

*THE OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE
ENGLISH TIDDLYWINKS ASSOCIATION*

WINKING WORLD

Number 41

October 1982

25p to non-members

C O N T E N T S

Editorial Jottings	Page 1
Notes on Strategy	2
Winkonundrum	7
The Varsity Match	8
The Hampshire Open	9
The National Pairs	11
The Marchant Trophy	14
I Fort	15
Individual Tournaments	17
News from America	18
The Jubilee Trophy	18

EDITORIAL JOTTINGS

Some dates to remember:

October 16th:- World Singles in London. David Lockwood's ninth defence of his title, this time against Charles Relle. Come and support your Editor

October 23rd & 24th:- National Singles.

November 27th & 28th:- Teams of Four and Annual General Meeting. Details of these two events to be circulated.

I hope to produce the next Winking World at Christmas or the New Year. No doubt there will be some material to fill it - maybe even an account of the handicap singles that actually did take place in February: but I appeal for articles of any kind.

As a result of my plea in WW40 some subscriptions have come in, but ETWA always needs new members, so spread the word everybody!

WW40 seems to have been quite well received. At least I have not been sacked as Editor. There have been complaints that some competitors have not been properly identified, and I acknowledge that this was true of the London Open. I could not remember to whom they all referred. I apologise for this.

Geoff Cornell now has a new address at :

16 Lesmo Road, Edgeley, Stockport, SK3 0TX
tel: 061 480 3501

We wish him and Chris every happiness in their new home.

NOTES FOR BEGINNERS ON TIDDLYWINKS STRATEGY

(To be read in conjunction with the Rules of the Game)

What makes Tournament Tiddlywinks the game it is? It has five distinct features: the element of partnership; squopping, by which a wink covered by another wink cannot be played; the fact that if you pot a wink you have another shot; the time limit; the scoring system. It is worth reminding you of this last. The first player to pot out scores four game points, the second two and the third one, and partner's scores are added together. Then one point is transferred from the losing to the winning side. If by the end of the game no-one has potted out, each wink in the pot scores three time limit points and each uncovered wink not in the pot scores one. These points are totalled and converted to the 4-2-1 game point scale with no transfer to the winning side. Since gaining first place secures a win, only one member of a partnership need aim for it, by potting or otherwise. To win by potting out is desirable because of the bonus it attracts. However, it is risky because you must pot all your winks to gain an outright win, and because your opponents will be trying to squop you. If they succeed in this they may, before your winks can be rescued, pot out themselves, or pot enough winks to be ahead at the end. Having even one wink squopped can lose you the game.

From this two things emerge: first, even if one partner goes for the pot, the other attempts to put his winks near to the pot in order to squop the opponents or to free his partner if squopped: second, neither partner will set out with the intention of immediately potting with some winks and squopping with others; six potted winks of one colour score a win but six of mixed colours do not. The simplest effective strategy, then, is for one partner to try to pot his winks as rapidly as possible, either one by one or after they have all been brought into the middle. He brings his winks from the corner into empty spaces or close to friendly winks. His partner puts his winks round the

pot and squop the opponents, especially the enemy potter. The potter, if squopped, tries to free himself by landing on the squopping wink and subsequently playing a shot hard enough to desqop all the winks. Remember that as long as he plays the top wink first he may play any wink beneath it. He may need help from his partner if he has few winks left or many winks caught. Mostly, however, partner will be at his task of squopping the enemy potter, or, if the opportunity arises, the enemy squopper. This type of game is exciting and open if both sides play it. There is plenty of space, winks are caught and rescued, and tension mounts as one or both sides get nearer to a pot-out. Battle scenes move from place to place and the game is usually quick and the end sudden. In fact in a beginners' four, it may be best for the players to have a gentleman's agreement to play this type of game, usually known as Pot-Squop. This ensures a lively game, and everyone gets a chance to practice all the skills.

