

THE WINKING WORLD

The Official Journal of the English Tiddlywinks Association

AUGUST 1970

PRICE 6d/2¹/₂p

NUMBER 17

SIXTH INTERNATIONAL TIDDLYWINKS CONGRESS

18th and 19th April 1970 at Manchester University

Summary of Activities

Delegates convened at 2.30 pm. on Saturday afternoon in the Lesser Debating Hall of the University of Manchester Union for the first Congress meeting. This was a joint meeting of National Associations and a report appears elsewhere in this Winking World. The important outcome was a new and constituted International Federation.

During the afternoon a very welcome tea was provided, and following the meeting delegates, with the exception of those from Cambridge University (who, it is rumoured, retired to a secluded training camp high in the Pennines), adjourned to Owens Park, a mile and a half away, for an evening meal. After dinner delegates returned to the mats in the Union and the semifinals of the Silver Wink and an International match were played. In the semifinals Southampton beat Hull comfortably, and Cambridge beat Aberystwyth in a tremendously exciting match by a much smaller margin. England beat Ireland 67¹/₂ - 44¹/₂ with Jon Mapley and Charles Relle scoring 21 for England. Overnight accommodation was provided at Owens Park.

Sunday morning saw Cambridge defeated by Southampton in the Silver Wink final to end their recent domination of this competition. Following some difficulty over playing surfaces Wales played Ireland and after the three rounds before lunch the score was 42 - 42. Wales clearly made the most of lunch at Owens and completed the match in the afternoon with a fourth round of 18¹/₂ points to 9¹/₂ in their favour. There were high scores on both sides, from Axford and Nettle for Wales and from Doris Nicholson and Stephan (can he really be Irish?) Jefferis for the opposition. During the afternoon ETWA held a Congress meeting to conduct routine business and later Wales challenged England for the Bombay Bowl but conceded victory after three rounds 58²/₃ - 25¹/₃, all the England pairs scoring equally heavily. Reports of some of these activities appear elsewhere.

Needless to say, squidgers not involved in formal matches were rarely idle and Congress must be judged a great success both on the mats and in administration.

International Congress Open Meeting

The meeting convened at 2.45 pm. on Saturday 18th April 1970 in the University of Manchester Union. At the top table were Mr. Stuart Clark, President of ETWA, Mr. Charles Relle, Secretary of ETWA, Mr. Martin O'Shea, Secretary of IrTWA and Mr. Nigel Shepherd, Secretary General of IFTWA. Apologies were received from Mr. Geoff Wilsher, Mr. Steve Drain and Mr. Tony Herbert. The minutes of the previous Congress were read from WWL3. Mr. Clark then introduced Congress '70 and stressed the need for Congress to determine the administrative structure for the future. Voting at Congress would be one man one vote.

It was then proposed by Mr. Nigel Shepherd and seconded by Mr. Clark and Mr. Jeremy Shepherd

1. "That Congress accept the resignation of N.C. Shepherd as Secretary General of IFTWA".
2. "That Congress confirm the dissolution of IFTWA as it now stands".
3. "That to allow Congress full freedom of choice, the existing constitutions of ETWA, WTWA, ScotWA and IrTWA be considered to have lapsed as from now and that these previously existing constitutions be fully reinstated at the end of this Congress unless these constitutions have been superceded by resolutions at Congress in which case these resolutions shall become effective and binding at the end of this Congress".

All three motions were passed nem. con.

It was then proposed "that the sport which is the particular concern of this Congress, heretofore called Tiddlywinks, shall in future be named Winks, at all times both in written matter and in verbal communication".

