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A NOTE FROM THE PUBLISHER.

It seems that most of you are taking our theme of "Let's Get Serious" seriously.

To a few, it has been an anathema which caused them to drop out. They finally reconciled themselves to the fact that they were just looking for something to play around and have fun with. By their own admission, finally, they never truly had any serious intention of making or supplementing their living thorough pari-mutuel fund investing.

When we proclaimed that henceforth we would dedicate our time and efforts primarily to the dedicated, they apparently felt threatened and looked elsewhere for some easy system, whose purveyor demanded nothing more from them than a check in payment. We remain, unchallenged, as the only handicapping information or method source whose primary aim is to develop a relatively small cadre of winners.

In our accounting procedures, the bottom line does not read dollars, but rather in percentage of users who report a consistent ability to profit over a majority of their 20 race cycles. In the past, we have reported that well over half of all clients were winning substantial amounts at the races. Subsequent closer investigation has revealed that though a large majority have the ability to win significant amounts of money, many find that they cannot do so with regularity. Many clients, who reported winnings in the past, have recently "come clean" and confessed to losing much of their winnings.

As of this writing, about one third of our people are winning significantly. They win at a rate of 65% with an average mutuel of $10.20. In their worst cycles, they may win only 11 of 20, though in these circumstances they report an average mutuel of $13.10.

The maximum number of winners achieved more than once is 16, or 80%. These cycles produced average mutuels of only $8.20. The consistent 13 of 20 average has been constant for this happy third of our clients for a protracted period of time. They are now sufficiently schooled in the psychology of winning to avoid wagering when they find themselves in periods of emotional stress caused by
personal or family problems. In truth, it is hard to pinpoint exactly how many such players we have, as they tend to go their own way; not attending seminars or workshops.

Most of the rest have many weeks when they reach 65% and above, but it seems these are invariably followed by: (and I quote several of them) "Bad days when they lose it all back." Any time one loses all the profit from a 65% 20 race cycle in a single day, we know without question that they were not following the strict RULES of proper money management. The one area where rules DO apply.

Those of you who have overcome this typical "horseplayer's" tale of woe know experientially what is happening to these people. A couple of losses and they plunge. All the veneer of reason that we have so carefully applied falls away and they become gamblers. They start thinking in terms of A DAY AT THE RACES, instead of in 20 race cycles.

What they are going through is known in psychiatric circles as the "Sisyphus Syndrome." In Greek mythology, Sisyphus was the forebearer of today's horseplayer. He was condemned to roll a rock up a hill. Each time he approached the top of that hill, and was about to get the rock to the top at long last, he goofed and the rock rolled back on him. Yet, over and over again, he TRIED.

Sisyphus syndrome is the genesis of those "over and over, here I go again" life scripts so many of us live. It's the old "just as it seems like I've got it made, something goes wrong!" It may seem that such episodes are a product of one's destiny. In truth, they are not. The answer to the problem lies not in our stars, but in ourselves.

Our May classroom (and probably beyond) in Beaumont will deal with curing the Sisyphus Syndrome. Since it appears to be the one remaining obstacle to so many of our clients, I HOPE many of you will come.

* * * * * * * * *

When I first met Greg Lawlor, I said to myself: "This guy looks like he ought to be a movie producer." At the time he was not. Now he is. Or at least a video producer. He produced the excellent Bonnie Leadbetter video cassette on body language. His new one on trip handicapping isn't as good, but it is still interesting. Narrated by Paul Mallos, the man who taught handicapping to Andy Beyar, it features excellent racing footage. It doesn't blend very well with our approach, but it makes a good jumping off place for the new series of articles that will replace the Harness Column; Trip Handicapping Via the Racing Form. If you're interested, there are ads in the Form or Racing Action, or you can write to Lawlor Productions, 3262 Holiday Ct. Suite 202, La Jolla, CA 92037.

* * * * * * * * *

cont. on p. 4
THE EDITOR'S COLUMN
BY DICK SCHMIDT

MOVING EXPERIENCES. We've all had them, now both the PIRCO staff and I are going to share them. The Inland Empire Institute is moving! Next door. They will be found in SUITE 5, not suite 6 from now on. The rest of the address and the phone number remains the same. This is especially good news to those who attend our workshops in Beaumont, as the new quarters are larger and more comfortable.

We will also be able to accommodate more people at each session, so fewer people will be turned away in the future. As always, the workshops will be on Saturday, with a (more or less) repeat on Sunday. The Saturday crowd gets the speakers when they are fresh and enthusiastic. The Sunday folks tend to get speakers who know what they are going to say. Practice makes sort of perfect. You pays your money, you takes your choice.

* * * * * * *

As a few of you who have visited me know, The Follow Up's editorial offices are located in my middle bedroom, along with half a dozen computers, two large desks and 400 feet of bookshelves. All this in an 8 by 10 room. Anyway, The Follow Up will be moving soon, because I'm moving and taking it along with me. I'll soon have semi-sumptuous quarters at my new abode and maybe there will be room for more than one person in my office at one time. Maybe. Anyway, what I'm leading up to is that I'll soon have a new address and phone number, and that there is a real good chance that the June issue of The Follow Up may be a little late. It may not hit the mail until around June 30, which means some of you may not get it until mid-July. Sorry about that. Give me a call and complain if you want. By June, my phone should be disconnected. Beh, heh.

As of about June 1, my new address, and that of The Follow Up, will be:

1215 Alma St.
Glendale, CA 91202

I don't have a new phone number as yet, but I'll give it out as soon as I know what it will be. The next two months promise to be hectic, so if you try to reach me and don't get an answer, be patient and keep trying. Just don't do what one guy did, and call at 7 AM, figuring I was sure to be home at that hour. I was, and he soon wished I hadn't been. My telephone hours are between 10 AM and 9 PM ONLY. I can't promise to be home at any given time, as I do go out (sometimes even to the races) but those who call outside the posted hours do so at their own peril. Grrr!
Now for a couple of letters:

Dear Dick,

In response to your question in a recent Follow Up, I personally would be more than happy to pay a larger subscription price and receive issues more frequently, as long as we don't burn out our beloved editor. Likewise, the continuing stream of new products and ideas is great to see, and no one with any knowledge of the PIRCO organization could ever label it a systems mill. Life (and handicapping) seems to me to be like a shark; when it stops moving forward, it dies.

As always, thank you for your time and efforts.

- Phil Mc Allister

What is it with you guys? Is Doc putting you up to these letters? Anyway, I liked the bit about the shark so much, I couldn't resist, but don't hold your breath for more than 6 issues.

Dear Bert,

I'm writing this little thank you note for one of the most unbelievable experiences I have ever had. I attended your PIRCO workshop this past weekend, and my mind is still buzzing. The quantity and quality of the information I received from both you and Michael was something I still can't believe.

I was really having a lot of difficulty in selecting contenders and pace lines. I think the second most important thing I got from the workshop was a clarification and a jumping off place to start.

The most important thing I got was the definite feeling that "beating the horses" can be done. More than ever, I am really convinced. Now all I have to do is learn to apply the knowledge and insights you gave me.

I can hardly wait for the next workshop. - Meyer Markon

cont. from p. 2

Just as we were finishing up this issue of The Follow Up, I received Barry Meadow's new book: Money Secrets at the Race Track. He asked me to review it; even, to quote Barry, "Though you may hate it." I don't hate it at all. Except For one gratuitously inaccurate paragraph, at first glance it seems an excellent, if very expensive, discourse on the realities of money management.

Successful handicapping is a three pronged fork. Selection method, psychological attitude and money management. All three prongs are essential to picking up the meat. Any author who adds viability to any of these is welcome in our PIRCO library. We'll give Barry's opus a full review next issue.
PROJECTING THE PACE OF THE RACE:

AN INTRODUCTION TO ENERGY!

BY MICHAEL PIZZOLLA

For the past year, I have been working with Doc and the Hat on the incredibly complicated, yet elegant algorithms of the new experimental ENERGY! program. This is perhaps the penultimate step in refinement of Methodology programs (the ultimate probably being deceleration). One step that we are currently refining has to do the "coloring" of a race; that is, given the mix of contenders and the matchup, which factors in a given race are likely to be dominant?

Ever since Doc set me loose on one Belmont meeting over five years ago, armed with only Percentage Early and Total Energy, I have realized that the makeup of the race is every bit as important as any perceived track bias. (In fact, it is my opinion that most track biases are just that, perceived rather than existent.) In developing this concept, I had to take apart and analyze closely how I approached a race before setting out to translate that approach into a computer program.

What I would like to outline in this article is an approach to looking at a race in the context of the Methodology, which may seem completely radical to many of you. It is my approach to the delicate, creative, fascinating and profitable process of projecting the probable pace of the race and determining which horses will most likely run well against it.

Like the Methodology itself, it is simple to do, yet not easy to master. Methodical, yet without rules. If you are comfortable with your approach to the Methodology and are applying what you have learned from Dr. Sartin with consistency and profitability, I urge you to apply what is outlined here in small doses ("If it ain't broke, don't fix it." - Dizzy Dean).

If, however, this whole business of the Match-Up is a puzzle to you, if you sense the simplicity and power of the approach, yet still can't see how Doc, Jim Bradshaw and other masters of the Methodology make pace line and adjustment calls which boggle the rule-oriented mind, I promise you this: if you will follow closely the approach I am about to outline, it can answer for you the most perplexing aspects of the Methodology. Contenders, pace lines, adjustments, even the subtleties of the different programs offered by PIRGO can all be brought into sharp focus.

This is not new, and by no means original with me. Doc Sartin presented just this approach during my first phone call with him seven years ago. Some of us need a long time for things to sink in.

Huey Mahl, the man Howard credits with giving us the first insights into the magnitude and potential of pace, has written a brilliant and
seminal book called The Race Is Pace. One of the main points of this work is that it is vital to know how and when the horses will be asked to run fast. At the beginning of our quest for understanding of the race before us, we must ask ourselves this simple, overshadowing question: what is the pace of today's race likely to be and which of the horses before us is likely to set that pace?

What I prefer to do when I attempt to answer that question is first, find the horse or horses which habitually take the lead in their races. Since I hate to miss even the smallest detail, I have developed a systematic procedure for this, which serves me well. I first circle all of the first and second call positions in every horse’s past performance charts where he had the lead. (In a sprint, consider only sprints in which the horse had the early lead. In routes, any lead at any distance will do.)

The horse or horses who habitually take the lead will be very obvious to you. Many times they jump right off the page. In some cases, this pattern is quite pronounced. Consider the case of Sound Anchor in the fifth race at Aqueduct’s Inner Track on March 3, 1988. There can be no question as to this horse’s habitual running style. In every race except one in the slop, Sound Anchor has been on the lead or within one length of the leader.

Looking at each horse in the race, contender or not, in this context will give you some very valuable information. Consider the other horses in this race and see if you can determine if any other horses exhibit this tendency.

In this case, virtually every horse in the race, Ain’t That Wicked, Angelic Lady, Lady Ashland and Classical Ballad, displays a tendency to set or run close to the early pace. Only one horse with any recent form shows a tendency to run from off the pace; Rick’s Delivery. If that type of horse can meet the Match-Up and is pitted against several impulsive front runners, it is a definite threat to win the race.

On the other extreme, sometimes you’ll find no horses in the race who exhibit this tendency of front running. Some races will not have even one horse who has ever run remotely close to the pace of any of its races. A good example of this is in the Pace Line manual, the Fly Gary Fly race. Between these extremes, we have every possible mix of running styles.

In those races in which only one horse habitually takes the lead, I will use his second call time in his last race as my projected pace today. Bear in mind that it is less important to have an accurate projection of the exact time that today’s race will run than it is to have a serviceable fulcrum around which your analysis can revolve. Therefore, I’ll use this last race time as my projected pace even if the horse has run faster in the past. The reason for this is that if a horse who habitually gets the lead either fails to get the lead in his last race or gets it in a slower time (barring any extreme daily variant swings), this is an indication that the horse might be declining in form. Rather than match the other horses against a better second call time, I would
rather give them the benefit of the doubt and use the slower time as the projected pace.

If there is more than one horse in a race who compulsively runs to the lead, I simply take whichever has the fastest last race second call. For example, in the Sound Anchor race, I selected as my pace the 45.2 set by Angelic Lady, since she had the fastest last race second call of all the impulsive front runners. Note that although Lady Ashland also ran a 45.2 last time, she came home in roughly 111.4, while Angelic Lady negotiated the same distance in about 111.2.

If there are no horses who impulsively go to the lead, I simply take the horse whose last unadjusted race second call velocity is highest. Although it is an inaccurate technique in many respects, for this purpose, and this purpose only, I will simply add the horse's beaten lengths to its time, counting each length as a fifth of a second. You want to be careful here; if the fastest velocity comes from a horse who was more than five lengths off the pace at the second call, this may be a "paceless" race in which this technique of Match-Up is not particularly helpful. These "paceless" races are best handled by selecting reasonable pace lines for any of the horses who may have a pulse and letting your computer do most of the work.

Note too that if the lone impulsive front runner has set a 46 second call last time, I will use that as the projected pace even if another horse ran successfully from two lengths off of a 45 pace. Again, I am not attempting to select the winner by this technique, but to set the race up accurately for analysis. This is what I have found works.

Okay, we've got ourselves a projected second call time, now what? The moment has come to determine which horses can run successfully against this pace. Again, I have a helpful hint you may find useful. For every horse in the race, I will circle every pace of the race second call time which is within one fifth of a second of my projected pace. For example, it the projected pace is 46, I will look at those races run in 45.4, 46 and 45.1.

Next, look at your pluses and zeros for those races. Is there a pattern? Does this horse ever run well against this pace? If not, Sparky, he's not a contender, unless he has negotiated a faster pace successfully. On the other hand, if the horse always runs well against our projected pace, it is an obvious contender. Does the horse sometimes run well and sometimes fail against the pace? I would leave it in for further consideration.

Although this sounds simple, and perhaps crude, the insights it will give you are truly remarkable. Consider the 6th race from the same day. It's quite easy to project the pace as 45.1 using Jiltavo's last pace line. Now, go through the exercise of determining which other horse has run successfully against that pace. I'll wait here until you finish.

Guess what? None of the other horses even comes close, with the possible exception of Dr. Tim Vail, who finished third by a neck after running against a 45.3. Guess what else? None of the other horses came
close to Jiltavo in the race, with the possible exception of Dr. Tim Vail, who finished second at 25 to 1. The Match-Up turns an unbeatable $3 horse into a $50 exacta.

