

Winking World

*The Official Journal
Of The
English Tiddlywinks Association*

51

November 1988

Contents

News	<i>Nick Inglis</i>	1
The retiring editor prattles on about nothing in particular.		
The 1987 Teams of Four	<i>Nick Inglis</i>	1
Victory for the Mr. Happy Fan Club.		
The Jubilee Cup	<i>Charles Relle</i>	3
Charles successfully fends off all comers.		
The 1987 National Singles	<i>Loads of Authors</i>	6
Five leagues, mat shortages and a record entry as the big one hits Pinner.		
A Question of Timing	<i>Rob Cartwright</i>	10
The ETwA secretary tells off all you laggards.		
World Singles 26 (Mapley v. Kahn)	<i>Jon Mapley</i>	12
The British player always wins at Churchill College.		
QuCTwC v. Rest of CUTwC	<i>Matthew Rose</i>	13
Oops! How very embarrassing.		
The 1988 Cambridge Open	<i>Nick Inglis</i>	14
I tried to check the new programme for errors, honest I did...		
The Adventure of the Black Squidger	<i>Tim Roscoe</i>	19
Confused? You will be...		
The 1988 Varsity Match	<i>Nick Inglis</i>	22
CUTwC fulfils its annual constitutional obligation.		
More On Tournament Format	<i>Charles Relle</i>	22
The continuing debate on Swiss formats...		
The 1988 Silver Wink	<i>Nick Inglis</i>	24
Somehow 3 matches get played, in between the pub crawls.		
It's Only a Game	<i>Jim Carrington</i>	28
Words of wisdom from the departing ETwA treasurer.		
World Singles 27 (Mapley v. Relle)	<i>Phil Clark</i>	29
Another chance to raid Hamleys sweet department.		
Thorpe's Ring and Other Problems	<i>Charles Relle</i>	30
More rules wrangling from the subcommittee supremo.		
The 1988 National Pairs	<i>Richard Moore and Andy Purvis</i>	31
Springtime in Oxford.		
The Jubirellee Trophy	<i>Jon Mapley</i>	33
Jon looks back at Charles' long reign as Jubilee champion.		

Letters to the Editor	<i>Various Correspondents</i>	34
Some of these letters are less than a year old!		
The 1988 London Open	<i>Nick Inglis</i>	35
Don't back the favourites...		
The 1988 NATwA Pairs		36
The Scoresheet		
The 1988 NATwA Singles		38
The Scoresheet		
How The Mighty are Fallen	<i>Alan Boyce</i>	39
Dr. Boyce contemplates his navel.		
On Tournament Direction	<i>Charles Relle</i>	39
Charles' recipe for smoother better tournaments.		
World Singles 28 (Mapley v. Kahn)	<i>Larry Kahn</i>	40
A match played in a boxing ring in a sports bar in Baltimore!		
Another One Bites the Dust	<i>Larry Kahn</i>	42
Geoff Myers is in good company according to Larry...but what does he mean?		
The 1988 Teams of Four	<i>Nick Inglis</i>	42
Who are Betty's Boys Despite Everything?		
A Winks Sportsmanship Problem	<i>Larry Kahn</i>	44
Ethical questions raised by the NATwA Singles.		

News

Nick Inglis

This, the much delayed 51st issue of *Winking World*, will be my fifth and last as editor. I have now had three years in the job and felt it was time to give someone else a chance, so Tony Brennan will be taking over the job. I wish him well. Since *WW50* there have been wholesale changes in the ETwA committee: Stew Sage is now starting his second year as chairman, and the secretary Rob Cartwright and publicity officer Phil Clark are also beginning their second years in those positions. Jim Carrington, who had been treasurer for a couple of years, now spends a lot of his time in the States and did not stand for re-election. The new treasurer is Patrick Barrie.

Several National Championships have been played: the 1987 National Singles was won by Larry Kahn ahead of Charles Relle, and the 1988 National Pairs was won by Alan Dean and Mike Surridge. Nine members of CUTwC went on a tour of the USA in September, taking part in the NATwA Pairs and Singles (Jon Mapley also took part in the Singles). The Pairs was won by Dave Lockwood and Jim Marlin, and the Singles by Larry Kahn, just half a point ahead of Geoff Myers (if you rely on *Winking World* for your news of winks then you may not know who Geoff Myers is — if so you'll soon find out by reading this issue). Jon Mapley successfully defended his world title against Larry Kahn and Charles Relle, but in September lost it to Larry, who regains the title for the second time.

Cambridge dominated both the 1987 and 1988 Teams of Four, Alan Dean won the Cambridge Open, and Mike Surridge and Jim Carrington narrowly but successfully defended their Hampshire Open title (unfortunately the report and scores of this tournament were lost in the post, so you'll have to ask people to find out what happened). Geoff Thorpe and Andy Purvis won the London Open and WETS retained the Marchant Trophy (though disappointingly only three teams entered). Finally an era came to an end when Charles Relle finally lost the Jubilee Trophy to Andy Purvis (who has since successfully defended it against Rob Cartwright and Alan Dean). Charles gives details of his recent defences and Jon Mapley looks back at his remarkable Jubilee record in this issue.

The 1987 Teams of Four

Nick Inglis

Southampton, 24th–25th October

The 1987 Teams of Four had an entry of 10 teams ranging from low handicaps of 8 and 9 (PAULS-BANE — a Sotwink team, and S.Q.U.O.P.T.T. — a CUTwC team) up to 20½ and 21 (the Carpenters' Fan Club — a WETS team, and Spycatcher — a past and present CUTwC team). As usual the tournament was a seven round Swiss, using scores adjusted according to handicaps. The first round saw Sideways Amigos (a CUTwC team led by Stew Sage) burst into the lead with a 22½–5½ victory over SOTWET (Mike Surridge plus some other Sotwink players). This they consolidated with 17 points off second placed PINTS (the Pinner team), but were pulled back towards the pack by the Mr. Happy Fan Club (yet another CUTwC team — which had managed 12 points in the first round with half the team missing and Nigel Parsons stepping into the breach, but which had then taken 23 off PAULS-BANE in round 2), which beat them 15½–12½. Meanwhile Spycatcher improved its chances with an 18–10 defeat of the Carpenters' Fan Club.

By round 4 the top five were Mr. Happy Fan Club followed by Sideways Amigos, S.Q.U.O.P.T.T., Spycatcher and the Carpenters' Fan Club. Rather boringly, these five continued to occupy the top five positions for the rest of tournament. Mr. Happy's lead was

A M.A.R.S. Bars (18)	
Jon Mapley (7)	Charles Relle (6)
Jo Mapley (2)	Owen Mapley (3)
B PAULS-BANE (8)	
Steve Chamberlin (5)	Nick Geary (2)
Chris Rawlings (1)	Helen Cussen (0)
C SOTWET (12)	
Ed Harry (3)	Paul Hutchings (2)
Katherine Hall (0)	Mike Surridge (7)
D Sideways Amigos (15)	
Stew Sage (4)	Richard Moore (4)
Alex Satchell (4)	Tim Roscoe (3)
E S.Q.U.O.P.T.T. (11)	
Gary Shrimpton (4)	Chris Andrew (4)
Matthew Rose (2)	Mike Dolding (1)
F The Carpenters' Fan Club (21)	
Phil Clark (4)	Rob Cartwright (5)
Jim Carrington (6)	Alan Boyce (6)
G PINTS (12)	
Tim Jeffreys (4)	Phil Scarrott (4)
Clive Gabriel (3)	Simon Braidman (1)
H SQER (15)	
Rob Culley (0)	Jon Carlaw (3)
Geoff Thorpe (5)	Alan Dean (7)
I Spycatcher (21)	
Tim Hedger (6)	Patrick Barrie (5)
Peter Wright (6)	Graham Hancock (4)
J Mr. Happy Fan Club (10)	
Andy Purvis (5)	Phil Hinder (0)
Geoff Myers (4)	Alastair Grant (1)

consolidated by a 16-12 win over S.Q.U.O.P.T.T., while the Carpenters improved their position by beating SOTWET $19\frac{1}{2}$ - $8\frac{1}{2}$ and Sideways-Amigos disposed of Spycatcher 17-11. Round six saw a set-back for Mr. Happy, who lost $10\frac{1}{2}$ - $17\frac{1}{2}$ to the Carpenters. Meanwhile Sideways Amigos beat SQER $14\frac{1}{2}$ - $13\frac{1}{2}$, Spycatcher beat PAULS-BANE $17\frac{1}{2}$ - $10\frac{1}{2}$ and S.Q.U.O.P.T.T. beat M.A.R.S. Bars (the previous year's winners under a different name) $16\frac{1}{2}$ - $11\frac{1}{2}$. This left Mr. Happy on $97\frac{1}{2}$, Sideways Amigos a point behind, and the Carpenters $1\frac{1}{4}$ behind them (the quarter point came from the first match when Rob Cartwright only arrived in time for the second game). S.Q.U.O.P.T.T. on $90\frac{3}{4}$ and Spycatcher on 90 weren't out of it, either.

The final round saw Mr. Happy play SQER, Sideways Amigos play the Carpenters, S.Q.U.O.P.T.T. play SOTWET and Spycatcher play M.A.R.S. Bars. Sideways Amigos beat the Carpenters 16-12 and S.Q.U.O.P.T.T. and Spycatcher both won comfortably, but an $18\frac{3}{4}$ -9 $\frac{1}{4}$ win was easily enough to give victory to the Mr. Happy Fan Club (Mr. Happy is a barman in Queens' Bar) and they are the first holders of the nice new trophy.

1987 Teams of Four

A	M.A.R.S. Bars	B	13½	F	8½	H	12½	C	18½	G	9½	E	11½	I	10½	8
		13½		22		34½		53		62½		74		84½		
B	PAULS-BANE	A	14½	J	5	C	15	F	10½	H	8½	I	10½	G	12	9
		14½		19½		34½		45		53½		64		76		
C	SOTWET	D	5½	H	12	B	13	A	9½	F	8½	G	13	E	8½	10
		5½		17½		30½		40		48½		61½		70		
D	Sideways Amigos	C	22½	G	17	J	12½	E	13	I	17	H	14½	F	16	2
		22½		39½		52		65		82		96½		112½		
E	S.Q.U.O.P.T.T.	F	16¾	I	17	G	13½	D	15	J	12	A	16½	C	19½	3
		16¾		33¾		47¼		62¼		74¼		90¾		110¼		
F	The Carpenters' Fan Club	E	11¼	A	19½	I	10	B	17½	C	19½	J	17½	D	12	5
		11¼		19½		40¾		58¼		77¾		95¼		107¼		
G	PINTS	H	18½	D	11	E	14½	J	7½	A	18½	C	15	B	16	6
		18½		29½		43½		51½		69½		84½		100½		
H	SQER	G	9⅝	C	16	A	15½	I	11½	B	19½	D	13½	J	9¼	7
		9⅝		25⅝		41⅓		52⅝		72⅓		85⅝		95⅓		
I	Spycatcher	J	16	E	11	F	18	H	16½	D	11	B	17½	A	17½	4
		16		27		45½		61½		72½		90		107½		
J	Mr. Happy Fan Club	I	12	B	23	D	15½	G	20½	E	16	F	10½	H	18¾	1
		12		35		50½		71		87		97½		116¼		

The Jubilee Cup

Charles Relle

It is some time since an article on the Jubilee Cup appeared in *Winking World*, possibly because as holder I thought that keeping quiet would reduce the number of challengers. Now that Tim Hedger, Andy Purvis, Rob Cartwright and Phil Clark are waiting to devour me or the winner of the previous challenge, I feel rather that I had better get my name in the record books before it disappears altogether.

The last Jubilee article was in WW46, and recorded the first match I played against Alan Boyce. This was played in two parts. A game was played at the end of the London Open at the Junior House of Blackheath High School, in which attempted pot-outs by both players came to grief, and I struggled to a 4½-2½ win. Then we went home to supper, and to quote WW46 "Food and drink resuscitated Charles in a significant way, for he won the next three games 6-1, 6-1, 7-0 to retain the trophy by 23½-4½". Ever since then I have been a devotee of the gastronomic deities Demeter and Dionysus, and they have stood by me.

After Alan Boyce came the challenge of Tony Brennan. Details of this have rather faded from the memory, but I believe that the evening began with a pilgrimage to the local Young's

hostelry. Here I poured an appropriate libation, but Tony, pleading a sufficient intake at lunchtime, offended the god by drinking Coca-cola. I recall subsequently an initial struggle in which I won a 6-1, and a much harder contest which resulted in a 4-3. A meal intervened, during which I was careful to indicate to Dionysus that I was supporting him as long as he continued to support me, and two more 6-1's my way were the result. As Tony had seemed to be in strong form, I was relieved to win 22-6.

Shortly after this a burst pipe and a collapsed ceiling stopped winking activity in my house altogether. Luckily the cascading water missed my 5000 books; even Poseidon knows where to stop. There was also a lull in challenges. After the house had been cleared of builders and the pipes relagged, I had to face Nick Inglis. The form-book pointed to this as a very close match, as in the previous singles I had beaten Nick 4-3 and finished half a point ahead of him overall. Subsequently he had turned the tables on me by winning the Amsterdam invitation in which I had come second. He had also achieved a very respectable result in the Cambridge Open, 21 places ahead of me. In fact I looked on this challenge as the one which was likely to prove that I was "over the hill". Still, there were other things to prove. My Dionysus had been mocked in an article in WW48, having been referred to as "loopy-juice". Who was to know when he would take his revenge, and on whom? Besides, Nick's challenge took place near the date of the ancient Athenian festival of Πιθοίγια (Pithoigia, or opening of pots). Maybe I would after all be able to defeat this trencherman so near to this Dionysic date. And so it proved, but not without a struggle. The first game was as close as could be, a 4-3 to me, and it was followed by a 6-1, also to me, which until the very end was equally close but just tipped my way in rounds. The third game was again a 4-3 to me, and was very like the other two, desperately close all the way. Now, however, the cumulative score was 14-7 to me, and I had to find four points from two games. Nick, on the other hand, had to find 11. This was too much for him, and I scored a 6-1 for a 20-8 victory.

My next opponent was to be Steve Harbron, who had coined the dreaded term "loopy-juice", but was such a confirmed Bacchanalian that there was no doubt that the god would forgive him even that. I had only encountered him once in serious singles, winning 6-1. To set against that was the fact that, partnered by the notorious Carlaw, he had, in the previous Hampshire Open, beaten me and Geoff Thorpe 5-2 in the first game, scuppering our chance of a third successive win. I invited him to dinner and he asked if he could bring his fiancée. Was I to be torn to pieces by a Maenad? He arrived, bringing a bottle with him. While I appreciated the kindness of a fellow devotee, I feared the danger of taking on such a fanatic. However, one must never show fear, and such people must be placated, so I opened the bottle and set up the winks. A close battle ensued, resolved 4-3 in my favour. Was this to be a repeat of my match with Nick? No, the next game was a $4\frac{1}{2}$ - $2\frac{1}{2}$ to me, from my point of view much too close. Lucy, Steve's fiancée, had arrived, and there was a clear case for bringing on dinner at once, thus placating my other patron deity, Demeter, and reducing my own chances of being immolated. During the worship of Demeter, Dionysus was not neglected, and after dinner further libations were poured. Battle recommenced, and it was again close, but I continued my half-point improvement with a 5-2. At $13\frac{1}{2}$ - $7\frac{1}{2}$ the match was still open, particularly if Steve now got a big win. A chance for us both came in the next game. I had six free of one colour, and decided to go for a pot-out. It failed after two, and I visualised a grim uphill struggle. But Steve had six free winks too, and elected to try for the pot, without success. He also failed to squop with his other colour, and I achieved the pot-out. This secured the win in the match, and the two points I gained when my other colour came second were not necessary. The 7-0 brought the final score to $20\frac{1}{2}$ - $7\frac{1}{2}$.

