

Winking World

The official journal of the English Tiddlywinks Association



Issue 86: Slow Play Special

Winking World is the official Journal of the English Tiddlywinks Association (ETwA). Copyright on the articles published herein belongs to their authors and ETwA unless otherwise stated. Quoting from Winking World is permitted providing the source is acknowledged. Opinions herein do not necessarily reflect the views of ETwA.

Winking World is edited by Matt Fayers. Please send any articles and pictures whatsoever, even if only tangentially related to 'winks, to him by e-mail or ordinary post (addresses inside back cover). For articles in electronic form, plain text is preferred, but most popular formats can be deciphered (Word users who disable the 'smart quotes' feature of that application will be looked upon very kindly).

Winking World is distributed free to members of ETwA, and may be purchased by non-members for the small sum of £3 (subject to availability).

Those wishing to join ETwA should contact the Treasurer, Stew Sage (address inside the back cover). Membership costs £10 for real people, £5 for students and the unwaged, and £3 for students joining for the first time.

Tiddlywinks equipment may be purchased from the Treasurer, Stew Sage.

© The English Tiddlywinks Association, 2006

Contents

Editorial	<i>Matt Fayers</i>	2
Correction	<i>Matt Fayers</i>	3
Typesetter's Note	<i>Matt Fayers</i>	3

The Slow Play Section

London Open	<i>Matt Fayers</i>	4
On the slowness of play: a rant	<i>Ben Fairbairn</i>	8
Slow play: some thoughts	<i>Charles Relle</i>	9
Slow play: the Editor's thoughts	<i>Matt Fayers</i>	12
Slow play: suggested solutions	<i>Andy Purvis</i>	14
Slow play: views from a slow player	<i>Andrew Garrard</i>	17

The Jubilee Trophy Section

Jubilee Trophy I	<i>Alan Dean</i>	28
NATwA 40th Anniversary	<i>Alan Dean</i>	31
Jubilee Trophy II	<i>Alan Dean</i>	34

The Singles Section

NATwA Singles	<i>Larry Kahn</i>	39
World Singles 60	<i>Dave Lockwood</i>	35
The Singles format: a reflection	<i>Matt Fayers</i>	37
ETwA Singles – Qualifying	<i>Paul Moss & Patrick Driscoll</i>	41
ETwA Singles – Plate	<i>Andrew Garrard & Ben Fairbairn</i>	43
ETwA Singles – Final		48

The Other Section

World Pairs 31	<i>Patrick Barrie</i>	49
CUTwC Long Vac Invitation Tournament	<i>Ben Fairbairn</i>	49
Twentieth anniversary Yogi's Whist evening	<i>Matt Fayers</i>	52
Myxomatosis	<i>Ed Wynn</i>	54
Letter to the Editor		51
World Ratings	<i>the algorithm</i>	55

Editorial

Matt Fayers

It was with great sadness that I accepted that I would have to stand down as ETwA Tournament Organiser because of my temporary exile to America. But, eager as I am to continue to contribute to (or perhaps to exert control over) ETwA, I volunteered for the Council job that I felt I could do from afar, namely editing Winking World. Unfortunately, given that WW is not yet an electronic journal, I can't actually do the job from afar. I can't even get A4 paper here. (Americans please note (and spread the word): your wholesale rejection of the metric system is laudable, but your failure to embrace the ISO paper sizes is incomprehensible and frustrating. Although the ISO paper sizes use a metric baseline (for those who don't know, a sheet of A0 paper has an area of one square metre), they're *not* part of the metric system, and A4 paper should supplant US Letter for sound and simple geometric reasons just as it supplanted foolscap in the UK.) Having got that rant out of the way, what I'm leading up to is to offer my huge thanks to Andrew Garrard for printing and distributing this issue of Winking World. Andrew is a hero of great proportions, and we love him. I'm intending to come back to England for the Pairs, and so should be able to put WW87 together myself.

Aside from paper sizes, life is very good here in Boston. It's less wet than England, the coffee is better and cheaper, and so is the public transport. I don't even miss playing 'winks – thanks to the work of Yan Wang and Greg Durrett, MIT is once more an active winking establishment, and I'm sure it won't be long before there's a battle for supremacy between the two Cambridges.

This issue of Winking World is loosely presented as a special on slow play. This has been a favourite gripe of winkers (and in particular of Winking World editors in their editorials) for several years, but it seems that finally we're doing something about it. Andy Purvis has been appointed Time Lord, with the job of compiling people's opinions and suggestions, and an experiment has been carried out at a tournament. In this issue, the results of the experiment are discussed, several winkers express their views, and Andy's catalogue of proposals is aired. I hope we keep on with experiments (actually, I hope we keep on with the *same* experiment for several tournaments – see my own article on slow play) and put tournament winks back on track. The cover photo (provided by Andrew, along with most of the other photos in this issue) was irresistible as an illustration of slow play, but it's a bit harsh of me (and Andrew) to pick on Dave and Paul, given that I'm not the swiftest player in the world, and Andrew (even once he's arrived at a tournament) is often mentioned in the same breath as Paul when glacially slow winkers are discussed. So I offer my apologies to Dave and Paul.

However good an editing job I do, this edition of Winking World would not be what it is without the many excellent articles people have sent me. I'm very grateful to those all who have contributed, especially Messrs Driscoll, Moss, Lockwood, Garrard and Fairbairn who were asked to write up the various parts of the World and ETwA Singles, and did so immediately. Alan Dean has also made a great contribution by writing up all his Jubilee Trophy matches (so please keep challenging him, but don't beat him unless you're prepared to do likewise). Please send any articles or pictures on any subject at all; it occurs to me that this edition, like slow play itself, is a little on the dull side, so more frivolous items are especially welcome.



Correction

Those who received a copy of WW85 from one of the first two printings will have noticed an error on page 26. In the scoresheet for the 2006 Varsity Match, it appears that OUTS fielded only four players. In fact OUTS fielded four pairs, namely

- Charlie Oakley & Nik Bamford,
- Liz Ford & Heather Golding,
- Nicola Golding & Mary Travers, and
- Chris Hook & Lucinda O'Donovan.



Typesetter's Note

Throughout this edition, the name 'Bradley-Williams' has been abbreviated to 'Bradley-W'. My apologies are due to DBW for this, but it made several tables and scoresheets easier to fit on the page.



London Open

8th July 2006, London

Matt Fayers

	Pair	Opponent						Total	Pos'n
		A	B	C	D	E	F		
A	Nick Inglis Matthew Rose	—	6 7	6	6	6	5½	36½	1
B	Patrick Barrie Ben Fairbairn	1 0	—	5	6	6	4	22	2
C	Geoff Thorpe	1	2	—	1 6	6	6	22	2
D	Andrew Garrard Alan Harper	1	1	6 1	—	2	6	17	4
E	Chris Abram Charles Relle	1	1	1	5	—	4 4½	16½	5
F	David Bradley–W. Stew Sage	1½	3	1	1	3 2½	—	12	6

Bit of a problem here. I thought the London Open was going to be written up in WW85, while Andrew was kindly leaving it for this issue. So there's no write-up. There were rumours that Matthew Rose was going to write it up, but he's been quiet on the subject. So here's my interpretation of what happened. The London Open was once more held in University College, thanks to the excellent organisational skills of Chris Abram. It seems that he managed to get the room by pretending he was holding a conference, but how winkers were able to fool the authorities (especially after lunch) beats me. Time was a little tight, so the format was an all-play-all plus a one-round Swiss for six pairs. As you can see from the table above, Nick and Matthew destroyed the field, and had already won the tournament going into the last round.

More interesting was that this tournament marked the start of the Time War, with an experimental rule change to prevent (or at least reduce) slow play. This was quite a simple experiment, namely a one-minute time limit on shots in rounds. There was a lot of discussion among Council members after the event, and on the whole it is felt that the experiment was a success. It seems that people generally made an effort to play more quickly, and that no-one actually forfeited a shot as a result of the rule. On the other hand, manipulation of timers was thought to be awkward, especially in cases where a wink was potted and the same player was then being timed again. In addition, some people were perhaps put off their shots by well-intentioned warnings from opponents that they only had a short amount of time left. It seems to be a

general feeling that these problems can be overcome with practice. Whether the rule actually helps reduce slow play (which is not typically a problem at the London Open anyway) remains to be seen.

Professional photographers were present at the tournament; here are some of their efforts, which were really very good before going through the WW reproduction process.



Alex Treacher



Alex Treacher

Ben finds lunchtime confusing, while Nick finds it amusing.



Keziah Herbert

Patrick and Alan enjoy a lighter moment.



Keziah Herbert

DBW concentrates hard.



Andrew Garrard

The London Open trophy is awarded. Notice the speed blur – clearly it's not Nick who's responsible for slow play.

On the slowness of play: a rant

Ben Fairbairn

At the last ETwA congress Charles Relle lamented the deceleration of the rate of play over the past few decades and its negative effect on the popularity of the game. We've all been there: waiting 30–40 minutes for an opponent/mat to become available purely because they're tied up in an overly drawn-out game or worse spending most of the 'rounds' stage of the game watching your opponents debating a shot for 10 minutes, just for them to decide to pass.

Cold hard fact: comparing games played at the 2004 London Open to games played in the 1994 National Pairs, games not ending in a pot-out before rounds have become around fifteen percent longer over the past decade alone (44.9 minutes compared with 39.0; cf. www.etwa.org).

Slow play is turning games and tournaments into lengthy waiting exercises and makes playing winks far more tedious and dull than it should be. Charles is right: slow play is stifling the Noble Game and is clearly a major factor in its decreased popularity.

The new ETwA council have become so concerned about the matter that they have now appointed a 'Time Lord', Andy Purvis, to 'solicit views on what could be done to force people to play more rapidly'. Any ideas should be sent to him ASAP.

As the new Tournament Organiser, I've been commissioned to write this article expressing what I am going to do to help combat the problem. A licence to rant is a dangerous thing. You are warned that this article will be a mixture of soon-to-be-implemented practicalities with my not-so-humble opinion on the matter.

First, the practicalities of play that I can lubricate. It is clear that there are numerous causes of delay to play. The availability of umpires, shot judges, torches, magnifying glasses, practice mats, toilets, beer, coffee, carrots, handbags, cheese and many other things may, to varying degrees, marginally accelerate play. I shall try my best to improve availability of these items.

I shall endeavour to have draws done more quickly. There have been numerous occasions when I have arrived at a tournament just to be met by a gaggle of winkers stood outside a door waiting for a key. Valuable drawing-time wasted! Again, this is of little consequence in the grander scheme of things, but every little helps!

It is worth making the following comment. Whatever is discovered at the London Open, whatever suggestions are made, it is probably best that such amendments are realised as 'ETwA recommendations' rather than fully flung changes to the laws of winks. There are times when slow play is appropriate: partnering someone new to the game, or a big competition such an international match. There are times, however, when it is a real pain in the posterior: tournaments involving a long succession of

games, for instance. I believe it is therefore unlikely that a change to the rules will occur any time soon. Such recommendations will be implemented at tournaments at the tournament organiser's wise and unshakable discretion. In what follows I give my views on some possible recommendations.

Mr Driscoll's proposed 'enforced espresso for slow players' is outrageous. Admittedly substance use in a liquid form has a long history in winks. I would gladly argue however that the 'zombiefying' properties of coffee may not necessarily be conducive to play.

I disagree with the proposed amendments in the styleeee of 'if the clock is stopped mid-game for longer than x amount of time, then the shot is forfeited'. Play during the main 25-minute stage of the game is roughly that: 25 minutes long. A stopped clock only occasionally happens, costs at most a couple of minutes when it does, and cannot be blamed for the bulk of the delays arising in an hour-long game.

The real problem lies in the rounds stage of play. My personal recommendation would be something along the lines of 'if neither a shot is played nor an intention to pass stated within one minute of the turn beginning, then the player automatically forfeits their turn'. I can foresee impracticalities with stopping and starting clocks so frequently and the rants that will explode when someone forgets (or 'forgets') to restart a clock, but these may prove to be minor hurdles. Perhaps a system of chess clocks (cue ranting) or egg timers could be employed? This is precisely what the grand 'London Open Experiment' is for.

The ideal rules change would of course be along the lines of 'the following people are barred from playing winks . . .' or 'the following partnerships are banned from all tournament games'. This would of course be counterproductive to the ongoing effort to encourage interest in the game, and would offend many, but by gads, we all know it would be effective! Perhaps my election to ETwA council has made me power-hungry???



Slow play: some thoughts

Charles Relle

Problems

1. We are getting far too few shots in each game.
2. The clock is being stopped too often. This sometimes results in Problem 1, but more often Problem 1 results when people allow the clock to run on after 30 seconds when they think it is advantageous to do so.

3. At the moment, some players and pairs are much slower than others. The rules have an underlying but unstated assumption that the time of a game is shared roughly half and half. This is not always so, by quite a large margin.
4. Rounds are taking as long as, and sometimes longer than, what the Americans call regulation.

Considerations

1. We want to enjoy the game more.
2. At least as important, and probably more so, we want newcomers to enjoy the game and stay with it.
3. Whatever solution we adopt, we must make it simple and comprehensible.
4. If several solutions are suggested, we must test them all, not theorise about what might happen if any one of them were adopted.

Towards a solution

1. We must do something soon. When I came back into Tiddlywinks in the late seventies, people, especially newcomers, were complaining about the length of games. Forty-five minutes was considered an unacceptable length. It is now nearly 30 years on, more than half the total length of the game's life, the situation is much worse, and nothing has been done.
2. A solution must not be too drastic.
3. It must be fair to both sides in any game. In particular, it should aim to make sure that a slow pair (or player) takes up only its own time, not time shared by both sides.
4. It must aim to limit the total length of a game, not necessarily the time taken to play an individual shot. This is because the first few shots of most games are fairly obvious; you bring in, and the spot for which you are aiming is obvious too, but you need to think out later shots.

