

WINKING



WORLD

The Official Journal of the
English Tiddlywinks Association

February 1990

Contents

Editorial	<i>Andy Purvis</i>	1
Andy Has A Rant		
The Catford Invitation Individual	<i>Rob Cartwright</i>	2
Mike Surridge earns the accolade 'very boring'		
The 1989 National Teams of Four	<i>Tony Heading</i>	3
Environmental disaster - CFC's rampant in Oxford		
Handicaps	<i>Mike Surridge</i>	6
A possible way forward for the Fours		
CB's Good Ol' Days	<i>Tim Jeffreys</i>	9
Featuring The Bay Tree Quote of the Week		
The 1989 National Singles		10
I'll give you three guesses who wins... yep, you guessed		
Blue Group	<i>Jon Mapley</i>	10
Green Group	<i>Geoff Myers</i>	11
Red Group	<i>Rob Cartwright</i>	12
Yellow Group	<i>Charles Relle</i>	14
The Final	<i>Andy Purvis</i>	15
Letters to the Editor		18
Poem to the Editor	<i>Geoff Thorpe</i>	19
The Third Somerset Invitation Individual	<i>Andy Purvis</i>	20
This time, the grandfather clock survives		
Rules Proposals, Part I	<i>Jon Mapley</i>	20
The Rules Sub-Committee's proposals...		
Intermission - The 'Free Wink' and Thorpe's Ring	<i>Geoff Thorpe</i>	25
Will this happen as often as Dave Lockwood running six within five minutes ?		
Rules Proposals, Part II	<i>Jon Mapley</i>	25
A Squidge Too Far...	<i>Andy Purvis</i>	26
(or 'how to fill a blank space at the bottom of the page')		
The 1990 Cambridge Open	<i>Andy Purvis</i>	27
Stoshman wins - but who is Stoshman?		
Nick Inglis' World Ratings	<i>Andy Purvis</i>	35
We can all have a good rant about this one		
Forthcoming Tournaments		38

Editorial

This is my first *Winking World*, and I hope I manage to maintain the high standards set by my predecessors. This issue is certainly unusual in one respect - it's coming out early. My intention had been to write up the Silver Wink, which hasn't yet happened, and produce *WW* for the Hampshire Open. However, there is a nasty computer virus going around at the moment, so I'm trying to finish this edition before things all go horribly wrong.

As well as reports of all the recent tournaments, this edition features Mike Surridge's thoughts on handicapping, the proposals for Rules changes (to be discussed at the Pairs), and the first appearance of the computerised World Ratings, where Tony Heading is at the top... of the second page. I should have liked to include some news from America but, despite my joining NATwA for both last year and this, I am yet to receive any Newswinks. Hint, hint... Two competitions which don't feature much in this issue are the Jubilee Trophy and the Golden Squidger. These are both challenge trophies, the former being singles and the latter for pairs. Currently, I am the holder of the Jubilee while the Golden Squidger remains in the hands of Alan Dean and Mike Surridge. Anyone wishing to challenge for either trophy should write to Stew Sage.

On the subject of tournaments - the scoresheet for the Singles Final has a new feature; pot-out games are asterisked. I think this makes the scoresheet more interesting, and would be grateful if tournament organisers could ask players to adopt this convention when filling in their scores.

I've been going through the *WW* archive lately. Hidden amidst a random mish-mash of paper (including Class 5B's Summer 1982 English Language Paper II, and a beautifully typed copy of the Bruces' Philosophers Song) I found rather a lot of spare back-issues. These can be purchased from me (oops, from ETwA) for 40p apiece. There are copies for sale of issues 8, 9, 12-14, 16-18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27-33, 35-37, 39, 41, 43-46 and 48. If you'd like a copy of any other issues, I'm happy to sell you a photocopy at cost price (ish). There are, however, some gaps in the archive too; I'd be very grateful to anyone who could supply me with spare copies or photocopies of issues 10, 15, 22, 26 and 42. Also in the archives were two small booklets, written by Guy Consterdine, which describe in great detail the first few years of the modern game. If there's any interest, I'll produce a nice new laser-printed edition of these.

Charles, Jon and myself have written a twelve page Introduction to Tiddlywinks, which covers shots, tactics and strategy. This is now available in huge quantities from myself or Patrick Barrie.

Finally from me, I'd like to thank everyone who's contributed to this issue, especially Tim whose sketches appear, often uncredited, throughout. Please keep the articles coming, or I may be forced to write up some Jubilee matches...

The Catford Invitation Individual

Spring 1989

by Rob Cartwright

It is unusual for Charles not to write his own pithy and witty description of this event, but this year the GCSE system got the better of his work capacity and forced me to step in.

As usual, the tournament was an 8-player all-partner-all, the players this time being Messrs Purvis, Inglis, Edwards, Surridge, Shrimpton, Clark, Cartwright and Host Charles Relle. The selection was due to the indefatigable efforts of this lot to go to Newts meetings, despite living up to a hundred miles away !

Play started promptly nearly an hour late, due to Mike having a minor contretemps with Network South-East (which shows up the vagaries of BR very well since I, using the ThamesLink, had got from Bedford to Catford in only an hour and a quarter), and the tension showed when both the opening games resulted in 4-3's. The second round was more clearcut, with a margin of $4\frac{2}{3} - 2\frac{1}{3}$ to myself and Charles against Cyril and Nick. Then a good 6-1 with Gary against Phil and Nick, and I unexpectedly found myself in the lead going into lunch. I also found to my distaste that I don't like Pimms !

Charles' culinary efforts proved to be to everyone's taste, with Mike ensuring that Phil didn't hoard the oca on his side of the table, and the whole family being present made a pleasant change from pie and beans in the pub. More wines and spirits probably made the difference to my game, since things deteriorated from that point on, and I scored a total of five points in the afternoon.

I retained the lead for the first game after lunch, but Gary had moved within $\frac{2}{3}$ of a point, and Charles was only a point behind. This was an impressive pot-out attempt where, under Cyril's guidance, I stuck five from outrageous places all under attack, but then missed the sixth. Andy cleared up and counter-potted and Cyril beat Phil for our two points. Next round, Gary took the lead but, after their six against myself and Nick, Andy and Mike were snapping close.

