

# Winking World

*The Official Journal  
Of The  
English Tiddlywinks Association*

50

October 1987

## News

Nick Inglis

This is the first edition of *Winking World* to be published using a higher quality printing process. I apologise for any gremlins that I haven't sorted out yet. It is also the 50<sup>th</sup> edition (the first appeared in 1961) and I had hoped to include a number of historical and review articles. In fact there is only one, by Stew Sage, but I hope to include more in subsequent issues.

In World Singles 25 Jon Mapley beat Alan Dean 29-20 to retain his title. Jon and his new partner Tony Brennan also won the National Pairs, two days later. Since then Alan Boyce and Mike Surridge have won the London Open (again) and there have been a number of invitation individual tournaments: two in Cambridge, won by Jim Carrington and Peter Wright, and the Northern Invitation won by Graham Hancock (ahead of Alan Dean, Geoff Thorpe and Geoff Cornell). The Americans have held a Singles tournament this year and Larry Kahn won (again).

Incidentally, I must apologise for accidentally suggesting that Alan Boyce and Mike Surridge's team had won the Teams of Four — in fact it was won by three Mapleys and a Relle with the traditional late charge.

I should have mentioned last time that Tony Brennan, Alan Dean, Jon Mapley and Charles Relle had set a new two minute four pot relay record of 20 on *Record Breakers*. CUTwC attempted to beat the three minute record of 28, and the team of Duncan Budd, Tim Hedger, Nick Inglis and Alex Satchell managed 35. We also accidentally broke the two minute record with a score of 24.

Congratulations are due to Sean Mayes and Graham Josland who were married on the 5<sup>th</sup> of September. We trust that they, and their wives, will find the arrangement satisfactory. Congratulations also to Graham Hancock on his successful operation — Stew's bin will be eternally grateful.

## Winks, Cambridge and the Game's History

Stew Sage

The 1987-88 season sees not only the publication of the 50<sup>th</sup> edition of *Winking World*, but also the completion of the first third of a century of winking in Cambridge, the modern game's birthplace. As time rolls on, there are probably now many who know little of the early years, so I offer here a potted history, drawn mainly from my own reading of the CUTwC archives, which include minutes from the past thirty three years.

The Cambridge University Tiddlywinks Club was formed at a meeting called in room Y19, Christ's College, at 9pm on the 16<sup>th</sup> of January, 1955. The meeting, a sherry party, had been called by Bill Steen who became CUTwC's first president. Steen and a few others wanted to create a game at which

they could represent their University in a match against Oxford, not fancying their chances of obtaining more conventional blues at rowing or rugby. It was decided to apply to the Senior Proctor for a licence to found a University Club and the Dean of Christ's was invited to become Senior Treasurer. Consent from the former and acceptance from the latter meant that the club officially came into being about a week later.

At the founding meeting, it was resolved to post notices in men's colleges, inviting others to apply for membership. Women were not admitted as members for several years, and then only amidst great controversy, making today's internal wranglings look decidedly like storms in teacups. Membership was originally restricted to eight and was later increased to twelve. The limited size of the club meant that it was necessary to be elected to membership, still a constitutional requirement today. However, the great expansion of the last few years has led to this rule being disregarded, the last election to membership being my marathon effort to propose 170 new members by name in 1984.

The first few meetings, held in Christ's, were occupied with devising the game, essentially as we know it, from a proprietary game available at the time. For a while, various combinations of winks were tried. There were three different sizes — our "small" winks were to them medium-sized. The maximum number used at one time was eleven, although six was soon adopted, two large and four medium. Contrary to popular belief, the rules supplied with the brand game, used as a basis for the present rules, did include the squopping concept. Many other changes were made, however, to give the balance between technical and tactical skills we are familiar with today. Fine adjustments, of course, are still being made, but CUTwC hasn't gone on to become the M.C.C. of winks and such matters are now left to the national bodies, the minds of Cambridge players being better applied to devising rules for drinking games.

The formation of the Cambridge club grabbed the attention of the media. In its early years, CUTwC subscribed to a cutting agency and was deluged by pieces, apparently from every newspaper in the country, from the most obscure Highland rag to *The Times*. Indeed, the outbreak of winks at one of the "Varsities" was the subject of a Fourth Leader. There were also television and radio appearances.

Initially, there were difficulties in finding opposition, but the fixture list grew and grew as challenges came in from hospitals, schools, airbases and even (!) women's colleges in Cambridge. One early highlight was a match against *The Daily Mirror*, held in a Fleet Street pub. The travelling team then must have been even more of a sight for sore eyes than now, for the side always turned out in black tie. They carried their own playing surfaces with them, then rolls of carpet, and used knee-pads, since the game was originally played

on the floor. Cambridge won the match, not surprisingly, but by a smaller margin than might have been expected. There seem to have been two causes. One was the drinking, a skill at which (in those days), the journalists seem to have been better practised, the other was the importation of "ladies from *The Windmill*". The state of comparative undress of these girls seems to have been a little unnerving for the Cambridge side, particularly when "the ladies" bent over the mats to play a shot. The minutes note, however, "that the difference between the ladies of *The Windmill* and those of New Hall (a women's college) is merely one of degree", which makes one think.

Oxford formed a club in 1957 and the founders of CUTwC achieved their original aim the following year, when the first varsity match was played. The CUTwC constitution still lists one of the aims of the club as "to play and beat Oxford University at tiddlywinks annually". The result of the first match remains controversial, as the (deliberate) string of correspondence I sparked off in the *Sporting Diary* of *The Times* in 1985-86 shows. At the time, the two Universities used different rules. It was agreed (according to Cambridge) to play two rounds with each set of rules, in an attempt to decide which to recommend for acceptance at the first (and presumably last) World Tiddlywinks Congress, which was to be held later that year in Cambridge. There is no doubt that Oxford won the match in 1957, but Cambridge maintain that it was experimental and so did not have Varsity status. To make things worse, Oxford declared themselves World Champions following their defeat of what was an until then unbeaten Cambridge side. Fortunately, relations did not break down totally and only a few years have gone by without an Oxford-Cambridge match. The World Congress (does anyone know anything about this?) adopted the Cambridge rules and spelling, Oxford apparently preferring "tiddleywinks" until that stage.

Another early aim of CUTwC's founders was to play a match against The Goons. The original challenge to play a match "at your convenience" was turned down, Spike Milligan noting that their "convenience was too small". When, in an apparently unconnected article, a newspaper asked "Does Prince Philip Cheat At Tiddlywinks?", Cambridge seized on this to secure a match against The Goons, cleverly challenging H.R.H. whilst suggesting that The Goons be nominated Royal Champions and that proceeds from the match go to one of the Prince's adopted charities, The National Playing Fields Association. Everything went according to plan, and Milligan (signing himself "Sir Spike") layed down the gauntlet, or rather posted a leather glove to Cambridge. The Goons wrote to the Duke asking for beer on which to train, Guinness, taking the opportunity for free publicity, obliged. Cambridge followed suit by approaching Showerings, purveyors of Babycham, because they

had noted that the company's symbol, a chamois, wore a Cambridge blue bow-tie. The move was obviously a good one, the largest source of income in the early club accounts was from deposits on Babycham bottles.

The Royal Match took place in The Guildhall, Cambridge, in March 1958. The Goons included various members of their production team in their side and John Snagge was appointed umpire. 500 people payed 3/6d to see the match, a recording of which is in the CUTwC archives. Several incidents received press attention. There was controversy at one point when Cambridge objected to Harry Secombe interfering with winks in play. The problem, it seems, was the then more rotund Secombe's frame. Snagge was called to advise on the problem of winks which had bounced off the gut, but declined to adjudicate because the paunch was "outside the three-mile limit". It was revealed later by Spike Milligan, The Goons captain, that they were lucky to have Secombe at all, a student plot to kidnap him, when his Fisons Rentokil Helicopter touched down from Coventry, having been only narrowly foiled. The Royal Match ended with Secombe giving the World Premiere of The Tiddlywinks Anthem, specially composed for the occasion by the Rev. E. A. Willis.

The first Varsity match and the Royal Match meant that hardly a day went by in 1957 and 1958 when winks wasn't in the news. CUTwC received so much correspondence that the committee was expanded to include two assistant secretaries to deal with issuing replies. (These now apparently peculiar positions have survived, but are now more associated with fetching kebabs than with dealing with the weight of committee business). It is not surprising that with considerable media attention the number of clubs grew rapidly. Cambridge appears to have been playing two or more matches a week in the late fifties and in 1962 there were 37 Universities competing for the Silver Wink, which Prince Philip had presented as the British Universities trophy the year before. As activity increased, the need for a co-ordinating body became apparent and ETwA was formed in 1958. It was during this period of intense activity that the game crossed the Atlantic, conveyed by a Guinness-sponsored Oxford team in 1961. The previous year the Irish brewers had presented the Home International trophy, The Bombay Bowl, a competition now sadly defunct.

Until the late sixties, all competitions, with the exception of the junior pairs, were for teams. It was only as interest began to decrease at the end of the decade that the National Singles and National Pairs were introduced. After a brief reversal, entries again began to fall as travel costs rose with the oil crisis of 1973-74. At the same time, however, links between ETwA and NATwA became firmly established. A team from MIT toured the UK in 1972 and surprised home players with their success. The World Singles began in June 1973, with a match between the British and American Singles Champions.

There have been 23 subsequent challenges to date. World Pairs matches have been sporadically held and in full international matches, the USA have a 2-1 lead over England.

The rather gloomy period of the late seventies and early eighties now appears to be over. Competition entries are rising and new areas of interest, notably Oxford and Pinner, are appearing. Much of the expansion reflects developments in Cambridge, where positive changes in image and approach were undertaken during 1982-4. Improved recruitment, the creation of much more internal competition and an unashamed promotion of the social aspects of the club have seen active membership rising rapidly. A few years ago one wouldn't have expected 17 Cambridge players to enter the London Open, nor a dozen or more to return to the fens to play in Individuals over the summer. We now see some administrators of the game in Cambridge spreading to ETwA (*if Stew or I spread any more we'll burst—Ed.*). I hope that, in this anniversary year, the Cambridge Winks Renaissance spreads too.

