

# Winking World

The Official Journal  
Of The  
English Tiddlywinks  
Association



February 1986

## CONTENTS

News	1
Minutes of ETWA Congress	3
The National Fours 1985	7
World Singles 22	11
Squeal of a Rabbit	12
Tournament Formats II	14
The 1985 National Singles	17
CUTwC v USA	24
The First Varsity Match?	26
England v USA	29
Rules Ramblings	31
World Pairs 5 and World Singles 23	32
Invitation Individual	33

News

Nick Inglis

This is the first issue of Winking World to be produced by the new management; I took over as Editor from Charles Relle at the last AGM and hope I can keep up the consistently high standard Charles was able to maintain. There was one other change in the ETWA Committee with Stew Sage (amply) filling the newly created post of Publicity Officer. The new Committee is:

Chairman: Jon Mapley, 2 Janmead, Witham, Essex, CM8 2EN.  
Tel:0376 516872

Secretary: Phil Clark, Flat 8, 14 Guildford Road,  
Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN1 1SW.

Treasurer: Alan Dean, 6 Birkland Drive, Edwinstone,  
Nottinghamshire, NG21 9LU.  
Tel:0623 823999

WW Editor: Nick Inglis, Churchill College, Cambridge,  
CB3 0DS. Tel:0223 61200

Publicity Officer: Stew Sage, Queens' College, Cambridge,  
CB3 9ET.

Subscriptions are still £5 per year (students etc. only £2). Please send them to Alan Dean.

The provisional tournament schedule for 1986 is:-

22nd	February	Varsity Match	Oxford
1st	March	Hampshire Open	Southampton
8th	March	Silver Wink	Cambridge
26th-27th	April	National Pairs	Cambridge
5th	July	London Open	London
25th-26th	October	Teams of Four and Congress	Oxford
22nd-23rd	November	National Singles	Southampton

(The National Singles may be held a week later by request of Larry Kahn.)

An American touring party came over at the end of November and played matches against CUTWC and England as well as participating in an enormous National Singles tournament (won by Larry Kahn for the second year running). At the start of the tour Alan Dean beat Arye Bittelman to become the first British player to win the World Singles title. Later in the week the USA team beat first CUTWC and then England, both by large margins and the tour ended with Larry Kahn winning the World Singles title from Alan Dean.

On the face of it, then, a most successful week for the Americans and not such a good one for British winks. In fact

there were a number of good things to come out of the American Tour. First was Alan's World Singles win which came after 7 or 8 unsuccessful British Challenges. Secondly, there has been a huge increase in interest in the Cambridge club, where weekly attendances rarely drop below 35. The international match was held in Oxford; the first time for ages that we've had any sort of event in Oxford - with Tony Brennan trying to revive the Oxford Club we hope that Oxford will soon become one of the established venues. Finally, the USA - CUTWC match was covered by *The Sunday Times* and this article, and some correspondence in *The Times*, have sparked off further interest in the media and elsewhere. There have been a couple of radio interviews and I shall shortly be trying to explain and play winks in an episode of *That's Life* on BBC 1. In addition there is the possibility of a sponsorship deal, and we have been contacted by one or two lapsed winkers.

Over the past year tournament attendances have been uniformly up and the Cambridge Open (which coincides with the publication of this issue) looks set to continue this pattern. If we can sustain the Southampton and Oxford clubs then the future of winks looks brighter than it has done for some time.

*Special Offer on page 16 - Larry Kahn offers to eat a rat!*

Minutes of ETWA Congress

Phil Clark

Held 26 October 1985

West Common Room, Southampton University

Present: Jon Mapley, Alan Dean, Charles Rells, Phil Clark,  
22 members.

The meeting opened at 8pm, Jon Mapley in the chair. Jon welcomed those present and drew attention to the minutes of the last meeting as published in Winking World. These were taken as read.

Matters arising

Regarding Sponsorship Jon reported that at that time winks had no sponsor, several letters having elicited no response. Apparently a "P.R." man was looking around - watch this space.

Chairman's Report

Jon began his résumé with comments on the growth in numbers of players and a wider variety of winners, a contrast to what was happening in America. There had been a growth of interest in clubs and Tony Brennan was undertaking to rebuild the Oxford Club. Jon then tendered his resignation from the publicity aspect of the Chairmanship and it was agreed that a separate publicity officer would be elected later in the meeting.

Secretary's Report

Phil mentioned that four newsletters had been sent out during the year, though to varying numbers. He outlined the problems of who to mail when only a small proportion of those on the address list had paid their subscription. At which point a new computerised address list was produced for distribution. No outside correspondence had been received and that was about all.

Treasurer's Report

Alan said he'd left the exact details of ETWA's finances in the car, a cunning move, so he was afraid the meeting would have to rely on his memory. This told him that the bank held £66 but with numerous subscriptions outstanding. There had been considerable income from equipment sales and to further augment funds he proposed that T-shirts and old style equipment which he had with him be "auctioned off" for a nominal sum.

W.W. Editor's Report

Charles said that W.W. seemed to have settled into a bi-annual pattern in A5 format. He had copies of the latest edition for distribution and thanked Geoff Thorpe for his assistance in production. Nick Inglis asked how much W.W. cost to produce and said that CUTWC wanted to make a greater contribution to ETWA by which they felt they could produce it for almost nothing.

The Great Equipment Debate

"New type" mats, as introduced at the London Open, were in use at the Fours and it was felt (sic) by those who had been using them that they should be formally adopted by ETWA. For the record the new mats were "industrial superfelt" supplied by a Woolwich firm.

Jon proposed that ETWA adopt the mats for all tournaments because they seemed to indicate a longer effective playing life and a greater consistency. There was some discussion as to their "playability" with most agreeing that they were an improvement since, prima facie, they didn't fluff up. Tony Brennan said they had hairs on them(!) and introduced esoteric golfing analogies in favour of retaining the current type. Jon's proposal was put to the vote and carried 23-3.

The debate then centred on when this decision should become operative. Charles proposed it take immediate effect, Nick that it come into force at the Pairs. After some discussion Charles' proposal was put to the meeting and carried by 14 votes to 10 with 2 abstentions.

Finally it was considered that the equipment for the GB v USA match was not a Congress decision, although participants would want to know beforehand which mats were to be used for practice purposes.

American Tour

Six Americans were "definitely" coming over and would enter the Singles. There would follow several World title matches, a GB v USA international and an individual 12 player match in Oxford the following weekend.

There was then an interruption from a wandering kindergarten (sorry Rugby Club) after which events moved forward to the even greater

National Singles Debate

There was unease over the possibility of all six Americans making the final and also the likelihood of a larger than usual U.K. entry, since Nick said about 20 CUTWC players would be almost certain to enter. Several possible

formats were proposed and Nigel Parsons suggested qualifying tournaments within clubs to establish a set quota of players. It was felt that novices should not be prevented from entering although Nick said CUTwC could restrict its numbers if necessary.

Eventually Jon (seconded A.Dean) proposed a Swiss tournament and Mike Surrige (seconded T.Brennan) proposed qualifying groups of up to 10 people with a final pool of 12.

