新中国基础教育课程改革的文化检讨

郑家福　著

重庆出版社

需要全本请访问 www.ertongbook.com



作者简介

郑家福，男，1963 年 1 月生。教育学博士，西南师范大学教授。与人合作出版著作、教材 8 部；科研成果中，有 3 项先后获四川省人民政府和重庆市人民政府优秀社会科学成果三等奖，1 项获四川省人民政府优秀教学成果二等奖。发表学术论文多篇。

内 容 提 要

学校课程作为文化的组成部分，是随着社会文化的变化而变化的。我国的基础教育课程改革在共和国 50 多年的风云激荡中，在社会政治、经济的强力作用下，几经变化，经历了“以阶级斗争为纲”的课程文化范式到以经济建设为中心的课程文化范式的发展变化，并显示出从文化借鉴→文化自立→文化迷失→文化觉醒→文化自觉五个反映不同文化特征的变革历程。

新中国成立初期的文化借鉴，主要是学习和借鉴苏联(1991 年 12 月，立国 70 多年的苏联宣布解体，但为了叙述的方便，在“苏联”前不加“前”字，全书同，特此说明)基础教育课程改革的经验，改造旧课程，重建基础教育课程，以确立新中国基础教育课程的社会主义性质。建立起了课程管理高度统一的、以学科课程为主的、对新中国课程发展影响深远的基础教育课程文化模式和课程体系。但本期基础教育课程改革本以文化借鉴为特征，却失去了文化借鉴须“取彼之长，为我所用”的最本质的意义，变成了不加选择的机械照搬和全盘的“苏联化”，忽视了文化部类、文化生态、文化传统对课程改革的重大影响。由此造成了苏联式的课程体系与中国的传统文化、与现实文化、与新中国改革者们的教育理想的严重失衡，埋下了此后“教育革命”的祸因。

20 世纪 50 年代末到 60 年代中期的文化自立，主要是探索我国基础教育课程的本土化模式，以实现我国基础教育课程文化的自主与自立。从实质上讲，这是一个把苏联的课程思想和课程模式与中国基础教育课程实际会通与融合，使苏联的课程思想和课程模式转化为我国基础教育课程实际的一部分，并因而体现出中国本土特征的过程。课程改革本土化立场，是课程改革的根本。本期

基础教育课程改革，经过一系列的调整与改革，扬弃和创新，打破了苏联式课程编制和课程管理模式，初步形成了具有时代性的本土化课程体系。然而在改革过程中，由于没有很好理解课程本土化必须坚持的基本原则，致使本期课程改革存在着许多问题。课程改革必须坚持的基本原则就是扬弃与创新相结合，要以扬弃和创新为指导达成课程的本土化。也就是要抛弃中西对立、体用二元的思维模式，以开放的胸襟、兼容的态度对外国课程文化的组成要素和结构形式进行科学的分析和筛选，根据我国基础教育课程建设的实际需要，发扬教育理论工作者和实践工作者的主体意识，经过辩证的综合，创造出既有本民族特色又充分体现时代精神的新课程体系。而本期课程改革是在一种文化相对封闭和“左”的文化思潮泛滥的情况下进行的，对外国文化特别是西方资本主义文化、传统文化采取了一概排斥的态度。因此，这并不是严格意义上的课程本土化探索。本期课程一方面仍留有抹不掉的苏联课程的痕迹，另一方面又浸透着强烈的“左”的文化思潮（主要是阶级斗争）的影响，并开始了“教育革命”的序幕。

“文化大革命”时期的文化迷失，表现为对前 17 年基础教育课程改革成果的自我否定，以及对传统文化形式和一切外来文化形式的否定，并异化为一套新型的“革命化”的课程文化模式。本期基础教育课程改革从本质上讲是毛泽东个人晚年社会理想和教育理想付诸实践的产物，它是以革命的方式进行的，并带有明显的乌托邦特征。它并不是对当代中国基础教育课程本土化和现代化的追求，而是以往课程本土化和现代化探索的中断，是为解决基础教育课程中出现的各种突出矛盾和问题所做的一次大胆而激进的尝试，是“以阶级斗争为主课”的课程文化范式极端发展的结果，也是与当时世界课程改革与发展的潮流背道而驰的。