The horses in the race which can run successfully against the Match-Up and are in form are, I believe, the true contenders in a race. Projecting the pace will also assist you in selecting pacelines for the contenders. Let's say you have read Dick Schmidt's wonderful Beginners Column in The Follow Up or the Beginners Manual. One of the suggested form criterion he gives in one article is that a horse should finish within 3 or 4 lengths at today's level. A useful guideline, but it can be misleading.

If, for example, you are projecting the pace of today's race as 47, a horse's poor showings in his last two races against a 45 pace are suddenly less significant. This tendency of mine to overlook poor last races when so warranted is what has given me the reputation as PIRCO's wildman when it comes to pace line selection. Doesn't seem all that wild now, does it? (Editor's note: you never 'splained it like that!) It is my observation that the horses who are in form and can meet the Match-Up are extremely dangerous and should be accorded every courtesy in the selection of a paceline.

In working with Howard and Jim on the experimental ENERGY! program, I have found that projecting the correct "Energizer" in the race, the horse who will either set or force the pace, is a crucial step in determining how the race will be "colored" or "variegated" and which factors will prove most predictive. Although the complicated algorithms of the experimental ENERGY! program will do this automatically, I can give you an example of this technique.

Consider the next race, the 7th from the same day. (I'm using three races in a row like this to demonstrate that you don't need to go looking for a special race to use the Match-Up on. These aren't problem races, just day-in, day-out investment opportunities. I don't need to "cherry pick.") I set the projected pace at 46.4 and thought that either Lil Kell's Brother or Ima Smarten would set that pace. Now, let's consider the other horses in the race, one at a time:

It's Acedemic - is a perfect contender. Twice he ran against today's projected pace, on Dec. 11 and again on Oct. 15, and twice he nearly won. It doesn't concern me that these races were both on off tracks, because I note that this horse has run successfully against faster paces.

High Rex - won his maiden race against today's pace. His form is not inspiring, but he did flash some early foot in his last race after breaking slowly. Note also that this horse has a race, the bottom pace line, in which it has run successfully against a faster second call time.

Briskeen - definitely an improving horse. Beaten 17 3/4 two races back, it was only beaten 17 last time out. Still, I don't think I'll use it. At this rate, I'll wait another 23 races or so.
Viva Dancer - has been away for almost two years, and while that doesn't ordinarily concern me (Editor's note: ??!) he doesn't look as though he'll run well against a 46.4 in a sprint.

Feldspar - simply cannot run well against today's projected time of 46.4 and so out he goes. (No speculation about Oscar Barrera's claim, his "moves," or any other such nonsense is necessary!)

Be Clever - has run tolerably well against today's project pace, finishing 3 3/4 lengths off in his last race against a 47 second call time.

So where does this analysis leave us? Lil Kell and Ima Smarten should contest the Early pace in about 46.4. The horses who can compete against this time are It's Acedemic, Be Clever and perhaps High Rex. Five contenders, just like the Doctor ordered. Now, let's take the analysis one step further. Your computer will do this for you, but it's important to understand the whys and wherefores before you turn it on.

Ima Smarten ran a third fraction last time in 26 seconds after having led the field to the half mile pole. Lil Kell ran a bit better; 25.3 from one length back of the second call pace. Be Clever ran a 23.1 last time, but did so from 3 1/2 lengths back and so will have trouble catching the pacemaker, since 3 1/2 lengths is typical of where this horse is at the second call in his successful sprints.

Now consider It's Acedemic. In his last race, which was against a pace very similar to today's projected pace, he ran a raw third fraction of 23.4. Even considering that he ran it from 5 lengths behind the pace, it should project extremely well against today's slow third fraction. About 5 lengths better. Because of this disparity in the third fraction, coupled with the lack of disparity in the second call times of the contenders, the race is variegated late: the late Energy horses with the proper expenditures (in ENERGY! speak, we look at the percentage Median, Hidden Energy and Factor X) should have a distinct advantage.

I am not suggesting that you attempt to carry this analysis out to the third fraction in every race. It can be extremely misleading. Howard has warned many times that people who attempt to carry the Match-Up into the third fraction will almost always overestimate the Sustained horses and underestimate the Early horses.

The reason for this is a factor which Howard affectionately calls the HUEY, the Horses Ultimate Energy Yield. Quite simply stated, a horse in a sprint needs to make up twice as much velocity in the third fraction as he is behind at the second call. In routes it is almost three times as much. If this sounds surprising to you, consider any winning pace lines where a horse has come from off the pace to win. Since I am looking at the Rick's Delivery race, let's consider one of Rick's sprint wins where he was off the pace at the second call; his win on October 22.

In that race, the horse was 2 lengths back against a second call of 46.1 and won the race in 111.2. The second call pace of the race is 2640 divided by 46.2 seconds, or 57.14 feet-per-second. Assuming 10 feet per
beaten length, Rick's second call velocity was 2620 (2640 feet minus 20 feet) divided by 46.2, or 56.71 F.P.S. The difference between the two velocities is 0.43 F.P.S.

Now, consider the third fraction velocities. The pace of the race third fraction is 1320 feet divided by 25.2 seconds, or 52.38 F.P.S. Since Rick gained 20 feet, his third fraction velocity is 1340 divided by 25.2 seconds, or 53.18 F.P.S. In other words, he gained 0.80 F.P.S. in the third fraction after being behind only .43 F.P.S. at the second call. Pretty close to Howard's rule of thumb of 2 to 1!

The reason I bring all this up is to emphasize that all of these complexities are handled by your computer programs. This is what they were designed for, and they do it beautifully. Therefore, I do not suggest that you try to Match-Up the entire race by eye (unless you happen to be from Tulsa, wear a cowboy hat and sport an I.Q. in the low 180's). However, the technique of projecting the pace and winnowing out contenders will allow the computer to do what it does best: analyze the pace potential of the true contenders.

In the future, the Institute will be releasing a program which uses many of the techniques I have described, translating them into sophisticated algorithms which can make suggestions about which factor is the most predictive, given the specific fractional Match-Up of a specific race. This approach, whether embodied in a computer program or in your mind as you select contenders and pace lines, takes into account a basic truth about horse races: no two races are alike, every race, like every moment of life, is unique and must be experienced freshly, rather than out of the context of hackneyed rules which deal only with the dusty past. Enjoy!

Exclusive Follow Up picture of Michael Pizzolla firing up his famous Way-Back Machine to go in search of a pace line from 1981.
Coupled—Forever Special and Classical Ballad.

**Ain't That Wicked**

Db. or br. 4, 4, 4, by Gold Stag—Lady's Ruby, by Northern Dancer

**Owner:** Thoroughbred J T (Ohio-C)

**AQUEDUCT**

2nd May 22 14 11 4 2 3 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

3rd May 22 14 11 4 2 3 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

4th May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

5th May 22 14 14 4 2 3 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

6th May 22 14 14 4 2 3 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

7th May 22 14 14 4 2 3 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

8th May 22 14 14 4 2 3 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

LATEST WORKOUTS

Jan 22 Did 1/4 of 14th f: b

Jan 18 Did 1/4 of 10th f: b

Agent Lady

B. m. s., by Shelter Half—Lady Cameron, by Roshelas Nation

**Owner:** Oakzyg B H

**AQUEDUCT**

2nd May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

3rd May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

4th May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

5th May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

6th May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

7th May 22 14 14 4 2 3 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

8th May 22 14 14 4 2 3 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

LATEST WORKOUTS

Feb 27 Did 1/4 of 6th f: b

Feb 23 Did 1/4 of 5th f: b

Feb 18 Did 1/4 of 10th f: b

Feb 18 Did 1/4 of 5th f: b

Lady Ashland

B. br. or. 4, 4, 4, by Lord Howard—Stephen, by Maroon

**Owner:** Fountain & Lewis (Ohio)

**AQUEDUCT**

2nd May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

3rd May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

4th May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

5th May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

6th May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

7th May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

8th May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

LATEST WORKOUTS

Feb 15 Did 1/4 of 6th f: b

Feb 11 Did 1/4 of 6th f: b

Feb 8 Did 1/4 of 6th f: b

Feb 4 Did 1/4 of 6th f: b

Sound Anchor

Ch. L. S. by Red Anchor—Sound Dollar, by Zachodago

**Owner:** Mahan J E L

**AQUEDUCT**

2nd May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

3rd May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

4th May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

5th May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

6th May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

7th May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

8th May 22 14 11 3 2 1 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 16

LATEST WORKOUTS

Feb 9 Did 1/4 of 6th f: b

Feb 5 Did 1/4 of 6th f: b

Feb 1 Did 1/4 of 6th f: b

Jan 28 Did 1/4 of 6th f: b

---

Copyright SartinMethodology.com - Not for Resale
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>horse</th>
<th>jockey</th>
<th>race type</th>
<th>distance</th>
<th>odds</th>
<th>post position</th>
<th>finish position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Lili Kell's Brother</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3-year-old</td>
<td>3 miles</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Its Academic**
- **Owner:** Vagabond M
- **Age:** 3 years old
- **Odds:** 12.00
- **Post Position:** 17
- **Finish Position:** 9

**High Rex**
- **Owner:** Vagabond M
- **Age:** 3 years old
- **Odds:** 15.00
- **Post Position:** 19
- **Finish Position:** 20

**Briskeen**
- **Owner:** Vagabond M
- **Age:** 3 years old
- **Odds:** 8.20
- **Post Position:** 19
- **Finish Position:** 20

---

**LATEST WORKOUTS**
- **Date:** Feb 28
- **Distance:** 1 mile
- **Odds:** 12.00
- **Post Position:** 17
- **Finish Position:** 9

---

**LATEST WORKOUTS**
- **Date:** Feb 28
- **Distance:** 1 mile
- **Odds:** 15.00
- **Post Position:** 19
- **Finish Position:** 20

---

**LATEST WORKOUTS**
- **Date:** Feb 28
- **Distance:** 1 mile
- **Odds:** 8.20
- **Post Position:** 19
- **Finish Position:** 20
### Fifth Race

**Aqueduct**

**March 1, 1981**

**Claiming, Purse $46,000, 4-year-olds and upward.**

Distance: 6 furlongs, Win and Place Mares, 123 Lbs. Non-winners of two races since February 15 allowed 3 lbs. Of a race since 1 Min. Claiming Price $50,000, for same $35,000 to July 31, 1 Min. Non-winners of a race other than Claiming since February 15 allowed 3 lbs. Of any race since February 15, 1 Min.

**Value of race $23,400, value to winner $14,400; second $9,000; third $5,000, fourth $1,400.**

**Mutual pool $267,684.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Raced</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>EAE 1/6 EAE 1/4 St.</th>
<th>Y 1/2 Str. Fin</th>
<th>Jockey</th>
<th>Trip or Odds $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Rock's Delivery</td>
<td>4 118 3 2 1 10 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Peck D J F</td>
<td>47,000 1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>5 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Santor A</td>
<td>40,000 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Ain't That Wicked</td>
<td>4 114 1 4 2 21 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Antley C W</td>
<td>42,000 7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Lady Ashland</td>
<td>5 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Krane J A</td>
<td>50,000 12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Classical Realist</td>
<td>5 111 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Cortes C J W</td>
<td>50,000 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>British Bluff</td>
<td>4 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Davis R C</td>
<td>36,000 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Second Anchor</td>
<td>4 115 4 1 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Ortega P J</td>
<td>40,000 52.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFF AT 2:25 Start good, Win driving, Time, :12 2/5, :27 2/5, 1:12 Track fast.**

**$2 Mutual Prices:**

- 6-F (Rock's Delivery) $2.00
- 2-H (Aqueduct Lady) $2.00
- 1-A (Ain't That Wicked) $2.00

### Sixth Race

**Aqueduct**

**March 1, 1981**

**Allowance, Purse $30,000, 4-year-olds and upward, limited to New York bred and approved by the New York State-Bred registry who have never won a race other than Maiden, Claiming, or Starter, 123 Lbs. Non-winners of a race other than Maiden since February 15 allowed 3 lbs. Of any race since February 15, 1 Min. No allowance. Value of race $21,600, value to winner $13,600, second $8,100, third $4,600, fourth $1,800.**

**Mutual pool $209,524.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Raced</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>EAE 1/6 EAE 1/4 St.</th>
<th>Y 1/2 Str. Fin</th>
<th>Jockey</th>
<th>Odds $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Deltavo</td>
<td>4 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Tim V C</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2-1</td>
<td>Dr. Tim Vail</td>
<td>5 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Nuesch S D</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Fleetfooted Passer</td>
<td>5 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Santor A</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Harmonica</td>
<td>6 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Mepiere</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Where's the Baby</td>
<td>6 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Venetia M</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Mind of Truth</td>
<td>6 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Davis R C</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Just Two Four One</td>
<td>6 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Carter T</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Gray A</td>
<td>6 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Krane J A</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFF AT 3:25 Start good, Win driving, Time, :12 1/5, :27 1/5, 1:12 Track fast.**

**$2 Mutual Prices:**

- 6-E (Deltavo) $3.00
- 2-D (Dr. Tim Vail) $16.00
- 3-C (Fleetfooted Passer) $5.00

### Seventh Race

**Aqueduct**

**March 1, 1981**

**Claiming, Purse $30,000, 4-year-olds and upward who have never won a race other than Maiden, Claiming, or Starter, 123 Lbs. Non-winners of a race other than Claiming since February 15 allowed 3 lbs. Of any race since February 15, 1 Min. No allowance. Value of race $21,600, value to winner $13,600, second $8,100, third $4,600, fourth $1,800.**

**Mutual pool $209,524.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Raced</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>EAE 1/6 EAE 1/4 St.</th>
<th>Y 1/2 Str. Fin</th>
<th>Jockey</th>
<th>Odds $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Its Academic</td>
<td>4 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Peck D J F</td>
<td>77.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>High Rex</td>
<td>5 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Mepiere R</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Lil Keil's Brother</td>
<td>5 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Krane J A</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2-1</td>
<td>Feldspar</td>
<td>5 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Boulanger G 4</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2-1</td>
<td>Be Clever</td>
<td>5 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Peck D J F</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2-1</td>
<td>Viva Dancer</td>
<td>5 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Dancer S</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>4 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Santor A</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>Irma Smarten</td>
<td>4 117 3 2 1 11 11</td>
<td>21 21 21 11</td>
<td>Venetia M</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFF AT 3:32. Start good, Win driving, Time, :12 2/5, :27 2/5, 1:11 3/5 Track fast.**

**$2 Mutual Prices:**

- 2-B (Its Academic) $3.00
- 1-C (High Rex) $3.00
- 1-A (Lil Keil's Brother) $2.00
- 2-E (Exacta 2-3 Paid $444.80)
CONTEXTUAL HANDICAPPING
BY BERT MAYNE

At the recent New York Workshop, (a first for this coast!), Michael Pizzolla and I used the word "context" a lot. This wasn't by design, but rather came from the nature of the discussion on contenders and pace lines which we presented, along with our Eastern look at the Match-Up. As the Hat has pointed out on any number of occasions, the "dang slow horse" of one race might be a ball of fire compared to some real Alpo-refugees in another race.