## World Singles 25

Nick Inglis

*Hamleys, Regent Street, London, 24<sup>th</sup> April 1987*

The long-awaited World Singles match between Jon Mapley and Alan Dean was held in a new venue: Hamleys of Regent Street. Alan Dean decided to break the journey in Cambridge and so a couple of car loads set off on Friday morning, heading down the A1 towards Finchley where we planned to take the underground into central London. The first problem was when the ticket seller unaccountably insisted on selling Mr. Sage two tickets. Thus the publicity officer was in a nervous state when he arrived on the platform, and this may explain why he leapt onto the first train that arrived, without checking where it was going. The party watched as the match organiser disappeared into the distance, but soon decided that this was no great loss. Things ran smoothly for the remaining party until we decided to change trains. At this point, with the skill appropriate to a former assistant director of MI5, Peter Wright timed his move from the train to ensure that nobody else except me got off.

Eventually the three different parts of the Cambridge party made their separate ways to Hamleys, confident that anyone following us would have been just as confused as we were. We found a Hamleys devoid of any notices advertising World Tiddlywinks matches, and not open to us until a few minutes later. We were finally shown to a room at the top of the building, where almost no casual spectators were likely to drop in. The match was therefore played before a small, but absorbed audience, and was umpired by Charles Relle, who was trying out some new optical aids.

The first game saw Alan, playing Green and Yellow, reduce Jon to a single Blue wink by the start of Round 3, but an excellent pile break by Jon gave him a couple of pottable blues which were enough to give him second place and 2 points rather than 1. In the second game Alan (Green and Yellow) brought in much better than Jon and took early control, but by the time Red was squopped up at the beginning of rounds, Blue had the only two completely free winks and looked to have a good chance of first place. But Alan played a nice shot sending a large blue from under a small green into and under another of his own piles. Green eventually potted the small wink concerned, and this, coupled with a couple of misses by blue, were enough to give Blue and Green equal first. The score was thus 4-3 to Alan giving him a handy 9-5 lead.

The third game began with Alan (Yellow and Green) potting a large yellow from the baseline and by the beginning of Green's 7<sup>th</sup> turn Jon had the better position, but Green had six free winks. Alan potted a large Green and then informed the referee and his opponent that he had touched his wink, lining up his next shot. Jon accepted the shot, "This is the World Singles", and with ten winks to twelve proceeded to take control. Yellow was soon squopped up, but the last green managed to knock a small blue off a pair of yellows, red then missed the yellows and squopped the blue, and yellow took both the red on blue and another large blue. Within a couple of rounds, however, Jon had regained control, and squopped Alan up, and again the 6-1 became inevitable. This gave Jon a slender lead of 11-10 as we retired for lunch.

After the resumption Alan (Blue and Red) took the upper hand in game 4 and with three minutes to go Jon had only one of each colour left. The yellow managed to get onto the main pile and free some of Jon's winks. Alan took some of these back, but a round later there was a big yellow on the main pile, a free small green threatening the pile, and with no mobile reds it looked as if the pile was bound to go. Alan then played a beautiful sequence: first Blue carved a large red out of the pile and onto the free green. This released a small yellow beside the large yellow, but red came off the green to take the yellow doubleton, and then a free blue came over the pile to take the green and squop Jon up. The resulting 6-1 gave Alan a 16-12 lead with just three games to go.

Jon came back strongly in game 5, taking advantage of early good fortune as Alan brought a big red in onto a big blue within range of a large green, and then producing some excellent shots to squop Alan up with two yellows still behind the baseline. Jon soon had six free turns and it looked as if he would be able to pot out easily, but he seemed to change his mind a couple of times over which colour to free for the potout. Shortly before rounds a freed blue came in onto a big yellow and big green, and soon managed to free a red.

A couple of pile breaks in rounds left blue with three winks, all of which he potted in Round 4, to put some unexpected pressure on Jon. But although Jon missed with a yellow in 4, a couple of pots in round 5 were enough to give him the 6-1 which had earlier seemed a certainty. The score was now 18-17 in Jon's favour (bringing back memories of Jon's 1980 match with Dave Lockwood when Dave led  $17\frac{2}{3}$ - $17\frac{1}{3}$  after 5 games, and then took a 7-0 in the sixth game to retain the title).

The crucial sixth game began with Alan bringing in a large blue onto another large blue near a large red. Jon took the trebleton and brought a large yellow close as a guard, but blue squopped the yellow from the baseline, red managed to get onto the pile and split it up nicely, and then green and yellow went off in the same round. Alan now had a splendid position, but Jon kept plugging away, forcing Alan to play some tricky shots, and almost imperceptibly the balance of power shifted. With five minutes to go Red was under, and a couple of minutes later Alan was squopped up. In Round 2 Alan got a red onto one of Jon's piles, but Jon played a good shot to squop it, and secure a vital 6-1 win. This gave Jon a 24-18 lead with only one game to play and meant you-know-what in the game.

In the final game Alan had five reds in, Jon brought a green in near a red and Alan tried to pot it, but missed, landing near a yellow. Jon soon took control, and was helped when Alan potted a red, attempting to come over the pot. Alan was squopped up within 9 minutes and Jon gradually increased the number of free turns from three to five. With four minutes to go Alan managed to break up one of Jon's piles. A large yellow took back much of the débris, but a few rounds later red freed all the blues, though two were immediately recaptured by yellow. Alan potted three of the blues and then in Round 2 he squopped the pile containing his last two blues. Yellow missed the squop and Alan had one last chance, but he couldn't pot the bottom blue and green squopped a large blue to end his world title hopes. In the end yellow potted enough to take first place and Jon won the game 5-2, retaining his title by a score of 29-20.

All in all, it was an exciting and close match, if not of the same standard as last year's National Singles and ensuing World Singles matches. Jon, of course, becomes the first Briton to successfully defend this title, and Alan's defeat means that still no British player has held the World Singles and a National title at the same time.

## Off the Mat Again

Charles Relle

Rob Cartwright's article *Rules and Procedures* was excellent, one of the most intelligent pieces of writing that *Winking World* has had. This is not to



decry the general standard, but to praise it according to its merits. Naturally it has made me think again, and now I offer these considerations.

In my article *Off the Mat* in *WW46*, I wrote "...people are nowadays very careful not to send their own winks off the mat, and I judge that a wink more often goes off the mat through bad luck than carelessness". I quote this because Rob writes "Charles states that going off is bad luck", which is not quite the same thing (I hope I will not be accused of quoting out of context!). My assertion is controversial, because others, including Rob, do not agree. But I would like to consider this matter of luck, carelessness and skill, which Rob also mentions. My statements are bound to be subjective and will not command universal assent, but I hope they will carry the discussion forward.

Skill in Tiddlywinks has two aspects, appreciation (summing up how likely a shot is to succeed, and the consequences of success or failure), and manual dexterity (putting the wink where you want it to go). For example, take a wink three feet from the pot. Appreciation involves the decision to play the wink at all, the decision not to put it near enemy winks and the decision to avoid the pot for fear of glancing off the mat. Dexterity involves carrying these decisions into effect. Appreciation is of course affected by tactical considerations. If the wink is your last, it is round 5 and the next opponent also has only one wink, you try to pot your wink.

Mistakes come from two sources: carelessness or even recklessness, and mismanagement. Carelessness is simply not taking enough care over the shot; recklessness might be a crud so violent that you have no control over the destinations of the winks. Mismanagement is failure to appreciate the likelihood of success correctly, or faulty execution of the shot. In practice these two may be hard to distinguish. You might think that to attempt and fail a 2' pot is faulty appreciation, but that failure in a 3" pot is lack of dexterity. There is a grey area in between.

Luck has not yet come into the discussion, so follow the failed wink. It might land safe among friendly winks, safe by itself, some distance away but still safe, fairly near enemy winks, among enemy winks or off the mat. These landing places range from the lucky to the unlucky. But it is not as straightforward as that, because the known risk of the original shot increases or diminishes the degree to which the result can be attributed to luck. This produces another grey area. The examples I have given are simple, but they illustrate principles that apply in most situations.

Grey areas mean that we have to make subjective judgements, and I still think, despite Cartwright, that winks (one's own winks, that is) go off the mat more often through luck than carelessness. As between luck and mismanagement, it is harder to judge, but it is undeniable that there is an

element of luck.

Should going off the mat attract a penalty? Arguments for a penalty are

- (i) we have always had one,
- (ii) transgressing the boundaries is in itself somehow reprehensible, and ought to be punished,
- (iii) carelessness, and what I have called mismanagement, resulting in sending a wink off the mat, ought to be punished.

Considerations (ii) and (iii) overlap. An argument against a penalty is that in present day conditions the loss of a wink to the edge of the mat is a sufficient disadvantage.

At this point I shall consider what ought to happen if you send a wink other than your own off the mat. Let us start with the opponents. If you send one of them off the mat, it is nearly always a matter of carelessness or recklessness. Provided you get rid of the wink, where it goes does not concern you. This happens more regularly in boondocks or cruds. I am sure that these days we send more opponent winks than our own off the mat. Somebody ought to do a count! Should we have a penalty for sending an opponent's wink off the mat? If arguments (ii) and (iii) above apply to one's own wink, they apply with equal if not greater force to an opponent's. It might further be argued that an opponent is entitled to some compensation for being removed in so reckless a fashion, and that if it was your greater skill that squopped him in the first place, you should apply that skill to sending him to a distance, but not off the mat. Against this is the argument that there never has been a penalty for sending an opponent off the mat. There is no doubt also that sending a partner wink off the mat is carelessness.

