

## Free Enterprise

---

Elmer Fike's company is in Nitro proper, which is a long string of chemical companies on one side of a highway and a string of housing on the other side. Lost amid a patchwork of these chemical yards is Fike's small company, barely marked by a dusty, unadorned cement-block building. Around the doorway of Fike's office on the second floor are plastered bumper stickers reading "Feed Jane Fonda to the Whales" and "If saccharin is outlawed, only outlaws will own cancerous cats," in keeping with his reputation for resisting the regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency. He had quickly made room for an interview at the end of the same day I called him. He has done countless interviews on the book controversy and readily hands out copies of *Elmer's Tune* and his many other writings. He would have been in his mid-fifties during the book imbroglio. He sounds tired and mechanical until some question stirs him to new thought, and he does indeed think. We did the interview in his office, and from time to time he took telephone calls, the last one from his wife, who was holding supper for him.

FIKE: Ever since the federal government's been in [education], the achievement has gone downhill, and I think it's primarily *because* of the involvement of the federal government.

MOFFETT: Do you think now that they're getting out of it that it will get better?

FIKE: They're not getting out of it, yet. I hope they will.

MOFFETT: They're cutting down on funds.

FIKE: They're not cutting down very much. They're not cutting near—I think they'll improve, sure. I think if the schools got back to more local control they'd be better. They might be more diverse schools, at different places, but—It's pretty terrible. Some guy from ACLU was being interviewed on National Public Radio and he was talking about the prayer-in-school amendment, and he said with the coercive influence of the educational system today he didn't think it was possible to have a strictly voluntary prayer. I turn that around and say, "If the environment of

school is that coercive today, can we have a diversity of educational approach that's really essential to preserve a democracy?" Have we got a system that's so coercive that everybody's following the same party line that's dictated out of Washington? If we are, we're in one hell of a shape. And I think we *are* in a hell of a shape.

MOFFETT: Does that mean that Washington is putting over a radical line in the schools?

FIKE: I don't think Congress is doing it deliberately, but Congress of course in their legislation to support education deliberately set it up so that they would not have any influence on it. So what this means is that the Department of Education has just got a blank check to do whatever they want to do, and that's what they're doing. They've had some really stupid programs that they've promoted and pushed, and one of the worst ones of course was MACOS. . . . [*Man: A Course of Study*, was a popular target for book banners because of its "humanism." The federal government did fund development of MACOS and other reformative textbook series of the 1960s, as in physics, biology, and mathematics, thus lending substance to charges of curricular influence from Washington.]

MOFFETT: Some of the main objections to the books seem to be that they criticized the government's authority.

FIKE: Well, it was just typical left-wing lying. You don't have to read the textbooks. If you've read anything that the radicals have been putting out in the last few years, that was what was in the textbooks. They were questioning everything, and the books put an awful lot of emphasis on the radicals of today, whereas there's very little information about the historical and the traditional heroes of our country. For instance, they had a book in there that had interviews with Charles Manson [*an* interview with Charles Manson appeared in *Interaction's Transcripts 1* for advanced senior high school] but they didn't have things in there like *The Man Without a Country* and the typically patriotic things, you know, the story of—and one other thing that I got criticized for a great deal was, we ran across a place in there—well, the committee had just been going through the books and pulling out four-letter words and curse words and things like this, you know. So they came across the classical expression of Admiral Farragut, which said, "Damn the torpedoes. Full speed ahead!" So they noted that down along with all the other damns and hells and swear words and stuff. Well, a lot of the papers picked this up and said we were complaining because there wasn't any patriotism in there—the books didn't talk about our heroes—and here was a case where we objected when they *did* put one of the heroes in. So I got the passage and read it, and actually the way they treated the quotation of Admiral Farragut they took it out of context, and they were making fun of that quotation. They were saying, "We can't afford to talk like that

any more. It would get us in real trouble today if we were to say, 'Damn the torpedoes and full speed ahead.' " And so they were actually making a caricature of one of our heroes.

MOFFETT: Do you feel that *all* people who criticize the government are radical?

FIKE: The textbooks were not especially *criticizing* the government. They were holding up—they were criticizing the free enterprise system. That's really what they were doing. And in fact Stein, an editorial writer for the *Wall Street Journal*, wrote and said that a lot of people were complaining about the textbooks here in West Virginia, and he read some of the books, and he agreed there was basis for criticism, but we weren't criticizing for the right things. What he said was that they were a total attack on the free enterprise, capitalistic system, which they were. That's what they should be criticizing about the textbooks. So I wrote him a letter and said, "Sure, I agree with you, and I've said that many, many times, but the news media won't report that kind of criticism. They try to make us look like a bunch of rednecks."

