

SOME PEOPLE WOULD PAY TO PLAY WITH
THESE GUYS.



WE'LL PAY YOU TO DO IT.
100% SIGN-UP BONUS UP TO \$600*

Learn, chat and play with the pros and take advantage of the best sign-up bonus while you're doing it. Go to FullTiltPoker.com, and use promotional code



ZEN POKER

The roots of this routine go back more than half a century, to Charles Jordan's "Demon's Divination". In that routine, a spectator was asked to think of a card. Groups of cards were then displayed (28 in all), with the spectator asked whether the thought-of value and/or suit were represented in various sets. From the information given, the performer was able to determine the specific mentally selected card.

Joseph Ovette's "The Buddha Whispers" offered essentially the same premise, but reduced the number of shown cards to 24. (In Howard Albright's version, "Perfect Card Divination", the number was increased to a full 52-card set-up.)

The principle was cleverly refined some years later, by U. F. Grant, in his "Monte Carlo" (one of the "Secret Service" series of manuscripts). Grant artfully concealed the mathematical nature of the method with a marvelous gambling presentation. This version also employed a 24-card set-up. In the 1981 book "Fourcast", Karl Fulves appended a magical production of the chosen card to the Grant routine.

Some time ago, I set about trying to streamline the effect. The principle is clever and functional, but displaying four sets of six cards is tedious and rather suspect. Clearly, there are limitations as to just how much the information could be reduced and still be practical. It occurred to me, however, that there were subtleties which could be incorporated in such a way as to by-pass some of those limitations.

After much effort (and many discarded versions), the following routine evolved. The number of cards displayed has been reduced to ten (actually eight, plus two nulls). Obviously, this affords far too little information with which to work, so there must be some cheating going on. Yes.

There is a ten-card set-up on top of the pack: the top five cards consist of an ace, three, six, eight, and court card. The suits of these are confined to spades and hearts, but it doesn't matter which value is of which suit. Too, the order of the cards within the set is immaterial. The next five cards are a deuce, three, seven, eight, and court card. These cards must be all hearts and clubs. Again, they can be in any order.

You will need, in addition to the set-up deck, a piece of paper; a pencil or pen; and a book or box of matches. Begin by inquiring, "Have you ever played Zen Poker? It's very similar to Two-Handed Solitaire, but rather different..." Bring out the pack of cards.

Continue, "We will need some betting chips to work with, as this is a gambling game." Take out the matches. If you are using a book of paper matches, tear them from the folder. While doing this, I usually comment, "I've been studying Zen principles of late. In fact, I've recently come up with the answer to the classic Zen koan, 'What is the sound of one hand clapping...¹"

Pause a moment, then blithely continue, "I'll be happy to explain it again, later." By now, the matches will be loose on the table. Push two-thirds of the matches over to the spectator. With much bravado, say, "I will give you more chips than I'll take for myself. You're going to need them - I'm very good at this game!"

Bring out the paper and pencil. Draw a rectangle on the paper, about two by three inches. Ask, "Do you know what this is?" Go on to explain that it is a picture of a "Zen playing card". Hand the pencil to the spectator, and instruct him/her to fill in the rectangle by drawing a picture of a playing card. Your instructions should be quite clear here, without seeming to be at all restrictive.

You want the spectator to draw the thought-of card, rather than write its name or initials. The reason for this is that, in this fashion, we will be restricting the spectator's selection rather severely. In fact, a lay spectator will not attempt to depict a court card, or even a spot card of much complexity. With this approach, the spectator's choice is effectively reduced to the values from ace to eight (and in truth, it is a rarity for a spectator to go above five.)

The reader may be skeptical about this. I can assure you, it does work. In the many times I've tested the idea since its conception, I have never had it fail. (At the conclusion of this write-up, I will discuss how to handle the unlikely event of a spectator drawing a higher value.)

While the spectator is drawing, turn your back. Instruct the spectator to place the drawing out of sight. Turn to face your audience. Bring out the deck, and shuffle (retaining the ten-card stack on top). Shuffle or cut the set-up to the center of the pack, obtaining a break above it, then perform a standard Riffle Force to arrive at the set-up.

State that in Zen Poker as in standard Poker, a "hand" consists of five cards – but in this particular game, only one hand is used at any given time. Deal the top five cards to the table, face down. The balance of the pack is placed aside (with the second five-card set-up on top).

Pick up the five cards, keeping them face down. Say, "If I were to bet that the card you are thinking of is among these five, that would not be a Zen bet... that would be a stupid bet! The odds are against it. I will, however, bet one chip of mine against one of yours that there is a card of the same value as the one you're thinking of among these five."

Slide a match into the center area of the table, and gesture for the participant to do the same. Raise the fan, faces toward the spectator, and smile triumphantly. Of course, there are two possible outcomes. The spectator may tell you that there is a card whose value matches the one being thought of, in which case you grab both matches from the betting pile, with a boastful comment.

Alternatively, the spectator may indicate that there is not a card of the appropriate value on display. In this case, ruefully push the central matches over to the spectator.

Now, if you won the first round, confidently offer to double the bet – this time, on whether there is a card of the same suit as the thought-of selection within the hand. Push two matches to the center. If, on the other hand, you lost the first round, mutter uncomfortably, and suggest the suit bet as an alternative you're sure you'll win.

Again, there are two possible outcomes. If you win this round as well as the first, assume an air of triumphant glee. If you lost the first round, but win this one, behave as if the game has "finally" gotten good. If you lose this round, respond with frustration, and say, "We've been playing the wrong hand!"

In any event, discard the first set of five cards, and deal the next set from the pack. Bet three chips that the value of the spectator's chosen card will be represented. Respond to the outcome according to whether you win or lose. Continue, by betting four matches on the presence of a card of the same suit as the selection being in this hand.

The success of this routine depends on your ability to "play the moment" There is no "preferred" outcome. Any of the sixteen win/lose scenarios can be made to play amusingly with the right theatrics on your part.

At the conclusion of the fourth bet, you have enough information with which to conclude the routine.

The value of the selection is ascertained by assigning "points" for the two hands. The initial hand is worth one point; the second is worth two. You need only keep track of which value bets you have won, in order to determine a two-value range for the chosen card.

The first possible value is the same as the point total for the two value bets. In other words, if only the initial hand contained the correct value, the point total is one (ace). If the second hand alone contained the correct value, the point total is two. If both hands had the right value, the point total is three (1 + 2).

Each of these point totals has a correlating value, found by simply adding five to the point total. Thus, ace correlates to six; deuce to seven; three to eight. So, for example, if you lost the value bet on the first hand, but won on the second, you would now know that the spectator's thought-of value is two or seven.

In the event that you have lost the value bet for both hands, the spectator's chosen value is either a four or a five.

In a similar manner, it is easy to ascertain the suit of the spectator's thought-of card. Rather than do this by juggling numbers, simply remember that if you won the first suit bet but not the second, the spectator's selected suit is spades. If you won the second but not the first, the chosen suit is clubs. If you won both rounds, the thought-of suit must be hearts. If you lost both rounds, it is diamonds.

Both Grant and Fulves suggested systems by which those chips played in the course of the betting may be used to tally the information. However, in this routine the calculations are so extremely simple as to render such systems unnecessary.

At the conclusion of the fourth bet, you have reduced the possibilities for the thought-of card down to two. At this point, state that the rules of Zen Poker allow for a variation in procedure. If you have been winning most of the bets, imply that you are tired of beating the spectator so effortlessly. If you've been losing, indicate your displeasure at continuing to play such a negative game.

Take the entire deck, and turn it toward yourself. Saying, "Let me try something different...", quickly cull one of the possible thought-of cards to the top of the pack, the other to the face. Table the deck, and push all of your remaining matches into the center of the table, instructing the spectator to do the same, for one final "all-or-nothing" wager.

Ask to see the spectator's drawing. Depending on circumstance, either turn over the top card of the pack, or turn over the entire deck, to reveal the actual thought-of card, to conclude. Sweep up all of the matches with this final victory, saying, "And that's why they call it Zen Poker!"

Some notes: it is a cleaner finish for the selection to be on top of the pack (although revealing it at the face is certainly acceptable). Therefore, the lower of the two possible values is best positioned on top. An exception to this: between a four and five, the latter is psychologically more likely to be chosen.

Now, what to do if the spectator has drawn a card with a value higher than eight? Again, let me stress that this is unlikely in the extreme. However, if you are concerned about this, the simplest out would be to have a Brainwave or Ultra-Mental deck in your pocket. Upon discovering that the spectator had drawn a high-valued card, you'd explain that the rules of Zen Poker allow for a second pack in the final round... and use the gimmicked deck to reveal your prediction of the thought-of card. As you never state your intention to bring the thought-of card to the top or bottom of the pack, the introduction of the second deck will play acceptably.

OUT OF SORTS

The performer announces a test of Remote Viewing, utilizing a pack of playing cards. The deck is shuffled, then cut by the spectator, who is then told to deal eight cards from the pack onto the table. The rest of the deck is placed aside.

The performer turns his back on the proceedings. He addresses the spectator: "Pick up the set of eight cards, and fan them toward yourself. Look them over, and think of any one of them. Have you got one? Fine.

"Now, in my mind's eye, I have a sense of the eight cards... but it's not too clear at this point. Let me run you through some simple actions, for the purpose of establishing some sort of 'synch' between us. If I can put myself in tune with your actions, I should be able to develop an accurate sense of what you are viewing...

"Hold the cards face up. Deal them back and forth, into two piles. Done? Okay, now pick up the pile which contains your thought-of card... Hold the pile face up in your left hand. Hmmm. Right! Now, pick up the other pile, and place it face up onto the cards you are already holding.

"I think I followed your actions... Let's try it again. Deal the face up cards into two piles... Pick up the one that contains your card... Place the other pile onto that... Ahh, yes, I think -

"Let me have one more run-through, just to be sure... Deal the cards into two piles. Pick up the one with your card; put the other pile on top.

"I think we have achieved the necessary rapport. Turn the entire pile face down. Deal the top card face up onto the table. Look at that card, but think of your card... Aha! The card you are looking at is not the one you thought of. Am I right? Good - let's continue.

"Turn up the next card. Concentrate on your thought-of card... No, again that's not your card. Correct? Okay, let's move one.

"Turn up the next card. Concentrate on the one you thought of before. No, again you have - no, wait! That is your card! Is that right? Fine - let me try to go further. It's a black card... a club... the six of clubs!"

The performer is, of course, correct, having not only located but identified the spectator's mentally chosen card, with his back turned... or so it seems. The work involves a simple set-up, plus a binary sorting procedure. This type of mathematical placement has been explored by several people, notably Alex Elmsley and Bob Neale; I believe this construction to be new.

You will need to prearrange eight cards. There is, however, no memory work to speak of, and the cards need not be the same for each performance. You must remove four pairs from the deck. Each pair is composed according to the system associated with the Berg Ultra-Mental arrangement: cards of opposite colored suits of the same majority (i.e., clubs/diamonds or spades/hearts), whose combined values add up to thirteen.

Set these pairs together, so that the first card of the packet pairs with the third; the second with the fourth; fifth with seventh; sixth with eighth. The color distribution should be randomized. A sample setup: 6C, 10H, 7D, 3S, QH, 2D, AS, JC.

At the start of the routine, the eight-card stack is on top of the deck. Start by shuffling the cards, retaining the set-up. Now, have the pack cut by the spectator, and force the set-up via the time-honored X-ing The Cut procedure. (Alternatively, shuffle the set-up to the center, hold a break above it, and Riffle Force to that location.)

proceed as per the instructions given at the start of this write-up. The patter provides a vaguely logical rationale for the procedure. Delivered with authority, the activities will pass for other than what they actually are — for, in fact, this sorting procedure will specifically place two important cards in known positions.

The spectator's thought-of card will end up third from the top of the face down packet. Too, the card that pairs with the selection will end up on top of the packet.

The spectator is asked to deal the top card face up to the table. Take a moment to concentrate... then announce that this is not the chosen card. As you say, "Am I right?", you briefly and casually turn your head back to the spectator, and note the card which is face up on the table. (This is a psychologically "invisible" action, related to Annemann's "Mystery Of The Blackboard". More than likely, the spectator will not be looking at you, but rather at the tabled card. Even if the participant or any other spectator should actually see your momentary turn, it will not register as having any significance. If you consider the structure of the moment, you will understand why this is so.)

From this peeked card, you can now easily determine the chosen one. If, for example, the tabled card is the 7D, the thought-of selection must be the 6C. You also know that that card will fall third in the packet. Thus, you now have all the information you need to bring this routine to a successful conclusion.

COUNTER FEAT

In this routine, the spectator is able to locate his/her own selection, under what seem to be quite fair conditions. Most of the action takes place in the spectator's hands; in fact, the audience will later believe that everything was done out of the performer's grasp.

There is a simple eight-card set-up. Disregarding suits, arrange four pairs of values in order, A,B,C,D,A,B,C,D. These can be any values, as long as $A + B + C + D = 19$. For example: 6,4,7,2,6,4,7,2, or perhaps A,10,3,5,A,10,3,5, etc.

The flexibility of the simple requirements here allow for quick preparation that can be done in the middle of a performance. At the start of the routine, this eight-card set-up is on top of the deck.

Begin by shuffling the pack, retaining the set-up. Table the pack, and instruct the spectator to cut the deck approximately in half. (In fact, there is much leeway here. As long as the bottom half of the pack contains from 20 to 29 cards, the trick will work.)

The spectator is directed to pick up the former bottom portion of the pack, and to mix those cards thoroughly. Now, with the cards in the spectator's own hands, a card is chosen, using a procedure devised years ago by Bill Nord: the spectator is asked to count the cards he/she holds, without revealing the total. This will yield a two-digit number. The spectator is now told to add the two digits together, to arrive at a new number.

Holding the half-pack toward him/herself, the spectator fans the cards, and notes the card which lies at that position from the face of the stock (the position dictated by the number derived previously). The half-pack is now placed aside. The selection is apparently in some arbitrary location. In truth, it is positioned exactly 19th from the top of the stock.

While the spectator is doing this, you pick up the former top half of the pack. Get a break beneath the top four cards, and cut them to the bottom. There is no need to conceal this activity; all attention is on the spectator's actions, and should anyone notice your actions it will seem to be no more than casual toying.

Table your half-deck in front of the spectator, and have him/her cut the cards about in half. The spectator is now asked to turn either portion face up. The two quarter-deck portions are now Riffle Shuffled together by the spectator, as you explain that this up/down mixing with "insure a random situation"...

Now, when the spectator turned one of the portions face up, you will have observed whether it was the former top section or not. If it was, the spectator is instructed to turn over the entire half-pack at the~~conclusion of the shuffle. If it was not, no turn-over is necessary.

The spectator is told to deal off the top four cards of the shuffled half-pack. You explain that the values of these four random cards will be totalled, and whatever their total is, that position will be counted to in the other half-pack.

The work is over, for if the above instructions are followed, the four cards must total 19. This will be true, regardless as to which cards may happen to be face up or face down. (Refer to Norman Gilbreath's work with palindromic stacking for why this works out.)

As the spectator's chosen card is indeed 19th from the top of the other half-pack, the experiment is thus guaranteed to have a happy ending.

SHUFFLED SPELLER

This routine was developed in 1978, in an effort to approximate Patrick Page's lovely "Beyond The Veil" (in Corinda's "13 Steps To Mentalism", Step Ten, 1959), without the use of gaffed packs.

The effect is as follows: two decks of cards are introduced. The spectator has a free choice of decks; the performer takes the one not chosen. Performer and spectator shuffle their respective packs. The cards are tabled, and nothing is ever handled by the performer again.

The spectator cuts to a card in his/her deck, then spells down the name of that card by taking the other pack, and dealing one card for each letter of the spell. The final card of the spell is turned up – and proves to be the chosen card.

There are no forces per se. However, there are certain limitations placed upon the spectator's actions, of which the spectator is not aware. Both decks are ungimmicked – but they are stacked. The arrangement for both packs is the same. From the top: 9 indifferent cards; AC, 9C, 5H, 3S, 9D, 7D, AD, 5D, 3D; 16 indifferent cards; 8D, 4D, 2D, QD, KD, 8S, QC, 2H, 6C; 9 indifferent cards.

As the two packs are stacked identically, the spectator's initial choice of which deck to use is genuinely free. The spectator may now shuffle the selected deck, but you must verbally guide the spectator's actions so that the pack is given one Riffle Shuffle. This will shift the designated eighteen cards to the center of the spectator's pack. Even if the shuffle is imperfect, the center ten to fifteen cards will belong to the set-up group. (Oh, yes – the performer's shuffle of the other pack is false.)

Both decks are tabled. The spectator is instructed to cut his/her pack in half. By using the phrase "in half", you guide the spectator to cut the deck near the center – thus cutting to one of the eighteen-card set now composing the central portion of the shuffled deck.

The spectator is now directed to spell to the cut-to card, by taking the performer's deck and dealing one card for each letter of the spell. The instructions for the spelling procedure will vary, according to the card. The rules, however, are easily remembered.

1. If the spectator's card is odd, the spelling is done from the top of the deck. You can remember this by realizing that "odd" and "top" both use three letters.
2. If the spectator's card is even, the spelling is done from the face of the deck. Remember this by realizing that "even" and "face" both use four letters.
3. Kings are considered even within this system.
4. All spelling is done by starting with the value, then "of ", then the suit (e.g., A-C-E-O-F-C-L-U-B-S). The final card of the spell will be the selection.
5. Exceptions to Rule Four are the A,2,3,4,5 and 8 of diamonds. When these are spelled, start with the word "the", followed by value, "of", then suit, still turning up the card on the last letter of the spell.

These rules, with the simple exceptions noted, are easy to learn. At the conclusion of the effect, the decks may be given away, as the spectator will have sufficiently altered the stacking of the shuffled deck so as to eliminate any noticeable similarities between packs.

REDUZ

The following is an elaboration on Stewart James¹ delightful "Heduz", from "Case For Cards" (serialized in the Pentagram in 1957, the published in book form in 1958). In that routine, the performer is able to predict a card and a number, under extremely fair conditions.

In brief: two predictive cards are placed aside, unshown. These are the ace of diamonds and the deuce of clubs. Several cards are now placed into a hat. The precise quantity is not revealed to the spectators; the actual number is three I (Given the changes in men's fashion during the past quarter-century, and thus the paucity of available haberdashery, this trio of cards may be placed into an empty pocket.)

During the above actions, you secretly position the deuce of diamonds 10th from the top of the pack, and the ace of clubs 19th from the top.

The spectator is asked to name a number from ten to thirty, and then to attempt to cut that exact amount from the tabled pack. The cut-off packet is counted (thus reversing the order of the cards), and the spectator congratulated on the relative accuracy of the result.

Now, in order to "randomize" the situation, the digits of the counted total are used to deal cards back from the packet onto the talon. (For example, if the spectator had cut off 24 cards, he/she would deal two cards back onto the pack, then four, to represent the number 24.) The remainder of the packet is put into the hat (or pocket) with your secret quantity of cards.

In our example above, the spectator cut between 20 and 29. The revelation would be as follows: the prediction pair would be turned up, and the two cards' values (deuce and ace) interpreted as 21. The total number of cards in the hat would be counted – and found to number 21! A further interpretation of the prediction pair would yield an ace and a club. The top card of the talon would be turned up, and found to be the ace of clubs.

Should the spectator cut from 10 to 19 cards, the procedure is the same, but the interpretations change. The AD and 2C would be arranged to portray the number 12 – which would indeed be the quantity of cards now in the hat. The suit/value interpretation would also be reversed, to predict the two of diamonds – which is in fact the card now atop the talon.

All that I have added to this Jamesian structure is a third option, which will allow you to cover the spectator's cutting from 30 to 39 cards, thus extending the range of the spectator's initial choice.

For this extension, you must be working with a 52-card pack. The initial set-up is compounded, by secretly positioning the 2S and AH 28th and 29th from the top of the pack.

