

W I W W W
I I I I I
N N N N N
K O O K K O O K
I R R I I R R I
N L L N N L L N
GD DG GD GD

Y FORT
T S Y
R I
O S XFORT
F I S Y
FORTY I T
X XFOR

98	1985	198	19851	9851	9	9	8519	5198	5198
1 5	1	1 5	8	9	98	19	8 8	5	5 5
19	198	1 5	8	985	9 5	9	8519	519	5 5
85	1	198	8	9	9	9	8 8	5	5198
1 5	1	1	8	9	9	9	8 8	5	5 8
98	1985	1	8	9851	9	9	8519	5198	5 5

CONTENTS

Editorial Jottings	1
The 1985 Silver Wink	1
Tournament Results	5
The 1985/86 Marchant Trophy	7
Going out of Turn	13
More about the Rules	14
Off the Mat	16
Winks is a Mental Game	17
Tournament Rationale	23
Revaluation	25
I Wouldn't Dream	27
That Was the Wink That Was	30
Beyond the Dictionary in Winks	34
Laying Back	36

The editor wishes to thank Geoff Thorpe for his very valuable assistance in the printing and production of WW45 and WW46.

Editorial Jottings

The two tournaments this autumn are the Fours and the Singles. The fours is at Southampton on the weekend of October 26th - 27th. Try, everyone, to bring at least one new player to this tournament. It is a friendly and relaxed occasion, and a handicap system will be used to give everyone a fair chance.

The ETWA A.G.M. will be on the evening of October 26th, also in Southampton.

The National Singles Championship will be held in Cambridge on the weekend of November 24th - 25th. We hope to be entertaining some Americans again, possibly as many as six. If you want a match against them, contact Jon Mapley at 2 Janmead, Witham, Essex; telephone 0376-516872. Please send offers of accommodation to him too.

My appeal for articles seems to have been heeded. Old and new authors have contributed. Thank you very much. But keep it up. WW47 is due next spring!

If you have not yet paid your subscription of £5 (or £2 for students), remember to send it to Alan Dean at 6 Birkland Drive, Edwinstowe, Nottinghamshire.

The 1985 Silver Wink

by Mike Surridge
Jim Carrington
Liz Bertoya.

On Saturday 4th May 1985 the long awaited 1985 Silver Wink match was played between Southampton University and Cambridge University in the students' Union at Southampton.

Both teams were substantially changed from the 1984 match. Cambridge had lost Paul Milditch as well as one or two lesser players, and came to the match sporting two first year players. The winning 1984 Southampton team was also sadly depleted, with G. Josland, P. Clark and R. Cartwright all gone. A new look team included three novice players, one of whom was the infamous J. Carlaw. An interesting feature of the Southampton line-up was the presence of Steve Harbron, who played in two Silver Wink Matches for Oxford in 1982. Although he had never played for Southampton before, it was felt that he might cope with partnering John Carlaw!

Cambridge arrived the customary half-hour late, and one round was played before lunch. Both Inglis (Camb.) and Surridge (Soton), decided to lurk in their team's lower pairs, but both choosing no. 3 they failed to avoid clashing in the first round. On this occasion the result was 6-1 to Southampton. Jim Carrington and Jon Ferguson - on paper Southampton's strong pair - also won 5½-1½ against G. Hobbs and P. Wright. The other two matches went to Cambridge but Alan Boyce and Liz Whitfield managed to hold out for 2½ points against S. Sage and J. Robertson, so that Southampton went to lunch with a 2 point lead.

Owing to the late(-ish) start, it was not possible to take lunch in any of the usual places, so we adjourned to the Crown (Highfield). As a result of this when Liz Bertoya (Cambridge and Salisbury) turned up to watch the match at 1 o'clock she was unable to find the teams, despite a tour of some fifteen pubs.

After the interval, the teams returned refreshed and got down to the rest of the match, now assisted by an impartial (?) and incorruptible (!) observer and umpire. Again in round two each side took two games, but this time it was Southampton who were unable to get the sixes and Cambridge took the round to level the match 28-28.

Round three was probably one of the longest in Silver Wink history, with the last game taking over an hour! Things started quite normally with M. Surridge and N. May piling up another win against B. Devlin and J. Prince. Then A. Boyce and L. Whitfield managed to beat G. Hobbs and P. Wright 5-2. A short pause, and another Southampton win: 6-1 to J. Carrington and J. Ferguson over S. Sage and T. Robertson in a close, tactical game. Whilst all this was happening all hell broke loose in the other game (Inglis and Hedger v Harbron and Carlaw). The first sign of trouble came early in rounds from Harbron. The ex-Oxford player was squopped up except for one wink on top of a massive pile which he proposed to crud. Nick Inglis not surprisingly asked for a shot-judge and Liz Bertoya obligingly strolled over. Her face fell as she encountered one of the all time great pile duplication jobs. After a long pause whilst this work was effected, Steve played the shot legally and survived to crud another day. A few shots later a repeat of this event took place (although the pile was slightly less complicated). In the post-crud mayhem Inglis tried a pot-out, after which Harbron also had a crack. Finally after some nail-biting potting shots in round 5 the Cambridge pair took the game 4-3. The third round was thus won magnificently by Southampton, who now enjoyed a 48-36 lead, needing just 8 points from the final round to retain the trophy.

For the final round Cambridge needed four large wins, and under the circumstances elected to go for pot-outs in 3 games. The first to succeed was S. Sage against J. Carlaw and S. Harbron. However his partner was unable to beat either of the Southampton pair (John Carlaw must have used up a full year's quota of successful potting shots in this game!). Next to achieve the pot-out was Bruce Devlin against Liz Whitfield and Alan Boyce. However, Jon Prince was always struggling to beat the 1985 National Pairs Champion and the result was 6-1. The third attempt was by G. Hobbs and P. Wright against N. May and M.

Surridge, and they might as well have shot at the moon. The Southampton pair took control of the situation, and passed out with free shots and only one Cambridge wink in the bucket. During this game, however, the Cambridge pair succeeded on a number of occasions in squopping the main pile, and it was always at these moments that Jim Carrington chose to enquire how many points he needed. Not wanting to be overconfident, Mike Surridge told him 4. Jim returned aghast - he had Nick Inglis squopped up and was playing for 3. Fortunately, the situation became clear before any serious damage was done, and in the end the Southampton pair won this last game 4-3, and the Silver Wink by 61-51.