The next match was with the much to be feared Alan Boyce, who had won the National

Pairs of 1985, the Cambridge Open in 1986, and the London Open in 1986 and 1987, beating me into second place in all these events. Not only this, but he had beaten me 7-0 in the Newts versus Sotwink match, achieving a six in a row pot-out. He was a formidable opponent, far more dangerous than the Boyce who had lost $23\frac{1}{2}$ - $4\frac{1}{2}$. Again, in an article in WW48, Mike Surridge declared that Alan Boyce's true vocation was beating me. Delicacy prevents me from quoting Mike's exact words. I invited him to dinner, but he opted to come to lunch: was this a ploy to beat me at a time when Dionysus' influence was less strong? Or was Coventry City playing an easy opponent, and was he hoping to pick up the vibes? I was disconcerted, but prepared lunch with a bottle of Chianti Classico, and Madeira to follow. We began to eat and I offered him drink, and he accepted — *orange juice*! I was totally nonplussed; Boyce had always been a fellow Dionysiac, but what was this? My brain was numbed as I searched for the word. Heresy, no; schism, no; apostasy — yes, that was it! After lunch, to the mat, and nothing went right; my winks kept going round in circles or off the mat or next to his, and he got a 4-3. His renegade action had put me off my stroke, fears of being "over the hill" welled up in my mind and all the time I was being forced to drink Chianti Classico all by myself. What could I do? The answer was "very little" as in the next game I played no better than in the first, co-operating in my opponent's plans to the extent of a 5-2 loss. I was 9-5 down, having, for the first time in the Jubilee, lost the first two games. Desperately I offered him Chianti, and again he refused; again I poured my own libation to the god, and started bringing in winks. Soon six winks of each of two opposing colours were free, mine slightly nearer than his. I cast a wink at the pot. It missed. He did the same. After vain attempts at squops by the other two colours, it was my turn again. I potted all six reds, and following a Boyce miss after two, all six blues, my first six-and-six pot-out for a very long time. The god had begun to take note of his true worshipper at last. Into battle again at 12-9 up; now I was a good deal more confident, or good deal less diffident. Alan had the worse of the luck in the forth game, which was a fairly solid 6-1 to me. Towards the end he accepted a little Chianti, but it was too late; the god had given his verdict on the players' offerings.

During the 1987 Singles Alan Dean, the next challenger, was staying overnight with me. I had twice before played him in the Jubilee, winning both times, when a combination of anger and a happy-go-lucky attitude had seen me through. Now, however, Alan was the current singles champion, he had beaten me 6-1 very easily the year before, and maybe it was third time lucky for him. It was also my 13th Jubilee contest, a dire numerological combination. We played after a meal, and again I produced the red wine and the Madeira. Alan did not evince the same out-and-out anti-bacchic attitude as his namesake Boyce, but drank with a judicious moderation. The match started after 9pm with a solid 6-1 to me, and followed with a very close battle which was very even into rounds. Alan got the edge, and I think I was slightly lucky to get three points. Game three did not begin well for me. I got two large winks under one of Alan's, and then a third. When this was followed by a fourth wink, I looked ruefully at the tetrad, and was wondering whether mentally to say goodbye to the game. But I had one large wink at the baseline, so I cast it at the pile, which was quite near the pot. The wink bounced just short of the pile, and into the pot. "Is there no limit to what this man can do?" said Alan. I resolved to find out what the limit was, and began to attack the pile, though his defences were gathering ominously. Eventually I got control by squopping his top wink and boondocking it, at the same time putting the next wink down (my own) right on top of the pile. The subsequent break-up left me in a very favourable position, and gave me an eventual 6-1. At this point I switched from red wine to Madeira, hoping that Dionysus would fortify me for the contest ahead. So to game 4: Alan had blues free, so I attacked one far from the pot, and though there were a good many small piles, the main battle developed

here. Fortune was not with Alan; he could not quite get control, even though my defences were not assembled. He attacked the main pile with a blue wink. The shot was about seven inches. It landed slightly short, on its side, and rolled very slowly another foot or so off the table. It was the archetypal Barrel shot. Time was running out and it was after 11 o'clock, so Alan offered me a six, which I accepted, for a 21-7 win. It was not until after the match that he revealed that he had had virtually no sleep the previous night, having spent it on a floor in Cambridge. At least I was able to offer him a proper rest before the final day of the singles.

This article is quite long enough, especially as I am writing about my own matches. Now I must go and make some more cider.

The 1987 National Singles

Nick Inglis, Richard Moore, Geoff Myers and Andy Purvis

Pinner Community Centre, 25th-26th November 1987

This year the National Singles was held, for the first time, at Pinner. The venue was excellent, but unfortunately we discovered on arrival that there were insufficient mats for the very large entry. The Singles is the one event in the year when mats are at a premium and it would certainly be helpful if everyone could make a special effort to bring a mat to next year's tournament. In the event it seemed that Oxford was the quickest source of mats, so Tony Brennan offered to go with Jon Mapley to fetch some more. As Tony had already arranged to go out that evening he was unable to play in the tournament, as were two Cambridge players who also had to leave in the early evening. This was very unfortunate, but we cannot guarantee tournaments finishing by a certain time. Slow play can (and often has) upset our calculations, so players wishing to participate in the Singles or Pairs must be prepared to be available to play later than expected, if necessary. Both these tournaments have had trouble with players dropping out and this was something I particularly wanted to avoid (it can seriously distort the tournament, especially if, as this year, people are qualifying by p.p.g.).

That's the down-side, but there were plenty of positive things. At 42 the field was the biggest ever, including some we hadn't seen at recent events. The 42 were in five leagues, two of 9 and three of 8, with the top two from each going through to the final, plus the two third placed players with the highest p.p.g. (points per game). Ironically (perhaps because we were running late) there was very little slow play, and the qualifying stage finished admirably quickly (which just shows what we can do when we put our minds to it).

	Blue Division	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	Total	Position
A	Alan Dean	—	6	6	4½	5	6	6	3	6	42½	2
B	Jim Carrington	1	—	6	1	6	6	5	5	6	36	3
C	Rob Cartwright	1	1	—	2	4	4	6	1	1	20	7
D	Geoff Myers	2½	6	5	—	6	5½	7	6	5	43	1
E	Phil Clark	2	1	3	1	—	7	7	5	4	30	5
F	Chris Rawlings	1	1	3	1½	0	—	6	1½	1	15	8
G	Rob Carnell	1	2	1	0	0	1	—	0	1	6	9
H	Steve Williams	4	2	6	1	2	5½	7	—	5	32½	4
I	Phil Rodgers	1	1	6	2	3	6	6	2	—	27	6

Geoff Myers takes up the story of the Blue Division: In the Blue Division it was especially nice to see Steve Williams return to the game after about 20 years. Expecting a knock-out format he had to place a hasty phonecall to tell his wife he would not be back by lunchtime after all! In the first round Jim Carrington potted out against him, Steve then proceeded to run twelve winks from all over the table. Obviously his potting ability has not waned over the years (he is the holder of the World Speed Potting Record). His squopping can't be bad either; he beat Alan Dean 4-3 in round two to record our tournament's first shock.

The battle for the two automatic qualification places was fought between Alan, Jim and Geoff Myers. In round five Geoff took 6 off Jim with a solid squop up, but lost $4\frac{1}{2}$ - $2\frac{1}{2}$ to Alan in the following round. Jim managed three straight 6's to close the gap on Alan and Geoff, but in the final round lost 6-1 to Alan, who was narrowly beaten into second place in the group by Geoff, by a mere half point. Even so, Jim also qualified for the second day as one of the highest scoring losers. Rob Cartwright must have been the most disappointed player in the group, finishing only seventh, but Steve came in an impressive fourth, a mere $3\frac{1}{2}$ points behind Jim.

	Green Division	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Total	Position
A	Jon Mapley	—	5	$4\frac{1}{2}$	7	4	7	6	6	$39\frac{1}{2}$	1
B	Tim Hedger	2	—	2	4	6	3	6	6	29	3
C	Andy Purvis	$2\frac{1}{2}$	5	—	1	4	6	1	7	$26\frac{1}{2}$	4
D	Gary Shrimpton	0	3	6	—	$2\frac{1}{3}$	6	1	6	$24\frac{1}{3}$	5
E	Richard Moore	3	1	3	$4\frac{2}{3}$	—	6	7	7	$31\frac{2}{3}$	2
F	Andy Davidson	0	4	1	1	1	—	2	4	13	7
G	Phil Scarrott	1	1	6	6	0	5	—	2	21	6
H	Ed Harry	1	1	0	1	0	3	5	—	11	8

Andy Purvis and Richard Moore give the details of the Green Division: Jon looked like a certain qualifier, but it was hard to know who would join him in this interesting group. In the first round Andy Davidson (making his first appearance for several years) wanted to play with his old winks. Nick diplomatically persuaded him otherwise, and Andy was so annoyed he beat Tim 4-3. In fact, Jon was the only one of the top seeds to win in round one. The next 3 rounds went more or less according to the seedings, and in round 5 Jon took 7 off Gary to really book his place. But Andy Purvis took 5 off Tim, putting the two in equal second, and round 6 saw the points shared evenly. So, it seemed either Andy or Tim would make it, but Richard had finished with 20 points from his last 3 games and seemed carelessly to have overtaken them. So, in the last round Tim needed 5 (against Jon) and Andy needed 7; unsurprisingly, both went for the Blitz. Tim was first to try, but Jon ran out 5-2 winner, and Andy missed with the sixth wink, leaving Gary to tidy up for a 6-1, and Richard to take the second qualifying place.

The top seeds in the Red Division were Mike Surridge and Peter Wright, but with Patrick Barrie and Stew Sage snapping at their heels, and two former qualifiers in Steve Chamberlin and Dave Hull further down, there were plenty of people to fight for the qualifying spots. 7-0 losses to Mike and Patrick and a 6-1 loss to Stew put paid to Dave's chances, but he also damaged Steve's by taking 6 off him. At the end of four rounds the top four were undefeated, but Peter had only managed $4\frac{2}{3}$ off CUTwC novice Phil Hinder. Round 5 saw Mike beat Steve

	Red Division	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	Total	Position
A	Mike Surridge	—	5½	1	4	6	6	6	7	7	42½	2
B	Peter Wright	1½	—	0	1	6	4½	6	7	6	32½	4
C	Patrick Barrie	6	7	—	5	6	5½	6	7	7	49½	1
D	Stew Sage	3	6	2	—	4½	5	6	7	6	39½	3
E	Steve Chamberlin	1	1	1	2½	—	5½	5	7	1	24	6
F	Phil Hinder	1	2½	1½	2	1½	—	3	7	2	20½	7
G	Nick Geary	1	1	1	1	2	4	—	7	2	19	8
H	Yuit Vong	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—	0	0	9
I	Dave Hull	0	1	0	1	6	5	5	7	—	25	5

6-1 and, most significantly Stew took 6 off Peter to raise the extraordinary possibility of the ETWA Chairman qualifying. He did his chances no harm with a narrow 3-4 loss to Mike in the next round. A 7-0 victory for Patrick over the out-of-sorts Spycatcher meant that it was a three way battle between Patrick, Mike and Stew, with third place (Stew) well-positioned to qualify on points per game. In the event Patrick steamrollered his way to first place with 6 and 5 off Mike and Stew respectively, for an impressive total of 49½ (the best qualifying score in any league). Mike beat everyone except Patrick to come second, while Stew, whose only two losses were a 2 and a 3, easily qualified with a p.p.g. of 4½ (perhaps there's something about the office of ETWA Chairman that boosts your play).

	Yellow Division	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Total	Position
A	Charles Relle	—	6	5	6	6	6	6	5½	40½	1
B	Alan Boyce	1	—	2½	6	1	6	6	6	28½	3
C	Geoff Thorpe	2	4½	—	6	6	6	6	6	36½	2
D	Graham Hancock	1	1	1	—	6	5	6	6	26	5
E	Chris Andrew	1	6	1	1	—	6	6	6	27	4
F	Simon Gouldsworthy	1	1	1	2	1	—	6	2	14	7
G	Paul Hutchings	1	1	1	1	1	1	—	1½	7½	8
H	Clive Gabriel	1½	1	1	1	1	5	5½	—	16	6

Charles Relle seemed certain to qualify from the Yellow Division, but second seed Alan Boyce (who has had great success in pairs tournaments, but little in this event) and third seeded Geoff Thorpe (who tends to be ludicrously unpredictable) seemed likely to be given trouble by CUTwC players Graham Hancock and Chris Andrew. The first two rounds saw Graham beat Chris 6-1 and Chris beat Alan 6-1 to leave Geoff, Charles and Graham on top of the table, where they stayed for the first five rounds until 6-1 losses to Charles and Alan put Graham out of the reckoning. With one round to play a good win for Alan against Charles or Graham against Geoff might have let them in, but both lost 6-1 (continuing Alan's bad run in the Singles) and so Charles and Geoff went through to the final.

Larry was top seed in the Brown Division, but second seed Nick Inglis was dismayed to see Keith Seaman (who has never failed to qualify) as third seed in the group. Tim Jeffreys

	Brown Division	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Total	Position
A	Larry Kahn	—	5	3	6	7	7	6	6	40	1
B	Nick Inglis	2	—	2	1	2	6	6	6	25	5
C	Keith Seaman	4	5	—	6	6	7	3	6	37	2
D	Tim Jeffreys	1	6	1	—	1	6	6	5	26	4
E	Alex Satchell	0	5	1	6	—	5	6	6	29	3
F	Ian Whitmore	0	1	0	1	2	—	6	0	10	7 =
G	Steve Harbron	1	1	4	1	1	1	—	1	10	7 =
H	David Dyer	1	1	1	2	1	7	6	—	19	6

and Alex Satchell also threatened to make life difficult for the top seeds, and so it proved with Nick losing 5-2 to Alex (who had beaten Tim 6-1) in the second round. A 6-1 loss to Keith (who had started by losing 3-4 to Steve Harbron) dented Alex's chances which were all but wiped out when Larry got 7 off him, potting out late in rounds after a very closely fought game. Meanwhile Nick was having a crummy day, typified by the game against Keith, whom he squopped up only to miss an easy shot late on and lose 5-2. A much more straightforward 6-1 loss to Tim (who had just lost 6-1 to Larry) followed and by now Larry and Keith were well clear, Keith having just beaten Larry 4-3 (Larry's first loss in qualifying leagues in this tournament). Tim had a chance if he could take 7 off Keith, but he lost 6-1, so Larry and Keith went through, with Alex finishing third, but with too low a p.p.g. to qualify. Nick (who had had a good position against Larry in the last game, only to screw it up yet again) now put an emergency fan belt on his car, but it gave out on the M25, so he was stranded on the motorway for a couple of hours with a broken fan belt, three bottles of Beaujolais Nouveau and no corkscrew! In the event failure to qualify proved very useful, as it gave him time to find a proper replacement fan belt and fit it on the Sunday.

	Final	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	Total	Position
A	Patrick Barrie	—	1	1	6	5½	2	4½	1½	1	6	6	5	39½	6
B	Charles Relle	6	—	2½	5	6	2½	6	6	5½	0	6	5	50½	2
C	Larry Kahn	6	4½	—	2	6	6	1	4	6	6	6	4	51½	1
D	Jon Mapley	1	2	5	—	6	1	1½	5½	4	4	5½	5	40½	5
E	Geoff Myers	1½	1	1	1	—	5	5	2	6	3	6	6	37½	7
F	Alan Dean	5	4½	1	6	2	—	5	3	5	5	1	4½	42	4
G	Mike Surridge	2½	1	6	5½	2	2	—	6	4	6	6	6	46½	3
H	Keith Seaman	5½	1	3	1½	5	4	1	—	4	3	2½	4	34½	8
I	Geoff Thorpe	6	1½	1	3	1	2	3	3	—	3	6	3	32½	10
J	Stew Sage	1	7	1	3	4	2	1	4	4	—	6	1	34	9
K	Richard Moore	1	1	1	1½	1	6	1	4½	1	1	—	6	25	12
L	Jim Carrington	2	2	3	2	1	2½	1	3	4	6	1	—	27½	11

Geoff, Richard and Andy give the story of the final day: after the organisational difficulties

on Saturday, the final got off to a nice early start. The seeding order might have looked odd, with Patrick first and Geoff Myers fifth, ahead of the likes of Alan and Mike, but in the first round this seemed justified when Geoff beat Mike 5-2, Patrick also got 5 and Alan could only manage 3 against Keith. Larry and Charles, with sixes, emerged as the early leaders. In round 3, Patrick took a six and the lead, as Larry went down 6-1 to Mike. Another surprise was provided by Richard's 6-1 squop-up against Alan. Jim, for the second successive round, was on the wrong end of a pot-out, but pulled out a Karnovsky to avoid the 0-7!