Now, should the spectator cut from 30 to 39 cards at the start of the routine, proceed as follows: after the cut-off packet has been counted, and the digits dealt back onto the talon, discard the remainder of the cut-off stock. Turn up the top two cards of the talon. These will be the 2S and AH. Turn up the two prediction cards, and show that they are the pseudo-mates (i.e., same color and value) to these two cards.

The remainder of the talon is placed into the hat. Now, the deuce/ace pairing is interpreted to predict 21. When the total number of cards in the hat is tallied, there will be exactly that amount.

Note that you can restrict the spectator's initial cutting action by simply claiming that it is impossible for a "novice" to estimate at all accurately with quantities of less than ten cards. This logically limits the spectator's choice to numbers between ten and forty.

Q&AVM

Alex Elmsley's "Animal, Vegetable and Mineral" is a wonderful effect, first published in the New Pentagram in 1973, and later marketed. The routine employs a set of word or picture cards. One card is taken by each of three spectators, while the performer's back is turned. The performer asks each participant a single question: is that person's selection "Animal, Vegetable or Mineral"? With no further clues, the performer is able to reveal all three selections.

The Elmsley routine makes use of an extremely clever method. The drawback to this has to do with the procedure by which the cards are selected. The process is quite functional, and very difficult to reconstruct when properly presented. However, the spectators must do a fair amount of dealing in order to arrive at the selections. This not only slows the pace of the routine significantly, it also runs the risk of seeming contrived; not a desirable quality in a mentalism presentation.

In considering the Elmsley effect, I decided to develop an approach based upon a stacking sequence such that any cut-point would yield a three-bit set which would, in turn, cue the performer as to the precise location of the break in the sequence. After much trial and error, I formulated such a chain.

(I later learned that this type of chain is known in mathematical circles as a deBruijn Sequence. While there have been a few published magic items making use of such sequences in binary form, the following is to my knowledge the first to apply the principle in ternary form.)

Having constructed the chain, I set about creating a list of items to fit the informational requirements, that would also be easily committed to memory. This proved easier said than done; however, the following list of twenty-seven items was devised:

APPLE	JASMINE	STEEL
BANANA	KUMQUAT	TOMATO
COPPER	LION	URANIUM
DIAMOND	MARBLE	VAMPIRE BAT
EMERALD	NIGHTHAWK	WATERMELON
FROG	OPAL	FOX
GOAT	POTATO	YAK
SAND	QUAIL	ZEBRA
IRON	RICE	PARSLEY

You will note that, with only a few exceptions, the articles are in alphabetical order. The exceptions are easily learned: as there is no easily recognizable mineral starting with the letter "H", I have used the word SAND. You can remember that this goes in the "H" position on the list by simply thinking of the term, "Hot Sand".

In the "X" position I have used the word FOX, as there are no common animals whose names begin with "X". This substitution is obvious.

The final article, PARSLEY, is appended to the list in order to bring the total to 27. As this is one more than the number of letters in the alphabet, this item does not fit into the run by virtue of its initial letter. You can easily remember this addition, however, by thinking of PARSLEY as the classic "extra" in the vegetable world; an ubiquitous garnish. (There is a particularly nasty joke which makes this mnemonic link extremely easy to access; I shall not repeat it here.)

In order to perform this routine, your first step will be to commit this list to memory. I have intentionally chosen rather simple items. This is both to make your task of memorizing as easy as possible, and also for the sake of functionality in spectator recognition.

Having come up with a workable word list, the next step was to develop a mnemonic system via which the information from the deBruijn Sequence could be efficiently translated, without the need for any sort of cue list. This, too, took a lot of doing, but it was managed by working with the standard Number Alphabet.

In that system, the digit "1" is linked to the consonant sound of "T" or "D". The digit "2" links to the sound of "N", while "3" connects to the sound of "M". I assigned numerical values to the three categories, based upon their position in the phrase, "Animal, Vegetable and Mineral". Thus, Animal = 1; Vegetable = 2; Mineral = 3.

I created 27 peg words, based on the above — one for each combination of the three digits. These peg words have been kept as simple as possible; in most cases there are no extraneous consonants. There are, of course, alternatives to the words listed here, but these seemed to be the most usable to me. Each peg word was then linked with the appropriate item on the alphabetical list. The final product is as follows:

111	Ta-Ta-Ta	(Think of a trumpet call for a FOX hunt.)
112	TiTaN	(Imagine a huge, titanic YAK.)
113	ToTeM	(Visualize a totem pole, topped with a FROG.)
121	TeNT	(Inside the tent is flying a VAMPIRE BAT.)
122	TaNNeN	(Picture a ZEBRA walking through a magic shop.)
123	DeNiM	(Wearing blue-jeans, you're hunting QUAIL.)
131	TaMeD	(Think of a tamed LION.)
132	DeMoN	(A wizard conjures up a demonic NIGHTHAWK.)
133	Two MiMes	(A pair of street-mimes are attacked by a GOAT.)
211	kNoTTeD	(Picture an impossibly knotted WATERMELON.)
212	NewToN	(Isaac Newton under a tree; hit by a POTATO.)
213	aNaToMy	(An X-ray print shows a KUMQUAT in the stomach.)
221	NiNeTy	(See an elderly man, drinking JASMINE tea.)
222	Na-Na-Na	(A man sticks his tongue out, spitting PARSLEY.)
223	aNoNyMous	(A man's body with an APPLE instead of a face.)

the deck can be spread face up to casually show the mixture of words, but not show too many items in direct sequence, or the alphabetical nature of the run may be discernable. Instead, spread through in blocks of

Turn the pack face down, and False Shuffle. Hand the cards to a spectator, and turn your back on the proceedings. The spectator is now-told to cut the pack as many complete cuts as desired. The top card of the pack is given to another spectator; the next to another individual, and the third taken by the original spectator doing the dealing. The balance of the pack is then placed out of view.

You must be certain as to which spectator received which card. Turn your back, sure to specify participants by name during the activities performed. When your back is turned. Each spectator is then asked to state whether the item is "Animal, Vegetable or Mineral". The answers are converted into digits, as previously explained. The resulting three-digit number is then translated into a peg word from the memorized list, which then cues the first item from the alphabetical list. That item will be the first-dealt card.

As an example, let's say the spectators' answers are "Animal", then "Mineral", then "Vegetable". This converts into 132. The peg word for the number 132 is demon, which cues NIGHTHAWK. You now know the first card to be NIGHTHAWK. Obviously, the next must be OPAL, the last POTATO.

In order to conceal the alphabetical sequence of the three items (which will be more obvious in some cases than others), reveal the chosen items out of sequence. This does not entail much effort, once you know the items are in the chain.

The effect can be performed for a single spectator, by having the cards distributed to three spectators, or by having the three chosen cards into specific pockets.

I realize that, at first reading, the system and memorization may seem to be formidably difficult. Rest assured, such is not the case.

Before the end of this manuscript, we will return to this system, and describe of a more elaborate construction.

ESPECTRUM

In this routine, the performer is able to determine which of eight colors are being thought of by two spectators. Although the method is relatively simple, it took several years of wrestling with the basic idea before I managed to develop a satisfactory solution.

Another binary sorting procedure provides the means for this routine. The presentational format involves a "game", which the performer does not always win. In this respect, it is related to the "Zen Poker" routine described earlier in this book.

To perform this routine, you will need to prepare a special set of eight cards, each bearing a different color. For later calculations, we must assign a value for each of the colors. The first six are in standard Color Wheel sequence, alternating Primary and Secondary hues:

RED, ORANGE, YELLOW, GREEN, BLUE, VIOLET.

(There is a traditional grade school mnemonic for this run: an acronymic name, "Roy G. Bv", which you may find helpful.) Each of these six colors is assigned positional value. Thus, RED = 1, ORANGE = 2, and so forth.

The seventh color is PINK. Remember this by thinking of the phrase, "seventh heaven", and associating pink clouds.

The final color used is BLACK. As this is actually not a color per se, but rather an absence of color, it is easy to remember that it has a value of zero.

Having obtained the eight color cards, the next step is to taper them, as per a standard Stripper Deck. This done, set the cards so that the ORANGE, YELLOW, VIOLET and PINK cards will strip forward, the others back. Now, mark the outer left corner of the back of each card. Thus, with the packet held face down, and the marks at the outer left, you will be able to strip the above-mentioned four cards into the left hand.

One final preparation: four of the cards, GREEN, BLUE, VIOLET and PINK are given an additional marking, at the center of the back design.

Set the cards into R-O-Y-G-B-V-P-Black order, from the top, and you are ready to begin.

Start by introducing the set of cards, showing them fairly, and asking two spectators to merely think of any color they like. Point out that there is no way of your knowing which color each has decided upon, and that there are actually 64 different possible situations...

Flip the packet face down. Perform any shuffle which will retain the parity of the cards. For example, you can run cards, Overhand Shuffle fashion, as long as you run odd numbers.

The cards thus mixed, deal them to the spectators. Start by dealing the top card to the spectator on your left, the next to the spectator on your right, etc. Continue alternating, until all eight cards have been dealt.

Say, "I have no idea as to which colors are being thought of – and yet I believe I have succeeded in distributing the colors such that each of you has his/her thought-of color within the packet in front of you. Take a look!"

The spectators examine their "random" sets. (In fact, of course, the distribution is hardly random; the left-hand set will consist of R-Y-B-P, though not necessarily in that order.)

Caution the participants not to reveal the specific colors they are thinking of, but only to indicate your success or failure in distribution. There are four possible outcomes: you may be correct with both, or with only the left-hand participant, or just the right-hand one, or neither.

In the case of complete success, express your pleasure, and offer to repeat the experiment under more difficult conditions. In any of the latter cases, express consternation, then exclaim, "I went about this incorrectly -- I should have let one of you shuffle the cards."

(At this point you have gained your first piece of information. If a spectator indicates his/her color is among the cards he/she holds, assign a value of one to that person. If the color is not among the cards, no value is assigned.)

Take the packet from the right-hand spectator, and add it to the cards held by the left-hand spectator. See to it that the corner markings align. Instruct the spectator to mix the combined packet. Retrieve the cards and hold them face down, so that the corner marks are at the outer left.

The packet is now apparently cut into two portions. In fact, strip apart the sets. The left-hand quartet (O-Y-V-P, though not necessarily in that order) is given to the left-hand participant; the remainder to the right.

Proclaim your certainty that this time the distribution will be correct. Of course, there are again four possible results. Again, your reaction should be appropriate to the situation. In a similar fashion to your earlier efforts, you announce your intention to make things more difficult. The left-hand spectator's cards are given to the right-hand participant for mixing.

(The spectators' responses during this round are given a value of two. So, if a spectator had received his/her thought-of color in both rounds, the running total would now be three. If the chosen color was not received in either round, the total for that person would remain zero, etc.)

Retrieve the combined packet from the right-hand spectator. Explain that this time you will distribute the cards purely by impulse. Here, the cards are dealt out in what appears to be a haphazard manner. In fact you are noting the center markings on the backs of the cards, and those bearing marks (G-B-V-P) are dealt to the left-hand spectator.

Again, claim that you have correctly distributed the colors so that each spectator has received his/her selected shade. Again, react to the actual outcome with appropriate histrionics.

At this point, you know the actual color being thought of by each spectator. A "yes" response in this third round is assigned a value of four. Your final total for the left-hand spectator tells you that person's chosen color, as per the original values connected with each of the colors.

(For example, if that spectator had seen the chosen color in the first round, not in the second, but again in the third, it would translate into $1 + 0 + 4 = 5$, and the color with 5 as a value in our system is BLUE.)

The right-hand spectator's choice is ascertained by subtracting that person's final total from seven. (Thus, for example, if that person had not seen the chosen color in the initial round, but had seen it in the second and third, it would translate into $0 + 2 + 4 = 6$. $7 - 6 = 1$, which would tell you that this person was thinking of RED.)

Having made your calculations, you can finish the routine. If you've had several failures during the distribution rounds (which is statistically likely), express some frustration, and say, "I'll try it the easy way... with the faces toward me!" Take the packet, and remove the thought-of colors, placing each card face down in front of the appropriate spectator. Have the participants name their mentally selected colors, then turn over the tabled cards to conclude.

If both spectators should happen to be thinking of the same color, resolve the situation by suddenly reacting with mock annoyance, exclaiming, "Well no wonder I was having trouble! It's no fair if both of you concentrate on --- at the same time!!"

PURPLE PROSE

The "Self-Correcting Set-Up" principle was first examined by Karl Fulves in his 1968 manuscript, "Principles of Riffle Shuffle Set-Ups". Later explorations were published in issue of Pallbearer's Review and Epilogue. Most of these, and other related material, can be found in "Riffle Shuffle Set-Ups" (1973) .

The basic idea we will deal with here is best described using two sets of number cards. The first group consists of numbers 1 through 30, printed in black. The second set has the same numbers printed in red. In each set the numbers are in order, with the top card being 1.

A spectator Riffle Shuffles the two packs together. The cards are now distributed to audience members, from the top of the shuffled pack, two at a time. Any spectator holding a pair which contains a red and a black is asked to stand, and the performer is able to know the total of the spectator's values.

This information is learned by the performer noting the spectator's position in the audience. If we refer to that position as "n", then the total of the spectator's numbers will equal $2n$. (For example, if the spectator is sixth -- i.e., recipient of the sixth pair dealt -- the total of the two cards will be twelve.) The performer does not know the precise identities of the two cards, but the total is guaranteed.

In this system, it is possible (in fact, likely, if the Riffle Shuffle is relatively even) that the spectator will hold a pair of matching numbers. This fact may suggest the nature of the method. It therefore occurred to me that there might be arrangements which would preclude matching pairs.

One such solution is to have the black number cards run from 1 to 30, and the red cards run from 2 to 31. With this situation, no spectator holding a red and a black will ever have a pair of mated values. You can calculate the total for any red/black combination by the formula $(2n)+1$ (e.g., for the sixth spectator, the total will be thirteen).

Another approach would be to have the black cards composed of only odd values, in order (1,3,5,7...), and the red cards even (2,4,6,8...). Here, the formula would be $(4n)-1$. (Thus the sixth spectator's cards, if a red/black set, would total twenty-three.)

In "An Approach To Reading", Fulves applies this principle to a clever book test. The number cards are shuffled and dealt out in pairs. Any spectator holding a red/black combination is given a book, and told to turn to the page designated by the total of his/her cards. The performer, of course, knows this total via the system just discussed, and by consulting a cue list is able to reveal the information on that page.

The effect is clean, but there is no logical reason for limiting participation to those spectators holding red/black sets. The following presentational gambit will provide such justification.

You will require two sets of number cards -- one printed in red, the other in blue. You will also need three books, or magazines. One of these has a red cover; one blue; one purple. It is the latter that you have covered with a secret index.

When the pairs of cards have been distributed, a spectator is invited to choose one of the books. Here, use Equivoque to force the choice of the purple book. Explain, "If you had chosen the red book, we would use those spectators holding two red cards; if you'd chosen the blue book, we'd use those holding two blue cards. As you have taken the purple book, we will use those people holding red/blue pairs, as red and blue combine to make purple."

BRAINWEAVE

In analyzing the "Self-Correcting Set-Up", I realized that the numerical nature of the cards could be concealed, thus making the principle all the more subtle. The first application I devised utilizes a pack of design cards substituted for one of the number packs, and a set of word cards in place of the other.

The design cards are in a known order, such that each design is linked to its position in the stack. There have been many such systems in print, by Annemann, Warlock, Dexter and others. I published a 25-card sequence of this sort in the routine "Vision Version" (in "The Red Book of Mentalism", 1977.)

The word cards must also be a known sequence. Beyond that, they should be words which are constructed for pumping. Probably the most functional approach is the Progressive Anagram concept. This is a very old idea which has been explored many times in print. A comprehensive discussion can be found in the instruction book for "Astrology, The Hidden Force" (1983), by Sam Schwartz and Karl Fulves. The most elaborate set of interlocking anagrams available is located in T. A. Waters' "Anagramarye", in "Octasm" (1982) .

To perform, have the two packs set in proper sequence. Display the cards, commenting on their different natures. Explain that it will require two different cerebral modes to thought-read this information, as one is in pictorial form, the other linguistic.

Invite a spectator to Riffle Shuffle the two packs together. The cards are then distributed in pairs to members of the audience.

Ask those spectators holding mixed pairs (one design, one word) to raise their hands. Your rationale for working with mixed pairs is logical, as you wish to demonstrate both of the modes previously discussed.

Pick a spectator to work with. Note his/her position in the audience, as this information will be put to use momentarily.

Instruct the spectator to begin by concentrating on his/her word. You now pump the word, via the Progressive Anagram system. In short order, you will reveal the thought-of word.

As soon as you ascertain the word, you will also know the design being held by that spectator, thanks to the "Self-Correcting Set-Up" principle. For example, let's assume you are working with the sixth spectator. You know that the combined value of his/her cards must be twelve. Let's say you have pumped the spectator's word, and learn that it is eighth in your memorized order. By subtracting eight from twelve, you now know that the design held by the participant must be the fourth in that sequence.

At this point, of course, you know exactly where you are in both runs of cards, and may make use of as much of that information as you so desire.

LOOMING THOUGHTS

Having developed the above routine, it dawned on me that the deBruijn Sequence involved in "Q&AVM" could be applied to the shuffling principle. By cross-breeding the systems, a remarkable amount of information can be derived from a very small amount of probing.

You will again need two sets of cards. One group consists of the 27 words from the "Q&AVM" routine. The other is a run of designs, in known sequence,

The cards are displayed, and the differing perception-modes commented upon. A spectator Riffle Shuffles the sets together, then distributes the cards in pairs to members of the audience.

This distribution is slightly different than in previous routines, for in this version it will be important to know for each participant which was the top card of the dealt pair. Therefore, the dealer is instructed to give the top single card of the combined pack to the first spectator, and that person is told to place this card in his/her right pocket. Now the next card from the pack is given to this same initial spectator, to be placed in the left pocket.

In this fashion, each participant receives a pair of cards, but the order of the pair is kept clear. (I realize that this is a potentially time-consuming endeavor. There will be circumstances for which this routine will not play well, simply for that reason. However, you can cut down the running time by not having the entire pack distributed. A dozen or so participants should be ample.)

A spectator is now chosen at random (and, in fact, this choice can be made by another spectator – say, the one who did the shuffling and dealing at the start of the routine).

The designated spectator is asked to state whether he/she holds a pair of design cards, a pair of words, or a mixed set. Note the answer, then move on to the spectator on either side of that person. Again, the spectator is asked to state only whether design, word, or mixed cards are being held.

Assuming the Riffle Shuffle at the outset was not ridiculously uneven, you will not have to address more than three or four spectators before hitting at least three word cards. (You may be able to achieve this in only two people being addressed, should luck be with you.) State that you will attempt to divine the identities of the words before going on to cope with the designs.

Go to the first spectator of this group who is holding at least one word card. Ask only if the thought-of word is "Animal, Vegetable or Mineral". Using the system described in "Q&AVM", you will soon be able to know your precise location in the word chain.

From here, you can determine the point in the design chain at which you are located, as per the "Self-Correcting Set-Up" principle.

Once you have established your location in both stacks, you can feed back all of the information to the spectators.

This is the most recent addition to my (mostly unpublished) Birds Of Prey series of "impossible" card locations. The effect is as follows: the deck is shuffled by the spectator. It is then cut into four piles, each of which may be re-shuffled by the spectator. While the performer's back is turned, any pile is chosen, and a card selected from it. (The spectator may choose with the cards face-up or face-down, as desired.) The selected card is pocketed, and the chosen pile replaced on the table.

The performer turns to face the spectator. It would be easy at this point, he explains, to locate the selected card — it is in the spectator's pocket! However, locating the mate of the selection (the card of the same color and value) is rather more difficult. Indeed, the spectator does not have any idea as to which pile contains the mate card.