Points made for the motion were that it would rationalise the existing situation, avoid the 'nursery' connotation and improve the general attitude towards the game, as well as preventing retailers from cashing in by using the name. Points against were that Congress should be proud of and uphold the tradition of the game, that the change was unnecessary and would make no difference to attitude, and that Marchant Games did not favour retail of their Tiddlywinks and were therefore largely immune from 'noddy' winks. The motion was proposed by Mr. Jeremy Shepherd and seconded by Mr. John Whyte and was defeated 27 against, 7 for, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. Martin O'Shea then introduced the question of a new International Federation by referring to Page 1 of WW15. As a result of further thought and discussion arising from WW15 a new draft proposal had been made to provide a framework for international Tiddlywinks. If it was accepted, amendments to existing National constitutions might be necessary but they would be small. A brief review of the new draft constitution was held. Mr. Relle said it was up to Congress to decide whether it wanted an International Federation, and Mr. Nigel Shepherd said the proposal must be considered in the light of the principle of mutual cooperation which must be upheld regardless of the existence of a Federation. Mr. Clark was of the opinion that a constituted federation was unnecessary and that we could continue virtually as we were with an unofficial liaison officer similar to the old Secretary General of IFTWA.

After a short discussion Congress adjourned for tea.

Congress reconvened at 4.15 pm. with the addition of Mr. Bryn Lewis representing Wales at the top table. After a brief recap of earlier discussions the Irish Tiddlywinks Association proposed that Congress set up a new International Federation of Tiddlywinks Associations. Congress consented 27 for and 11 against. The Constitution for the new Federation was determined by a discussion of the draft proposal made by Ireland. The result is published below. A summary of the discussion of certain points in the draft Constitution is as follows:

- Clause 3c) The word 'international' was inserted by Mr. Nigel Shepherd and Mr. Relle, nem. con.
- Clause 3e) The original requirement for an IFTWA journal was removed by Mr. Wells and Mr. Clark, nem. con., to allow publicity by any means available and to reduce cost.
- Clause 5) A two-thirds majority of Council was replaced by a unanimous vote of representatives, 18 for, 14 against. Two weeks notice was increased to 2 months by Miss Diane Jacks and Mr. Relle, nem. con., to provide time for a mandate to be obtained.
- Clause 6) Mr. Relle and Mr. Alan Cook suggested that the Secretary General should be eligible for reelection, nem. con.
- Clause 10) "By proportional representation" was deleted by Mr. Geoff Cornell and Mr. Wells nem. con. since no-one understood what it meant.
- Clause 13) The original clause concerning Council's appointment of individuals was deleted and an entirely new clause inserted later.
- Clause 15) Support by any two Council members was changed to a simple majority by Mr. Cook and Mr. Jon Mapley, nem. con.
- Clause 17) This clause was extensively reworded by Mr. Nigel Shepherd and Mr. Clark and passed nem. con.
- Clause 16) This was reworded for clarification and then passed nem. con.

All the remaining clauses of the draft proposal were accepted nem. con.

Constitution of IFTWA

- (Name) 1. The Federation shall be known as the International Federation of Tiddlywinks Associations.
- (Membership) 2. The Federation shall be composed of National Tiddlywinks Associations.
- (Aims) 3. The aims of the Federation shall be:
 - a) to promote interest in the playing of tiddlywinks.
 - b) to sponsor and govern international competition.
 - c) to coordinate the international activities of the member associations.
 - d) to organise an annual convention.
 - e) to publicise its activities.

- (Government) 4. The affairs and activities of the Federation shall be conducted by a Council consisting of:
- a) a Secretary General.
 - b) one representative from each National Association in membership of the Federation.
- (Amendments) 5. Any article of this Constitution shall be repealed or amended on a unanimous vote in favour by the representatives of the National Associations in membership provided that each representative shall have received at least two months notice of such amendments.
- (Secretary General) 6. The Secretary General shall serve for a term of one year and shall be eligible for reelection.
- (Duties) 7. The Secretary General shall ensure that all members of the council are informed of all matters affecting the Federation, and shall be responsible for the implementation of all decisions made by the Council.
- (Candidates) 8. Any person wishing to be considered for the post of Secretary General shall present his or her name to the Secretary General at least six weeks before the commencement of the year in which he wishes to take office.
- (Notification) 9. The Secretary General shall send a list of candidates to each member of the Council within the two weeks following the closing date for nominations.
- (Election) 10. The members of Council except the Secretary General shall elect the Secretary General on a system of the single transferable vote.
- (Votes) 11. The votes shall be received by the Secretary General at least two weeks before his or her retirement from office.
- (Council) 12. The representative on the Council for each member Association shall be determined by the Association.
- (Voting) 13. Decisions taken by Council, except where otherwise stated in this constitution, shall be by simple majority of all the members of Council.
- (Fees) 14. The Council shall decide the annual fee for membership of the Federation.
- (Member Associations) 15. Any National Association applying for membership of the Federation shall be elected by simple majority of the Council.
- (Expulsion) 16. No member of the Federation shall be expelled without the consent of all members of Council except for the representative of the member in question.
- (Rules and Records) 17. The Council shall be responsible for implementing any amendments to the International Rules of Tiddlywinks proposed by member Associations of the Federation providing that Council obtains the unanimous agreement of all the member Associations, and shall also be responsible for the ratification of records.

