

W I N K I N G
O R L D
44

A U T U M N 1 9 8 4

C O N T E N T S

Editorial Jottings	1
Roger Kirby	2
Etwa A.G.M.	3
The National Fours	5
The 1983 Singles	7
The 1984 Hampshire Open	10
The National Pairs 1984	12
The World Singles Championship	15
The Silver Wink	16
The Catford Individual	19
The London Open 1984	19
Mats-on the-mat?	23
Tailpiece	25
stop press SINGLES VENUE	26

Editorial Jottings

First, some dates: the national teams of four championship will be in Cambridge on the weekend of 27 and 28 October. A handicap system will, as last year, be used. This is the most relaxed national tournament, and the handicap gives every team, whatever its strength, a real chance of winning. So come along and bring your friends: this is the ideal tournament at which to introduce new players to the winking fellowship. The ETWA A.G.M. will be on the Saturday evening.

* The national singles championship will be in *
* L O N D O N on the weekend of 24 and 25 November. *
If all goes well, it will coincide with the American tour, and it will be one of the strongest tournaments ever. The format will be the same as that of recent years, but the final pool will be larger. Please come along: if you make the final it will be an achievement in itself, and if you do not, there will be a consolation tournament.

We hope there will be an international and World Master's tournament on 17 November and 18 November in Cambridge, and that the American tour will run from this weekend to the next. Please do all you can to make the Americans welcome. If you can offer accommodation, or if your club wants to play against the Americans, please get in touch with Jonathan Mapley at 2 Janmead, Witham, Essex.

It is late in the year to be asking for subscriptions, but if you have not paid your £5 for 1984 (or £2 if you are a student), please send it to Alan Dean at 6 Birkland Drive, Edwinstowe, Nottinghamshire. Remember to join again for 1985, and try to get new members, or even start a new club!

* PLEASE SEE END OF THIS ISSUE.

This issue of WW contains mostly match and tournament reports. I hope that in the next there will be more discussion articles, but these will only appear if you write them: it is your magazine.

We congratulate Severin and Pam Drix on the birth of a son, Julian Alexander; and Julius and Clare Mach on the birth of a son, Patrick David.

Roger Kirby

We much regret to record the death on 1 August 1984 as a result of a brain haemorrhage of Roger Kirby.

He was born on 14 January 1949, and was at Ealing Grammar School with Keith Seaman, Mick Still and Mick Wiseman. Like them he went to Southampton University where he read Mathematics. In his final year he was secretary of the Winks Club, taking to all parts of the country what was then a new team, containing names now familiar, such as Nigel Knowles, Mick Mooney, Julius Mach and Hugh Goyder.

After graduating in 1971, he worked for a year in Ealing, and was largely responsible for the resurrection of the London League, which he ran during that year. In October 1972 he went to train as a schoolteacher at St Catherine's College, Liverpool, but never finished the course: instead he began a career in public transport. This was no real surprise to those who knew him well, for public transport, especially buses, always held a fascination for him. He began as a conductor on Crosville, and with short breaks to study Transport Design at Liverpool University and as a research assistant at Leeds University, he progressed to become an Analyst for Merseyside Passenger Transport Authority with responsibility for bus routing and timetabling.

In recent years Roger's practical interest in beer drinking led him to CAMRA and eventually to be Treasurer of the Merseyside Branch of CAMRA.

His funeral on 7 August at Wavertree Crematorium was attended by over 100 friends, including Mick Still and Mick Wiseman. Ironically, there was a local transport strike that day, but one bus did run - it took colleagues and friends to pay their last respects to him. He will be remembered as a modest man with great humour and integrity, who was a good and loyal friend to so many.

May he rest in peace.

This notice was largely contributed by Mick Still.

The A.G.M. of ETWA held 22 October 1983 in the Clubs and Societies Room, Southampton University: notes supplied by Phil Clark.

The meeting began with all standing in silence in respect for Pam Knowles.

The Minutes of the last A.G.M. as published in WW42 were passed as an accurate record of proceedings. Jon Mapley then began his report with a résumé of the activities of the previous year and Tim Broome was complimented on becoming the youngest winner of a tournament in the Cambridge Open. Comments were passed on the handicap system in operation at the Fours and Jon brought everyone up to date in the results of challenges for the World Championship.

Nick Inglis gave the secretary's report mentioning that no outside correspondence had been received save a brochure for an expensive conference centre somewhere in Wales. He mentioned the previous year's tournament publicity which it was hoped had

gone out in time.

The treasurer's report, given by Alan Dean, revealed that ETWA funds were not too healthy and that he had himself made a loan to ETWA. He hoped that the situation would improve if stocks of old equipment could be sold and reported on efforts made in that direction. It was proposed that the cost of membership should be increased and after some discussion it was finally agreed that new costs of £5 (£2 to students) were to be introduced. Charles Relle as Winking World Editor, drew attention to the Easter issue (WW42) and mentioned that several contributions had already been received for the next publication.