MOFFETT: Does this mean that some kinds of criticism of the government are all right but not other kinds?

FIKE: I'm not worried about criticism of the government. It wasn't so much criticism of the government. It was portraying the Communist governments and the totalitarian governments and the socialist governments in a very favorable light as opposed to a very critical attitude about the old free enterprise system and the freedom that we have. . . .

MOFFETT: Do you feel there's a conspiracy?

FIKE: Well, I don't know that it's a conspiracy so much, but the whole publishing industry and the whole Eastern media is so left-oriented, so liberal-oriented, that—I don't think it's a conspiracy; I think those people just got there and control the situation, and that's just the way they think. I don't call that a conspiracy. . . . The publishing business to some extent is just out of touch. They don't see anything wrong with what I see as really bad.

Here's what they did. I think they made a mistake. Back in the late sixties, when all the riots and stuff got started, everybody became socially concerned, you know. So a lot of these publishers went around—it takes eight or ten years from inception to completion—and they were concerned about all these riots and race riots and war demonstrations and everything, so they went around and talked to people: "What should the textbook offer to make it more responsive to the needs of the people?" Well, everybody they talked to said we ought to, you know, talk more about race relations, we ought to talk more about minority groups and all of this kind of stuff. So they believed all that, and they started to write the books based on the problems of the inner city and all that kind

of stuff. Well, you know, sure, the inner city's got those kind of problems, but why in the hell do we have to indoctrinate our children out here in semirural communities with the problems of the inner city? . . .

\* \* \*

The textbook supporters . . . were the country club set. There's a term came up that I had never heard before. They claim it's used in West Virginia a lot — the "hillers" and the "creekers." The hillers are the people that belong to the country club and live up on top of the hill — the rich people, so to speak — and the creekers are the people who live up in the hollows. I live with the creekers, but theoretically I should be a hiller because I have a college education, and I own a company, and I have the prestige and the social graces, theoretically, that entitle me to be a hiller, but I'm a creeker at heart, I guess. But that was kind of the conflict it was.

MOFFETT: That sounds like it was the rich versus the poor.

FIKE: Oh, it was to a very large extent. At least that was — now let me go back and say that there were a hell of a lot of people of the better educated and upper social status who sympathized with us but they didn't want to do it publicly. . . .

MOFFETT: I understand that the Heritage Foundation contributed to your side.

FIKE: I've contributed to the Heritage Foundation all through the years. I was one of the first to contribute to the Heritage Foundation, and I know what they were doing. They didn't put any money into this *locally*. They got involved in the whole educational system nationwide as a result of this, and they've written a lot of publications promoting traditional, basic education. But they never put much money in down here.

MOFFETT: Maybe they did it mostly through legal support.

FIKE: They didn't even do much of that. That was grossly exaggerated. The textbook supporters tried to make it *sound* as if there were a lot of people coming in here giving support. I suspect I've spent as much money on one of the women by the name of Fay McGraw, who kept her children out of school, and they brought truancy action against her twice. The first time, I got it thrown out of the JP court. The next time, they won in the JP court, and we got it thrown out at the circuit court level because they hadn't done their homework. They didn't have the necessary legal work done properly. I think if we had gone to a jury we could have probably beat them. But I paid for that out of my own pocket. . . .

\* \* \*

MOFFETT: Did you feel it was fair that the Rev. Marvin Horan served time for fire-bombing schools?

FIKE: No, I really don't. I feel that guy was railroaded. I really think he was railroaded. I think what happened was that he probably, at some meeting—he was a very emotional kind of guy, and he was pretty upset about this thing, and he probably at some meeting said, "By Golly, we ought to burn the schools down, blow them up" or something. I don't question but what he *said* that, you know. The only thing that tied him to it was that a gas can that belonged to him was somehow involved in the commission of the crime. *Very* tenuous thing, and he had very poor legal representation. In fact, I got my lawyer to get into the thing to try to help him out, and his lawyer was so inept that he didn't even have the witnesses lined up; he was just a terrible case . . . and my lawyer went down to the courthouse to try to get ahold of their lawyer to try to bring up some points that proved the defense, and the case was already over! The case only lasted just a few *hours*. You know, a case like that—look how long—look how long they go with Hinkley, God knows! . . .