One at a time, the piles are fanned for the spectator's perusal. The participant is instructed to look for the mate card — but not to give any indication as to when it is seen. Despite this lack of help, the performer is able to "sense" the spectator's reaction, identifying the proper group. From this, he continues by locating the thought-of mate card.

The cards are ungimmicked, but they are arranged, in what we might call a Palindromic Rosary Stack. The simplest way to achieve this is to arrange the pack in a standard Rosary set-up, such as Eight Kings or Si Stebbins. The suits are immaterial, but the colors must alternate. Now, reverse the order of one half of the pack. Thus, for example, if you set the deck in an Eight Kings rotation, starting with a black eight, and reversed the order of the bottom half, the top card would now be a black eight as would the last (52nd) card. The second card would be a red king as would the next-to-last (51st) card. The 26th card would be a red jack as would the 27th card.

At the start of the routine, false shuffle if you wish. Now, cut the pack into two equal halves. (If you are not blessed with the ability to cut a perfect 26, you may wish to crimp that card as a key. Alternatively, you can spread the cards face-up to show them as being all different, and get a break between the two mates at center.)

The spectator is directed to Riffle Shuffle the two halves together. This done, you state that you will divide the pack into four "approximately equal" groups. In fact, you must separate the cards into exact units of thirteen cards. I prefer to do this by thumb-counting, but spreading off cards will suffice. There is no need to be subtle about this.

The top thirteen cards are tabled; the next thirteen placed to the right of the first pile, next to the right of that, last to the right of all. Offer the spectator the opportunity to re-shuffle any*or all of the four piles.

The spectator will now select a pile, and from it remove one card. Your back will be turned during this. If you wish, you can allow the pile to be chosen after you've turned your back. If so, you will have to make careful note as to the precise position of each pile on the table. Thus, when you turn back around, you will know which pile was used, as it will not be in the exact position it originally held. (If you're working on a patterned surface, it's easy to find some detail of the pattern to use as a point of reference for each pile.) Frankly, I find this unnecessary, and simply have the spectator pick up a pile just prior to turning my back on the proceedings.

As per the effect description, the spectator removes a card from the chosen pile, pockets the card, and replaces the pile on the table. You now turn back to face the spectator.

Explain that you will show the spectator each of the groups in turn, and that the spectator is to look for the mate to the selection – without giving any discernable reaction. The pile which you display first must be the same one from which the spectator made the selection – but your choice of this pile should seem arbitrary.

Fan the cards face-up, allowing the spectator to look them over. As this is done, you are also scanning the cards. Now, despite the fact that the pack was initially shuffled, thanks to the Gilbreath Principle each pile was composed of one each of the thirteen different values. Thus, whatever the value of the spectator's card, it is now missing from the group of twelve you are now displaying.

It is not a difficult task to determine the missing value as you look at the spread. Given that you are assuredly more familiar with playing cards than your average spectator, you will discern the missing value before the spectator is finished examining the cards. When you know what value is missing, turn your head away. The impression you wish to give is that the faces of the cards are unimportant to you.

Close the fan. Stare at the spectator for a moment, then announce that you perceived no reaction... the mate card was not in that group. You are, of course, correct, and the spectator will tell you so.

The position of this first-shown pile in the tabled row determines which pile is shown next. If the piles are considered as being A-B-C-D, then A corresponds to B, and C corresponds to D. Thus, for example, if the first pile displayed was C, you would now display D.

At this point, you know the value of the spectator's card, but not the suit. The card of the appropriate value in this next-shown group will be of the opposite color to the selection (and mate card). Fan out the pile for the spectator's observation. Here, since you know that the mate card will not be in this group, you can fan the cards with their faces away from you. Let the spectator look over the cards. Announce that you sense no reaction; the mate card is not in this pile. The spectator will confirm this.

As you close up this fan, allow yourself a glance at the faces. It will take but a moment for you to spot the card of the ascertained value as you close the fan.

You now know both the color and value of the card you seek, although you do not yet know in which of the two remaining piles it resides. Pick up either of the remaining piles, and fan it for display. If the mate card is not contained therein, say so, and work with the final pile. If you do see it there, make the pronouncement – but remember, you are apparently reacting to the spectator's reaction, not to what you see in the fan.

Having determined the correct pile, divide those cards into blacks and reds. Ask the spectator to think of the group which contains the mate card. As if responding to the spectator's thought, discard the set that does not contain the mate card.

Divide the remaining cards into suits, and again have the spectator make a mental assignment. In response, discard the set without the mate card.

Requesting the spectator to concentrate on the exact identity of the thought-of mate, remove that card from the packet, tabling it face-down. Discard the other cards. Have the spectator retrieve the selection from his/her pocket. Turn up the tabled mate to reveal your success.

Astrologame

The following routine evolved while I was exploring unused positional relationships in Karl Fulves' "Mark Of The Reader" (in "Notes From Underground", 1973; that effect should not be confused with the Stewart James item of the same name). The presentation involves an astrological game played by the performer and the spectator, in which two chosen zodiac signs are revealed.

You will need a special set of zodiac cards. This set consists of six pairs of duplicate signs (e.g., two Aries cards; two Taurus cards, and so forth), plus an extra card bearing a sign other than those covered by the pairs. You will also need an index card, upon which you have printed the text that is shown below.

To prepare, arrange the six pairs in cyclical order: ABCDEFABCDEF. At the start of the routine, the extra card is hidden beneath the index card.

Start by offering to show the spectator a curious game concerning astrology. Introduce the twelve-card packet. Casually fan out the first few cards in a face-up display, showing different signs. State that the game uses twelve cards, one showing each of the twelve astrological signs. There is no reason for the spectator to doubt that you hold twelve different cards.

Place the packet face-down in front of the spectator. Now, each of the game rules is read out loud from the card. For clarity, you should do the reading - but allow the spectator to see the printed information to make it clear that you are not deviating from the text.

Astrologame Rules

1. Spectator gives packet as many complete cuts as desired.
2. Spectator deals off six cards, then chooses either set with which to play. Performer gets the ~~un~~chosen set.

number from ^{any} ~~six~~ remembers
fans packet
whatever sign is at that
position from the left.
Performer does the same,
but must think of three.

4. Each participant mixes his/her cards quite thoroughly.
5. Performer puts his cards on top of spectator's.

(see other side)

6. Spectator, in order to create Numerological Harmony within shuffled packet, deals thought-of number of cards from packet to table. Balance of cards placed on top.
7. Performer does the same. (Of course, his number is three.)
8. Performer announces thought-of sign.
9. Spectator ~~Ann~~
10. Spectator announces thought-of sign. ~~card will be the one~~ ^{card remains, &c.,} thought of by performer.
11. Spell "ZODIAC", dealing one card for each letter. Final card of the spell will be the spectator's thought-of sign.
12. Everyone goes home happy.

The first two instructions are followed genuinely. In Step 3, while the spectator notes a sign from his/her packet, you pretend to do the same. In fact, you need remember nothing at this point.

Step 4 calls for each of you to mix your respective packets. The spectator may shuffle in any manner he/she chooses. Your shuffle is no more than to run the cards singly, in Overhand fashion, reversing their order.

As stated in Step 5, place your packet on top of the spectator's. At this point you will have completed the instructions on the top side of the index card. Pick up the index card (with the extra zodiac card concealed beneath it), and hold it in front of the spectator as you indicate the "see other side" direction. As the index card comes over the combined packet, unload the extra card from beneath the index card onto the packet.

Follow each instruction on the second side of the card, just as written. In Step 8, when you are directed to announce your thought-of sign, simply give the name of the sign on the extra card.

If the remaining instructions are followed, everything will come out as promised.

Nymble

The performer states that each of us, at one time or another, has the urge to be somebody else; to assume a new identity. Three spectators will now be given that opportunity, at least momentarily.

Three men are invited to participate. Each is given a blank card and a pen, and asked to write his first name on his card. The performer turns his back (or, if circumstances permit, leaves the room). The spectators are told to trade identities/ by exchanging name-cards so that each has a new name. The cards are placed into the spectators' breast pockets, out of sight.

The performer returns, and addresses each of the participants by his new name.

The method involves a simple principle, first given magical application in Mel Stover's "Two Cues", which appeared in *Ibidem* #6 (July, 1956). That same issue featured further uses of the principle by Howard Lyons ("Ambiguous Cards"), Martin Gardner ("The One Two Three Trick") and Paul Curry ("In His Cups"). A dressing for the Gardner routine was subsequently marketed by Lin Searles ("Especially Mental", under the pen-name Dr. Norman Vincent Pangloss).

The method requires that the cards be distributed such that no person has his own name. *I* think this presentation offers a logical reason for this distribution, and thus makes rather subtle use of the principle. Although the range of possible outcomes seems wider, there are in fact only two ways that the cards can be distributed.

If we consider the spectators as A, B and C, then the cards can only be ordered B-C-A or C-A-B. Thus, upon returning to the room, the performer need only determine which of these two arrangements is in effect.

To accomplish this, one of the blank cards is gaffed. The card given to Spectator B has a thin metal shim. The simplest way to do this is to glue a razor blade between two pieces of card stock. The other two cards are ordinary, but should be double-thickness to match the gimmicked card in feel. You will also need a small magnet.

During the time that you are out of the room (or that your back is turned), the magnet is obtained and palmed. (You may prefer to attach a clip to the magnet, in order to hook it onto your finger-ring.)

When you return to the group, address the three participants, saying, "Have you each assumed a new identity?" They will tell you that they have. Continue by asking, "Are the cards in your pockets?" As this latter question is voiced, lightly slap your palm against Spectator A's breast pocket. The action will seem to be no more than an illustrative gesture, and will pass unnoticed.

It is of course this action which provides you with the needed information. You will be able to feel a slight "tug" from the pocketed card, if it is the shim card responding to the magnet. (Related ideas with shims have been developed by Stanley Jaks, Ned Rutledge, Sam Schwartz, Leslie Anderson and Katlyn Miller, among others.)

If A has the shim card, the distribution order is B-C-A. If there is no magnetic attraction to A's card, the order must be C-A-B. In either case, with no fishing, you can now address each participant by his new name.

Universal Speller

The performer borrows a pack of cards, which have been thoroughly shuffled by the spectator. "I am going to ask you to think of a word. It may be any word, in any language, provided you know how to spell it."

The spectator tells the performer that a word has been thought of. "In order to lock the spelling into your mind," says the performer, "I want you to take the deck, and while my back is turned, spell your word, dealing the cards onto the table, one for each letter of the spell. For example, you might be thinking of the word 'cat'¹ – and if you are, please say so, and we'll end the demonstraton right here... At any rate, if you were thinking of 'cat'¹, you'd deal like this..."

The performer illustrates the dealing procedure, spelling C-A-T as three cards are dealt singly to the table. "When you've finished, drop the rest of the pack on top of your dealt pile, square the cards, and tell me you are ready to continue."

Cautioning the spectator to deal quietly, the performer turns his back. At the spectator's indication, the performer turns back around, and takes the cards. "Now that the spelling is locked into your mind, I'm going to show you cards from this shuffled pack, one at a time. As each card is displayed, I want you to mentally spell your word again, one letter for each card. Please remember the card which falls on the last letter of the spell."

This is done – the performer dealing enough cards to insure that the spectator has remembered a card. "You are thinking of a word, and a card," says the performer. "I have no way of knowing either. Nevertheless, at this very moment, with no questions asked, I can accurately spell your chosen word, and thus arrive at your thought-of card."

This unlikely claim is repeated, to be absolutely sure that the spectator understands the performer's contention. (It is at this point that many spectators get a tad uncomfortable.)

In a perverse fashion, the performer makes good on his claim.

The method utilizes an ancient mathematical placement, in conjunction with a rather nasty play on words.

When you receive the shuffled pack from the spectator, secretly crimp the bottom card. Have the spectator think of a word, and explain the dealing process to be carried out while your back is turned. Demonstrate with the three-card spell for "cat", dropping the balance of the pack on top. (The crimped card is now fourth from the bottom.)

The spectator does as instructed. When you turn around, explain the procedure by which the card will be noted. Remove the top card of the pack, and hold it up so the spectator can view it. Deal the card face-down to the table. Continue showing cards, one by one, until ten have been shown. At this point ask if the spectator has remembered a card. As few spectators will bother to choose a word of more than a few letters, the answer will probably be yes. (If you get a no response, the procedure is modified, as explained below.)

The balance of the pack is dropped on top of the ten-card dealt pile. Now, as you patter, casually cut at the crimp, transferring all of the cards below the crimp to the top.

Stress the impossibility of your claim, that you can "accurately spell your chosen word, and thus arrive at your thought-of card". When this has registered, blithely spell Y-O-U-R-C-H-O-S-E-N-W-O-R-D, dealing one card for each letter of the spell.

Ask the spectator to name the thought-of card. Turn up the last card of the spell. It will be the selection.

Should the spectator not have seen enough cards during your ten-card display, show another five cards. You will then claim to be able to spell "your exact chosen word", to accomodate the extra five cards.

Should the spectator not have seen enough cards during your fifteen-card display, throttle him.

NeoGeo

In Abra #924 (October, 1963), Len Belcher contributed an extremely clever routine, "The Geomino Trick". It involves a set of twenty-five squares of cardboard, apparently used for a children's game similar to dominoes. Each card has an assortment of partial designs, such that four cards can be combined to form a complete design at center.

The performer shuffles the cards. A spectator cuts the pack, then distributes sets to a number of participants, who form designs while the performer's back is turned. The performer is able to tell each spectator what design he/she has formed.

The Belcher method involves a stack, which is kept intact by the performer doing a false shuffle. The cards are also marked on their backs, so that when the spectator cuts the packet, the performer is able to know where in the secrucence the deal will begin. Thus, he is able to know what design will be formed by each participant, as there are built-in limitations in the run of partial designs which force the construction of specific full designs.

In working with the system, I developed an approach which does away with the need for marking the cards; they may have blank backs. As the performer has no marks to observe, he may leave the room — and the effect can be concluded long-distance.



A

B

C

[Ps



E

D

Obtain twenty-five squares of blank cardboard. Any size will do, but I have found a three-inch width to be practical. Make five each of the five cards shown above. If you render each type of partial design in a different color (e.g., each curved segment in red, each right-angle segment in blue, and so forth) it will make the cards more attractive, and also help the spectators to work with the patterns more efficiently.

You must memorize this simple sequence: CIRCLE, DIAMOND, CLOVER, SQUARE and NULL. This is easily done. For circle, think of it as being drawn with one continuous line. For diamond, picture a two-car at diamond ring (or think of the playing card, two of diamonds). For clover, just recall that the standard clover has three leaves. The square, of course, has four sides. And null is what's left over.

The twenty-five cards are stacked cyclically: ABCDEABCDEABCDEABCDEABCDE. At the start of the routine, display the cards. Explain that they come from a children's game, in which the object is to make designs by combining sets of four cards. You can demonstrate this with the first four cards, but make sure they are replaced in the proper order.

Convey the idea that any four random cards can generally be combined to make several different complete designs. (This is, in fact, true – provided that the cards are truly taken at random. They won't be.)

Although these cards have been specially designed, there is no reason for the audience to doubt that they come from a commercial game (provided you've done a decent graphic execution). There are a number of similar games and puzzles on the market. You may even find some spectators commenting that the game is familiar to them. Who are you to doubt their word?

False shuffle the pack. The classic Charlier False Haymow works well here. Invite four spectators to come up to the performance area, and give the pack to one of them. We will refer to this spectator as S, and the other participants as X, Y and Z.

If circumstances permit, leave the room, delivering your instructions through the open doorway. Otherwise, simply turn your back. Spectator S is told to give the pack a complete cut, then to deal the top four cards to Spectator X, the next four to Y, the next four to Z, and to take the next four for him/herself. The rest of the pack is placed aside.

Here is where the stack becomes functional. If a spectator receives the set A-B-C-D, the only design that can be formed is the CIRCLE. The next set is E-A-B-C, from which only the DIAMOND can be formed. D-E-A-B yields only the CLOVER, and C-D-E-A the SQUARE. The set B-C-D-E cannot be used to form any complete design, and this is considered the NULL.

The cards having been dealt out, each spectator is directed to use his/her four cards to form a complete design. Having given this instruction, wait a brief moment, then ask, "Has everyone got a design?" Due to your haste, some of the participants will not have managed to do so, and they will say so. Offer to wait. A few moments later, inquire again. This time, one of the spectators is likely to say that he/she has still not managed to form a design. This is your NULL, and you now have all the information you need to identify the other spectators' designs.

Note that the audience will perceive the situation quite differently. They will not know that the NULL spectator has landed a set of cards from which it is impossible to form a complete design. Rather, they will assume that the spectator is a bit slow, having trouble with the game. Thus, there is no sense of this condition as having any informational value.

When the NULL spectator announces the inability to form a design, say that in the interests of time, that spectator may return to his/her seat, and you will work with the other three players. (There is no need to be overly cruel about this.)

The position of the NULL player in the group tells you where you are in the design sequence. If Spectator X is the NULL, you know that Y has made a CIRCLE, Z has a DIAMOND, and S has a CLOVER.

If Y is the NULL, X has a SQUARE, Z has a CIRCLE, and S has a DIAMOND.

If Z is the NULL, X has a CLOVER, Y has a SQUARE, and S has a CIRCLE.

If S is the NULL, X has a DIAMOND, Y has a CLOVER, and S has a SQUARE.

If all four players are able to form complete designs, X has a CIRCLE, Y has a DIAMOND, Z has a CLOVER, and S has a SQUARE.

Throw Rug

One of the most offbeat card revelations I've encountered is Toni Koynini's "Karpets," which ran in the March, 1953 Magic Wand. In that routine, a card is selected and returned to the pack, which is then dealt out into seven face-up rows of seven cards each. Upon determining that the chosen card was a red one, the performer removes the red cards from the dealt stock. To the spectator's great surprise, the remaining black cards form the figure 8 and the letter H, revealing that the chosen card was the eight of hearts.

The effect requires a full-deck stack, which does not have a regular pattern and is thus difficult to memorize and time-consuming to set. Too, it requires a rather large area (or a rather small pack of cards) to accommodate the seven-by-seven layout.

I set about trying to work out a simpler approach to the Koynini routine, and devised the following. The layout uses only half the .pack, and thus can be done upon a normal tabletop. Too, the stacking of the deck is much simpler, and can be done in front of the audience.

There is a preliminary set-up: you must separate the black cards from the reds. There are many ways to achieve this (e.g., Harry Lorayne's "Great Divide"). Alternatively, you could do a routine wherein the colors are openly sorted (e.g., Paul Curry's "Out Of This World"), then false shuffle the pack prior to going into this effect. The Laurie Ireland Red/Black Shuffle is ideal for this.

There is one further set-up requirement: you must locate the four of hearts, and bring it to any convenient position from whence it can be forced upon the spectator. Do so.

While the spectator is noting the chosen four of hearts, casually cut three cards from the bottom of the pack to the top. Now, obtain a break beneath the top seven cards, and raise this block of seven into "Tilt" position. The four of hearts is retrieved from the spectator, and inserted into the break.

You will now shuffle the pack — in fact, arranging the cards into proper color sequence for the layout to follow. The shuffle is of the Overhand Run-Up variety. It may seem complex at first reading; it is not problematically so. With practice it will flow smoothly, apparently no more than a thorough Overhand Shuffle.

Holding the pack face-down in the right hand, as per a standard Overhand action, the left hand runs five cards, one at a time, into the left hand. Now, perform a milking action, pulling the bottom card of the right-hand stock plus the top card of that stock onto the left-hand cards. After this, milk once more.

Run a single card from the top of the pack onto the left-hand stock. Milk three times. Run five cards. Milk two times. Run one card. Milk once.

This completes the Overhand Run-Up. It is easily committed to memory by simply learning the number sequence, 5213-5211. Each number refers to a run or a milk, and they alternate (i.e., run 5, milk 2, run 1, &c.) .