Attention was then turned to the report of the Rules Committee, Xerox copies of which were distributed. Notwithstanding frequent beer breaks the lengthy report was meticulously examined and disagreements were noted. Of immediate significance was the acceptance of the American system of leaving a gap between winks separated after a pot-out.

There was greater discussion over the so-called 'megacrwd' and the height with which the squidger was brought down. With a view to imposing a height limit serious thought was given to think of any situation in which great height was needed. Once it was determined that there were not any a suggestion of a limit of 2" was put to the vote. A show of hands revealed the majority to be in favour with only 2 dissensions.

The officers for 1984 were then chosen with Jon Mapley (Chairman), Alan Dean (treasurer) and Charles Relle (WW Editor) being re-elected unopposed. Nick Inglis however said he would not stand again as secretary since he would be out of the country for much of the year. Phil Clark was proposed by Jim

Carrington, seconded by Charles Relle and elected unopposed.

Dates and venues for 1984 were chosen with the only real discussion coming over the Pairs. Southampton players expressed concern at the date (too near exams) and Cambridge at the venue because they could not afford to get there. Accordingly the date was moved back and London chosen as the venue, it being felt that both Cambridge and Southampton players could travel there easily.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 10.30 pm.

The National Fours by Alan Boyce

There was another disappointing turn out to the fours. Only 19 players managed to turn up, 12 of them from Southampton University. We added interest to the tournament by handicapping each player and adding the four players' handicaps to achieve a team handicap. Carrington, Eizzard, Beck and Darling thought their best chance lay by playing together with a combined handicap of 6. It turned out that they were wrong and they proved it by coming last.

The early pacesetters were Boyce, Clark, Ferguson and Lees (handicap 15) who started with a less than convincing victory against the Carrington team. They then had a narrow defeat against Mapley, Inglis, Attwood and Tim Jeffries (18). But after a good win over Josland, Cartwright, Surridge and Till they ended the first day on 46 points from 3 rounds and narrowly in the lead.

Meanwhile Relle, Thorpe and Dean (24) had been progressing well by annihilating the opposition and then transferring many points to their lower handicapped foes. They had a bye in the first round,

then managed to amass a net 15 against Carrington's team. They scored 24 points on the table to arrive at this score, so playing together was making it tough for them. They had $44\frac{1}{2}$ points after 3 rounds, then came to play Boyce on 46 points. That match produced the biggest net win of the tournament (sadly in favour of the Relle team).

Only two pairs, Surridge and Cartwright and Mapley and Attwood managed to win games against Relle's team. So despite a huge handicap, Relle, Dean and Thorpe still managed to win the tournament.

However, the biggest winner was the handicapping system which kept the difference between first team and last team down to $13\frac{1}{2}$ points. It even managed to cope with 2 players not being available for the second day.

Net scores after handicap

Dean, Relle and Thorpe	$63\frac{1}{2}$
Attwood, Inglis, Jeffries, Mapley	$57\frac{1}{2}$
Boyce , Clark, Ferguson, Lees	55
Cartwright, Josland, Surridge, Till	54
Beck, Carrington, Darling, Eizzard	50

Editor's note: the handicapping system was an idea of Julius Mach carried into execution by Mike Surridge. They are both to be congratulated on its efficient working: I am sure it made the tournament more fun for everybody.

The 1983 Singles, or the 25th National Title

When we arrived at Westfield College we discovered that the only tables available were 4'6" x 3', so hasty discussions determined that the best arrangement would be to group them in threes so that there was a crack about 9 inches from each end of the mats, rather than one across the centre. A visit to the catering department produced some washing-up liquid, a bucket and cloths to set about cleaning the gunge off the surfaces.

Once again, we were left in suspense as to how many players would turn up, but nine from Southampton and a welcome return by four Luts swelled the total to 24. Sadly, Nick was the only CUTWC representative - how about it Cambridge?

12 seeds were spread amongst three qualifying groups and by the time the draw was completed, it looked to be a fairly even competition.

The top three seeds in Black Division had things pretty much their own way, with Dave Lockwood undefeated on 46½, and Geoff and Tony level on 35. Jon Ferguson's 24½ was the next highest, possibly not enough for the elusive 10th spot. Tim Chown's performance, including scores of 5 and 6, is worthy of mention, as he only started playing during the week leading up to the tournament. Green Division was won by Jon Mapley with 44, followed by Keith (36) and Dave Hull (29). The five remaining players were so busy scoring off each other that none of them stood a realistic chance of qualifying. Blue Division was by far the most interesting. Again it was won by an undefeated player, Charles with 42 points, closely followed by Alan Dean (39). Jim Carrington finished on 28½ and had to wait while Alan Boyce and Nick Inglis played out the final game of the group, starting with 25½ and 26½ respectively. Virtually any sizeable score by either player would see Jim qualify but they managed to contrive a 4-3 to Alan, and so both of them ended with 29½ and squeezed him out.

