



The Transgressions of HERBERT HOOD

Readers of this Jinx either will say that the ideas encompassed within are awfully good or awfully bad. There can be no happy medium. To our way of thinking plus our success at fooling wise magi to say nothing of the laymen, the effects described, from their marvelous starts to their utterly incomprehensible finishes, offset the stupendous simplicity of the methods used.

---- Herbert Hood

HERESY NO.1

THE PSYCHIC SLATE

The performer puts a single slate and a pack of cards on the table. Before leaving the room he asks a spectator to shuffle the deck (all of this after he is out of sight, of course), cut it several times, and then put the top card face down under the slate. The mystic returns when this has been done. He peers at the blank upper surface of the slate. He may state that he is going to prove that man can, with proper training, use his eyes and brain to surmount normally impassible barriers. He draws a picture of a card on the upper side of the slate. He steps away. His picture is seen and named. The slate is lifted and the card beneath turned over. That's it.

A miracle? To the on-lookers, yes. To the magicians present, again yes. To you? No. You aren't duly amazed because you know that the deck of cards is both marked and stacked at the beginning. Let's start at that beginning.

Take your marked deck, one which doesn't require too much squinting at in order to decipher the identity of the top card. We'll try to illustrate a practical method later. Stack, or arrange, the cards in the Si Stebbins order or in the Eight-Kings arrange-



ment as you see fit. Now, by a peek at the back of the top card you always can know the one next beneath.

Go away and let someone give the deck a shuffle. As you get almost out of talking distance tell him to cut the pack a couple of times. Then he takes the top card and puts it under the slate. You return, pick up the piece of chalk on the table and concentrate. It is easy enough for you to see the top card of the deck laying close by, catch its identity, and count one back in the stack system. That gives you the name of the card under the slate. Why? And after the shuffle? Simply because a stacked deck can be hastily shuffled by anyone and still remain stacked in sections too many to mention. After this shuffle it is cut once or twice. The percentage is terrific in favor of the top two cards being mates. Therefore, when one is taken from the top and put under the slate, the next can tattle if you know how to read its marks.

It but remains for you to draw its picture on the slate - the card beneath, and, in the remote case of failure, just admit of a "fog" and try again, turning the slate over and having the deck cut again for another selection. It will be an event in your life when you must try the second time.



HERESY NO. 2

A THOUGHT OUT-THOUGHT

The performer shuffles a deck before a volunteer and gives it to him for further mixing. He cuts, looks at the top card, and buries it in the center of the deck, or thereabouts. Next he is asked to fan the deck out and hold it with faces towards himself. All of this time has seen the performer at a far side of the room.

The performer now holds a slate and chalk. He attempts to get an impression, but is dissatisfied. He moves toward the spectator, asking him to hold the fan of cards up and directly before himself. The spectator is told to try and see his card among all of the others. The performer comes close and raises or lowers the spectator's arms to an eye level. Then he steps away and does another picture. The spectator names his card -- and the slate is shown. It is pictured there.

Again we have used a marked and stacked deck -- and again we have presented the effect in such a manner as to deceive the most erudite. The first shuffle by the performer was false, a mere matter of cuts. The spectator's shuffle was slight -- the performer didn't let much time elapse before telling the person to cut the deck, pick off the top card, look at it, and bury it. The first bit of writing on the slate was fakery. Then the performer approached the spectator with his fan of cards. His manoeuvres here amounted to nothing, except, he was able to see and read the identity of the top card of the deck -- at his (performer's) right end of the fan. Counting one back he knew which card to draw actually on the second (?) attempt.

The beautiful part of this test lies in its simplicity to laymen and its "throw-off" to magicians who immediately think of Jardine Ellis and his mirror principle of reading a card in a spectator's hands. Magi will nod their heads in a "I know that one" manner, but when they get home they'll begin to think and wonder

how the magus knew WHICH one of the fanned cards was the correct pasteboard.



HERESY NO. 3

YOU AND YOURS -- ME AND MINE

You can do this modern version of the "You Do As I Do" type of trick without any of the faults which haunted your first instruction sheet. Nobody exchanges decks, and it looks awfully fair to the initiated. This can follow either of the #1 or #2 effects because it needs only a marked deck and no stacking. The spectator gets the marked deck and you keep the one that is ordinary. Both of you shuffle well and then put your decks on the table opposite each other -- both decks are face down.

