

中国人民大学
中国人文社会科学
发展研究报告 2005
精品与评价



RESEARCH REPORTS ON CHINA HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES DEVELOPMENT, 2005
BY RENMIN UNIVERSITY OF CHINA
FINE WORKS AND EVALUATION

顾问 袁贵仁 纪宝成 程天权
主编 刘大椿


 中国人民大学出版社

中国人民大学
中国人文社会科学
发展研究报告 2005
精品与评价

RESEARCH REPORTS ON CHINA HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES DEVELOPMENT, 2005
BY RENMIN UNIVERSITY OF CHINA

FINE WORKS AND EVALUATION

顾问 袁贵仁 纪宝成 程天权
主编 刘大椿

 中国人民大学出版社

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

中国人民大学中国人文社会科学发展研究报告 2005: 精品与评价/刘大椿主编.
北京: 中国人民大学出版社, 2005
ISBN 7-300-06462-0

- I. 中…
- II. 刘…
- III. ①人文科学-研究报告-中国-2005②社会科学-研究报告-中国-2005
- IV. C12

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2005) 第 038473 号

中国人民大学中国人文社会科学发展研究报告 2005

精品与评价

顾问 袁贵仁 纪宝成 程天权

主编 刘大椿

出版发行	中国人民大学出版社		
社 址	北京中关村大街 31 号	邮政编码	100080
电 话	010-62511242 (总编室)		010-62511239 (出版部)
	010-82501766 (邮购部)		010-62514148 (门市部)
	010-62515195 (发行公司)		010-62515275 (盗版举报)
网 址	http://www.crup.com.cn		
	http://www.ttrnet.com (人大教研网)		
经 销	新华书店		
印 刷	河北三河市新世纪印务有限公司		
开 本	787×1092 毫米 1/16	版 次	2005 年 4 月第 1 版
印 张	28.75 插页 3	印 次	2005 年 4 月第 1 次印刷
字 数	474 000	定 价	56.00 元

版权所有 侵权必究 印装差错 负责调换

中国人民大学发展研究报告

编委会

主任 纪宝成

副主任 袁 卫 林 岗 冯惠玲

委员 (按姓氏笔画为序)

冯 俊 冯惠玲 纪宝成 刘大椿 杨瑞龙

林 岗 郑杭生 周蔚华 胡乃武 郝立新

贺耀敏 高培勇 袁 卫 董克用 曾宪义

本报告各部分主笔和参与编纂者

(以姓氏笔画为序)

以下主笔和参与编纂者，除特别说明外，工作单位均为中国人民大学。

主笔：

- | | |
|-----|--------------|
| 马 中 | 环境学院院长、教授 |
| 王化成 | 商学院副院长、教授 |
| 王顺生 | 马克思主义学院教授 |
| 王贵元 | 中文系教授 |
| 刘大椿 | 研究生院常务副院长、教授 |
| 刘劲杨 | 哲学系博士 |
| 刘晓路 | 财政金融学院博士 |
| 冯 俊 | 副校长、教授 |
| 冯玉军 | 法学院副教授 |
| 孙健敏 | 劳动人事学院副院长、教授 |
| 叶剑平 | 土地管理系主任、教授 |
| 朱 青 | 财政金融学院教授 |
| 朱景文 | 法学院教授 |
| 庄孔韶 | 社会人口学院教授 |
| 吴易风 | 经济学院教授 |
| 余 虹 | 中文系教授 |
| 李世安 | 历史系教授 |
| 陈慕泽 | 哲学系教授 |
| 杨慧林 | 中文系主任、教授 |
| 郝立新 | 科研处处长、教授 |
| 顾海兵 | 国民经济管理系教授 |

高 放 国际关系学院教授
高德步 经济学院副院长、教授
曾贤刚 环境学院博士
蓝 虹 环境学院博士

参与编纂者：

王久高 博士生
王 俊 博士生
刘化军 博士生
邬晓燕 博士生
吕致文 招商银行博士后
李 韬 博士生
李 伟 博士生
李永乐 博士生
李雅菁 博士生
佟 岩 博士生
张 伟 博士生
赵 辉 博士生
徐 青 博士生
涂明君 博士生
程小可 清华大学博士后