Seven players turned up on Sunday for the Runners-up tournament, which was convincingly won by Tim Broome on $32\frac{1}{2}$ points. Mark Eizzard ($23\frac{1}{2}$), Rob Cartwright ($22\frac{1}{2}$), Jim Carrington (22), Tim Chown (21) (an amazing score - some real talent here!) and Jon Ferguson ($19\frac{1}{2}$) must have had a battle royal, and Déjà Lockwood suffered from the demands of Samantha and the lack of a husbandly guiding hand, scoring 6.

The order of play in the main tournament was arranged so that the highest scoring qualifiers played the lowest scorers first. At lunchtime, with three games played, there was already an eleven point gap between fifth and sixth places. Alan Boyce's potting let him down against Dave Lockwood - two reasonable pots in round five would have given him a 4-3 win instead of a 1-6. In his next game, a similar opportunity to knock a big hole in Jon's 100% record (three consecutive 7's) was spurned. This required three fifth round pots but the first failed - result $1\frac{1}{2}$ - $5\frac{1}{2}$. Alan will remember those two games for a long time!

With four games played, Jon held a four point lead on $26\frac{1}{2}$, from Alan Dean $22\frac{1}{2}$ then Charles and Keith both on 22. Where, one might ask, was last year's winner? For the third time in the four singles games they had played, Tony Brennan beat the mighty Lockwood. The score, 5-2, tempted one to ask if it had been a lucky pot-out. 'No, I just squopped him out of sight', said Tony, modestly. At this stage of the tournament Geoff Thorpe was languishing on $4\frac{1}{2}$ points, equal last. Dave Lockwood crushed Keith 7-0 in round 5 but then lost a crucial 1-6 to Geoff. This game was won and lost by a single shot - a small wink already squopping a large was Bristolled onto a free doubleton three inches away. If only Deja had taken a picture of Dave's face. Charles beat Alan 6-1 then lost to Jon by the same margin and suddenly from being two separate groups of five, the tournament had become one plus nine. At the end of round 6 Jon's lead had stretched to $9\frac{1}{2}$ points,

from Charles, with Alan a further half point adrift. All three took sixes in round 7, Alan's win against Dave meaning that the title had to return to British hands.

Dave beat Charles in round 8, and Alan knew that his game with Jon was make or break. He bravely went for a difficult pot-out, but after two reds he missed the third. Jon breathed a huge sigh as his squop of a red hung on by its finger nails and he gradually managed to draw all Alan's remaining winks into a mammoth pile. If Alan had succeeded with the potout it would certainly have been a 7-0, but as it was, Jon won 5-2, and with a 13 point lead and one game to play it was all over bar the shouting. Dave L won a pot-squop race in the final game after Jon's sixth yellow had missed by miles.

If the tournament had been decided over the last five games, Geoff's $28\frac{1}{2}$ would have won it. His remarkable run tied Keith for fifth place. Dave was fourth, Charles third and Alan second, in his best tournament since he last won in 1978. Dave Hull came seventh and Tony commendably was eighth, considering his lack of competitive winks in the past eighteen months. Alan Boyce's total of $19\frac{1}{2}$ could have been so much better if he had taken his two expensive scalps. Finally, there must be a word of praise for Nick. He carries the Cambridge banner single-handed on so many occasions. He might not be the greatest player, but he is one of the nicest guys around and comes up smiling after a nine game losing sequence in a way we can all envy.

SCORES

	JM	AD	CR	DL	KS	GT	DH	TB	AB	NI	TOT
Jon Mapley	-	5	6	2	6	7	7	6	$5\frac{1}{2}$	7	$51\frac{1}{2}$
Alan Dean	2	-	1	6	5	$4\frac{1}{2}$	6	6	6	6	$42\frac{1}{2}$
Charles Relle	1	6	-	1	4	6	4	6	6	6	40
Dave Lockwood	5	1	6	-	7	1	5	2	6	6	39
Keith Seaman	1	2	3	0	-	6	5	6	6	4	33
Geoff Thorpe	0	$2\frac{1}{2}$	1	6	1	-	5	6	6	$5\frac{1}{2}$	33
Dave Hull	0	1	3	2	2	2	-	6	2	5	23
Tony Brennan	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	-	5	$5\frac{1}{2}$	$21\frac{1}{2}$
Alan Boyce	$1\frac{1}{2}$	1	1	1	1	1	5	2	-	6	$19\frac{1}{2}$
Nick Inglis	0	1	1	1	3	$1\frac{1}{2}$	2	$1\frac{1}{2}$	1	0	12

The 1984 Hampshire Open by Phil Clarke

The Hampshire Open was held on Saturday 18 February at Southampton University and started reasonably promptly. The only initial snag was that dream situation - an odd number of people in a pairs tournament. However this situation was overcome with your reporter playing solo. Attendance was down on the previous year and the tournament was contested largely among experienced players.

