

TELEVANGELIST SUMMARIES
October 1988

D. JAMES KENNEDY

Coral Ridge anniversary.....74-76
Last Temptation of Christ.....84

PAT ROBERTSON

ACLU, part 1.....78-81
ACLU, part 2.....81-83
Satanism.....89
Vice presidential candidates' debate.....76-78

JERRY FALWELL

Employment.....84
Talent.....84

CORAL RIDGE MINISTRIES 10-2-88

Coral Ridge Ministry's Anniversary

DAN SCALF, executive producer, Coral Ridge Ministry

"...Why did you feel that you wanted to begin a television ministry at the church? Why did you feel it was important?"

KENNEDY

"Well for a number of reasons, one of them is, many people had said that they felt that there were certain things that needed to be said on television that weren't being said. If you go to the theater, if you read the average magazine, or novel, or listen to radio or television, you increasingly see a culture which is devoid of any Christianity. Now that's not the way this country got started. And it's become almost totally secularized because we have withdrawn and I wanted to see us attack, go on the offense and carry the word of God into every part of life..."

SCALF

"Jim, when you speak out on issues like communism, the economy, AIDS, church and state, a lot of people will state that that's not appropriate, that's not appropriate for a minister of the gospel...how do you respond to that?"

KENNEDY

"Well you know Dan, a lot of people would like to take Christianity and put it in a box. They'd like to put it in the closet and close and lock the door. Oh, it's alright for you to be a Christian, it's alright for you to worship God and to sing songs and read the Bible. Just get into your closet and close the door and don't bother us. We secularists, we're going to take over the country, we're going to corrupt the kids, we're going to corrupt the media...we refuse to be put in a box and there's some people who don't like that. Jesus Christ is King of kings."

SCALF

"Sounds a little like censorship in reverse. The people who are screaming censorship are very actively involved in trying to censor you."

KENNEDY

"That's a very good point. They certainly are and it is interesting that the greatest amount of censorship going on in this country today is the continual censorship of Christian views everywhere that they can be censored. If it's possible for them to keep them from the minds of the American people and present only the secularist, atheistic, humanistic view, they're going to do that. But by the grace of God, we won't let them get away with it."

SCALF

"There's another issue that I know you feel very strongly about and it has to do with life and where the value of life comes from and that's evolution v. creation. Share with us how you feel about that and the significance of that issue."

KENNEDY

"Well you're right. It goes back to the Declaration of Independence which says that God has created all men equal and that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights. Now if we took the Supreme Court decision on the Louisiana Balance Treatment of Creation and Evolution which the Supreme Court struck down, we couldn't even teach the Declaration of Independence to our schools because the Declaration doesn't say that all men have evolved equally and they are endowed by the primeval slime with certain inalienable rights. You see if we have no Creator we have no inalienable rights and that's why these nations who believe in evolution such as the Soviet Union, or Communist China or Bulgaria, have no inalienable rights. They have only those rights which are granted to them by the state. and the same state which gives them those rights can take them away and that's why creation is a very, very vital doctrine, all of our liberties ultimately hang on that truth...if evolution were true, then Jesus Christ is not the eternally divine son of God, he is a descendant of the simian. He's just a complicated ape and that is blasphemous. And of course that would take away all of our hope of everlasting light and of course the evolutionists know that. They know that ultimately evolution is the complete denial of the Christian faith...

...Communism is based upon spiritual error. It's based upon the idea that there is no God and that man has no intrinsic and eternal worth. AIDS ultimately arose because people had violated the divine commandment and had become involved in what the Bible calls sin and homosexuality. Education is a vital spiritual problem and the question is, is there a God who has given us absolutes. And there are actual moral standards that should be taught to children or are we simply going to give them values clarification which simply tells the child that whatever you think, whatever you want, whatever you value, that is right and there is no absolute that can possibly be given to the child. this is the kind of thing that destroys societies and civilizations and it is vital that God's truth be proclaimed...