The players left for lunch — kindly arranged for us by Tim Jeffreys — with Charles remarking on the way, "Ah, Sage after lunch — mustn't lose to him." We knew Charles was serious when he took his shoes and socks off — but Stew got the 7 in about five minutes — and Geoff M. took 6, to go into the lead. In the next round, however, Charles "pulled himself to pieces" to retake the lead with 6 from Mike, whilst Jon was saving the situation against Richard by producing a wink from his pocket! In round six, Geoff M. clashed with Geoff T. — and got six — but in round seven he lost second place to Larry.

Soon the other Geoff was up to his tricks; Jim had control of the major pile, and so Geoff potted to leave him in a hopeless freeing position. Now Jon fell victim to successive pot-outs at the hands of Patrick and Alan, slipping to 7th place, and a top of the table clash between Larry and Charles saw Larry take the lead with his first ever $4\frac{2}{3}-2\frac{1}{3}$.

Another blow to Charles followed — he was well up against Alan, but an over-the-pot knock off turned the game round. Larry extended his lead with a six from Patrick. Some entertainment was provided at the bottom of the table, with Stew "crying all the way to the scoresheet" after potting out against Richard following a controversial incident ("that fifth wink brushed your sleeve — it was obviously going off, Richard").

In the last round, Mike potted out against Keith in a bid to be top Briton (this seems to be the only way to get more than 4 off Keith!). Charles, however, also took six, overtaking Mike and giving himself an outside chance of the title. But Larry secured victory with 2 from Jon, although this key match went almost unnoticed due to the excitement on the next table, where Geoff M. went for a blitz against Alan, and after about 20 nailbiting minutes completed the pot-out ending round five.

So Larry had won, and Charles was top Briton — they both fully deserve their world singles challenges. Mike, Alan and Jon filled the next 3 places — though none were perhaps at their best — it was round ten before Jon got his only six of the day. Perhaps the most notable performances, however, came from the first-time qualifiers from Cambridge. Patrick was sixth, Geoff M. seventh (the best performance by someone at their first attempt?). Stew was 9th, and Richard wasn't, but even he didn't disgrace himself. Congratulations to Larry for yet another win (his third in four years) and thanks for an excellent weekend to all at the Pinner club.

A Question of Timing

Rob Cartwright

The question being, "why do some games take so long?"

1. Failure to start on time. There are 3 reasons for this: laziness on the part of one or two players getting back from the pub; players reluctant to stop casual games and those who insist on practising for 10 minutes in between each round.

In golf, if you miss your start time at the 1st tee, you forfeit the round, and hence the Competition. This has happened to even the best players such as Seve Ballesteros (who was in a traffic jam at the time). Imagine if you were allowed to start at the given time without

the opponents! The sight of 12 winks all 3" from the pot might encourage one or two players to be a bit keener next time.

2. Continual clock-stopping. There are one or two again who seem to delight in taking 5 minutes per shot; also those who insist on stopping the clock the microsecond it goes over 30 seconds. Think carefully — do you really want or need the extra time? If you've got a good position and the pot-out is not on, don't you want to get the game over ASAP? If your opponent takes ages over each shot doesn't that mean he doesn't know what to do? Play quickly yourself and put him back under pressure.

3. Slow play in rounds. This is the killer I think, because shots of 2 minutes plus are common and at that rate rounds can take well over half an hour. With a full round zero it's close to an hour!

I would like to see the 2 minute rule amended; either we buy chess clocks (not cheap) and alter the rules properly, or enforce the 2 minute rule more rigidly. Personally I think that a warning at 1.30 and an opportunity to play within the normal 30 seconds is quite reasonable. I don't think it is an excuse to say "A 2-minute rule wasn't announced", because playing speed is basically good manners. Similarly the attitude "I took 5 minutes in my last game and they didn't complain" gets no sympathy from me.

4. Pile rebuilds. These are sometimes necessary, but not always. I found it rather disturbing in the National Fours that some players were taking the games seriously enough to do this at every opportunity. You have to make a judgement of the player's ability and not rebuild a pile just because it is large and complex and about to be crudded. Think about it — if the player is going to try something subtle he's probably good enough to do it legally; if it's a crud the main problem is squidger height and continuity, and if the player is warned in advance this problem should never occur.

5. Dithering (this links in with number 2). Of course if you are a relative novice it's not always easy to decide what shot to play. In most circumstances however, it's better to play a simple shot well than a difficult shot badly; and it is always better to make a positive decision and play smartly and confidently rather than be wishy-washy and tentative. Don't spend ages trying to find the exactly ideal shot which you might miss — pick the good shot which you know you can play well. In rounds the situation is more complex, but the basic principle still applies.

So — a 10 point plan to speed up the game.

A. Most important. Impress on all players that a game of more than 45 minutes is unacceptable.

B. Start play promptly in the morning. Have a "check-in" time 15 minutes before the start time, and entry after the check-in time costs more — say £1 extra. The same "fine" will apply after lunch.

C. Each game to have a Scoring Slip with the players written down. The game start, Round 0, and finish times are to be recorded on this. We'll soon suss out who the bad offenders are!

D. Don't be afraid to enforce the 2 minute rule. Warn the player at 1.30 and give him the chance to play a shot promptly.

E. Don't rebuild piles unnecessarily, or ask for umpires and shot judges all the time.

F. Don't stop the clock all the time either — use it to your advantage (on the subject of clocks I think ETwA should buy a dozen cheap digital clocks to ensure that every game has one — some of us don't have 21st century watches).

G. Be positive in your play — by dithering you just put yourself under unnecessary pressure.

H. In Swiss tournaments the time should be 20 minutes to allow for the time taken to draw rounds.

I. Don't practise potting on every mat — come on, the variation isn't nearly as bad as it was, and can you really make a millimetric adjustment with only a dozen or so practice shots?

J. Purchase chess clocks and amend the rules so that as from the end of round 0, each partnership has a fixed time of 10 minutes which may be used in any way — i.e., you can take 9 minutes over one shot and seconds over all the others if you want. If your time elapses, your partnership may play no further shots at all, irrespective of the round number or game position (i.e., free turns are over if you were playing them, and the failure to free rule is applied if necessary).

World Singles 26 (Mapley v. Kahn)

Jon Mapley

Churchill College, Cambridge, 23rd November 1987

The keenness of the current crop of C.U.Tw.C. players had been in evidence at the Singles, with Patrick, Geoff and Richard making their début in the finals, as had Stew, who has been around for a little longer. The usual dozen or so spectators were therefore welcomed to the Club Room at Churchill College for the 3p.m.squidge-off. Mike Surridge had also made the trip "I wouldn't have missed it for anything" and found himself the most likely candidate for umpire, as Stew was busy entertaining the media and Nick was impersonating Whispering Ted Lowe to a small group of non-winking undergraduates.

The players tossed for corners in Game 1, then alternated. The squidge-off winner was yellow throughout, which also alternated, with Larry getting the honour first. However sotto Nick was keeping his voice, Jon couldn't help overhearing "He didn't really want to do that" as a big red bounced straight in. Memories of their previous encounter, when Jon took an opening 6-1 despite two early red pots, had an effect, as Larry was squopped up from about the fifteenth minute.

Rob Cartwright arrived at this point, to witness probably one of the best games ever played. Larry was determined to get even, and eased ahead in the opening forays with some great squops and a slight edge in placement. Jon came back at him, with a typical four inch doubleton, but then the forming of a large pile became the centre of attention. Shot after shot took and re-took control, or stopped defenders doing so in breathtaking colour order sequences. Larry finally got the upper hand in rounds, despite Jon potting a big green from under a little, which he then just missed from two feet away. With red sitting on six points, green and blue three and yellow zero, the penultimate shot of round five should have seen Larry boondock a yellow off blue to make $5\frac{1}{2}$ into 6. It turned out to be the first of two shots which cost him the match, as, inexplicably, two yellows came out, one trivial and one fifteen inches from the pot. Jon checked the points one last time, and sank them both for a 3-4. The long pot had saved three points, and it affected Larry's play in Game 3.

This was another close squopping battle, but the longer it went on, so Jon's grip on it tightened. He kept making the shots he had to, and Larry missed some vital ones, culminating in squopping himself on the largest pile in rounds, making the tidying exercise much easier than it would have been.

World Singles 26	Game Scores					Total
Jon Mapley	6	3	6	6	4	25
Larry Kahn	1	4	1	1	3	10

15-6 is a big lead, and as the baseline shots proceeded in Game 4, and the early squops were taken (green on red, red on green, two blues on two yellows), Jon sensed that Larry might be tempted, as the remaining four blues were free. He didn't deliberately attack blue, gambling that the angles of the two on the yellows would complicate the shots. Everyone could see how significant Larry's blue turn would be to the outcome of the match. "Pot the most difficult first" is a good maxim, but Larry sank the four free ones, then with the crowd holding its breath, the fifth hit the rim and bounced back. "That's the match" said Larry, Jon took that blue with green, the other by a long yellow squop, and although Larry freed one and potted it, Jon had too many defenders, despite a great bomb which temporarily released the sixth. Green was potted out, and with two nurdled reds, the seven was there for the taking. Jon joked that he missed a yellow to win the match, as two consecutive sixes had always guaranteed that in the past.

Larry struggled manfully in Game 5, but there was a sense of inevitability about the outcome. Although he maintained tenuous control, Jon sacrificed blue to keep both green and yellow occupied, tiptoeing round the edges with red, and by rounds the pressure had got to Larry. Break-ups and re-squops went against him, and Jon potted two reds in the fourth for ten points when the most either of Larry's colours could get was nine. 4-3 was enough for a 25-10 margin, and Jon proved, as Dave had done many times before, that once you get your hands on the title, it does something for your confidence. Larry will equal Dave's thirteen matches with his next challenge, which will, for convenience, be played after Charles has his shot at it. If Charles can reproduce his Jubilee form, life could get interesting!

QuCTwC v. Rest of CUTwC

Matthew Rose

Armitage Room, Queens' College, 5th December 1987

A Match that had been suggested earlier in the term was finally arranged for the end of term, and sixteen of the best winkers in Cambridge gathered in Queens' for what seemed likely to be a close encounter. In the first set of matches Queens' ended up doing well, following a remarkable turnaround by Geoff and Matthew, having been squopped up in round 1 by Graham and Patrick, and two other solid games, except for Dave and Alex's victory. It was good to see Dave back at a winks table following his relative obscurity during the term.

In the second round Graham and Patrick began their fine run with a good victory over Stew and Phil, but the tensest game was that of Alex and Dave's failed pot-out against Gary and Tim, when finally Tim potted out in round 5. Two 4-3 victories in the other games gave Queens' a 32-24 lead halfway through.

The third round was a good one for the Rest, although Chris and Alastair played well in rounds, and Stew and Phil turned their game around to win 4-3, following the ETwA chairman commenting "We're not doing well, but two points are better than one", when asked for a possible outcome of his game.

Going into the final set of matches Queens' had a $1\frac{1}{2}$ point advantage, which was soon stretched by Geoff and Matthew potting out for 7 quickly. However, despite Patrick and Graham scoring another 6, the solid play of Stew and Phil earned them a 6-1 over Nick and Duncan, to wrap up the match. The final result was then made much closer, as Queens' old boy Phil Rodgers, obviously having heard the result, produced a fine sequence of shots in rounds 4 and 5 to earn $5\frac{1}{2}$ points for him and Andy.

Overall, the afternoon was played in a good, competitive, yet friendly spirit. Word must be made of Phil Hinder, a novice 8 weeks or so before this, playing so well. Stew later said that he, in partnering Phil "was pleased not to let the 'novice' down".

The Rest v. Queens'5th December 1987*The Rest*

	Patrick Barrie Graham Hancock	Andy Purvis Phil Rodgers	Nick Inglis Duncan Budd	Dave Salter Alex Satchell	
<i>Queens'</i>					
Geoff Myers	$2\frac{1}{2}$	3	6	0	$16\frac{1}{2}$
Matthew Rose	$4\frac{1}{2}$	4	1	7	
Stew Sage	$5\frac{1}{2}$	2	1	3	$16\frac{1}{2}$
Phil Hinder	$1\frac{1}{2}$	5	6	4	
Gary Shrimpton	6	$5\frac{1}{2}$	1	1	$14\frac{1}{2}$
Tim Roscoe	1	$1\frac{1}{2}$	6	6	
Chris Andrew	6	$2\frac{1}{3}$	4	5	$10\frac{2}{3}$
Alastair Grant	1	$4\frac{2}{3}$	3	2	
	20	$12\frac{5}{6}$	12	9	

The Rest $53\frac{5}{6}$ *Queens'* $58\frac{1}{6}$ **The 1988 Cambridge Open**

Nick Inglis

Queens' College, 30th-31st January

For this year's Cambridge Open I decided to rewrite the programme, adding a few extra facilities to make it easier to use, and also introducing games involving 3 players, to try to avoid people having byes. In addition I wrote a routine to make sure that no-one played more than one game without a partner, and no-one played too many with the same partner. To

Opponents	
Partner	Score

A	Nick Inglis	F,M	c,Q	O,L	N,X	E	c,B	c,L	M,K	F
		N 1	R 2	Q 6	G 7	T 1	P 0	U 6	L 3	Z 6
B	Peter Wright	Z,Q	g,H	P,R	T,c	b,L	P,A	i,T	H,O	T
		J 2	X 5	g 1	D 3	R 4	c 7	f 6	h 6	U 6
C	Phil Rodgers	I,X	b,P	a,X	L,U	Y,i	X	a,G	G,I	i,Q
		c 6	1	F 3	M 2	U 5	f 5	Z 1	V 5	P 4
D	Liz Bertoya	—	—	K,N	c,T	H,a	—	—	—	h,S
				U 0	B 3	K 5				5
E	Chris Andrew	W,H	h,T	Y,J	h,K	T,A	Z,J	M	Y	X,g
		K 6	e 1	V 1	W 4	6	4	X 4	J 6	O 2
F	Patrick Barrie	A,N	W,K	X,a	Q	V,G	Q,V	j,K	U,X	Z,A
		M 6	L 6	C 3	a 1	S 4	K 6	I 7	j 6	1
G	Gary Shrimpton	L,R	U	b,M	X,N	S,F	i	Z,C	C,V	J,H
		b 6	N 6	H 3	A 7	V 3	W 7	a 6	I 2	K 3
H	Matthew Rose	K,E	X,B	M,b	b,J	D,K	R,S	S,Q	B,h	K,G
		W 1	g 2	G 3	5	a 2	d 3	e 3	O 1	J 4
I	Stew Sage	C,c	a,f	Z,c	Y,g	N,Z	Y,b	K,j	V,C	N,V
		X 1	V 1½	h 1	2	f 6	L 7	F 7	G 2	R 1½
J	Graham Hancock	Q,Z	Y	V,E	H	g,d	E	—	Y	G,K
		B 2	d 3	Y 6	b 2	h 6	Z 3		E 6	H 4
K	Andy Purvis	H,W	L,F	D,U	W,E	a,H	V,Q	I,F	L,A	H,J
		E 6	W 1	N 7	h 3	D 5	F 6	j 0	M 4	G 3
L	Duncan Budd	G,b	K,W	Q,A	C,M	R,B	b,Y	U,A	K,M	c,W
		R 1	F 6	O 1	U 5	b 3	I 7	c 1	A 3	Y 1
M	Charles Relle	N,A	S,Z	H,G	U,L	Q,O	—	E,X	A,L	k,a
		F 6	O 5	b 4	C 2	c 6		3	K 4	f 6
N	Phil Clark	M,F	U	U,D	A,G	I,f	a,T	R	k	I,R
		A 1	G 6	K 7	X 0	Z 1	U 4½	P 6	T 6	V 5½
O	Tim Roscoe	a,Y	Z,S	A,Q	S,V	c,M	—	W,V	h,B	g,X
		P 6	M 5	L 1	f 6	Q 1		2½	H 1	E 2
P	Geoff Myers	Y,a	C	B,g	R,Z	X	B,c	R	Q,g	Q,i
		O 6	b 6	R 6	d 1	W 3	A 0	N 6	Z 3	C 4
Q	Richard Moore	J,B	R,A	L,O	F,a	M,c	F,K	c,H	P,Z	P,C
		Z 5	c 5	A 6	6	O 1	V 1	S 4	g 4	i 3
R	Jim Carrington	b,G	Q,c	g,B	P,d	L,b	H,d	N,P	c,S	V,N
		L 1	A 2	P 6	Z 6	B 4	S 4	1	W 4	I 1½
S	Paul Moss	U,V	M,O	W,T	O,f	G,V	d,H	H,e	W,R	D
		T 2	Z 2	f 4	V 1	F 4	R 4	Q 4	c 3	h 2

