

Jack Kennedy (winning roulette) Gambling Stories

<http://www.gambling-stories.com/2014/04/jack-kennedy-winning-roulette.html>

brid.ger /brij-ger/ n 1: a person who builds bridges to connect broken circles of thought 2: a person who can perceive hidden social structures after reflecting on seemingly random, unrelated material 3: a realist 4: a philosopher

We can rant, rave and scream how unfair life is. We can pray to Buddha, to Christ, to Allah, to Jehovah, to Stone idols, to pictures of saints, or even to Karl Marx and Lenin,... We can donate our time and money to saving the whales, to stopping acid rain, to preventing the cutting down of the rain forests, to every conceivable ecological problem,... We can give our time and money to try to control or eliminate poverty and worldwide hunger, and to try to give everyone their social, religious, and civil rights, but...we...can predict that even with sufficient zeal and a willingness to sacrifice our life for a cause, that unless it is conducted in relationship to [understanding] the ... "Grand Unified Engine" which is continually running in the background...than all we can do is to temporarily mitigate, alleviate and relieve many of the problems of the world; but they cannot be permanently solved until thier main cause is addressed--too many human beings competing for its limited habitats.

--Chapter 29: The Bridger

INTRODUCTION TO THE HIDDEN STRUCTURE OF ROULETTE

My name is Jack Wise Kennedy. On this web sight, you are about to learn how to consistently win at roulette. You might even become a professional gambler and make your living by learning my system. In fact if enough people learn to play my system, the gambling houses will have to change some of their procedures at the roulette table. My system is so unique that it could eventually have the same effect as Professor Edward O. Throp's "Beat the Dealer" had on blackjack. It is the definitive system of roulette; yes, it can be said that it is the conclusive, decisive, ultimate, final system. I can say with confidence that in the future any small variation attached to my system of play will be based on the analytical data that I am going to give to you. (Do not misunderstand me, roulette [in the casinos](#) will

thrive under my system. They will not be able to cram enough tables on the floor to serve the new people who will play it when word gets out that the wheel can be beaten.)

CANDOR

Oh Ye of Little Faith. Most of those who are reading this should be ashamed of themselves; I can predict some of your reactions, even anticipate some of your thoughts. Many are saying a combination of learned, ritualized speech: "It is impossible to beat the roulette wheel;" "Neither man nor machine can predict the next roulette number;" "You cannot change a negative expectation into a positive one;" "Every spin of the roulette wheel is independent;" "There is no such thing as a [professional roulette player](#)." These are some of the polite ones. Most of you will think: "Is there any way to keep these insane (crazy, mad, deluded, deranged, foolish, absurd, stupid, ignorant) people off the Internet?" And of course, there is: "Uh ohh!!! Another con artist is after our money." At this time I can only relieve your mind on the last one. My programs "Square Ro-Let", "Jack's Positional Roulette" and now "Kennedy's Even Money Bets" will be absolutely free. Not only [how to win](#) but why you win; yes, every facet, aspect or phase of roulette will be explained; even why you lose with other systems of play. My system is copyrighted only because I do not want someone else to sell it or claim credit for devising it.

WHO IS THE AUTHOR?

It is alleged that Albert Einstein said, "The only way to win at roulette is to steal the chips when the croupier isn't looking." So why do I believe that I have found a way to win when thousands of players over the years have tried to devise a system that would overcome the gambling house odds of 5.26% on a double zero wheel and 2.70% on a single zero wheel? Well, I am not sure I am the only one to have succeeded. But, when this system is posted, I half expect hundreds to claim they discovered it years ago. Just remember my "Square - Ro - Let" program and "Jack's Positional Roulette" and now how to play "Kennedy's Even Money Bets" are provable systems. When I use the word "system," I do not mean a betting or progression system with the manipulation of the size of the unit of bet to overcome the house odds. I believe that because house rules limit the size of bets, most progressive systems cannot beat the house odds by manipulating the size of the bet. However, if you have a winning system like mine, one that does

not depend on progressive betting to win, there will occur optimal betting times when it is a good option to temporarily increase your bet when past patterns show the probability to be above one hit per 37 or 38 spins.

QUALIFICATIONS NEEDED?