随着“文革”的结束到 20 世纪 80 年代中期，中国人民从文化迷失的痛苦中醒悟过来，重新开始了基础教育课程现代化的探索。

经过艰苦细致的“拨乱反正”工作,基础教育课程逐步恢复了“文革”前的课程模式。本期基础教育课程改革由于以恢复正常的教学秩序和学校课程设置为目的,基本上是对“文革”前课程模式的恢复,因此,“文革”前的课程模式所存在的问题,在本期课程改革中并未有多少实质性的改变。但与“文革”前的课程改革相比,又有两个本质的不同:一是本期课程改革是人们在经历了“文革”十年文化迷失的痛苦而开始对自身的文化建设与发展有了逐步正确的认识后的文化行为;二是本期课程改革是在人们彻底摈弃了“以阶级斗争为纲” 的文化范式并确立了以经济建设为中心的文化范式的宏观背景下进行的。因此,本期基础教育课程改革既是“文革”前基础教育课程本土化探索的继续, 也是中国人民有意识地致力于基础教育课程现代化的开始,它并不是“文革”前基础教育课程文化模式的简单重复,而是更多地体现了当时文化发展的新特征,突出反映在课程内容对人类文化的选择、课程观念和课程活动形式等所发生的一系列新变化上,并开始注意到文化部类、文化生态、文化交流、文化遗产对课程改革的意义。

自 20 世纪 80 年代下半期至今所进行的课程改革, 是中国人民在对本民族文化和对世界文化有正确的认识和把握之后, 为顺应世界课程改革和文化发展的趋势而创建具有中国特色社会主义现代基础教育课程体系和现代新文化所进行的科学探索, 是一种自觉的文化行为, 其目的是为了在新的历史条件下取得自身文化转型的自主能力,取得决定适应国际新环境、新时代文化选择的自主地位。本期课程改革经历了两个发展阶段:从 1985~1999 年是构建中国特色社会主义义务教育课程体系阶段;1999 年至今是构建21世纪基础教育课程新体系阶段。通过前一阶段的改革,初步建立起了具有中国特色的现代义务教育课程体系。但这一体系在文化形态上仍然是传统的学科课程, 它的最大特点是以人类固有的知识为本位,忽视主体存在的价值,课程观念陈旧。它作为一种文化,

需要全本请访问 www.ertongbook.com

仍然是以一种社会文化工具而存在的，不能对社会文化产生批判与生成的意义，不利于人的全面发展。后一阶段的课程改革现正处于实验和深化阶段。本期课程改革力图实现对课程的文化工具品性的转换，使其由传统的文化的工具性存在转变为文化的主体存在，成为一种以文化批判、反思与生成为机制及品质的建构性文化，一种旨在促进人全面发展的文化，即课程文化。这一改革是中国人民在知识经济时代和全球化背景下进一步的文化自觉行为。

本研究认为，新中国成立之初提出的新中国的教育应以老解放区原有的新教育的良好经验为基础，吸收旧教育的某些有益经验，特别要借助苏联教育建设的先进经验的教育改革方略，其实质就是要求把当时并存的三种不同的教育形式有机结合起来。如果从文化的意义上讲，就是实现对传统文化、现实文化和外来文化的有机整合。而整个 50 年代的中国教育，集这三种不同的经验于一体，只是这种结合始终具有不确定性，没能很好地协调起来。即使在今天仍然能看到这三种经验各自的影响，而中国历次课程改革也总是游移于三者之间寻求平衡，一旦失衡，就会产生矛盾和为解决矛盾而进行变革甚至革命。因此，如何实现三者的有效整合，既是过去和现在课程改革必须面临的重大课题，也是课程改革成功的关键，还是我们考察新中国 50 年基础教育课程变革的立足点。