中国人民大学
人文社会科学发
展研究中心

确定以

精品与评价

为主题

设计、组织和编写

本年度报告

突显

精品的意义与期盼

评价的缺失与矫正

并以

学者的睿智和良心

特别关注

马克思主义理论建设

一如既往地

请各学科、各问题领域的
领衔专家

用独特的笔触

剖析

学科进展

聚焦

学术视点



出版说明

近几年来，中国人民大学年度系列发展报告（即《中国人民大学中国社会
社会发展研究报告》、《中国人民大学中国经济发展研究报告》和《中国人民大
学中国人文社会发展研究报告》）的出版发行，引起了社会各界和广大
读者的广泛关注，产生了较大的社会影响，成为我校一个重要的学术品牌，
这让我们深感欣慰，也增加了我们继续做好这项工作的责任和信心。正是基
于这样的责任和信心，加上近一年的努力，我们又编写出版了中国人民大学
系列发展报告 2005。

中国人民大学系列发展报告 2005 的各个子报告均由编委会负责审定选
题、整体框架、主要内容和编写体例，并由其组织有关专家召开研讨会，审
核写作提纲。各报告实行主编负责制，主编由校学术委员会主任、秘书长会
议确定，学校聘任；主编聘请副主编或执行副主编。各报告根据主题，分别
聘请相关部门的领导和知名学者担任顾问。中国人民大学社会学理论与方法
研究中心、中国人民大学中国经济改革与发展研究院和中国人民大学人文社
会科学发展研究中心分别作为《中国人民大学中国社会发展研究报告
2005》、《中国人民大学中国经济发展研究报告 2005》和《中国人民大中



国人文社会科学发展研究报告 2005》的依托单位，在组织和写作方面发挥了主要作用。

报告的编写出版工作现已纳入学校的年度工作规划，成为一项常规性工作。

由于报告所涉及的问题大多具有重大、复杂和前沿性的特点，加上写作与出版周期较短及研究水平的局限，尽管我们尽了努力，报告中的不足或易引起争议的地方仍在所难免，欢迎专家和学者批评指正。

中国人民大学发展研究报告编委会

2005年3月3日



Abstract Fine Works And Evaluations

I A survey of Fine Works and Some Reflections

1 Origin

1.1 Beginning with "A Survey of One-hundred-year Academic Fine Works"

This survey does not aim to present "a detailed list of public knowledge". In fact, it is to stir up a discussion about "academic fine Works", ponder on the differences and likeness between Chinese learning and western learning, and examine the academic pursuance of Contemporary China, so as to arouse a "fine work awareness" in the domain of humanities and social sciences and find out its theoretical basis, probe into standards for evaluating academic Works of humanities and social sciences and detect academic masters' spiritual secrets.



1.2 Structure of Questionnaires

This survey is carried out through questionnaires, which include four parts: basic information of the interviewees, their basic viewpoints, the bibliography to select from, and the bibliography to select at will.

2 Analysis: Revelations and Limitations

2.1 Outcome

There are 803 questionnaires retracted. After an analysis with SPSS software, there remains 109 kinds of academic fine Works during the one hundred years home and abroad, among which China harbors 34 kinds, foreign countries 61 kinds, and self selection at will takes 14 kinds. Such a list of books is arrived at in some method and procedure, thus only available for reference and discussions; it is not compulsory. For there is an easy way to deal with the variety of statistic outcomes, that is to “Make good use of Them while Stand on the ground”.

2.2 Analysis

1. More books in the west and especially the US are selected and heeded among the “academic fine Works”.
2. Distribution of the Chinese booklist is in a shape of “saddle”.
3. There are more books about humanities than social sciences in the Chinese booklist. In addition, some Works more of ideology and politics win more tickets.

2.3 Debates about “Strengthening Academics, Weakening Politics”

Academics and Politics, which one is dominant and which is subordinate? Or can we keep a harmonious relationship between them? It is still an old but difficult question. What we need is not to present some interpretative understandings of ancient Chinese or western thinkers' ideas, for it is a kind of subordinate academy, which can never generate original ideas, but only live in others' shadow. What we need is also not featherbrained meditations or simple duplication of academic Works, after all, life would be impermanent without Works with original ideas that will go down from generation to generation. In brief, what we need are those scholars who can not



only interpret the world but also change the world. It is they who instill in academics original ideas.

2.4 Limitations

Firstly, this survey has the limitation of questionnaire mode. To ask people to choose from a given bibliography would form various preferences and result in an incomplete booklist.

