Systems, Methodologies And Rational Thinking - Special interest group

The SMARTsig newsletter is put together, shaped, typeset, published, compiled, collated, stapled, packed, stamped and posted from Stefan Perry at

PO Box 44
Hayle
TR27 6YH

> **Tel**   **01736 754400**
> **Fax**   **01736 754400**
> **email**   **stef@smartsig.com**

with help from and thanks to:

> SMARTsig members (letters, contributions & advice)
> A large letter box and an understanding Postman
> IBM compatible PC (published using Microsoft Word)
> Panasonic laser printer (it's never worked so hard!)
> An understanding family (at the moment)
> A very large work area (I am a messy worker!)
> Turkey & mince pies (to soothe the savage b(r)east)
> Any one else I've forgotten

The legal stuff:

SMARTsig magazine 2.1 - January 1995

In this months issue . . .

Systems, Methodologies

SMART

And Rational Thinking

Special Interest Group

"Progress is gained through wisdom shared"

**REMEMBER - This is YOUR magazine,
its content and size is determined by you the
members.**

**You can play your part in maintaining the high
standards by contributing your views to our magazine,
remember though it is unlikely that everyone will
agree with you! The world would be a very boring
place if we all agreed, we all have our own piece of
the jigsaw, share it with others in the group and we
will all reap the benefits.**

**Two heads are better than one, just imagine what a
powerful force that makes the SMARTsig membership.**

**Spread the good word about the SMART group to
encourage new members, and we will truly be a force
to be reckoned with in the future, a force in which you
can play your part and where your voice is recognised.**

BACK ISSUES - BACK ISSUES - BACK ISSUES - BACK IS

**Back copies of SMARTsig magazine are now available from us
at £4 per copy post free (1st issue was August 1994)**

SMART Up Front

The first of our new look magazine, so I'll start by wishing all our members, old and new, a very happy, successful and prosperous new year!

Not too much to report this issue, the main reason is that I am having to put it all together in two weeks instead of the usual four. Christmas and New Year holidays at the printers have made it necessary that I get this issue prepared and printed earlier than usual to have it ready for distribution by the first week of 1995. Otherwise you would be receiving this around the middle of the month.

I know that none of you will deny me a peaceful time over the festive period, feet up relaxing, ready to hit 1995 with renewed vigour, Cheers!

Consequently, this issue may be a little lighter than usual, I suppose many of you are busy with other commitments and my letter box has been a little quieter than of late with your letters. We should be back to normal service for the February magazine.

The email address I gave last issue has changed already! For the computer users among you, it was recommended that I subscribed to Demon Internet, which I did. Only trouble is that my local connection point in Sheffield was constantly engaged, (and all the other numbers too!) morning, noon and night, even the early hours of the morning (2.00am !!!). As a result I was paying a subscription to a service I was unable to use, it appears that Demon stay one step *behind* their membership number.

Their help line informed me (when I managed to get past the engaged tone) that 800 new lines would soon be in place, within the week. I waited, I tried, God knows I tried, but ...... constantly engaged. If I did have any email awaiting my collection, I couldn't get at it! so much for the *snail mail* comment I mentioned last issue! The *Information Superhighway*

was looking more like the M1 motorway, but not just cone hotlines and contraflow, I was experiencing *no flow!*

I have now signed with Delphi, (a Rupert Murdoch subsidiary) *(another one!),* where I can log on whenever I call, *AND* they have their own gambling forum (I'll report on that in another issue). Delphi can be contacted (voice) on 071 757 7080, or for those with a more masochistic approach, Demon are on 081 349 0063

For those who are a little puzzled as to just what this Internet thing is all about I have reprinted some sample conversations from the U.S. based gambling forum, you'll see they face similar situations *over the pond*. It's mainly casino topics they discuss, but I have edited out some items you all may find of interest. A system for Baccarat would you believe! and a chain letter, they get everywhere don't they! However, I have discovered a couple of horse racing forums and may report on these at a later date should I get a favourable response from SMART members about these re-prints.

Raceform have kindly given their authority to the Computer Challenge, it is now the SMARTsig Computer Challenge sponsored by Raceform Ltd. I am awaiting all the players to be in touch and should have the first months results for you all next time, and our first monthly award winner.

The Football Intelligence Network idea is still alive and kicking, although it has now gone underground, away from prying eyes of the odds makers. Anyone who feels able to contribute their local football knowledge and prediction skills can still get in touch with me here at SMART, and I'll put you in touch with the group.

Last month was the first where members addresses and telephone numbers were given in our Swap Shop, this was to save the extra work it placed on my shoulders. It has turned out to have been a terrific success! Members have now made new friends in all parts of the country, and I hope that this help-a-friend trend can continue, and spread throughout the SMART membership.

A final word to the £18 million Lottery winner, no need to renew your SMART subscription for next year Mr X, just tell the press that you got your inspiration for your choice of numbers by reading our magazine.
By the way if you could see yourself clear to lend me . . . . . .

See you all again in February, still finishing the last of the turkey.   - Stef

SMART Food for Thought

Last month's offering from Dave Pollard set me thinking about his ideas for backing prospective home wins as correct score singles rather that the forced "multiples" as required when backing results.

SELECTING "VALUE" FOOTBALL HOME SCORES

Stefan Perry

I t is no coincidence that the major bookies fall over themselves in tempting the punter to go for multiple bets, trebles and upwards, with all sorts of special offers and incentives.

Now, are they doing this because they are keen to see the customer win more money, or is it perhaps to increase their own chances of relieving Joe Punter of his cash? - I wonder!

Dave Pollard's thoughts were definitely along the right lines as far as I am concerned, back in win singles wherever possible and your betting accounts will look so much better for it. By forever chasing the illusive "pot of gold" that multiple betting gives hope to, you are far less likely to make the upward move from *gambler* to *investor*. and to make your betting pay.

This strategy cannot make everyone a success, you still need to find the winners to back, but it will put a great many who are currently in the red, into profit. It breaks my heart to see so many who would never dream of placing a win single, every bet they make is a treble, yankee, patent or whatever.

They exist by living with a dream, a dream of that one big hit, and they've been "Oh so close!" so many times in the past, or they know of someone who collected a four figure sum for a £5 bet.

Far better to be 1% in profit at the end of the month than saying "It was just a short head between me and a fortune". The bookies help to promote this get- rich-quick image, don't fall for it!!!   This brings me to the heart of this article, so, climbing down from my soap box, I will continue.

My fascination with correct scores is not I hope an irrational fixation, but a way of giving a edge to the bettor by allowing the best bet of all to be employed, the one the bookies fear, that's right - the win single.

Dave used the table I printed in issue 1.1 to determine the percentage successes of the scores 1.0, 2.0 and 2.1. This would appear quite logical and indeed should prove useful. However, the table referred to was based on *all* the results over a seven year period, league and cup games.

If we assume that some of the cup games were between quite ill matched teams then perhaps a more reliable picture would emerge by using data from league games only where the two teams ability should fall into a narrower band.

Table 1 shows the percentage of results returned from league games only over the same period.

Table 1

		Away	scores			
		0	1	2	3	4
	0	7.937	7.660	3.865	1.729	0.680
Home	1	10.355	12.782	6.518	2.450	0.994
Scores	2	7.896	9.167	5.344	1.724	0.730
	3	4.110	4.415	2.607	1.100	0.370
	4	1.794	1.734	0.994	0.416	0.157
	5	0.920	0.837	0.458	0.185	0.074

Total games: **21632**   **Homes:**   **9940 (45.95%)**
                                        Draws: **5902 (27.28%)**
                                        Aways: **5790 (26.77%)**

Grid showing all recorded scores from 0.0 to 5.4 in league games taken from season 1984 (English clubs only) and English & Scottish 1987/88 to 1993/94 inclusive. The figures are expressed as percentages.

If we follow Dave's rules and support the scores of 1.0, 2.0 and 2.1, further, if we also stick to league games only, it can be seen that we achieve an historical percentage of 27.418% success. One further simple calculation using the %Homes figure shows that these three scores account for almost 60% of all home wins. (several points better than shown by Daves figures, possibly because of using data from league games only). Using the same logic to view away wins, it shows that the scores of 0.1, 0.2 and 1.2 account for over 82% of all these results.

Yet another good reason for looking at correct score betting, which has been mentioned in these pages before, is that the odds offered are not calculated individually to the game in hand, but based upon the odds quoted about the result. So we can look for what many would term "***the value***"

Using Table 1 we can see the percentage frequency of the individual scores, and to some extent this will be reflected in the odds on offer. But by comparing what the bookies are offering against the percentage chance we can have a better idea of where the value lies. This does not imply we are looking for the most likely score, but the one that over the long term, will give us the best return for our outlay. To give an example, Saturday 2 December 1994, Tranmere v Watford, a solid home prospect with Coral win odds of 4-6. Using the Coral correct score chart shows the odds on offer for our three scores are

<div align="center">1.0 @ 6-1, 2.0 @ 7-1 and 2.1 @ 7-1.</div>

In order to compare the value first convert the bookies odds into their implied percentage chance (i.e. add 1 and divide into 100), the three odds expressed as percentages are;

<div align="center">14.286%, 12.5% and 12.5%.</div>

Convert each of the three into value terms by dividing the actual percentages from Table 1 by the bookie percentages and we arrive at figures of;

<div align="center">0.725, 0.632 and 0.733</div>

The higher the figure, the better are our chances according to the historical data. The best value bet here is the 2.1 score and the worst is the 2.0 score. Further investigation shows that all four bookies offered 6-1 about the 1.0 score but odds of 15-2 were available for both 2.0 and 2.1 by shopping around, transforming the value figures to;

0.725, 0.671 and 0.779

When we realise though that a figure of 1.000 offers nothing more for our chances than a break even position, even without considering the 10% tax, the above figures are less than inspiring. But we've been operating on blanket coverage, without consideration to the merits of each team involved. If we use a basic method of match ratings, we should expect the score percentages to shift in our favour - let's see.

The rating method I'll use is one that any of you can operate, the information is available through many of the papers and no time consuming records have to be kept by the individual.

Most newspapers will show the WDL information for each teams previous six games, i.e. WWDWLW in front of the home team indicates that they have won four, drawn one and lost one of their previous six home matches. Using the assumption that recent form is more significant, award 3pts per win and 2pts per draw for the teams most recent three games. Award 2 pts for a win and 1 point for a draw for the oldest three games.

For example, to evaluate the above sequence, assuming the most recent games are on the right, would be, working from right to left, 3+0+3+1+2+2, or 11 points total. Work out the two opposing teams in a similar fashion the deduct the away side points from the home sides points to arrive at a match rating.

e.g.
      JLWWLJ   ASTON VILLA   EVERTON   LJLLdW
                    (most recent games on the right)

ASTON VILLA 2+0+3+2+0+1 = 8
EVERTON   3+2+0+0+1+0 = 6

Match rating = 8-6 = 2

Using the above rating system, the seven years of data for league games played gave the information as shown in Tables 2a and 2b.

The left hand column shows the match rating as described above, and the columns show the frequency of actual scores in a range of up to two goals per team.

Table 2a - frequency of match scores to match ratings

match rating	00	01	02	10	11	12	20	21	22	data sample
-10	12	16	8	13	21	7	3	4	11	138
-9	7	12	8	12	22	13	7	8	3	132
-8	20	30	15	24	29	27	10	23	14	259
-7	33	38	22	24	37	37	23	37	18	370
-6	41	56	23	45	82	45	26	31	23	536
-5	65	69	40	83	95	63	56	56	46	779
-4	97	96	51	109	123	72	65	72	43	986
-3	89	112	51	122	149	96	72	107	67	1199
-2	137	117	63	153	167	100	103	128	81	1434
-1	151	136	65	173	189	107	130	150	95	1605
0	150	120	57	171	211	112	142	156	89	1628
1	122	125	49	158	224	92	133	158	92	1552
2	106	93	45	138	228	84	124	167	74	1502
3	99	80	38	134	163	63	100	119	71	1225
4	71	55	31	122	124	45	106	84	31	950
5	46	36	22	76	95	33	79	70	49	745
6	37	28	12	68	60	36	65	53	21	560
7	30	16	6	46	43	28	31	45	11	353
8	22	12	6	35	32	16	33	18	6	257
9	13	9	3	16	14	4	16	15	9	149
10	7	6	3	12	14	2	13	14	3	128

All match ratings that were -10 or less were grouped together as -10, similarly, all ratings over 10 were grouped with the +10 ratings.

This enabled the frequencies to be based upon a minimum sample of 128, a small number perhaps, but viewed with the other figures shown, patterns do begin to emerge.

As would be expected, the percentages expressed in Table 2b do show quite wide ranging variations in certain columns, dependant on the match rating used.