--o00o--

IFTWA ELECTION

Nigel Shepherd writes:

At present the newly constituted International Federation is without a Council or a Secretary General. As retiring Secretary General of the old IFTWA, I must therefore call an election for the new Secretary General and ask for names and addresses of appointed National representatives to the Council. To allow time over the summer recess for the necessary processes to be completed I propose that the date of the start of the new term of office be 1st. October 1970. Any person wishing to be considered for the post of Secretary General should send their name and address to me,

Nigel Shepherd,
18 Meadow Bank,
Timperley,
Altrincham,
Cheshire.

at least 6 weeks before 1st. October. National Associations should send their names and addresses to me as soon as possible.

--oo000oo--

THE SILVER WINK FINAL 1970

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY v SOUTHAMPTON UNIVERSITY

It was literally true that this year's Prince Philip Trophy final was played behind locked doors - not because ardent anti-tiddlywink demonstrators had the Manchester venue under siege, but because of the strange opening hours of the Union.

After much practice on both sides, the game eventually got under way at 10.00. Both teams had been sleeping rough in the backwoods of Manchester and this at first told on Southampton as Cambridge, surprisingly fresh after the rigours of their previous evening's semifinal against Aberystwyth, moved into the lead at the end of the first round, albeit by a mere two points.

At this the Southampton pairs gritted their teeth and oiled their squidgers, so much so that they won all four matches comfortably to take the second round $21\frac{1}{6}$ to $6\frac{5}{6}$. This gave them a $12\frac{1}{3}$ point lead at the half-way stage, a lead which they never let slip.

The last two rounds were both taken by Southampton, but only by a point in each case. The final round began with the Southampton team wanting only $7\frac{1}{2}$ points to clinch their first-ever PPT win, but soon their no. 2 pair had lost 6-1 and Cambridge were fighting.

However, steady play by the other pairs again gave Southampton the round and the Trophy had found new owners, by the impressive margin of $63\frac{1}{6}$ points to $48\frac{5}{6}$. The features of the winners' play were the strength in depth of their four pairs - each scored between $16\frac{2}{3}$ and 14 - and the ability to pot under pressure, a most important attribute in these days of double-squop.

While giving Cambridge the utmost credit for their hold on the Trophy over the last four years, it is good to see a new name added to the list of winners; this can only be for the good of the game.

STUART CLARK

Referee.

*We wuz robbed.....but seriously folks, many congratulations to Southampton who have proved themselves worthy holders of the Silver Wink. Meanwhile, they can take their thieving eyes off the Marchant Trophy.....- Editor.

---ooOOoo---

I have not received the scorecards for the PPSW semifinals and final, but hope to include these in the next Winking World, for posterity's sake, if for no-one else's.

---xoXOXox---

WINKS SALES UP

Recent figures show that the number of winks sets sold shows a healthy rise on corresponding sales figures last year. In the year ending 31st. July 1969, the total was 487 sets. So far this year (since 1st. Aug. 1969) 570 sets have been sold, 220 of them to the USA !

