

THE WINKING WORLD

The Official Journal of the English Tiddlywinks Association

MAY 1973

PRICE 5p

NUMBER 22

EDITORIAL

As you know, there is some doubt about the origins of the game of Tiddlywinks. My recent researches have proved, however, that TW (or winks as they called it in those days) was actively played in Elizabethan England. We don't know whether Good Queen Bess herself enjoyed a tiddle but the immortal Bard (Uncle Will) certainly did. He recalls:

When most I wink, then do mine eyes best see,
For all the day they view things unrespected;

etc. Sonnet 43

This is not to say that the game will go on for ever. It died out once to be revived in 1954 and judging by some of the articles in this issue, Winks is again facing something of a crisis. Most of us are aware of the declining numbers playing the game but if we are not careful, our efforts to pull the game together may pull it apart if we all pull in different directions.

It all depends on why you play the game. Some regard it as their only serious competitive outlet, some as light relief after more serious competition some purely for a laugh (why most of us started), and others as a means of being sociable and seeing the country.

So what is to be done? We could carry on as now and watch the number of clubs shrink to perhaps 5. No, we must do something. Some want to change, or simplify or clarify the rules but this alone is not enough. Others wish to advertise the game as being more serious than its present image - an alternative to chess, bridge and snooker. Others would advocate a less serious attitude to encourage more people to try the game and some take delight in performing crazy stunts in the hope of attracting publicity. But perhaps the best and most radical alternative is that presented in a well argued article below. Think about it.

As ever, I shall sit on the fence, and this issue contains plenty for you no matter what view you hold.

The first in an occasional series of in-depth analyses by leading authorities connected with our noble game: THE STATE OF WINKS TODAY

by Roger Kirby.

In recent months, enlightened members of our fraternity have become aware that all is not quite what it used to be. People are losing interest in the game, so that clubs fold up as members leave, and no new ones are formed to take their place - as statistics elsewhere in this magazine demonstrate. This trend must of course be stopped, and even reversed, in the immediate future if the continuation of winks is to be assured.

So what is going wrong? Firstly, let us consider the disappearance of existing clubs. There are now only a handful of thriving clubs, and the obvious explanation is a lack of new members, coupled with the drifting away of disillusioned winkers and the retirement of graduating members (if it is a college club, as most are). Where are the clubs failing? It would be interesting to hear from individual committees what lengths (if any) they go to to get new members. I would suggest that once a club reaches a certain size - enough players to provide a reasonable team of 8 whenever required - a clique forms and no further recruitment is attempted. The members concentrate on improving their game and the club flourishes for a year or two until, if it is a college or university club, a large proportion of the members leave. Unless the organisation within the club is sufficiently strong, the few remaining members give up and the club dies. The answer is steady recruitment every year and to achieve this, existing players need to become slightly less obsessed with self-improvement

and the status quo within their club, and to actively encourage new players with advice, tuition and general inclusion in all activities, and not just tolerate their intrusion into the existing circle of friends, when they will soon feel they are not wanted. New players would obviously not be suitable for inclusion in important matches immediately, and so second team games should be arranged where possible, both to involve the players and to give them match-practice. This of course is impossible while most clubs are so short of members.

And then, why are individual people becoming disillusioned with the game? This inhibits the essential formation of new clubs, since it normally takes a reasonably experienced winker to start a club. There is a hard core of experienced winkers who have become obsessed with the game to the extent that they are ignoring the traditional spirit embodying sociability as well as the competitiveness on which they now almost exclusively dwell. Doubtless some of them socialise within the narrow confines of their own club to some extent, but when it comes to matches their sole aim seems to be winning. Little consideration is shown to the other, usually weaker, team, who are just trodden on. No wonder so few clubs exist if this kind of reception welcomes them to the winking scene.

Unfortunately, there is another recent development which has had adverse effects on the game - namely the formation of 'super-club'. I refer particularly to Quesh of which I am a member. This club was formed in the autumn of 1970 by a group of players who had graduated from Southampton University the previous summer. The original dual intentions of keeping the players in contact after leaving university, and giving them an active interest in winks, was of course valid. More graduates and others who have left the university for other reasons have joined since, and only 2 or 3 of the original team now play for the team regularly. Quesh, being the holders of the Marchant Trophy and ineligible to enter the Silver Wink are possibly the top club in the country - whatever that means! The club would seem to have outlived its purpose. Most of the team are now good friends and would meet anyway, and could even more if special events like pairs tournaments were organised more often - with advance publicity in Winking World of course!

I have heard that another similar club has formed, namely the Old Bancroftians - as an inevitable rival to Quesh, formed by established players who are naturally anxious to end Quesh's dominance. The cause of winks would be far better served if clubs like these disbanded immediately, and the players put their efforts into forming new clubs in their home towns. The only new club I've heard of recently is that formed by Mick Still (who?) of Quesh, at Hull University, but I fear they may be becoming Disillusioned already.

Quesh could of course play occasional matches against the present Southampton team, but otherwise its members efforts should be placed elsewhere. There is naturally a nucleus of Southampton graduates in London who could maintain a team, and perhaps this year's graduates from the university will also want to form a team, but these should be new clubs with new names, since they would not be related to the original team and its spirit.

It could well be asked what I've made myself in the last year or two. I have the potential of interested friends to form a team in Liverpool, where I am now living, but at present I hesitate to introduce them to the current winks scene - except hopefully for a match against Hull this summer.

In short, fresh faces should be encouraged, and new teams formed by the staid old timers instead of concentrating exclusively on their own virtuosity. It's not up to Congress or the committee to bring about a change. It isn't even in their power. Each individual and club should decide now whether their real concern is the furtherance of winks or just the furtherance of their own existence in the game. If something is not done soon it will probably be too late and no-one will be left playing the game.

In writing the above article I should like to acknowledge the incalculable assistance of both Sir Arthur Guinness and Sons (Dublin) and the Scottish and Newcastle Breweries for their inspiration, Roget's Thesaurus for all words of more than two syllables, and numerous friends in college for their valuable comments and proof reading

RK.

ENGLISH TIDDLYWINKS ASSOCIATION: THE 1973 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.

Held at St. Anselm Hall, Victoria Park, Manchester on 24th March. The meeting was opened at 8 pm. 43 people were present, including 22 who had voting rights. Nigel Knowles was in the chair.

1. Minutes.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

2. Matters Arising.

- (i) Pamela Knowles asked if nominations could be made by anyone, but it was agreed that only those with voting rights should be allowed to make nominations.
- (ii) It was proposed by Cyril Edwards and seconded by Idwal Jones, that the numbers of votes received by candidates in elections should not be disclosed. The motion was carried by 9 votes to 8 with 5 abstentions.
- (iii) Alan Cook asked if Stefan Jefferis had been approached with regard to the possibility of holding the next ETWA congress at his castle. Jon Mapley said that this had been done, but the castle was not suitable for reasons of accommodation and the provision of suitable tables.

3. Chairman's Report.

The chairman, as organiser of the National Pairs Championship, commented on the decision to make this competition a knock-out, on the same lines as the National Singles Championship. The entry, 16 pairs, was not very satisfying. He explained that the all-play-all tournament in Manchester in the summer would be retained, and renamed the Manchester Open.

Nigel went on to the problems of organising the Congress with the withdrawals of Wales and Ireland, the latter at ridiculously short notice. The hopes to raise a Scotland team also failed to materialise.

4. Secretary's Report.

Alan spoke of the competitions which he had organised during the year. The Silver Wink Competition for 1971-2, which had not been completed, was eventually settled in favour of Southampton, who beat Manchester in the final. In the present competition, of the eleven entries, four (Belfast, Univ. of London Union, Westfield College and Aberystwyth) had defaulted. On the brighter side, it was encouraging to see new teams emerging from Hull and York.