Table 2b - frequencies expressed as percentages

match rating	00	01	02	10	11	12	20	21	22
-10	8.70	11.59	5.80	9.42	15.22	5.07	2.17	2.90	7.97
-9	5.30	9.09	6.06	9.09	16.67	9.85	5.30	6.06	2.27
-8	7.72	11.58	5.79	9.27	11.20	10.42	3.86	8.88	5.41
-7	8.92	10.27	5.95	6.49	10.00	10.00	6.22	10.00	4.86
-6	7.65	10.45	4.29	8.40	15.30	8.40	4.85	5.78	4.29
-5	8.34	8.86	5.13	10.65	12.20	8.09	7.19	7.19	5.91
-4	9.84	9.74	5.17	11.05	12.47	7.30	6.59	7.30	4.36
-3	7.42	9.34	4.25	10.18	12.43	8.01	6.01	8.92	5.59
-2	9.55	8.16	4.39	10.67	11.65	6.97	7.18	8.93	5.65
-1	9.41	8.47	4.05	10.78	11.78	6.67	8.10	9.35	5.92
0	9.21	7.37	3.50	10.50	12.96	6.88	8.72	9.58	5.47
1	7.86	8.05	3.16	10.18	14.43	5.93	8.57	10.18	5.93
2	7.06	6.19	3.00	9.19	15.18	5.59	8.26	11.12	4.93
3	8.08	6.53	3.10	10.94	13.31	5.14	8.16	9.71	5.80
4	7.47	5.79	3.26	12.84	13.05	4.74	11.16	8.84	3.26
5	6.17	4.83	2.95	10.20	12.75	4.43	10.60	9.40	6.58
6	6.61	5.00	2.14	12.14	10.71	6.43	11.61	9.46	3.75
7	8.50	4.53	1.70	13.03	12.18	7.93	8.78	12.75	3.12
8	8.56	4.67	2.33	13.62	12.45	6.23	12.84	7.00	2.33
9	8.72	6.04	2.01	10.74	9.40	2.68	10.74	10.07	6.04
10	5.47	4.69	2.34	9.38	10.94	1.56	10.16	10.94	2.34

If we now convert the traditional bookies odds for correct scores into their implied probabilities, we can make a direct comparison between the chance the bookie gives to a particular score and what the tables show as the chance using our simple game rating method.

In order to spot where the value lies the probability figure in Table 2b needs to be greater than the bookies probability figures, shown in Table 3. By way of an example, look at the match rating of 4 in the above Table. The most likely score at this rating is 1-1 with a percentage probability of 13.05%, this would not be unusual, we already know that the most common football score recorded is the 1-1 draw.

Table 3 - implied percentage probabilities of bookies odds

Bookies Odds	Implied % Probability
5-1	16.667
11-2	15.385
6-1	14.286
13-2	13.333
7-1	12.500
15-2	11.765
8-1	11.111
17-2	10.526
9-1	10.000
10-1	9.091
11-1	8.333
12-1	7.692
14-1	6.667
16-1	5.882
18-1	5.263
20-1	4.762
22-1	4.348
25-1	3.846

However, in order to make this a value bet the bookies odds would have to be 7-1 or better, highly unlikely odds for a 1-1 draw!

Using the same game rating of 4, the likelihood of a 1-0 result is 12.84%, so we would need odds of 7-1 to put the bet in our favour. A much more realistic proposition.

Remember though, we are looking for value odds and not necessarily the most likely outcome. Far better, for example, to wager that number one will show on the roll of a die, at odds of 4-1, than heads will show on the toss of a coin at evens. Less likely, but in the long term, better value!

By using the Tables given, it still requires the user to do plenty of cross checking to arrive at a possible bet, and no consideration, as yet, has been taken into account of the pre paid tax element. If we did manage to get 7-1 about the above example, taken over 100 bets it would yield;

12.84 wins @ 7-1 = 102.72 (including returned stakes), a pre tax profit, but a post tax loss!

In fact odds of 8-1 would be required in order to make up for the dreaded tax element. Unless of course you try Coomes bookmakers (081-858-6615) who offer tax free betting on correct scores in live televised games!

The final Table therefore brings all the elements together. It simply shows what odds are needed to represent a value bet, after pre paying tax, using the game rating procedure explained earlier. The odds shown in Table 4 are the minimum required for value, odds higher than those shown increase the value element. Where "NV" is found, then the odds required are in excess of 50/1 and deemed to be No Value.

Table 4
Odds required to give value for match ratings -10 to 10 when 10% tax is pre paid.

match rating	00	01	02	10	11	12	20	21	22
-10	12/1	17/2	18/1	11/1	13/2	22/1	50/1	40/1	14/1
-9	20/1	12/1	18/1	12/1	6/1	11/1	20/1	18/1	50/1
-8	14/1	17/2	18/1	11/1	9/1	10/1	28/1	12/1	20/1
-7	12/1	10/1	18/1	16/1	11/1	11/1	18/1	11/1	22/1
-6	14/1	10/1	25/1	14/1	13/2	14/1	22/1	20/1	25/1
-5	14/1	12/1	22/1	10/1	17/2	14/1	16/1	16/1	18/1
-4	11/1	11/1	22/1	9/1	8/1	16/1	16/1	16/1	25/1
-3	14/1	11/1	25/1	10/1	8/1	14/1	18/1	12/1	20/1
-2	11/1	14/1	25/1	10/1	17/2	16/1	16/1	12/1	20/1
-1	11/1	12/1	28/1	10/1	17/2	16/1	14/1	11/1	18/1
0	11/1	14/1	33/1	10/1	15/2	16/1	12/1	11/1	20/1
1	14/1	14/1	40/1	10/1	7/1	18/1	12/1	10/1	18/1
2	16/1	18/1	40/1	11/1	13/2	20/1	14/1	9/1	22/1
3	14/1	16/1	40/1	10/1	15/2	22/1	14/1	11/1	18/1
4	14/1	20/1	33/1	8/1	15/2	25/1	9/1	12/1	33/1
5	18/1	22/1	40/1	10/1	8/1	25/1	10/1	11/1	16/1
6	16/1	22/1	NV	17/2	10/1	18/1	17/2	11/1	33/1
7	12/1	25/1	NV	15/2	17/2	14/1	12/1	8/1	40/1
8	12/1	25/1	50/1	15/2	8/1	18/1	8/1	16/1	50/1
9	12/1	18/1	NV	10/1	11/1	40/1	10/1	10/1	18/1
10	20/1	25/1	50/1	11/1	10/1	NV	10/1	10/1	50/1

Always remember to shop around the different layers to find the best odds, wild variations can been found between the different companies, even with the same or similar win odds.

The above odds are needed to give value when allowing for the pre payment of tax, by sticking to live televised games you can take advantage of Coomes tax free option. But remember it's better to pay tax and get 14/1 than have a tax free 10/1 - so shop around!

█ SMARTsig

The sequel from the Flying Fox, who's first contribution appeared in last month's magazine . . .

SO YOU WANT TO BE SUCCESSFUL AT BETTING?

The Flying Fox

Well let's start by being painfully honest. The biggest problem is not how to select winners, or finding value, or discovering the perfect system , or, or, or, or . . . . the main problem is *YOU!*

It is perfectly simple to be successful at betting. All you have to do is *TWO* things:-

1. **Get yourself an advantage or edge over the layers.**

2. **Don't let anybody, especially the layers, know that you have this advantage.**

Sounds too easy doesn't it, or perhaps some of you think that it is impossible to get ahead of the bookies, surely they've got it all sewn up? Well let me show you a few recent examples, where an edge over the bookies has been created and then promptly taken or given away again:-

Our friends at The Racing Post are the world's famous for this! Let's start with Pricewise, in it's time it was a major step forward for punters and Mark Coton should have been given a medal for devising it.

Anyway, those of us who followed Pricewise in the early days, did quite well out of it and we could still be raking it in, if it wasn't for the headlines which followed after each notable success. "Racing Post's Pricewise does it again. Another bumper weekend! Winners galore at 25/1 16/1 10/1 etc.

When are these poor bookmaker saps going to learn? We're too clever for them!" *Well they did learn, didn't they!*

Another example from the Racing Post was when highlighted how you could profit from lack of the bookies understanding of Sports Betting, in particular divisional betting on American Football, They showed us how to virtually

guarantee a profit by backing different teams as the season progressed. I remember the very next year, the Post crowing that it was almost like a license to print money. You try to get an easy bet on American Football now!

<div align="center">

NO WAY!

</div>

And the thing is, they are still doing it today! Can't they understand that every time they expose a rick or weakness in the bookies defences and then shout it from roof top, they are just making easier for them and much harder for the punters.

The Racing Post are not the only ones who assist the bookies by blowing the gaff! Here's a little beauty from Odds On magazine which scuppered a nice little earner for yours truly:-

Remember when the new pass-back rule was introduced in football a couple of years back? A nightmare for goalies and defenders, that's for sure. At the time I was looking, ***as usual***, for some kind of edge for fixed odds and I felt that this new rule may open up an opportunity. The theory was that a lot more goals were going to be scored, because of the confusion and indecision of goalies and defenders and so it proved. But how could I turn it into a profitable situation? To cut a long story short I noticed that the ***minimum*** odds for a 3-3 Draw on most coupons was 66/1.

This meant I could back every match on a Saturday (all fifty odd of them) to end as a 3-3 result and still make a profit after tax as long ,as at least one ended in 3-3. Surely this new pass-back rule would create a greater possibility of more goals and hopefully lots of 3-3 results. ***As I said initially it turned out to be a nice little earner.*** One or two bookies obviously caught on to this situation, perhaps some of you Smarties were on the same bandwagon, because their odds for 3-3 draws were cut to 50/1. But I could still get on at 66/1 with a couple of the big chains, that was until to my horror Odds On magazine ran a full page article on the very subject that I describe above. Can any of you guess what happened? ***Yes that's right all the leading fixed odds layers cut their 3-3 minimum odds to 50/1*** Another perfect example of trying to give the punters an edge and in the process highlighting it to the bookies, who promptly removed it!

So there you have it, I could go on and on with countless examples of us punters gaining an edge and then simply having it taken away from them by the bookies, or giving it away, one way or another. This is the dilemma that faces all SMARTies and will ultimately I think, decide the future of

SMARTsig. For what is the point in us sharing all our secrets, systems, tips and ideas in an open forum such as this magazine, only to have any successful venture destroyed by our own hands. I know Stef will disagree with this, but let's hear how the membership feel about it.

That is why I said in my previous letter that I think we will, at some stage, have to control the number of people in or group. After all there is a limit to the number of enlightened souls out there anyway.

I know that sounds a terribly snobbish thing to say, *but I truly believe that most SMARTies who have "a nice little earner" on the go, will keep it firmly to themselves and not risk having it taken away from them.* What do you think ?

But all is not doom & gloom

There is *some* light at the end of the tunnel! One of the areas that we can exploit is, (despite the 3-3 debacle) football fixed odds, because they are odds and they are fixed! Sounds like part of a Blackadder script doesn't it? What I mean is they are printed well in advance of the games and as far as I am aware they don't change them, prior to the off. That's why I think this Football Intelligence Network might be a bit of a cracker. *So let's all of us give it our fullest support!*

Let me finish by offering you an example of a system which I think *might* be profitable and that the bookies may find it difficult to screw down. Perhaps our friends at the Racing Post, may be able to check out the long term profit prospects for us? (I know I have a cheek after slagging them off!)

This is what you need to operate - **FOXWISE**

1. A copy of the Racing Post on days when they have a Pricewise column.
2. Preferably, credit accounts with all the bookmakers listed. (I have over 20 at present)

Anybody who has tried to profit using the Pricewise data will know how difficult it is, due to the fact that these races, which are priced up in advance are usually the most difficult to fathom, resulting in long losing runs. So this is what I suggest that you do!

1. The only races to look at are those which have been priced up in the Pricewise column.

2. Note the selections of the following, from the Racing Post, for the races in question. Diomed, Topspeed, Spotlight, Postmark, Pricewise (if any) and the Forecast Favourite. In other words we can have a minimum of 1 selection up to a maximum of 6 selections.
3. Try to get the top price on offer from the Pricewise tables. (I know this may be difficult sometimes)
4. Now bet these selections at top prices against the field. By this I mean you proportion the amount you stake on each selection relative to the odds you can get for them.

This system has proven quite profitable in the short term and I would be grateful if Mel of the Racing Post could check this out over a longer period. Since the minimum bet most credit bookmakers will take is £5, then it follows that you will need at least a £30 + tax outlay for each race, if there are six selections. More often than not though, some of the selections are duplicated.

The beauty of this system, is lots of losing bets, spread over a number of bookies and *hopefully* covering up a nice little profit, at the end of the day. I leave you now with some recent examples of how the system is used in practice. The examples are based on a maximum outlay of £30 + tax per race.

See you in a better life!