Mike overhauled the leaders in round six with another 6-1 against Phil and me. Cyril had his best game so far, a $4\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2}$ to take Andy to only half a point behind, whilst Gary dropped back to third. But Andy had the disadvantage; he was partnering me. The almost inevitable silly pot-out followed, failed, and another 1 point for Rob. Had we got the seven, of course, Andy would have won... Mike got yet another six, winning the title with a total of 32 from seven games and getting the accolade "VERY boring" on the scoresheet.

Despite a valiant effort, I didn't quite come last, thus breaking my own record in Individuals. That honour went to Cyril, who was in plenty of tight

1989 Catford Invitation Individual

A	Andy Purvis	B	FH	E	DF	H	CD	F	CG	D	BG	C	BE	G	EH	4
		3	3	4	7	3	10	5	15	6	21	$4\frac{1}{2}$	$25\frac{1}{2}$	1	$26\frac{1}{2}$	
B	Nick Inglis	A	FH	C	GH	F	EG	H	DE	G	AD	E	AC	D	CF	6
		3	3	$2\frac{1}{3}$	$5\frac{1}{3}$	1	$6\frac{1}{3}$	4	$10\frac{1}{3}$	1	$11\frac{1}{3}$	$2\frac{1}{2}$	$13\frac{5}{6}$	6	$19\frac{5}{6}$	
C	Cyril Edwards	E	DG	B	GH	D	AH	G	AF	H	EF	A	BE	F	BD	8
		3	3	$2\frac{1}{3}$	$5\frac{1}{3}$	4	$9\frac{1}{3}$	2	$11\frac{1}{3}$	1	$12\frac{1}{3}$	$4\frac{1}{2}$	$16\frac{5}{6}$	1	$17\frac{5}{6}$	
D	Mike Surridge	G	CE	F	AE	C	AH	E	BH	A	BG	H	FG	B	CF	1
		4	4	3	7	4	11	3	14	6	20	6	26	6	32	
E	Gary Shrimpton	C	DG	A	DF	G	BF	D	BH	F	CH	B	AC	H	AG	2
		3	3	4	7	6	13	3	16	6	22	$2\frac{1}{2}$	$24\frac{1}{2}$	6	$30\frac{1}{2}$	
F	Phil Clark	H	AB	D	AE	B	EG	A	CG	E	CH	G	DH	C	BD	5
		4	4	3	7	1	8	5	13	6	19	1	20	1	21	
G	Rob Cartwright	D	CE	H	BC	E	BF	C	AF	B	AD	F	DH	A	EH	7
		4	4	$4\frac{2}{3}$	$8\frac{2}{3}$	6	$14\frac{2}{3}$	2	$16\frac{2}{3}$	1	$17\frac{2}{3}$	1	$18\frac{2}{3}$	1	$19\frac{2}{3}$	
H	Charles Relle	F	AB	G	BC	A	CD	B	DE	C	EF	D	FG	E	AG	3
		4	4	$4\frac{2}{3}$	$8\frac{2}{3}$	3	$11\frac{2}{3}$	4	$15\frac{2}{3}$	1	$16\frac{2}{3}$	6	$22\frac{2}{3}$	6	$28\frac{2}{3}$	

Partner	Opponents
Score	Running Total

games and had two or three just-missed pot-outs that never quite worked out. Charles' position ? Third, probably better than his average !

Thanks Charles, for a good fun day's winks.

The National Teams of Four

University College, Oxford, 28th - 29th October 1989
by Tony Heading

1989 was the year of the Carpenters. Carpentry has a long and distinguished tradition. Jesus was trained as a carpenter, Joseph was a carpenter, and his father and grandfather before him, yea unto the dawn of time. Many would suggest that the members of the Carpenters Fan Club are similarly venerable, and should thus be held in some esteem.

Whatever the truth of the matter, Cartwright, Carrington, Boyce and Clark have broken the mould of the Fours. It is pleasing to see that it was not a Cambridge

A. All Over Betty's Boys Again (16)

Richard Moore (7) Stew Sage (5)
Simon Gandy (4) Paul Chatrath (0)

B. The Blatant Lie (12)

Patrick Barrie (7) Stew Fenton (3)
Ian Gameson (2) Kristian Armstrong (0)

C. Charles Relle's Brain (10)

Nick Inglis (6) James Cullingham (2)
Ed Wynn (2) Simon Guest (0)

D. PINTS (12)

Tim Jeffreys (5) Phil Scarrott (4)
Simon Braidman (3) Graham White (0)

E. The Carpenters' Fan Club (21)

Alan Boyce (6) Phil Clark (5)
Jim Carrington (5) Rob Cartwright (5)

F. Jetsam (11)

Steve Chamberlin (5) Nick May (4)
Margo Outhwaite (1) Jon Harris (1)

G. Something Witty (7)

Jon Carlaw (3) Steve Phillips (3)
Jackie Carter (1) John Duffield (0)

H. Who The Hell Is Betty ? (14)

Jon Mapley (7) Geoff Myers (7)
Gavin Keyte (0) Kath Mumford (0)
Simon Julier (0)

I. The Edible Doormats (16)

Mike Surridge (7) Geoff Thorpe (6)
Ken Zetie (3) Rupert Wilson (0)

J. 3615 Giles (13)

Andy Purvis (7) Tony Heading (6)
Jon Stanbridge (0) Damian Connaughton (0)

K. The Team That Loses All The Time (11)

Alex Satchell (6) Stu Collins (3)
Naveed Chaudhri (1) Andy Ball (1)

whitewash as has perhaps been the case in the last couple of years, due to under-handicapping the Fenland freshers. This year saw liberal application of the Mike Surridge "Give the bastards two points per game, handicaps of 17x10⁹ each, and tie lead weights to their squidgers" philosophy. Some credit for bloody-mindedness must be given to "The Blatant Lie" for overcoming these adverse conditions, and finishing second.