If you do not want the opponents to know which of you is intending to pot, you may decide to bring all your winks of both colours as near to the pot as you can. The opponents will probably do this too, and winks of all four colours may be squopped before anyone starts potting. Whatever the intentions of either side, the game may develop into the pattern called Double Squop. Pot-Squop is a high-risk strategy because if you pot some of your winks and the rest are squopped, you may never get back into the game, and because the opponents, by leaving their potting effort until near the end, will have superior forces with which to improve their position by squopping your winks. It is, of course, a great advantage to squop all the winks of one enemy colour, thus gaining two turns to the opponent's one, and this is easier to achieve if some of their winks are already potted. Double Squop, a low-risk strategy in which both partners bring all

their winks into play with the intention of squopping the opponents, giving up the chance of an immediate outright win with its concomitant dangers, aims to squop all the opponents' winks, or at least most of both colours.

Double squop may transpose into pot-squop, either when one player finds all his six winks free and tries a pot-out, or when a much superior pair squops up the opponents completely, frees all its winks of one colour and pots out. It is more likely, however, that when both sides are playing double squop, that winks of each colour will be squopped, and that there will be several places where one or other side has the upper hand. The game will then turn on the extent to which each side manages to free its own winks and cover the opposition, and whether, as the endgame approaches, the side with the advantage can hold it. During the game, as squops are made and rescues are successful or frustrated, piles of winks form, with the wink on top controlling several others, and a pile is likely to become the centre of attention in proportion to the number of winks in it. If you control a pile containing more of the opponents' winks than of yours, it is a valuable asset that you must guard. You should put your winks near it ready to squop enemy winks that approach the pile. Try to bring distant winks near to important points, keeping a tempo or two ahead of the opponents. Do not let your winks be lured away from guarding your assets. If the opponents have more assets than you have, attack isolated winks or unguarded piles; if the opponents have one big pile, attack it before it can be protected, or try to draw the winks guarding it and then attack it. It is best to try to gain control of enemy piles and then to break them up, releasing your winks. A bomb shot that attempts to dislodge the controlling wink from a pile is rarely effective, and often just loses another wink. Nevertheless, accurately played, it can be devastating.

Most players think of double squop as battle concentrating on a few key piles each containing several winks, but the variety of situations is almost infinite. Sometimes each side controls an area where it is powerful and the opponents weak. A few winks are squopped and well guarded. If a wink strays into enemy territory it is almost irretrievably squopped, so the game develops into one of positional warfare, and each side perhaps nibbles at the edges of the enemy area with mutually supporting winks. The game appears to be static for long periods, but you can only keep the balance by very accurate play. Aneven position can turn into a win or a loss very quickly, either when atoo rash venture is punished or when one side gains a hold on enemy territory and cannot be repelled. Also, a threat to win by potting many winks or by potting out completely may induce an enemy foray that ends in disaster.

Whatever your strategy, and however it is varied by the tactical disposition of the winks, you must not forget the time limit. Having only five turns per colour after the time severely restricts your scope, so you must plan ahead to secure first place and preferably second as well. You can do this by keeping more winks free than the opponents, (remember that at the end each colour is reckoned separately and that first place gains an overall win), and by potting some winks as this is a useful means of drawing ahead. It is difficult to judge how and when to move over to the final attack; potting reduces your forces, and leaving winks on the mat means they may be squopped. Much depends on the tactical situation in the individual game. A single mistake can bring about a loss. To avoid fatal errors, always keep a count of the number of actual and potential time-limit points each colour has, decide which of your colours has the better chance of first place and try to promote it. The opponents will try to do the same with one of their colour. The more real your threat to win

becomes, the more pressure there is on the opponents: they may engage in a desperate bid to salvage first place, and lose that and second place too. Be careful that this does not happen to you if the opponents are ahead. Assess your chances and play for the greatest likely number of points, especially in a match, in which the final result is decided on points scored, not games won.