My suggestion

1. Give each side in regulation 10 minutes for singles and 12 minutes for pairs. These figures are not hard and fast; we could go for 7 and 10, or 12 and 15, or whatever we feel appropriate.
2. Each side must have a timer, and an arrangement must be made, as in chess, to stop one timer and start the other at the end of each turn. This need not involve chess clocks; Boots timers like the one I own (Tim Hunt has one too)

would be perfectly adequate, but are no longer made. However, Lakeland sells timers that count down by the second, and they cost £7.95. They are adequate for the job. People could be encouraged to buy them and bring them to tournaments, and ETwA could probably afford a stock. Cheaper timers are available in 'Poundland' type shops. I have one, and it works, though how reliable it will be for how long I do not know.

3. Play until one side runs out of time; then give it 30 (or even 20) seconds per turn, and continue playing until the other side runs out of time, then begin rounds. If a side overruns its 30/20 seconds, it loses that turn.
4. In free turns, do not go through unnecessary stopping and starting. If, however, a side is in 'Constraint', the situation described in 3 above, it cannot have more than 30/20 seconds per free turn.
5. Give each side in rounds 5 or 7 minutes. This timing would have to start at the beginning of Round 1, so that both sides are always timed for the same number of turns. If a side overruns this limit, it may finish the turn it is on, but forfeits all further turns. Again, these figures are not hard and fast; we could have 7 minutes for singles and 10 for pairs. Round zero would have to be 'limbo', not timed in regulation or rounds, but it is at most four turns.
6. If a side pots (Blue, for example, pots blue, not another colour) it has 'free time', that is, its clock is stopped, and the opponents' is not started, until the end of that turn. This applies even when a side is in 'Constraint'; it also applies in rounds. More potting may result! A side may, of course, simply attempt a pot to gain time, but I do not think this is a worry. For one thing, the pot may fail and the turn end. For another, potting a wink means it cannot be played again; thus the side has fewer options about which to think. Thirdly, as people get used to thinking more quickly, they will resort to this ploy less often.
7. For umpiring decisions, and all other occasions not now counted as part of the game, both clocks are stopped. This is inevitable, and not a major cause of hold-ups. The appropriate clock is started after the interruption.
8. This system would end all 'stopping the clock after 30 seconds' situations. It would also ensure that each side uses only its own time, not that of the opponents. At the moment, as mentioned above, we tacitly assume that the time for the game is divided roughly half and half, but in fact we know it is not so. This system would thus be fairer.

Final thoughts

1. Whatever we decide, we need to rewrite the rules so that the present system remains, but that in tournaments a timing system is used. People playing casual

games at home will not want to bother with timers.

2. Using timers may at the beginning be fiddly, but we shall get better with practice. An initial awkwardness should not rule out a good proposal.
3. We must try out all the possible ideas in practice. I said this at the beginning, but want to stress it again, as I do not believe we can judge the outcome of any scheme without trying it.



Slow play: the Editor's thoughts

Matt Fayers

It seems that I am something of a visionary. Three or four years ago (when I was Tournament Organiser), I suggested to the rest of the ETwA Council shortly before the National Pairs that we impose the two-minute rule throughout the tournament. This suggestion was firmly rejected – a certain veteran winker who could remember the application of the two-minute rule described it as a 'disaster'. And yet, a few years later, here we are imposing the rule at a tournament but with one minute rather than two. Disaster? It seems not.

But of course, this was just one experiment at a fairly laid-back tournament, where slow play was not likely to have been a problem anyway. Further experimentation will give us more idea of how well this rule change works. And I think it vitally important that we continue to experiment with the same rule change for several tournaments, including the National Pairs. It seems to be the intention that each of the proposed rule changes will be tried at just one tournament. (In fact, there was a crazy suggestion before the London Open that we try several different proposals during the course of the tournament.) I cannot see that a single tournament (in fact, in the case of the London Open, only eighteen games) tells us very much about how well the one-minute rule works. In my view, we need to persist with the same proposal at several tournaments, so that we get more feedback as unusual situations occur, and we see how well players get used to the rule.

A slight drawback with the one-minute rule at the London seems to have been the manipulation of several timers. But this would be remedied with familiarity; all regular players have got used to timing the game, stopping the clock for interruptions and counting rounds, and I dare say that we shall become just as expertised with the one-minute rule, given practice. As far as I can tell, the problem with the two-minute rule was that it was hardly ever applied, so that things didn't go smoothly. I would recommend that unless a disaster occurs which makes it clear that the rule is unworkable, we persist with this experiment: we should certainly try it at the

Cambridge Open and the Fours, and possibly the NHIP (especially if there aren't any newcomers), and then at the Pairs. People should also try it in friendly games and at club meetings. Only then will we really know whether the rule is workable, and whether it helps to remedy slow play.

Another thing that has struck me on reading other people's views on slow play is that some of the suggestions are rather complicated. People have talked for years about using chess clocks, and there has even been discussion of custom-made timers. It strikes me that unless ETwA buys a lorry-load of chess clocks and sells them on to winkers at a knock-down price, then we will not be using chess clocks except at big tournaments. This will mean firstly that those of us who don't play chess will not become very used to using the clocks, and that tournament 'winks will be a fundamentally different game from casual 'winks. People may argue that this does not happen with chess: friendly games are untimed, and competitive games, though timed, are not played in a different way; the tactics are just the same, and thinking is a little more pressured. But tiddlywinks has a more complicated structure than chess, in two important ways:

- the game has an overall time limit anyway, and the players' individual limits need to mesh with this;
- the two sides do not get an equal number of shots.

As reported in Alan Dean's account of his Jubilee Trophy match with Patrick Driscoll (see page 29), these two factors can cause strange things to happen when one side has a squop-up, even if it plays each shot briskly. There are ways round these problems: the first problem goes away if chess clocks are only used for the 'rounds' part of the game, while the second can be remedied by using so-called 'Fischer chess clocks', which increment the time available to a player with each shot that he plays. But Fischer chess clocks are even more expensive than conventional clocks. There is no need for this complicated kind of machinery in tiddlywinks; I'm sure we can find a solution that just involves timing individual shots with an ordinary watch.

To summarise: there is no quick fix, and we don't need a clever idea to solve the problem of slow play; we just need to choose something simple and stick with it so it becomes natural and is used in *all* winks games. The one-minute rule seems a fine option in this regard.



Slow play: suggested solutions

Compiled by Andy Purvis, edited by the Editor

Suggestion 1: If a partnership takes longer than one minute over a shot for the third time in a game, they lose the game 7–0. (Suggested by Patrick Barrie.)

Comments

Tim Hedger: The three-strikes-and-you're-out approach seems a bit nuclear, and I could imagine heated debate about when the clock was started for a turn (and whether it was).

Alan Dean: I don't like this suggestion, mainly because it needs someone to start a stop-watch after every turn, and then count down as the deadline approaches, or to do this once it becomes apparent that they may be about to take over a minute, by when a fair amount of time has already been 'wasted'.

Modifications

1. Tim Hedger: Perhaps a point transfer for the third time, with maybe a further point for each subsequent time.
2. Phil Carmody: If a partnership takes longer than one minute over a shot for the third time in a game, they forfeit that single shot.
3. Larry Kahn: As we do now, opponents can stop the clock after 30 seconds. At that point, the opponents must get off a shot within the next 30 seconds or else take a 'timeout' that can be at most another 2 minutes and you have to shoot by the end of the timeout. You are allowed 3 (maybe this should just be 2) timeouts per game (this includes rounds, also, so that you can't take forever during those), after that you either shoot within one minute, like before, or else you are deemed to have passed. During stoppage/timeouts, the opponents should nicely remind the timeout team when, say, 15 seconds remain until the 1 or 2 minute limits. A related option would be to do away with any of the timeouts, and just make people shoot within a minute or else it's a forced pass.

Comment by Andy Purvis: I'm not sure Larry's suggestion would speed up regulation much, as everyone would be stopping the clock all the time, though it would mean games developed more (everyone would get more turns). I can see that it might speed up rounds, and it is at least easy to operate.

Larry Kahn: You could just make people shoot within 30 seconds, or else it's a forced pass. Maybe after 30 seconds give them another 10–15 seconds to shoot (and don't be obnoxious about counting down the seconds). Or else warn them

at 20 seconds. This includes rounds also. You'd be allowed two or three timeouts per game, with perhaps 2 minutes to think.

There would have to be a bit of tolerance in implementing this and not enforce it down to the very last second. Most of the time we don't watch the clock and it's just by 'feel' that you think 30 seconds is up. If you aren't actually looking at the clock but pretty much know that 30 seconds is about to elapse, maybe just say '15 seconds' to alert the opponents that they have to shoot.

Suggestion 2: Each partnership has 20 minutes (for pairs – probably a bit less for singles) on its clock at the start of the game. The game time limit is the same as at present, after which there are five rounds as at present. If a partnership runs out of time, it either loses 7–0 or forfeits all subsequent shots. Games should therefore not last longer than 40 minutes. (Suggested by Patrick Driscoll.)

Comments

Phil Carmody: 'forfeits all subsequent shots' would be acceptable, but 7–0 forfeit is too harsh.

Alan Dean: Alan liked this suggestion very much until he tried it in a Jubilee match. Before the match, he said: 'Maybe the proposed penalties are a bit severe [see Alan's suggested modification below]. Some allowance needs to be made where inexperienced players are involved (not that we see many of those these days) [see Andy Purvis's suggested modification below]. I could bring two chess clocks to tournaments, and maybe one or two more if I asked around.' In the match, he nearly ran out of time having squopped Patrick up, despite playing briskly, indicating a possible pathology with the original proposal.

Modifications

1. Alan Dean: I would opt for a sliding scale of point transfers, starting with something like a half point transfer when one side uses 5 minutes more than the other, with a further half point transfer for each additional two minutes of additional time used above that of the opposition. (Suggested before the Jubilee match.)
2. Andy Purvis: Each partnership has 20 minutes, though inexperienced players or partnerships may be awarded extra time for each game in the tournament at the start of the event at the discretion of the tournament organiser.
3. Andy Purvis: If a partnership runs out of time, it has to play each subsequent shot within 20 seconds on pain of forfeiting the shot. [This is intended to avoid

pathologies associated with a partnership running out of time despite playing quickly; it might also be more widely useful.]

4. Alan Dean/Andy Purvis: In the event of a squop-up, the squopping partnership gains an extra allocation of time on their clock (maybe a minute, maybe a function of the number of free turns, maybe at the expense of the opponents – there are a few ways this could be done). [This is intended to avoid pathologies associated with a partnership running out of time despite playing quickly; see Alan Dean’s Jubilee match report.]
5. Patrick Barrie: If using chess clocks, don’t have squop-up turns and any obligation to free. Instead the pair that got the squop-up can play as many shots as they like before freeing an enemy wink. The only pressure on them to free an enemy wink is the clock pressure.

Comment by Patrick Barrie on his modification: The game in squop-up situations would be completely different to that we’re familiar with (not necessarily a bad thing); it would also be completely different to games in which no chess clocks were available (probably a bad thing).

Suggestion 3: If neither a shot is played nor an intention to pass stated within one (two?) minutes of the turn beginning, then the player automatically forfeits their turn. (Suggested by Ben Fairbairn, based on his view that slow play in rounds is the main problem.)

Comments

Phil Carmody: Permits ‘pot the easy one, go for lunch, come back to play a brundle.’

Suggestion 4: Rather than change the rules, do more analysis: using chess clocks, measure and record the time taken by each side during the game. (Suggested by Phil Carmody, who found an earlier exercise like this useful as it prompted him to speed up his own play.)

Suggestion 5: Impose a maximum time per game (while retaining the 30-second rule) of, say, 35 mins for pairs, 30 mins for singles. Have a gong sound and the score recorded as it stands at that point (if the game isn’t already over). (Suggested by Cyril Edwards.)

Comments

Andy Purvis: I suggested previously that we consider starting the next round at a fixed time, and people who’d not finished the previous game couldn’t play in

it. I prefer that to Cyril's suggestion, which I think encourages exactly the slow play that rounds were introduced to solve.

Suggestion 6: Another proposal that could work in any tournament that is a full all-play-all (or multiple thereof): if any game lasts longer than X (perhaps 40 minutes for pairs, 35 for singles), both teams lose a tournament point. (Suggested by Andy Purvis.)



Slow play: views from a slow player

Andrew Garrard

The problem(s)

I see slow play as two distinct problems:

1. games are overrunning;
2. turns are taking longer.

The former mostly affects the other players in the tournament: it increases variation in the game duration (which is the real cause of players waiting for the next round – most wouldn't mind much if the average game time grew by ten minutes if *everyone's* game took exactly ten minutes longer). However, long games also reduce the number of games that can be played, and hence the variety of winks experienced during a tournament. Finally, longer games both impede using a 'fair' tournament format (e.g. all-play-all becomes impractical with fewer players), and hinder the decree of an end time to a day's play, thus limiting the time that people have to drinkve home.

The latter problem more frustrates the players directly involved. As others have pointed out, waiting for an opponent's indecision, when the decision should have been obvious, is annoying – it can result in a 'loss of feel' if a player is kept from the table too long (a problem shared by snooker players when a large break is scored against them). Slower, and thus fewer, turns can stop a game from developing fully, which can impede the strategy of one side.