Finishing in third place were the PINTS. These dear little men from London are surprisingly resilient in the face of stiff competition. Much praise must go to the inexperienced Graham White, who played with Phil Scarrott. The 6-1 against that nice Mr. Surridge was a particularly entertaining game.

And plummeting down the results table, "Who The Hell is Betty?" posed a rhetorical question, and it remains to be seen whether they found out. "Oooooooooooooohhhh, that Jon Mapley - he's such a *nice* boy!" This team was much in keeping with the spirit of the Fours, both Jon Mapley and 'Beady' Myers partnering novices. One hopes they all enjoyed themselves...

"The Team that Loses All The Time" patently didn't lose *all* the time, finishing ahead of "The Edible Doormats". No prizes for realising that something as patently unedible as a doormat will have some connection with Ken Zetie. A reasonable performance all round, unremarkable score-wise

1989 National Teams of Four

	Team	Rd. 1	Rd. 2	Rd. 3	Rd. 4	Rd. 5	Rd. 6	Rd. 7	Ave.	Pos.
A	All Over Betty's Boys Again	Bye	I	D	B	C	J	K	11.25	10th
		---	11	12	$5\frac{1}{2}$	10	$13\frac{1}{2}$	$15\frac{1}{2}$		
B	The Blatant Lie	K	E	Bye	A	D	C	F	15.67	2nd
		16	$9\frac{1}{2}$	---	$22\frac{1}{2}$	$11\frac{1}{2}$	17	$17\frac{1}{2}$		
C	Charles Relle's Brain	G	H	K	D	A	B	I	11.21	11th
		$13\frac{1}{2}$	13	4	10	18	11	9		
D	PINTS	E	F	A	C	B	I	H	15.50	3rd
		$8\frac{1}{2}$	14	16	18	$16\frac{1}{2}$	$21\frac{1}{2}$	14		
E	The Carpenters' Fan Club	D	B	I	K	H	F	J	16.21	1st
		$19\frac{1}{2}$	$18\frac{1}{2}$	$17\frac{1}{2}$	$14\frac{1}{2}$	$13\frac{1}{2}$	18	12		
F	Jetsam	J	D	G	Bye	K	E	B	12.92	8th
		13	14	17	---	13	10	$10\frac{1}{2}$		
G	Something Witty	C	J	F	H	I	Bye	Bye	12.52	9th
		$14\frac{1}{2}$	$13\frac{1}{2}$	11	$11\frac{7}{12}$	12	---	---		
H	Who The Hell Is Betty ?	I	C	J	G	E	K	D	15.39	4th
		$13\frac{1}{2}$	15	$18\frac{5}{6}$	$16\frac{5}{12}$	$14\frac{1}{2}$	$15\frac{1}{2}$	14		
I	The Edible Doormats	H	A	E	J	G	D	C	14.00	6th
		$14\frac{1}{2}$	17	$10\frac{1}{2}$	$14\frac{1}{2}$	16	$6\frac{1}{2}$	19		
J	3615 Giles	F	G	H	I	Bye	A	E	13.78	7th
		15	$14\frac{1}{2}$	$9\frac{1}{6}$	$13\frac{1}{2}$	---	$14\frac{1}{2}$	16		
K	The Team That Loses All The Time	B	Bye	C	E	F	H	A	14.92	5th
		12	---	24	$13\frac{1}{2}$	15	$12\frac{1}{2}$	$12\frac{1}{2}$		

perhaps, but entertaining to play against, provided you didn't mind an average waiting time of 2.2 eons per unit shot.

And so we come to Little ol' Me and Mad Dog Purvis. Working under the code-name "36-15 Giles" we had a superb bye just adjacent to lunch-time, and many pints of mulled wine were consumed in the local hostelry. Winks was unremarkable, though both Damian Connaughton and Jon Stanbridge played to a high novice standard. Sadly though, their combined handicap of zero did not help them when Purvis & Heading teamed up to take the wind out of the Carpenters' sails with a brace of 6-1's. Nonetheless, the cry of pure joy and exultation when Phil Clark potted out against Jon and Damian does remind one that there is still sportsmanship in the game.

And while we're on the subject of gentlemanly behaviour and sportsmanship, what happened to Sage's team? Second from last. Oh well, never mind. Better luck next time.

"Something Witty" vaguely coped, a very low handicap team, which doesn't make it easy to come high up the score table. One might have expected slightly more from "Charles Relle's Brain" but the results there were a little disappointing.

All in all, a witty tournament. Many thanks to OUTS for providing the venue and entertainment - see y'all next year!

Quotes of the tournament :

"I can't drink tonight; I've got work to do." - Naveed Chaudhri.

"Bloooooaaarggghh!" - Naveed Chaudhri, later that night, after changing his mind and then tripping over Geoff Thorpe.

"If Steve Chamberlin says he'll be late, he'll be late." - Anonymous Carpenter.

Handicaps by Mike Surridge

This year at Congress during the last minute rush for the door, the outgoing Chairman announced that ETWA would no longer need my services as handicapper and would adopt a system similar to the seeding process used for the singles.

I have on occasion been involved in the seedings, and I can't help feeling that the methods used for determining the order of the top 20 or so players are unlikely to work well for the handicapping problem. I have been setting handicaps since 1984, and I would like to set out the problems I have encountered, so that ETWA can find a more sensible system of doing the handicaps.

Essentially, the method I have used for handicapping is to make up a list of 20-30 players spanning all the ratings (7 down to 0). These people serve as landmarks or milestones against which all other players can be judged.

The manner in which I work out these ratings is as follows :

1. Set up a list for players whose current form is well known to me, Sotwink and perhaps some WETS. This list is based on week-to-week form over a period, and is tested at regular intervals by use in Sotwink internal events.

2. Add well known players with a good attendance record at tournaments, for whom relative strengths can easily be established. Hopefully, there will be enough reference points between these and the

players listed in (1) to allow all handicaps at this stage to be on a consistent scale.

