

The 2010 Election: The News Inside the News

David Barton

Traditional media coverage on Election Night provided a general overview of the most obvious political shifts but largely ignored the massive pro-life, pro-family, and conservative gains that occurred. This report will provide a general summary of the elections and will also report many results of particular interest to God-fearing conservative voters.

Federal Election Results: An Historic Shift

On the surface, Republicans did well, gaining more U. S. House seats than in any election for the past 72 years: ¹

- In 1938, Republicans picked up 80 seats in the House
- In 1946, 56 seats
- In 1966, 47
- In 1994, 54

Republicans gained 63 seats – the most since 1938. But it would be a mistake to assume that voters simply chose Republicans in this election. To the contrary, like the four previous landmark elections cited above, voters decisively chose to reject the liberalism exuded by national Democrat leaders; Republicans were simply the beneficiaries:

- In 1938, following six years of President Roosevelt’s “New Deal” expansionism, voters overwhelmingly rejected further growth of the federal government.
- In 1946, they rejected the revival of the “New Deal” under President Harry Truman.
- In 1966, following three years of President Johnson’s “Great Society” federal growth, voters halted any further expansion of government.
- In 1994, they put a stop to President Bill Clinton’s attempt to expand the federal government through “Hillarycare,” also ending his radical social agenda (e.g., lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military, protecting partial-birth abortions, etc.).

Election 2010 was a similar voter repudiation of the explosive growth of federal government under national Democrat leaders (i.e., the takeover of health care and student loans, government bailouts of private businesses, “stimulus” spending bills, etc.); it was also a resounding affirmation of limited government and conservatism, both economic and social.

While some national pundits argued that the Republican victories were the result of an “enthusiasm gap” (that is, Republican voters were highly motivated to go to the polls but Democrat voters were not), such was

definitely not the case. In this election, the numbers of voters from each side was exactly equal: 35% of voters were Republican, and 35% were Democrat.² (In recent elections, the comparative percentage of Democrat and Republican voters has remained relatively close.³) The difference in this election was not a greater turnout of Republicans or a suppressed turnout of Democrats but rather that non-affiliated independent voters overwhelmingly chose conservative candidates (running primarily as Republicans) and rejected liberal ones (represented primarily by Democrats)⁴ – a 37-point swing in their decision from only four years ago.⁵

Some additional interesting election statistics:

- In every state in the nation, self-identified conservatives outnumber self-identified liberals; and in 25 of the states, conservatives outnumbered liberals 2 to 1.⁶
- Overall, 42% of voters self-identified as conservative, and 20% as liberal⁷ – a 22% gap. (In 2006 and 2008, it was only a 12% gap.⁸)
- Tea Party supporters made up 41% of voters.⁹
- Voter turnout was slightly higher in 2010 than in 2006, projected at 42% in this election (i.e., 90 million), which is 6.2 million more than voted in 2006 in the last mid-term election (83.8 million).¹⁰ (Mid-term elections are always smaller in turnout than presidential elections, so comparisons are best made of mid-term to mid-term, and presidential to presidential.)
- Voter turnout increased in nine states, especially Florida, Minnesota, and Texas, but decreased in other states, such as Ohio and Pennsylvania.

Given the conservative nature of voters this election, it is not surprising that the average new freshman in the House and Senate is more conservative than the Member he replaced. In fact, in several states not traditionally conservative, numerous congressional seats switched from liberal to conservative, including Republicans gaining 6 congressional seats in New York; 5 each in Pennsylvania and Ohio; 3 in Illinois; and 2 each in Colorado, Michigan, and Wisconsin. They even gained ground in traditionally conservative states, including 4 more seats in Florida; 3 each in Virginia, Tennessee, and Texas; and 2 each in Arizona, Arkansas, Indiana, Mississippi, and New Hampshire. By the way, in traditionally liberal Wisconsin, not only did liberals lose 2 congressional seats, they also lost a U. S. Senate Seat, the Governorship, the State Senate, and the State House – the only state to lose control of so many levels of government in this election.

While the changes toward conservatism were substantial, nearly all of the national news coverage focused only on fiscal conservatism; but statistics affirm that the election was also about social conservatism. For example, exit polling showed that among conservative voters:

- When asked what was needed to get America back on track, reducing spending and restoring values were equally important.¹¹

- A majority of voters said members of Congress and political leaders are ignoring our religious heritage. ¹²
- 53% of the voters opposed homosexual marriage. ¹³
- Christian conservatives comprised 28.8 million, or 32% of all voters ¹⁴ – the highest recorded percentage of any election. ¹⁵

Furthermore:

- 30% of all voters said that the abortion issue affected their vote; 22% said they voted for pro-life candidates, and 8% for pro-abortion candidates, thus providing pro-life candidates a 14-point advantage over abortion voters. ¹⁶ That large advantage provided the margin of victory for pro-life candidates in many otherwise close races.

Interestingly, exit polling has long demonstrated that the frequency of church attendance is the best indicator of whether an individual will vote conservative or liberal. As *Washington Post* writer Thomas Edsall had reported: "Pollsters are finding that one of the best ways to discover whether a voter holds liberal or conservative value stands is to ask: How often do you go to church? Those who go often tend to be Republican, those who go rarely or not at all tend to be Democrat." ¹⁷ In 2010, that tendency was again reaffirmed:

- Among Born-Again or Evangelical voters, 77% voted for Republicans – up 7% from four years ago. ¹⁸
- White Protestants voted for Republicans over Democrats by a 69% to 28% margin – up 8% from four years ago. ¹⁹
- White Catholics voted for Republicans over Democrats by a 59% to 39% margin – up 10% from four years ago; ²⁰ and among all Catholic voters, 54% voted for Republicans, an increase of 12% from two years ago. ²¹

But on the other hand:

- Those who have no religious affiliation supported Democrats over Republicans by a 68% to 30% margin (although this is an 8% improvement from four years ago). ²²

Exit polling from this year's election makes clear that conservative people of faith carried their values with them into the voting booth – something that they did not do two years ago in 2008 (as will be seen below).

Another disappointing number from two years ago was that only 14% of churches provided voter guides or urged parishioners to vote, compared to 27% in 2006. In 2008, WallBuilders created a website (www.ChristianVoterGuide.com and www.Judeo-ChristianVoterGuide.com) in order to make conservative, pro-family state voter guides available to voters in every state. This year, a mailing was sent to 285,000 of the 325,000 houses of worship in America, urging pastors, rabbis, and priests to get voter guides from those websites and distribute them to their congregations or synagogue, resulting in more than 140,000 website hits from that mailing.

Because values mattered to voters, there was more cohesion between economic and social conservatives than in recent elections. Consequently, nearly all the conservative candidates who won this year were not only economic but also social conservatives.

For example, in the U. S. Senate, 16 new freshmen were elected: 3 Democrats and 13 Republicans. (The 3 Democrats all replaced Democrats, and 7 of the 13 Republicans replaced Republicans, with the other 6 replacing Democrats). Of the 13 freshmen Republican Senators, 12 are conservative and pro-life (Mark Kirk of Illinois is not); and of the 3 Democrat freshmen, 1 is pro-life. Thus, 13 of the 16 new Senators are pro-life – an 81% pro-life class. (Compare this year’s freshman Senate class with that of 2008, which was only 14% pro-life.)

Similarly, of the 97 new freshmen in the U. S. House, 81 are pro-life – an 84% pro-life class. In fact, this election resulted in a net gain of 52 pro-life seats in the House! (Of the 97 freshmen, 33 seats showed no change, with 26 pro-life freshman replacing pro-life predecessors, and 7 pro-abortion freshmen replacing the same. There were 3 seats where a pro-abortion freshman replaced a pro-life predecessor, 40 seats where a pro-life freshman replaced a pro-abortion predecessor, an additional 15 seats where a solid pro-life freshman replaced a predecessor with a mixed pro-life voting record, and 6 where the pro-life positions of the freshman are unknown.)²³ As a result of the election, Congressman Chris Smith (R-NJ), co-chair of the House Pro-Life Caucus, announced that “January will mark the beginning of the arguably most pro-life House ever.”²⁴ (Compare this year’s freshman House class with that of 2008, which was only 40% pro-life.)

While voters overwhelmingly chose pro-life candidates in this election, apparently, Democrats became increasingly less tolerant of pro-lifers in their own ranks. For example, Democrats for Life raised only \$7,989 and gave only \$7,309 to 14 candidates,²⁵ while the Republican National Coalition for Life raised almost ten-times as much (\$67,152), and gave \$77,045 to 60 candidates.²⁶ And in states such as Hawaii, during the Democrat primary in September, most pro-life Democrat incumbents were defeated and replaced with a pro-abortion Democrat. But outside of Democrat-only circles, the general population did elect some proven conservative pro-life Democrats, including Congressmen Mike McIntyre and Heath Shuler of North Carolina.

(By the way, non-liberal Democrats appear to be a shrinking group. Before the election, there were 54 Democrats in the Blue Dog Caucus, which is composed of conservative to moderate Democrat House Members. Only 26 from that group were re-elected.)²⁷

Some other interesting facts about the new Republican freshman class:

- 2 black Republicans were elected to positions never before held by any black representative. There are 6 new Latino Republicans in Congress (5 in the House, 1 in the Senate), and 9 new female Republicans (8 in

the House, and 1 in the Senate). All of these new freshmen are pro-life; and the addition of these new women increases by 60% the number of pro-life women in the U. S. House.

- 8 freshmen are military veterans, most of whom served in Iraq and Afghanistan. ²⁸ They all support victory on the battlefield in both countries and also hold a very strong national security position. ²⁹ These 8 more than double the number of like-minded War on Terror veterans already serving in Congress and will form the new Victory Caucus. Significantly, however, every War on Terror veteran who ran as a challenger and who held an anti-war position was defeated, as were 2 incumbent anti-war Iraqi war veterans. ³⁰
- All of the new Republican Latino members ran on the Arizona-style immigration position that the media and liberals so denounce – that is, securing the borders, enforcing existing laws, controlling immigration, and opposing amnesty.
- The new freshman class is very strongly pro-Israel, replacing many incumbents who were openly critical of Israel.
- 3 of the new Republican Senate Freshmen (Marco Rubio, Pat Toomey, and Ron Johnson) are openly and unabashedly pro-American Exceptionalism, boldly advocating Americanism, God-given unalienable rights, the Free Market, and constitutionalism.

And finally, there is the Congressional Prayer Caucus. Most citizens are unaware that every week Congress is in session, as votes begin, dozens of congressional Members meet in Room 219 of the Capitol (directly across from the House Chamber) to join together in extended prayer for the country. The Prayer Caucus has been bold in defending religious liberties and public religious expressions, including at the Washington Monument, the Capitol Visitor Center, veterans' funeral ceremonies, and many other areas where officials had ordered the removal of public acknowledgments of God. (To see something of their admirable work, go to www.FindRoom219.com or www.CPCFoundation.com.) Significantly, of the 62 Members of the Congressional Prayer Caucus running for re-election, 61 were returned – a percentage much, much higher than the House at large.

State Election Results

Clearly, the federal election results went heavily in favor of conservatives (and Republicans), but the state level results were even more dramatically pointed in that direction.

There are a total of 99 State legislative chambers (Nebraska has a unicameral government with only one chamber). As the 2010 election began, the balance of power in 25 of those chambers was such that it could change hands. When Election Night ended, Republicans lost control of no chambers but Democrats lost control of 20.

Heading into Election Day, Democrats held 783 more state legislative seats than Republicans, but when the night ended, Republicans held a 523 seat advantage.³¹ Republicans gained 680 state legislative seats (with several still undecided).³² They not only gained 134 seats in New Hampshire, 41 in Minnesota, 28 in Maine, etc., but they also made massive gains even in chambers where they already held control. For example, Republicans held a slim 77 to 73 majority in the Texas State House, but on Election Night jumped to a 99 to 51 majority. And in Tennessee, the State House went from a 2 seat majority to a 31 seat supermajority. Amazingly, Republicans lost seats in only 5 of the 99 legislative chambers (the Senates of Hawaii, Mississippi, Maryland, and Massachusetts, and the House in Delaware; Republicans were already in the minority in all 5 states).

Republicans currently control both chambers in 25 states, and one chamber in 6 more states. They have not controlled this many legislatures since 1928.³³

And just as a number of state legislative chambers changed control, so too did a number of Governors' Mansions: 15 switched hands, 11 to Republican, 3 to Democrat, and 1 to Independent (one is still undecided). Republican governors currently outnumber Democrat governors by a margin of 29 to 19, with 1 Independent.

Republicans now hold a trifecta (that is, they control the state house, senate, and governorship) in 20 states, while Democrats hold a trifecta in only 11. Several of these new trifectas are historic. For example, the last time Republicans controlled Alabama government, Robert E. Lee was still alive. (Since the election, four Alabama Democrat legislators have switched to Republican; expect this pattern to be repeated in other states as conservative Democrats feel less and less at home in the Democrat Party.) Minnesota government had never been under Republican control before this election, and North Carolina is now in Republican control for the first time since 1870.

As an interesting aside, the Louisiana House also flipped to Republican control as a result of this year's election, even though there were no state legislative races in Louisiana. (Louisiana is one of five states, along with Mississippi, Kentucky, Virginia, and New Jersey that hold state elections in the years between federal elections.) Nevertheless, following the nationwide conservative tsunami, a Democrat State House member announced that he was changing parties, thus giving Republicans control of that chamber for the first time since Reconstruction.

State Effects on the Federal Congress

State legislative results have a direct effect on the composition of the federal Congress through the process of decennial redistricting – a process required by the Constitution in Art. 1, Sec. 2, Par. 3. Every ten years, a census is conducted to determine the national population, and the total population is then divided by 435 (the number of Members in the House) to determine the number of citizens in each congressional district. Once that number is ascertained, new congressional lines are drawn and elections are held. In this case, the census was conducted in 2010; state legislatures will redraw lines in 2011; and congressional elections under the new lines will be held in 2012, and those lines will remain in place for the next decade.

Because state legislatures draw the lines in most states, the party that controls the legislature will draw the lines in a manner more favorable to their party. Thus, states like New York make it easier for Democrats to be elected, and states like Texas make it easier for Republicans to be elected. However, redrawing lines becomes especially significant when the population has shifted in such a manner that a state either gains or loses a congressional seat.

Over the past decade, millions of citizens in the north have moved toward the south where the economy is much better. As a result, Texas is gaining 4 congressional seats and Florida 2; Arizona, Georgia, South Carolina, Washington, and Utah will each gain 1. Since most of those states are controlled by Republicans, it is likely that lines will be drawn to make it easier to elect Republicans to Congress in these new districts. States losing a congressional seat include Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Michigan, Missouri, and Pennsylvania, and New York will lose 2 seats. Since most of the seats to be eliminated are currently held by Democrats, it is likely that Democrat numbers in Congress will be reduced.

As a result of the state legislative changes on election night, the redistricting process could result in a 20-25 seat federal congressional gain for Republicans – a gain that could last for the next decade.

State Judicial Races

Just as conservatives gained control of state legislatures and governorships, they also re-gained control of judiciaries in Alabama, Michigan, North Carolina, Texas, and other states.

One of the most dramatic wins of the night (and one of my personal favorites) was in Iowa, where 3 of the Iowa Supreme Court Justices who handed down a 2009 decision to allow same-sex marriage were turned out of office by the voters. This is the first time in the nearly fifty year history of judicial retention elections in Iowa that any Supreme Court justice was defeated, and in this case, all 3 that appeared on the ballot were defeated.

Significantly, the removal of any judge in a retention election is so rare (99% of all state judges facing retention elections are retained ³⁴) that their

positions are essentially lifetime appointments. The removal of these liberal judges sent shockwaves throughout the judiciary across the nation, delivering a clear message that voters can and will hold judges accountable if they abandon their traditional role and instead try to become judicial legislators. (To see something of the story behind this remarkable victory, go to DallasBlog.com and read the article by Dr. Richard G. Lee on "Behind the Fall of Iowa's Judicial Gods." ³⁵)

State Ballot Initiatives

With very few exceptions, voters across the nation expressed conservative positions in their decisions on 160 ballot initiatives in 37 states. For example:

- Oklahoma said that their judges must base their rulings on federal and state law, not international or Sharia law. (However, an Islamic group has already filed suit against the measure, and a federal judge has granted a temporary injunction in their favor.)
- Arizona and Oklahoma joined Missouri in allowing their citizens to say "no" to federal health care.
- Arkansas, South Carolina, and Tennessee approved a constitutional right to hunt, thus pushing back against liberal animal rights groups.
- California rejected the legalization of marijuana, and Oregon and South Dakota rejected medical marijuana.
- Arizona, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Utah passed constitutional amendments to protect the right to secret ballots in union elections, pushing back against President Obama's promise to allow workers to unionize without a secret ballot.
- Washington rejected a state income tax.
- Indiana placed a cap on property taxes.
- Kansas passed a constitutional amendment securing the right of citizens to bear arms.
- Missouri and Montana voted to prohibit new taxes on the sale of property (i.e., no capital gains taxes on property).
- California and Washington passed measures making it harder to tax citizens by requiring a legislative supermajority to approve a new tax.
- Missouri passed a measure that allows citizens to decide on the taxes on their earnings.
- Nevada rejected a measure to allow lawmakers to change taxes without a vote of the people.
- Rhode Island overwhelmingly rejected a name change for its state. (This was the second of my personal favorites of the night. The official title of Rhode Island is "State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations," given when the two colonies merged in 1663. Liberal legislators asserted that

the use of “plantation” was a racist term, despite the fact that Rhode Island’s Governor Stephen Hopkins – a Founding Father and signer of the Declaration – signed America’s first anti-slavery law; and the colony’s founder Roger Williams had excellent relations with American Indians. Rhode Island was long a model of early American justice and civil rights; and citizens overwhelmingly rejected – by a 78% to 22% margin – the liberal attempt to rewrite their state’s history!)

A Few State Disappointments

Despite the numerous conservative victories in states across the nation, there were a few underperforming states, including Arizona, Colorado, Washington, California, and Hawaii. For example, in Arizona, many of the congressional seats that were expected to change hands from liberal to conservative failed to do so, and the state also passed a measure legalizing medical marijuana. Colorado experienced similar statewide underperformance, and their initiative on the unborn failed by a large margin (it was the only pro-life initiative in the nation this year). This is not to say that some conservative gains were not made in most of those states; they were; it is just that they were not nearly as broad as in other states. (By the way, as noted earlier, Hawaii was one of only a handful of states in which conservatives and Republicans actually lost ground. As a result, the current composition of Hawaii’s 25 member state senate is now 24 Democrats and 1 Republican. What a lonely senator!)

A few of the disappointments included:

- Colorado did not opt out of federal health care mandates, pass tax limitation amendments, approve the personhood amendment, or prohibit the increase of state debt through loans.
- Massachusetts did not reduce state sales tax from 6.25% to 3%.
- Arizona passed medical marijuana, and did not protect the right to hunt and fish.
- Maine narrowly allowed a casino (but opponents have announced a call for a recount).
- California did not suspend the “Global Warming Act.”
- Washington voted to allow the state to run its own liquor stores.

Yet notwithstanding these few losses, Election Day was an overwhelming success for God-fearing conservatives, both social and fiscal.

An Interesting Side Note – “Hollywood Stays Home”

Compared to the presidential election of 2008, Hollywood stars stayed out of this election. According to Stephen Zunes, a professor at the University

of San Francisco, the Obama administration has not been living up to Hollywood expectations. As he explains, "The more left-wing of the celebrities feel that Obama and the Democrat Congress haven't been liberal enough (i.e., still in Iraq, escalating in Afghanistan, no single-payer health care (or even public option), no climate legislation, etc.) and are therefore part of the 'enthusiasm gap'." ³⁶

A Big Loser

Liberals and Democrats were the election's biggest collective loser, but perhaps the biggest individual loser was George Soros.

Soros is the secularist billionaire who has invested so heavily into severing America from its traditional religious, moral, and constitutional foundations. He has been tactically brilliant, advancing his dangerous agenda through scores of well-coordinated but seemingly unconnected groups, gaining control over numerous powerful but relatively unglamorous political positions that exercise tremendous influence over the direction of the states and thus the nation.

Considered one of the most powerful men on earth, Soros has sought to further his secularist, progressive, socialist agenda by distributing (so far) more than \$5 billion through numerous allied groups (e.g., Open Society Institute, Tides Foundation, ACLU, America Coming Together, Media Matters, America Votes, Center for American Progress, MoveOn.org, etc.). Soros unabashedly opposes free market economics, the American military, and our constitutional form of government; seeks a massive expansion of government, including welfare programs, socialized medicine, and amnesty for illegal aliens; supports the elimination of all prisons and the release of all inmates; supports abortion and opposes traditional marriage and all forms of traditional morality; supports anti-American Arab groups and defends anti-American terrorists; opposes tax cuts of any type; opposes American sovereignty and supports complete globalism; promotes radical environmentalism; supports unilateral disarmament and the placing of American foreign policy under the control of the United Nations and the placing of American criminal policy under the control of the World Court; etc. ³⁷

Much of Soros' effort to fundamentally transform America has occurred at the state level by seeking to place his like-minded operatives into the more unglamorous but nevertheless influential political positions of state judges and secretaries of state, and he also works heavily for the passage of specific state ballot initiatives. Soros had experienced almost unbridled success in recent elections, but in 2010, his agenda became one of the biggest election losers.

For example, he has already spent over \$45 million ³⁸ to "remake the judiciary and fundamentally change the way judges are selected." ³⁹ His plan is to move state judges as far away from voters as possible, having judges chosen instead by groups of elitist lawyers appointed by the governor or some other state official. ⁴⁰ After being appointed, the judges only have to face the voters in

periodic retention elections – a plan that, as noted above, amounts essentially to a lifetime appointment. ⁴¹ Soros wants judges to be unaccountable to, and independent from citizens – much in the same way that federal judges in recent decades have also wrongly become independent and unaccountable. But not only did Soros suffer a setback with the Iowa judges being turned out, but in Nevada, the Soros-backed initiative on appointing rather than electing judges was overwhelmingly rejected by a 57% to 42% margin. ⁴²

(By the way, other Soros-supported ballot initiatives that lost on Election Night included California’s plan to legalize marijuana, and its plan to keep redistricting in the hands of the extremely liberal Democrat state legislature rather than in the hands of a citizens’ commission. ⁴³ Gratefully, several Soros-backed measures went down at the hands of the people.)

In addition to Soros’ judicial activities, another area in which he is heavily involved is his “Secretary of State Project,” ⁴⁴ which is his effort “to elect Secretaries of State around the country willing to impose Democrat-friendly election laws in an attempt to tilt the playing field in their favor on Election Day.” ⁴⁵ Soros clearly understands the axiom delivered long ago by Communist leader Joseph Stalin, who declared: “The people who cast the votes decide nothing. The people who count the votes decide everything.” ⁴⁶

Consider how Soros’ involvement with secretaries of states impacted the 2008 U. S. Senate race between Democrat Al Franken and Republican Norm Coleman. The Secretary of State who oversaw the recount was Mark Ritchie, a Soros-backed official. Ritchie was so overtly partisan during the recount that even national newspapers questioned the integrity of the recount process, noting that almost all of the voting “errors” that Ritchie “discovered” in the state went in Franken’s favor. ⁴⁷ As the *Wall Street Journal* reported:

Mr. Franken's gains so far are 2.5 times the corrections made for Barack Obama in the state, and nearly three times the gains for Democrats across Minnesota Congressional races. . . . Mr. Franken's "new" votes equal more than all the changes for all the precincts in the entire state for the Presidential, Congressional and statehouse races combined. ⁴⁸

Soros’ “Secretary of State Project” was undertaken to “tilt the playing field in the Democrats’ direction,” and Soros’ Mark Ritchie certainly did that.

Another example is Soros-backed Colorado Secretary of State Bernie Buescher. When the attempt was made to place a pro-life personhood initiative on the ballot this election, Buescher unilaterally changed the normal rules of engagement, actually shortening the normal time allotted to collect signatures for that measure, thus making it much more difficult to get it before the people. ⁴⁹

It is clear why Soros has focused so much money on gaining the positions of secretaries of state (as well as of judges and ballot initiatives): they have

significant impact in moving forward a secular progressive agenda with less interference from the people. Nevertheless, despite Soros' efforts, 17 of the 26 secretaries of state up for election this year were won by Republicans;⁵⁰ and several Soros-backed candidates lost or were voted out of office.

Thankfully, at the level of state judges, secretaries of state, and state ballot initiatives, George Soros' anti-American agenda was one of the biggest losers on Election Night!

Some Other Pro-Family Victories

The biggest winner on Election Night was definitely America's conservative pro-family voter. And in addition to the numerous gains already mentioned (e.g., in the federal Congress, state legislatures, and ballot initiatives), there were also many other momentous pro-family victories that night.

For example, last year in 2009, Maine legislators passed and the governor signed a gay marriage law, but citizens objected and mounted a drive to place the issue on the ballot. The necessary signatures were gathered, and in November 2009, citizens vetoed the gay marriage law passed by the legislature. In this election, voters continued to make their voice heard on this issue, replacing 22 of the legislators who had voted for same-sex marriage last year with 22 who supported traditional marriage; they also elected a new governor who supports traditional marriage. With this change, traditional marriage in Maine is now safe for the foreseeable future.

Similarly, New Hampshire passed a gay marriage law in early 2010; but this election likewise removed dozens of legislators who had supported the law (recall that an amazing 134 seats changed hands), placing both the House and the Senate into the hands of conservative Republicans. Plans are currently underway to secure a vote on a constitutional amendment to permanently ban homosexual marriage.

In Minnesota, the new Republican controlled house and senate now ensure that a homosexual marriage initiative will not make it through that legislature.

In El Paso, Texas, city leaders had given medical benefits to gay partners of city employees, but voters rolled back that policy by a 55% to 45% margin.⁵¹

And because of the gains in Missouri, of the 34 members of the state senate, 29 are now pro-life; and of the 163 members of the state house, at least 126 are now pro-life, thus making Missouri a rock-solid, pro-life, veto-proof legislature.



Reviewing this year's election results makes it seem as if citizens had taken their marching orders from President Ronald Reagan's speech of March 8, 1985, in which he declared:

I said, "This is a wonderful time to be alive," and I meant that. I meant that we're lucky not to live in pale and timid times. We've been blessed with the opportunity to stand for something – for liberty and freedom and fairness. And these are things worth fighting for – worth devoting our lives to. And we have good reason to be hopeful and optimistic. We've made much progress already. So, let us go forth with good cheer and stout hearts – happy warriors out to seize back a country and a world to freedom.

Voters this year did indeed seem to be happy warriors, taking back their country to freedom.

But as voters, we have to remember that this election was not an event – it was only a single step in a lifelong process of involvement and civic engagement, requiring us not only to be involved in every election but also to always carry our conservative religious, moral, and constitutional values with us as we vote (and we must also stay actively involved between elections). To use President Reagan's phrase, "we've made much progress"; but really we have only just begun. So let's stay engaged and finish the job, no matter what happens or how long it takes.

God bless!



David Barton

¹ "The Four-Year Majority," *Wall Street Journal*, November 3, 2010 (at: http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704462704575590871101994524.html?mod=WSJ_RIGHTTopCarousel_1).

² "CNN National Exit Polls, Election 2010," *CNN.com* (at: <http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2010/results/polls/#USH00p1>) (accessed on November 19, 2010).

³ See "CNN National Exit Polls, Election 2006," *CNN.com* (at: <http://us.cnn.com/ELECTION/2006/pages/results/states/US/H/00/epolls.0.html>);

"CNN National Exit Polls, Election 2008," *CNN.com* (at: <http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/results/polls/#USP00p1>).

⁴ In 2010, 37% of Independents voted Democrat and 56% voted Republican. See "CNN National Exit Polls, Election 2010," *CNN.com* (at: <http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2010/results/polls/#USH00p1>). This was quite a reversal from previous elections. For example, in 2008, 52% of Independents voted Democrat and 44% voted Republican. See "CNN National Exit Polls, Election 2008," *CNN.com* (at: <http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/results/polls/#USP00p1>). In 2006, 57% of Independents voted Democrat and 39% voted Republican. See "CNN National Exit Polls, Election 2006," *CNN.com* (at: <http://us.cnn.com/ELECTION/2006/pages/results/states/US/H/00/epolls.0.html>).

⁵ From the 2006 midterm elections to the 2010 elections, there was a 37 point swing in favor of the Republican Party; and from the 2008 to the 2010 elections, there was a 27 point swing in favor of the Republican Party. It was these Republican-voting independents who gave the winning margin to conservatives, represented especially by Republicans, in the 2010 elections. See "CNN National Exit Polls, Election 2010," *CNN.com* (at: <http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2010/results/polls/#USH00p1>); "CNN National Exit Polls, Election 2006," *CNN.com* (at: <http://us.cnn.com/ELECTION/2006/pages/results/states/US/H/00/epolls.0.html>); "CNN National Exit

Polls, Election 2008,” *CNN.com* (at:

<http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/results/polls/#USP00p1>).

⁶ Lydia Saad, “Political Ideology: “Conservative” Label Prevails in the South,” *Gallup.com*, August 14, 2009 (at: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/122333/Political-Ideology-Conservative-Label-Prevails-South.aspx#2>).

⁷ CNN National Exit Polls, Election 2010, *CNN.com* (at:

<http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2010/results/polls/#USH00p1>) (accessed on November 19, 2010).

⁸ CNN National Exit Polls, Election 2006, *CNN.com* (at:

<http://us.cnn.com/ELECTION/2006/pages/results/states/US/H/00/epolls.0.html>) (accessed on November 19, 2010);

“CNN National Exit Polls, Election 2008,” *CNN.com* (at:

<http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/results/polls/#USP00p1>) (accessed on November 19, 2010).

⁹ “CNN National Exit Polls, Election 2010,” *CNN.com* (at:

<http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2010/results/polls/-val=USH00p2>) (accessed on November 19, 2010).

¹⁰ Matthew Daly, “Voter turnout increases from last midterm in 2006,” *WashingtonPost.com*, November 3, 2010 (at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/11/03/AR2010110305169.html>).

¹¹ “FFC National Survey,” *FFCoalition.com*, November 3, 2010 (at: <http://www.ffcoalition.com/2010/11/03/ffc-national-survey/>).

¹² “FFC National Survey,” *FFCoalition.com*, November 3, 2010 (at: <http://www.ffcoalition.com/2010/11/03/ffc-national-survey/>).

¹³ “CNN National Exit Polls, Election 2010,” *CNN.com* (at:

<http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2010/results/polls/-USH00p3>) (accessed on November 19, 2010).

¹⁴ “FFC National Survey,” *Faith and Freedom Coalition*, November 3, 2010 (at: <http://www.ffcoalition.com/2010/11/03/ffc-national-survey/>).

¹⁵ “Evangelical, Social Conservative Turnout Highest Ever Recorded in Mid-Term Election,” *ChristianNewsWire.com*, November 3, 2010 (at:

<http://www.christiannewswire.com/news/1660315402.html>).

¹⁶ Dave Andrusko, “Abortion, Abortion Funding, Public Opinion, and the Mid-Term Elections,” *National Right to Life News*, November 3, 2010 (at:

http://www.nrlc.org/News_and_Views/Nov10/nv110310part2.html).

¹⁷ Thomas B. Edsall, “Voter Values Determine Political Affiliation,” *Washington Post*, March 26, 2001 (at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A56905-2001Mar25>).

¹⁸ Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, “Religion in the 2010 Elections,” *Pew Research Center Publications*, November 3, 2010 (at: <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1791/2010-midterm-elections-exit-poll-religion-vote>).

¹⁹ Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, “Religion in the 2010 Elections,” *Pew Research Center Publications*, November 3, 2010 (at: <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1791/2010-midterm-elections-exit-poll-religion-vote>).

²⁰ Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, “Religion in the 2010 Elections,” *Pew Research Center Publications*, November 3, 2010 (at: <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1791/2010-midterm-elections-exit-poll-religion-vote>).

²¹ Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, “Religion in the 2010 Elections,” *Pew Research Center Publications*, November 3, 2010 (at: <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1791/2010-midterm-elections-exit-poll-religion-vote>).

²² Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, “Religion in the 2010 Elections,” *Pew Research Center Publications*, November 3, 2010 (at: <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1791/2010-midterm-elections-exit-poll-religion-vote>).

²³ Dianne Edmondson, “Pro-Life Victories Are Sweet!” *Republican National Coalition for Life E-Notes*, November 5, 2010 (at: <http://www.rnclife.org/e-notes/2010/nov10/10-11-05.html>).

²⁴ “Rep. Smith: New U.S. House Arguably Most Pro-Life Ever,” *LifeSiteNews.com*, November 5, 2010 (at: <http://www.lifesitenews.com/ldn/2010/nov/10110501.html>).

²⁵ “Committee (C00414219) Summary Reports - 2009-2010 Cycle, DEMOCRATS FOR LIFE OF AMERICA INC PAC,” *Federal Election Commission* (at: http://query.nictusa.com/cgi-bin/cancomsrs/?_10+C00414219) (accessed on November 21, 2010); “Committees And Candidates Supported/Opposed, DEMOCRATS FOR LIFE OF AMERICA INC PAC,” *Federal Election*

Commission (at: http://query.nictusa.com/cgi-bin/com_supopp/2009_C00414219) (accessed on November 21, 2010).

²⁶ “Committee (C00255406) Summary Reports - 2009-2010 Cycle, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COALITION FOR LIFE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE,” *Federal Election Commission* (at: http://query.nictusa.com/cgi-bin/cancomsrs/?_10+C00255406) (accessed on November 21, 2010); “Committees And Candidates Supported/Opposed, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COALITION FOR LIFE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE,” *Federal Election Commission* (at: http://query.nictusa.com/cgi-bin/com_supopp/2009_C00255406) (accessed on November 21, 2010). A letter from Dianne Edmondson, Executive Director of the Republican National Coalition for Life, confirmed that the RNCL PAC contributed to 60 candidates in this election cycle.

²⁷ Matthew Shaffer, “Blue Dog Dems: How Did They Fare?” *National Review Online*, November 3, 2010 (at: <http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/252400/blue-dog-dems-how-did-they-fare-matthew-shaffer>).

²⁸ “Elected Candidates from Operation 10-in-10,” *Vets for Freedom Political Action Committee* (at: <http://www.vetsforfreedom.org/pac/Operation10-in-10/>) (accessed November 24, 2010).

²⁹ All eight freshmen veterans were endorsed by the VFF-PAC, whose mission is “to help Iraq & Afghanistan veterans – who believe in succeeding on the battlefield and in advancing strong U. S. national security policies – get elected to the United States Congress.” “VFF-PAC Mission,” *Vets for Freedom Political Action Committee* (at: <http://www.vetsforfreedom.org/pac/about/>) (accessed November 24, 2010).

³⁰ Pete Hegseth, “The New Victory Caucus in Congress,” *National Review Online*, November 4, 2010 (at: <http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/252476/new-victory-caucus-congress-pete-hegseth>).

³¹ Greg Janetka, “Most states which saw legislative chambers switch to Republican were won by Obama in 2008,” *Ballotpedia*, November 4, 2010 (at: http://ballotpedia.org/wiki/index.php/Most_states_which_saw_legislative_chambers_switch_to_Republican_were_won_by_Obama_in_2008).