The two aren't entirely independent – solving one problem in the right way may fix the other – but this distinction matters because many of the rule suggestions alleviate just one issue. For example: the existing thirty-second rule mitigates the issue of one side taking up so much of the 'regulation' time that their opponents cannot develop the game, which is one aspect of the second problem – but total game time is actually

increased by this rule (exacerbating the first). Some suggestions see the existing 20- or 25-minute regulation time as sufficient, and only regulate time spent in rounds; this aspect of slow play most impinges on other players in the tournament, but perhaps doesn't affect the involved players so much.

The proposed mechanisms imply that people's priorities differ when it comes to these issues. Some seem to consider slow shots to be part of play, and that constraining match duration is the priority – and doing so may inherently influence the time spent on each shot, as people try to develop their strategy in the time limit. Others may feel that speeding up shots is sufficient, as the game time cannot exceed the sum of its turns. For so long as people seem to be approaching the time problem(s) from different directions, there is merit to defining the problem(s) we're trying to solve.

Others may differ, but I consider both problems important. I hate holding up a tournament (hopefully I have looked at least apologetic, if not flustered, when doing so) and I suffer from my 'touch' going, when an opponent has been discussing a shot for too long. On the other hand, I find 'stopping the clock' a cantankerous thing to do, as an implicit criticism of the time an opponent has taken, and try to avoid it unless seriously compromised – especially when opposing novices, for whom even common scenarios require thought.

While many agree some kind of solution would help, the range of suggestions indicate not only that people have widely-varying ideas, but also that their approaches vary equally widely. This article is, if you like, a meta-discussion about slow play rules.

Factors to consider

There are many factors that characterise each solution – some may only matter under obscure conditions, but rules with failure potential will show this up eventually, and failures seen are likely to be blown out of proportion (or abused) by those affected. The tiddlywinks community is not known for its tolerance of error, or for resolving disputes amicably – this is a natural consequence of the stress of serious tournaments and the alcohol content of the more 'friendly' ones. Only by ensuring that the rules are precise, effective and free from abuse or misinterpretation can we ensure that players don't find them a source of antagonism.

Where I raise issues with suggestions (as examples) below, I must stress that I'm not condemning them as unworkable. All solutions have limitations – but we should know what they are before we start. Some may think a given factor is irrelevant; I'll not dispute it, so long as it's been considered.

Does the rule improve the situation? A fundamental starting point but not one to

ignore. It's easy to create a rule that seems good, but in practice is either unworkable or abused, or has unforeseen consequences. The thirty-second rule partially solves one problem, but exacerbates another, making games longer. Allocating time to each side, then giving slower players a fixed shot time until the faster side runs out, could actually extend the time if there's a large disparity (and doesn't stop individual shots taking several minutes). With Charles's suggestion (see p. 10), if one pairing took 20 seconds per shot average (not unheard of) and the other consistently took five seconds (also not unlikely, allowing for clock manipulation time and if thinking time is subsumed into that of the other team – see 'does the rule penalise an innocent party?') then rounds would not start until an hour after the squidge-off! These extreme circumstances may, of course, never occur, and could be excluded by modifying the rules; I'm not suggesting *this* rule be discounted, just that potential weaknesses in any scheme needs careful consideration. Even if total game time is reduced, a rule might not reduce the *variation* in game times (and therefore the dead time between rounds).

Might the rule change the strategy of the game? Some people may accept a change in strategy; others may consider the game to be perfect and want any change to impinge upon the game they know and love as little as possible. A small change can easily have a major influence on style of play, especially if a deliberate attempt is made to exploit it. Adding a time limit and rounds made an enormous difference to the way that people play – and play in rounds is very different from the play in 'regulation'; proposals that eliminate rounds need to account for this. While some changes may be a good thing, on the whole I expect that we'd rather keep them to a minimum, since this is not the intent of this rule change.

I'm especially wary of any rule that rewards 'speed winks' (even the extreme of playing fast until your opponent's time runs out, then doing something complicated that your opponent has no time to consider; I could imagine this being effective, and evil, against a novice). The intellectual aspect of the adult game is fundamental – 'chess with the ability to miss' – so while avoiding the extremes of slow play, we should be wary of rewarding the opposite. Is it right to force a side into a risky pot-out when they are about to run out of time? (This might actually slow games down!)

Is the rule immune to human judgement? An issue with the thirty-second rule is that few players start counting thirty seconds as soon as their shot is played. Some are more willing than others to enforce clock stopping, and differ in leniency regarding extra time taken by situations such as a novice encountering a new situation, time taken to explain a shot, or drastic changes in position. Some let

the clock run when ahead, to reduce the time left for the situation to change.

Players preparing (or discussing) a shot rarely hear what their opponents say to them about time issues, hence any latitude for the mood of the player when making timing decisions will likely invoke argument or at least ill will – especially with more ‘nuclear’ options such as forfeiting the game if too long is taken. Even if the penalty is simply a missed turn, the subsequent ranting if a player is unaware of the impending penalty may outweigh time spent simply allowing the shot to be played. That said, the ability to accommodate extenuating circumstances is a good thing – winks is, ostensibly, a friendly game, and most players will give novices a bit of slack or wait for missing squidgers to be found.

Does the rule penalise an innocent party? The frustrating games to be in, from a time-keeping perspective, are those where the *difference* in speed of play is greatest. In a complex situation *both* sides may need thinking time. That said, some situations are complex only for one side, with the other only needing to respond to the outcome of an obviously complex decision. These can be exacerbated when the thinking time of one side masks the thinking time of the other: if both sides need a minute to decide what to do, but the situation is unaffected by the first shot, it can appear that one side is playing much more quickly.

This situation especially applies when experienced players oppose novices – even when the expert must consider the situation, the thinking time can be absorbed into that of the novice. These games are less frustrating for the participants (who spend time thinking, not waiting) but can be indistinguishable statistically from genuine instances of imbalanced slow play; this may exacerbate problems with suggestions that let play continue until time expires for both sides (although a single fast turn by the side that appears to be occupying all the time can invert the appearance).

I feel it’s inappropriate to penalise opponents of slow players (as in suggestions that victimise all participants in overrunning games). Games vary too much to hope that a penalty would be evenly distributed between the opponents.

How does the rule differentiate tournament and ‘friendly’ games? Timekeeping is primarily a concern in tournament play. When playing games at a friend’s house or in a college room, little harm comes from a game overrunning. Individual shots also generally take less long – there is less pressure on each shot and more willingness to advance the game than to eke out the smallest advantage.

Many solutions to slow play are inconvenient or awkward or need additional equipment, and aren’t worth implementing for such games; the problem then

arises that the rules are different from tournament games and this may influence game strategy. Rules deal with this problem in four ways:

1. being simple enough to apply everywhere;
2. changing the rules to keep friendly and tournament play in line;
3. being sure not to alter the strategy, so existing home play is unaltered;
4. accepting that strategy for tournament and friendly games will be different.

This last seems, to me, the least desirable.

This raises a question of the minimum requirements for a game of winks; the answer may differ for tournament and friendly play. One does not, contrary to popular opinion, need a timer in order to play winks – games have been played using a wall clock (on the understanding that stopping the clock is infeasible) even at national tournaments; it's friendly to newcomers that this be possible, even though a stopwatch or countdown timer is more convenient and flexible. Suggestions of multiple timers or chess clocks must either raise this requirement for friendly games (can novices, having just bought a mat and set, be expected to have two stopwatches for a friendly game in a college room? – maybe they can), or accept that friendly and tournament games must differ.

This is a concern with games that remove the existing time limit completely: there is no simple 'less strict' derivative version. Even if a 'friendly version' supports a similar style of play, if it does not *appear* similar, there will be confusion. Switching from a single total clock to a fixed time per side may require the same winning strategy, but it's not obviously related in the way that, e.g., a master clock plus *two* clocks, one per player, is.

How simple and foolproof is the rule to understand and implement? Some suggestions seem more complicated than they actually are; any rule that's not entirely transparent will be hard to follow when players are distracted by strategy, winks fatigue and beer. A rule is more understandable (and invokes less complaint) if there is clear logic and intent behind each component of it – and rules relating to something as peripheral to the game as time-keeping must be instinctive.

Even comprehensible rules can be inherently impractical. The current rules allow for some flexibility in the 'thirty seconds' concept, and have one overall time for the game – for the most part, this can be a few seconds off without helping one side (at least predictably). Rules with team timers must ensure no bias is introduced (if one player activates the timer faster than another), since differences can accumulate to become significant; especially with a cut-off

time for game forfeiture or a score change, the exact time cannot be in dispute. Timekeeping should be secondary to game play: if timing intrudes on the game, and players spend more time working the clock (especially with more complex rules), or more concentration on the rules, than they do playing, then something is wrong: it has already been shown that short turns can happen before the clock can be updated, and often remembering who won the squidge-off is hard enough.

The more complex a rule, and the more exceptions it contains, the greater the chance of error. Familiarity will remove some errors, as (e.g.) setting a timer becomes part of the habit of making a shot; since players are inherently (and rightly) distracted from the rules by the game itself, the rule must rely on these habits to be practical. Exceptions don't get subsumed into habits in this way, as evidenced by the frequency with which clocks aren't restarted after umpire calls.

Here are two guidelines that may make a rule more foolproof.

- The rule should be consistent, with the fewest possible exceptions. This implies that time-outs and keeping track of the number of times a side has exceeded a time limit might be error-prone.
- 'Forcing actions' should be used (or recommended). If a player must change which clock is running after his turn, make the other player hold both clocks in his hand: a clock on the table can be ignored and then forgotten but it's harder to forget to do something with a clock if it's just been handed to you, and it's hard to forget to return it when your hands are too full to play your shot. Many stopwatches have multiple timers – both clocks on the same device: 'stop, switch timers, start' is more reliable than 'find timer a; stop it; find timer b; start it'; a player thinking of starting the opposition clock will be inherently reminded to stop their own when staring it in the (clock) face. This is why ATMs return your card (which you might forget) before giving you your money (which you're unlikely to leave, since this was your goal in using the machine)

Mistakes will happen and a rule must also consider recovery from them. Forfeiture of a game due to a timer error seems excessively harsh, yet letting things stand could significantly favour one side. An illegal shot can be replaced or accepted; what should one do with a frozen timer?

Will the rule need special equipment? The complexity of some rules can be offset by technological assistance (if the technology isn't itself too hard to use). Rules

that suggest the addition of time after each turn are woefully complex without some kind of Fischer clock. No rule that measures independently per side is practical without separate timers, ideally with alarms. Used correctly, a device that implements a complex rule can make it practical.

The downside of relying on technology is the exclusion of players without access to it (especially if expensive). Thus either the technological requirements should be kept at a low level (e.g. two timers could become a prerequisite even for a friendly game – despite exceeding the current requirements and potentially discouraging the most casual interest) or the rules for tournament play and friendly play should differ in some way that should not overly influence the way the game is played. Having obscure timing requirements may scare off potential newcomers.

Whatever equipment is required, it's important that it definitely be necessary, even if most players may be expected to exceed the 'minimum spec'. It *helps* to have a timer to play winks (with the current rules) but that's not the same as needing one.

One benefit of modern technology is that relatively advanced technological assistance need not be expensive, and indeed may cost nothing but time. Investigations suggest that a custom timer could be made for well below the price of most off-the-shelf chess clocks (and a small multiple of the price of most decent timers). Further, many players carry a programmable device with them: a Java-capable mobile phone. Writing an application to make these devices act as timers implementing arbitrarily complex rules should be relatively easy (and free). The consequences for the battery life of the phone, and what happens if someone is called during a tournament, might still preclude this approach.

Will the rule affect the comparison of players? People have spent years advancing their ability at tiddlywinks and their styles of play vary significantly. If a rule has enough influence to alter whether one player is 'better' than another, I feel we'll have gone too far. Who would penalise Stew because he rests on a wink that he's going to pot for a long time? Forcing him to rush would impair his long potting, an important aspect of his game. I reserve the right to spend a few seconds working out how to nudge a pile millimetrically in order to make a wink on the far side become squopped – whilst accepting that I must not take *too* long.

More fundamentally, rules that alter the scoreline of a game need to be considered carefully. Should the change be reflected in the World Ratings, since the speed of play might affect all games with which the player is involved?

Does the rule have too much influence? There are circumstances in which slow play is the fault of the player; these we wish to limit. However, there are also times where slow play is the fault of the situation – something complicated has happened, there is a fundamental disagreement between partners over a shot, a squidger has been lost, a novice needs to be shown how to play a shot. I feel that these are acceptable, although others may disagree.

The current thirty-second rule limits the influence of these events at the cost of changing game duration (and relies upon the opponent's discretion, at the cost of distracting them with clock-watching). Many of the current proposals either average out the shot time or have some accommodation for a limited number of exceptional circumstances (although it may be hard to distinguish fairly between a side that has taken their entire time-out allowance and one that has gone one second over their normal time once too often). Some are more draconian.

Any rule must be measured by all these factors (and, I'm sure, by many others) and found acceptable. Each suggestion scores very differently in each category, which implies that the weight that players give to these factors also varies.

The time it takes us to experiment with any given solution enough to establish its practicality is going to be significant – as the Editor has said, a single tournament is hardly enough (especially with modern attendance figures), although clubs may be able to test a suggestion between ETWA events. Whilst I'm keen to start the experiments, I also think it's worth finding out what kind of solution players actually want; an ideal solution to a player that has one set of priorities may be unacceptable to another.

What rules are acceptable?

There is a price to be paid for any rule change that might solve the slow play problem. This price may be paid in changes to the strategy of the game, in the level of complexity added to the rules (both conceptually and in the difficulty of implementation) or in the requirement of additional equipment. Each can counteract the others – a rule can be made simpler by accepting some changes to the way the game is played, or by some technological assistance; the game may be kept more faithful to the way it is currently played by complicating the rules; less equipment means either the rules or the strategy of the game diverge from the ideal. The greater the price we pay, shared between these elements, the more effective at solving the slow play problem the rule will be – a simple change by all these measures will only partially solve the problem.