The early rounds produced no dominant pair and scores were fairly level. There were moments of subtle interest, for instance a Cartwright 'boondock - through-the-pile' shot ended with several winks propped up against the pot. It took Charles Relle and his rule book to work it out somehow. At some point the intrepid rule-wielder also broke his squidger.

Things finally sorted themselves out with Relle and Thorpe to the surprise of no one in particular going through to the final play-off. Their opponents were Boyce and Surridge, the current holders, who faced the task of needing six points to win.

The final was a close fought contest, if not exactly a speedy one. With the advantage shifting, the Southampton quest for six points received a setback when Thorpe potted two greens. Protracted tactical debate in rounds resulted in the holders searching for available winks to launch the counter-pot. The pressure was increased when Relle nonchalantly potted a boondocked yellow from the edge of the mat. This left Boyce in round 5 needing to pot a couple of reds. Attention focussed on a small wink some $1\frac{1}{2}$ " from the pot - he sized it up, contemplated it, walked around the room, warmed his hands (!) and with studied deliberation, missed. They won the game 4-3 but this was insufficient to stop Relle and Thorpe taking the trophy.

Thanks should go to the people who came down for the tournament and who, despite the mats, made the day very enjoyable.

#

The National Pairs Championship 1984

Every tournament in London poses a problem, that of finding an inexpensive venue. This year the National Pairs resorted to Blackheath High School, the Library of which has tables 6' x 3'. There was one distraction from winks - a television set brought by Liz Bertoya, to watch the Boat Race; on it we saw one of the weekend's sad results.

The turnout, of ten and a half pairs, was at least an improvement on the 1983 tournament, and it was good to see some new and some not-so-new but recently absent faces, but there were, once again, a number of notable absences from what is one of the two major events of the winking year.

It was good to see the return of Nigel Knowles, although the way he played he probably did not enjoy it much, and it is to be hoped that he was not put off by his first experience with the new winks. His partner was the grand old man of Tiddlywinks (he'll most likely thump me for that) Charles Relle. Nigel and Charles were aiming for a moral, if not actual, hat-trick because after taking the title in 1981, and retaining it in 1982, they were unable to compete in 1983 as Nigel was in a computer mending China (or vice versa), and so Charles went to a friend's wedding. The Mapley and Dean partnership, which someone amended the score-sheet to read Torvill and Dean, following the recent success of the latter pair at the Winter Olympics, was formed the previous year. It was considered to be the most likely way of preventing a Relle-Knowles hat-trick and, although they did indeed win last year, it was against a much depleted field without, as has been mentioned, their main target being there to shoot at. Jon did later confess to another reason for partnering Alan: it was the only way he could ensure remaining outright leader in the National Pairs championship stakes, with his five previous wins against Alan's four.

The prospect of a crack at the World Championship, when the Americans come over later in the year, added extra spice to the competition. In the event, it was not Relle-Knowles duo who provided the main opposition for the reigning champions, as Charles was also playing well below his best. It was left to the Southampton pair, Mike Surridge and Graham Josland, still improving steadily, and the old faithfuls Dave Hull and Geoff Thorpe, putting in another very consistent performance, to keep up the pressure. There ought to be several new England caps from among these four when the Americans come over in the winter. Alan Boyce, spreading himself out to look like a pair (of what?) also put in a very creditable performance, but narrowly failed to qualify for the final stages.

After the all-play-all section it looked extremely doubtful if anyone could stop Mapley and Dean. They had won all their games, although they had to work hard against the other top three pairs. (Regrettably it is not possible to elaborate, because of the recent editorial policy of this journal, of describing events which occurred about a year previously, means that people with poor memories who only work when faced with imminent deadlines, are at a distinct disadvantage

The top four played one additional match against each of the others, with points being carried forward from the first stage. When Surridge and Josland took the 4-3 win over Mapley/Dean in the penultimate round, the losers were not too upset as the three points were just what they needed to be certain of retaining the championship. At the end of the day, Surridge and Josland must have been disappointed to find themselves pipped into third place by Thorpe and Hull. He has not won as many Pairs Titles as Jon, but at least Alan can claim to be the first person to win ten National Championships. The big question now is 'who will stop the hat-trick this time?' (the answer will be revealed at the 1985 Pairs tournament - don't miss it!