3. Fine tune the list to take into account factors which will affect current form, or which indicate changed form over the period of the Fours. This is done because I take as my objective producing a close result, rather than picking out those whose abilities have changed since they were last tested.

4. On the day, integrate all other players based on the opinions of those most likely to know them (I rely to a great extent on Nick Inglis and Stewart Sage who usually produce their own lists of handicaps with all the CUTwC attendees). This is done by using the partial list to normalise the scales of other lists incorporated at this point.

Firstly, I will say why the singles seeding system is unlikely to work. The method used there is that a number of people produce their lists of the top 20-30 players. These are then added together to obtain average rankings from the lists. These average rankings are taken as the seeding order for the singles.

The reason it works is that the higher ranked players (say twice the number of finalists) appear on all lists and are well known. We may get inconsistencies lower down, but these rarely affect who actually goes through (as can be seen from the fact that very few top seeds fail to make it).

In handicapping, one has to get reasonably accurate rankings for everybody, which will be difficult once you start to consider players known only within a single club. Furthermore, having an ordering is not enough - it is also necessary to decide where to break the ordering up into bands for each rating. For these reasons, it is unlikely that the great and good will reach a sensible set of handicaps without extensive discussion amongst themselves and with representatives of all the clubs.

Now I would like to bring up the problems I have encountered with the Fours. Firstly, I would like the result to be close. This means that one can afford to get some people wrong by a point, but one has to be careful not to get a team wrong by several points. If we play 7-8 rounds, then a single player being a point out in handicap makes for a four point difference in the team's score over the tournament - the same as a single game going astray. It is not very meaningful for individuals to wrangle over their handicaps for this reason. If I was less easy-going (!) I would simply add a point to the handicap of anyone who argues (a small penalty, but possibly enough to speed up the start of the tournament significantly).

The main reason for teams being handicapped wrongly over the years has been that they are usually made up of people from one club, many of whom were handicapped during phase (4) of my system (see above). In a strong club (such as Cambridge), the top players tend to get spread out a bit more, and all but the very strongest end up with lower handicaps overall. I became aware of this after the gross under-handicapping of Tim Hedger in his second year. I do not always manage to account for it accurately when incorporating the CUTwC lists into the final list of handicaps.

Another problem is the case of extremely strong teams. The handicaps are not very good at catering for single matches, tending to reduce the scale of the result rather than give a draw. This is because a small superiority often results in a 6-1, so that scores are rarely very close before transfer. The hope is that when averaged over many different opponents, the handicaps give a close result for the whole tournament. The strongest team will therefore tend to win most matches, but will lose heavily when a slip-up occurs. Sometimes this doesn't happen, as with the Four Gauche Men a few years ago. This year, the Carpenters Fan Club had a highly error-free run and, helped by my error in lowering Jim Carrington on the basis of a long absence from the game, built up a large lead. (I don't know if they retained it until the end as I left early).

More serious than the sheer good play of the top team is an under-handicapped weak team. Such a team can win a few games against low (but nominally better) opposition and get a long way in front. Thereafter, they cannot be caught because the transfer gives them a reasonable score even if thrashed, and the rest of the field can only make up a few points per match. The Hedger debacle was a disaster principally because it created such a team (in combination with the under-handicapping of an unknown player making a comeback several years after graduating from CUTwC).

Assuming something like my system is used for handicapping, there are a number of problems which should be resolved before the next event.

The most serious problem is the mismatch between handicap scales used at the different clubs. The Sotwink scale which underpins my implementation tends to maximise the gap between inexperienced players and mid-range experienced players, with the result that all the strong Cambridge people end up above Steve Chamberlin (*i.e.* handicap 6-7). I think this is reasonable as it gives a greater edge to novices, although it may result in less close scores between teams containing strong players whose differences are less well reflected.

The crucial step in resolving this problem is a decision on what function the handicaps are to serve. Do we want to make life easier for novices, or distinguish more finely the stronger players?

The second problem is the "strongest team", who are unlikely to lose many matches and will win easily if they don't make any errors. A solution here may be to alter the way individual handicaps are combined so that teams with no weak players are penalised a little more heavily. The geometric mean (as opposed to the arithmetic mean) has been proposed, but when I tried this out it didn't work at all well for any base value (which is added to all ratings before doing the multiplication). The best I can come up with is a "bonus" scheme, where the team's handicap is adjusted upwards for each pair higher than 8 (say). Again, one has to address the question of whether the system should cater properly for very strong teams, or be so weighted against them that no strong team will enter.

Thirdly, we need a more accurate method of comparing the weaker players (whose form is often very variable, and who rarely play each other).

As noted, errors in handicapping weak teams are far more serious than errors in strong teams as a weak team can never be beaten very heavily and can quickly become uncatchable in the lead. Part of the problem here is the different standards at each club, but a further aid would be a better analysis of the lower players' results (at the Cambridge Open, for instance). Nick's rating program is not ideal, but can be very helpful where there is little data to go on.

Finally, I raise the question, what do you do about wrong handicaps after the start of the tournament? At Sotwink we ran a tournament last term in which the handicaps were adjusted upwards every time a team won by a certain margin and downwards if they lost by a larger margin. This meant that to win the tournament, your handicap had to rise quite a bit. The top pairs had some very tough games, while the bottom pairs found it increasingly easy to achieve an upset. We used it on an all-play-all tournament with 6 pairs, and it was never in anybody's interest to lose deliberately (as this cost more than the handicap benefits). In a larger event, one has to be careful with the precise rules under which handicaps change. Such a system would help to negate errors in assigning the starting handicaps, but would add slightly to the overheads of running the tournament. Does anybody want to try it at the Fours?

C.B.'s Good Ol' Days

by Tim Jeffreys



"The Bay Tree"
Quote Of The Week

"I only came in for a quick half"
Nigel Parsons, 20th October, 1989
Time of quote - 7.29 p.m.
Time of arrival - 12.00 noon

The ETwA National Singles

*Southampton University Students Union, 19th - 20th
November 1989*

The Singles returned to Southampton after two years away, but quite a few well-known faces were missing - Mike Surridge, Jim Carrington, Alan Boyce and Keith Seaman, to name but four. Dave Lockwood was flying in to Gatwick on the morning of the tournament. As the start time neared there was still no sign of him. But speculation about possible Customs difficulties proved groundless; he eventually arrived after a slightly late flight and a frisky sprint down the motorway with Charles. Ominously for the British players, both Dave and Larry were saying that they were on their best form for years...