Secondly, it is limited by the reservoir selection pattern (to select limited books from a book reservoir). The fine Works selected through this pattern are not distinctive enough, thus only “a detailed list of public knowledge”, while some Works of strong specialty are neglected.

Thirdly, to some extent, the interviewees’ specialized background structure would have significant influence on the outcome, which therefore affect the survey’s objectivity.

Then, some books possess such high fames that they tend to get the upper hand.

3 On Academic Fine Works?

3.1 What Is Academy?

Academy in essence pursues “truth” and takes human’s freedom and full development as its target, for there is nothing higher than human itself. In order to achieve this target, China academy must embark from the universal human nature condition and take human’s freedom and full development as its solid independent foundation. Chinese scholars must reconstruct an academic logic and establish an independent academic value system. If someone presupposes a logic outside the academic one to consider non-academic needs more important than the academic logic and evaluate academy with utilitarian or political standards, it is no less than denying academy itself.

3.2 Essence of Academic Fine Works

“Academic fine Works” can be defined as “perfect academic Works” literally, or “best among academic Works”. “fine Works” are different from classics. The former carries the meaning of the word “extract”, but has discarded the supremacy of the word “classic”.



Although we can be clear with the meaning of “fine Works”, it is hard to define its connotation without comparison. The wording “academic fine Works” repeatedly appears in our times, which can be better said to be a thorough opposition against academic commonplaces, fakes and inferiors rather than a pursuit for so-called “fine Works”.

3.3 Difficulties in Evaluating Academic Fine Works

It is very difficult to find some recognized evaluation means and procedures for “academic fine Works” in practical operation. The difficulties are manifested in three aspects:

First, academic masterWorks have no fixed form, and it is improper to make simple comparison among distinct Works with the use of one fixed standard.

Next, comparison among academic Works is of value judgment, thus the subjective feeling of the people who carry on the comparison would have a bearing on the result.

Finally, the evaluation process of masterWorks is not instantaneous; history has always selected time but not human as the final judge. Men with academic achievements are not necessary to be recognized by their times, but history will surely give them a just and objective judgment.

It is truly difficult to make an objective evaluation of academic fine Works, but that they exist and emerge from the bottom of people’s hearts is a true fact.

3.4 Dependability of Fine Works on Masters

Several qualifications must be fulfilled if someone is up to the title “master” in the humanities and social sciences.

Firstly, a master must have huge achievements. Secondly, a master must have sound academic foundation and observe society; a master should be skeptical like Descartes and courageous enough to blaze new areas; a master is academy-oriented and dare to defy any authority above academic truth and any materialistic interest.

Finally, a master should be able to obtain people’s esteem. Academic achievement is just one of the conditions that make a master respectable, on-



ly perfect morality and personality can lastingly affect people's mind.

No masters, no fine Works, and no fine Works, no masters. Who is a master? A master is an academic advance landmark. What is a fine Works? A fine Works is the engraved inscription on the academic landmark.

4 Our Times Calls for Fine Works

The goal of "A Survey of One-hundred-year Academic fine Works" would rather "call for fine Works" than "seek fine Works". Our Times calls for fine works, and only in this way can academic fine Works come forth in succession. What is academic prosperity? That is a situation in which impetuous trend is removed; power corruption is eliminated, and limits to freedom are abolished.

II Deviation of Liberal Arts Evaluations and Its Rectification

1 Examination of Liberal Arts Evaluations

In recent years, many quaint phenomena occurred in Chinese academia, such as unjust scientific research, unjust appraisal, and so on. They have made our society anxious about humanities and social sciences research. The Academia is also alert on problems like the loss of discipline independence and the decline of academic spirit. Without appropriate and scientific evaluations, it would be impossible for scientific management, profound reconsideration of realistic questions and effective promotion of discipline competitive power, or feasible plans for grand goals.

1.1 Orientation of Liberal Arts Evaluations

1. The liberal arts evaluation is "an evaluation of evaluations".
2. Evaluations are subject to managerial goals.
3. To encourage innovation or to follow conventional standards, which shall we choose?

1.2 Conflicts between Evaluation Standards

Evaluations of Humanities and social sciences will inevitably face con-



flicts of different norms and standards. There are conflicts between academic standards and non-academic standards, between basic-theory research standards and applied research standards, between localized standards and international standards, and also between creative standards and normative standards.

