

MEET THE PRESS

In the last issue I showed you A \$100 check sent me by Mark Cramer to test the profit potential of our Bottom Line/Betting Line.



In the current CRAMER-OLMSTED REPORT (Volume 6 #9) Mark dedicates 13 pages to the results of this test, along with some sage commentary. It begins with a reference to the early eighties where he and Dick Mitchell reached the conclusion that an effective Odds Line would guarantee a 100% chance of being a winner!

He cites my humorous references to "The Value Boys" but erroneously states that I was against betting a third choice; something I voiced very clearly in the Yellow Manual when I said a 3-3-3 ranking was the BEST indicator of a long shot. Yet, a slight error on Mark's part is worth more to me than all the erroneous crap published by the "Other" Value Boys.

On pages 6 and 7 of the article he published the worksheets from the test, which as you can see, produced a profit of \$258 or 258% R.O.I on his initial \$100, with bets confined to \$2, WIN ONLY! In the article Mark acknowledges receipt of my check for the \$258.

The documentation; workout of results: Santa Anita

<u>Date</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Horse</u>	<u>BL odds</u>	<u>Track odds</u>	<u>Mutuel</u>
2/27	2	Pirate's Hoist	8-5	4-1	10.80
		Polvita	9-5	2-1	-----*
	5	Cut an Paste	4-1	11-1	24.60
		Prized Peaches	4-1	14-1	-----
	6	Wasatach	7-2	17-1	36.20
		Champ's Star	7-2	11-1	-----
	7	Knife Maker	even	9-2	11.00
		Megawing	3-2	15-1	-----
	8	Wayne's Whirl	even	16-1	-----
		Current Agenda	5-2	10-1	-----
3/1	2	Diggs Retreat	5-2	22-1	46.60
	6	Erasmus Hall	3-1	8-1	-----
		Shot of Gold	3-2	3-1	8.20
	7	Futuristic	even	7-1	-----*
*BL/BL was 1-1 on the eventual 2-1 winner but they decided not to bet because, given their type of line, they require a greater advantage, I imagine					
8		Gentilhomme	2-1	12-1	-----
		Fabulous Guy	3-1	45-1	----- 2nd!
	9	Pete the Greek	9-5	4-1	----- 2nd
*BL/BL made the eventual 7.60 winner Viareggio 8-5, but again, it looks like they were demanding a greater overlay					
3/4	2	Corwun	2-1	8-1	----- 2nd
		Eastern Spirit	7-2	6-1	-----
	3	Linear	5-2	19-1	-----
		Cyrano Storm	3-1	4-1	10.00*
	5	As The Bell Tolls	5-2	7-2	9.00*
	Savvy Connection	7-2	3-1	-----	
8		Danebo Stampede	3-1	5-1	-----
		Daily Rounds	5-2	10-1	-----
3/6	1	Miss Brite Eyes	9-5	4-1	-----
		Coney Belle	5-2	13-1	-----*
3		Park View	5-2	8-1	19.40
		Boy Chick	even	14-1	-----
4		Nat's Wedding	2-1	7-2	-----
		Bamboo Victory	5-2	8-1	-----
6		Devoted Pirate	even	5-2	7.60
		Highland Fire	3-1	18-1	-----

3/7	3	Emimag	even	7-1	16.00
		Coastal Time	9-2	11-1	-----
	4	Hawksley	even	7-1	16.80
		Via Lombardi	5-2	9-1	-----2nd
	6	The Exeter Man	8-5	26-1	-----
		Gold Land	2-1	5-1	-----2nd
	9	Innovative	even	14-1	-----
		Billy Dazzler	2-1	21-1	-----
	10	Evening Watch	even	2-1	-----
		Bepton	2-1	5-1	-----
3/8	1	Mighty Lobo	9-5	16-1	-----
		River Rhythm	2-1	6-1	-----
	3	Kidnap	8-5	14-1	-----
		Clickety Clack	8-5	4-1	10.00
	4	Estrella Voladoras	2-1	19-1	-----
		Milbree	5-2	8-1	-----
	5	Melrose Lane	2-1	34-1	70.40
		Silverbuffetman	even	2-1	-----
	6	Houston Station	8-5	20-1	-----
		Jovi San	7-2	22-1	-----
	8	Toda Una Dama	9-5	32-1	66.60
		Fun In Express	2-1	16-1	-----
	9	Expresser	even	7-2	8.80
		<u>Damascus Eagle</u>	5-2	103-1	-----
				RETURN	372.00
				INVEST	114.00
				PROFIT	258.00

It would be at least unethical for me to publish the entire report as long as C&O report is being printed. I can, however, reveal these few excerpts.