What special qualification do I have to produce a winning roulette system from observing and charting a series of random numbers confined to 37 and 38 numbered slots? I am a "Bridger." Defined in my dictionary: brid - ger /brij - jer/ 1: a person who builds bridges to connect broken circles of thought 2: a person who can perceive hidden social structures after reflecting on seemingly random unrelated material 3: a realist 4: a philosopher. Being a "Bridger" also allows me when viewing empirically obtained mathematical data to discern hidden structural patterns that can be obscured and thought of as of little use in solving a problem (The problem: how to win at roulette) by a less astute observer who is blinded by his or her prejudices.

QUALIFICATIONS

I pride myself in being an atheist, so when doing a scientific experiment, I know the mathematical answer I receive will not be affected by anything outside of our measurable universe. As an atheist, I believe in natural selection, and believe that only things that can be measured can be used as valid arguments in a scientific experiment. So I don't believe in Gods or Goddesses or Satan; and neither do I believe in Heaven nor Hell; nor Ghosts, Angels, Fairies, Evil Spirits, Demons, Witches, Vampires, Werewolves, Zombies, Unicorns or Voodoo; neither Hypnotic Regression to past lives, Reincarnation, Facilitated Communication, Astral Projection, Astrology, Tarot, or Numerology; nor Astral Projection, Remote Viewing, Psychokinesis, Extrasensory Perception, (ESP), Precognizant or Psychic Spying; nor UFO's, Extraterrestrial little green men or women, or Extraterrestrial Crop - Circles or Alien Abductions or Telepathic or Clairvoyant human beings. (If anyone believes he or she has any of the above or other psychic powers, they should immediately go to www.randi.org and prove it to collect over a million dollars to play roulette with.)

SOME OF MY BELIEFS

What, then, do I believe? I believe in Evolution; in Occam's Razor, in Self - deception, Selective - memory; the Placebo - effect; Double - blind tests, Self -

hypnosis; and that Natural Selection has not had the time to adapt our brains to our present environment. So, our quest to penetrate into the workings of nature, to know its causes and linkages, requires an unbiased scientific empirical observation; but the tool we work with (our mind) is held hostage by complex social constraints, by historically - created illusions that lead to delusions, and limited perception. Thus we fool ourselves into believing that we are unbiased in our search for the truth; that our interpretation of our empirical observation is always scientifically - based truth. Therefore, true insight, must take into account that we are restricted by our past mental beliefs. As an atheist I am not exempt from this fault; I realize I also have baggage when I interpret my observations. The final arbitrator, however, is time. That is all I am asking from you: time; time for other people to learn my system. For my roulette system to be true, the answers I received in my examination of empirical evidence must be repeatable by others using the same method. Other people must win with it; win consistently; win so consistently that they are barred from the casinos.

WHAT IS IN IT FOR YOU?

For a short time after publishing this system on the Internet, professional gamblers will make some easy money, quickly. But my system is so unique that it is almost impossible to hide that you are using it, especially if you are playing alone at a table. However, once you learn to play it correctly, there are ways to camouflage your play. I will not tell you what they are because I do not want to alert the casinos. You need to know this because 99% of the roulette players will not learn my system, which means the casinos can (and will) bar those caught using it just like they did the blackjack card counters.

A GLIMPSE INTO YOUR FUTURE

To show you how much my system, "Jack's Positional Roulette," stands out when playing it in a casino (with just one other player at the table), I am going to give you 40 numbers I played on July 16, 1998 at Boomtown outside of Reno, NV: 32, 9, 14, 10, 19, 29, 12, 9, 30, 33, 20, 1, 12, 7, 36, 7, 18, 34, 20, 22, 14, 27, 3, 2, 6, 26, 27, 36, 15, 34, 36, 13, 13, 15, 8, 22, 7, 16, 35, 0.