Voting saw 14 in favour of qualifying groups, 8 in favour of Swiss.

Subscription

It was agreed to maintain subs at their present levels and at tournaments non-members should be prepared to pay a higher entry fee.

Tournament Dates

After much consultation of diaries the following was agreed:

Cambridge Open	Feb 8th/9th
Hampshire Open	March 1st
National Pairs	April 26th/27th in Cambridge
London Open	July 5th venue to be decided
National Fours	Oct 25th/26th in Oxford
National Singles	Nov 22nd/23rd in Southampton

Election of Officers

There was much activity here, a contrast to recent years, and the meeting decided that voting figures were not to be recorded in the minutes. The results can be summarised as follows:

<u>Position</u>	<u>Candidate</u>	<u>Proposer</u>	<u>Seconded</u>
Chairman	Jon Mapley	Mike Surrige	Phil Clark
	Alan Boyce	Geoff Thorpe	Charles Relle
	Nick Inglis	Tony Brennan	Nigel Parsons
	Elected: Jon Mapley		
Secretary	Phil Clark	Geoff Thorpe	Alan Dean
	Re-elected		
Treasurer	Alan Dean	Phil Clark	Geoff Thorpe
	Stew Sage	-----	sundry CUTwC -----
	Elected: Alan Dean		

WW Editor Charles Relle Mike SurrIDGE Nigel Parsons  
Nick Inglis ----- sundry CUTwC -----  
Geoff Thorpe Alan Boyce Liz Bertoya  
Elected: Nick Inglis

Publicity Officer Charles Relle Alan Dean Jon Mapley  
Stew Sage ----- sundry CUTwC -----  
Elected: Stew Sage

Any Other Business

The new rules for the Marchant Trophy were briefly explained and agreed, with Phil, Mike and Nick reappointed as organisers.

Nigel Parsons proposed that the 2" rule be abolished (seconded Graham Josland), this was put to the vote and defeated. The main body of the rules had been revised in a script produced by Charles. With time running short it was agreed that ammendments already suggested would be examined by Charles.

Jon, Alan and Charles were elected as the committee responsible for the selection of the England team.

The meeting closed at 10.30pm (or thereabouts).

The National Fours 1985

Mike SurrIDGE

Southampton University 26th/27th October 1985

The 1985 Teams of Four competition took place on the 26th and 27th of October in the Students' Union Building at Southampton University. There was a good turnout for the event (27 players), although due to a conspiracy of adverse circumstances the expected handful of Southampton novices failed to appear, due finally to their only getting two days warning of the event.

For the third time in history the competition was handicapped on the Mach system. Each time this has been tried there have been a spate of complaints about the handicapping, and as one of the two people who have taken on the task of setting the handicaps I would like to take this opportunity to explain some of the problems.

Phil Clark and myself originally set up the list of handicaps for the better known E.Tw.A. participants for the 1983 Teams of Four. The list has never been used for any other Tournament of national standing, and has been maintained expressly for the Fours. The objective of handicapping this event is seen by us as inducing stronger players to team up with weaker (especially less experienced) players without actually preventing anyone from joining a team of their choice (which led to a low attendance when tried). Aside from this, we attempt to make for as close a result as possible, so our handicapping must account for recent form as well as the past achievements of the players.

Given this requirement, we find our purpose greatly hindered by the tendency of Cambridge people to conceal the current form of many of their players. Their attitude is understandable given that to be more forthcoming would undermine their Silver Wink challenge (whose importance is greatly magnified by the fact that it is all they or Southampton can reasonably hope to win). Cambridge players also tend to under-rate their less well known comrades. For the record, Mr Hedger and Mr Walmsley were under-rated by a point each. Mr Clark and possibly Mr Josland were over-rated by a point. The rest of you should stop complaining. It should be noted that these mistakes in handicapping would have altered the final placings of the teams this year in only one case, namely that the 5th and 6th placed teams would have tied, although the scores would have been much closer. I hope that with J. Carrington spying in Cambridge and E. Bertoya filling a similar rôle in Southampton we will

be better informed about such players next year!

Now to the Tournament! An all-play-all format was possible played over the two days at a fairly easy 7 games per day (3½ matches). In fact one game was shifted from Sunday to Saturday, so that with the extra hour resulting from the advent of G.M.T. nobody could complain of insufficient sleep! The team handicaps ranged from a very strong 23 (C. Relle, A. Dean, T. Brennan and T. Jeffreys) to a mere 9 (S. Sage, N. May, S. Every and A. Purvis). Things began quietly with the leaders taking 15½ from the first round and moving on to 29 after two. Having had a bye in the first round, my own team were quite happy lurking in the background with 15 at this point, the highest average ppm. We were further pleased to take 16½ in the next round against the lowest rated team, raising our average well above half points after three rounds. But when we entered our score we found that some bunch of upstarts had taken 22 from their game against the highest rated team, a result which was to prove decisive in two ways. Firstly, it cast the losers into a pit from which not even Relle, Dean and Brennan could escape. Secondly, it placed the winners (Inglis, Hedger, Wright and later Walmsley) into a handsome position at the head of the field. In the last round on Saturday, this fine bunch of unknowns (except Nick) played the crunch match against their nearest rivals on points-per-match. This was the awesomely powerful combination of Surridge, Carrington, Clark and Whitfield, who were however carrying an 18 handicap against 11 for the weaker team. For all that this may have been the crucial match of the tournament, it was a pretty run of the mill affair. The weaker team played perhaps a little better than expected, but their achievement of a tie (14-14) before the handicap transfer owed as much to a rash of missed pots in rounds 3-4 by Clark and round 5 by Surridge which allowed Inglis and Wright to steal a 4-3 win when 1-6 might otherwise have resulted. The handicap difference adjusted the match score to read 17-11 in favour of Inglis, Hedger and Wright.

Thus the Cambridge team ended the first day in the lead, with the remaining challenge coming from the strongly rated outfit of Boyce, Thorpe and Bertoya (handicap 20 or 22 depending on their choice of pairings), just 3½ points behind and both with a bye to come. It was clear that the second placed team would have to do extremely well to catch up, however, since they were going to be transferring 12 points to their opponents in the remaining 2 matches, 5½ of