More generally than the above list of factors to consider when examining each rule, I contend that these three elements – strategy change, equipment change, rule

complication – categorise each rule. The rules that the winking community could accept probably lie close together when measured by these costs; it would be helpful when deciding on rules to know where the collective priorities lie. If great effort goes into fine-tuning a rule that carries with it unacceptable baggage, it is important that this be known before this effort is wasted – and as one person’s unacceptable baggage can be insignificant to another, we need some consensus of the relative prices we’re prepared to pay before we start. For example, being a technophile, I’m prepared to rely on complicated equipment in tournament play – to solve the slow play problem, not for the sake of it – if it keeps the strategy unchanged (and thus the same as for friendly games) and keeps implementation simple. Others may feel that we should keep equipment simple (to facilitate tournament play outside ETwA and avoid expenditure within it) but that we can cope with convoluted rules or some change in the game. We can ascertain the feelings of ETwA by voting on each rule in turn, but it would be more efficient to draw boundaries before experimentation starts.

Course of action

For all this analysis, I strongly believe that a *good* solution to the slow play problem implemented today is better than spending another fifty years finding a *perfect* solution. However, while we’re still deciding what solution we should pick, we should ensure we’re not arbitrarily picking something that’s inferior to an obvious alternative. At the end of the slow play debate I’ll gladly embrace whatever rules the collective membership of ETwA can agree upon, understanding that others will have different priorities from my own and that the consensus is important, so long as everyone involved is fully aware of what effects that chosen rule will (and will not) have. My sole concern is that we should not vote in a rule without understanding it adequately.

It’s important to comprehend the repercussions of any rule that we do pick, lest it come back and bite us in the future. Some problems may be rare, but that doesn’t mean that we shouldn’t try to exclude them. Equally, we need to test any rule that we consider. No discussion can find every problem, and unforeseen issues may be found in a brief actual trial. The process is similar to software development: it’s important both to analyse every apparent circumstance under which something can fail (because one might spot a potential difficulty that is rare, but still important) and also to test empirically (to expose situations that have not been thought of, and check that the assumptions made were valid).

Note that a perceived problem might not turn out to be a real problem in practice (it may be, for example, that nobody adopts ‘speed winks’ in order to build up a time

buffer). So long as the correct circumstances have arisen to prove this, this is important: it means we shouldn't refuse to try a rule with some potential shortcomings, so long as we know what they might be. Given how long the experiment will take, this assertion doesn't mean that we shouldn't try to tune the rule to remove those shortcomings before we start – something that's definitely problem-free is better than something that *might* be.

This raises the question of how we measure the effectiveness of any rule (other than by asking players how 'satisfied' they were with the way a tournament was run – which might end up bearing a closer correlation to the quality of the beer). As mentioned, it is no longer expensive (and possibly free, although not in terms of effort) to make custom devices that can be used in the timing of winks games. A corollary to that statement is that it's possible to make devices that will gather accurate statistics, should we find it useful. Something to consider. We might also uncover unknown sources of slow-down; how much time is *really* lost to unnecessary umpire calls, and should this be eradicated by penalising the judged-against party?

My proposal

I do have a personally preferred suggestion, although I may prefer it solely because it's my idea and I'm biased. I present it as another point for discussion, to be measured by the same factors as any other.

Firstly, I must counter what Matt says about the use of chess clocks. The reason that I, at least, raised the idea of a chess clock (or something like one) is precisely so that the style of play in tournaments *not* change compared with the casual game. I feel some suggestions do not effectively solve the time problem in all its forms and that others are open to abuse by players who alter the way they play to fit the time rules. I have not heard a solution that does not increase complexity, that uses a single timer, that I would not expect to cause some players changing their style of play (and some rules might force me to do so myself). The more complex rules might avoid this trap but strike me as error-prone and awkward.

The solution I can think of that has least influence on the style of play (whilst solving the problems that I care about) is as follows.

1. Friendly games stay exactly as they are. These rules apply only to tournament games.
2. Keep an overall time limit, as in the current rules, of 20 or 25 minutes.
3. Each side has a time bank. At the start of each shot that the side has to take, a fixed amount of time (such as 20 seconds, but to be determined experimentally) is added to that side's clock, in the style of a Fischer chess clock, and the clock

starts, running until the shot is played. If the clock runs out of time before a shot is played, that turn is forfeit.

4. To avoid the strategy of queuing up time by playing a lot of fast shots at the start of the game (thus allowing a lot of time to be spent later on, and encouraging speed winks in the early stages), a cap is placed on the size of the time bank. Again, the size of the bank should be determined experimentally, but a preliminary suggestion is three minutes.
5. Rounds happen as usual, with the time bank still in force, but in rounds the increment to the time bank is larger – for example, 30 seconds per shot – to allow for the increased complexity of the end of the game.
6. In case of error, a clock can be started late, or the time bank can be zeroed, as appropriate to penalise the offending party.
7. This rule encourages players to play quickly in order to build up a time bank, but not so much as to advocate foolhardy ‘speed winks’. It’s likely that the time bank will be mostly full early on in the game even without special effort, since the first few bring-in shots are relatively fast, after which playing ‘fast enough’ is sufficient.
8. It’s acceptable for several circumstances to arise where a lot of cogitation is needed. The faster the play the rest of the time, the more slow shots can be accommodated. Unlike schemes that have a total time per side, this suggestion also spreads out the occurrences of slow play.
9. Experienced players can allow extra time to show novice partners how to play a shot, by rushing their own shots. This reduces the requirement that novices rely on the good will of their opponents.
10. Both shot time and game time are controlled by this proposal.
11. Obviously, this suggestion is too complicated to implement effectively without additional equipment – probably custom equipment, since the behaviour exceeds that of a standard Fischer chess clock. Since this equipment would be required only for tournament play, and since it ought to be possible for this to be a software-only solution, I don’t think this precludes its consideration – although it is a clear disadvantage.
12. I am, of course, prepared to try to produce a suitable J2ME program for this suggestion. As usual, though, the number of things I volunteer to do exceeds the number that I have the time to do, so I’ll commit to doing so only if others don’t object on other grounds.

I’m prepared to be persuaded that this solution won’t work, or at least that another is better. To paraphrase Knuth, I have only proven that it’ll work, not tried it.

Jubilee Trophy Report

Somewhere between a half and one and a half matches, played with somewhere between twenty-three and twenty-five winks, and a first experience of winks against the clock

29th & 30th April & 14th May 2006, Sandy/Cambridge

Alan Dean

The Jubilee Trophy competition was reactivated when fourteen-year-old Jonathan Lockwood, who was over with his father, Dave, for a World Pairs match and the National Pairs, decided he would like to have a shot at it. The challenge was made on the Saturday evening of the Pairs and, with the Lockwoods heading south from Cambridge the next day, there was not a lot of time to fit in a match. However, it was agreed that the match could be completed in Ithaca in July if necessary.

Round 1 started around 10:30 on the Saturday evening, after the ETwA Congress in Cambridge and a Chinese takeaway meal at the Dean residence. Alan had a couple of glasses of wine with the meal, which is his only excuse for what happened next. Game 1 saw him, playing red and blue, comfortably squop Jon up for an easy 6–1. Colours were switched ready to begin Game 2 when Jon observed that there were five small reds on the mat! It thus appeared that, without either player noticing it, Alan had played the whole first game with thirteen winks! Alan's suggestion that Game 1 should be expunged from the record was gratefully accepted.

After two more 6–1 squop-ups to Alan it was approaching midnight, so the match was adjourned overnight. Jon got up too late next morning for another game before returning to Cambridge, so the match resumed in the Bowett room during the Sunday lunch break in the Pairs, with no witnesses. Alan captured most of Jon's winks with just his yellows, and prepared to pot out with green. The only problem was that only five greens could be found on the mat! Mat, pot, and surrounding floor space were searched before they decided that there must have been one missing wink, or possibly one had been inadvertently shot off the mat and lost. To squop up the opposition with an extra wink, and then to pot out with one too few would just bring his name further into disrepute, but Alan was reluctant to give away another dominant position, so he suggested that another green be obtained and placed on its baseline. This was brought in and potted. The pot-out plan was going quite well, until two or three rounds later, when a pile was disturbed, and the missing small green appeared underneath it! So, Alan had an extra wink, probably for the second time in the match, and felt he had no option but to scrap this game too.

Cambridge lunch breaks being of rather generous proportions, there was still ample time to play another before the Pairs restart, and thus began the second Game 3. Both players brought in quite well. Jon may by now have decided that he was

unlikely to win a squopping game, so tried Plan B. After an initial miss (or maybe it was an approach shot) and a round of squop attempts involving one large wink of each colour, three of these winks were in one pile. Jon still had six pottable winks of one colour with the furthest being about eight inches from the pot. Slowly and nervously he went for the pot out, and was delighted to achieve six consecutive pots! Alan followed in with six in a row to take second place, and also achieved third place for a 2–5, bringing the cumulative score after three real rounds and two imaginary ones to 14–7 in Alan’s favour. So the match is still alive and we look forward to its resumption in Ithaca, New York State, during the NATwA 40th Anniversary weekend. Whatever happens next this match will break a number of records:

1. the longest, both in terms of games played (if you include the duds), and elapsed time from start to finish;
2. the greatest number of venues for a single match, and the maximum distance between them;
3. the largest number of winks used in a Jubilee match game;
4. the largest age difference between defender and challenger (42 years), with the difference in lengths of winking careers not being much less than that;
5. the youngest ever Jubilee Trophy player;
6. the youngest player to have defeated Alan in a singles game since he was 17.

Patrick Driscoll, fired up with enthusiasm following a successful Varsity Match, put in a challenge for the trophy during the second week of May. Alan explained that a match played now would not count if he went on to lose to the young Lockwood, but Patrick was prepared to take this risk, so Patrick travelled to Sandy in the late afternoon of Saturday the 14th of May. The roads were probably rather quiet given that the FA Cup final was in progress at the time.

Both players had agreed to try out Patrick’s anti-slow-play proposal, and to report back to the Time Lord on how it went. Chess clocks were used, each player being assigned 20 minutes in which to complete the whole game, with the penalty for using up all the time being to forfeit the game 7–0. A stopwatch was also used, as usual. The chess clocks were placed at one end of the mat. It was agreed that a wink hitting the clock was deemed not to have gone off. The players agreed to press the clocks for each other if they were closer to it and remembered to do so, though each person was obviously ultimately responsible for pressing his own clock. In practice Alan did this more often, being much more used to using clocks from his chess- and go-playing experiences. Being both naturally quick players they did not expect the clocks to play a significant part in the games, but in one of the games this turned out not to be the case.

A warm-up game was played first, to get the hang of the timer, and to give Patrick the feel of the mat. Alan won this 4–3, and used a total of 12 minutes to Patrick's 14.

Alan won the first match game by the same margin, with two colours tying for first place. Total times used: Alan 13 mins, Patrick 14½ mins, so again the clocks were not an issue.

In Game 2 Alan potted out in Round 4 to win 6–1, with just over 12 minutes on his clock against 11 for Patrick, so the four rounds obviously did not last long! It was agreed to stop the clocks on a pot-out, so the full game lasted marginally longer. A break for dinner was taken at this point, at which the players restricted themselves to one glass of wine each.

In Game 3 Patrick was squopped up for much of the time, and Alan repeatedly got free turns. But turns mean seconds, and Alan used a dangerously high proportion of the first twenty minutes despite playing briskly throughout. With the clock now dominating Alan's thoughts, he fluffed a possibly rather foolhardy freeing shot of a wink on the main pile, leaving an enemy wink free on the pile. Patrick gratefully obliterated it, leaving an unclear situation in rounds. With no time left for Alan to think, a damage limitation exercise was undertaken. He concentrated his attack on Patrick's second colour. He could still have won had he not missed a fairly easy but crucial squop in Round 5, allowing his opponent to free a wink and squeeze into first place on the last shot of the game for a 4–3. Patrick used 13 minutes in this game, and Alan a little over 19. Interestingly, before the match began Patrick raised the question of the effect of squop-ups on the clocks, and Alan commented that if a player was that far ahead he should be able to cope, but it proved not to be so easy in the event. This raises the question of whether or not the timing rules should be modified in some way so as not to penalise the successful squopper.

Game 4 was rather scrappy, and eventually went 6–1 in Alan's favour, taking the final result to 19–9. Alan used more time in this game: 16 minutes against Patrick's 13.



NATwA 40th Anniversary (including Jubilee Trophy report)

1st & 2nd July 2006, Ithaca

Alan Dean

The event actually started the day before for some, including a cruise/dinner on Lake Cayuga on the Friday evening. The venue for the winks tournament was the Myers Seminar Room, Warren Hall, at Cornell University. Getting there posed some problems, as a number of the interstate highways were under water as a result of the prolonged very wet weather in New York State.

There was a good spread of ages amongst those present, from old-timers like the first World Singles Champion, Bill Renke (no need to mention here who he thrashed to win that title), to a number of Severin's current Ithaca High School students, and the offspring of various winkers.

Perhaps 'tournament' implies too much organisation as a word to describe the winks playing part of the celebrations. The aim was to allow everyone to play as much or as little as they wished, and to give as much time as people wished to renew old friendships or explore the locality. Accordingly, all those present were divided into two teams, based roughly on their allegiances from their winking days, with the sole Brit permitted to play for either team. Basically, the plan was that whenever you felt like playing you found a partner from your own team and a couple of opponents from the other team and got on with it. Even the restriction of partnering one's own team mates was not insisted on in cases where two people from opposing teams felt like playing together, and no-one bothered to work out which team had won. Avoiding one-sided games was foremost in the thinking when selecting pairings.