Some of Mark's comments are quite flattering as long as you know about the great poet Pablo Neruda and the Man from La Mancha (Don Quixote).

The Research

I probably surprised Howard when I sent him a check for a hundred dollars. I explained that I wanted to do a C&O research project on the BL/BL. I asked him to put in 50 \$2 bets, mechanically playing horses that appeared as the largest overlays on the BL/BL read-out. For research purposes, I wanted win bets only, and, in keeping with my original writings on personal odds lines, I didn't care if the bet was on a first, second, or third choice, nor did I have an objection to making multiple win bets in the same race; if you've got two overlays in the same field, by all means bet them both.

Sartin's mind goes far beyond the narrow confines of handicapping factors. He relates analysis of the past performances to chaos physics, jazz music, and gestalt psychology. The broad context of the Sartin methodology is just as important as the details.

"Nobody ever accused Doc Sartin of trying to pander to a mass audience," wrote Andrew Bever.

I believe that winning handicapping methods can only come from (1) gifted intellect with (2) an against-the-grain personality. Howard is both.

Sartin is hard to understand at times. He often does not write in a sequential style. His workbooks often read like a collage. He reminds me of the poetry of the great Pablo Neruda, who is understood only by the cumulative impact of his lines and not by their sequence.

Howard and I implicitly agreed to disagree. I've always been intrigued by iconoclasts and Howard is one of them. He reminded me of Don Quixote, a brilliant man who often antagonized others by being hard-headed.

The nuances existed in Howard Sartin's constantly evolving but conceptually consistent pace analysis; not the linear or additive thinking that we are conditioned to follow, but a more subtle view of things that takes into account the way horses match up against each other and not just their intrinsic fractions.

I won't get into this and so many other iconoclast ideas that Sartin has used in a number of different and thankfully contradictory computer software programs. The point is that Sartin's methods are stubbornly different in the factors they use or the ones they decide to ignore.

The Bombshell

But how to test his methodology? Lo and behold, Sartin came up with a new product that indicated a major evolution (or revolution) in his perspective. After having belittled the "value boys" for playing third choices because they were overlays, Sartin himself came up with software program called the Bottom Line Betting Line (BL/BL).

Subject: Synthesis-Quantum Rater

Date: 1998 00:04:14 -0400

From: joseph t

To: SHANE SARTIN <shane@discover.net>

Hi Shane,

Using synthesis/trackmaster- love it

The nuances to which he refers are presumably (but not actually) the ones that he and Mitchell came up with when determining that a proper betting line was tantamount to a 100% "can't lose" proposition. One still can lose and many do unless they have Mark's unique betting talent!

"The Bombshell" refers to his surprise that BL/BL did as well as claimed in many Follow Up articles (Mark is a subscriber).

And his final numerical synopsis of his test:

The Results

In all, there was \$114 invested (57 horses). I see from the printouts sent to me that the reason for going beyond the original \$100 is that the research was approached by racing card. After five cards of betting, \$86 had been bet. Partways through the sixth day, the \$100 amount was reached, but they decided to finish out the day's card, using money from winning bets.

The gross return was \$371, for a profit of \$257 (225 percent!)

I can fully reprint his interview with me in the same C&O issue, since most of the text is my replies. Seeing these responses to questions posed by someone outside the Methodology might be of value to you.