Cartwright says that "I like the game as it is; I don't want to see it altered" is a self-defeating argument. I have strong sympathy with this, but it is a very strong case. The onus of proof is on those arguing for change, as Cartwright says elsewhere. Most people like the game as it is, or they would not play it. Most people also play the game for a short space of their lives, and do not realise how much the game has changed (often not because of defects in the game itself, but because of outside pressures). I want now to look at the changes that the game has seen since the present going-off rule came into being, for if it can be shown that the rest of the game has evolved while this part of it has remained static and got out of step, that is an argument for change. The novelties are

- (i) double squop,
- (ii) the time limit,
- (iii) rounds after the time limit.

They are not novelties to anyone playing the game today, but there was a time

when even the present going-off rule was a novelty! It was not in the original Marchant rules. However, the difference is that when the rule was introduced, the game was unlimited in duration, and that if you did go off, there was therefore time to recover. Now that the game is limited, the possibility of recovery is much less, and the penalty is much greater. I know these changes happened a long time ago, but they are just such an evolution as I have described. This is another reason why I should like to see the penalty for going off altered. It would be more consistent with the present nature of the game. (Incidentally, try playing a game without a time limit. It must end in a potout, of course; the strategy is different from that of the present game, but great fun. The time limit was introduced to make matches possible after the development of double-squop.) When new situations occur, we can do three possible things:

- (i) legislate them out of the game (like the xylophone shot),
- (ii) assume they do not affect the game and do nothing,
- (iii) make a slight alteration in the rules to adjust to the situation.

So far we have (ii); I would like to do (iii), even though the situation is no longer new!

Because of the time limit the loss of a shot is quite a large penalty; you lose one of the 25 to 30 turns you are likely to have in the game. It is also inconsistent in its severity: if you win the squidge-off and then send your first wink off the mat, it is comparatively unimportant; to send a wink off in round 3 or 4 is much worse. The penalty proposed below, essentially involving distance rather than tempo, would be much more consistent and therefore better.

I am now going to quote Cartwright again: "the new law proposed still has a small penalty for going off. Charles will say it is just a compromise, but it is an inconsistency in the argument which does not make it any more believable". No, I will not say it is just a compromise, any more than I said that going off is bad luck. I am trying to answer the question, what is the appropriate penalty for sending a wink off the mat? In the case of one's own wink I now believe that the suggestion advanced by Larry Kahn in WW47, and rightly attributed by him to Joe Sachs, is the correct one. It is better than my suggestion in WW46 of having no penalty at all. Let the opponents decide where on the mat the wink is to be replaced, and let there be no loss of shot. Why? Because we recognise (as I have always done) that there is an element of carelessness in going off, and because, in the present state of the game's development, such a penalty is severe enough.

If you send an opponent's or partner's wink off, the same penalty should apply, certainly on the carelessness or recklessness argument, and on the grounds of consistency too: can it really be right that to send off a wink

not your own attracts no penalty? There is a strange illogicality about the present situation.

To adopt this suggestion would also solve the problems I raised in my article "On Larry Kahn, Free Turns and Other Matters" (WW48 p.22), to which, as far as I know, no other solutions have been proposed.

What would happen if this situation were adopted? People would still be careful not to send their own winks off the mat. The disadvantage of having a wink far away would see to that. They would also be careful not to send other winks off too. This, I think, would be an advantage on two counts: winks would not be boondocked off the mat indiscriminately, and people would, whether boondocking or desquopping, think much more carefully about where they put each wink. Some interesting developments might follow.

I do not want to justify in detail Jonathan Mapley's suggestion that you should have an extra shot for each wink you pot of whatever colour, because it was not my proposal, but it appealed to me for this reason: there are two basic shots in the game, potting and squopping. At present squopping is overwhelmingly the more often played, and it would be attractive to redress the balance, as well as open up new strategic possibilities.

## The 1987 National Pairs

Nick Inglis

*The Old Hall, Queens' College, Cambridge, 25<sup>th</sup>-26<sup>th</sup> April 1987*

Late April usually means the National Pairs in Cambridge, and this year was no exception with a good entry of 16 pairs. With this number of pairs it was impossible to have the usual top four play-off, so I decided that the tournament would be a straight all-play-all. The top four pairs from last year's event were back, but Jon Mapley and Alan Dean were playing with new partners (Tony Brennan and Alan Boyce respectively), after their lack of success in this event (*only* two titles in five years). There were also plenty of other strong players, and it was good to see some Cambridge novices and an Oxford pair playing.

The draw was slightly complicated by the late arrival of Dyer and Beattie. The first round was started with a draw for 15 pairs, but judicious relabelling of the mats meant that the transition to a 16 pair tournament was achieved painlessly. After three rounds the leaders were Barrie and Inglis with three 6-1's, but Graham Hancock and Gary Shrimpton, who being in the bottom half of the draw had a difficult first day draw, had had a couple of fine results, beating Brennan and Mapley  $4\frac{1}{2}$ - $2\frac{1}{2}$  and Carrington and Josland 4-3.

At this point Barrie and Inglis went into free fall, giving away point after point to the other Cambridge pairs. The real battle was for the top pairs to keep notching up the points against the bottom half of the draw. Relle and

Surridge and Boyce and Dean both stumbled, losing 2-5 and 1-6 respectively against Budd and Purvis (a strong field means there are bound to be good players in the lower part of the draw). This left Hedger and Wright in the lead with 39 point from 7 rounds, 3 ahead of Relle and Surridge, closely followed by Carrington and Josland.

The next round saw Sage and Salter beat Hedger and Wright 4-3, while Hancock and Shrimpton beat Hull and Thorpe 6-1. At the half way stage Hedger and Wright still led with 42, one ahead of Relle and Surridge, and Brennan and Mapley, with Carrington and Josland, and Boyce and Dean, not far behind. Significantly, Hancock and Shrimpton had amassed 31 points (with 5 wins) with an easier second day draw to come.

The start of the second day saw Hedger and Wright stumble badly, losing to Carrington and Josland, Boyce and Dean, and Brennan and Mapley in successive games. Meanwhile Barrie and Inglis beat Relle and Surridge, before letting off Brennan and Mapley. Then Hedger and Wright stopped the rot, beating Relle and Surridge. At the same time Barrie and Inglis were thrashing Carrington and Josland before I persuaded Patrick to attempt a difficult freeing shot in Round 5. It failed, and Graham potted well for an appalling 4-3 turnaround. It was particularly galling as I should have noticed that I could later have freed one of Jim's winks, on the main pile, but after he had played his last shot. Our extreme irritation was always likely to be fuelled by the sight of Hedger and Wright, who had sneaked an impossible 6-1 off us the previous year. This time Patrick went for a reasonable potout, but missed the last one. Peter squopped the wink, but not very well, and I was able to knock it off immediately. Tim then missed a shortish squop and Patrick potted out for a 5-2 revenge.

With three rounds to go Brennan and Mapley had a 1 point lead over Boyce and Dean with Carrington and Josland a further  $2\frac{1}{2}$  points behind, and Relle and Surridge 2 points behind them. Brennan and Mapley took 4 off Boyce and Dean, while Relle and Surridge took 6 off Carrington and Josland. Jon Mapley attempted to pot out against Carrington and Josland, and failed, but squops were missed and Jon was allowed to complete the job. After some less than scintillating potting Tony secured second place, which after Boyce and Dean's 6-1 against Relle and Surridge, gave Jon and Tony a three point cushion. Boyce and Dean took 6 off Carrington and Josland and came over to watch the frantic end of the Brennan and Mapley v Relle and Surridge game. A couple of missed pots (from a fair distance) by Mike, and a pot at the second attempt by a shaking Tony meant that Brennan and Mapley just sneaked the 3 points required to take them into a play-off. Meanwhile Carrington and Josland's slump had carried them down to sixth place behind

Hedger and Wright and the amazing Hancock and Shrimpton.

The play-off game was, for a long time, close (if not always of the highest standard) and eventually Jon and Tony won 5-2 to take the title and consolidate Jon's lead over Alan in the number of Pairs titles. The most impressive performance was surely that of Hancock and Shrimpton, who won 10 games and scored 62 in 15 games. It's amazing how fast the young players improve these days — it makes me want to throw up (and I hate to think what effect it'll have on Graham).

### Pile Pushing in the Modern Game Mike Surridge & Jim Carrington

In the last year there has been much discussion of rules and how they enforce (or fail to enforce) something we call "standard practice".

A major feature of the discussion has been the struggle to find a good definition of a legal shot. The current wording of this (provided by Charles Relle) is far superior to the previous ambiguous version. However in order to reach this new improved rule it was necessary to introduce some examples of what the rule intends to say.

We feel that more can and should be done in this direction. Our bone of contention at present is the push-shot. This is a pile shot in which the top wink is played, usually with the side of the squidger in such a way that it moves without leaving contact with the squidger.

Let us for a moment think back to the origin of tiddlywinks, to the flicking of tiddlywinks into a cup. The game has changed a lot since then and rules have been written to define how shots can be played, which winks can be touched with the squidger, etc. But surely the basic winks shot involves a flick or ping. The squidger strikes the wink so that it moves. The wink is propelled, but the squidger remains at the scene of the crime. The squidger does not carry the wink to its destination, it kicks it there.

After protracted confabulation (with the aid of a number of beer-mats) we have identified four basic variants of push shot which are contrary to the spirit of tiddlywinks.

- (i) The sliding of the wink across the mat by downward and forward pressure before release of the wink (e.g., towards the target pile in a Good shot).
- (ii) The sliding of the top wink backwards in a boondock or other freeing shot whilst remaining in contact with the squidger.
- (iii) The use of push shots to achieve more controlled disruption in a separating shot, or with less subtlety in crudding.
- (iv) The shove shot, designed to move a pile a short distance without risking breaking it up (as might happen with the legitimate pile-jump shot).