SOUTHAMPTON

CAMBRIDGE

B. Devlin G. Hobbs
S. Sage N. Inglis
J. Prince P. Wright
J. Robertson T. Hedger

A. Boyce	- 4½	- 6	- 4	- 2	
L. Whitfield	2½ -	1 -	3 -	5 -	11½
J. Carlaw	- 5	- 6	- 4	- 6	
S. Harbron	2 -	1 -	3 -	1 -	7
N. May	- 2	- 1	- 1	- 1	
M. Surridge	5 -	6 -	6 -	6 -	23
J. Carrington	- 1	- 3	- 3	- 1½	
J. Ferguson	6 -	4 -	4 -	5½ -	19½
	12½	16	12	10½	

Southampton : 61 : 51 : Cambridge.

The scoresheet makes very interesting reading - but we'll leave Charles Relle to make up some appropriate sarcastic comments. And so to the celebratory pub crawl... but that's another story. Look out for the Liz Bertoya Memorial Silver Wink Construction Hat!

Tournament Results

We took advantage of the presence of Larry Kahn and Dave Lockwood in November 1984 to hold a World Masters tournament. This is for anyone who has won a National Singles Championship. The holder from 1981 was Jon Mapley. So in Cambridge Messrs Kahn, Lockwood, Mapley, Dean, Relle, Seaman and Knowles assembled for a round robin tournament. Four were to qualify for a knockout semi final and final, and Kahn (29½), Mapley (27), Dean (25½) and Lockwood (22) got through. In the three game semifinals Lockwood beat Kahn and Dean beat Mapley. Time ran out, and the final was played in stages, at the National Singles and the National Pairs. It resulted in a victory for Lockwood. Congratulations to him for his success. Maybe the result prompted his article later in this journal!

The World Championship has changed hands again, but remains in America. Jon Mapley did not manage to wrest the title from Larry Kahn, losing 25-17, but Larry later lost by the same score again to the 1984 U.S. Singles Champion Aryc Gittleman. Larry subsequently won the U.S. 1985 Singles, so an interesting series of matches is in prospect.

On the domestic front, the two features of the season seem to be the number of new winners of the various tournaments and the closeness of the results. The biggest discrepancy has been in Steve Harbron's report on the Hampshire Open: the score is - number of words promised 500 - number of words written 0.

Setting this aside, I record the winners of the National Fours as Boyce, May, Surridge and Miss Whitfield, who were four points clear of Clark, Relle, Shearman and Thorpe. The difference between third and fourth places was $1/6$ of a point and the mapley team that finished fifth scored 99 11/24, the first time such a fraction has been recorded.

The Cambridge Open and Hampshire Open have in recent years developed their individual characteristics, adding variety to the season, and providing enjoyment for the participants. Both were excellently organised and well attended, with players from the main winking centres coming to both. Mike Surridge (5.25 p.p.g.) triumphed in the Cambridge Open with Charles Relle (4.91) second. These players met once in the random-random tournament, and Mike won. Third was Geoff Thorpe. These three players were prominent in the Hampshire open a few weeks later, Relle and Thorpe winning for the second year in succession despite again losing the final game to against Surridge, whose partner this year was Jim Carrington. Our sympathy goes to Jon Mapley, who had to miss the Hampshire Open when he damaged his back humping duty free liquor.

Once again I held an invitation individual at my house. This year I was rash enough to invite Mapley, who won. Second was Thorpe, and the host climed to the dizzy height of third.

Hat tricks were possible to Alan Dean in the National Pairs and the London Open. Maybe he does not like to be too prominent these days, for he took his partners to third place in both events. A report on the national pairs appeared in the last issue: the London Open saw a victory by half a point for Hull and Thorpe, with Rob Cartwright second followed, again at an interval of half a point, by Dean and his partner Charles Relle. Mapley and Parsons (the Megacrudder) were a further three points behind. As everyone drifted away, Alan Boyce and Charles Relle

began a challenge for the Jubilee Cup. An open game soon saw one wink of each of three colours in the pot, and Boyce remarked that this was how tiddlywinks ought to be played. He would have been right if either player had played less ineptly. As it was the failure of any pot out threat to carry any conviction led to a scramble for points in rounds and an eventual $4\frac{1}{2}$ - $2\frac{1}{2}$ to Charles. Then we went home to supper and resumed. Food and drink resuscitated Charles in a significant way, for he went on to take the next three games 6-1, 6-1, 7-0 to retain the trophy by $23\frac{1}{2}$ - $4\frac{1}{2}$.

I hope this report has done justice to everybody. Please let me know whether you like or dislike the balance of this issue of Winking World. I am always pleased when people contribute discussion articles, humour and reflections, and hope that they will encourage more writers to do the same. But this is your magazine and, basically, what you write will go into it.

The 1985/86 Marchant Trophy

by Mike Surridge

This article is not a match report.

The Marchant trophy has in the past few years become a sad affair. When I started playing Winks in 1980, the Marchant Trophy was some mythical challenge trophy which had been held by Quosh for as long as anybody could remember. However in 1981 it became a knockout competition for teams of six. My first Marchant trophy match was for SUWC (as we were then called) against Jon Mapley's OBwink. The result was the famous tie, which Mapley resolved (as tournament director) in favour of his own team. It was a highly enjoyable match for us because we weren't too keyed up (as we often get over the Silver Wink), and as a sixes match it was possible for us to field a team without too many weak players in it.

OBwink went on to win the 1981 Marchant trophy. My next (and last) game was against NewTS. We had a much weaker team and didn't play very well, so that in the end we lost as heavily as expected. It wasn't too bad a match, though, since we were then rebuilding our side after losing several key players, and it looked as though we might be a very useful outfit in 1982/3.

Imagine our fury when the 1982 Marchant trophy final didn't take place until a fair way into 1983. By this time our team (which had developed as expected) was on the verge of breaking up again. I don't know if there was a 1983/4 trophy, because it would have been too late to enter a Sotwink team by the end of the 1981/1982 tournament.

At the 1984 ETWA congress, Phil Clark presented a plan to resurrect the ailing tournament. In the end most of his proposals were accepted. In essence, the Clark plan called for a central organizing committee to be empowered to disqualify teams which were laggardly about getting matches played. In effect, he was the committee, and set about distributing entry forms and prepared to notify teams of the draw. Nick Inglis and myself were incorporated into this committee largely to ensure that we would be able to cope if an argument developed in which Phil had a vested interest.