Blue Group *by Jon Mapley*

Ten players - top three to qualify - piece of cake. That's how it should have been - it is a lot more comfortable knowing that third place is a guarantee, but tell that to Alan Dean. John Duffield, the first-term Southampton novice, scored five points and finished 12 behind the next player, but played some unbelievable shots, using sensible strategy. Congratulations to John and the coaching team!

After four rounds, the shape was apparent, with Mapley, Dean and Hancock, the top seeds, filling places 2nd and 4th. The leader, on 25, was Matthew Rose. Tony Heading, the other real contender, was fifth on 18, and dived out with ones against Alan and Jon in the next two rounds. His cause had been scuppered earlier by Nick May, who took six off him in round two, having failed to take advantage of Jon's customary sweaty start in the first game.

Matthew handed the lead to Graham, who was to share it with Jon, on and off, for the rest of the qualifying. This did not dent Matthew's challenge, though, as he took a 4½ off Alan in the sixth and a 4 off Jon in the seventh. This round also saw Alan drop out of the qualifying spots with a one against Graham.

The other contenders, Julian, Stu Collins and Jon Carlaw, were now knocking hell out of each other for the minor placings. Julian would have done himself some good if his sixth wink against Jon M. had behaved as impeccably as the other five in round 5, Jon's cause being saved by a long squop.

Matthew suffered a setback in round 8, losing 6-1 to Tony. Jon's 5-2 against Graham made them both safe on 44 points and Alan, after a relieved 7 against John, was on 40. Matthew was apparently out of it on 35½, but got

	Blue Division	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	Tot.	Pos.
A	Jon Mapley	-	5	5	6	3	6	7	6	5	6	49	1=
B	Alan Dean	2	-	1	6	2½	6	7	5½	6	6	42	3
C	Graham Hancock	2	6	-	5	6	5	7	6	6	6	49	1=
D	Tony Heading	1	1	2	-	6	6	6	5	6	1	34	5
E	Matthew Rose	4	4½	1	1	-	6	7	6	6	6	41½	4
F	Julian Wiseman	1	1	2	1	1	-	6	4	1	7	24	8
G	John Duffield	0	0	0	1	0	1	-	1	1	1	5	10
H	Stu Collins	1	1½	1	2	1	3	6	-	5	6	26½	7
I	Jon Carlaw	2	1	1	1	1	6	6	2	-	7	27	6
J	Nick May	1	1	1	6	1	0	6	1	0	-	17	9

six in his last round fairly quickly, leaving Alan to score two against Jon to qualify. At this stage, from a positionally ultra-defensive start, Alan had got himself well and truly buried, but squeezed a couple of winks out late in the game. Some nervy potting saw him scrape the requisite two. Sportingly, Matthew was the first to congratulate him. Half-points can appear huge at times. After Tony, all on his own 7½ behind Matthew, there was another seven point gap to Jon C., who pipped Stu by a half for sixth. Julian was close behind in eighth, with Nick not really doing himself justice with 17 points. Oh, what might have been !

Green Group *by Geoff Myers*

In Green Division the early rounds saw things go according to plan for the top seeds Geoff Myers, Richard Moore, Alex Satchell and Tim Jeffreys - clearly the qualifiers would come from this quartet. Gary Shrimpton had his chances blighted by 3-4 losses in the first two rounds against first-timers James Cullingham and Ed Wynn.

Richard and Geoff began to dominate leaving a battle royal for the final qualification place between Alex and Tim. In Round 5 Richard defeated Tim 5½ - 1½, but worse was to follow for Tim with the indignity of a 0-7 against Geoff. Alex fared better against the top two - but only slightly. He managed a mere three points from rounds seven and eight. Meanwhile Tim was held to a 4-3 by Ian Cragg (who was giving everyone a tough game). This left Tim on 29½ points and Alex on 30 with just the head-to-head to come. It proved to be a nerve-racking affair but Tim held on to win 5-2. Commiserations to Alex who was thus narrowly nudged out of the last

	Green Division	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	Tot.	Pos
A	Geoff Myers	-	7	6	7	5½	7	6	7	6	51½	1
B	Richard Moore	0	-	5	5½	6	6	7	6	6	41½	2
C	Alex Satchell	1	2	-	2	5	5	6	6	5	32	4
D	Tim Jeffreys	0	1½	5	-	6	4	6	7	5	34½	3
E	Gary Shrimpton	1½	1	2	1	-	4	3	7	3	22½	7
F	Ian Cragg	0	1	2	3	3	-	6	6	6	27	5
G	James Cullingham	1	0	1	1	4	1	-	6	0	14	8
H	Adrian Jones	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	-	0	4	9
I	Ed Wynn	1	1	2	2	4	1	7	7	-	25	6

twelve for the second year running. The other games in the final round provoked only apathy amongst the other players, who surprisingly seemed totally unconcerned about the potential effect upon their career statistics. Three quickfire 7-0's duly resulted.

So Geoff finished top with an obscene p.p.g. and Richard qualified comfortably in second place. Both Ian Cragg and Ed Wynn put in a useful performance but, as usual on these occasions, the weakest player Adrian Jones learnt little about winks except what happens after a pot-out.

Red Group by Rob Cartwright

Speaking personally, I was more frightened of Purvis than of Lockwood, in the same way one is more frightened of a Black Widow as opposed to a tarantula. One tends to bite hard and kill quickly, while the other just wears you out... Third seed Patrick Barrie was obviously a keen bet so I figured I just had to beat one of them at least.

The day started well, with no points for a bye. Tim Jeffreys and I started a demo game for the S4C cameras, but had barely squigged off when Andy wandered up and penned in the first 7-0, against Chris Cantrill. This set a rather alarming precedent for the rest of the day's games...

