

TELEVANGELIST SUMMARIES  
June 1986

**PAT ROBERTSON**

Creationism.....79

Federal Reserve Board.....74-75

**FEIN, BRUCE**

Manion, Daniel.....80-81

Gramm-Rudman.....77-78

Judiciary.....73, 74, 78-79

Presidential aspirations.....75-76

Textbooks.....77

**LAHAYES**

**FARRIS, MICHAEL**

Religious freedom in school.....66-68, 70, 71, 72

Public education.....82-83

Religious freedom in school.....68-73

**ROB SCRIBNER**

Public policy.....66

Rob Scribner 6-2-86

**SCRIBNER**

**Public Policy**

"In talking about Communism, in the beginning of our country with the pilgrims really brings to mind the conflict of ideological beliefs today. Here in the United States we believe in a capitalistic society, we believe that a man earns according to his labor. And Jesus Christ...refers specifically to this concept...the idea of redistributing the wealth or the idea that we should take from some that have a lot and give to the others does not put into practice what the word of God teaches."

"Let me read a little bit, a few quotes of the people that shaped our society at that time...in the Articles of Confederation that said that God had created man with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and property. And when government comes in and restricts the ownership of property and put all kinds of designs on property and says who should and shouldn't have it and what can be done with property, then once again we restrict this concept of property that is inherent in the Christian dogma, which says that we have been given by God certain rights and that right of property, it goes on in the Declaration of Independence, to call that the pursuit of happiness."

"The fundamental orders of Connecticut -- once again, preliminary documents to our Constitution -- let me read the beginning of it...'There should be an orderly and decent government established according to God.'"

"John Locke said 'The study of morality, of this there are books enough writ, both by ancient and modern philosophers but the morality of the Gospel does so exceed them all that to give a man full knowledge of true morality I should send to him no other book but the New Testament.' John Locke, the writer of Civil Government, the book, The Treatise of Civil Government, said there's no other book but the New Testament, this is the evidence that we are founded upon the principles of Jesus Christ."

LaHayes on Family Life 6-6-86

**MICHAEL FARRIS of Concerned Women for America  
School Prayer**

"For the most part in this country the practice of any type of prayer, be it voluntary or compulsory, is not allowed. There are a few renegade school principals here and there that are still practicing it, but if they were caught by the ACLU that would be eliminated overnight."

"The Constitutional standard for our schools is supposed to be religious neutrality but it has become far beyond religious neutrality to anti-Christian and anti-religious hostility. To a Christian, the Bible says that fear of the Lord is the beginning

of knowledge and just to allow a child to acknowledge God at the beginning of the school day, simply accommodates his religious beliefs, it doesn't force it on anyone else but by saying you can't bring God into this classroom in any way, shape or form is not neutral to that Christian child who believes that God is the foundation for his learning."

### **Censorship**

"Derogatory references to God and Christ and the Bible are made constantly but any type of positive situation that would be interpreted as witnessing or promoting the gospel in any way would be illegal, while the promoting of the humanist gospel or the anti-Christian message is perfectly permissible in many areas."

### **School Prayer**

"The introduction to this program talked about voluntary silent prayer, and I think it's very important to emphasize each one of those words...I think that the silent nature of it -- I would be opposed to anyone getting up and leading prayer in the classroom, particularly the teacher or principal because more as likely as not, they would say, "Dear heavenly mother," or something like that, knowing the humanistic background of a lot of the teachers, so I think that what should be done basically is two things that need to be changed. One is the moment of silence at the beginning of the day, where the teacher would say you can pray or meditate or just be silent during this time, to allow people to accommodate their religious beliefs. And secondly, there's a lot of groups of students who would like to meet before school or after school or during lunch or during a free period when other student groups are meeting but they're not allowing voluntary student groups to get together and pray and read the Bible."

"The most important thing, right now, would be to write your congressman and your Senator both, to tell them that you would support a voluntary prayer amendment."

"In 1962, the Supreme Court decided a case that was brought by a number of people including the famous Madeleine Murray O'Hare and in that case, children were obligated to pray or read the Bible in certain schools on the east coast. Now, they could excuse themselves from the room, but the Supreme Court said that that kind of context still compelled the children's conscience. That's the big difference from what we're talking about today and how it has evolved over the years from saying that children can't be forced to pray to say they can't be allowed to pray even silently at the beginning of the day."

### **Education**

"The trend is to take away any biblical basis from teaching morality. The argument is that if you teach that the Bible says that abortion is wrong, you can't teach about abortion at all, in the public schools, in a positive way, in a pro-life way. You can only teach about it from the other perspective, that is the

planned parenthood, pro-abortion type approach."