本研究在总结历史的基础上认为，当今的基础教育课程变革应立足于课程文化的建构，使课程能够作为文化的主体存在，以一种自主的文化形态在社会文化的进步、创新与生成中发挥主导性作用，真正显示出课程的主体性品质。因此，构建主客统一的新型课程范式，建立包括课程本质观、课程构成观、课程价值观、课程系统观、课程过程观以及课程与教学的关系在内的大课程观和课程目标体系、课程改革运行的新机制、课程实施的指导机制、多元化的课程体系，以及健全的课程评价体系等，是当今课程文化变革的必然趋势，我国课程改革必须顺应这一发展趋势。

A cultural retrospection over the transformation of P.R.C.'s elementary education curriculum

Abstract

As part of culture, school curriculum has been evolving along with the larger socio-cultures. Over the past 50 years since the People's Republic of China was established, the curriculum reforms in elementary education have gone through many changes. With the powerful social, political, and economical influences, the curriculum culture diagram transformation went through the *Class Struggles oriented* and *Economic Construction centered* periods; and it has displayed five characteristic phases of evolution which can be named as Cultural Borrowing and Reuse, Cultural Independence, Off-track Cultural Dilemma, Cultural Disillusion and Cultural Consciousness.

During the early years of Cultural Borrowing and Reuse, P.R.C. mainly studied and drew ideas from the Soviet Union's curriculum reforms on elementary education, renovated its old-style curriculum, and rebuilt its new-style curricula of elementary education in order to establish P.R.C.'s socialism characteristic curricula. The government set up the curriculum culture mode and curriculum system for the elementary education, which was highly monolithically managed,

centered by course-structured curricula and showed far-reaching influences on the Chinese curriculum construction. During this period, the elementary education curriculum reform was characteristic with culture borrowing and re-use although it was lost of its essential significance of *drawing benefits from others and applying them for ours*. Therefore, it became to be a reprinting version of full *Soviet Union-ization* without any selection, ignoring the importance of culture clusters, culture ecologies and culture traditions with regard to the curriculum reform. This resulted in a serious imbalance between Soviet Union style curriculum system, Chinese traditional cultures, contemporary cultures and Chinese reformers' education philosophy, and thus imbedded the disastrous seeds of *education revolution*.

From the end of 1950s to the middle of 1960s was a period of cultural independence. P.R.C. mainly explored its curriculum naturalization on the elementary education in order to achieve the target of self-determination and full independence in the light of curriculum culture of the elementary education. In substance, this is a process of mixture and union of Soviet Union curriculum thoughts and curriculum mode with the Chinese practices of elementary education curricula, and therefore transforming the Soviet Union curriculum thoughts and curriculum mode into part of our nation's elementary education practices, and displaying the naturalized Chinese characteristics. The standpoint of naturalization was the essence of the curriculum reforms. Throughout a series of adjustment and renovation, selection and creation, the elementary education curriculum reform broke through the Soviet Union style curriculum design and curriculum management mode, and thus roughly brought along with a naturalized curriculum system of contemporary characteristics. Regret-

tably, the reforming process encountered some problems due to the less understanding of the fundamental principle of the curriculum naturalization. The principle should have been the guaranteeing of the union of selection and creation that leads to the success of the curriculum naturalization. The ideal situation should have discarded the thinking mode of Sino-West antagonism and body-function dualism, should have analyzed and selected scientifically components and structure of foreign curriculum cultures, should have based upon our own demands of national practices within the elementary education curriculum construction, should have enhanced the mastership of the researchers and practitioners in the education fronts, should have created a new curriculum system with both national characteristics and contemporary morale through the methods of filtration and integration. Because of the general context of relatively closed culture and overspread political *leftism*, the curriculum reform exclusively refused foreign cultures, especially the Western capitalism cultures, and Chinese traditional cultures. This is why it cannot be regarded as thorough curriculum naturalization. The curricula left their undeniable Soviet Union vestiges on one hand, and strongly imbedded with *leftist* (mainly class struggle) cultural trends on the other hand, and therefore opened the prelude of *Education Revolution*.