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	Round 5	Round 6	Round 7	Tot/Pos
1 J. Carrington (5) P. Clark (5) M. Surrridge (6) E. Whitfield (2)	Opp=Bye 0	Opp= 7 6 1 = 15 3 3 = 15 15	Opp= 6 4 5 = 16½ 6 6 = 16½ 3 1½	Opp= 5 4 1 = 11 6 3 = 11 42½	Opp= 4 6 1 = 12½ 1 6 = 12½ 55	Opp= 3 7 4½ = 16 2 4 = 16 7 1	Opp= 2 6 1 = 10½ 1 2 = 10½ 81½	81½ 4th
2 T. Brennan (6) A. Dean (7) T. Jeffreys (3) C. Relie (7)	Opp= 7 3 4½ = 12½ 4½ 1 12½	Opp= 6 5 6 = 14 6 4 = 14 26½	Opp= 5 2 2 = 6 6 2 = 6 32½	Opp=Bye 32½	Opp= 3 7 1 = 12 4 4 = 12 44½	Opp= 4 1 6 = 10½ 5 1 = 10½ 55	Opp= 1 6 1 = 17½ 5 6 = 17½ 72½	72½ 7th
3 K. Beck (2) R. Cartwright (5) G. Josland (5) N. Parsons (3)	Opp= 6 4 2 = 14 6 5 = 14 14	Opp= 5 6 5½ = 14½ 1 4 = 14½ 28½	Opp=Bye 28½	Opp= 7 4 1 = 10½ 1 1 = 10½ 39	Opp= 2 0 6 = 16 3 3 = 16 55	Opp= 1 0 5 = 12 2½ 3 = 12 67	Opp= 4 0 1 = 7 4 2 = 7 74	74 6th
4 J. Aggett (2) J. Carlaw (3) S. Chamberlain (3) J. Mapley (7)	Opp= 5 2 2 = 12½ 6 4 = 12½ 12½	Opp=Bye 12½	Opp= 7 1 4 = 9½ 0 1 = 9½ 22	Opp= 6 6 5 = 15 2 5 = 15 37	Opp= 1 1 1 = 15½ 6 6 = 15½ 52½	Opp= 2 6 1 = 17½ 2 6 = 17½ 70	Opp= 3 7 6 = 21 3 5 = 21 91	91 2nd
5 T. Hedger (2) N. Inglis (5) P. Wright (3) M. Walmesley (1)	Opp= 4 5 1 = 15½ 5 3 = 15½ 15½	Opp= 3 1 1½ = 13½ 6 3 = 13½ 29	Opp= 2 5 1 = 22 5 5 = 22 51	Opp= 1 3 1 = 17 6 4 = 17 68	Opp=Bye 68	Opp= 7 3 4 = 15½ 3 0 = 15½ 83½	Opp= 6 6 5½ = 18½ 4 4 = 18½ 102	102 1st
6 S. Every (1) N. May (3) A. Purvis (0) S. Sage (5)	Opp= 3 3 1 = 14 5 2 = 14 14	Opp= 2 1 1 = 14 2 3 = 14 28	Opp= 1 3 2 = 11½ 1 1 = 11½ 39½	Opp= 4 1 5 = 13 2 2 = 13 52½	Opp= 7 1 4 = 15½ 1 3 = 15½ 68	Opp=Bye 68	Opp= 5 1 3 = 9½ 1½ 3 = 9½ 77½	77½ 5th
7 E. Bertoya (4) A. Boyce (6) G. Thorpe (6)	Opp= 2 4 6 = 15½ 2½ 2½ = 15½ 15½	Opp= 1 1 4 = 13 6 4 = 13 28½	Opp= 4 6 7 = 18½ 3 6 = 18½ 47	Opp= 3 3 6 = 17½ 6 6 = 17½ 64½	Opp= 6 6 6 = 12½ 3 4 = 12½ 77	Opp= 5 4 4 = 12½ 7 3 = 12½ 89½	Opp=Bye 89½	89½ 3rd

these to the team ahead of them. A gain of 18 in 2 games was thus required, clearly a tough proposition for any team. The slight underhandicapping of Mr Hedger and Mr Walmsley (who joined in for the later rounds), whilst not in itself a decisive factor, ensured that the leaders would retain a comfortable cushion of some 10 to 15 points for the whole of the second day, perhaps a disappointing anticlimax to what might have been a rather closer event.

Inglis et al began the second day with a bye, during which they were caught by the teams whose bye rounds were still to come. They then shrugged off the challenge of Boyce et al by taking 15½ points from the match between them (after h'cap transfer). The other challengers, SurrIDGE and friends, were unable to recover from their defeat of the previous day and slumped badly to finish fourth. It was left to a team of low rated Botwink players, J. Carlaw, J. Aggett and S. Chamberlin joined for the occasion by J. Mapley (who?) to mount the final attack. They finished in grand style, their Sunday scores reading 15½, 17½ and finally 21, but were unable to get within 10 points of the leaders, who themselves notched up an impressive 18½ in the last round despite giving away points on handicaps for the only time in the tournament. Congratulations are due to Messrs Dean, Relle, Brennan and Jeffreys, who despite being rated the strongest team (h'cap 23), managed a magnificent total of 72½ from 6 matches, made the first ever attempt to gain a negative score in a match (but failed, ending up with +6), and finished a convincing last!

World Singles 22

Nick Inglis

Churchill College, Cambridge, 22nd November 1985

The American Tour began in earnest with Alan Dean playing the Champion Arye Gittelman for the World Singles title in the Bevin Lecture Room, Churchill College. The match was arranged at fairly short notice so the audience mainly consisted of the other members of the American party (most of the Cambridge contingent were involved in serious pre-Singles "training"). The games were played on a new mat on which Arye had had a chance of playing, the previous evening.

The match began fairly quietly, with three matches in which one player built up a good position only to make errors late on. The first two went 4½-2½ and 4-3 to Arye and the third was a 4-3 for Alan, leaving the score at 11½-9½ in favour of Arye.

In the fourth game there was a very open bring-in and Arye decided to try for a pot-out. He potted the first four quite happily, but looked very nervous before the fifth, pulling away from the table before eventually potting it. The last wink was about 1cm from the pot and Arye sent it over the pot. This was a turning point in the match; Alan squopped the wink and eventually potted out himself for a 6-1.

The fifth game saw Alan play some of his best winks of the match. He took control of a large pile from fairly early on and kept the pressure on to take a 6-1. The score now stood at 21½-13½ in Alan's favour.

As rounds began in the sixth game it looked as if Arye might get a 5-2, but in the event he could only take 4-3 and so with the score at 24½-17½ Arye was left needing a 7-0 in the last game to force a play-off. Although Arye fought hard he never had a realistic chance of a 7 and, as is so often the case in such circumstances, Alan won the game 6-1 to take the title 30½-18½.

Warmest congratulations to Alan on becoming the first ever British World Singles Champion and whose exploits prompted one of the most subtly understated headlines ever to appear in the Cambridge Evening News: "*Brit outwinks a Yank to become best on planet*". Commiserations to Arye who is, presumably, the first resident of Cambridge to lose playing away from home in Cambridge.

Squeal of a Rabbit

Jonathan Ferguson

(Re "Tournament Rationale" - David Lockwood WW46)

I was rather surprised to hear David Lockwood advocating the knock-out format for national tournaments. As a "rabbit" I thought I could add to the views already aired in WW46 of the "big game" of the Winking World.

Here are my somewhat disjointed thoughts on the matter.

1. I agree that the objective of the tournament is to determine the best player or pair on the day. However, I would propose two other equally important objectives:

(a) To provide enjoyment for ALL the participants (not just the likely winners).

(b) To promote or nurture healthy interest in winks to ensure its continuation into the future i.e. to ensure winks does not disappear underground - perhaps into some subterranean warren!

2. Rabbits will not scurry to tournaments if it is likely that they will get no more than a couple of games. It must be remembered that travelling to winks tournaments involves time and money; the former being scarce for working "rabbits", the latter for student "rabbits".

