

CONTENTS

Editorial Jottings

ETWA A.G.M.

The National Singles

The Three Shots That Won A Championship

The Jubilee Cup

The National Pairs

Points to Ponder

Rules Problems

More on the John Lennon Memorial Shot

Reflections

Winks on Mats

Editorial Jottings

1984 was to have seen another visit from the Americans. In the event only Larry Kahn and Dave Lockwood came, and played in an All-Stars v Cambridge match, as well as a World Masters' tournament. Larry won our singles after sharing top place with Dave, and Dave has now won the World Masters. Larry also retained the World Singles against Jonathan Mapley, but has since lost the title to Arye Gittleman 25-17. We hope for a further visit from America this autumn.

I hope to have reports on the World Masters and the World Singles in the next issue. This one looks fairly full so I want something to put in the next, especially discussion articles!

There seems to have been an exodus from London recently, and Newts is in abeyance. But if you are moving to London, let me know, at 26 Canadian Avenue London SE6 3AS (01-690-2385).

Alan Dean, 6 Birkland Drive, Edwinstowe, Notts is still Treasurer: subscriptions (£5 or £2 if you are a student) should be sent to him.

Dates for your Diary:

London Open

July 6th

National teams of

four and AGM

Southampton October 26 & 27

National Singles

Cambridge November 24 & 25

We congratulate Geoff and Christine Cornell on the birth of a Daughter, Helen.

Minutes of the ETWA Congress

Held in the Erasmus Room, Queens college, Cambridge
on 27th October 1984. Hosted by Phil Clark.

Present: Jon Mapley, Alan Dean, Charles Relle,
Phil Clark. 15 Members.

The Meeting opened at 8.50pm, Jon Mapley in the
Chair.

The minutes of the 1983 meeting as invented by
the secretary were passed with no matters arising
since no-one could remember what happened.

Chairman's Report

Jon began to name the winners of the previous
year's tournaments but gave up when he mentioned his
own name for the third time. He commented on the
continued support given to ETWA by Southampton and
was able to report that the Americans were also using
the relatively new winks.

Secretary's Report

Phil said he'd sent out four newsletters
although not always to everyone on the mailing list.
An updated address list had been produced, no outside
correspondence had been received and very little else
happened.

Treasurer's report

Alan brightened up the proceedings being able to
report that ETWA finances were gradually recovering
from the shock of buying all the new equipment. Since
1984 saw no major expenditure ETWA now owes Alan less
money. Income was boosted by sales of equipment and
T-shirts but membership was only 18. However more
people had joined for 1985 by the end of the evening.
Since several people had paid during the day it was
agreed to keep prices the same as for 1984.

Finally anyone wanting vast stocks of old winks should contact Alan so he can have his garage back.

W.W. Editor's Report

Charles explained the problems involved in producing WW 43 and was able to display no. 44 "hot off the presses." He asked members for articles to make future productions interesting.

Charles then introduced the further deliberations of the rules sub-committee, distributing xeroxed documents. Discussion centred initially on the movement of the pot by winks in flight and when it (the pot) could be held by hand. Attention then turned to the magnum opus i.e. squopping and free turns, which produced much learned discussion and a resolution accepting Charles' expert rewording. Charles was complimented by the meeting for all the hard work he'd put in. Oh gosh I almost forgot, Alan Dean suggested the term 'seduction' be re-introduced to the glossary. Jon said Heineken enjoyed it (well don't we all?)

Jon Mapley, Part Two

Jon circulated a report on sponsorship in which it appeared he'd succeeded in attracting two sponsors - Heineken and a Blackpool leisure group. He also admitted to reading the Sunday Express. There was a discussion on how to fit in the proposed tournament in Blackpool in March and whether it should supersede the National Singles. Charles said he liked the Singles as it was and was generally supported in this. Jon promised to break it to the sponsors gently.

Disappointingly the American tour was not to be; only Lockwood and Kahn would be coming over. There were mutterings about a tournament in the Sunshine State in 1985.

And Finally...

A timetable of venues and dates was tentatively fixed and the current officers were all re-elected, pleas from Alan Dean unheeded. Phil raced through proposals for the Marchant Trophy which were accepted with Mike Surridge and Nick Inglis making up a 'gang of three'. There being no other business everyone left in haste as it was almost closing time.

The National Singles 1984

"Well who won?"

"Cambridge."

"CAMBRIDGE?"

"Yes 32-6. Six tries: they dominated the game - wonderful threequarter play."

"What are you talking about?"

"The Varsity Match of course. I didn't get to Twickenham, but I saw most of it on television."

"What about the Boat Race then?"

"Never mind about that."

"Anyway, I was asking about the National Singles at Tiddlywinks. Who won that?"

"Hang on, I'll get the score sheet. Here we are; Hkan won."

"That's a funny name!"

"Yes; he comes from America. The H is Silent. In fact he was arranging a tour, but in the end only he and Dave Lockwood could make it. It was good of them to come."

"What about writing up the Tournament now? You don't want to wait for months, and then be like Alan Dean and have to fill up the report with corny jokes. And you can't complain about editorial policy - you're the editor yourself."

"Very well - here goes. We were at Blackheath

High School again, as Southampton couldn't get their Union. A lot of them turned up though: they and ex-Southampton players made up more than half the tournament."

"So the turn-out was reasonable - twenty players in fact, in two divisions, with six from each to qualify for the final."

"That's right. It started off as nineteen, but Phil Clark came after the first round, and we managed to squeeze him in. He hadn't intended to play, as he had an exam in the morning, and didn't think he could make it at all."

"An exam isn't the best preparation for a tournament, surely?"

"So it proved. He only won one game, against Mark Eizzard."

"Did the rest of the Southampton contingent do well?"