**TIM LAHAYE**

**School Prayer**

"Actually, what we're trying to do is not only let children pray as they want to on a voluntary basis, but also to acknowledge the fact that there is someone up there paying attention when they pray and make it a God-conscious environment in which to go to school, instead of a secular or a-God environment."

In response to a question about whether silent prayer would be a satisfying solution, and wouldn't it be possible to have a representative prayer for the classroom, **Farris** replied:

"That would be possible in areas with a very high agreement among the local constituency of what would be a representative prayer and the democratic process would work pretty well especially since the context of the amendment that I've been told would be the likely amendment says no one would be forced to participate and they would come up with some kind of a non-sectarian prayer and if that's acceptable to those rare communities in America where there is a high level of agreement that would be potentially permissible but the vast majority of the communities in America would be so split on what is acceptable -- I would say ninety percent of American communities would be the silent situation."

"Groups like the ACLU and others in the liberal media basically make it seem as if everybody is going to be forced to pray and there will be certain ministers who will write the prayer and everybody in America will have to bow down to the same prayer."

**TIM LAHAYE**

**Secular Humanism**

"Basically the ACLU is a co-laborer in the humanist effort; in the Humanist Manifesto Two, they say we're trying to create a secular society on a global scale and that is what I believe is at the heart of groups like the ACLU in trying to wipe out any possible acknowledgement of God in our country."

**School Prayer**

"You're probably aware of the fact that in 1962 it was by decision of the Supreme Court that children could no longer pray in our public schools. As far as I know, that's the first major institution in American life -- in a country where we've always honored religious freedom until the last few years -- that individuals are not permitted to pray. Have you ever asked yourself what was really behind that group of atheists and secular humanists that wanted to kick prayer out of the public schools? What are they really after? It wasn't because anyone was going to be converted by the kind of prayers that were offered or that someone was going to impose their religious values on them. Instead, those humanists and atheists didn't want our public school children to be suspicious that there was

someone up there listening when they prayed. And that whole picture changed the entire picture of education. For example, ever since they have expelled prayer, they have for practical purposes expelled the Bible. Now, legally you can use the Bible as literature, but so many teachers have been intimidated, they almost never use the Bible in the classroom."

"Government itself is an institution of God...but those things have changed in recent years, and it seems we have people in government that no longer have the value system of the Bible. Instead, they have a new standard that every generation sets its own standards and now government is no longer the protector of the family. Now government wants to come in and make the decision for the family. And this is also true in relationship to the education system. Personally, I'm concerned that values be returned to the public schools. When I say values, I'm talking about moral values...You cannot have freedom, justice and liberty without morality and that morality has to be based on something greater than mankind. Traditionally, it has always been based on the Word of God...There is someone up there telling you and me what is right and wrong...And it usually starts with your decision about what are you going to do with His son, Jesus Christ."

#### **Secular Humanism**

"In many of our big cities there are so many drug pushers, there are so many child molesters and perverts walking the streets that it is no longer a safe haven for children. Let's face it folks, our culture has changed. Now who changed it? Well, it wasn't we ministers. It wasn't Sunday school teachers. It wasn't Christians. It wasn't dedicated people committed to traditional moral values. It was the people that are committed to anti-moral values. And who are they? They are the secular humanists of our culture...I believe that secular humanism is a religious ideology...They admit it themselves in their manifesto. Eleven times. I counted. Eleven times they called their own ideology, secular humanism, a religion. The Supreme Court of the United States in 1963 in the Tercaso case acknowledged it like Buddhism as a religion. Well, my question is if the religion or the moral values of the Book is no longer welcome in our public schools then what business does secular humanism have in our schools?"

#### **LaHayes on Family Life 6-9-86**

#### **TIM LAHAYE**

#### **Secular Humanism**

"Despair, I'm sure that's one of the results of the humanistic influence. Humanism has no hope for the future, it has that doomsday philosophy that comes out in its music."

#### **Education**

"The only commands I find in the Bible for young people are that they should `obey their parents and the Lord for this is right,' and `honor their mothers and fathers.'"

**MICHAEL FARRIS**

**Religious Freedom**

"I think we're on the verge of becoming very much like the soviet Union in our practice of religious freedom in this country."

"One of the most shocking to me is a case that I was involved in where the city of Seattle issued an order to a Bible study that was taking place in a girls' boarding house, saying that these girls did not have the right to have a Bible study in that class. In their home where they lived. And I took the deposition of the city official in that case and I asked him if I had a Bible study in my home with just myself and my wife and my next-door neighbor and his wife, would they shut that down too. And he said if we had a complaint, we'd shut that down too."