The response to this arrangement was pathetic. Only Sotwink had entered a team by the original closing date for entries (although CUTwC had given notice verbally that they intended to take part). We extended the deadline and CUTwC got two teams entered. This still seemed rather stupid so we left the deadline open until the Hampshire Open in Feb. '85. By this time we had run into problems organizing a venue for our Silver Wink match due to the considerable dissimilarity between our term dates (Easter vac. eliminated some 10 weekends in all). When this was played early May, it was clear that we

would not have time to play our Marchant Trophy games. Nick I and myself therefore agreed that the Silver Wink winner would pull out of the Marchant Trophy - Hence Cambridge are now holders of the Marchant Trophy 1984/5. (Perhaps one game has been played, if CUTwC still has 2 teams to play for the trophy). Our decision was to a large extent influenced by the argument that the existence of a holder would increase the options available for a new format in 1985/6.

Because a new format there has to be. In view of the above tale of woe, I hope everybody now agrees that the existing Marchant Trophy format is a disaster, and that the existence of a controlling committee has failed the fundamental problems inherent in it.

Nick Inglis and myself have come to an arrangement whereby we intend, with appropriate discussion including Phil, to produce a Marchant Trophy package for the next ETWA congress. This new format will be presented with the recommendation that it be accepted or that the Marchant Trophy be abandoned - a view arrived at through the unfortunate delay in beginning this year's tournament. Clearly we would like to incorporate as many suggestions from as many people as possible, but we feel that unless wingers have the entry forms before congress so that they can enter there we will not have a particularly successful tournament in '85/'86 either.

I have considered the most desirable format for the Marchant Trophy at length, although so far I have had little opportunity to discuss it with the other Marchant Trophy committee members. However, I believe that some statement must be made now so that everyone who wishes to take part in the discussion may do so. Any ideas that you people out there want us to think about should be sent to Phil Clark (ETWA secretary) or to me, Mike Surridge at 43 High Rd., Swaythling, Southampton, Hampshire, or to Nick

Inglis, c/o Cambridge University Tiddlywinks Club,
Queens' College Cambridge.

I have produced a list of rules which could be used as a basis for the 1985/86 Marchant Trophy tournament. They are reproduced in the appendix below. As I have already pointed out, only very few of these have been discussed by Nick and myself, but I feel I should outline my reasoning behind these rules and indicate where agreement (or disagreement) exists at the moment.

Rule 1 is the only point which has been fully discussed and agreement reached. The idea is that a team of four uses one car ($1/4$ of a car each) and that a team of six requires two cars (i.e. more cars and a whopping $1/3$ of a car each). Thus by switching to fours we make it cheaper and easier to travel to fixtures, as well as increasing the number of teams possible over last year's lamentable entry.

Rules 2 and 3 are an attempt to force the teams to have some consistent identity. However, they do allow for a large but scattered group (e.g. Quesh) to enter with a fair chance of being able to raise a team from a large list. Of course if they all want to play then competition for selection becomes fierce, for which purpose rule 5 is introduced. (I hope that if they all feel able to play regularly then they will enter more than one team).

Rule 4 I regard as an option. It contains two statements, the first designed to prevent individuals playing for all kinds of teams by refusing to join any one. The second is supposed to stop players doing so even though they may be on a team list. However, the second should probably be employed with the proviso that if such a player is refused then no half point transfer will be applied to the resultant half-pair. This is because it undermines rule 2 which is designed to make it easier to play the games.

Rule 6 I disagree with (I think travelling maybe 50 miles for two games a little daft), but on the other hand a visit by OBwink four to Cambridge would be feasible only occasionally, so the games should be short so that OBwink can play all four Cambridge teams (The above is not satire - it is an Example!).

Rules 7 to 10 specify how the tournament should be run. I like the league basis with a fixed period to play because it does not restrict when during the year you have to play each game. E.g. If my team has to play Garibaldi High School it would not be convenient to be forced to play within 4 weeks so that a new round can be drawn. The league basis allows us to pick any suitable occasion.

Rule 9 in effect rewards a keen bunch of winkers who get their fingers out and goes around playing matches. It punishes the team which complains about higher things and travel costs and does nothing. On the other hand, teams at a club (e.g. CUTwC or Sotwink) will gain an advantage by being in a position to play a lot of their games at home. A way round this is to divide fixtures into external and internal ones - internal being used to describe a match where six or more players have the same home town (we need to include this information on lists and permit the committee of rule 11 to determine the effective home town in cases such as the undergraduate of Southampton Univ, home Edinburgh).

Then replace rule 10 by:

10a. The tournament placings will be determined from the p.p.g. attained in external matches only, with internal results effective only in the event of a tie.

Note that rule 9 would stand - your p.p.g. includes zero's for all the games you fail to complete. I hope that the internal games in Sotwink, CUTwC etc. would still get played, since there is no great difficulty in doing so and they would act a bit like "goal differences" and so be worth having.

Good luck to you in Marchant '85/'86!

Appendix

1. Marchant Trophy games will be played between teams of four.
2. Each team must contain at least 3 players drawn from the team list.
3. A team may have any number of players listed (but it must have at least four). No player may appear on the team list of more than one team, however.
4. If a player is used by a team and he/she is unlisted, then the player must be added to that team's list. Players from other teams' lists may only be played by agreement of the opponents.
5. Each team must have a Captain, who will be responsible for-
 - a) Picking the side
 - b) Organizing fixtures with opposing captains
 - c) Maintaining contact with the tournament organizers.
6. Each match will consist of a normal fours match with two rounds and each pair playing each opposing pair.
7. The tournament will be organized on a league basis, with every team playing every other team once.
8. The tournament will last for 350 days from an official start date, to be declared by the organizers.
9. If after the 350th day the organizers have not received a completed scoresheet for any match (whether or not it was played within the life of the tournament), then both sides will be credited with a zero score for the match.
10. The tournament winners will be the team which has scored most points, not the one which has won most matches.
11. The current Marchant Trophy Committee will organize the 1985/86 tournament - new elections may be held by ETWA congress to replace members

of this committee. The team captains must provide the committee with up to date copies of the team lists, and complete scoresheets of matches played. The committee will inform team captains if their lists contain players listed elsewhere and resolve disputes in this respect. It will also provide the team captains with a list of outstanding fixtures and a League table as often as possible.

Going out of turn

David H. Lockwood

Of the possible illegal occurrences, going out of turn is probably the most frequent. Unfortunately, the original transgressor may be rewarded with a choice of whether accept his/her opponent's subsequent shot which would have been correct in the original sequence. In several major tournaments, this has had a significant effect on the final result.