...The atheists and the unbelievers and secularists and the humanists don't fight a dead dog. The reason that they are so hostile to Christianity is because they know that Christianity is growing and it is threatening their secularistic, atheistic, humanistic empire. The fact of the matter is, 20 years ago a Gallup poll indicated that 45 million Americans declared that they were born again Christians...Twenty years later in the most recent Gallup poll indicates that 40% of the American people say

that they are born again Christians and that's 96 million Christians, that's 51 million Christians in 20 years and I want to tell you, that scares the daylights out of unbelievers, the fact that Christians are growing in spite of the titanic, continuing assault upon evangelical Christianity in this country. You know it's interesting that one of our intelligent commentators today, Michael Novak wrote in a column that today you can no longer publicly defame groups like women or blacks or Jews or Poles or homosexuals, but the only group, he said, which today can be publicly defamed and denigrated are Evangelical Christians. And it is tragic the amount of anti-Christian bigotry that we see in our land today. And of course the most recent example of this is the utterly blasphemous film The Last Temptation of Christ which even goes beyond anti-Christian bigotry all the way to anti-Christian blasphemy. And this is the first time that we have seen anything like this on American films and I think it's a very bad omen for the future of Hollywood."

700 CLUB 10-7-88

Vice Presidential Debate

PAT ROBERTSON

"There's a commentator from Illinois who said Dan Quayle could sink Bush in a close race. You think that debate hurt Quayle or helped him or just about left him where he was?"

FRED BARNES, senior editor, New Republic

"I think it probably left it the way it was before. I didn't think Quayle did particularly well. You can look at debates in different ways. You can look at them on the basis of personality and we all know George Bush won on the basis of personality in his debate with Mike Dukakis. You can look at it on issues. Did you talk about your issues. Quayle did well on that, he lost in personality but he did what he wanted, mainly talking about the liberalism of Dukakis. And then there's just debating points and I think they both did fairly well on that. I think in balance, because personality means a lot and style, that Bentsen probably won, but not by much and Quayle isn't any more of a harm to the ticket than he was before and I think he's only a small drag on the ticket and probably won't effect the outcome of the race."

ROBERTSON

"I was talking to Bob Martinez, the governor of Florida a couple of nights ago and he said Bush is leading in Florida by 17%, that Dukakis is moving people out of the state and there's some thought, they're going to give up the South. Dukakis has got to go in and win Ohio, Illinois, Michigan. He can't win the presidency without those states."

BARNES

"That's absolutely right, because Bush virtually has the whole south, there are only two states that are up for grabs now, North Carolina and Arkansas. Bush has locked up Texas and despite Lloyd Bentsen being on the ticket with Dukakis, Bush has the rocky states, he has a large base of approximately 200 electoral votes. So Dukakis can't win unless he gets Michigan, Ohio and Illinois, all three of them. They have a quarter of the votes needed which is 270, needed to win the presidency. So Dukakis has no margin for error and the fact is, I would dispute one thing in your report, the fact is from talking to pollsters in Michigan, Bush has a lead 6 to 8 points, a lead that he's held for some time so it really does not look good for Mike Dukakis in the middle west."

ROBERTSON

"The game's over. That's what you're saying essentially."

BARNES

"I'm saying unless Dukakis wins all the big states in the middle west, then the game is over for him. There's just no room for error. He also has to win California which is a toss-up and California has had a very Republican voting record in recent presidential elections."

ROBERTSON

"What strategy do you think he has to take? He's been on the defensive, Jim Baker has been a master tactician, Bush has taken the offensive, they hit him everyday with the line of the day and Dukakis has to react. What can he do? There are only 34 days left."

BARNES

"There's really not a whole lot he can do. I think he needed Dan Quayle to be horrible in the debate last night, to commit gaffes, to say things people would be laughing about and to have an overwhelming consensus today that Dan Quayle is not qualified to be president and therefore, Dan Quayle would be a substantial drag on the Bush ticket. That didn't happen and so Michael Dukakis is just floundering around for issues. He tried practically everything and nothing works with him. He has been on the defensive. I think he'll go back to Iran-Contra, Noriega and I think he'll try to solidify a Democratic base by talking about spending on programs like education and childcare and even that won't work. I think the race is in Bush's hands and if Bush doesn't make some horrendous mistake, Bush should win."

ROBERTSON

"You're the second analyst in a second region who said just that. First the south and now the midwest. About Quayle by the way, he served in the House, he is a second term U.S. Senator, when

you look at Geraldine Ferraro for example, she was only a couple term member of the House of Representatives. Nobody brought up all this 'qualifications to be President' to her. It never happened. Why are they beating on him so badly?"

