

WHY DID GEORGE BUSH REALLY WIN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION?

by Tom Watchorn ▪ November 25, 2004

For the same reason he won the election four years ago - God wanted him to!

“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God... For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.” **Romans 13:1, 4-5**

Paul is telling the Christians in Rome in the passage above, that the authority of the government is not the result of the consent or the agreement of those being governed, (as in by voting or appointment). Instead, he states that **all authority to govern originates entirely with God**. Therefore, God made, or allowed, George W. Bush to win both presidential elections. It was part of His Master Plan for the world in November 2000, and it was part of His Master Plan for our country and the world in November 2004. Leaders in power, are either God's servant to do that which is right and just, or His agent to "execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

This Biblical truth is easier to accept when leaders are basically good, God-fearing, moral and just. But, what about when they are evil? What about the Hitler's and Stalin's and the thousands of other evil leaders the world has had to suffer under? The Bible tells us that God allowed them to become leaders – **they**

did not become authorities apart from God's control. This is a stark Biblical reality that is sometimes difficult for us to swallow! God actually allowed countless monsters like Hitler, Stalin and Saddam Hussein to become dictators in their countries, resulting in the death and suffering of millions of people? Yes, He did. These evil leaders must have come to power with God's consent, for ultimately God is in control of everything. Remember, when Paul was writing to the Romans, the evil emperor Nero, who was killing and torturing thousands of Christians, was on the throne.

Paul provides an explanation in his letter to the Romans regarding why it is that God allows evil leaders to assume power and authority, albeit only temporary. The average tenure of a ruthless dictator is incidentally, less than 10 years. Paul's explanation starts with a foundational truth about all mankind and it is found in **Romans 2:11-16** and **Romans 1:18-32**, which I'll paraphrase here: God created man with an inherent knowledge of His "invisible attributes" (such as love, kindness, mercy and justice), and even His "power and Godhead" (Divine Trinity). This means that even the savage native in a remote jungle has within him the knowledge of God. How this is exactly done, we don't know, because the Bible doesn't go into detail about it. But, I trust God that it is fair and just. Why did God give every man this knowledge of Himself, both visibly and inherently? Paul explains, *"For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly*

seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; **so that they are without excuse.**"¹ Therefore, it is by this standard, at least, that God judges everyone when they die. Remember, the Bible states, *"And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment."*² How much more are those of us who actually heard the Gospel of Jesus Christ, going to be "without excuse" when we face Jesus on Judgment Day! Jesus said, *"I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me."*³ Therefore, we know that God has provided a means by which everyone is allowed the choice to receive Jesus as their personal Savior. For the Old Testament saints, such as Abraham and David, it was a place referred to as "Abraham's Bosom". Jesus called it (from the cross to the thief), "paradise." I trust, God has made similar provisions for everyone, so that prior to their final judgment, going to heaven or going to hell, no one will have the excuse of saying, *"I never knew. Nobody ever told me about Jesus."*⁴ This is exactly why Jesus descended into the "paradise" section of Hades following His death on the cross. He went to preach "freedom to the captives." That is to say, He preached the Gospel of Christ to those waiting there for Him. After which, the Bible tells us they were lead to heaven by Jesus, thus testifying to the fact that no one ascends to the Father, except through Jesus. With the exception of the Old Testament saints, the Bible is not explicit in the manner and method by which the Gospel is preached to everyone prior to

their judgment. Nevertheless, by faith I know that God is perfectly fair and just and God is *"...not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."*⁵

Paul goes on to build upon this foundation to say that despite their knowledge of God, and in many cases despite the clear teachings of God's spokesmen - Jesus Himself, the prophets and apostles, many men and as a collective group, many nations, have still rejected God. In fact, they have knowingly exchanged this knowledge for "a lie." Paul says, *"Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools."*⁶ When this happens, what does God do? In modern English, the Bible says, - *"God washes His hands of them."* He gives them up to the desires of their evil hearts and in the case of nations, gives them the evil leaders they desire (and deserve.) **It is no accident that the verses that follow specifically speak of the sin of homosexuality, and I believe also, abortion.** Paul goes on to say, *"Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature."*⁷ *And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the*

¹ Romans 1:20

² Hebrews 9:27

³ John 14:6

⁴ Acts 17:29-30

⁵ 2 Peter 3:9b

⁶ Romans 1:21-22

⁷ It is a natural thing for a woman to give birth and unnatural to have an abortion.

woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful.”⁸

Unfortunately, some of these men (and women) end up as political or religious leaders, leading ungodly nations in ungodly ways. This may be what God has done in the case of many countries in Europe, Africa, Asia and the Middle East. Because their collective hearts have become so hardened against Him, God has allowed ungodly men to assume positions of authority and leadership, and thus they shall reap as nations what they have sowed. I pray that the remnant of God-fearing and genuine Christians that continually pray for and repent for America, will delay the day when God allows ungodly leaders to rule over America. It appears for the moment, because of doing the following: *"Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong"* that we have held back God's anger and wrath towards our nation.⁹ I pray America will continue to be "a light upon a hill" for the world to see.