In the course of the workshop, we looked at two days of racing at the infamous Aqueduct Inner Dirt Track. The two days we used were chosen because they were days we had both handicapped, they were typical of the types of races and horses we saw all winter, they were two days of racing in sequence (18 races, just as they came at us), and by applying the Sartin Methodology, both of us were able to make a tidy profit from these typical Inner Dirt racing days.

Let losers worry about system sellers who hand pick three races from an entire meet to "prove" their bogus approach. We showed as fairly as we could just how we, and the Sartin Methodology, could do in day to day practice.

As we spoke of the conventional approaches to contender selection, we found ourselves making qualifying statements about class/APV, or form cycle pluses and zeros. They all had a similar ring: "in the context of this race . . ." We realized as time went on that the basic concept of the Match-Up was very naturally dominating our presentation. As perfected by PIRCO-West, the pace Match-Up has become accessible to all clients. As one who will always be a student, let me encourage others who are students of the Methodology to extend their use of Match-Up wisdom to the entire field of handicapping. Contextual handicapping, if you will. I know all PIRCO Charter Members do something similar, but I've never been so impressed by the necessity for clients to see this point as I was at the workshop.

The Class Rating/APV must be looked at in terms of the context created by the horses in today's race, as well as the context in which it was earned. The class factor fails as a contender indicator precisely when the context is ignored and a mechanical application is attempted. We saw this last Fall, when a Finger Lakes horse showed up at Aqueduct and was ignored by the crowd. Its earnings box said it was worth only two-thirds of today's competition.

Its Class Rating, however, was 50% higher than almost all the other horses, and in 11 past starts this horse had, at worst, finished perhaps 2nd by a half length. In the context of Finger Lakes, this was a horse the Canandaigua bettors would never let go off above even money in the highest class races at the track. In the context of Aqueduct racing, the much-vaunted, wily Big Apple punters saw any Finger Lakes horse as having no chance. In fact, since the horse was entered at about the bottom of the AQU class ladder it was actually a class standout (a
triumph of the Class Rating over raw APV). The horse won for fun at boxcar mutuels.

The point is to look at how the APV comes to be, and what it really means in today's race context. Is the horse coming in from a track where the purses are lower? Did it earn its money in open competition and today faces a bunch of state bred? Is its high APV the result of being a professional maiden or state bred finisher? In the context of today's competition, how should I view its APV/Class?

Similarly, plus and zero form plotting must be seen in context. A quick glance can often tell you that a plus is weak, or unlikely to be repeated today, while a zero may be perfectly excusable. What was the context of that race that gave the plus or zero? Was the poor critter clearly in over its head? If the pace at the second call was 2 seconds faster than it's ever encountered, in a race three times as pricey as it's ever seen, and it betters its own usual second call pace while still turning in the same third fraction time it does when its winning at a lower level, shouldn't we look twice at the zero?

The mind of a person at the track is occupied, and clouded by many things. One of these is the psychological game of "projection." When you watch someone holding a losing ticket at the end of a race, how often do they calmly stand there and say: "My, my, I certainly missed something there. My analysis just wasn't what it could have been." Instead of being honest and facing their own responsibility, they project their inner dishonesty outward.

The greatest reason for the near universal perception that racing is fixed or crooked is the sheer psychic weight of projection by nearly all those who go to the track or frequent an OTB outlet. People who won't fix problems love to fix blame. So they go away spreading the truly groundless notion that racing is unbeatable. This is the arena of the hardest context to deal with; the psychological context of the individual. Naturally, I'll defer to the Doc in this realm. I'm certain he's right in recommending that anyone thinking of a full time career investing at the races had darn sure better spend some time with him before trying to launch the endeavor.

Every year, people approach the Inner Dirt track as though it were harder to handicap than the Main track. Every year, we hear about the shippers, the cheap horses, the weather, the slow times, the difficulty of making a model etc. I think that the first NY workshop deflated these phantom worries while bringing something useful to those who had harbored them. The Inner Dirt is just another racetrack, and the animals on it are as equally equine as any others. After all, to quote the Bard of Oklahoma, "It's jest a danged horse race."

That's the truth. and Truth is the context that will get you winning and keep you winning, day in, day out, at any track in North America; or in any other area of life you care to explore. We plan future workshops, and will continue to look at Eastern racing in the context of a positive, honest, reality based use of the Sartin Methodology. Hope to see you at one soon.
LOW-RISK RACE TRACK INVESTING
BY DICK MITCHELL

Thoroughbred horse race wagering is generally perceived as gambling, and not investing. Investing is nothing more than a respectable (socially accepted) form of gambling. You can't tell me that the stock market is not gambling. Same for real estate. The difference between plants and weeds is about the same as the difference between investing and gambling. A weed is only a weed by definition, and one man's weed is another man's salad.

An investment is an investment by definition. For skilled players, thoroughbred wagering is not a gamble at all. It's a judicious form of investment. The same holds true for the stock market. Highly skilled players (investors) make consistent profits, while the average players donate their money. The average player wins and loses some, depending on luck, chance or the opinions of his broker (tout) and others.

This is exactly the same for horse race bettors. Most of them lack the skills to be consistent winners, but enjoy the pastime and don't mind donating. For the average race bettor, the high-risk, high reward aspect of the game is quite attractive. To have a few bucks on a 20 to 1 shot is quite thrilling and gives an immense sense of accomplishment and corresponding bragging rights when they hit. The idea of place and show betting is sissy stuff. What's so great about a $3.20 show payoff?

The professional doesn't think like the average player. He or she looks at the investment in terms of the risk-reward situation, focusing on return on investment (R.O.I.). This is absolutely the case when it comes to the race track. The purpose of this article is to urge the thoroughbred handicapper to view place and show wagering as a low-risk, high-reward form of investing.

Many handicappers, including some professionals, don't take advantage of this wonderful and very safe investment. Pity. The truth is that practically every day, money is literally given away at the race track. Consider the following chart:

| 8116 EIGHTH RACE, 6 Furlongs, Purse: $53,900, Junior Miss Stakes — Stakes — Fillies, Two year olds. Total Purse $53,900, winner $21,600, second $10,000, third $7,500, fourth $3,750, with $1,250 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sheehan | Pincay | 117 | 4 | 3 | 4-4 | 3-3 | 1-1-1 | 1:20 | 40 |
| Lost Kitty | McCarron | 122 | 3 | 2 | 1/1 | 2-3 | 3-3 | 3-3 | 3.90 |
| Torch the Track | Baus | 117 | 2 | 4 | 2-3 | 5-3 | 5-1 | 2-2-2 | 7.90 |
| Acura | G. Stevens | 117 | 3 | 1 | 3-1 | 4-1 | 4-1 | 4-1 | 16.90 |
| ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Constantly Right | Kellam | 117 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 20.80 |

Time: 22, 45.3, 56, 1:10.2, Start Good. Won Handicap.

SHEEHAN $2 MUTUELS PAID

SHEEHAN | 3.90 | 2.80 | 1.30 |
LOST KITTY | 3.40 | 2.60 |
TORCH THE TRACK | 7.90 |
The Junior Miss Stakes didn't present any great handicapping problem. Practically everybody at Del Mar that hot August day knew that either Sheesham, Timely Match or Lost Kitty would win the race. With Sheesham the odds-on favorite, it stood to reason that she had a very good chance to be in the money.

Odds-on favorites win or place over 50% of the time, and light the board over 80% of the time. According to my computer program, Sheesham had at least a 90% chance to show, hence a generous show price would have been $2.40. $2.22 was the fair price. To calculate the fair price a bet should pay, divide the estimated probability of winning the bet into the bet size. In this case, we divide $2 by .9, which yields $2.22.

If the worst possible outcome occurred, Sheesham, Timely Match and Lost Kitty all finishing in the money, Sheesham still figured to pay at least $2.60 to show! If the expected payoff is 22 cents, and the actual payoff is at least 60 cents, this represents a 272% bonus. Looking at this situation from the point of view of mathematical expectation (what happens if you make this bet a large number of times) a $2.60 show price looks rather juicy:

$$E(x) = .9 \times (.60) - 2.8 .1 = .34$$

This means that you can expect to earn 34 cents for every two dollars wagered, or a net return of 17%. An R.O.I. of 17% is nothing to sneeze at. Most investments don't pay anywhere near this rate of return, especially considering that this 17% is earned in a minute and ten seconds!

As you can see from the chart, Sheesham didn't pay $2.60, she paid $3.20. Imagine taking a 10% risk and being paid a 60% return on your investment! In other words, the chances of you losing this bet were around 10%, yet you were paid 60 cents profit for each dollar you invested. This represents an R.O.I. of 44%. Looking at this situation from a financial point of view, it would be very hard to find a better opportunity.

This is not an isolated circumstance; similar situations occur every day at just about every race track in North America. What is needed to take advantage of this generosity? A small pocket computer loaded with a few simple programs.

In my pocket computer, I have the actual win, place and show routines that the tote board uses to figure the mutuel payouts. In addition, I have the Dr. Z equations that compute your expectation on a $1 place and show bet. The results are reasonable approximations which save a great deal of calculating. Also, I have exacta and trifecta fair price algorithms. This little tool has paid for itself over and over. In just the first month of use, I earned over $1,700 while making $100 place and show bets. (Editor's note: all these programs mentioned are included in the Money Management program package written by Bob Purdy.)
The following is a wonderful situation as far as back hole betting is concerned:

A crude approximation technique to value a show bet is to take the public's win odds, convert to probability and double this value to arrive at the horses chances to show. Place probability is approximated by taking the average of the win probability and the show probability. This doesn't apply if the horse is going off at odds-on. In this case, Powerful Paul’s win odds were 1.1 to 1. This translates into a 47.6% chance to win.

To convert odds into probabilities, add 1 to the “odds-to-1” and divide the result into the number 1:

\[
\text{Probability} = \frac{1}{\text{"odds-to-1" + 1}}
\]

Show Approximation = \(2 \times \frac{1}{(1.1 + 1)}\) = .952
Place \(= \frac{.476 + .952}{2} = .714\)

Whenever a horse is near even money, it's a good idea to reduce your estimate by at least 10% just to be safe. In this case, I would give Powerful Paul an 85% chance to show and a 63% chance to place. Therefore, fair prices to place and show were approximately $3.20 and $2.40. It really wasn't predictable that Powerful Paul would pay more to place than to win, but it was damn sure that he would be a giant overlay in place and show.

If Powerful Paul, Good Thought Willie and Valiant George all ran in the money, with Powerful Paul and Good Thought Willie in the top two spots, this worst case scenario would have yielded place and show prices of $3.80 and $2.80 for Powerful Paul. All that was needed to determine this in advance was to run a few numbers through the computer. The best bet was Powerful Paul to show. It's nice to know you have a very large chance to win your bet and at the same time know you'll be paid at least twice as much as you deserve. The show bet on Powerful Paul assured a minimum 14% R.O.I. When all was said and done, the bet earned a 60% rate of return and you took a 15% risk.

Only a small minority of people who attend the races have the skill to figure out prices in advance. In order to call yourself an intelligent investor, you must be able to do this most fundamental
task. Why sweat and strain with formulas and approximation methods when a simple pocket computer will tell you the exact minimum payoff you can expect in the worst case (or any other case).

Try this next example for yourself to see if you could have spotted this wonderful low-risk turf investment.

Prince Bobby B. had an approximate 80% chance to show, using our approximation technique. This means that his fair show price was $2.50. Using my pocket computer, and figuring the worst case (Will Dancer and Lordalik getting in the money with him), he was still going to pay $3.00 to place and $2.80 to show.

Needless to say, I made a large show bet on him. What a wonderful surprise to have Lordalik run out of the money. Here again, we see a wonderful investment to begin with, made better by a fortunate circumstance. In the worst case, we were taking a 20% risk and were going to get a 40% reward. It turned out that we actually received an 80% reward.

These situations come up every day, offering the so-called race track gambler a great way to make low-risk, high-reward investments. The improbable team of a pocket computer and a horse who is usually an underlay in the win pool can produce profits out of all proportion to the associated risk. I know a number of individuals who make their living using this technique and also applying a similar approach to exacta wagering.

Least you think that I am advocating a place and show system using only favorites, consider this next race:

---

3368 NINTH RACE. 1 1/16 Miles. Purse: $21,000. Four year olds & up. Claiming Price, $20,000-18,000. To Win $11,150, 2nd $4,200, 3rd $3,150, 4th $1,575, 5th $525

3316 Misschievous Matt
3318 Siberian Hero
3325 High Regard
3328 Siberian Hero
3329 Bronze Tester
3330 Lemon Drop
3332 Silver Surfer
3335 Amaur
3352 Max Melody
3363 To Win
3366 Derrin D
3369 Mandana

Time: 2:23.4, 46.2, 1:11.4, 1:37.4, 1:44.4, Start Good. Won Driving.

$2 MUTUETS PAID

MISSCHIEVOUS MATT .......... 10.00 6.00 3.00 53/2
SIBERIAN HERO ............ 6.00 53/2 3.00 3.60
HIGH REGARDS ............. 10.00 53/2 3.00 7.80

23
I was at the races that day with Tom Brohamer, who was very high on Mischievous Matt. He was willing to take him at 5 to 2 to win. He came up on my computer as a close second choice at 2.78 to 1. Maui Melody was my computer's top pick at 2.46 to 1. Needless to say, Mischievous Matt was a wonderful overlay in the win pool.

When I checked the show pool, I was amazed to find that he was going to pay over $6.00 to show in the worst case. As I was walking up to make the bet, the horses were approaching the starting gate. I didn't have time to return to my seat to consult the computer's estimate of his show probability. I quickly took the reciprocal of 3.78 and multiplied by 2. This gave his approximate show probability as greater than 50%. 52.9% to be precise. Hence, I made both a win bet and a show bet on him and cashed them both. Both win and show mutuels were a gift.