THE RESULTS

Seven numbers were hit playing a dollar unit on four numbers straight up for forty spins. Which was seven hits out of a possible 22 chances. The odds say I should

have had about four hits. The math: 40 spins times four units played = 160 units played. Subtract the seven units from the 160 units played (because you did not lose those seven units on the seven hits) and you lost 153 units on the 40 spins. Incorporated into the 153 unit loss were three units for each time you hit, which is three times seven for 21 units. Now 7×32 units gives the actual payoff of 224 units for seven hits (Although you were paid 35 to 1 on each of the seven hits, three more units were lost on each hit, so your gain on each of those seven hits was 32 units, because in the 35 to 1 payoff, you must always subtract any additional units you lost on each spin to arrive at the true payoff.). So you won 71 units for 40 spins when you subtract 153 units lost from 224 units won; which is about a 46.4% win. (The mathematics of these numbers will be explained in Chapter Three.) Of course you cannot win by 46% over a long period of time with my system; I was just illustrating how explosive the system is for short periods of time. You will consistently have these short bursts of winning hits, but overall, in the long run, playing "Jack's Positional Roulette" correctly you will have about 5 - 1/2 hits per 38 spins playing four units straight - up on four different numbers; which gives about a 19% win over the long run. After lunch on the same day, I played my system for another 45 minutes and won another 90 dollars, then I had to leave because I am on oxygen 24 hours a day and live 90 miles away in Grass Valley, California. Even when I can be driven up in a van that has a bed, it is an extremely exhausting one and a half - hour drive. I usually try to integrate my visits to the VA hospital in Reno, Nevada, with a couple of hours of gambling.



MATHEMATICIAN'S MIND IMPEDIMENTS

Professor Edward O. Throp looked into several aspects of roulette. He tried to clock the wheel to ascertain if he could find the sector the ball would fall into and have time to place his bet before it landed in that sector. Even with a small hidden computer (which was and is now illegal in the U. S. casinos) it was not possible to obtain an accurate and timely bet. (February 2001: Live, real time roulette on the

Internet has no way of knowing if you are using a computer to help you play.) He also looked into the theory of the "Dealer's Signature" and came to the conclusion that even if there was such a thing, there was no indication to favor even one half of the wheel, let alone a smaller section. When he was through examining roulette, he had not come up with a system that could consistently beat the house percentage in roulette.

OBSERVATIONS

Why then did I come up with a winning roulette system and he could not? The reason is simply that he is a professional mathematician and computer programmer and I am neither. He is and was handicapped by previous mathematical assumptions that said, "Each and every spin of a roulette wheel is random and independent and has no connection to past or future spins. Because it is a 'replacement' game the odds of the number hitting again remain the same after each spin, so you cannot give any weight to that number." If you have this mind - set (and I believe that most mathematicians who have looked into roulette do agree with it), you cannot conceptualize from empirical evidence a system of giving weight to each asymmetrical feature inherited in roulette without violating the asymmetrical bias built into probability. Mathematicians keep telling us, "Roulette Wheels have no memory, dice have no memory, tossed coins have no memory and cards have no memory because they are inanimate objects."

A STUDIED VIEW

But we are human observers who do have memory to record, chart and deduce the mathematical relationship of previous events to future events. If a mathematician believes that previous events are always independent then he or she will not test if they are related to the past. The term "memory" is used to refer to systems which exhibit probabilities which change in a way that allows certain predictions to be made, which means you can assign weight to past outcomes to predict the outcome of future spins. A human being playing roulette can use his or her memory to observe and chart a "connection" between past and future spins that can be used to create a formula that is applicable on other roulette wheels.

ANOTHER MATHEMATICAL DEFICIENCY

Another failure of mathematicians is their use of random number generators to mimic the probability inherited in real roulette wheels. As you will find out on an abstract roulette wheel, man - made "random" computer spins have no meaning, no connection to actual roulette wheels. However, on a single and double zero roulette wheel each slot is numbered differently, and those numbers remains in a predetermined sequence that does not change with each spin; so if you can determine a mechanical pattern of play, you can, after each spin, give more weight to some numbers than to the probability of them hitting once in 37 or 38 spins. An abstract roulette wheel has no gravitational mass assigned to it, no weight, friction, spin, balance, axis, rotor or an inherent molecular structure, so it must be instructed to mimic a real roulette wheel

INVESTIGATE

However, I am not claiming that random number generators used to simulate a roulette wheel over the Internet cannot be set to mimic a real roulette wheel. And when it does, preliminary observations lead me to believe that it overcompensates when trying to achieve a true roulette pattern; which might allow my system (if the instruction code can be ascertained) to discern playable patterns that can be used to add weight to past numbers to predict future numbers. But because all random number generators are not equal, each one should be tested and charted to find out how much they diverge from real patterns before you play over the Internet.)