After three rounds it looked as predicted; the top 4 all had sixes and sevens against the lower players, and middle order were notching up some more elevating scores. Simon Gandy and Phil Scarrott both played well but missed a few shots costing them keys games. In round 4 I dropped a point against Dave Hull, who was playing his usual "squop and boondock" strategy and having outside help from somebody under the table. (*His 'helper' is very well trained. During the two Daves' game, she looked up at Mr. Lockwood and asked, very politely, "Am I distracting you?" - Ed.*)

Round 5 saw me bring in 4 greens very well, while the opposition got a mixed double squopped and then, for some reason, subbed a couple more

	<i>Red Division</i>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	Tot.	Pos
A	Dave Lockwood	-	6	6	6	6	7	7	6	6	50	1
B	Andy Purvis	1	-	6	2	6	7	7	7	7	43	2
C	Patrick Barrie	1	1	-	1	5½	6	7	7	6	34½	4
D	Rob Cartwright	1	5	6	-	6	3	7	7	5	40	3
E	Simon Gandy	1	1	1½	1	-	2½	6	7	4½	24½	6
F	Phil Scarrott	0	0	1	4	4⅔	-	7	7	7	30⅔	5
G	Rhoda Henson	0	0	0	0	1	0	-	6	3	10	8
H	Chris Cantrill	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	2½	4½	9
I	Dave Hull	1	0	1	2	2½	0	4	4½	-	15	7

underneath. After deciding to take the plunge, I potted all four, then brought in and potted the fifth. The sixth had nowhere obvious to go, so I wandered round the pot and stuck it in from a foot away. Jon Mapley (on his own post-p.o. meander) lifted his eyes to Heaven and said "oh no not another..." - he seemed rather surprised to learn that the instigator was me, and not Andy after all. This put Andy "back into 4th place (just), but everybody expected him to move into overdrive and qualify easily anyway". He bloody did of course !!

Simon and Phil were well behind, but were still to play two novices, while Lockwood was 6 points clear at the top. Patrick then went through a bad home-run, losing successive 6-1's to Andy and Dave. I failed to take advantage, only scraping 4-3 against Phil, who played an excellent all round game. In the final round, Dave and Andy had already qualified, and I had to go head-to-head with Patrick, with only half a point separating us.

Patrick brought in superbly, forcing me to make a dodgy squop, which I missed. Amazingly, however, Patrick missed the pot with the fifth wink. I squopped and tried to hang on, but Patrick eventually broke the pile and sent the last blue to the edge of the mat. All the area around the pot was bare - I couldn't possibly defend. I potted 5 yellows, 2 off piles, and moved the 6th - again about a foot away: it was first one in, wins ! After a couple of misses each from long range, I was the lucky one and so got the third place.

Special mention must be made of Rhoda Henson, who got conned into playing for the Welsh TV people and showed great guts. I'm glad she won a game. Although poor Chris must have been disappointed with his set of results, they aren't really surprising against such a strong group. Dave's scores were immaculate as usual, and Andy's potting set the precedent - by my estimate over half the games ended in pot-outs !

Yellow Group by Charles Relle

The yellow group was the most sinister (five left-handers out of nine players), the most learned (Drs. Gameson, Inglis and Sage) and the most protuberant (Inglis and Sage again).

The seeding put Larry Kahn at the top and Charles Relle second but, with three qualifiers from each group and promising young players in each, many people could feel hopeful and no-one, except perhaps Larry, really safe.

	<i>Yellow Division</i>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	Tot.	Pos
A	Larry Kahn	-	7	1	6	6	6	7	7	6	46	1
B	Charles Relle	0	-	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	39	3
C	Nick Inglis	6	4	-	6	4	6	7	6	6	45	2
D	Geoff Thorpe	1	1	1	-	6	7	6	1½	6	29½	4
E	Stew Sage	1	1	3	1	-	6	6	6	2½	26½	5=
F	Jackie Carter	1	1	1	0	1	-	7	0	2	13	8
G	Jon Harris	0	1	0	1	1	0	-	1	2	6	9
H	Steve Phillips	0	1	1	5½	1	7	6	-	5	26½	5=
I	Ian Gameson	1	1	1	1	4½	5	5	2	-	20½	7

Geoff Thorpe had the bye in the first round and, therefore, for the first and only time, a predictable score. Otherwise the higher seeds all won 6-1. Round 2 saw Stew Sage lose 4½ - 2½ to Ian Gameson, which warned everyone that nobody could relax. Steve Phillips confirmed this in round 3 by beating Geoff Thorpe 5½ - 1½. This took some of the pressure off Nick Inglis and Charles Relle, especially when they each scored 6 in round 4, and 7 and 6 respectively in round 5. Larry was in the lead, but had not yet had a bye. Round 6 featured the ponderous encounter between Inglis and Sage, which the Scotsman won 4-3: Larry and Charles both won 6-1, putting the top three more than 10 points clear of the rest. Steve took 7 in this round off Jackie Carter, which perhaps prompted her to a more adventurous game herself, for she got 7 against Jon Harris in the next round. Nick again scored 4, this time against Charles, who had been on top for most of the game, only to see his advantage dissipated by a late pile breakup. Charles was alarmed to see that his next opponent was the other weighty Cambridge doctor, Sage, whose play against him in previous years had been rather more frisky than his corporation. Charles tried to commit both players to a squopping game from the start, in which Stew was disinclined to co-operate, but was eventually pinned down and lost a 6-1. Meanwhile Nick was beating Larry



Inglis - "protuberant"



Sage - "disinclined to co-operate"

6-1 in a game whose course was influenced by the fact that both players knew they were sure to qualify. Larry made amends by beating Charles 7-0 in the last round, while Nick beat Geoff 6-1 to qualify unbeaten in a hard field. Congratulations to him. Of the newer players, Steve Phillips was the most successful, tying for fifth place.



EXSTARD!

