



**FISM**<sup>TM</sup>

Fédération Internationale des Sociétés Magiques  
International Federation of Magic Societies

## **FISM CONTESTANT ALLOCATION SYSTEM (CAS)**

(5<sup>th</sup> of October 2007)

### **SUMMARY**

Now that FISM is expanding again and the championships attract more and more attention and also more and more contestants, the allocation of contestants to a FISM championship becomes urgent. The physical restriction of the number of contestants in a FISM championship requires some objective rules that can be accepted by all member-societies.

This paper describes an objective system for the allocation of the numbers of contestants for a FISM World Championship of Magic. The system should be used as a basic system that can be adjusted according to specific circumstances.

A first conclusion is that with the current number and sizes of the member-societies for a 6 days WCM, the maximum number of contestants should be around 150, divided into approximately 100 Stage acts and around 50 Close-up acts.

The system is based on the following premises:

1. **A.** The allocation of the number of contestants per continental division for a FISM championship is the responsibility of the Presidium.  
**B.** The allocation of the number of contestants per member-society for a FISM championship is the responsibility of the Presidents of the continental Executive Boards and in the absence of an Executive Board by the Presidium of the FISM.  
**C.** The Presidents of the member-societies are responsible for the allocation of individual performers and their (artistic) quality.
2. The approved number of contestants for a continental FISM division should be calculated as the proportion of its collected number of votes to the total number of votes in the General Assembly of the FISM.
3. For a World Championship of Magic, every continental FISM division has the right to have a least 1 (one) contestant in the WCM.
4. The positive differences between the initially approved numbers of contestants of continental divisions and their actual applicant contestants are gathered in a “**Distribution Pool**”.  
The total numbers in the Distribution Pool are proportionally divided over those continental divisions that have more applicants than initially approved.
5. Every country has the right to have at least 1 (one) contestant in the competition.
6. Every society within a country must have a chance to have a contestant in the competition,
7. 1<sup>st</sup> Prize winners of a Continental Championship have a non transferable guaranteed entrance in the FISM World Championships of Magic.

Based on the aforementioned premises the Presidium has allocated the following numbers of contestants for a FISM World Championship of Magic.

**Eric Eswin**

**International President**  
Grotiuslaan 18  
2353 BV Leiderdorp  
The Netherlands  
GSM : +31 654 638385

**Allocated by the FISM PRESIDIU**

FISM divisions	Country	Votes	Stage	Close-up
<b>FISM AFRICA (SAMCO)</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>FISM EUROPE</b>			<b>60</b>	<b>31</b>
1st Prize winners ECM			<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>FISM EUROPE Total</b>		<b>291</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>FISM OCEANIA Total</b>	<b>Australia</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>FISM ASIA</b>				
China Magic Art Society	China	24	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>
BLACK HAT MAGIC ASSOCIATION	China	4		
Magician Association of Hong Kong	China	6		
Japanese Profess. Magician Association	Japan	4	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Society of Japanese Magicians	Japan	4	<b>1</b>	
Malaysia Magic Ring	Malaysia	6	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Siam Magic Club	Thailand	4	<b>1</b>	
Inner Magic Club	Philippines	4	<b>1</b>	
I.B.M. Singapore Ring 115	Singapore	4	<b>1</b>	
Alexander Magic Family	Korea	6	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Korean Magic Society	Korea	6	<b>1</b>	
<b>FISM ASIA Total</b>		<b>72</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>FISM Latin AMERICA</b>				
Centro Magico Platense	Argentina	2	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
Círculo Mágico Argentino	Argentina	1		
Club Porteno de Ilusionismo	Argentina	2		
Entidad Magica Argentina	Argentina	6		
Red Maso - Red de Magos Solidarios	Argentina	2		
Sociedad Chilena de Ilusionismo	Chili	6	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Union Peruana de Ilusionistas	Peru	4	<b>1</b>	
Escuela de Artes Magicas de Bogota	Colombia	4	<b>1</b>	
El Circulo de Magos Mexicanos	Mexico	2	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Club Magico del Ecuador CLUME	Ecuador	1		
Asociacion de Magos de Guatemala Gran Jaguar	Guatemala	1		
Magos Latino Americanos en Miami (MALAM)	USA	1		
<b>FISM LATIN AMERICA Total</b>		<b>32</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>FISM North AMERICA</b>				
Canandian Magic Association	Canada	8	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Academy of Magical Arts	USA	4	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
International Brotherhood of Magicians	USA	20	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
Society of American Magicians	USA	10	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>FISM North AMERICA Total</b>		<b>42</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>444</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>53</b>



The mentioned numbers of contestants per society are initially approved maximum numbers. According to Premise nr. 4 these numbers of contestants per society can be altered.