"Yes and no. Surridge played well for 39 points, and beat Relle and Brennan. Cartwright and Carrington both got through, and so did Seaman and Dean. But they belong to a different generation. In some ways Carrington's was the best result. He was the lowest qualifier in the Black Division on 27, but he edged out Hull, Josland and Thorpe who got 25 2/3, 25 1/3 and 25 points respectively. He was playing Inglis in the last round and got a 2, whereas Josland, who had just put Thorpe out of the running with a 6-1, only got a 1 against Lockwood. Thorpe's last game was a 2 against Mapley."

"So some good players were off form. I notice Boyce didn't make it either - even though he was described as illustrious in your last issue."

"No: he didn't play well; a pity after his good showing in the Pairs and Fours. Chown, Eizzard and May were the other Southampton players who didn't make the final."

"Perhaps we had better sort out who did make the final."

"I agree. In the Blue Division the bottom two qualifiers were Budd and Brennan on $25\frac{1}{2}$ and 35 respectively. It was good to see them back. Budd beat Eizzard 5-2 in the last game to make the final. He also achieved a rare shot against Alan Dean, potting two of his own winks, and getting two extra shots. Then there were Surridge and Dean, the latter scoring 43, Relle on $43\frac{1}{2}$, and Kahn was undefeated on 57 with 6 sixes and 3 sevens."

"That's not how you spelt his name before."

"No. As I said, the H is silent."

"Like the L in Newts?"

"Yes."

"But there isn't an L in Newts."

"That's why it's silent."

"Oh get on with it."

"Anyway, Khan won..."

"There you go again."

"Stop quoting President Reagan at me: I'm not writing for Newswink. In the other section Lockwood came top, also undefeated, on $52\frac{1}{2}$, Mapley second on 46, Seaman 38, Inglis $37\frac{1}{2}$, Cartwright 32, and Carrington."

"I suppose you're going to put another dig at Cambridge because only Inglis came."

"No; it's not worth it. They are just not bothered about the game outside their own club. Inglis in fact played very well. He beat Mapley 4-3 and only lost twice - one of those a 4-3 against Lockwood."

"You started the final on Saturday evening, didn't you?"

"Yes, on a system drawn up by Jon Mapley that meant that the two highest qualifiers played each other in the last round. That meant Lockwood and Ankh."

"Lockwood and who?"

"Sorry, Nahk. Anyway, the system means that on the whole the higher players have more and more

difficult matches and the lower ones progressively easier. I myself had Tony Brennan in the first round, and squopped him up in about 10 minutes. However, he used his freed winks very well, and managed to fight back for a 4-3. In particular he achieved a very fine squop onto a doubleton controlling a pile that really tipped the game. One other first round tussle was between Keith Seaman and Mike Surridge - Keith won 6-1 in the event."

"I've been looking at the score-sheet. Surridge had a disappointing day, didn't he?"

"Yes, He will probably want to forget it - only three wins and eighth place. It was a poor result in an otherwise good season. But it could be said that he had an important influence on the result - Dean, had he got 6 against him instead of 4, would have won the tournament."

"You are always advocating these large final pools aren't you? Can you really justify the claim that everyone significantly affects the result?"

"I like to think so. Take Cartwright and Carrington - they came 11th and 12th and only had one win each. But they had qualified by putting out more fancied players. Further, Cartwright's 3 against Lockwood prevented him from getting an outright win, and Carrington's 2 against Dean stopped a triple tie. Again, Nick Inglis, who was without a win in the final pool last year, scored three wins this year including one against Surridge."

"On the other hand he lost to Duncan Budd."

"Yes, and there should be some interesting games between those two at Cambridge next year."

"Let's look at the rest of the results."

"Very well. Keith Seaman took seventh place on 39 points, an average of just over $3\frac{1}{2}$ points. He was 11 points clear of Surridge and 5 below Mapley. Interestingly, he had all the possible whole number scores in the final. The zero was against Hank."

"You haven't mentioned him before."

"Yes I have. Khna was the American who won it"

"Yes, of course. How did you get on yourself?"

"Fourth overall: results were ups and downs. One point against Dean, when I failed on a pot-out. I made two difficult shots and then failed an easy one. Three against Lockwood: a careless shot in rounds probably cost me the game. Six against Mapley - my first in a singles. My one good shot of the tournament was in this game - a Bristol from the edge of a pile over it. A real struggle against Keith Seaman getting 4; he never lets me near the pot these days. Nhak beat me 6-1 quite easily. Both Americans beat Mapley too: he was recovering from 'flu and his results were generally down. Tony Brennan got a 5 against him - one of several good results to put him in fifth place half a point ahead of Mapley."

"Dean beat both the Americans, didn't he?"

"Yes: he had a sensational 7-0 against Dave Lockwood: two Carnovskies helped him pot out in five turns and he beat Kahn 5-2. He had no result lower than a 3 - against Keith and, in the final round, Jonathan. A 4 would have tied him for 1st place and anything better would have given him the win. Again, he potted out against Inglis, but missed the pot six times with his second colour for a 5-2."

"So there were plenty of ifs and buts."

"Yes, but they do not detract from the fine performance of the two Americans, especially Lockwood's 6 against Larry in the last round, which kept him in contention. We have his own account of the final game...."

"Incidentally...."

"Yes?"

"You had no trouble with the rules did you? Not after sorting them out for about 6 years on two committees?"

"You must be joking. A "no free turns" situation came up. Geoff Thorpe had raised the point at the A.G.M., and we took the common-sense solution, but

it is not officially in the rules yet. Then after Jon Mapley had potted out, Jim Carrington started on the wrong colour, potting two before anyone noticed what was happening. After consultation he was required to take them both out. I am not sure the decision I gave was right."

"I am sure you will enjoy sorting it out and writing up the final version. You are always boasting about your grammar and spelling. Besides, we must have a definitive version of the rules, as according to an article by Brad Schaefer in Newswink, winks will one day be as popular a sport as baseball."