---xoXOXox---

MARCHANT GAMES

Alan Dean reports that Marchant Games is being sold to another company, who wish to retain the same name. His information came from Mr. Rudd of Marchant Games, who does not want to pass on the ETWA section, and therefore intends incorporating it in another of his companies, Ilkeston Toys Ltd., of the same address (Loughton, Essex). For the time being, any correspondence relating to winks will reach Mr. Rudd via Marchant Games. All of which is slightly irritating, especially in view of the recent (and continuing) Tiddlywinks/Winks controversy, as a switch from Games to Toys would suggest a swing towards the iniquitous Noddy and his nursery companions.

---oXXxo---

The following article, contributed by Guy Consterdine, highlights the fact that the choice of whether or not to change the name of the game is a crucial one in relation to the future development and expansion of winking.

INTO THE FUTURE

by Guy Consterdine
Honorary Vice-President, ETWA

The modern game of tiddlywinks has enjoyed a remarkable growth since it was first taken seriously in the winter of 1954-55. The foundations laid down in the difficult formative years up to about 1960 have been proved sound, and the period of consolidation in the 1960s has been encouraging. It has been clear for some time that the game has a long-term future. But there must be a conscious effort to shape the future, and it must be a future in which it is widely accepted outside the ranks of the players as an adult game.

More Working Players

One of the main problems at the moment is that only a tiny fraction of those playing the game at school, college or university are still playing the game at all within a few years of finishing their formal education. All school/college/university games and sports lose a high proportion of players once they begin working, but the dropout for winks is probably unusually high. This has serious implications for the future because if it continues winks will remain a game where about 95% of the active players have not finished their full-time education; it cannot be regarded as a fully adult game if it cannot retain more than a handful of active players beyond the age of about 25. What can be done?

Change The Name

An essential step if the game is to become accepted outside the circle of players as a serious adult game is a change in the name - most logically to 'winks'. The name 'tiddlywinks' is irrecoverably associated with the nursery game, and everyone (including the manufacturers) will rightly continue calling the nursery game 'tiddlywinks' since that has always been its name. Any other game which has the same name will inevitably have to bear associations of childishness.

The arguments against changing the name of the adult game amount to saying that the game has always been called 'tiddlywinks' so we should "preserve the ancient name", and that "our game is inseparable from its origins" (WW15, back page). But the name 'tiddlywinks' as applied to the adult game is neither ancient nor original. The game is only about 16 years old, and it adopted the name from the nursery pastime. When Bill Steen and his friends, at the end of 1954, alighted upon tiddlywinks as a sport to take up, they did so because it was a joke game. They wanted an eccentric joke game which could be the source of amusing stunts. When a little later they developed the original Marchant Games rules into today's game of skill they neglected to change the name because they were still interested in it as a source of stunts. As the emphasis progressively shifted from stunts to serious and skilful playing the link with the original nursery tiddlywinks became merely historical (apart from the fact that similar equipment was used). Although the two games are now quite distinct, a distinction in name is also necessary before the difference is generally appreciated outside the players' world. We must accept that, for all practical purposes, it is impossible for our modern game to be widely accepted as adult while it bears the name of a nursery pastime. The very reason why 'tiddlywinks' was a good name for Bill Steen's purposes is now a compelling reason why it is highly unsuitable today.

It is a pity that the Manchester Congress in April rejected a proposal to change the name, but it remains necessary for a future Congress to do the job.

No Gimmicks

Winks is not a spectators' game to the same extent as most sports; it will not normally attract large crowds of the general public to watch. This is partly because only a small proportion are aware of the rules and are therefore able to follow what is happening, and partly because it is not a spectacular game in the same sense as soccer, athletics and so on.

This should not however lead to the use of unnecessary gimmicks (e.g. squidding a wink as far as possible in one shot) to get people along to matches or to create publicity. This drags the game back to the nursery. ETWA has been absolutely correct to consistently refuse to recognise such feats as official records, remarkable as they may be. (Naturally one is not in a position to recommend that these feats should not be entered into in any circumstances, but they shouldn't be given the same name as the adult game; calling these activities 'tiddlywinks' will be all right once the adult game is officially 'winks').