					Pl.	W.	D.	L.	Total	Ave.	Pos.	Partners	Opponents
												Difference	
A	Nick Inglis	E,B	F,Y	N,i	12	5	0	7	40½	3.375	17	3.779	3.996
		C 0	O 2½	M 6								+0.217	
B	Peter Wright	C,A	W,g	—	11	7	0	4	48	4.364	6	3.946	3.372
		E 7	G 1									-0.573	
C	Phil Rodgers	B,E	f	G,c	12	5	0	7	35	2.917	23	4.035	3.495
		A 0	J 2	h 1								-0.539	
D	Liz Bertoya	—	—	—	4	2	0	2	13	3.250		3.748	3.326
												-0.422	
E	Chris Andrew	A,C	S,P	L,T	12	9	0	3	53	4.417	5	3.551	3.346
		B 7	a 6	f 6								-0.205	
F	Patrick Barrie	P,H	A,O	W	12	8	0	4	51½	4.292	7	3.524	3.698
		c 3	Y 4½	H 4								+0.174	
G	Gary Shrimpton	U,h	g,W	C,h	12	7	0	5	55	4.583	4	3.452	3.541
		L 5	B 1	c 6								+0.089	
H	Matthew Rose	c,F	c,N	W	12	5	0	7	36	3.000	21=	3.293	3.880
		P 4	V 4	F 4								+0.587	
I	Stew Sage	k,N	U,R	S	12	4	0	8	39	3.250	20	3.761	3.491
		J 6	T 1	Z 3								-0.270	
J	Graham Hancock	N,k	f	k,Y	11	6	0	5	46	4.182	8	3.374	3.253
		I 6	C 2	K 6								-0.121	
K	Andy Purvis	Y,O	L,Z	Y,k	12	7	0	5	48	4.000	9=	4.079	3.357
		Q 6	i 1	J 6								-0.722	
L	Duncan Budd	h,U	K,i	E,f	12	5	0	7	40	3.333	18	3.616	4.003
		G 5	Z 6	T 1								+0.387	
M	Charles Relle	i,S	k,Q	i,N	11	9	0	2	54	4.909	2	3.865	3.238
		R 6	h 6	A 6								-0.627	
N	Phil Clark	J,I	V,H	A,M	12	6	0	6	42	3.500	15	3.243	3.569
		k 1	c 3	i 1								+0.327	
O	Tim Roscoe	Q,K	Y,F	—	10	3	0	7	28	2.800	24=	3.680	3.519
		Y 1	A 2½									-0.161	
P	Geoff Myers	F,c	a,E	R,Q	12	6	0	6	41	3.417	16	3.150	3.576
		H 4	S 1	a 1								+0.426	
Q	Richard Moore	O,Y	h,M	a,P	12	8	0	4	48	4.000	9=	3.235	3.657
		K 6	k 1	R 6								+0.422	
R	Jim Carrington	S,i	T,I	P,a	12	8	0	4	47½	3.958	12	3.790	3.290
		M 6	U 6	Q 6								-0.500	
S	Paul Moss	R,M	E,a	I,Z	12	5	0	7	32	2.667	26	3.690	3.342
		i 1	P 1									-0.347	

Opponents	
Partner	Score

T	Lavan Mahadeva	V,U	e,E	f,S	B,D	E	U,N	f,B	k	B,U
		S 2	h 6	W 3	c 4	A 1	a 2½	i 1	N 6	1
U	Phil Scarrott	S,T	G,N	N,K	M,C	i,Y	T,a	L,c	F,j	T
		V 5	1	D 0	L 5	C 5	N 4½	A 6	X 1	B 6
V	Clive Gabriel	T,S	f,a	J,Y	f,O	F,S	K,F	O	I,G	R,I
		U 5	I 1½	E 1	S 1	G 3	Q 1	W 4½	C 5	N 5½
W	Dave Salter	E,K	F,L	S,f	K,h	X	i	O	S,c	Y,L
		H 1	K 1	T 3	E 4	P 3	G 7	V 4½	R 4	c 6
X	Geoff Thorpe	c,C	H,g	F,C	G,A	P,W	C,f	M	j,F	E,O
		I 1	B 5	a 4	N 0	4	2	E 4	U 1	g 5
Y	Tony Heading	P,O	J,d	E,V	I	C,U	I,L	—	E,J	W,c
		a 1	4	J 6	g 5	i 2	b 0		1	L 1
Z	Alan Boyce	B,J	O,M	I,h	d,P	f,l	E	G,a	g,Q	F
		Q 5	S 2	c 6	R 6	N 1	J 3	C 1	P 3	A 6
a	Rob Cartwright	O,P	I,V	C,F	Q	K,D	N,U	C,Z	f,i	f,M
		Y 1	f 5½	X 4	F 1	H 2	T 2½	G 6	e 1	k 1
b	Ian Whitmore	R,L	C	G,H	H	B,R	L,I	—	—	—
		G 6	P 6	M 4	J 2	L 3	Y 0			
c	Alex Satchell	X,I	A,R	h,I	D,B	O,Q	A,P	A,U	R,W	L,Y
		C 6	Q 5	Z 6	T 4	M 6	B 7	L 1	S 3	W 6
d	David Smith	—	Y	—	Z,R	h,J	S,R	—	—	—
			J 3		P 1	g 1	H 3			
e	Liz Bate	—	T,h	—	—	—	—	Q,S	i,f	—
			E 1					H 3	a 1	
f	Alan Dean	—	V,I	T,W	V,S	Z,N	X	T,i	a,e	a,k
			a 5½	S 4	O 6	I 6	C 5	B 6	i 6	M 6
g	Jon Mapley	—	B,X	R,P	I	J,h	—	—	Z,P	O,E
			H 2	B 1	Y 5	d 1			Q 4	X 5
h	Owen Mapley	—	E,e	c,Z	E,W	d,g	—	—	O,H	D
			T 6	I 1	K 3	J 6			B 6	S 2
i	Iain Sharp	—	—	—	—	U,C	G,W	B,f	e,a	C,P
						Y 2	0	T 1	f 6	Q 3
j	Phil Hinder	—	—	—	—	—	—	F,I	X,U	—
								K 0	F 6	
k	Matt Johns	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	T,N	M,f
									1	a 1

					Pl.	W.	D.	L.	Total	Ave.	Pos.	Partners	Opponents
												Difference	
T	Lavan Mahadeva	V,Z f 1	R,U I 1	f,E L 1	12	3	0	9	29½	2.458	27	3.441	3.581
												+0.140	
U	Phil Scarrott	G,L h 2	I,T R 6	V,g 5	12	8	0	4	46½	3.875	13	3.498	3.181
												-0.318	
V	Clive Gabriel	T,f Z 6	N,c H 4	U g 2	12	6	0	6	39½	3.292	19	3.689	3.659
												-0.030	
W	Dave Salter	g,a X 2	B,G g 6	F,H 3	12	6	0	6	44½	3.708	14	3.584	3.438
												-0.145	
X	Geoff Thorpe	a,g W 2	—	—	10	5	0	5	28	2.800	24=	3.537	3.496
												-0.041	
Y	Tony Heading	K,Q O 1	O,A F 4½	K,J k 1	11	4	0	7	26½	2.409	28	2.846	3.398
												+0.553	
Z	Alan Boyce	f,T V 6	i,K L 6	S I 3	12	6	0	6	48	4.000	9=	3.532	3.779
												+0.247	
a	Rob Cartwright	X,W g 5	P,S E 6	Q,R P 1	12	5	0	7	36	3.000	21=	3.260	3.563
												+0.303	
b	Ian Whitmore	—	—	—	6	3	0	3	21	3.500		3.842	3.453
												-0.389	
c	Alex Satchell	H,P F 3	H,V N 3	h,C G 6	12	8	0	4	56	4.667	3	3.705	3.569
												-0.136	
d	David Smith	—	—	—	4	0	0	4	8	2.000		3.624	3.231
												-0.393	
e	Liz Bate	—	—	—	3	0	0	3	5	1.667		3.636	3.065
												-0.571	
f	Alan Dean	Z,V T 1	J,C 5	T,L E 6	11	10	0	1	56½	5.136	1	3.361	3.086
												-0.275	
g	Jon Mapley	W,X a 5	G,B W 6	U V 2	9	5	0	4	31	3.444		3.207	3.712
												+0.505	
h	Owen Mapley	L,G U 2	Q,k M 6	c,G C 1	9	4	0	5	33	3.667		3.616	3.486
												-0.130	
i	Iain Sharp	M,R S 1	Z,L K 1	M,A N 1	8	1	0	7	15	1.875		3.380	3.599
												+0.220	
j	Phil Hinder	—	—	—	2	1	0	1	6	3.000		4.107	3.474
												-0.633	
k	Matt Johns	I,J N 1	M,h Q 1	J,K Y 1	5	0	0	5	5	1.000		2.901	3.777
												+0.876	

make sure that everything was all right I ran an entire simulated tournament, to test that there were no bugs.

To the mild disgruntlement of a few latecomers the tournament made the radical move of starting on time at 11 o'clock. After three rounds Geoff Myers was the leader with 18 points, but next round he partnered CUTwC novice Dave Smith to a 6-1 loss to Alan Boyce and Jim Carrington. A couple of rounds later Alex Satchell had taken over the lead (on 27 from 5 games) just ahead of Alan Dean (21½ from 4). At this point the programme showed distressing signs of madness, giving rise to a nightmare world where there were two Geoff Thorpes (and no Liz Bertoya). Some quick running repairs soon had the show on the road again and Alex consolidated his lead by taking 7 (with Peter Wright) against Geoff Myers and me after I'd sent my own wink off trying to lunch one of the opposition's winks. Alan Dean had kept near the top of the table by taking 5 (with Phil Rodgers) off Geoff Thorpe, while Gary Shrimpton (who did so well here last year) took second place after a 7-0. At this point (the end of the second day) Alex had a 2 point lead over Gary and a 6 point lead over the fourth placed player.

The notorious CUTwC dinner seemed almost tame by previous years' standards, but the antics of one or two youngsters at the far end of the table from the committee (it's not normal to eat crème brûlée with your hands), led to the premature arrival of a Porter to stop the riot. Despite this, many of those present were able to indulge themselves heartily, especially Mr. Thorpe.

Sunday morning saw Alex and Duncan Budd lose 1-6 to Phil Scarrott and me, and Gary and Stew lose 2-5 to Phil Rodgers and Clive Gabriel! Thus Alan's two 6's gave him a lead of about 4 points (it's hard to be exact since players had played different numbers of games).

Trouble broke out again with the draw for round 9. This completely refused to work, so about 40 minutes of fiddling with files were necessary before a reasonable draw could be produced (even then some players were being forced to play more than one game without a partner). It was later to transpire that the bug causing all this trouble would not have caused any problem if I hadn't tested the programme! As a result of the delay it was decided to allow players to be eligible to win the tournament despite leaving before the last game, provided they told the organisers of their intentions at once (it had been intended that eligibility would depend on missing no more than 2 games and playing in the final round).

Alan's winning ways continued in round 9, but round 10 saw him stumble losing 1-6 (with Lavan Mahadeva, a Trinity novice) to Boyce and Gabriel. This left Gary, Alex, Peter Wright and Charles Relle close behind. In round 11 Alan won 5-2 (against Hancock and Rodgers) and Charles won 6-1 with Owen Mapley against Matthew Johns and Richard Moore, but Alex, Gary and Peter lost.

The final round saw Charles and me take 6 off Phil Clark and Queens' novice (but Lester Piggott Trophy winner) Iain Sharp, but Alan and Chris Andrew won 6-1 against Duncan and Lavan. Thus Alan joined the illustrious list of Cambridge Open Champions, Charles came second, Alex third and Gary fourth. Owen Mapley had the impertinence to get 2 points more than his father (after last year it was about time Jon got a bad draw) and Geoff Thorpe continued to prove an enigma, finishing near the bottom just above a group of novices.

The Adventure of the Black Squidger

Tim Roscoe

I recall it was a bleak Cambridge evening in December 198-. I was looking idly out of the window of my rooms in Fisher when there was a knock at the door.

"Who is it?" I asked cautiously. One has to be careful of being hit by second hand medieval chicken on a night like this. It was the evening of the Charles Relle Trophy, an evening when cats were wearing bullet proof vests. I breathed a sigh of relief as my friend and colleague Boondock Holmes entered.

"Come on, Potson, the game's afoot!", he said breathlessly, "There's a dead body at the Relle!"

"What's so unusual about that?", I asked. "People die at the Relle every term."

"This one was sober."

"Good God, Holmes!" We hurried to the Erasmus Room to find those winkers who were still standing to be in a state of some confusion. An authoritative figure in a Princess of Wales wig and the sort of long overcoat old men get arrested in seemed to be in charge. He approached us with a suspicious look in his eye.

"I'm Detective Inspector S.O. MacGoo of the Yard, gentlemen. What might I do for you?", he said with a hint of a Humberside accent.

"Scotland Yard I presume?", I inquired.

"No, Lion Yard. I find it's more convenient for kebabs."

"My name is Boondock Holmes, and this is my colleague Dr. Potson", said Holmes.

"Ah yes, wasn't it you who helped us out in the case of the exploding novice?"

"It was indeed. But that was only a matter of a lethal cocktail of chilli sauce, Abbot Ale and courgettes. It appears you have something more serious here."

"We have indeed. I hope you can help shed some light on it, Mr. Holmes. It's all very snorey borey, essentially."

Just then a novice clutching a plastic cup full of punch staggered into the room.

"We've found another body! In Queens' Drain! It was hooeerrrrghghghgh..."

"Don't worry sir, I've brought a clean coat along.", said MacGoo, reaching for a damp cloth.

"I would hazard a guess that it was male, with spectacles, a large red beard, an old sweater and a Sainsbury's bag full of Winking World magazines.", mused my colleague.

"Great Scot, Holmes!"

"That as well, Potson."

"He can probably still be revived - I suggest you send an assistant secretary to alert the porters, Inspector.", said Holmes. MacGoo beckoned across the room and a winker wearing a cygnet ring and a glazed look lurched towards us.

"Deez aneeewun wanton aneeegoss?", he asked in a pleading voice. He was soon despatched to explain the situation to a large doner without disguised as a porter.

"Alright then Inspector, let's see the body."