The proceedings opened with a song from the NATwA Songbook: Bill Renke provided reprints of the 1981 edition. One game began before the song: the Jubilee Trophy match between Alan Dean and Jon Lockwood had resumed ten minutes previously. This was either the sixth or the fourth game of the match, depending on whether or not you count those which were discounted due to anomalies concerning the number of winks used. A report of this has been given earlier: Alan was 14-7 ahead, and he was keen not to lose another game through inattentiveness so he stood guard over the mat during the singing. When the song was over he quickly turned round to put his song book on an adjoining table, and turned back to find that Yan had gathered the winks together ready to play his first game. Thus ended the third non-game of the match.

Many people spent more time socialising than playing, as the scores chart below will testify, and it was a very relaxed and fun occasion.

On the Saturday evening MP Rouse hosted an excellently organised barbecue at her

home, which was probably attended by more people than were at the tournament. She was ably assisted by the fifteen winkers who were staying with her over the extended weekend. The weather was kind, which was fortunate given the way it had been recently, so those who wanted to get wet had to resort to the use of her swimming pool. There were a few short speeches, and a plaque was awarded to Severin, in appreciation of his contribution to winks as founder of NATwA, and as a continued inspiration to the younger generation of players at his school. Alan relayed a few messages of goodwill from other English players, and a letter from Charles Relle was read out. Particularly moving were the remarks from and about Larry Kahn, and from his partner Cathy. Larry's father had died two days before, and the funeral was on the following Monday, which is why Larry played so little. He arrived shortly before the party and had time for only one game the next day before he had to head back. He said he felt a strong need to be with family at a time like this, and thought of the winks fraternity as his family. After the speeches there were more songs from the Songbook, before we went indoors where some of us remembered old winking times with the help of old videos, newspaper clippings and letters. With so many resident guests the party doubtless went on very late, but your reporter left around half past midnight with Severin to return to the Drix household which was about a 45-minute drive away. Their wives had gone back together some time earlier.

The Jubilee match was finally completed on the Sunday. Alan was not on good form, and Jon looked like taking full advantage. He played rather well and had a clear advantage as rounds approached, in a squopping game, until a rather ambitious shot which Jon attempted on a pile with five of Alan's winks left them all free. Alan took control from that point, and went on to win 6-1, and take the match 20-8. Jon certainly did not disgrace himself, and later remarked that he had been very happy to take Alan to seven games.

The table overleaf records the number of games played and points scored by each player, in the 4-player games from the main event. It does not include the result of the one six-player game, in which Rich Davis, Bill Renke and Severin Drix won 15½-9½ against Greg Durrett, Sunshine and Kurt Hendrix. A number of the games were played using mats and/or winks and/or rules from the 1970s, reflecting the fact that some of the players have not been particularly active since those days. One such game also saw the reappearance after a fifteen-year gap of the freak yellow wink known as Muenster, used by Sunshine partnering Alan Dean against Ferd Wulkan and Rich Davis. This, an end-cut from a cylinder from which the old winks were cut, varied in thickness by between about one and four normal wink thicknesses. It had quite an effect on the game, even after being squopped, and helped its owners to a 5-2 win.

Player	Games	Points	Player	Games	Points
Larry Kahn	1	2	Jon Lockwood	4	16
Dave Lockwood	10	50½	Collin Reed	8	28½
Bob Henninge	9	34½	Bill Gammerdinger	8	21
Alan Dean	13	54	Matt Sola	4	10
Ferd	11	38½	Dave Barbano	4	13
Severin Drix	8	26	Josh Katz	9	28½
Charles Frankston	7	27½	Joe Sarnelle	7	18
Arye Gittelman	6	15½	Carl Chenkin	2	6
Tim Schiller	10	39½	Andy Leed	4	13½
Yan Wang	5	15	Rachel Gittelman	4	14
Sunshine	2	6	Carolyn Hoffman	1	5½
Bill Renke	3	13	Fred Shapiro	3	5½
Vanya Temnykh	2	4	Caitlin Allen	1	6
MP Rouse	6	27½	Shana Bricklin	1	2½
Greg Durrett	9	28½	Richard Hussong	1	1
Stephanie Chu	10	42	Bonnie Allen	1	1
Kurt Hendrix	8	25½	Sam Chenkin	1	4
Max Lockwood	7	26	Steve Krasner	2	2
Rich Davis	5	16½	Juli Gittelman	1	1
Gred Gross	5	20	Samuel Hoffstaetter	2	1
Joe Davis	8	32			

The players are listed in order of World Ratings after the event (before the event many of them did not feature in the ratings).

Alan's wife, Barbie, travelled with him. Before the winks weekend they spent a couple of nights in each of the Catskill Mountains and the Adirondacks (a wilderness region of lakes and mountains about the size of Britain) and afterwards a couple of nights at the Canadian side of Niagara Falls. All great fun, and the car only had to be rescued twice, both times at the B&B at Saranak Lake in the Adirondacks. The first time was when it got stuck half way up the very steep driveway leading to the house, after the heavy rains had loosened the surface of the dirt track. The second time was after reversing onto the road at the bottom of this driveway. The roadway was being replaced and only the new kerbs were in place. The hired car had a very high back and poor rear vision so Barbie got out to direct proceedings. What Alan didn't know was that Barbie was looking at only one wheel, the one with the two inch drop from kerb to road, and not the one where the drop was two feet! The invoice from Maddens Towing & Recovery records the job as 'wreck recovery', which was a bit harsh as there was not a scratch on the car (well, possibly some underneath).

Jubilee Trophy

7th, 8th & 14th October 2006, Sandy/Maidstone

Alan Dean

Alan Dean	5	1	1	3	3	3	1	4	6	6	6	5½	2½	4	3	3	3	60
Charles Relle	2	6	6	4	4	4	6	3	1	1	1	1½	4½	3	4	4	4	59

I started slowly, having not touched a wink since the NATwA 40 weekend at the beginning of July. The only pot-out of the match was a result of my failure to pot my sixth wink three times: I got closest the first time, when playing it off the back of a pile. In two other games, including the final one, Charles tried to pot out, and I squopped the sixth wink. In several games Charles finished very strongly to steal 4–3 wins from losing positions. I also helped to keep the match exciting to the very end by missing a few easy pots late in rounds.

This is my first Jubilee victory over Charles in four attempts. He won 18–17 last time.

Addendum

Charles said it was my fifth Jubilee match against him. I don't expect records go back that far, but he has a better memory of such things than me so he is probably correct.

I forgot to add that we started with a warm-up game, and decided to try out Charles's suggestion of having clocks for each player: after playing a shot you stop yours then start his. Before we began I asked if you were allowed to change the clocks if the opponent had already replied before you got to them. Charles agreed that one should not do this. We played like this for about three or four turns each, with Charles never getting anywhere near the clocks before I had played again, so the scheme was then abandoned by mutual agreement.



World Singles 60

20th October 2006, Cambridge

Dave Lockwood

Andy Purvis	4	1	6	5	1	6	6	29
Larry Kahn	3	6	1	2	6	1	1	20

Larry played red–blue in odd-numbered games.

Game 1. Larry (red) wins squidge-off.

Two main areas develop, one for each player. The action is in Larry’s side but Andy’s blow is weak. Into rounds, the colours involved in piles are imbalanced within each partnership. Larry’s colours are even. Andy is free with yellow and involved with green. Three yellows up and free in Round 4. Poor potting by Andy and Larry with free red leaves 10–8–4–3; 4–3 to Andy.

Cumulative: 4–3 Andy.

Game 2. Andy (red) wins squidge-off.

A busy game keeps six winks (three green, one red, one blue, one yellow) at corners with twelve minutes gone. Three winks (one green, one red, one yellow) are still in corners at end of time. Andy has three reds free and one on pile. Blue is squopped out in Round 0. Green has two free, one up; yellow, two free, one up. Larry defends well against red attacks to free blue. Game ends with one green still in corner. Larry wins 6–1 with 5–4–3–2 in tiddlies.

Cumulative: 9–5 Larry.

Game 3. Red (which happens to be Larry) wins squidge-off again.

Larry (blue) and Andy (green) have pot threats with five in each. Blue squops yellow. Red squops green. Yellow, from eighteen inches, squops red on green. The last blue is two feet away from the cup. Yellow frees the last green at 6:30 into the game. Blue squops green. Yellow takes blue on green and a red. With eight minutes left, there are five single squops. Andy has six of seven single squops (no other piles) and position with three minutes left. In first, nine of ten single squops are Andy’s. Larry boondocks to make it nine of nine. Having two free reds, Larry tries to get a third to get second place. Andy squops well to squop out Larry in Round 4. 6–1 Andy.

Cumulative: 11–10 Andy.

Game 4. Yellow, by now considered an interloper, wins the squidge-off.

The main pile goes back and forth. Larry employs questionable strategy – disdains a one-inch squop, loses it. Ignores a three-inch squop onto part of pile with three of Andy’s bigs. Larry fights back in rounds but Andy has time on his side. Larry overhits a freeing shot in Round 4 with green, sending green off. Red pots in Round 5. Andy takes a 5–2. Tiddlies 6–4–2–0.

Cumulative: 16–12 Andy (no lead change for the first time).

—Dinner Break—

Game 5. Yellow, starting to challenge red for squidge-off supremacy, wins, squired by Larry.

One primary pile reaches twenty winks. Larry has tenuous control going into rounds. Andy misses an easy squop to let Larry delay any Andy recovery. Andy misses a five-inch pot in 5 for an extra half-point. 6–1 Larry.

Cumulative: 18–17 Larry.

Game 6. Red (Andy) settles the squidge off winner colour competition, winning its fourth squidge-off.

Andy goes off with his second red. Larry has early position advantage. Red and green blitzes emerge but Andy misses first (with five brought in) next to green. Threats defused. Larry allows Andy to regroup. Few squops. Focus on green on last red. Red gets chance to go with red on red but resists. Larry misses three shots in a row to put Andy up well. Andy gets blue out to look at 6–1. Larry throws greens into pile, diminishing chance at second with green. With his last wink, Larry plays green to top of main pile in Round 3. Larry blows weakly to allow Andy to resquop all but one. Andy 6–1.

Cumulative: 23–19 Andy.

Game 7. Blue (Larry) wins squidge-off.

Early position to Larry after Andy goes off with green. Larry has potential double-blitz within twelve in and one yellow squopped by both red and blue. Green has six free with one at edge. Larry boondocks yellow to leave both of his colours pottable but puts blue on big red. Yellow comes in on a red pottable. Yellow has six up. Blue fails to put under red near yellow squop. Green pots one and comes in to twelve inches. Red misses yellow. Yellow pots three and misses off the red squop. Larry misses first blue. Green takes easy red. Red misses nine-inch squop of yellow. Yellow pots out to win match. Larry runs six blues. Green takes 3rd. 6–1 Andy.

Final Score: 29–20 Andy.



The Singles format: a reflection

Matt Fayers

Editor's note: this article was written before the 2006 ETwA Singles, and some of the suggestions here were implemented at that tournament. So those of you who wondered at the novel format should regard this article as an explanation, and blame me rather than Ben.

During my six years as ETwA Tournament Organiser, the format for the National Singles underwent some experimental changes. I have discussed some aspects of this in previous issues of Winking World – chiefly, the qualification criteria when the qualifying leagues are of unequal sizes – but I want here to discuss how we deal with the dwindling number of participants, and also the problems of slow play.

The traditional format for the Singles (in the days when there were more than thirty entrants) was that the entrants would be divided into qualifying leagues of between nine and twelve players each, and the top twelve (defined according to criteria we need not address again here) would play in the final on the second day. The non-qualifiers, along with anyone else who just happened to turn up, were invited to play in the Plate.

Then came the plummet in attendance. Only twenty-one players played on the Saturday in 1999 (my first year as TO), and the entry has not exceeded twenty-four since. When the entry first dropped to just nineteen, it was observed by several players that an all-play-all over the whole weekend would be possible (even preferable?), doing away with the traditional qualification-based format. What would I do, I was asked, if there were only thirteen entrants? Fearing continued low attendances, I consulted the rest of the ETwA Council about the possibility of breaking with tradition in this way, and in 2003 (when the attendance again hit nineteen), we did the all-play-all. At the end of that tournament, I had a lot of positive feedback, and suspected that this might be the way forward. So my policy became: if there were few enough players for an all-play-all to be possible (i.e. twenty or fewer), then we would do that, and if there were twenty-one or more, then we'd stay traditional. In my eagerness, I even catered for the possibility of fewer than seventeen participants, at which point just an all-play-all would begin to look lightweight. And it's a good job I did: in 2005, only fifteen people wanted to play. We had an all-play-all, followed by a four-player final late on the second day, with the non-qualifiers joining in the Plate. Big thumbs-down from the panel: understandably, middle-of-the-road players (actually, most players) want to do well or get knocked out; they don't want to have to keep dragging through the games on some or all of the Sunday, unless they happen to be doing well. There are other problems with the two-days-compulsory (or worse, two-

days-possibly-compulsory) format: some people know they definitely don't want to play for two days, and so don't turn up at all on the first day (and it's particularly ironic when their very presence would obviate the format they're trying to avoid). Also, the people who come just for the Plate need company; this is particularly relevant now that we have the Singles in October – the Plate is especially recommended to CUTwC novices. Two such novices came along on the Sunday in 2003, to find us still ploughing through our all-play-all. They played several games against each other, and seemed to enjoy it, but haven't been seen since.