"Will it indeed? What's baseball?"

"I don't know."

National singles Qualifying Round Scores

Blue Section

L. Kahn	57
C. Relle	43½
A. Dean	43
M. Surridge	39
A. Brennan	35
D. Budd	25½
M. Eizzard	22
A. Boyce	19½
T. Chown	16½
P. Clark	14

Black Section

D. Lockwood	52½
J. Mapley	46
K. Seaman	38
N. Inglis	37½
R. Cartwright	32
J. Carrington	27
D. Hull	25 2/3
G. Josland	25 1/3
G. Thorpe	25
P. May	6

Opponent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	Posit
1 Larry Kahn	1	5	6	2	6	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	57	1=
2 Dave Lockwood	6	7	4	0	6	6	6	6	6	4	6	6	57	1=
3 Jon Mapley	2	0	1	4	6	4	6	2	6	7	6	6	44	6
4 Charles Relle	1	3	6	1	5	4	6	3	6	6	6	6	47	4
5 Alan Dean	5	7	3	6	4	3	5	6	6	5	6	6	56	3
6 Mike Surridge	1	1	1	2	3	1	1½	1	4½	6	6	6	28	8
7 Keith Seaman	0	1	3	3	4	6	5	2	7	6	2	39	7	
8 Nick Inglis	1	1	1	1	2	5½	2	1	4	6	0	24½	10	
9 Tony Brennan	1	1	5	4	1	6	5	6	4½	5	6	44½	5	
10 Rob Cartwright	1	3	1	1	1	2½	0	3	2½	4	1½	20½	11	
11 Jim Carrington	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	2	3	6	19	12	
12 Duncan Budd	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	7	1	5½	1	25½	9	

NATIONAL SINGLES FINALS. Larry beat Dave 6-1 in the play-off.

The Three Shots That Won A Championship

by Dave Lockwood

In the most star-studded Singles ever, in the closest finish, in the heat of battle, it's easy to lose sight of some of the fundamental truths of the game. I must confess that I fell victim to such a lapse in the 1984 ETWA Singles. So let me remind all of you. "It ain't all over 'til it's all over!"

In the twelve man final of Sunday the 25th of November 1984, Larry Kahn made all the early running. Those who initially kept apace gradually dropped further and further behind. Only Alan Dean's 5-2 pot-out win marred Larry's record through 10 rounds. His nine victories tallied 54 points. I was less consistent with two 4's, a 7, and a 0 (against Alan). Still, I accomplished my aim of being within a 6-1 of Larry going in to my last round game with him.

The last round began with Larry in first on 56, Alan (guaranteed top national) on 53, and me at 51. Alan plays Jon while Larry and I go head-to-head. Unfortunately, the development of our game pushes me to entangle four of one of Larry's colors. (I won't say I was forced because "You don't have to do anything.") However, I need to win big. If Larry decides to try to rescue with his other color, he comes to me, while if he tries to pot-out and misses, I'm on track for a 6 or possibly even a 7. Larry on the other hand has Alan closer on his heels and a pot-out would guarantee his (Larry's) victory. After running 5 yellows, Larry has a 2 inch pot of a little off of his partner's big. Easy. While my whole life didn't flash before my eyes, my chances for the title seemed about to do so. Once again, however, Larry failed to close the door. He missed about 10-11" long. The problem for the rest of us is that Larry is great enough to overcome most of these incredible

mistakes.

After two more misses, I finally got him. I maneuver to pot-out with blue (the color after his potting color) hoping red can beat yellow for the 7. A seven would be great for me because it would push Larry out of the title picture entirely. Alas... it was not to be. Larry's final yellow is against the cup which means I will probably have two turns with red before yellow pots. The red that was on the yellow proves to be the first miss and the first of three 5" pots is the second. Larry grabs his vital 1 point and I get the 6 to tie at 57 all.

Attention now switches to the critical Alan - Jon game. A 4 for Alan would leave a 3 way tie. (Procedurally, this is a very interesting scheduling dilemma.) The game is very tight but Alan falls 3-4 to finish at 56, one point shy of the tied Americans. Jon said afterwards that he would have loved to throw the game to Alan to make him outright winner. Obviously, none of us, least of all Jon, would ever do more than note the possibility. If such an undesirable element should ever enter our game, we would have to move to knockout formats where this would only affect one round.

Alan's finish was his most rewarding since 1978, if not his best. By finishing top Brit, he earns a World Singles challenge, but his third place was worse than 1983's second (to Jon) which merely gained him some amount of honor and glory.

The past is prologue. What follows may suggest that we should all change to Larry's religion - whatever that is.

The first part of the extra game was straightforward and I managed to almost squop Larry out.

Eleven of Larry's winks were squopped by eight of mine with my other four not in the game (2 behind each baseline). Despite the relative lack of my winks in the battle area, I hadn't been too constrained, Larry's last wink - a small yellow - is behind his baseline. This is the setting for "The Three Shots That Won A Championship".

The first was Larry's approach. After travelling slightly more than three feet in the air, it strikes the edge of the main pile and knocks a red (me) off a yellow to about 3" away. Blue takes the just-shot yellow and red decides to gromp over on the pile and not try the 3" shot. Red fails to grab the yellow but manages to knock it off the pile.

Blowing up a pile without being on it is difficult but not impossible. Invented by John Goode, the "Goode" shot involves pressing a free wink next to a pile into the mat and then hoping a low trajectory will favorably disturb the pile next to it. It also helps if you don't go off the table. One judging problem is making sure the wink to be shot only moves down in the preparation for the shot. Legally done, the shot can be quite effective despite its ugliness.

Usually this shot is attempted when the nearby pile is stacked up. Larry's wink was tangent to a wink on the pile. In spite of this handicap, the second shot of the three was an effective Goode from this position. Larry frees a couple of winks, of greatest significance a green leaning on the most important pile. Close to this main pile is now a triple of me on Larry. The situation for me is still recoverable if blue can get the green. In a less than perfect attempt, I bounce in front of it and end beyond it.