\* \* \*

MOFFETT: What do you feel the real conflict was about? Was it just the textbooks?

FIKE: It wasn't just the textbooks. They brought it to a head and made clear what the so-called progressives in the educational system were trying to do. The traditionalists objected for the following reasons—and I'm reading from "The Textbook Dispute Updated": [For the sake of completeness, more is included than he read. This is one of his own editorials.

The traditionalists perceive education as a process of teaching the child the basic knowledge and skills. Since some indoctrination is inevitable, it should promote the accepted social attitudes and morals of the society in which the child lives. The job of the schools is considered to be the transmission of the tradition of the parents to the children in order to preserve society. Books and supplementary material should be chosen to promote that end. While other cultures and governmental systems should be considered, the American system should always be the yardstick by which others are measured.

The progressives claim to object to any indoctrination because it gives too much power to the agency that determines the thrust of the indoctrination and because it does not teach the child how to examine ideas critically. They would prefer that the child be allowed to examine all philosophies with a minimum of guidance. Thus, the child develops the ability to choose what is best and will not, as a mature adult, be easily misled or indoctrinated by demagogues who offer simple solutions. The philosophy is most easily

summed up by the statement, "Teach the child how to think, not what to think." The progressives also prefer a minimum of discipline and greater freedom for the student to decide what or how he will study.

Traditionalists object to the progressive philosophy of education for the following reasons:

1. Basic skills are slighted. Instead, the available time is used to explore all sides of every issue.

2. Most children need discipline. Without it they end up wasting time and learning little. Declining test scores bear witness to this fact.

3. It is difficult to arrive at new truths without a solid basis in fact. New ideas are usually only slight extensions or variations of known facts. A sound knowledge of facts—what to think—is essential training for how to think.

4. Students are not mature enough to debate moral values in an objective way. Without the necessary understanding of the complexities of real life situations, the student is apt to oversimplify and attempt judgments beyond his ability. Those who do not become pompous simply become confused by the smorgasbord of ideas they are indiscriminately fed.

5. Some selection of materials must be made, and what is selected results in a form of indoctrination even though the progressives claim otherwise. The complete lack of material supporting traditional patriotic values supports this contention. Although the progressives claim that the material does not indoctrinate, it is written in such a way that it subtly attacks traditional ideas. While the material supposedly only asks questions, the questions are asked in such a way that the desired answers are elicited from the children, and the teachers' manuals often give the answers the teacher is supposed to get and states clearly what attitudes the teacher should strive to instill.

6. It appears that the progressives (at least the radical element that appears to be in control) do not approve of the American system as it now stands and consider education of children a means to affect [sic] the dramatic change they consider desirable. The traditionalists consider that the legitimate goal of education is to preserve the society. Necessary changes should be determined and made by elected representatives through the legislative process or by consensus of the adult community. A complete change of direction should not be the prerogative of the educators.<sup>1</sup>

MOFFETT: Were there real difference in values that are never going to be reconciled?

FIKE: Well certainly—tremendous differences in values. And it comes to the question where you wonder if we've got such a diverse society if a public school system is a viable way to go. This country survived for a hundred and twenty years without a public school system. You know, we've been almost as long without a public school system as we've been *with* one.

MOFFETT: How would you pay for private schools?

FIKE: My lord, if you didn't have your taxes to pay for public schools,

you could sure afford to pay for private schools. Private schools are tremendously cheaper than public schools—they've gotten totally out of hand.

MOFFETT: Are you thinking of a voucher system or of just cutting the taxes?

FIKE: Aw hell, just cutting the taxes. I see some merit in a voucher system, but I prefer tax credits or tax-deductible expenses. I prefer not to give vouchers simply because if the government is giving you the money they are exercising control. And I'd just as soon they didn't *have* any control. The control is where the money is.

MOFFETT: Are poor people going to be able to afford this?

FIKE: Listen, let me tell you about this Fay McGraw—

MOFFETT: They don't have much tax money to *save*.

FIKE: Let me tell you about this Fay McGraw. Let me tell you about this Fay McGraw. [Laughs.] She and her husband worked as janitors, and they had a total income of about less than \$12,000 a year, and they put their two kids through private school, because they would not send their kids to public school. I'm not worried about the poor people finding the money. It's the rich people who can't find the money—they're so deep in hock to buying things they don't need and don't want.