12.11.94   CHELTENHAM 1.15

DIOMED	ATOURS	
POSTMARK	SQUIRE SILK	
SPOTLIGHT	MAJOR BUGLER	
PRICEWISE	CHIEF MINISTER	
TOPSPEED	SQUIRE SILK	
F/FAV	ATOURS	(i.e. 4 sels against the field)

SELECTS	ODDS	STAKE	+ TAX	RETURN	PROFIT
ATOURS	4/1	£10	£11	£50	£39
S/ SILK	4/1	£10	£11	£50	£39
M/BUGLER	10/1	£5	£5.5	£55	£49.5
C/MINISTER	8/1	£5	£5.5	£45	£39.5

RESULT	ATOURS	WON	4/1	RACE PROFIT = £17

12.11.94   CHELTENHAM   1.50

DIOMED	BRADBURY STAR	
POSTMARK	BRADBURY STAR	
SPOTLIGHT	TIPPING TIM	
PRICEWISE	BRADBURY STAR	
TOPSPEED	COMMERCIAL ARTIST	
F/FAV	TIPPING TIM	(i.e. 3 against the field)

SELECTS	ODDS	STAKE	+ TAX	RETURN	PROFIT
B/ STAR	7/1	£10	£11	£80	£69
T/ TIM	4/1	£15	£16.5	£75	£58.5
C/ ARTIST	16/1	£5	£5.5	£85	£79.5

RESULT   BRADBURY STAR   W 7/1   RACE PROFIT = £47

12.11.94   CHELTENHAM 2.25

DIOMED	CAB ON TARGET	
POSTMARK	CARDINAL RED	
SPOTLIGHT	DANCE OF WORDS	
PRICEWISE	DANCE OF WORDS	
TOPSPEED	CARDINAL RED	
F/FAV	LOCH SCAVAIG	(i.e. 4 against the field)

SELECTS	ODDS	STAKE	+ TAX	RETURN	PROFIT
CAB ON TGT	5/1	£10	£11	£60	£49
C/ RED	40/1	£5	£5.5	£205	£199.5
D O'WORDS	10/1	£5	£5.5	£55	£49.5
L/SCAVAIG	4/1	£10	£11	£50	£39

RESULT   NO WINNERS   RACE LOSS = £33

SMARTsig

An interesting and extensive article arrived recently detailing how one of our members converted from gambler to investor.
He shares his wisdom gained en route.

SOLID FOUNDATIONS FOR SUCCESS (part I)

Iain W Simpson

Most of the members who have contributed to the SMART magazine, have written about specific methods or systems. So I thought it worthwhile to write a piece on betting in general, and set some solid foundations for long term success.

". . . adopt a more professional attitude to betting"

Having become interested in betting via a naive glance across the racing pages of a tabloid back in April 1989, I've certainly had to learn a thing or two over the years in order to turn the percentages in my favour.

This knowledge took a long time to acquire, and I'd like to offer advice regarding some of the most important aspects of that long educational process. This brings me to the first point I would stress to any punter wishing to make a profit from betting,

- *1) learn about the real mechanics of betting*.

This does not mean reading some £4.99 paperback from W.H.Smiths about *'How To Win At Betting'*. I'm talking here about probability and statistics.

Many people will instantly ignore this and move on, but I can assure you that if you truly want to win at betting, it is essential that you understand and appreciate the importance of probabilities, percentages, chance, odds, mathematical expectation, and the law of averages. Knowledge of these terms and their practical implications will instantly put you ahead of 99% of the people you ever have, and probably ever will see in a betting shop. It will also force you (assuming reasonable intelligence), to adopt a more

professional attitude to betting. Your local library or bookshop should stock a range of suitable introductory texts on probability or statistics. Statistics books usually have at least one chapter on probability.

- *2) Read as much as you can about all aspects of betting*.

Do this only when you have read and understood a basic book on probability, as this will place you in a stronger position to judge between the truth and the fallacies of what you read.

Unfortunately there is a desperate shortage of books available in Britain for the betting practitioner, and only a handful of those that are available will teach you anything worthwhile. If you want to expand your knowledge beyond the average, you have to get your hands on American books. See end of article for a list of books and further info.

- *3) Don't jump straight in to reality . . . . . . be patient.*

Running a fictitious bank for a set period of time is highly recommended. This period is not just to test your ability to register a profit, but also to assess your performance under the various psychological circumstances which you may find yourself.

How your confidence is affected by a long losing run. Does it affect your method of assessment? Does it encourage you to back shorter priced horses?

"Do you begin betting more than your bank can really afford?"

How you react to a significant winning run. Do you begin betting more than your bank can really afford? Do you become lazy in your methods of form study? How you act following a run of 2nd placed bets. Do you resort to each-way betting?

Stringent self analysis during this period will increase your awareness of some of the problems you will inevitably encounter, should you enter the betting game for real. If, after a period of recording all details for say 50 to 60 level stakes bets, you fail to return a profit, it is not time to shrug your shoulders and dive in anyway, nor is it time to give up, rather it is time to consider your position.

Sit down and go through your bets. Did you really suffer an unlucky losing run? Did you make bets that should not have been made? Do you truly believe that you obtained value prices on each and every bet? Do you think you spent enough time studying the form and statistics for each bet to truly merit a financial investment in the final decision? Do you honestly think that you have acquired enough knowledge of the sports on which you are betting? After answering these questions and similar, take the appropriate actions to correct any mistakes or shortfalls and repeat the exercise. If you are intelligent, and honest with yourself, then trial periods will force you to face reality and consequently make the correct decision about your future relationship with betting. One further point about a fictitious bank is that it should be set at a monetary level equal to that of any real bank you may set up following your test period. It is not a wise idea to get used to £100 level stake bets if when the time comes for a real bank, you are more likely to be betting £5.

- *4) Set aside a betting bank and keep accurate detailed records of all bets made.*

The accurate and detailed recording of all betting transactions should have been established during your trial period, but setting up a betting bank is also crucial. A gambler will bet whatever he feels he can afford at any particular time (in some cases this will be however much he can lay his hands on, no matter the source). As an investor, planning an investment in your own betting skills, you must decide how much you can comfortably afford to risk in this investment. Then you must set that amount aside and consider it invested in your 'betting bond'. You must not see yourself as a gambler, but as an investor making a deposit in a medium risk investment fund. Betting is not a high risk investment. If managed methodically, with the appropriate degree of safety, and with a real will to win, it carries only medium risk. It has only been tagged a high risk area (in most cases 'stupidity' or 'throwing money down the drain'), because virtually everybody who bets has no real intent to win. If they did, they would make a positive attempt to learn about the mathematics involved, about the odds, the basic theory of bookmaking, how odds relate to probabilities, about bookies profit margins, about the true effects of tax on odds, to name but a few. They would spend time studying relevant form and statistics, and have all possible bets in any one race

". . you must decide how much you can comfortably afford to risk"

clearly set out with minimum acceptable odds and probable stakes. Spend an afternoon in a betting shop and you will soon find that this is no more true than pink visor-wearing aerobatic hedgehogs flying to Mars in pedal-powered hovercrafts.

The vast majority of bettors have no appreciable knowledge of probabilities, the law of averages, or positive mathematical expectation. Instead they are only interested in backing the horse they consider to be the best in the race. They know only two things. The horse that they think is best, and the

"Is it any wonder that betting is branded a losers game"

other horses that they do not think are best. Ninety percent of betting shop punters suffer from tunnel vision. They think the best horse in a race is the only horse worth betting on, otherwise they are betting on a horse they think is going to lose. Every horse in the field has a chance of winning the race that you are studying. The horse which you personally consider to be the best in the race, in your estimation, simply has the highest probability of success, and consequently merits the lowest odds. This does not make it a certainty. Betting is not a matter of black and white, it is a game of relative chances. It is this 'tunnel vision' brigade, (unintelligent, naive, unknowledgeable, we don't read books and we're proud of it, I'll have a bet. What's the fav?, it's odds on so it must win, dreaming of the big heinz or canadian win, 120 reverse forecast doubles please, I don't think he can win so I'll back him each-way, I've just lost £20 I couldn't afford to lose on a 4-6 fav. so I'll swear at the jockey and then annoy lots of other people with things like "I almost backed that b_____d, but....."), who represent the widely held image of what people who bet are like. Is it any wonder that betting is branded a losers game.

Betting, as stated previously, is only a medium risk investment if managed correctly. In order to manage your betting activities effectively you have to know your present level of resources, not just how much you won or lost on your last couple of bets. This is necessary if you are to stake amounts on each bet which realistically reflect your betting bank (i.e. it is not advisable to stake £20 on a 5-1 shot if your betting bank is only £300). Keeping detailed accounts also enables you to

thoroughly analyse your betting operation over any chosen period (e.g. what is your strike rate on national hunt bets, what is your % profit on turnover for snooker bets, what is the percentage increase/decrease of your bank after every 'pocket' of 20 bets, etc). Don't bet on the sports you enjoy, bet on the sports that you profit from. Keeping records allows you to continually monitor the various levels of profit or loss in each and every area of your betting operation. If you don't record your transactions, you are not continually reminded of the reality of any recently incurred losses, large or small, and when one or two negligible wins come along, your brain will focus on the positive and all too easily forget the fact that you remain in the red.

If you don't keep betting records, you're stupid, you're scared of the reality, you'll live for today and forget about last week, but if someone secretly knew the reality, approached you in two years time and informed you of the extent of your losses due to betting, would you believe them. "It can't be that much, it just can't be!. . . . . Can it?"

- *5) Apply for a Switch or Delta card from your Bank or Building Society.*

The Switch/Delta facility is a crucial tool for any serious off-course punter, as it provides access to a large number of bookmakers and consequently a diversity of opinion over prices for all types of betting events. I know it is virtually impossible to get on at a price if that price is either a clear discrepancy or is tipped by the Racing Post's Pricewise service, but the point is that if you can get 7-2 instead of the 3-1 on offer by the big three, then you have gained an additional edge. GET ONE!

- *6) Build a library of information and statistics on your chosen areas of betting.*

This involves acquiring sources of information and statistics to aid you in the selection and relative assessment of the runners or competitors who partake in events on which you choose to bet. If you are serious about betting then you must learn to make your own assessments of events or races. I'm not saying don't read or listen to what other people say, merely that the ultimate decision must always be based on your own judgement. If you are really serious about betting, then you should not simply be making a selection, you should instead be attempting to 'rate' each participant, in order to 'make a book' and consequently calculate prices for each competitor based on your own thoughts/views/judgements.

For this you need information and statistics about each 'runner'. The more information you have, the greater the probability of your assessments being correct, and the greater is the chance of you keeping one step ahead of the competition.

To give you some ideas about sources of info and statistics, I've listed some publications which I presently use, or have used in the past.

American football.

    Channel 4's N.F.L Annual

    Pro Football Weekly's yearly Almanac(imported)

    Channel 4's teletext (page 425+) (weekly stats)

    Racing Post (Friday) 75p

Football

    Racing & Football Outlook's Annual £2.50

    Friday's Racing Post (weekly form guide)

    The Times(Monday) 20p (excellent coverage & results)

Snooker

    Racing Post sports betting section

    BBC's Ceefax service (normally page 327)

Motor Racing

    BBC's Teletext service (normally page 360)

U.S. Golf

> PGA Tour (Official Media Guide) £12.99
> Racing Post (mostly Thursday)

Golf (U.S & Europe)

> Odds On magazine £1.95
> Racing Post (mostly Wednesday)
> The Times (Mon & Tue) 20p (results)

Horse racing

> Racing Post
> Odds On magazine
> BBC's Ceefax Racing Service
> Sporting Life Weekender (Nick Mordin) £1.35
> Raceform Update (weekly form book) £1.30
> Superform Annuals
> Timeform racecards (for Royal Ascot, Chelt., etc.)

Rugby

> The Times
> BBC's Ceefax (normally page 370)
> Friday's/Saturday's Racing Post

- *7) Draw up your own personal odds line (P.O.L.)*

This need not mean devising some magical formula, which after gathering together a few figures (speed figures, handicap ratings, etc.), will enable you to jiggle those numbers around and produce an astoundingly accurate odds line (although this would be the ideal solution).

Part II of Iain's article, detailing how he formulates his own P.O.L. will appear in the February edition

> > > > > > > *Stef*

SMARTsig

A "method" is detailed by a member who is looking for feedback from other SMARTies, he claims to make it pay, but suffers long losing runs.

DETECTING THE "HIGH PRICE" WINNERS

Michael Dalton

One of my favourite methods is detailed below. I prefer to call this a method, rather than a system since it does not have rigid rules.

From the Racing Post, look at the horses record of runs, wins and places.

Select horses with at least two career wins and the number of wins must equal or exceed the total number of second and third places.

```
e.g.      Muskora
                    W  6
                    2nd 2
                    3rd  2
6 is greater than 4

          The Caumrue
                    W  2
                    2nd  1
                    3rd  1
2 is equal to 1+ 1
```

I stick mainly to handicaps, the lower the value the better. Make a note of each of these horses, studying their form. these are horses who have the potential to win a race, but may have poor form figures because of running inappropriate distance, going, track, class, etc. Occasionally they may be types who run well after a break.