The third shot was Larry's little green blowup. While superbly executed, the results were still gross. One of the winks in the pile just happens to knock me off the separate triple on one side of the pile while 3" on the other side of the pile one of his winks just happens to land on three of mine. Effectively, the game was over. His advantage in terms of winks in the battle area could now be fully exploited and he controlled for a 6-1, the title, and an Ace-in-the-Hole in case he loses to Arye or Alan, the two current challengers. I get nothing but "some amount of honor and glory".

Congratulations are due to Larry who escaped from dire straits, a position in which he himself thought he "was dead". I deserved what I got, a lesson. Larry finished a great week. He was in the top pair in the the All-Star v CUTwC match, beat Jon 25-17 in WS19, and was top man in the Singles preliminaries. His only match loss was to me in the World Masters semi finals 1-6, 6-1, 6-1 (Dave first). I look forward to his future exploits and fantastic shots. Good luck to you, Larry. You're now on my extra special hit list.

The Jubilee Cup

by Charles Relle

After a period of inactivity there has been a small flurry of challenges for the Jubilee Cup. Phil Clark, staying overnight at 26 Canadian Avenue, decided to have a tilt at the trophy before the National Fours. Since he and I were to play in the same team, the result, whatever it was, could be read as a boost to team confidence. Recent encounters were an equivocal guide to form: Phil and Rob Cartwright had beaten me and Nigel Knowles comprehensively in the National Pairs, but had lost

7-0 in the London Open to me and Alan Dean. Perhaps the match was to be decided on who could better survive my home-brew.

For me all started well with a 6-1. Luck seemed to be with me and confidence rose, but a severe blow was dealt to it in the next game. Phil played well and I played badly. My impression was that however I played any wink it either subbed or went off the mat. It cannot have been quite like that, but that is how it felt. A 6-1 loss was the score, so we were level going into the third game, which I began in the spirit of "This can't go on." I did not attempt to define "This", but like Chaucer's host realised my need for "a draught of moist and corny ale". The third game was a tussle that swung this way and that, and happened to end at a point where I had the advantage - and enough of one to secure a 5-2. The player who is behind is always under increasing pressure as the end of the match nears, and perhaps this told on Phil in the fourth game, for although I had not played really convincingly at any time in the match, I in fact managed another 6 and kept the trophy.

So to the weekend of the National Singles and a challenge from Alan Dean that had been postponed several times by reason of distance. When he and the next challenger, Geoff Thorpe, met, they began a discussion on the date for the next challenge to be played at Alan's home town in Nottinghamshire, and maybe this was a ploy to unnerve me. I was, however, determined that if I went down I would go down fighting, and after some negotiation Alan and I agreed to play some of the challenge during the National Singles. It turned out that the seeding had put Alan and me in the same half of the draw. Our game ended early (6-1 to me in a pot-out), and so the Jubilee began, with me reflecting ruefully that

since it was being played in my school library, it could be maintained that I had the home draw. Not far into the first game I found one colour all free in a not unreasonable position, and managed to pot them, after one safe miss. Time pressed, and when I had one wink of the other colour left and Alan had several scattered, he conceded a 7. Next game I tried it again, but my potting was not good enough: Alan caught me and played surely for a 6-1. By this time the National Singles was ready to move for the next round, so the match was interrupted. We agreed to resume at my home in the evening.

Somewhat glazed by having played 11 games during the day, I had supper, set up the table and poured out some home-brew. Alan appeared, and we began the third game. After a few minutes there was a typical, indeterminate, even game with the occasional squop in an open position. Through the haze I saw six winks of one colour free. What to do? I mentally checked that it was my colour, counted carefully to make sure there really were six and, inspired no doubt by the moist-and-corny, decided on my fourth pot-out in four games. All six went in, Alan got second, and I got a 6-1. Game 4 was very different in character, all four colours being quickly involved in squops. It was clear that neither player was going to extricate a colour completely. Things did not go Alan's way, and after twelve minutes or so I was having free turns. Having free turns is agreeable, but there is the ever-present sense that the position may be turned by a single bomb or desquop. Nevertheless I managed to hang on, some lucky long squops forestalling attacks on key piles. A 6-1 resulted and the Jubilee Cup did not go to Edwinstowe. On reaching Keith Seaman's house, where he was staying overnight, Alan said I was playing "like a demon". It would be interesting to know what basis he has for the comparison.

The challenge of Geoff Thorpe was thus moved to London, and took place the evening before the Hampshire open, which we were defending. Reminders over the year that Geoff had carried me to our victory the year before emphasised to me the necessity of proving that I was no longer a passenger. In this match there were no pot-outs. Each of the games was a double-squop. The first was a 6-1 to me. At the end Geoff said "You outplayed me". However there was no point at which I felt I could relax. In the next game, which had the same result, the outcome was in doubt well into rounds. So Geoff was facing a 12-2 deficit, and the knowledge that only once had the Jubilee been lost 18-3. The third game was rather like the second - a hard struggle in which an advantage became apparent only in rounds. It was decisive, however, and I scored a 6-1 for a successful defence.

The 1985 National Pairs

by Mike Surridge

The 1985 National pairs took place on 16/17th March at Garibaldi High School, Mansfield, Notts. It was intended that a first day qualifying tournament should lead to an all-play-all final on the second day. However, due to the low turnout (possibly because of the difficulties of travelling to that part of the country from the winking south), the format was changed to a double all-play-all competition, the total from the two rounds deciding the winner.

There were nine pairs in the starting line-up, with Dean & Mapley favourites to win for a record third successive year. The main challengers were Hull & Thorpe (runners up in 1984), and two new pairings - Relle and Surridge(!) and Alan Boyce of Southampton

getting the short straw (Lockwood).