As described in an earlier article, a player gets about 25 shots per color in a 20 minute singles game (including the last five rounds). This is less than I would have expected without empirical evidence; any unnecessary reduction from this number would diminish the game. Usually I know the next shot I wish to play before my opponents' shot. If their shot has not demonstrably changed the situation, I proceed with my planned shot. If my opponents have gone out of turn in the interim, I am then deemed out of turn. It's unfortunate but it seems that I will have to consider the "orderliness" of my opponents after every shot. This will interrupt my concentration, decrease flow and strategy, and most importantly slow down the game. What must be must be and I can no longer accept the losses I incur from the mistakes of others.

As a partial remedy, I would strongly recommend that anyone should announce that a player has gone

out of turn as soon as it is noticed. This includes the player who went out of turn, his/her partner, opponents or even spectators. Contrary to Charles Relle's comment in WW45, however, I would not require anyone to announce the possibility of someone going out of turn before the shot is made. If an opponent feels honor-bound to do so, that's fine. Personally I will usually tell the player. Spectators should certainly not verbally note a mere possibility. There is a advantage to be gained by the wronged party and rightfully so. In some free turn situations, mistakes of this sort may represent the best chance for the squopped out pair. It is regrettable that some good players have difficulty playing in the correct order. It is more regrettable if they get away with it because their opponents were not on the lookout for such an error. The out of turn occurrences are so few that keeping an eye out for it continually has not seemed worth the effort. However, its impact on certain games has now led me to change my opinion.

More about the Rules

by Geoff Thorpe

Since I raised the no free turns position at the last A.G.M. the situation has occurred several times in tournaments. The ruling suggested by Charles Relle in WW45 seems to have been generally followed, and but for actually approving the necessary rule wording, the story seems to be over.

However it is possible to get into a position where you can't free in time despite having as many as two free turns. With yellow squopped out, green plays a shot which simultaneously squops up the opponents and sends a green off the mat. Yellow and green cannot now play for the next three turns so if there are less than three free greens the freeing shot cannot be played in time. It might be that this is regarded as green's own fault for going off, and

that as he has failed to free, a wink is moved aside. This I feel is certainly the case when a player is unable to free because he has gone off, or been squopped by his partner during the free turns.

But consider the following case. With yellow and blue squopped out green sends a wink off. Red sees green has only two free winks and pots or subs his last wink. Again two free turns with three turns to be missed. I feel it would be unjust to penalise green-yellow in this position.

Perhaps the extra sentence in rule 12(a) should read "If the squopping pair, at the time the squop-up occurs, are unable to play any turns until after a wink is due to be freed, they shall free on their first playable turn".

On potting out of turn I agree with Charles' ruling but not his reasoning. Also I am not happy with his suggestions for some of the hypothetical cases he quotes. I feel that a positive action is required to accept any shot played out of turn. Thus I disagree with Charles about the situation where green plays out of turn, red is squopped up and yellow plays. I feel both shots can be retracted unless red and blue in any way accepted the first shot.

The ruling made the only other time I can remember seeing a wink potted out of turn was clearly wrong. The player who had potted was asked to finish his turn after which the opponents could accept or reject the entire turn. Umpires who make this sort of decision have only themselves to blame if the next shot is a C.B. megacrud and they have to rebuild the pile. Despite the absurdity of the ruling, as usual the umpire's decision was accepted without question at the time.

One final point on playing out of turn. It is not possible to play out of turn when you have free

turns: playing one colour when the other was due to play constitutes a passed turn. Similarly if green is squopped out then if red plays when it is blue's turn, blue has passed. If red pots six the opponents can't take them out and ask blue to play!

Off the Mat

by Charles Relle

If, playing blue, you send a blue wink off the mat, you lose your next shot. This rule has been with us since the late fifties, and is indeed part of the tradition of the game. It was not however one of the original Marchant rules, but was presumably incorporated because people felt that careless or violent shots should be penalised. Desquopping techniques were much less refined then, and people quite often sent their own winks off while desquopping. Nowadays, you are more likely to send off an opponent than yourself, and the strategy of the game has so far advanced that to lose a wink from the main area of play is a decided drawback in itself.

Ought we to keep this rule? It has not been discussed in recent years, but change has always been rejected, possibly because winks players are excessively hidebound by tradition, for tradition is the only reason for keeping this rule.

Why should we change? To keep the rule makes tournament tiddlywinks more like a children's game in which penalties are exacted arbitrarily and without reason. To get rid of it acknowledges the implications of a 6'x3' playing surface (one of the main differences between tournament and 'noddy' winks), and appreciates that the temporary loss of a wink to the edge of the mat is a severe blow which should not be punished by a further penalty.

In addition, people are nowadays very careful not to send their own winks off the mat, and I would judge that a wink more often goes off the mat through bad luck than carelessness. How often have you seen a wink glance off the pot or another wink, bounce onto its edge and roll off, sometimes from quite a short shot? Should bad luck be penalised? I think not. Moreover, to abolish this rule would make the rules simpler. I would like to see it go.

Some people, admitting the validity of the above arguments, but wishing to keep to tradition even if in a new form, have proposed a lesser penalty for going off the mat, such as that the wink that goes off must be the wink played on the next shot. I am against this, which is an idea of John Mapley's, because it is fussy and an unnecessary complication.

Should you lose a turn if you send off an opponent's wink? Most boondock shots deliberately send an opponent off, so by removing an opponent's wink you gain a strategic advantage without any special skill. Suppose, however, the penalty were attached: the boondock would become a much more delicate shot, and the skill of the game would be increased.

Against the penalty is the argument of tradition, and the fact that to introduce such a provision would complicate the rules. Nevertheless, I am for this change too.

Winks is a mental game
by Rob Cartwright

When I left university, I started to pursue more fully my other main hobby, golf. I found an excellent book by Jack Nicklaus called "Playing Lessons", which deals with the strategy of golf rather than just its

shots, and while reading about 'The Inner Game' i.e. the way to think and play your best, I found it fascinating to relate the same ideas to winks. I have quoted here some bits and pieces; I hope that others find them as relevant - and I also hope we don't get done for copyright!

1) Stay cool by knowing your capabilities

"You'll see players get into a good position, then play badly. Why? Not because they're bad players - They had to be good to get into contention. The main reason is that they don't think and act totally objectively under pressure, and try to do more than they are capable of. So before you play anything, look at the position; get a gut feel for its difficulty. The harder the shot 'feels' to you instinctively, then almost certainly the harder it really is. Try to visualise in your mind the shot you want to play - 'see' the trajectory of the shot, the behaviour on landing. Think about what you must do to achieve that. If you honestly can't 'see' the shot behaving as you would like, you know that your chances of pulling it off are pretty slim.