THEY DO NOT KNOW

At this time, the casinos do not realize that there is a discernible, weighted, mathematical formula between the numbers that have hit and the numbers that will hit in the future. When they find out can they change the roulette patterns inherited from the odds of one hit in thirty-seven or thirty-eight hits? The answer is no!!! I do not care from where the dealer starts the ball, how fast or slow the dealer spins the wheel, whether it is spun clockwise or counter-clockwise for long periods of time or alternates after every spin, whether they use the small or large ball for long or short periods of time or alternates them after every spin, whether casinos change the dealer after long or short intervals or after every spin, because unless the wheel is fixed, nothing they do can change the inherent pattern in roulette wheels.

HOW I GOT STARTED

About three years ago I knew I had a winning system of play that players have been searching for since roulette's introduction to the gambling world. How I found the system is worth noting. It all started about twenty-five years ago when I was going on a tour bus to Reno about twice a month. When I started to win at roulette, it renewed my interest in trying to find a winning system. Years before, when very young, I had already found that systems that require doubling or cancellation or had French names like Martingale, Labouchere and D'Almbert were losing systems, so I immediately eliminated them from contention. At first, I charted 100 spins on a double-zero wheel and brought them home to see if I could detect any pattern. There was one. The next two times, playing quarter chips on a double-zero wheel, I went to Reno, and played and won on that pattern. Because they had a single-zero wheel in Reno, I thought my chance would be better playing at a 2.70% disadvantage instead of a 5.26% disadvantage. After that I would have runs of luck, but eventually would lose. After several sessions, I gave up roulette because I hate to lose.

A RENEWED INTEREST

About three years ago, one of my drivers and helpers expressed a wish to learn how to play roulette. I explained to her that over the long run you could not win playing against the house because they had an advantage of 5.26%. But I would show her that if she had twenty dollars to lose, that she might get lucky if she played the way I would show her. We walked up to the table and I received \$20 in chips and placed four of them on four single numbers related to the last number that came up. One of my numbers hit. I explained that we now take that \$36 and put \$9 on each of four related numbers according to what number hit. One of my numbers hit again, and I now had \$324. I wanted to put \$80 on each of four single numbers, but since the table limit was only \$25 on single numbers, that is all I could play on four numbers. I lost that spin, which cost me a hundred dollars. If I could have played \$80 on single numbers and won, I would have had \$2,880; and if I had won on the third spin playing \$25, I would have had \$1,099. Now is the hard part I told her, because you put \$200 in your pocket as you want to be a winner. I still had \$16 of my original \$20 and an extra \$24 for a total of \$40, so I played that and hit two more times but when I doubled, I lost; I did not get a second hit in a row.

THE NEXT TIME

With a different driver and helper, I once again tried to show the correct way to play roulette. This time I did not hit until my last four chips. I played those 36 chip on four numbers and won. I again had 324 chips but learning from my last win, I put \$300 into my pocket and played the 24 chips four at a time. I did not get a hit with them, so I left the wheel.

LUCK?

Lucky? Yes, after several months of intensive study, it eventually turned out to be just that, but analyzing what happened gave me the incentive to see if there was a possible system lurking behind those winning plays. Before I found out it was luck, I had gathered and charted in various ways thousands of actual roulette numbers and had bought almost all the current published books on roulette systems. But by the time I knew it was luck, I had my "Square Ro-Let" system and the basis for "Jack's Positional Roulette." And in all the roulette books and systems, I could get my hands on, there was not one that had an inkling that they were there.

LURKING IN THE BACKGROUND

For the last couple of years I have been monitoring roulette sites on the Internet. I have been following the dejanews newsgroup's alt. and rec. gambling and other-games the longest. I have watch it deteriorate to the extent that about 95% of the messages were by a few people selling worthless roulette systems. And the other 5% are people who try to expose them as frauds because they know that no system in the long run can overcome the house percentage of 5.26% or 2.70%. After discovering my system, that left me in a dilemma. All the fraudulent systems, whether they sold it for \$19.95, \$100, \$1,000, \$10,000 or a \$1,000,000 were described as unique and had a guarantee that you would win with their system. Several of these systems have been exposed on the Internet, but since they are not unique or different but just a rehash of previous systems, those who sell them cannot afford to take those who expose them to court and win a judgment from them because they would have to prove that their system is different and really can win.

