

## EDGING CLOSER TO A NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW

# WHY BUSH WON THE 2004 ELECTION

W  
M  
1  
2  
4  
4

***As you know, I do not normally delve into political matters. But the results of the 2004 race are astonishing, when we consider the single factor which produced them. For this reason, we should carefully consider what actually took place, its causes, and implications.***

It was Election Day, November 2, 2004. As President George W. Bush flew back from Crawford to Washington, D.C. on Air Force One, his strategist Karl Rove, seated not far away, started calling around to get the results of early exit polls. But none of them were good. He told the president that it looked like they were going to lose.

Even data from Florida indicated it was being lost. Governor Jeb Bush had earlier been saying the state was looking good. The Bush team had expected to be ahead in Ohio; but the exit polls showed they were losing there also. Bush bowed his head and prayed; then he said, "Well, it is what it is."

It would not be till six long hours later that the Bush team would begin to learn what was really happening that day, as millions of Americans went to the polls.

Meanwhile, John Kerry had just flown in from the mid-west to Boston. He knew that in order to win he had to be prepared; and he was: He wore his lucky Red Sox cap, carried an Ohio buckeye in one pocket and a four-leaf clover in the other. In addition to those fetishes, on every previous election day, he had eaten at the Union Oyster House in Boston in order to ensure that he would be reelected to Congress. He had to eat there today; and he did. It would guarantee a win.

Yet, even though he walked out of that restaurant that evening with oysters in his stomach, he still lost.

Kerry and his advisers failed to understand that the election would not be decided by the economy, immigration, the Iraq war, or jobs. Americans were becoming frightened about the growing takeover of the forces of immorality.

In an earlier phone call, Bill Clinton—always looking for ways to pick up swing voters by reaching into the "red states" (those held by Republicans)—had urged Kerry to back local bans on gay marriage. Kerry respectfully listened; then he told his aides, "I'm not going to ever do that." Thirty-six hours later, that phone call was printed in the *New York Times*. It did not help his cause.

Kerry knew that the homosexuals were one of his biggest strengths. They manned the internet sites, gathering in money for the party; and they were among his best sources of unpaid helpers in local campaign offices and on the streets gathering signatures. Because they did not need to help support a family and were financially self-sufficient, they had heavily contributed to Democratic campaigns on all levels and were always ready to help. The Democratic machine relied heavily on the contributions of gays, lesbians, and abortion clinics.

Back at Republican campaign headquarters in Washington on that final Election Tuesday, the information streamed toward operatives sitting at laptops and watching their maps change color. They used blue to indicate "Bush country." A county colored blue meant that Bush was doing better than he had in 2000. The Ohio map just kept getting more blue. In some places it turned purple, indicating that Bush was doing 10% better than in 2000.

That evening, once it was clear that the early rumors of a Kerry sweep were all wrong, the television and radio networks began being more cautious about declaring this state and that state as having been won by Kerry.

Finally, after midnight, NBC and Fox dared to announce that Ohio, the key swing state, had voted for Bush—giving him the electoral votes needed to win the election. Bush was ahead in that state by 130,000 votes.

But about the same number of provisional ballots—given to voters whose eligibility had been challenged—still remained unopened. If all of them had voted for Kerry, the two would tie in Ohio. Yet "all" was a statistical impossibility.

There was still the danger of post-election lawsuits. But by 9:30 on Wednesday morning, the conclusion was clear to Kerry's aids: Kerry simply did not have the number of votes in the Ohio provisional ballots—or anywhere else—needed to defeat Bush. Kerry phoned Bush at 11:00 a.m. to concede the election.

This outcome is astounding. What is it that made the difference? Why was Bush reelected, when there were so many reasons for not keeping him in office?

Just consider all the obstacles Bush had to overcome:

Since the 2000 election, the nation had racked up a record deficit. (The “deficit” is the amount of federal loss each year; the national “debt” is the total amount the government owes to the creditors, which is in the trillions of dollars. Few wish to discuss *that* problem!) The nation now has a \$400 billion yearly deficit. That amounts to more than \$1 billion a day that the U.S. Treasury has to borrow to pay the bills.