Having shuffled off about half the pack at this point, continue legitimately Overhand Shuffling the remainder of the pack on top of the left-hand stock. However, the first card of this latter portion should be in-jogged. At the conclusion of the complete shuffle, cut beneath the jog. The cut-off stock is placed aside.

State that you believe the chosen card is somewhere within the half-pack you hold, and that you will attempt to narrow down to the precise card. As this is being said, Double Undercut four cards from the bottom to the top of the stock.

The twenty-eight cards are now dealt out into four rows of seven. Refer to the diagram below, which shows the order in which the cards are turned face-up and dealt.

28	27	26	25	24	23	22
21	20	19	18	17	16	15
14	13	12	11	10	9	8
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

(Performer's P.O.V.)

Caution the spectator not to make any sign if he/she should see the selected card during the deal. When you've completed the layout, ask the spectator only to verify your hunch that the selection was within this half-pack. Of course, you will be told that you are correct.

Tell the spectator that your next hunch is that the chosen card was red. When this is affirmed, remove all of the red cards from the tabled layout. At this point, I like to pretend to study the removed group of red cards, as if searching for the right one.

Sooner or later (and the perception will take different lengths of time with different spectators), the onlooker will realize that the remaining tabled cards form the number 4 and the letter H, identifying the chosen card.

Spectrum

In the previous volume of this series, "Thequal" (1984), I explained a routine entitled "ESpectrum". The routine used eight cards, each bearing a different color. Two spectators thought of colors, and the performer was able to reveal those thoughts.

The method depended upon a binary sorting procedure, requiring that the cards be sorted three times in order to ascertain the thought-of hues. As I mentioned in that write-up, I wrestled with the basic idea for several years before finally developing that solution.

Actually, there was a previous version which required only one sorting to determine the two thought-of colors. As this is hardly enough binary information to cope with the number of possibilities, there had to be some sort of cheat involved – and indeed there was, in the form of a restricted selection procedure.

I was, however, not happy with that procedure, as it was somewhat contrived – hence the development of the "ESpectrum" routine, in which the spectators are allowed to choose their colors by merely thinking of them.

During the past year, I returned to the original problem, and managed to devise a much more straightforward selection procedure that accomplishes the same restriction as the one created years back. This is it.

As with the previously published version, you will require a special set of eight cards, each bearing a different color. The same ones are used as in the earlier routine: RED, ORANGE, YELLOW, GREEN, BLUE, VIOLET, PINK, BLACK.

Again, it will be necessary to assign a number value to each of the colors. The first six are in the standard Color Wheel sequence, which can be remembered by the old grade school mnemonic acronym, "Roy G. Bv". Thus, RED = 1, ORANGE = 2, and so forth.

The seventh color, PINK, is associated to the phrase "seventh heaven", by the visual hook of pink clouds. The final color, BLACK, has a value of zero – easily remembered, as black is the absence of color.

Having obtained the eight color cards, the next step is to taper them, as per a standard Stripper Deck. This done, set the cards so that the RED, YELLOW, VIOLET and PINK cards will strip forward, the others back. Now, mark the outer left corner of the back of each card. Thus, with the packet held face-down, and the marks at the outer left, you will be able to strip the above-mentioned four cards into the left hand.

One further preparation: the GREEN, BLUE, VIOLET and PINK cards are trimmed short.

The cards are now set into pairs: RED/VIOLET, ORANGE/BLUE, YELLOW/GREEN and BLACK/PINK. These pairs are easy to remember, as the combined number-value of each pair is seven. In each pair, with the cards face-down, the short card goes above the one of normal length.

Gather the pairs, in any order. You are ready to begin.

The presentation is as follows: you explain that, in any demonstration of ESP, it is important to understand the statistical odds in order to determine whether a given test is truly impressive. Offer to show an example.

Introduce the set of eight cards, showing them fairly. If you wish, you may false shuffle the packet.

Hand the packet to the first spectator, instructing that the cards be given as many complete cuts as desired.

Almost every person will cut a packet by grasping the cards from the ends, not the sides. Observe the spectator's initial cutting to make sure that this is the case with this individual. (If it's not, have the first spectator hand the packet to a second spectator for further cutting. You are almost certain to have better luck with this person.)

Having satisfied yourself that the cards are being cut properly, turn your back on the proceedings. When the first spectator has announced that the cutting is completed, instruct him/her to deal the top card of the packet to the second spectator, who is asked to note and remember that color.

The first spectator is asked to note and remember the color that is now on top of the packet. The selection process seems simple, direct and fair, but you have restricted the choice such that the first spectator is thinking of RED, ORANGE, YELLOW or BLACK, and the second spectator is thinking of the color which pairs with the first.

The selected cards are returned to the packet, and the cards are shuffled by both spectators. You now turn around, and take the packet.

The above procedure was designed to minimize the possibility of either spectator reversing cards, but that is not guaranteed. Therefore, as you continue with the patter, casually fan the packet and observe the outer left corners of the cards. All should either have marks, or be unmarked. If any cards have been reversed, you will now know it, and can rectify the situation during the subsequent talk. Too, the marked ends of the cards should be at the outer end of the packet.

Say, "Each of you is thinking of a color. Let's suppose *I* claimed that I could separate the cards into two groups, handing one set to each of you, and that each of you received your thought-of color in your group..."

Here, suit actions to words by separating the packet into two four-card sets. This is done by apparently cutting the packet, but in fact stripping apart the sets. The left-hand set (R-Y-V-P, although not necessarily in that order) is given to the first spectator; the remainder to the second spectator.

Ask the spectators to examine their "random" groups. Caution them not to reveal their thought-of colors, but only to indicate your success or failure in distribution. There are four possible outcomes: you may be correct with both, or with only the first spectator, or only the second, or neither.

If you are correct with both, express your pleasure. If you do not have complete success, say, "Well, even if I was successful, you would be wrong to be too impressed. After all, if you consider the odds, there are only four possible outcomes!" Here, explain the distributions given above.

Continue, "No, even .a complete success would only be a one-out-of-four probability, and thus not very significant. I wish to try something far more difficult. You see, each of you is thinking of one of eight colors. Thus, if I were to guess your exact colors, that would be a one-out-of-sixty-four success - far more exciting."

At this point, you know the thought-of colors. The spectators have told you this information, by revealing the distribution within the two sets.

Consider the first spectator as having a value of one, the second as having a value of two. For each "yes" in your distribution, assign the point value of that spectator. Thus, if the first spectator does have his/her color, but the second does not, the point total is one.

Similarly, if the first spectator does not have his/her color, but the second does, the point total is two. If both spectators have their colors, the point total is three. If neither has, the point total is zero.

This point total tells you the first spectator's color. (RED = 1, ORANGE = 2, YELLOW = 3, BLACK = 0.) Of course, once you know the first spectator's color, you know the second spectator's color, as they were paired. Simply subtract the first spectator's color value from seven, to learn the color thought of by the second spectator.

Numper

The Progressive Anagram principle would seem to have first seen use in "The Nonpariel Book Mystery", a marketed item created by Stanley Collins in 1920. Edward Bagshawe applied the principle in his "Invisible Power", released in the 1930's. Probably the first version to generate particular attention was Bertram Adams' "The Krazy Kode" (Jinx #31, April 1937).

Significant advances were made by Stewart James ("Anagramatic Facsimile", Tops, March 1953), Howard Adams ("Words Of Wonda", Genii, July 1962) and Sam Schwartz ("Anagramatic", Linking Ring, January 1963; also marketed as "Word-A-Matic").

Still more variations can be found in the work of Peter Warlock, Stewart Judah, Trevor Hall, G. A. Arrowsmith, Bob Wagner, Sam Dalai, Karl Fulves, J. G. Thompson Jr., T. A. Waters, Terri Rogers and Stephen Tucker.

I have been fascinated with the principle for years, and have put some of my applications in print previously. Not long ago, it occurred to me that it would be practical to marry the Progressive Anagram concept with the standard Number Alphabet.

That system, as most readers will know, connects each consonant sound with a specific digit: 1 = T or D; 2 = N; 3 = M; 4 = R; 5 = L; 6 = J, SH, CH or soft G; 7 = K, hard C or hard G; 8 = F or V; 9 = P or B; 0 = S, Z or soft C. A full explanation can be found in any basic mnemonics text.

The following word list will be quite easy to learn. Each word begins with the appropriate consonant to cue its position on the list. There are two exceptions: TERMINOLOGY has a soft G as its final consonant, cuing its sixth position; SPECIFIED ends with a D to help remember its eleventh position.

- | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1. TOUGH | 4. REMNANT | 7. COY | 10. SOPORIFIC |
| 2. NEUTER | 5. LAMINATOR | 8. FOCUS | 11. SPECIFIED |
| 3. MUTINY | 6. TERMINOLOGY | 9. PEACEFUL | 12. DYNAMISM |

To perform the basic effect, copy the list onto a piece of paper. It's best to list the words in other than their memorized order, so as to conceal the fact that you will be calling off their initial letters in sequence.

Hand the list to the spectator. Explain that these words have been chosen carefully, for an important reason: each is extremely difficult to visualize. Therefore, when the spectator concentrates on one of the words, the letters and sounds will be the center of attention, making it easier for you to receive the spectator's thoughts.

You will now reveal the thought-of word, one letter at a time. This is done by calling out the initial consonants, in order.

The system begins, of course, with the letter T. Inform the spectator that you sense the presence of a T in the thought-of word. *If* you are told that there is not a T in the word, you will jump to the second half of the list, as will be explained momentarily.

If the presence of a T is confirmed, state that you feel there is an N in the word. If you get a negative response, the work is over — you know the word is TOUGH. If you get a positive response, continue by guessing M.

If M is denied, you know the word is NEUTER. If M is confirmed, go on to guess R. If R is rejected, the word is MUTINY. If R is accepted, go on to the letter L.

If L is not present, the word is REMNANT. If L is confirmed, guess G. If G is denied, the word is LAMINATOR. If G is contained in the word, it must be TERMINOLOGY.

You can see that, in each case, a "no" response informs you that the word being thought of is the one which begins with the last confirmed letter. The exception is with your initial guess on the letter T. If you get a negative response to T, jump to the second half of the list. Say that you did not "hear" the letter correctly... it was a C. Go on to guess F.

If F is not present, the word is COY. If F is confirmed, continue by calling the letter P. If P is rejected, the word is FOCUS. If P is accepted, go on to the letter S.

If S is denied, the word is PEACEFUL. If S is confirmed, the word is either SOPORIFIC or SPECIFIED. You will determine which by guessing the letter D, but prior to that you can call out the letter I, for a guaranteed "yes" response. If D is denied, the word is SOPORIFIC. If D is confirmed, the word is SPECIFIED.

If your initial guess of T is rejected, and your next guess of C is also turned down, the word must be DYNAMISM.

You'll never get more than two negative responses before the word is known, and that will happen in only five cases. There is one case in which you'll get no negative responses, and the rest will involve only one. (In the case of two "no" responses, the first takes place at the start of the pump, and will be perceived not so much as an error as a "false start".) Properly presented, the "read" will play quite convincingly.

The idea of integrating a Progressive Anagram list into a text is hardly new; the original Collins routine was built around a specially printed book ("Holiday In Morocco"), with the anagrams placed at forcible locations. Sam Dalai created a pamphlet of limericks ("My Favourite Verse", 1976) using a similar premise. Karl Fulves hypothesized a book in which every page began with a word from such a list, in "True Test Conditions" (in "Origins", 1982). In 1983, Sam Schwartz released his extraordinary "Astrology, The Hidden Force", which contains an elaborate network of positioned anagrams.

When T. A. Waters showed me his impressive 73-word interlocking list in 1980, we discussed the idea of a page of text containing only words from the list (combined with short supporting words that would not be chosen). The page would be set into type, and tipped into a book or magazine. The presentation would be to force the special page, then have the spectator choose a word from it, going into the Progressive Anagram pump.

After much effort, I created such a piece of text. It can be found along with the Waters list in his "Anagramarye" (in "Octasm", 1982). Recently, Terri Rogers released a delightful approach with the text in the form of a one-page flyer ("Word Of Mind", 1985).

For what it's worth, the following piece of dreadful prose has been constructed from the "Mumper" list. There have been some substitutions in the word list: NEUTER is altered to NEUTRALIZE; MUTINY is now MAINTAINED; LAMINATOR is replaced by LACRIMATION (...look it up).

It's tough to be peaceful without becoming soporific, and no specified terminology will neutralize that. In the case of lacrimation, maintain your focus to get a remnant of dynamism, and don't be coy about it.

With the paragraph set into type and added to a book or magazine, it will play as acceptable text. (Remember, the spectator is not going to read it carefully, but rather scan it looking for a word to choose.) If you instruct the spectator to look over the paragraph, and choose an "interesting" word, one of the words from the pump list will be selected.

Dynamix

In "Thequal" I offered several routines based on the Fulves Self-Correcting Set-Up principle. One item, "Brainweave", used a set of design cards plus a set of word cards. The latter set was composed of Progressive Anagram words. Since that time, I have returned to the concept, and developed a rather more sophisticated approach.

Two groups of cards are displayed, one bearing simple designs, the other abstract words. The spectator shuffles the packs together. While the performer's back is turned, two cards are chosen in a fair manner. Without turning back around, the performer is able to reveal both thought-of pieces of information.

The method makes use of the "Numper" list, plus a special set of memorized designs:

1. (The circle is formed with one continuous line.)
2. (Think of this as a modified two-line cross.)
3. (This design is made of three wavy lines.)
4. (The square is a four-sided shape.)
5. (Picture the five of hearts playing card.)
6. (A valentine association links arrow with heart.)
7. (Consider these clouds, as in "seventh heaven".)
8. (This design vaguely resembles the figure eight.)
9. (The spiral approximates the figure nine.)
10. (The straight line and closed box resemble ten.)
11. (Two circles equal two ones - eleven.)
12. (Think of the twelve astrological star-signs.)

Obtain twenty-four double-blank cards. The twelve designs, plus the dozen "Mumper" words, are inscribed on the cards, one on each.

The cards are now arranged in two interlaced sequences. The first set is in order from the top: CIRCLE (first design); NEUTER (second word); WAVY LINES (third design); REMNANT (fourth word), and so forth, ending with the 12th word, DYNAMISM. The second set runs TOUGH (first word); CROSS (second design); MUTINY (third word), and so forth, ending with the STAR.

The sets, thus arranged, are kept in separate boxes. At the start of the routine, bring each set out of its box, explaining that you will work with a group of simple design cards, and a group of abstract word cards. You do not display the packs at this point; to do so would reveal the alternation of designs and words. Simply hold each packet up, face-out, showing a word at the face of one, a design at the face of the other.

Of course, it is possible to start with the design and word sets separate, to arrive at the above condition via a Faro Shuffle, if you wish to give yourself that task.

Table the two twelve-card packs in front of the spectator, and instruct him/her to Riffle Shuffle the sets together. Point out that the fact that the cards have blank backs precludes their being marked, but that you will nevertheless turn away from the proceedings, in the interest of fairness.

Tell the spectator to deal the top two cards of the shuffled pack onto the table. The next pair is dealt to the right of that, the next pair next to that, and so on, until there are six pairs in a tabled row. Direct the spectator to start a second row of pairs beneath the first, dealing the next half-dozen sets onto the table.

The spectator is now told to pick up any set, to look at the cards, and to concentrate on what he/she sees. With your back still turned, announce the fact that you sense the spectator is concentrating on a mixed pair — one design and one word. You will be correct; due to the Gilbreath Principle, every pair is a mixed set.

Say that you'll try to receive the word first. Here, use the pumping procedure explained in "Numper" to establish the spectator's word.

Having done this, you will now go on to reveal the thought-of design. Two situations can exist at this point: the spectator's design can be one that was next to the chosen word-card in the pre-shuffle sequence, or it can be one that was shuffled next to that card.

If you examine the design sequence, you'll notice that the odd designs are all constructed from curved lines, while the even designs are made out of straight lines. This information will determine the situation that exists for the spectator's design, relative to the chosen word.

The basic rule is simple: whatever the parity of the spectator's word-value, if the paired design is from the original set-up its parity will be opposite. If the design has been shuffled next to the word-card, its parity will be the same.

As an example, let's say the word you've ascertained is LAMINATOR — the fifth word in the sequence. If the paired design comes from the pre-shuffle set-up, it can only be the SQUARE (fourth) or the ARROW (sixth). LAMINATOR is an odd value; SQUARE and ARROW are even. Therefore, tell the spectator that you sense the thought-of design is constructed from straight lines. If you receive a confirmation on this, you have narrowed the design down to the two just named.

To determine which of those two is being thought of, we will take advantage of another factor built into the design sequence: within either parity run, a design drawn with a single line is always followed by one drawn with more than one separate line.

Thus, in our example, to distinguish between the ARROW and the SQUARE you might say, "I have the feeling your design is made of one continuous line." If the spectator agrees, the thought-of design is the SQUARE. If the statement is denied, you'd continue by saying, "Oh, I was confused because the design does contain an extended line — an angle, in fact..." Go on to reveal that the spectator has thought of the ARROW.

As you gain experience with this design sequence, you'll find that the system of pumping becomes quite easy to use in a manner which seems quite direct, and in no way engenders suspicion.

Now, what if the parity of the thought-of design is the same as the chosen word? (In our example, this would mean that the spectator has denied that the design is constructed out of straight lines.)

In this case, the Self-Correcting Set-Up will be exploited. Say to the spectator, "Are you concentrating?" As this is said, turn your head back toward the spectator for just an instant. This turning of the head is a natural action to accompany the query, and will not register upon the audience; they will later remember that your back was turned for the entire demonstration. (This "invisible" action was first explained by Annemann in his seminal "Mystery Of The Blackboard" (Jinx #1, October 1934.)

In the brief moment of looking back, you have glanced at the table. Given the two-row layout of pairs, it is an instant's work to determine which pair is missing (i.e., which pair is being held by the spectator).

Double the positional value of that pair. Now, subtract the spectator's word-value from that number. The result will tell you the value of the chosen design. (In our example, let's say the spectator's pair came from the sixth position on the table. $2 \times 6 = 12$. $12 - 5$ (the value of the thought-of word, LAMINATOR) = 7. Therefore, the spectator's design must be the CLOUDS.)

When you have concluded the demonstration, turn to face the spectator. Sweep the tabled pairs together. (This eliminates the evidence concerning the fact that each pair consisted of one design and one word.) The spectator may of course examine the cards; there is no system to be discerned.

ESPRESSO

We'll begin with a simple routine employing a standard pack of ESP symbol cards, consisting of five each of five designs (circle, cross, waves, square and star). The pack is shown and shuffled. A spectator is invited to give the pack as many complete cuts as desired, and then to give the pack one final cut, leaving it in two piles.

The spectator is instructed to take the card cut to, and to place it into his/her pocket, unseen. The subject is now invited to choose either half-pack to be used for the next part of the demonstration. The chosen portion is taken, and fairly sorted into four groups, as the performer points out that the specific groups thus arrived at are clearly the product of the spectator's cutting and choosing.

The first card of each group is noted, and it is found that one each of four designs is represented. Although this result is against the odds, it is not terribly impressive, until its significance is explained -- for the only symbol not on display proves to be the one residing in the spectator's pocket.

* * *

The method makes use of a cyclical stack (*abcdeabcde*, &c.) in conjunction with a binary sorting procedure which, happily enough, will function here without the need for any positional adjustments.

The opening shuffle is done by the performer, and is false. (The classic Charlier False Haymow Shuffle works well with the 25-card ESP deck.) The spectator gives the pack unlimited complete cuts, then cuts the pack into two portions. The top card of the lower portion (the cut-to card) is pocketed. (If you like, you may offer a choice between that card and the face-card of the cut-off stock.)