ETWA NATIONAL PAIRS CHAMPIONSHIP 1984

	MD	RK	HT	SJ	BB	SR	CC	PS	SD	JB	HB	PLAY-OFF	FINAL TOTAL				
Mapley/Dean	-	5	6	6	5	7	5	6	7	7	6	60	4	3	7	74	1
Relle/Knowles	2	-	3	1	5	7	1	6	6	6	6	43	3	1	6	53	4
Hull/Thorp	1	4	-	6	4	5	5	6	5	6	6	48	5½	6	0	58½	2
Surridge/Josland	1	6	1	-	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	50	2½	4	1	57½	3
Boyce/Boyce	2	2	3	1	-	6	5	6	6	5	6	42					
Shearman/Ryan	0	0	2	1	1	-	1	2½	3	1	1	12½					
Clark/Cartwright	2	6	2	1	2	6	-	4	2½	4	4	33½					
Peake/Summer	1	1	1	1	1	4½	3	-	1½	1	1	161/6					
Sage/Docherty	0	1	2	1	1	4	4½	5½	-	1	1	21					
Jeffreys/Batham	0	1	1	1	2	6	3	6	6	-	1	27					
Hilditch/Bertoye	1	1	1	1	1	6	3	6	6	6	-	32					

17/18 March 1984

The World Singles Championship

Larry Kahn is the present Champion. He took the title from David Lockwood in February 1983, in what was obviously a gruelling match. The first four games produced 1-6, 6-1, 6-1, 1-6 (Larry's scores first) - the latest stage at which a world singles match has been tied. The next games put pressure on David as Larry took a 6-1, and David could only respond with $4\frac{1}{2}$ - $2\frac{1}{2}$ in game 6. In the last game, in which Larry needed $2\frac{1}{2}$ or more to win the championship, both players thought of an early pot-out, and each potted 5 winks. David had a 14" pot to win the game, but missed; he also missed an attempted squop on Larry's last green about 2" from the pot: incredibly, Larry missed the pot with it, giving David another chance with the last red, which had landed 13" from the pot. Despite his known proficiency at such shots, he did not make this one, or squop the last green, and Larry potted out, followed with yellow and took the match $29\frac{1}{2}$ - $19\frac{1}{2}$.

Larry had to defend his title on two consecutive days in May 1983, first against Jonathan Mapley, then against David Lockwood once again. Against Jonathan, Larry began 6-1, $1\frac{1}{2}$ - $5\frac{1}{2}$ and was thus 1 point ahead. In the third game Jonathan made a 5" squop from under the pot to foil a possible green pot-out. By round zero he had a potential 5 or 6, but Larry "grossed out" everyone (including himself) by making "accidentally" a 20" double of two reds on a yellow" (Newswink). This, I think, means that the shot was surprising and lucky. A 10" double, this time intentional, in round 1, left Larry with $4\frac{1}{2}$ at the end. Game 4 saw Jon take the lead with a 6-1, but game 5 was a 6-1 to Larry. Here again Jonathan was unfortunate, the second in a potential pot-out bouncing clean out of the pot among Larry's winks. In the sixth game Larry won 6-1 to take the match 25-17. The next day Larry beat David Lockwood $29\frac{1}{2}$ - $12\frac{1}{2}$. However, Lockwood's win in the U.S. singles gave him another challenge, which took place on 17 February 1984. Larry held his title by $29\frac{1}{2}$ - $19\frac{1}{2}$. He now faces challenges from Jonathan Mapley and Arye Gittleman, the 1984 U.S. Singles Champion. (Most of this material has been gleaned from Newswink.)

The Silver Wink 1984: some reflections by the Editor

Whatever name we give to the game, we all know how hard it is to start and run a Tiddlywinks club. Graduates, however keen they are at university, tend to give up and lose touch rather than form new groups. Skill at tiddlywinks is not a social asset like skill at squash or bridge, and it would seem eccentric to invite friends round for an evening's winks, unless they were already acquainted with the game. It takes some time to understand the range of shots and the tactical depths of an apparently absurdly simple game. So most people do not make the effort to recruit new players and either turn to other hobbies or maintain a more or less half-hearted membership of an already existing group.

It is in student life that eccentricity - or non-conformity - is most tolerated and the tendency towards it is most marked. Also the opportunities to experiment with new hobbies without a definite commitment are at their most extensive. So we might expect Tiddlywinks to thrive among students, if at all, but it is hard to imagine a new club starting by itself. Novelty has a powerful appeal, and tiddlywinks is not new - even if it was started 30 years ago, and a new start may seem desirable.

These musings are prompted by the arrival of the Silver Winksheet scoresheet: one match, between Cambridge and Southampton, and by the thought that it would be much more agreeable if there were more. Will the arrival of some of the LUSTS team at university make any difference? Ought we to circulate all universities with details of the Silver Wink in the hope that someone, somewhere, can raise a team?