As I left the track, I patted my pocket which held my trusty Sharp computer. What a wonderful investment opportunity the race track actually presents us all. The Charles Bukowski in me loves the idea that society at large looks down on race tracks as benign dens of iniquity, whose only saving grace is the fact that they contribute to the common weal by donating a good portion of the money bet by the hopeless degenerates who support this folly.

The truth is that most pillars of our society would be wiped out at the track, where they would be forced to put their money where their mouth is. The race track is one of the purest forms of democracy known to mankind. Boardroom and bedroom antics are not well paid at the track. B.S. will not work at the track. You can't "fake it until you make it" at the track. The only way you are paid is by having a winning ticket.

Winning tickets are paid regardless of color, national origin, sex, religious affiliation, political viewpoint, what clubs you belong to, what you read, who you associate with or any of the other silly ways people judge other people.

What is even more profound is the fact that my Sharp computer itself is a gigantic overlay. It cost me less than $150 dollars, and the one $100 bet on Mischievous Matt alone more than compensated me for this investment. Each day, many investment opportunities present themselves. Our job is to recognize them. A pocket computer and a race track is a good place to start.
SHOWING A PROFIT
A POSTSCRIPT FROM THE DOC ...

In a "Let's Get Serious" scenario, it behooves us to capitalize on these near "sure thing" opportunities that have long been Mitchell's favorite hobby horse. Dick's mathematics are sound and accurate over both the short and long range.

There is another aspect of show betting for which Mitchell has no mathematical corollary. This is the in-the-money horse with virtually NO CHANCE of winning. Note the show payoffs for the horses in Dick's example races that actually finished third in each race, and the show price on the horses that ran second. These, as well as Mitchell's show overlays, represent portfolio betting opportunities consistently overlooked by the mob. A large part of our research has been devoted to isolating these low win, high in-the-money potential contenders.

For example, we are currently engaged in a continent-wide test of two isolated aspects of ENERGY: the "Energizer," modified by the "M.U.V." and the horse closest to the median Energy. (Editor's note: don't worry if you don't know what Doc is talking about. You will.) Perfunctory results have been spectacular. An automatic show bet on this computer derived horse has won 67% of the time with an average mutuel of $4.10 over 270 races so far. Additional test results come in daily.

The clients doing the testing are, for the most part, from the ranks of our LEAST proficient users. (Editor's note: Thanks, Doc. I wondered why I was testing ENERGY!) Further, they are NOT testing this part of the program specifically. This is merely a by-product of the program.

Think what this can mean; a supplemental tool designed to capitalize on horses lightly regarded by the public that pay maximum show prices. Further, there should be a play in virtually every race and NO impact on the win pools. We can stay out of low win potential and low win-mutuel potential races and still profit from volume wagering. We can easily earn expenses and have some profit left over even during those periods when winners elude us AND during those times that come at every track when low priced favorites are winning every race.

When this program reaches fruition, it will become the optimal weapon for Huey Mahl's Portfolio Betting, which was the thrust of his money management presentation at the last Las Vegas seminar. The capacity to profit from the full range of potential offered by the tote board has always eluded the public and has been virtually ignored by handicapping authors, who all seem to appeal to our macho by going for win only.
SANTA ANITA CHARTS

Copyright 1969 by Daily Racing Form Reproduction Prohibited.
ARCADIA, CA.
Saturday, March 26, 1969, 9th day of 91-day meeting. All finishes confirmed by Em T. Jones & Associates.

3613—FIRST RACE, 6 furlongs, 4 year olds & up. Claiming prices $12,500-$10,500. Purse $15,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horse and Jockey</th>
<th>Wt.</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Fm</th>
<th>St</th>
<th>Fin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3543 And Justice Meta</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3554 California</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3555 Atlas Blue</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3556 Lesser Perfection</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3557 Joel Smith G Stew</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3558 Stacey Paris</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3559 Double Eagle Black</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3560 Fullfold</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3561 Nante Tamander</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3562 Redhead, Casatino</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3563 Double Deal, Harvey</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scratched—General Commotion, Dr. Reality, El Ancon, Cloud Buster.
Claimed—Jose Santor by Donna S. J. Amer (brought by Pedro M. Lopez) for $12,500.
Horsing Presence by C. Forster & R. Rodriquez (bought by Frank Nogas) for $12,500.

8—AND JUSTICE | 7.60 | 4.40 | 2.60
9—CLOVER CAIN | 6.00 | 4.40 | 2.60
10—MAC BLUE | 8.40 | 4.40 | 2.60

Avelino Hernandez Trained._hdl $325,270.

3614—SECOND RACE, 8 1/2 furlongs, 4 year olds & up. Claiming prices $20,000-$18,000. Purse $20,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horse and Jockey</th>
<th>Wt.</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Fm</th>
<th>St</th>
<th>Fin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3478 Wally Silly</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3479 Fabulous Pretender, Olivares</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3480 Possibility, Morehead</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3481 Houston Bragg, Valvassori</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3533 Mon Legonore, Hawley</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3534 Royal Agno, Schmelzbach</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3487 Pas De Guerre, Gay</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3488 Healthy B, Westmore</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3573 Redwood Boy, Stevens</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scratched—Me To Be Won.
Claimed—Restless Image by Bradley & Englebert bought by Charles Markey for $20,000.

7—CLOVER CAIN | 8.40 | 4.40 | 2.60
8—MAC BLUE | 8.40 | 4.40 | 2.60
9—MAC BLUE | 8.40 | 4.40 | 2.60

Time—21 1/5, 44 1/5, 1:05 1/5. Clear & fast winner—B G B S Pledge—Shea.
Further, it will be the salvation of those who cannot seem to overcome the decision making hazards that haunt them when investing to win only. I know of two individuals in Southern California alone who have a long history of "chickening out" on win bets yet who have absolutely no problem making a profit when following my personal prescription for isolating the show horse.

If our long range motive is to make a profit, this breakthrough will serve us well at all tracks under all conditions. To illustrate my point, I picked at random the non-maiden races from one day at my local track. Feast your eyes on some of the payoffs on the horses that actually came in second or third. Horses that many times had little or no chance of winning.

We are probably the only informational source in the handicapping field that has made a concerted effort to demonstrate how to isolate these in-the-money horses. Authors and experts have steadfastly ignored them because there is little, if any, public demand. We are a WIN ORIENTED society.

The important point to remember is that these horses DO NOT place and show at random. They have distinct patterns that are more easily recognized than those of win horses.

* * * * * * * *

Editor's note:

I was very fortunate to meet Dick Mitchell soon after I became interested in handicapping. I owe him a great debt for the lessons he taught me on place and show betting; lessons that have stood me in good stead over the years, grinding out a slow and steady profit.

Because the races represent my major source of income, I have never felt that I could afford to pass by any money making opportunity at the track. Dick so ingrained place and show betting in me that even back before I met Dr. Sartin and was many times floundering trying to win races, I was always ahead. No, it's not the key to the mint, nor a ticket to fast money, but it is an opportunity that you should be aware of.

Ask yourself, as Dick asked me many years ago, can you afford to leave that money lying around at the track and not stop to pick some of it up and take it home? The ENERGY! program produces one way to pick show bets; there are many others. A careful study of your track may surprise you. Do you know that 80% of the #1 Early horses show? Neither do I, but they just might at your track. Start looking for patterns; you will surprise yourself.
In the first installment of this column, I discussed choosing and buying a computer for use in handicapping. This time, I want to get more specific and mainly talk about the Sharp handheld computers. Before we get started with the Sharps, however, I want to share a few observations I have made over the past year as one of the PIRCO computer "experts."

First off, though I would never claim that our computer programs are perfect, please keep in mind that they usually undergo at least a year of testing before they are released. I've had people call me and announce that Synergism won't do route races, or that Phase III gives them an error message every time they try a sprint. We can't test every single situation that comes up, but please think a second before you reach for the phone. Is it logical that in two years of testing Synergism we never tried it on a route race?

What we have here is a failure to communicate. Between you and your computer. Most of the time, this is the result of a failure to read the instructions that come with most of our programs. Before you call, go back over the instructions and see if you aren't inputting the wrong information or using the wrong format.

Let's look at a few common errors I hear all the time. Such as, trying to input the distance of a route race and not converting it to furlongs. The computer just doesn't understand 1 for a one mile race, it needs 8 furlongs. Several of our programs will convert a mile and 40 or 70 yards for you, but if it doesn't work, enter the equivalent in furlongs: 8.181 or 8.318.

All of our computer programs have been taught to use racing form times, yet some people stubbornly convert to seconds and tenths. I know it says to do it in the old manuals, but time has marched on and things have changed. And speaking of times, please know which is the second call in a route before you start wagering a lot of money. I get this asked at least once a month. The second call is the second one listed in the Racing Form. In a sprint it is taken at four furlongs and is almost always between 44 and 48 seconds. The second call in a route is the six furlong time, again the second listed, and is generally between 1:09 and 1:16 or so. In either case, the numbers are entered exactly as you see them, leaving out the colon (:) and
using a decimal point to delineate the fifths. Do not convert to tenths. It will only annoy your computer, to say nothing of the person you call to complain about it.

Basically, what I'd like to encourage is a spirit of exploration about your computer. There is nothing you can do to a computer from the keyboard that will in any way hurt it. If an answer doesn't look logical, play with the program some. Don't just keep blindly plugging in numbers. Of course, this assumes you know approximately what numbers the machine should produce, so a bit of basic homework is in order for all of us. I'm in the process of learning to use the new ENERGY! program, and have had to learn all over again what numbers make sense and what signals an input error. No horse in the history of the world ever ran a 75 feet-per-second fraction, so this kind of number is a tip off that you screwed up.

Now, on to the little Sharp computers. The Sharp handhelds are by far the most popular computers for use by Doc's clients, and are the computer of choice for most beginners. Familiarizing yourself with these little marvels should only take an hour or so and anyone who can't operate one should find another hobby.

You should know how to do the basic things that make the computer operate. I'll go over the things I consider essential: loading a program, saving a program, erasing a program and changing DEF keys. You do not need to learn how to write program to do any of these, but learning these basics will enable you to master your most basic tool.

First off, I want to give you a warning. Especially those of you who use the PC-3, 1261 or 1262 computers. All of the Sharp computers have different "modes" of operation. Unless you know what you are doing, it behooves you to stay OUT of the Program Mode, as anything you type either becomes part of your program or erases part of your program. The 1261 type machines have a sliding on/off switch that make it very easy to slide on up to the Program Mode without meaning to. Especially if you use your computer as a calculator and start typing in numbers, you can do a lot of damage to the program. The only way to fix this is to dump the program and reload the computer from a backup tape.

One possible way to avoid this problem is to put a password on your program. Chose a word that is easy for you to remember. I generally use my first name, Dick. Type in PASS"DICK" and Dick will become your password. Now, neither you or anybody else can make changes to the machine unless you remove the password. To take a password off, type in the same thing as you did to put it on: PASS"DICK". Just be real sure to use a word you won't forget, because if you do, your only alternative will be to reset the computer and lose everything in memory.

The 1350 and 1360's are much better designed. To change modes, you must push the green button labeled MODE in the upper right of the keyboard. The on/off switch just turns the computer on and off. A far more sensible arrangement. A password is still a good idea,
however. By the way, the 1261 and 1350 are no longer being made. They are like 1986 cars. They still run and work, you just can't buy a new one anymore. The new and improved models are the 1262 and 1360. I'll use these numbers to refer to both old and new models, as both function exactly the same.

Now, let's suppose you have ruined the program in your computer. Or better yet, just bought a new program from Doc and are hot to try it out. Either way, you need to clear out what is currently in the computer and replace it with the program you want to use. As you all know, the programs are stored on cassette tapes, the same kind you use in your car stereo. To load a new program, follow these steps. First, I like to clear the memory of the computer to make sure that all the bits and pieces of the old program are gone. The CLOAD command is supposed to do this automatically, but who trusts computers? To erase the memory completely, go to the program mode (on/off switch or green button) and type in the word NEW. Hit the ENTER key and the entire memory of the computer is wiped out.

It is not possible to erase just part of the memory. If you have more than one program in the computer, you must erase all of them to get rid of just one. The one exception to all this is Synergism. You see, we put a password on the program and do a couple of other sneaky things so no one can peek inside and see how it works. To clear Synergism out of your computer, you need to turn it over and push the tiny little RESET button with the point of a sharp pencil. I usually push a couple of keys while I hold down the RESET button. If you do this to a 1360, you need to reset the memory state. Don't panic, it's easy. After you push the RESET button, or change batteries for that matter, you will see a question on the screen that says something like:

MEM$ = "C"
RAM CARD S1 CLEAR O.K.? 

Got that? Neither do I, but I know how to make it all well. First answer the question by typing in Y. You will now find yourself in the RUN MODE. Oh, happy day! Only problem is, you can no longer access one of your RAM cards in the machine and are short about 16K of memory. To get it back, type SETMEM"B". Wait a sec and all will be well. If you type in MEM, the computer will tell you how much unused memory it has (you can do this any time). In the case of an empty 1360 with an 8K and 16K RAM cards, the total will be 22942. All is now right with the world.

Now that we have a nice, empty computer, let's fill it up. First off, you'll need a printer/cassette interface and a cassette player. We'll ignore the printer part and just use the interface. Almost any old cassette player will do; I've used all sorts, including Walkmans and cheapos from K-Mart. You attach the interface to the tape recorder with the set of three wires that came with the printer. Make sure to connect the MIC(raphone) hole on the interface to the MIC hole on the tape machine. The other large jack goes into the EAR(phone) holes. The small micro jack goes into the REM(ote) control hole. If
you don't have a remote control on your tape machine, don't worry about it, you can still make it work.

Now, hook up the computer to the printer, make sure both the switches on the printer are ON and we're ready to go. The book that comes with the printer is full of odd instructions about when to turn on and off the remote switch on the front of the printer/interface. I turned mine on the day I got it and haven't turned it off since. Same thing with the printer; it stays on all the time.

Okay, now we press the PLAY switch on the tape machine, type the word CLOAD (pronounced see load, from C(assette) Load) and press the ENTER key. You do not need to type in a name for the program. I know the Sharp book says you need a name, but if you read the fine print, it tells you that you don't absolutely need one. We never put names on our program tapes. If you don't use a name, the computer will automatically load the first program it encounters on the tape. Since we only put one program on each tape, no name is needed. As soon as you push the ENTER key, the computer will start to squeal and the tape player will turn itself on. If you don't have a remote control on your tape machine, type CLOAD first, then turn on the cassette player.