The numbers of contestants for the societies belonging to FISM Europe should be approved by the European Executive Board.

An example of how this can be done is given in **Table 7** of this paper.

However that is just an advice, the EEB is responsible for the allocation per European society.

## **FISM CONTESTANT ALLOCATION SYSTEM (CAS)** (5<sup>th</sup> of October 2007)

### **I. Introduction and History**

Now that FISM is expanding again and the championships attract more and more attention and also more and more contestants, the allocation of contestants to a FISM championship becomes urgent. The physical restriction of the number of contestants in a FISM championship requires some objective rules that can be accepted by all member-societies.

The purpose of this paper is to provide such a system

Before 2003 there were no official limitations to the number of contestants for a FISM World Championship of Magic (WCM). All applicants could enter the competition. At the WCM2003 we had a rule in the Statutes that the competition was limited to 150 contestants for both stage and close-up together. For practical purposes the organizing team settled a maximum number of contestants of 100 for the stage contest and 50 for the close-up contest. There was also an unwritten rule that each member-society should have the right to have at least 1 contestant in the competition.

At that time there was no prior distribution per society. We kept our fingers crossed that the maximum numbers would not be surpassed. As each contestant could apply at his convenience, there were early applicants and late ones. We kept a waiting list after the first 150 applicants of contestants who could enter as soon as an accepted applicant retired. There was no regard to society or country, the waiting list was made in chronological order. "First come, first served".

Nobody questioned the final results. Member-societies seemed either to be happy with the results or were not happy at all but realized that they couldn't change it anyhow.

For the WCM2006 we had stricter rules. A procedure was developed in which only after a deadline for application had been reached, the theoretical number of contestant per society (as a percentage of their votes of the total number of votes of all societies who had applicant contestants) was calculated and surpluses and shortages were distributed as fair as possible. There were no exact rules for this distribution. The results were forwarded to the Presidents of the member –societies. Those who had sponsored more applicants than their theoretical maximum were asked to withdraw the surplus. Although this system was not received with great enthusiasm, it was accepted in the absence of a better and more objective solution.

Main objections were that the Presidents did not know in advance how many applicants they could sponsor and therefore had the chance to have to withdraw applicants only less than 3 months before the competition started. Many had the idea that this was not the way to treat a potential contestant who had worked for maybe 3 years and only learned 3 months before the competition that he would not be in the competition.

For the WCM2009 approximately the same procedure as for WCM2006 is due to be carried out.

Additionally, we have the first continental championship in Europe (ECM) in 2008 (and maybe also the Asian Championships of Magic) The ECM has (because the competition is – unlike a WCM – so far only held for 4 days) a physical limitation to 100 contestants, about 60 for stage and approximately 40 for close-up.

To underline the importance of the ECM the European Executive Board (EEB) had expressed the wish to guarantee the Grand Prix and first prize winners of the ECM2008 a place in the WCM2009. Even more when all continental divisions exist, this would be a good rule, that gives coherence to the idea of local competitions → national championships → continental championships → world championships.

### **II. Problem definition**

With the continuing development of FISM's professionalization, time has come to define some basic rules for the distribution and allocation of contestants for a FISM World Championship of Magic that can be accepted by all concerned, as objective as possible and applicable for a number of years.

### III. The absolute maximum numbers

As was already mentioned, before 2003 there were no fixed limits for the approved number of contestants. All applicants could be accepted. As of 2003 the maximum number of contestants for a 6 days convention was fixed to 150, divided into 100 stage acts and 50 close-up acts.

This maximum was not the result of an intelligent analysis or calculation, but just an educated guess, based on past events.

How well did we guess?

Basically there are 2 ways to analyze this issue: theoretically and practically.

*Theoretical approach.* Of course the absolute number of contestants depends on the duration of the convention and the time needed for the contest.

Performing time per contestant is a maximum of 10 minutes and we calculate 2 minutes between two contest performances, which will bring the total contestant time to 12 minutes. The same time is needed for the rehearsals, so 1 contestant needs 24 minutes of the available time.