The off-track dilemma during the Great Cultural Revolution can be interpreted as the self-denial against the elementary education's reforming achievements over the past 17 years, against all forms of traditional cultures and foreign cultures, and dissimilated as a new-style *Revolutionized* cultural mode of curriculum. In essence, the curriculum reform in this period was the outcome of the old-aged Mao Zedong's social idealism and education idealism that was put

需要全本请访问 www.ertongbook.com

into practice. It was carried out by the name of revolution and strongly tinted with utopia. Rather than the continuation of exploration into naturalization and modernization of Chinese elementary education curricula, it is an interruption of the former process of naturalization and modernization. It was a bold and radical attempt to solve various conflicts and problems appeared in the elementary education curricula, and were the product of the radical development of *Class Struggle Main Course* curriculum culture diagram. This process ran against the contemporary global trends of curriculum renovation and development.

At the end of the Cultural Revolution, the Chinese people aroused from the deep agony of the off-track culture dilemma, restarted the exploration into elementary education's curriculum modernization throughout into the middle of 1980s. By experiencing tough and large-scaled work to *dispel chaos and restore peace*, the elementary education curricula gradually restored to the former curriculum mode before the Great Culture Revolution. Due to the aim to regain the normal teaching orders and to re-establish school curricula, the elementary education curriculum reform basically restored the former curriculum mode, and therefore, the former problems were not resolved substantially. However, the curriculum reform during this period was substantially different from that before the Great Culture Revolution in two points. One is that the reform was carried out after the grievous experiences of the ten-year off-track cultural dilemma, and posed as a cultural activity based on what people acquired to recognize their own culture construction and development gradually. The other is that the curriculum reform was undertaken within the larger context in which people discarded *Class Struggle Oriented*

cultural diagram completely, and thus established *Economic Construction Centered* cultural diagram. Therefore, the elementary education curriculum reform in this period can be regarded as both the continuation of the naturalization seeking process before the Great Culture Revolution period, and the Chinese people's new start to pursue for elementary education curriculum modernization. It is not the mere reprint of the elementary education curriculum's cultural mode before the Great Culture Revolution period. Instead, it demonstrated much more new contemporary features of cultural development. This was highlighted in the curriculum contents within which a series of new changes can be seen in the selection of human cultures, curriculum conception and all forms of curriculum activities. People began to understand the importance of culture clusters, cultural ecologies, cultural communications and cultural heritages to the curriculum reform.

The curriculum reform conduct from the late 1980s till now was the result of what Chinese people gained a clear self-knowledge of its national cultures, and a righteous understanding and comprehension of global cultures. The aim was to conform to the global trend of curriculum reform and cultural development, and therefore, to carry out the scientific exploration to create the curriculum system within the modern elementary education with the China-style socialism characteristics. It was a conscious cultural activity that aims to achieve the culture-transition with its self-determination ability under the new historical conditions, and achieve the self-determining status that would lead China to adapt to the new international circumstances and new selection from different cultures in the new era. The reform in this period can be divided into two phases. The first

phase of 1985 ~ 1999 is the stage to build the Chinese characteristically socialism compulsory education. And the second phase since 1999 is the stage to build the 21st century's new regime of elementary education curricula. Through the reforms at the first stage, the Chinese characteristically socialism compulsory education regime had roughly been established. However, by the viewpoint of cultural configuration, this curriculum system was still the traditional course-oriented curriculum structure. The most obvious feature is that the regime proper is based on the human beings' indigenous knowledge while ignoring the value of the subject existence, and with an old-fashioned curriculum philosophy. As a form of culture, it also exists as a kind of socio-cultural tool. It does neither lead to criticism and creation upon the socio-culture nor benefit human being's full development. The curriculum reform at the later stage is still undergoing the experiments and needs to be enhanced. The curriculum reform in this stage aims to achieve the transition from the culture's tool character, turning the traditionally cultural tool character into the cultural subject existence. The reform would engender a constructive culture in which the culture criticism, retrospection and creation form part of the mechanism and quality. It is the so-called curriculum culture that would lead to the human being's full development. This reform is the Chinese people's conscious cultural activity that is positioned in the knowledge-based economic era and the context of globalization.