In the absence of a report from any of the participants, here are a few points of interest deduced from the scoresheet. The initial impression must be

CAMBRIDGE

	Nick Inglis John Stapler (12 Points)	Mike Lampkin Andy Williams (9 1/2 Points)	Jon Prince Mike Smith (7 Points)	Paul Hilditch (Capt) Steve Sage (15 Points)
Phil Clark Jon Ferguson (16 1/2 Points)	4 / 3	5 1/2 / 1 1/2	6 / 1	1 / 6
Graham Jostland Jim Canningham (23 Points)	5 / 2	6 / 1	6 / 1	6 / 1
Alan Bayle (Capt.) Mark Gizzard (11 points)	4 / 3	1 / 6	6 / 1	0 / 7
Mike Summige Rob Cartwright (18 points)	3 / 4	6 / 1	3 / 4	6 / 1

SOTW-2K

SOTW 68 1/2

CAMBRIDGE 43 1/2

that Southampton have improved whereas Cambridge have stood still - or that Southampton had a lapse last year. Six players on each side - including Graham Josland, whose life, like that of Teiresias, has extended to three generations - remained from last year, but only one partnership, that of Hilditch and Sage, remained intact, scoring 15 points as against 16 last year. It is interesting to observe the results of the re-arrangement of the Southampton partnerships. Josland (the perpetual student) had parted from Phil Clark - and scored 23 this year instead of 11. Clark had sloughed Josland (the Southampton greybeard) and his score increased to 16½. Mike Surridge and Rob Cartwright, whose partners of 1983 were not playing in 1984, joined forces and both improved their scores. A key man in the Southampton side was Jon Ferguson. In 1983 he had carried Alan Boyce to 15: in 1984 he was assigned to Phil Clark, with the result noted above. This left Southampton with a problem: what were they to do with Boyce, the illustrious captain of 1984? The burden was shouldered by Mark Eizzard, but it proved too heavy for him. The partnership scored 11, the only negative score on the Southampton side, and crashed to an 0-7 defeat against Hilditch and Sage, the only such score in two years.

Congratulations to Southampton on their good win, and may future Silver Wink competitions have a larger entry.

The Catford Individual 1984 by Charles Relle

Experience teaches. My third attempt to win my own tournament at least produced an improvement in my result; fourth out of eight as against fifth in the previous two years. The only other player to have taken part in all three tournaments came first. It was, however, a newcomer to the tournament, Alan Shearman, recently returned to winks, who made the early running, scoring 6, 5 and 5 in the first three rounds. By contrast David Hull had scored $6\frac{1}{2}$ points at this stage, a point behind the other Oxford representative, Geoff Allen. Geoff Thorpe started with a 1, partnering Dave Byard, but subsequently was undefeated, ending on 30 points and taking second place. Dave Byard himself had not played for a long time, and scored only one win, a 4 in round 4, partnered by Alan. It was in this round that Mick Still took a lead that he was never to relinquish: he ended with $34\frac{1}{2}$. Andy Vincent took over the host's traditional fifth place. All in all the tournament seemed to go well.

I end with a reflection prompted by a remark of Jon Mapley's. The movement for this tournament is very precise: it requires the players to be in particular corners for each round. All players except one play 4 games in the left-hand corners and 3 in the right. The remaining player plays all his games in the right. In this tournament he scored $25\frac{1}{2}$ points - just over $3\frac{1}{2}$ a game. The total number of points scored from right hand corners was 57 and from left hand corners 41 - just over 4 per game to right hand corners.

The London Open 1984 by Charles Relle

Congratulations and thanks to Jonathan Mapley, who arranged the venue, his firm's sports club in Beckenham, and to the sports club itself. We were made very welcome there, an excellent and economical lunch was provided, and during the relevant hours the bar was open with drinks at very reasonable prices. It was a

sunny day, the air was fresh and the playing fields inviting. Perhaps it was a good thing that there was no cricket to watch.

On arrival I saw a number of winkers playing snooker, a game with which I had previously been acquainted only from television. It was evident that the winkers were playing a different, and possibly more advanced, game. "The object of the game is to flick the winks into the pot", said the rules when I started playing winks in 1960, but we all know it is no longer true. The winkers appeared to be trying to achieve a similar effect in snooker; if so, they were certainly succeeding.

As starting time drew near, Mapley the organiser had not arrived. We strolled out into the car park, expecting him to turn up in the scarred and battered machine that has always made us wonder whether his other hobby is stock car racing or industrial archaeology. However, he appeared in a brand new, seemingly chauffeur driven, limousine, but, as various hypotheses to account for his new-found prosperity were being advanced, we saw that the chauffeur and owner of the car was his partner, Gregory Hogg, who had perhaps wisely elected to drive himself.