As the vast majority of winks-playing "rabbits" in this country are at university this fact should not be ignored.

Proverb: Beware of the tiger cub in rabbit's fur.

Even the good players must start at the bottom. As in every game or sport players improve by playing better players. Weaker players learn shots, better players may learn tactics or strategy.

If more attention were given to overall standards winks could become even more fun!

3. With a Swiss or league format consistency of play and ability to "cull rabbits" is tested - and why not?

Should someone be national champion if:

(a) He/She has only played a handful of games against a minority of opponents possible, as happens in a knock-out competition?

(b) He/She is unable to obtain six or seven points against the weaker players?

I think not.

Indeed, if Dave Lockwood dismisses the weaker players

offhand he should prove he can actually "bash" them. He usually does (in my case 7-0 in eight minutes, National Singles 1983).

Others have problems at times!

Incidentally, the weaker player can get a lot of pride from being able to say, "I've played the World Champion!"

4. David suggests the joy obtained by a weaker player, when causing an upset in a knock-out competition, is very great.

I would suggest that:

- (a) The joy is no less under any format.
- (b) A weaker player may regard a 4-3 loss as an upset and if his opponent comes a point behind the victor it clearly has had an effect on the overall outcome of the tournament.

Also, should a good player having been beaten by a poorer player not have the opportunity to redress the balance by achieving a reasonable total score in the tournament? I would suggest he does.

Finally,

5. Due to the ridiculous English licensing laws pubs are shut during the afternoon leaving non-contestants (i.e. those eliminated) at their wits ends for something to fill in the time until opening time. They might as well get practice at playing winks under tournament conditions.

Tournament Formats II

Larry Kahn

The last WW had several interesting views on match format. Here are my opinions on the subject. Championship matches should 1) provide a reasonable format for determining a winner, and 2) be fun for the most people. If you sacrifice the fun for format, pretty soon nobody will show up and then what do you do?

There are many ways to format a match, the two primary types being round robin and knockout. Matches may contain a combination of both, but for the purposes of this article I will keep them separate.

First, the fun aspect. I don't think there is any question but that most players have more fun at a round robin event. One of the things I enjoy most is playing a lot of different people, because if nothing else, it isn't boring. Also, if I were a weaker player, I certainly wouldn't want to show up at a match knowing I'd likely play only two games before being sent packing. In the one NATWA singles that had a partial knockout format, the non-finalists played only 4 or 5 games and were extremely unhappy. We never use that format anymore. So, in terms of fun, I think round robin is a winner.

Well, that was the easy part. Now for the harder question of determining a winner. I will consider 3 types of formats: 1) straight knockout, 2) straight round robin, and 3) round robin plus finals with 2 or 4 players playing a mini-round.

First, no tournament ever guarantees that the best player wins, particularly a fairly short tournament. What you get is the best player for that tournament. Does anyone really think that Boris Becker is the best tennis player at Wimbledon?

I'd like to first address several of Dave's arguments which to me sound suspiciously like sour grapes. The first concerns so called "rabbit bashing". If a player is a true rabbit, then by definition everyone is going to get at least a 6 and the most you can lose is a point. However, if the player is merely a squirrel then he's capable of winning a few games against the stronger players and certainly deserves to have his scores count towards the final standings. If he beats you, then tough nookies! Besides, if you beat all the contenders you'll probably end up winning anyhow.

The second argument deals with the cases in which the winner lost to second place head to head. This can actually happen fairly frequently, but Dave only gave one of the three reasons for it (the rabbit bashing theory).

The other two reasons can be 1) The winner clinched the tournament with one or two rounds to go and relaxed, while second and third place were still up for grabs and there was more incentive for the other players, and more importantly, 2) In the last round the eventual winner only needed 1 or 2 to clinch and ended up playing for the points rather than a win. Case 2 is very likely and is, in fact, what happened at the 1985 NATWA Singles.

One other thought on the head to head theory. In a stroke play golf tournament, the winner conceivably could have had the worst individual round score for the entire tournament in 3 of the 4 rounds, but one great round could save him. In effect, he lost to everyone 3 out of 4 head to head matches, but his overall performance was the best. Similar things can happen in our baseball leagues, where the division winner has the best overall win/loss record, although not necessarily the best against second place head to head. I don't think this is such a bad thing if overall performance is to be measured.

Dave's chain argument is ridiculous. The worst college football team in the country typically uses that argument to claim they're the national champions. His statement that the knockout player can claim a corresponding chain over all the other players is true, but a lucky schedule can help even more. I refer again to Becker, who was lucky not to have to play McEnroe in the finals.

Now for some strong arguments for round robin formats. I think the one overriding factor is that all the finalists have played the identical schedule. In knockouts, for any given match, the two players have had no common opponents. Is this really fair? Schedules can be of different strengths. Take the simplified case where there are three extremely strong players in a knockout field. A, B and C are all equally strong against each other, but will kill everyone else. A is in bracket 1 while B and C are in 2. Simple probability theory shows that A's chances of winning are 50% but B and C only have 25% each. This is an oversimplification, but shows the effect of uneven schedules.

Another thing to consider is that for 3 game knockouts each game represents 33% of your chances of proceeding. One unlucky bounce or an opponent's missile shot can send you down the tubes. In a round robin, however, one game is only about 10% of your total and an unlucky game or two can be overcome. Freaky shots are more likely to even out over the long haul.

A double elimination knockout could reduce these problems somewhat, although not entirely. For the simplified case, if scheduling is based solely on the number of match losses, A's chances are 42/96 while B and C's are 27/96. Some improvement, but still unfair.

In terms of personal preference, I like the full round robin plus top four playoff. In a 12 game final (10 players) 6 of your games have come against the top contenders. I don't much like the one game 1-2 playoff because unless 1 and 2 are close you get a perverted final game. However, for large initial fields, such as England, the 12 player single round final is reasonable.

The 12 player final format and prelims can easily handle 60 players (6 divisions of 10, top 2 make it from each, 12 seeds). If you ran this format over two weekends you could accommodate 3600 players, and if we ever get that many to a tournament I'll eat a mat.

The above views in no way (or at least not much) reflect the fact that I've historically had better success under the round robin format. I'm not saying that knockouts aren't valid, I just place a high importance on the finalists playing comparable schedules. I also enjoy playing against a lot of different people rather than just a few. Also, if Dave had to play against himself more often in consecutive game head to head matches he might be inclined to favour a round robin.

The 1985 National Singles

Nick Inglis

Queens' College, Cambridge, 23rd/24th November

This year, for the first time, the Singles found itself in the decadent setting of the Old Hall, Queens' College, Cambridge. The presence of the six touring Americans, the long-awaited return of Cyril Edwards and the unprecedented surge of interest in CUTwC meant that the total entry (40 players - half of them from the host club) was easily the largest since the format changed from knockout. It must also have been the strongest field ever assembled, with the four most recent World singles champions (including Alan Dean who had won the title the previous evening) and every ETWA singles champion except Nigel Knowles.