The Final *by Andy Purvis*



As always, the Final was to be a twelve-player all-play-all. This year there was also a Plate competition, sponsored by S4C. This used Mike Surridge's proposed handicapping system and resulted in a tie between Steve Phillips and Jackie Carter, with Ed Wynn in third place. Mike hopes to write this up more fully for the next issue.

Geoff and Dave's outrageous qualifying scores meant that they headed the seedings for the second day, ahead of Larry. Charles was lurking near the bottom of the draw, setting the scene for some important early games. However, when the Finalists arrived on Sunday morning they found that no-one was sure quite where they were supposed to play. Happily, some keys emerged and play got underway. Larry and Charles were soon involved in a close game, which Charles won when Larry subbed a Bristol late in rounds.

Dave and Richard, with two sixes apiece, shared the early lead while Nick beat Charles 5-2. In round 3 Nick missed a difficult pot-out against Richard, who converted the chance into seven points. Dave and Geoff both won 6-1, but Larry could only manage a draw against Andy.

Extraordinary things always seem to happen when Alan plays Jon. This time Jon got the better of it; an attempted round five long pot slipped out early but bounced in. Jon then added insult to injury by going for another long pot - this flew over the cup, but got a knock-off and squop the other side! While Andy notched up another draw (with Nick), Graham beat Tim to record his first win in a Final, and perhaps his first ever win in a game played straight after lunch. Meanwhile, Larry emphatically ended Richard's spell at the top, working a pot-out in around ten minutes.

Richard blitzed Geoff to catch up lost ground. Tim had Larry squopped up but couldn't hold on, Larry escaping completely in rounds to steal a 6-1 win. Andy tried a pot-out against Dave for old times' sake, but missed the first. A very close and extremely long game ended $5\frac{1}{2} - 1\frac{1}{2}$ to Dave as Andy carelessly knocked himself off a doubleton in round four.

In the next round, however, Dave could only manage two points off Richard, who went back into the lead. Alan had to beat Larry twice - he squopped him up but failed to free, finally securing $5\frac{1}{2}$ by winning the resulting potting race.

Round 7 saw Geoff and Graham's witty game end with each colour on just two points. Richard took 6 off Tim while Nick worked hard to get second place in his game against Dave; Richard was now $2\frac{1}{2}$ points clear. Jon, playing green against Larry, managed to knock a blue onto a hitherto safe pair of yellows. Larry made the most of it and moved past Jon into third place.

Charles won a good 6-1 over Richard, giving everyone else a chance to catch up. Dave, meanwhile, was playing Jon in a hotly contested game. Early in rounds, Jon decided to pot out of a pile. Dave demanded a shot judge. Jon objected strongly, claiming that the request was purely intimidatory as the legality of the shot would be obvious. Eventually Alan watched from a diplomatic distance as Jon made the difficult pot look easy. Jon went on to win 4-3 by potting from a foot in round five. Larry and Geoff both won, and at the start of round nine only one point separated the top three, with Geoff, Charles and Jon not far behind.

	Final	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	Tot.	Pos
A	Geoff Myers	-	6	1	7*	2 $\frac{1}{3}$	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	0*	5	6	6*	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	43 $\frac{1}{3}$	5
B	Dave Lockwood	1	-	0*	5	3	1	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	6	4	6	6	39 $\frac{1}{2}$	6
C	Larry Kahn	6	7*	-	6	6	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	7*	6*	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	56	1
D	Nick Inglis	0*	2	1	-	2	4	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	0*	5	5	5	3	30 $\frac{1}{2}$	10=
E	Jon Mapley	4 $\frac{2}{3}$	4	1	5	-	6	6	1	6	2	5	6	46 $\frac{2}{3}$	4
F	Graham Hancock	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	3	1	-	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	7*	1	1	5	31 $\frac{1}{2}$	8=
G	Andy Purvis	5	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	-	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	5	3	4	2*	38 $\frac{1}{2}$	7
H	Richard Moore	7*	5	0*	7*	6	6	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	-	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	5*	6	51	2
I	Rob Cartwright	2	1	1*	2	1	0*	2	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	-	2	1	1	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	12
J	Charles Relle	1	3	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	5	6	4	6	5	-	6	5	48 $\frac{1}{2}$	3
K	Alan Dean	1*	1	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	2	6	3	2*	6	1	-	1	30 $\frac{1}{2}$	10=
L	Tim Jeffreys	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	1	4	1	2	5*	1	6	2	6	-	31 $\frac{1}{2}$	8=

(* indicates a pot-out game)

Now Dave played Larry. As last year, Dave went for the blitz. Last year he got it, but this year he didn't. Larry's 7-0 win gave him the lead for the first time, Richard having scored only 5 off Alan in a worked pot-out. Jon beat Geoff in a superb "anything goes" game which finished with three colours on 15 points.

With two rounds left, Larry led Richard by a point with Dave and Charles a further 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ behind. Dave fell away completely; 1-6 defeats by Graham and Geoff relegated him to sixth place by the end. While Larry scored a crucial 6-1 over Geoff, Rob and Richard joined forces to put Richard in all sorts of trouble. Nearly squopped up, Richard attempted to save the day with an over-the-pot bomb, but the Seventh Cavalry charged straight into the pot by mistake. As the game tightened up it looked as though this potted wink might just be enough for a 4-3 win. Rob tried to free a wink to pot but a couple of Richard's winks came out too. An excellent pressure squop across the pile took out Rob's last two winks and Richard went on to win 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ -1 $\frac{1}{2}$. Charles beat Alan 6-1 to keep alive his chances of second place. Larry now had 50 points, Richard was on 48 $\frac{1}{2}$ and Charles had 43 $\frac{1}{2}$. Their last-round games were against Nick, Andy and Rob respectively.

Richard didn't start out well against Andy but then began to edge his way in. Andy, noting that Richard still had a green and a yellow behind the baseline, tried to run away into the pot. As Richard looked elsewhere, two blues went in before the third hit the rim. Richard took a blue, but later fell

victim to nerves and freed it. This time the wink bounced out of the pot. "Unlucky", said Richard, but I'm not convinced he meant it. By now Larry had Nick squopped up, so Richard concentrated on securing second place in the tournament. Rob, who hadn't been firing all day, restricted Charles to five points anyway.