The author states that the proposal Chinese government posed at the early years of P.R.C.- new nation's education should be based upon new-style education which had been carried out in Old Liberated Areas, some beneficial experiences be drawn from the old-

regime education, especially drawn from the progressive experiences and education reforming strategies that was gained in Soviet Union education building – the essence was to unite all the three different forms of educations. By the viewpoint of culture studies, it aimed to achieve the integral combination of traditional culture, contemporary culture and foreign culture. China's education in 1950s can be regarded as a mixture of all these three different experiences, although this kind of mixture always demonstrated its uncertainty and less of harmony. Even today, we can still be aware of the influences from the three different experiences. The curriculum reformers over the past years in China have always been seeking the balance between these three different parts. Once the balance is lost, some conflicts, and the solution of the conflicts will arise, and a reform or even a revolution will come into being accordingly. Therefore, how to achieve the effective integration of these three parts is both an important task to which the curriculum reform in the past and present faces, and the key point on which the success of curriculum reform lies. It is also the standpoint from which we explore the elementary education curriculum transformation over the P.R.C.'s past 50 years.

Based upon the historical exploration, the author states that the transformation of today's elementary education should be rooted on the construction of curriculum cultures in order to build the curricula as a cultural subject existence. We should genuinely display the subjects and characters of the curricula, and therefore perform leading roles of the self–determining cultural form in the middle of the progress, renovation and building of social cultures. Based on these, the inevitable trends of today's curriculum cultural transformation can be seen as follows: to build a new–style curriculum diagram with

the union of objects and subjects; to build Big Curriculum View and curriculum target systems, including curriculum essence view, curriculum structure view, curriculum system view, curriculum process view and the relationship between curriculum and teaching; to create a new mechanism on which the curriculum reforms are undertaking; to produce a guiding framework within which the curricula reform is carried out; to construct a pluralized curriculum structure and a sound curriculum assessment system. We China should keep the curriculum reform along with these socially evolutional trends.

前　言

一、本研究的意义

课程作为人类教育活动的核心构成，自产生以后，就一直处于不断的发展变革之中。可以说，变革是课程的本质特征。新中国成立半个多世纪以来，由于社会主义政治、经济、文化的日益进步，特别是在我国实行改革开放政策和科教兴国战略，教育逐渐成为带动社会发展的“轴心机构”之后，这种变革更是高潮迭起，一浪高过一浪，出现了从未有过的繁荣，也取得了举世公认的成就。联合国教科文组织曾称赞 50 年中国基础教育的进步和取得的成绩是其他发展中人口大国难以比拟的。然而在这繁荣和巨大成就的背后，却有着令人难以忍受的创痛，隐藏着深刻的危机。课程改革并未逃脱适应论和工具论的藩篱，在各利益集团固有权利的再分配的反复较量下，各次课程改革总是存在着这样或那样的问题，难以实现其既定目标。在人类刚进入 21 世纪的今天，从更宽广、更深层次的文化视野，特别是文化变革视野反思半个世纪来我国基础教育课程改革和发展的历程，建构新的课程理念，搞好新一轮基础教育课程改革，以培养新世纪的一代新人，是我们必须面临的重大历史课题，也是教育发展的必然选择。因此，对新中国 50 多年来课程变革的研究就有了特定的意义。