I will never be able to forget the sight of the unfortunate winker which greeted our eyes. He lay on the ground with a contorted grin on his face, his glasses neatly placed in a pint glass of Mill cider where they were slowly dissolving. But his stomach has spattered with blood and signs of the most hideous mutilation.

"God Lord, that's horrifying!", I gasped.

"No Potson, that's only his T-shirt. Death appears to have been by asphyxia, am I right Inspector?"

"Apparently so, Mr. Holmes, we've ruled out food colouring this time. He clearly choked on some sort of foblet and in some sense snuffed it. We haven't moved the body for fear of disturbing some business or other."

Just then a voluminous figure holding a glass of beer and wearing the size of shirt underneath which Richard Branson could have probably crossed the Atlantic came up to us.

"Move him by all means - it's getting in the way of the drinking and besides might be putting my fellowship in jeopardy. Clearly the man can't cope with a little drink and is pretty typical of the sort of total wassock we now have in the club. The bloke isn't worth three tenths of sweet F.A. if you ask me."

I rolled the unfortunate member of the club over, and as I did a small black plastic disc fell out of his mouth and rolled over the floor towards where the president appeared to be involved in a boxing match. MacGoo picked up the squidger and tested it. He missed 24 successive half-inch squops.

"Clearly one of his own manufacture as well", the policeman deduced. "My theory is essentially that the squidger was made for someone who lost a vital match playing with it, and took his revenge in this generally horrible way."

"But who would ask for one of his squidgers?", asked Holmes, "If you are correct, we are looking for a first year winker with an IQ of below 20, and there are no novices in Magdalene this term."

"That's all very well Mr. Holmes", retorted MacGoo, "but Magdalene schmagdalene. I know an economist..." Suddenly this gave me an idea.

"Maybe someone bored him to death and he committed suicide?", I ventured.

"It's a possibility, Potson."

"Well, I'm not on for this nonsense", said MacGoo, who had by now finished cleaning his coat. "I'm off to the toilets to look for this novice we're after."

"I'm convinced this man was killed because he knew too much", said Holmes when MacGoo had left. "He had recently left the committee, you know. Machiavelli said, 'Knowledge is Power', Potson."

"Aldous Huxley said, 'Ignorance is Power', Holmes."

"Shut up, Potson. Let's search the body while the Inspector is away."

A moment later Holmes found a piece of paper in the victim's back pocket.

"It seems like a list of some kind: eye of toad, ear of bat, half a cup of Cam water, a used binliner from W staircase, half a can of styling mousse, and a Guinness amigossed by the light of a full moon."

"Good gracious Holmes, are we dealing with Black Magic?"

"Well the last two items on the list are six antihistamine tablets and twenty litres of vodka so I suspect it's the punch recipe. I suggest we try his room."

It became clear when we arrived that we were not the first people to have been there that evening. The room had been searched from top to bottom. There was nothing that had not been exposed. We picked our way over the grovelling platypusses.

"Maybe they didn't find what they were looking for - maybe it's still here."

"Then what places wouldn't they think of looking in?", I wondered.

"What places wouldn't they dare look in?", Holmes asked with a glint in his eye.

"The sink!"

"Brilliant Potson. I'll take off the U-bend. Pass me that large squidger on the shelf."

"Which one is that?"

"The forty-sixth from the left. That should do as a screwdriver." The pipe came off, and to our delight it contained a bag with a piece of paper inside.

"Well, in many ways I'll take that if you don't mind."

We turned to see the enormous winker we had met earlier, holding a small furry mammal. The eyes had a hungry, bloodthirsty look and saliva dripped from the jowls, and the ferret didn't look too friendly either.

"Hand over the paper, and no random funny business. This ferret is loaded."

Apparently so was the floor, rather too much by now. There was a sound of rending joists as the person tottered into the room. It took one dead snail under the foot - there was a cry of "Oh, goodness gracious!" and our friend disappeared.

"Is he dead Holmes?"

Holmes peered down the newly created hole in the floor.

"No, I think his stomach broke the fall. Come on, Potson, let us leave while we may."

Pausing only to inform the Porters of the incident and advising them to call a certain Detective Inspector S.O. Macgoo, we hurried away and soon found ourselves outside the Oasis discussing our prize over a couple of Haji Babas.

"It's a map of somewhere - somewhere where there is lots of Fosters Lager, surfing, and kangaroos everywhere."

"Queens' Bar!"

"Precisely.", said Holmes.

"Well, let's go!", I exclaimed.

"Not yet, it'll be closed. Besides, I think these Hajis are nearly dead. We can probably eat them now and check the Bar tomorrow. We are, after all, the only people with the map."

So it was that the next morning we found ourselves in Queens' Bar. Our map was clear and we followed it to a putrid heap of compost in one corner. This was it.

"But that sweater hasn't been touched since that spycatcher fellow left, Holmes." I said.

"At least that is what we have been led to believe, Potson. Let's have a closer look" -and with that he walked off to the bar and began a protracted negotiation with the staff. Some time later he returned with a frown on his face, holding a pint of stout.

"Bloody retired airmen. Now, let's stretch this Guinness into a stick to lift the thing."

And so at last we discovered the end of our quest - a small sheet of paper covered in strange names and figures.

"But surely these are only CUTwC election results, Holmes?" I asked.

"Ah, yes, Potson, but can't you see, these are next year's..."

The 1988 Varsity Match

Nick Inglis

Wadham College, Oxford, 13th February 1988

The bald result of the 1988 Varsity Match doesn't seem to reflect terribly well on Oxford (being a worse loss than that in 1987), but this fails to take into account how much the Cambridge team has improved over the past year. The play was certainly of a rather higher standard than last year's match and although it must have been bitterly disappointing to take no more than 2 points in any match, it must be said that Oxford pairs were often in contention, only to lose out in rounds, due partly to a lack of experience. The Cambridge performance was uniformly impressive, but for the first time in years, Oxford succeeded in avoiding any 7-0 losses (Andy Purvis did pot out in the third round, but Richard could only manage third place).

More On Tournament Format

Charles Relle

In *Winking World* 49 Mike Surridge wrote an interesting article on tournament format, much of which was concerned with Swiss tournaments.

The Swiss system was designed to cope with large entries for tournaments of limited duration, and that is why it fits the Hampshire Open well. On the whole it is good at picking out the best pair or player, and less accurate at the minor placings. This is partly because

OUTS v. CUTwC

13th February 1988

OUTS

	Tony Brennan Dave Dyer	Kath Henson Ian Whitmore	Malcolm Beattie Ken Zetie	Richard Brownsword Jim Wicks	
CUTwC					
Patrick Barrie Duncan Budd	2 5	1 6	$1\frac{1}{2}$ $5\frac{1}{2}$	1 6	$22\frac{1}{2}$
Richard Moore Andy Purvis	2 5	2 5	1 6	1 6	22
Chris Andrew Alex Satchell	$1\frac{1}{2}$ $5\frac{1}{2}$	$1\frac{1}{2}$ $5\frac{1}{2}$	1 6	1 6	23
Geoff Myers Gary Shrimpton	1 6	1 6	1 6	1 6	24
	$6\frac{1}{2}$	$5\frac{1}{2}$	$4\frac{1}{2}$	4	

OUTS $20\frac{1}{2}$ CUTwC $91\frac{1}{2}$

of the phenomenon described by Mike in his third paragraph: each pair plays any other only once, and as the draw is made from the top, some apparently distorted matchings can turn up at some stages of the tournament. Mike states that this happens as the number of rounds exceeds one third of the number of pairs. I accept this, and assume that things even up as one approaches an all-play-all situation. Even so, in the 1984 London Open, a seven round Swiss among ten pairs, Alan Boyce and Mark England failed to qualify for the semi-final by one point, and had not played against two of the qualifying pairs. If there had been two more rounds, they might have qualified for a hypothetical final after an all-play-all, and won the

tournament.

Swiss is essentially a compromise: an all-play-all would establish a ranking order for a given tournament, and we resort to Swiss because there is not time. In effect, a Swiss is a part-played all-play-all, with built-in directions to the strongest pair at each stage to play other strong pairs. The end of a Swiss tournament is, in a sense, an arbitrary cut-off, and there is bound to be some rough justice. This is why it is best avoided at the National Singles and National Pairs. To stay with the situation of the 1987 Hampshire Open: an extra round might not have made much difference, because the top two pairs were some way in front, but in the 1986 tournament the top four were closely bunched, and there might have been changes as a result of another round. Frankly, we have to accept this: it is the nature of Swiss tournaments, and if we do not like it, we should not enter them. It is also, as Mike says, wrong to vary the conditions of a tournament after they have been laid down, and equally wrong to expect this to happen.

Given the choice, should we go for an extra round in a Swiss tournament, or a play-off? An extra round does keep everybody playing, and articles in recent numbers of *Winking World* certainly suggest that people want to play as much as possible when they come to tournaments. An extra round might also make for a fairer result. It just depends on the stage the tournament has reached in relation to the size of the entry, and that cannot be predicted. A play-off provides sharper competition for the top two pairs, and a chance for the second pair to overtake the first. Perhaps we should, instead of considering individual tournaments, think of the tournament season, and, since we have two one-day tournaments that are likely to be Swiss, make the Hampshire Open Swiss with play-off and the London Open plain Swiss.

The 1988 Silver Wink

Nick Inglis

Queens' College, Cambridge, 5th-6th March 1988

In a masterpiece of logistics, teams from Cambridge, Southampton and Oxford (somewhat late) assembled in the Armitage Room for the 1988 Silver Wink. The tournament was to be an all-play-all with 2 Silver Wink points for a win and 1 for a draw, with match scores considered only in the event of a tie. Cambridge had allowed themselves the luxury of selecting Nick Inglis and/or Stew Sage, but Chris Andrew and Geoff Myers were unavailable for the Oxford match (Bridge Varsity Match? What sort of excuse is that?). In the event Nick Inglis and Graham Hancock were added to the Varsity Match team. Oxford had brought over a slightly weaker team than that which had lost the Varsity Match, but they began very well, with Tony running six from all over the place to beat Patrick and Duncan 5-2 and Richard Brownsword and Tim May holding Nick and Alex Satchell to a $3\frac{1}{2}$ - $3\frac{1}{2}$ tie. Cambridge still won the first round $17\frac{1}{2}$ - $10\frac{1}{2}$ and the next three rounds were the sort of crushing performance we've become used to seeing from this team. Ironically, the final result of $91\frac{1}{2}$ - $20\frac{1}{2}$ was exactly the same as in the Varsity Match. Interestingly, Graham, who had not been selected for the CUTwC v. Sotwink match, was equal top scorer on 25 points.

The match between Oxford and Southampton promised to be the most interesting, but Sotwink started with a fairly decisive 20-8 win in round 1. There were two wins for each side in round 2, but Sotwink won the round $15\frac{1}{2}$ - $12\frac{1}{2}$ to go further ahead. Round 3 was very close, with four 4-3 games, three of them victories for Oxford, including a fine win for Jim Wicks and Patrick Wainwright over Stef Norman and Mike Surridge. Sotwink now needed just under 8 points to win and they got them easily with a 17-11 round score, to win $65\frac{1}{2}$ - $46\frac{1}{2}$ overall. The Sotwink victory was largely built around the performances of Stef and Mike and of Chris Rawlings and Steve Chamberlin. For Oxford, the strong pair of Tony Brennan and Dave Dyer

OUTS v. CUTwC

5th March 1988

OUTS

	Tony Brennan Patrick Wainwright	Dave Dyer Jim Wicks	Ian Whitmore Martin Green	Richard Brownsword Tim May	
CUTwC					
Patrick Barrie Duncan Budd	5 2	1 6	1 6	1 6	20
Richard Moore Andy Purvis	1 6	1 6	1 6	0 7	25
Graham Hancock Gary Shrimpton	1 6	0 7	1 6	1 6	25
Nick Inglis Alex Satchell	1 6	1 6	1 6	3½ 3½	21½
	8	3	4	5½	

OUTS 20½ CUTwC 91½

did particularly well. This result meant that the Silver Wink would go to the winners of The CUTwC v. Sotwink match.

The night before the Oxford match, several CUTwC team members had taken part in the Rag 3-or-more-legged pub crawl, winning the prize for largest team as usual with an impressive 8-legged group. The effect of all this had seemed so good for the following day's play that CUTwC keenly took up Mike Surridge's suggestion of a pub crawl on the Saturday night, managing a good tour of King Street before ending in the Rhadegund for the Old Peculier.

For the Sotwink game Chris Andrew and Geoff Myers came back in at the expense of Gary

Sotwink v. OUTS

5th March 1988

Sotwink

	Stef Norman Mike Surridge	Paul Hutchings Ed Harry	Chris Rawlings Steve Chamberlin	Nick Geary Rob Culley	
OUTS					
Tony Brennan	6	1	4	1	16
Dave Dyer	1	6	3	6	
Ian Whitmore	6	6	4	3	9
Martin Green	1	1	3	4	
Jim Wicks	3	6	6	4½	10½
Patrick Wainwright	4	1	1	4½	
Richard Brownsword	6	3	6	2	11
Tim May	1	4	1	5	
	21	16	20	8½	

Sotwink 46½ OUTS 65½

and Duncan (but there was no room for the ninth placed finisher in the National Singles!). The first round saw a titanic struggle between Patrick and me and Stef and Mike. Mike and I always seem to have interesting matches in the Silver Wink and this was no exception: a close-fought tactically-interesting struggle with the result in doubt to the end — the sort of game that really makes this competition. In the end, Patrick and I were relieved (and a shade lucky) to sneak away with a 4. The rest of the games had gone CUTwC's way, and the round was won 21-7. In the next round Patrick and I were pushed hard in rounds by Chris and Steve before winning 5-2, but Richard and Andy lost 3-4 to Mike and Stef, and Ed and Paul had

Sotwink v. CUTwC

6th March 1988

Sotwink

	Mike Surridge Stef Norman	Steve Chamberlin Chris Rawlings	Ed Harry Paul Hutchings	Nick Geary Rob Culley	
CUTwC					
Patrick Barrie Nick Inglis	3 4	2 5	1 6	1 6	21
Richard Moore Andy Purvis	4 3	1 6	1 6	0 7	22
Chris Andrew Alex Satchell	5 2	1½ 5½	2 5	1 6	18½
Geoff Myers Gary Shrimpton	3 4	1 6	5 2	1 6	18½
	15	5½	9	3	

Sotwink 32½ CUTwC 79½

pulled off a bit of a shock, beating Geoff and Gary 5-2. Chris and Alex managed 6 off Nick and Rob to give CUTwC a narrow 16-12 win in this round. The third round was much more to Cambridge's liking with only one loss (Chris and Alex losing 5-2 to Stef and Mike) and the 21 points gained were enough to secure victory. Jon Carlaw, who had driven the Sotwink team and tirelessly acted as umpire (with Stew Sage) had to leave fairly sharply, so the final round was reduced to 20 minutes. This time CUTwC won all the games (including a good 4-3 win for Geoff and Gary against Stef and Mike), to give a final score of 79½-32½ (almost the same as last year). As usual the Cambridge performance was fairly uniform, but for Sotwink

the score of 15 by Mike and Stef was outstanding (the next best score by any pair against CUTwC this year was 9). Cambridge therefore retain the Silver Wink, but the overwhelming memory is of a fun winks weekend, with plenty of tightly contested, but good-natured games.

It's Only a Game

Jim Carrington

While I am delighted at the increased attendance and quality of play in winks competitions, I am concerned at the uncomfortably tense atmosphere in tournament winks. It seems that the importance of winning and the amount of personal pride apparently at stake is taking much of the fun out of the game.

I accept that winks is a competitive game and I am pleased that people take the game seriously. But when I finish a tournament exhausted and tense, I sometimes wonder whether I enjoyed my week-end's tiddlywinks.