A 6 days WCM has 6 x 15 hours per day (10:00-00:00) = 90 hours available. As the contest is the most important part of a WCM, one could argue that 2/3 of the available time should be spend on the contest ( $2/3 \times 90 = 60$  hrs or 3600 minutes) and 1/3 of the time (30 hours) on other events like the time for meals, jury deliberations, opening- and closing ceremonies, the gala shows, the social event and the awarding of the prizes event (dealers exhibition and lectures are not counted, because those events can be held simultaneously with the competition).

The availability of 3600 minutes for the contest means that we can handle  $3600/24 = 150$  contestants.

It is only fair to say that this is a rough calculation, as the rehearsal times for the Stage and for the Close-up performances can be programmed simultaneously.

*The practical approach.* For this approach we take a look at the historical data.

In 1948 the convention lasted 4 days and there were 45 contestants from 13 countries.

In the period 1949-1976 the FISM conventions lasted 5 days and the number of contestants grew from about 50 to about 135, coming from about 15 to about 35 countries.

From 1979 due to the many applicants for the contest, the convention was prolonged to 6 days. The number of contestants expanded from 130 to the set limit of 150, coming from more than 50 countries.

The actual numbers of contestants for 2000 (Lisbon), 2003 (Den Haag) and 2006 (Stockholm) are depicted in **Table 1**

Number of contestants <b>Stage</b>			Number of contestants <b>Close-up</b>		
2000 Lisbon	2003 Den Haag	2006 Stockholm	2000 Lisbon	2003 Den Haag	2006 Stockholm
99	95	100	39	45	46

Table 1 also shows that the actual total number of contestants has never been more than 150 and it also shows that a distribution of 100 for Stage acts and 50 for Close-up acts is quite feasible.

Both in 2003 (Den Haag) and 2006 (Stockholm, when the number was fixed to 150, the number of contestants seemed to have reached (almost: exceeded) the staying-power of the stage-crew, the jury members and the audience.

In summary, both from a theoretical and a practical point of view we may formulate the following

#### **Conclusion:**

With the current number and sizes of the member-societies for 6 days WCM, the maximum number of contestants should be around 150, divided into approximately 100 Stage acts and around 50 Close-up acts.

#### IV. Responsibilities

Having established the maximum numbers of contestants for Stage acts and for Close-up acts, the next step is to allocate these maximum numbers to the continental divisions and distribute them over the member-societies.

Immediately the question rises who should be held responsible for the allocation.

At first it will be wise to lay down the responsibilities for this next step. In this respect we should distinguish between the responsibility for the allocation of the approved numbers of contestants and the responsibility for the individual contestants and their artistic quality.

As the allocation of the approved numbers for the continental divisions exceeds the interests of each individual continental division and likewise the allocation of the approved numbers for the members-societies exceeds the interests of each individual member-society, a first **basic rule** in the allocation process should be:

1. **A.** The allocation of the number of contestants per continental division for a FISM championship is the responsibility of the Presidium.  
**B.** The allocation of the number of contestants per member-society for a FISM championship is the responsibility of the Presidents of the continental Executive Boards.  
**C.** The Presidents of the member-societies are responsible for the allocation of individual performers and their (artistic) quality.

Of course a performer himself is responsible in the first place for the (artistic) quality of his act, but the Presidents of the member-societies are responsible for the sponsoring of the participation of individual performers in a FISM championship. Because the Presidents know the performers and know their acts, they are the best to judge whether a performer has reached the FISM-level or not.

#### V. The allocation of the numbers of contestants to the continental divisions

The next step is to distribute the total numbers of contestants amongst the continental divisions. As this is something that surpasses the responsibility of a continental division, it should be done by FISM International, i.c. the Presidium.

What criteria can we use? One could think of the number of countries within a continental division, or the total membership, or the quality level of the magicians in a continental division, or the prizes won in the past by magicians from a division, and so on. Many of the criteria are difficult to calculate or to define (how would you define the quality level of a society, a country, or a continental division?).

An easy, controllable and acceptable criterion is the comparison with the total number of votes of all societies within a continental division. Using this as a criterion we have taken care of both the number of countries in a division and their relative weight in the decision making system of the FISM.

A second **basic rule** for a fair and open system should therefore be:

2. The approved number of contestants for a continental FISM division should be calculated as the proportion of its collected number of votes to the total number of votes in the General Assembly of the FISM.