Ask him to think of any number, not too large. He tells it aloud. Each of you count off together cards from your own decks until the number is reached. The last card (at number) of each pile is put aside from the pile onto which the other cards were dealt. Then each of you peek at that card you have selected -- something like looking at the "hole card" in a stud poker game.

The performer says, "Put your card back now, anywhere among the others, and shuffle. I do the same." And then, quickly, as an afterthought, (but after your will has been done) say, "I'm sorry, but the cards should be face up in the decks instead of face down. I'll turn around and reverse mine that way -- and you do the same, just turn your card over among the others."

You again face each other. You call for a coincidence. Have him spread his pack across the table with the backs up. In the middle there turns up his selected card facing everybody. You spread your deck in the same manner. And the card face up in your deck is the same as his!

Coincidence? No. This time it was simply a case of one marked deck. The spectator gets it and can shuffle well because "stacks" do not enter here. The counting business is purely "business". The selected cards are laid aside and then much ado made of the peeking at them. It doesn't matter what you have. Your ability is used for getting the name of his card from its back. The aftermath allows you to find the duplicate of the spectator's card and turn it over. How can you go wrong after that?



A laddin Productions presents "A Night of Magic". Brooklyn (N.Y.) Y.M.C.A. - April 19, 1941 - Reviewed by Robert Houdin, Jr.

AL FLOSSO was forced by circumstances (he had to play another date) to go on first. Despite a discourteous audience which refused to settle down for quite a while, Al, by brute force, got it to

A PECULIAR HAPPENSTANCE

GEORGE W. LORD & M.D. OVERHOLSER

The performer writes a prediction upon a slip of paper which is folded and placed aside. He shuffles a deck and gives it to a person for cutting. The spectator looks at the top card of the deck and puts it face down on the table. Onto it he deals seven cards, and then deals eight cards in a pile for the performer.

The performer picks up his eight cards, remarking that the spectator knows the name of the card at the bottom of his (spectator's) pile, so therefore he will look at the bottom card of his pile --- he does.

The spectator shuffles his own pile of eight cards and then also the performer's pile of eight. Each picks up his packet. Both simultaneously deal card after card face down in two parallel rows. The performer then announces the name of the card he looked at in his pile, and asks someone to read his prediction.

It reads as follows: "Your card will be opposite mine."

The spectator then turns face up, one at a time, the cards in the performer's row until he comes to the card looked at previously by the performer. He then is asked to name his card and turn over the pasteboard in his row and directly opposite the performer's card. It is the one he chose.

Method: The deck is both marked and stacked. The performer's shuffle is false, but a spectator may cut. When the performer picks up his pile of eight cards and notes the face card he can compute eight cards back and know the identity of the spectator's noted card. (With either of the two rotating suit stacks the spectator's card will be of the same suit as the performer's card. This will aid in the figuring. With the Nikola system the suits will be different, but one who has learned this arrangement

should know each card by its number value of from 1 to 52. In such a case the card performer notes has its numerical value from which is deducted 8, and the resultant figure translated gives the name of the spectator's card.

After the shuffled packets of eight are dealt in rows opposite each other, the performer can locate the spectator's card, the name of which he now knows, wherever it may be in his row. Then he determines the name of the card in his own row directly opposite the spectator's card and calls that as his noted card. The rest of the effect is automatically successful.

A neat addition to the effect is to have the spectator first cut the deck and pocket the top card without looking at it. Then the trick proceeds exactly as described. After the denouement the performer, by figuring back 1 card from the one spectator noted, knows the name of the pocketed card and can reveal it as he may wish. Mr. Lord's favorite method is to obtain a duplicate of the spectator's card by use of a set of pocket-indexes. This is loaded into the frame of the now popular "card between glass plates" trick as he brings it forward. The spectator then is asked to remove his freely chosen card and look at it. From here the routine for its startling journey is carried out.

Well marked cards can be secured from most magical marts, or from the many "houses" which advertise gambling ware in the theatrical trade papers and cheap "sensational" magazines. Most of these places have catalogues showing various backs and the systems of marking so you can take your pick. As for the ethical question of using such things we've always figured that if gamblers can use them to make more money than magicians plying their trade, why can't magi use them for truly entertainment purposes?

sit up and guffaw. After seeing Al work a few times, I realize that it is his technique, and not luck, that makes his stooges (kids from the audience) so funny. Al left them laughing as usual.