The field was split into four qualifying divisions of ten players with four seeds in each. On the Saturday each division played an all-play-all with the top three going through to Sunday's final pool of twelve. This format meant that over the two days 244 games were played; which compared favourably with the 142 games in the entire American 1984-5 season.

The Blue Division always looked likely to be strongly contested having, in addition to its four seeds, Rick Tucker (who would have been seeded if he'd arrived before the draw was made) and some of the stronger CUTwC players. The early rounds included some interesting results including Stew Sage's 4-3 defeat of Arye Bittelman and, more significantly, Rick Tucker's 6-1 over Tony Brennan. Rick then suffered a 7-0 at the hands of Arye to leave Tim Hedger with a 1½ point lead over the rest of the field after two rounds. Any thoughts of glory were quickly dashed by Arye who took 6 points off Tim, while Simon Every showed scant respect for the ETWA publicity officer, giving Stew a 7-0 thrashing. The following rounds saw some sort of return to sanity, and after 8 rounds Arye and Keith had qualified, with the final place being contested by Tony, on 36; Rick, half a point behind; and Tim, on 32½. Dave Hull and Stew Sage had both had fairly uninspiring days and were already out of the running. In the last round Tony went down 6-1 to Arye to leave him on a disappointing total of 37. We feel sure Tony will be back to his best form soon, and wish him the best of luck with the newly reformed Oxford Club. Meanwhile Tim took 6 off Simon to give him a chance of qualifying if Rick slipped up against Stew. In the event Rick won 6-1, but Tim's total of 38½ was still a tremendous achievement for someone who had only been playing for just over a year.

	Blue Division	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Tot	
1	Arye Bittelman	—	6	4	6	6	6	4	6	7	3	48	1=
2	Tony Brennan	1	—	1	5	6	6	6	4	2	6	37	5
3	Keith Seaman	3	6	—	5½	6	6	5	5	6	5½	48	1=
4	Dave Hull	1	2	1½	—	4½	7	5	1½	1	3	26½	6
5	Paul Clark	1	1	1	2½	—	5	4½	0	1	1	17	9
6	Sean Mayes	1	1	1	0	2	—	1	0	1	1	8	10
7	Simon Every	3	1	2	2	2½	6	—	1	1½	7	26	7
8	Tim Hedger	1	3	2	5½	7	7	6	—	1	6	38½	4
9	Rick Tucker	0	5	1	6	6	6	5½	6	—	6	41½	3
10	Stew Sage	4	1	1½	4	6	6	0	1	1	—	24½	8

	Green Division	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Tot	
1	Larry Kahn	—	7	4	6	7	6	6	6	5	6	53	1
2	Charles Frankston	0	—	6	6	0	6	6	6	7	6	43	2
3	Jim Marlin	3	1	—	6	6	6	6	6	5	3	42	3
4	Jim Carrington	1	1	1	—	5	6	6	6	6	3	35	4
5	Patrick Barrie	0	7	1	2	—	6	1	2	6	6	31	6
6	Andy Purvis	1	1	1	1	1	—	6	7	5	1	24	8
7	Steve Harbron	1	1	1	1	6	1	—	5½	6	3½	26	7
8	Phil Rodgers	1	1	1	1	5	0	1½	—	4	0	14½	9
9	David Salter	2	0	2	1	1	2	1	3	—	1	13	10
10	Nick May	1	1	4	4	1	6	3½	7	6	—	33½	5

The Green Division went much more to form, the only early upsets being Nick May's 4-3 defeat of Jim Marlin, and Patrick Barrie's pot-out against Charles Frankston. In the latter game Patrick chose(?) to go off twice with his last wink, thus drawing Charles' winks to the edges of the mat and leaving him an easy 7-0. Who says CUTWC don't know anything about tactics? In fact, as Larry Kahn pointed out, if yellow tries this against you then there's a straightforward remedy: squop a red with a blue, then play it towards the yellow on blue's next shot leaving red at least one shot at the yellow from close range. With two rounds to go Jim Carrington looked to have a good chance of making the final at the expense of Jim Marlin, but in the eighth round Mr Carrington went down 4-3 to Nick May, while Mr Marlin took 3 points off Larry Kahn. This left Mr Carrington needing to beat Mr Marlin by more than 2 points in the final game, but it was not to be, and the three Americans in this group all went through. There were several other good performances in this group: Nick May and Patrick Barrie finished with totals of 33½ and 31 respectively, and Andy Purvis scored 24 (including 6 against Steve Harbron) - an excellent score for a novice.

In the Red Division neither Charles Relle nor Dave Lockwood were ever in any trouble and the interest centred on the battle between Geoff Thorpe and Alan Boyce for the third qualifying spot. In round 7 Alan took 3 points off Dave, but, crucially, he lost his next match 2-5 to Phil Clark. This left Alan a point behind Geoff before they played each other in the final round. A 5-2 win secured Geoff's place in the final and left Alan with a good total of 40, but nothing to show for it. Among the pack Phil Clark scored 32, but never really threatened the leaders, while there was another fine novice performance: 26 points for Paul Brummell.

As we could only fit sixteen tables into the Old Hall, the Yellow Division was played in the smaller, but warmer, Erasmus Room. This looked to be another closely contested division with Cyril Edwards and some strong CUTWC members among the unseeded players. In the event it was much more clear cut with the top three seeds all averaging more than 6 after five rounds. More importantly Nick Inglis had taken 6 points off Cyril in the opening round after which Cyril had almost beaten Jon Mapley 6-1, but typically Jon had come back in rounds to sneak a 4-3. Meanwhile Rob Cartwright, who

	Red Division	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Tot	
1	Dave Lockwood	—	0	6	4	7	7	6	6	7	6	49	2
2	Charles Relle	7	—	6	6	7	6	6	6	6	5	55	1
3	Geoff Thorpe	1	1	—	5	7	6	6	6	6	6	44	3
4	Alan Boyce	3	1	2	—	7	6	6	7	6	2	40	4
5	Chris Andrew	0	0	0	0	—	3	3	1	1½	1	9½	10
6	Hugh Pumphrey	0	1	1	1	4	—	5½	1½	5	3½	22½	7
7	Paul Brummell	1	1	1	1	4	1½	—	5½	6	5	26	6
8	Kevin Beck	1	1	1	0	6	5½	1½	—	3	1½	20½	8
9	Niall Mackay	0	1	1	1	5½	2	1	4	—	1	16½	9
10	Phil Clark	1	2	1	5	6	3½	2	5½	6	—	32	5

	Yellow Division	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Tot	
1	Jon Mapley	—	1	1	6	7	6	4	7	7	7	46	3
2	Alan Dean	6	—	6	7	6	7	6	6	7	7	58	1
3	Nick Inglis	6	1	—	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	51	2
4	Rob Cartwright	1	0	1	—	6	4	2	4	7	2	27	5
5	Richard Dunn	0	1	1	1	—	1	1	1½	1	4	11½	10
6	James Robertson	1	0	1	3	6	—	1	2½	3	6	23½	7
7	Cyril Edwards	3	1	1	5	6	6	—	5	6	6	39	4
8	Peter Wright	0	1	1	3	5½	4½	2	—	1	7	25	6
9	Richard Wheatley	0	0	0	0	6	4	1	6	—	5	22	8
10	Trish Willink	0	0	0	5	3	1	1	0	2	—	12	9

had something of an off day, had lost to Cyril and only taken 4's off Peter Wright and James Robertson (despite the fact that James had been very tired and emotional the previous evening). In rounds 8 and 9 Jon lost 6-1's to Nick and the new World Champion to finish in a rather surprising third place. Cyril finished strongly on 39, none the worse for his long layoff, and would have run Jon close for third place if he had taken that 6-1 against him. Richard Wheatley recorded a good total of 22 and another CUTwC novice, Trish Willink, gained a notable scalp, beating Rob 5-2.