You will hear a high pitched squeal for 6 or 7 seconds and then the computer will start to chatter to itself. The chattering is the program. That's how computers sound when they talk. When the chattering starts, an asterisk (*) will appear in the lower right hand corner of the screen to tell you that all is well. The computer will stop chattering and shut off the tape player when it is finished loading the program.

Easy, you say. Except that what if you don't get the asterisk, or the tape plays for 20 seconds and then the dreaded ERROR 8 message appears on the screen. The problem is that all tape recorders are not created equal. Some are louder than others. Some put the sound on slightly different parts of the tape. Some are just ornery. Jim Bradshaw and I have exactly the same model of Radio Shack tape recorders, but I have lots of trouble loading his tapes. Tape is a bitch.

What you want to do to fix the problem is first, try another volume setting on the tape recorder. I always start with the highest setting and work my way down, but it doesn't matter. When you find a setting that works with your computer, make a note of it, but don't expect that all other tapes will work at that same setting. Depends on what machine made the tape.

If that doesn't work, the second thing to try is another tape recorder. Most folks have one or two laying around. Make the rounds of friends and neighbors and try each tape player in turn. Try to plug them into the wall, as opposed to using batteries, as this will usually produce a more consistent speed. If that isn't possible, carry new batteries with you. Keep trying all the volume settings on each machine.
Lastly, if this doesn't work, send the tape back to the Institute and they'll send you a new one. Don't be too quick to give up on a tape, however. I make all the tapes for Howard and use the same tape recorder for all of them. If one doesn't work, chances are we have incompatible tape machines and you'll need to shop around some. Try to borrow before you buy. It is possible for any magnetic media to be damaged in transit. All that needs to happen is for it to get too hot or near a magnet (like in a post office truck motor) and if even a tiny piece of the program is erased, the tape will refuse to load. Most annoying. Also, we use high quality, made-for-computers tape, but there is still a slight possibility that there is a glitch in the tape.

If it is an old tape, one that you've loaded dozens of times before, there is still a chance it may suddenly refuse to load. A passing magnet may have zapped it (a ringing telephone or the X-ray machine at the airport will do the job). Believe it or not, cosmic rays can also zap tape. (Sometimes the Racing Gods get very personal) All of which leads us to our next topic, saving programs from the computer to tape.

So many clients get a program on tape from the Institute, load it in their computer and toss the tape in a drawer. If something goes wrong later on, they assume it will load again. As we have seen, maybe so, maybe not. The answer is to MAKE A BACKUP! Especially if you had trouble loading the tape we sent you. You don't want to drive over to Aunt Matilda's to use her tape player every time you want to change programs. The solution is to make your own tapes on your own tape recorder. The tapes you make yourself on your own machine will almost always play back on that same machine.

To accomplish this very worthwhile goal, hook up the printer and tape player exactly as described above. Push the RECORD switch on the tape recorder. Now, type in CSAVE (see save). Just that. You don't need any name or other nonsense after CSAVE. The computer will again turn on the cassette recorder and record a copy of the program that is in memory. If you have made any changes to the program, they will be saved exactly as is. Now, as soon as you've finished making a backup, do it again. Trust me, you need TWO backups. A decent tape is $2; live it up, make two. Personally, I make three and store one at my mother's house, but I'm a fanatic. I lost my entire collection of programs once.

How do you know that your computer put exactly what is in memory onto your tape? Glad you asked. Shows your developing a proper paranoid attitude. If you will rewind the tape and type in CLOAD? the computer will check what is on the tape against what is in its memory. Don't forget the question mark (?). It makes all the difference.

All right, a couple more tricks and school is out. What say you want to load two programs into the computer at the same time. Assuming you have enough memory, you can stack a dozen programs in on top of one another. It's easy. Just CLOAD the first program as described. Then, change tapes and instead of CLOAD, type in MERGE.
The computer will then add the second program to the first and you can have Ultra Scan and Fargenerator Plus in the machine at the same time. Easy, what? So where's the catch? Right here.

What if you want to merge Phase III and Ultra Scan? They both live on DEF A. If you merge the two programs together without changing one of the DEF keys, you will not be able to run the program you loaded first. Luckily, changing DEF keys is a snap. I do it all the time and so can you. You do need to enter the realm of the dreaded Program Mode, but I'll show you how to escape intact.

First off, we need to find the DEF setting in the program. Let's say we want to change Ultra Scan from DEF A to DEF J so we can put Phase III on DEF A later. We put the computer into the Program Mode (on/off switch or green button, remember?) and type the word LIST. What will appear is something like this:

10: "A" : PRINT "ULTRA SCAN" ; . . . etc.

We are only interested in that first letter. The rest of the line doesn't matter just now. The number is the basic program line number, and you should leave it ALONE. What you do is push the up/down arrows until the line that starts with the letter in quotes marks (" ") is at the top of the screen. Then push the Right Arrow (>) key until the little blinking square is sitting right on top of the A. Now type in the letter you want to change the DEF setting to. In this case, we would type in J, but you can use any letter or symbol from the bottom two rows of letters on the keyboard. Next, hit the ENTER key and the blinking square will disappear and the J will remain. Congratulations, you just changed a DEF key.

Okay, that first key was easy. It was at the start of the first line in the program. What about some of the other DEF keys, that might be on line 450? Well, if you patiently press the arrow key that points down, the lines will appear one at a time and you will eventually get to line 450, where the change can be made as described. I know a shortcut.

Go back to the Run Mode, and press the DEF key you want to change. Let's say we want to relocate DEF S on our Ultra Scan program. That's the Energy Calculator. We'll stick it over by DEF J on DEF K. But first, we have to find it. As soon as you push DEF S, press the BREAK key, labeled BRK. The computer will say something like BREAK IN 450. Now, back to the Program Mode and type LIST 450. Sure enough, this will appear:

450: "S" : PRINT "ENERGY . . . etc.

The program may have raced beyond line 450 before you could hit that break key, so you may need to use the up-arrow key to find the letter in quotes you are looking for. When you do, drive over the S with the arrow key and change it to whatever you want. K will do nicely. As soon as all the DEF keys are where you want them, it's a good idea to make yet another backup tape. The new DEF keys will be saved to the tape.
One last thing you should know. Before you start stacking in programs, be aware that you can only make changes to the LAST program you put into the computer. If you first CLOAD Ultra Scan, and then MERGE Phase III on top of it, you can no longer make any changes to Ultra Scan. If you type LIST, the computer will show you the first line from Phase III, and will not go back to the Ultra program. If you use the UP arrow key, you can page back through the Ultra Scan code, but you cannot change it. Trust me, I've tried.

What this means is that you should plan your DEF keys in advance. Let's take the merger of Ultra and Phase III. Ultra Scan uses DEF A, S, D, and L. Phase III uses DEF A, S, D, and V. We can see that V and L are okay, but some of the others must be changed. DEF D on both programs is the APV AND CLASS calculator, so we don't really need to change D. After all, we only need one APV program, so who cares if we can't use the one from Ultra Scan? However, we will need to move A and S from one of the programs. If we decide to move Ultra Scan, we must either make the changes before we MERGE Phase III or CLOAD Phase III first.

With these two programs, life is simple, but when you want to merge, say, Contender Scan, Phase III, Pargenerator Plus, Combo Scan and Q-Scan into your 1360, you need to do some fancy DEF key moving. In fact, this is why I don't recommend getting a huge memory for the 1360. Yes, you can cram 64K of memory into the machine, but you will run out of DEF keys long before you can use all that memory. Slows down the computer some, too.

Once you have all the programs merged together and the DEF keys just the way you want them, you can again make a backup and the computer will save all the programs on one tape, DEF keys and all. If you routinely carry Ultra Scan, Pargenerator Plus and Q-Scan in your computer, you might as well make a special tape of all three of them merged together. It only takes a few minutes to change DEF keys, but why do the same job more than once?

Of course, as many of you have already found out, very little of the above applies to Synergism. Since the program is locked up tight, you can't get in to change DEF keys and you can't make a backup. If you want to merge Synergism with another program, make sure you put the other program in first, make any DEF key changes you may need and only then MERGE Synergism. Once Synergism is in the computer, you can no longer look at any of the programs or make changes to any of them. If you don't like this situation, please feel free to discuss it with Mr. Purdy.
BITS AND PIECES

That's the end of the Computer Column, but since I'm talking about Sharp computers, I want to fill you in on the latest news. As you may have heard through the rumor mill, Bob Purdy is working on a new version of Synergism. IF it works better than the original version, it will be offered for sale sometime later this year. Those who have already bought Synergism will get a special price on the new version.

I wouldn't hold my breath waiting for this, by the way. Bob has tried to improve Synergism twice before and failed both times. Let's face it, the original Synergism is a tough act to follow. He now has some new ideas and thinks it will be even better than before, but we'll just have to wait and see.

The good news is, when Synergism II is released, we hope that it will be compiled into machine language. What this means to the user is that it will run much faster. No more 3 minute waits for the computer to sort out 5 horses. We hope to cut the waiting time down to 10 or 20 seconds. The same thing will be done to the new Energy program when it is finally ready.

Now for the bad news. Neither Synergism II or the ENERGY! program will fit in the 1261 or 1262 computers. We have tried desperately to keep all our programs down to the size that the 1262 can accept, but we have just outgrown it. We will continue to provide Synergism I and all our other programs for the 1262, but I'm afraid we have reached the end of the line. It had to happen someday, and like the PC-3 before it, we have exceeded the capacity of the machine with our new programs.

* * * * * * * * *

One of the questions I'm asked most frequently is: where can I get paper for my Sharp printer? You can use adding machine paper, as long as it is thermal paper, but the results are marginal at best. Sharp makes great paper, but only in the inconvenient and expensive little rolls. I recently discovered that Hewlett-Packard makes excellent paper that prints in black. I mentioned it in the article on the Snazzy Paper Holder Thing.

But where do you find this miracle paper? Hewlett-Packard has a telephone service that will sell you 6 large (80 ft.) rolls of paper for $12, postpaid. Call 1-800-538-8787 and ask for Black Print Thermal Paper, ID number 82175 A. Have a credit card ready. You should get the paper in a week or two. I'm sure they'd prefer you to order several boxes at a time.
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THE PSYCHOLOGY OF WINNING
BY HOWARD G. SARTIN, PH.D.

For seven straight issues of The Follow Up we dealt with the fundamental psychological stumbling blocks that prevent people with adequate intellectual handicapping skills from making consistent profits. Most of you have engaged in some healthy introspection and have isolated the problem. Now the question is: what to do about it?

This is the point where we must supplant psychological theory with positive action. Imagine yourself in a cherished portrait painted long ago. It hangs on the wall of your life and has always been a focal point. To take it down would be upsetting to your family. Commissioning a new portrait involves an unknown risk you're not willing to undertake. Still, you want to change. What to do? Get a NEW FRAME!

Like re-arranging the furniture, putting an old picture into a new frame can often work wonders. We call this a "Frame of Reference." It is the source code, the data base from which springs our behavioral reactions. It is synaptic channeling. Our persona. How we perceive and are perceived by others. It is habit and prejudice; smugness and complacency. If we "have it all together" and are achieving all our goals, we don't alter this frame. If not, here's an exercise I'm going to ask you to follow.

Do you drive from point A to point B on the freeway or highway? Leave early tomorrow and take surface streets. Hate anchovies? Order an anchovy pizza and eat the whole thing. Dislike Arabs? Visit an Arabian restaurant. Anti-Semitic? Get yourself a yarmulka and go to synagogue. Always make love on Saturday? Switch to Wednesday. Never take home candy and flowers? Start. Always buy a box seat at the races? Join the railbirds. Preferred parking? Use a public lot, or better yet take a bus to the track.

Alter your habit patterns. Don't just DO these contrary things. Live them. Enjoy the sights, the smells, the sounds of new EXPERIENCE. Involve yourself and observe yourself participating in new behavior. Think all this is silly? Then give up trying to be a successful handicapper.

You're in a self-imposed rut. You don't want to change, not REALLY. You're getting some inner satisfaction from your status quo. Are you a beer drinker? Don't like wine? Think it's for sissies? Buy a case, along with one of those little books on appreciating fine wines. If you don't drink at all, then skip this exercise, But if you do drink, and your bartender always has "the usual" waiting for you, change drinks. Nothing should be more insulting to your sense of individuality than being predictable to a bartender. I did a long study of bartenders once. The thing that bugs them most is a customer they can't peg. STOP BEING PEGGABLE!
The first thing to change may be the most difficult. Stop going to the track with your friends. They're losers. If they were not, you'd be too busy making money to read this. Besides, they're probably not really your friends; merely entities you use to justify and rationalize your failure. Don't fret. They're using you for the same reason. Remember now, this is a prescription for losers. It does NOT apply to winners.

Next, stop going to the track at all, if possible. Go to a legal off-track sight. Don't try analyzing tote action. Bet your choices as soon as the window opens. Don't you realize by now that it's the ambience of the track, the frenzy, the action, the moving tote that causes you to lose in the real world while you're winning on paper when you stick to the selections you made the night before in the security of your den? Sure, I know all the authors tell you to visit the paddock, learn body language, trips and tote board analysis. But their payoff comes when you buy the book. Mine only comes when you start winning consistently. They don't give a damn about you as an individual. I do.

Save your binoculars and your track-side expertise for AFTER you get the winning habit. Until then, WEAR A NEW FRAME! Stop watching races. Grow up and face reality. If you can win on paper, handicapping at home but you lose at the track, it should be obvious that it is the gambling atmosphere that is altering your judgment and your decision making abilities. Remove the aura of gambling. Situate yourself as far away from the spectacle as possible.

Isolate yourself from all conversation pertaining to horses. In reality, we're not wagering on horses anyway. We're predicting the future market value of a commodity through the analysis of symbols that appear in a daily report called the Racing Form. Horses are but a label affixed to this symbolism. The commodity itself is EGO. Yes, we're investing in our own ego as manifest by a correct evaluation of the symbols we use. If we project accurately, we get a payoff, both to our ego and our pocket book.

It is axiomatic that losing gamblers, along with alcoholics and addicts, have a low sense of self-worth. Nothing elevates a "gamblers" feelings of self-worth more than winning. The ambience of a racetrack is dictated by the mob, which consists for the most part of losers. Until you get the winning habit, ISOLATE yourself from the company of losers.

Begin by altering every possible aspect of your current predictable behavior. Supplant each habit pattern with a new one. If a month from now you come to me with a tale of woe and you have NOT tried this prescription, I'll be genuinely disappointed. I probably won't give up on you, but I'll continue to ask that you give it a try.