**Table 2** shows the application of this rule, compared to the actual numbers of contestants of the latest 3 WCM's.

**Table 2. Maximum allowed contestants per division (according to the number of votes) and the actual contestants in 2000, 2003 & 2006**

FISM divisions	votes	Initially approved contestants Stage	Number of contestants Stage			Initially approved contestants Close-up	Number of contestants Close-up		
			2000 Lisbon	2003 Den Haag	2006 Stockholm		2000 Lisbon	2003 Den Haag	2006 Stockholm
FISM AFRICA	6	1	1	0	2	1	0	1	
FISM ASIA	72	16	19	20	17	8	3	4	
FISM EUROPE	291	66	50	60	63	33	26	31	
FISM North AMERICA	42	10	13	8	9	5	2	3	
FISM Latin AMERICA	32	7	14	7	9	4	7	7	
FISM OCEANIA	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>46</b>

Based on the maximum approved numbers of contestants (around 100 for Stage and 50 for Close-up) the green columns show the number of contestants that can initially be approved for each continental division. According to the first Basic Rule, these initially approved numbers are calculated by dividing the number of votes of a continental division by the total number of votes in the General Assembly of the FISM (444).

*Example: the initially approved number of (stage) contestants for FISM ASIA is:  $72/444 \times 100 = 16$ .*

Applying Basic Rule nr. 1, to every continental division, means that Oceania, for the Stage competition would have  $1/444 \times 100 = 0$  and for the Close-up competition  $1/44 \times 50 = 0$  initially approved contestants. Likewise FISM Africa would have  $6/444 \times 50 = 0$  initially approved Close-up contestants. This may not look right, when it comes to a WORLD Championship.

Therefore we need an additional rule:

3. For a World Championship of Magic, every continental FISM division has the right to have a least 1 (one) contestant in the WCM.

A consequence of the application of this additional rule (if we don't want to decrease the initially approved numbers of one of the other continental divisions) is that the total approved contestants for the Stage competition should be increased to 101 and for the Close-up competition to 52

## VI. Distribution Pool, Bonuses and Penalties

The initially approved numbers in the green columns can be increased by additional contestants from other divisions that have not 'used' all their approved numbers. How can we fairly distribute these 'unused' numbers?

This can be done by another additional rule:

4. The positive differences between the initially approved numbers of contestants of continental divisions and their actual applicant contestants are gathered in a "Distribution Pool". The total numbers in the Distribution Pool are proportionally divided over those continental divisions that have more applicants than initially approved.

*Example:*

*Consider the situation for Stage acts as depicted in Table 3, in which FISM Asia, Latin America and Oceania have not used their full number of initially approved contestants, while FISM Europe and FISM North America have more applicants than their initially approved numbers.*

*The distribution pool has 4 'unused' numbers in total and there are 2 continental divisions (FISM EUROPE with 291 votes and FISM North America with 42 votes), that needs more approved contestants.*

*FISM Europe may increase its 66 inifinitally approved number with  $257/(291+42) \times 4 = 3$ , resulting in a final total of  $66+3=69$  approved contestants.*

*FISM North America may increase its initially approved number (10) with  $42/(291+42) \times 4 = 1$ contestant, resulting in a final y approved total of  $10+1=11$  contestants.*

**Table 3. Example of the process from "Initially approved" to "Finally approved"**

FISM divisions	votes	Initially approved contestants (Stage)	actual applicants (Stage)	Distribution Pool (Stage)	Finally approved contestants (Stage)
FISM AFRICA	6	1	1	0	1
FISM ASIA	72	16	15	1	15
FISM EUROPE	291	66	>66	-	69
FISM North AMERICA	42	10	>10	-	11
FISM Latin AMERICA	32	7	5	2	5
FISM OCEANIA	1	1	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>&gt;101</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>101</b>

This process can of course only be executed after all the continental divisions have applied and when it is known which continental divisions have more contestants than initially approved.

The process from 'Initially approved' to "Finally approved " for a WCM should be carried out by the Presidium.

To encourage societies to carefully choose their applicant contestants, the finally approved number of contestants can further be adapted by introducing a system of Bonuses and Penalties.

If a society has two first prizewinners in the Championships, as a bonus that society can be allowed to have 1 more contestant in the next Championships.

On the other hand, for each contestant that performs below FISM-level in the championships, the approved number of contestants for that performer's society for the next Championships the approved number of contestants will be decreased by 1.