"To do this, you must know your own, and your partner's capabilities. Be realistic. There are shots almost anyone can play, shots you might be able to play, and shots you almost certainly cannot play, depending on your experience and form. Every tournament I see people play shots beyond their capabilities, and I sometimes see players try shots beyond anybody's capabilities. That's dumb, not just in terms of a bad eventual score, but also in terms of your confidence.

"Don't let your opponent's shots affect you. Accept what has just happened, then forget it, totally. If you react emotionally to the past, you'll be much less cool-headed about what you need to do now. Similarly, don't let bad luck or a mistake

create mental carelessness. Understand that the game is not and never will be entirely 'fair', there will always be an element of luck beyond your control. Secondly, being human and therefore fallible, you will always hit a percentage of bad shots along with the good ones. Remember, if there's one thing above all that wins tournaments, it's keeping cool under pressure."

- How often have you blown an easy win? I shan't forget my most spectacular blunder, really a basic mental error. In the 1984 Singles against Lockwood, he had gone pot-squop and got 5 yellows in but had three greens buried. Then he missed the last pot and I got him. I got another green too, and with a huge advantage in free winks was looking at a fairy-tale victory. Then on a simple 6" approach shot I played a pot-type shot without thinking - and yes, I bombed my own pile. I've never forgotten that, but if I'd have stopped to visualise the shot I might still be celebrating...

The bit about knowing your capabilities makes me think. Normally, given two shots I'll try the 'more interesting' -i.e. the more difficult! Perhaps we shouldn't spend so much time on multi-Lennon break-ups or ill-advised chips between piles, but get the 2" squop instead.

Also I think about how many times I have seen young players try to Bristol with the top wink in front of instead of behind the bottom one. Any fool knows it just can't be done. Another one is the off the table boondock when the squop is only just on; I've seen players try these 'down the line' (instead of at an angle so the squidger gets a good leverage) and they just "George Michael" (wimp) the shot about half an inch.

2) Give you opening shots 100% plus

"What's your most important shot in a game? The same one every time - the opening drive. It often sets the mood for the entire round, apart from any trouble it causes. Hit it well and confidence surges; hit it badly and you're on a downer.

"It's only natural to save the big effort until last, but it is usually very poor strategy. You gain a big psychological advantage by drawing first blood, and the earlier and further you can get ahead the more pressure you place on your opponent."

- I would say this is absolutely true to Winks. I believe that bad bringing in is the most major cause of lost games amongst average players, and my bringing in is as bad as it comes! The mats don't help here of course; currently the bounce (into the pot or off the mat) is very hard to predict. Even so, it would seem to highlight a major imbalance in technique and practice. Everybody practises potting, but few bringing in, and even some of the best players have problems (such as Mick Surridge).

The importance of this was shown to me in the 1984 Singles, when Dave Hull potted out on me for a 7-0 because I had only about 8 winks on the mat - some had gone on the floor and most were around a foot away from the pot.

Remember that the way to get points against mediocre players is to pot out on them; by bringing in well you have a much better chance of doing this. And perhaps more important, against a player much better than yourself, good bringing in may be the only way you are likely to survive at all.

3) Stick to proven methods

"Don't try to invent a new technique, or drastically alter your style, just before a tournament. Any major changes not fully assimilated in practice will almost certainly break down under the pressure of trying to score well. The result is usually even more confusion and frustration than you suffer trying to make an imperfect but familiar method work. By all means you should try to increase your versatility as a shotmaker, but the shots should be practised enough so that you know they work for you. Don't be like a friend of mine; we get him back to fundamentals and playing nicely to his handicap. But every time he makes one bad shot in play, he's off in search of a new theory. He's always in trouble."

- I can relate to this as well, having had a totally disastrous 1984 National Pairs (with Phil Clark). I'd just made myself a new squidger and had only used it a few times, and I was experimenting with the squop-style bring in. I only played well in one game (against Relle and Knowles), largely I believe because Phil did all the real work. I sent winks off the table in almost every game, and I couldn't play any pile worth a darn.

Luckily I didn't get depressed; in fact I enjoyed that tournament more than many when things have gone better. Of course now I'm used to that squidger I wouldn't play with anything else.

The variety of potting and squopping techniques used by players shows that there is more than one way of killing the cat. I'd advise anybody to experiment and find what's best for you, but don't get over anxious if it doesn't work first time. At all costs give any new technique a fair trial, enough to show whether it really works or is just a gimmick.

4) Practise for a build up

"Accept that absolute consistency is impossible, so to have peaks you are bound to have valleys. Some players really berate themselves when off form, instead of building for another peak. Try to peak for two or three tournaments a year, the ones when you want to play your best. Accept that you won't be at your best at other times; indeed I often regularly slow down or even forget the game for a while. When you build up after a layoff, you'll find renewed interest and a positive attitude to make you play and practise - and you'll play better and be more confident for it."

- I believe that the most boring thing in tournament reports is to say someone or other was off form, as if it's the end of the world. It isn't, and we know the same player will peak again and thrash us next time around.

The main difference of course between Winks and golf is that in golf you can practise alone; and because your real opponent (the course) is always around, you can practise strategy too. In winks the second half is that much tougher - you need a real opponent and a real partner. That is why I believe the less serious tournaments are just as important as the nationals. (A note of apology here since it appears I was 'invisible' in the first half of 1985 (M. Surridge WW45) - the effects of a new home, a new job, travelling to Plymouth for work and sheer exhaustion have made me miss more tournaments this year than I would have liked. The mats, or lack thereof, had nothing to do with it!).

Tournament Rationale

by David Lockwood

When we hold a tournament, what is our objective? Is it social, organizational, or skill level determination? We try to address the desires of all players through varied format arrangements in different tournaments. We have developed tournaments with handicaps, one game knockouts, preliminaries and finals, Swiss formats, round robins, knockout systems, and combinations of all the above. Most people would agree that the national championships are the tournaments for assessing relative skill levels on the day (or two). No quarter is given and none is expected within the framework of our gentlemen's/gentlewomen's sport. But which format is best for determining who is best?

If our objective in the national championships is primarily to determine the best player or pair on the day, are we currently achieving that goal? The main difference between a round robin and a knockout format in determining skill levels is that a round robin should yield the best player/pair versus the average of the tournament participants while a knockout yields the better between two individuals or pairs. In the former, the worst player in the tournament is sometimes able to trace a chain of A beat B beat C etc. in which he or she beats the champion. Fairly often the second or third place finisher will beat the champion head to head but do less well against the average. Who's better? In a knockout format the champion can always claim to be better than everyone else in the tournament because he/she can trace a chain of A beat B beat C etc. where the champion is always A.