STANLEY AND WILLIE. Good ventriloquial act. Good voice - mouth moves a little too much. Did all the tricks, including drinking a glass of water, stuffing a scarf in his mouth, etc. His distant voice was excellent. It's too bad that ventriloquists so rarely do the downstairs and up in the ceiling gags any more. This act proved that they are entertaining.

HARRY BURNS, "The Magical Mandarin", presented a well-routined oriental act. Nothing too startling but the pace was fast and each trick was well linked. Liason tricks are important, as Burns realizes. Too bad more magicians don't see how a trick is strengthened by being allied to those preceding and following it. The only objection to Burns' act is that he closes with the rice bowls, which didn't seem strong enough.

AL BAKER was in good form. He did his egg bag routine, his hank dyeing, his salt vanish, and finished by baking a cake in a hat with the assistance of a couple of kids from the audience. Very satisfactory performance which went over very well.

BILL WILLISTON, who had M.C.'d lethargically, came to life when his act came on. He did the usual run of gag magic. It is

always good for laughs and he got them. From the opening vanish of a bird cage to the final production of a string of flags from a spectator's coat, he kept the audience giggling. It's unfortunate that, working as fast as he does, he seems to think he has to talk fast. A few times he spoke so rapidly that it was just gibberish.

PRINCE MENDES. If you are going to imitate an established performer you should do it well. Mendes does! Completely Cardini, his card productions with gloved hands, card fans, production of lit cigarettes, were flawless. A nice touch finished the manipulative portion of his act. Removing his top hat for the first time he produced five or six ringing alarm clocks which, at a gesture, stopped ringing. He closed his act with a novelty. He got the assistance of a girl from the audience and made an impromptu ventriloquial figure of her. Very funny and well done. A good act!

The BUNIN PUPPETS closed with three admirable skits. A puppet version of an Apache dance was extremely clever. They smoked, used a dagger, and in general comported like human beings. Next - a perfect satire of a magician, "Spudini the Great", was the essence of the hammy trickster, done in miniature. The act finished with a blasphemous skit on Mussolini that was hilarious.

The entire show as above magic evening average. From all viewpoints it was worth the time and dollar.

~ EDITORIAL ~

As of April 30, 1941 -----

We have just seen the light which shines on Russell Swann. It has taken a good many shows, with us at front tables and at far bars, but, it has made an average, and now we feel safe in saying that The Swann duplicates in magic the effervescent qualities of radio-picture's Bob Hope. This man Hope exudes some sort of spontaneous appearing talk less looks, and Russell does the first in as perfect a manner while outdoing Hope in the latter part by being quite genic as well as photogenic. This all has to do with a night recently when we saw Swann parade his terrible tricks in a terrific manner before the elite of N.Y.'s cafe society. Suavely, Mr. Swann introduced Max, his pet snake in the basket. Still suavely, Mr. Swann had a card selected, returned to the pack, and all were "sprung" into the basket from which "Max" arose to the tune of wierd instruments especially kept for the occasion. The chosen card was rescued from his mouth and "Max" was next (according to the builder) supposed to disappear into the rattan container.

But "Max" didn't move. And after being exorable to the limit, Mr. Swann proceeded to lay himself down upon the floor, tails and all, and fenagle with the underside of the table for a few seconds. Then he stood up, Max went down, came up, and retreated for the rest of the routine which, to our way of thinking is the funniest of all magical items - the way Swann does it.

If you want to scream "expose!" we can't stop you, but we've never thought of the snake as more than a clever mechanical contrivance with generally a pretty awful looking snake carrying as much of an air of mystery as a custard pie in a Greek restaurant window. Swann has dramatized it very funnily in the Bob Hope manner and if every reader of this sheet could see it done before swank and blase cafe audiences who convulse over it night after night and request it by name, it would be a swell lesson. And what would you do if the snake stuck? Quit? We'll admit that not many would or could suffer their dignity to the extent of laying down on the floor of the Coply-Plaza or Biltmore-Ritzmore, but it caused a near riot when we saw it, and it sort of proved to us that the performer can be greater than his magic or whatever he uses as an incidental to selling himself as an entertainer.