Note the size of the two tabled portions. If both contain over eight cards, the spectator may choose which will be used for the subsequent procedure. If the cut was exceptionally light or deep, no choice is offered, and the larger packet is used as if that were your intention from the outset.

If the lower portion is being used, the sorting procedure is done with the cards face-down. If the upper stock is used, the procedure is done with the cards face-up. In any event, the sorting is constant:

Perform a Reverse Faro. (The packet is held in the left hand. The top card of the packet is taken by the right hand. The next card is taken beneath the first, in-jogged. The next is taken beneath the right-hand stock, out-jogged; the next, in-jogged, and so on, until the entire stock is alternately jogged up and down.

Strip the two interlaced sections apart. The up-jogged portion is tabled. The remaining cards are given another Reverse Faro, and the jogged portions stripped apart. Again, the forward section is tabled. Repeat the jogging procedure. You will thus end up with four packets of decreasing quantity.

(If the original packet contained less than sixteen cards, the final "packet" will actually consist of a single card. If less than twelve, both the third and fourth will be single cards. This will not interfere with the results.)

As the above procedure is executed, explain to the observers that you are fairly sorting the cards by removing every other one, narrowing in to the center. Point out that, quite obviously, if the spectator had cut a different-sized portion, the results would be different. (This is an outright lie, but it seems to be true.)

Turn up the top card of each of the four packets. (Of course, if the sorting was done with the cards face-up, the top cards will already be on display.) One of each of four designs will be seen ~ which, together with the pocketed card, will comprise a discreet set of five ESP symbols.

NOTE: If you prefer, when using the upper portion, the sorting can still be done with the cards face-down. When the jogged packets are stripped apart, simply table the one which has the pre-jogged bottom card on its face. This means, of course, that your choice of which packet to table will not always be consistent, but if you proceed with assurance, it will not be questioned.

MOCHA

The following procedure yields the same results as the preceding routine, via a different methodological means. Again, the deck begins in cyclical stack condition. In this case, do *not* use a Charlier False Haymow to apparently mix the cards, for later in the routine the spectator will be asked to give the pack a Riffle Shuffle. Therefore, either use a false mix that mimics that manner of shuffling, or leave it out altogether.

The spectator is given the pack, and allowed to give the cards as many complete cuts as desired. This done, he/she is told to begin dealing the cards face-down from the top of the pack into a tabled pile. The spectator stops dealing at any time, and the card dealt to (either the one on top of the talon or on top of the tabled group) is pocketed, unviewed.

The spectator is now told to Riffle Shuffle the dealt portion into the remainder of the pack. This would seem to destroy any evidence as to the identity of the chosen symbol. In fact, due to what I will refer to as an Interrupted Gilbreath Principle, at the conclusion of this shuffle the top four cards of the pack will be one of each of the designs other than the one in the spectator's pocket.

The specific order of those four cards is beyond your ken, but their location as a group is a mathematical certainty. There are a variety of ways in which this can be exploited.

For example, direct the spectator to deal out four four-card packets, distributing the cards in rotation. Thus, the face-card of each packet will be one of the four-card set that was on top of the pack prior to the deal.

Invite four other spectators to participate. Each is told to pick up a packet, and to perform a Down/Under Shuffle. (In brief: The top card of the packet is dealt to the table; the next is transferred to the bottom; next to the table, and so on, until one card remains.) The four designs thus arrived at will be the post-shuffle top-stock.

If fewer spectators are present, direct the first participant to deal two six-card piles. Two members are told to take the packets, and perform Under/Down Shuffles to arrive at a card from each group. The remaining cards are again given Under/Down Shuffles, to arrive at two more cards. This procedure will again yield the four designs which, with the pocketed card, complete the five-symbol set.

ENCOUNTER

In this hands-off routine, the performer offers to demonstrate how accountants play poker. Two packs of playing cards are introduced, one red and one blue. The spectator is invited to choose either pack; we'll assume the blue one. A card is fairly chosen from that deck. The cards are shuffled, and a group of five removed, making a poker hand.

The performer explains that when accountants play poker they do not concern themselves with looking for pairs, flushes, and so forth. They care only about the total value of the cards. Thus, the values of the five cards are totaled.

The red deck is taken, and the number of cards indicated by the five-value total dealt down. The card at that position proves to be the same as the one originally chosen, thus "winning the game." The cards are ungimmicked, and thus may be used for subsequent effects.

* * * A set-up for each deck is required. The red deck has
eighteen indifferent cards on top, followed by the following cards:

8C,7S,X,5S,4C,X,2C,AS,AH,2D,X,4D,5H,X,7H,8D,rest of
pack

You will observe that the top half of the set-up is black, the lower group red. Too, the odd values are major suits (spades and hearts), the even values are minor suits (clubs and diamonds). The X's in the above listing indicate indifferent cards. In the upper portion, these may be any cards. In the lower half, black cards are desired, of mixed suits and values.

The blue deck is stacked with four indifferent cards, followed by a 24-card run consisting of the value-set A-2-4-5-7-8, repeated four times. (In fact, this can be *any* sequence using those specific values, repeated cyclically.) The first six-card set must contain odd cards of minor suits, even cards of major suits. The second and third sets must be the reverse: odd/major, even/minor. The fourth set is odd/minor, even/major. Thus, the central part of the run is composed of the same dozen cards which are specially placed in the red deck.

Start with the decks in their respective cases. Ask the spectator to choose either pack. If the blue deck is designated, say, "Fine. We'll work with the blue deck, and save the red one for later." Have the spectator put the red deck in his/her pocket, and uncase the blue one.

Should the red deck be selected, say, "Fine. We'll do the magic with the red deck, and use the blue deck for the preliminary work." Direct the spectator to put the red deck in his/her pocket, and uncase the blue one.

So, no matter what the spectator's choice, the working situation will be the same, with the blue deck used first. Instruct the spectator to hold the blue deck face-down, and to begin dealing the cards one-by-one into a tabled pile.

When ten cards have been dealt, tell the spectator to stop dealing at any time. There is now a lee-way of twelve cards; as long as the spectator stops after ten but before twenty-two cards have been dealt, the trick will work. (In other words, the spectator must stop on a card from within the central twelve-card set-up.)

The stopped-at card is placed aside. It is necessary for you to know the identity of this card. There are various ways to determine this information secretly - peeking at the next card in the run, or using a marked pack, for example. However, it will not hurt the effect if the spectator is told to simply deal the chosen card aside, face-up, so that all (yourself included) can see it.

The participant is now told to Riffle Shuffle the dealt-off stock into the talon. This done, the top five cards of the deck are dealt into a face-up pile. Because of the shuffling, these cards will seemingly be random. In fact, due to the Interrupted Gilbreath Principle, they will be of mixed suits but specific values, depending on which card was previously placed aside.

Have the spectator bring out the red deck. If the chosen card is *black*, instruct the spectator to deal the designated (five-card value-total) number from the top of the red pack, turning up the last card.

If the chosen card is *red*, the dealing is done from the face of the red deck. (The fact that the set-up is broken up by indifferent cards will conceal its existence during a face-up deal.)

The card dealt to will be the same as the one initially chosen.

TODDLER

Using cards to generate numbers brings us to this next item. Back in 1967, Charles Hudson published "Baby Hummer" in his "Card Corner" column in the December *Linking Ring*. This was an inspired application of the Hummer CATO principle to a packet of four cards, in this case aces. Although the spectator mixed the aces with satisfactory thoroughness, a designated ace was the only card reversed at the conclusion.

In the February, 1973 *Pallbearer's Review*, Bob Neale offered a clever variation, "Number Hummer." This was used a set of four cards, each a different value. The Hudson/Hummer idea was used for a two-phase routine, the latter part of which being a number force.

A drawback to the Neale routine was that the values of the cards were not systematic. This is hardly a major problem; the cards can be forced, and thus a supposed random assortment. However, some time ago I set about trying to devise a version using a logical cluster of numbers. This was the result.

Begin by removing eight cards from the pack, the values running ace through eight. These can be of uniform or mixed suits. Openly arrange these in order, with the ace at the top. The purpose of this arrangement is ostensibly to clearly show the run of values as being complete and fair.

Turn the packet face-down in position for an Overhand Shuffle, and mix them by running the top card into the left hand, then milking the top and bottom cards on top of that, then throwing the balance of the packet on top, obtaining a left little finger break beneath this added stock. Thus, the order of the cards is now, from the top: 3,4,5,6,2,8[^]. You are holding a break above the deuce.

Execute a Half-Pass to secretly reverse the three-card block beneath the break. Hand the packet to the spectator, directing him/her to take the cards beneath the table (or behind their back). The spectator is now instructed in the CATO procedure: the packet is cut; the top two cards are turned over (as one).

The spectator is allowed to repeat this procedure as many times as desired. At any point in the process, the entire packet may be turned over. When satisfied, the spectator is told to bring the packet into view, and to deal the cards back and forth into two piles.

Either packet is now turned over and placed on top of the other. The combined group is now spread, and the face-up values added together.

Despite the seeming lack of control by the performer, the outcome is guaranteed to be eighteen. The ending condition of the packet will have the four, six and eight reversed. If these three cards are face-up, the total is eighteen. If the other five cards are face-up, their total is also eighteen.

Obviously, the simplest use of this would be to write a prediction for the number eighteen, then show the successful outcome. However, the idea lends itself to incorporation in more elaborate presentations. It can, for example, be used as part of a one-ahead routine, or as a way of locating a card previously chosen from the remainder of the pack (and controlled to the eighteenth position).

FRATERNAL TWINS

The performer removes two cards which, it is explained, will serve as predictions for two subsequent selections. The pack is cut into three piles. A spectator is asked to pick up the first pile, shuffle it, and withdraw one card. Before that card is looked at, it is explained that the *value* of this random card will be used to count to a card in the second pile, which will become the first selection. The procedure is followed, and the card thus arrived at is placed aside with the first prediction card.

A second spectator is told to take the balance of the second pile, and mix it together with the first pile. Again, a card is withdrawn from the shuffled group. Before that card is looked at, it is explained that the *name* of this random card will be used to spell to a card in the third pile, which will become the second selection. The card thus arrived at is placed aside with the second prediction card.

Each selection is now compared with its respective prediction. Despite the fairness of the procedures, both sets comprise pairs which match in color and value.

* * *

A stack is required, involving three groups as follows: the first fourteen cards from the top of the pack are the fours, fives, kings, QC and QD, in any order. This set is followed by the J D (i.e., the jack is fifteenth from the top of the pack).

The next seventeen cards consist of the AS, AH, 2S, 2H, 3C, 3D, 6S, 6H, 7C, 7D, 8C, 8D, 9H, 9C, 9D, 10S, and 10 H. These may be in any order, but the nine of clubs must be in the thirteenth position in the set (i.e., twenty-eighth from the top of the pack). This set is followed by the JH (i.e., it is thirty-third from the top of the pack).

The third set is made up of the remaining nineteen cards, with the nine of spades in fifth position (i.e., thirty-eighth from the top of the pack).

With the deck thus arranged, you are ready to begin. If you like, you can false shuffle the pack as you explain that you will use two cards as predictions. Hold the pack with the faces toward yourself. Run through the cards until you come to the 9S. The card just before the nine is *down-jogged* as it is thumbed into the right hand. Break the pack at this point, so that the jogged card is at the back of the right-hand stock, and 9S is on the face of the left-hand stock.

The left hand turns palm-down, and thumbs the 9S to the table, face-down, as you state that this will be your first prediction.

Bring the hands together, and continue running through the cards until you reach the jack of hearts. The card just before the jack is down-jogged, and the above handling is used to deal the JH face-down to the table as your second prediction.

Bring the hands together, and turn the pack face-down. The pack is turned over book-fashion into the left hand, thus retaining the two jogged cards at the inner end. The right hand now cuts off the top fourteen cards, by pressing the right thumb on the first in-jogged card and cutting off all of the cards above it. This cut-off stock is tabled.

The next seventeen cards are cut off, using the second in-jogged card as a guide. This cut-off stock is tabled next to the first. The balance of the pack is placed at the end of the row.

These cuts should be made quickly and casually. There must, of course, be no indication that you are cutting to specific locations; it should appear as if you are simply cutting the pack into approximate thirds.

Instead of using jogged cards, crimps or other tactile locators can be used; however, the jogging is efficient, and leaves no "work" in the deck at the conclusion of the routine.

The first spectator is told to pick up the first pile, mix it, and remove a card. State that whatever card is taken, its value will be used to deal to a position in the second pile. Explain that aces have a value of one, jacks are eleven, queens are twelve, and kings are thirteen. (It is important to clarify this in advance, as there is a reasonable chance that the withdrawn card *will* be a queen or king.)

The withdrawn card is turned up, and its value used to count to a card in the second pile. However, the procedure will vary slightly, depending on the value to be used.

If the card is a king, the second spectator is told to count down to the thirteenth card in the pile, which is turned face-up and placed on top of the first prediction card. If it is a queen, twelve cards are dealt off, and the *next* card is designated as the selection. If the card is a five, the counting is done from *the face* of the pile. If it is a four, four cards are dealt from the face, and the next card taken. In any event, the card arrived at will be the nine of clubs. The second spectator is asked to mix the first two piles together, and remove one card. State that whatever card is taken, its name will be used to spell to a position in the third pile.

Unlike the previous procedure, this time the dealing will *always* be done from the face. If the first dealing was done from the face, there is no discrepancy. If the first dealing was done from the top, comment during the procedural explanation, "This time, to make it even more fair, we'll deal from the face of the pile."

No matter what card is withdrawn from the combined first and second piles, it will spell with fourteen or fifteen letters. (In some cases the word "the" will be used in the spell to reach the desired total; e.g., T-H-E-A-C-E-O-F-S-P-A-D-E-S".) Obviously, if the withdrawn card is a fifteen-speller, the last card of the deal is used as the second selection; if it is a fourteen-speller, the next card is used.

Regarding this last point, there may be a procedural discrepancy. The counting used for the first selection may have used the last card of the deal, while the spelling used for the second may have used the next, or vice versa. There is no reason for this to be problematic, as the two procedures are clearly not identical, anyway. So long as you do not telegraph guilt over the discrepancy, and attitudinally convey the idea that this is the way it is always done for each respective procedure, it will not raise doubts on the part of the spectators.

The card thus arrived at will be the jack of diamonds. It remains only to turn over the two prediction cards, showing the matching results.

DISKETTE

The mystic explains, "From the dawn of history, humans have been developing systems which attempt to divine the future. These tend to fall into two categories: those which rely on interpretations of existing natural information, and those which examine patterns determined at least partially by chance.

"Examples of the former would include astrology and palmistry. Those systems of the latter type usually involve physical materials such as bones, pebbles or cards. One of the most well established methods of this type is the ancient Chinese / *Ching*, which originally determined information based upon the patterns formed by tossed yarrow stalks. In modern times it is more common to use coins. Random combinations of heads and tails are used to generate the indications of the future.

"Today I would like to demonstrate a related system which is rather more arcane. It's a relatively simple process, employing eight coins. Despite its simplicity, with proper interpretation the results can be quite profound.

"The first thing you will need to do is to decide on the area of your life you wish to examine. Here is a list of the most common categories of inquiry. Please think of a question concerning your future, and decide in which category it fits. Don't tell me the question or the category, we'll keep that your private thought for now."

The list is as shown at right.

Handing the subject eight coins, the mystic turns his back and continues. "Please put four of the coins aside. Shake the remaining four coins in your cupped hands, then toss them onto the table. Assemble those coins into a row. Obviously, the pattern of heads and tails has been determined by chance.

"Pick up the four coins you placed aside, and arrange them into another row beneath the first, so that they are in the same sequence of heads and tails.

Thus far, the arrangement of the coins has been left completely to chance. Here is where we'll use your personal input. Spell out the name of the category of inquiry you thought of a moment ago. For each letter of the spell, you will turn over a coin. Start at the left end of either row, and continue moving along to the right. If you reach the end of that row, go back to the left and continue from there, until you complete the word.

"At any point during this process you can switch to the next position in the other row. If you choose to do this, make sure it is done on impulse, and not by calculation."

This done, the mystic turns around, and interprets the pattern of the coins. The interpretation is accurate, specifically in terms of the participant's thought of question.

**MONEY
FRIENDSHIP
HEALTH
ADVENTURE
BUSINESS
LOVE
TRAVELS
SEX**

* * *

The method is based on a rather complicated routine of Bob Hummer's, "Dial A Date Deal" (probably from the 1940's). In "Magic Dungeon Mentalism" (1972), Howard Adams had a simpler version, "Starstrick." The approach I will describe here is greatly streamlined, and wrapped in a fortune-telling presentation which hopefully adds some logic to the structure.

The presentation is followed as described above. When you turn around and claim to interpret the pattern of the coins, this is exactly the case. What you are looking for are matched pairs between the two rows. That is, you examine the coins at the right end of each row. If both are tails, or both are heads, it's considered a match.

From the parity of the four pairs, a binary number is generated. This is worked from right to left, as is standard. (I am presuming here that you are sitting opposite the spectator, so that his/her left orientation is on your right.)

The first pair at the right end has a value of one; the next pair has a value of two; the third pair has a value of four; the final pair at the left end has a value of eight.

As an example, we'll say the layout looks like this:

H	T	H	T
T	H	H	T

This converts to the binary number 0011, which converts to the decimal number three.

Each of the eight words on the list will generate a different number. In three cases (*business*, *adventure* and *friendship*) this will be a two-digit number. In these instances, subtract ten.

By following this formula you will discover that each word generates a number which indicates its position on the list. There is one exception to this: *love* (the perennial exception), which generates a value of zero. That category is positioned sixth on the list, and as no other word generates the number six it is an easy exception to remember.

The list is out in the open, and there is no reason for the spectator to suspect that it doubles as a cue-sheet. Having determined the category, it is now up to you to devise an divinatory interpretation of the coins which fits the nature of the spectator's question.

With practice, you can develop surprisingly accurate answers to the spectator's unspoken query, by combining your secret knowledge of the category with Cold Reading techniques. There is, of course, an extensive literature on that subject.

Instead of using common coins, you may prefer to use talismanic tokens with mysterious symbols. A visit to your local New Age supply shop should provide an assortment to choose from. Another alternative, fitting in with the introductory / *Ching* references, would be to use ancient oriental coins. Tarot cards drawn from the Major Arcana are another option.

Ordinary coins do, however, carry the advantage of allowing this to be a completely impromptu routine.

If you are willing to jettison two categories from the list, you can also reduce the number of coins to six. In this case, the list is as shown at right.

The spectator makes two three-coin rows, and the same procedure is followed as already explained. The positional values are *not* the same as for standard binary notation. Both the first (right end) and middle positions carry a value of one; the last (left end) position has a value of three.

Thus, for example, the layout may look like this:

H	T	H	T	T	H
---	---	---	---	---	---

LOVE
MONEY
BUSINESS
TRAVELS
HEALTH
SEX

This converts to Oil, which in this value system would convert to the decimal number two.

Consulting the list would reveal that the spectator is thinking about *money*.

In this version, *sex* has a value of zero (at least according to these mathematics). As with the first system, this goes into the otherwise unused sixth position.

OCT-SEE, MORE ON

Three books ago, in *Thequal* (1984), I explained a routine entitled "ESpectrum," which used eight cards, each bearing a different color. In my next book, *Doth* (1986), I described a related effect, "Inspectrum."

The following also uses eight color cards, with a quite different methodological approach. It can be used alone, or in conjunction with one of the above-mentioned routines.

The eight-card set is introduced, and handed to the first spectator for thorough mixing. The performer turns away as this is done. The packet is now given to the second spectator, who chooses a color via a fair and simple procedure. This, too, is done with the performer's back turned. The noted card is mixed back with the others prior to the performer turning around.

The packet is given to the first spectator, who repeats the process while the performer turns away, again mixing his/her card back among the others before the performer turns around.

Immediately, without asking questions and without touching the cards, the performer identifies both thought-of colors.