The bonuses and penalties will be taken out of or added to the Distribution Pool, of course before the process as just described in the example.

## VII. The allocation of the numbers of contestants to the member-societies

### A. General introduction.

The closer the system gets to the allocation of individual contestants, the more sensitive the allocation will be and the more difficult it will be to settle strict rules. In practice we can be sure that every rule will at one time or another be violated for reasons of justice. It is an illusion that the allocation of individual contestants can be done by strict, mathematical rules. However, a few rules can be helpful in acquiring a basic system.

Once a basic system has been formulated, we leave it to the continental divisions to which extend they want to adhere to the basic system. Common sense and feelings of justice might sometimes be more helpful than rules.

After the Presidium of the FISM has calculated the initially approved number of contestants per continental division, it is the task and responsibility of a continental Executive Board to further allocate the approved numbers of contestants to the member-societies of their division.

In the absence of a continental Executive Board (during the transition period of FISM's reorganization), the Presidium of the FISM will allocate the numbers of contestants for a continent to the member-societies of that continental division.

Please remember that a continental Executive Board is only responsible for the allocation of the *number* of contestants to a society or country (see later). The Presidents of the member-societies are fully responsible for the allocation of the *individual contestants and their quality*.



Basically the allocation of the initially approved numbers of contestants to the member-societies may follow the same principles as were used in allocating the number of contestants to the continental divisions. That is to say that the initially approved number of contestants for a society can be calculated by the formula:

**number of votes/ total continental votes \* the initially approved number of contestants for that division**

### B. FISM AFRICA and FISM OCEANIA

The results of such a calculation per continental society depends on the composition of the division: FISM AFRICA and FISM OCEANIA each consist of one member-society only, so their finally approved number of contestants is the same as the initially approved number for the whole continental division as mentioned in the green columns of **Table 2**.

### C. FISM NORTH AMERICA

The approved number of contestants for the societies belonging to FISM NORTH AMERICA can be calculated according to the proportion of their number of votes to the total number of votes for that division. Please remember that, according to the Statutes, the USA, as a country, cannot have more than 34 votes, which will be proportionally distributed over the 3 North American societies.

*Example: FISM NORTH AMERICA may have 10 Stage contestants and 5 Close-up contestant). The total number of votes for FISM NORTH AMERICA is 42. (See Table 3) The Canadian Magic Association (8 votes) may have  $8/42 \times 10 = 2$  stage contestants and  $8/42 \times 5 = 1$  Close-up contestant.*

<b>Table 4</b>	<b>North America</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Votes</b>	<b>initially approved (Stage)</b>	<b>Initially approved (Close-up)</b>
	Association Canadienne de Magiciens	CANADA	8	2	1
	Academy of Magical Arts	USA	7	1	1
	International Brotherhood of Magicians	USA	18	5	2
	Society of American Magicians	USA	9	2	1
	<b>Total North America (4 societies)</b>		<b>42</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>

### D. FISM ASIA

In the FISM Asia there are some small societies (4 votes) that in applying the basic calculation rule, will end up with 0 approved contestants in the Close-up contest.

In such a case societies of one country will be grouped and the number of contestants per country will be calculated.

<b>Table 5</b>	<b>Asia</b>	<b>country</b>	<b>votes</b>	<b>initially approved (Stage)</b>	<b>initially approved (Close-up)</b>
	China Magic Art Society	CHINA	24	5	4
	BLACK HAT MAGIC ASSOCIATION	CHINA	4	1	
	Magician Association of Hong Kong	CHINA	6	1	
	Japanese Profess. Magician Association	JAPAN	4	1	1
	Society of Japanese Magicians	JAPAN	4	1	
	Malaysia Magic Ring	MALAYSIA	6	1	2
	Siam Magic Club	THAILAND	4	1	
	Inner Magic Club	PHILIPINES	4	1	
	I.B.M. Singapore Ring 115	SINGAPORE	4	1	
	Korean Magic Society	KOREA	6	3	1
	Alexander Magic Family	KOREA	6		
	<b>Total Asia (11 societies)</b>		<b>72</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>



Example: (See Table 5)

At first the Japanese Professional Magician Association, with 4 votes of the total 72 votes for FISM ASIA, may have  $4/72 \times 8 = 0$  competitors in the Close-up category, just like the Society of Japanese Magicians (also  $4/72 \times 8 = 0$ ) Together however the two Japanese FISM member-societies have 8 votes and are allowed to participate in the Close-up category with  $8/72 \times 8 = 1$  contestant.