BARNES

"It certainly didn't happen and you're touching on how the press operates. It certainly is a bias against conservatives and against Republicans. Most reporters are liberal and they didn't bring that up. The same people who told you what a wonderful running mate Ferraro was and of course, she turned out to be a terrible one on pure political grounds, now are questioning Dan Quayle. The same people who told you Teddy Kennedy would be a wonderful president in 1980 are criticizing Dan Quayle. You know there may be some sympathy for Quayle since he was the one who was pummeled in the debate with the question of 'are you qualified, what would you do the day you took office if you were president,' and those same questions were not given to Lloyd Bentsen."

700 CLUB 10-12-88

Michael Dukakis' broad proclamation that he is a card carrying member of the ACLU has sparked a flurry of controversy in this presidential race. But why? Has the ACLU proved to be the anti-conservative champion of liberal causes? Or is it simply as its supporters say, the defender of individual human rights.

PAT ROBERTSON

"Dr. Donohue, the ACLU claims to be a nonpartisan group that has no true agenda. Is that the case or not?"

WILLIAM DONOHUE, author, *The Politics of the ACLU*

"No, as a matter of fact one of the nice things about Roger Baldwin, and I had an opportunity to meet him back in 1978, was that he was refreshingly candid about what the organization's purpose was. The organization was designed to use procedural rights, that is to say the rights of the individual, to advance the agenda of the left. The only difference really between Roger Baldwin and Ira Glasser today is that Ira Glasser would like to throw up a smokescreen. That is to say that somehow they're interested in the rights of all Americans. They do pick and choose a couple of cases here on the conservative side, but for the most part, their aim is to reform American society according to the wisdom of conventional liberal left thinking."

ROBERTSON

"Well I saw one quote from Roger Baldwin he says, 'we will use

civil rights to bring in a worker's state in America.' Is that an accurate quote in accordance to what he told you?"

DONOHUE

"More than a worker's state. Most people when they think of a worker's state, they think maybe they're going to give some rights to men and women. People need to know that the ACLU was so far to the left when they were founded that they actually worked against the rights of working men and women in this country. They worked to defeat the Wagner Act. They called it the tool of the fascist state. They joined hands with the communist party, the only two organizations left of center in the United States to try and defeat the Wagner Act. So when they talked about rights of working men and women, people should know that Samuel Gompers and John L. Lewis condemned the ACLU because they understood what the ACLU was all about using the law to bring about radical change not to moderate, not gradual change but a major transformation in American society along the lines of Marxist, Leninist thoughts."

ROBERTSON

"At it's founding in 1919, were there communist party members on the board of directors. The initial board of the ACLU?"

DONOHUE

"...There's no question about it...when the ACLU was founded, right up until August the 23 of 1939, the ACLU was very receptive to having communist work in their organization. I chose August 23, 1939 as a breaking point because that's when Hitler and Stalin signed their mutual non-aggression pact which eventually led to World War II. It was that that convinced Baldwin and many others that you couldn't trust the communist anymore than you could the fascist and then Baldwin the following year, sought to purge people like Elizabeth Gurley Flynn from the organization."

ROBERTSON

"Well that's what I was going to say. They then amended those things and now welcome communists in various positions don't they. I shouldn't say welcome, but they allow them to be members. Is that correct?"

DONOHUE

"That is certainly true. In 1967 they repealed their 1940 resolution which prohibited the communist from being engaged in the ACLU governing staffs. Now in 1967 it was very interesting. They said, well we're going to supersede the 1940 resolution. They said if you are at all committed to totalitarian thinking or to groups, then you cannot serve on the governing board of the ACLU. But that is simply not true. For example, to this date William Kunstler is on the national advisory board of the ACLU. William Kunstler has openly said in 1971 in the New York Times,

'I am a double agent working within the system, working within the system to bring down the system.' He said that he refuses to criticize violation of human rights if they exist in socialist countries. Only in capitalist countries will he criticize them. And Lillian Hellman was on the national advisory council of the ACLU until her death and she was one of the greatest defenders of Stalinism in the 20th century so yes, they do in fact welcome anybody no matter how committed they are to the far left agenda to serve in their governing staff."