Notice, however, that all strategy depends on the threat to pot, and your ability to pot depends on your nearness to the pot. So, at the beginning, bring your winks in close to the pot: this will mean that the opponents will have to try to squop you. Therefore your winks must be defensible, so they must be close together: if one is squopped another is on hand to rescue. On the other hand they must be sufficiently dispersed to keep the opponents away from the pot at all points. This may seem to pose a dilemma. In practice it does not, for the opponents are doing the same, and space round the pot becomes short if bring in accurately. Battle is soon joined, so bring in carefully to points where the winks are in your judgement most needed. If you do this well, the advantage in tempo is very useful.

Finally, no strategy, however well planned, can succeed if it is faultily executed. You must be able to pot, squop and bring in well, and it does help to practice. After the initial frustration, this is very relaxing, the ideal recuperation after a hard day. Even more so is the game itself, in which strategy, tactics, dexterity and sociability all play their part.

(This article has been contributed by the Editor.)

To brush up your knowledge of the scoring system, try the puzzle on the next page !

The first Lundy Island Singles Championship attracted an entry of only six players, and because of the long travel delays, it was determined that a round-robin tournament, with one game against each opponent, would decide the winner. The following report appeared in the Lundy Island Morning Post:

" The winner of the tournament lost only one game, against Larry, who came fourth, despite suffering only one defeat himself. The closeness of the tournament is evidenced by the fact that the difference between first and last was only $12\frac{1}{2}$ points, and no game was potted out. Duncan lost every game, which is surprising as he and Mr Edwards had just won the Cape Cod Pairs. Mr Edwards was still in good form, beating Geoff $5\frac{1}{2}-1\frac{1}{2}$ and Charles $4\frac{1}{2}-2\frac{1}{2}$, this latter victory being Mr Edwards' third fractional score. There were others: Mr Josland beat Geoff $4\frac{1}{2}-2\frac{1}{2}$ and there was one tie, between Charles and Mr Brennan. Mr Brennan was also involved in the only game where three colours tied for first place. Fortunately for him, his opponent, Idwal couldn't score any points with his green winks. All Idwal's other games were whole number scores. Mr Frankston didn't do very well, winning only one game but one of the best performances came from Mr Knowles, with threee resounding 6-1 victories, which helpedhim to achieve second place, only half a point behind the winner. This was the only case of a player getting three identical scores. The player who finished sixth was the only one with five different scores. 4-3 was the most frequently occurring score and Larry had more 4's than anyone else, one of these being against Mr Hull. Alan's total included only one 3. Charles eventually finished on 19 points. "

The LIMP could obviously do with some help: can you supply full names of the players and a complete score chart ? The solution will be in our next issue.

THE VARSITY MATCH - 1982

On Sunday May 9th a team from Cambridge travelled to New College, Oxford, to play the Varsity match.

Cambridge started as they meant to continue, the first score on the sheet being a 7-0 victory to Bertoya and Long. Two of the other Cambridge pairs obliged with 6-1 victories, but Abel and Hilditch managed to blot the score sheet in inimitable style with a 1½-5½ defeat at the hands of Harbron and Webster.

After lunch, suitably refreshed and encouraged by several pints of Varsity ale, Cambridge continued to pull ahead, the running total at the end of the second round being 40½-15½. Oxford fared better in the third round, taking 10 points off Cambridge, but despite this a Cambridge win was inescapable by the end of this round. In round 4, the status of "least imaginative Cambridge pair" was achieved by Godfkin and Lamprey (sic) who scored 6-1's in each round.

The final score standing at 81½-30½ in Cambridge's favour, the Varsity Trophy could return to Cambridge whence it had been brought, thus continuing their unbeaten record in Varsity matches since 1966. Full credit, however, must go to the Oxford team, who put up an entirely creditable performance throughout.

OXFORD

	TEW WELLER	SATCHWELL POLSON	GIBSON WILKS	HARBRON WEBSTER	
C BERTOYA	7-0	6-1	5-2	6-1	24
A LONG					
M GODFREY	6-1	6-1	6-1	6-1	24
B LAMPKIN					
R INGLIS	4-3	2-5	6-1	4-3	16
I WILLIAMS					
D ABEL	4-3	2-5	7-0	1½-5½	17½
E HILDICH					
	7	9	4	10½	81½-30½

THE HAMPSHIRE OPEN - 27th February 1982

Owing to the rather low turnout for this year's Hampshire Open, the tournament format was an all-play-all amongst the six pairs, with the traditional play-off between the first and second placed pairs, the scores from this being added to the previous scores to determine the winner.