For the Stage category it is not necessary to group the two Japanese societies, as each of them may have 1 contestant participate in the contest ( $4/72 \times 16 = 1$ ).

#### E. FISM LATIN AMERICA

In FISM Latin America, like in FISM Asia, there are some small societies that will end up with 0 contestants. It is even more complicated because some of these small societies are the only ones of a country and cannot be grouped with other societies of the same country. In such a case we have to group several countries of the division and the calculated number of contestants will be allocated to this group of countries.

Example: (See Table 6):

None of the member-societies from Guatemala, Ecuador, Mexico and the Latin-American part of the USA (MALAM) has a sufficient number of votes to allow a contestant in the Championships. Neither society can be grouped with another society of the same country. Now these 4 societies/countries will be grouped and their collected number of votes (5), will give the right to enter  $5/32 \times 7 = 1$  contestant in the Stage and  $5/32 \times 4 = 1$  in the Close-up category.

<b>Table 6</b>	<b>Latin America</b>	<b>country</b>	<b>votes</b>	<b>initially approved (Stage)</b>	<b>initially approved (Close-up)</b>
	Centro Magico Platense	ARGENTINA	2	3	2
	Círculo Mágico Argentino	ARGENTINA	1		
	Club Porteno de Ilusionismo	ARGENTINA	2		
	Entidad Magica Argentina	ARGENTINA	6		
	Red Maso - Red de Magos Solidarios	ARGENTINA	2		
	Sociedad Chilena de Ilusionismo	CHILI	6	1	1
	Union Peruana de Ilusionistas	LIMA-PERU	4	1	
	Escuela de Artes Magicas de Bogota	COLOMBIA	4	1	
	Asociacion de Magos de Guatemala Gran Jaguar	GUATEMALA	1	1	1
	Club Magico del Ecuador CLUME	ECUADOR	1		
	El Circulo de Magos Mexicanos	MEXICO	2		
	Magos Latino Americanos en Miami (MALAM)	U.S.A.	1		
<b>Total Latin America 12 societies)</b>			<b>32</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>

The allocation of a total for a country or the total for several grouped countries is left to the societies involved. How can the societies that are grouped in country and countries that are grouped together decide who of their participants will be elected as a contestant?

There are 2 possibilities: either the societies of the countries come to an agreement or if they don't, each of the societies or countries send the name of 1 preferred contestant to the Presidium who will set up a committee to decide (either by video screening or by ballot)

## F. FISM EUROPE

FISM EUROPE is, so far, the only FISM division with an Executive Board. This European Executive Board (EEB) is responsible for the allocation of the numbers of contestants to the member-societies. The way to this is free. The only condition is that the European General Assembly accepts the allocation.

Of course the EEB can take over the way the Presidium would do the distribution over the societies, but the EEB is not obliged to do so. They may have their own allocation system. The Presidium will accept every 65 contestants from Europe, as proposed by the Presidents of the European societies.

To give an extreme example: Even if the EEB, endorsed by all European member-societies, will send to a WCM 65 stage competitors all from Germany, the Presidium will not question it or interfere.

As this extreme example is not likely to occur and the EEB is curious about the way the Presidium would do the distribution over the societies, let's try and apply the former principles to FISM Europe.

The results for the Stage contest and for the Close-up contest are mentioned in Table 7 on the next page.

The calculation of the initially approved contestants is as follows:

The approved number of contestants from Europe is 66 for Stage and 33 for Close-up.

The total approved number per society is depicted in column 3 of Table 7.

The numbers in this column are the results of the formula:

$$\text{votes of the society} / \text{total votes} * \text{approved number of contestants}$$

*Examples: Magisk Cirkel Denmark:  $6/257 \times 66 = 2$*

*Club Magico Italiano:  $14/257 \times 66 = 4$*

Column 3 (initially approved numbers) shows 16 zero's, which means that 16 (small) societies will not even get the right to have 1 contestant in the stage contest. Although mathematically right, this seems not to be fair to our common sense and feelings. Giving each of those small societies the right to send in 1 contestant will cause another injustice as this will mean that the small societies will have a relatively larger part in the distribution.

*Example:*

*A society with 1 vote (20 members) that may have 1 contestant and a society with 6 votes (250 members) that may have 2 contestants in the competition doesn't feel right.*

Moreover, giving all the societies with a "0" in column 3, the right to have 1 contestant in the competition, will increase the total number of 66 to 82, which can not be handled at a WCM.