MOFFETT: But what I was thinking is that if we count on a tax cut it will be harder on the poor because they don't pay that many taxes in the first place.

FIKE: Fay McGraw got the money to send her kids to private school.

MOFFETT: How did they do it?

FIKE: Well, they did without. And their kids got out and scrounged and saved, and—I did her income tax for her one year, and her reportable income was something less than \$6000, and she had a daughter in a private college, in East Valeria. They raised their own food, they made their own clothes, they did everything. But they felt it was important. Now, besides that taxable income, I think he was on Social Security at that time but they had another name for Social Security. But it can be done if people want to do it. . . .

\* \* \*

The First Amendment says [he looks it up]—I keep it handy here—"Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And we clearly are prohibiting the free exercise of religion in the schools today. The freedom of religion stops at the schoolhouse door. No other activity does. The Constitution protects every other activity in school except the right of religious freedom.

MOFFETT: OK, if we go that way, would we just teach the religions of all the peoples of the world?

FIKE: No, no. No, you don't have to teach it at all. You don't have to teach it. You just ignore it and let the kids do what they want to do about it. Just ignore it. That's what they should do. But they *won't* do that. I don't know if you're familiar with the case we had here in Charleston, Kanawha County—Hunt versus the School Board—that was tried in court. And a bunch of kids that wanted to have a religious club were meeting before school. They were *bus* students, and after the bus ride they had a half hour of free time before classes started, so they started a religious club. The Kanawha County Board of Education said they couldn't do that, took them to court, and it was stopped. Now, that was a purely voluntary religious exercise. And the judge said the School Board was within its rights to prohibit it. In fact, he questioned if they could even allow it if they wanted to. And this has been held in many other cases around the country, so we've gone way beyond. . . .

\* \* \*

MOFFETT: What is your general view of Communism? What does it mean to you?

FIKE: You know, George Ball, the secretary of state, I heard him on an interview. He made two statements about Communism that I thought were totally wrong. One, he said: the ideology of Communism has gone out, it's out of the balloon, it has no real impetus any more. Nobody in the hierarchy really believes in the ideology of Communism any more, so that we're really not dealing with an ideological situation; we're just dealing with power brokers with expansionist tendencies. Well, of course there is some truth in that. The ideology went out of Communism back with Lenin. He gave up the whole concepts of Communism right in the very beginning because they didn't work, and he established totalitarianism. I don't think he made any *pretense* of establishing Communism. He *did* make a pretense—pardon me—he made an enormous pretense of establishing Communism, but he never really established the *philosophy* of Communism. He started with a totally autocratic system right from the beginning where you're told what to do or else. And that's not Communism. You know, it's not a dictatorship of the proletariat at all, like they claim it's going to be. It's a totalitarian form of government not greatly different from what Hitler had. It's an autocracy just the same as all the rest of them except that it's an extreme case of it. But they use the *ideology* of Communism in order to gain supporters, to get people to support their ways, and they're being very effective at that. They're



using, as I understand it, somewhere between ten and a hundred times as much money in propaganda as we do in this country.

MOFFETT: Maybe we ought to get a new term. Maybe instead of talking about anti-Communism, we should talk about antifascism or antitotalitarianism.

FIKE: I agree with that. We shouldn't even refer to them as Communists, because they're not Communists.

MOFFETT: I heard on the radio driving into Charleston this morning a minister talking about prophecies in the Bible, and he says that the Soviet Union of today has been prophesied — its military might and its authority over other nations.

FIKE: Yeah, but you know, it's happened time and time again. It's not anything new exactly. It's just that these people are more effective. Their technology is better developed, so they have better control of their people than they ever could in the past. With mass communications indoctrination is easier and better. With computers it's easier to keep track of people and do all sorts of things. So the technology makes them more powerful than in the past. But on the other hand, we're doing absolutely *nothing*, or very little, to combat it. There are a lot of things we could be doing we're not doing, and I think it's a big mistake.

MOFFETT: You mean besides military?

FIKE: Oh yeah, besides military. We could be cutting back on our trade with them, we could put the heat on them in lots of ways, we could — Even our Voice of America is not an effective propaganda tool because — I don't know whether you read about the controversy that's been going on — the Reagan administration put some guy in there to reform it and really start using a hard line toward the Russians, and they threw him out — didn't want to do it, didn't want to *cause* trouble with Russia. Their whole motivation is questionable.

MOFFETT: I think that generally Reagan has started to turn things around and get tougher.