The London League was again running (perhaps crawling is a better word) once again. From last year, Royal Holloway College had dropped out (and had disappeared) and St. Gabriel's College had joined. Hardly any results had been received, with the exception of those involving Soton or Quesh (but not both).

The secretary explained that the Marchant Trophy had at last ceased its wanderings, as it was now in the hands of its rightful owners, Quesh, who took it from Southampton and have successfully defended it against Cambridge, Southampton again and Oxford.

5. Treasurer's Report.

The treasurer first commented on ETWA's financial position, which was quite healthy, with £16 in the bank after all debts had been paid. He expressed his thanks on ETWA's behalf to all those clubs and individuals who had paid their subscriptions which enable us to continue our work.

Going on to the Singles Championship, Jon said that 38 entries had been received, of which 18 were from Southampton or Quesh. The competition, which had reached the semi-final stage, was proving to be a very interesting one.

The annual Fremlin Trophy match, between Surrey and Kent, had been won this year by Kent.

6. Winking World Editor's Report.

The editor began with an appeal for contributions for WW (he now rather wishes he hadn't - Ed). Mick said that sets of back numbers of WW were now available at a price of 50p which would go into ETWA's funds. He proposed a vote of thanks to Jon's secretary for the work she had done in producing these, and this was carried unanimously.

7. Matters Arising.

- (i) It was pointed out that the Hull and York clubs were revivals not new.
- (ii) Alistair Duncan explained the difficulty he had encountered in attempting to raise a Scottish team. He added that Jack Drever of Dundee, was now taking charge of winking affairs in Scotland.

8. Elections.

(i) Chairman

Nigel Knowles, the present chairman, was proposed by Jon Mapley and seconded by Mrs. Pamela Knowles. Before anyone comments on the validity of the seconder being the candidates wife, we must point out that at least 5 other people tried to second Nigel but Pam's voice was the loudest.

Alistair Duncan was proposed by Dave Ackland and seconded by Andy Davidson, but Alistair decided to stand down.

Nigel was thus elected unopposed to remain as chairman.

(ii) Secretary

The nominations were:

Alan Dean (p Nigel Knowles, s Bungy Wells)

Hugh Goyder (p Mick Still, s Julius Mach)

Pam Knowles (p Cyril Edwards, s Alan Cook)

Hugh and Pam stood down so Alan was elected unopposed to continue in office for the fourth year.

(iii) Treasurer

Jon Mapley was proposed by Bungy Wells and seconded by Alan Cook. Mick Still was proposed by Phil Tepper but stood down so quickly that we never found out whether or not anyone was going to second him. There being no other nominations, Jon was re-elected, unopposed, to the office of Treasurer for yet another year.

(iv) "Winking World" Editor.

Mick Still was proposed by Jon Mapley and seconded by Alan Dean. There being no opposition worthy of standing against this dynamic personality (it says here - Ed), he was elected Unopposed.

(v) Council Members

Two Council Members were to be elected, and the nominations were as follows:

Dennis Opposs (p Alistair Duncan, s Jeremy Shepherd)

Mick Mooney (p Hugh Goyder, s Pam Knowles)

Cyril Edwards (p Alan Dean, s Idwal Jones)

Jeremy Shepherd (p Andy Davidson, s Dave Ackland)

Phil Tepper (p Alan Cook, s Bungy Wells)

John Mesher (p Cyril Edwards, s Harvey Orrock)

Bungy Wells (p Phil Tepper, s Alan Cook)

Hilary Swerdlow (p Pam Knowles, s Hugh Goyder)

Each voting member was given two votes, including the candidates, and the Council members elected were Alistair Duncan and Phil Tepper (not necessarily in that order).

Editor's note: According to the secretary's draft minutes, Alistair was not proposed, nor even seconded; so either Alan is keeping things from us or Alistair has a surprise in store for him.

Summary of Elections.

	The ETWA Council is:
Chairman	Nigel Knowles, 31, Maple Close, Canada Street, Heaviley, Stockport, Cheshire.
Secretary	Alan Dean, 11, Khartoum Road, Southampton, SO2 1NY.
Treasurer	Jon Mapley, 7, Hornbeams, Vigo Village, Meopham, Kent.
WW Editor	Mick Still, 8, Church Road, Hanwell, London W7 1DH.
Ordinary members	Alistair Duncan Phil Tepper

9. Other Business.

(i) The Silver Wink Competition

There had been some confusion about which clubs, and which individuals, were legally permitted to take part in the Prince Philip Silver Wink Competition. Martin O'Shea quoted Winking World 1, which stated that the PPSW was open to "all winking universities". The suggestion that only persons with a valid University Union Card may compete was thrown out when it was discovered that Alan Dean still has one, despite leaving two years ago.

Alan Cook proposed that anyone should be eligible who is following a full time course of study at the relevant Institute of Higher Education. Alan Dean seconded this. Bungy Wells expressed the view that the PPSW should be one competition which is open only to universities. Nevertheless, the motion was carried by 18 votes to 2.

On the suggestion of the chairman, a subcommittee was formed to deal with any problems which may arise in connection with this new rule, or the running of the competition in general. The members of the subcommittee are Phil Tepper, Alistair Duncan and Alan Dean.

(ii) The County Championship

The question of eligibility to play for a county team was raised. Bungy Wells proposed and Jon Mapley seconded that "A person may play for any county in which he (a) was born, (b) is resident or (c) has been resident for ten years continuously, at any time in the past. Being at college or university in a particular county does not, of itself, constitute residence in that county. No person may play for more than one county in any season (31 July to 30 July)."

This was carried by 19 votes to 1.

Phil Tepper agreed to be the County Championship organiser when it became a challenge trophy at the end of the present competition.

(iii) South African Winks

A group of ex-servicemen in South Africa have started playing winks after reading about it in the Guinness Book of Records, and writing to Altrincham Grammar School (who are mentioned in the item). They are having sets and mats made by manufacturers out there, and will send samples over here for our approval. The question was raised whether we should officially recognise this group. Martin O'Shea quoted from the Constitution of ETWA, that one of the aims of ETWA is "to promote the playing and enjoyment of the game of Tiddlywinks". It was proposed by Jon Mapley and seconded by Alan Cook, that the ETWA attitude should be one of help, consideration and friendship. This was carried by 12 votes to 5.

(iv) Suggestions for changes to the International Rules

ETWA does not have any power to change the Rules, but the object of the exercise was to produce a list of suggestion to put before the International Federation of Tiddlywinks Associations. It was decided that a rules sub-committee should be appointed, to take of the exact wording of the proposals, in such a way as to make them as unambiguous as possible, whilst preserving the intended meanings. Thus a great deal of time (of which the meeting was short) could be saved. Jon Mapley, Bungy Wells and Alan Dean agreed to form the Rules sub-committee.

The inadequacy of the present rules had been felt by many people for some time, and before Congress Jon did a tremendous amount of work in producing a draft of proposed rules changes so that Congress would have something definite to work from. Jon listed the proposals after much discussion with Alan Dean and other interested parties.

At 25 past midnight, there being no further business, the meeting closed.

- - 0 - -

A full report of the proposed Rules changes appears elsewhere in this issue.

And now for the competitors among you

THE SILVER WINK COMPETITION

The 1971-2 competition, which was unfinished last season due to problems organising Congress, was eventually completed by playing the final in Soton on Feb 10th 1973. The scores:

<u>Southampton</u>					
1. Hugh Goyder, Edna Chivers	1	5½	6	3	15½
2. Dave Howard, Dave Baker	6	6	1	5	18
3. Mick Mooney, Steve Welch	7	6	5	6	24
4. Mary Timmins, Julius Mach	1	1	5½	5	12½
					<u>70</u>
<u>Manchester</u>					
1. John Harman, Sue Harman	6	1	0	6	13
2. Pete, Dick	1½	1	1	6	9½
3. Rog Kirby, Nigel Knowles	1	6	2	1½	10½
4. Pam Knowles, Chris Nichols	4	2	1	2	9
					<u>42</u>

Round scores: 17-11, 11-17, 23-5, 19-9.