The scene of the action was the school Assembly Hall, in which four mats of varying quality were deployed on twelve tables. The light was extremely good - the tables were at one stage actually moved into the shadows!.

The first day began in the expected fashion, with Dean & Mapley piling up the 7-0's against the Garibaldi pairs. There was some confusion over lunch, with Relle and Surridge heading for the pub early only to find its kitchens under redevelopment. After finding food further along the road in a second pub, they were obliged to walk back rather too fast for Relle, who retired to the off-licence during a bye for further refreshment. The Tournament was slightly delayed by this sundering of winkers during lunch, with the result that by the close of play some two rounds remained from the first series of games.

The only significant result by this stage was a surprising 6-1 win by Relle & Surridge against the champions. Hull and Thorpe had by this stage failed against Boyce & Lockwood, and were unconvincing in their wins against lesser opponents. The general feeling was that they would not repeat their 1984 success.

In order to complete the tournament, the leading pairs agreed to complete the first series of games at Alan Dean's house in nearby Edwinstowe. Here, Dean & Mapley revived their chances with a $5\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$ win over Boyce & Lockwood, and a 6-1 over Thorpe & Hull. The latter also lost 6-1 to Relle & Surridge, and were now clearly out of the running, with Relle & Surridge beginning to look a good bet. However, in the final match on Saturday Boyce & Lockwood beat Relle & Surridge 6-1. This left the situation as follows:

	played	points
Relle & Surridge	8	43
Boyce & Lockwood	8	42½
Dean & Mapley	7	39½
Inglis & Sage	6	26½
Hull & Thorpe	7	25

Unfortunately, the Cambridge pairs were unable to attend the late session, so that some gaps appeared in the scoresheet. With several of the less strong players unable to play on Sunday (they had anticipated being eliminated on Saturday under the original tournament format), many of these gaps remained unfilled.

On Sunday Dean & Mapley achieved the expected pot-out against Inglis & Sage so that they ended the first series in the lead, despite the upset against Relle & Surridge. They consolidated with a string of pot-outs against the weaker pairs. Then a new element entered the struggle. One of the people who were unable to compete on the second day was the novice partner of one K. Seaman. Now unleashed, Seaman gave Relle & Surridge a fright before losing 1-6 to them. Dean & Mapley were not so lucky, and fell 6-1 to the in-form Seaman. Boyce & Lockwood struggled but won 5-2 against Keith, so now Dean and Mapley had their backs to the wall, their lead eroded to half a point.

The question which now remained was whether it would be Boyce & Lockwood or Relle & Surridge to try to take the title from the crumbling champions. This was decided when the former beat the latter 6-1 and then smashed the Dean - Mapley hat-trick with another 6-1.

With only Inglis and Sage left to play, Boyce & Lockwood looked certain to take the title. The last

round saw Dean & Mapley play Relle & Surridge, both needing a large score to put any pressure on Boyce & Lockwood, quite apart from deciding which of them would come second. Surridge, after a frustrating day of playing well below his best, achieved the necessary pot-out. However, the score in this game was only 5-2, so that Boyce & Lockwood needed only 3 in their game against the Cambridge pair. They eventually managed 5-2 to take the trophy by 2½ points in one of the closest pairs tournaments of recent years.

Finally a vote of thanks to Barbie and Alan Dean for putting up (with) about 10 of us on Saturday evening, and for providing us with lunch and dinner in the wilderness!

Round 1.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	pld	pts
1 Dean & Mapley	-	6	1	5½	7	7	7	7	6	8	46½
2 Hull & Thorpe	1	-	1	1		6	5	6	5	7	25
3 Relle & Surridge	6	6	-	1	5	6	7	6	6	8	43
4 Boyce & Lockwood	1½	6	6	-	4	6	7	6	6	8	42½
5 Inglis & Sage	0		2	3	-	6	6	5	4½	7	26½
6 Ball & Seaman	0	1	1	1	1	-	7	1		7	12
7 Sykes & W'field	0	2	0	0	1	0	-		1	7	4
8 Peake & Sumner	0	1	1	1	2	6		-		6	11
9 Devlin & Hedger	1	2	1	1	2½		6		-	6	13½

Round 2

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	pld	pts
1 Dean & Mapley	-	2	1	7	7	7	1	14	71½
2 Relle & Surridge	5	-	1	7	6	6	6	14	74
3 Boyce & Lockwood	6	6	-	5	6	6	5	14	76½
4 Inglis & Sage	0	0	2	-	6	2	1	13	37½
5 Hull & Thorpe	0	1	1	1	-	5	4	13	37
6 Devlin & Hedger	0	1	1	5	2	-	1	12	23½
7 (Ball) & Seaman	6	1	2	6	3	6	-	13	36

Points to Ponder

by Dave Lockwood

The 1984 ETWA Singles was the second Singles tournament in history to include more than one foreign player. However, unlike the 1980 NATWA Singles in which Alan Dean finished fifth to Pam Knowles' first, the Americans in 1984 finished one-two. Therefore, for the first time, a player who doesn't get a World Singles challenge (Dave) finished ahead of one who does (Alan).

In the six games Larry and Dave played against each other in England in November, they were 3-3 with each taking three 6-1's.

How much is the extra turn of the squidge-off winner worth? In the only evidence I've seen on this subject, Sunshine counted the rounds in 5 of the games of WS6. (The other two were pot-outs.) Of special note these were 25 minute singles games. Including the last 5 rounds, the games took 26, 33, 31, 35, and 32 rounds. Therefore the squidge-off winner gets about a 3% advantage in turns. In twenty minute singles games, this may rise to 4%. Conversely if you go off the table, you will lose about 3-4% of your turns. (This analysis has, of course, ignored the attendant advantages finishing last and whether the turn in which you went off the table might also be deemed a total loss.)