"The complaint that came in the case that actually went to Court and we actually won was there was a lady who always complains about anything Christian around the University of Washington. She just doesn't like Christians and having them study Bible."

**Secular Humanism**

"Groups like the ACLU who want to promote their kind of philosophy of religion, they want to create a secularist society where God cannot possibly be honored in any public forum. They would be very content with the religious freedom of the Communist countries."

"The law schools of this country are predominately controlled by humanists and they are indoctrinating students in believing the ACLU mentality about religion in America."

**TIM LAHAYE**

"Government, friend or foe. Is our government for us or against us? It depends on the philosophy of government. It may surprise you to know that government is an institution of God and the consistency of the government is what determines whether it obeys God or disobeys god. Now, you can tell by the laws they make. If the law makers make laws that are contrary to the Word of God, then you can tell that they're of a secularist origin. And it's interesting to me that in the last few years, regardless of who's been in power, we have a tendency to elect individuals that seem to have no respect for God. We appoint people to high positions of leadership in our country or elect them to office and we don't ask them what are their religious values, what are their Biblical commitments. And if they don't have a Biblical commitment, it's going ultimately to come out but it's not just our elected officials...we have three million people, actually it's over three million people in the bureaucracy we call it, they're individuals that have been appointed by our elected officials and

often times they're referred to as the unelected officials. They're the people that impose the law and sometimes they use the power of government to coerce people, whether its the tax people who do that or some of them, certainly we're not indicting all of them but some people use the power of government against the people. What was the purpose of government in the first place, why did God establish government?"

### LaHayes on Family Life 6-13-85

Today's guest was attorney Michael Ferris of Concerned Women for America.

#### **Education**

##### **TIM LAHAYE**

"We believe the Bible has the answer for today's public schools."

##### **BEV LAHAYE**

"Concerned Women for America has an education and legal defense fund, not realizing how much we'd have to use it when we started it, now we find out it's getting very active because many people need legal defense in America and today we're talking about a specific case and I think probably the best way to get into it is to have you simply tell us the story of how this mother contacted you and what happened."

##### **TIM LAHAYE**

**Censorship:**With reference to Carolyn Grove's lawsuit in Spokane, Washington, asking for removal of The Learning Tree from a high school reading list because it allegedly contains "anti-Christian" bias.

##### **MICHAEL FARRIS**

"...What we're trying to do in the lawsuit which we have filed in federal court is asking the courts to apply the same standard that they created to throw the Bible out and use those same standards with the idea of promoting religious neutrality which is supposedly what they have been promoting all the time. If we win, it will be the first time in judicial history where they have thrown out a book for being anti-Christian, which is the specific purpose of this whole book is to denigrate Christianity and make the parsons look crazy and make the Christians look crazy, just to promote the idea that there is no God and especially that there is no Christian God."

"If we win this case at the appellate level, it will be the first time in the history of our country that any material will be taken out of a public school as required reading because of its anti-religious basis. So far, all the material that's been taken out has been censored because it was pro-religious and we're saying that if the courts are really serious about this supposed religious neutrality, they're going to have to once in a while

take out something that's anti-religious as well as taking the pro-religious out. There have been a few attempts with not nearly so offensive material and they have been unsuccessful ...The Supreme Court has said that you can't let children opt out of religiously oriented material, be it pro-religious or anti-religious, because it would put them in the position of being coerced in their conscience, in other words, they're being made fun of by their teachers and their fellow students."

**TIM LAHAYE**

**Secular Humanism**

"In a vital sense, this is taking our tax dollars and using them in the public schools to discredit Jesus Christ and destroy the faith of a young person in God."

"Most people that defend that kind of thing -- academic freedom, they call it -- freedom to pollute the minds of the child irrespective of what the parents want, they really don't know what's in it because it's doctrine, it's evil doctrine, detrimental to a person's faith."

**MICHAEL FARRIS**

**Secular Humanism**

"In fact, in the Humanist they have published an article on adolescent literature and they say that the very purpose of that is to teach children humanistic values. We've simply cited back to the article that says that one and the same thing and showed how the humanists have deliberately manipulated the legal system to throw Christianity out and put their religion in as -- recently they think that the public schools are a pulpit for proselytizing their faith."

**Censorship**

"But basically I think the Bible says we should be wise about those things which are pure and innocent about those things which are evil. I frankly really did not want to read this book myself...I don't think it did any good for me and I think we should be very cautious about studying evil too closely."

