

turned up as tiny pottery shards in Krug's "archeological deposit," but tracing influence is a notoriously difficult task, and merely alluding to a few real or alleged similarities with respect to nebulous concerns and questions plainly will not cut it.

HERBERT M. KLIEBARD

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, EMERITUS

### To the Editor:

I am pleased to reply to the points that Herbert M. Kliebard advances to defend Edward A. Krug's social efficiency interpretation in the order in which he presents them. First, if I may correct that problematic sentence on page 497 (there is always at least one!), it should read, "For the last forty years, virtually all historians of education have subscribed to the contention that the *Cardinal Principles* report is best understood as a manifestation of social efficiency-social control ideology." This revision would make that sentence congruent with the context of that paragraph and would focus the reader on the main topic of my article. Second, Kliebard's allegation that I claimed that "the CRSE has come under fire by some historians" because it "endorsed the comprehensive high school," misrepresents my line of argument. Rather, I suggested that historians and other educational researchers dismiss the comprehensive high school in part based upon Krug's association of the CRSE's *Cardinal Principles* report and the comprehensive high school with social efficiency-social control ideology (see pp. 495, 511, 514, 515, 516, and 517 of the article).

Third, upon revisiting Kliebard's sentence from page 115 of *Struggle*, I was momentarily astonished myself that I could have misconstrued the meaning that Kliebard attributes to it in hindsight. When I reexamined the paragraph and chapter section in which that sentence appeared, however, its meaning became less obvious. Kliebard's interweaving discussion of the comprehensive high school, differentiated curriculums, and the commitment of social efficiency advocates to "different forms of secondary education for different kinds of youth" conflates these concepts sufficiently to mislead the reader. If I misread that single sentence, I stand corrected. Yet, Kliebard, in passing in his response and in other works, allows that the CRSE departed from social efficiency-social control ideology only in its rejection of a dual system of secondary education. Kliebard insists that, nevertheless, social efficiency ideology appears as, for example, the "dominant refrain" (*Schooled to Work*, p. 143) in the CRSE report. Thus, the connection of social efficiency with the CRSE report that I sought to represent, in fact, appears as a recurring theme in Kliebard's work.

Fourth, evidence of dismissal of the comprehensive high school model by contemporary academics, which Kliebard characterizes as "a figment of

[my] “fervid imagination,” is documented on pages 513, 514, 515, and 516 of my article.

Fifth, because my attempt to indicate remarkable similarities between Dewey’s ideas about secondary education and principles advocated by the CRSE was indeed intended to suggest “a congruence of ideas” rather than to demonstrate exhaustively a direct influence, the strength of Kliebard’s objection to my suggestion seems misplaced.

Krug got some of his facts wrong, facts that were pivotal to his association of the *Cardinal Principles* report with social efficiency-social control ideology (see pp. 499-511 of my article). Krug also equivocated on his interpretation of the CRSE’s report to the extent of contradicting his argument (see p. 510). The correction of these errors weakens Krug’s case for associating the *Cardinal Principles* report and the comprehensive high school model, however mildly, with social efficiency-social control ideology. Kliebard has repeated Krug’s errors as he has reiterated Krug’s interpretation. I hope that Professor Kliebard is as willing to amend Krug’s social efficiency interpretation, as he is eager to correct my reconsideration of it.

WILLIAM G. WRAGA

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA