

OBAMA POISED TO CRUSH MCCAIN BY MORE THAN TEN MILLION VOTES, ANALYST PREDICTS;

Says Illinois Senator Could Even Take McCain's Home State

TORRINGTON, CONN, July 9—Using an entirely new methodology for gauging the impact of demographic factors observed in the divisions between supporters of rivals Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton during the primary season, a quantitative expert based in Connecticut who has been accurately forecasting presidential contests since 1996 has unveiled a recently completed study predicting that the junior senator from Illinois will trounce Republican John McCain by more than ten million votes this November—more than three times the margin by which George W. Bush defeated John Kerry in 2004—and may even overcome the senator from Arizona in his own home state, an outcome none of the major pollsters considers even remotely possible.

“Conventional polls and polling methodologies fall far short of providing clear understandings of the underlying demographic factors driving voter sentiments,” contends Reid Holloway, who authored the study. “The biggest hole in the models used by the major pollsters, who are generally quite adept at collecting data accurately, is accounting for and precisely weighting income-growth and other highly politically relevant economic characteristics forming the most decisive aspects about voters shaping their views about elections. These dynamics vary widely from state to state, so their impact on presidential contests is especially important because, no matter what the polls show about nationwide samplings, it’s the outcomes in respective states that establish the Electoral College numbers, and that’s how we pick presidents in the United States.

“Because income and economic conditions differ so markedly from region to region,” Holloway explains, “we’re really looking at 51 simultaneous yet entirely distinct elections whenever we vote for president.”

Holloway’s number-crunching currently foresees Senator Obama garnering approximately 66 million votes this fall, with Senator McCain’s tally at roughly 56 million. He further predicts that Obama will win 319 of the 538 electoral votes *versus* 219 for the senator from Arizona. Holloway also believes Obama will carry Florida, a state critical to McCain’s fortunes, which most pollsters see so far as leaning toward the Republican—even though he sees McCain carrying industrial heartland states such as Ohio and Michigan, significant Democrat strongholds.

Holloway’s predictions and methods differ strikingly from conventional pollsters. For one thing, he doesn’t do any polling himself, but he does keep track of polling done by others. But the thing Holloway does that’s unique is that he projects individual candidate vote tallies for every state and the District of Columbia, not just percentage shares based on small samples. “Once we settle on projected tallies, it’s just a matter of seeing who comes out ahead in each of the states and the District and totaling up the electoral votes,” Holloway summarizes, “although assembling those estimates is a bit more complex than it may sound.”

Holloway was inspired to radically change the model he's used to forecast presidential elections for the past twelve years by what he observed in the prolonged primary contest between Democrat rivals Obama and Clinton.

"It was really a kind of glaring and obvious thing to spot," he begins. "For decades we've been wondering when American voters would overcome the prejudices of the past and contemplate a black or a woman president. Finally, this year, we got two for the price of one."

Holloway says the unlikely matchup during the Democrat primary season between a black male and a white woman offered "just about the best test lab you could ever ask for" to study what had been anticipated for years, but had never previously occurred.

"And everything has turned out upside down so far," he points out. "Practically nothing that has actually happened now that this historic development in American politics has actually taken shape even slightly resembles what the pundits envisaged."

Holloway says he is generally motivated to start an involved investigation—which in his "day job" normally encompasses the stock market, real estate and business and strategic planning—by something that "gnaws at" him.

"What gnawed at me in this case was fairly obvious. Indeed, I'm surprised that just about nobody's discussing it," he notes. "We generally thought that the first viable black candidate for president would be a champion of the 'have-nots,' rallying disadvantaged minority constituencies whose traditional positioning among Democrats tends toward social spending and income and wealth redistribution. Similarly, we assumed the first viable woman candidate for president would be a crusader for women's rights and the social and economic advancement of women."

While those traits in large part have so far been true and observable, Holloway says, they're not among the most important lessons of this year's drawn out Democrat primary season.

"Instead," he points out, "it's an unanticipated emphasis having far less to do with race and gender than was traditionally assumed. Barack Obama has become the darling of affluent urban white professionals in large metropolitan areas, and Hillary Clinton the refuge for right-center, downscale and mostly rural white Democrats, some with misgivings about electing a black president. What the primary season reveals is totally unexpected against the backdrop of what experts assumed for years would be the most important characteristics of the first election involving viable black and woman candidates. What we've also learned is that—rather than race and gender—it's all about the income and economic characteristics of widely differing individual regions around the country, and how those respective regions' voters think about choosing presidents today. Barack Obama's huge popularity has practically nothing to do with being black."

So, how did Holloway put these insights to use, formulate the parameters of his study, and end up forecasting an Obama rout over McCain this fall?

“We start by looking at economic conditions particular to the individual states, and we also look at the corresponding circumstances of the voters in those states. Which states have strong incomes and income growth? Which states don’t? The main finding is that Barack Obama is not the ‘black man’s candidate,’ but rather, he is the candidate with whom young, upwardly mobile professionals—mainly white, I might add—identify, and see as not just a fresh and attractive new kind of political figure, but as having a ‘21st century’ outlook and feel for a rapidly changing world viewed and understood in innovative and imaginative ways.”

-o0o-

Current Holloway Aggregate Popular Vote Forecast

McCain	Obama	McCain %	Obama %
55,710,526	65,736,338	45.87%	54.13%

Current Holloway EV Forecast

2008 projection	EV	McCain	Obama
Alabama	9	9	0
Alaska	3	3	0
Arizona	10	0	10
Arkansas	6	6	0
California	55	0	55
Colorado	9	0	9
Connecticut	7	0	7
D. C.	3	0	3
Delaware	3	0	3
Florida	27	0	27
Georgia	15	0	15
Hawaii	4	0	4
Idaho	4	4	0
Illinois	21	0	21
Indiana	11	11	0
Iowa	7	7	0
Kansas	6	6	0
Kentucky	8	8	0
Louisiana	9	9	0
Maine	4	0	4
Maryland	10	0	10
Massachusetts	12	0	12
Michigan	17	17	0

Mississippi	6	6	0
Missouri	11	11	0
Montana	3	3	0
Nebraska	5	5	0
Nevada	5	0	5
New Hampshire	4	0	4
New Jersey	15	0	15
New Mexico	5	0	5
New York	31	0	31
North Carolina	15	15	0
North Dakota	3	3	0
Ohio	20	20	0
Oklahoma	7	7	0
Oregon	7	0	7
Pennsylvania	21	0	21
Rhode Island	4	0	4
South Carolina	8	8	0
South Dakota	3	3	0
Tennessee	11	11	0
Texas	34	34	0
Utah	5	5	0
Vermont	3	0	3
Virginia	13	0	13
Washington	11	0	11
West Virginia	5	5	0
Wisconsin	10	0	10
Wyoming	3	3	0
Total	538	219	319

Contact Information

Reid Holloway.
860.482.6673.

Background Information

Using quantitative and other techniques developed professionally, Reid Holloway published studies in 1996, 2000 and 2004 forecasting the outcome of the Electoral College. His 2004 model accurately forecasted not only the Electoral College outcome but also the popular vote totals for each of the candidates in all 50 states and D.C. within one half of one percentage point of the actual shares. He called 47 states correctly. During the two-week period leading up to the 2004 election he was a nightly guest on the ABC Radio Network discussing his findings with John Batchelor.

<http://stocksthatwobble.com/aboutus.aspx>

Here is a summary of Holloway's 2004 forecast compared with actual results:

actual turnout 2004 (b,k only)	121,069,816		kerry actual	59,028,548	48.27%
model proj. turnout (b,k only)	112,704,684		kerry model	55,387,599	48.63%
model o/u	-8,365,132		model o/u	-3,640,949	
model o/u %	-6.91%		model o/u %	-6.17%	
bush actual	62,041,268	50.73%	nader+ actual	1,228,591	1.00%
bush model	57,317,085	50.33%	nader model	1,180,977	1.04%
model o/u	-4,724,183		model o/u	-47,614	
model o/u %	-7.61%		model o/u %	-3.88%	
b-k actual	3,012,720		bush	kerry	model errors:
b-k model	1,929,486		ev actual	286	new hampshire
b-k actual %	2.49%		ev model	231	oregon
b-k model %	1.71%		model correct in 47 states + d.c.		wisconsin
					b-k act
					-9,274
					-76,332
					-11,384

Additional Background—2004 Actual Results

2004 actual results	Bush	Kerry	Nader+	Bush	Kerry	Other	B-K Margin	%Margin	Total Vote	bush ev
Alabama	1,176,394	693,933	13,088	62.46%	36.84%	0.69%	482,461	25.62%	1,883,415	9
Alaska	190,889	111,025	10,684	61.07%	35.52%	3.42%	79,864	25.55%	312,598	3
Arizona	1,104,294	893,524	16,041	54.83%	44.37%	0.80%	210,770	10.47%	2,013,859	10
Arkansas	572,898	469,953	12,094	54.31%	44.55%	1.15%	102,945	9.76%	1,054,945	6
California	5,509,826	6,745,485	164,546	44.36%	54.31%	1.32%	-1,235,659	-9.95%	12,419,857	0
Colorado	1,101,255	1,001,732	26,643	51.71%	47.04%	1.25%	99,523	4.67%	2,129,630	9
Connecticut	693,826	857,488	27,455	43.95%	54.31%	1.74%	-163,662	-10.37%	1,578,769	0
Delaware	171,660	200,152	3,378	45.75%	53.35%	0.90%	-28,492	-7.59%	375,190	0
D. C.	21,256	202,970	3,360	9.34%	89.18%	1.48%	-181,714	-79.84%	227,586	0
Florida	3,964,522	3,583,544	61,744	52.10%	47.09%	0.81%	380,978	5.01%	7,609,810	27
Georgia	1,914,254	1,366,149	21,472	57.97%	41.37%	0.65%	548,105	16.60%	3,301,875	15
Hawaii	194,191	231,708	3,114	45.26%	54.01%	0.73%	-37,517	-8.74%	429,013	0
Idaho	409,235	181,098	8,114	68.38%	30.26%	1.36%	228,137	38.12%	598,447	4
Illinois	2,346,608	2,891,989	36,818	44.48%	54.82%	0.70%	-545,381	-10.34%	5,275,415	0
Indiana	1,479,438	969,011	19,553	59.94%	39.26%	0.79%	510,427	20.68%	2,468,002	11
Iowa	751,957	741,898	13,053	49.90%	49.23%	0.87%	10,059	0.67%	1,506,908	7
Kansas	736,456	434,993	16,307	62.00%	36.62%	1.37%	301,463	25.38%	1,187,756	6
Kentucky	1,069,439	712,733	13,688	59.55%	39.69%	0.76%	356,706	19.86%	1,795,860	8
Louisiana	1,102,169	820,299	20,638	56.72%	42.22%	1.06%	281,870	14.51%	1,943,106	9
Maine	330,201	396,842	13,709	44.58%	53.57%	1.85%	-66,641	-9.00%	740,752	0
Maryland	1,024,703	1,334,493	27,482	42.93%	55.91%	1.15%	-309,790	-12.98%	2,386,678	0
Massachusetts	1,071,109	1,803,800	37,479	36.78%	61.94%	1.29%	-732,691	-25.16%	2,912,388	0
Michigan	2,313,746	2,479,183	46,323	47.81%	51.23%	0.96%	-165,437	-3.42%	4,839,252	0
Minnesota	1,346,695	1,445,014	36,678	47.61%	51.09%	1.30%	-98,319	-3.48%	2,828,387	0
Mississippi	684,981	457,766	9,618	59.44%	39.72%	0.83%	227,215	19.72%	1,152,365	6

Missouri	1,455,713	1,259,171	16,480	53.30%	46.10%	0.60%	196,542	7.20%	2,731,364	11
Montana	266,063	173,710	10,661	59.07%	38.57%	2.37%	92,353	20.50%	450,434	3
Nebraska	512,814	254,328	11,044	65.90%	32.68%	1.42%	258,486	33.22%	778,186	5
Nevada	418,690	397,190	13,707	50.47%	47.88%	1.65%	21,500	2.59%	829,587	5
New Hampshire	331,237	340,511	5,914	48.88%	50.25%	0.87%	-9,274	-1.37%	677,662	0
New Jersey	1,670,003	1,911,430	30,258	46.24%	52.92%	0.84%	-241,427	-6.68%	3,611,691	0
New Mexico	376,930	370,942	8,432	49.84%	49.05%	1.11%	5,988	0.79%	756,304	5
New York	2,962,567	4,314,280	114,894	40.08%	58.37%	1.55%	-1,351,713	-18.29%	7,391,741	0
North Carolina	1,961,166	1,525,849	13,992	56.02%	43.58%	0.40%	435,317	12.43%	3,501,007	15
North Dakota	196,651	111,052	5,130	62.86%	35.50%	1.64%	85,599	27.36%	312,833	3
Ohio	2,859,764	2,741,165	26,974	50.81%	48.71%	0.48%	118,599	2.11%	5,627,903	20
Oklahoma	959,792	503,966	0	65.57%	34.43%	0.00%	455,826	31.14%	1,463,758	7
Oregon	866,831	943,163	26,788	47.19%	51.35%	1.46%	-76,332	-4.16%	1,836,782	0
Pennsylvania	2,793,847	2,938,095	37,648	48.42%	50.92%	0.65%	-144,248	-2.50%	5,769,590	0
Rhode Island	169,046	259,760	8,328	38.67%	59.42%	1.91%	-90,714	-20.75%	437,134	0
South Carolina	937,974	661,699	18,057	57.98%	40.90%	1.12%	276,275	17.08%	1,617,730	8
South Dakota	232,584	149,244	6,387	59.91%	38.44%	1.65%	83,340	21.47%	388,215	3
Tennessee	1,384,375	1,036,477	16,467	56.80%	42.53%	0.68%	347,898	14.27%	2,437,319	11
Texas	4,526,917	2,832,704	51,128	61.09%	38.22%	0.69%	1,694,213	22.86%	7,410,749	34
Utah	663,742	241,199	22,903	71.54%	26.00%	2.47%	422,543	45.54%	927,844	5
Vermont	121,180	184,067	7,062	38.80%	58.94%	2.26%	-62,887	-20.14%	312,309	0
Virginia	1,716,959	1,454,742	26,666	53.68%	45.48%	0.83%	262,217	8.20%	3,198,367	13
Washington	1,304,894	1,510,201	46,618	45.60%	52.77%	1.63%	-205,307	-7.17%	2,861,713	0
West Virginia	423,778	326,541	5,568	56.06%	43.20%	0.74%	97,237	12.86%	755,887	5
Wisconsin	1,478,120	1,489,504	29,383	49.32%	49.70%	0.98%	-11,384	-0.38%	2,997,007	0
Wyoming	167,629	70,776	5,023	68.86%	29.07%	2.06%	96,853	39.79%	243,428	3
Total	62,041,268	59,028,548	1,228,591	50.73%	48.27%	1.00%	3,012,720	2.46%	122,298,407	286