The Cramer - Olmstead Report
Published Bi-Monthly by:
TBS
PO Box 6283
Annapolis, MD 21401
24-hour FAX number
410-268-0526

Single Issue \$16.00

An Iconoclast Speaks Out: A C&O Interview With Howard Sartin

MC: I understand that you don't bet on the Bottom-Line-Betting Line, without consulting sets of corollaries relating to total energy, distance, surface. But it seemed to work for me just fine in the research without the corollaries. Is it possible that the corollaries can confuse the decision-making process?

SARTIN: Very few C&O bettors would waste a bet on the #1 BL horse: TWO TONE, even though it would pay \$6.80.

<u>HORSE</u>	<u>BL/BL ODDS</u>	<u>TRACK</u>
TWO TONE	EVEN	2-1
TEMPEST GAL	EVEN	3-1
LADY TAP	9-5	11-1
PASSE	3-1	5-2
MISTY KNIGHT	5-1	20-1

I know some Hardcover book authors who regularly take \$6.80. There are still too many handicappers everywhere who bet on ONE HORSE ONLY. Many seem too conservative to bet Lady Tap at 11-1. They would rather bet on the more sure Tempest Gal at 3-1. For a one-horse bettor, Tempest Gal is an overlay relative to odds being paid to the favorite. Now look at the string of corollary rankings:

Since we are NOT going to bet Two Tone, I normally "hide" such a horse, eliminating it and its rankings from my readout. This leaves Lady Tap and Tempest Gal for the two-horse bettor. I'd back Lady Tap with a place bet as well as a win bet. Misty Knight, at 20-1 has only a single top ranking: Early Pace (EPR). It had not raced for 230 days (which shows up on the printout of the BL/BL not included here, so we passed that horse.

The final choice was based on the supporting Corollaries relative to risk/reward. Hence, the corollaries simplify rather than confuse the decision-making pro-

SYNTHESIS POWER RANKINGS AND FRACTALS

#	PNCNAME	LdNT	SR	PRIM										SUPP					FRACT			ESP	SCBL				
				L	T	E	L	C	T	H	F	F	W	X	S	P	E	T	T	S	P			N	E	L	N
1	2	MISTY1	81	5	4	-	1	5	4	5	5	5	4	29	5	5	4	5	4	5	23	5	4	5	5	EAR	4.0
2	3	TEMPR1	92	2	3	3	2	1	4	2	1	1	14	2	2	1	1	1	3	8	2	3	3	1	PRE	5.0	
3	4	PASSR2	88	4	5	5	3	3	3	3	4	5	26	4	4	5	3	3	4	19	4	5	4	4	S/P	9.0	
4	5	LADY 2	88	3	1	2	4	2	1	4	3	3	19	3	3	3	4	2	2	14	3	1	2	3	EAR	2.0	
5	6	TWO T3	92	1	2	4	1	1	2	1	2	2	13	1	1	2	2	1	1	7	1	2	1	2	E/P	2.0	

FRACTALS WEIGHTED: E=Early L=Late N=Normal

9508 -- BIRTH RACE, 5% Purse, Purse \$50,000. Claiming/Allowance, PWs and more, 4-year-olds and up. Claiming price \$50,000.

Rank	Horse and Jockey	ML	PP	BY	S	R	E	SP	Ph	To (I)
0750	Lady Tap, B. Blane	110	8	8	6	6	6	6	114	11.00
0210	Tempest Cat, K. DeCrombrughe	110	3	4	214	1st	1st	1st	1st	3.00
0372	Two Tone Lads, G. Stevens	110	6	1	50	50	50	50	3rd	2.00
0405	Passport, J. P. O'Brien	110	4	2	4th	4th	4th	4th	3rd	3.00
0084	Misty Knight, V. Espinoza	110	1	3	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	2nd	7.75
	No Favorites									20.30

6-LADY TAP 24.00 9.50 3.00
 3-TEMPEST CAT 2.00 3.20
 6-TWO TONE LADS 2.00

ON 3:37 Time: 22:45 1:09 4/5 1:16 Track Clear 8 Feet Whip 6 1/4 Pleasent Top
 Chocoma Tr. BOA Cool Corn-Mary V & Wilton H Lester, Mutual Pool \$338,014.50 Es-
 octa Pool \$278,218 Quinella Pool \$40,834 Pick Three Pool \$57,448.