The favourites at the start were Still and Edwards and the holders, Mach and Mooney, with three Southampton pairs and Thorpe and Lees ("looks like we're playing together then") making up the numbers.

The first round went to form except for the surprise defeat of Surrige and Boyce by the first-year pair Cartwright and Clark, a pairing which was made to force one of them to start thinking about tactict! This embarrassing result had greater consequences than anybody expected. In round 2 Mach and Mooney and Still and Edwards continued to amass points to go 3 and 4 points clear at the top. Round 3 saw what many considered to be the crunch game between the two leaders, and the resulting 6-1 win by Mick and Cyril seemed to have decided the tournament, since it put them 6 clear of the pack with two round plus the play-off to go and three 6-1's under their belts.

In round 4 Mach and Mooney lost to Josland and "Megacrudder" Parsons, but the tournament was not over. Boyce and Surrige, fuming still after their defeat by first year team mates, smashed the leaders 7-0. This was due to Surrige's appalling bringing-in, which left 6 free but too far out to do anything but "accidentally" pot a few. My thanks to Alan for digging the last one out! Suddenly there were only 8 points spanning all the pairs, only two of which knew could not qualify for the play-off.

In round 5 Edwards and Still got the expected 6-1 against Cartwright and Clarke and Surrige and Boyce managed to throw away 6-1, and to lose 3-4 against Mach and Mooney, a result that kept them in second place despite a last-minute surge by Josland and Parsons.

The holders were therefore out, and the play-off was between Edwards and Still and Boyce and Surridge.

The final play-off was a game fraught with errors by the Southampton pair and ineffectiveness by the London pair. Needing just 2 points to be sure of victory, Edwards and Still quickly got themselves into a 6-1 losing position, which Boyce and Surridge proceeded to fritter away with rushed play and the occasional fozzled shot. As rounds began the Southampton pair had a safe 5-2, but needed Cyril to make an error in order to get a 6-1 and win the tournament. Not satisfied with this, Surridge made an ill-advised chip between piles which would have converted the thing into a safe 6-1. Instead, the chip stopped short and squopped his partner. It all came down to potting in round 5, with Surridge leading, and Boyce losing. Surridge lost another pile freeing Boyce so that the latter could pot his way into second place. This left him tied with an opponent in first place. Then Alan fozzled his potting attempt on the second wink to get a tie for third. The score of the game was thus 3½-3½, leaving Still and Edwards as winners of the Hampshire Open.

Congratulations to Cyril and Michael on winning, and also to Rob Cartwright for thinking about tactics and coming up with a new winks term "the fozzle" which I am reliably informed means a complete and utter cock-up

RESULTS

1.	C Edwards	M Still	24
2.	A Boyce	M Surridge	20
3.	G Josland	N Parsons	19
4.	J Mach	M Mooney	18
5.	R Lees	G Thorpe	13
6.	R Cartwright	P Clarke	11

Play-off

Edwards/Still 3½ Boyce/Surridge 3½

(Thanks to Mike Surridge for this article)

THE NATIONAL PAIRS CHAMPIONSHIP 1982 by Nigel Knowles

Once again the Old Hall at Queen's College, Cambridge was the venue for the National Pairs, amid medieval splendor and wandering tourists,

The turn-out was down on last year's excellent attendance with a few of the well known 'oldies' missing and the Latymer Upper School 'O' levels taking their toll, The unaccustomed absence of Cyril Edwards at least meant that all comments on the games were printable.

The format was as last year - an all-play-all with the top four pairs playing another game against each other to add to their totals.