The ambiguity inherent in a round robin has created a tournament system in which the ability to "bash rabbits" is most important. The 1984 ETWA Singles champion averaged 3 points per game in his three round robin games against the second, third,

and fourth place finishers but his average of six against the rest of the field won the day. The 1985 NATWA Singles champion averaged 3 1/3 points in his six games against the second, third, and fourth place finishers but 6.43 against the rest. Have we achieved our objective? Would we have a different winner if the rabbits had not shown up?

The only reason the third place finishers in the 1985 ETWA Pairs Championship were at all close at the finish was their seven 7-0 wins in their fourteen games. This sort of performance is required by the format but detrimental to the game.

NATWA has almost always used round robin formats in its national championships but ETWA began its championships with knockout formats. It should be remembered the greatest number of participants were in these early year-long ETWA tournaments. Whether the participation level is directly correlated to the tournament structure is uncertain. Most likely the small commitment of time and the informality encouraged weaker players to "have a go" and see if they could get through a round or two. Such a format might appeal to Cambridge newcomers for the same reasons. Good players could relax after a good first game and avoid the "rabbit bashing" required under a round robin format. I remain unconvinced that weak players enjoy 8-10 games in a day averaging less than 1 point as opposed to 2-3 formal games and time for the pub, sightseeing, fun games, and spectating.

Fact. Half the players in a knockout tournament get eliminated in every round. On the other hand, perhaps the glass is half full. There is only one winner in any tournament no matter what the format, but making it to the quarters, semis or finals or even just through one round can represent a more accomplishable but still satisfying goal. For those who do manage an upset, the joy is greater than the odd win or two in ten games.

If we expand, we will eventually be forced to move to knockout systems. As I have pointed out, however, the ability to handle greater numbers is not the only advantage of a knockout. A more relaxed environment in the early rounds, greater time for other activities including the pub, fun games, and even studying, less pain for weaker players, these are the more immediate reasons for switching to the better format, knockout.

Revaluation

by Charles Relle

"Tournament Rationale" is a persuasive title, but David Lockwood's article is less so, and invites examination. A tournament must be seen to arrange players in order of merit, but it must be so organised that people are attracted to it. This in turn means that it must be short, no longer than a weekend, and that everybody must play in a good proportion of it. No-one wants to give up a weekend, or even a day, for the possibility of participating in a tournament only for a single round perhaps of 2 games.

This is what a knockout tournament produces for half the players, and in the second round for half of those remaining. It is not an argument for knockout tournaments to say that eliminated players can amuse themselves in other ways. They come to participate; they have less fun if they do not. There is a difference between the American and British attitudes to the game. For the American, the superstar is all. The ambition to become a superstar is paramount: essentially the Americans have a killer instinct, and this is one reason why they have always produced the World Champions. It is possibly also why American tournaments have smaller entries than British: enjoyment is provided (whatever the tournament format) for the superstars rather than for

everyone. "Some of you newcomers may just be boring people generally" wrote Dave himself in Newswink 10. This is an attitude we would not express. Our tournaments aim to provide fun for all.

Do our national tournaments give a fair order of merit, with the best player or pair at the top? This is a hard question, but I think they do. What do they test? They test consistency (as do knockout tournaments), the ability to recover from a bad result (would you like to lose a knockout 7-0 to a man who did two Carnevskies?), and the ability to play continually to your own standard, even though your first opponent may be comparatively weak and the next comparatively strong. This is not the same as an exercise in "rabbit bashing". None of the games in the final pool of the National Singles is easy, and a 6-1 result may end a close struggle. In the 1984 ETWA Singles, those who did not make the final pool included the secretary of ETWA, two former captains of Southampton, one of the 1985 National Pairs Champions, and the two players who as a pair won the 1985 London Open. It is unlikely that those who remained were "rabbits".

It is true that the early ETWA National Singles had very large entries, and that they were on a knockout basis, but a return to knockout would not produce larger tournaments. Transport costs have increased, and it would strain the resources of many people to travel often. They would rather not enter than be unable to see a tournament through. Others have families whom they do not wish to leave too often. And as I pointed out above, a knockout system over a single weekend gives satisfaction only to the superstars. David's argument fails from the unsoundness of its basic premiss: a knockout is in fact not much fun for most players. If we expand, there are plenty of ways of accommodating more people.

I Wouldn't Dream of Bashing Rabbits,
But Lockwood Gives Me Grey Hairs
by Jon Mapley

Dave Lockwood's suggestion that National Singles and Pairs tournaments should become knockout events is an interesting one. It must come as a surprise to someone like Larry to find 20+ entries in a National Singles, when they are lucky if 10 turn up in America. Dave himself complained in 1980 that 20 games in a weekend were too many, but has he really considered the effect of changing to knockout?

Back in the heady days of the Dean Hat-trick, there were 60-odd players in the Singles and over 20 teams in the pairs. Each event took a year and the early rounds were drawn, unseeded, to minimise travel as far as possible. The tournaments depended on good organisation, and goodwill from all the players in meeting round deadlines.

It worked well for a few years, and then a noticable change took place. Petrol costs soared, and people became less enthusiastic about making a 50 mile journey for a probable 12-2 defeat. Fewer entries resulted, the journeys became longer, matches were defaulted rather than played, and it all culminated in the strange "final" of 1976 where three players ended up playing a round robin.

1977 saw the first break with tradition. 20 players were divided into two leagues, fighting for four semi-final places, which then reverted to the familiar three-game knockout and a head to head final. All systems have strengths and weaknesses, but that year was memorable for its excitement. Everyone played a minimum of nine games, and so each could claim to have affected the result. The battle for the four semi-final places was tremendous, with half points here and there costing players dearly, but despite the "one-off" drawback of the subsequent knockout, the most consistent player from the two

leagues ended up the winner. It was also the last year when everyone who mattered actually turned up.

Since '77 we have tinkered with this basic format, but the knockout element has disappeared in favour of either a final pool of 10/12 or an additional game / series of games between the leaders being added to their league results.

Before any radical revision is considered we must ask ourselves why we hold National Championships. The principal reason is to establish goals and standards of play at the highest level, to which all players can aspire, or against which they can measure themselves. It is also a natural selling point when publicising the game to be able to say definitively to the media "He/she is National Champion" rather than some woolly comment about strong players. The third and no less important aspect is the social element. Whereas, for example, the Hants Open will tend to attract a preponderance of Southampton winkers and the Cambridge Open will contain predominantly Queens' undergraduates, the nationals offer two opportunities for all to congregate and renew friendships and rivalries.