True tests of skill are legitimate, and can also be spectacular, as the recognised ETWA Record events are, and it is this kind of spectacular sideshow which should be promoted. All publicity should show the game in an adult light.

Extend Competitive Winking

The time is ripe for extending the range of organised competitive winking.

We already have, of course, the fundamental "grass roots" levels of competition - friendly individual games and occasional leagues or knockout competitions within clubs, and friendly inter-club matches. The next level, organised regional leagues, has been growing healthily, starting with the London League in the early 1960s and now spread to several parts of the British Isles.

But in the sphere of national competition there are gaps. At present there is an individual club challenge trophy for English clubs (the Marchant Trophy), an annual knockout university tournament (the Silver Wink), and annual junior pairs championships (Northern and Southern, culminating in the English Junior Championship - though only the Northern materialises each year without fail). Although this list is not completely comprehensive, there is still a need for a wider range of national club competitions providing regular competitive matches for all participants (none of the competitions mentioned above provide regular matches except for a handful of successful university teams), and championships for individual players and pairs which may be entered by 'seniors' as well as 'juniors'. Examples of competitions which would help fill the bill are:

(1) County Championships. The occasional county match has already been played - indeed, there is a Fremlins Trophy for the annual Kent v Surrey match - but a properly organised county league run (presumably) by ETWA would be of great value, especially to players who have begun their careers and may do little other winking, particularly against good opposition. Happily, since the Congress in April ETWA has begun to take the initiative. (See Alan Dean's article - Ed.)

(2) Open Individuals' Championships, in which players from anywhere assemble annually and compete. As well as a championship for pairs, there should be a singles championship - identical to conventional doubles except that a single player plays two colours; this is a true test of individual ability because each player has to rely entirely on his own skill in physically controlling the winks and at the same time is solely responsible for his own strategy and tactics - he has no partner to confer with. Again, ETWA or a higher body must take the initiative in setting up such a championship.

International winks is fortunately as well catered for as the present development of the game permits.

An important advantage of increasing the number of competitions is that one can more easily see who the leading clubs and individuals are at each point in time - a significant element in building up the traditions of the game. For example, any player who managed to win the Open singles championship three years in a row would certainly rank among the legendary all-time greats.

—oo000oo—

THE COUNTY TIDDLYWINKS CHAMPIONSHIP TROPHY

by Alan Dean
Secretary, ETWA

As you may know, it was decided at Congress that I should write to Michael Crick in the USA to ask for his permission to spend his donation of £10 on a trophy for County tiddlywinks. I wrote to Michael some time ago, and he replied that he thought that this was a good way to spend the money. He generously donated a third five pounds, so we are able to buy an even better trophy. By the time you read this, the treasurer should have purchased a trophy, which will be engraved "THE COUNTY TIDDLYWINKS CHAMPIONSHIP TROPHY. Presented by Michael Crick."

The basic problem now confronting us is to decide how to administer the trophy. The three obvious possibilities which spring to mind are to hold either an annual league competition, an annual knockout competition, or to make the County Trophy a challenge trophy. My own view is that a league of more than about six teams would involve players in more time and expense than they were prepared to give, and we certainly hope for and expect more than this number of counties to take part in future years, and even in the first competition in 1971. A challenge trophy, I feel, would take us to the other extreme, with not enough matches being played. Also, the situation would probably develop where only the strongest counties considered it worth challenging the holders. A knockout competition appears to be the best way to give everyone a comfortable number of matches each year. The only drawback that I can see at present is that half the teams will get only one match, but there is no reason why counties who want to play more matches cannot arrange friendlies, and they will have lists of other county captains' addresses to help them. The comments and suggestions of readers, and

particularly those of players likely to take part, would be most welcome.

I already have the addresses of the captains of Essex, Kent, Hampshire, Lancashire and Surrey, and I assume these five counties are all interested. Any other county which wishes to join in the fun should appoint (or lumber) a captain, who should write to me before the end of November, say, in order to give me time to finalise the rules in the light of future suggestions, get these duplicated together with address lists, and distributed so that everything will be ready for a prompt start in the New Year.