I mark these horses every day. I am not suggesting you back them all! there may be three or more qualifiers per race. However, there are often tell-tale

signs of a return to form. A course winner, jockey change, good draw in a large field, etc.

NOTE ESPECIALLY THE TRAINERS WHO'S NAMES APPEAR MOST FREQUENTLY!!

If you study these horses for a few months, you'll pick up some 20-1 winners. Naturally, there are some long losing runs, but I have managed to turn in a level stake profit.

I would appreciate feedback on this approach from fellow members.

█ **SMARTsig**

FOOTBALL INTELLIGENCE NETWORK

We are still looking to establish a network of football supporters who have the ability to predict, with some accuracy, the results of their chosen team. All the information will be collected and then re-distributed from a central point.

It is just one more way that our SMART special interest group is doing all it can to help members to help themselves, and to get that important "edge" over the bookie.

If you think that you, or in fact someone you know, can make a contribution to this network then please get in touch. Let me know the name of your team, and the number at which you can be contacted on Thursday & Friday.   Send details to:

SMARTsig
PO Box 44
Hayle
TR27 6YH

01736 754400

A fax arrived earlier this month from a SMARTie making observations on what's being discussed in other journals.

OVERBET SELECTIONS

SIR,

WHAT ABOUT THE VALUE OF NEGATIVE INFORMATION?

BOTH NICK MORDIN AND PHILIP ALEXANDER HAVE MISSED OPEN GOALS OVER THE LAST 12 MONTHS.

THIS IS NOT MEANT AS CRITICISM BECAUSE I HAVE A GREAT RESPECT FOR BOTH GENTLEMEN BUT RATHER AN OBSERVATION.

IF WE BACK RACEHORSES THEN WE SHOULDN'T LOSE MORE THAN AROUND ONE POUND IN SIX BECAUSE THAT'S HOW MUCH THE ODDS ARE STACKED AGAINST US.

IF WE LOSE MORE THAN THAT THEN SOMETHING IS WRONG.

THIS IS WHERE NEGATIVE INFORMATION COMES IN.

IF CERTAIN HORSES HAVE ATTRIBUTES THAT CAUSE LOSSES OF TWO POUNDS IN EVERY SIX OR MORE THEN THE OBVIOUS QUESTION GOES UNANSWERED.

WHAT HORSE OR HORSES TEND TO BEAT THESE OVERBET SELECTIONS?

ANSWER THAT QUESTION AND PROFITS SHOULD BE FORTHCOMING.

BEST REGARDS,

RAY COX

Don't always blame your system when things are going against you, look sideways, you may discover the goal-posts have been moved.

BE AWARE OF CHANGING CIRCUMSTANCES

Peter Jacobs

With regard to horse racing systems, we all think we have "cracked it", only to get our hearts broken by the seemingly inevitable LLR (long losing run). But things are not always what they seem, we should look a bit sideways when this takes place, it may not be our system at all, rather a change in circumstances. I'll illustrate with a few examples.

All this dry summer, the Clerks of the Course have been watering their tracks. They don't want to waste water on the outside of the tracks, but to use just enough to sway the official going, the surface ends up being very varied between the inside and outside gallops. This often has the effect of enhancing the effect of the draw (Effect of the Draw, Bob Roper, issue 1.1 page 19). Even a small amount of rain can amplify this advantage further.

Horses drawn on the inside tend to take the lead and keep it, running a shorter distance than those forced to take a wider route, and on different going conditions.

Result, a win is 70% due to connections and 30% to circumstances. This winner enters our calculations and next time, from a wider draw, on different going, fails to reproduce its apparent previous form. Chester and Royal Ascot are good examples of this effect this year.

Another thing that happens is that jockeys get permission to "go down" very early on some premise or other, get down to the start and then climb off. This horse, not having lugged around a hundredweight or so for ten minutes, romps in a winner. Again it enters our calculations as a winner and fails to produce next time, when it does not use the same ploy. (M Roberts is an expert exponent of this trick)

Then there is the Trainer strategy (I speak from having a taste of ownership) First the horse wins, it is then entered and runs in races where the distance, company or going are totally unsuitable. This in turn ensures that it will not win, it goes down the handicap until it gets a suitable mark, it is then placed in appropriate conditions to win again, and so the process goes on. ***(I've heard this somewhere before, oh yes, Michael Dalton, in the previous article! - Stef)***

One way I have of avoiding the dreaded LLR in the systems I operate is to add the stipulation of;

      Flat   less than 2-1, no bet
      Nhunt   less than 6-4, no bet

Do not bet jumps systems on heavy going nor flat systems on soft. Sure you may miss winners, but you will save more losers.

having said all that I had better put forward a system of my own.

Flat and Jumps inclusive.
From the Racing Post, look at the selections for the Placepot perms, our selections are the ones which are single selections (confident selections by implication). With the proviso on your bet, less than 2-1, no bet. Bet win only.

Simple is it not? I have been working with it from 7 Sept 1994 to 11 November 1994 (the date of this letter)

with the overall result of:

            37 WON   82 LOST

stakes	tax	total	winnings	profit	loss	
119	11.9	130.9	145.54	14.64	--	11.1% profit

I would be interested to know how this has fared at other times if anyone has access to back copies of Racing Post.

That's all for now, all the very best of luck to everyone.

SMARTsig

SMART Surfin' the 'Net

Last month I reported that I now had an email address, this also gives me access to the "Internet".

The 'net is rather like a gigantic special interest group, but with no bounds on the interests covered. Of course there is a gambling group, USA based, that has a very popular forum. Printed below are some extracts from recent postings.

(a total of 929 postings were made to the gambling group alone, during the preceding 14 days!)

"Surfin'" is the term used by Internet members for cruising around the different areas and newsgroups.

No apologies are made for spelling errors or subject matter, all items are printed without censorship. . . .

```
Re:     playing poker on the 486 computer.
    From:       Carl Lau <ag363@lafn.org>
    Date:       Sun, 27 Nov 1994 22:47:57 GMT
In a previous article, nagy@interport.net (andras m. nagy) says:
>Does playing poker on your friendly, unemotional 486 improve your game
quantifiably ?
I would think that this depends upon your level of playing.  If you are
just a beginner or don't play all that much than having a poker software
program can help sharpen one up and shorten the adaptive time that one
has to undergo say when playing in Vegas.
 I have played 7stud and holdem on my machine, I own 3+ software
packages, and I have found that 7stud is a bit more playable. I also
have a software that has excersises for picking out the nut hand for
holdem.
I remember someone was looking for holdem that played no limit. I never
got that !
This was probably a reference to Masque's World Series of Poker
Adventure which is I believe to only be available for DOS, not MAC.  The
machine has no fear, you can't intimidate a software program, or if you
program something like that if will probably work different than in real
life, in front of Doyle Brunson.  At present there is no perfect
strategy that one can employ at all times.  The way to play is dictated
by your competition.  None of the existing computer poker software
programs can factor this into its strategy. This is why the
expert/professional player will always beat today's poker software.
```

The expert, once figuring out the strategy of the software, can
radically change how he plays and suddenly the computer is at a big
disadvantage.
When I was trading for a living, there was a saying about "paper
trading" i.e. trading without money. Most experienced traders called it
garbage, cause when one's money is at stake, one tends to act
differently. Is this true in poker software ??
There is no perfect poker software, but what is there is a lot better
than having nothing.

->*** QUICKCASH *** RIGHT NOW!
(Arnold Lipman writes)
-> Dear Friend,
->
-> I recently received the following communication and am forwarding it
on to you. Please read it carefully and you too may realize an amazing
return for your efforts in following its simple instructions.
-> "My name is Dave Rhodes. In September 1988 my car was reposessed and
the bill collectors were hounding me like you wouldn't believe. I was
laid off and my unemployment checks had run out. The only escape I had
from the pressure of failure was my Apple computer and my modem. I
longed to turn my advocation into my vocation.

-> This January 1989 my family and I went on a ten day cruise to the
tropics. I bought a Lincoln Town Car for CASH in Feburary 1989. I am
currently building a home on the West Coast of Florida, with a private
pool, boat slip, and a beautiful view of the bay from my breakfast room
table and patio. I will never have to work again. Today I am rich! I
have earned over $400,000.00 (Four Hundred Thousand Dollars) to date and
will become a millionaire within 4 or 5 months.
->Blah Blah Blah,

I don't know who you think you are but posting to group of people who
continually are looking at mathematical permutation and combinations
trying to find the extra percentage is a real slap in the face.

What you are trying to do is set up unwary people into giving up money
that they will never see again.

Only the top people get rich on these schemes and in the middle alot of
unwary people get hurt. These types of scams are illegal in this
country because repeatedly people who can't see the scam in the numbers
are sucked in.

You have as much right as anyone to write your crap, but don't insult my
intelligence by posting it in the middle of intelligent people's
comments on true gambling.

Sandy Wiseman
Guelph Ontario
Canada

    From: Paul Vinkenoog <dawn@xs4all.nl>
    Date: Sun, 27 Nov 1994

Arnold Lipman wrote in (amongst other groups) soc.culture.netherlands:
" Dear Friend, I recently received the following communication and am
forwarding it on"
[etc.]

```
Will you STOP posting this crap in newsgroups where it doesn't belong?
Thanks a bundle.

Re:      *** QUICKCASH *** RIGHT NOW!
    From:        Rebecca Radnor <japlady@nwu.edu>
    Date:        Sun, 27 Nov 1994

        FOLKS! Pyramid schemes, are and always will be ILLEGAL!!!!
Rebecca Anne Radnor              // I know everything,
Dept. of Anthropology, NU        // I know nothing,
Japlady= Jewish American Princess // I used to put sticks under
        and Japan-ophile         // the back porch
                                 // and wait for them to petrify

Re:      *** QUICKCASH *** RIGHT NOW!
    From:        Arnold Lipman <intex@access2.digex.net>
    Date:        Sun, 27 Nov 1994

I would be delighted to delete the objectionable posting as it was
placed by one of my adolescent children and I have just discovered what
has happened.  How does one DELETE a posting?  help please
        Arnold Lipman

Re:      *** QUICKCASH *** RIGHT NOW!
    From:        Richard Sexton <richard@interlog.com>
    Date:        27 Nov 1994

In trn, the capital C key will (C)ancel  posting.  do it quickly! you're
gonna get a heap of mail over this.
                   ``Never let weeds grow on your dreams''

Re:      *** QUICKCASH *** RIGHT NOW!
    From:        Brian Taylor <bft@acpub.duke.edu>
    Date:        27 Nov 1994

Jesus Christ, not again.......Don't these idiots ever learn?

Re:      *** QUICKCASH *** RIGHT NOW!
    From:        Dik T. Winter <dik@cwi.nl>
    Date:        Mon, 28 Nov 1994

        (Rebecca Radnor) writes:
 > FOLKS! Pyramid schemes, are and always will be ILLEGAL!!!!
Depends on the country I would say.

Re:      *** QUICKCASH *** RIGHT NOW!
    From:        Mike Schenk <mrs@tinac.com>
    Date:        Thu, 1 Dec 1994

        >FOLKS! Pyramid schemes, are and always will be ILLEGAL!!!!
No they are not! Why should they be? If you're stupid enough to fall for
it, it's your own fault...
        Mike
```

```
Washington Blackjack Conditions
    From:        Stephen Dailey <smdailey@u.washington.edu>
    Date:        28 Nov 1994

Well, here's the first edition.  I'll post revisions as new information
comes in.  Name of the contributor is shown for each house; entries
without names are my own.

***  Blackjack Games in Washington as of November 27, 1994 ***
```

```
Mill Bay Casino (Manson)
Limits $3-$100.  8D, 80%, DOA, DAS, S17, 24 hrs.
Other games: slots, VP, craps, roulette

Double Eagle Casino (Chewelah)
Limits $3-$5.  6D, 75%, D10-11, no DAS, H17
Other games: slots, VP, craps (?)

Tulalip Casino (Marysville)                 Stephen Wood Limits $3-
$25.  6D, 75%, DOA, no DAS, H17.
Mon-Thurs 6PM-2AM, Fri-Sat 10AM-2AM.  Poker 11AM-2AM daily.  Other
games: roulette, craps, baccarat, pull tabs, poker Lummi Casino
(Bellingham):-                  Stephen Wood Limits $2-$100. 6D, DOA,
DAS, S17, LSR, Penetration 66%-70%. Open 24hrs.  Other games: poker,
pull tabs and high stakes (unlimited) player banked Pai-Gow, not
available 24hrs/day.

Nooksack River Casino (14m E of Bellingham on WA 542):- Stephen Wood
Limits $3-$100.  6D, DOA, DAS, H17, LSR, Penetration 87%-90%. Mon-Thur
6pm-2am, Fri 11am-2am, Sat/Sun 10am-2am.
Other games: craps, red dog, pull tabs, roulette and poker.  Poker from
11am daily.
Contributors:
Stephen Wood    swood@unixg.ubc.ca
Stephen Dailey
Woodinville, WA
smdailey@u.washington.edu
```

```
Cheating revisited
    From:        Chris Kevlahan <chrisk@mdis.co.uk>
    Date:        28 Nov 1994 02:00:18

Just read in the newspaper today that 3 unnamed individuals have filed
suite and are settling a cheating lawsuite against Sycuan Indian
reservation.

The modus operandi was in the "player banks black jack", marked cards
where used.  Thus enabling the professional cheat to see what card was
going to come out of the shoe.  The three individuals who filed suite
had a banking sydicate going Thats where they banked most of the BJ
games at Sycuan.  The reason being is that house banking games are
illegal in California.  The house just charges a small fee per hand from
the banker and the players.

Implicated where a couple of dealers and some players.
```

```
Re:     Four Color Playing Cards - Great Idea !
    From:        Ian Rintel <ilr6864@hertz.njit.edu>
    Date:        Mon, 28 Nov 1994

>   [4-color decks are...]
>> a simple, and good, idea.

I realize that some players will bitch.
Howabout for games where cards of the same color are somewhat related?
It will make it harder for new players to identify the 'left bower' in
Euchre.  Also, it will make playing solitaire annoying - You'll have to
remember which two colors can be placed on which two colors...
Actually Mr. Caro should be the one to comment. He's behind the current
move. I'd like to hear his reaction to the suggestion of using "cut-out"
shapes for the minor suits, which I think is a great (and simpler) idea.
```