I believe that this last reason is why we should retain at least the "one weekend" format for National Championships. People expect value for their time, effort and money, and even those who may average only $1\frac{1}{2}$ points over a dozen games will surely enjoy their top level winks once or twice a year far more than if they had to get in a car, train or bus and spend half a day or more to play two games.

Two specific criticisms are made by Dave of the league basis being used throughout a championship. The first is that it does not necessarily guarantee that the best player wins. I do not believe that any system could offer such a guarantee, but I think that year in, year out, the eccentricities are evened out by this method. A player who wins a knockout can, of

course, claim that he is a valid champion because he has remained undefeated. However, in a field of 16, he did not play against 73.3% of the opposition, and in a field of only 32, a staggering 83.9%. In my view that must weaken the argument, as against someone who has lost a couple of individual games but triumphed from a series involving games against 78.9% of the opposition (1984 singles) or, in a three-league, 10 man final, approx. 60% (1981 singles). One other area where Dave's non-loss theory falls down is that his superman would be assumed to have won every game in a series of three-game matches (possible, but even more unlikely than winning every game in a league).

His other point sounds rather like Geoff Boycott criticising Graham Gooch. I know which batsman most people outside Yorkshire would choose to watch, (especially if they live in Essex!! - ed.) and I think the same is true of winks. If Dave would rather win a tournament by grinding out 5's, 5½'s and 6's, and not losing a game, then that's one way of playing. Let's say that in 7 games he amasses 40 points. I would rather get my 40 points by five sevens, a sneaky four and a one. Dave seemed to imply that Alan and I had no right to expect to win the Pairs because we lost four games while he and Alan Boyce only lost one. In that case, I was level with Larry, three games each, in my last World Singles Challenge, and should have played the seventh deciding game instead of shaking hands on a 25-17 defeat. Come off it Dave, you're just jealous when people play the game the way it should be played! If we were "rabbit bashing" then why couldn't Dave bash the same rabbits just as hard?

So where do we go from here? Should we consider knockout on the final day of the singles, say with eight players instead of 10 or 12? With three games per match, it would take nine games to complete, the same as a ten player group. Would the losing quarter-finalists pack up and go home at lunchtime or stay and watch, or act as umpires? Would as many players turn up on day one? I don't know, but I would

not want anyone to be discouraged from doing so because of the feeling of poor value for a weekend's efforts. Perhaps we should discuss this subject at 1985's Congress for 1986's tournaments.

That Was The Wink That Was

by Phil Clark

While the sound of leather on willow has been known to grip the nation, the undeniably less romantic sound of Italian plastic on American plastic has left the populace generally unmoved. Not surprisingly, you might say, but last October the low key image was threatened by our erstwhile chairman's enthusiasm for collecting sponsors. Such was the spate of media attention that for a while one could hardly open the pages of the journals of a certain profession without coming across the man. So the spectre of publicity loomed and whether it was a "good thing" or a "bad thing" it certainly fired the imagination. I mean, would Charles' barefoot string-vested approach have housewives on the edge of their seats? Would the streets throng with clones of competitors with more avant-garde hairstyles? On the other hand would we all (even Liz Bertoya) have to don waistcoats and bow ties and acquire agents? In the event all this proved somewhat ephemeral: no one was required to expose fragile egos to the glare of the cameras, winks was back amidst the obscure.

Did I say obscure? Surely not, I mean everyone's heard of Tiddlywinks haven't they? So it seemed when I left university for the "big wide world" (also known as Tumbridge Wells) when colleagues at work learnt the "real" reason for my trips to Southampton, Cambridge and Catford. Such revelations did not command immediate respect for of course they'd all played the game as children. "Ah no" I'd say, "this is different..." and minutes later they'd be wearing

looks of disbelief, laughing long or attempting both simultaneously. Ah well, one learns. I should exclude from the above certain secretaries (thanks Claire) to whom I am indebted for the production of ETWA newsletters. I've even told one girl that if she'll stop laughing long enough to play a couple of games I'll follow her to 8000 feet and go parachuting. So far no sign of this offer being taken up, not macho enough perhaps? True one can hardly boast of injuries heroically sustained playing winks where I suppose the only risk is of alcohol poisoning.

Of course living in a winking wilderness has had its disadvantages, since I've rarely played a wink in anger between tournaments. Close observers might say that a deficiency of practice has made no difference to my play whatsoever but I've certainly felt in less than prime touch. So while Jon Mapley searches for shots "ahead of technical accomplishment" I play shots which are ahead of rational explanation, searching for moments of esoteric inspiration (some people call them tactics) to stave off another heroic defeat. Actually Jon might like to consider the "quantum tunnel shot", a concept which gained some popularity at Southampton a while back. In the meantime, I'll continue in my attempts at squopping and see you all next "season".

Beyond the Dictionary in Winks

by Jim Carrington

During the many hours the Southampton University Winks Team spent practising for the 1985 Silver Wink, players found the standard winks jargon insufficient to describe certain shots which were being played. New terms began to emerge and become accepted amongst many members of the club.

Now that various players may be using such terms in national tournaments, other winkers may be interested in the following explanations of some of the more commonly used words. I don't expect them to become universally used, but I feel that tournament winkers might like to be familiar with some of the strange Southampton vocabulary.

Instant: This involves the accurate deployment of a wink to a tactical position. An INSTANT is often a movement into a guard position for a pile or towards an important developing area. The use of the word INSTANT implies an urgency for a wink in that area, and therefore a nearby wink will often be used rather than one from the baseline or another far-off region, so that accuracy can be ensured.

Barrel: This name has been in the Southampton glossary of winking terms since the 1984 National Singles. Jim Carrington and Mike Surridge, having qualified for the finals, both proceeded to play winks of an embarrassingly low standard throughout the Sunday. And so it was a relief to the two players when they met each other about half way through the day. In the ensuing abysmal game was born the BARREL. A BARREL shot involves the played wink rolling uncontrollably across the mat, ideally careering through various piles and maybe landing on a wink when it comes finally to rest.