01 EXACTA (5-2) PAID \$92.10 11 QUINELLA (3-5) PAID \$42.00
 11 PICK THREE (7/8) PAID \$200.00

24.00

cess.

MC: Without getting into formulae and program details, what are the basic handicapping concepts that go into the BL/BL?

SARTIN: I'm not sure there ARE any Basic Handicapping Concepts in my programs. Basics get too many low-paying winners. My object is to win the money when the Basic Handicappers lose. EPR (Early Pace Rating), even though figured by Chaos Math is still fairly basic. By the same token, LPR (Late Pace Rating) still defines late pace. A few of my other corollaries have been importuned by others

using linear mathematics; CPR (Composite of early/late pace), TT (turn time), were NEVER considered basic until some well-meaning clients of mine wrote about them in books.

The major corollaries are not yet basic. If they ever become so, I'll develop new ones. LSP (longshot potential), Hidden Energy, Factor W, SPN (Sartin Pace Numbers), Factor X, Entropy (Deceleration relative to velocity), TS (total speed but NOT final time), TPP (total pace potential), Fractals, and Balance. Balance is derived from Early and Late Potential through NonLinear Dynamics.

The whole purpose of the methodology is to WIN and teach others to win. It should be obvious when viewing the plethora of non-profitable winning favorites that BASIC HANDICAPPING CONCEPTS have been over-proliferated. After all, they're conventional wisdom, orthodox, and mainstream.

MC: In BL/BL readouts from the research sample, I noticed that the total odds-as-percentages often add up to more than 100 percent in a race. That would be tantamount to saying there is more than a 100% chance that there will be a winner in the

race, implying that horses' chances are being overappraised. In reading from the printouts which horses were bet for my research, I see that you have demanded a more substantial overlay. My assumption is that to compensate for what may be an over-optimistic odds line, you demand a much more significant overlay. Is my assumption correct, and if not, explain.

SARTIN: This is my favorite question. I once wrote a modified Bottom Line Betting Line article for *American Turf Monthly*. Letters to the editor and myself flowed in, calling me a mathematical idiot and demanding that the magazine publish an apology. I offered to go to the races with one outraged person. He refused saying, "It isn't winning that matters as much as making a betting line using pure mathematics like (.....) and he named two of your Value cohorts, but happily NOT you.

I'm fully aware of the kind of lines that are made from pure math. So-called pure math is derived from the ancient Greeks. Influence from those times, today the left brain was considered as the source of all that was true and good. The right brain was deemed as the source of

evil and darkness. Pure mathematical odds lines are derived from thinkers with highly developed LINEAR left-hemisphere brain development.

My betting lines are based on the proven ability of the BL/BL to determine what a horse should pay relative to what it DOES pay. That there may be two or even three horses rated EVEN, adding up to 150 percent, and several others at various odds that could bring the total to over 276 does NOT add up to 100, but it produces relationships that help clients to win at a greater rate and with more profit than at any time in history.

In short, I've produced a "kinky" line to help people make bets on higher-priced winners when the line so indicates. Your assumption about demanding a more significant overlay is correct. The Ancient Greeks and mathematical purity be damned. My job is to make all my clients winners—of races and money. I suppose I owe much of my transition from Line Scores to BL/BL to you.

MC: Seems that the BL/BL is especially productive in what I call "lesser of evils" races. For example, Melrose Lane, a horse made 34-1 by the public in

a non-descript, low-level claiming race, came up rated on top in seven of the twelve categories. So the BL/BL made Melrose Lane 2-1 when the crowd made him 34-1. That's quite a discrepancy. I've found overlays like that with turf pedigree ratings for horses with poor dirt form switching to the turf for the first time. But in these bottom-level claiming races, what are the against-the-grain overlay factors that get picked up by the BL/BL?