"I think we still under the long tradition of public schools in this country and we haven't realized the close relationship between religion and education. It's almost impossible to have a public school system that is truly religiously neutral and if you can't have religiously neutral schools then the government doesn't need to be in the business of promoting one religion against another and so I think that the Courts need to really grapple with that question and come to the understanding that you've come to."

**TIM LAHAYE**

**Education**

"...competition in America has improved almost everything and one of the problems we have with education is that we have the idea if we throw more money at it it's going to improve the quality



and just the opposite is true. The more money we give the educators, the worse the academic level becomes. I think it would be much better for education, and educators, and certainly for parents to make it competitive and let the parent choose to send his child wherever he likes."

"The reason I wrote the book, The Battle for the Public Schools, is because to be honest with you, we're losing the battle for our schools. Secularism has taken over, that is those who are hostile toward God, toward Christ, and toward the Bible have taken over the curriculum, they have taken over the teacher training sessions, they have taken over the school boards, they have taken over the federal educational department, and it just seems that almost everything that is produced in public education is hostile to the God of the Bible, and the Christ that we love, and all we do is subsidize it through our taxes."

700 CLUB 6-10-86

**ROBERTSON**  
**Judiciary**

"What has been done recently in the Judiciary Committee by people like Joe Biden, who perhaps is setting himself up for something further in national life, it's very hypocritical. Regretfully, Arnold Specter who went to Yale Law School the year after I did, came down very hard on a Justice Department nominee, William Bradford Reynolds, who is very highly qualified, and he trumped up some specious evidence and it was pointed out in the Wall Street Journal as being just that, specious. And this thing with Manion, Manion is an extraordinarily qualified man to be a federal judge. There's no question about it. There's absolutely nothing in his private life, nothing in his intellectual life which would disqualify him from serving. And his father, you know, Daniel Manion, was, I believe, Dean of the law school at Notre Dame and a very outspoken conservative. And so the idea that somebody is conservative and wants a traditional value, he was grilled by the way, on whether he would accept some of these outrageous Supreme Court decisions of the past several years and he said essentially, "I support the Constitution," and that's what a judge is supposed to do. But Biden kept saying, "Are you going to accept these decisions," that Manion felt were erroneous. Well, you shouldn't ask a judicial candidate whether or not he will go along with every, every bad decision of all the Courts that preceded him. What kind of independent Supreme Court Justice would that be?"

"I think, very frankly, that the Republicans stand in danger of losing the United States Senate in the fall, if they back away from the President on this issue, I think they will present a divided front and a lot of conservatives will sit on their hands and they could really be in serious danger..."

700 CLUB 6-12-86

**ROBERTSON**

**Judiciary**

(Referring to the contempt finding against the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and the United States Catholic Conference for refusing to turn over documents sought by abortion rights activists in a lawsuit) "Ladies and gentlemen, this is one of the most serious cases that has ever come before the Courts, the Courts have intruded repeatedly into the areas of government that were never given them under the Constitution, they have usurped the executive branch and with this particular case they are usurping the basic rights of religious people under the First Amendment of the Constitution. And they are runaway and it seems like to me that all who stand for freedom in America should stand with the Catholic bishops on this issue and I would recommend that you write your Congressman about it or you Senator about it to say that the Catholic Church is being taken advantage of in this litigation. It will open the door to every other religious group in the country to have all of its papers and records the subject of deposition from whoever, whatever group wants to come along with three to four members and say we'd like to sue them and find out what they are doing. It's an outrageous infringement on religious liberty and we all, all, who care about religious freedom should at this point demand from Congress that they clarify the law to give the IRS the determining decision in relation to tax exemption and not make these cases open to whoever from wherever desires to bring a lawsuit."

700 CLUB 6-11-86

Robertson interviewed Representative Beau Bolter about the power of the Federal Reserve Board.

**ROBERTSON**

"The Constitution clearly gives Congress the power to coin money and to regulate its value. These are the two things that -- now they're printing money instead of coining it -- but they're printing money and not regulating it's value, that's totally in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board and out of the hands of Congress. That's un-Constitutional, isn't it?"

**BEAU BOLTER**

"I think so, Pat; it's certainly not in accord with the intent of the founding fathers who did not want Congress to have the power to emit bills of credit, which is what paper money is ... politicians have control over the monetary supply if you have a paper money system. That's really a power that we should not allow bad men to have and it's also a power that good men should not want. So we need to radically change our money supply system."