ROBERTSON

"It's a shocking thing that what you quoted Kunstler is apparently what the organization is doing...and that is precisely what Michael Patrick of the Rutherford Institute said the whole organization is doing, working within the system to move the system in a far left direction. Is that a fair statement?"

DONOHUE

"I think you have to understand Pat in fairness to the ACLU, you have 250,000 members, many of those people are in fact sincerely committed to the Bill of Rights. I think that many of them really are ignorant of what the organization has turned out to be, particularly in the last 20 years. Many of the people in the ACLU's history like Norman Thomas, six time presidential candidate for the socialist party were fine outstanding Americans who sincerely believed in civil liberties for everybody. But my charge is this, the most active members in the ACLU, those on the national board of directors are by in large, people who are using civil liberties to advance the agenda of the liberal left. There are no doubts that there still are principled people in the ACLU. But for the most part unfortunately, those people have gone by the wayside."

ROBERTSON

"Two last questions. Number one, is Susan Estrich, Michael Dukakis' campaign manager, is she on the governing board of the ACLU? I heard she was."

DONOHUE

"She was the head of the Massachusetts Civil Liberties Union and she was on the national board of directors of the ACLU and she is the woman who in 1984 co-authored a piece with Virginia Kerr talking about the need for us to defend the rights of lesbian mothers. She also talked about the need for women to be drafted, to go into combat and yet the press seems reluctant to ask Ms. Estrich why in fact she's been hiding from these..."

ROBERTSON

"One last question. Who pays the bill. Sixteen million dollars is a lot of money, considering an enormous amount of pro bono legal work that would double or triple the budget. Who's paying the bill?"

DONOHUE

"Members pay a minimum of \$20 a year, they get money from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Playboy Foundation, but with the pro bono work, that helps keep their expenses down."

700 CLUB 10-13-88

This segment (Part II of a 2 part series) discusses the ACLU's political agenda. Here are some excerpts.

PATRICK MCGUIGAN, Free Congress Foundation

"Their philosophy is the most radical conceivable elements of the liberal agenda."

MICHAEL PATRICK, Rutherford Institute

"Their claim to be a neutral defender of the Constitution. I don't think anybody really takes that seriously other than their own PR man."

Pledge of Allegiance

IRA GLASSER

"One of the things that patriotism means in this country is the right not to salute the flag, the right not to show your faith or bend your knee to what the majority or the government thinks is orthodox in politics or religion."

PAT ROBERTSON

"Tell us about how the ACLU's view of the first amendment would differ from yours, the Washington Legal Foundation?"

DANIEL POPEO, founder and general counsel, Washington Legal Foundation

"Well first of all you have to look at the ACLU not on the pious beliefs that they espouse, get behind the Hollywood dynamics of their PR people and see what they really do...they espouse a radical left wing liberal, democrat agenda and I find that when they go out in the name of free speech or the first amendment or civil liberty or constitutional rights or whatever right that they're out there defending, in reality what they do when they win is they restrict others to engage in exercise and benefit from their own civil liberties. When the ACLU wins honest, law abiding citizens, normal mainstream Americans lose."

ROBERTSON

"The Polochak case in Chicago, tell us about that. This young boy wanted to stay in America, essentially defect from the Soviet Union, the ACLU came down in favor of his parents and forcible

deportation back to communism. How do they justify that?"

POPEO

"Well they really can't. Even Alan Dershowitz who served on their board had a major dispute with the ACLU over it. I find it almost comical to see the hypocrisy here. Here you have a young man that the only reason he is in America today and not in Russia, and you know what would have happened to him if he did go back to the Soviet Union, is because he turned 18 and the court actions became mute. But the ACLU represented his parents when they wouldn't represent a young man from Chile who wanted the same type of legalization taken on his behalf to stay in America, because they felt Chile was a different type of government. Clearly when it comes to the Soviet Union and dealing with communistic Russia, they have taken a very political position. For example, in the Grenada rescue mission, I know of no organization that holds the basic precepts of the Constitution and the welfare of the American public at heart in their own priorities that would go to court and try and have the Grenada rescue mission declared unconstitutional. That's what the ACLU did."