Rearrange your furniture.

Above all, get a new frame for your self-portrait!
THE PIRCO FAMILY
BY DAVID A. EICHHORN

Editor's Note: This article was submitted in the form of a letter to Dick Hazen, who leads the Seattle Study Group.

* * * * * * * * *

Just wanted to drop you a line and let you know how impressed I am with Dr. Sartin and the PIRCO family! I have just finished going through the 6 back issue of The Follow Up for the second time, and now my new issue #7. The material contained within is really super! I love working the problem races because they are from "foreign" tracks and present different problems than we usually encounter at Longacres and Portland Meadows. The stuff is great! I am really excited about the group I have joined and where we are headed.

You know, I have been around Larry a lot, (another member of the Seattle study group) and picked up most of the nuts and bolts of what he was doing and thus had no trouble understanding what was going on. But he never really said much about the PIRCO family and what they stood for, what they have done and where they are headed. It was not until I began digesting the issues of The Follow Up and the Pace Line manual and tapes that I really saw and understood what this organization is all about! I want you to know that I am proud to now be a part of this family and that I will do my utmost to contribute and live up to the standards set forth by the Doc and the Charter Members.

I really love this stuff! The Match-Up concept and the pluses and zeros is a killer and really makes it easy to select the contenders and pace lines. The math and concepts behind the programs has not been very hard for me to digest, as I majored in math and physics in college. I can really appreciate the potential of what I have read and from what I have heard from you.

I have been going back over last year's races at Longacres almost daily and it really amazes me the things I see now that I missed last year. Additionally, the pace Match-Up is really great for getting contenders. In many cases, I find the winner without using the computer. Ah, if I had only known last year what I know now...

I spent a lot of time on the Longacres Mile Day card in particular, because all the races were routes and the big crowd kept the prices generous. By simply using the pluses and zeros and the pace Match-Up you could narrow most of the races down to 3 of fewer contenders. In the races where there was no real pace, the new Class Factor collects your contenders nicely. I've always felt that the longer the race, the more important class becomes, especially with females.
By getting my Energy pars from Saturday's results charts and then calculating the percent Early after each race on Sunday and keeping a current par for Sunday from the races already run, you could really nail down the winners and other money horses. In race after race, the winner is obvious. When I compare my results now to what I actually did that day, it's amazing.

The Match-Up produces an $11.60 winner in the first race, which I had handicapped also at the time and an $*.00 winner in the second, which I also had. Both were pretty easy to see. However, had I been using the Match-Up and the Tandem theory, I would never have missed the $11.60 winner of the third, or the $8.20 winner of the fourth or the $14.60 place horse in the fifth. I did have the $12.00 winner in the sixth, but so did the Match-Up.

In the seventh race, the only logical way to get the $48.40 winner was by using the Tandem concept. In both the eighth and ninth races I passed $21.20 and $26.80 winners because I didn't think either horse had the "class." The new Class Rating shows that both are in the top three. Of course, I'd have had Judge Angelucci in the Mile, and this time I would have had Leading Hour at 45-1 to place.

In the 11th race, I would have gotten Fleet Al at $17 along with the $10 place horse and the fancy price in the exacta. Instead, I actually played three horses who did not have a chance to light the board because they did not fit the pars for the day, nor had the "new class" to carry their early speed to the end. I wound up losing $60 on the race. Looking back, it's easy to feel stupid, but actually I was just not knowledgeable of the Sartin Methodology.

I also noticed that the track was running very Sustained that day. The grounds crew had "dressed" the track for the big race. If I had taken my top Sustained horse that fit the Percent Early pars that were being run that day, I could have started a show parlay with $5 in the first race, let it ride for three races and then bet one third of my parlay on each following race and wound up with $230. With a $10 start, it would have totaled $460. Makes you think.

Anyway, I just wanted to let you know I'm really looking forward to being part of the PIRCO Family, and will do my best to contribute whatever way I can. I really want to get good at this pari-mutuel investment opportunity I have discovered. It's a great challenge and a great way to set yourself up for future financial independence and job freedom.

See you at the races, pardner. This nice weather we're having surely makes you glad that Longacres is open again!
The quality of questions coming into my mail bin at the office has improved a hundred fold in the past few months. In fact, just since the anniversary issue in February, I've noted a glimmering of true insight even from our newest clients.

Much of this metamorphosis can be traced to Synergism and its auto-adjust feature, which has virtually eliminated those nagging questions concerning basic adjustment factors. Clients are finally comprehending the fact that ALL paceline adjustments are based on Total Energy relationships as delineated by the Variant or ParGenerator programs.

Another breakthrough in client comprehension has come through the medium of Dick Schmidt's Beginners Manual and its accompanying audio tapes. While much of this material is contained in the first seven issues of The Follow Up, most of you have expressed a willingness to buy the manual and tapes at $49 just to have all the material under one cover. I'm delighted and truly amazed at the progress shown, even by rank beginners, as a result of Dick's work. In easing the burden of answering individual questions, we have been given more time for researching the computer breakthroughs that are on the horizon with Synergism II and ENERGY!

One adjustment question that persists has to do with those pocket areas where the auto-adjust in Synergism does not quite take care of extreme variations in times between such tracks as Charlestown going to Penn National, Calder to Gulfstream or Aqueduct Main to Inner Dirt track.

The answer is really quite simple, and is something we have been doing for some time. We determine the Total Energy (Variant) from the pace of the race by distance and class for each track. (There is a reason why Bob provided a Variant Program with each copy of Synergism). We then simply subtract one from the other to get an Energy adjustment. The real question is where to put the adjustment and how much of it to use.

Where Synergism now asks for a class adjustment, it might better read OPEN ADJUSTMENT. This is where you would put your energy adjustment in those rare situations when the automatic adjustment does not handle the disparity between the tracks, and yet horses from the
slower tracks are winning. However, if we were to put all of the resulting figure into Synergism, the results would almost always be disastrous. We would be completely overpowering the subtle Synergism adjustments and substituting a crude Meridian adjustment in their place. Synergism is going to make its adjustments. We are trying to add on a bit more in extreme cases. I would suggest that this is an area that demands research on your part. Start with about one third of the gross Energy differential and then experiment with other proportions. We would appreciate hearing from you when you discover a winning procedure.

Remember, this is a procedure that should be necessary only on a very small percentage of races. For the vast majority, the Synergism adjustments are more than adequate.

Incidentally, some of you are answering N for no when the program asks for a Class Adjustment. DON'T DO IT! This is not a question, it is asking for a number. If you don't want to use a class adjustment, just hit the ENTER key and the program will automatically put in a zero adjustment. Putting in an N adds the number of the horse (the third or fourth horse put into the computer) as the class adjustment and will almost always make the final horse put into the computer come out on top. Beware.

Q: In the Match-Up section of the pace line manual, Jim Bradshaw gives no guidelines for equating the value of fractional times from slow to fast tracks. He suggests that using raw times is adequate. I have not found this to be universally true. What do I do about it?

A: Granted, Jimmy is a little cavalier in this regard. He is fond of referring to himself as "just a dumb Okie" (which he ain't). But from this orientation, he reasons that if he could figure it out, anyone should be able to. Not necessarily so.

The problem will be fully addressed in the forthcoming Match-Up Manual. In the meantime, here is the essence of your answer: using the Pace of the Race from the immediately available past performance lines of the tracks in question, establish an average "Fast Fraction" for the first and second call only. You're not looking for precision here, only ball park averages. Take the fractions from similar class levels, with Daily Racing Form variants ranging between 18 and 21. Now equate them.

In the Match-Up manual, we will provide a master Pace/Speed chart that will ease the process. For example, your master second call times for a sprint will look like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Rating</th>
<th>2nd Call</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc. etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now, determine the equivalent rating at any other track in question:

\[
\text{Track B:} \\
45 = 100 \\
45.1 = 99 \\
45.2 = 98 \\
\text{etc. etc.}
\]

If track B's 100 rating is a 45, and track A's 100 rating is a 44, you merely adjust your Match-Up analysis accordingly. We will supply a master chart for each fractional split in both sprints and routes. Let's look at a couple of examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track A</th>
<th>Track B</th>
<th>Track C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see that the horses coming from Track A and Track B are quite evenly matched, while the horse from Track C, with apparently the fastest times, actually does not match up well against either of the other two horses.

These charts are for quick analysis only, and cannot replace F/P/S Energy comparisons. Still, they will be quite adequate for Match-Up analysis. A more precise way of doing this, of course, would be to have par Pace/Energy figures for every track you might encounter. Tom Brohamer has provided precise lessons for doing this (an outline of which will also be in the Match-Up manual), but few have undertaken the job. A simplified procedure was thoroughly described in the Factor Analysis manual and in a number of seminar manuals; especially the Omaha and Laurel workbooks.

For use with the Match-Up, however, a simple master chart employing the ancient fifth of a second/beaten length differential will suffice. By the way, the Match-Up manual is turning into a major work. Bradshaw's contribution alone exceeds 100 pages and counting. Along with the manual will come a computer program that computes and prints out the end results of the Match-Up process. This program, which is intended as a research and learning tool, not a handicapping program, should enable you all to get a firm grasp of the Match-Up process.

Once the Match-Up is learned and put to use, you should have no trouble in making a good living at the track. Testimony to this has been provided by a number of clients who have had hands-on training in the Match-Up procedure from Jim or myself. One of these people is Bruce Jorgenson of Shelton, WA, who went from a highly skeptical attendee at a small seminar in Yakima to a 70% + win proficiency.

He attributes his sudden grasp and success with the Methodology almost exclusively to his final comprehension of the Match-Up. He has written the foreword to the Match-Up manual from his perspective as a
full-time professional. It seems like only yesterday that he was shaking his head at virtually everything we said at that seminar.

Q: Which do you consider to be the best manuals to get in order to go full time?

A: After the basic yellow Phase III manual, of course, my suggested order of preference is:

3) The Brohamer Model.
4) The Match-Up Manual with computer program. (NOT available yet. Stay tuned)

I would also recommend that everyone re-read the pink Introduction to the Dynamics of Incremental Velocity and Energy Exertion manual that came free as a part of your Phase III package. It presents an overview of practically everything.

For clients who wish to advance to the ultimate level, I would also suggest:

1) The Tom, Dick and Doc Beaumont workbook with audio tapes.
2) The Tandem manual.
3) The 55% Solution: Key to Winning Exotics.
4) The advanced Omaha Seminar workbook.

Above all, continue to subscribe to The Follow Up, which I consider the best handicapping investment of all.

I'm always a little reluctant to recommend any further expenditure on your part. We've explained that a number of times. After all, I personally became a full time winner without reading a SINGLE ONE of these works. Their only purpose is to save you time and money.

My own education came at minimal cost: $5 for a used copy of Ray Taulbot's Thoroughbred Racing: Handicapping for Profit, $2.50 for Huey Mahl's The Race is Pace and $2 an issue for those Systems and Methods editions edited by Huey Mahl. All in all, I spent about $55 for my education. The rest of my investment was in time and in the purchase of lots of losing mutuel tickets.

Without those losing tickets, there would have been no flow of winning tickets to follow. Unlike training to be a surgeon, handicappers cannot practice on models or cadavers. The only true preparation for the thrill of victory is the agony of defeat.
BOOK REVIEW
BY DOC SARTIN

Amicus Press $24. Baltimore, Maryland

Once again, William Scott proves himself the master of the catchy title: Investing at the Race Track, How Will Your Horse Run Today? and now Total Victory at the Track. All are titles that elicit the response of: "I wish I'd said that."

In his latest opus, Scott "puts forth" what he considers the best of his work on handicapping; a synthesis of everything he feels is viable. The result is a three pronged system. Since we are purveyors of a methodological approach to handicapping ourselves, we cannot objectively evaluate his system. You all know my feelings on this subject. People promoting their own method have no right to judge the methods of others! Ralph Nader taking GM to task while manufacturing cars in his basement? No way!

Therefore, I'll confine myself to a review of the book as handicapping literature. As such, it represents the coming trend in handicapping books based on publishing demographics. These are the figures indicating the most profitable market. According to author James Quinn, his publisher, William Morrow, the largest in the field, sees a demographic swing away from the serious better toward the $2 weekend wagerer, the recreational handicapper. The feeling is that those who aspire to handicapping professionalism have been adequately served by Quirin, Quinn, Beyer, Ainslie and Scott himself in his second book. Also, it is felt that this esoteric group is the least susceptible to mass marketing.

Scott has analyzed this demographic well, and should profit handsomely from the results. He offers a system in which every single running line for all the entrants is mathematically averaged to make a class rating. (Editor's note: that alone should make it wildly popular, especially among some of our most stubborn clients) The same procedure will also give evidence of whether the animal is a front runner or closer. Since a lot of adding and dividing is required on every horse, Scott proffers an accountant's short-cut to addition.

The top three ranked horses in his class rating become prime candidates for the winners circle. These replace his former use of the top three public betting choices. Hence, this procedure is designed to
pick better priced horses. The second step is derived from Form Cycle via an updated version of *How Will Your Horse Run Today?*

The final step represents a new look at ability times, first presented in *Investing at the Racetrack*. No longer is route ability the second fraction interpolated. Now ability times in both sprints and routes are derived from the final fraction interrelation to the second call time. Since Scott believes that all chart callers are suspect and that their lengths behind the leader calls are erroneous, he offers a chart designed to correct their shortcomings. The logic behind compounding a possible felony with another felony is one that might escape all but a brilliant attorney; which Scott truly is.

Since conventional logic and reason do not necessarily make to a profitable system or method, (Editor's note: witness Ultra Scan) one should accept Scott's illogic without question, at least during any testing of the system. To those who worry about the influence of the track variant, Scott offers a solution not unlike our own from the 1983 Factor Analysis manual.

He reasons that at virtually every track in North America, the daily variant averages between 18 and 20. Thus if a horse's speed rating is accompanied by a variant of between 18 and 20, no adjustment is made. Above or below these numbers, a "tick" per point of variant is applied. Scott explains how he evaluated the very best daily variant services (even those of a prominent West Coast scholar, whom I perceived to be Tom Brohamer) and found them to be no more proficient than the above technique.

Considering the approach that Scott is advocating, I can see how this could easily be true. In fact, this chapter (9 - The Troublesome Problem of the Track Variant) may be the most significant aspect of the book.