**ROBERTSON**

"Two major thing happened in our life that year [1913-- the

income tax was enacted and Congress] allowed the establishment of a privately dominated bank which would serve as a central bank, but not really into the control of the government but sort of in a quasi-governmental relationship but essentially controlled by private banking. The most powerful of which was obviously the Federal Reserve Bank in New York. Now, from that time, the growth of debt in our country has been simply astronomical...Now, there have been several times when the Federal Reserve Board has been egregiously in error, for example in the 1920's...they fueled that enormous stock speculation of the later part of that decade...and then after the crash...(their policies) were of one of the major factors which tipped us not from a little recession into a deep, searing depression...it was a tragedy of mismanagement of the organization that manages the economy. Now, at the present time, the President is elected by the people. His economic policies are one thing and here's an un-elected man in charge of a quasi-private organization who is just as powerful. A President can put us on the road to prosperity and this un-elected man can put us into a depression, merely by regulating the money supply. It's a very, very dangerous thing for people who love democracy and I think more and more there's a groundswell beginning to build in this country that says in matters dealing with the vital interests of all of us the people have to have control of what's being done."

THIS SEGMENT FEATURED AN "INTERVIEW" OF PAT RE: PRESIDENTIAL ASPIRATIONS

Q: How important was hurricane Gloria in this crystallization process?

**ROBERTSON:** It was extremely important because I felt, interestingly enough, that if I couldn't move a hurricane, I could hardly move a nation. I know that's a strange thing for anybody to say and there's hardly anybody else who would feel the same way but it was very important to the faith of many people.

Q: If it had come ashore, would you have seen that as a signal from the Lord not to "go for it"?

**ROBERTSON:** Absolutely, I would have done a Sherman (sic) the next morning.

Q: Some people think (running) would be a step down...

**ROBERTSON:** I would only do it (run for President) if I felt it was a direct call and leading from God and it was something he told me I had to do and I would do it under those circumstances.

Q: Does that mean that anyone who opposes you is opposed to God?

**ROBERTSON:** Absolutely not. Everybody has to make his own decisions. I couldn't run as quote "God's candidate" or say that I was the moral man and somebody else was immoral. I would have

to stand on the issues. I think it would be arrogant and unfair to come out and say well, I'm God's anointed. I wouldn't want anybody else to do it and I certainly wouldn't do it myself.

Q: Some political analysts say that your biggest weakness is your lack of experience, that you've never been elected to anything.

**ROBERTSON:** Well, I grew up in politics, my father went to when Congress when I was two years old -- from the age of two on I learned the discipline, if you will, of being in the public eye and of serving people and this is just part of my life and part of my heritage. It would not be a difficult transition. It's not like coming just strictly out of a hard-driving business career into the public service, I've been in public service.

Q: Are you concerned that the people that you're recruiting may be very zealous but may be unwise politically?

**ROBERTSON:** That's a danger. It's impossible to go into a Republican or Democratic caucus and, you know, wave the Bible and quote Scripture, it scares people to death. And we don't want to be just the people for prayer-in-public-schools and pro-life although we are those things. We need to have a broad-based agenda having to do with the budgets and having to do with defense and having to do with a broad range of government policies because if we're only seen as single issue people then we won't be taken very seriously.

**ROBERTSON:** I've never been an evangelist, I've never been out in the tent meetings. I'm a broadcaster --

Q: But you have an electronic tent. I've heard you win people to the Lord myself.

**ROBERTSON:** Well I do that, but I'm a religious broadcaster.

Q: But your religious broadcast is designed to what? To lead people to Jesus Christ, isn't it?

**ROBERTSON:** Well, it's designed as more than that, it's designed to present a life-style.

Q: What could be more than that?

**ROBERTSON:** Well, the Kingdom of God. It's the broadening of that initial experience to dominion over the whole earth. It's discipleship. That's what Jesus said. Go and make disciples of all nations.

700 CLUB 6-13-86

**KINCHLOW**  
Textbooks and Religion

"There is a deliberate attempt to remove God from the textbooks that your children study."

**ROBERTSON**

"For the last several months, CBN News has reported on a study by Professor Vitz that was funded by the National Institute of Education. This study found that religion as a force in our history or as a contemporary American experience has virtually disappeared from our public school textbooks. Now, an author of children's books, who happens to be Jewish, has publicly accused one of the nations biggest publishers, Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, of censoring religion. Now, two other studies from some unexpected sources are showing up more deficiencies in textbook treatment of religion, one from Americans United for Separation of Church and State deals with social studies textbooks. The other from **People for the American Way** examines history books. All three studies express dissatisfaction with the nation's textbooks."

