The first step was to count the number already there. In a student body of 27,000 a racial survey of U.S. citizens found 236 Negroes, 68 Mexican-Americans, and 36 American Indians. Less than two percent of the student body consisted of minority persons, who make up more than 16 percent of the state's population.

The university then surveyed San Francisco Bay-area high schools, asking how many minority youths were preparing for college in general and for the university specifically. The answer came back: Virtually none.

Today, due largely to a vigorous program of recruitment, financial aid, and academic assistance, the minority-group population at Berkeley has more than doubled. But this still is far from the goal of 4,000, a figure approximately proportional to the state's minority population.

Of the 175 students who were brought in by the program last year, only 42 did not complete the three quarters. Half of the 42 were dismissed for poor grades and half dropped out. (About 25 percent of all Berkeley freshmen drop out in their first year.)

"We're not doing anything more for these students than universities have done for athletes for years," the program director says. "The athlete, in most colleges and universities, is given admission, financial, and academic assistance to the degree necessary to insure that he has every possibility to succeed academically."

More than 65 percent of the program students do not qualify academically for admission to the university. California requires that incoming students be in the top 12.5 percent of their high school class. These students are admitted under a rule—long in effect for athletes—permitting exceptions for up to 2% of the student body.

Five-Language Movie Film

Among the new technical advances in education is a five-language motion picture film. Five sound tracks instead of one are produced on the edge of a 16mm movie film. Small black boxes connected to the projector permit an auditor to select the language he wants. The same system can be used to convey information in the same language at different intellectual levels, so that a single film showing can reach an audience of widely differing linguistic and educational backgrounds. The five-track magnetic sound strip costs 20 percent more than a single track.

**Backtalk**

**Pro Ebel**

We all owe a great deal to Mr. Ebel (Kappan, October '67) for his excellent rejoinder to Mr. Cronbach (Kappan, June '66).

Among his many cogent observations Mr. Ebel states that "Most of ① our educational problems involve questions of purposes and values." After we establish our purposes and values, in which basic research is of no help, applied research can help us achieve them.

Nowhere is Ebel's point better illustrated—unintentionally, I suppose—than in what he lists as two basic educational questions: What shall we try to teach children? And how shall we go about getting them to learn it? These two questions arise within a certain set of values about education. This set of values is widely but not universally accepted. Those of us who do not accept that set of values would not concede that the two questions are basic.

All of which strengthens Mr. Ebel's position.—Beecher H. Harris, curriculum director, retired, Shasta County, Calif.

**Con Ebel**

The first time I glanced at Robert Ebel's "Some Limitations of Basic Research in Education" [October Kappan] I passed it off as another editorial mistake; the author was probably just trying to court the establishment by expressing a point of view, presently universally accepted. But this still is far from the goal of 4,000, a figure approximately proportional to the state's minority population.

Among his many cogent observations Mr. Ebel states that "Most of our educational problems involve questions of purposes and values." After we establish our purposes and values, in which basic research is of no help, applied research can help us achieve them.

Nowhere is Ebel's point better illustrated—unintentionally, I suppose—than in what he lists as two basic educational questions: What shall we try to teach children? And how shall we go about getting them to learn it? These two questions arise within a certain set of values about education. This set of values is widely but not universally accepted. Those of us who do not accept that set of values would not concede that the two questions are basic.

All of which strengthens Mr. Ebel's position.—Beecher H. Harris, curriculum director, retired, Shasta County, Calif.

I am particularly angry about three reasons Ebel selects to show why "basic research in education can promise very little improvement in the process of education." These reasons* are precisely those which are most appropriate to the very sort of research he is proposing—the collection of raw empirical or survey data of the type that has characterized much of educational research for the past 30 years.

*1) Its record of past performance is very poor. 2) ... explanations of that poor performance call attention to serious basic difficulties that are unlikely to be overcome in the foreseeable future. 3) ... education is not a natural phenomenon of the kind that sometimes rewarded scientific study....

**Why Religion in School**

I am quite disturbed by what I think Mr. Warshaw is saying in "Teaching About Religion in Public Schools: 8 Questions" [January Kappan]. Early in the article he states, "To bar study about religion, religions, and the Bible from the public school curriculum because of the Supreme Court's decision is unnecessary; more