It should be clear from the Scriptures presented, that it is God that places all

those with power and authority in their positions. He does so according to His Master Plan for a particular nation or the world. He can use righteous men (or women) as instruments of His will to bring about blessings upon a people, or He can use evil men (or women) to bring about deserved punishment. There are numerous examples presented in the Bible of God using nation's leaders, good ones and evil ones.

Did Paul always submit to the authority of Rome? No. In fact, he was repeatedly thrown into jail for breaking the civil laws of Rome and Jerusalem concerning the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He eventually was executed for violating these laws. By what "higher authority" did Paul willfully disobey the civil and religious authorities? Obviously, the authority we ultimately all must submit to – God. Peter and John make this very clear when they were commanded by the civil and religious authorities not to speak of or teach in the name of Jesus. *"And they called them, and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus. But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.”¹⁰*

If we believe in the inerrant Word of God as presented to us in the Bible, we must accept that there is no civil or religious authority, except that which God himself has established. And, because He established it to suit His purposes, we must be willing to submit to that authority, unless what we are being told to do is unbiblical. That is, it goes against our conscience as guided by Scripture. Then, as always, we are to obey God.

⁸ Romans 1:24-31

⁹ 1 Corinthians 16:13

¹⁰ Acts 4:18-20

With the question of who's really behind placing people in leadership positions now settled, let's revisit the original question: "*Why did George Bush win the election?*" and re-phrase it. Let's ask, "*How did George Bush actually win the presidential election of 2004?*" The simple answer, if there is one, is: **Bush received more popular votes in electorally strategic states than his opponent - John Kerry.** Because the popular vote by itself is *not* the determining factor in who gets elected President of the United States, we have to consider both aspects of the American voting process. First, the population or electorate that actually voted was 118 million people. And secondly, the Electoral College, consisting of 538 votes that determine legally (constitutionally) who is the President and Vice-President of the USA. Obviously, there is a correlation between the popular vote and the electoral vote, but as it has happened in a few other elections, a President has assumed office without receiving the majority of popular votes. He became President by virtue of receiving the majority of electoral votes. In the present case, that's 270 electoral votes. The population and thus, the electoral votes differ from state to state. California, with over 35 million people, has the largest number of electoral votes – 55. The next largest state is Texas with 22 million people has 34 electoral votes, followed by New York, Florida and Pennsylvania. For comparison, there are eight small states, such as the Dakotas, Wyoming and Delaware that have only three electoral votes. The system works when the majority of the popular vote of a particular state are placed in favor of a particular candidate for President and Vice-President. This takes place on November 2nd. As a result, these two winning candidates subsequently receive

all the state's Electoral College votes. These electoral votes are submitted in early January by the states' delegates. It is then that the candidates are considered legally "voted into office."

Therefore, it was not only important for Bush to win the majority of the popular vote (which he did, 60.6 million), but, more importantly, that he do so in the individual states that would give him the majority of electoral votes. Because Kerry won the big population and electoral vote states such as California, Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois and Michigan, Bush had to win the election the hard way. He had to win a majority of the popular votes in an overwhelming majority of the remaining 46 states. He did. He won the popular votes of 31 states or 61%. Ultimately however, it wasn't the number of states won, but who received the most electoral votes. Ultimately, it came down to who won Florida, Ohio, North Carolina and Georgia, collectively representing 77 electoral votes. Bush did!

We were told that the major issues facing voters in the 2004 election were: the economy, the war in Iraq, global terrorism, moral values (homosexuals and abortion) and personal character. There were dozens of other smaller issues that collectively must have had some impact on voter's decisions. Kerry's war record and religion, Kerry's wife (2nd wife), Kerry's anti-war behavior following Vietnam, Kerry's record as a Senator, taxes, a candidate's world view and the role of the U.S. plays in it, Bush's conduct and decisions during his presidency, Bush's religious beliefs and the environment were some of these other issues. It's easy to fall into the trap of trying to pick the most important issue. That's a trap, because **any one issue can be the most important in the eyes of a particular voter.** Therefore, the

candidate that is **perceived positively by voters on the majority of issues** has a better chance of winning. The utopia for candidates is to be viewed as being, "all things to all people", but being, "most things to most people" usually is enough to win! As I said earlier, it's a trap to try and pick what you think is the most important issue. Especially if you focus almost all your campaign efforts in one or two areas, hoping that if you win the hearts of the voters on these one or two "important" issues that will be enough to assure victory. John Kerry fell into this trap. He thought the economy and the war in Iraq were the two most important issues for most Americans. He put most of his "campaigning eggs in this basket" and he was obviously wrong. In addition, he never made a convincing argument that Bush had failed in both of these areas, or that he (Kerry) could do any better.