THE COUNTY CHAMPIONSHIP

This rather protracted competition reached a climax at Congress, with a final between Cheshire and Essex. The score seems to have escaped the joint clutches of Alan Dean, Jon Mapley and Phil Tepper (the umpire). I think Essex won. Challenges from county teams (of 6) should be sent to Phil Tepper at 30, Edenfield Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 8EE. See P 18

THE SILVER WINK 1972-73

York (37) v <u>Hull</u> (75)*	}	Hull (easily)
Manchester		
<u>Cambridge</u> (62) v Imperial Coll (22)	}	Cambridge (wo)
Westfield Coll(wo) v UCL		
Oxford (401/6) v <u>Soton</u> (645/6)	}	Southampton (wo)
Aberystwyth		
Queen's Belfast (?) v Ulster (?)	}	Belfast (?)

* = approx!

The semi-final (Belfast withdrew) and final were played at Congress, and the scores were as follows:

Semi-final: Southampton v Hull

Southampton

1. Julius Mach, Dave Howard	6	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	5	19 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mick Mooney, Dave Richards	6	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	1	18 $\frac{1}{2}$
3. Hugh Goyder, Brian Stoker	4	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	6	17 $\frac{1}{2}$
4. Malcolm Fraser, Rod Lees	3	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	2	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
					<u>66</u>

Hull

1. John Chapman, Roy Hammond	1	1	3	4	9
2. Derek Gregory, Bill Stelling	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	14
3. Allen Gethin, Gordon Statham	1	1	1	6	9
4. Sally Haden, Mick Still	2	6	1	5	14
					<u>46</u>

Round Scores: 19 $\frac{1}{2}$ -8 $\frac{1}{2}$, 15 $\frac{1}{2}$ -12 $\frac{1}{2}$, 15 $\frac{1}{2}$ -12 $\frac{1}{2}$, 15 $\frac{1}{2}$ -12 $\frac{1}{2}$.

The Final: Southampton v Cambridge

Southampton

1. Julius, Dave H.	6	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	3	3	14 $\frac{1}{2}$
2. Mick, Dave R.	6	4 $\frac{3}{8}$	6	6	22 $\frac{3}{8}$
3. Hugh, Brian	3	6	3	5	17
4. Malcolm, Rod	2	1	3	2	8
					<u>62 1/6</u>

Cambridge

1. Alistair, Paul	1	1	4	5	11
2. Dennis, Alan	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	6	13 5/6
3. Alan, Jo	4	1	4	4	13
4. Hugh, Andy	4	1	2	5	12
					<u>49 5/6</u>

Round scores: 15 $\frac{5}{8}$ -12 $\frac{1}{2}$, 13-15, 17-11, 16 $\frac{1}{2}$ -11 $\frac{1}{2}$.

Southampton thus win the SW Trophy for the third time in four years - isn't it boring?

OFFICER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

addresses p. 4

Alan says most clubs will be electing new secretaries soon and asks them to write to him telling them who they are. This will save time next season.

Nigel invites you to enter next season's National Pairs Championship, which will get under way around November. Entry 40p per pair.

Jon says there was a good response at Congress to the complete sets of Winking World he provided (all 9 sets were sold very quickly). Jon is prepared to take orders for further sets at 50p or individual copies at 5p each.

About next year's singles tournament, Jon writes

Following the low entry for the 1972-3 singles tournament and not by Alan Dean's continued success, it has been decided that, provided sufficient entries can be attracted, next year's tournament will be organised differently from previous years. There will be 16 seeded players (decided by the ETWA council) and the rest of the entries will be divided into 16 groups, arranged as locally as possible, headed by a seed. Each player will play each other player in his group and then the 16 league winners will go forward into the knockout as at present. This means that everyone should get 3 or 4 games, that newer players will have the chance to play good players and people of their own standard and that some of the elitism of recent tournaments should be eliminated. Entries 15p by October 31st 1973.

Entries for Winking World no 23 by mid October please. Hopfully a smaller quieter edition after all the frenzied activity reported here. MJS.

RULE CHANGES: THE ETWA CONGRESS PROPOSALS

It was the method employed by Congress to work through Jon Mapley's proposals, one at a time, making any alterations or omissions as the meeting saw fit. For this reason, the method of presentation employed here will be to quote each of Jon's proposals, and follow it with the relevant discussion and amendments.

"1. TIDDLYWINKS is a game for 4 players, those who play opposite each other being partners."

Note that the bit about flicking winks into the pot has been omitted. It was generally agreed that this causes confusion among newcomers, and anyone who knows how to play is aware that it is possible to win without potting a single wink (so we shan't mention it).

The finally accepted version was "Tiddlywinks is a game for 2 or 4 players. If 2 people play, they control two colours each, but the game (with respect to colour order etc.) is exactly the same as it would be played if a different person controlled each colour. Those who play opposite each other shall be partners."

"2. THE WINKS. Each player plays with 6 counters, called winks:

2 large ones, thickness $3/32$ ", diameter $7/8$ ".

4 small ones, Thickness $1/16$ ", diameter $5/8$ ".

The sequence of the colours shall be Blue, Green, Red, Yellow, Blue etc, being the alphabetical order of the colours.

A circular plastic counter, between 1 and 2 inches in diameter must be used to flick the winks and is called a squidge."

"3. THE MAT. Authorised felt mats, measuring 6 x 3 ft. are available from the official manufacturers. The surface on which the mat is placed should be hard, smooth and horizontal. Visiting captains are entitled to refuse to play only if the table surface measures less than 6 ft. by 3 ft. The base lines, to be marked at each corner of the mat, are straight lines crossing the mat's diagonals at right angles 3 ft. from their mid-point."

This differs from the original only in that it states explicitly that all matches must be played on official mats, something which has been done for years in any case.

"4. THE POT should be $1\frac{1}{2}$ " high, with a top diameter of $1\frac{7}{8}$ ". It is placed at the centre of the mat. Nothing may be allowed inside the pot other than potted winks, and potted winks may not be removed from the pot. The pot may not be removed to facilitate the playing of winks close to it, and should where necessary be held manually to prevent this from happening. If the pot moves after being hit by a wink in flight, it is immediately replaced at the centre of the mat, but the winks disturbed by the motion of the pot remain in their new positions. However, deliberate knocking of the pot with a wink from close range in order to disrupt a pile constitutes a foul shot."

It was proposed and carried that the last sentence should be omitted. Also it was decided that winks disturbed by the motion of the pot should be replaced in their former positions.

"5. SQUIDGE OFF. Initially, each player puts the 6 winks of one colour behind his base line and squidges one of them towards the pot. These winks are replaced behind the base lines, and the player whose wink was nearest the pot has first squidge into play. Should there be a tie those concerned have a resquidge."

With the addition of the statement "A potted wink is nearer to the pot than one touching it on the outside." this was carried unanimously.

"6. PLAY proceeds in a clockwise direction. Each player may play only his own winks (except see rule 8(b)), and has one shot per turn, with an extra shot for each of his winks that he pots in that turn. If he pots one of his partners winks, either he in that turn, or his partner in his next turn, may take an extra shot. A wink is deemed potted only when it has come to rest in the pot or is balanced on the rim. In this latter case the wink is to be placed in the pot by hand. Potted winks are replaced if knocked out by another wink. If a wink comes to rest leaning against the pot it is moved to lie flat, just touching the pot, even if this results in it covering another wink. If, however, a wink comes to rest leaning against the pot with its far edge covered by a wink already lying

there it is moved down to lie flat, just touching the pot, below that wink, without otherwise moving that wink."

It was decided to omit the third sentence, that is, there is no extra shot for potting a partner's wink, and the amended rule was carried unanimously.