ROBERTSON

"We ask ourselves, and I'm sure many people watching this program would ask themselves, how does an organization that seemingly is so far out of the mainstream of American thought in many, many ways, gain such incredible power because they are a very, very influential organization."

POPEO

"You know Pat, I asked myself the same question. They have an \$18 million budget, they have organizations active in every state in the union. They get the benefits of free legal services from some of the major law firms in the country and I would suggest that they're just a little more organized and they've been around a little longer than groups like the Washington Legal Foundation and other organizations that are organizing to take them on. I like to refer to them as the American Criminal Lovers Union. You will see them take an issue like for example, abortion and they will have vast segments of the American public believing that there's going to be government invading their bedrooms when in reality, the only people who are invading bedrooms in this country are the burglars and rapists and criminals that the ACLU gets off the hook and gets out of jail early or somehow creates a technicality in criminal action precedents or courtroom action where these people don't get prosecuted and don't get punished and that's really what we need to look at with the ACLU. You have this enormous empire with Hollywood friends, with liberal Democratic friends like Mike Dukakis and Teddy Kennedy, that are woven right into the mainstream and the establishment of the American processes. The media cuts them breaks, academia and the law schools are

standing behind them but it's a matter of time before good people like you and all of us at the Washington Legal Foundation get our message out because when the American public learns the truth about the ACLU, I think that it's very clear where they stand and what's going to happen is I think they're going to deliver like that to Mike Dukakis this November over the ACLU."

ROBERTSON

"How did you do in court? Have you taken them on certain cases and did you win some?"

POPEO

"Yes we have, we oppose them continuously when they try to get the death penalty knocked out. The funny thing about the ACLU is that they turn around and say there shouldn't be a death penalty but there's a right to execute or commit murder and get away with it. I haven't found it in the Constitution. I think our founding fathers must be rolling over in their graves. But then they say, put them in prison instead. But then they have another project called the prison project which is funded with many millions of dollars where they go to court and try and get people out of jail early because prison isn't a convenient place or you don't have your private cell. They took a case once out west where they sued a warden because there was not a dietician on staff at the jail who had a college degree in the dietician field. We've taken them on in the Grenada rescue mission case where they have said it is unconstitutional that President Reagan would have ordered military action to rescue those American medical students that would have probably been held hostage like Iran and a variety of other cases. We take them on in every courtroom we can except we're not as organized as they are but we're getting there."

ROBERTSON

"Ronald Reagan has appointed well over 50% now, of the federal judges. Not only key appointments on the Supreme Courts but circuit courts and the district courts. Is this going to make a difference? Are we going to shift the balance a little bit do you think, in what the judicial system will give us in the next 20 years?"

POPEO

"I hope so but the thing to remember is that the liberal Democrats, when they got on the bench, are radical activists who pursue the ACLU's agenda. When the Republicans get on the bench, they believe in judicial restraint, they don't pursue anyone's agenda. It's not what they do, it's what they don't do that's important. Jimmy Carter appointed almost 50% of the federal judiciary as well so there is a liberal Democratic influence throughout the judiciary that we will have to deal with no matter what Ronald Reagan accomplishes."

OLD TIME GOSPEL HOUR 10-23-88

Definition of Talent

FALWELL

"A talent is a supernatural ability given to a believer of Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit the moment of his or her salvation. The moment God saved you he put his holy spirit in you and instantly inspired you will gifts, abilities."

Employment

"...We've got a lot of lazy spiritual bums in the church who say they're living by faith and who wouldn't work in a pie shop eating the holes out of doughnuts. The Bible says, 'if a man shall not work, neither shall he eat.' I'm for workfare with welfare. Workfare. It doesn't say if a man cannot work, it says if he will not work. And we have a lot of saints who instead of getting a job out here and getting up at 6:00 and 5:00 in the morning and punching in and working all day, they'll beg the church, give me some money, can't pay my light bill and so forth."

CORAL RIDGE MINISTRIES 10-23-88

This was an in depth program with Kennedy's attempt to discredit The Last Temptation of Christ by going back in history and calling upon experts to give their opinion about the film

700 CLUB 10-2 thru 10-8-88

Operation Rescue Updates

700 CLUB 10-24-88

Supreme Court

PAT ROBERTSON

"Over the past two presidential campaigns, it was commonly noted that whoever would be elected for the White House could well determine the ideological shape of the Supreme Court into the next century. The same is being said of this year's presidential

race where there are three judges who most likely will be retiring during the next four years and yet the federal judiciary had hardly been a major issue at all during this election. Why not?