Conclusion: knocking people out at the end of Saturday is essential (and I don't mean by getting ten pints of Hobgoblin down them). We make it definite and clear that people may play for just the Saturday if they wish. The way to deal with the low-attendance problem is simple: we have fewer qualifiers. The twelve-player final has long since become unwieldy anyway (with the first round or two being played on the Saturday evening in recent years), and should be reduced to at most ten, or fewer if the number of entrants is sufficiently small. I've made a suggestion in the table below, but the borderlines could be shifted. I've given a suggested format for the final in each case, aiming at about nine or ten rounds; in fact, at the 2006 Singles this was felt excessive, and an eight-round format was used. Some of the formats below could be 'sexed up' by carrying over points scored against other qualifiers on the first day. In the table I assume that there are at least 7 players; if there aren't, think again about whether you really want to hold the tournament.

Entrants	Qualifiers	Final Format
17+	10	all-play-all
13–16	8	all-play-all, followed by top four play-off
10–12	6	all-play-all twice
7–8	4	all-play-all three times

That's my recommendation, based on experience. I hope that the publication of this article will mean that future tournament organisers use this as a reference point (so that they don't have to go over some of the arguments I've been over several times), even if they don't follow the advice herein.

Another thing I would like to recommend before I finish is a slight change to the way qualifying leagues are organised, to reduce the number of byes and/or make leagues take more equal amounts of time. Instead of the traditional all-play-all within each league, arrange it so that everyone from one league plays everyone from another (formats for this are available on Julian's web site). For example, if there are fourteen players in two leagues of seven, this format still takes seven rounds in total, but gives each player seven games and no byes rather than six games and a bye. I would have

introduced this sort of thing in recent years, but circumstances and numbers haven't been appropriate.

I wish Ben and all TOs after him (some of whom may be me) success with the job.



NATwA Singles

27th & 28th May 2006, Washington

Larry Kahn

This tournament had so many bizarre twists and turns I had to write it up in detail. First, the format. We expected a lot of Blair High School students, so Dave concocted a 'pod' format that allowed novices to play only a few games on Saturday morning. This was fine in theory, but in practice made things a bit weird when only fourteen people showed up. So the initial structure was four seeded (seedy?) pods of four; top two from each make it to the quarter-finals (this was an even year, so we were doing knockout).

The eight qualifiers were more or less as expected: Larry, Dave, Ferd, Bob, Rick, Max, Ben, and Joe. Jon had gotten somewhat screwed by being in a pod with Ferd and Rick (Dave decided to put one Lockwood per pod for whatever reason). The quarters were Larry/Ben, Dave/Max, Ferd/Rick, and Bob/Joe. However, since Ferd and Rick had already played each other, the F/R and B/J pairs 'petitioned' to simply play a round robin among themselves, top two go into the semis. Nobody objected to this, so the quarters progressed.

Ben played well against me in the first game and got 1 by making a fair number of squops, but I decided to blitz in the second game and got 7. Dave easily dispatched Max. In the round robin, Rick took a 5 off of Ferd which gave him a leg up on making the semis. However, the final round saw a point-shaving scandal worthy of the Mafia.

Rick quickly got a 7 off Joe, so Bob and Ferd knew that if Ferd got a 5 there would be a Ferd/Rick playoff for the 4th spot; a Ferd 6 meant a Bob/Rick playoff; and a Ferd 5½ meant both Ferd and Bob were in. It looked like a moot point for a while until Ferd came from behind and by Round 3 was positioned to get a 6 by doing a somewhat difficult piddle and then blowing up a different pile in Round 5. However, he failed on the piddle in Round 3, making it even more difficult. So in Round 4 he simply passed and blew up the pile in Round 5, giving him the dreaded 5½. As of this article the investigation is still ongoing.

In the semis, Ferd played very well against me in the first game, and by the final turn (mine with red) he was looking at a 6-1 win. It was mostly a small squop situation, and the tiddlies were 6,5,4,2 for green, yellow, blue, and red. I potted my

small free red from about 6 inches and had my other free big about 2½ feet from the cup. I could either try to pot (3–4 loss) or try a pile bomb and hope to get more than 1. Since there were a bunch of piles in one area near the cup I decided to aim for a green red/blue double (all smalls) and hope for the best. Well, I got close to the best. I hit the double I was aiming for, flipped it so that the blue now squopped the green, and freed the red. After looking for a few seconds we both realized that it was now a 5–5–5–5 tie. Then in the next game I got a 6 by playing very well, and in the last game Ferd found that playing lousy, getting bad luck, and having the opponent not miss a shot isn't the optimal situation.

Meanwhile, in the other semi, Dave got a 4 in the first game but Bob took 6 in the second. I wandered over midway through the third, where Dave was in the process of trying a pot-out (his only realistic chance for 6). It hadn't been a straight-out blitz; rather, it was a squopping game where Dave apparently had six free at one point and Bob didn't consider the possibility. I showed up right on time to watch Dave bounce a small wink out of the pot (from about 6 inches, two other winks in the pot). Amazingly, it was his second bounce out of the game. Eventually this turned into another squopping game but Dave played very well to still have a small chance in rounds. Bob responded equally well, though, and got 5 to win 14–7. Later, Dave told me that he had woken up early that morning, saw the clock said 7:14, and immediately thought that would be a terrible score to lose by.

The final was closer than the score indicates (7,6 to Larry). In the first game I carnovskied my very first big red but was able to make Bob come to me to prevent a red pot-out attempt. This turned into a regular squopping game with reds starting to get somewhat tied down. At one point I simply clicked a blue off of a yellow (this was a squop over in Bob's area) more to preserve a blue pot-out if things got desperate. Bob thought it was weird for me to do this, and I thought it was weird that he thought it was weird given what just happened in his last game against Dave. Anyway, Bob made a nice yellow shot to double the two mobile reds so I decided to go for the pot. I ran the somewhat close five blues and repositioned a faraway big to about a foot. Then missed that the next turn and Bob had two chances (from 3–4 inches) but didn't get it so I potted out and got the 7. With five minutes to go in the next game I was more than happy to play for a 3, which looked to be straightforward. Bob had to be aggressive to get more than 4, and this didn't work out and I was able to get 6. Dave took the one-game playoff for third.

Even though I don't care for knockouts, I did find there's one benefit. I didn't have to play Dave at all during the entire weekend. This is only the second time where Dave and I have been at a national singles and not played each other. I'm sure Andy remembers the first.

ETwA Singles – qualifying

21st October 2006, Cambridge

Lower Case League

Paul Moss

Fancy asking me to write up the first day of the Singles! As though I'd care enough to remember much, given that I never have more than a distant expectation of qualifying for the second day (though my time will come, just you wait).

Nevertheless, perhaps it *is* time I contributed again to this august organ, so I'll tell you all I recall about my division. That is to say, the little I remember about the games I played in.

I do recall that the day started well. I played well in a squopping game against Geoff Thorpe which could have gone either way. Geoff missed a fairly long pot at the end of rounds which would certainly have given him a better result, but I got my pots in rounds and secured the six points.

Both Larry and Dave potted out against me. I should have had a point against Dave, but missed a simple pot. I had hoped for another chance, but Dave potted his twelfth from a millimetre away from the pot, alerting the room to this achievement with his familiar shout of triumph. I delayed Larry briefly by chasing him around the mat for a short time, but never managed to get him under. At least I got a point this time, though.

Against Alan, I went for the pot-out; not because I was well-placed (I certainly wasn't), but on the grounds that one has to attempt a ridiculous pot-out at least once in a tournament; or, more truthfully, because, for me, a squopping game against Alan almost invariably means a 6–1 defeat. Which it did. Had I potted as I did partnering Dave in the Plate the following day, I might just have got away with it.

The first thing that happened in my game against Charles was that he helpfully reminded me of the precise pot-off shot with which he'd beaten me the last time we played. Then he set it up and potted it again. Once the game started, Charles offered, and I took, an early doubleton, which briefly gave me the upper hand. Sadly, a bring-in intended to defend it instead knocked me off one of the pair. I was always on the back foot after that, and the loss was almost inevitable. Apparently, though, I took two points, so well done me.

I did get eventually get my pot-out, this against Andrew in my last game of the qualifying section. It seems to me that most of our games end up being a race for the pot, regardless of whether or not the position justifies it, and I suspect that is how this game went. Andrew seemed content in having made sure he got one point rather than none.

I thought the new venue, the Selwyn Diamond, worked well, though the light

under the central atrium varied somewhat according to the weather. Certainly all the comments I heard were positive.

All this fun secured me a respectable fifth place in the league. Clearly, the only way is up!

	Player	Opponent							Total	Pos'n	ppg
		a	b	c	d	e	f	g			
a	Larry Kahn	—	6	5	6	6	6	6	35	1	5 ⁵ / ₆
b	Dave Lockwood	1	—	6	5	6	6	7	31	2	5 ¹ / ₆
c	Charles Relle	2	1	—	6	6	6	5	26	3	4 ¹ / ₃
d	Alan Dean	1	2	1	—	6	5	6	21	4	3 ¹ / ₂
e	Geoff Thorpe	1	1	1	1	—	5	1	10	6	1 ² / ₃
f	Andrew Garrard	1	1	1	2	2	—	1	8	7	1 ¹ / ₃
g	Paul Moss	1	0	2	1	6	6	—	16	5	2 ² / ₃

Upper Case League

Patrick Driscoll

Eyebrows might have been raised at the distribution of winkers into the competitive eight-man qualifying Upper Case League and the distinctly uncompetitive seven-man Lower Case League, had any but the eight who eventually reached the final entertained any ambitions in that direction. In practice, the redraw that followed Jon Mapley's realisation that the home of English Tiddlywinks has moved from Queens' to Selwyn was agreeable to nearly everyone, even after the hard-pressed but eager-to-please new Tournament Organiser had made allowances for the usual farce of Andrew Garrard's poor time-keeping.

After the organisational and logistical challenges that surrounded the staging of the ever-smaller ETwA National Singles in the excellent venue of the Selwyn Diamond, the winks themselves were somewhat anticlimactic. I have already noted that the Upper Case group was fairly strong and competitive, the weakest player (Ben Fairbairn) being good enough to humble even the mighty Andy Purvis in a 4–3 error-fest. Plenty of other group games ended with unexpected results, though I of course remember most clearly both of my successful pot-outs against stronger opponents and my surprising and untraditional 6*–1* loss to Stew Sage. It is many years since I last failed to beat Sage 7*–0* in a competitive singles match.

Almost before proceedings had palled too much, it was time for the final round. Patrick Barrie and Jon Mapley were heard to agree that 4¹/₂–2¹/₂ would see them both

safely through to the final, while Ed Wynn, Matty Rose, and even (tenuously) I had chances to finish in the top four of the group. I believe Matty, playing against Andy, actually had some doubts about whether he would qualify or not, but these were rapidly resolved as Ed and I clinically achieved the only score¹ that would see us both eliminated regardless of other results: I won 6*-1*. Ed and I were thus able to sit and watch in comfort as Andy, Jon, Patrick, and Matty battled their way into the final. The qualifying table for Upper Case ended thus:

	Player	Opponent								Total	Pos'n	ppg
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H			
A	Andy Purvis	—	3½	7	1	6	6	6	3	32½	1	4 ⁹ / ₁₄
B	Matthew Rose	3½	—	1	6	6	1	4	6	27½	4	3 ¹³ / ₁₄
C	Patrick Barrie	0	6	—	3	4	5	4 ² / ₃	6	28 ² / ₃	3	4 ² / ₂₁
D	Jon Mapley	6	1	4	—	2	6	6	6	31	2	4 ³ / ₇
E	Ed Wynn	1	1	3	5	—	1	6	6	23	5	3 ² / ₇
F	Patrick Driscoll	1	6	2	1	6	—	1	6	23	5	3 ² / ₇
G	Stew Sage	1	3	2 ¹ / ₃	1	1	6	—	6	20 ¹ / ₃	7	2 ¹⁹ / ₂₁
H	Ben Fairbairn	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	—	10	8	1 ³ / ₇



ETwA Singles – Plate

22nd October 2006, Cambridge

Editor's note: there are actually two write-ups of the Plate below. The reasons for this are not worth going into here, but you might as well have both of them.

Andrew Garrard's account

Sunday dawned very wet, justifying my decision to have brought my CUTwC umbrella to the tournament, and being less sympathetic to my decision to leave it in Stew's room overnight. I arrived in time to see a friendly game between people who, from lack of recognition, I deduced must be the latest batch of CUTwC novices. Whilst Stew prepared himself for the day, Ben, Paul and I tried to find a fair pairing against the novices. Ben took Kim and Andy in hand, while I settled into a singles match against Paul and Mia.

Sportingly trying to make a proper game of it, I concentrated on working a convincing strategy that would lead me to a 7*-0* in rounds. Alas, six hours of kip with

¹Actually, 5½-1½ would have worked as well, but our way was quicker.

an hour's drive either side didn't provide me with a full recovery from my previous editing exploits, nor from a truly entertaining evening of Trappist Squop-Bristol in the Castle (from which I hope Matty, doing sterling Smith duty for most of the evening, recovers), and I demonstrated instead the importance of getting simple shots. Paul very nearly took the lead with the final shot of the match, but fortunately for me missed a fairly easy pot off a pile; I was slightly lucky to scrape the 5-2.

Switching to partnering Mia, I carelessly assumed that Paul would use a similar strategy to the one I had previously failed to execute. Since Paul and I never agree on strategy, I should have known better, and he proceeded to attempt a double blitz, with lunchtime looming. I would have demonstrated how foolhardy this was were it not for two distant subs and some other incompetence. 7*-0*, and I'm not sure that Mia enjoyed it much. Oh well.