"7. BOUNDARIES. The base lines and the edges of the mat are the boundaries of the mat. If at any time a player squidges one or more winks (either his own, his partner's or a an opponent's) over a boundary or so near the edge as to be unplayable, they are immediately replaced into play a large winks width from the edge, near the point of departure, and the player misses his next shot. No winks crossing a boundary in the same shot may be replaced nearer than 4" apart, and no wink may be replaced on top of another wink."

Instead of this, Congress voted by 12 to 5 that the present rule be kept, where a player only misses a turn for for sending one's own wink over a boundary. Discussion afterwards add ed the following " In matches played on tables which are too small for the mat, then the mat shall not be moved during the game, unless both players agree otherwise beforehand. Thus a wink which comes to rest on the mat, but beyond the the edge of the table is deemed unplayable."

8. SQUOPPING. (a) Any wink or winks covered, however slightly, by another wink, may not be played. The act of covering another wink is called "squopping". If two winks come to rest balanced against each other with only their edges touching the mat, both must be considered squopped until hit by another wink. The same rule applies to a wink which comes to rest in a vertical position, balanced against a pile of other winks. If a continuous ring of winks occurs (the last wink played squops the top wink of a pile but slides under another covered wink in the pile) the pile must be left as it stands until hit by another wink. If this situation occurs when there are no other winks left, the game is adjudicated as if the time limit had expired (see rule 11(b)).

(b) In a pile containing two or more winks the squidger must first touch only the player's uncovered wink, and a short continuous stroke must be made. During the stroke, the squidger may also touch only those winks vertically beneath the first wink played. When the shot frees some or all of the squopped winks it is known as "desquopping".

(c) When all the remaining winks of one pair are squopped, the opposing pair counts its free winks (neither squoppng nor squopped) in play, has the same number of free turns. If one member has no playable wink the free turns are all taken by the other member, otherwise they are shared by the two players in normal rotation. The next shot must free one of either opponent's winks. If the player whose turn it is to make this freeing shot has no playable wink squopping an opponent, the freeing shot must be made by his partner with the last shot of free turns. If the freeing shot does not release an opponent's wink, or pots it without freeing another, the pair with free turns move aside one or more of their winks, to allow the next player in normal rotation to play. If a squopped opponent is freed during free turns, they cease at once. A squopped opponent whose wink is freed during or after free turns must be allowed at least one shot before being squopped again. (The actual wink released may be resquopped, provided that another wink of the same colour is freed in doing so). Otherwise, if an opponent is resquopped before being allowed the turn to which he is entitled, then the squopped pair may decide which of the squopping winks is moved aside to allow them to play."

It was decisively agreed that sentence 4 of 8(a) should be deleted, and also that the definition of squopping be clarified to make it clear that a wink is squopped by any other wink, part of which is vertically above it even if the winks are not touchig. It was agreed that "when playing a de-squopping shot, the squidger must first touch the upper surface of the wink first played. If an umpire is present, and decides that a particular desquopping shot is foul, then the opponents may decide whether to leave things as they are, or set up the position before the shot. The shot would then not be replayed. If an umpire is present, but not actually watching that particular game, any player has the right at any time to ask for an umpire to watch a particular shot being played. Any time wasted in waiting for an umpire shall be added on to the time limit." It was proposed that

"of their" be deleted from sentence 5 of 8(c), to cater for the situation where all winks belonging to the next player in normal rotation are below his partner's winks in piles. This was agreed unanimously. The Secretary would be interested to hear from the proposer and seconder of the last motion, as he was rather weary at the time, and omitted to record their names in the minutes. With the above amendments, the proposed rule was accepted.

"9. POTTING OUT. The first player to pot all his winks is said to have "potted out". When this occurs, squopping ceases to have any effect and all squopped winks are immediately uncovered as are any that subsequently become squopped. This uncovering is done by moving aside the squopping wink, always at the same distance from the pot, until it no longer squops any wink. On potting out, all further restrictions on the duration of the game (see rule 10) cease."
This is precisely the rule at present and no-one expressed any desire to change it.

"10. THE TIME LIMIT. It is suggested that a time limit of about 20 minutes per game be imposed. If and when this expires, play continues until the player who won the squidge off has had his turn. Five complete rounds of turns are then played. If after these rounds, no player has potted out, the game is concluded, and adjudicated as set out in rule 11(b)."

It was proposed and agreed that the umpire should be given the authority to declare an extension to the time limit in games where one of the pairs was, in his opinion, deliberately wasting time in order to gain an advantage.

"11. THE SCORE. (a) On a pot out. The first player to pot all his winks scores 4 game points, the second 2, the third 1 and the fourth does not score. Partners add their scores together, and one point is transferred from the losing pair to the winning pair.
(b) On the expiry of the time limit. Each player receives 3 time limit points for each of his winks in the pot and 1 time limit point for each wink in play, not squopped. Players total these points individually. The player with the highest total then receives 4 game points, the next 2, the third 1 and the lowest does not score. Partners add their scores together, but there is no point transferred as in 11(a). In the event of a tie on time limit points, the appropriate average game points are awarded to each player concerned."

This is exactly equivalent to the present rule, and merely makes it easier for beginners to understand. It was carried unanimously.

"12. DISTURBANCE OF WINKS. Any winks disturbed accidentally eg. by the follow through of a shot or by bodily contact, should be replaced in their former positions. If a wink in motion is accidentally obstructed, it is placed in a mutually agreed position and the next player continues with his turn. If a foul shot is committed, the opponents of the player have the option of making the player play again, or leaving the winks as they stand. A wink may be turned over or changed unless it is squopping or squopped but otherwise if a player deliberately interferes with any wink in play, or impedes his opponent the game ceases and the opponents receive all 7 points."

It must be pointed out that the rule concerning foul shots given here now only applies to games which are not being umpired (see after rule 8). It is one of the tasks of the rules sub-committee to clarify this point in the writing of the final proposals.

"MATCH PROCEDURE. A Tiddlywinks team normally consists of 4 pairs of players. Each pair plays one game against each pair of the opposing team, making 16 games in all. The winning team is the one which scores more points (not necessarily the one which wins more games)."
This is exactly the same as the present rule.

"14. UMPIRING. In matches of some importance, an umpire should be present. He should (a) be impartial or (b) not be aware of the colours being played. His decision is to be final on what constitutes a fair shot, and should also adjudicate whether or not any wink is squopped in cases where the players disagree."

It was unanimously agreed that "The umpire should also be the final arbiter on any matter not explicitly covered by the rules."

Editor's note: The above are only proposals. They should not be used in matches but I am sure the rules committee would appreciate any comments if you try them out in friendly games.

SOME ODD BITS by some odd people

I may not know what happened in the County Final but to prove that I am not a complete moron, here is a report on the semi-final played last December. An anonymous ETWA treasurer gives his unbiased opinions on the game.

At long last an opponent for Cheshire in the final has been determined. Essex travelled to Folkestone on Sunday 17th December and beat Kent 40½-22½. Dennis Opposs caught 'flu the day before the match and Mick Mooney got buried under the Xmas mail somewhere in Ilford, so Essex were reduced to 5 players. It had been pre-arranged by the captains that a team of five would be acceptable, so Kent were asked to select the Essex player who would go solo. This received the response of "as long as it's not Mapley, we don't care". This turned out to be their first mistake, as John Mesher notched up 18 points on his own and the aforesaid treasurer played like a twit during the first two rounds, with his partner, the dreaded Harold, salvaging their reputation with some mind-boggling de-squops.

Ian Bewick and Bill Cartman achieved a 5 minute pot-out against Colin Joseph and Dave Ackland in the first round. Colin was later heard to complain that he had left his squidger out in the rain for the last year and it had gone rusty.

Meanwhile, back at the ranch, short, fat hairy-legged Mesher was showing that twelve months in the USA had done him no harm and was nonchalantly picking up 6-1's as if he'd never been away.

For Kent, no pair really stood out from the crowd. Terry Sewell and Roy Gannaway had obviously not recovered from the throes of fatherhood and Martin Newland and Frank Mount only got their heads above water against Colin and Dave.