There was not a lot of disagreement on who would qualify for the final. At the end of the first day² after six rounds, the surprises were the order of the four pairs with Hull and Thorpe a close third to Seaman and Pam Knowles and the mighty Dean and Mapley relegated to fourth place. Relle and Nigel Knowles were showing their intention of retaining their title, having held the lead throughout the day. Three other pairs had looked likely at the outset to challenge at least for fourth place - Inglis and Lampkin, Boyce and Long and Josland and Cartwright, but none of them could manage consistent results, and the excellent form shown by Thorpe and Hull ruled them out.

At this point there was a frantic Marchant Trophy match, reported elsewhere, which had to be completed before 8 pm when the Hall was taken over for a college party. Whilst we had a relatively sober Indian meal and more Greene King ale the Party-goers had no worries about the 'morning after', and we had the problem of scrubbing the wine etc. off the tables !

Unfortunately in the morning Smith and Williams did not turn up, causing some discussion as to how to treat their scores. In this case it made little difference, but there should be a rule agreed beforehand to cover this situation.

Pam Knowles and Keith Seaman edged up on the

leaders by winning the game between them 4-3. Charles Relle and Nigel Knowles continued their winning way apart from this, but not without some disputes (friendly!) in two rule problems against Long and Boyce. In the first, Roger Long broke up a pile and one of Charles's winks hit his finger. We were happy to accept where it landed, reckoning that it was Roger's fault that he impeded it. However, the rules do not allow this, saying that the wink is placed in a 'mutually agreed place' - which of course did not exist. It was eventually decided to place it halfway between where it landed and where we guessed it might have landed: not satisfactory. In the same game a second problem arose. We had had free turns and Charles managed in freeing a wink to resqop it, thus forcing another wink to be freed manually - showing up two problems in the rules we are now using. First, the rules when read carefully give the offended pair a choice of which Squopping wink to move, whereas I am sure the intention was to give a choice of which squopped wink should be freed. I think the rule is right as it is - Ed) Second, (and this did arise) there is no order of precedence as to whether the squopping wink is moved so as to free only one wink or to remain the same distance from the pot - I believe the former should take precedence. To return to the pairs; Relle and Knowles qualified only two points ahead of Knowles and Seaman with the other pairs well behind.

In the first round of the final the order of play is 1st v. 4th, 2nd v. 3rd, and this led to no change of position. The second round draw attempts to leave the likely first and second pairs playing each other in the final round. This meant Knowles and Relle v. Dean and Mapley and Knowles and Seaman v. Thorpe and Hull. The leading pairs lost, but Knowles and Relle managed two points to get a five point lead - a crucial margin as in the final round even a 6-1 win would give Pam and Keith only a tie. In this last match both pairs showed great wariness, each occupying an

NATIONAL PAIRS 1982

			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	TOTAL
1	CHARLES RELLE v NIGEL KNOWLES	NEWTS/ADONIS QUESH	-	5	6	6	3	6	6	6	6	44
2	JON MAPLEY v ALAN DEAN	NEWTS/OBVIANK QUESH	2	-	5	1	1	6	6	6	7	34
3	PAUL HILBITCH v STEVE SAGE	CANTAB.	1	2	-	1	2	1	1	3	5	16
4	DAVE HULL v GEOFF THORPE	QUESH ADONIS	1	6	6	-	1	6	2½	5	6	33½
5	PAM KNOWLES v KEITH SEAMAN	QUESH	4	6	5	6	-	2	6	7	6	42
6	ALAN BOYCE v ROGER LONG	SOUTHAMPTON UNIV. CANTAB.	1	1	6	1	5	-	4½	1	7 _{DEF}	26½
7	GRAHAM JOBLAND v BOB CARTWRIGHT	SOUTHAMPTON UNIV.	1	1	6	4½	1	2½	-	6	1	23
8	NICK INGLIS MICHAEL LAMPKIN	CANTAB.	1	1	4	2	0	6	1	-	7 _{DEF}	22
9	ANDREW WILLIAMS v SMITH	CANTAB	1	0	2	1	1	DEF	6	DEF	-	11

THE FINAL

			1	2	4	5	FINAL TOTAL
1	CHARLES RELLE v NIGEL KNOWLES	44	-	2	6	4	56
2	JON MAPLEY v ALAN DEAN	34	5	-	3	5	47
4	DAVE HULL v GEOFF THORPE	33½	1	4	-	4	42½
5	PAM KNOWLES v KEITH SEAMAN	42	3	2	3	-	50

area and not entering into a fight. This suited Charles and Nigel who kept one colour unoccupied to ensure at least two points - though Pam's and Keith's attempts to improve their score eventually caused them to lose the game.