"Ladies and gentlemen, 94% of all the people in the United States profess a belief in God or a Supreme Being. At least 85% of these profess a belief in the God of the Bible, the Old and New Testament, according to the Judeo-Christian tradition as we know it. Six percent of the people in our country consider themselves atheists. They do not believe in God. Now the question is although this 6% has the right to publish, to preach, to have newspapers, to have television and radio stations, to run for public office, to promulgate their views in any way they see fit in a free country such as this, why, under any intelligent concept of reality, would the 94% who are believers have a duty to dismantle our entire public affirmation of faith in God in order to appease the 6% among us who don't believe in anything, and can any society endure which gives absolute veto over its positive actions to a tiny minority who only want negative actions. Well, the answer is so obvious, you wonder why the textbook manufacturers and why the publishing companies and why the school boards and the teachers' unions and the Courts haven't figured it out, unless some of them really are part of the 6% who want to wipe out from our public arena all mention of the great religious heritage which we have in this nation. "

700 CLUB 6-16-86

**ROBERTSON**

**Gramm-Rudmann**

"I'm very disturbed about the tendency of the Supreme Court to strike down laws at will. And I have a quote from James Madison. He was the author of the so-called Bill of Rights and obviously a Constitutional expert and he said that in the state constitutions as well as the Federal, no provision is made for a case of a disagreement in expounding the laws and he says that as the Courts are generally the last in making a decision, the results to them, by refusing or not refusing to execute a law, to stamp it with its final quality...And, you see, Congress, all the

Congressmen take an oath to uphold the Constitution, the President takes an oath to uphold the Constitution, so we've got 535 members of Congress, plus the President of the United States signing a bill and it's my feeling that the Court at that point ought to execute the bill and interpret its provisions in relation to cases brought before it, but I don't think it should just willy-nilly be...Because James Madison as well as Thomas Jefferson said the Constitution knows no such supreme authority...It's a very dangerous thing and sooner or later the Congress is going to have to take back its powers because they are the legislature and they should know what's Constitutional and the President should know what is Constitutional. And when they have signed a bill into law then its law. And the Supreme Court should faithfully execute it. End of story."

700 CLUB 6-18-86

**ROBERTSON**  
**Judges**

"I am delighted, obviously. Judge Scalia would have been, if I had a list, he would be at the top of the list. I think Judge Bork would have been very close behind, he's a former solicitor general. They both sit on the D.C. circuit, they're both outstanding Constitutional authorities. The thing about Judge Scalia is he is just impeccable; he has credentials that are also impeccable, not only is he the outstanding judge, but he's an outstanding legal scholar and a teacher of law, he graduated from Harvard Law School, taught at the University of Chicago. He's just a superb choice. And there is just no way that in the Senate confirmation, here's, it seems like to me, that anybody can oppose him on other than ideological grounds and that normally is not considered acceptable. I mean, his nomination should just breeze through. William Rehnquist is again an outstanding judicial scholar. He served with great distinction on the Court and he knows his way around the Supreme Court. The only problem is he has had some ill-health, but apparently that is over now. That would be the only question that would be raised about him. Justice Burger has been a very fine justice. He has come out on a conservative position a number of times. And I think the country owes him a debt of gratitude. He's a wonderful man and I think that we all should be appreciative of what he's done. What he did, Danuta, was a very sacrificial thing. The game plan was this: He is an older conservative, so he voluntarily retired to give a conservative President the opportunity to appoint a conservative judge in his place. And a conservative chief justice and he held on `til he died, which could have been four or five years from now, then Reagan's successor whoever that would have been could have appointed someone with a different philosophy so Burger did this in a sense for the good of the country and it was a very noble act that perhaps has not been brought out as much as it should. It's been in the works now for some months."

"Well, [the liberal majority] is still five-four. They, I think, will come down very hard on the original intention of the framers of the Constitution. As Rehnquist wrote an absolutely brilliant dissent in the recent prayer case, he went way back into the history of our country and traced the entire tradition of religious freedom in our country. So he understands the issues as Chief Judge. The problem is that you still have Marshall, Brennan, Stevens and Blackmun as the block of people who are more or less liberal in orientation and Lewis Powell seems to be, he's a swing man, he goes either way but he has been in ill health, and he's quite old, most of those people are in their seventies with the exception of Stevens who is in his late sixties."

### **Creationism**

"Later this year the Supreme court will hear arguments in what could be one of the most significant cases of this decade. It involves a Louisiana law requiring that creation science be given equal treatment with evolution in the public schools."

**RICHARD BLISS, Director of Creation Science Education at the Institute for Creation Science**

"[the Louisiana law] is anti-science. We're training this young person to look at evolution only and even if creation is a better model and it is a far better model, scientific model, and even if it is a better model, he's not allowed to look at it because we're programming his mind in this one direction."

