

Yes, you’re witnessing the debunk-rebunk war rn.
Debunk of rebunk is here (tab 2)
Rebunk is here
Debunk is here (tab 1)
The original doc is here

Made by:
Arthen
Contacts:
Discord: svakeloo
TikTok: arthenam

“Again, perfect data is not needed. That only works *if* you're using Lorenz Equations since you'd need to know everything about the current position of an object and what is affecting it to correctly predict what is happening after it begins to change state.

Stating Lorenz Equation to validate a section of the feat then saying it wasn't the point of the argument—despite using it as a support structure—is simply wrong.” No, almost perfect data is needed because Van Pelt shuffling is a chaotic system. Lorenz equation is only one of the

examples of chaotic systems, there are other things. To prove that Van Pelt shuffling cards is a chaotic system let's make a thought experiment. Imagine a person shuffles the same exact deck 20 times in a row for the same amount of time but the conditions when they shuffle a deck are different in every shuffle. So what do you think is gonna happen? I think it is obvious that every result of shuffling will be different, every deck in the result is gonna be different. I would prove it by math or stuff if I could, but I can't. But at this point it should be obvious it is very sensible for starting conditions and let me make another thought experiment. Imagine you are playing poker with your friends in the same room and the same deck and you are shuffling it. Do you think the resulting deck is always gonna be the same? I don't think so. Yes, I still cannot prove it experimentally, but no one actually can because conditions are gonna be not "slightly" different but highly different. But I hope now you understand. It fits the criteria of being very sensible to the starting conditions.

"It is plausible for Jane to have predicted van Pelt's last two shuffles and the factors that require Lorenz (temperature and all that) aren't needed in that. Only the number of cards, the initial placement of the cards and van Pelt's skill level (amateur)

We know from the scene before they play Poker that Jane had bought some souvenirs for the 4 of them. We know that Jane usually expresses his knowledge of people via use of trinkets and such that they'd like. We also know that Jane, earlier that morning, had cold read Cho and revealed the fact that he had been saving coins since he was 15. So from that we know that Jane has a deep understanding of the people around him even if he didn't initially voice it.

He already understood enough about van Pelt to anticipate/predict her actions + he always had just enough view of her hand, despite looking at Rigsby and Cho the whole time, to know what she was doing with the cards from beginning to end." As I explained before - it's not enough for predicting the chaotic system.

“Rigby's eyes drifted towards van Pelt when she was doing the last two shuffles. We know Jane is observant so he wouldn't miss a detail like that.

It's immediately after this that he told van Pelt to “deal the river card”. Why, though?

Because Rigsby, who likes van Pelt, will always take notice of her. It's a repeated pattern in human psychology. When you like an object/person or find it/them important/attractive, you always find yourself looking for it/at them. It's an involuntary response.

For example: You have 10,000 dollars in your pocket and you're walking in public. Every couple seconds, you find yourself patting the pocket where the money is without realizing.

Anyhow, Patrick uses Rigby as his cue for when van Pelt makes her move to trip him up and as soon as she does, he calls her out on it.” What? How is it easier? Like it gives perfect understanding of Rigsby then, because how would it possibly indicate how Van Pelt is shuffling exactlyb

“But the fact that she was always close enough for him to *perceive* her movements at all times allows for him to easily visualize the finer details of the cards in the deck and shuffle them in his head.

There was no need for the factors you listed (room temperature + volume) aside from the ones I've singled out. So again, there was no perfect data needed to do this feat.” You cannot make something more clear by visualizing it. Go try it yourself, put your hand to the right of you and try to count your fingers, you can count them but your vision is just not clear enough to see how many fingers you have. I personally see like 2 fingers and even these aren’t fingers but just a blurry object in the shape of the whole hand.

“Your description of it makes the feat seem better than it actually is. I used myself and a friend—who are both non-professionals in the card

business—to ground the feat and show that any lay person can do the same thing with less mental effort.

And also, you don't *have* to be the one to shuffle the deck. But that does not mean the person shuffling it *has* to switch up the way they shuffle.

What is true for a part is not necessarily true for a while and vice versa.

In this case, van Pelt switching up her shuffling method towards the end is problematic to lay people, but to a professional like Jeremy Tan on YouTube, that isn't much of an issue." I have a quick question. Who shuffled the cards? Also in your original debunk you said "This is a trick almost every non-professional card dealer is aware of. My friend and I have practiced it once before as well to trick people into thinking we can read minds.

The trick is basically you placing a card, any amount of cards, above the one you want (the Ace).

All you have to do is track **that** card (Ace)**,** which is currently behind the one at the very bottom of the deck. This is not mandatory though. You can track any card in the deck, so long as you're aware of the **initial position** of the one you want.

The Jack is the 10th

The 2 of diamonds is the 36th

36 - 10 = 26

The Ace is 37 so you'd just add 1" What is that? Why did you subtract 10 from 36? What's the point of it? How will it possibly help you? Is it by relation between the cards? Who was shuffling? The stranger? What is you

talking about bro🙄 To keep track of the card? Yes, how will it help you determine from the start how someone will shuffle the card? How did you determine the dealer card will be ace of spades if you started tracking it before the trick? That's a circular argument, you are determining the card by the trick but to do the trick you have to determine the card that will be the dealer one.

There was also other stuff in the doc but I don't think it's important.