The scoreboard order for the final was decided by the scores in the qualifying groups and made rather bizarre reading with Nick Inglis at number 4 and Messrs Lockwood and Mapley in the bottom half (the more observant among you may have noticed that Dave scored more than Arye or Keith in qualifying; in fact both Dave Lockwood's and Charles Frankston's scores were added up wrongly on the official scoresheets - it was only while writing this article that I noticed the mistakes. Neither error affected who qualified - the only change would have been in the order of play for the final. Players should make a habit of checking their own scores and those of their close rivals).

One consequence of this unusual order was that some important games were played much earlier than usual. In the first round Jon lost 6-1 to Arye who went on to beat Dave 5-2 after an unlucky rebound from Dave in rounds. Jon played Larry in the second round and lost another 6-1 leaving Jon in last place. He didn't stay there for long; Nick took over that exalted position after round 3 and successfully hung onto it for the rest of the day. After 4 rounds Larry had gained a small lead over the rest of the field and Jon, after another 1-6 from Larry, looked to be totally out of it. Round 5 saw Alan lose 6-1 to Jon and Arye drop 3 points to Jim, but Dave took 7 off Charles to keep the pressure on Larry.

Before the tournament Dave produced some statistics to show that Alan has the best results against him in recent ETWA singles. As if to underline this Alan took his now customary 7 against Dave in round 6. At this point Larry had a three point lead, but Dave beat him 5-2 and this would have let Arye take over the lead had not Charles Relle, who had a very inconsistent day, beaten him 6-1. Things were now very tight with Larry, Alan, Arye and Dave all within 5 points. The next round saw Arye beat Alan 5-2 while Larry and Dave took 6's to leave Larry on 43 with Arye and Larry

Final	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Tot	Pos
1 Alan Dean	—	1	2	6	2	6	7	1	5	6	4	5	45	5
2 Charles Relle	6	—	1	6	6	2	0	1	5	4	6	2	39	6
3 Larry Kahn	5	6	—	6	4	6	2	6	6	6	6	5	58	1
4 Nick Inglis	1	1	1	—	0	2	1	1	1	1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1	1	11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	12
5 Arye Gittelman	5	1	3	7	—	4	5	6	6	4	6	6	53	3
6 Keith Seaman	1	5	1	5	3	—	1	1	2	3	2 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1	25 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	11
7 Dave Lockwood	0	7	5	6	2	6	—	6	6	5	6	6	55	2
8 Jon Mapley	6	6	1	6	1	6	1	—	6	6	1	6	46	4
9 Geoff Thorpe	2	2	1	6	1	5	1	1	—	4 <sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub>	1	6	30 <sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub>	9
10 Charles Frankston	1	3	1	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	3	4	2	1	2 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>3</sub>	—	4	6	32 <sup>5</sup> / <sub>6</sub>	8
11 Jim Marlin	3	1	1	6	1	4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1	6	6	3	—	5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	38	7
12 Rick Tucker	2	5	2	6	1	6	1	1	1	1	1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	—	27 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	10

on 38.

It was at this point that Geoff decided that the crowds needed some light relief. Before the last shot of his match against Charles Frankston he noticed that one colour was a point ahead with two others tying for second place. He therefore decided to squop the leading colour to bring it level with the other two. Geoff played the shot perfectly, the only slight problem being that red had been the leading colour and Geoff (who was playing red and blue) had deliberately squopped a red with a blue, thus brilliantly turning a 5½-1½ win into a 4½-2½ win!

Larry beat Alan 5-2 in round 10 to hold a 4 point lead over Arye and Dave before his last round match against Arye. A 4-3 win to Larry was enough to give him the title for the second year running with an impressive total of 58. Dave took 5 off Charles Frankston to take second place with Arye, on 53, in third. Meanwhile Jon had scored 18 in his last three games to sneak 4th place (and become highest placed British player) from Alan, who lost a 6-1 to Charles in the last round. With 9 points after 4 rounds Jon can't have expected to gain a World Singles Challenge! Jim Marlin and Geoff Thorpe also had good days, Jim finishing 7th, a point behind Charles Relle, and Geoff finishing 9th.

Finally I must thank the many members of CUTwC, especially the committee, who helped with room bookings, tables, refreshments, and sundry errands, and without whose help such a vast tournament could not have run so smoothly.

CUTWC v USA

Queens' College, Cambridge 27th November 1985 Nick Inglis

**CAMBRIDGE**

Tim Hedger      Simon Every      James Robertson  
 Peter Wright      Nick Inglis      Stew Sage

U	Larry Kahn	2	6	1
	Rick Tucker	5	1	6
				12
S	Charles Frankston	1	3	1
	Arye Bittelman	6	4	6
				16
A	Jim Marlin	1	1	0
		6	6	7
				19
		4	10	2

**CUTWC 16      USA 47**

Members of the CUTWC and USA teams who were awaiting the arrival of the representatives of the Sunday Times were bemused to see a fleet of black limousines accompanied by a police escort arriving at the main gates of Queens' College. We were even more surprised to discover that this was the entourage of Chancellor Kohl of West Germany, and that Herr Kohl was not coming to watch the match.

The match was played in the Erasmus Room with a fairly average turnout of about 35 club members present. Dave Lockwood had flown back to the States to see Déja and their newly arrived second daughter Alexandra Charlotte, but the other five members of the US team were able to make it for

this long-awaited needle match.

The first two games to finish resulted in a 7-0 for Jim Marlin over Stew Sage and James Robertson and a 5-2 for Larry Kahn and Rick Tucker over Tim Hedger and Peter Wright. The other game was more closely fought with Simon Every and Nick Inglis holding an advantage before Arye Bittelman and Charles Frankston fought back and Arye attempted a pot-out. Arye potted five, but then, much to the Americans' disgust Nick pulled off a long squop to keep the Cambridge pair in the hunt. Good pressure potting by Simon late in rounds and Nick in round 5 brought them 3 points to leave CUTwC trailing 16-5.

The first round had been quite good for CUTwC, but after this the Americans reeled off five 6-1's to easily win the match. The final game was delayed by the need to take numerous pictures of Nick and Simon in "realistic" poses. The game itself was fairly tight with each side gaining the upper hand before a couple of misses with about 3 minutes to go gave the CUTwC pair an advantage to which they were able to hang to record a 6-1, CUTwC's only win.