Since this book is by William Scott, it is sure to have a wide readership. Being a system, it will be subject to the interpretive alterations of the user. This is unfortunate because such tampering will obscure its worth. It is axiomatic that a systematic procedure must be applied in exact accordance with the author's instructions.

One thing is certain: it will soon be computerized by a few well known bandits, who have already computerized Scott's other systems without his permission. In the long run, they will probably make more money out of this work than Scott himself. I predict that *Total Victory at the Track* will be applauded in those circles catering to the masses. (It already got a very strong 8 rating in PRN, for what that is worth). However, those who regard Scott as a contributor to advanced handicapping technology will be disappointed, because the book obviously regresses to old formulae.

The bottom line is: Does it work? Will it produce the promised Total Victory? If it does, what else matters? If not, it is still an interesting excursion through a lot of races and handicapping situations with William Scott as an erudite tour director.
Harness Handicapping

PHASE II
BY DOC SARTIN

As this series has progressed, we've heard from many of you who want to seriously pursue the investment opportunities presented by the sulkies. Your input has made it possible to test factors over a wide range of tracks and geography. During the past year, many of you have been sending us your results obtained by using one of our existing programs with harness times.

Those using Phase III, either raw or with their own perceived adjustments, did not fare as well as those using either Ultra Scan or Synergism. The reason is that both Ultra Scan and Synergism employ an automatic variant adjustment feature based on an average deviation from a meridian. As our harness user data base increases, we're able to test this concept on harness races, and the results have been very positive.

Jesse Cohen of New York (and now Las Vegas) recently joined the testers. Because of his deep insights into pace and the Methodology, his results have been most useful. They confirm the viability of the Energy Adjustment. For the last two months, he has forsaken his lucrative thoroughbred "practice" and concentrated on the buggy program. His observations on post positions at ovals of less than one mile vs. mile tracks have been quite revealing. He generally ignores post position at the mile tracks. Jesse's bottom line shows a good profit playing only ONE horse to win, unless the odds justify a two horse wager. His exacta and especially his place and show portfolios are also well in the black.

In Florida, Jim Jacque, who has not yet acquired Cohen's handicapping sophistication, is also showing a profit from single horse win betting.
February 18, 1988

Howard G. Sartin, PhD
The Inland Empire Institute
1390 E. 6th St., #6
Beaumont, CA 92223

Dear Dr. Sartin:

I have been playing the Pompano Harness Tract and have been averaging about 45% winners betting one horse to win only for about a $6.25 payoff. I run the data on the Phase III program. I bet almost 100% of the card.

I have problems with class and picking pace lines. I use a Rube Goldberg method of picking contenders which works fairly well. I am however, waiting with bated breath for your release of the Phase III Harness Manual.

I have taken the Method II Harness Method from the "Follow Ups," bound them in a folder so that I don't have to flip from issue to issue to get the meat. This helps to unscramble my brains and lets me peruse the information in a logical manner. I hope that Dick Schmidt gets on the stick with Issue No. 7 of "The Follow Up" which should contain "putting it all together." Dick does a fine job.

Yours very truly,

Jim Jacque

encl: 1 copy of this letter
       1 self-addressed stamped envelope
Several other positive reports from those using our existing programs have already appeared in previous issues of The Follow Up. The key issue in these success stories has been the use of an Energy adjustment and placing less emphasis on final time (true speed) than handicappers employing conventional harness handicapping techniques.

Jim "The Hat" and I have now incorporated a Harness ParGenerator feature into the Phase III Harness program that is proving most effective. Putting the contenders from the following race at the Meadowlands through the ParGen shows J.J's Bunny and H H Caliber with a suggested adjustment of .48 each. These two proved to be the winner and the place horse when the results were in. For that race, we used record time to establish a variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENERGY TOTAL %MED FX</th>
<th>VAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.H. 44.02 42.94 44.06</td>
<td>8 .49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASI 44.51 44.11 43.58</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.J. 44.87 43.61 43.20</td>
<td>9 .48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMBL 44.33 43.59 42.36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS 44.51 44.86 44.95</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORSE</td>
<td>BREEDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH Caliber</td>
<td>Misch-Cote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitaro</td>
<td>Misch-Cote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Skipper</td>
<td>Misch-Cote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Van</td>
<td>Misch-Cote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadydale Eclipse</td>
<td>Misch-Cote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masi Warrior</td>
<td>Misch-Cote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.J.'s Bunny</td>
<td>Misch-Cote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimble Bg</td>
<td>Misch-Cote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Bye</td>
<td>Misch-Cote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottie</td>
<td>Misch-Cote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purse:** $11250

**Exacta Wagering:**
- P: $2.60
- 2: $1.20
- 4: $3.40

**Selections:** 1-5-7

**7-1-9 Actual**
RACE # 1

H. H. C.

1  2  3  4  W
43.90 44.48 43.90 46.31
41.56 45.93 43.59 47.84 46.44

CLASS: 1.06
FW: 47.5
EP 43.7 SP 45.37 AP 44.54
TS 46 %EX 48.22

RACE # 1

SHADY

1  2  3  4  W
45.37 45.25 45.07 43.26
42.12 46.09 45.07 43.26 44.68

CLASS: 0.57
FW: 45.25
EP 44.11 SP 43.69 AP 43.9
TS 42.72 %EX 49.94

RACE # 1

MASAI

1  2  3  4  W
44.60 44.96 43.42 45.52
41.22 47.06 43.69 45.52 46.26

CLASS: 0.68
FW: 46.94
EP 44.11 SP 44.82 AP 44.47
TS 44.52 %EX 49.33

EARLY PACE

SHADY

---

MASAI

---

NIMBL

---

RUSS

---

H. H. C.

---

J. J. S.

RACE # 1

NIMBL

1  2  3  4  W
43.42 44.90 44.08 45.52
41.08 46.43 44.55 44.69 45.56

CLASS: 0.77
FW: 46.33
EP 43.76 SP 44.23 AP 44
TS 44.37 %EX 49.04

RACE # 1

RUSS

1  2  3  4  W
44.90 44.38 42.58 46.48
42.47 45.65 42.56 47.43 46.54

CLASS: 0.73
FW: 47.27
EP 44.06 SP 45.75 AP 44.91
TS 44.45 %EX 48.99

RACE # 1

J. J. S.

1  2  3  4  W
44.49 44.20 44.86 44.79
42.58 45.61 45.33 44.78 45.20

CLASS: 0.99
FW: 46.19
EP 44.06 SP 44.42 AP 44.24
TS 45.93 %EX 48.9

TRUE SPEED

SHADY

---

MASAI

---

NIMBL

---

RUSS

---

H. H. C.

---

J. J. S.

SUST. PACE

SHADY

---

MASAI

---

NIMBL

---

RUSS

---

H. H. C.

---

J. J. S.
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A more proficient procedure is demonstrated in the 3rd race. Here we used the fastest last race final time showing to make a zero variant. We'll use Passing Thunder's time of 1:56. The other contenders were Farm Alba, Uproot and Rock The Gaspar R. The ParGen program gives us an average variant of 9. Using .08 per point of variant differential generated by the ParGen program from our established zero, gives Farm Alba and Rock The Gaspar R each a +16. Uproot gets a zero adjustment, while Passing Thunder is given a -72.

The results: Rock The Gaspar R won, Farm Alba placed and Uproot ran third. By merely analyzing the Track Profile, you can see that Farm Alba, who had the highest Total Energy, was an Early Pace horse, as seen from his higher expenditure of Median Energy and his high Factor X. Rock, with a lower Median Expenditure and Factor X appears to be a better win candidate based on the Meadowlands Win Model. Let's put them through the program and see:

```
ENERGY TOTAL %MED FX VAR
FARM 44.62 43.66 44.27 11 +16

ENERGY TOTAL %MED FX VAR
PASS 44.74 43.48 44.73 0 +12
Silver

ENERGY TOTAL %MED FX VAR
UP 44.37 44.63 45.47 9 +4

ENERGY TOTAL %MED FX VAR
ROCK 44.45 43.39 42.65 11 +16
```

**TRACK PROFILE**

```
*********************************
TOTAL  HIGH  LOW  AVERAGE  AVG
45.53 44.03 44.62 9

*********************************
%MED  HIGH  LOW  AVERAGE
45.37 43.39 44.03
```
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horse Name</th>
<th>Jockey</th>
<th>Odds</th>
<th>Starting Position</th>
<th>Finish Position</th>
<th>Purse</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Joseph Faro &amp; Angela Faro, Mass</td>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$9000</td>
<td>2:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE MILE</td>
<td>Daniel O'Brien</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>$9000</td>
<td>1:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURSE $9000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please Ask for Horse by Program Number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horse Name</th>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Starting Position</th>
<th>Finish Position</th>
<th>Purse</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FARM ALBA</td>
<td>JIM DOHERTY</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>$9000</td>
<td>2:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSING THUNDER</td>
<td>ROBERT PETTIT</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$9000</td>
<td>2:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUM SKIPPER</td>
<td>MATTHEW ROMANO</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>$9000</td>
<td>2:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALANTINO KEY</td>
<td>JEFF FOUNT</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>$9000</td>
<td>2:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPROOT</td>
<td>JOHN CAMPBELL</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>$9000</td>
<td>2:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTERATTACK</td>
<td>JOHN LABBE</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>$9000</td>
<td>2:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCK THE GASPER</td>
<td>MIKE GAGLIARD</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>$9000</td>
<td>2:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABDUCTOR</td>
<td>WILLIAM O'DONNELL</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>$9000</td>
<td>2:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVERMAN'S KASH</td>
<td>JOE SILVERMAN</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>$9000</td>
<td>2:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUE-RED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please Ask for Horse by Program Number**

- PACE: Joseph Faro & Angela Faro, Mass
- ONE MILE: Daniel O'Brien
- PURSE $9000

**Please Ask for Horse by Program Number**

- FARM ALBA: JIM DOHERTY
- PASSING THUNDER: ROBERT PETTIT
- RUM SKIPPER: MATTHEW ROMANO
- VALANTINO KEY: JEFF FOUNT
- UPROOT: JOHN CAMPBELL
- COUNTERATTACK: JOHN LABBE
- ROCK THE GASPER: MIKE GAGLIARD
- ABDUCTOR: WILLIAM O'DONNELL
- SILVERMAN'S KASH: JOE SILVERMAN
- BLUE-RED
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**Please Ask for Horse by Program Number**

- PACE: Joseph Faro & Angela Faro, Mass
- ONE MILE: Daniel O'Brien
- PURSE $9000

**Please Ask for Horse by Program Number**

- FARM ALBA: JIM DOHERTY
- PASSING THUNDER: ROBERT PETTIT
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**Please As...
EARLY PACE

FARM
PASS
UP
ROCK

FACTOR W

FARM
PASS
UP
ROCK

HIDDEN ENERGY

FARM
PASS
UP
ROCK

AVERAGE PACE

FARM
PASS
UP
ROCK

***************

RACE # 3

PHASE III HARNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>HE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FARM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It is interesting to note that Passing Thunder, running against those extremely fast fractions, comes out well despite being beaten 10.25 lengths. The three horse exacta box of Rock The Gasp R, Farm Alba and Passing Thunder paid very well. With Passing Thunder being the morning line and betting favorite, the win price on Rock The Gasp R was very good, as was the place price on Farm Alba.

Our Harness Program uses a Factor W formula tailored to harness win Energy. It, along with Hidden Energy and Sustained Pace have proven to be the best win predictors, while a combination of Early and Hidden are the most predictive of place. Before the program is released, we will be incorporating the automatic adjustment features we have found successful from the ParGenerator program. We feel that this is the optimum adjustment procedure, given the present state of our knowledge. Once the Harness Program is released and in wide spread use, we will count on you to provide us with the feedback necessary to make any needed improvements.

* * * * * * *

I was privileged to be a key speaker at the recent Harness Tracks of America convention at the Frank Lloyd Wright designed Arizona Biltmore in Phoenix. While there, I could see that track owners and managers are making a concerted effort to prevent driver manipulation in harness racing. I was most impressed with some of the measures they're taking, including exhaustive computer analysis of each drivers record in exotic races and the betting patterns on each horse.

We can now recommend harness handicapping, as we feel that we can approach harness from the same position of trust as the thoroughbreds. There seems little likelihood that the recent cheating scandals will be repeated. The harness people are becoming as vigilant at their thoroughbred counterparts. They are also less pompous, and a great deal of fun to be around.

HARNESS TRACKS OF AMERICA, INC.
35 AIRPORT ROAD / MORRISTOWN, NEW JERSEY 07960 / (201) 265-9000

March 21, 1988

Dear Dr. Sartin:-

I want you to know that your thought-provoking talk generated a great deal of favorable comment and clearly was a highlight of the meeting. I thank you for coming over and spending a little time with us; your visit was a major contribution and most enjoyable.

Please let me have your expenses, and stay in touch. I'll send a transcript of the edited version of our selected presentations as soon as it is available.

Cordially

[Signature]
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For our last workshop in Beaumont, Jim Bradshaw and Virginia Butler flew in to address the assembled multitudes. They both got in on the Friday morning before the weekend workshop and I picked them up at the airport. Somehow, rather than drive directly to Beaumont to spend a quiet afternoon in contemplation, they managed to talk me into stopping in at the San Bernardino off-track betting site.

We got there just as the second race was going off, so we bought Racing Forms, found seats and started in on the third race. Within seconds, we were all saying things like "Oh, my goodness gracious," and other exclamations of surprise and wonderment. What greeted us when we turned to the third race was what Jim Bradshaw, the master of the Match-Up, called the most competitive race he could remember.

Let's look over Jimmy's shoulder while he takes us through this very competitive race.

* * * * * * * * *

I was out in California to assist Doc with the March workshop. Dick Schmidt, Virginia Butler and I took time out to visit the new California OTB bank.