Massive numbers of jobs have been lost. Lots of bankruptcies and corporation swindles have occurred. A steadily increasing number of manufacturing jobs keep moving overseas.

Bush had led the nation into an increasingly controversial war in Iraq. He promised it would cost no more than \$50 billion a year; yet it is running at nearly three times that amount.

The nation is worried about medical care and social security. Bush’s administration had been the first, since Herbert Hoover’s, to preside over a simultaneous decline in payroll jobs and the stock market.

Hollywood had put out a full-length movie (*Fahrenheit 9/11*), attacking Bush viciously—and it was a motion picture which millions flocked to see. Every possible device, slur, insinuation, and report—true and false—had been trumpeted through the media against him.

On the evening of election day, fully 55% of voters said the country was moving in the wrong direction. (But perhaps many of them had gays and liberal judges in mind, not the Iraq war.) Only 49% approved of the job the president was doing. —And, in the past, anything below 50% on an election day always meant the president would not be reelected.

But Bush was relying on those who agreed with him against abortion, did not want embryonic stem cell research, opposed gay marriages, and feared a homosexual takeover of America. Even among his associates who disagreed with him on one point or another, they sided with him on so many issues—that he had a 97% approval rate within his party, which surpassed that which Ronald Reagan had.

It was moral values which were the deciding issues. And, for Advent believers, the significance of that looms large.

Exit polls on Election Day showed that the top issue, for *all voters*, was not Iraq (15%) or the economy (20%);—but it was moral values (22%). Among those that voted for Bush, moral values ranked most important among 75% of them. (In contrast, only 18% of those who voted for Kerry considered moral values the most important issue.)

The other crucial issue for those who voted for Bush was security and terrorism. A full 85% of voters, concerned about either or both, voted for Bush.

Very significantly, he won 76% of the Evangelical vote and a majority among those who regularly attend religious services.

Another important issue which greatly helped propel Bush to victory was the fact that 11 states—including Ohio—had an anti-gay-marriage measure on the ballot. Large numbers had gone to the polls to vote against it. While they were in the voting booth, they voted for Bush. In every one of those states, including Oregon, Americans voted down the homosexual initiatives.

Then there was the decision by the Supreme Court in Kerry’s home state, Massachusetts, requiring gay unions. This only added to the worries of conservative Americans who wondered what Kerry would do if he gained the presidency.

Kerry attended mass, wore a crucifix, and claimed to be a devout Catholic; yet his stated positions on gays and abortion caused a majority of Catholics and 45% of the Hispanics to vote for Bush.

*Because of the significance of this election, here are some additional statistics:*

\$1.2 billion was spent on this presidential election. If you add the House and Senate elections, it rises to \$1.5 billion. \$800 million of it was spent for TV ads. It was the first \$1 billion-plus campaign (up from roughly \$600 million in 2000).

In 193,000 polling places, about 120 million Americans voted. That was 15 million more than in 2000, with Bush winning over Kerry by about 51% to 48.5%.

Among white males, Bush got 61% to Kerry’s 38%. Married women: 54% to 45%. Veterans: 57% to 42%. Once-a-week churchgoers: 58% to 41%. Bush got a majority of married women and married mothers, whites, white Christians, military families, and those who weekly attend religious services.

(In contrast, Kerry’s support came from single women, working women, blacks, Hispanics, Jews, young voters, gays, lesbians, pro-abortionists, and those who rarely or never attend religious services.)

Kerry had the edge with African Americans: Kerry 89% to Bush 11%. Hispanics: 55% to 42%. First-time voters: 54% to 45%. Not married: 59% to 40%.

Because of the American public’s fear about the dramatic slippage of values, they not only reelected Bush,—but they also swept many other Republicans into office. The whole thing was a stunning loss for the Democrats.