I spent the Friday and Saturday before this year's Hants Open winking and drinking with two fellow Exiles, Mike Surridge and Rob Cartwright. It was so pleasant to have an extra day in Southampton, visiting watering holes of days gone by, and playing winks in a relaxed atmosphere. We must have got through seven or so games, starting just before lunch and finishing early enough to enjoy a pizza in Portswood and still get down to the docks in time to get a table to stand on at the Frog 'n' Frigate. No game could have taken more than 35 minutes. I hadn't enjoyed winks so much in months. No pressure, no personal reputation to defend, no umpires, no shot-judges, no pile reconstructions. I realised why I had become involved with the game in the first place!

It could be said that this is all very well in a casual practice session, but what about national tournaments? Well I can say the same of the 1987 National Singles, a tournament where I usually feel most pressure.

I was fortunate to be drawn in a qualifying group with many of the gentlemen of the game. I thoroughly enjoyed several games of winks devoid of long interruptions, disputes and none of them lasting longer than necessary.

There was a cheerful, light-hearted game with Steve "Hurricane" Williams, in which I worked hard to complete a pot-out, only to find that Steve could pot his twelve winks in the time it takes many players to decide which wink to pot first.

Geoff Myers quietly and briskly dismissed me 6-1. There was none of the incessant chatting and running commentary which some opponents offer, and no cheer and lap of honour each time a two inch squop was successfully executed. Playing against someone who seems desperate to beat you is like playing away from home in the first division. Winks is a tense enough game without this added pressure.

Alan Dean apologised for damaging my chances of qualifying after he beat me in the final game of the day. He felt and looked guilty at his dirty deed and was a relieved man when he found out I had in fact squeezed through.

The second day was equally pleasant. Even though I lost nearly every game, I found the day's play very enjoyable. I was particularly impressed by the quiet and friendly manner of Geoff Myers and Richard Moore. These are two players who had been playing for just over a year and were brought up in a generation of very competitive new winkers. Many of their seniors and contemporaries can learn a lot from their attitude and behaviour.

If only other tournaments could be as enjoyable as the Singles was for me! Why do we have to introduce newcomers to such an aggressive game? The Teams of Four at Southampton included some of the longest and most competitive matches I have seen. And it's meant to be a friendly tournament!

I am suggesting one or two tips to make the game more enjoyable.

1. Have the manners of a golfer. Play quietly and stand back to give your opponent plenty of room when he plays his shot.
2. Try not to take too long over tactical decisions. I find that making quick firm decisions improves my shot making as well as speeding up the game.
3. Don't call for umpires on the off-chance that a close decision may be made in your favour. Be fair and keep the game flowing.
4. Keep celebrations until after the game.

There is only one winning team in each tournament. If winning is such an important part of playing the game then there will be a lot of unhappy people at the end of each tournament.

Let's get out there and play winks. Let your squidger do the talking. You never know, you might enjoy it!

World Singles 27 (Mapley v. Relle)

Phil Clark

Hamleys, Regent Street, 17th February 1988

Hamleys was restored as the venue for the World Singles which saw Jon Mapley making his third defence of his title. His opponent this time was the rejuvenated "grand old man of tiddlywinks", Charles Relle. Having cunningly alighted at the wrong tube station I arrived in Regent Street just in time to witness the defending champion swagger into Hamleys like a millionaire with plenty of credit left on his plastic. It transpired that Thames TV were recasting the event as a Spaghetti Western.

The serious stuff over, we moved inside to wait while some men assembled the table. Rivetting stuff. However the game eventually began at 11.45 before a large and reasonably expectant crowd.

Game one saw both players exhibit the signs of nervousness appropriate to the occasion. With numerous free winks in two distinct areas, Jon began to pot out with red, but missing the third. With Charles missing squops Jon potted numbers 3, 4 and 5 next time round but missed long with the sixth to be gratefully squopped by yellow. A brilliant long freeing shot by blue presented Jon with a second chance which wasn't squandered as the pot-out was completed. Charles then ran 6 yellows and cleaned up with green to salvage two points.

The second game was very tight but going into rounds Charles was slightly ahead. He consolidated his position with an excellent bristol onto two of Jon's blues; many players would not have shared Charles' view that the shot was on. Sound potting in round 5 by yellow secured Charles a 5-2 win bringing the match level at 7 each.

We retired for lunch; some to Hamleys sweet department others to the British Academy (thanks Charles). In spite of the diet Jon began game 3 in more confident mood burying most of Charles' winks in one pile. Charles played without much luck, achieving one artistic bristol sub, however finding at last a free wink on the periphery of the pile. This necessitated a complex pile reconstruction by umpire Andy Purvis. Charles' large yellow was only on the very edge of the main pile and it was difficult to obtain sufficient purchase to achieve the requisite effect. An illegal shot resulted leaving Andy the unenviable task of rebuilding the pile for a second time. Eventually, Charles was able to play a legal, but less effective, shot and Jon took a 6-1 to establish a 13-8 lead with four to go.

In the early stages of game 4, Jon tried a red pot-out but looked relieved to miss the first which Charles squopped with green. Jon's squopping had the edge and he was establishing firm control when Charles played his remaining free yellow onto the crucial pile. After the

World Singles 27	Game Scores						Total
Jon Mapley	5	2	6	$4\frac{1}{2}$	6	3	$26\frac{1}{2}$
Charles Relle	2	5	1	$2\frac{1}{2}$	1	4	$15\frac{1}{2}$

break up, another large pile evolved onto which Jon bristled well in round 2 to preclude a break up. Leaving a group of bridgeable reds Jon was relieved to see Charles miss but only one was potted before Charles missed with yellow to end 4. In 5, blue and green missed the pot but red was more successful to give Jon a $4\frac{1}{2}$ - $2\frac{1}{2}$ win and a $17\frac{1}{2}$ - $10\frac{1}{2}$ lead overall lead.

Jon continued to move ahead in game 5 playing some excellent shots to confine most of Charles' winks to the bottom of a large pile. Charles managed to break this up but sent his wink off in the process after which Jon began to pot-out with blue, but missing the third. After elaborate pile manoeuvrings Jon potted the next three but missed long with the last. Charles missed the squop with green and began to pot with yellow, sinking two. Jon duly potted out knowing that a 7-0 win would give him the match. He potted 3 reds but scrunged the fourth; yellow and green missed followed by Jon and Charles each missing twice in succession. Charles eventually ran in the greens and Jon, somewhat annoyed with himself, had to be content with a 6-1.

Going into round six the match was neatly poised at $23\frac{1}{2}$ - $11\frac{1}{2}$, Jon needing 1 point and Charles you know what. Jon played well to squop Charles up but suffered some frustration in his attempts to extricate his own winks from the large pile which had developed. Charles had several abortive attempts at bombing the pile but eventually scored a direct hit. Jon could not take the small yellow on the top of the pile to which Charles delivered the inevitable coup de grace. Mindful of his requirements Charles potted three yellows but missed the fourth to end round 3. In four, Jon potted one red then missed and Charles missed his fourth yellow off a pile close to the pot landing on another yellow. Beginning round 5, Jon missed the blue squop onto the two yellows and also missed with red. With the last shot of the game Charles potted the two yellows before a tense band of spectators. This left the last big yellow approximately 15 inches from the pot. Against a backdrop of silence and tension, Charles sent the wink straight into the pot only to see it bounce out in perhaps one of the unluckiest moments of the day. Charles took the game 4-3 but this was not enough to prevent Jon retaining his title with a $26\frac{1}{2}$ - $15\frac{1}{2}$ victory.

Thorpe's Ring and Other Problems

Charles Relle

Geoff Thorpe is well known for setting, on and off the mat, more problems than he or anyone else can solve. His "ring" problem is typical. Imagine one red wink free and all the other winks potted or squopped. It is red's turn, and of course he has one free turn. He can pot the wink; whether it is his last or not, the rules provide for the situation. But what if he fails to pot? He must now free. Must he bomb the pile, or may he have another try at potting, as being the most likely way of freeing? This only works if it is his last wink, and is of dubious legality. Suppose now that this situation has been brought about by *yellow subbing*. The one free turn is taken by blue (forced to pass), and red must free instantly. How? And if he pots, does the game end, as in rule 6(b), or have the opponents the options set out in rule 11(c)? Probably they have the latter; if so, they also have this choice if it was red's last wink. In either case, what if he fails to bomb or pot? Presumably the opponents now have the option of moving a wink aside, and as there are no uncovered winks, this means any wink. It all

seems a bit hard, especially as bringing about this situation involves a squop-and-sub, and one side is as likely to do this as the other.

To make things easier, we can turn our backs on the doctrine that the desquopping shot must be the first shot of the freeing turn if that is the turn on which the player is obliged to free, but that only helps to a very limited extent — one turn's grace. We might provide in the rules for this and similar situations. The sentence: "If at the time when a squop-up occurs, the squopping partnership can play no turn until after a wink is due to be freed, it must free at the first available turn" can be modified to read "If at the time when the squop-up occurs, the squopping partnership is prevented by the rules from playing until after it is due to free, it must free at the first available turn. If the partnership has no squopping wink, and the game does not end by a pot-out or under rule 6(b) at or before the last free turn, it must free by desquopping as soon as it can. Any turns taken after the partnership is normally due to free are not counted as part of the game during regulation time, nor as turns in rounds after time is up." This also takes care of the two problems raised by Geoff Thorpe in *WW46* pp. 14-15 and discussed by me in *WW48* pp. 22-23.

I wrote this article before my appointment to the chairmanship of the rules committee, and want to make it clear that I have not at the time of writing discussed with them the ideas set out here, which are purely personal.

The 1988 National Pairs

Richard Moore and Andy Purvis

Lincoln College, Oxford, 23rd-24th April 1988

Late April usually means the National Pairs in Cambridge, but this year was an exception, with the tournament moving to Oxford. A very strong entry of 16 pairs meant that even the "rabbits" in the bottom half of the draw promised to spring some surprises, and sure enough Shrimpton and Hancock were quick to oblige, with a 6 in their first game, against Carrington and Cartwright. Even before lunch on the first day, Thorpe and Hull had also gone down 6-1 to an unfancied pair, but Dean and Surridge were ominously setting the pace, with two wins putting them $\frac{1}{2}$ point ahead of Boyce and Relle. Some of the Cambridge pairs were also now figuring strongly.

The first day's play pitted the top pairs against the bottom half of the draw, but upsets continued: Boyce and Relle could only manage four from Rose and Smith, and then went down 6-1 to Gary and Graham, who ended the day top of the "rabbits" after another win, against Barrie and Myers. Their 23 points promised to be increased with an easier draw on the Sunday, but it was still Dean and Surridge who went in as leaders - despite only taking 5 from Wiseman and Grant, who played Plan 47 right from the squidge-off. Purvis and Inglis were the other unbeaten pair, $\frac{1}{2}$ point ahead of last year's champions Mapley and Brennan. Budd and Moore, finishing the day with two sevens, occupied fourth place.

The next morning, play resumed at the unearthly hour of 9 (well, half past anyway...) and an upset was nearly provided straight away when Dean and Surridge were lucky to escape with four from Heading and Roscoe — another good result for the CUTwC pair who had earlier beaten Jim and Rob. With the second game on Sunday morning, games between the top seeds began, and the top-of-the-table clashes produced some interesting results. Jon and Tony took a six off Nick and Andy to take them into second place, and closed the gap still further when Mike and Alan could only take four from the game before lunch - their opponents also being Purvis and Inglis.

After lunch, Dave and Geoff (having claimed that any pair without six pints behind them were unsporting) had a poser for the Rules Committee. What, asked Dave, happens if you're

1988 National Pairs

Opponents																	Total	Position
Pair	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P		
A	Alan Dean & Mike Surridge	—	3	2	6	6	4	6	6	4	5	6	7	6	7	6	81	1
B	Alan Boyce & Charles Relle	4	—	1	6	3	2	6	1	4½	5	4	1	6	6	7 5½	62	7
C	Patrick Barrie & Geoff Myers	5	6	—	1	5	1	6	3	5	6	4	3	3	6	7 5	66	5
D	Jon Mapley & Tony Brennan	1	1	6	—	6	6	6	2	6	7	6	3	6	4½	7 3	70½	4
E	Jim Carrington & Rob Cartwright	1	4	2	1	—	0	5	1	2	4	6	1	5	3	7 6	48	10
F	Andy Purvis & Nick Inglis	3	5	6	1	7	—	6	5	6	5	7	5	6	6	5	79	2
G	Geoff Thorpe & Dave Hull	1	1	1	1	2	1	—	0	1	6	7	1	6	5	6 3	42	12
H	Richard Moore & Duncan Budd	1	6	4	5	6	2	7	—	6	6	6	6	1	7	7 4	74	3
I	Tony Heading & Tim Roscoe	3	2½	2	1	5	1	6	1	—	5 5½	1	2	1	7	1	44	11
J	Julian Wiseman & Alastair Grant	2	2	1	0	3	1	1	1	2	—	1	1	2	6	7	31	15
K	Matthew Rose & Dave Smith	1	3	3	1	1	2	0	1	1½	6	—	4	1	6	7 1	38½	13
L	Gary Shrimpton & Graham Hancock	0	6	4	4	6	0	6	1	6	6	3	—	6	6	6 3	63	6
M	Alex Satchell & Chris Andrew	1	1	4	1	2	2	1	6	5	6	6	1	—	6	6 1	49	9
N	Richard Brownsword & Ken Zetie	0	1	1	2½	4	1	2	0	6	5	1	1	1	—	6 1	32½	14
O	Jim Wicks & Martin Green	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	—	8	16
P	Keith Seaman & Heather Dean	0	1½	2	4	1	2	4	3	6	0	6	4	6	6	6 —	51½	8

sick in the pot? Barrie and Myers, unimpressed, took a 6-1, and Duncan and Richard also stayed in contention by taking a 5-2 off Mapley and Brennan — after Jon bizarrely squopped one of Tony's winks ending round 5. Andy meanwhile potted from the edge with his last shot to get a 5-2 win over Boyce and Relle. Jon and Tony were still second, and in the next round Jon chanced his arm at a pot-out against Alan and Mike in an effort to close the gap — but a wink bounced out of the pot, and a 1-6 resulted. Andy and Nick, squopped up against Thorpe and Hull, were able to escape and move into second place, whilst Budd and Moore climbed into third after an arduous 6-1 against Jim and Rob.

In round 14, Dean and Surridge finally lost (5-2 to Geoff and Patrick), and Jon and Tony's chances were knocked on the head with a third successive defeat, 1-6 against Relle and Boyce. Nick and Andy closed the gap on the leaders, taking 5 off Budd and Moore in a dreadful game. This left them an outside chance, if they could get 7 against Jim and Rob in their last game — which they did — but Alan and Mike knew what was needed and took 3 off Relle and Boyce to secure first place. Duncan and Richard also took a 7, giving them third place and allowing Geoff to catch his train, whilst Jon and Tony beat Geoff and Patrick 6-1 to clinch fourth place.

So congratulations to Alan and Mike (yet another tournament win!), and congratulations also to Heather, who partnered Keith Seaman to four sixes in their last five games and sneaked into eighth place overall — becoming in the process the youngest player ever to beat the World Champion (at least for 25 years!) Another fine performance too from Gary and Graham, proving that last year's placing was no flash in the pan — they finished sixth after a string of good results on the second day. It was good to see first tournament showings from Martin Green and Julian Wiseman; Moore and Myers were there this time last year — and look at them now... perhaps this will encourage the less-experienced players! Finally, thanks must go to Oxford for the excellent organisation, accomodation, fun and beer — this all added up to a very enjoyable weekend.

The Jubirellee Trophy 1982-88

Jon Mapley

Amongst many momentous singles games which I played against Dave Lockwood in 1981, there were five in Manchester on a 6' x 3' piece of chipboard balanced on trestles in Nigel Knowles' back room. The match finished at 1.15 a.m., and Dave won 20-15. My memory is vague on how I subsequently came to play Charles in early 1982, but I think Lockwood had decided it would be un-American to hide the trophy away in New York, Jeddah, Rio, etc., and it was declared vacant.