This is a perfect idea. Lets see solid spades and hearts, but hollow
clubs and diamonds. - I'm taking a course "Human Factors of Industrial
Engineering", and although the course by no means makes me an expert, I
think because in many games cards of the same color are related in some
way, there should be something in common to those cards (namely their
color). What may be useful is an additional 'Cue' for telling the two
cards of the same color and denomination (but different suits) apart -
and a hollow figure compared to a solid one would take care of this...
Ian Rintel

Re: Four Color Playing Cards - Great Idea !
    From: Michael Daniel Eckstut <mde@acpub.duke.edu>
    Date: 29 Nov 1994

Would you change the Mona Lisa to give her a nicer smile? Would you
tear down the Green Monster in Fenway Park to give righties and lefties
equal advantages?

Of course not and that is why four color playing cards are disastrous to
all card lovers. It is unpure and goes against all that is right in the
world. Fight, fight, fight against the devil in disguise as a green
club.
         Just a thought.

Re: Four Color Playing Cards - Great Idea !
    From: James Michael Hammond <hammond@cs.utk.edu>
    Date: 29 Nov 1994

In article (Michael Daniel Eckstut) writes:
>Would you change the Mona Lisa to give her a nicer smile? [etc]

Do you wish that penicillin and insulin had never been invented?
Would you put a stop to the Boston Artery construction project?
Of course not and that is why four color playing cards are a boon to all
card lovers. It is progress and goes against all that is wrong in the
world. Fight, fight, fight against change-fearing reactionaries in
disguise as poor attempts at clever writers.
Just a thought.

Re: Four Color Playing Cards - Great Idea !
    From: David A. Cantor <DCantor@chqsplay.mv.com>
    Date: Tue, 29 Nov 94

         (Michael Daniel Eckstut) writes:
>Would you change the Mona Lisa to give her a nicer smile? [etc]

I have a deck of 4-color playing cards in which the clubs are blue and
the diamonds are green. The problem I have is that my particular kind
of color-blindness and the particular shades of blue and green that were
used makes the color of the clubs and diamonds look almost identical to
me. I'm partially red-green color-blind, and I've learned, over the
years, to distinguish the usual dark red of hearts and diamonds from the
black of clubs and spades. The 4-color deck confuses me, rather than
helps me.

I do not speak for all color-blind people, of course (and of course, I
do not speak for my employer), but for me, I prefer to leave things the
way they are. Continue to use two colors.

On the other hand, if a group of people who play together prefer a 4-
color deck, by all means, use it. Manufacturers, by all means, make
them available. Just please continue to leave the traditional 2-color
decks available.

By the way, how do you play games (Klondike solitaire comes to mind)
that use color to determine the legality of a play when you're using a
4-color deck? Let's see, there's a Seven of Spades, can I put a Six of
Clubs on it? Why not, it's a different color!

What a confusing game to teach to children if you only have 4-color
decks. "You can put hearts and diamonds on clubs and spades, and vice
versa, but you can't put clubs on spades, nor vice versa, nor hearts on
diamonds, nor vice versa." It's so much easier to learn "You can put
red on black and black on red, but you can't put black on black nor red
on red."

    From: Party Animal <bkacheri@rcp6.elan.af.mil>
Well, cut out shapes might be another idea. I wonder what Mike Caro
would say about that. Although I'm pretty sure that he's looked into
everything that would be possible before deciding on the 4 colors.

Also the main reason for the 4 color deck is probably mainly for holdem.
When you are on the edges it's kind of hard to seperate the similar
colored suits. By the way, Mike Caro said that the deck should be
coming out in the next couple of weeks. Check Card Player frequently.

A Baccarat System
    From: hare <hare@nevada.edu>
    Date: 13 Dec 1994

This system has worked very well for me. It is not a "get rich quick"
system. I play the system to win enough money to get an expensive meal
at a strip casino or earn enough money for a show ticket. I live in
Vegas by the way. I know I will eventullly loose playing this system.
I wished I would loose so I would quit playing it.

Whenever I need some money and am low in cash waiting for the next
paycheck, I use my system to earn enough for my activites. When I
present this system, please do not be harsh with me. I know (Martingale
sp?) progression systems are doomed to fail. I played this system for
100's of baccart hands and have not lost yet! Please send $5.00 to this
address......... Just kidding!

Here is the system: Go to a mini baccarat table with a few people
playing. Wait for the Bank to win 3 consecutive times (tie not
included). After the third bank win without a tie, bet for the player.
Bet 1,2,4,8,16 unit progression. If you wish, go to 32 units. Do not
go past 32 units.

Your minimum investment is $155.00 If a tie occures, leave your same
bet for the next hand. Begin to look for an opportunity to bet when
there is a new shuffel. DO NOT LOOK FOR A BET OPPORTUNITY if 3/4 or
more of the cards have been dealt out.

Example: new shuffel, payer wins, player wins, tie, bank wins, tie, bank
wins, bank wins, bank wins, make your player bet.   The most I have had
to bet is 8 units.   I have not lost yet.

When I lose my $150.00, I will stop playing this system and inform the
gambling group. Please express comments, observations.
Curtis

```
Cards needed!  HELP!
    From:       Jim Dorman <jimd@psg.com>
    Date:       Mon, 28 Nov 1994

I know, that sounds like the oddest thing you've ever heard, someone who
can't find playing cards.  But I need some hard-to-find stuff, and this
group being full of people who know the business....

I need some jumbo-face cards (with the big numbers on the corners and a
small window in the center with the pips).  They need to be "Bee" Club
92 Specials, and I need at least 4 decks, as quickly as possible.  And
the decks MUST be identical in sets of 4 (can anyone tell I'm loading
shoes?).

The best price I can find on promised jumbos is $2.50/deck + shipping.
I know I can do better, but I'm not bound for Reno or Vegas or A.C.
anytime soon, and I have a very immediate need for these cards.  If you
can help, I'll be forever grateful.  Thanks.
```

```
RE:EASY MONEY AT HORSES
    From: <mbsfpmy@menhpd.eng.man.ac.uk>
    Date: 12 Dec 1994

The way it works is simply to bet on all but the highest odds horse in
the race. Using some gaussian elimination you get solutions for bets to
be placed on all the other horses. Solutions are only real for approx.
30% of the races per day but that still gives you about 10 races to win
on

Re: EASY MONEY AT HORSES
    From: James Michael Hammond <hammond@cs.utk.edu>
    Date: 12 Dec 1994

What the hell kind of mathematical hairball are you coughing up here?
What matrix are you talking about?  What do you mean by "solutions are
only real for approximately 30% of the races"?  That's the kind of
language one uses when doing the _eigensystem_, not when solving the
system Ax = b by Gaussian elimination.
I can just see it:

"And here they come around the turn into the clubhouse stretch, it's
Markov Process by a neck, followed by Givens Transformation on the
outside, Householder Vector coming on strong, then two lengths back it's
Orthogonal Basis and ... wait a minute ... damn, it happened again, the
horses have all disappeared.  That's the sixth time today. Someone's
*got* to do something about the damn complex eigenvalues at this
racetrack."
--JMike
J Michael Hammond <hammond@cs.utk.edu>| Bogosity meter reading:Graduate
Research Assistant    | (on the old 1-10 scale)
Univ of Tenn Dept of Comp Sci         |
http://www.cs.utk.edu/~hammond/jmike. |        9.5 + i

Re: EASY MONEY AT HORSES
    From: Carl Rhodes <cuf@cco.caltech.edu>
    Date: 12 Dec 1994

I am not sure about this real solution thing, but what I think you are
proposing is that you bet to win on every horse except the longest shot
on the board (dutching your bet on these horses to guarantee a profit as
long as the longshot doesn't come in first).
```

That stuff about the solutions are real stuff must mean that you only
make a bet if the win bet on all the horses shows a profit (excluding
the longest price horse) What will this get you????? Here is what will
happen.

1. You will get a small profit most of the time when any horse beside
the longshot wins.

2. You will lose your shirt when that longshot actually does come home.

The take on the win pool in horse racing is 15-18%, so in the long run
the best you could do with this "system" is lose about 13-15% (I will
give you the fact that the crowd tends to overbet longshots, but only
slightly so. Certainly not enough to make your system profitable). If
you like this system, why not play roulette where the take is smaller.
Bet straight numbers 1-30 at 1 unit each.

You bet 30 units and you end up winning 35 units each time your bet
comes home. Just better hope those longshot numbers don't come home.
Heck 79% of the time you will show a 16% profit if there is a double 0
wheel.
         Carl

Re: EASY MONEY AT HORSES
     From: Robin Faichney <rjf1@stirling.ac.uk>
     Date: 13 Dec 1994

What you mean is this : The way it works is that you are trying to scam
people into something that can't possibly work. If you are talking
about pari-mutuel pools you literally don't know what you are talking
about.

I'm fairly new to horse racing, but as far as I know all of the
objections raised in this post apply also to betting in the UK with
bookmakers (the original post was from the UK), except for some minor
points: different bookies are to some extent different betting pools,
there is no breakage, and books may be "overbroke" by much more than
120%--I've seen >160%. In summary: it won't work here either.

Some of these schemes remind me of typical economists' claims: "but the
math has been checked and is error-free--it *must* work!"
Robin Faichney

Re: RE:EASY MONEY AT HORSES

That's what we call The Tote - we have it but not widely. He'll be
talking about "proper bookies" - but their take is typically about 20%,
as you say, so the rest of your objection stands.

Our Tote is in fact better as regards the take - regulated by law I
believe. However, there is only this one pool.

The bookies effectively form another single pool by laying off their
risks on each other, and this in fact affects the starting prices to the
detriment of the ordinary punter.

Re: EASY MONEY AT HORSES
     From: Robert White <rwhite@metronet.com>
     Date: Tue, 13 Dec 1994

$1/(20+1) = .0476$. Now unless the total of the take and breakage is less
than 4.76% you can't make a profit (and of course this horse could win
in which case you loose everything).

No matter what dutching scheme you use if you want to cover all of the horses the best you can do is to loose (take + breakage) - 4.76% and the worst is to loose it all. Now to make 25% you will really have to remove some low odds horses.

Removing a 3-1 shot and a 4-1 shot from a 120% pool (common in the US) will allow you to make 25% profit if any other horse wins. But remember you can certainly loose it all if either wins.

How do you come up with the 0.476 number? Could you show me the math on that and on how to get the total of 115%- 120%. Also what would the win percentage look like if you bet on all except the favorite?
Rob   rwhite@metronet.com   --

Re: EASY MONEY AT HORSES
    From: J A Stephen Viggiano <jsvrc@edison.uucp>
    Date: Tue, 13 Dec 1994

question was: >How do you come up with the 0.476 number?

Crimminy, it was 0.0476, not 0.476, and its derivation was in the text you quoted!

Probabilities and odds are related through the following formulae:
        P = 1 / (1 + Odds)
        Odds = (1 / P) – 1

These formulae are for gambling odds, which are quoted *against* a proposition, rather than *for*.

The 1.15 to 1.20 figure comes from calculating the probabilities from the gambing odds based on the formula above, for each horse in a race, and adding up the probabilities. These "probabilities" will sum to greater than unity (i.e., 1.15 to 1.20, typically), because of the track rake, vigorish, or whatever you want to call it, as well as the breakage (rounding down to the dime).