In the aforementioned game, Surridge held the major pile and had Carrington squopped up. Just when it seemed that Mike could once again take the game of winks seriously, a BARREL raised its ugly head, reducing both players to hysterics. With his last free shot before he had to release a wink, Mike's attempted INSTANT resulted in the entertaining BARREL. The wink rolled half-heartedly towards the pile it was supposed to guard, before veering off into a

spectacular spiral path around an apparently innocent one-on-one pile, surveying the new target before eventually coming to rest neatly on top. But this shot was not just a crowd-pleaser from the Surridge collection of trick shots. The pile he squopped happened to be the only pile from which Mike could free one of Jim's winks with his next shot. The resultant failure to free gave Jim the chance to release one of his winks on top of the major pile. As for the inevitable crud that followed, well that's another disaster story!

Watney's Red: One of the favourite places from which to BARREL is the baseline. The term WATNEY'S RED is a recent derivative of the BARREL, describing the devastating bring-in from the baseline, which merely rolls across the battlefield without any intention of stopping and gaily falls off the edge of the table. Such shots often have the executing player in a state of shock and disgust (hence the name).

Simpleton: Southampton's answer to Cambridge's 'doubleton', 'tripleton' etc. the SIMPLETON describes a very simple squop. The term encompasses the 'millimetric' squop as well as the squop involving two adjacent winks.

George Michael: A term much used by Southampton in the Silver Wink and preceding weeks, the GEORGE MICHAEL is the shot that falls woefully short of its target. The typical GEORGE MICHAEL fails even to get half way. Two particularly embarrassing instances of this shot are the WAVE SHOT (see below) and the GEORGE MICHAEL from the baseline. A common excuse for this shot is that the squidge occurs before the player is ready.

Gary Glitter: The GARY GLITTER is the exact opposite of a GEORGE MICHAEL, overshooting its target by a large margin. A classy GARY GLITTER might eventually end up off the table and could incorporate a BARREL somewhere along its destructive path. The reason why the GARY GLITTER and GEORGE MICHAEL are so called I leave for you to work out!

Wave Shot: Christened by Nick May after watching his partner Jon Carlaw producing a seemingly impossible display of delicate tiddlywinks. I have only had the pleasure of seeing this shot performed once, and that was on this occasion when Carlaw managed to GEORGE MICHAEL a SIMPLETON. Presented with the simplest possible squop (i.e. two adjacent winks), Jon stroked his wink slowly and almost lovingly with his squidger so that it reared up like a begging dog on its hind legs. But instead of the expected propulsion of the wink onto the opponent's wink, the wink gently sat down again into its original position, delighting Mr. May with its wave action. This is one of the rarer examples from Jon's unique array of spectacular shots (see CARLAW and ANTI-CARLAW).

Brundle: This is the 'wild card' of winking terminology and can be used to describe any shot you like. This word, introduced by ex-Oxford winker Steve Harbron, is most commonly used towards the end of a long evening's winking, when the large glossary of terms becomes a little too much to cope with and the proposed shot is referred to as a BRUNDLE. This unrevealing word can be useful for tacticians when they don't know which shot they should instruct their partner to play. Having been told to 'BRUNDLE the small wink', the junior partner has to imagine which shot was intended and take the blame if the shot he chooses goes wrong.

Decapitation Shot: The object of this shot is to remove a wink from the top of a pile without worrying too much about the final position of the wink played. The shot resembles the removal of the top of a boiled egg.

Carlaw: This shot, named after its greatest player, is the most devastating disaster shot. It can turn a safe 6-1 victory into a certain 6-1 defeat. Its complexity and sheer inventiveness makes it impossible to safeguard against, however easily you are winning. The CARLAW can be destructive, rearranging the winks in a configuration which bears no resemblance to the previous arrangement, or can be subtle using the travelling wink as a missile to gently dislodge the occasional wink and tickle the odd pile. But all CARLAWs leave the player looking at no more than a one point. Miraculously, the visionary Jon Carlaw can usually predict the outcome of a CARLAW before he executes it. But his partner never believes the outrageous prediction and tells Jon to proceed... alas!

Anti-Carlaw: The only way of recovering from a CARLAW is to ANTI-CARLAW. The ANTI-CARLAW looks very similar to the CARLAW, but has the opposite effect, destroying and rearranging piles to the player's advantage, not disadvantage. Again, Jon Carlaw is the greatest player of this shot, and when his ANTI-CARLAWs outnumber his CARLAWs, he can be unbeatable.

Laying Back

by Rob Cartwright

The article by C.B. (Nigel Parsons) prompted me to make these comments. I believe that the more casual players should be encouraged, since they in turn may well produce more serious contacts. I also would agree that the megacrud is an extremely spectacular shot (as anyone else who's seen one would testify) and is a great crowd-puller. Our photographic session in the bar, and my own attempts to emulate the master some time later, proved this. For this reason the megacrud was immortalised onto the Sotwink sweatshirt (plug - see M. Surridge for details) and I believe is the most important advance Sotwink has made in terms of publicity. It would perhaps be a shame never to see the shot played for real again, and I thoroughly endorse C.B.'s idea of a special event. Say 50p a go, and a fiver to the successful entrant?!

Also, I have noticed that tournaments are becoming more formal. The great teams of the past are gone: today's teams seem to have really elevating names like "Alan and Jon" or "Hull and Thorpe" - WOW! what's next - "Peter and Jane"? (you can tell my reading standard can't you!). I remember when winks were real winks, and teams had real names: like "the Megastars", "The Hamptons" and (guaranteed to strike terror into the the hearts of opponents) the dreaded "C.B. and the Megacruders"! There is no doubt that tournament reports are more interesting as a result, and publicity is gained again. How long did it take before the awful truth about "Quesh" emerged?

So as to push back the frontiers of laid-back writing, I publish this silly little ditty, composed (after several pints) a while after Lockwood had his marginal loss over Kahn in the 1984 Singles. Funnily enough, no-one can remember quite who wrote it...

I'm Going for you

Dedicated to Larry "Chaka" Kahn

(with absolutely no help from grandmaster Relle Rel...)

L-L-L Larry Kahn

L-L-L Larry Kahn

Larry Kahn

Larry Kahn let me squop you let me squop you Larry Kahn

Let me squop you it's all I wanna do

Larry Kahn let me squop you let me squop you Larry Kahn

Let me squop you cos I'm going for you

Larry Kahn will you tell me what you want to do

Will you go for me the way I'm going for you

Larry Kahn let me tell you what I wanna do

I wanna beat you 6-1 I wanna pot-out too

So let me take you in my pile

Let me wipe off that smile Larry

Cos you know I'm gonna beat you by miles Larry

I'll make it more than just a physical thing

I wanna squop you Larry baby cos you make me wanna
scream!!!

Da-Da D-D-D-D- Da-Da.....

.....etc.

I thought I'd spare you the rest!

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.