We feel that people who use these shots in contradiction with the spirit of the game should no longer be able to appeal to the fact that the rule-book does not explicitly outlaw them. The rules should be altered so that the fair minded are no longer at a disadvantage compared to those whose shotmaking is more cynical. If necessary, this can be achieved by including descriptions of illegal push-shots (and perhaps of legal alternatives such as the Bristol), extending the "rules by example" principle introduced by Charles Relle in this area.

Finally, there is now a new surge of interest in the game from persons who cannot (for geographical reasons) be coached by those familiar with "standard practice". In the light of this, and in order to allow freer spreading of the game, perhaps we should make a wholesale conversion to "rules by example" in place of the "definitive statements" which, although inevitably less definitive than we hope, are the current method for setting out what is or is not allowed.

### Who Needs the Rule-book Anyway?

Jon Mapley

I have recently re-read Rob Cartwright's article on rule changes, published in WW49, and agree with most of his principles, if not all of his views. Perhaps Charles and I, having played the game for a combined total in excess of 50 years, are in a position different from most. We can remember when:

- (1) There was no fixed time limit;
- (2) The xylophone shot was legal (virtually anything was because no definition of legality existed);
- (3) After a time limit was introduced, potted winks counted two time limit points;
- (4) Winning by a potout scored the same as by any other means;
- (5) A shot was lost for each of one's own winks sent off...etc., etc.

Over the years, the rules by which we now play have evolved in a number of ways. The vast majority of the "changes" have been in order to codify accepted practice or clarify ambiguity. The examples cited above are some of the more radical moves which altered either the way the game is played, or the result, or both.

We have now reached a position where the rules are explicit and relatively easy to understand. Most of us would broadly agree with the statement "I like the game the way it is". For any game to be attractive, whether physically, aesthetically, intellectually or from all these angles, there must exist in it a balance between skill and luck. The best games are those where the rules permit the good player, by exercising his skill, to minimise his bad luck and either maximise his own good fortune or take the best advantage from his opponent's misfortune.

Perhaps there was an element of frivolity in my suggestion that a player should gain an extra shot by potting any wink. It was intended mainly to force people to think.

e.g. Why should there be a lost turn for going off?

Why should there be an extra shot for each wink of your own colour potted?

Should the game continue after one side is totally squopped?

Why should squopping cease after one colour is potted out?

All the above points have been an accepted part of the rules for many years, even pre-Relle in some cases! We take them for granted, but would the game be improved if they were repealed? Take the latter two questions, which, to my knowledge, have never been seriously discussed.

A number of board games contain a proviso that if one side is unable to play, you continue until they *are* able to. Not "you play a specified number of turns, *then* you must let them back in". That would be different wouldn't it? In chess, the game is a draw — hardly what we want. But why should the squopping pair not be declared 6-1 winners immediately? It would make life interesting, avoiding making that last squop if you knew you had a good chance of 7-0 by potting at some stage. Would it be 6-1 anyway? Suppose the "squopped" pair had some potted winks. If they were otherwise embarrassed, would Plan 47 become a much sharper sword to wield if it meant you could salvage a win from an otherwise lost position? The obligation to free at a specified time is unusual, if not unique, among games of this type. I'm not suggesting it is wrong, but have we considered all the possibilities?

How different the game would be if squopping continued after a potout. The skill required with the second colour would be significantly greater, unless of course, he was still on top of all the piles and was not obliged to free! Perhaps the full point transfer would only apply to first and second, with half a point, i.e.,  $5\frac{1}{2}-1\frac{1}{2}$  for first and third, and nothing for first and last. I'm beginning to like the sound of this! There would, of course, be the problem of the time limit expiring before everyone had potted out. Perhaps then you would count eighteen time limit points for the potted colour and the others in the normal way, and transfer half a point. I've always wanted to win  $6\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ . But what if two or three colours had potted out? Four for first, two for second...

Seriously, though folks, the lost turn has always been a perennial favourite for the blue pencil. It has traditionally been disliked by "good" players who see it as penalising "an unlucky bounce". Weaker players recognise it as an opportunity to even things out if the better player is foolish enough to make an "error", knowing that two separate winks can safely be attacked. Personally, my favourite variation on this theme is that there should be no lost turn,



but the player is obliged to play the wink from where it left the mat as his next shot in normal sequence. This minimises the penalty aspects of what is usually poor luck rather than poor skill. However, this was proposed and defeated some years ago.

How about a six inch high pot and triangular winks?

### Sotwink v. OUTS

Silver Wink Match

3<sup>rd</sup> May 1987

Sotwink

Steve  
Chamberlin  
Adrian  
Nicolle

Stef  
Norman  
Paul  
Hutchins

Alan  
Boyce  
Chris  
Rawlings

Ed  
Harry  
Nick  
Geary

### OUTS

Tony  
Brennan  
D.  
Denholm

Ian  
Whitmore  
Kath  
Henson

David  
Dyer  
Rob  
Carnell

Richard  
Brownsword  
Malcolm  
Beattie

1	6	6	1	14
6	1	1	6	
2	1	6	4	15
5	6	1	3	
4	5	6	1	12
3	2	1	6	
6	6	6	4	6
1	1	1	3	
13	18	24	10	

Sotwink 65      OUTS 47

## What? MORE Bloody Rules Proposals?

Andy Purvis

'Fraid so! However, unlike some recent proposals, these don't threaten to change the whole face of the game. Hopefully, they'd just make it a little more consistent and fair.

Consider this example. Red and blue have a squop-up. Blue docks yellow, and red pots out. The piles are now desquopped, with millimetre separation. Yellow, with one wink at the edge, can't pot to beat blue. Instead, he plays a Good shot sending himself and blue off the mat. Green pots for a 1-6, when 0-7 should perhaps have resulted. This may not sound likely (and on some mats, it isn't), but it's often quite easy on a springy mat to Good a wink from 1mm away.

Perhaps some people feel that the playing of a successful Good shot "deserves" a point. But this, I believe, misses the intention of the current desquopping rule. The 1mm separation clearly exists to make the game, after a potout, a simple race to the pot. Winks should not interfere with other winks, and the Good shot clearly does so. I would therefore suggest that the distance of separation be increased to 2mm, at which range the Good shot is not really on.

Furthermore, the current desquopping rule is inconsistent. If two winks are touching, but side-by-side, at the time of the potout, they are not moved apart. This may leave the farther of the two winks unpottable, as its path to the pot is blocked by the other wink. This is particularly a problem on fluffy mats, where the front wink may be considerably higher than the back one. Again, this situation could well affect the score after a potout. Furthermore, it has been known to result in one colour, badly placed for a potting race, playing deliberately to just in front of a wink so as to impede it. Once more, I feel that this misses the idea behind the rules - that of a straight race to the pot. So I would suggest that the separation of winks should apply to *all* winks, not just those involved in piles.

On a rather different track, I'd like to see an idea of Larry Kahn's adopted into the rules. He suggested (in, WW48) that the squidge-off winner should always play blue for the rest of the game. This would certainly make life a lot easier in rounds, trying to remember who ends. I've certainly played in several games (mainly singles) in which, as rounds approached, noone had the faintest idea who had won the squidge-off

Finally, I *do* like Dave Lockwood's proposal for the new colour order. I agree with him that spectral order would be far less confusing. After all, who could mistake the logical order of blue, green, yellow, red?

## The Chewy Bits at the Bottom of a Glass

Mike Surridge

As I sit here chatting with Jim Carrington in a Cambridge public house, I am moved to question the reasons for having the A.G.M.

Each year, we have in October an influx of new players to the game in the Universities. Then, three weeks into term, we take these people off for a weekend in some exotic place (such as the public bar of the Brook Inn, Portswood Road). On offer is a unique opportunity for the novices take their more expert colleagues to the cleaners in the only handicapped ETwA tournament.

But then, at the height of the celebrations, when the newcomers have managed to get in a few wins (after transfer); and have discovered how physically and mentally demanding the game of winks can be, we have the A.G.M. Frankly, I'd much rather be out getting a few beers down. And that's after a good few years getting used to the demands of tournament play. For a new winker the sheer exhaustion caused by their first full day's play at tournament level can be raised to unbearable levels by the A.G.M. It must be the most boring thing ever to face people whose enthusiasm is vital to the interests of the establishment.

One problem is the tendency of Jon Mapley to introduce spurious rule changes and to argue for hours about them to people who barely know what he's talking about. Another is the annual ritual of patting each other on the back and saying well done. I think we can anticipate a fair number of sleeping ETwA members in the WCR this year.

After Jim Carrington's recent proposal to hold the A.G.M. in the loo, I feel that the time has come for a radical rethink. My proposals are as follows:

- (i) Disband ETwA and reform a national ruling body of tiddlywinks to be referred to as EWA.
- (ii) Put Jon Mapley in charge.
- (iii) Hold the annual G.M. behind closed doors in Jon Mapley's loo (with Jon in the chair).

## The 1987 London Open

Stew Sage and Andy Purvis

*Blackheath High School, Saturday 4<sup>th</sup> July*

The 1987 London Open, back in Blackheath after its brief excursion to Pinner, began with the tournament director, Charles Relle, shuffling a pack of cards. Cambridge hopes that the drinking games were to begin a little earlier than usual were dashed when this turned out to be a bizarre new way of making the first round draw. After teething troubles, a draw did emerge. Apparently there weren't two people called Andy Purvis after all (which should please Dave Lockwood). It seems that Charles was simply replacing drawn cards

back in the pack. Squidge-off eventually came at 11 o'clock and seventeen and a half pairs took to the mats.

The first round saw Hedger and Wright on opposing sides, the former taking 6 with Carrington off the latter with Rose. Meanwhile Mapley and Clarke went down 3-4 to Myers and Shrimpton.