* * *

What makes this situation interesting is that the performer determines each spectator's selection *before* the spectator selects it.

You will need a set of eight cards, each bearing a different color: red, orange, yellow, green, blue, violet, pink, black.

The backs of the cards are marked. The simplest system for this is to assign number values to the colors using the system discussed in the previously mentioned routines. The first six are in the standard Color Wheel sequence, which can be remembered by the old grade school mnemonic acronym, *Roy G. Bv*. Taking the colors in this order, red = 1, orange = 2, and so forth.

Pink receives a value of seven, easily remembered using the phrase "seventh heaven," which can be associated via a mental image of *pink* clouds. As for black, assign it the value of zero, as per its absence of color.

Once the backs are marked, you're ready to perform. Begin by displaying the packet, showing the various colors. Hand them to your first spectator, and request that the cards be vigorously mixed. Make a point of turning your head away during this.

When the spectator says that the mixing is over, turn around and take the deck from the first participant, handing it over to the second. As you do this, read the marked back of the top card of the packet. Remember this color; in a moment it will be chosen by the second spectator.

Turn your back, and direct the second spectator in performing an Under/Down Shuffle (i.e., the top card is transferred to the bottom; the next is dealt to the table, next to the bottom, and so on, until only one card remains). The spectator is told to note and remember this final card, then shuffle it back amongst the others.

As you've had your back turned from before the selection process began until the legitimate concluding shuffle, it will seem that there is no way you have any access to information concerning the spectator's card. However, *the noted card will be the one which was on top at the start of the procedure*, so you're way ahead of the game.

Turn around, take the re-mixed packet from the second spectator, and hand it over to the first. As this is done, read the back of the new top card. Turn your back, and direct the first spectator in the Under/Down selection procedure. Have the spectator note the final card and mix it back with the others.

Turn to face your participants. At this point they may expect some further action, verbal or physical; thus, it is quite startling when you immediately reveal which color each is thinking of. Retrieve the cards, and go home.

Of course, the routine can be done for a single spectator. However, the impact is significantly stronger with two, and the opportunities for sighting the marks are naturally contained within the two-person structure.

There is no reason why this routine must be done with colors. Any subject can be used: symbols, words, celebrity portraits, scenic photographs, &c.

FOREHAND

The idea of generating matching sequences in mixed packets has been explored from a wide variety of methodological angles, by such notable inventors as Hen Fetsch and Paul Curry, among many others. In the recent book "And A Packet Of Cards," Karl Fulves describes a version using two three-card sets, entitled "Hand Out." In that same volume can be found an interesting variation by Roy Walton, "Strathclyde Solution."

Could the basic idea of the Fulves method be applicable to four-card sets? Indeed; in fact, the procedures are a bit more straightforward.

Eight cards, consisting of four pairs, are required. Playing cards can be used, but the performance will evoke more interest if you employ ESP symbol cards. For the purpose of this explanation we will assume that symbol cards are used, two each of the circle, cross, waves and square.

The backs of one pair must be marked in the upper left and lower right corners. We'll assume this is the pair of squares.

At the start of the routine the eight cards are arranged cyclically. For example, from the face: circle, cross, waves, square, circle, cross, waves, square. The sequence need not be exactly this, but the marked cards must be either in the third and seventh positions, or in the fourth and eighth.



Begin by fanning out the cards, displaying the two four-card sets. Square up the packet, obtaining a left little finger break above the lowermost pair of cards. The right hand grasps the packet from above, and the right thumb takes over the break.

State that you will give one set of cards to the spectator. The left hand comes over to the packet, and the left thumb draws the top card (circle) into the left hand. At the same time, the left fingers milk the two bottom cards from beneath the break into the left hand, behind the circle card. The left little finger obtains a fine break above the lowermost pair.

The hands come back together, and the left thumb draws the next card (cross) onto its stock. The hands again come together, and the left thumb draws off the next card (waves), but at the same time the two cards above the left little finger break are stolen back beneath the right-hand stock, Biddle-fashion.

The hands come back together, and the left thumb draws off the next card (square) from the right-hand group. At this point the spectators will believe you have simply counted four cards, one of each design, into the left hand, retaining a mate set in the right. The actual state of affairs is that the left-hand stock is, in order from the face: square, waves, waves, square. The right-hand stock runs: circle, cross, cross, circle.

Flip the left-hand packet face-down, and hand it to the spectator, asking that the cards be thoroughly mixed. Say that you'll do the same with your cards. In fact, you must bring your packet to an *aabb* order. This can be circles above crosses, or vice-versa. If you don't want to pay undue attention to this mixing, you can simply execute an Elmsley Count, which will achieve the necessary outcome.

Place your packet face-down onto the table, and gesture for the spectator to do the same. Say, "You've mixed your cards into a random arrangement that I could not possibly know." As this is said, casually reach over and slightly spread the spectator's packet, as if for emphasis. In fact, you are spreading the cards just enough to be able to sight the positions of the marked cards in the spectator's packet.

Continue by saying, "And, I have mixed my cards into an order you could not possibly know." Explain that you will now put the two packets together, and have them mixed yet again. Here, the next step in the procedure will vary, according to the condition of the spectator's cards.

There are only three generic outcomes for the spectator's mixing: divided (*aabb*), interlaced (*abab*), and palindromic (*abba*). It does not matter which symbol is "a" or "b" in these arrangements. You will know immediately from the locations of the marked cards which of the three conditions exists in the spectator's packet. Continue according to the following procedures:

If the spectator's packet is divided: This is the simplest situation. Instruct the spectator to place either packet on top of the other, then to deal the combined packet into two piles, dealing back and forth. Turn up the top card of either pile, displaying a match. Put those cards aside, and turn up the new top cards, showing another match. Repeat with the third and fourth cards.

If the spectator's packet is interlaced: Drop your packet on top of the spectator's. Now, direct the spectator to pick up the combined set and perform an Under/Down Shuffle (top card transferred to the bottom of the packet, next dealt to the table, next to the bottom, &c., until the stock is exhausted). Direct the spectator to do another Under/Down Shuffle. Now, have the top four cards dealt out into a row from left to right, and the next four cards dealt out on top of them (again from left to right). Turn over the four pairs, revealing four matches.

If the spectator's packet is palindromic: Drop your packet on top of the spectator's. Pick up the combined set, and explain that you are going to have the spectator execute a Down/Under Shuffle. Illustrate this by dealing the top card to the table, the next to the bottom. Now, drop the packet onto the dealt card, and push the entire pile over to the spectator. The spectator does the Down/Under Shuffle, then deals the cards into two rows, which will prove to be matching pairs.

KNOWKER

The performer comments on the obvious value of being able to read the mind of one's opponent at the gaming table. A pack of cards is shuffled by a spectator. Five poker hands are dealt out, and a spectator picks up any one. Fanning the cards toward him/herself, the spectator concentrates on the best card in the hand.

After a suitable bout of brow-knitting, the performer reveals the thought-of card.

"Sometimes," the performer comments, "just knowing one card is not enough." Therefore, a more difficult demonstration is attempted. The hands are gathered and returned to the pack, and five more hands dealt. A spectator picks up one, and this time concentrates on the full identity of the hand.

The performer gets this one, too.

The pack is ungimmicked, and may be left with the spectator as a souvenir at the finish. There *is* a rather extensive set-up, which will seem much more complicated upon first reading than is actually the case.

The preparation begins with the removal of five specific cards, which we will refer to as the Full House set. These are the KS, KH, QC, QD, and QS, which must be arranged in that order from the top. The order of these cards must be committed to memory, easily done as the suits run in the popular "shocked" rotation.

The balance of the pack is prepared as follows: first, take out the four eights, four deuces, and two of the nines. Place these cards aside.

You are now going to build two face-down piles. Take out a three, four, five, six and seven (of any suits), and place them in a pile, arranged in numerical order. Take out another set of these same values. Arrange them in the *reverse* order of the first set. Table this pile next to the first.

Take out the four aces, and place them on top of one of the piles. Take out the kings of clubs and diamonds and the queen of hearts, and place them on top of the other pile.

Divide the remaining cards in half, placing ten onto each pile.

Pick up the eights, deuces and tens you placed aside. Arrange them into two sets, one in 8-8-2-2-9 order, the other in 9-2-2-8-8 order. Place one set on top of each pile.

Crimp the top card of one pile. Place the other pile on top. The set-up is complete. I realize this may seem confusing, but upon examination you will see that the deck is now arranged into clusters, in order from the top:

- A. Five cards consisting of two eights, two deuces, and a nine.
- B. Ten indifferent cards.
- C. Four aces *or* two kings and a queen.
- D. Five cards consisting of a three through seven in sequence.
- E. Five cards consisting of two eights, two deuces, and a nine *in the reverse order to set A.*
(The top card of this cluster is crimped.)
- F. Ten indifferent cards.
- G. The complement to set C: four aces or two kings and a queen.
- H. Five cards consisting of a three through seven in sequence, *in the reverse order to set D.*

At the start of the routine, the Full House set is in your pocket or lap. Establish the premise of telepathic gambling, and bring out the deck. Cut above the crimp, and begin the actions of a Riffle Shuffle. Pretend to change your mind, pushing the cards over to a spectator with the comment, "You do it, instead."

The spectator Riffle Shuffles the portions together. While this is being done, palm the Full House set in your right hand. When the spectator has finished the shuffle, extend your left hand for the return of the pack. The right hand comes over the deck, ostensibly for the purpose of squaring the cards, and loads its cards on top.

Say, "You shuffled, so by the rules of poker I get to cut." As this is said, riffle off five cards from the bottom of the deck with the right thumb, and obtain a break at that point. Giving action to your words, Double-Undercut the pack, bringing the bottom five cards to the top.

If your audience is well versed in poker procedure, this double cutting action may be suspect. An alternative is to give the deck a straight cut at the break-point, tilting the pack forward so that the spectators cannot view the edges and see how extremely deep you are cutting.

Obviously, another alternative is simply to execute a Pass at the break, and dispense with any reference to cutting the cards.

Hand the deck to another spectator, and ask for five poker hands to be dealt out, face-down, in standard rotation. Invite a spectator to pick up any one of the packets, to look at the cards, and concentrate on the best one.

The spectator will almost certainly interpret this to mean the highest-valued card in the hand, which is precisely what you want. I prefer to use "best" rather than "highest," as it seems less restrictive and makes the situation seem uncontrived. If you are concerned that a particular spectator will interpret the term to mean "favorite," "luckiest," or "most aesthetically pleasing," by all means use the more explicit term.

At any rate, the spectator will now be thinking of a card, and you know exactly what it is. The highest card in any hand will be from the Full House set. The first dealt hand will contain the king of spades; the second will contain the king of hearts; the third the queen of clubs, and so on.

After appropriate histrionics, announce the name of the card being thought of. Comment, "Sometimes it's not enough to know just one card in the hand," and offer to repeat the experiment using more difficult standards.

Have the spectator turn the selected hand face-down, and drop it onto any other packet. The other hands are similarly added to this pile, in any order. The combined twenty-five-card set is replaced on top of the pack.

You may, at this point, want to give the pack a quick false shuffle or false cut, but it is not really necessary, after all, the pack was legitimately mixed by a spectator previously.

Have a spectator deal out five hands. At this point, thanks to a delayed use of the Gilbreath Principle plus the added se; of cards which were unaffected by the spectator's mixing, you are in the pleasing position of knowing the precise contents of one hand, the general contents of two hands, and some approximate information about the rest.

The fourth dealt hand is the one you know fully; it contains a full house, queens over kings. These are the cards from your memorized set.

The third dealt hand will contain two pair, eights over deuces, with a nine kicker. You do not know the suits of these cards, but revealing this much will be amply impressive.

The fifth dealt hand will contain a seven-high straight. Again, you don't know the suits; again, that is rather moot considering what you can reveal.

So, if the spectator chooses one of the last three hands for this phase, you're home free, and can bring the routine to a strong finish by revealing the general contents of the hand.

Should the spectator pick up the first or second dealt hand, your situation is far from hopeless; I shall offer several approaches for dealing with this situation.

The first and second hands' contents are not controlled. However, it is certain that there are no aces, and almost certain that there are any tens or court cards. Therefore, you can announce that your hunch is that the hand is made up of spot cards. The second dealt hand is likely to contain a pair of eights or a pair of deuces, possibly both. With a bit of pumping you can often come surprisingly close to identifying the contents of the hand.

If, however, you do not enjoy this type of risk-taking approach, it is possible to get around having to identify the cards of one of the first two hands, should it be chosen. This is done by the simple expedient of turning to another spectator, and asking him or her to try guessing the general contents of that hand.

If this spectator's guess is correct, you can take credit for an astonishing display of psychic influence. If the spectator's guess is wrong, it only serves to prove just how difficult a demonstration this is.

Go on to have another hand chosen. If it is one of the latter three, you can reveal its make-up. If it is the other one of the hands you are not certain about, let another spectator try guessing the contents. To give a sense of progression, this time have two cards from the chosen hand turned over, and let the spectator try guessing the total hand with this informational "advantage." Of course, whatever hand is chosen next will be one whose contents you know, and you can conclude successfully.

MONAURAL

The performer hands a pocket-size address book to a spectator, who is invited to look over its contents. There are dozens of entries for different names and phone numbers. The spectator thinks of any person in the book, and the performer reveals the thought-of name and phone number.

You may wonder if the effect can really be as direct as what I have just described. For all intents and purposes, it is. There is a system for honing in on the correct information, of course, and it makes use of some pumping. However, this is concealed in the structure, and the resulting routine will play as very straightforward.

An address book is a very functional vehicle for mentalism, as it is an everyday object which everyone is familiar with, which contains a wide range of information in a convenient space. The commonly available pocket-size books are small enough to allow you to always have on hand, and thus be ready at any time for a seemingly impromptu performance.

I am not the first to realize the viability of this prop; tests with personal phone books have been published by others, notably Bob Farmer and Larry Becker. My system is rather different, and is based on intertwined methods.

The contents of the phone book are shown on the next page. There are seventy names. Of course, the actual article would not be on a single sheet; you would purchase an address book, and fill in the names and numbers in your own hand.

Upon examination, you will see that the names in this list are familiar ones from the world of magic and mentalism. The reason for this is more than the opportunity to flatter those friends of mine whose names are therein. (A note here to those friends who are not on the list: it's probably because your name did not fit the system ~ or, perhaps I just don't like you that much.)

Because the names are already known, the cue-list that will be employed does not require first names. By listing only surnames, the physical size of the list can be cut in half, allowing for a very tiny prompter.

The cue list is shown at right. The names are divided into seven groups of ten. You will notice that at the top of each group there is a letter and a number. The letters have to do with the initial phase of the pumping system, which utilizes the Progressive Anagram principle. (I provided historical information on this principle in an earlier book in this series, "Amperthand.") The mnemonic for the pump is ONE EAR. When the spectator thinks of a name, he or she is told to concentrate on the *last* name only.

The pumping will begin with the first key-word,

ONE. State that you sense that there is an O in the name. If you are told that there is *not* an O in the name, jump over to the second key-word, EAR.

If the presence of an O is confirmed, state that you feel there is an N in the word. If you get a negative response, this phase of the work is over; you know that the thought-of name is one of those on the O9 list.

If N is confirmed, continue by guessing that there is an E in the name. If E is denied, the name must be on the N8 list. If E is verified, the name must be on the E7 list.

If your original guess of O was denied, your next guess will be E (the first letter of the second keyword, EAR). If this is wrong, the name is on the X3 list.

If E is present, go on to guess A. If that is wrong, the name is on the E6 list. If there is an A, go on to guess R. If there is no R, the name is on the AS list. If there *is* an R, the name is on the R4 list.

The system is not difficult to follow. You make your guesses until you either complete a key-word, or are shot down. At this point you will always know that the name is on the list headed by the last correct letter you guessed.

O9	N8	E7	
1 Elliott	1 Jordan	1 Benson	
2 Hoy	2 Rawson	2 Vernon	
SMcComb	3 Goshman	3 Anderson	
4 Bloom	4 Lyons	4 Samelson	
5 Warlock	5 Burton	5 Orleans	
6 Vosburgh	6 Thompson	6 Pendragon	
7 Fox	7 Ascanio	7 Lorraine	
SFogel	8 Collins	SOgden	
9 Stover	gCorinda	9 Reynolds	
0 Rogers	0 Onosaka	0 Wonder	
E6	A5	R4	X3
1 Burger	1 James	1 Farmer	1 Slaight
2 Fisher	2 Keating	2 Germaine	2 Marshall
3 Hummer	3 Hallema	3 Cartier	3 King
4 Elmsley	4 Chelman	4 Hauser	4Truzzi
5 Miller	5 Newmann	SCarlyle	SBritiand
6 McBride	6 Daley	GLarsen	eWillmart
7 Weber	7Menna	7 Baker	7Jaks
8 Brunelle	8 Neale	8 Ireland	SAndruzzi
9 Shiels	9Faye	9 Gardner	QTamariz
0 Freer	0 Annemann	0 Waters	OMinch

-A-	Alex Elmsley 684-5705	-K-	-R-
Theo Annemann (212)-570-0232		Fred Keating (212)-572-8417	Terri Rogers 960-1446
	-F-		
Leslie Anderson 743-5052	Bob Farmer 461-9984	Jennifer King 353-6284	Charles Reynolds (212)-749-6450
Arturo Ascanio 857-4140	Maurice Fogel 968-3408	-L-	Clayton Rawson (212)-852-7512
		Howard Lyons 854-4152	
Tony Andruzzi (312)-358-1221	Anna Faye 579-2800	Irene Larsen 466-4254	-S-
			Mel Stover 969-3501
-B-	John Fisher 682-6286	Sid Lorraine 747-0154	Peter Samelson (212)-744-9140
Roy Benson (212)-741-4920			
	Karrell Fox 967-7458	-M-	Tony Shiels 689-1265
Al Baker (212)-467-5974		Frances Marshall (312)-352-8420	
	Winston Freer 680-2012	Stephen Minch (206)-350-0182	Allan Slight 351-5205
Gaetan Bloom 964-7129			
	-G-		-T-
Eugene Burger (312)-644-6294	Martin Gardner 469-3412	Katlyn Miller 685-7152	Juan Tamariz 359-2134
David Britland 355-1819	Albert Goshman 853-5941	Billy McComb 963-9537	Pam Thompson (818)-856-9313
Jon Brunelle (312)-688-6294	Karl Germaine 462-7456	Lisa Menna (415)-577-5032	Marcello Truzzi 354-3465
Lance Burton (702)-855-5209	-H-	Jeff McBride (212)-686-6837	-V-
	Bob Hummer 683-9934		Dai Vernon 742-1842
-C-	Flip Hallema 573-8595	-N-	Jack Vosburgh 966-6780
Francis Carlyle 465-8420		Robert Neale 578-4941	
Tony Corinda 859-1274	Finn Hauser 464-8204	George Newmann 575-6462	-W-
			Michael Weber 687-3759
Christian Chelman 574-7401	David Hoy 962-1810		
		-O-	Peter Warlock 965-0.144
Rhoda Cartier (212)-463-4174	-I-	Jan Orleans (312)-745-6245	
	Laurie Ireland (312)-468-5445		Thomas Waters 460-1301
Stanley Collins 858-0125		Ton Onosaka (813)-850-1220	
	-J-		Phil Willmarth (312)-356-8553
	Stanley Jaks (212)-357-0125	Tom Ogden 748-1371	
-D-			
Jacob Daley (212)-576-6791	Stewart James 571-0141	-P-	Tommy Wonder 740-1321
		Charlotte Pendragon (702)-746-6451	
-E-			
Bruce Elliott (212)-91-9405	Charles Jordan 851-6450		

About fifteen percent of the time you will have no negative responses. About fifteen percent of the time you will have only a negative response at the very outset, which will likely not even register because it's as if you hadn't really begun. About thirty percent of the time you will have one negative response on your second or third call. About forty-five percent of the time you'll have an initial mistake, and a subsequent one. Two negatives is the maximum you'll receive, and even in the worst-case scenario this is not a presentational problem, for two important reasons.