BRUCE FEIN, judicial scholar, Fein and Associates

"Politics is keeping the Democrats in the Senate from confirming nominations made by President Reagan in the hopes that Michael Dukakis will capture the presidency in November and some 50 openings that are now there will be filled by a Democrat rather than a Republican, George Bush."

NARRATOR

"Fein says the committee is probing much too far into how justices would vote in particular cases and is searching more for ideology than for professional competence. Fein says that forces the justices to compromise intellectual integrity."

FEIN

"Once they get on the high court, they really aren't free to depart from what they stated before the Senate and moreover, a litigant before those particular justices don't think they have already expressed themselves to 250 million persons and as judge Bork stated he would be a ridiculous burlesque in the eyes of history if he departed on the high court in his vote in a way that differed from what he said before the Senate."

Brown v. The Board of Education

FEIN

"And there was such intransigence about compliance with that particular decision for so many years that the court became reluctant to wait on any other area of law either, where it thought itself of improving upon what the legislative or the executive branches were accomplishing. So the court soon moved beyond simply racial desegregation as being an activist mode, into areas of abortion, obscenity and criminal justice and the death penalty."

ROBERTSON

"These issues come before courts in our nation, capital punishment, abortion, church-state relations, electoral appointment, affirmative action, treatment of the handicapped, property rights, school busing, defamation, just some of the ones that apparently are giving the judiciary a much stronger role than perhaps the framers of the Constitution ever intended. One year ago yesterday, the Senate rejected a man who was considered to be the best qualified nominee for the Supreme court in our history. He had been a professor of law for 15 years at Yale holding two endowed chairs and an authority on anti-trust and constitutional law. He was an honor student at the University of Chicago, he was Solicitor General to the United States for 4 years, represented the Supreme Court, he was unanimously

confirmed by the Senate for the D.C. Circuit in 1982 and received the ABA's highest rating 'exceptionally well qualified' which has only been given to a few nominees. Beyond all that, Judge Bork in his career on the D.C. Circuit in more than 100 opinions, never had a majority opinion that he wrote overturned by the Supreme Court. Right now judge Bork is a John M. Olin scholar in legal studies with the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research...Judge Bork, it's a pleasure to have you. You went through one of the most excruciating grillings and humiliations, you ultimately resigned your position on the circuit court. What are your thoughts about the process of judicial selection and confirmation right now after a year of retrospection?"

ROBERT BORK

"Well I want to say right off the bat, Mr. Robertson, I didn't feel humiliated. I got beaten but I didn't feel humiliated. I thought the process has now become extremely humiliated. They're trying to get judges who will make law for them, laws that they don't dare pass themselves. In some of the areas you mentioned [abortion, church-state relations...] the court has made laws that no legislator who wanted to get re-elected would ever vote for."

ROBERTSON

"You're a student of our Constitution. The framers of our Constitution never intended any such powerful judiciary did they?"

BORK

"No, they thought the judiciary would apply the written law and in terms of power as Hamilton said 'could be relatively insignificant' as compared to the Congress and the President."

ROBERTSON

"Let's take one that is perhaps one of the most hot issues and emotional in our society, abortion. That, as I understand, rests on a premise that there's a right of privacy in the Constitution. I remember Senator Lloyd Bentsen said publicly in Texas that he would vote against you because you were opposed to the constitutional right of privacy. Is there such a right and if it is, where does it come from?"

BORK

"No, there is no such right. There are various aspects of privacy that are clearly guaranteed by the Constitution but this generalized, undefined right of privacy the Supreme Court is using is something they made up and they apply it to make law as they see fit and they did it with Roe against Wade, the abortion decision which has nothing to do, that I can think of, with the Constitution itself."

ROBERTSON

"So you're saying in essence, that Roe v. Wade rests at best on shaky law and really has no constitutional precedent other than what the Supreme Court said in Blackman's decision?"

BORK

"That's right, in fact I wouldn't say it rests on shaky law, they just made it up. It rests on no law."