Paul Curry has written a book entitled "Something Borrowed, Something New". Its 35 pages cover card, coin and mental tests, all of which are really practical and well thought out along the lines of subtlety and subterfuge. That I.O.U. effect is a "must" pocket item. --- Our Jinx #135 expose of who was behind the Life-Clark expose caused a few letters to flow in asking why Keith Clark wasn't blamed more than George Karger, the photographer. The answer is that Clark wouldn't have gotten into Life magazine if Karger hadn't approached him for the pics and supplied both suggestions and a model -- and because Karger is a member of the S.A.M. and Clark is not. We can't be bothered, in this instance, with a magus who poses for an expose of principles not his own and not used by himself. There is no legal way to stop him. But we can shoot at a member of an established society who violates the oath he took and papers he signed. Remember that Karger, upon joining the S.A.M., asked the members to co-operate in picturised exposes and was turned down. If he went ahead with his idea of popularizing magic, and for the money he got for the layout published, without the decency

of resigning, he should be chastised. And if anyone wants to bring up the question of his being "compelled" to make the pictures, we'll be glad to produce two N.Y. news photographers and one magazine executive in refutation of Karger's claim that his job was in jeopardy. No "job" was concerned. Karger had an "idea", picked up models Clark and Nadine "panties" Gae, and sold the set of pics to Life and pocketed the check. If Karger or the S.A.M. wants to call our hand we'll show some Aces. It would be fun for us to testify because we resigned and left a lot of swell friends and times for the right to say our thoughts without being out of order.

We were of the opinion that it was done long ago, but a news item just to hand says that Paramount pictures has registered the title "Houdini" for a possible film on the life of the famous magician. And to repeat ourselves of long ago, we think Chester Morris could put "feeling" into such a part. --- John Van Gilder, the Nashville (Tenn.) nanny, is taking verbal beatings because of his god-awful Dante review in the March Linking Ring. The shirt and tie that walks like a man did a page after page piece of pseudo-criticism which covered everything except the fact that the Dante show was popular. If you've got a million dollars and pet magic as a hobby, our advice is to keep out of print with deprecating talk about the finer points of dress -- unless you want to back a show. And the Linking Ring editor can go hide without supper for wasting so much space. --- Dell O'Dell just called our attention to a Variety article which said that Dante has opened the way for magic in theatres that never considered it previously. And we were among the first to say it couldn't be done!

Mail Box: From "Duon"

comes a tip for those who may have had difficulty getting Potassium Nitrate in solution for the Elliott cig trick in issue #127. It seems that KNO₃ is soluble in 2.8 parts of water, 0.5 parts boiling water. Alcohol is N.G. Thus it is nearly 6 times as good if you use boiling water, and the trick is 100% perfect.

Although the Washington D.C. paper didn't mention the name of John Mahomet, editor of The Sphinx, it did serve

Good Morning!

A Little Chuckle To Start the Day

WARSAW, Mo., April 2.—(UP)—Dr. Gus Salley likes to dabble with magic. He was doing the rope trick at the Lions' club meeting, and he invited two spectators to cut the rope in two.

Salley's trick was to wave a magic wand, cause the rope to disappear, then reappear in one piece. The spectator with the knife brought a sudden end to the proceedings when instead of cutting the rope, he cut off the end of one of Salley's fingers.

up an editorial mention of that mag's position as a "magicians' mouthpiece" and ridiculed its worry about foreign magi being restricted to tricks not needing food items with the words, "The tricks of Treasury magic are numerous and bewildering. -- and the stunt of squeezing forty-one cents out of a dollar has never been duplicated on the stage. -- The Sphinx subscribers would do well to come here reverently, with hats off, to get the real lowdown on sorcery." It was in the Evening Star, of Mar. 29th, and the recognizance should give Mahomet a thaumaturgical thrill. Withal, magic's oldest magazine is due for sad blows due to the S.A.M.-M.U.M. department of forced subscriptions' departure come May. Non-advertisers tell anyone who will listen of strife and turmoil with the personel division, Mr. Mahomet not having time to capably (as he could and might) attend to the details of customer and dealer satisfaction. However, if Johnny ever finds a wolf actually worrying his door, he can do what most of us can't. He need only open the door and let the Wolff -- out. Gabbatha!

Thos Annemann