Once it has been decided what form the competition will take, most of the rules we require will be pretty obvious, and even I should be able to write them out fairly easily. However, there are two points which are worthy of discussion. The first is to decide who should be eligible to play for a given county. Jon Mapley suggests that a person should only be allowed to play for their county of birth or of normal residence. This is a reasonable suggestion because we are trying to cater, in particular, for the player who has left university, but I think that some counties would have difficulty in raising a team without using some students. The other point concerns the number of players in a team. I think most people would prefer eight in a team, but perhaps more teams would take part if we just said that eight was the recommended number but a team unable to raise eight for a particular match could insist on only six, although such a rule could be used unfairly by a team which lacked strength in depth. Comments are invited on these points also.

---oo000oo---

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Sir,

May I, through the columns of your excellent journal, enter this plea on behalf of tiddlywinks administration.

The recent Congress at Manchester again emphasised that, whilst the interest in playing the game is still as strong as it ever has been - and encouragingly so - there is nonetheless, with a few exceptions, a marked lack of enthusiasm on the administration front. It is not difficult to understand this, as to take an active interest is time-consuming, time that those still engaged in University careers can ill afford.

Consequently I direct my remarks primarily to those about to leave their Colleges who have derived enjoyment from the game and who feel they would like to put something back into it.

Now that we have voted ourselves a properly constituted IFTWA, the burden is accentuated and the calls upon individuals' time made greater. So I urge all your readers to help, where possible, actively or failing that, passively, by supporting the present Committee and, to be blunt, by paying their subscriptions when due.

On this latter subject I personally do not feel that one pound is too much for clubs to pay each year for the services that are provided; these include "Winking World", liaison between clubs and other national associations, and, perhaps most important, the provision of a firm basis for future expansion.

In closing I would like to wish the recently elected ETWA committee a successful term of office and thank them for their enthusiasm; may they enjoy the same support that I enjoyed during my seven years as a member of the committee.

Yours faithfully,
Stuart Clark.

Treasurer of ETWA 1963-7
Committee member 1967-8
Chairman 1968-70

---oo000oo---

A FUTURE FOR TIDDLYWINKS? - SOME IRISH REFLECTIONS

by Martin O'Shea
Secretary, IrTWA

Although only a small organisation, currently confined entirely within the boundaries of Northern Ireland, the Irish Tiddlywinks Association has been experiencing the same problems and mysteries as its larger counterpart across the water. Clubs appear, rise to the highest levels in barely a couple of seasons, and then just as suddenly disappear completely. Winkers reach peaks of perfection that earn them international honours, and then inexplicably quit the game without even a twinge of remorse. Does this happen in other games too, or is there something drastically wrong with the whole structure of our game?

Enquiries seem to suggest that up to a certain point both questions could be answered with a "yes".

Any sporting coach will tell you how hard it often is to keep even a winning team together, while many a leading winker will openly admit that his number one love is another, totally different, game. In recent years, tennis, rugby league and cricket (to name but three of many), have undergone major changes in organisation and form in order to create wider appeal and greater enjoyment for players and spectators alike. Surely it is time for Tiddlywinks to give itself a thorough shaking too, to cast off all its old and inhibiting rules, and to open its doors to a successful future.

Readers of WWs 15 and 16 will already be aware of some of the ideas at present being mooted and experimented with. The trials with Single Winks in serious competitions have had mixed successes in Northern Ireland, but it does seem that a solution to many of our problems lies in this field. Below is an extract from the rules of the 1970 N.I. Knockout Competition:

"Teams shall consist of four players, who shall be numbered from 1 to 4. Team sheets must be made out in advance, and exchanged between opposing captains upon the arrival of the teams.

The first round of the match shall consist of two doubles games, with the first and second players on one table, and the third and fourth players on another. In round two, there shall be four singles games, arranged as follows;

1 v 3; 2 v 4; 3 v 1; 4 v 2.

