear to his heart.
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