Lunch was taken after round two, with Moore and Purvis on 12, a point ahead of Sage and Andrew. When these two pairs met after refreshment in a close and time-consuming game, the 4-3 result did nothing for the chances of either. Boyce and Surridge emerged as leaders after the third round by taking  $5\frac{1}{2}$  off Hedger and Carrington. A 7-0 to Shrimpton and Myers over Whitmore and Henson put them only  $\frac{1}{2}$  a point behind, but when they met the leaders in the next round, the result was a 6 to the WETS pair. Round 3 also saw Dave and Geoff entertain the crowds with their usual post-lunch antics, going for the double potout against Wright and Rose. The result was a 1-6. Perhaps Geoff should stick to coke and tomato juice next time.

Round 4 saw Sage and Andrew in another tight match, this time against Wright and Rose. In rounds, Jon Mapley intervened with a stop-watch claiming that the 2 minute rule was in force. However, none of the players concerned were aware that an announcement to this effect had been made. There clearly is a case for the use of this rule in one day tournaments, but it is essential that the tournament organiser informs all the players at the outset. What is more, the same rule must apply to all. One is reminded of the London Open two years ago, when Relle refused to accept that he had been timed out when he and Dean were losing to Bertoya and Sage. This year, Dean and Relle had no time problems, but could only take 2 off Moore and Purvis in round 4.

The fifth round saw Boyce and Surridge extend their lead by taking a 6 off Moore and Purvis. However, in round 6 the leaders went down  $5\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$  to Dean and Relle, who were thus only  $1\frac{1}{3}$  points behind. Hedger and Carrington kept in touch by taking 7 off Budd and Satchell. Going into the last round, less than 3 points separated the top four pairs. Tim and Jim slid out of contention by getting only 2 in a close game against Moore and Purvis. A 6 off Shrimpton and Myers put Dean and Relle in with a shout, but Boyce and Surridge stayed ahead with a  $5\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$  win over Wright and Rose.

Congratulations to Alan and Mike on retaining their title and thanks to Charles for putting the show on the road. Commiserations to bottom placed Alistair Grant who, playing solo, managed only 3 points from the first 5 rounds, before being joined by Steve Chamberlin. Steve had a significant effect on the future fortunes of the Australian: the pair failed to take a single point in the last two games.

With the tournament over, 9<sup>th</sup>-placed Mapley and 14<sup>th</sup>-placed Brennan

1	Alan Dean Charles Relle	15	6	2	3	11	6	4	2	14	6	16	$5\frac{1}{2}$	13	6	2
			6		9		15		17		23	$28\frac{1}{2}$		$34\frac{1}{2}$		
2	Tim Hedger Jim Carrington	14	6	1	4	16	$1\frac{1}{2}$	10	4	7	6	11	7	4	2	3
			6		10	$11\frac{1}{2}$		$15\frac{1}{2}$		$21\frac{1}{2}$		$28\frac{1}{2}$		$30\frac{1}{2}$		
3	Stew Sage Chris Andrew	5	5	9	6	4	3	14	3	13	1	12	3	6	6	7
			5		11		14		17		18		21		27	
4	Richard Moore Andy Purvis	8	6	10	6	3	4	1	5	16	1	13	3	2	5	4
			6		12		16		21		22		25		30	
5	Steve Harbron Rob Cartwright	3	2	17	5	10	1	12	3	15	2	6	3	18	7	11
			2		7		8		11		13		16		23	
6	Roddy Stein Clive Gabriel	10	1	14	1	18	0	8	$1\frac{1}{2}$	9	4	5	4	3	1	16
			1		2		8		$9\frac{1}{2}$		$13\frac{1}{2}$		$17\frac{1}{2}$		$18\frac{1}{2}$	
7	Tim Jeffreys Phil Scarrott	11	4	13	2	17	2	9	6	2	1	18	7	8	6	5=
			4		6		8		14		15		22		28	
8	Dave Hull Geoff Thorpe	4	1	15	6	14	1	6	$5\frac{1}{2}$	12	3	17	6	7	1	12=
			1		7		8		$13\frac{1}{2}$		$16\frac{1}{2}$		$22\frac{1}{2}$		$23\frac{1}{2}$	
9	Ian Whitmore Kath Henson	18	7	3	1	13	0	7	1	6	3	15	2	17	6	15
			7		8		8		9		12		14		20	
10	Tony Brennan David Dyer	6	6	4	1	5	6	2	3	11	$1\frac{1}{2}$	14	1	12	2	14
			6		7		13		16		$17\frac{1}{2}$		$18\frac{1}{2}$		$20\frac{1}{2}$	
11	Duncan Budd Alex Satchell	7	3	12	6	1	1	17	6	10	$5\frac{1}{2}$	2	0	15	2	12=
			3		9		10		16		$21\frac{1}{2}$		$21\frac{1}{2}$		$23\frac{1}{2}$	
12	Phil Clark Jon Mapley	13	3	11	1	15	5	5	4	8	4	3	4	10	5	8=
			3		4		9		13		17		21		26	
13	Gary Shrimpton Geoff Myers	12	4	7	5	9	7	16	1	3	6	4	4	1	1	5=
			4		9		16		17		23		27		28	
14	Peter Wright Matthew Rose	2	1	6	6	8	6	3	4	1	1	10	6	16	$1\frac{1}{2}$	10
			1		7		13		17		18		24		$25\frac{1}{2}$	
15	Graham Hancock Tim Roscoe	1	1	8	1	12	2	18	7	5	5	9	5	11	5	8=
			1		2		4		11		16		21		26	
16	Alan Boyce Mike Surridge	17	$4\frac{2}{3}$	18	6	2	$5\frac{1}{3}$	13	6	4	6	1	$1\frac{1}{2}$	14	$5\frac{1}{2}$	1
			$4\frac{2}{3}$		$10\frac{2}{3}$		$16\frac{1}{6}$		$22\frac{1}{6}$		$28\frac{1}{6}$		$29\frac{1}{3}$		$35\frac{1}{6}$	
17	Jon Carlaw Ed Harry	16	$2\frac{1}{3}$	5	2	7	5	11	1	18	6	8	1	9	1	17
			$2\frac{1}{3}$		$4\frac{1}{3}$		$9\frac{1}{3}$		$10\frac{1}{3}$		$16\frac{1}{3}$		$17\frac{1}{3}$		$18\frac{1}{3}$	
18	Alistair Grant Steve Chamberlin	9	0	16	1	6	1	15	0	17	1	7	0	5	0	18
			0		1		2		2		3		3		3	

(the National Pairs Champions), left with the Rest of England team for their match in Catford against WETS (q.v.). Meanwhile, Cambridge players, with nothing better to do, headed for Wimbledon, forsaking the finals in progress on centre court for the fine hospitality of Sir Robert and Lady Andrew. Late night entertainment was provided by the luckless Alistair Grant, the professional games player, for whom *Nurdle*, *Boondock*, *Gromp* proved a little too much. Even Mr. Moore's Vegimite failed to bring the Antipodean round, lending some support to the theory that this mysterious brown gunge is intended to be eaten rather than be used in lieu of smelling salts.

### There's No Such Thing As Bad Publicity...

Stew Sage

There's no such thing as bad publicity, at least so they say (whoever "they" are). I did begin to wonder, when the first thing to appear in black and white after my election to the newly created position of ETwA Publicity Officer was an atrocious article in *The Daily Express*. However, the attention of *The Sunday Times* and others a few days later did something to restore my confidence in Fleet Street (as much of it then was). Generally speaking, things have not been too bad since then, so I thought it about time for a brief explanation of what I've got up to over the past two years, in case people are queueing up to have a bash themselves after Congress.

I would say that the essential needs of a Publicity Officer are a sense of humour, a flexible timetable, a nearby collection of winks players, preferably a club, and a high alcohol tolerance.

The need for a sense of humour is fairly obvious. We have all had conversations with people who have started to laugh when told we play tiddlywinks and who become hysterical when it is explained that it *is* a serious game. The situation is no different when the person concerned is a representative of the media and it is, unfortunately, essential to meet them at least half way if the real message is to stand any chance of getting across.

A flexible timetable is necessary since most of your ETwA responsibilities require bursts of activity around tournament times. For the most part I've relied on sending out releases to the press and then dealing with calls when they come in. This can mean spending sizeable parts of the day on the phone, not always having very profitable conversations. What is more, it's nothing to receive a call from a Press Photographer or Television Camera Crew saying that they'd like shots of a dozen or so people playing and they will be with you in an hour. Several times I've found it necessary to drop everything and charge around Cambridge (such as I charge anywhere) finding members of CUTwC who want to get their boats on the box. Whilst anyone would do in theory, I think it best to use only those who really know what is going on. That's

where having other players nearby comes in.

So is being P.O. fun and do you get anything out of it? I've certainly enjoyed the job (so far), and have a string of tales as long as my waist measurement. I limit myself to a few favourites, which brings me to alcohol tolerance.

Journalists' expense accounts, and their own prodigious ability to drink their way through them, are a pleasurable, but distinctly hazardous, part of the job. When *The Sunday Times* were in town for the CUTwC v USA match, and gathering information for the article which was to coincide with the Dean v Kahn World Singles, the Cambridge team spent a morning talking to them and posing for endless photos. Since they knew from their archives that CUTwC traditionally turned out in black tie for matches (I can't think why we've stopped), we were asked to do the same. The six of us gathered round the Old Hall piano and took up various poses at Veronica Horwell's instruction. Eventually, it was decided that we should be more animated. "Sing or something", she said. Having exhausted the Winks and CUTwC Anthems, we resorted to another club favourite, Yogi Bear. The camera continued to click for a worryingly long time, but to my relief, the photographer decide he had enough shots to halt us, just as we got to the bit about the sexual proclivities of Cindy. For once, that's when the drinking started. We were all rewarded with lunch in *The Granta*. I'm never one to turn down the freebies, even if five pints at lunchtime is a bit excessive. Indeed, it all seemed a good laugh at the time, until Nick and I realised we were due to teach in little over an hour. Whether or not I got enough sherry into my supervisees for them not to notice my own state, I don't know. However, I'm certain I've never had that much trouble with spermatogenesis before.