Little has been written about the Jubilee in the intervening years, other than the odd one-liner in WW. I received a breathless phone-call from Andy Purvis recently, which went something like "I knew I had to play pot-squop to beat him, and although one game degenerated into a double-squop fiasco, I got him in the other three". So ended possibly the longest reign in winks history.

The clinical statistics show that Charles Relle won fourteen consecutive Jubilee matches in a period of just over six years. Now, we all know that any old Tom, Dick or Marmaduke can challenge for this particular piece of hardware, but funny things can happen in head-to-head matches. Not so with Charles — on one occasion only was the fifth game necessary, and that was in his final win, against Tim Hedger. Alan Dean tried three times, and 8-20 was his best scoreline. Geoff Thorpe received three straight sixes, and Alan Boyce did little better at $4\frac{1}{2}$ — 23 $\frac{1}{2}$, although his second attempt reached double figures at 10-18. Phil Clark also reached double figures, but Steve Harbron, Nick Inglis, Tony Brennan, Pam Knowles, Cyril

Edwards and I all failed to do so.

Reverting to statistics for a moment, in his 14 wins, Charles won 47 games, lost 9 and had a p.p.g. of 5.12. In the company of the players who lost, those are remarkable figures, Charles!

Letters to the Editor

26 Canadian Avenue,
London SE6 3AS.
27th December 1987.

Sir,

I wonder how many people know that a club exists for former Oxford and Cambridge players. It was founded in the early sixties, and like similar clubs for other sports, was called after a Greek hero, in our case Adonis. In early Winking Worlds it is occasionally mentioned, though there is no record of its ever having played a match. I was its last secretary some time ago, and would like to restart it. Please, therefore, if any qualified person is interested in playing at or for Adonis, let me know.

I was also the organiser of the New London Tiddlywinks Society (NEWTS) before a steady stream of emigrations from the Metropolis made it impossible to hold regular meetings. Now, however, the increased membership of Cambridge and the revival at Oxford means that there may be some players about to leave both these universities, and Southampton too, and taking up residence in London who would like an occasional or regular game. There is of course the club in Pinner, but I should like to welcome players to my corner of the capital. May I please do so through your columns? Anyone, whether he or she would like to play under the title of Adonis or Newts, is invited to contact me at the address above, or to telephone me on 01-690-2885.

Yours faithfully,
Charles Relle

Sir,

I was interested to see the new colour order as proposed by Mr. Lockwood. I totally endorse this view. There is another good International Standard which agrees with his proposal, this being the electronics colour code. The order would be red, yellow, green, blue. In this case Mr. Kahn's suggestion that the squidge-off winner play blue makes perfect sense, instead of the ridiculous Cambridge suggestion of yellow.

R. Cartwright

Sir,

By the time you read this I shall be sitting on a sun-drenched Florida beach (or slaving away at the University of Miami, depending on how you look at these things).

Since the long and boring council minutes are no longer to be published in *WW*, I thought a (hopefully not long and too boring) note from the Chairman might be a useful substitute.

The Committee has been busying itself with usual day to day business and has also been working on a new constitution, which will be presented in time for the next Congress. The last revision was in the 1960's, so that the existing constitution bears no relation to present practice.

On the global expansion front, Cambridge have given a demonstration at University College School and have assisted with a competition at the Pedva Sports and Social Club

in Newmarket. ETwA have followed up these visits in the hope that new centres may be established.

Hamley's have hosted another World Singles. This time in a prominent place on the ground floor and with T.V. and radio coverage. Arrangements worked well, particularly considering the short notice. Hopefully, we shall return there in due course. Congratulations to Jon on retaining his title yet again. Will ETwA have to provide another cup soon?

Finally, two ideas that the committee would welcome members' views on.

Firstly, it has been suggested that ETwA start a new team competition. The idea is that two nominated captains would pick teams from all those turning up. Pairs would be nominated before each round and so there should be an opportunity to play with a number of different people. This should provide a useful chance for less experience players to learn more and allow those outside the established clubs to indulge in the thrills and spills of team play. The probable time for such an event would be in the summer. London would seem a reasonable venue.

Secondly, is the Fours the best time to have Congress, or should it be moved to another tournament? The Teams of Four is intended to be a fun tournament which is supposed to be attractive to novices. It seems unlikely that the rather heavy proceedings of Congress are that entertaining to the uninitiated, and it might be better to keep the evening free for more conventional socialising. Would it be better to hold Congress at the Singles or the Pairs, when essentially all those entering have rather more experience of the game than is the case at the Fours? In the long term, a summer team event might be a good time to hold Congress.

Stew Sage

A Letter to the M.D. of various large DIY stores, U.K.

Dear Sir,

We have tried unsuccessfully to obtain a piece of chipboard size 2m x 3m as a playing base for a game of tiddlywinks. We are sure you are aware that this is an internationally agreed standard size, yet your store did not cater for it at all. There was no timber of any sort in this size, and no facility to enable one to be cut.

We were forced to do our shopping elsewhere. Since none of your competitors stock timber in this size either, and the one which did have a cutting facility had no timber at all large enough to even need cutting, we were forced to purchase an interior door.

This is not totally suitable since the size is incorrect and it is subject to "bad bounce" (it also distorts when leant on). We trust you are taking note of our displeasure, and we have persuaded the English Tiddlywinks Association to blacklist your stores.

Regards,

R. Cartwright

M. Surridge

The 1988 London Open

Nick Inglis

Pinner Community Centre, Saturday 18th June

The London Open returned to Pinner this year. Sixteen pairs took part in the seven round Swiss, though the tournament started with three players playing singles since my car (which was known to be arriving with me, Andy Purvis and Patrick Barrie) had been delayed by looking for Andy's partner in Cambridge, a high-speed blow-out on the A1(M), and a missed turning. Patrick and I arrived to find that his partner (Dave Smith) had just potted out against mine (Matthew Rose). We were immediately drafted into action for the subsequent

potting (not what you want to do just after a harrowing journey) and a rather undistinguished performance followed before Matthew and I secured 2 points. Meanwhile the partnerless Andy was now to play with Geoff Thorpe (who had lost 6-1 in the opening game). The clear favourites seemed to be the very strong pairing of Jon Mapley and Charles Relle and last year's winners Mike Surridge and Alan Boyce, but Gary Shrimpton and Peter Wright beat Jon and Charles 6-1 and then did the same to Alan and Mike. A further 6-1 (off Alan and Heather Dean) in round 3 left them $1\frac{1}{2}$ points clear of Alex Satchell and Graham Hancock. The match between these was won 4-3 by Alex and Graham, and Geoff and Andy were catching up with three consecutive sixes.

Now Gary and Peter went into sharp decline, losing 6-1 to Andy and Geoff and 5-2 to Richard Moore and Giles Pickering. Alex and Graham beat Matthew and me $4\frac{2}{3}$ - $2\frac{1}{3}$, so their lead was cut to a sixth of a point. A 4-3 win to Andy and Geoff in the top-of-the-table game meant that they took a five sixths of a point lead on 29 points, but Matthew and I on $25\frac{1}{3}$, and Richard and Giles, and Alan and Heather on 25, were not quite out of it. In the last round Alan and Heather played Graham and Alex while Matthew and I played Geoff and Andy. A 7-0, especially, would have given Matthew and me a chance of the title so we were on the look out for a blitz, but in fact Andy and Geoff both had six free and well positioned. There were one or two attempts before Matthew put three in and then missed into Andy's area. From then on no result really seemed likely except a big win to Geoff and Andy, and that is indeed how it turned out, so Andy wins the London Open for the first time and Geoff for at least the second. Alex and Graham won 4-3 to take second place ahead of Gary and Peter, who 7-0'd Chris and Alastair in the last round. As for the pre-tournament favourites: Jon and Charles finished ninth with 23 points and Mike and Alan finished eleventh equal with $21\frac{1}{2}$ points from seven games!

1988 NATWA Pairs, Boston 10th-11th September 1988

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Total	Position
A	Larry Kahn	—	4	$4\frac{1}{2}$	4	6	$4\frac{1}{2}$	3	1	$59\frac{1}{2}$	2
	Rick Tucker	—	6	6	6	5	6	$1\frac{1}{2}$	2		
B	Richard Moore	3	—	$1\frac{1}{2}$	1	6	7	6	2	54	3
	Geoff Myers	1	—	$4\frac{1}{2}$	5	5	7	3	2		
C	Alex Satchell	$2\frac{1}{2}$	$5\frac{1}{2}$	—	3	$2\frac{1}{3}$	1	6	2	$44\frac{1}{3}$	5
	Peter Wright	1	$2\frac{1}{2}$	—	$4\frac{1}{2}$	6	1	3	4		
D	Tony Heading	3	6	4	—	2	5	6	0	44	6
	Brad Schaefer	1	2	$2\frac{1}{2}$	—	6	4	1	$1\frac{1}{2}$		
E	Tim Roscoe	1	1	$4\frac{2}{3}$	5	—	3	1	4	$28\frac{2}{3}$	8
	Chris Andrew	2	2	1	1	—	1	1	1		
F	Stew Sage	$2\frac{1}{2}$	0	6	2	4	—	$4\frac{1}{2}$	1	$38\frac{1}{2}$	7
	Nick Inglis	1	0	6	3	6	—	$1\frac{1}{2}$	1		
G	Bob Henninge	4	1	1	1	6	$2\frac{1}{2}$	—	6	$53\frac{1}{2}$	4
	Ferd	$5\frac{1}{2}$	4	4	6	6	$5\frac{1}{2}$	—	1		
H	Dave Lockwood	6	5	5	7	3	6	1	—	$69\frac{1}{2}$	1
	Jim Marlin	5	5	3	$5\frac{1}{2}$	6	6	6	—		

1988 London Open

Opponents	Score
Running Total	

1	Mike Surridge	11	6	15	1	6	1	9	5½	3	5	8	2	2	1	11=
	Alan Boyce	6		7		8		13½		18½		20½		21½		
2	Jon Mapley	15	1	16	1	11	3	4	6	9	2	7	4	1	6	9
	Charles Relle	1		2		5		11		13		17		23		
3	Patrick Barrie	13	5	10	2	12	4	5	2	1	2	4	4	9	3	10
	Dave Smith	5		7		11		13		15		19		22		
4	Simon Braidman	5	2	12	2	9	1	2	1	7	2	3	3	11	4	16
	Steve Harbron	2		4		5		6		8		11		15		
5	Richard Moore	4	5	7	5	10	1	3	5	14	4	15	5	6	2½	5
	Giles Pickering	5		10		11		16		20		25		27½		
6	Tim Roscoe	14	1	11	6	1	6	16	1	8	2	12	5	5	4½	7
	Geoff Myers	1		7		13		14		16		21		25½		
7	Tim Jeffreys	9	5	5	2	16	1	11	1	4	5	2	3	12	4	13
	Phil Scarrott	5		7		8		9		14		17		21		
8	Alan Dean	16	6	14	5	15	1	13	3	6	5	1	5	10	3	4
	Heather Dean	6		11		12		15		20		25		28		
9	Stew Sage	7	2	13	1	4	6	1	1½	2	5	14	2	3	4	11=
	Tony Heading	2		3		9		10½		15½		17½		21½		
10	Alex Satchell	12	5½	3	5	5	6	15	4	13	4⅔	16	3	8	4	2
	Graham Hancock	5½		10½		16½		20½		25⅙		28⅙		32⅙		
11	Sean Mayes	1	1	6	1	2	4	7	6	12	5	13	0	4	3	14
	Dave Salter	1		2		6		12		17		17		20		
12	Graham Josland	10	1½	4	5	3	3	14	2½	11	2	6	2	7	3	15
	Rob Cartwright	1½		6½		9½		12		14		16		19		
13	Matthew Rose	3	2	9	6	14	4	8	4	10	2⅓	11	7	16	1	6
	Nick Inglis	2		8		12		16		18⅓		25⅓		26⅓		
14	Chris Andrew	6	6	8	2	13	3	12	4½	5	3	9	5	15	0	8
	Alastair Grant	6		8		11		15½		18½		23½		23½		
15	Gary Shrimpton	2	6	1	6	8	6	10	3	16	1	5	2	14	7	3
	Peter Wright	6		12		18		21		22		24		31		
16	Geoff Thorpe	8	1	2	6	7	6	6	6	15	6	10	4	13	6	1
	Andy Purvis	1		7		13		19		25		29		35		

NATWA Singles 1988, Falls Church, Virginia, 24th -25th September 1988

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Total	Position
A Richard Moore	—	6	1½	5	1	5	5	5½	2	3½	5	1	3	3	6	2	54½	7
B Tony Heading	1	—	4	1	4	1	1	6	4	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	28	15
C Brad Schaefer	5½	3	—	5	6	4½	4½	6	6	4½	1	5	4	6	6	1	68	5
D Rick Tucker	2	6	2	—	1	2½	4	6	2	1	5½	1	1	4	1	4	43	11
E Peter Wright	6	3	1	6	—	6	4	2	6	6	2½	0	1	4	0	1	48½	9
F Jim Marlin	2	6	2½	4½	1	—	6	0	4	1	2	1	4	6	0	5½	45½	10
G Tim Roscoe	2	6	2½	3	3	1	—	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	27½	16
H Stew Sage	1½	1	1	1	5	7	5	—	4	1	1½	0	1	2½	1	1	33½	14
I Nick Inglis	5	3	1	5	1	3	6	3	—	1	2	1	1	5	1	2	40	13
J Geoff Myers	3½	6	2½	6	1	6	6	6	6	—	6	7	6	6	6	1½	75½	2
K Alex Satchell	2	7	6	1½	4½	5	6	5½	5	1	—	1	1	6	5½	0	57½	7
L Jon Mapley	6	6	2	6	7	6	6	7	6	0	6	—	1	6	6	2	73	3
M Severin Drix	4	6	3	6	6	3	6	6	6	1	6	6	—	6	1	3	69	4
N Chris Andrew	4	6	1	3	3	1	5	4½	2	1	1	1	1	—	5	3	41½	12
O Dave Lockwood	1	6	1	6	7	7	6	6	6	1	1½	1	6	2	—	2	59½	6
P Larry Kahn	5	6	6	3	6	1½	7	6	5	5½	7	5	4	4	5	—	76	1

How The Mighty are Fallen

Alan Boyce

Between them, Relle, Surridge, Mapley and Boyce have been winners in virtually every tournament of recent years. In this year's London Open, Surridge and Boyce were going for the hat-trick. Relle and Mapley looked to be their greatest challenge. The clash of the titans came in the seventh and final round.

All winks were brought in. Boyce squopped one of Relle's which had landed adjacent. Boyce saw that all his winks were free and suggested a pot out. Surridge, having seen Boyce struggling slightly in a previous game, was doubtful but agreed to the attempt. Boyce potted the first four, all within about six inches of the pot. He then potted the fifth one from something over a foot. The last one (large green on large blue) flew up in the air and landed within an inch or so of three blues. Relle squopped and Boyce retired until Mapley had completed his counter-pot.

Relle and Mapley won the game 6-1. Was this win enough for Relle and Mapley to overhaul Boyce and Surridge and win the tournament? At the time of writing I don't know who won the tournament, but it certainly wasn't Boyce and Surridge...or Relle and Mapley. Both pairs were about half way down the pack having been beaten by comparative novices throughout the afternoon.

How did this come to pass? I would suggest that the main reason is lack of competitive practice. Boyce has been exiled from Wessex for more than a year. Surridge, now back in Southampton, finds the club almost extinct and anyway has little time to practise. Relle and Mapley are isolated in Catford and Witham respectively. One wonders how they have stayed at the top so long.

In the olden days, I played at Sotwink on Thursdays. Phil Clark lived just up the road and regularly came down to play winks and drink home-made wine. Lots of competitive practice, probably 10 games a week. Now I'm exiled up in Redditch (or down if you live in the North). No winkers in sight. I have practised. I now bring in reasonably well: only one off in this year's London Open (there were three off in the semi-final alone two years ago — and we won). My potting and squopping are not too bad most of the time. Strategy and tactics are disappearing fast. You can practise the shots but you cannot practise outthinking the opposition when there is none.