FIKE: Yeah, but he has not done near what he could have done, near as much as he should have done. For instance, there was a resolution up before Congress just a few weeks ago to reestablish the Monroe Doctrine, sort of, and the State Department testified to water it way down, so we're not taking nearly as strong a stand as we could take or, in my opinion, should take.

MOFFETT: You probably read the NEA report on the book controversy.

FIKE: Yeah, I testified. [Shuffles papers on his desk.] Here is the testimony I gave, "Academic Freedom or Censorship," because that's what they claimed their hearing was all about.

MOFFETT: One thing they said was that the objections were strongly racist.

FIKE: That was absolutely ridiculous! The only people who were racist were the blacks. They grab on every issue they can and try to make it look racist. I went to talk to them, and they nearly threw me out because I quoted a black author, and that made them very mad. I went to the NAACP in Charleston and I said "I think you misunderstand us. We are on the same side of this thing as you people." . . .

MOFFETT: They didn't agree with you that you were on the same side?

FIKE: Well, that wasn't it at all. [Chuckles.] They were committed to be against us. . . . I really felt that the whole textbook thing degraded the blacks in many respects, degraded them terribly. There was one tape they had that told the story of a black man and how a bunch of redneck people, down in the South presumably, cooked up a deal that he had got a white girl pregnant, and the thing went out, and it ended up lynching him. That was the whole story. [This was the "The Eye," a short story by J. F. Powers included as both text and tape in *Interaction's Monologue and Dialogue 1* for advanced senior high. Like certain other *Interaction* books for secondary school, this came in two versions, only one of which, the one we called the "mature" version, contained "The Eye." The story is a monologue in the vernacular by one of the rednecks.] And I had a black preacher here from California—I didn't have him here, he came in—and I said, "I'd like for you to hear this tape." Well, it was terrible the way they referred to the blacks all the way through . . . as niggers and, you know, no-goods, and worthless, and all that. You know, the old stereotype of the redneck of the South and how they treated the blacks. And I said, "I want you to hear this tape and see what you think of it." He almost cried. He was a grown man. He just thought it was horrible. So I said, "I'll tell you what let's do. Let's take it up to the guy who's head of Human Rights, a black man, state Human Rights Commission, and let *him* hear this tape." So we played that tape for him and said, "What do you think about that? Do you think that ought to be in schools?" He said, "Yes, I think it ought to be in there because it shows how the black [Fike corrects himself.]—the white—people used to treat the blacks."

MOFFETT: He said "used to"?

FIKE: Well, I suppose—I don't remember. But it's sort of the attitude of the white people toward the black. [He changes to a ringing, pompous tone.] "It ought to be in there to make the white people ashamed of what they've done." I played this tape for my daughter, who's a schoolteacher in one of the rural counties of West Virginia, and I said, "What do you think about it?" and she didn't think it was a very good tape. I told her what the fellow from the Human Rights Commission said, and she said, "Well, the students *might* think that, but it would more *likely* reinforce their ideas, and they'd say, 'By God, he got what he shoulda got.' " She said it would *reinforce* the kids; it wouldn't make them feel *ashamed*.

MOFFETT: Can you imagine a way whereby they might have discussed the story and made sure they didn't take it the wrong way?

FIKE: Oh, theoretically you can do that, but, you know, who's gonna do it? Who's gonna do it? I think there are some people who would have heard that story and it would reinforce them and there wouldn't have been anything you could have said that would have made it any better. But what got me was, why would they object to *Black Sambo* and *Huckleberry Finn* and accept that sort of story? It didn't make any sense to me at all.

MOFFETT: No matter what offends you, in a way you're the judge since it's all about what offends whom.

FIKE: Well, I took the position—I think it's written in here in one of my essays somewhere—that no one should be the judge except the man himself. If it offends him, take it out. And if it gets to the point where we can't have an educational system, then let's close her down and let everybody have their own. If you can't have an educational system that's free of offense to some groups, then maybe we shouldn't have public schools any more. Maybe we ought to go back to the neighborhood schools so the blacks can have their schools and the whites can have theirs and the Jews can have theirs and the Spanish can have theirs instead of trying to put everybody in the same room and then trying to teach everybody everybody else's culture. You know, some people contend that education is passing the culture of the parents on to their children. How can you do that when we have all this busing?

MOFFETT: Well, how can you do it when you have a whole lot of different people in the society who don't agree on the culture?