In Utah and North Dakota, Republican governors kept their seats. In Indiana and Missouri, Republicans replaced Democratic governors. There are now Republican governors in a majority of the states: 28 of the 50.

Both in the House and Senate, there was a de-

cided increase in Republicans. In the Senate, there are now 55 Republicans (an increase of 4) to 45 Democrats. (The exact amount of Republican increase in the House is still not known at the time of this writing.)

The fact that Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle was replaced by a young Republican, John Thune, was deeply significant. Daschle previously had served four terms in the House and three in the Senate, had brought lots of money and favors (called “pork”) to his home state, and would have continued to do so. But, in the Senate, he had led out in blocking every attempt of President Bush to have conservative judges approved.

This fact was of crucial importance; for it is only the Senate, not the House, which approves new federal judges and Supreme Court justices. Daschle had been the first Senate party chief to be ousted, at the polls, in 52 years. It is obvious that the people of South Dakota wanted conservatives elected as judges. Over \$25 million was spent by both parties on that one election. Thune, who does not drink or smoke, is against abortion and the gay agenda.

As election day drew near, in the vice president candidates’ debate, John Edwards made a point of mentioning that Dick Cheney’s daughter was a lesbian. That uncalled-for statement, which brought grief to the hearts of Dick Cheney and his wife, revealed the character of Edwards. During his single term in the Senate, according to his voting record, Edwards was known to be *more liberal in his votes than any other Democrat except Ted Kennedy*. So much so, that he had not run for a second term because North Carolina voters were disgusted with his pro-abortion, pro-gay positions. You will run into him again in the forthcoming presidential elections.

A few days later, about 30 minutes into the third debate between Kerry and Bush, Kerry was asked by moderator Bob Schieffer, of CBS, whether he thought homosexuality was a matter of choice or birth. In reply, Kerry immediately focused on the fact that Cheney’s gay daughter, Mary, was a lesbian. This was entirely inappropriate, before an audience of millions around the world.

Prior to that final debate, Republican pollster Ed Goetas had collected five Republicans, five Democrats, and five independents with instant response switches. Prior to that remark, a majority favored Kerry; but, as soon as he deliberately made that statement, a “huge negative reaction” occurred. From then on, the 15 people were suspicious of everything Kerry said and interpreted it in a negative light. When the debate was over, 11 of the 15 cast sample votes for Bush. Kerry thought the studied remark would encourage more immoral people to go to the polls and

vote; but it only helped solidify the Christians. Making the situation worse, Kerry’s closest campaign adviser, Mary Beth Cahill, afterward excused the remark, saying that Mary Cheney was “fair game,” as though she were just an animal to be chased down and killed.

The press did not report that, a few sentences later, Kerry said, “God made homosexuals the way they are.” (I personally heard speeches by all four Democratic presidential candidates at a major homosexual political gathering in the northeast prior to the Iowa primary. Each one promised to do great things for the gays if elected.)

After that third debate between Bush and Kerry, only three weeks remained. The two sides were hardening in their attitudes; and Christians all over America were becoming determined that they must keep Kerry from winning.

All along, the Republicans predicted they would beat the Democrats in the final 72 hours because the Democrats were relying on hired help ; whereas the republicans were using volunteers to encourage people to vote. Most of those volunteers were Protestants and Catholics.

Throughout the year, everyone who came to a local Republican campaign office was asked to volunteer. Only those who did were permitted to shake hands with the president, when he later passed through the area. The volunteers worked the phone banks and went from door-to-door in the neighborhoods.

The Republican National Committee had set strict (constantly updated) “turnout targets” for every one of the nation’s 193,000 voting precincts. As he traveled the country with Bush, Rove received detailed briefings from field lieutenant / sales reps.

In the final weeks, the Democrats finally began working in earnest to get liberals to the polls. They hired poll watchers and drivers to get their people to the polling places.