The last game to finish was the most inept display of potting seen in many a long year. Ian Bewick had left on another assignment, blaming the fact that Essex were 70 minutes late, and had left his partner to fend for himself in a hairy pot-squop with the all England Champions. Jon finally redeemed himself by potting five in a row and sat back to await the inevitable 7-0 which would take the gilt off Mesher's gingerbread. The Woodford wizard had other ideas and a macabre pot-leaping session between Harvey and Bill resulted in a 5-2 after two golden opportunities had been spurned, causing much hilarity to the opposition and to the said short, fat hairy-legged gentleman, who was heard to murmur "Oh, what bad luck".

	<u>Scores</u>			
	<u>Round</u>			<u>tot</u>
<u>Kent</u>	1	2	3	
Terry Sewell, Roy Gannaway	2	4½	1	7½
Ian Bewick, Bill Cartman	6	1	2	9
Martin Newland, Frank Mount	1	1	4	6
				<u>22½</u>
<u>Essex</u>				
Jon Mapley, Harvey Orrock	5	6	5	16
Colin Joseph, Dave Ackland	1	2½	3	6½
John Mesher (solo)	6	6	6	18
				<u>40½</u>

Footnote: 'Ere, wot's orl this abart Cheshire gettin the 'ome draw in the final? Everyone knows that Bancroft's school library is the most central point in England.

DUPLICATE WINKS or the lengths Alan Dean will go to to avoid learning Bridge

Needed: 2 mats and sets. 2 or 4 people.

Method: The same position is set up on both mats (as accurately as possible) and each pair plays the last five rounds only, once from each side of the position, and the scores of each half are totalled.

One way to set up the starting position would be to get someone else to set up what he considers to be an interesting position, but it might be better to have a 2-round competition, and let each pair in turn select the starting position. This way it is possible to set up shots which you hope you can do better than your opponents, and this would be a good way of getting to practice shots which someone else is very good at.

QUIZ SECTION

B. GORRAH'S EASY QUIZ

for people with amnesia.

Fill in the missing _____ in the following:-

1. Alistair, _____ pair again!
2. "Could you hold your _____ a bit higher please, Cyril?" - Anglia TV interviewer.
3. "Nice one _____" - Oxford supporter.
4. Von _____.
5. Hugh Pelham's _____.
6. "I could have danced all night, I could have danced all night, and _____ have danced some more".
7. Knigel Knowles from _____.
8. _____ Wells.
9. "Just getting my _____" David Ackland.
10. The aim of the game is to flick the counters into the egg _____.

ANSWER SECTION

I have had some complaints that the crossword in WN21 was impossibly difficult. So to make it a bit easier, here is the missing clue:

DOWN

7. Dead men can make a change to the rules (7).

And now the answers:

ACROSS

1. Winks, 3. Pile jump, 8. Squabbles, 9. Inside, 11. RM, 12. End turn, 14. PE, 15. Crud, 16. Murdle, 17. Be, 18. Squidge, 19. Von Quesh, 21. Radii, 23. IQ, 25. Ludo, 26. Lose a turn, 29. Zulu, 30. Deadly, 31. BTWA, 32. Spot.

DOWN

1. Wasted, 2. Khartoum Road, 3. Pylon, 4. Lost, 5. Joined, 6. Must cede it, 7. Amended, 10. Drub, 13. Red, 14. Prunes, Neville, 18. Seduce, 20. Squop, 22. Dozy, 24. On it, 27. Out, 28. Era.

The answers to B. Gorrah's Easy quiz:

lengthMapleybottomcupTunbridgeDorisbottomKnutsfordStill.

How did you get on?

If you got 10 correct answers, then you are F. Knackers.

"	"	"	9	"	"	"	"	"	Dennnis Oppos/David Ackland
"	"	"	8	"	"	"	"	"	a member of C.U.Tw.C.
									etc.
"	"	"	7	"	"	"	"	"	Cecil the Dog
"	"	"	2	"	"	"	"	"	The Duke of Edinburgh.
"	"	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	Alan Bean
"	"	"	0	"	"	"	"	"	Harold Hare or Julius Mach.

Next issue - O. Ky's Difficult Test.

The Cambridge President Writes:

IN RE MEMSARUM

"The game grows up when it moves to tables" was a remark made at Congress, and I feel that the attitude that lies behind it is detrimental to the future of the game. If Tiddlywinks is to expand, or even to survive, it must attract new players, most of whom will meet the game for the first time at university, when, their interest having been aroused for some reason, they wander along to a club meeting. What do they find? In the case of CUTWC they would find people crawling around on the floor between visits to the bar, or at the other extreme they might find people making remarks like that above, in an atmosphere reminiscent of a university chess or bridge club. In my experience the former case is more likely to result in their staying long enough to learn the game. Unlike chess and bridge clubs we cannot afford to be too professional in our approach to the game: our first priority must be to teach people to play Tiddlywinks; playing technically brilliant games must take second place (not that I wish to offer this as an excuse for the standard of my own play). We cannot yet allow the game to grow up; although Quesh is probably the first example of a "grown-up" club and in time will be joined by other clubs of its kind (eg Obwink) university clubs must concentrate on teaching new players rather than winning the Marchant Trophy. Most people play games because they enjoy them so let our slogan be "tiddlywinks is fun".

The views expressed above are the personal views of Alistair Duncan - not CUTWC

AROUND THE CLUBS

1. Cambridge

Footnote to the above article (In Re Mensarum)

C.U.Tw.C. will continue to play on the floor at home and on suitable tables away, if so requested. This is C.U.Tw.C. policy.

THE 1972-73 FLINTSHIRE OPEN

by Dennis Squoppos
(disorganiser)

In the summer of 1972, half of the Cambridge first team, together with many other of the club's stalwarts, left to seek their fortunes in the wide world. To keep the club functioning effectively needed a large influx of freshers and thanks to good campaigning at the societies' fair, this was achieved. The club now has nearly 40 members, over half of whom joined this year.

Four matches were provisionally arranged for the Michaelmas term but the death of winking at Essex University together with the non-arrival of a team from Imperial College cut this to 2. The annual friendly against Oxford was played on 19th November, the first team including 3 freshers. At half-time Cambridge led by 10 points and they hung on to their lead for an eventual win by 59 1/6 to 52 1/6 - two of the pairs (Davidson & Light, Opposs & Imeson) together contributing over 40 of their side's points. The following Sunday saw our first attempt to bring home the Marchant Trophy after its loss 18 months earlier. The match ended in the worst defeat in the club's history due, in part, to the non-arrival of two top players. Two of us therefore played solo for two rounds, Alistair then being rescued(?) by the timely arrival of Andy Davidson just before the third round. Pair 2 made his mark but the others lacked either the experience or expertise that is a necessity when facing such distinguished opponents.

Cambridge

1. Paul Light, Andy Green	1	2½	1	-	4½
2. Dennis Opposs (solo)	6	1	6	-	13
3. David Ackland, Alan Imeson	1	1	0	-	2
4. Alistair Duncan (solo)	1	3	1	-	5

Quesh

1. Nigel and Pam Knowles	6	6	6	-	18
2. Mick Still, Mick Wiseman	1	4	7	-	12
3. Alan Dean, Roger Kirby	6	4½	1	-	11½
4. Keith Seaman, Steve Welch	6	6	6	-	18

Quesh won by 59½ to 24½

By 4th February we had recovered sufficiently to face the much rated Manchester University team which, to our surprise, was easily beaten 71½ to 40½ - Duncan and Light scoring 21 points and the bottom Cambridge pair scoring more than the top Manchester one. This match was intended as practice for the first round Silver Wink match against Imperial College that had been arranged for the following Sunday. IC arrived with only six players and, even with with two playing solo and no point transfers, found the Cambridge team too strong losing in three rounds by 62-22. For Cambridge, Opposs and Pelham scored 18½, Duncan and Imeson 15½ points.