Rules Problems

by Charles Relle

The rules are like the hydra; eliminate one problem and two more appear. The Rules Committee has been wound up, so I offer my solutions to two of the latest problems as a basis for discussion.

The first is a "no free turns" situation envisaged by Geoff Thorpe that subsequently appeared in the National Singles. Say you are blue, and red and yellow are all squopped. With your only totally free blue, you squop the last green. Now red has to free, but cannot. Common sense suggests blue should free, and it is easy to incorporate a sentence in rule 12(a) that runs something like this: "If the squopping pair has no free turns it must free with the first playable colour."

The second problem arises when a player pots a number of winks out of turn. This situation is not covered by the rules, and the opponents' options are therefore undefined. Can they make him take all the winks out of the pot, and play in turn? When the question was put to me I said yes, and it says much for the sporting quality of the player involved that he accepted the ruling without demur. I have subsequently thought about the problem, and here are my thoughts, which, as it happens, support my action.

Consider some basic points: 1) The rules are constructed to define correct procedure, and provide redress for accidental transgressions. Apart from 14(c), they assume that nobody cheats, and this is right. 2) If you make an elementary mistake - say one of your winks falls off the baseline, and you play with 5 winks without noticing the absence of the sixth - you have no redress. You are expected to keep an eye on the table, and know what is going on. 3) This is all the more necessary because we do not have an umpire at each table. 4) If you play a turn subsequent to an opponent's turn out of turn, you accept his turn - more of this later.

Consider also the following case. You are blue and red and red is squopped up. this sequence occurs: blue, green, green, yellow. What are your rights at

this point? I would say you must accept the situation and play blue. You cannot make both yellow and green retract. This case is not covered by the rules, but it would be easy to modify the rule to cover it.

To revert to my point 4 - what happens when you play following a turn out of turn? You are blue and red, and this is the sequence: yellow, blue, yellow. If you make yellow retract and green play, you now follow with red, but if you accept the yellow shot you must follow with blue, for if you accept a shot you accept its consequences. But what happens after yellow, blue, yellow, you play red without noticing yellow's mistake? Are you out of turn? I think yes, and your opponents can make you retract. You, however, cannot make yellow retract at this stage; correction cannot go beyond one turn. To do more could too easily make the rule unworkable.

Are these points relevant to the case in which a player pots more than one wink out of turn? What about Rick Tucker's dictum in Newswink 14 that "a shot is the increment of play in the game, and the state of the game is sampled when each shot is completed"? Assuming that all this has some bearing on the case blue, yellow (potting), yellow, how do we judge? The second yellow is in the correct sequence so should it, and the previous one, be allowed to stand? In fact, must they be allowed to stand, and must yellow be allowed to play on? Logically, on the premisses, yes.

But there is an objection. The rules do not cover this situation because the distinction between a shot and a turn, crucial in some situations, was not perceived by the early rule makers or their successors. Rule 7 was problematical because of this, and it was some time before it was established that if you potted one of your winks, and sent off another

in one shot, you lost the next shot: you could not go on potting and lose the next turn, if it ever came. What happens, incidentally, if you pot 2 of your winks and simultaneously send one off? I think you are entitled to another shot. But enough of this. It can be argued that the present discussion is about turns, not shots. What follows? It seems you may require your opponent to retract all the shots played in the turn out of turn, or accept the them and let him play until the turn ends. This conclusion is not inconsistent with those in the other cases I have cited, in which the distinction between shot and turn is not relevant.

All this raises another point: in the absence of an umpire, are you duty bound to alert an opponent as soon as you notice he is playing out of turn, and indeed to warn him if he is about to do so? The answer must be yes, though it has not always been my own practice.

My own view is that the conclusion based on the distinction between shot and turn is right, but I would like to hear the views of others. There is room for disagreement.

More on the John Lennon Memorial Shot

by Jonathan Mapley

Cyril Edwards' article in WW40 flattered not only our editor's geographical knowledge, but also complimented the chairmen of SATWA and ETWA on their grey cells if not their manual dexterity. Answering for myself, I have always believed that winks should be a colourful game in the metaphorical, as well as the physical, sense. The Grauniad article, undoubtedly quoting someone else (I have never found

out whom) said that I was renowned for pulling out of trouble with risky shots. A shot which might appear risky to one person may not be so considered by the person playing it.

Cyril concentrated on the straightforward one on one John Lennon, where the top wink is played somewhere useful and the bottom (enemy) wink is boondocked virtually anywhere. Even this simple scenario can be developed. If blue is squopping yellow, not only can the blue be played onto another wink or pile, but the yellow could be played, say, onto a green, if a red is lurking nearby. This is eminently more satisfying than crudding the yellow to kingdom come. On the subject of boondocking, few players seem to realise that the further away the wink is played, the more latent force it possesses when returned to the fray. This is important if the wink is being released after the expiry of free turns. The last place you want it to land is on top of your biggest pile, but better to have it do so from 18 inches rather than four feet. The optimum place to position a released enemy wink is touching the pot on the far side from your largest pile.

To continue with the "ideas which are ahead of technical accomplishment", what about the Lennon with a bigger pile, say blue on yellow and red? Given reasonably favourable angles, it should be possible to squop two separate enemy winks or piles with the blue and the red, whilst boondocking, potting or doing something even more dastardly with the yellow. The bigger the pile the more fiendish the opportunities. If you practice the more outrageous, you will gain the confidence to attempt them in a situation which calls for something picturesque. Of course when dealing with a big pile, you can be less certain of the outcome, but quite often a shot played with confidence will turn out more favourably (even

if differently from what was intended) than a half-hearted nudge.