Still, there exists a conflict between different evaluation object standards. The evaluation of humanities and social sciences involves multitudinous different evaluation objects, which include macroscopic discipline evaluations, in-between institution evaluations and scientific research evaluations, and microscopic achievements evaluations and scientific researchers evaluations.

1.3 Coordination between Qualitative Method and Quantitative Method

The current achievement evaluations of humanities and social sciences attempts to set up some so-called absolute index (mainly quantifiable index), gives judgments on the objects' academic level, achievement and value. In this sense, the evaluations are oriented at the objects' quantity difference of academic value. Next comes their quality determination.

As for quantity difference, the qualitative method emphasizes comprehensive "direct understanding", while the quantitative method stresses a feasible quantitative index to weight objects' difference, which is a kind of "indirect measure". Direct understanding, a dialogue between thoughts, goes deep into the objects' meaning world and value world, obtains a direct feeling, understanding and interpretation. Since any qualitative judgment based on evaluation individuals is subjective and limited to their experience, knowledge, local cultural environment, and so on, it has unavoidable limitations. Indirect measure is superior to the former in its objectivity, which may largely remove subjective influence and describe the quantity difference degree more objectively and clearly. Its weak point lies in that the establishment of index system is somewhat subjective and random, and that it is hard to surely determine whether indirect index is relative to evaluation target. In fact, it emphasizes now and realistic needs.



1.4 Problems in Evaluation Implementation

1. Main content and evaluation procedure
2. Re-evaluations of the figures and organizations who exert evaluations
3. Weak points in liberal arts evaluation practice
 - (1) Creativity
 - (2) Non-unitary index
 - (3) Localization of evaluations

2 Rectification of Structural Disorder

In a deeper sense, the problems in the current humanities and social sciences evaluations are rooted in the contradictions of China transition period. China is experiencing a social economic transition; accordingly, Chinese humanities and social sciences are undergoing a social institutionalization transforming process.

2.1 Utility Pursuit out of Grand Control

It is improper to question whether the institutionalization transition of China humanities and social sciences is its own development logic or an external request of China social economic transformation. But one thing we can make sure is that this transition has been in a dilemma between "efficiency pursuit" and "value construction".

However, the utilitarian choice has always been the end of material interest pursuit. The social institutionalization of this discipline is an unavoidable transformation process from truth-oriented one to material interest-oriented one.

One reason for such a structural disorder is that the discipline transition overstresses quantitative expansion and neglects structural upgrade and qualitative promotion. The quantitative standard overrides other value standards, which reduces quality to quantity. Thus, the competition between universities turns into a comparison and depredation of academic resources, while competitive power of university scientific research is related to the number of research achievements and doctorate conferrers, and the achievements of scientific research management are decided by the topic number of



significant scientific research, and so on.

2.2 Utility Pursuit out of Micro Control

When such a quantity-oriented standard is “locked in”, quantitative pursuit has become scholars’ “survival instinct”, and the academic knowledge-oriented need has given in to the realistic benefit-targeted “survival material need”. Thereupon, scholars’ achievements are identified with their publications rather than their academic standards.

2.3 A Vicious Circle of “Replacing Quality Standard by Quantity Standard”

The key of current problems lies in that a utilitarian field has come into being and brought academic disorder and corruption, because personal material satisfaction now becomes the first way and symbol of individual self-realization and honorable knowledge pursuit increasingly gives way to realistic material interest.

Knowledge producers of China humanities and social sciences deep in the utilitarianism field are at a loss about how to choose between survival matter and academic need. On one hand, as a professional, he must enable the market to recognize the value of himself or his knowledge, otherwise he is unable to survive; on the other hand, as a knowledge inventor, he must comply with academic needs and knowledge orientation so as to realize a scholar’s value. Once the entire field falls into a complete vicious circle of “replacing quality standard by quantity standard” with efficiency as its ultimate choice, an overall structural disorder is its inescapable end.

2.4 A Knowledge Field Construction as An Alternative

Peter M. Senge believed that, to eliminate structural disorder, a whole System Thinking rather than separated responses is fundamental, for we probably perceive the dynamic evolution complexities of the structure through a deep understanding of the structure “affecting our individual actions as well as causing these actions similar”.

1. Macroscopic Responses

The key to solve this problem in macroscopic sense is how to suppress the blind growth of achievement quantity and institution scale of humanities