ROBERTSON

"How does America get back it's judiciary. The Constitution gives to Congress extraordinary power to regulate the court but it doesn't seem to want to use it. What do we do?"

BORK

"I think what you do is vote for candidates who will nominate and confirm the kind of judges the American people want and that's one reason it's too bad the issue of judicial selection hasn't been prominent in this election."

ROBERTSON

"How do you see the court right now. Is it coming down now to a conservative majority. Did Tony Kennedy make that much of a difference or not?"

BORK

"He may, I don't know. His record isn't really long enough yet for me to judge. Friends of mine who's judgement I respect are very high on Justice Kennedy so he may make a big difference."

ROBERTSON

"Where are we in terms of the judiciary right now. President Reagan has put in quite a few fine conservative judges in the circuit courts and the district courts around the nations. Do we have some outstanding candidates who could go through this gauntlet that the Democrats will obviously put on them assuming that George Bush wins the presidency?"

BORK

"Well there are a lot of fine candidates for the Supreme Court. See my difficulty was that I had written more than any other nominee in history on the relevant subjects so I could be grilled about my views. Some of these good candidates have not written as Justice Kennedy had not and the Democrats will have a much harder time making a circus out of it with them."

ROBERTSON

"I went before the Washington Post editorial board and made a statement that seemingly shocked the ladies and gentlemen assembled, that a Supreme Court decision is not the supreme law of the land. I said as far as I could tell from the Constitution

it was the Constitution, treaties ratified on the Constitution and acts Congress that had been signed by the President. Now am I in error in that? Is the Supreme Court's decisions the supreme law of the land or not?"

BORK

"Well in one sense it is and in one sense it isn't. Obviously if a Supreme Court decision departs from the Constitution, we none the less follow the decision because otherwise we would have chaos and civil disobedience but if it departs the Constitution of course, it's always subject to being revisited and half the justices go back to the Constitution."

ROBERTSON

"But if the Constitution is what the judges say it is, then we in essence have an unelected tyranny...what control do we have in our society over a runaway court?"

BORK

"Well there isn't really any control. That's why it's so important that you get judges who apply the principles that the ratifiers put in the Constitution and not make up the principles as it happened from time to time in the past."

ROBERTSON

"What is the legal education...what is the prevailing judicial, or at least the law school consensus on what a judge should do and how free they should be to interpret the Constitution?"

BORK

"Well unfortunately, I think in the most prestigious law schools and many others, the prevailing view is that the judge should not be bound by the intentions of the framers or the ratifiers but should apply some form of moral philosophy. Oddly enough, the moral philosophy the professors all advocate turns out to be very liberal in it's political results. But right now, there's an enormous gap between what the American people think judges should be doing and what the law professors think they should be doing."

ROBERTSON

"And your position obviously judicial restraint and would you ever want to get back on the bench again? You resigned from what is the second most powerful court in the country. What is your feeling?"

BORK

"Well as a matter of fact, I think I had more influence on the development of anti-trust law when I was writing about it than I would have had if I had been on a bench. And I hope to have some influence on constitutional law by writing and talking about it. So for the moment at least, I'm not thinking about going back on

the bench."

ROBERTSON

"Judge Robert Bork...in my estimation a man who should be on the Supreme Court, one of the great legal minds in our country and it was strictly politics. Those who said that judges should be interpreting the Constitution not according to the intentions of the framers, but according to various types of liberal philosophy, judge Bork said no I'm a strict constructionist, I believe in following the intention of the framers and those who passed and ratified various amendments to the Constitution. It's a shame."

700 CLUB 10-31-88

Halloween/Satan

PAT ROBERTSON

"...We have fallen angels, Satan, Lucifer...and demonic forces. So because something supernatural is real doesn't mean it's right. It just means it really happens and so there are conduits into this other world. And what happens is that when you begin to deal with tarot cards, horoscopes, and you deal with astrology and Ouija boards and various paraphenalia of the occult, it can easily enter you into a world that you're not prepared for. And some of the things that are called 'new age,' these out-of-body experiences and other things can have demonic origins. We talked earlier in this broadcast about the slaughter of unborn children [abortion], we talked later about ritual killing of babies, this is all part and parcel of the same thing."