So Charles Relle and Nigel Knowles retain their title and the statisticians are looking for various records. Charles needs to win the Singles this year to take a record four titles in a row. The Pairs has been won twice in a row before now - we need to win it next year as well for a record.

Thanks as usual to Cambridge for the hospitality and organisation. The playing conditions are close to ideal and the provision of drinks for sale was an excellent idea.

THE MARCHANT TROPHY 1982

Only two matches have been played in this year's competition. At the National Pairs Qhesh beat Cambridge despite having only five players. The whole match was played at breakneck speed so as to be finished by the time the hire of the hall ran out. Here are a few highlights from my impressionistic notes:

Qhesh decided to play Nigel Knowles by himself, and he justified this in the first round by getting a 7 (reduced to $3\frac{1}{2}$) after a pot-out in round 4. The match between Pam Knowles and Alan Dean and Inglis and Smith was full of incident: Inglis went off the table and as if to compensate for this his partner carnovskied: Alan, sensing victory already, began a pot-out, alarming Pam, who squopped him deliberately, as she maintained! Later Alan potted a second yellow wink (his own) and Pam, wishing to justify herself, squopped him again. Their opponents now entered into the spirit of the thing and Smith put a green wink (Pam's) on top of a pile previously controlled by his own side. Struck by the novel idea of squopping the opponents, Pam tried it out herself and actually made a squop. Subsequently she even potted one of her own winks. Despite this, and the multiple pile-

-ups described above, and a sub by Alan, Pam and Alan found themselves in free turns in round 3 and took a 6-1. Meanwhile Keith Seaman and David Hull were playing at their own pace against Godfrey and Lampkin, eventually scoring $4\frac{2}{3}$ - $2\frac{1}{3}$. In the second round, however, they scored 6 as did Nigel; his score was reduced to 3. Alan potted out. The third round happened so rapidly that your reporter was unable to follow any games, and cannot remember the scores.

In the other match NEWTS met a well-primed Southampton team towards afternoon closing time one Saturday. Andy Vincent did not appear on time and was replaced in the first round by Denedict Relle, who, partnering his father, lost 6-1. Southampton did manage one other win, a 5-2, and apart from this contrived to average just over one point a game, finally losing by 62 points to 22.

It is hoped that the other matches are played soon.

I FORT NOMENCLATURE WOZ ORL ABART WIMMIZ LIB UNTILL
I RED WINKING WURLED by Jonathan Mapley

For as long as I have been playing, names and phrses have entered and departed from the Glossary of Winking Terminology. Some start as local dialect and become accepted by the masses. Others are rejected because they are too contrived, too American or for other less obvious reasons. Also, words need to be needed. Take 'boondock' as an example. A single, colourful word has replaced four - 'send off the mat'. The only other term I have heard used in this context is 'lose' which is too boring. It is essential elements of mystery, colour or double-entendre which makes a word acceptable. If anyone thinks we would now be talking about 'newcastling' two winks onto another if the inventor had attended a University 300 miles to the north-east of where he actually was, then he deludes himself.

I would take issue with our illustrious editor over his meanderings westward from the Severn estuary. My definition of a Bristol is 'a shot where the plane of the squidger is at right-angles to its normal plane'. It matters not what angle is formed by the tangent to both winks and the line of intended flight; it is the way the squidger is held that makes it a Bristol. The Yanks have a word 'gromp' which I have always liked, and which means to jump any pile of winks a long way by any method of squidger propulsion. I feel it is a useful word to describe the type of shot in which the top wink is ahead of the lower as regards the line of flight. This has to be played quickly in the normal squopping style, clipping both winks in the hope that the lower will be carried beneath the upper. I have laughed inwardly at many players' attempts to play the gromp bristol fashion, with disastrous results.