The winning team shall be the one which scores the most points, regardless of the number of games won. Singles games are to be played according to the International Rules but players are advised to pay careful attention to the colour order, and are recommended to leave spare squidgers of the appropriate colours in each corner during the game".

Two amendments to the above rules have been suggested since the playing of several matches. Firstly, three rounds should be played, with Round Two being another doubles round (1st. pairs v 2nd. pairs), and secondly, in the singles games players should face their opposite numbers if only one singles round is to be played (cf. Badminton).

Frequently it is the most obvious idea which is the most elusive. It was during a monthly Council meeting of IrTWA earlier this year, that Ray Cashell of Queen's University suddenly dared to query the sacrosanct figure of 7, in use in our scoring system ever since the modern game began. Since we award three "points" for potted winks, and one "point" for playable winks elsewhere, why not simply adopt this scoring system instead?

Practical tests have proved this to be one of the brightest ideas so far put forward. Scores can vary over a much greater range, and no longer does every game carry the same number of points (we all know how lifeless and boring some 'closed' games can be). The total points scored in a game can range from one to sixty-three. The "race for the pot" following a pot-out (often highly embarrassing to the novice) now ceases to exist, and the game finishes, and scores are counted immediately, should a player pot out before the time limit. The transferring of points after pot-outs becomes another rule of the past. But more important than all this, it now becomes possible for the pair with the leading scorer to be the losing one, thus placing far greater emphasis than ever before upon teamwork and cooperation within each pair. The rewards are rich for pairs able both to attack and defend steadfastly.

It would be unheard of for a professional golfer to borrow a set of clubs each time he wanted to put in some practice, or for a leading soccer star to use a cindered back yard for all his serious training. Yet none of us flinch when we learn that most tiddlywinks players don't even possess their own set, let alone their own mat. A new approach to the whole game is needed, and we would like to offer our suggestions above as a starting point. Experiment now and draft out your proposals for next year's Congress; 1971 could see a genuine rebirth of Tiddlywinks.

---ooo000ooo---

WW18 is expected to be available from purveyors of high-class periodicals sometime in January. It is further hoped that the January referred to will be that of 1971. All contributions (articles, letters, match reports, tactical talks or anything else) should therefore be sent to me,

Phil Tepper, 30 Edenfield Road, Prestwich, Manchester M25 8EE
sometime before Christmas 1970.

Please note that my house number is 30, not 39 as some readers may have seen in an ETWA circular sent out a few months ago by Alan Dean, who shall be nameless.

WW18 will include details of arrangements for Congress '71, and also lists of clubs, members, secretaries, etc.

STOP PRESS

It is confidently expected that Congress '71 will be held at the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST) on the weekend of April 3rd and 4th, 1971. Full details to be announced in WW18.

ETWA ties designed by Steve Drain are now available from Alan Dean, price 18/- (the ties, that is). They have as their main feature a St. George's Pot, and are easily adjustable to all human and most animal neck sizes. (Buy one for your dog!) Alan's home address is 9 Firs Avenue, Failsworth, Manchester M35 0AN, and his address during term is 11 Khartoum Road, Highfield, Southampton, SO2 1NY.

Indications are that Scottish Tiddlywinks is having difficulties at both a playing and organisational level. All correspondence should be addressed to The Secretary, The Tiddlywinks Club, The Students Union, The University, Dundee.

It should be noted that the closing date for nominations for the Secretary Generalship of IFTWA, given on page 3 as "6 weeks before the 1st. October" need not be taken too literally. Nigel Shepherd's lenience will in fact extend up to 5 weeks before Oct. 1. Which is one way of saying that a few more days will be allowed for nominations to reach Nigel, in order to take account of any delays in the distribution of this WW.

Martin O'Shea's article on page 7 contains a deliberate (?) mistake in the phrase 'one to sixty-three' which appears about half-way down. After laborious computation, Martin has assured me that this should actually read 'zero to sixty-six'. If you spotted this, score 5 points. If not, the Editor will be pleased to supply brief details of the calculation, on receipt of a S.A.E.