Until the Kangaroos coiffed our Editor last autumn, he was a very marketable product, and I often felt like his manager as I told him where the "tumbling mass of fiery red beard" was required next. Unfortunately, however, he's unlikely to make it as a soloist. When his *That's Life* interview turned to song, our mate Esther wasn't entirely taken with the Inglis vibrato, and so a crew were dispatched to Queens' Chapel to re-record the Winks Anthem. I was asked to raise a choir of winks players. As it was, I got four of us together, Cambridge never being particularly thronging five minutes before Christmas. Once a new harmony had been written, we assumed we would only be there a few minutes. Several hours later we were much in need of the BBC beer poured down us, for a change, in *The Granta*. The problem was that they wanted to play the new sound track over the old film, and thus we had to keep in time with Nick's original. Even with the aid of headphones playing the old recording (it looked like something from Band Aid), this was almost impossible. The Rev. E. A. Willis, the anthem's composer, undoubtedly turned in his

grave at the Inglis extreme use of *tempo rubato*.

Nick' and I were also involved in a bizarre interview with *The Sunday Telegraph*, shortly before the re-birth of the Varsity Match. The whole thing was a little strange from the start. The Porters directed a call to the college bar, cleverly anticipating my presence, and I spoke to John Moynihan, who told me to meet him in the bar of *The University Arms*. I was told, "I will be the one with the red scarf". He wasn't. Nick and I had a couple of pints whilst waiting for someone suspicious to arrive. All of this time there was just one man, drinking alone at the bar. Yes, Moynihan. He seemed a little irritated, and proceeded to tell us that he was "off up to Edinburgh for the (Commonwealth) games, then out to Mexico for the (World) cup". We assumed we were supposed to read his displeasure at being dispatched to the fens over mere tiddlywinks. However, as the beer continued to flow, now at his expense, the conversation became quite convivial, and the game and its history were well explored. At least, that is how I just about remember the evening. I'm sure quite a bit of what emerged from his typewriter was never said, or intended, but "the piece" was, as he'd promised, a good one, and contains all my favourite quotes to date. "Sage and Inglis", he wrote, "didn't look as if they'd enjoy a good game of rugby. They were built more for comfort than speed". "Sage said he often found he was not taken seriously. He recalled the time a *Breakfast-Time* appearance was cut short because a news story had broken. Then, Frank Bough is only a former tank driver". Bough didn't sue, but we weren't terribly popular after "Inglis said few women took up the sport. Then it is well known that Cambridge girls prefer hockey and knitting". But this was admirably made up for by the best description of me yet. What a lucky thing that your Publicity Officer is "a disciple of the game's seriousness"!

## WETS v Rest of England

Jon Mapley

*Catford Stadium, Independence Day 1987*

Back in the days of World Singles No.1, a challenge match was held at Imperial College London. I can remember a crowd of nonplussed Japanese tourists watching the strange British ritual, as a team of ten calling itself QESH took delight in beating the best five pairs that the rest of England could muster, despite Yours Truly and Shepherd Junior amassing 27 points.

Fourteen years later, a team of six with similar educational origins decided it was time to repeat the victory. The acronym has changed — perhaps it means Winifred's Establishment for Technology, Scunthorpe, or was that a pop group?

Of the non-Wet, non-Yankee, top finishers in last year's singles and this



## Wessex Exiles v. Rest of England

*Rest of England*

	Tim Hedger Peter Wright	Tony Brennan Jon Mapley	Alan Dean Charles Relle	
WETS				
Jim Carrington	1	1	1	18
Mike Surridge	6	6	6	
Alan Boyce	6	$3\frac{1}{2}$	2	$9\frac{1}{2}$
Rob Cartwright	1	$3\frac{1}{2}$	5	
Phil Clark	5	2	6	8
Steve Chamberlin	2	5	1	
	12	$6\frac{1}{2}$	9	

WETS  $35\frac{1}{2}$       Rest of England  $27\frac{1}{2}$ 

year's pairs, Nick was at a wedding and Cyril was poorly (get well soon, Cyril), so the representative squad showed a good balance between youth and experience, do you know what I mean, Harry?, with half the team averaging half the age of the other half.

A pointer to form was apparent at the London Open earlier in the day, with Boyce and Surridge edging out last year's winners (*Boyce and Surridge were last year's winners — Ed.*) Dean and Relle.

Round one pitted England newcomers Tim Hedger and Peter Wright against Mike Surridge and Jim Carrington — Stomp! 1-6. Alan and Charles redeemed things with a 6-1 against Phil Clark and Steve Chamberlin (who was the freshest player, having avoided the dreaded humidity of the jungles of

Blackheath High School library). The last game could have resulted in just about any score, and  $3\frac{1}{2}$ - $3\frac{1}{2}$  was probably right.

In round 2, Tony persuaded Jon that, having Penhaligoned a large blue, the other five felt lonely. The problem was that Steve and Phil managed to pen the runt of the litter and eventually score 16 to Jon's 15 for a 5-2 win. Jim and Mike were turning the screw by comprehensively out-squopping Charles and Alan (who sat out most of the game), and the only win for England was a 6-1 by Tim and Peter, against Rob and Alan.

Mike and Jim kept up their average with another immaculate performance against a now heat-stricken Tony and demoralised Jon in round 3, condemning the new Pairs Champions to  $6\frac{1}{2}$  from three games.

Even going for silly shots in an attempt to achieve unlikely 7's was futile in the other two games, Rob and Alan squeezing a  $4\frac{1}{2}$  against Charles and Alan, and some respectability for themselves, and the final score was earned by Tim and Peter with another win, 5-2 against Phil and Steve, for the second highest total (12).

So we crawled away and licked our wounds. Team spirit and a distinct edge in performance had won the day. If we wait another fourteen years, perhaps the Southampton Portswood And Cobden Eccentrics will go on an Odyssey to beat the rest of England whilst orbiting to the strains of "The Blue Danube". Can you imagine potting a weightless wink?

## Letter to the Editor

8th September 1987

Sir,

May I offer my sincerest congratulations on the 50<sup>th</sup> issue of *Winking World*. It has long been the premier winking journal in both the breadth and depth of material offered. Its detailed match reports allow the players to practice their skills of statistical analysis and trivial pursuit while the current winking debates on rules, sponsorship, and organisation are well featured.

Writing from the fallen winking angel, the U.S., I well appreciate the varied but continuous efforts of winkers over more than a quarter of a century that were required to reach this point. The English Tiddlywinks Association currently has active players who range in experience from 1 month to 26 (27\*) years. Those few who have seen winking history being made tie us to those who preceded them. That we continue to exist to this day is due in no small part to Jonathan Mapley who has the longest continuously active career. His stewardship as Chairman has overseen the greatest growth in many years. In 1975-77, ETwA was at the end of a long decline. Jon turned it around — with the help of Cambridge and Southampton. More recently, new active clubs have

appeared at Oxford (Thank you, Tony Brennan) and Pinner (Thank you, Tim Jeffreys). I am particularly proud of the latter as I had something to do with bringing Tim into the game 10 years ago. If Jon has to step down this year due to dubiously legal maneuverings, let his successor not forget the significant accomplishments of Mr. Mapley. His numerous World Singles sponsorships have been to my benefit in particular. Jon's only problem now is going to be promoting World Championships from which he may benefit. It's tough to be honest and modest in those situations.

The excitement in English winks today is not mirrored in The U.S. The August 1987 NATwA Singles had 5 competitors. The last two ETwA Singles had 39 and 40. I hope to improve on the U.S. number.

It would appear that I will take up residence in the Washington, D.C. area, joining the only active center of winking activity in America. My world travelling will be curtailed but I hope to play in every ETwA Singles, if at all possible. I look forward to taking a more active rôle in American winks, recruiting and perhaps drawing examples from the recent British experience. The U.S. still has some of the best players in the world but it has very few of the top fifty. Further, I will promote the introduction of prize money for top tournaments. We in America must take control of our winks destiny, if we are to have one at all.

1. It is with these goals in mind that I wish to resign from the post of Secretary-General of the International Federation of Tiddlywinks Associations.
2. The only regret I have is that my successor may not agree with the U.S. interpretation of the failure to free rule. The U.S. version, for those of you unfamiliar with it, allows any shot in the freeing turn. If, at the beginning of the following turn a wink has not been freed, the normal freeing process is executed. Therefore, you can try potting but you know the risk. This is one rule change I would like proposed at the ETwA Congress in October.
3. I also do not agree with the new ETwA ruling constraining the officers of ETwA from serving more than three consecutive years in a position. It brings to mind the folly of the Self-Denying Regulation during the French Revolution. I would propose to do away with this amendment.
4. I would propose that the terms of office of ETwA's officers should be lengthened to perhaps 3 or 4 years. We should allow the successful candidates the tenure to plan, develop, and implement his or her policies.
5. We should amend the rules to the more natural color order, spectral order. The new order would be red, yellow, green, and blue. If we succeed in international expansion, spectral order is less arbitrary than the English alphabet and would be readily accepted. It would be a short term problem for everyone to adjust to the changed pairings but would not hamper most players for long.

6. Lastly, if Jon Mapley is turned out of the ETwA Chairmanship this year, I would like to propose him as the new IFTwA Secretary-General. We have no finer candidate.

Yours in winking,  
David H. Lockwood

## Minutes of ETwA Council Meeting

Phil Clark

*Saturday 25<sup>th</sup> April 1987, The Mill, Cambridge*

Present: Jon Mapley, Jim Carrington, Phil Clark, Nick Inglis, Stew Sage and several members.

### *Publicity*

#### (i) World Singles:

Stew reported that the publicity gained on the day of the World Singles (24<sup>th</sup> April) had been very disappointing. Relatively few spectators outside the game watched the match while the media representation was a lone local radio reporter. The responsibility for the public relations had been left with *Hamleys'* own public relation people and it was resolved that ETwA would handle such events itself in future.