To lunch, where I bought some narg juice for the novices (too early to tell whether this is a concern), and demonstrated to Mia that I was too tired even to explain the rules of drinking games successfully. She claimed that drinking games made a good spectator sport, and resolutely refused to join in. Rupert, meanwhile, was refusing to eat until 'food' was available. Between Pigs, desperate incompetence at Nurdle-Boondock(-Penhaligon), almost equal incompetence at Squop-Bristol Tales of the Unexpected, and an educational session of Famous Winker Conjectures, lunchtime dragged on a bit, with Ben declaring the restart to be 1:40, 3, and 3:30 at various points. The finalists clearly found us too dull, and left earlier. It remained somewhat unclear why Paul was so keen to get to the pub, given that he had to switch to narg juice part way through.

Returning, still rain-sodden, we found Sick Boy, Sarah Quinn et al. approaching rounds in their third game 'after lunch'. This would have disqualified those of us who'd been in the pub by the 'must play all but two rounds' rule, so a quick game with a gentleman's agreement to double-pot was started between those of us still in the running from the morning. Alan partnered me against Paul and Mia, and potted out fairly promptly. Paul had been trying to engineer a safe win and, in spite of previous discussions about the need to finish the game at the same time as the one in force, was alternating between trying to pot and dithering about what to do. I demonstrated that the lunchtime's caffeination had failed to lift my competence, and barely scraped third (after a very impressive pot from Mia). Sick Boy later indicated that, had he contrived to disqualify those of us still in the pub in absentio, he would himself have skipped a game to ensure that nobody at all was qualified to win.

Some more games happened that afternoon, but honestly I have very little recollection of them (apart from anything else, I was trying to exercise my new lens in producing some photos of the final for this Winking World). I have more of a

recollection of Ben carefully re-doing the point transfers, that we'd previously done correctly, incorrectly, and refusing to listen to my attempts to indicate that he'd got the first round wrong until after he'd finished propagating the results through. He seemed under the careless misapprehension that anyone minded, and I hope he's since grown out of that – it's traditional for the Plate to be hopelessly confusing (and I can exclusively report that it's not just the lunchtimes that make it so).

After waiting for the result of the final (apparently Andy had pressured Larry into missing a vital pot; given how I played for the whole weekend I can sympathise), some people retired to Stew's room, which involved a slalom course between the displaced (presumably) boaties who would have been using the Diamond to exercise in, had we not been in it. I strongly suspect that beer happened, but at that stage I took my leave, and was regaled during the traffic jams on the way home by Andy's tales of how he'd not found a rhythm and that nobody had been playing at their best. Given my eight-place drop in the rankings over the weekend (possibly a record for someone with a Rating Reliability Factor of 100?) I could only agree, and hope to be seeded a three at the NIHPper.

Ben Fairbairn's account

Another Singles, another Plate, and this year was as pot-out-filled, crazy-shot-engrossed and frantic-arithmetic-endowed as ever. As official tournament organiser (as opposed to the Tournament Organiser, who failed to properly organise the Singles itself) my arrival that morning was met by an entire three novices already engrossed in a warm-up game before the plate had even begun. 'Fantastic!' I optimistically thought.

The first round was barren of pot-outs and the round before lunch, surprise surprise, saw nothing but pot-outs. Who cares?

Lunchtime in the Red Bull began with DBW introducing us to his completely beer-proof semi-translucent bilingual Disney cards that were promptly deemed by all to be totally unusable after barely a couple of rounds of SEPTIC Hold 'Em. We continued with Stew's cards (whose jokers we eventually lost.) At the two o'clock restart time we turned to Pigs (iiiiinnnnn spaaaaaace. . .). At this point DBW produced his German-speaking pigs and promptly became Schweinmeister. You wouldn't know it, but it was actually Mr Beckett who was visiting from foreign parts. At the three o'clock restart, the lunchtime reached a new high by introducing the novices to Conjectures with Ed's Famous Winkers Cards. Or at least we eventually did after Mr Beckett's attempt to soak the entire table and everyone's cutlery in beer and fake beef.

We returned for a three-thirty restart. Little did we know that the confusion was only just beginning. Upon our return to the Diamond we found that that two further rounds had been played in our absence and that new scores/handicaps had not

been computed. Within a couple more rounds, there were games that had not been recorded, games that had to be disqualified due to last-minute changeovers and rants about handicapping former national singles champions zero. (I will never forget the look on Andy Purvis's face when posed with the question 'Do you wish to be inserted [into the plate competition]?'.) If the tournament were anything more serious, I'd have resigned. Thankfully the absence of the plate itself made presentations to the winner impossible, so urgency was not required.

Two days, some clarification emails and many recalculations later and it turns out that we have finally found a way to engineer Sick Boy losing. Paul Moss was officially the winner. A true and *accurate* scoresheet of the uncorrected game results appears below.

Editor's note: It seems that the organisation of the Plate was more haphazard even than the above reports suggest, despite (or perhaps because of) the fact that this was the first time in several years that the Tournament Organiser has actually played in the Plate. The scores below were sent to me by Patrick 'after removal of a game in which people swapped sides half-way through, correcting a scoreline of 6-2, and swapping a score so that a complete beginner playing singles did not win'.

Round 1			
Andy Blackburn & Ben Fairbairn	6	1	Kim Ferrett
Mia Balashova & Paul Moss	2	5	Andrew Garrard
Round 2			
Kim Ferrett & Ben Fairbairn	1	6	Andy Blackburn & Stew Sage
Mia Balashova & Andrew Garrard	0	7	Paul Moss
Round 3			
Patrick Driscoll	6	1	Sarah Quinn
Round 4			
Patrick Driscoll & Bob Wilkinson	6	1	Sarah Quinn
Round 5			
Sarah Quinn & Bob Wilkinson	1	6	Keith Seaman & Patrick Driscoll
Andrew Garrard & Alan Dean	6	1	Paul Moss & Mia Balashova
Round 6			
Patrick Driscoll & Keith Seaman	2	5	Paul Moss & Dave Lockwood
Ben Fairbairn & Andrew Garrard	1	6	Stew Sage

Patrick Barrie's analysis of the scores

Given that at the time no-one seemed to know who had won, I've now analysed Plate scores. I had to invent starting handicaps for Keith Seaman, Alan Dean and Dave Lockwood.

If there hadn't been any handicaps at all, the top two would be:

1. Patrick Driscoll – 20 from 4 games
2. Paul Moss – 15 from 4 games.

If handicaps hadn't changed at all, then the top two would be:

1. Patrick Driscoll – $16\frac{1}{2}$
2. Paul Moss – $15\frac{1}{2}$.

If handicaps had changed by the normal Plate method ($\frac{1}{2}$ -point change to participants if game score was 5–2 or greater), then the top two would be:

1. Patrick Driscoll – $16\frac{1}{4}$
2. Paul Moss – $15\frac{3}{8}$.

If handicaps changed by Ben's scheme ($\frac{1}{4}$ -point change to participants depending on whether they won or lost after transfer), then the top two become:

1. Paul Moss – $16\frac{1}{16}$
2. Patrick Driscoll – $15\frac{13}{16}$.

Given that the last scheme was described as being in force to participants, I think this means that Mr Moss won the Plate. He did so by virtue of using two narrow defeats to keep his handicap down and had two big wins. Poor Mr Driscoll's wins in the first three rounds (two of which were narrow) only meant his handicap had grown to the extent that he had to give away sufficient points in the final game to lose the tournament.

(My gut feeling is that the adjustable handicap scheme normally used in the plate is probably better.)

Anyway, congratulations to Ben on coming up with probably the only scheme that prevented Patrick from winning the title.



ETwA Singles – Final

22nd October 2006, Cambridge

I don't have a write-up of this yet (but I'm confident that there will be one in WW87). Here are the scores and a photo, to tide you over. Probably if you read any of the write-ups from the last three years, you won't be far off the mark.

	Player	Opponent								Play-off	Total	Pos'n
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H			
A	Larry Kahn	—	4	7	5	5	2	4	6	3	36	2
B	Dave Lockwood	3	—	1	1	2	5	3	6		21	5
C	Andy Purvis	0	6	—	6	5½	4½	5½	6	4	37½	1
D	Jon Mapley	2	6	1	—	6	2	1	0		18	7
E	Charles Relle	2	5	1½	1	—	1	3	1½		15	8
F	Patrick Barrie	5	2	2½	5	6	—	4½	5		30	3
G	Matthew Rose	3	4	1½	6	4	2½	—	6		27	4
H	Alan Dean	1	1	1	7	5½	2	1	—		18½	6



Andrew Garrard

World Pairs 31

28th April 2006, Cambridge

Patrick Barrie

Patrick Barrie & Andy Purvis	3	3	6	6	6	7	31
Dave Lockwood & Jon Lockwood	4	4	1	1	1	0	11

The American Pairs champions admitted they didn't expect to win the World Pairs title, but hoped to be competitive and get some points. They certainly achieved this.

The first two games were very similar. Patrick and Andy brought in on top of each other, and as a result had more winks than they would like in piles. Their attempts to split the piles in a controlled fashion to give themselves lots of winks in the right areas didn't work as expected. By rounds, Dave had few active winks but Jon still had some uninvolved winks. Excellent potting by Jon meant that he managed to sneak first place in both games.

In Game 3, Andy got a doubleton of reds (Jon) with support. Patrick then played a good yellow squop to get a doubleton of blues (Dave) that were about to attack. While the squop was tenuous, it survived repeated knock-off attempts and the game became a safe 6-1 to Patrick and Andy.

In Game 4, Patrick and Andy went two doubletons down early on, but soon managed to rescue them. Dave became short of winks and Jon was forced to play an awkward pile shot to free some of Dave's green winks. The shot partially worked, but stacked three greens on top of each other at the end of the pile. Patrick playing blue got an excellent squop on to this which soon led to a solid 6-1 win.

Game 5: I don't recall anything about this game, other than that it was short in duration.

Game 6: Needing only a single point for victory, Patrick and Andy brought in well to threaten the old double-pot strategy. One of Patrick winks was then squopped, but all Andy's soon became potted winks.



CUTwC Long Vac Invitation Tournament

29th & 30th July 2006, Cambridge

Ben Fairbairn

One pound. That's all it took for the then Junior Treasurer of CUTwC, Nick Inglis, to declare that the room hire charge for playing winks in the Castle pub was too expensive and that meetings should be moved in Queens' College premises. That

	Player	Partner												Total	Pos'n	
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	self				
A	Stew	—	1	6	6	6	4	0	6	2	4	2	1½	—	38½	6
B	Ben	1	—	6	1	6	0	1	1½	1	5	1	1	—	24½	9
C	Rupert	6	6	—	1	—	0	5	6	1	5½	1	6	5½	43	4
D	DBW	6	1	1	—	3	1	1	1	1	6	1	2½	—	24½	9
E	Nick	6	6	—	3	—	5½	3	2	2	6	2	3	6	44½	2
F	Ed	4	0	0	1	5½	—	6	2	7	6	6	6	—	43½	3
G	Tim	0	1	5	1	3	6	—	7	1	7	5	1	—	37	7
H	Sick Boy	6	1½	6	1	2	2	7	—	1½	5	5	4	—	41	5
I	Andrew	2	1	1	1	2	7	1	1½	—	5	6	4½	—	32	8
J	Patrichristine	4	5	5½	6	6	6	7	5	5	—	1	6	—	56½	1

was in 1979. Now, nearly three decades later, winks finally moves on. The moving of the present Senior Treasurer of CUTwC, Dr Stewart Sage, from Queens' College to Selwyn College brings this chapter in the story of modern winks to a close.

To mark this historic occasion the 'Stew Sage memorial Long Vac Invitation Tournament' was held on the weekend of July 29th–30th.

Some token winks was played, which I'm sure is neatly summarised in the table above. As we all know, the real spirit of Long Vac tournaments is the lunchtimes. On Saturday, the great barbecue rant was spurred on with our arrival at the Red Bull and the news that the only food being served that day was from a barbecue. Twelve pints of vinegar and Anne Austin's half-abandoned £5 sausage later and operations were riskily moved to the recently reopened Hat and Feathers. After great admiration of their well-kept IPA and rants on the expensive nature of their food, play eventually resumed at the early hour of 5:30pm. An un-notable evening in the Sad Pad took place.

The following day, after DBW's unfortunate disagreement with a brick wall and some more winks, a lunchtime in the Eagle ensued. The state of the food was elegantly summarised by Rupert's aborted order of 'Fish and chips without the fish'.

The evening croquet session neatly rounded off an historic weekend of winking, drinking and general merriment.

Many valuable lessons were learned from the weekend's events, including:

- electric keyboards become more difficult to play when unplugged from the wall;
- Americans can't act;



Andrew Garrard

Dr Sage, still showing them how it's done, as 'winks bids farewell to Queens'.

- English is a wonderful language, especially when 'Andrew is going to be coming';
- eleven Magna cost £13.20 (I only have the one mathematics degree, I'm afraid).

May the next twenty-five years of winks be as glorious as the last twenty-five.



Letter to the Editor

Dear Sir,

I understand that most Winks events involve a certain amount of alcohol consumption by many of the participants, so it is not unreasonable that the accounts in Winking World include some references to this. However, I don't understand by what criteria Ed Wynn's 'Circle Line 2006' article in WW85 was deemed suitable for inclusion: it contains no reference to winks at all. Am I alone in not being the slightest bit interested in reading about the drunken ramblings of a group of people who are or were at one time players of the noble sport? Perhaps you should consider the introduction of a sister title, 'Drinking World', so you can then purge WW of this irrelevant rubbish.