First, this is clearly a difficult test. If you are imperfect in reading the spectator's mind it can heighten the drama, not take away from it. Second, such mistakes lead right into the next phase of the routine, for once you have narrowed down the spectator's thought to a ten-name group you say, "You know, I seem to be having a hard time connecting with you using letters. Perhaps we can build a greater rapport with numbers. Look at the person's phone number. If there's an area code, ignore it, because it might confuse me. Look at the first digit of the actual phone number."

Here, you are going to accurately reveal that first digit. This is because every name in a given group has a phone number that starts with the same digit. Thus, if you ascertained that the thought-of name was in the O9 group, the first digit would be a nine; for the N8 group, an 8, and so on.

You also now know the second digit, because they are also consistent. The phone numbers starting with digits over six always continue with a digit which is three less. Thus, if a number begins with nine, the next digit is six. An eight is followed by a five, and a seven is followed by a four. The lower numbers are followed by digits that are two greater: six is followed by eight, five by seven, four by six, and three by five.

So, your guesses on the first two digits of the phone number will always be correct. The third digit, however, you do not know; it will be anything from zero to nine. When you come to the third digit, say that you feel less sure about this one - it's coming in less clearly. Guess the digit five. Ten percent of the time, you'll be right. If the spectator gives you a negative response, say, "Hmmm, I was close, wasn't I?" No matter what the spectator answers, continue, "Well, what was the digit?"

As soon as the spectator tells you, you now know *everything* about the thought-of name and number. The third digit informs you of the position of the name on its list. If you were correct in guessing five, the name would be the fifth one on the list. If the spectator told you the third digit was actually a nine, the name is on the ninth on the list, and so on.

It is at this point that you will need to consult a prompter, to learn the name. The cue-sheet shown above can be reduced to a size small enough to be concealed in your palm, and still be easily read.

Now you know the thought-of surname. Because the names were chosen for familiarity, you also know the given name. And, from the full name you know the last four digits of the phone number, because they consist of the first four consonant sounds of the name rendered into Number Alphabet.

Let's look at an example. The spectator thinks of a name. You guess O. The spectator tells you this is wrong. You say, "I'm sorry — it's not an O, it's an E." This is confirmed.

You continue by guessing A, and this is denied. You now know that the name is on the E6 list.

You suggest trying the phone number, instead, telling the spectator to ignore the area code if there is one. You call the digits six and eight, correctly. Now, you guess five, and are wrong. You say, "I was close, wasn't I?" The spectator says that you were not — the third digit was a one.

A glance at the cue-list tells you that the first name on the E6 list is *Burger*; so now you know that the full name being thought of is *Eugene Burger*. You know that the exchange of the phone number is 681, and the last four digits are 6295 (from "Eugene Bur").

From here, you can deliver the full information in whatever order you choose. You can elect to return to the name, getting several individual letters correctly and then revealing the full name, then completing the number. If you prefer, you can finish out the number, then go back to the name.

A few comments are in order concerning the construction of the list. Obviously, I chose names that are familiar to me; some may not be so for you, in which case you will find that with a little experimentation you can come up with your own alternatives. When I first began constructing name lists, I attempted to make an even alphabetic distribution, until it occurred to me that a real phone book would not have this quality. I did, however, opt for a reasonable distribution of gender, to reflect a legitimate listing.

You will notice that many of the names have area codes. This is primarily because such would be the case with a real set of phone numbers. I live in Los Angeles, so names associated with LA. do not have area codes. The ones that do are for people I can firmly associate with cities whose area codes I already know, such as 212 for New York, 312 for Chicago, and 702 for Las Vegas. Thus, when a spectator has thought of a name which has an area code, I will automatically know those numbers, without extra memory work, and can provide that information, too.

One last point: a real book of this sort would most likely have addresses for most or all of the names. If you decide to make this prop I would urge you to include addresses. By using ones that you already know (the true addresses for various names), you will again have additional information to feed back without further memorizing.

This system may seem complicated, but as with everything else in this book (and this series), it's far more elaborate in the devising than in the application.

THE SCHIZOID ROSARY

Two spectators are Invited to participate, each being given a folded piece of paper to be opened and read at a later time. A deck of cards is handed to Spectator A. The performer explains, "If we were to use the entire pack, this experiment would take too long... Therefore, we shall use only two dozen cards."

To make things fair, the spectator is asked to cut off some cards from the pack. The next 24 cards from that cut-point are dealt into a tabled pile. The rest of the cards (those above and below the dealt stock) are put away.

To add a randomizing factor, Spectator A is asked to take the tabled stock; to think of a number from ten to fifteen, and to deal that many cards from the in-hands group to the table. Next, the spectator is told to Riffle Shuffle the two groups together.

Clearly, the 24-card stock has been fairly chosen, and furthermore well mixed. The assisting spectator is now told to deal exactly one dozen cards onto the table, thus arriving at two 12-card packets.

The performer turns to Spectator B, saying, "So far you've not had the chance to make any decisions. However, I've saved the most important decision for you." Spectator B is invited to choose either 12-card set to work with; the un-chosen group is retained by Spectator A.

Spectator A Is instructed to sort through his/her cards, and to count the number of red cards in the group. Spectator B is asked to count how many court cards are in his/her set.

The predictions are now read and compared to the spectators' results. The note for Spectator A reads, 'You will have exactly eight red cards.' The note for Spectator B reads, 'You will have exactly three court cards.'

Both predictions are accurate. The deck is ungimmicked, and may be used for subsequent work, or left with the spectators as a souvenir.



I first became acquainted with the Gilbreath Principle in 1960, via Martin Gardner's "Mathematical Games" column in *Scientific American*. It has fascinated me ever since. I've published a variety of effects based upon it, but I find myself frequently returning to the principle, convinced that there are always further potential applications.

This routine involves an unusual stack for use with the Gilbreath Principle. Arrange a set of twelve cards in order from top to bottom:

R-R-B-R-R-B-R-R-B-R-R-B

(Underlining denotes a court card; all others are spot cards.) Upon examination, you will see that this arrangement forms an endless loop, built on two coexisting cycles: every third card is black, and every fourth card is a court card.

To prepare a full pack for this routine, you will need to construct three 12-card sets according to the arrangement on the previous page. Place one set atop another, so that you now have a 36-card arrangement.

The remaining sixteen cards will consist of two red spot cards, three black court cards, and eleven black spot cards. The 36-card run is now extended by placing the two leftover red spot cards beneath the stack, followed by one black spot card. One of the leftover black court cards is positioned on top of the stack. You now have a 40-card stack, with twelve leftover nulls. Place two nulls beneath the stack, the remaining ten on top, and you're ready to perform.

The presentation is as described at the start of this write-up. The prediction notes are handed out, and the procedures followed. The only thing you must make sure of is that when Spectator A cuts the pack at least ten and less than twenty-seven cards are cut off. The latter requirement can be assured by asking the spectator to cut off "less than half" - a reasonable request given that you are about to have two dozen cards dealt from the cut point.

Should the spectator cut off less than ten cards (which is not likely), simply say, "Oh, cut off a few more, to make it difficult..." This has no actual meaning, but it sounds "fair", and will pass.

The rest of the routine works itself. It does not matter which 12-card set is chosen by Spectator B, for thanks to the set-up (and the peculiarities of the Gilbreath Principle), both packets will contain exactly eight red cards, and exactly three court cards.

Of course, you will want to casually gather the spectators' packets as the predictions are being read, to prevent anyone from comparing their contents. Mind you, this has never seemed to occur to anyone who has seen this routine to date, but better safe than sorry. The evidence thus removed, you are left with an ordinary pack of cards.

RAW DEAL

In this card routine, the deck itself reveals a spectator's chosen number, and also locates a selected card. A simple set-up is required: seven indifferent cards, followed by an ace through ten (of any suits), then the balance of the pack.

False shuffle, retaining the seventeen-card arrangement on top. Spread the pack, and have a spectator take a card. Make sure you have spread past the set-up when the spectator removes a card.

As the cards are spread, count twenty cards. Separate the pack at that point, for the selected card's replacement. Thus, the chosen card is now twenty-first from the top of the pack.

False shuffle again, if you wish. Table the pack. Instruct the spectator to cut off a small amount of cards — ten or less. This cut-off stock is placed aside, uncounted.

Now tell the spectator to pick up the remainder of the pack, and to deal ten cards into a face-down pile. Another face-down pile is then dealt next to the first. The rest of the deck is discarded.

Ask the spectator to choose either pile. If the second one is chosen, say, "We have no idea as to which pile your card is in — assuming it is in either. However, as you've chosen that pile, we'll look for your card there. And, we'll use the other pile to discover some interesting information..."

Should the spectator choose the first pile, simply say, "We'll use your chosen pile to discover some interesting information..."

In any event, the first-dealt pile is now taken by the spectator, who is instructed to perform a Down/Under Deal, retaining the final card. This last card is turned face-up, and its value noted.

Say, "The value of this card tells me exactly how many cards you cut off previously..." Direct the spectator to count the cut-off packet. It will indeed match the value of the noted card.

Continue, "It also tells me how to find your chosen card." Have the spectator count down in the second pile to the position indicated by the noted card's value. The card at that position will be the chosen one.

And, when the performer's note is read, it is found that this was the very same hexagram that had been cast the night before.

In the past I have developed several routines using the I Ching. It's a commercial premise, for most people have at least heard of it, and thus there is a built-in intrigue. When I read Jack Yates' "I Yates" routine (themed around the I Ching, although a very different

STAX-VOLT

This routine has a presentational similarity to my "Abacus" (first published in *Apocalypse* in 1980, and later in my 1982 book *"Thunday"*). The method uses an ancient mathematical forcing principle, combined with a Reverse Faro procedure which has been explored by numerous inventors.

The deck is stacked with the queen of clubs second-from-top, and the other queens in the sixth, eighth and ninth positions. The cards in positions twelve through twenty are an ace through nine, in sequence. (These may be of any suits.) The bottom card of the pack is a ten.

Start by false shuffling the pack. Write a prediction for the QC, and place it aside.

Turn your back. Instruct a spectator to think of a number between ten and twenty, and to deal that number of cards from the pack into a face-down pile.

With your back still turned, comment, "Of course, I don't know your chosen number of cards. To insure that I also have no idea as to the position of any card in your packet, we'll alter its condition..."

Tell the spectator to add the two digits of the thought-of number together, to arrive at a new number. That many cards are now transferred from the top to the bottom of the packet.

Turn to face the spectators. Invite another spectator to cut the remainder of the pack in half. Say, "We'll come back to this later," as you place the lower half of the pack cross-wise on top of the cut-off stock. (This is, of course, the classic "X-ing The Cut" force.)

Take the packet from the first participant, reminding the audience that you had no control over the quantity of cards chosen, nor the positions of the cards within the packet.

Explain that you will sort through the cards, to arrive at the center of the packet. Stress the fact that, were a different quantity being used, a different card would be arrived at.

Perform a Reverse Faro (i.e., the top card is out-jogged; the next is in-Jogged; the next out-jogged, and so on, until the cards are all alternating up and down). Strip out the out-jogged stock, and table it face-down.

Perform another Reverse Faro, again stripping out the out-jogged cards and tabling that group next to the first.

A third Reverse Faro is executed, and again the out-jogged portion is extracted and tabled.

Depending on the original size of the packet, you will have either one or two cards left. If one is left, point out that this was (apparently) the center card of the packet. Turn that card face-up. If two are left, say, "This is as close to the exact center as we can get..." Then table the two-card set, and turn its top card face-up.

Either way, you will arrive at the QC, in what appears to be a fair manner dictated by the spectator's thought-of number. Have your prediction opened and read.

Offer to explain how the trick was accomplished. Ask the first spectator to state what number was originally thought of. Say, "Well, the reason I knew we'd arrive at the queen of clubs is that I knew you would choose that number. In fact, not only did I know it... so did the other spectator!"

To "prove" this, remove the cards above and below the cross-point in the remainder of the pack — supposedly the location cut to by the second spectator. Turn these cards face-up. They will yield the first spectator's number. (In other words, if the first spectator thought of twelve, the two cards will be a ten and a deuce. If the thought-of number was sixteen, the two cards will be a ten and a six, and so on.)

Continue, "I can understand how all of this was accomplished... but what even I can't explain is this..." Turn up the top card of each of the three piles discarded during the Reverse Faro procedure, revealing the other queens.

A prediction is introduced. The performer displays a pack of ESP symbol cards. These are mixed by the spectator, who is then told to deal the cards face-up from the top of the shuffled pack, until any symbol has been repeated.

The spectator deals, for example, a square, a circle, then another circle ~ at which point, according to the instructions, the dealing stops. The prediction is now revealed. It reads:

*"YOU WILL DEAL TO A PAIR OF CIRCLES - BUT
NOT UNTIL YOU'VE ALSO DEALT ONE SQUARE."*

As you've no doubt guessed, the method makes use of the Gilbreath Principle. The pack is a standard ESP set, consisting of twenty-five cards, five each of five symbols. A set-up is required: the top three cards of the deck are a circle, a square, and a circle. The 13th, 14th and 15th cards are a square, a circle, and a square.

You will also need to prepare a two-way out for your prediction. One message reads as shown above. The other message is the same, but with the symbols reversed: 'YOU WILL DEAL TO A PAIR OF SQUARES ~ BUT NOT UNTIL YOU'VE ALSO DEALT ONE CIRCLE.'

The audience is only going to be aware of one prediction, so you'll need access to either message. So, for instance, the messages can be in either side of a double-envelope, or in either side of a Himber Wallet.

At the start of the routine, the pack is displayed face-up, as its historical use as an ESP testing device is discussed. As nineteen of the symbols are in genuinely random order, no pattern will be discerned during this display.

Turn the pack face-down, and cut off exactly twelve cards. You can achieve this by pre-crimping the 13th card, or by thumb-counting. Place the two half-packs in front of the spectator, and instruct him/her to Riffle Shuffle the two packs together.

Proceed as per the effect description. When the spectator deals from the top of the shuffled pack, only two outcomes can be reached — both of which are covered by your predictions.

FORCE MAJEUR

I've long been fond of the Matrix Force. The principle was first given magical application by Walter Gibson in "Date Sense" (*Jinx* #41, 1938), where it was used as an information-getting technique. The forcing modification was put into print by Maurice Kraitichik (*"Mathematical Recreations"*, 1942).

1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16

The Matrix Force, in brief: the performer shows a four-by-four grid of sequential numbers, as in the diagram at left. The spectator is asked to circle any number. The other numbers in the same row and column as the circled one are crossed out. Any one of the remaining numbers is circled and again its row- and column-mates are cancelled. One of the remaining numbers is circled, and again those numbers in the same row and column are eliminated. One number remains, and this is added together with the three circled ones.

Despite the seeming fairness of the procedure, the four designated numbers will always total thirty-four.

Various routines with the force have been devised over the years, by Mel Stover, Stewart James, Martin Gardner, Howard Lyons, Leslie May, Sam Dalai, and Allan Slaight, among others. In 1980 I published a new procedural approach. "Rainbow Matrix" (in *"The Violet Book of Mentalism"*), which, which garnered much favorable comment.

Here, I wish to address a different aspect of the Matrix Force. In the *New Phoenix* #340 (1957), Mel Stover detailed "The Irrisistible Force", a significant addition to the principle, as it explained a method for generating grids to force any desired total.

The Stover method does not entail complex mathematics; it can be plotted rather quickly. However, the nature of the calculations is such that a paper and pencil are required. Unlike, for instance, many Magic Square formulae, a conditional Matrix Force cannot be plotted in front of the spectator without exposing the method.

Some time back, I wanted to write a computer program for generating Matrix Force grids. In solving that problem, I came up with the following approach to the "Irrisistible Force" which can be swiftly computed mentally. Thus, all that the spectator sees is that you draw a four-by-four grid, fill in sixteen numbers, and proceed from there.

A four-number sequence must be memorized. For the sake of simplicity, I've used 9-5-12-4, which many readers will already know as part of the classic "Eight Kings" card mnemonic ("ninety-five ladies for"). Once the system is understood, you'll see that other groups of numbers can be used. For now, I'll explain it with this particular set.

These four numbers add to thirty, and this will be the base number for our computations. When the desired force total is known, your first step is to come up with three different numbers which, when combined with thirty, will yield the force total. Thus, if we refer to the force total as "N", it is necessary to choose three numbers ("a", "b" and "c") such that $30+a+b+c=N$. So, for example, let's say that the desired force total is sixty-four. $64-30=34$, so $a+b+c$ must equal 34. Thus, one solution would be: $a=6$, $b=17$, $c=11$. (Obviously, this is not the only solution. Any three numbers - including negative numbers — which total 34 would suffice.)

Having made this simple calculation, the grid can be filled in quite rapidly, by following this simple model shown below left. So, in our example for a force total of 64, the result would appear as shown below right.

9	5	12	4
$9+a$	$5+a$	$12+a$	$4+a$
$9+b$	$5+b$	$12+b$	$4+b$
$9+c$	$5+c$	$12+c$	$4+c$

9	5	12	4
15	11	18	10
26	22	29	21
20	16	23	15

I realize that, at first glance, the system may seem difficult. I assure you, with very little practice, it will become extremely easy. Thus, for example, you can ask a spectator to name any number (or, to be more deceptive, have a number written down, which you secretly learn), and immediately draw your grid, fill in the numbers, and go on to cause the spectator to surprisingly arrive at the previously thought-of total.

This system can obviously be used in conjunction with any of the previously published Matrix Force routines. Too, once you understand its workings, it can easily be adapted to grids of different sizes.

Another classic type of magical matrix is that based on the principle of Intersecting Sets, which has been explored under various titles for over a century. (In recent times, the effect has unfortunately become attached to the name "Princess Card Trick" — a pointless source of confusion, as there is a long-established [and completely unrelated] card plot with that title.)

Briefly described, the effect is as follows: several sets of objects are distributed to participants. Most often (but not always), the items used are playing cards. Each spectator thinks of an item from his/her set. The materials are gathered and mixed. The performer now calls off an apparently random assortment of items. In fact, the called-off items consist of one from each original set. The spectators are asked if anyone has heard a thought-of item in the called-off group. If a participant acknowledges that his/her thought-of item was called, the performer is able to correlate and determine the chosen item.

Many versions have been released, by an impressive roster of names. In his marvelously thorough book on the subject, *"The Impostress Princess"* (1986), Peter Tappan provides an exhaustive history and survey of this material.

The principle is wonderful, but what has always troubled me about it is a lack of justification for calling off the items. This has always made this sort of routine seem rather contrived, and has afforded the observant spectator a perfect opportunity for suspicion and analysis.

I have returned to this presentational stumbling block repeatedly over the years. Not long ago, I finally came up with a solution which I feel solves the problem, providing a logical reason for calling off the items.

You will need to prepare a set of seventeen cards. Sixteen of these bear the names of race-horses, one to a card. (The nature of your audiences will determine the style of naming you'll find suitable, so I will not offer examples here.) The names are divided into four sets, and stacked:

A1-A2-A3-A4-B1-B2-B3-B4-C1-C2-C3-C4-D1-D2-D3-D4

(The order of the four cards within any letter-group is of no importance. In other words, the first four cards might just as well be in A2-A1-A4-A3 order, or A3-A2-A1-A4, and so on.)

On the seventeenth card, write a cue-list, with the names regrouped along with several null names (i.e., names which do not appear on any of the first sixteen cards):

A1-B1-C1-D1-N-N-N A2-B2-C2-D2-N-N-N A3-B3-C3-D3-N-N-N A4-B4-C4-D4

In addition to the cards, you'll need a stack of play money. At the start of the routine, the cue-card is hidden face-down beneath the stack of bills, which is either in your pocket or lying on a table.