### **ROBERTSON**

"Well, why should the Supreme Court, or any federal Court, get involved in this? I mean, this is a free inquiry for people to say, well, did man really come from lower forms or was there really a Creator. And this is the sort of thing that people should be allowed to explore. Why should a Court even get into it?"

### **BLISS**

"Right, Pat, this is the most unconscionable thing that has ever been perpetuated on the minds of young people and the Courts have no business in this one at all and the fact is this is all where the school boards should be coming in and the state legislatures and so forth, who are in fact responsible for the curriculum in the state...There's absolutely no evidence of one kind of organism turning into another kind. There's no evidence, not a record of it anywhere."

### **ROBERTSON**

"Well, its really one religion being taught against another. The question is why can't the children have the option at least of learning the two religions, rather than accepting one, by the tax-payers' dollars, as a absolutely matter of faith when is apparently is quite flawed."

700 CLUB 6-24-86

On Daniel Manion

"The nomination of Daniel Manion to the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in Chicago was rejected by the Senate Judiciary Committee on a tie vote but then went to the full Senate anyway, without recommendation. Manion, a South Bend Indiana lawyer, has come under attack from Senate liberals who charge he is unqualified. Conservatives believe the real objection is to Manion's ideology. Democratic Senator Joseph Biden seemed to admit as much when he said he though Manion was quote "a decent and honorable man" but that he couldn't vote for him because of his political views. The politics of judicial nominees has traditionally been off-limits. Eight hours of debate and then a vote is expected in the Senate on Wednesday. Administration officials are said to be concerned that a defeat of the Manion nomination would embolden political opponents to attack the judicial appointments."

700 CLUB 6-27-86

A magazine style segment on Daniel Manion, narrated by a CBN reporter, was followed by Pat's PERSPECTIVE on Daniel Manion. Pat interviewed Bruce Fein of American Constitutional Institute.

On Daniel Manion

ROBERTSON

"The Senate has given a tentative OK to the nomination of Daniel Manion for a seat on the federal bench."

FEIN

"Daniel Manion is qualified. He received a qualified rating from the American Bar Association. And he certainly falls within the range of competence that has typically justified Senate confirmation in the past. Daniel Manion is not an intellectual giant, but that is not a requisite for appointment to the federal judiciary. I think that there is politics involved in the opposition to Daniel Manion. It might be noted, for instance, that Senator Kennedy, when he was in the Senate in the 1960's, had supported a very lack-lustre candidate named Mr. Frank Morrissey, who was nominated by Lyndon Baines Johnson, because Morrissey was a friend of Ted's father, Joseph Kennedy."

ROBERTSON

"Senator Metzenbaum of Ohio was excoriating Daniel Manion. And the reason for doing so was because he joined in with a bi-partisan group of Senators in Indiana to get a bill passed to post the Ten Commandments in public schools, and Metzenbaum was acting as if somehow one Supreme Court decision dealing with Kentucky was binding on the sovereign legislature of Indiana. Is that the case or not?"

FEIN



"No, I think that comment represents the profoundly misconceived view of the Supreme Court, not only today but in our history. The Supreme Court decrees certainly are binding in individual cases on all litigants but it has never been the case that all the doctrines necessarily bind others who are not parties. The Supreme Court has overruled some 260 precedents, one of the most famous instances where a very exalted public official, President Abraham Lincoln, defied a Supreme Court concerning the treatment of blacks in the United States. In 1857, the Supreme Court ruled Congress could not outlaw slavery in the territories. In 1862, nonetheless, President Lincoln signed a bill outlawing slavery in the territories.

#### ROBERTSON

"Why does the press and why do many members of Congress -- among them Joe Biden, who is on the same general tangent -- why don't they understand the history of this country, with which -- you said it's very clear that it's indeed the history since the founding of our nation?"