A fortnight later, the annual Varsity match was staged in Christ's College. Both sides had 3 former ¼ blues and Oxford 2 internationals. The match was televised by both TV channels (simultaneously) and this proved too much for Oxford who, after winning the first two games to finish by 6-1, gradually slipped behind leaving Cambridge to score only 5½ points in round 4. They made no mistake, retaining the Varsity Trophy which they have now held for seven consecutive years.

Cambridge

1. Alistair Duncan, Paul Light	1	1	6	6	14
2. Dennis Opposs, Alan Imeson	6	6	5	1½	18½
3. Alan Grayer, Joanna Dibblee	1	5	4	6	16
4. Andy Davidson, Hugh Pelham	6	6	4	5	21

Oxford

1. Cyril Edwards, John McKenzie	6	2	3	5½	16½
2. Alan Shearman, A. Bunnell	1	1	3	1	6
3. Alistair Reid, Steven Chandler	6	6	2	2	16
4. Stephen Felton, G. Griffiths	1	1	1	1	4

Cambridge won by 69½ to 42½

Exploits of C.U.T.W.C. contd.

While the greats fought for the coveted trophy the Kippers were bearing the Dodos - David Ackland and John ffitch scoring one point for every year of winking experience they have between them - 22. The final score was $73\frac{1}{2}$ - $38\frac{1}{2}$.

The 18th annual dinner took place on Friday 2nd March and on the following afternoon a match between Past and Present teams from Cambridge ^{and Soton} was played. Participants included such stars as Steph Jefferis, Jeremy Shepherd and (inevitably) Alan Dean. Overall, Cambridge won $87\frac{5}{6}$ - $87\frac{1}{6}$, a mathematically astounding score, and in the words of Tony Hoare, "we put the buggars from the Solent in their place" (but only just).

Our second round Silver Wink match was scheduled for 11th March although we did not know exactly who we were playing. In the end we played no-one and received a letter from UCL forfeiting the match. Next - Congress.

The first section of our team complete with Cecil the dog and a spare David Ackland arrived in Manchester on Saturday expecting to face Manchester University in a semi-final that afternoon. Their hopes were shattered when they learnt from the ETWA chairman himself that we were to play Belfast on Sunday morning but they weren't coming anyway. Twenty-eight hours later we battled against Southampton in the final and although being only $1\frac{1}{2}$ pts behind after two rounds, plunged to a $62\frac{1}{6}$ - $49\frac{5}{6}$ defeat. The consolation was that of the 16 games, we won 9 but the number of 6-1's going to Soton was the decisive factor. (Perhaps a change in rule 13 is called for?).

So another year in C.U.T.W.C.'s sordid history is drawing to a close and it has generally been quite successful despite the loss of two important matches. Next year could be even better - none of our top players are leaving (Alistair may return as well) so watch out Quesh! (and your infantile section).

Editor's notes: The full Silver Wink results are on p6. Late news, Congratulations to Dennis on his election as C.U.T.W.C. President for next session. May the parent club of the game continue to flourish.

2. Martin Walter

Terry Sewell, the secretary, has sent me details of some of his club's recent adventures, thus putting to shame some of the more famous clubs who remain notably absent from this issue.

On 11th March Martin Walter went up to London and not being overcome by smoke, played a winks match against Imperial College. The teams had met in Folkestone last October when the result was a resounding $55\frac{1}{2}$ - $7\frac{1}{2}$ win for Martin Walter's.

A new improved Imperial College team (due to an amazing number of recent fixtures) made the return a very interesting fixture, with the result, a win for Martin Walter's by $38\frac{1}{2}$ - $24\frac{1}{2}$.

<u>Imperial College</u>				
1. H. Isaac, J. James	5	$1\frac{1}{2}$	2	$8\frac{1}{2}$
2. B. Ixes, G. Jones	$2\frac{1}{2}$	3	1	$6\frac{1}{2}$
3. C. Douglas, S. Crawley	$5\frac{1}{2}$	1	3	$9\frac{1}{2}$
<u>Martin Walter's</u>				
1. Martin Newland, Frank Mount	2	$4\frac{1}{2}$	$1\frac{1}{2}$	8
2. Roy Gannaway, Terry Sewell	$5\frac{1}{2}$	4	6	$15\frac{1}{2}$
3. Ian Bewick, Bill Cartman	5	6	4	15

Terry also sent a report on the KENT v SURREY FREMLIN TROPHY match. This match takes place annually for the Fremlin Trophy and is between Kent and Surrey only. Until this last match, the tally on the side of the cup reads Surrey twice, Kent twice and Surrey twice, so it was Kent's turn for a victory! The match took place on 8th April at the Bull Inn at Linton, a delightful 17th century inn just outside Maidstone in Kent.

It had been agreed beforehand that the match would be played with 4 pairs, as always in the past. On the day, however, Surrey, captained by Geoff Wilsher arrived with six players and Kent, captained by Ian Bewick with seven.

It was agreed that four tables still be played, however and that Surrey would play 2 solo and Kent 1 solo. The Kent team consisted chiefly of the Martin Walter club, aided by Steve Grant of Sidcup. Surrey came mostly from AviaWink.

The full scores are on the next page. Terry sportingly admits that Surrey were the better team and they went on to win 64-48.

Fremlin Trophy Result

Kent

1. Terry Sewell, Roy Gannaway	5	5½	2	2	14½
2. Bill Cartman, Steve Grant	2½	1	1½	5	10
3. Ian Bewick (solo)	1	3	4	6	14
4. Frank Mount, Martin Newland	1	1	3	4½	9½
					48

Surrey

1. D. Baker, B. Smy	2	4½	6	6	18½
2. J. Kluth (solo)	1½	6	4	6	17½
3. C. Loughton (solo)	5	5½	3	4	17½
4. G. Wilsher, D. Walter	5	2	1	2½	10½
					64

Round scores (Kent first) 14½-13½, 14-14, 9-19, 10½-17½.

THE THIRD ANNUAL SINGLES CHAMPIONSHIP

The entry of 38 was the lowest in the three years of the tournament and was, to say the least, disappointing, especially when one considers that 17 of these are past or present Southampton players and only Oxford and Cambridge, amongst other universities were represented by current undergrads. (Pam Knowles is also ex-Southampton).

RESULTS

Preliminary Round

M. Fraser	v <u>A. Duncan</u>	9½-11½
B. Stoker	v <u>J. Mesher</u>	3-11
C. Edwards	v <u>A. Dean</u>	2-12
D. Opposs	v <u>B. Rowlatt</u>	12-2
A. Cook	v <u>K. Seaman</u>	13-8
P. Tepper	v <u>P. Knowles</u>	10-11

Second Round

M. Nash	v <u>J. Mapley</u>	3½-17½
J. Mesher	v <u>H. Goyder</u>	?
B. Wells	v <u>E. Chivers</u>	wo
H. Orrock	v <u>M. Wiseman</u>	11-10
A. Dean	v <u>M. Mooney</u>	13-8
N. Martin	v <u>P. Knowles</u>	2-12
N. Knowles	v <u>J. Mach</u>	11½-2½
J. Harman	v <u>M. Still</u>	10-11

First Round

A. Duncan	v <u>J. Mesher</u>	2½-11½
A. Dean	v <u>D. Opposs</u>	13-8
A. Cook	v <u>P. Knowles</u>	3½-17½
B. Wells	v <u>D. Troup</u>	12-2
J. Harman	v <u>D. Howard</u>	14-7
D. Richards	v <u>N. Knowles</u>	2-12
M. Wiseman	v <u>B. Baker</u>	12-2
I. Jones	v <u>J. Mach</u>	7-14
E. Chivers	v <u>S. Melton</u>	11-3
N. Martin	v <u>A. Shearman</u>	12-9
H. Macdonald-Smith	v <u>J. Mapley</u>	0-14
M. Nash	v <u>S. Drain</u>	wo
D. Rose	v <u>H. Goyder</u>	3-11
H. Orrock	v <u>A. Davidson</u>	11½-9½
S. Harman	v <u>M. Still</u>	wo
M. Mooney	v <u>D. Ackland</u>	12-2

Third Round

J. Mapley	v <u>H. Orrock</u>	15½-12½
P. Knowles	v <u>B. Wells</u>	11-3
A. Dean	v <u>M. Still</u>	13-8
N. Knowles	v <u>H. Goyder</u>	?