Look in the newspaper for racing results. Find a set of charts that show all runners, not just the in-the-money finishers. Locate the column that says: "Eq. Odds to $1" or something similar. These are the gambling odds. Convert all the odds into "probabilities" using the first formula above. Add up the "probabilities" for all the horses in a single race (counting coupled wagering interests such as entries and fields once apiece).

The sum will be unity for a so-called "fair" line. In fact, it will sum to approximately 1.18, because of the vigorish and breakage.
If you are a handicapper and are constructing your own odds lines, this is something to keep in mind. Suppose three horses are entered in a race, and there are no coupled entries

Suppose, further, that all three horses had an equal chance of winning. A valid odds line for this race would be 3:2 (1.5:1) for each horse. The "probabilities" computed from these gambling odds would sum to 1.20.

An invalid odds line for such a race would be, for example, 3:1 for each horse. You would never see a single bookmaker offering these odds in a race like this, and you certainly never will see three interests in a single race going off at 3:1 apiece under the Pari-mutuel system. There wouldn't be enough money in the pool to pay the winners, let alone a profit for the track (or the state).

A "fair" odds line for such a race would be 2:1 for each horse.

The probabilities computed from these gambling odds sum to unity. There
will be enough money to pay the winners, but there will be no profit.
You won't see an odds line like this in real life, either.
Have fun & fly 'em high!
--
Having fun at NARAM-37 should be easier than pronouncing "Geneseo".
John Viggiano, jsvrc@rc.rit.edu or sjvppr@ritvax.isc.rit.edu
NAR 25615   I'm the NAR, and I vote!

Help: ISO pro football schedule,spreads score for last 5+ years
    From: <jdetora@gtech.com>
    Date: Mon, 12 Dec 1994

I am trying to compile information related to pro football teams'
performance over the last five to ten years. I am looking for a source
where I can find schedules, spreads, and scores. Can anyone help?
Thanks.
John D.

Re: RE:EASY MONEY AT HORSES
    From: DeaconBlu <zlsiida@fs1.mcc.ac.uk>
    Date: Mon, 12 Dec 1994

The big problem here is that the betting forecast in the papers is only
a rough approximation. I suppose you could stand in the bookies (oh no
they allow seats these days...) with a portable but you'll need to be a
nifty typist to get it all done between first show and the off. Does it
work if limited to those races where they offer advance prices?

 DeaconBlu is the IRC poker channel nickname of Dave Budd, who works at
the Manchester Computing Centre, is Densa's mole in Mensa (& vice-
versa!), and advises you to take up juggling.

Richard Dawkins says: "Francis Crick is one of the greatest scientists
of the 20th century: who is Fraser Watts?"

Re: RE:EASY MONEY AT HORSES
    From: christensen_monte <lamont@fiend.newshost.dsg>
    Date: Mon, 12 Dec 1994

What you mean is this : The way it works is that you are trying to scam
people into something that can't possibly work. If you are talking
about pari-mutuel pools you literally don't know what you are talking
about.

If you add up the probability of any parimutuel pool by converting the
odds of each horse into a probability you will find (at least in the US
) that the sums are 115%-120%. The amount over %100 is the take by the
track and also the breakage (the track only pays in increments of $.20
and they allways round down).

Now by throwing out the highest odds horse in the race how much of that
take are you removing. Lets say you remove a horse at 20-1 (which is
usually not the highest price). What is the pool looking like now?

1/(20+1) = .0476. Now unless the total of the take and breakage is less
than 4.76% you can't make a profit (and of course this horse could win
in which case you loose everything).

No matter what dutching scheme you use if you want to cover all of the
horses the best you can do is to loose (take + breakage) - 4.76% and
the worst is to loose it all.

Now to make 25% you will really have to remove some low odds horses.
Removing a 3-1 shot and a 4-1 shot from a 120% pool (common in the US)
will allow you to make 25% profit if any other horse wins. But remember
you can certainly loose it all if either wins.

There is a way that you can dutch all of the horses in a race but you
will have to find the same race with different betting pools. If this
is your solution others have already tried it.

I formed a team of bettors which actually did this in the late 1980s on
simulcasted races in the US. We had people writting down the odds at 4-
6 tracks around the US. They would all call in the 4 minute to post
odds line and give it over the phone.

I wrote a computer program that would take input from n people betting
on the SAME m horses. The program would take into account how much
money each bettor had with him and the total amount the team wished to
bet.

It would then compute the best way to spread that money out on each
horse at the various tracks and compute the possible edge. If we could
get at least 20% we would make the bets.

But we ran into problems of timing, honesty of the players (probably
the biggest problem), and also odds changing after we called them in.
However we were able to bet on a series of races quite well.

This idea will work since in big simulcast races people in each part of
the country will bet on their local horses and therfore the odds will be
different in each track pool.

You still need a large difference between them to have a 20% negative
game turn 20% positive but it could be done by using 4-6 tracks.

We were able to bet on every horse and make a profit no matter what.
The problem is that back then there weren't that many simulcast races
like there are today. Also coordination of team players is a major
problem.

Every other dutching scheme involves a great deal of risk since you
can't cover all of the outcomes and are taking a chance at losing it
all. And I am willing, like almost everyone else on rec.gambling, to
give this advice away for free unlike you who wants to profit from it.

Monte Christensen   "I am going to kill this GOD .... RACE"

Email christensen_monte@tandem.com   -- Andy Beyer

**Let me know if you have found this re-print of the Internet gambling
discussion group interesting. It has served a very useful purpose from
my point of view this month with my very limited time to prepare the
magazine.
I'll be looking at the horseracing forums before the February issue,
would you like to know what goes on there?**

SMART Review

PRS PF1 Review

Following your comments on reviews of systems, I have enclosed a review of the PFl system by Precision Racing Systems. I have been fairly meticulous about the analysis of system selections and have included full results, including copies of my analysis sheets, for you to examine. I can appreciate your fears concerning reviews made by system owner's relatives etc. However, I have a nasty habit of calling a spade a spade, then using it to beat the truth out of programs, systems etc. In fact I think Robin Lloyd is still reeling over my analysis of his Blockbuster program!

Systems. Love them or hate them, there are certainly plenty about to spend your money on. The proverbial $64,000 question is, of course, do any of them actually produce the goods and make a level stake profit? In order to answer this question we have to look at what is on offer. The system under scrutiny here is PF1 sold by a company called Precision Racing Systems (PRS). Don't order a crate of champagne and book your round the world cruise just yet, because PFl is not going to fulfil these dreams.

What is refreshingly unique to systems sold by PRS is exemplified by the whole approach of proprietor, Dave Garratt. The first and most striking difference is the quality, not only of the documentation but of the service. Instead of the all too typical photocopy which looks as if it has been rescued from the toilet, and where the text has been produced by a Victorian typewriter complete with abundant spelling mistakes, all documentation produced by PRS is of the highest quality and laser printed. In fact it's almost as good as the SMARTsig magazine!

What is also novel, and extremely welcome, is that all subscribers to PRS systems are sent a monthly newsletter detailing the previous months results and two free retyped systems. Not only that, each letter from PRS is always accompanied by a reply paid envelope which you can use to correspond with Dave Garratt if you have any queries, suggestions etc. And yes, you do get a reply!

The last and most important facet of the service provided by PRS, and which is mostly devoid from sellers of most systems, is honesty. I have independently checked the results of this years flat season and have not found any anomalies (e.g. missing races, etc.) whatsoever. This is particularly commendable

> *" . . . most important facet of the service provided by PRS . . . is honesty."*

as this years results were disappointing and the temptation to 'enhance' results must have been ever present.

Okay, enough of the service what about the system? PF I is a favourites system for the flat season and is based on three criteria; track analysis, winning form and professional opinion. The track analysis is based on research which earned the winning performance of favourites, taking into account distances ran and time of year, culminating in a list of tracks from which the selections can be made. Winning form is gauged by a two pronged strategy, namely that the horse must have won last time out (LTO) and that it must have won by 3 lengths or more. Finally, the criteria for professional opinion is that the selection should be the forecast favourite in the Racing Post. And that's it! Using level 1 point stakes (£l.00) the results for the entire flat season are as follows:

DATE/RACE/TIME	SELECTION	Res/SP	STAKE	PROFIT	BANK
					£0.00
MAY30/SAND/3.40	LOCHSONG	w 4/9	£1.00	£0.34	£0.34
SAND/5.20	SPECIAL DAWN	w 7/2	£1.00	£3.40	£3.74
JUN 2/BEVE/3.10	GONETOHEAVEN	4 9/4	£1.00	(£1.10)	£2.64
JUN 6/PONT/4.45	CIM BOM BOM	w 7/2	£1.00	£3.40	£6.04
PONT/5.15	JOSEPHS WINE	w 2/1	£1.00	£1.90	£7.94
JUN 16/ASCT/3.05	OWINGTON	w 4/1	£1.00	£3.90	£11.84

JUN 24/NWM/3.30	KISSAIR	4 4/1	£1.00	(£1.10)	£10.74
JLY 2/SOTH/6.30	KING'S SHILLING	11 9/2	£1.00	(£l.10)	£9.64
JLY 5/NWM/3.05	LOVELY MILLIE	4 3/1	£1 .00	(£1.10)	£8.54
JLY 7/NWM/3.40	LOCHSONG	8 11/4	£1 .00	(£1.10)	£7.44
JLY 8/LING/3.20	IRADAH	4 7/4	£1.00	(£1.1 0)	£6.34
JLY 16/NEWB/2.30	BRIEF GLIMPSE	w 7/2	£1.00	£3.40	£9.74
NEWB/3.00	WAVIAN	2 4/5	£1.00	(£1.10)	£8.64
SOTH/8.40	D'CING TRLTHEE	4 5/2	£1.00	(£1.10)	£7.54
JLY 23/SOTH/4.45	MR DEVIOUS	3 11/8	£1.00	(£1.10)	£6.44
JLY 28/GOOD/3.45	LAWAAL	3 2/1	£1.00	(£1.10)	£5.34
AUG5/NWM/6.00	ONE VOICE	3 4/1	£1.00	(£1.10)	£4.24
AUG18/YORK/4.45	YENDA	2 7/4	£1.00	(£1.10)	£3.14
AUG19/CHES/3.30	WIZARD KING	w 7/2	£1.00	£3.40	£6.54
AUG27/NWM/4.20	MUFTAB	2 9/2	£1.00	(£1.10)	£5.44
SEP 8/DONC/4.10	POLISH ADMIRL	w 11/4	£1.00	£2.65	£8.09
SEP 9/DONC/3.35	ALAMI	3 10/1	£1.00	(£1.10)	£6.99
SEP10/DONC/3.40	RED ROURE	7 15/8	£1.00	(£1.10)	£5.89
SEP13/SAND/4.00	JADWAL	2 6/4	£1.00	(£1.10)	£4.79
SAND/5.35	DOUCE MAISON	3 7/2	£1.00	(£1.10)	£3.69
OCT 6/HAYD/4.10	RUNSIN' FAMILY	2 9/2	£1 .00	(£1.10)	£2.59
OCT13/REDC/1.50	RORY	2 5/1	£1.00	(£1.10)	£1.49
OCT 22/DONC/3.40	CELTIC SWING	w 1/1	£1.00	0.90	£2.39

MONTH	WINS	BETS	HIT	TOTAL RETURNS	PROFIT/ (LOSS)	BANK
PRS PF1 – 1994 FLAT SEASON MONTHLY TOTALS						
OPENING BALANCE						£0.00
MAY 94	2	2	100%	£5.94	£3.74	£3.74
JUN 94	3	5	60%	£12.50	£7.00	£10.74
JLY 94	1	9	11%	£4.50	(£5.40)	£5.34
AUG94	1	4	25%	£4.50	£0.10	£5.44
SEP 94	1	5	20%	£2.75	(£l.75)	£3.69
OCT94	1	3	33%	£2.00	(£1.30)	£2.39
TOTALS	9	28	32%	£32.19		

Notes
1. Return   = Winnings + Stake.
2. Profit   = Return - Stake - Tax.
3. Hit rate   = 9 wins/28 bets = 32%.
4. Average winning S.P.
   $= 4/9 + 7/2 + 7/2 + 2/1 + 4/1 + 7/2 + 7/2 + 11/4 + EV$
   $= 24.19/9$
   $= 2.69$
5. ROC   = (Total Returns - Tax)/(Total Staked) x 100
   $= (32.19 - 0.9)/(28 \times 1.1) \times 100$
   $= 102\%$

The results speak for themselves. Although a (very) small after tax profit of 2.39 points was shown it is hardly earth shattering. Examination of the monthly totals table reveals that the system got off to a very good start in May and June, but from July onwards it effectively made a loss every month. Interestingly, using the recommended staking plan of 10% of the betting bank, shows a loss of approximately 2.5 points. This acts as a salient reminder to anyone contemplating using some sort of staking plan to boost their winnings - it can also boost your losses!