—ooo00000ooo—

PRINCE PHILIP SILVER WINK 1969-70 RESULTS

<u>PRELIM</u>	<u>ROUND 1</u>	<u>ROUND 2</u>	<u>GROUP WINNERS</u>
<u>GROUP 1</u>			
YORK MANCHESTER I S T	YORK (W.O.) Q C BELFAST	YORK 77-35	HULL 76-36
	DUNDEE HULL	HULL 81-31	
<u>GROUP 2</u>			
ABERYSTWYTH NOTTINGHAM	MANCHESTER U WARWICK	MANCHESTER 75-37	ABERYSTWYTH 67-45
	ABERYSTWYTH BANGOR	ABERYSTWYTH 66-46	
<u>GROUP 3</u>			
OXFORD IMP. COLL. LONDON	OXFORD (W.O.) SOUTHAMPTON	SOUTHAMPTON 71 ¹ / ₆ -40 ⁵ / ₆	SOUTHAMPTON 60 ¹ / ₆ - 51 ⁵ / ₆
BATH BRISTOL	BRISTOL 94 ¹ / ₂ -17 ¹ / ₂ UNIV. COLL. LONDON	BRISTOL 79 ¹ / ₂ -32 ¹ / ₂	
<u>GROUP 4</u>			
WESTF. COLL. LONDON ESSEX	ESSEX 82-30 UNIV. COLL. LONDON	ESSEX 81 ¹ / ₂ -31 ¹ / ₂	CAMBRIDGE 66-46
	KENT CAMBRIDGE	CAMBRIDGE (W.O.)	
<u>SEMI-FINALS</u>	<u>FINAL</u>		
HULL SOUTHAMPTON	SOUTHAMPTON 64 ¹ / ₆ - 19 ⁵ / ₆		SOUTHAMPTON 63 ¹ / ₆ - 48 ⁵ / ₆
CAMBRIDGE ABERYSTWYTH	CAMBRIDGE 57-55		

INTERNATIONAL MATCHES PLAYED AT CONGRESS '70

ENGLAND	67½	IRELAND	44½
N.G.SHEPHERD (Adonis)	17½	D.NICHOLSON (Oxford)	15½
R.GREENWOOD (Altrincham)		S.JEPPERIS (King's London)	
G.ALLEN (Oxford)	14½	R.CASHELL (Q.U.B)	4½
C.EDWARDS (Oxford)		J.McNAUGHTON (Q.U.B)	
M.NASH (Essex)	14½	D.BOYD (St.Mary's)	13
B.ROWLETS (Essex)		J.WHYTE (N.U.Uster)	
J.MAPLEY (Old Bancroftians)	21	I.PATTERSON (Lurgan)	11½
M.A.C.RELLE (Adonis)		M.O'SHEA (Lurgan)	

WALES	60½	IRELAND	51½
C.REAY (Aberystwyth)	11	D.NICHOLSON	20
D.BINDING (")		S.JEPPERIS	
S.LEWIS (")	12	R.CASHELL	7
N.HALL (")		J.McNAUGHTON	
S.AXFORD (")	20½	D.BOYD	14
D.NETTLE (")		J.WHYTE	
B.LEWIS (")	17	I.PATTERSON	10½
D.SHELTON (")		M.O'SHEA	

ENGLAND	58 ² / ₃	WALES	25 ¹ / ₃
J.D.SHEPHERD (Cambridge)	13 ² / ₃	C.REAY	5
P.I.TEPPER (Cambridge)		D.BINDING	
D.C.CARRINGTON (Cambridge)	15	S.LEWIS	5
J.MAPLEY (Old Bancroftians)		N.HALL	
R.WELSEY (Altrincham)	15	S.AXFORD	8 ¹ / ₃
C.BLEARS (Altrincham)		D.NETTLE	
A.DEAN (Southampton)	15	B.LEWIS	7
G.CORNELL (Southampton)		D.SHELTON	

—ooo00000000ooo—