1.有助于厘清制约我国基础教育课程改革存在的一些重大的基本问题，总结经验教训，避免重蹈覆辙。

50多年来，我国的基础教育课程改革从理论到实践都存在诸多的问题，这些问题突出表现在：

第一，历次课程改革自觉或不自觉地顺应政治文化的主导和制约，具有强烈的政治倾向性。

在新中国成立后的相当长一段时间里，政治对课程改革的主导和制约往往是通过制度、政策、方针、通知、社论或讲话来体现的。在民主很不健全的情况下，这些东西往往是领导者意志的产物。这种情况在“文化大革命”前的几次课程改革中尤显突出。

在新中国的历史上，毛泽东作为中国人民的伟大领袖，留下的印迹最深最广。埃塞俄比亚最后一位君主海尔塞拉西在 1971 年 10 月访问中国时说：“毛主席的一生经历实际也就是新中国的历史。个人对一个国家的历史有这么深刻的影响，那是很少见的。”① 的确，毛泽东不仅一手缔造了新中国，彻底改变了百余年中国半殖民地半封建的屈辱历史，使一个贫穷落后的国家一跃而成为独立自主、初步繁荣富强的社会主义新国家，而且他的影响也渗透到了中国社会发展的方方面面。“文革”前的几次课程改革，都留下了深深的毛泽东个人影响的痕迹。毛泽东一生最关心意识形态问题，在他看来，教育特别是学校课程作为意识形态领域的重要组成部分，直接关系到为无产阶级革命事业培养接班人的大问题，不能有半点差错。因此，他对教育和学校课程给予了特别的关注，发表了若干重要的具有方针意义的指示或讲话，直接指导着教育和课程的改革。

毛泽东一生高瞻远瞩，对中国的社会政治、文化具有深邃的洞察力和分析力，但人非圣贤，毛泽东毕竟是时代的产物，个人的认识水平总是要受时代的局限和制约。马克思主义历来认为，领袖人

① 韩素音：《早晨的洪流》，杨青译，香港南粤出版社 1974 年版，扉页。

物的作用就在于他比一般人站得高些,看得远些,在给定的历史条件下能够顺应时代的潮流,领导民众成就宏伟事业。在中国革命时期,毛泽东正是顺应了时代潮流,才正确地引导中国人民的革命事业从一个胜利走向另一个胜利。而在新中国社会主义建设时期,由于毛泽东个人认识水平的局限,也由于毛泽东对中国革命所做出的巨大贡献而受到全国人民由崇敬变为了极端的个人崇拜,更由于没有健全的民主与法制的监督,在这种情况下,当毛泽东对如何搞好社会主义政治、经济、文化建设的认识开始出现偏差并导致一系列失误,特别是对这些失误因个人崇拜而无法加以及时纠正的时候,像"大跃进"、"文化大革命"这样更大的失误的发生就势所难免了。

"文革"前的几次课程改革,既渗透着毛泽东的个人意志,又浸染着强烈的时代政治色彩,它随时代政治的需要而发生,也随时代政治的终结而结束。

第二,历次课程改革缺乏课程和课程改革的理论指导,具有盲目性。

课程改革是一个涉及社会各个方面的庞大的社会活动,左右它的力量繁多而复杂,其中,既有教育行政部门(包括个别领袖人物)的行政参与,又有学校和教师、学生的自觉行动,还有全社会成员对课程改革重要性的认识和支持、配合。这些力量和原因是显而易见的。然而,正是由于这些显而易见的原因,使人们忽视了另一个课程改革和发展必须具备的先决条件,这就是正确的课程改革和发展理论。一般来说,课程改革必须立足于两大基石:一是课程的历史研究;一是课程的理论研究。

虽然新中国成立以来,中共中央、国务院、教育部等先后颁布了一系列有关课程改革的决定、纲要、规程等,毛泽东等党和国家领导人也作了很多重要的讲话和指示,以此作为课程改革的纲领性文件。但它们并不等于课程改革的理论,它们仅仅是国家行政部

需要全本请访问 www.ertongbook.com