*Hamleys*, however, seemed willing to cooperate with ETwA in staging other matches in the future by which time the attic to which the match was confined should have been transformed into a more prepossessing venue.

#### (ii) Lowestoft:

Nothing more had been heard from Anglia Hosts since the initial enquiries discussed at the last meeting. Jon would try to contact the company and find out what, if anything, was happening.

### *Rules*

With Charles' latest draft, incorporating the recommendations of the last Congress just printed there was some discussion on whether further changes were needed.

The only mistake noted was the size of small winks being shown as 15mm not 16mm.

Consideration was given to the current practice of quoting metric and imperial specifications where measurements were shown; it being felt the matter ought to be decided one way or the other. It was agreed to quote the specification in which the equipment was ordered; so winks, the pot and squidgers would be shown in metric only. In rules on play and boundaries, distances should be expressed in metric. So the 2" rule would be expressed as 5cm and the distance between winks separated after a potout as 1mm.

However it was recognised that there were certain problems and inconsistencies, notably the 25mm squidger and continuing to quote mat sizes in imperial.

Phil was asked to write to Charles on these matters.

On the subject of presentation, Jim asked whether ETwA should invest in card covers as had been done for earlier versions.

Jim said he'd obtained a quote of £45 for 500 or £65 for 1000 having done the artwork himself. Other sources could be investigated and Jon said he could look up his original supplier. It was also suggested that the covers on the "old" rules could be detached and re-used.

#### *Term of Office*

Following discussion and vote at Congress there was uncertainty as to whether there was now a maximum term of three years. If this was the case then Jon and Phil would be directly affected.

Jon said that certain committee posts, notably treasurer/equipment secretary, did not benefit from frequent changes and recognised that Stew had built up a large range of media contacts. He added that he intended to stand down at Congress irrespective of any ruling.

It was decided that the vote at Congress should be taken as a recommendation but that it was not binding. Geoff Thorpe informed the meeting that he would send a proposed constitutional amendment on the lines of the recommendation to WW50.

In light of the situation it was felt that it would be courteous of anyone else intending to stand for office at 1987 Congress to declare their intention prior to that meeting.

#### *Equipment*

Jim reported that he had continued in his attempts to contact the supplier of winks so that new stocks could be ordered. Having obtained various Italian translations to letters, Jim had been sent price calculations for a new batch, but the efforts to finalise this point had floundered amidst efforts to trace a seemingly non-existent contact who apparently lived in "Londonstratford-york". This had proved too much for the combined ingenuities of Jim and numerous directory enquiries offices. However efforts were continuing.

Jim estimated that in the end the acquisition of 1000 sets should cost no more than £200.

As far as mats were concerned, there was currently a variation in selling prices due to a mistake by the supplier. The "new" mats would gradually be phased in.

In connection with the World Singles, *Hamleys* had been contacted by *Spears* (manufacturers of "Noddy" winks) who wanted to see if they could

supply some of the equipment. This request was refused.

A letter had been sent to *Spears* explaining why their "winks" were not suitable. They had responded asking to be kept informed of developments in equipment and offering to pay a subscription to ETwA. Attractive though this seemed Phil said it could be dangerous to accept money as *Spears* could then feel able to use ETwA's name to promote their sub-standard equipment. It was felt that it would be safest to refuse any financial offer.

### *World Singles and Pairs*

Jon raised the question of the eligibility of the challenge of an American "Champion" following the recent very low turnouts in competitions and abandonment of the 1986 Singles. He envisaged the situation where the Singles would just be Kahn *v* Lockwood and asked whether the winner of such an encounter would be allowed a World Singles Challenge.

It was asked whether to permit a challenge in these circumstances would devalue the title when all the game's current strength was in the UK.

Jon said he thought the Americans did themselves a disservice by not holding the 1986 Singles despite there being only 4 entrants. However he recognised that ETwA would have to be careful if it was to try to impose conditions.

It was felt that a Singles Championship, even if this was just a two man affair, should consist of a minimum number of games over a day. After discussion Phil was asked to write to Larry to set out the problem and suggest that a tournament had to last a day and consist of at least 10 games before a legitimate World Singles Challenge could be recognised.

Concerning the World Pairs Jon reported that any match had little chance of taking place since one of the holders, Arye Gittelman, appeared to have given up the game.

Jon suggested that in these circumstances the title should be declared vacant and that the 1986 UK Pairs Winners (SurrIDGE and RellE) should play the 1987 UK Pairs Winners to decide it. The winners of such a match would then be open to defend their title against an American Pair in the circumstances outlined for the Singles.

Nick asked whether if Mike and Charles won again in 1987 whether they should play the second placed pair. Does second place deserve a challenge or should they wait another year?

A vote saw a 4-1 majority in favour of allowing them to play the second placed pair.

Phil was asked to seek Larry's views on this as the other half of the last holders of the title.

It was recognised that Larry's response to all these points would have to be considered very carefully.

#### *Any Other Business*

(i) Jim said he'd sold some more equipment to outside enquirers, e.g., a Mr. Cook who said he had played at the National College of Food Technology, Reading.

(ii) Nick said that due to production problems only 20 copies of WW49 were produced, but he would ensure all members received a copy.

There being no other business, glasses were drained and the assembled persons returned to the National Pairs.

#### **The Marchant Trophy 1986-87**

**Phil Clark**

Since its resurrection, the Marchant Trophy has fitted fairly easily into the winks year; seeming to be unnoticed by many but enjoyed by those who participate. For the second year it was run as an all-play-all between teams of four and five teams entered, two from Southampton and Oxford plus the Wessex Exiles. It was unfortunate that more teams didn't enter, but five entrants meant a possible 10 matches and who was to cavil at that?

The previous year had seen the use of "mass-meets" to play a number of games over a single day one of which had been the Sunday after the Hampshire Open "which looks set to become a standard Marchant Trophy venue" (WW49). Following mentions at Congress and advance publicity several players had their diaries marked for 1/3/87. In the event only one match was played — WETS *v* Sotwink A — which WETS won 22-6, finding the opposition demoralised following their Silver Wink defeat. All in all the day was a considerable disappointment for those who had stayed overnight in Southampton specifically to play Marchant games.

This was not an auspicious beginning, especially as it had become clear by this stage that Cambridge were not interested in entering. However a few weeks later OUTS A and OUTS B met with the A team winning 15½-12½ and a Marchant day was fixed for 2/5/87 in Oxford.

All the entered teams assembled at Wadham College and with eight matches to play it was intended to settle the tournament that day, barring of course any late entrants. Sotwink A and OUTS B kicked off with a tight (if slow) match eventually won 15-13 by Sotwink. WETS meanwhile took on OUTS A in a match that ran well for the exiles until the Hampshire Open winners, Surridge and Carrington, took on the inexperienced Dyer and Carnell. A betting man would have been wise to stay away as the WETS pair played a game of tactical luminescence just about recognisable as double-pot. Dyer was able to raise the shout, "nine free shots", to bring amazed onlookers in

to see a spate of missed pots before Dyer beat an uncharacteristically nervous Carrington to the potout. OUTS took the game 5-2, WETS the match 20-8 and everyone retired thankfully to lunch.

The teams returned, suitably refreshed, with Sotwink B making their first appearance, against OUTS A. A second 15-13 score resulted, reinforcing the view that there was not much between the four university sides. WETS played OUTS B and secured a comfortable win by 21 points to 7. This match demonstrated the value of the tournament "guest" rule when OUTS were left a man short.

The next round saw OUTS A play Sotwink A and produce another 15-13 score while the B teams met with OUTS fielding that redoubtable Oxford man Alan Boyce. This was the first time that a guest had a significant effect as Boyce and Zetie scored 12 points to help OUTS B to a 19-9 win. This ran against the evident trend of close matches between OUTS and Sotwink, but noone complained of unfair advantage. The competition rules allow for objections to be made against particular guests and for a team of three to play. In retrospect I wonder whether Sotwink were aware of the rule but fortunately the excellent spirit of the day prevailed.

The final game saw WETS, in lighthearted mood, play a determined Sotwink B, WETS escaping with a  $16\frac{1}{2}$ - $11\frac{1}{2}$  win. Sotwink A and B were unable to play due to lack of time and so the adding up commenced. This revealed, without particular surprise, that Wessex Exiles were the 1986-87 Marchant Trophy Champions with  $79\frac{1}{2}$  points from 4 games.

The competition drew only five teams but 26 players represented them, many of whom were not regular faces at more established tournaments. For the second year running the Oxford day was highly successful, allowing the competition to end on a high note. The success of the Marchant Trophy depends on the willingness of teams to play and to date this has not been a problem. Perhaps next year more teams will feel able to make an appearance?