Reflections

by Nigel Parsons

After an absence from tiddlywinks for two years, I have joined ETWA and played in the Cambridge Open. I left the tournament armed with a couple of Winking Worlds (43,44), kindly provided by Charles, to catch up on all the latest gossip. After all - no WW, no comment! These two issues are the first I have read for as Charles so rightly observes (WW 44): "It is in student life that eccentricity or non-conformity is most tolerated." When I was at University this included not paying ETWA subscriptions! It is remarkable that Charles has turned what is essentially a ridiculous pastime into the subject of a well produced journal.

I have however one criticism. All of the articles seem to be written by members who take the game very seriously. The issue in which this article is printed should not suffer from this problem. I feel sure there must be members other than myself who would like the views of the non-serious or laid back winker represented.

A number of changes to the game have taken place since I last played. In my opinion, the most unfortunate of these is the banning of the megacrud. As the greatest living exponent of this shot, I was saddened to see its demise. This spectacular shot was probably the only shot I was ever any good at. My 'crud and pot' tactics are still remembered in Southampton. I refute Jon Mapley's argument that the shot involves 'brute force and ignorance.' The first megacrud I ever played sent numerous winks off the

defeatable (none of which was my own), broke one of my opponent's winks and was not questioned as regarding legality (ask Mike Surridge). If the game is ever to grow in popularity and be televised, it is shots like this which will draw the audience and not Mapley's feeble namby pamby 2 inchers! It occurs to me that a solution to one of ETWA's major problems - what to do with the old winks - would be a megacrudding tournament. This could run alongside one of the more conventional tournaments and I should be happy to organise it.

Another major change to the game is the introduction of the new EEC standard Hi-Tech Euro wink. These make not the slightest difference to my game. I still play just as badly as I ever did. Still, for a while at least, I can blame this on not being used to the new winks. Then again, I play so badly that I doubt if anyone would believe this to be the reason. The new mats? I expect they show up beer stains just as badly as the old ones.

Now some observations made at the Cambridge Open. I believe that the format of this tournament is an excellent idea for both the serious and laid back player alike. It enables players such as myself to enjoy a game to the detriment of nobody but ourselves yet still play with a variety of partners and opponents.

One of the major attractions of winks for me is the chance to visit a variety of interesting towns and get drunk in pubs. (Please can we have a tournament in Oxford?) There has been a long and happy relationship between the Southampton University Winks Club and the Real Ale Society. I am ex-president of the latter and ex-treasurer of the former. Graham Josland can boast a similar career. It was with great irritation therefore that I noticed

Alan Boyce delaying rounds at the end of both periods of play thus wasting valuable drinking time. I appreciate that some shots require a great deal of thought but Alan seems to consider every conceivable possibility from a missed squop to a nuclear strike from the Russians.

Another bad habit which Alan hasn't broken is his ear-drum bursting shouting when analysing the state of play (see above). One could easily be led to believe that he is attempting to desquop a pile by yelling at it. The sound waves which he emits must have a destructive power far greater than any of my megacruds. It also occurs to me that the solution to this problem also solves another great ETWA poser - what to do with old mats - the proverbial sock clearly not being sufficient in this case.

Coming back to the more serious subject of the game's growth, I don't see how present tournament formats (save the Cambridge Computer System) can cope with any increase in tournament entries. Most of the competitions I have entered have run into time difficulties even with a relatively small field.

Finally, I hope that the role of the non-serious player will not be forgotten. In particular novices' tournaments (such as the 'teams of four') should be treated as a chance for experienced players to coach new starters and not an occasion for Charles to hand out dunce's caps to anyone missing a shot when they are unlucky enough to partner him.

It would be nice if there were more lighthearted articles in WW and I hope that this article will encourage other laid back players to contribute. See you all at future events.

Winks on Mats

by Mike Surridge

The 1985 Hampshire Open Pairs and National Pairs tournaments finally brought to a head the severe problems which ETWA is having with mats.

We believe winks to be a game of skill, in which intelligent tactics play a major part. With this basic principle in mind we can divide mats into three broad categories:

(i) Unplayable - this covers all mats which are of such a condition that many of the shots are likely to fail due to mat imperfections. Such imperfections are of a very local nature (notably bits of fluff). They may enhance a sub by propping up one side of the wink, or in some cases hold a pile together (how often have you tried unsuccessfully to rebuild a pile after a foul because the piece of fluff holding it together was destroyed in the shot)?

(ii) Playable - this includes all mats where the incidence of local aberrations is sufficiently low that one might get through a game without having a shot screw-up by virtue of the active participation of a mat. However, if there are only a few pieces of fluff then the intervention of one of them may be decisive by virtue of being the only such event in a game. Therefore it would not be advisable to use such mats in tournaments where one would like the games to be a pure test of ability.

(iii) Tournament Playable - this category can be defined quite tightly. A tournament mat must be devoid of fluff or crinkle. It must be uniform across the entire mat. It must also conform to

some agreed standard type: it must be the same as all other tournament mats!

The current mat type (ROB2) does not fall into this last category even when new, by virtue of a large variation in softness and thickness between different, new ROB2 mats. The ROB2 mat tends when used to become thinner in the middle and develops tufts of fluff. This does not take long - Sotwink mats are used for about 3 to 5 games a week. They become thinner in the middle and fluffy within four months of purchase, by which time they are firmly in the "playable" only category. The 1985 Hampshire Open was a "mat disaster" because of this problem. Our two new (Oct '84) mats were clearly not up to standard, but although Alan Dean had with him several new mats (which we pressed into service) these two mats had to be used. One was particularly bad, and may have affected the outcome of the tournament (Liz Bertoya's pot-out vs Josland & Clark and also her missed round 5 pot vs Carrington & Surridge were on this mat). Both were quite different from the new mats, which themselves did not quite play the same as each other.