Ten pairs were present, including Shearman and Puplett, once of Oxford, and Peake and Sumner, pupils of Alan Dean, who had also come for the National pairs. There was a good contingent of Southampton players, who always give support to ETWA tournaments, which is much appreciated: one wishes that Cambridge were less insular.

Last year's tournament report reads 'Relle and Dean always looked hot favourites': this year things were not so certain. Relle had been off form in the national pairs, and it was no secret that Thorpe had carried him to their win in the Hampshire open. Thorpe and Hull were in harness again, as were Surridge

and Josland: both had done very well in the National pairs. There was also the partnership of Mapley and Hogg, who are first recorded as a pairing in WW6.

Seven rounds of Swiss were played. What should you aim to do in a Swiss tournament: plough through the opposition creating mayhem, or lose an early game in the hope of an easy subsequent draw? Dean and I chose the former course, Mapley and Hogg the latter, losing the first game 5-2 to Surridge and Josland. This was in itself a shrewd move by Surridge and Josland, as it put them against Cartwright and Clark, who were decidedly out of sorts, and achieved only two wins on the day, ending in ninth place. In the first round they had met Thorpe and Hull who beat them $5\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$. Memory groped back to last year when Thorpe and Hull had started with the same score, but only scored $5\frac{1}{2}$ in the rest of their games. However, they were determined that this should not happen again, and in the second round took a 7-0 against Seaman and Jeffreys, and went into the lead, on $12\frac{1}{2}$ points, followed by Relle and Dean on $11\frac{1}{2}$ and Surridge and Josland on 11. Two rounds later Relle and Dean, by virtue of a six against the erstwhile leaders and a hard fought four against Surridge and Josland, who should have won, were on $21\frac{1}{2}$, three points ahead of them and of Mapley and Hogg, both on 18. Shearman and Puplett were trailing, but the rest of the pairs were grouped between $14\frac{1}{2}$ and $10\frac{1}{2}$. Four pairs were to qualify for the semi-final, with no carry-over, so the run-in was likely to be tense and interesting. And so it was: a glance at the score sheet shows that Relle and Dean, after suffering their only defeat of the tournament, a 2-5 against Mapley and Hogg, had leapt back into the lead with a 7-0 against Cartwright and Clark, and were virtually certain of qualifying, and that four pairs were in close contention for the remaining three places, while Seaman and Jeffreys had an outside chance. However, in

LONDON OPEN 1984 : SWISS SECTION.

KEY: OPPONENTS | SCORE
RUNNING TOTAL

PLAYERS ↓	ROUND →	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	POSITION
1 DEAN and		9 6	6 5½	2 6	3 4	5 2	7 7	4 4	1 st
RELLE		6	11½	17½	21½	23½	30½	34½	
2 THORPE and		7 5½	4 7	1 1	5 1	8 5	3 6	10 6	2 nd
HULL		5½	12½	13½	14½	19½	25½	31½	
3 JOSLAND and		5 5	7 6	6 4	1 3	4 5½	2 1	8 6	4 th
SURRIDGE		5	11	15	18	23½	24½	30½	
4 JEFFEYS and		10 6	2 0	8 4	6 4½	3 1½	9 4½	1 3	6 th
SEAMAN		6	6	10	14½	16	20½	23½	
5 HOGG and		3 2	10 6	9 4	2 6	1 5	8 2	7 6	3 rd
MAPLEY		2	8	12	18	23	25	31	
6 BOYCE and		8 6	1 1½	3 3	4 2½	7 6	10 4½	9 6	5 th
ENGLAND		6	7½	10½	13	19	23½	29½	
7 CARTWRIGHT		2 1½	3 1	10 6	9 5	6 1	1 0	5 1	9 th
and CLARK		1½	2½	8½	13½	14½	14½	15½	
8 CARRINGTON		6 1	9 2½	4 3	10 5	2 2	5 5	3 1	8 th
and EIZZARD		1	3½	6½	11½	13½	18½	19½	
9 PEAKE and		1 1	8 4½	5 3	7 2	10 6	4 2½	6 1	7 th
SUMNER		1	5½	8½	10½	16½	18½	19½	
10 PUPLETT		4 1	5 1	7 1	8 2	9 1	6 2½	2 1	10 th
and SHEARMAN		1	2	3	5	6	8½	9½	

the last round, they lost 4-3 to the leaders. The working of the Swiss system meant that none of the other contenders played another, and as it happened all won 6-1. The unlucky pair were Boyce and England, who failed to qualify by one point. They were unlucky in another sense too: a quirk of the draw had meant that they had not played two of the qualifying pairs. This is one of the weakness of Swiss tournaments.