It seems Mr Carnovsky has at last infiltrated our vocabulary, which is only right and proper, considering his legendary feat. One word which will never cross the Atlantic is 'lunch', meaning to pot an opponent's wink. I once asked Bob Hemmings what it meant, and he replied 'to send him out to lunch'. I smiled politely and asked him what he thought of President Carter. Another is 'piddle', meaning a gentle pile manoeuvre. We used to call that a 'naddle' at Bancroft's - heaven knows why. Another Bancroftianism which has stuck is 'Plan 47'. Most people know that this is the panic tactic of potting any freed winks when you are squopped up, in the hope that you can score at least nine points with one colour and embarrass your opponents more than by diving into their well-defended territory, but why 47? It was simply the house number of a girl whom Gregory Hogg fell madly in love with at the age of 15. I well remember the look of bemusement on Alan Cooper's face when, in the 1964 National Junior Championship,

Greg suggested we try the tactic. 'Do you have as many as 47 plans? We've only got three' he lied. (Altringham only ever had one.) Charles may be recalling the 'ULU' when he says that shots are named after places, but this has converted itself into 'sub' yet another American word.

I don't see 'the John Lennon Memorial Shot' becoming a permanent addition to our vocabulary. It is too complicated. There does seem to be a need for a word meaning 'boondock and squop', but 'wirral' ? - I'm not sure. 'Knock off and squop' is another cumbersome phrase that needs an esoteric word.

In conclusion, after listening to players at the National Pairs talking about 'total exclusion zones' round the pot, maybe in future the 'bomb shot' will be referred to as the 'Port Stanley' or even better 'Galtieri'.

INDIVIDUAL TOURNAMENTS

by Charles Relle

Just after Easter I put into practice an idea which I had been thinking of for some time, and launched the Catford Invitation Individual Tournament. This was for eight people, each of whom had to play seven games, partnering each of the other players in turn, and playing against each twice in various combinations. I decided I could not cope with more than eight in this experimental situation but movements can be devised for any number of players, though I have not yet found one for fourteen. Guide cards were prepared for the players and these helped in the smooth running of the event. It was a good test of adaptability and tolerance as well as of winking skill, and strikes me as excellent way of introducing new players to more experienced partners. For me, the high point of the day was when Nigel Knowles, observing that his partner was leading the tournament, exclaimed 'Hey, I want you to lose!' They did, but partner Dennis Opposs

went on to win. When it was all over, I was relieved that the movement had worked out, and I do commend the experiment to others.

NEWS FROM AMERICA by Charles Relle

Readers of WW may occasionally be puzzled by computer mnemonics (who wants to know who the MAGASTARS are anyway?), but decoding American names is really hard. Did you know that * and L came second in this year's pairs in America? Are you any the wiser, or even better informed? The tournament had an entry of seven pairs, and was a single round robin one-day event, won by Joe Sachs and Charles Frankston, both of whom came to England in 1978 and 1981. They won all six games and amassed 35 points. The world champion partnership of Larry Kahn and Severin Drix had split for this event: Larry played with Rick Tucker and rolled in third; Sevrin partnered Sam (Sam who? sorry Sam, whom? Surface to Air Missile, perhaps?) and finished sixth. Various cryptograms filled the other places. Seven players appeared for the singles: Larry won for the second year running, winning all his games in a double round robin and scoring 70 points. Arye was second on 55½ and the rest of the field was coded in monosyllables, with Severin, I think, third.

THE JUBILEE TROPHY

Dave Lockwood relinquished this trophy on taking up residence in the Middle East, and it was decided that Charles Relle and Jonathan Mapley should play for it. The match took place at Witham in Easter week and the home player lost 1-6, 2-5, 2½-4½, 1-6. Cyril Edwards and Alan Dean have challenged, and further challenges should be sent to the Secretary of ETWA, Geoff Thorpe at:

9 Sussex Road, Cheadle Heath, Stockport
tel: 061 477 2640