To escape from these shortcomings, the following rule is introduced:

5. Every **country** has the right to have at least 1 (one) contestant in the competition.

This rule means that if there is a society in a country with 0 initially approved contestants, the sum of the votes of ALL societies of that country will determine the total initially approved contestants for that country.

*Example:*

*6 of the 7 Belgian societies have a calculated number of approved contestants of 0. All 7 Belgian societies together however have the right to send  $8/65 \times 396 = 2$  contestants in the Stage competition and  $8/257 \times 32 = 1$  contestant in the Close-up competition.*

Some advantages of this rule are that the results do not exceed the approved number of contestants (66) too much, are more in mutual proportion and the competition is now clearly a contest between countries.

Moreover, as the societies of such a country have to talk about the distribution between their societies, there might be some more cooperation and less animosity between societies.

**Table 7 EUROPE**

	Votes	Initially approved number	Country wise	Country wise + 6 guarant.	Initially approved number	country wise	Country wise + 2 guaranteed
Magischer Klub Wien	1	0	3	3	2	1	1
Magischer Ring Austria	9	2					
Cenacle Magique	1	0					
Cercle Magique Liégoise 'Les 52'	1	0					
Goochelvereniging Magic Victoria	1	0					
I.V.M.V.G.	1	0	2	2	1	1	1
Koninklijke Vlaamse Goochelaars van België	2	1					
Magic Club Belge	1	0					
Royal Club des Magiciens de Bruxelles	1	0					
Bulgarian Magic Union	6	2	2	1	1	1	1
Cesky Magicky Svaz	8	2	2	2	1	1	1
Magisk Cirkel Danmark	6	2	2	1	1	1	1
British Ring	19	5	5	4	3	2	2
The Magic Circle	15	4	4	3	2	2	2
Suomen Taikapiiri ry – Finnish Magic Circle	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Cercle Français de l'Illusion Jules Dhotel	6	2	2	1	1	1	1
Fédération Française des Artistes Prestidigitateurs	22	6	6	5	3	3	3
Magischer Zirkel von Deutschland	34	9	9	8	5	4	4
Budapest Magic Club	6	2	2	1	1	1	1
The Society of Magicians, Israel	4	1	1	1	1	1	1
Circolo Amici della Magia di Torino	2	1					
Club Arte Magica-Milano	1	0	5	5	3	3	2
Club Magico Italiano	14	4					
Club Magico Roma	4	1					
Magica Club Letzebuerg	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Nederlandse Magische Unie	12	3	3	3	2	1	1
Magiske Cirkel Norge	8	2	2	2	1	1	1
Krajowy Klub Iluzjonistow	4	1	1	1	1	1	1
Associacao Portuguesa De Ilusionismo	5	1	2	1	1	1	1
Clube Illusionista Fenianos	1	0					
Moskovskiy Klub Fukosnikov	6	2	2	1	1	1	1
As. Catalana de Mags Ill. Prof. Y Empr.	1	0					
As. Mags Illusionistes de Catalunya	1	0					
Asociacion Magica Aragonesa	1	0					
Club de Illusionistas Profesionales	3	1	8	7	5	4	4
Sociedad Española de Ilusionismo	24	6					
Secretaria Permanente de Congresos Magicas Nacionales	2	1					
Svensk Magisk Cirkel	10	3	3	2	2	1	1
Club des Magiciens de Geneve	1	0					
Club des Magiciens de Lausanne	1	0					
Club des Magiciens de Neuchatel	1	0	3	2	2	1	1
Magic Promotion Club	1	0					
Magischer Ring der Schweiz	6	2					
<b>Guaranteed contestants (GP + 1st prize winners)</b>		0	0	6	0	0	2
<b>Total Europe (43 societies)</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>37</b>



The distribution of the 'country-total' is left to the societies involved.

This doesn't guarantee each society that it may have a contestant in the competition. Such a guarantee cannot be given, but it will be wise to formulate another rule:

6. Every society within a country must have a **chance** to have a contestant in the competition

Rule nr. 6 prevents that a society is *a priori* excluded from the distribution of the initially approved numbers of contestants.

The results of Rules nr 5 and 6 are shown in the green columns ("Country wise") of Table 7.