We arrived in time to handicap the third race, and my comment to Dick was "Wow," what a field of closely matched horses. Schmidt was testing the new ENERGY! program, and as always I was using the Match-Up to find contenders in the race.
3rd Santa Anita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Horses</th>
<th>Odds</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 1/2 FURLONGS. (1.14) CLAIMING. Purse $7,700. 4-year-old and upward. Weight, 121 Lb. Non-winners of two races since December 25, allowed 5 lbs. of a race since then. 4 lbs., since December 1, 18 Claiming price $6,250; for each $2,500 to $5,999, allowed 1 Lb. (Races when entered for $6,250 or less not considered).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Royal Blue Eyes**

**OLIVARES F**

**115**

**B. A. S. & by Blue Eye Bay—TS Royal Lady, by Extremapersona**

**VRC—录igovty A & & Senti (Cal)**

**Tr.—Anderson Robert G.**

**$52,500**

**8 1/2 FURLONGS. Allowances: 1/4 mile, 1/2 mile, 1 mile. Weight, 121 Lb.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>Odds</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Royal Blue Eyes</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Olivas P. F.</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Olivas F. J.</td>
<td>10/1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lifetimes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 1/2 FURLONGS.</td>
<td>1:28.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Donner Party**

**PINCAY L. JR.**

**115**

**B. P. T. & by Impressive—Winter Tobin, by Tobin Bronze**

**Br.—Kerr J. Jr- R. W (Cal)**

**$45,150**

**$2,500**

**8 1/2 FURLONGS. Allowances: 1/4 mile, 1/2 mile, 1 mile. Weight, 121 Lb.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>Odds</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Donner Party</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pinckney L. J.</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Pinckney L. J.</td>
<td>10/1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lifetimes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 1/2 FURLONGS.</td>
<td>1:28.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Our Lordship**

**DELAHOUSSAYE E**

**115**

**B. P. S. & by Sound Book—Middle Cardinale, by Speak John**

**Br.—Kilroy W S (Ky)**

**$45,150**

**$2,500**

**8 1/2 FURLONGS. Allowances: 1/4 mile, 1/2 mile, 1 mile. Weight, 121 Lb.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>Odds</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Our Lordship</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Dehounessey E</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Dehounessey E</td>
<td>10/1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lifetimes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 1/2 FURLONGS.</td>
<td>1:28.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Bundel Of Iron

**PEDRIZMA M A**

- Br.: c. e., by Iron Raiser—Love Bundle, by Lightning Orphee
- Owm.: Bello-Herto-Weinberg
- Br.—Mephan H (Fla)
- Tr.—Mephan H CB
- Rec.: $62,500
- Str.: 6/18 7/7 7/3 21233456
- Lwt.: 117 117 117 117 117 117
- Age: 4
- Sex: F
- Gait: F
- Rg.: 3
- Mdn.: 1 2 3
- Status: G1/G2

**Sweel-TSA**

- Br.: c. e., by Iron Raiser—Lightning Orphee
- Owm.: Bello-Herto-Weinberg
- Br.—Mephan H (Fla)
- Tr.—Mephan H CB
- Rec.: $62,500
- Str.: 6/18 7/7 7/3 21233456
- Lwt.: 117 117 117 117 117 117
- Age: 4
- Sex: F
- Gait: F
- Rg.: 3
- Mdn.: 1 2 3
- Status: G1/G2

**20ccf-TSA**

- Br.: c. e., by Iron Raiser—Lightning Orphee
- Owm.: Bello-Herto-Weinberg
- Br.—Mephan H (Fla)
- Tr.—Mephan H CB
- Rec.: $62,500
- Str.: 6/18 7/7 7/3 21233456
- Lwt.: 117 117 117 117 117 117
- Age: 4
- Sex: F
- Gait: F
- Rg.: 3
- Mdn.: 1 2 3
- Status: G1/G2

## Quip Star

**STEVEN D L**

- Br.: c. e., by Gis-Top Lean, by Saltville
- Owm.: Bello-Herto-Weinberg
- Br.—Lewie Craft A
- Tr.—Lewie Craft A
- Rec.: $62,500
- Str.: 6/18 7/7 7/3 21233456
- Lwt.: 117 117 117 117 117 117
- Age: 4
- Sex: F
- Gait: F
- Rg.: 3
- Mdn.: 1 2 3
- Status: G1/G2

## Sundance Square

**GRYDER A T**

- Br.: c. e., by Bundy Illinois—Runaway, by Cutbank
- Owm.: Bello-Herto-Weinberg
- Br.—Simonino M C (Tax)
- Tr.—Thomast Tidwell
- Rec.: $55,000
- Str.: 6/18 7/7 7/3 21233456
- Lwt.: 117 117 117 117 117 117
- Age: 4
- Sex: M
- Gait: F
- Rg.: 3
- Mdn.: 1 2 3
- Status: F

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Dist.</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Gait</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/28/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/22/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Dist.</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Gait</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/28/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/22/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Dist.</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Gait</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/28/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/22/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Dist.</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Gait</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/28/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/22/21</td>
<td>20ccf-TSA</td>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>1/4 mi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>PEDRIZMA M A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1/G2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Today's distance is 6.5 furlongs, and only Royal Blue Eyes and Donner Party have a recent race at this distance. Therefore, I decided to Match-Up the horses at 6 furlongs, as they all have a race showing at that distance. To determine the pace the horses would most likely be facing today, I used Sundance Square's last race.

Royal Blue Eyes second race is a good example of what he is capable of running when facing the pace I project for today's race. In looking at the pace of the two horses, it is easy to see that Royal Blue Eyes' last quarter will be too slow in today's Match-Up.

Looking at Donner Party's 6 furlong races, he was not made a contender. Bundle of Iron has just returned to action after a layoff, and after a quick evaluation he was eliminated. Quip Star has three races in his past performances that show that he can handle today's pace, so he is definitely a contender. I'll use his most recent 6 furlong race. Although Our Lordship has not seen action since October, his record shows that he can compete after a layoff, even against fast times.

My three main contenders for win consideration are Sundance Square, Quip Star and Our Lordship. After matching these three horses against each other, I eliminated Sundance Square. This left me with only two horses for win consideration, with Quip Star my number one contender and my prime selection to win.

As I said in the beginning, these were all fast horses. This race is unusually competitive, none of the horses could be eliminated at a glance. It took me quite a while to find the winner of the race, so I didn't play an exacta. However, Dick Schmidt, using the computer, was able to find both the winner and the place horse for a nice exacta.

I have included a printout from the race, showing excerpts from both the new Match-Up program and the ENERGY! program. You can see that Quip Star is a standout.

* * * * * * * *

Editor's Note:

Though I would never presume to offer advice to such a talented handicapper as Jim Bradshaw, I will give you readers a hint about this race. To find the place horse, try doing an E-S-P analysis of all the horses in the race.
3rd Santa Anita

6 1/2 FURLONGS. (1:14) CLAIMING. Purse $37,500. 4-year-olds and upward. Weight, 121 lbs. Non-winners of two races since December 25, 2000, allowed 2 lbs.; of a race since then, 4 lbs. Since December 1, 6 lbs. Claiming prices $32,500; for each $2,500 to $35,000, allowed 1 lb. (Races when entered for $35,000 or less not considered).

Royal Blue Eyes *

B. 1961, by Blue Eyed Boy—IZ'S Royal Lady, by Exterminator

OLIVARIES F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Foal</th>
<th>Bred</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Earnings</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olivaires F</td>
<td>Dam</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. Karolik</td>
<td>R. M. Davis</td>
<td>1995-04-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/16th</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>Winner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of Livaires F, by Blue Eyed Boy—IZ'S Royal Lady, by Exterminator.


Donner Party

PINCAY L. JR.

B. 1961, by Impressive—Winter Tobin, by Tobin's Breeze

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Foal</th>
<th>Bred</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Earnings</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donner Party</td>
<td>Dam</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. Karolik</td>
<td>R. M. Davis</td>
<td>1995-04-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/16th</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>Winner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Our Lordship

DELAHOUSSEY E

B. 1961, by Sheep's Head—Middle Cornish, by Sheep's Head

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Foal</th>
<th>Bred</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Earnings</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Lordship</td>
<td>Dam</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. Karolik</td>
<td>R. M. Davis</td>
<td>1995-04-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/16th</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>Winner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of Our Lordship, by Sheep's Head—Middle Cornish, by Sheep's Head. Earnings $2,250. Status Winner.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horse Name</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Breeder</th>
<th>Sire</th>
<th>Dam</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
<th>Pedigree Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bundle Of Iron</strong></td>
<td>PEDRIZA M A</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quip Star</strong></td>
<td>STEVENS G L</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sundance Square</strong></td>
<td>GRYDER A T</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bundle Of Iron**

- **Owner:** Micael Hart—Love Bundle, by Lightning Gryphon
- **Breeder:** McGee R (Fla)
- **Sire:** McConde
- **Dam:** McConde

**Quip Star**

- **Owner:** R. G. S. by Quip—Yambo Ooome, by Softwilde
- **Breeder:** James M (Cal)
- **Sire:** Lewis Craig A
- **Dam:** Lewis Craig A

**Sundance Square**

- **Owner:** Johnson W R
- **Breeder:** Johnson W R
- **Sire:** Sundance Square
- **Dam:** Sundance Square

---

**Table Row:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horse Name</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Breeder</th>
<th>Sire</th>
<th>Dam</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
<th>Pedigree Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bundle Of Iron</strong></td>
<td>PEDRIZA M A</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quip Star</strong></td>
<td>STEVENS G L</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sundance Square</strong></td>
<td>GRYDER A T</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RACE # 3  SANTA ANITA

MATCH 1ST  2ND  3RD  2CALL

Pace  60.93  58.66  54.07  59.70
Star   60.84  58.66  53.48  59.70
Lost   59.97  58.63  54.97  59.19
Squar  60.55  57.69  53.66  59.19
Blue   60.93  57.57  51.16  59.19

ENERGIZER STAR
RACE VARIEGATE S/P PRESSER

PRESSER VARIEGATE

Star
Lost
Squar
Blue

FRACTION PACE RATING

Pace  60.93  58.66  54.07

1ST  2ND  3RD RANK

Blue  x x x 9
Squar x x x 9
Star  x x x 5
Lord  x x x 7

3561—THIRD RACE.  1 1/2 furlongs.  4 year olds & up.  Claiming prices $9,200-$8,000. Purse $2,800.

Index  Horse and Jockey  Wt.  Pp  ST  H  H  St.  Fin.  To $1
3257 Quip Star, O. Stevens 115  5  4  3  4  2  3  1  5.90
3487 Donnie Party, Pincay 117  2  6  6  2  4  1  2  3.50
3467 Royal Blue Eyes, Oakes 115  1  5  4  2  4  3  2  8.10
1160 Our Lordship, D. Gauvin 116  8  3  6  6  8  8  4  1.50
3466 Siskap Square, Corder 112  3  1  6  5  1  1  1  9.60
3295 Bube O'Kiff, Persiles 116  4  2  2  3  5  6  3  3.40

Scratched—Amanoletta, brother, Marvin's Policy.
Claimed—None.

1—QUIP 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
9—DONNIE PARTY 4.80 3.00
1—ROYAL BLUE EYES 3.80

Time—21 4/5, 44 3/5, 1:09 2/5, 1:14, Cleared & fast. Winner—b. g. Quip—Tennino

$2 EXACTA (8-3) PAID $40.00
WINNING WITH SARTIN

BY BARRIE W. BLASE, PH.D.

Translating your winning handicapping selections into winning pari-mutuel tickets while in the circus-like atmosphere of the race track is not easy. Here's how I dealt with this problem.

I used (and misused) the Sartin Methodology for about 9 months before I started to win with it. I would handicap the night before, and then take my selections to the track and play them. I soon noticed an interesting phenomenon: I would have a higher win percentage on those days when I didn't get to the track the next day. Then my wife made the observation that it seemed as if I did much better at the track on those days when my racing buddies weren't there. Was it possible that my friends and other track influences (tote board, horse appearance, jockey overweight etc.) were hurting my betting that much? I decided to find out.

The procedure was simple. I took a piece of paper and divided it into two columns. One I gave the heading "Sartin" and the other "Me." Before I left for the track, I would enter "Sartin's" picks for each race. "Sartin" would play basically the computer picks. (At this time, Longacres was in a prolonged period of Sustained Pace bias, so "Sartin" played the top 2 Sustained horses). When I returned home after the day's races, I would go through my race program and enter in the "Me" column the horses that I had actually bet that day in each race. I would then figure the win percentage for both of us. After each 20 races, I re-figured the win percentage for the whole cycle.

Guess what? "Sartin" won 69% of the races, while I, with help from friends and up-to-the-minute knowledge of jockeys, horses and odds, won 49%! The conclusion was obvious: I should stick with the Methodology, believe what the computer told me and ignore everything else.

For the next 5 weeks, I wrote down my computer selections and took them to the races with me. I played only those selections. With "Sartin" and "Me" both betting the same horses, we won 67%. The point is that it is very easy to be influenced by the wealth of information (and misinformation) at a race track and not even be aware of it. Just a friend asking your opinion of a particular horse or noting that one of the jockeys is winning less than 5% can sway your thinking. So can seeing one of your horses odds go up to 15 to 1 while the favorite you threw out gets hammered down to 4/5. Even Dr. Sartin himself says that when people begin to discuss the next race, he runs out and makes his bets before he joins in the discussion.

So, if you find you're winning more races on paper than at the track, try playing against "Sartin." But watch it; he's awfully good!
The MATCH-UP MANUAL will be ready on June 1, 1988. If there is a single vital key to handicapping in general and the Sartin Methodology in particular, it is the Match-Up. First introduced years ago by Dr. Sartin in his very first manuals, it has now been raised to a high art. The true master of the Match-Up can handicap and win with it alone. To aid you in your search for understanding, we have brought together four of our best at using this unique concept:

Jim "The Hat" Bradshaw – today the chief proponent of the Match-Up, Jim uses it in every race he handicaps. He contributed 100 pages of his own unique insights in this book, including a step by step analysis of a card at Belmont.

Michael Pizzolla – gives us his own unique Eastern approach to the Match-Up. Michael has developed a systematic approach to the Match-Up that drastically cuts learning time.

Dick Schmidt – who not only edited the book, but also presents his own unique insights and thoughts on the Match-Up. Has provided a complete translation from the original Okie.

Dr. Howard Sartin – of course. The man who started it all. Doc gives us the benefit of his experience; he's used the Match-Up longer than anyone else. He shows not only how to use the Match-Up to find the true contenders for win betting, but also how to find those horses which have no chance of winning yet are very good bets to place or show. He has put together a set of Match-Up Track-to-Track charts that allow for easy conversion of times from any track in the country.

Not only are we providing this 150+ page manual, we have designed and written a computer program that enables the beginner to gain the insights of the experts at a glance. Though this program is not really designed for handicapping, it will teach you how to take a race apart, finding only those horses that truly have a chance of winning. Our most valuable teaching tool since the original Face of the Race/Face of the Horse program that started it all years ago.

The program will be available for all the computers we support, though there might be a slight delay on the Apple and Model 100. This entire package, including the computer program, will be available JUNE 1 at our usual price for a manual alone.

- $49.00