		Sotwink A	
		Ed Harry Adrian Nicolle	Steve Chamberlin Sean LePicq
WETS Jim Carrington Mike Surridge  Alan Boyce Phil Clark	1	2	11
	6	5	
	1	2	11
	6	5	
	2	4	
		WETS 22	Sotwink A 6

		OUTS A	
		Tony Brennan Dave Dyer	Kath Henson Ian Whitmore
OUTS B David Orchard Richard Brownsword  Steve Scruton Malcolm Beattie	5	$2\frac{1}{2}$	$6\frac{1}{2}$
	2	$4\frac{1}{2}$	
	3	5	6
	4	2	
	8	$7\frac{1}{2}$	
		OUTS A $15\frac{1}{2}$	OUTS B $7\frac{1}{2}$

		OUTS B	
		Ken	
		Zetie	
		Mark	
		Conway	
D.			
Denholm			
Malcolm			
Beattie			
Sotwink A			
Steve	5½	2½	6
Chamberlin	1½	4½	
Adrian			
Nicolle			
Ed	1	4	9
Harry	6	3	
Nick			
Geary			
	6½	6½	
		Sotwink A 15      OUTS B 13	

		OUTS A	
		Dave	
		Dyer	
		Rob	
		Carnell	
Tony			
Brennan			
Richard			
Brownsword			
WETS			
Jim	1	5	8
Carrington	6	2	
Mike			
Surridge			
Alan	1	1	12
Boyce	6	6	
Rob			
Cartwright			
	2	6	
		WETS 20      OUTS A 8	

		OUTS A		
		Tony	Dave	
		Brennan	Dyer	
		Richard	Rob	
		Brownsword	Carnell	
Sotwink B	Stef	$4\frac{1}{2}$	4	$5\frac{1}{2}$
	Norman			
	Chris	$2\frac{1}{2}$	3	
Rawlings	Jon	4	$2\frac{1}{2}$	$7\frac{1}{2}$
	Carlaw			
	Paul	3	$4\frac{1}{2}$	
Hutchins				
		$8\frac{1}{2}$	$6\frac{1}{2}$	

OUTS A 15

Sotwink B 13

		WETS		
		Alan	Mike	
		Boyce	Surridge	
		Rob	Phil	
		Cartwright	Clark	
OUTS B	Ken	3	6	5
	Zetie			
	Steve	4	1	
Chamberlin	Malcolm	6	6	2
	Beattie			
	D.	1	1	
Denholm				
		9	12	

WETS 21

OUTS B 7

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		OUTS B		
		D. Denholm Malcolm Beattie	Ken Zetie Alan Boyce	
Sotwink B	Stef Norman Chris Rawlings	6  1	6  1	2
	Jon Carlaw Paul Hutchins	1  6	6  1	7
		7	12	
			OUTS B 19	
		Sotwink B 9		

	Stef Norman Paul Hutchins	Sotwink B Jon Carlaw Chris Rawlings	
WETS			
Rob Cartwright	1	$2\frac{1}{2}$	$10\frac{1}{2}$
Mike Surridge	6	$4\frac{1}{2}$	
Jim Carrington	$5\frac{1}{2}$	$2\frac{1}{2}$	6
Phil Clark	$1\frac{1}{2}$	$4\frac{1}{2}$	
	$6\frac{1}{2}$	5	
WETS $16\frac{1}{2}$		Sotwink B $11\frac{1}{2}$	

## Marchant Trophy 1986-7

	Sotwink	Sotwink	OUTS	OUTS	Wessex	Total
	A	B	A	B	Exiles	
Sotwink	A		13	15	6	34
Sotwink	B		13	9	$11\frac{1}{2}$	$33\frac{1}{2}$
OUTS	A	15	15	$15\frac{1}{2}$	8	$53\frac{1}{2}$
OUTS	B	13	19	$12\frac{1}{2}$	7	$51\frac{1}{2}$
Wessex Exiles		22	$16\frac{1}{2}$	20	21	$79\frac{1}{2}$

### Three Problems

Rob Cartwright

1. I was watching my partner practising potting with Red and Blue winks. I realised that one wink was potted, but didn't know which colour it was. My partner then proceeded to pot a blue wink, then stop and take a blue out of the pot.

What is the chance that the wink left in the pot is a blue wink?

2. I've just made a set of new squidgers, all of which exactly covers 3 winks (laid so that they all just touch each other on the mat.

Squidger A covers 3 small winks.

Squidger B covers 3 large winks.

Squidger C covers 1 large and 2 small winks.

Squidger D covers 1 small and 2 large winks.

If small winks are 16mm diameter and large winks 22mm, what are the sizes of the squidgers?

3. At this year's ETwA Annual Dinner (!) we decided on a new seating arrangement — a circular table to seat the 40 guests. Unfortunately everybody got so drunk beforehand they couldn't read, and took their places totally at random. They discovered that nobody was at his correct seat. Because nobody could be bothered to move, we decided to rotate the table instead.

Regardless of how everybody was seated, would it have been possible to rotate the table so that at least 2 people were seated in their correct places?

We had a short break for more drinks, and this time there was similar confusion — only the chairman managed to find his seat. Now was it possible to rotate the table so that at least 2 people were correctly seated?

*The more enthusiastic of you may like to consider what would have happened after Graham Hancock had left to be stomach pumped and his place had been removed — Ed.*

### The CUTwC Long Vacation Invitations

Andy Purvis

We thought it would be easy enough to find 12 players:

"Sorry, I'm going to the Proms that night..."

"...I'll be on the Isle of Mull, 450 miles away..."

"Must be in Doncaster by Sunday afternoon..."

"I'd have to take my sleeping bag and stuff into work with me. It's easy enough to get something that size *into* an MOD establishment, but as for getting it back *out* again..."

"He's in Edinburgh. For 6 weeks."

But some people could make it:

"I'll definately (sic) be along to the drinking (lots more sic) next weekend."  
(from Graham, of course).

And so, finally, 12 keen winkers gathered in the Erasmus Room, Queens' to start play promptly half an hour late. Geoff Myers had brought a bottle of whisky back from holiday with him, which he generously put up as a prize. So perhaps it's not too surprising that Nick led at the end of the first day, with Jim and Tim Roscoe close behind.

It was at this stage that Jim revealed the secret weapon in his armoury — he wasn't going to the pub. Ten of us did, however, ending up in Churchill bar, where the drinking games were even more tasteless than usual ("Oink, oink", "Grrr!"). By 9pm, the barman was so intimidated he began to close the bar. But he did kindly let us buy one more round. This comprised ten Mars bars. Twenty packets of crisps. A bottle of Guinness. And forty-two assorted pints.

Graham was sitting in the suicide seat — next to Peter Wright. He is not the first to suffer — the same fate befell someone, whose name escapes me (well, it escaped me at the time), at a CUTwC dinner one year. Both brought in well, but Peter always had the edge. Graham was soon pretty much squopped up and the inevitable messy potout attempt ensued...

On the Sunday, Jim used his sobriety well and in the end won comfortably. Going into the last round he led Tim by 3 points. While Tim went down 6-1 with Patrick to Chris and Peter, a 5 for Jim was easily enough to secure the whisky for him.

Before leaving, Graham suggested that such events be held every week. Generally the preference seemed to be for another tournament on 22<sup>nd</sup>-23<sup>rd</sup> August, a weekend which, purely by chance, happened to coincide with the Cambridge Beer Festival. Only 11 people could make it, so Mr. R. T. Ficial made his tournament début (being the "partner" of the person playing solo, if you see what I mean).

Play finished early on the Saturday to give time for a punt trip to Grantchester. Anthems were sung, punt poles lost, and Dave and Tim managed to fall in. After closing time the punts serenely made the return journey. You can't see the overhanging trees in the dark. Or the nettles. And we could only tell from the splash that Graham had gone for a swim.

By Sunday lunch, Nick was a point ahead of Stew and Peter, with Graham a further point behind. In the next round, Stew (with Dave) played Peter (with Richard) and drew  $3\frac{1}{2}$ - $3\frac{1}{2}$ . Meanwhile Nick (with Andy) took 7 off Graham (with R. T. Ficial, who had obviously had far too much to drink in the Mill) to go into a  $4\frac{1}{2}$  point lead at this stage. But round 10 saw Peter and Geoff beat Nick and Stew 6-1. So it all rested on the last round. Peter notched up a 5-2 win, leaving Nick needing 6 from his game. He could only manage 4, but managed to spin it out long enough for Peter to miss his bus.

Hopefully, these tournaments will become regular events — both were a lot of fun, and had drink:wink ratios among the highest recorded. Presumably Geoff must have particularly enjoyed them — he came back early from holiday in Scotland for the first and then gave away his ticket to MCC Bicentenary Match which clashed with the second!

1987 National Pairs																			
Opponents																			
Pair		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Total	Position
A	Charles Relle & Mike Surridge	—	4	1	6	2	6	6	2½	5	6	6	2	6	6	6	4	68½	3
B	Tony Brennan & Jon Mapley	3	—	4	7	5	6	6	5	4	7	6	6	5½	4	2½	6	77	1 =
C	Alan Boyce & Alan Dean	6	3	—	6	5½	6	6	6	6	4	7	1	6	6	4	4½	77	1 =
D	Jim Carrington & Graham Josland	1	0	1	—	5	5	6	4	6	6	6	4	5½	6	3	3	61½	6
E	Tim Hedger & Peter Wright	5	2	1½	2	—	6	6	2	6	5	6	4	3	6	6	6	66½	4
F	Rob Cartwright & Steve Chamberlin	1	1	1	2	1	—	6	2	3	5½	6	4	4	3	1	0	40½	13
G	Dave Hull & Geoff Thorpe	1	1	1	1	1	1	—	6	4	4	6	5½	2	6	1	6	46½	12
H	Patrick Barrie & Nick Inglis	4½	2	1	3	5	5	1	—	6	6	6	1	1	1½	1½	6	50½	9
I	Phil Clark & Alex Satchell	2	3	1	1	1	4	3	1	—	5½	6	6	5	3	2½	6	50	10
J	Ed Harry & Stef Norman	1	0	3	1	2	1½	3	1	1½	—	3	1	1	5½	1	1	26½	15
K	David Dyer & Ian Whitmore	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	—	1	1	3	2	1	20	16
L	Duncan Budd & Andy Purvis	5	1	6	3	3	3	1½	6	1	6	6	—	2	5	6	1	55½	7
M	Stew Sage & Dave Salter	1	1½	1	1½	4	3	5	6	2	6	6	5	—	3	1½	2½	49	11
N	Richard Moore & Tim Roscoe	1	3	1	1	1	4	1	5½	4	1½	4	2	4	—	4	1	38	14
O	Graham Hancock & Gary Shrimpton	1	4½	3	4	1	6	6	5½	4½	6	5	1	5½	3	—	6	62	5
P	Chris Andrew & Geoff Myers	3	1	2½	4	1	7	1	1	1	6	6	6	4½	6	1	—	51	8

Play-off: Tony Brennan & Jon Mapley 5 — Alan Boyce & Alan Dean 2