Alan Dean

Dear Alan,

Without having consulted my predecessor, my best guess is that he included the article because he was loath to exclude anything; all recent editors of WW will know that material is hard to come by. I'm certain that the article wasn't included at the expense of anything else. WW is written by its readers who supply articles for no reward, and until there are significantly more readers as forthcoming with contributions as you and a few others, editors will be grateful for any articles, even if they are of narrow interest. One might reasonably ask why articles unrelated to winks should be of interest to any readers of WW, and the answer is that they are written by winkers. Although I find tiddlywinks a highly enjoyable game, I would not bother playing it unless I found the other people who play it to be interesting, intelligent and amusing. So it's reasonable to suppose that I will enjoy a decent proportion of the articles these people write. Of course, one can't please all the people all of the time (I personally don't remember reading a journal of any kind in which I found every article interesting), and I understand that you might not be interested in an article about a pub crawl. But while such articles remain merely uninteresting, rather than offensive or otherwise deleterious, I suspect they will remain – it's not difficult for uncaptivated readers to skip over them. In any case, relevance to tiddlywinks is not a criterion which has been applied in the past for inclusion of articles: off the top of my head, I can recall the appearance in WW of book and theatre reviews, recipes, crosswords and other puzzles, several 'where are they now?' updates, an explanation of the origin of railway gauges and a palindromic sentence containing the word 'squidger'. I think it is generally felt that these articles, far from being 'padding', bring a bit of variety to WW; the article you cite at least has the merit of being about winkers.

If you want to start a discussion about the wider and thornier issue of the rôle of alcohol in tiddlywinks, then I invite readers to respond. But if you're just interested in the content of WW, then there is one simple way you can exert great influence; I'll vote for you.

Best wishes,

Matt.



Twentieth anniversary Yogi's Whist evening

19th May 2006, Cambridge

Matt Fayers

Here's an article purely concerning drinking games; if that's not your cup of tea, then please move along – nothing to see here. But as a change from the usual cut-out-and-keep guides to rules and strategy for drinking games (many of which are now detailed at www.cutwc.net in any case), here's a drinking games report.

One day in 1986, Nick Inglis changed CUTwC for ever, by inventing the drinking game Yogi's Whist. This was based on David Parlett's non-drinking game Ninety-nine, and ever since has remained a favourite drinking game of winkers. The next issue of Winking World will contain a retrospective from Stew Sage of the invention of the game and its place in CUTwC over the last twenty years. In the meantime, here's what happened on the twentieth anniversary itself, when a celebratory session of Yogi's was held in Queens' bar.

Stew had alerted us to the anniversary (which helpfully fell on a Friday) in advance, and had advertised it to CUTwC members with the only questionably enticing 'Dr Fayers will be in attendance'. In fact, Dr Fayers didn't make the trip to Cambridge just for the event – he had arranged to play cricket in Cambridge the next day. In the event it rained heavily, and so as it turned out he was there just for the Yogi's anniversary.

The hard core of players gathered fairly early in the newish conservatory-style part of Queens' bar, armed with Ed's excellent *colonne*, used for titrating exact fines during a closed Relle. The colonne was filled with beer (not to the brim, of course; seasoned users will know that with an opaque colonne light is an issue, and space needs to be left for dangling a torch inside – how we look forward to the unveiling of Colonne Mk II) and the game commenced. Ostensibly in order to help keep track of the fines to be dispensed, but in reality to prove that he is the best player, Dr Fayers kept a careful note of all the fines incurred.

We were joined after a few hands by Harper Phatter, emerging earlier than usual from the lab, and later still by Hugh (whose surname remains unknown to this correspondent). Hugh's lack of experience quickly led to a revoke, making him the only player to put up anything like a serious challenge to DBW for Worst Player award. At a quarter to nine, Dr Fayers announced 'It's a quarter to nine, sir' in the manner of the obsequious and slightly pervy butler from the old Yellow Pages advert in which the cricket umpire buys a new Panama; this was not just Dr Fayers's usual strange behaviour, but marked the exact moment of the anniversary. An anthem was sung, and the third decade of Yogi's Whist began. Dr Fayers and Sick Boy remained close in the contest for incurring fewest fines, Sick Boy having made two successful revelations in Rounds 4 and 6, but Fayers responded with two more of his own in Rounds 11 and 14, and Sick Boy's failed revelation in Round 16 drew any realistic contest to a close. Rupert and Matt Harper retired hurt towards the end, but DBW stuck it out to take his total fines over eight pints. A fun time was had by all, and a subsequent curry was much enjoyed.

The table overleaf records the fines incurred during the evening, which are in pencils. Those familiar with the fining system in Yogi's (which of course we all are,

Player	Round																				extra	total	rnds	avg.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20				
Matt Fayers	0	0	0	11	4	4	7	0	8	10	0	0	3	0	11	0	4	0	10	4	0	76	20	$3\frac{4}{5}$
Patrick Driscoll	4	4	7	0	4	0	0	0	8	4	12	5	0	4	11	13	0	3	4	0	0	83	20	$4\frac{3}{20}$
Alan Harper	—	—	—	—	4	4	0	14	4	—	4	0	11	11	0	5	4	3	0	4	0	68	15	$4\frac{8}{15}$
Stew Sage	10	11	0	4	0	4	7	6	0	4	4	5	3	11	4	0	4	3	10	4	0	94	20	$4\frac{7}{10}$
Matt Harper	4	11	0	4	4	4	0	0	8	0	4	0	0	11	11	5	12	—	—	—	2	80	17	$4\frac{12}{17}$
Rupert Thompson	10	4	0	4	12	12	0	0	4	10	4	0	3	4	4	5	—	—	—	—	0	76	16	$4\frac{3}{4}$
Dave Beckett	4	11	0	4	12	4	0	0	8	4	4	9	3	4	4	5	4	0	10	10	2	102	20	$5\frac{1}{10}$
Sarah Knight	10	4	0	4	4	4	0	6	8	10	12	5	3	4	4	0	12	3	4	10	1	108	20	$5\frac{2}{5}$
Hugh ???	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	12	5	3	4	4	0	4	3	4	4	16	69	11	$6\frac{3}{11}$
David Bradley–W.	4	4	15	11	4	12	7	6	8	4	4	5	3	11	—	5	4	11	4	10	0	132	19	$6\frac{18}{19}$

having read about it in an earlier issue of this journal) will be able to reconstruct what happened in terms of premium bids from the individual fines incurred in each round. The ‘extra’ column records bonus fines incurred for mis-titration and a revoke.)



Myxomatosis

Ed Wynn

(A reflection on the lack of bunnies in the Singles, with apologies to Philip Larkin)

Caught in the middle of a dull 3:4
 While hot inexplicable hours go by.
 What round is this? Who’s got the bloody draw?
 We want to ask.
 Ben makes a sharp reply
 Then combs the mats. I really can’t explain
 What made me think I’d re-participate.
 It’s possible that I will play again,
 But please don’t hold your breath during the wait.



World (keenness) ratings

The algorithm/Matt Fayers

It's conventional to include the latest World Ratings in Winking World. However, it occurs to this editor that any eejit can look up the ratings on the electric interweb. So for originality's sake, I've re-ranked the players, here according to the number of games they've played in the past year. It's only fair – Patrick has worked hard on the ratings for a long time, and it's nice to see him back at the top of the table.

	Player	Rating	RRF	Past year games	Past year ppg		Player	Rating	RRF	Past year games	Past year ppg
1	Patrick Barrie	2299	100	91	4.16	26	Ferd	2065	97	22	3.55
2	Dave Lockwood	2295	100	86	4.21	27	Phil Freeman	1531	60	22	2.80
3	Alan Dean	2157	100	85	4.16	28	Collin Reed	1595	76	21	3.29
4	Charles Relle	2140	100	77	3.90	29	Sarah Knight	1492	52	19	2.29
5	Larry Kahn	2446	100	76	4.65	30	Geoff Thorpe	1966	100	18	3.14
6	Andrew Garrard	1895	100	64	3.40	31	Alan Harper	1936	99	18	4.25
7	Matt Fayers	2352	98	64	4.56	32	Ben Lockwood	1538	74	18	2.56
8	Andy Purvis	2480	100	63	4.60	33	Greg Durrett	1662	92	15	3.43
9	Stew Sage	1924	100	62	2.88	34	Stephanie Chu	1658	77	15	3.93
10	David Bradley-W.	1617	94	58	2.68	35	Josh Katz	1537	66	15	2.87
11	Paul Moss	1907	100	55	2.97	36	Severin Drix	2047	97	14	3.82
12	Patrick Driscoll	1978	100	54	3.70	37	Jon Mapley	2123	96	14	3.50
13	Matthew Rose	2311	100	48	4.09	38	Geoff Myers	2369	91	14	3.57
14	Jon Lockwood	1605	94	47	3.19	39	James Cullingham	1895	89	14	2.96
15	Richard Ackland	1511	77	46	2.48	40	Ian Gameson	1958	79	14	3.82
16	Ben Fairbairn	1606	99	37	2.62	41	Jonathan Gameson	1471	61	14	2.43
17	Max Lockwood	1633	100	32	3.59	42	Andrew Gameson	1338	49	14	1.43
18	Joe Davis	1611	91	28	2.98	43	Joe Sarnelle	1508	73	13	3.12
19	Chris Abram	1920	96	27	3.50	44	MP Rouse	1686	86	12	4.13
20	Tim Hunt	2051	97	26	3.79	45	Serita Rana	1693	52	11	3.36
21	Dave Beckett	1693	80	26	3.14	46	Tim Schiller	1877	77	10	3.95
22	Bob Henninge	2198	100	25	3.90	47	Nicola Golding	1531	53	10	3.50
23	Kurt Hendrix	1637	85	24	3.23	48	Laura Clarke	1412	53	10	2.70
24	Rick Tucker	2016	93	23	4.04	49	Chris Hook	1445	45	10	3.10
25	Rupert Thompson	1796	89	23	3.13	50	Charlie Oakley	1799	91	8	2.81

	Player	Rating	RRF	Past year games	Past year ppg		Player	Rating	RRF	Past year games	Past year ppg
51	Bill Gammerdinger	1567	52	8	2.63	86	Jennifer Kraft	1355	18	3	1.00
52	Toby Wood	1504	44	8	3.38	87	Jessica Weaver	1408	15	3	2.17
53	Heather Golding	1356	25	8	1.25	88	Vanya Temnykh	1720	87	2	2.00
54	Ed Wynn	2008	89	7	3.29	89	Patrick McQuighan	1608	67	2	4.50
55	Charles Frankston	2017	73	7	3.93	90	Sunshine	1871	50	2	3.00
56	Mary Travers	1400	33	7	2.14	91	Keith Seaman	1705	50	2	4.00
57	Nick Inglis	2168	92	6	6.08	92	Mihir Narain	1387	49	2	0.75
58	Yan Wang	1877	89	6	3.00	93	Kristen Tauer	1391	36	2	2.50
59	Cyril Edwards	1664	74	6	2.58	94	Bob Wilkinson	1463	21	2	3.50
60	Arye Gittelman	2012	70	6	2.58	95	Samuel Hoffstaetler	1336	21	2	0.50
61	Mac McAvoy	1929	62	6	4.25	96	Carl Chenkin	1474	19	2	3.00
62	Aaron	1848	62	6	4.25	97	Chris Beyers	1472	18	2	3.50
63	Scott Zuccarino	1585	54	6	4.50	98	Kim Ferrett	1395	18	2	1.00
64	Miriam Nussbaum	1584	43	6	2.92	99	Bernice Tighe	1478	14	2	3.00
65	Liz Ackland	1363	38	6	1.58	100	Steve Krasner	1358	14	2	1.00
66	Beth Davis	1456	33	6	2.83	101	Andy Blackburn	1522	13	2	6.00
67	Rich Davis	1621	40	5	3.30	102	Kevin Ruano	1475	13	2	4.00
68	Gred Gross	1618	37	5	4.00	103	Jason Portillo	1420	10	2	3.00
69	Liz Batty	1524	79	4	2.00	104	Christine Barrie	1799	69	1	1.00
70	Jordan Fein	1540	43	4	2.50	105	Deja Lockwood	1381	18	1	2.00
71	Matt Sola	1567	40	4	2.50	106	Francesca Kerby	1397	14	1	1.00
72	Shaagnik Mukherji	1464	39	4	1.88	107	Carolyn Hoffman	1414	9	1	5.50
73	Henry Scher	1428	36	4	1.63	108	Caitlin Allen	1404	4	1	6.00
74	Andy Leed	1465	32	4	3.38	109	Shana Bricklin	1387	4	1	2.50
75	Nik Bamford	1461	32	4	3.38	110	Moises Umanzor	1408	3	1	6.00
76	Rachel Gittelman	1451	32	4	3.50	111	Juli Gittelman	1355	3	1	1.00
77	Dave Barbano	1552	30	4	3.25	112	Bonnie Allen	1375	2	1	1.00
78	Lucinda O'Donovan	1376	20	4	1.38	113	Richard Hussong	1375	2	1	1.00
79	Diego Ardila	1418	18	4	1.88	114	Sam Chenkin	1373	2	1	4.00
80	Liz Ford	1372	17	4	1.00	115	Luis Umanzor	1390	1	1	4.00
81	Bill Renke	1847	45	3	4.33	116	Andrew Hyder	1386	1	1	3.00
82	Sarah Quinn	1440	42	3	1.00	117	Alex Hyder	1386	1	1	3.00
83	Alejandro Newell	1360	39	3	0.33	118	Linda Gameson	1380	1	1	5.00
84	Mia Balashova	1366	26	3	1.00	119	Eddie Hyder	1372	1	1	1.00
85	Fred Shapiro	1408	19	3	1.83						

The ETwA Council

Chairman
Patrick Barrie

Secretary and Time Lord
Andy Purvis

Treasurer
Stewart Sage

Publicity Officer
Charles Relle

Tournament Organiser
Ben Fairbairn

Winking World Editor
Matthew Fayers