Thus Cambridge were able to end with the score at a fairly creditable (especially in view of the following Saturday's events) 16-47. The club is very grateful to the American team for taking the time to come and beat us and we look forward to being able to win a similar fixture in the future.

The First Varsity Match?

Nick Inglis

We are accustomed to think of 1955 as the start of modern tiddlywinks, but those of you who have been keeping up with the recent correspondence in *The Times* will have seen mention of a Varsity Match in 1946. This article contains what we know about that match - I hope to have more information for a later issue.

Our first information about this match came from a letter in 1980 (I've been leafing through the CUTwC archives) from Alistair Duncan, whose mother (listed below as Jean Pidsey, though her maiden name was Pidsley) played for Oxford. The following account appeared in the *Oxford Mail* on Saturday 16th March 1946:

**ANOTHER BLOW FOR OXFORD**  
Light Blue Tiddly-Wink Eight's Skill

Flushed with victories over Manchester and Bristol Universities, and hardened in the fires of many an inter-college battle, the Cambridge University Tiddly-Winks Eight visited Oxford today for the first of what is hoped will become the annual match between the Tiddly-Wink Quarter Blues.

Cambridge have been the pioneers of tiddly-winks, and to-day's match was Oxford's first major encounter. At the moment you just play for Oxford or Cambridge, but the matter has been raised before the Hawks Committee at Cambridge, and it was favourably disposed towards the suggestion that a man or woman who "tiddled" for the University should have his or her prowess recognised by the award of a Quarter Blue.

Cambridge already have ideas about a Tiddly-Wink tie, and the design which finds the greatest favour is that of a blue tie, yellow spotted with "Tiddles" and embellished with a Tiddly-Wink Cup.

**RIGID RULES**

There is nothing haphazard about this business: the rules stipulate that it must be played on a "decent and clean carpet" and you can only tiddle with a half-crown, a penny or a small tiddle.

Cambridge were first on the pitch to-day and it came in for the most careful inspection, followed by a long discussion on its qualities for the short and the long tiddle. The hazards of the game find their reflection in the Cambridge motto, "Per ardua ad pocula".

The Cantabs fielded four women and four men, Oxford included five women in their eight.

Their names were:-

Oxford - Phillipa MacLeish (St.Anne's), Jean Pidsey (St.Anne's), Vivien Bearn (St.Anne's), Megan Parry (St.Anne's), June Mercer (St.Anne's), Ted Bunker (Kemble), Alan Taylor (Kemble), Malcolm Waterfall (University)

Cambridge - Monica Brut (Newnham), Hilary Guest (Newnham), Janet Knight (Birton), Cecilia Pelmeare (Birton), John Shaw (Sidney Sussex), Fritz Bauchwitz (Sidney Sussex), Reg Gilbert (Clare), Ted Purver (King's)

Cambridge beat Oxford by seven games to one, the points score being: Cambridge 95; Oxford 50.

Oxford were afloat for 90 minutes, and Col. Raikes, coach, said he was pleased with their form.

The *Cambridge Daily News* (precursor of the *Cambridge Evening News*) also contained three items relating to the match in a back page column called "Sports Gossip" by "The Looker-On".

The following appeared on Thursday 4th June 1946:

#### WAS IT A HOAX?

An unusual query to-day from Mr M.Freeman of 96 Blisson Road, who writes:

Certain of us are of the opinion that the game of Tiddley-Winks is being played on an inter-Collegiate basis.

Can you please enlighten us?

As full term is over it is difficult to get full particulars, but it was reported a few weeks ago that Cambridge University had defeated Oxford, Manchester and Bristol Universities at the noble game.

There have been suggestions that the whole thing was a hoax, but possibly a reader can enlighten us on the subject?

Then on Saturday 6th April:

#### " VARSITY 'S OLDEST GAME. "

Earlier in the week I asked if any reader could give us any information regarding the playing of tiddleywinks on an inter-collegiate basis - a query originally raised by a correspondent. To-day, I am pleased to be able to throw considerable light on the subject thanks to a letter from Mr

Fritz Bauchwitz, the secretary of the Sidney Sussex Tiddley Winks Club. He writes:

It is with deep regret that I learned how badly informed you are of the University's noblest game - tiddley winks. Every week you devote pages to the mere kicking of a ball, whereas you leave poor Mr Freeman ignorant of the one game that requires really supreme powers of concentration, skill, endurance, and social tact. The game, moreover, which has settled once and for all the vexed question of the supremacy of Cambridge over the other place.

We most certainly did beat Oxford last term, and I enclose a cutting from the "Oxford Mail" to prove it. Our victories over Manchester and Bristol are less well authenticated, but no less genuine.

As for inter-college games, only Newnham, Birton, King's, Clare and Sidney have so far competed. Sidney are at present champions, though they have to wink pretty hard to keep ahead of the women.

If other colleges should care to take up the game, the secretaries of the five teams mentioned will gladly give them copies of the C.U.T.W.C. rules, and all encouragement.

The final piece appeared on Tuesday 9th April:

#### TIDDLEY-WINKS TAILPIECE

Following our recent examination of the progress of tiddley-winks as a competitive sport in the University, "F.C." (name and address supplied) has something to say:

Could not Sir Ben Smith be persuaded to allow the gallant tiddley-wink team extra rations, or would it be better to buy them a baby's comforter?

I suggest they use their time for the benefit of the nation.

I find it fascinating that quarter-blues had been applied for and that there had been matches against Manchester and Bristol. If anyone has further information on the events of 1946 (or any earlier tiddlywinks occurrences) then I'd like to publish it in a future issue.

		ENGLAND			
		Tony Brennan Jon Mapley	Alan Dean Geoff Thorpe	Nick Inglis Charles Rellie	
U	Larry Kahn	6	1 1/2	1 1/2	
	Rick Tucker	1	5 1/2	5 1/2	
S	Charles Frankston	3	5	1	
	Arye Gittelman	4	2	6	
A	Dave Lockwood	1	0	1	
	Jim Marlin	6	7	6	
U	Larry Kahn	2	1		
	Rick Tucker	5	6		23
S	Charles Frankston		5	5	
	Arye Gittelman		2	2	16
A	Dave Lockwood	1		1	
	Jim Marlin	6		6	31
		13	12 1/2	9 1/2	
ENGLAND		35	USA		70

England v USA

Nick Inglis

Wadham College, Oxford 30th November 1985

For the international match we made a welcome visit to the city of Oxford. Closer inspection revealed that Oxford houses a University and, now, even a tiddlywinks team. Keith Seaman had declared himself unavailable and, although in the original team selection, so had Mike Burridge, so the England team consisted of Messrs Brennan, Dean, Inglis, Mapley, Relle and Thorpe.

The match was scheduled for six rounds with each pair playing each opposing pair twice. England got off to an encouraging start with wins by Tony and Jon over Larry and Rick, and by Alan and Geoff over Charles and Arye, but Nick and Charles were always behind in their game against Dave and Jim and finally went down 6-1 to leave the score after one round at 12-9 in England's favour.