As a useful comparison to the wild swings which this and many other systems can show from season to season, I have included a list of the results of PRS PF1 for the 1993 flat season which were part of the system package. Please note, I

have NOT checked these results and cannot comment on their veracity. In 1993, PF1 had 33 winners from 53 bets giving a hit rate of 62% and an after tax level stake profit of 27.05 pts. and a Return on Capital (ROC) of 141%.

Dave Garratt expressed his disappointment on the 1994 flat season results, yet states that he is at a loss as to why the system has performed so badly this year. My preliminary thoughts are that the poor results may be due to the track analysis component of the system. This is because the list of tracks/distances run provided for each month from which system selections are made, is based on the previous season results. As we are all too well aware, what happened in one season does not necessarily mean that similar trends will be repeated in the following season. Naturally an analysis of the 1994 season would be required to determine whether this was true or not. Alternatively, if any SMARTies have any other ideas please write in!

Future Reviews

I have recently bought a book on the subject of pools betting entitled *Football Pools: Large Profits From Small Stakes*, written by Chris Brown and published by Chartsearch. You may have seen their adverts in the press including Racing & Football Outlook. The book certainly has an engaging title, but does the book live up to expectations? If interested I will submit a review in time for the January issue.

I am also in the process of examining the performance of the JQL Pools Plan program by John Q. Lavelle. This program is distributed as shareware and I bought the registered version. The program has recently been upgraded to V2.0. As you may be aware the program uses newspaper expert forecasts as the basis for its predictions. It would be interesting to know on what basis the program works - have you any thoughts? What I have embarked upon is an analysis of the first 12 weeks of this season using both VI.0 and V2.0 of the program.

Although the sample size is very small (an awful lot of work is involved), this should give a reasonable indication of the general performance of both versions of the program and whether the 'improvements' in the latest version really do enhance the predictive capabilities. I have not done enough analysis at this stage to comment on the performance of the software except to say its certainly not going to make you rich! If you wish, I shall keep you informed of results.

Graham Kendall

SMARTsig

SMART Feedback

SYSTEM "X" REVEALED

In answer to the request from Robert Hattrell** I devised "system X" many years ago and it has had some very good seasons especially over the jumps. Whilst giving the details of this method I would remind him of my previous remarks concerning systems with rigid rules.

Using the Daily Mail

• Note any selection given by both R. Goodfellow and Gimcrack.

It must conform to the following:-

• A race with 5 to 18 runners
• Forecast 4-5 to 9-4
• Must have raced during the current season

Ignore Selling, Auction and Amateur races.

In National Hunt races the selection must not have refused, pulled up, ran out or fell in it's last run. And must be:-

• Top rated by Formcast
• Forecast Favourite

Nat Hunt: Use only non handicap hurdles
Flat: Use non handicap races only

May I also take this opportunity to thank Alan Coldrick for his research of the Longbow headlines.

It was good to see Nigel Taylor (Formcast) has joined us, I have followed his ratings since he took over that position in 1979. One thing I have learned is that you back against his top rated selection at your peril! I wonder if he could answer a couple of questions for me?

1. Why are there never joint top rated horses when very often there are co, joint 3 and even joint 4 second rated?

2. Why are some horses with form given no rating?

Jim Streek SMARTsig

GENERAL

M**any thanks.** I must say that I am most impressed and heartened by the way that the SMARTsig magazine is growing from strength to strength. The additional benefit of having some of the well known experts joining the membership is extremely encouraging. I am also pleased to see that there are quite a number of contributions from fellow SMARTies as well as the articles from the regular contributors (thanks Alan) and your good self . You will have noted that I also like the term 'SMARTies' to describe SMART members and will use it as appropriate. We do have to be careful, however, that this expression is not translated in a derogatory manner to mean 'smart asses' - even if it is true! I would also like to cast a favourable vote in support of your idea concerning a membership lapel badge/tie pin. Any chance of getting one before Christmas?

Tax Free Betting Your feedback feature on tax free betting was as welcome as it was revealing. As usual, the law is never straightforward, even with straightforward matters! However the *coup de grace,* so to speak, is the fact that it is legally possible to bet on a tax free basis (in theory) without the rigmarole and expense of attending race courses. It is just a pity that as the law currently stands, the vast majority of punters will never know of the marvellous opportunities of losing their money on a tax free basis!

Newspaper Football Expert Monitoring Source Do you know of any source which gives a comparative study of the performance of newspaper football experts along the lines of the horse tipster tables in the Racing Post? *(Do any members know of anything? – Stef)*

Bulietin Boards/CompuServe Are you aware of any bulletin boards or forums within CompuServe which might be of interest to SMARTies? I have been considering purchasing a modem for some time now. The price of modems has dropped quite dramatically and range of features (fax/voice etc.) combined with the high communication speeds make them extremely versatile and reasonably cheap to use. This may even be an avenue in which SMARTsig could expand it's activities. It would certainly be particularly suitable for projects such as the Football Intelligence Network?   *Graham Kendall*

(See Up Front and Surfin' the 'Net - this issue - Stef)

DATA ANALYSIS - CONSECUTIVE WINS

Sorry for the delay in this letter. I would first of all like to comment on some items in issue 1.2. On page 12, Engineer IOM no.9, he quotes a figure of 5.75% of horses with form figures 11 win a third race in succession.

Here is a data analysis from 4161 flat races between Jan 1st 1993 and Dec 31st 1993.

Win/Run analysis following consecutive wins

Form figures	Wins/Runners	%strike	LS profit/loss (pre-tax)
11 & 211, 311, 411, etc	116/560	20.7%	loss 59.34
111 & 2111, 3111, 4111, etc	25/117	21.3%	loss 16.15
1111 & 21111, 31111, etc	11/35	31%	profit 0.73

From the same 4,161 races, the details on beaten favourites, last time out (issue 1.2, page 46)

Beaten Favourites analysis

Days since Btn Favourite	Wins/Runrs	%strike	LS profit/loss(pre tax)
1 - 4	21/124	16%	loss 5.31
5 - 7	44/236	18.6%	loss 7.22
8 - 11	70/419	16.7%	loss 109.23
12 & over	353/2308	15.3%	loss 322.86

Figures extracted using Raceform computer form & Access database.

Michael Dalton

SMARTsig

DESTROYED BY FIVE-DAY ENTRY INTRODUCTION

I had better answer the question by explaining exactly what the system entailed and correcting an error in my original letter.

I first devised the system in 1982 and used it successfully until the end of 1986.

The basis of the system was to marry Time Horses in handicap races of all description under one mile with the W Factor ratings in the Daily Express (top three only published in those days). To find the raw material for a selection one worked down the ratings from the top rated. The first rated Time Horse from my list (if any) became the selection subject to it falling within one of the following qualifying categories:-

1. Winner last time out.

2. Course and distance winner.

3. Second (inc. third beaten less than a length by winner) and beaten favourites running within seven days.

The selection then became a bet subject to a minimum price restrictions which I calculated very crudely by taking the mark from the runners in the handicap proper and dividing that figure by three.

I wish I had kept my records but I can remember that throughout four completed seasons I averaged 33% winners at an average S.P. of 11/2 which explains, I think, why the method was profitable!

Of the various categories winners last time out were by far the most consistent although course and distance winners had their moments including Touch of Grey which won the Wokingham at 20/1.

From the beginning of the 1987 season the last time out winners simply stopped winning which I put down to the introduction of the five day entry system. I know that a colleague in the North whose selections were based solely on recent winning form and who had bet very profitably for ten years prior to 1987 suffered also and eventually gave up.

Vic Lee **SMARTsig**

STAKING SYSTEMS

In reply to Jonathon Wellingham in the November issue who enquires *"Are staking plans ever to be considered when a system cannot produce a level stakes profit?"* The system he refers to reviewed by *Horseer* and *Methodmaker* will achieve that to a limited extent. (and by the way Jonathon Horseer's figures for the level stakes profit were incorrect - check them!) The aim to win one point per bet plan will turn a small loss into a gain. It will only achieve this if around 45% winners at evens or longer can be attained consistently. That is nine winners at evens in every twenty selections, initial stake to be not more that 1% of capital.

- One point is staked on the first selection and if lost another theoretical point is added to this and recorded in the "due" column.
- Future stakes are always increased by one point whilst there is a figure remaining in the due column, except that such stakes will never be more than one point greater than the outstanding figure in the due column.
- When a winner is backed the "due" column is reduced by the number of points won, minus one.

(I personally don't bother with odd amounts, just leaving them in the "won" column to accrue).

> SMARTsig note: In the original magazine the second bullet point above was incorrect. In this version it is amended as per a statement given by Alan in issue 202. His correction statement in that issue remains.

I prefer the more cautious approach of aiming to win one point in a coup.

- One point is staked on the first selection and if lost another theoretical point is added to this and recorded in the "due" column.
- After a loser remain on the same stake.
- After each winner increase the stake by one point.
- When a winner is backed the "due" column is reduced by the number of points won.

Results using the return sequence given are:-

	Outlay	lost	won	bank	% on outlay
Level stakes	40	22	18	-4	-10%
Win plan	290	120	170	+50	+17%
Win coup	126	56	70	+14	+11%

No allowance has been made for betting tax.

This may not be exactly the answer Jonathon is seeking but hopefully it will at least be of interest to him and to others.

Win 1 point per bet plan

Stake	Result	Lost	Won	Due
1	L	1		2
2	L	2		5
3	W		3	3
4	W		4	0
1	L	1		2
2	W		2	1
2	L	2		4
3	L	3		8
4	L	4		13
5	W		5	9
6	L	6		16
7	W		7	10
8	W		8	3
4	L	4		3
5	L	5		14
6	W		6	9
7	L	7		17
8	W		8	10
9	L	9		20
10	W		10	11
11	W		11	1
12	W		12	0
1	L	1		2
2	L	2		5
3	L	3		9
4	L	4		14
5	L	5		20
6	L	6		27
7	L	7		35
8	L	8		44
9	W		9	36
10	L	10		47
11	W		11	37
12	W		12	26
13	W		13	14
14	L	14		29
15	W		15	15
16	L	16		32
17	W		17	16
17	W		17	0

Alan Coldrick   **SMARTsig**

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

I **would like to comment** on some of the items in previous issues, you may or may not find these to be of interest.

August issue 1.1

Yes by all means include ethical advertising both as a service to your readers and also to keep costs down.

Bob Roper correctly points out that different publications have different recommendations on the effects of the draw. The recent publication "Solidus" does give information which enables a "lengths advantage" to be worked out from the draw and this can be used to modify ratings. Solidus is a very interesting book although the formula given for place betting is dubious in the extreme!

September issue 1.2

Alan Coldrick's "calculating value for money odds" gives rise to some questions. Different ratings have different spreads, e.g. Formcast top rates at 78, The Sun at 99, the Official handicapper at 120, so differing ratings will probably give different odds.

> *". . . weight of money reduces the prices and turns the system into a loser."*

Also how do the ratings turn out for different distances? - are sprints as accurate as long distances? Marshall's formula in the 1970s turns the ratings into "lengths advantage" on the grounds their weight has more effect over longer distances than in sprints. This seems logical.

I like the "Golden Oldie" by Engineer IOM because of Bacons theory of ever-changing cycles. When winning systems become well known, weight of money reduces the prices and turns the system into a loser. From my youth I remember two such systems:-

- The favourite in the last race, if not a handicap.   and

- The most recently placed.

Both were winning systems which eventually became losers - perhaps the cycle will change again. However, the oldies do now have to battle against the 10% tax for at home punters.

October issue 1.3

Jim Streek's letter was most interesting but surely the "Longbow" results for Friday can have no logical basis and despite the good results shown in Alan Coldrick's reply, I can only think that it is a statistical quirk. Alan's idea of a portfolio of systems has merit.

T Southern's analysis of handicaps is interesting but I feel that his figures should be broken down further. Possible break-downs should include distance, severity of course, easy, standard and severe, and going of soft, good, firm. I feel that this would be likely to throw up variations. it would be interesting to know if his survey agrees with a point made in an American publication that the best 50% of anything win 80%

"Money management is as important as selections"

On page 43 you state that you will avoid publishing systems that use staking plans as part of their strategy. Whilst I agree that you should avoid systems that show a level stakes loss, a staking plan should be a part of any system. Money management is as important as selections. Serious investors should of course use the Kelly percentage of the book method, since extensive computer simulations in the U.S. have shown that this enables the bank to increase at the quickest rate.

Other staking plans can be used with systems that overall produce level stake gains as it can even out returns. For example, when I was a young boy, the favourite in the last race, if not a handicap was a winning system. However, a system which overall shows a profit may have losing seasons. The use of the percentage of the bookmakers bank has its uses here. A small loss or break even is turned into a profit, and a small profit is increased. You cannot get this for nothing - a large profit will be reduced and a large loss will be increased.