In the last three tournaments I have been partnered by Mapley (Hants), Relle (Pairs) and Surridge (London) and finished halfway down in all of them. Boyce will partner me in the Singles. I can only hope that he plays better than my previous partners. The only trophy I now hold is the Marchant as part of the Wessex Exiles team. However we are all suffering from the effects described in this article and will be lucky to retain it. At the moment things look black but, like General MacArthur, I shall return. Anybody want a partner for the Hants?

On Tournament Direction

Charles Relle

The size of recent tournaments has grown with the growth of the game and with the increasing expertise of many players, and again, as we did a few years ago, we must look at the organisation and direction of tournaments, for we cannot now make do with ad hoc arrangements. Here are some suggestions for future tournaments.

1. Either ETwA or the club hosting the event should, well in advance, appoint a tournament director. The director should be responsible for the conduct of the tournament, and should, if necessary, delegate to someone else the arrangements for overnight accommodation.

2. Members should be informed of the name of the director as they are of the date of the tournament. They should also be informed of its format, and of possible variations to cope with larger or smaller numbers than expected. Now that movements for most sizes of tournament are generally known, this is not too difficult. Arrangements about accommodation should be circulated too. Generally our information service is very good, but the more information is given in writing beforehand the less cause for complaint there is.

3. ETwA and the director should ascertain how much equipment is going to be brought to the tournament and by whom, and ensure that there is an adequate supply. They should also ensure that one person is put in charge of assembling equipment, so that everyone does not leave it to everyone else. This may involve sending a reply slip with the announcement of a tournament, so that the size of the entry is known in advance. ETwA has a stock of winks and pots: perhaps it ought also to consider buying a stock of mats as well.

4. Tournaments must be started on time. As they grow, it becomes more and more difficult to fit in latecomers and those without partners. I found this in the London Open of 1987 when we lost a round trying to be kind to those who were not in time. This produced more discontent than sending latecomers away. However, since some tournaments are played in the winter and some people have to travel long distances, and since transport of all kinds can be unreliable, it would be a good idea to send out a contact telephone number, preferably that of the venue, with tournament publicity, so that anyone held up can inform the director. This would save wasted journeys.

5. Before the tournament starts, the director must inform the participants whether the two-minute rule is to be applied. If it is applied, it must be applied consistently throughout the tournament. Otherwise (as was again the case in this year's London Open) there is unavoidable tension between tournament directors who have to placate the caretakers of venues and players who feel that unfair pressure is being put on them.

6. Conduct of the tournament includes checking the scores, making sure that the movement is adhered to (what happens if you play the wrong opponents?), settling disputes and fixing the lunch hour. This should be early rather than late, as the pubs are then less full. We should not make the unworthy assumption that players will stay in the pub until closing time! People do sometimes linger, because the lunch hour is the only time in a crowded day in which to renew old acquaintances and make new friends, but the director can politely but firmly urge them back to the tournament, even if this confers on him the onerous duty of being last out of the pub!

I hope these suggestions will be of some use. We put some of them into practice already, but I think that to apply all of them would make our tournaments smoother.

World Singles 28 (Mapley v. Kahn)

Larry Kahn

World Singles 28 proved to be a real slugfest, particularly since it was fought in the middle of a boxing ring at the Original Sports Bar in Baltimore. To set the stage, Jon was 4-4 in World Singles matches, Larry 6-6, and 2-2 against each other.

It was a great setting for a match, although a bit noisy. I think Dave has found his true calling as a winks play-by-play announcer, following in the footsteps of many washed-up jocks. Rick and Jim provided camera work (I haven't seen the tapes, but Rick says they're pretty good) and Brad took notes (ignored for the ETwA version of this report).

Game 1. Jon does not Carnovsky to open the third straight match against Larry and takes an early lead. This is a feeling out game for both players, and pretty soon it feels great for Jon as he squops Larry out. However, Larry continues to attack or bomb and in rounds finally

manages to get the needed blow-up. Very poor potting by Jon allows Larry to make a few game ending pots to escape with a 4.

Game 2. Jon recovers nicely, gaining a solid 6-1. I don't remember much about this game without the notes, other than Jon played quite well and had control most of the way. Larry has a chance for a 4 on the last shot of the game if he can squop-pot a little wink from the bottom of his pile. He makes a good attempt, hitting the side of the pot, but Jon ends with a 6 to lead 9-5.

Game 3. Jon wins squidge-off, both sides come in to establish pot-out threats. Larry Carnovskys fourth wink and brings in his fifth nicely. Jon continues to bring in his potting color well and sends a sacrificial lamb at Larry's close four, just missing, but in the center of several. Larry must now decide, and he decides to pot. He makes the four close ones and brings his last little in very safe, about 12-14" away. Jon tries for it with two long squops but misses.

There are three typical types of great result shots. First, the superbly executed shot, in which the player tries something difficult and does it. Then there's the good/lucky shot, in which you pretty much execute the shot like you want but get an unexpected bonus. The lucky shot is like a rolling bring in that squops a double.

Of course, then you have your basic wild-ass disgustingly perverted ball-buster shot, which Larry now performs. From 12-14" he tries to pot, lands about $\frac{3}{4}$ " short and slightly off center, and the wink bounces up and in. Jon is completely grossed out and Larry then runs his other color to get 7. Larry leads 12-9.

World Singles 28	Game Scores						Total
Jon Mapley	3	6	0	5	1	1	16
Larry Kahn	4	1	7	2	6	6	26

Game 4. A great game for Jon. Larry has all of Jon's winks squopped in one pile fairly early on but has to free one from in the pile. He still has several winks at the baselines. He tries a difficult free and blows up more of the pile than he wanted. Jon takes full advantage and blows up the rest, gaining a triple in the process. The game becomes a real dogfight, Jon having the upper hand. At one point, Jon attacks a double from 2 feet, squopping both the double and the protecting wink. On the very next shot, Larry tries the squop with a big from $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet, hits the pile and does some sort of weird reversal, resquopping it with an underneath wink. In the end, however, it isn't quite enough, as Jon makes some key pots in rounds to take a 5-2 and leave the match tied at 14.

Game 5. Larry brings in well and this begins to make a difference midway through the game as his area becomes solidly established. He eventually squops Jon out, and although he makes a couple of slight errors later in the game to give Jon a few additional chances, he makes the recovery shots to get a solid 6-1. Larry leads 20-15.

Game 6. Again, Larry brings in really well. Jon makes a very questionable decision to go into Larry's area with both colors, since one color was still a pot threat. He attacks reasonably well, but Larry is rolling now and is able to respond to most of Jon's attacks. Larry has full control by the end of time and although Jon gets to squop the big pile in rounds, Larry gets it back to run out the 6 and take the match 26-16.

Larry now becomes the Muhammad Ali of winks, winning the World Singles title for the third time. The match was extremely well played in general, with the bounce-in being the only really lucky break. Most games were won on good play rather than blown, and each

player won a game in which he had been completely squopped out. For a few months, at least, all outstanding challenges have been cleared for the first time in I don't know how long, although Larry has a stored re-challenge from his NATwA Singles win.

Another One Bites the Dust

Larry Kahn

With his narrow $\frac{1}{2}$ point second place finish in the NATwA Singles, Geoff Myers becomes another of the many players to fail to break through during his first tournament of being in contention. He's in very good company, however. Dave won it in 77 and 78 after narrowly missing out to Sunshine in the last round the previous year. Larry led most of the way in 78 before fading and then got overtaken by Pam in the last round in 1980 before getting over the final hump the next year (and the next and the next...). Arye finished second three years in a row before winning in 1984. Joe never did recover. After losing in a 1979 play-off to Severin he never came close again. In the last 12 years, only Pam and Sunshine managed to win without coming close previously, and they never repeated.

Us old fogies are still managing to hold on. In the 1980's, there have been 16 National Singles so far. Out of these, Larry has won 8, Dave and Jon 2, Alan and Charles 1 each. The only relative non-olddimers have been Pam and Arye. Is it time for the upstart youngsters to take over or can the old guard hold out for another few years? We keep expecting it to happen, but at least for now I think we can keep ahead of you young whippersnappers. How about an old timer (15+ years) - young stud match sometime?

1988 Teams of Four

Nick Inglis

Southampton, 29th-30th October

The early leaders in this year's Teams of Four were a team led by Alex Satchell and Graham Hancock rejoicing in the charming name of F.O.A.D. (that's what happens when you let Graham name the team), who beat the a Nonc-2-Shabby Sotwink outfit 24-4, but only won $19\frac{1}{2}$ - $8\frac{1}{2}$ after transfer. They were closely followed by Betty's Boys Despite Everything (led by Richard Moore and Stew Sage), but can't have been worried because, after all, Stew never wins anything. Despite this Betty's Boys had a comfortable victory in the top-of-the-table clash and took first place, while Geoff Myers' Team With No Name (later to become known as the Team With No Brain) sneaked into second, just ahead of Steve Chamberlin's Scraping The Barrels, who had made good use of an $8\frac{1}{2}$ point transfer against the heavily handicapped Leftovers (Charles Relle, Andy Purvis, Alan Dean and Heather Dean — a total handicap of 24).

Satanic Cat Stranglers (a CUTwC team led by Patrick Barrie and Nick Inglis) were right in the middle of the table at this point with 27 points from 2 matches, just a sixth of a point behind PINTS (the Pinner team, strengthened this year by the addition of Gary Shrimpton). A $22\frac{1}{2}$ - $5\frac{1}{2}$ victory to the Cat Stranglers took them to the top of the table (a sixth of a point ahead of the Team with No Brain, who had narrowly defeated Betty's Boys) and sent PINTS to the bottom. In the report of last year's tournament I observed that after round 4 the top five rather boringly remained the same, so this year I won't even bother to point out that the top four after round 3 most unimaginatively continued to occupy these positions for the rest of the tournament.

In order to keep Congress down to a manageable length it was decided to break early (half way through the fourth round), hold Congress immediately and let people's stomachs

A Satanic Cat Stranglers (11)	
Patrick Barrie (6)	Nick Inglis (5)
Stewart Fenton (0)	Stuart Collins (0)
B Carpenters Fan Club (22)	
Mike Surridge (7)	Jim Carrington (6)
Rob Cartwright (5)	Phil Clark (4)
C None-2-Shabby (5)	
Paul Hutchings (2)	Nick Geary (2)
Paul Baron (0)	Steve Phillips (1)
D Betty's Boys Despite Everything (15)	
Richard Moore (6)	Stew Sage (5)
Tony Hending (4)	Savice Alcock (0)
E The Team With No Name (11)	
Geoff Myers (7)	Matthew Rose (4)
Andy Leiper (0)	Simon Gandy (0)
F F.O.A.D. (14)	
Alex Satchell (6)	Graham Hancock (5)
Julian Wiseman (3)	Ed Wynn (0)
G PINTS (14)	
Tim Jeffreys (4)	Phil Scarrott (3)
Simon Braidman (2)	Gary Shrimpton (5)
H Scraping The Barrels (7)	
Steve Chamberlin (4)	Jon Carlaw (3)
Jackie Carter (0)	Margo Outhwaite (0)
I The Leftovers (24)	
Charles Relle (7)	Andy Purvis (7)
Alan Dean (7)	Heather Dean (3)
J The Dregs (18)	
Alan Boyce (5)	Nick May (4)

persuade them to be brief. This seemed to work and the assembled masses departed to find accommodation, those CUTwC players who imposed on Liz Bertoya's hospitality in Salisbury being given the opportunity to eat some outstandingly greasy kebabs and witness a street brawl (which we didn't even start!).

The Cat Stranglers slightly consolidated their lead by beating the Team With No Brain 18-10, but then lost 12-16 to Betty's Boys, giving Betty's Boys a half point lead over the Cat Stranglers, who in turn led F.O.A.D. by one and a half points. Round six saw Stew playing silly buggers against the heavily handicapped Carpenters Fan Club (WETS by another name). Stew and Richard's 11 points (I just typed 11 pints — perhaps that would have been more appropriate) helped Betty's Boys to a 15-13 victory, $18\frac{1}{2}$ - $9\frac{1}{2}$ after transfer. Meanwhile the Cat Stranglers were losing to The Dregs (Alan Boyce and Nick May playing singles), and F.O.A.D. leapt into second place.

In the final round the Cat Stranglers played F.O.A.D. and their $17\frac{1}{2}$ - $10\frac{1}{2}$ win was good enough to overtake F.O.A.D., but Betty's Boys were always in control against PINTS and a $17\frac{1}{2}$ - $10\frac{1}{2}$ victory was easily good enough to take the title. Congratulations to the winning

1988 Teams of Four

A	Satanic Cat Stranglers	H	13½	B	13½	G	22½	E	18	D	12	J	12½	F	17½	2
			13½		27		49½		67½		79½		92		109½	
B	Carpenters Fan Club	E	11½	A	14½	C	16	F	12	I	13½	D	9½	J	16	7
			11½		26		42		54		67½		77		93	
C	None-2-Shabby	F	8½	J	15½	B	12	I	12½	G	9½	E	16	H	12	10
			8½		24		36		48½		58		74		86	
D	Betty's Boys Despite Everything	J	18½	F	17	E	12	H	16½	A	16	B	18½	G	17½	1
			18½		35½		47½		64		80		98½		116	
E	The Team With No Name	B	16½	G	16½	D	16	A	10	F	13	C	12	I	17½	4
			16½		33½		49½		59½		72½		84½		101½	
F	F.O.A.D.	C	19½	D	11	H	16½	B	16	E	15	I	16	A	10½	3
			19½		30½		47		63		78		94		104½	
G	PINTS	I	16	E	11½	A	5½	J	12½	C	18½	H	17	D	10½	8
			16		27½		32½		45½		63½		80½		91½	
H	Scraping The Barrels	A	14½	I	17½	F	11½	D	11½	J	13½	G	11	C	16	6
			14½		32		43½		55		68½		79½		95½	
I	The Leftovers	G	12	H	10½	J	11½	C	15½	B	14½	F	12	E	10½	9
			12		22½		34		49½		64		76		86½	
J	The Dregs	D	9½	C	12½	I	16½	G	15½	H	14½	A	15½	B	12	5
			9½		22		38½		54		68½		84		96	

team of Richard Moore, Stew Sage, Tony Heading (who played particularly well) and Savige Alcock, one of an excellent crop of six CUTwC novices. Many thanks to Sotwink for organising the venue, putting people up and helping to make this a very successful and fun tournament.

A Winks Sportsmanship Problem

Larry Kahn

Here's a situation that actually arose at the NATwA Singles. After thinking about it after the fact, an interesting ethical dilemma could have arisen. I don't know if there's a right or wrong answer, this article is simply to facilitate a discussion.

Going into the last round, I was ahead of Geoff by 1½ points. We agreed to start or games at about the same time. At the end of my game, I had the last shot. I had a guaranteed 5 if I did nothing, and had to pot 3 reasonably easy winks for a 6. If I missed and landed on my other color, it would be a 4, so there was a big risk to try it. I went over to Geoff's game where he had a 6. It was in the fourth round and one of each of his colors was single squopped. I went back and took the 5. In the fifth round Geoff's opponent tried to pot off Geoff's ending color instead of off another wink, giving Geoff a chance for the 7, which he didn't end up

getting. I'm not complaining about the choice of shot, but in retrospect I thought about what the correct procedure should be in exchanging information.

Given that the games were not played in total isolation from each other (the ideal case) I would have proceeded as follows: before taking my last shot I would go to Geoff and say "I have a guaranteed 5 with a play for 6 if I need it. To have a chance of winning the tournament you need 7." I feel that after supplying this information I should then be allowed to wait until his game was completed before deciding whether to try for a needed 6. I think this is OK since Geoff gets information that 6 isn't enough, whereas in the purely isolated case he might not try for 7 if he believes 6 will win. Any other opinions?