MARKETING THE SQUARE RO-LET SYSTEM

In competition with these dishonest sellers, I had an advantage in marketing my roulette system because I could prove in advance to any buyer that it was a truly different method of play. How would I do that? I simply would have the intended buyer read 100 actual roulette numbers (of his or her choosing) one at a time over the phone. Although they could see that they would have won, there is a very limited chance that they could deduce the foundation of my system from such a small sampling. By picking one or several wealthy persons and teaching him or her or all of them at the same time, I could have successfully marketed my system. I never had the option of making a large amount of money by playing my system myself. At times, I am physically unable to get out of bed for a week or so; and just sitting up for several hours can put me in danger of an attack of asthma that can be life threatening.

GIVING IT AWAY?

For several reasons, I finally decided to give it away free. I concluded that once my "Positional Roulette" and "Square Ro-Let" were out there, I could not control its distribution; that I could not even be assured that I would be the person who would get the recognition as the author of my own system. Of course, time played a major part in my decision; my age (75 years old in April of 2001) with all of its drawbacks (including short term reduced memory), was the deciding feature to give it away.

THE UNBELIEVERS

As for the small percentage of mathematicians that kept telling us that there was no way to overcome the house's odds in roulette because every number was independent and had no connection to the past or future spins, all I can say is you were right in believing that because nobody selling their worthless systems would allow their system to be independently tested. Further, if any one of them were as good as they claimed, you would have seen winning people being barred from playing roulette. System players are still being welcomed by the casinos, which tell you that nobody has come up with a winning system. This includes my system. I have no idea what is happening with my system. About 20 people around the world have emailed me that they were winning with my system, and were going to try to write a computer program for it. That is the last I hear from them.

SHOW IT TO US

The mathematicians on the Internet keep asking "Show us how you turn a negative outcome into a positive one; prove it to us." And that is what I am doing; that is why I decided to give my "Square Ro-Let" and "Jack's Positional Roulette" and now "Kennedy's Even Money Bets" away. It is all here on the World Wide Web at sq-ro-let.com so that everyone has an equal chance to learn how to win at roulette.

NEGATIVE INTO POSITIVE

When you read gambling books by qualified mathematicians and experts claiming "random number generators" have proven you cannot turn a roulette wheel's statistical negative into a positive outcome just point them to my web site. Go to "Kennedy's Even Money Bets" Part Two. On June 4, 2001 there were 334 recorded spins and seven zeros for a negative of 2.09%. Playing red and black correctly I won 24 units which is 7.18%; playing odd and even correctly I won 30 units, which is 8.98%; playing high and low correctly I won eight units which is 2.40%. On June 7, 2001 there were 259 recorded spins and seven zeros for a negative of 2.70%. Playing red and black correctly I won five units which is 1.93%; playing odd and even correctly I won 13 units, which is 5.0%; playing high and low correctly I won 13 units which is 5.0%. All in all, playing single-zero roulette wheels in a casino that has "en prison" or "surrender" you will have a positive outcome about 37% of the time. The results of 8,940 spins and 241 zeros produced a 2.69% negative outcome. But it also produced the best bet obtainable in a casino. Better than blackjack or dice. Playing red and black for 8,940 spins there was a loss of only 0.14%; playing odd and even for 8,940 spins there was a win of 0.06%; playing high and low for 8,940 spins there was a loss of 0.14%.

AN ANSWER

So when the sheep bleep out their mantra of "you cannot turn a negative into a positive," you can inform them that a blanket "cannot" should be replaced with a qualifier such as: "sometimes" or "occasionally" or "at times," because if you play correctly, 37% of the time you can turn a statistical negative into a positive. A warning: this can only be accomplished if you use actual recorded spins from a roulette wheel. You cannot use "Random Number Generators" and get the same results.

MY REWARD

What do I receive for giving my program away free? Well some people claim that if you develop a roulette system that over the long run will consistently win at roulette, you will become famous; someone (kidding of course) even claimed that that person should get the Nobel Prize in Mathematics.

WAITING FOR FAME

So, after three years on the Internet, I am still waiting not only for Publisher's Clearing House to come to my door with my \$10,000,000, but for a letter telling me that I have been nominated for the Noble Prize in Mathematics. My preliminary results shows that I have a better chance to win the \$10,000,000 from Publisher's Clearing House than be nominated for a Nobel Prize.

Posted on 4/04/2014