### VIII. Guaranteed contestants in the World Championships of Magic

To underline the fact that the Continental Championships of Magic are the porches to the World Championships of Magic and to make the Continental Championships of Magic of importance and therefore attractive for the magicians of the continents, the first prize winners of a continental Championship of Magic should be guaranteed their participation in the World Championships of Magic.

7. 1<sup>st</sup> Prize winners of a Continental Championship of Magic have a non transferable guaranteed entrance in the next FISM World Championships of Magic.

*Example: As there are 6 categories in the stage competition of a European Championships of Magic (see Table 7), the approved number of contestants will now be  $66-6=60$ . These 60 will now be distributed in the same way as was done for the numbers in the green columns.*

*Likewise the approved number of contestants for the Close-up contest (two 1<sup>st</sup> Prizewinners) will be  $33 - 2 = 31$ .*

*The results of these guaranteed contestants for each society are shown in the orange colored columns "Country-wise + ... guarant." of Table 7*

### IX. Epilogue

The main advantages of the system as explained in this paper are the use of an objective criterion (membership) and the fact that the Presidents of societies can be told beforehand what their guaranteed numbers of contestants will be.

The system should not be considered as a strict, mathematical law. It should be considered as the starting point for an allocation of contestant numbers that will be fair and transparent

Elements of injustice in the application of the system should be taken away by adapting the results manually.

A negative critical remark could be that this CAS will take out all the spontaneity and attractive whimsicality of the past. Presidents of FISM member-societies and that they would lose their independency and freedom.

To test the validity of such remarks and thoughts, I wondered how the CAS would have resulted in the past three WCM's: Lisbon (2000), The Hague (2003) and Stockholm (2006)

The results are depicted in Table 8.

I was pleasantly surprised to note that only in 2003, for the Stage competition and in 2006 for the Close-up competition we would have a few contestants too many. Nothing that couldn't be solved with common sense.

All the other results were completely in line with what was, without any prior constraints, wanted by the Presidents of those member-societies who had contestants to sponsor.

Finally another remark could be that the system is far too complicated.

Although it is true that it takes quite some pages to write the system down, one should realize that this is done to be as explicit about the steps to be followed as possible to make the CAS absolutely well understood.

Once one has grabbed the idea of the system, the application of it is dead easy.

Nevertheless one should never neglect the possibility of another system that would – just like the CAS – meet all the requirements of an allocation system for our contestants.

If you happen to know such a system, the Presidium will be happy to hear from you.

**Table 8 Theoretical use of the CAS in 2000, 2003 & 2006**

	Europe	Asia	N. Amer.	Lat. Amer.	Africa	Oceania	Total	Europe	Asia	N. Amer.	Lat. Amer.	Africa	Oceania	Total
	<b>Stage FISM WCM 2000 (Lisbon)</b>							<b>Close-Up FISM WCM 2000 (Lisbon)</b>						
<b>Nr of Contestants</b>	51	21	12	11	1	1	97	27	4	4	8	1	0	44
<b>CAS - Initially approved</b>	65	15	11	7	2	1	101	32	7	6	3	1	1	50
Distribution Pool	14				1		15	5	3	2			1	11
Distributed		6	1	4			11				5			5
<b>CAS Finally approved</b>	51	21	12	11	1	1	97	27	4	4	8	1	0	44
	<b>Stage FISM WCM 2003 (The Hague)</b>							<b>Close-Up FISM WCM 2003 (The Hague)</b>						
<b>Nr of Contestants</b>	65	20	10	7	3	2	107	31	4	3	8	0	0	46
<b>CAS - Initially approved</b>	65	15	11	7	2	1	101	32	7	6	3	1	1	50
Distribution Pool			1				1	1	3	3		1	1	9
Distributed		1					1				5			5
<b>CAS Finally approved</b>	65	16	10	7	2	1	101	31	4	3	8	0	0	46
	<b>Stage FISM WCM 2006 (Stockholm)</b>							<b>Close-Up FISM WCM 2006 (Stockholm)</b>						
<b>Nr of Contestants</b>	63	17	9	9	2	0	100	32	4	8	3	1	0	48
<b>CAS - Initially approved</b>	65	15	11	7	2	1	101	32	7	6	3	1	1	50
Distribution Pool	2		2			1	5		3				1	4
Distribution		2		2			4			2				2
<b>CAS Finally approved</b>	63	17	9	9	2	0	100	32	4	8	3	1	0	48