As the mats get older their fluffiness worsens and, if they spend much time rolled up it is usual for crinkle to set in within a year. By this time the mats are only borderline playable - by their second birthday they are not. It is possible to keep a mat quite free of fluff by not using it too often and combing the surface occasionally. If it is only loosely rolled (possible by keeping it in a cardboard tube), then it will not crinkle unless it is quite thick. Jon Mapley has such a mat - it is several years old and a rather thin example. It has been kept in a tube and crinkle has been avoided (probably only possible because of its thinness). It is only slightly fluffy and not much thinner in the middle than at the edge (again, thin mats are often better

in this respect). I would seriously doubt that it has been used for three games per week, so that it is perhaps an artificially 'conserved' mat, but is in very good condition. This mat was used at the National pairs this year, along with three new ones. Apart from one of the new mats being thinner than the other two, we saw the inconsistency between batches of ROB2 felt set at nought all the conservation work Jon had done on his mat. Because, although in good condition, Jon's mat is totally different in thickness and to some extent surface furriness from the current, brand new mat. It is therefore difficult to justify using it in a tournament (but we did!).

I hope I have convinced everyone that we have a mat problem. I cannot stress enough that it is a very major problem and one that we should seek to remedy immediately. Nobody likes to turn up at a tournament and find that they can't play on the mats in use until part-way through the second day. However, those of us that occasionally win tournaments seem able to cope. It is my contention that such people can cope because they have access to "current mats" for practice purposes. I imagine that Jon Mapley has a new or nearly new mat somewhere and that he practises on it, at least in the periods leading up to tournaments which he wants to win. I am a current Sotwink member, and so I get to play 2 or 3 games a week on a mat of appropriate thickness and density, although the games are sometimes spoiled by surface fluff. The people who are hit by the mat problem fall into two categories. There are those who have recently left university teams and find themselves isolated from other Winks players and not sufficiently well established to start promoting winks in their new environment. Such people have to put their faith in one piece of felt, which can scarcely aid their return to form. Perhaps this is why Rob Cartwright became invisible at tournaments in

1985! The other group of people who are disadvantaged by the lack of mat consistency are the complete novices. Sotwink has only about 2 poor mats and about 6 awesomely bad ones. The best two mats have to be kept in slightly good condition at least until the Hampshire Open and Silver Wink have been played, so our first years only get to borrow the horrible ones. But of course we want beginners to practise the basic shots and learn them quickly - if you can't squop or pot you don't realise the importance of tactics in winks, without which the game is rather arbitrary and uninteresting. For two years now we have been inundated with complaints from first-years that they can only pot on the mat that they have borrowed for practice. Many lose their interest in winks as a direct result of this failure.

Two years ago Charles Relle communicated with Sotwink (!) to tell us about an alternative type of mat. We visited him and tried it out and subsequently borrowed it for a few weeks. We found it quite suitable for a high standard of play, although rather different from the ROB2 which was at that time going through a rather thick time. The mat is extremely dense and not given to fluffiness or crinkling. It was used in the 1984 National Singles, although if anybody noticed it was to complain about how different it was. Make a note of that guys - the mat was used in the Singles when it was to my knowledge over 2 years old!

Two more mats of this type were purchased by Sotwink members through Charles at the Hampshire Open 1985. The original was also present, and we were able to confirm that it was indistinguishable from the two new ones. (It was a bit darker, though, which threw us for a while as we expected an older-looking mat to

be thinner!).

These mats can be obtained individually for £10 each (contact Charles Relle for details). In fact the price is £10 per metre, so if ETWA were to sell 14 of them at £10 a profit of £10 would be incurred. (13m=14yds). Sotwink is extremely keen since we believe they can retain tournament playable status for at least 5 years. Thus if we bought 1 per year at £10 we would have a pool of 5 tournament playable mats plus more older ones which would be good enough to be of value in practice games or casual winks. We currently buy 2 x ROB2 mats for £11 each year and by February have no tournament playable mats, 2 of reasonable standard, 2 not good and a load of 3-5 year old mats which are only good for sleeping on.

In short, it appears to be in everyone's interest to switch to this new type of mat, both financially (thanks to its long life) and also with regard to improving the technical side of the game. The main worry is, however, that ETWA may find itself with a large number of unsold ROB2 mats which would become increasingly difficult to dispose of. Hopefully the ETWA treasurer can shed some light on this side of the argument. It may be possible to phase in the new mat over a 12-month period in order to maintain the demand for ROB2 a while longer, in the hope of selling most of them off. (I don't have any good idea for doing this, however!). Whatever happens we should make a decision at the 1985 congress, because failure to do so would leave us playing with substandard equipment for another year, and in that time Sotwink could lose maybe 4-5 new winks players to the equipment problem as well as sink another £16 in equipment which will not retain its playability for even our own pairs tournament in February. (Do Cambridge have similar problems?)

be thinner).

These mats can be obtained individually for £10 each (contact Charles Relle for details). In fact the price is £10 per mat, so 11 ETWA were to sell 14 of them at £10 a profit of £10 would be incurred. (1984-85). So what is extremely hard when we believe they can retain tournament payable status for at least 7 years. Thus if we bought 1 per year at £10 we would have a pool of 7 tournament payables plus more older ones which would be good enough to be of value in practice funds or casual matches. We

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.

interest to switch to this... financially... regard to improving the financial side of the game. The main worry is, however, that ETWA may find itself with a large number of unpaid RONI rates which would become increasingly difficult to dispose of. Hopefully the ETWA Treasurer can shed some light on this side of the argument. It may be possible to phase in the new rate over a 12-month period in order to maintain the demand for RONI a while longer, in the hope of selling most of them off. (I don't have any good idea for doing this, however!). Whatever happens we should make a decision at the 1985 congress, because failure to do so would leave us playing with substandard equipment for another year, and in that time Soetink could lose maybe 4-5 new winks players to the equipment problem as well as sink another £10 in equipment which will not retain its playability for even our own games tournament in February. (Do Cambridge have similar problems?)