Semi-Finals

P. Knowles	v <u>H. Goyder</u>	?
J. Mapley	v <u>A. Dean</u>	10-11

FINAL

P. Knowles	v <u>A. Dean</u>	3-11
------------	------------------	------

The first round produced many one-sided matches, with only 6 going to a third round. Dave Rose could not repeat his fine performances of last year, being comprehensively beaten by Hugh Goyder. Mick Wiseman beat Dave Baker 12-2 again, although, as is often the case, Mick says it was closer than it sounds. Pam Knowles had to wait a long time for her match against Alan Cook, for a multitude of reasons too complicated to mention here. Alan's progress was halted when Pam got the 7-0 that Alan needed in the third round. Thus the last 16 included 6 previous semi-finalists and 2 quarter-finalists, so nobody was going to get an easy passage into round 3.

The draw for round 2 was made in the week before the Hants Open and a number of the last 16 singles players were "in town" for that event and so played their singles at the same time.

Nigel Knowles beat Julius Mach without ever really extending himself and Pam made it a family occasion by trouncing Neville Martin. The match of the round was between Alan Dean and Mick Mooney. Mick won the first 6-1, dared Alan to pot in the second (and lost 0-7) and never recovered losing the decider 2-5.

Meanwhile, back in London, Jon Mapley was keeping up his average against Mike Nash, who had travelled home from Germany for the privilege.

Meanwhile, Micks Still and Wiseman were having exciting finishes against John Harman (last year's finalist) and Harvey Orrock respectively. The WW editor needed a 6-1 from the last game and having six free winks went for the pot but missed the sixth. John preferred to pot for second and third places rather than squopping, and also potted 5. Eventually Mick potted his last two when John had just one wink left on the table. The Wise lost 11-10 in an extraordinary series of 4-3 matches, all of which could have gone the other way. With the last turn of the third game, Mick had to decide whether to leave things as they stood, with the score $4\frac{1}{2}$ - $2\frac{1}{2}$ in his favour and the total $10\frac{1}{2}$ all and play a fourth game. He elected to play the only shot open to him, namely to pot off one of Harvey's winks, missed and gave up that precious half point.

John Mesher did not meet Hugh Goyder until the Saturday morning of Congress, and failed to prove that experience, cunning and playing the odds were a match for the in-form, match-fit, Southampton captain. Like all the games he played at Congress, Hugh and company have forgotten the scores!

The draw for the quarter-finals produced some very keenly fought games. The first, and closest, was played the weekend before Congress between Jon Bapley and Harvey Orrock, who had eleven year's experience of each other's play behind them. Jon took a scrappy first game 6-1, and Harvey proved that he was playing the better of the two, being unlucky to win the second 4-3. Jon realised that he was losing the third but should have had a 2-5 sewn up when a stupid shot virtually handed Harvey a 6-1. Jon hung on till the last shot, which needed a complete fluke to save it and after he had played it, both players agreed Harvey had won 6-1 and thus the match by 11-10. Jon will be eternally grateful that the winks were not disrupted because five minutes later, on a second examination, it was found that the score was only $5\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$. Harvey sportingly agreed to play a fourth game which Jon won 5-2 despite missing his sixth wink in a pot-out attempt after 5 minutes.

Bungy Wells only decided to attend Congress a few days beforehand and so Pam Knowles was denied the walkover she expected. His trip north was to no avail, however, as Pam was in commanding form, winning 6-1, 5-2 without really being pressed at any time. This delighted Pam as she had now put out three "England ties" and was staking her claim to an international place in no uncertain manner.

Pam's better half was engaged in a battle royal with Hugh Goyder, who had sharpened his squidger on John Mesher in the morning. Again, no details are available.

The other quarter-final was also between two players who know each other well. A psychological battle it was too. The first round went to Alan when he fooled Mick into winning 6-1. (Anyone who has played him knows Alan is much more dangerous coming from behind). The second game started with 6 blues and 6 greens free. Mick neglected to try and squop a blue, knowing that Alan would be so scared of green potting that he might just try it himself. That Alan put all 6 in and won the third game easily is now history.

And so to the semi-finals. Jon had tried to persuade Alan to play at 12.30am after the ETWA AGM, but they eventually crossed squidgers in the bright sunlight (no, surely not!) of a Manchester Sunday morning. It turned out to be a match of the highest quality with neither player making many unforced errors. Alan was clearly upset to find he had won the first game 6-1 but he looked a bit more relaxed when Jon levelled it at 7 all. Jon had the psychological advantage as the third game progressed, and with about 3 minutes left, he was in command of most of the piles. But as has so often happened Alan succeeded in getting on top of the biggest pile and freeing 5 yellows and potting 4 of them next turn. Jon's last turn consisted of potting a large wink from 6" and desquopping a red-yellow-red pile, potting the top red at the same time. This would give him a final place but he nervously missed the large wink. So Dean marched on with more than a little sigh of relief. There was plenty of tension but not a lot of noteworthy play in the other semi-final between Pam and Hugh. Neither was in top form but Pam got through because she made less mistakes. No scores are available; I am beginning to wonder if Hugh really entered the tournament.

The final was a good example of the teacher's greater experience, overcoming his pupil's youthful exuberance. Pam was rather overawed and failed to reproduce her giant-killing exploits of earlier rounds. Alan came out an easy 6-1, 5-2 winner to retain the trophy. He has now won it each of the three times it has been contested. Congratulations Alan But when are you going to retire and give someone else a chance?

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Mick,

One of the things that we hoped would be discussed at Congress, was the growth of winks. Owing to the length of discussion on the proposed rule changes it was decided not to bring this up at the meeting.

Since then, dipping into our newly acquired series of WW the following alarming figures have emerged:

Date	WWnumber	No of clubs
Oct 1960	0	60
Oct 1961	2	65
Jan 1963	3	65
Oct 1965	6 & 7 (joint list)	80
March 1966	9	92*
Nov 1968	14	30 ⁺
Jan 1971	18	33 ⁺

* and another 34 inactive clubs

+ from questionnaire answers, list not inclusive

⁷ only 13 of which were affiliated

In issue 21 (Oct 1972) it is reported that only 6 clubs had affiliated in the year prior to the 1972 Congress.

At the present time we can only think of 13 clubs that still play. Of these (some of whom share personnel), some are very weak, if indeed they do exist, and others have played very few games.

In view of this, the spread of the game, and publicity for the game seem to be the two prime objects for the coming year. What is the point of defining rules precisely, if nobody will play the game in a couple of years time?

Surely those clubs which are known to be strong and active should

a) try to promote clubs in local schools, colleges and businesses.

b) persuade all those leaving to go to different universities, or even to the outside world to continue playing and found new clubs.

Another essential is publicity. This year's Varsity match showed that radio and TV can be interested in winks. Why not try to get the finals results from Congress in the newspapers? Where has the post of ETWA publicity officer gone? Shots of Hugh Pelham's bottom on Anglia TV may or may not be interesting but at least it's a start!

Let's see action from the strong clubs (Cambridge, Oxford, Southampton, Manchester, Quesh, Altrincham). More clubs more publicity!

Yours sincerely

OBWink (Junior Section)

In the same ink, pen, writing and envelope came the following

Dear Mick,

Although this letter has no connection with the one above, which of course I know nothing about, maybe the question of keeping winkers winking is also important.