³² “Republicans Exceed Expectations in 2010 State Legislative Elections,” *National Conference of State Legislatures*, November 3, 2010 (at: <http://ncsl.org/?tabid=21634>).

³³ Huma Khan, “Will Redistricting Be a Bloodbath for Democrats?” *ABC News*, November 4, 2010 (at: <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/republicans-historic-win-state-legislatures-vote-2010-election/story?id=12049040>).

³⁴ David W. Neubauer and Stephen S. Meinhold, *Judicial Process: Law, Courts, and Politics in the United States, Fifth Edition* (Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2010), p. 187 (at: <http://books.google.com/books?id=qG9K5q7Q9NQC>).

³⁵ Dr. Richard G. Lee, “Behind the Fall of Iowa’s Judicial Gods,” *DallasBlog.com*, November 23, 2010 (at: <http://www.dallasblog.com/2010/11/23/1007382/guest-viewpoint/behind-the-fall-of-iowa-s-judicial-gods.html>).

³⁶ Hollie McKay, “Liberal Hollywood Quiet for 2010 Midterm Elections, Experts Say,” *Fox News*, October 26, 2010 (at: <http://www.foxnews.com/entertainment/2010/10/26/hollywood-celebrities-vote-elections-midterms-enthusiasm-gap/>).

³⁷ “Guide to the George Soros Network,” *Discover The Networks*, (at: <http://www.discoverthenetworks.org/viewSubCategory.asp?id=589>) (accessed on November 19, 2010); Glenn Beck, “Soros Exposed: Research on the Progressive Puppet Master,” *GlennBeck.com*, November 11, 2010 (at: <http://www.glennbeck.com/content/articles/article/198/47856/>); “Organizations Funded Directly by George Soros and his Open Society Institute,” *Discover The Networks*, July 2007 (at: <http://www.discoverthenetworks.org/Articles/orgsfundeddirecly%20.html>).

³⁸ “Justice Hijacked,” *A report published by American Justice Partnership*, September 2010 (at: <http://www.americanjusticepartnership.com/hijacked.php>).

³⁹ Bob Unruh, “Report: Soros spent millions to ‘undermine’ judiciary,” *WorldNetDaily*, September 09, 2010 (at: <http://www.wnd.com/?pageId=201409>).

⁴⁰ Bob Unruh, “Exposed! George Soros’ scheme for ‘elite’ judiciary,” *WorldNetDaily*, October 30, 2010 (at: <http://www.wnd.com/?pageId=220849>).

⁴¹ David W. Neubauer and Stephen S. Meinhold, *Judicial Process: Law, Courts, and Politics in the United States, Fifth Edition* (Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2010), p. 187 (at: <http://books.google.com/books?id=qG9K5q7Q9NQC>).

⁴² Tom McClusky, “Altered States: Pro-family victories were seen everywhere,” *The Cloakroom*, the Blog of FRC Action, November 5, 2010 (at: <http://www.thecloakroomblog.com/2010/11/alterd-states-pro-life-victories-were-seen-everywhere/>).

⁴³ “Soros-Sponsored Candidates, Ballot Initiatives Go Down on Election Day,” *Fox News*, November 4, 2010 (at: <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/11/04/soros-sponsored-candidates-ballot-initiatives-election-day/>).

⁴⁴ “‘Secretary of State Project’ Website” (at: <http://www.secstateproject.org/>).

⁴⁵ Mark Hemingway, “You know who was a big loser in this election? George Soros.” *Washington Examiner*, November 3, 2010 (at: <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/blogs/beltway-confidential/you-know-who-was-a-big-loser-in-this-election-george-soros-106640398.html>).

⁴⁶ Matthew Vadum, “Soros-supported ‘Secretary of State Project’ dealt blow in midterm elections,” *The Daily Caller*, November 9, 2010 (at: <http://dailycaller.com/2010/11/09/soros-supported-secretary-of-state-project-dealt-blow-in-midterm-elections/>).

⁴⁷ Ed Lasky, “The Soros Connection in the Minnesota Senate Race Vote Count,” *American Thinker*, November 17, 2008 (at: http://www.americanthinker.com/2008/11/the_soros_connection_in_the_mi.html).

⁴⁸ “Mischief in Minnesota?” *Review & Outlook, The Wall Street Journal*, November 12, 2008 (at: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122644940271419147.html>).

⁴⁹ “Colorado deadline for personhood amendment moved up,” *Ballotpedia*, January 25, 2010 (at: http://www.ballotpedia.org/wiki/index.php/Colorado_deadline_for_personhood_amendment_moved_up). There were so many complications created by Buescher, including the failure to communicate ID rules to notaries, that it resulted in a voter lawsuit against him over his actions on this initiative.

⁵⁰ Mark Hemingway, “You know who was a big loser in this election? George Soros,” *Washington Examiner*, November 3, 2010 (at: <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/blogs/beltway-confidential/you-know-who-was-a-big-loser-in-this-election-george-soros-106640398.html>).

⁵¹ Marty Schladen, “City ready to reverse partner benefits vote,” *El Paso Times*, November 16, 2010 (at: http://www.elpasotimes.com/news/ci_16613774).