FIKE: If you have the neighborhood schools, in general you end up with similar cultures. You see, by getting into busing and trying integration and everything, then you've destroyed the possibility of passing people's culture on to their children. Maybe that's good and maybe that's bad—I don't know.

MOFFETT: What did they say at the NAACP when you were there?

FIKE: Well, I told them a story. Here's the story, just briefly. [Hands me a copy of it.] What I objected to was that many of the books about the black culture made it appear that the blacks didn't have an opportunity in this country. Well, I said I don't think that was a fair presentation anymore. There are plenty of opportunities for blacks. And I started to read to them a passage from George Schuyler, or Skooler or whatever his name is—he's a black author—and now when I mentioned his name, they just—they wouldn't hear of him, that was the end of it, they wouldn't even listen to me anymore.

MOFFETT: Why was that?

FIKE: Well, he's not one of their boys. He's—they don't like him.

MOFFETT: He's local talent?

FIKE: He's local talent. And the passage I wanted to read from Schuyler said, "In spite of the difficulties that still exist, the black still has more opportunity in America than in any other country in the world." And Schuyler points out that the essential ingredient for them to arrive in the social status is *hope*, that they must have a feeling of *hope*. And I thought that made a lot of sense. And I went in there and I told them about how I started out in Florida in the Depression and we were sharecroppers, but I never gave up hope. And that was the story. But these textbooks teach the blacks there *is* no hope, and I think that's a terrible mistake. You ought to be teaching young people that there are tremendous opportunities, and there's a chance. And I started to read this passage by George Schuyler and—wow!

\* \* \*

MOFFETT: Some people have charged that the books are un-Christian. Do you think that this is true?

FIKE: Well, there were *some*. There's no question that there were *some*. There were stories in the third- and fourth-grade textbooks that referred to the story of Creation and many other stories in the Old Testament as myths. And it would tell a myth that was almost identical to this. Now, you know about the myths. They were trying to indoctrinate the children that their whole religious heritage was based on myth, and there's no real basis. It is a real offense to destroy young people's faith in a religion by referring to these as myths. They would mix up the myths of the Bible with Indian myths and all those kinds of myths. . . . If they wanted to stay away from religion, that was all right, but they were not staying away from religion. They were *dabbling* in religion and trying to destroy the religious feelings of the people in this community.

MOFFETT: What about Genesis?

FIKE: I don't think there's any contradiction between the story of Genesis and the scientific concept of evolution.

MOFFETT: The fundamentalists feel of course that both evolution and Genesis can't be true.

FIKE: Well, you know, the fundamentalists say the world was created in seven 24-hour days, just like it says in Genesis, but there's awfully good evidence, *very* good evidence, that that's not so. There's also irrefutable evidence that evolution took place. Now, to those people who would say that evolution as where we are today is the result of random action without divine direction I would say that it's pretty hard to imagine that anything as complicated as a human being came into being by random evolution. . . . [From chemistry he develops the argument that

staggering odds are against the random rise of life.] Let me give you another example. My daughter is studying entomology. She's going to get her doctor's degree out at Berkeley, this month, and she is doing *evolutionary studies*. She is working on developing spider mites through evolutionary processes, beneficial spider mites that will eat up the harmful spider mites. And of course she's using evolution, and it's done all the time to evolve various species that will do what we want them to do instead of what we don't. What they do is select the ones that do what you want and breed and modify them, so that we in effect control evolution, create things that have different strains and different tendencies and different resistances. She was in a meeting with a group of scientists, and they were talking about these kinds of problems, and they said, "This insect is *designed* in such a way that it can withstand so-and-so; this plant is *designed* so that it will do this." That's the way scientists talk; they say it's *designed* in order to — And my daughter said, "Did you ever stop to think that we're talking as if somebody really designed all this, as if there was a hand that planned it." Well, there was a big silence; nobody even wanted to discuss that possibility. These people are by and large publicly committed to the idea that it's all the result of random action, but when they're *talking* about it, they talk as though it's all the product of some kind of design. . . .

MOFFETT: I think it's the same here as with "anti-Communism"; maybe we ought to change the terms, and instead of talking about anti-Darwinism or antievolution —

FIKE: We ought to talk about "random evolution" instead of just "evolution."

Mrs. Fike telephoned to remind her husband that it was supper time.

My teen-aged waitress where I had dinner afterward recognized *Elmer's Tune* lying on the table and volunteered to tell me that Fike spoke to her high school about "his ups and downs in business" and that he speaks occasionally at other schools about business and free enterprise.