"Ladies and gentlemen, it's amazing in our society that we, and the legislators, the Senate, the House of Representatives and other executives around this nation and the citizens as well as many members of the press assume that any particular ruling of the Supreme Court becomes the Supreme law of the land. That isn't true of the history of the Constitution of the United States. A court ruling only binds the litigants; as Mr. Fein said, very eloquently just earlier, and that's all. And any legislature is free to do what it pleases in terms of crafting some other legislation that seems to be a little bit at variance with the particular ruling, on what it wants to. Congress is the same way and the President is the same. The executive power is free, if you will, from the judicial and the legislature as well. That's what the framers of our Constitutions intended to have a separation of powers, independent of one another. And not to make one branch preeminent over all the others. But in the common parlance, it's said the Supreme Court quote "struck down" a law. It didn't strike down a law, what it did was fail to apply it in a particular case and therefore say that they felt it was Constitutional. It could be applied again or it could be brought back for review as was done by Justice Hand in the Alabama prayer decision. Justice Hand said, "I disagree with the Supreme Court prayer decision. They are un-Constitutionally -- they are Constitutionally incorrect and therefore the whole thing should be changed." That's what the dissents are on the Court. We've just had a recent dissent in *Roe v. Wade*. And so this is subject to constant change. But the legislature is the one that should make the law, not the Courts."

TELEVANGELIST SUMMARIES  
June 15 - June 30, 1986

TO: Interested Staff

FROM: Naomi

---

LaHayes on Family Life 6-19-86; *rebroadcast 11-5-86*

Beverly: It's well known that the public schools in America began with teaching the Bible, with prayer and acknowledging that all truth came from God.

Tim: But unfortunately, that's all past history today, the Judeo-Christian values have been replaced with the amoral atheistic doctrines of secular humanism.

Bev: But there is hope because we believe that the Bible has the answers for the public schools today.

Tim: Well, in The Battle for the Mind I point out that that's what life is all about, just whether it's going to be secular or biblical, a recognition of God or man as the creator of all things and the public schools is the conduit to the mind of 43 million children and that conduit is controlled by secularists. They exclude the Bible and things about God. Consequently, the once great school system that produced the greatest society in the history of the world is now falling apart under its own weight and failing to educate the children that are kept in their trust.

Bev: So many of us just trust our children to the school system thinking they are in good hands for all these years and they were going to do the educating.

Tim: Well, until the days of John Dewey, I think logically you could. But John Dewey was an atheist, he was anti-moral and I think anti-American in many of his philosophies. And he set about to change the whole school system and he has done just that and many of his changes have brought very bad academic standards and bad morals and bad behavior, confusion to the public schools. You know, change just for change's sake is not really beneficial, and the school system came along with that look-say method of teaching that has just proven so disastrous.

As a parent...you have got to safeguard the minds of your children. There is nothing more precious to you than the mind of your child, therefore, you ought to know what that child is being taught...you ought to read their textbooks, you ought to discuss what's going on in the classroom and make sure that no humanist is pulling the wool over your eyes. And remember this about humanists. Your child may have seven different teachers in a

committed educators...it's the teacher that has something to hide like he's teaching socialism or he's teaching anti-religion or anti-God or anti-Bible, so number one, be aware of what your child is being taught...as a taxpayer, you have a vested interest in that school down the block where you send your children. Do you know your school board members? Why not? Are you interested in getting the right kind of representation...it may surprise you do know that secular humanists have advocated that their people run for school board members for the last two decades and one of the reasons we have so much secularism in local schools is because they have been making it a point to get themselves appointed or elected to school boards and what we need in this country is the about eighty thousand dedicated pro-moralists to run for public schools. And so the next time you have an election in your country, I would suggest you have two options. Number one, consider running for school board yourself or number two, find someone who shares your moral values and encourage the voters to vote for them. Help them get elected so you will have the right kind of representation on the school board and I think we can then demand accountability from our educators. And then the taxpayers will be served, the children will be served and education will be better in this country...That's what they said ten years ago and we have increased education or spending on education ten times and the academic level has come down. What we need is more accountability and I agree with the President's concept of merit pay for the good teachers instead of just treating them all alike and giving them all the same salary but the number of years and seniority. Pay the good capable teachers extra pay.

But one of the things you have to look for is radical sex education I mean more than just the birds and the bees and more than just the basic biology. The intimacies and it's rampant and I think nothing is more obvious to the average moral minded citizen than this adult penchant for teaching too much intimacy. And too much education on sex and it almost creates an obsession on sex and that's one. Values clarification whenever you have a child who seems to think that there are now rights and wrongs, he got that from somewhere. There are rights and wrongs. But educators through the form of indoctrination called values clarification have set about a scientific assault on the moral values of our children and I'd like to suggest if you see any questioning of moral values coming home in your curriculum, you know that's one of the dangerous signs of secular humanism. And then one that's easy to recognize is a form of liberal socialism or anti-Americanism and right now educators are all uptight over the nuclear freeze. Let's have a freeze on nuclear armament and of course, we'll just trust Russia to also freeze and what it means is disarming ourselves and trust those nice benevolent butchers in Communist countries to be nice to us. You cannot trust educators like that from an Americanist point of view or a moral point of view.