So to the one-game sudden-death semi-finals. These pitched Relle and Dean against Surridge and Josland and Mapley and Hogg against Thorpe and Hull. A 6-1 in the Swiss had given Mapley and Hogg a psychological advantage over Thorpe and Hull, whereas Relle and Dean had with some difficulty extracted a 4-3 from their game against Surridge and Josland. Experience and observation, incidentally, have suggested to me that one of the weaknesses of Southampton players in general is an inability to turn a small advantage into a convincing win. Nevertheless, Relle and Dean did not face their match with breezy confidence. The game was rather a shapeless one, that gradually drifted towards last year's winners, and their opponents were unable to halt their progress to the final. Meanwhile Mapley and Hogg had got the better of Hull and Thorpe. In the final, Dean's good form continued and his partner at last began to play well and with some confidence. Mapley and Hogg lost both games, one of them 2-5 in a reversal of the result between the pairs in the Swiss, and the other 1-6.

Mats-on-the-Mat?

The nature of the equipment we use has in the past year or so been the subject of considerable debate and by now almost everything seems to have been said about the winks. I would just like to ask whether I'm the only person who finds it hard to distinguish between blues and greens in imperfect light?

Yet if everything's been said about the winks, very little has been said about the mats; Rob Cartwright alluded to a problem in his article in WW43 and I would like to take the discussion a stage further.

The quest for the standard mat seems to be one which is doomed to failure; even the rolls off which the mats are cut differ in thickness. The variety of thickness and its adverse effect on consistent shotmaking is, I feel, a serious problem which merits serious action. At present it seems one can turn up to a tournament and on (say) six tables encounter six different surfaces. I venture to suggest that this year's London Open saw the situation reach rock-bottom where each surface was blessed with individual peculiarities making (for me at any rate) a nonsense of consistent play. It would seem that unless the mats are taken off one roll immediately prior to play the organisers will have to continue to make the best of what is often a very bad job. Perhaps the major problem arising from the variety is, to use a phrase more common^{ly}, Test Match Special, variable bounce. The number of responses which the mats give ensures that a shot played on one mat will not produce the same result on one slightly thicker (for example). The parameters seem to be the very hard bounceless surface to the ultra-thick on which it is possible to bring in and bounce into the pot off the mat: a sort of Carnovsky by default. It would be interesting to know whether there is a consensus view on which thickness is best.

It further appears that however carefully mats are kept they will eventually 'fluff-up' and have short effective playing lives. To a club like Southampton it is very difficult financially continually to replace equipment which quickly becomes sub-standard. It thus becomes impossible to 'retire' mats which should never see the light of day in competition again. About the only think one could say on the standard of mats at the 1984 Hants Open was that they were all consistently appalling. Fluff can also inhibit effective umpiring and it is necessary now to decide whether a squop has been achieved or whether fluff is inducing the

illusion of one. All these factors prevent consistent play and the best one can say is that by moving about tables at a tournament at least everyone experiences the same disadvantages. At a time when it seems to be hard to fit a respectable number of rounds into a day's play I can see the mats themselves slowing things down even further. I and several others are becoming increasingly reluctant to go straight into a match until we have worked out how the mat will play and how it differs from the one we were on before. I don't believe that the time to discover that a change of technique is needed is in the middle of a game once a shot has been fozzled. It is impossible to single out any particular area which the inconsistencies affect because every shot suffers and this is why the poor standard we currently tolerate produces play considerably below par.

It is clear that we can either accept the situation as it stands or seek improvement. Finance would seem to be the greatest constraint to the latter - can Etwa afford to cut new mats before every tournament or seek alternatives when it presumably still has vast stocks of the present surface to offload? There is, however, nothing to stop serious investigation of alternative suppliers being made so at least we can be aware of the range of options. It might be useful to open a discussion at Congress in order to ascertain the majority opinion on the matter. However, if we are concerned to maintain a reasonable standard I feel that there are serious grounds for concern. After all, how do you explain to a novice player that not only does he have to master the shots but the mats as well? Therefore is it not time that we improved the standard and grasped the shoots that remain of the equipment nettle?

Tailpiece You may like to know that 1985 is your Editor's Silver Jubilee Year as a winks player. Charles Relle started playing at Cambridge in 1960, and his initial first team match was the Varsity Match of 1961.

Winking World is the official journal of the English Tiddlywinks Association, and is edited by Charles Relle of 26 Canadian Avenue, London SE6 3AS. It is issued free to members of Etwa and costs 25p to non-members. Material published in Winking World is not copyright, but anyone who quotes from Winking World is asked to acknowledge the source.

The venue for the national ⁹Singles championship will be Blackheath High School, Wemyss Road, London SE3. The nearest station is Blackheath, to which trains run on the line from Charing Cross via Waterloo East and London Bridge. Trains leave Charing Cross at 13 and 43 minutes past the hour.