This desirable state of affairs was not, alas, destined to continue; the next two rounds went heavily in the USA's favour with every game being won by the Americans to give them a huge 43-20 lead. In Nick and Charles' case both games were closely contested, but in each game one or other player made a crucial miss.

The Americans now even had an outside chance of finishing the match in 4 rounds. Fortunately this did not happen and a second win by Alan and Geoff over Charles and Arye ensured that the second round was lost by the slightly more respectable margin of 8-13. The seven and a bit points required for victory were duly scored in the fifth round despite a consolation win for Nick and Charles over Charles and Arye and, as there were a lot of games to get through that weekend, the sixth round was left unplayed, leaving the result a resounding 70-35 win for the USA.

The England pairs all had poor scores with Tony and Jon getting the most points (13) and only Alan and Geoff managing two wins. For the Americans Larry and Rick won four games for a total of 23 points, but Dave and Jim were outstanding, taking 31 points from their five games. This meant that, including the CUTwC game, Jim scored 50 from eight representative games on this tour.

Finally, a word of thanks to Tony for the organisation. We look forward to the Teams of Four and Congress in Oxford in October.

Rules Ramblings

Larry Kahn

Charles' "Off The Mat" article was very interesting. I have often thought that losing a turn may be too harsh a penalty, particularly since a lot of shots off the table are a result of bad luck. In informal games at my house, I have a "house rule" in which if a wink is sent off the table without hitting any other winks along the way, you don't lose a turn.

In reference to boondocking, I think this is too important a strategic move to risk penalizing a player for. However, a modification (I think proposed originally by Joe) may be in order.

I would be interested in the following rules modifications: Any wink shot off the table is placed on the boundary at a position chosen by the opponents. There is no loss of turn. With this rule, if you shoot yourself off, the opponents will place you at the worst possible position, while if you boondock your opponent off the table he will be at worst 18" from the main pile and often a lot closer. This will place a premium on executing a boondock, since if you try for distance but shoot too far, the opponent's wink will be returned fairly close to the action.

The only major impact of this rule would be in reducing the risk of trying a Good shot. However, these shots don't come up that often (mostly during ETWA singles playoffs) and the overall effect would be small. Besides, Good shots can be fun and players would be more inclined to try them.

On the matter of free turns, the American rule states that if one colour is squopped, the free colour can use all the free turns. This application reduces many of the complications that Geoff presents. I think the distinction should be made between turns and "go's". A go would be defined as the opportunity to execute a legal shot, even if it is a pass. This requirement necessitates a free wink.

The freeing rule would now specify the number of free "go's" before an opponent must be freed.

The one sticky example is if one color is squopped but becomes uncovered during free go's. I think you simply include it in the count, and if the colour gets squopped again you ignore it.

For example, green squops out red and blue, but yellow is under. There are 5 free go's. Green's first does nothing. Green's second piddles a yellow. Yellow now has the third go and pots. Green now takes the fourth, and on the 5th frees another yellow on a pile. Yellow now must free a wink.

This may sound complicated, but it is totally straightforward to apply. In the case I gave it allows yellow a free pot, but is that so bad? If you can work yourself into an advantageous position you should be able to take advantage of it.

The last rule change probably makes too much sense to ever have a hope of being passed. Players squidge off with any colour but the squidge-off winner gets blue. At least you'll never have to remember what colour won the squidge-off.

### World Pairs 5 and World Singles 23

Nick Inglis

Wadham College, Oxford 30th November - 1st December 1985

World Pairs 5 brought together the ETWA Pairs Champions Alan Boyce and Dave Lockwood and the NATWA and World Pairs Champions Arye Gittelman and Larry Kahn. I didn't see the match, but Rick Tucker gave me the scores. The match began well for Alan and Dave with a 5-2 from a pot-out, but a 6-1 for Arye and Larry put the score at 8-6 to the World Champions. A 6-1 and a 4-3 by Alan and Dave gave them a useful lead of 16-12, but another 6-1 for Arye and Larry took the score to 17-18. A very close match, but Arye and Larry had a crucial 1 point lead. A 6-1 in the sixth game was enough to leave Alan and Dave needing 7 to win the match. A 5-2 from a pot-out was enough for Arye and Larry to hang on to the title.

World Singles 23 saw a devastating display of winks by Larry Kahn to take become the first player to regain the World Singles title. In the first three games he squopped up Alan Dean to take a huge 18-3 lead and then in the fourth game, after squopping up Alan again, he potted out and, although his potting was less impressive than the rest of his game, managed to get 7 to win a World Match in 4 games

for the first ever time. Congratulations to Larry and commiserations to Alan for coming up against Larry in such unstoppable form. The only outstanding challenge is Jon Mapley's (as top British player in the Bingles) although Larry has a spare challenge (as ETWA Bingles Champion) in case he's beaten.

Invitation Individual

Nick Inglis

Wadham College, Oxford, 1st December 1985

Partner	Opponents
Score	

1 Alan Boyce	8 36	9 27	3 59	5 28	2 34	7 56	4 78	6 49	—	31
2 Charles Relle	4 57	7 19	6 48	8 15	1 34	9 38	5 69	—	3 67	23½
3 Geoff Thorpe	6 18	5 46	1 59	9 47	4 12	8 29	—	7 58	2 67	28
4 Jon Mapley	2 57	6 35	8 26	7 39	3 12	—	1 78	9 16	5 89	24
5 Arye Gittelman	7 24	3 46	9 13	1 28	—	6 17	2 69	8 37	4 89	35½
6 Jim Marlin	3 18	4 35	2 48	—	8 79	5 17	9 25	1 49	7 23	18½
7 Nick Inglis	5 24	2 19	—	4 39	9 68	1 56	8 14	3 58	6 23	24½
8 Rick Tucker	1 36	—	4 26	2 15	6 79	3 29	7 14	5 37	9 45	39½
9 Charles Frankston	—	1 27	5 13	3 47	7 68	2 38	6 25	4 16	8 45	26½

It had been intended that the players from both sides in the International Match would participate in an individual tournament on the Sunday. Tony, however, couldn't make it, Alan and Larry were playing their World Bingles Match, and Dave was umpiring/filming it, so Alan Boyce (who had been in Oxford for his World Pairs match, was drafted in and a nine player individual tournament was played.

In the event Rick Tucker ran away with this one from fairly early on, taking the lead after a 4½-2½ win for Rick and Jim Marlin over Charles Frankston and Nick Inglis. A 6-1 by Nick and Rick over Alan Boyce and Jon Mapley in round 7 left Geoff Thorpe as Rick's only serious rival (Arye Bittelman and Charles Frankston were closer to Rick, but each was to partner him in one of the last two rounds). Rick and Arye beat Nick and Geoff 5½-1½ in round 8 and Rick came top by a large margin, despite losing his unbeaten record in the final round.

Perhaps the notable feature of this tournament was the finishing order of the British players: Boyce, Thorpe and then Inglis, with Mapley and Relle bringing up the rear!

Winking World is the official journal of the English Tiddlywinks Association, and is edited by Nick Inglis of Churchill College, Cambridge, CB3 0DS. 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.