Bring out the name-cards, explaining that for the next few minutes, four members of the audience will become wealthy gamblers, each of whom owns a stable of prime race-horses.

False shuffle the cards, then hand the top four to Spectator A, the next four to Spectator B, the next four to Spectator C, and the rest to Spectator D. Of course, it should not appear as if you are counting the cards, but rather that you're dividing the pack roughly into fourths. If you don't feel you can spread-count in such a way as to not be obvious (although sets of four are extremely easy), you may wish to mark (or corner-short) the top card of each group.

At no time will you state how many cards are in play. Say, "Each of you now holds five or six cards, with the names of your horses. Now, I have good news for you: there's a weekend racing tournament coming up, and your horses are all running."

Continue, "Each of you is a daring gambler, willing to put everything on the outcome of a single race. Therefore, please look your horses over, and decide for yourself which single horse you want to bet on."

Pause to allow the spectators to make their choices. Now, have a spectator collect all of the cards, mix them, and return them to you.

Hold the pack face-down in your left hand. Bring out the stack of play money as you comment, "We'll soon find out who's lucky enough to win some money!" As this is said, the hands come together for an instant, and the hidden cue-card is secretly loaded from beneath the bills onto the pack.

Place the money aside. Overhand Shuffle the cards, running the cue-card to the bottom, as you explain that the random order of the shuffled cards will determine the winning horses.

Turn the pack toward yourself, and spread the cards. Say, "Here are the winners of the races run on Friday." Pretend to call off the first seven cards from the face of the pack; In fact, read off the first set of seven names from the cue-list.

Of course what's going on here is the standard call-off procedure used in all routines of this ilk. However, there is a theatrical context now provided.

Rather than saying, "Has anyone heard his or her thought-of horse's name," query, "Do I owe any money to anyone?" This steers the audience away from the correlation that is, in fact, going on.

If one or more spectators indicate that they are owed money, you immediately know their thought-of horses. (For example, if Spectator B were to raise his/her hand, the thought-of horse would have to be B1 from your cue-list.) However, I think it best to refrain from offering that information just yet. Instead, simply hand a bill to the appropriate individual(s), making a mental note as to the thought-of horse(s), and continue.

The winners of Saturday's races are announced. You pretend to read off cards from the near-center section of the spread pack, actually calling off the second group on the cue-list. Find out if there are any winners, and distribute the money accordingly.

Repeat the procedure with Sunday's races, apparently reading names from the far-center section of the spread pack, but in fact reciting the third group on the cue-list. Take care of any financial obligations that may have come up.

Explain that the weekend is over, the races won. If one or more spectators has not had a winning horse (and the odds are reasonable that this will be so), you can develop some humor out of the situation, commiserating with the loser(s) while congratulating the winners.

At this point, you know all four thought-of horses. (In the case of a spectator who did not win a race, the thought-of horse must be the appropriately lettered name from the fourth set on your cue-list.) It only remains to reveal the information. Turn to a winning spectator, and say, "You certainly were clever to bet on BLANK!" In short order, identify the other participants' choices. If you've got a losing player, save that person for last, exclaiming, "Next time, don't bet on BLANK, it's too expensive!"

Of course, the above construction can be revised in many ways. Most of the intersecting sets routines detailed in the Tappan book and elsewhere can be re-dressed in this horse-race presentation.

NUMPERSONA

\

In the previous book in this series, *"Amperthand"* (1986). I explained a routine called "Numper", based on the Progressive Anagram Principle. I will briefly re-cap the system here. (For a more detailed explanation, plus historical information, refer to the original write-up.)

}

The Numper system uses twelve words constructed via the Progressive Anagram Principle, cross-bred with the standard Number Alphabet:

1.TOUGH 2.NEUTER 3.MUTINY 4.REMNANT 5.LAMINATOR 6.TERMINOLOGY 7.

COY 8.FOCUS 9.PEACETUL 10.SOPORIFIC 11.SPECIFIED 12.DYNAMISM

The list is easily memorized, as most of the words begin with letters which cue their positional value via Number Alphabet.

The spectator thinks of a word. The performer calls off letters, one at a time, apparently reading those letters from the spectator's thoughts. Each time a letter is called, the spectator indicates whether the performer has correctly named a letter from the thought-of word.

The called-off letters are also in Number Alphabet order. The first called is T. If that is confirmed, N is called, followed by M, R, L and G. If all six letters are correct, the thought-of word is TERMINOLOGY. If you get a negative response along the way, the word will be the one which begins with your last confirmed letter. (Thus, for example. If you receive confirmation on T and N, but not on M, the word is NEUTER)

If your Initial call of T is denied, you jump to the second half of the list, calling C, followed by F, P, S and D, using the same rules as above. If T and C are both incorrect, the word is the last on the list, DYNAMISM. Thus, you will never get more than two negative responses before the word is known.

In "*Ampertharut*" I offered several presentations using the Numper list. Recently, a new function occurred to me, applying the system to a telephone test.

The performer displays a pack of forty or fifty cards, each bearing a different word on its face. It is explained that these words have been selected from a self-help text on building a better vocabulary.

The spectator chooses a word-card, and then telephones the medium, who proceeds to discern the word — and goes on to reveal the caller's astrological sign.

You're probably ahead of me at this point. The performer must first learn the spectator's zodiac sign. This can be accomplished with any of the standard mentalism techniques (impression devices, billet work, &c.). Michael Weber has suggested doing a prior routine involving the spectator's driver's license — upon which is listed the person's date of birth.

The deck of cards includes the twelve Numper words, along with a few dozen nulls. Once the spectator's birthsign is known, it remains only to force the Numper word whose positional value matches that of the spectator's sign:

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. ARIES tough | 7. LIBRA coy |
| 2. TAURUS neuter | 8. SCORPIO focus |
| 3. GEMINI mutiny | 9. SAGITTARIUS .peaceful |
| 4. CANCER remnant | 10. CAPRICORN, .soporific |
| 5. LEO laminator | 11. AQUARIUS. .. specif ied |
| 6. VIRGO.... terminology | 12. PISCES dynamism |

So many card forces already exist in print that IVE no need to offer one here, except to suggest that the one used be quick and to the point.

The spectator calls the medium, who divines the thought-of word by using the Numper system. Once the word has been revealed, the medium knows the caller's sign, and can reveal it in whatever presentational mode is warranted.

MESSAGE UNITS

In this routine, several choices are made by a spectator, who then calls the medium. The medium is able to accurately state the results of all of the tests, concluding by revealing the spectators birthday.

Ever since the telephone test was created by John Northern Milliard ("*Twentieth Century Telepathy*", in the February, 1905 *Sphinx*), magicians have been devising new ways of secretly transmitting information to a partner on the other end of a phone line.

The more subtle telephone tests allow the spectator to do the calling and talking alone, with no apparent input from the performer.

A major breakthrough in this regard was Annemann's "*Weird Wire*" (referenced earlier), in which variable actions recounted by the spectator to the medium served to code the necessary information.

Scalbert's seminal "*Mystery of the Seventh Card*" (marketed in the 1940's) was the first of several wonderful effects from that source wherein the order in which information was conveyed to the medium provided the coding. This was also the methodological foundation for Bob Mason's brilliant "*Mental Miracle*" (marketed in 1968).

The following routine has a clear relationship to the material just mentioned. To work it you will need to be prepared to conduct six different tests, although you'll never actually do more than five at one performance.

All six of the tests are actually forces. For the first five, *any* may be employed, although I will suggest some specifics. The sixth test will be the "Numpersona" effect explained previously.

Ideally, the tests should fit three criteria: they should use pocket-sized materials; they should be quick and direct; each should involve a greater set of variables than the one before.

The first test is simply the flip of a coin, heads or tails. A double-faced coin will work to force this outcome, although there are some interesting sleight-of-hand techniques in print which will function with a straight coin.

The second test is a choice from among three different denominations of paper money, forced via Equivoque. The third test is a selection from five ESP symbols. A Rough-&-Smooth forcing packet will accomplish this efficiently.

The fourth test is the total rolled with a pair of dice. A variety of loaded or mis-spotted dice are available from the dealers, as well as several types of gaffed dice boxes which can be used to force a total.

The fifth test is a choice of color. Probably the most trouble-free way to achieve this force is with a small copy of the classic Color-Counting Frame, invented by Stanley Collins. (A particularly good variation is Rupert Gilbert's "Precognition", which can be found in the Ganson-edited *"Magic of the Mind"*.)

The sixth test is, as already stated, a choice from a pack of forty or fifty "vocabulary" cards.

Each of the first five tests is assigned a value:

COIN=1 HILL = 2 SYMBOL = 4 DICE = 8 COLOR =16

As in the "Numpersona" routine, prior to the performance you will have secretly learned the spectator's date of birth. The month will be cued via the forced word in the final test. The day will be signaled by the combined value of the initial tests. Because the values are binary, any day of the month can be coded. Some examples:

If the spectator's birthday is FEBRUARY 27, you would conduct the COIN, BILL, DICE and COLOR tests ($1+2+8+16=27$), followed by the word test (in which you'd force the word NEUTER to code the second month).

If the spectator's birthday is DECEMBER 21, you would conduct the COIN, SYMBOL and COLOR tests ($1+4+16=21$), followed by the word test (forcing DYNAMISM to code the twelfth month).

If the spectator's birthday is JULY 8, you would conduct just the DICE test (8), followed by the word test (forcing COY to code the seventh month).

Obviously, until you learn the spectator's birthdate you will not announce just how many tests you will do. The tests should be conducted in a manner suggesting that these are precisely the tests you always do.

When the spectator is told to call the medium, he/she is instructed to simply ask for the results of each test in turn (e.g., "What color am I thinking of?") As all but the final test are forces, the medium will have no trouble in providing the correct answers.

In five of the thirty-one cases, you'll only need to conduct one test prior to the word test. Ten dates will require two tests, five dates necessitate three tests, and five dates entail four tests. The only date for which all five pre-word tests are needed is 31, and if you prefer, you can code this number by doing no tests other than the word test. Thus, in every case, the testing sequence will be relatively brief.

CALVINIST POKER

The performer inquires, "Are you familiar with the game of Poker?" The spectator will answer with at least a conditional "Yes". Bringing out a pack of cards, the performer continues, "Well, let's play a hand..." He gives a folded slip of paper to a spectator for safekeeping, saying, "I suppose it's presumptuous of me, but I've decided to advise you in this game. In fact, I've already decided exactly how I think you should play your hand, before you've even got it! My instructions are on that piece of paper, which we'll read later."

Taking the deck out of its case, the performer comments, "Draw Poker is the most popular card game in the United States, and the reason for this is that it combines chance and skill. A skillful player can lose due to bad luck, and a rank amateur can win through good fortune. Let me show you what I mean..."

The pack is tabled in front of the first spectator, who is asked to cut the cards. The card cut to is turned up. It is, say, a jack. "That's a good card," says the performer, "but look—if you'd cut just one card deeper..." (turning up the next card) "...you would've had a three, which is not a very strong card. So you see how luck can affect a game; the difference of a single card can change a winning hand into a losing one, or vice-versa."

The performer says, "Let's really leave it to chance..." The spectator is asked to shuffle the deck. Seven or eight five-card hands are now distributed around the table, face-down. The spectator is invited to choose any hand. The others are discarded, although in the process these unchosen hands are shown, and the spectator offered the chance to trade.

The hand finally selected by the spectator is turned face-up. It contains, for example, the queen of hearts, the four of diamonds, the queen of spades, the six of spades, and the eight of clubs. The spectator is asked to state how he/she would play this hand.

The spectator explains his/her strategy: to keep the pair of queens, discarding the other cards to draw three more. (Any mildly experienced card player will arrive at this decision. If the spectator is not used to the game, other spectators are certain to coach this strategy.)

The performer says, "That's not a bad approach — but it's not the best way to go about it." The spectator holding the paper is asked to open and read it out loud. It says:

**'I SUGGEST YOU CHANGE YOUR MIND:
KEEP THAT SIX OF SPADES, IN
ORDER TO DRAW TO A FULL HOUSE.'**

Taking your advice, the spectator keeps the 6S along with his queens, drawing two cards from the remainder of the shuffled pack — which prove to be two more sixes, creating the promised Full House.



A special pack of cards is required. To make this, you will need to start with an ordinary deck.

Discard one 4, 8, 9, 10, jack, queen and king, of assorted suits. Discard the five of spades, six of diamonds, and seven of spades.

Take the six of clubs, six of hearts and ace of diamonds, and trim about 1/32nd of an inch off of the end of each, making them into short cards.

Mark the backs of these three cards in the outer left and inner right corners. The ace of spades is not trimmed short, but its back is marked in the same fashion.

Obtain eight extra sixes of spades. These, along with the 6S from the original deck, are marked on their backs at the center. This done, you're ready to assemble the pack.

Place the four marked cards aside, along with one 3. The remaining forty-five cards are arranged in the following cyclic order from the top: X-X-X-X-6S-X-X-X-X-6S, and so on. (In other words, every fifth card is one of your duplicate sixes.)

The null cards can be in any order, with this restriction: see to it that there is a deuce among the top few cards, and a deuce among the bottom few cards. Beneath this 45-card set-up, place the two trimmed sixes, followed by the AD, the AS, and the remaining deuce. The pack is now ready to use. Write a prediction note as quoted earlier, and you're set to begin.

The opening patter is as indicated at the start of this write-up. It is to your advantage to use a spectator who does have at least some experience playing cards. This is easily determined in conversation.

Table the pack in front of the spectator, and ask him/her to cut the cards "about in half". It doesn't matter precisely how deep a cut is made, as long as it's not wildly off-center. (Technically, even a very imbalanced cut will function, but it will make the subsequent shuffle awkward.)

The situation we wish to arrive at is for there to be a marked card (6S) on top of the bottom half of the pack. If the spectator happens to cut to this situation, simply direct him/her to Riffle Shuffle the two halves together.

If the card on top of the lower portion is a null, turn that card face-up, commenting on its worth in a Poker game. Now, if you see that the next card is a marked 6S, simply end your patter, replacing the shown card beneath the lower portion. Have the spectator Riffle Shuffle the two halves together.

If the next card down is not marked, turn it face-up and comment on its value relative to the first card. Similarly, if the next card (or the one after that) is a null, turn it up and continue patterning about the difference it would have made if the spectator had cut only a few cards deeper. You will never have to show more than four cards in this manner before reaching a marked 6S atop the lower portion. As soon as this situation is reached, replace the shown cards beneath the bottom stock, and have the spectator Riffle Shuffle the half packs together.

Thus, no matter where pack is cut, you will arrive at the same situation regarding the status of the top stock of the lower portion.

When the shuffle is concluded, take the deck from the spectator, complimenting him/her on the quality of the shuffle. Say, "Because the cards were mixed so well, everything has been left up to chance."

Spread off the top five cards, dropping them onto the table, face-down, as you continue, "For example, these five cards are no longer the five which were on top of the pack before you shuffled, but instead a random assortment."

In fact, the assortment is not completely random. We're back to the Gilbreath Principle, thanks to which the top five cards (and the next seven or eight five-card groups, as well) must contain precisely one 6S, no more, no less.

Spread off the next five cards, tabling them as you say, "...and these are also a random assortment..."

Continue spreading off groups of five, placing them onto the table in no particular order. As you reach the lower part of the pack, pay attention to the upper left corners of the cards. When you spot a marked corner among the top five cards of the pack (which will be after about seven or eight hands have been tabled), stop, saying, "I guess that's enough to work with..."

The corner-marked card will be the first card of your corner-marked quartet (sixes over aces). Because the first three cards of that set have been trimmed short, those four cards will stay together during the spectator's shuffle. (It is possible that a particularly brutal shuffle will interlace some nulls within this group. Although it's highly unlikely, that potential problem will be dealt with momentarily.)

Say, "I think that's a fair assortment. Please point to whichever hand you wish to play." While attention is focused on the spectator's actions, casually cut as many cards as necessary from the top to the bottom of the in-hands stock, to bring the marked set to the top.

This action takes place at a time when the audience has no reason to be paying attention to you, so no sleight-of-hand per se is required. Keep your own eye focus on the spectator's actions, and everyone else will do the same.

Now is the time to check to make sure that the four-card marked set is still together. Spread the top four cards of the talon, and check the corners. In the unlikely event that an adjustment must be made (i.e., one or more nulls must be extracted from the set), you can gain extra time by telling the participant to pick up the chosen packet and hold it face-down in between his/her hands.

The undealt portion of the pack (with the four-card set on top) is in your left hand. A tabled Poker hand having been selected, pick up one of the other tabled packets with your right hand, and ask if the spectator wishes to trade the chosen hand for the one you hold. As you pick up the packet, glimpse its face. If there is a 6S on the face, retain the packet face-down. However, if there is a null on the face, you can casually flash it to the audience.

If the packets are tabled in loosely spread condition, you will find it easy to adjust a null-foeri packet with one hand, so that its 6S is concealed, but several nulls are on view.

If the spectator wants to trade with you, do so. If not, discard your right-hand packet beneath the left-hand stock. Repeat the process, picking up a tabled hand, offering it for trade, flashing its face (if conditions permit), and (if no trade is desired) discarding it beneath the talon. (Of course, if at any point trade is made, the hand given to you by the spectator will be discarded beneath the talon.)

When all of the hands have been eliminated except for the spectator's chosen one, table the remainder of the pack. Direct the spectator to spread the chosen hand face-up on the table.

Due to the set-up, the spectator will not have a Full House, or anything higher. (The only hands that can beat a Full House are a Straight Flush or Four Of A Kind, and neither result is possible here.)

Whatever the hand, allow the spectator to decide his/her mode of play. The decisions will be rather consistent:

It is extremehr unlikely that the spectator will have a Flush or a Straight. If such Is thi case, the spectator will not want to draw any cards. Your predictive message will be surprising, not only for Identifying the presence of the 6S in the hand, but also for advising the spectator to break up a pat hand. The spectator having discarded all but the 6S, turn up the top four cards of the pack (the "draw" cards), which will be two sixes ai'd two aces, forming die promised Full House.

(A note here: I realize that in standard Draw Poker, it is Illegal to draw four ciuds, unless the one retained is an ace. However, this is hardly a standard Poker situation, so the rules are allowed to bend.)

The spectator may have Three Of A Kind, in which case the desired play will t-e to discard the two other cards (the 6S and one Indifferent card). In this situation, the meaning of your written instructions is slightly changed through verbal Interpretation.direct

the spectator to keep the three mates, plus the 6S. The indifferent card is discarded, and one card is drawn — another six, to complete the predicted Full House.

If the spectator has Two Pairs, the obvious play will be to discard the un-paired card (which will be the 6S). As In the case of a Flush or Straight, your advice to discard the pairs will seem ridiculous, until the draw provides the Full House.

If the spectator has a Pair, the situation is similar to that with Three Of A Kind: the message is interpreted to mean that the 6S is retained In addition to the pair, and two sixes are then drawn to complete the Full House.

There are three types of "dog" hands (no mated cards) left to discuss. If the spectator has a Partial Flush or Partial Straight the situation should be treated in much the' same manner as with a pat Flush or Straight.

If the spectator has an Ace-High hand, the standard play is to keep the ace and draw four more cards. In this situation. Interpret the message to mean that the spectator should keep the 6S and the ace. Three cards will be drawn--two more sixes and one more ace -to make the Full House.

Finally, if the hand is just an assortment of values, the spectator will elect to retain the highest-valued cards — which will almost certainly not include the 6S. Again, your prediction will seem to go contrary to established form, but prove successful.

•X:W- •-<• '^11

,': rC*'"*""^ 'i- *^^

'r 'r»V*)'VV •* •*** *'?" ' *S

• *- '?£*}..:§|| '*^, f&.£

:••; &*; »»

""! -i>£?, su<-, t, ---."tt., *fe

Entire contents copyright ©1987 by Philip T. Goldstein

*

»-
/

(If you think this stuff is difficult to *read*, imagine how hard It Is to write*.*)