Games lacking that goodwill, which was discussed endlessly at Congress, can be enough to put one off for years. Perhaps when playing against bores or pedants (who persist in rebuilding piles, or take few shots before rounds and half an hour over rounds) in friendly (?) matches, it might be worth offering them the game 7-0. It might at least make them stop and think.

Peace to all mankind and goodwill among nations.

Yours slightly eccentrically

F. Knackers

Dear Sir,

Gradually, without many people noticing, or at any rate caring, a new evil is entering our midst. I refer to the means whereby players are induced to play for other clubs, not by direct payment since we have no true professionals in our game, but by backhanders which would normally involve free drinks and food and even overnight accomodation on occasions. This 'shamateurism' must be stamped out for once and all, since it goes against the true spirit of winks. No more clubs should entertain ideas of approaching 'Rentasquidger' when short of players, and should instead sign up new talent from their environs. I hope never to see another advertisement for

contd.

Rentasquidger in the classified columns of this periodical.

Yours
Geoffrey L. Ponsonby-Smythe

Geoffrey - Were you a more avid reader, you would know that although we discussed the advertisement, I never actually composed or published it. Also, this is not so much a periodical as an occasional - Ed.

Dear WW,

This year the arrival of Dick Still at Hull University prompted the formation of a winks team among a group of student houses. We initially played against each other and after a bit of persuasion entered the Silver Wink. We played York and Manchester and enjoyed meeting our opponents. The games, although not of a brilliant standard, were still exciting to play in.

We then set off for Manchester to play Southampton in the semi-final and were rather disappointed at what we found. Top class winks appears to be a clique among a few people and this led to the majority being involved in two or more competitions. As the timetable did not cater for any delays our late start on Sunday resulted in the semi-final being played in the time allotted to the final. If games cannot be kept to a reasonable length of time could not the number of fixtures at Congress be reduced?

This was bad enough but worse was yet to come. The lack of friendliness exhibited by many of the good players promoted a feeling that were only interested in winning (which they did) and not in the game as a whole. If winks is to have any future, could not these experts show that playing is just as important as winning? This would encourage more people to stay in the game and not fall by the wayside.

Yours
Allen Gethin (CASH Captain)

Dear Sir,

I should like to complain about the number of letters, quizzes, etc. that appear in WW under ridiculous noms-de-plume.

I suggest that this practice should cease forthwith,

Ever yours
X. Treemly-Silley.

P.S. There was an interesting article recently by an up-and-coming youngster, name of Dean, about strategy. Why not more articles like that?

X.T-S.

SECOND NATIONAL PAIRS COMPETITION

by Nigel Knowles

For its second appearance the National Pairs was changed from an all-play-all weekend event to a Countrywide knockout tournament with the final stages at congress. The tournament had a somewhat wider participation (i.e. less from Southampton) and was a little larger than the first.

The next tournament will again be held on a knockout basis with the Manchester Open (advertised elsewhere) taking over from the all-play-all. If the Manchester tournament is a success then I believe this system of two competitions is the correct one - I should like to hear reader's views on the subject.

In round one it was surprising to see Wells and Cook go down so convincingly. The St. Gabriels pairs were beaten without offering much resistance. It is rather discouraging to see two defaults in this round.

Edwards and Jones continued their winning way in Round 2 and were joined by Papley and Orrock who disposed of Dean and Seaman with ease. Mach and Mooney went through on a default as Mike Nash was unable to return from Germany. The Knowles family played Bolton and Gould when expecting to only watch the Altrincham G.S. pair's first round game. However Rog Kirby was prevented from arriving and Bolton and Gould played well to reach the third round by a convincing margin.

The remaining games were played at Congress. Bolton and Gould had more competition but won their semi-final by a reasonable margin. Papley and Orrock won their 3 games with straightforward squop-ups to end the challenge of Mach and Mooney.

The final between the pairs of OBWink (the holders) and Altrincham G.S. was hard fought. In the first game the Altrincham pair got three winks of one colour in the pot early on. They succeeded in holding this advantage

contd.

and getting second place to go into the lead, 6-1. Jon Mapley potted out in the next game but both his opponents potted six in a row so only won 5-2. The last game gradually slipped towards Bolton and Gould who won 5-2 to take the trophy.

RESULTS

Idwal Jones, Cyril Edwards } Bungy Wells, Alan Cook } Hugh Goyder, Mary Timmins } Dave Ackland, Bob Steemson } Simon Gould, Alan Bolton } Rog Kirby, Vince Brown } Fam & Nigel Knowles } Gareth Lewis, Richard Clarke } Jon Mapley, Harvey Orrock } Julia Hudson, Jill Brown } Alan Dean, Keith Seaman } Julie Allinson, Sally Cable } Mike Nash, Brian Rowlatt } Sandra Braidwood, Alison Spencer } Julius Mach, Mick Mooney } Alan Shearman, Steve Melton }	Jones, Edwards } 6-1, 6-1 } Goyder, Timmins } 6-1, 6-1 } Gould, Bolton } Default } Knowles } 4-3, 6-1, 6-1 } Mapley, Orrock } 7-0, 7-0 } Dean, Seaman } 7-0, 7-0 } Wash, Rowlatt } Default } Mach, Mooney } 6-1, 5-2 }	Jones, Edwards } 6-1, 6-1 } Gould, Bolton } 12½-8½ } Gould, Bolton } 6-1, 5-2 } Mapley, Orrock } 6-1, 4-3, 6-1 } Mapley, Orrock } 6-1, 4-3, 6-1 } Mach, Mooney } Default }
--	---	---

LATE NEWS

Phil Tepper has sent this report on the Counties final (his address is 49, Chester Road, AUDLEY, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffs.)

Essex v Cheshire County Championship Final 24th March 1973

Essex				Cheshire			
1. Mapley, Hogg	3,	5,	4 = 12	Clarke, Fenner	4,	1½,	3 = 8½
2. Mesher, Orrock	5½,	6,	1½ = 13	Bolton, Gould	2,	1,	4 = 7
3. Mooney, Opposs	4,	3,	3 = 10	Shepherd, Lewis	3,	5½,	4 = 12½
			<u>35</u>				<u>28</u>

The saga of the first County Championship was brought to a satisfactory conclusion from Essex's point of view, when they defeated Cheshire in the final. Despite the fact that some members of the winning team were considerably richer in years than the opponents, the sides were fairly evenly matched in winking ability, and a close match resulted. In the event, Essex forged into a three point lead after the first round, and maintained their advantage without too much difficulty.

After 15 minutes play in the first round, two games were even and Cheshire led narrowly in the third. From then on, Essex pair two improved their position to gain the only 6-1 victory of the match - in passing it might be mentioned that neither side throughout felt tempted to try to seek a 7-0. In the top pair's confrontation, Essex fell behind, and only by both Essex players showing a commendable lack of last round nerves, and potting 2 winks each, were they able to rescue themselves from the jaws of a 6-1 defeat.

Cheshire held their own in the second round of the match, assisted by John Mesher, who obliged by potting a wink from the baseline, probably just to impress the spectators, of whom there were now a handful.

In the third and final round, Essex were in no mood to relinquish their slender lead, and with Mick Mooney and Dennis Opposs (evidently well briefed in safety-first tactics) maintaining their run of even games, they brought the final margin to seven points.

Highlights of the final round were firstly the ETWA treasurer reminding us that his skills are not merely financial, by playing a wink off a pile to squop two separated enemy winks, and Jeremy Shepherd missing by a whisker, having flicked a wink over the top of the pot and spun back towards a vital Essex wink.

When the match was safe, and the Essex 1 v Cheshire 3 game was the only one still in progress, a certain informality became evident among the players. Thus

Mapley: (deliberately) "If I have 13, how is Green going to beat me?"

Hogg: (thoughtfully) "By getting 14"

(Laughter).

That's all for now read us again in the Autumn. Have fun, good squidging.