Traditionally, the Democrats could count on labor unions to organize the most effective get-out-the-vote operations. Republicans had always relied largely on unpaid volunteers, housewives, grandmothers, small businessmen, and retirees.

Day after day, republican helpers phoned and went to homes, urging the importance of the conservative vote. Meanwhile, the liberal press was printing articles on the large numbers of Democrats that were being urged to come out and vote, and downplaying what the Republicans were accomplishing.

Then, on Friday, October 29, Osama bin Laden decided to ruin Bush’s chance for reelection—by putting out a video, attacking him and declaring that Al-

Qaeda would crush America. But that only helped Bush's campaign.

Geographically, Bush won the South, the Plains, and the Mountain States. If you look at a *state-by-state* map, you discover that Bush won the electoral votes of every state *except*:

*A cluster in the Northeast:* Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia.

*A cluster in the West:* California, Oregon, Washington, and Hawaii.

But if you look at a *county* map, nearly all of America voted for Bush—including most of the territory in the above-named states. The only exceptions were the large urban areas, which had many voters.

Most of the counties *in every state* voted for Bush, with the exception of six states in the far northeast, in which nearly all the counties voted almost entirely for Kerry: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

George W. Bush defeated John F. Kerry by more than 3 million popular votes and 34 in the Electoral College. Bush received more popular votes than any other president in U.S. history—four million more than Reagan received. And moral issues was the primary reason.

He became the first son of a president to win reelection. (John Quincy Adams, son of John Adams, lost his run for a second term to Andrew Jackson in 1828.)

Two factors, above all others, stand out as the causes of Bush's victory; and the two blend into one:

*First*, a majority in the nation voted for "moral values" instead of, as the press had predicted, for economy, antiwar issues, and a variety of other urgent concerns.

*Second*, Karl Rove's single-minded goal throughout the campaign: Get 4 million more Evangelical voters to the polls than in 2000.

Never before in American history had an election like this occurred, when one party solidly stood

**During my research for this article, I came across a fabulous report on events during the entire election campaign: pages 35 to 127 in the November 15, 2004, issue of *Newsweek*. It is extremely revealing.**

in support of several (but not all) Christian principles while the other vigorously defended anti-Christian policies.

Yet it is now a week later and the Democrats are totally unable to face reality. They talk about "reaching America's heartland" with "more economic help"; they declare that their loss was merely a flux and had nothing to do with morals. They will not accept the fact that there are any other "values" than "take-home-pay values." They dare not abandon abortion and gay-rights issues; because these are major power bases, of the liberals, which comprise the party.

*What does all this tell us about the possibility of a full-blown U.S. National Sunday Law ahead of us:*

First, it can be done. Second, it will probably be the Republicans who will do it. Third, the Republicans were desperate to find ways to cement their popularity with as many conservatives as possible. Eventually, they will hit on the one party plank which will win the most voters.

Nothing would unite Protestants, Catholics, blacks, and Hispanics as much as the supposed "moral value" of a National Sunday Law. Even the labor unions would gladly climb on board. The ecologists would see in it a way to reduce pollution; and health advocates would proclaim it a great help in reducing physical innervation in our modern world.

A National Sunday Law could either be suddenly sprung on the nation in the middle of a presidential term or it could be the pivotal part of the party platform to bring a party to victory in a forthcoming presidential election.

The placement of conservative appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court by a Republican president would remain important. All that would be needed would be a solid five conservatives willing to maintain a 5-4 vote in crucial areas of concern.

It is believed that Bush will fill at least two, and possibly three (maybe four), vacancies in the next four years. Chief Justice William Rehnquist, Antonin Scalia, and Clarence Thomas are the three current conservative justices. And Rehnquist is currently being treated for thyroid cancer. That is not a favorable situation.

Political experts say that Bush will only have 18 months in which to push through any radically new legislation. Then the battle over the next election will begin. But a National Sunday Law could be one of the party planks to bring success. —*vf*