Staking plans do inject a little interest into the process. For a system which shows small gains the "Oscar" staking system has merit.

Colin Evans wrote a very good letter and he is quite right that "the only key is knowing how accurate is your calculation of value". If I knew the answer I would have cracked it, but here are a couple of ideas to research.

Instead of surveying the whole field, take only the first four in say, the Sporting Life betting forecast. Calculate the probability from these forecast prices and add them together. Say for instance they add up to 0.8 - now use this in your formula (whichever variation you are using) instead of the usual 1.0 for the whole field.

Another thought is that if there is anything in the suggestion that the best 50% win 80%. Use 0.8 in you formula instead of 1.0 and calculate only the top half in the ratings.

I'm glad I decided to subscribe and look forward to future issues.

Bernard Rasmussen

PS

How about all members recommending the best two books they have read on gambling systems?   My two are:-

Winning at the Races (computer discoveries in thoroughbred handicapping - William L Quirin)

The Casino Gamblers Guide (Alan N Wilson)

SMARTsig

How about this suggestion then members?
And who's going to be first to tell us the best book they've read is "The Money Spinners" Black, Jacques?

What about a rogues gallery of "don't touch with a barge pole" books?
                                                                Stef

SMART Questions

Some members require clarification from previous contributors, on issues raised, comments passed or where a reference was not understood. I hope the originator will reply to these questions, but others may pass comment if they feel it may help.

PUZZLED BY JACQUES BLACK ARTICLE

I **have just received my second copy** of SMARTsig and must congratulate you on the interesting and varied content spread.

I was particularly interested in the article by Jacques Black where he discussed *"the number of trials necessary to be confident you have a winning system"*

My own knowledge of statistics is pretty limited and I was therefore particularly grateful for the way he put forward the formulae in a simplified fashion with full explanations.

On p.41 he stated that when the cumulative win on a series (of 30 or more) is almost five times the standard deviation, then the gambler can be more than 99% confident that his win reflects the viability of his system rather than pure chance.

At the time of reading the article I had a pocket full of coins and tipped them randomly on the table. I decided I would apply the formula to the distribution of the heads and tails on the coins assuming that I could back

"heads" for £100 a time! It transpired that I had 31 coins and they fell as 18 heads and 13 tails.

According to my calculations the cumulative win would be £500, averaging £16.13 per coin and the standard deviation 98.7 As the cumulative win is more than five times the S.D. it would seem to indicate that the person backing heads could be more than 99% confident that his win was not the result of pure chance.

31 selections
18 wins
13 losers >>   +5 x 100=£500 gross profit

Average: = £500 ÷ 31 = £16.13

$$SD = \sqrt{\sum (X - \overline{X})^2 \div n}$$

Differences   18 x 83.33²   = 124,990
               13 x 116.13²   = 176,955
                                  301,945

$$SD = \sqrt{301,945 \div 31}$$

$$= 98.7$$

My next move was to examine various series of 31 spins at roulette and I found that differences of five or more between reds and blacks were quite frequent. I would be grateful for the comments of Jacques or any other members who could put my random findings in context with reference to the very interesting article.

One of the big drawbacks I find is the time taken to arrive at any rating based on these figures as one has to look back to the previous races to find the going correction in order to arrive at the correct time to cover the distance.

The Apothecary

SMARTsig

SMART computer network

Computer contacts

Chris Patten-Walker, a computer enthusiast from Kent would like to hear from other computer "junkies" who would be interested in forming a SMART computer subgroup, swapping ideas and strategies.

He sees many possibilities and benefits for a SMARTsig communications network with members in contact via their computers and telephone lines using modems.

If you see yourself as a computer *user* rather than a *whizz-kid* who doesn't feel able to use your machine to the full, and you don't know your modem from your IDE card or your interface from your elbow, Chris has offered all the assistance he can to help the rookies to use their machines to the full.

Because of location, he would initially prefer contacts around his South of England base, but such is the technology these days, distance is less of a problem for members who are already modem literate!

Chris may be contacted on 071 516 3979 during working hours, or by post, member no. 2160, c/o SMARTsig, at our address.

Special note for non-computer users

No, this is not the thin end of the wedge!

Subgroups such as this will always have a place within the SMARTsig umbrella. However, non-computer users and the computer-haters among you will always be well served. SMARTsig will meet the needs of the majority and this will be reflected through the magazine. I have no firm figures, but my guess is that non-computer SMARTies still outnumber the rest!

- Stef

SwapShop

How to use Swap Shop

If you have any items for inclusion in SwapShop please send details to SMARTsig. Indicate if you wish either or both your telephone number and address to be included, alternatively you may use your membership number as a box number, in this case please include 2 x 1st class stamps to cover any postage.

To obtain items from the SwapShop, either;
*   contact the address or telephone number accompanying the ad.

Or, in the case of a box number;
*   send a letter or telephone SMART with;
*   your name
*   membership number
*   preferred contact address/telephone number
*   the reference number of the item(s)

DO NOT SEND ANY MONEY WITH YOUR REQUEST

The goods are being offered by our members - not by SMARTsig

Many items offered through SwapShop will keep their value even when you have finished with them, simply recycle them once again through our SwapShop pages.

WANTED
A copy of The Solidus   Contact Vic Lee
174 Sutton Road
Mansfield
NG18 5HH
01623 633371

Special Offers

Yes Folks - we've done it again!

Racing Post Form Book

Flat 1994

Available to FULL SMARTsig members for just
£18.50 including postage.
(saving £10.00 on normal post-paid price)

To place your order;

Send a cheque/money order made payable to S.
Perry to;

Stefan Perry
SMARTsig
PO Box 44
Hayle
TR27 6YH

n.b. this offer is dependent upon a minimum total order from the SMARTsig Special Interest Group, try to ensure your order reaches here before the end of January to avoid disappointment.

Books & Publications

GENERAL BOOKS
An effective 10% discount and free postage on books. Book finding service. Contact Jay Cook, The Bookshop & Gallery, 40 Earsham Street, Bungay, Suffolk, NR35 1AQ. Tel: 0986 895164.   Fax: 0986 895748

BRED
Tim Coe the author is able to offer a discount to full members. Contact Tim Coe, 19 Cherry Way, Upper Halliford, Shepperton, Middx. Tel: 0932 779393

RACING POST
Current form books @ £18.50 (all prices are post paid. Contact me here at SMART sig. Cheques etc. made payable to S. Perry.

SOCCER
Every professional football result is available in book and on computer disk from a member of the Association of Football Statisticians.
Tony Brown, 4 Adrian Close, Beeston, Nottingham.   Tel: 0602 736086

HORSE RACING
Computer Raceform offer their "form on a disk" at a discount to full members.
FLAT 1994 - Now available!

> *SMARTsig welcomes special offer ideas from members, either offers you like to see, or offers you are able to make.*
>
> *Let SMARTsig know about it!*

SMART Information Providers

Members who have offered help, research, etc. Write to SMART with any queries, the answers will then be published for everyone's benefit.
If any members would care to offer their services to other club members please let me know.

Alan Coldrick

Has a very extensive collection of Raceform Update and Handicap books (Raceform's previous guise). Offers research, all manual, for facts, figures and the like from this collection.

Stefan Perry

Home league and cup soccer on computer from 1987/8 season, can test theories etc. over that period.

Tim Coe

Racehorse breeding and the study of pedigrees

Mel Collier

Help with Racing Post facts and figures, Topspeed, Postmark, Pricewise, Diomed, etc.

Rex Towers

Overseas betting

SMARTsig

Merit Table

Our 'Merit Table' of all the products and services referred to by members in their correspondence. No quoted comments will be added, simply one mark under the (+) column when I hear a positive comment, or under the (–) if the remarks are not complimentary. A mark under the (   ) column denotes a non committal statement.

Additional marks and/or other products will be added to the list as the months roll on. SMARTsig will leave you to your own individual interpretations.

Product/Service	Type	(+)	( )	(–)
		numbers of comments		
Eternity	Horse System			1
Law of Averages	Horse System			1*
New Ultimate	Horse System			1
Peter Wards 'One a Day'	Horses System			2
Strudden method	Horse System			1
Winning for Life	Horse System			1
ALL premium line tipsters		off the scale		
Winning Line	Tipping service	2	1	2
Brimardon	Horse Computer Prog	1		
Combeys	Horse Computer Prog	1	1	
Computner	Horse Computer Prog			3
Oracle Racing System	Horse Computer Prog			4
ProPunter	Horse Computer Prog	3	1	2
22-1 football method	Football Fixed Odds			1
James Ashley Formula2	Football Fixed Odds		1	3
Perfection	Football correct scores			2

* This system makes a profit usually! However it employs the notorious "double stakes after a loser" method. This technique really is a recipe for DISASTER! It is not a case of if it goes wrong, but when!

SMARTsig

SMART "2-2" system update

The second profitable month in succession!

Results from 29 November to 16 December 1994

29/11/94	Birmingham v Gillingham	3.0
	Stockport v Scarborough	3.1
30/11/94	Norwich v Notts County	1.0
	Huddersfield v Lincoln	2.2 ✓ 28/1(Lad)
2/12/94	Airdrie v Stranraer	8.1 !!!
	(Stranraer had FOUR players sent off!)	
6/12/94	B. Leverkusen v Katowice	4.0
	Juventus v A Wacker	2.1
	Lazio v Trabzonspor	2.1
	Real Madrid v Odense	0.2
13/12/94	Azerbaijan v France	0.2
14/12/94	Finland v San Marino	4.1

The second month in succession to do the business for us, but we're still reeling from the heavy blank months of September and October. It's looking far more promising now though, and we're making inroads into our deficit.

Looking back over the results it looks as though by omitting the games where UK clubs were not involved would have made all the difference! *Hindsight is* or what!?! To be fair though the data used was based upon domestic competitions and domestic clubs in European games.

Balance Sheet to Date:

Bets	Stake (inc tax)	Returns	Profit/Loss
138	151.8	107	44.8 loss (-29%)

SMARTsig

PLEA FOR VOLUNTEERS from AFS

Tony Brown, our soccer data expert puts forward a plea on behalf of the Association of Football Statisticians.

It is the aim of the AFS to try to complete the full "computerisation" of every league game, a task we estimate will take in the order of 8000 hours, or about five man years.

Clearly this is beyond the scope of one individual, but by the pooling of resources it will be possible to achieve the goal.

I'm happy to advise on ways of capturing the data. The method I use is to start with a spreadsheet of the players and the season's games, entering just the players numbers in the cells of the spreadsheet. I then use the computer to "unpack" the data.

Any "purely" typing effort to create some of the spreadsheets would be welcome, but obviously access to a computer is required. Volunteers welcome!

The Association of Football Statisticians

The AFS Soccer Data collection now includes complete club records for Arsenal, Aston Villa, Liverpool, Manchester Utd and Spurs; every game and every player.

Norwich, Accrington, Ipswich and Luton are underway. Would any other "one club" enthusiast with a DOS based PC who are working on their own club in a database or spreadsheet form please let me know (through the AFS) so that we can save duplication of effort.

Secretary Ray Spiller
22 Bretons
Basildon
Essex
SS15 5BY
Tel/Fax 0268 416020

SMART Brain Teaser

Often at this time of the year magazines offer a "brain teaser" to the reader, why should you miss out?

King Smart, who lived in the land of Sig, gave a sigh. He was weary, so very weary of all the wars fought over the years between his small kingdom and the surrounding principalities. And it had recently been reported to him that all these battles had taken it's toll on the countries population of menfolk, in fact there was a serious imbalance between the number of males and females in the land. There had been no hostilities for the past three years, and the good King was looking forward to a peaceful future. But he needed to do something to increase the proportion of male subjects.

He was a kindly king and would not follow the actions of some of his neighbouring   monarchs who had passed laws to have all new-born females killed. So he summoned his two most skilful statisticians to the court and asked them to resolve the problem in a non brutal way and report back with their recommendations. The statistician who proposed the most successful solution would be rewarded with one million Totes of gold and the hand of the fair Princess Coral, in marriage.

On the due date first to speak was Lord William of the Hill.
"Sire, 'twould truly be a folly to try and prevent your subjects from having a family if they so choose, but we must do all we can to restrict any one family from having too many daughters, and encourage the families who bear many sons. I therefore propose that a law be passed preventing a mother from having **any** more children after the birth of a daughter. Thereby allowing multiple boys to be born without restriction, but a single daughter would be the maximum allowed by the law."

The other sage, the Duke of Ladbroke, said "My proposal is the direct opposite your highness. The law passed must restrict births to a single son, and allow unrestricted daughters"

Lord William laughed, but the Duke simply smiled. Both theories were tested, so which nobleman won the Princess's hand?

SMARTsig