It is an over simplification and simply not accurate to give the "conservative religious right", the "moral majority" or the "evangelicals" all the credit for Bush's presidential election victory. However, these groups do deserve a lot of credit. More Christians were encouraged to vote this election than ever before by their churches. A generation ago, most Americans thought churches should stay out of politics. Now, most Americans think its okay – even sinful not to! While the same percentage of voters representing evangelical Protestants (23%) voted in this election as before, more of them in sheer numbers voted for Bush. 78% in 2004 compared to 71% in the 2000 election. That translated into more popular votes across the board for Bush. This also reflects a trend of the past decade. More and more evangelicals are calling themselves Republican. Catholics represent a larger percentage of voters

and are more numerous than evangelicals. They represent about 27% of the electorate compared to 23% for evangelicals. However, because of the abortion issue, Kerry must have lost a considerable amount of Catholic votes that traditionally have voted Democratic in the past. Setting the economy and the war issues aside, (Kerry's main campaign points) many Catholics simply voted for Bush because many of their church leaders (priests and Bishops) encouraged them to do so. (*Some went as far as to say it was sin to vote for Kerry.*) Here also, Bush found favor with more Hispanic voters, mostly who are Catholics. 42% of the Hispanic Catholics voted for Bush, compared to 31% in the 2000 election.

Bush received 10 million more votes in November 2004 than he did in the 2000 election. (60.6 million, compared to 50.5 million.) Seven million of this increase can be directly traced to evangelicals and Catholics! (3.5 million votes each.) We must ultimately attribute this net increase in votes primarily to one issue and one cultural fact. The issue was moral (homosexual marriages and abortion) and the cultural fact that most Americans today believe the church *should* be involved in politics. This is a big shift in acceptable behavior from the attitude 30 years ago. Many people, even the non-religious, might agree that because of the "religious conservative right", God did have something *indirectly* to do with the outcome of the 2004 election. As discussed above, however, we know from what the Bible states, that God had something *directly* to do with Bush's election victory. In fact, He determined it, for it was His desire to see Bush remain President. Why? I don't pretend to know the mind of God, so I can't say for sure.

But, I do know that George Bush's personal beliefs align themselves closer to what the Bible teaches than any of his political opponents. I am confident in stating that Bush, as the most powerful man on earth, apparently has a continuing role to play in God's Master Plan for our country and the world.

The remaining three million (out of the total of 10 million) more votes that Bush received in 2004 over the previous election is a net increase and the result of a conglomerate of mixed perceptions about other issues. Bush probably did a better job of promoting his "commander-in-chief" image and being tough on terror, in contrast to Kerry's "flip-flop voting record" and wanting the U.S. to "pass the global test at the UN" before taking action against terrorists. As a result, many of the "undecided" or "independents" decided to stick with someone they knew. Probably as many folks voted "for" Bush because of specific issues close to them, as did others who voted "for" Kerry because of the same issues. For instance, if you just got a job – you voted for Bush. If you just lost your job – you voted for Kerry. If you paid less taxes than before – you voted for Bush, if you paid more – you voted for Kerry. If you're a military officer who received a raise – you voted for Bush. If your son died fighting in Iraq – you voted for Kerry. And so on, and so on, with each vote on these secondary issues probably canceling each other out. When all the other issues washed out, it was a net gain of three million more votes for Bush.

Even though Bush "earned" 10 million more votes in 2004 than four years earlier, and more importantly - 3.3 million more than John Kerry, it was still essential that these popular votes be spread across electorally strategic states, such as Ohio and Florida. And they were.

Bush basically won the same states as he did four years earlier, which is why he won the electoral vote. Bush received 286 electoral votes to Kerry's 252, or Bush's 53% to Kerry's 47%. However, unlike the previous election, Bush won with a clear popular vote victory – something the Democrats are still trying to figure out. The "media elite" are dumb-founded. The "liberals", "intellectuals", and "social scientists" are numb over the 2004 election results and can't comprehend what happened or why. Homosexuals and abortion advocates are in shock. The six million Muslims that live in America and endorsed John Kerry, are well, laying low. European countries, such as France, think there's a bunch of "red-necks" lead by a Christian fanatic that are leading our country. Newspapers in Britain, Germany and Russia are calling us "dumb" and worse. The reality that smacked these folks in the face is that America is still "one nation - under God", believing in the God of the Bible and His Son, Jesus Christ. Maybe by only a small majority, but nevertheless, there are more God-fearing, Jesus loving, Christians in America than they thought possible. Perhaps within this Christian band of brothers, which the world hates, is yet a smaller remnant of genuine born-again, psalm singing, Jesus worshipping, praying and fasting Christians who are standing firm in their faith and resisting the strategies and deceits of the devil. Knowing therefore, that we do not war against flesh and blood, but against despotism, against powers, and against rulers of the darkness of this age, we have put on the breastplate of righteousness, and are making a stand.