SARTIN: Regrettably, my answer here is not going to please anyone. Among my cadre of Former Teachers, most of them salt of the earth, who have gone solo, writing books and other things that pros do, all focus on handicapping, per se. They handicap the horses. I handicap the race, any race. They know more about horses than I do about my wife. They feel they can tell what today's pace would be, whether the race set up for an Early, Presser, or Sustained horse. They know all about class, breeding, condition, trainers, jockeys, suspicious class drops, and can ESPECIALLY identify the alleged "playable" race. They limit themselves to betting from two to four races a day. They do okay,

but feel lucky when their average mutuel reaches or exceeds \$7.

Every time I hit a win bet, or even a double-digit place bet, they roll their eyes skyward. . .and then say (quite courteously) "Good Call." To me, the so-called playable race is ANY race (especially the ones experts call UN-playable, even those with a few first-time starters, providing their odds don't indicate a lot of backing from sources who know more about them than I. I don't try to be or even want to be a handicapper - at least by popular definition. These are the kind of ego-centered persons who insist that a horse's past performance history meet some sort of arbitrary criteria that is usually supported by "popular, conventional wisdom." I say this freely because you're not one of them.

Perhaps you saw lesser quality winners in your test samples because these are the kinds of races those EXPERT handicappers would not "play".

The last part of this Q is the best: "against-the-grain overlay factors that get picked up by the BL/BL?" I use virtually NO linear-sequential formulae to rate horses. All other numerical systems I know of do, because they represent what one author friend of

yours called in the subtitle of a hardcover book: "THE LOGICAL, LEFT-BRAINED APPROACH TO WINNING AT THE RACES."

In short, virtually every other handicapping method or procedure has been developed by LEFT-brained LINEAR THINKING. All my corollaries are NON-LOGICAL RIGHT-BRAINED figures that are COMPOUNDED and use the mathematics of chaos physics. With rare exception, they are NOT linear or sequentially arrayed. COMPOUNDING blends various race increments in a Non-Sequential order. In one instance using first and final fraction together as a single composite entity. Or, through chaos math, dividing the race in HALF instead of by fractions and/or calls. FRACTALS are infinitesimal portions of fractions, slight deviations from actual fractional time that can be very significant. Entropy, that ratio of DECELERATION compounded by distance with velocity. I seldom look at race conditions, age or sex of horses. I've seen this produce more losers than winners from far too many persons.

AND, I've taken an oath to God to never look at the name of a trainer or jockey.

Finally, staying aware of what the best known ex-

perts are promoting, and then doing just the OPPOSITE.

MC: Thanks for the interview. One final editorial comment. I agree with The Doc about going against conventional wisdom. For this reason, my book Kinky Handicapping was banned by the *Racing Form*. Where I disagree with Sartin is that I believe there are many ways to win at the races, all of them unconventional, and I know, to give just one example, that trainer handicapping has meant profits for several pro players I know. C&O readers know of Ed Bain. I've seen Bain in action over the years and can testify that his approach both wins and is unconventional. Why is it unconventional? Because, like Sartin, he discards every other conventional factor, while most conventional handicappers integrate the trainer factor with other handicapping conventions, thereby diluting it.

To approach handicapping like engineering (what Sartin refers to as linear thinking), is to be like most everyone else, which means that there will be few overlays and no profits.

C&O is now in its sixth year of presenting unconventional handicapping ideas. Sartin's is one of them. ■

The Cramer-Olmsted Report

What for?

Last January, I had an interesting discussion with one of the best players in the country, Barry Meadow. I may disagree with Barry on many points, but I've never stopped admiring his professional approach to betting horses.

Barry told me he had finished 1997 with a 4 percent profit. Given the high amounts of money that Barry bets, 4 percent probably meant a considerable chunk of dinero.

But Barry tells me he gets no thrill from going to the track and essentially handles horse betting the way a blackjack card counter handles sitting at tables and wearing out chairs. My question is this. If there is little or no thrill left and you make 4 percent at the track with a large bankroll, why not put the same money into an account that makes 8 percent and then go to the races recreationally a few times a month?

To Barry's credit, he has managed to sustain himself in the daily grind without wavering psychologically. That's why he's a pro. Most of the other professional handicappers I've referred to have not been able to withstand the erosion principle.

MONEY SECRETS ? ✓ **AT THE RACETRACK**

Barry Meadow