So Larry wins the ETwA Singles for the 43rd time, or so it seems. Congratulations to him, and also to Richard for a fine performance. At 21, he must surely be the youngest World Singles challenger. He also faces the toughest proposition - Larry has two spare challenges in case he's beaten !

Letters to the Editor

The Jubilee Trophy

Dear Sir,

Who says "Purvis won $19\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$ " ? He might be good, but Tennants Extra shots prevailed when I played him. We agreed that five games would be pretty boring and, as I had gained endless experience of seven-game series, and he was hoping to in the near future (!), we would play seven in the Jubilee.

He tried his usual tedious strategy of double-pot, but most people grew out of that in about 1962. Being a generous soul, however, I let him get away with it three times. After the regulation five games I was ahead 18-17. Of course, he says it would have affected his strategy (what strategy ? - previous Ed) if that had been the end of the match, but he managed to ease out a 7-0 at a crucial time and won 26-23.

Seriously though, it was a thoroughly enjoyable match, and it proves how dangerous an obsession with potting can be. Well done Andy !

Jon Mapley

On Safe Driving

26, Canadian Avenue,
London. SE6 3AS.
18th December 1989.

Dear Sir,

I write on three points.

I was somewhat alarmed to see in WW52 that I was alleged (in an article by yourself) to be "doing 100ish" on the M11, and that elsewhere in the

publication, Mr Phil Clark states that I was driving at inadvisably high speed. I was alone in my car, and can therefore unfortunately produce no witness to my very temperate velocity. Mr Clark was alone in his car too, and must, I think, have been looking at the k.p.h. rather than the m.p.h. dial on his speedometer.

I visited America in the summer, and did not play very well, so I will leave the history of the winking to be written by the winners. But I want to put on record my thanks to Larry Kahn for his superb hospitality, and to the Lockwood family for entertaining me delightfully on more than one occasion. Despite my results, I enjoyed playing in America, and being there. I found Washington a most interesting city.

I have written articles advocating prompt starts to tournaments, and others have recently done the same. In November, I promised to drive David Lockwood from Gatwick Airport to the Singles. I realised that we would only just make the start of the tournament, so I was perturbed when his plane arrived half an hour late, killing our hopes of arrival in time. It was just as well that Mr Clark was not in the car during our journey to Southampton. Be that as it may, I want to say thank-you to the officers of ETwA for holding the start of the tournament and allowing us to play.

Yours faithfully,
Charles Relle

Charles would also like to thank everybody who sponsored him for his Crisis At Christmas walk from Canterbury to London. In all, Charles raised the magnificent sum of £345 - Congratulations, Charles!

Poem to the Editor

Thorpe was responsible for this one, too...

Our old friend from Catford, Charles Relle
Plays winks with no shoes, oh how smelle.
While our standards of dress
Remain such a mess
We'll never get winks on the Telle.

The Bard of Stockport

The Third Somerset Invitation Individual

The Somerset Wagon, Chilcompton, 3rd-4th January, 1990
by Andy Purvis

Despite last year's trouble with the greenhouse and clock, the Sage family still felt that they could put up (with) 16 Cambridge and ex-Cambridge winkers in their pub. If all tournaments were in pubs, I'm sure that late starts would be a thing of the past; Ed and I managed to arrive three days early for this one, seeing in the New Year by helping out with all the "spare" Malibu. We used the time well, seeing the sights when the weather permitted and developing the drinking games to new heights ("Squop, Boondock, Stomach-Pump" and, my favourite, "Bibble, Bibble, Bibble, hic") when it didn't.

The tournament was run as an all-partner-all, at a fairly leisurely pace. Simon had to go early, so the round were played in a strange order, with extra games fitted in here and there. This had the happy side-effect of making it very hard to work out what was going on. In the last round, Geoff needed a six to win. A $5\frac{1}{2}$ would have left he and I tied; as the game reached rounds this score looked feasible, but Geoff got his 6 so the tie-breaker of knockout port-drinking proved unnecessary. Patrick was eleven points behind in third place, with Simon a close fourth. Kristian Armstrong put in a good performance, while the National Champion finished well down the table.

Thanks to all of the Sage family for tolerating us and being such splendid hosts, making this so enjoyable a tournament yet again.

Rules Proposals **by Jon Mapley**

This year's Rules meeting will be held after the first day's play of the National Pairs. In order to keep the meeting as brief as possible, the items to be discussed are being published here.

Notes:

1. This version of the Rules is that sanctioned by Congress 1989, modified to include proposals by the Rules Sub-committee. These proposals cover the brief given to the Sub-committee to resolve the following issues:

(i) The unsatisfactory nature of the rule for moving a wink balanced against the pot, specifically where its movement would involve both squopping and being squopped.

(ii) The incorporation within the "Free Turns" Rule of the suggestion that failure to free should result in a single, simple remedy, namely a "free wink" as in snooker. The opportunity has also been taken to clarify certain other aspects of Rule 11 which were either known to be ambiguous or became so in our investigations.

(iii) Acceptance of the American ruling that winks resting on unsupported mat over the edge of an under-sized table should not be penalised by the forfeiture of a shot.

2. Not incorporated in this version, but raised as points of interest, are a small number of further items for discussion:

(i) Should we consider changing the sequence of play to spectral colour order, *i.e.* Red, Yellow, Green, Blue ?

(ii) Would novices better understand the scoring system if a more convenient description than "time-limit-points" were introduced ? My own preference is "Imps", preceded in the first instance by "Intermediate Points". Bridge connoisseurs may not agree.

(iii) "Players are invited to agree before a game starts that they will endeavour to point out in advance that a player is about to play out of sequence". Such a statement in the foreword would broadly be in line with current (sportsmanlike) practice.

(iv) In Rule 7, in place of "he forfeits the next shot to be played with that colour" it has been suggested that "he is obliged to pass on the next shot capable of being played with that colour" is better. This would cover the situation where the colour which went off is immediately squopped up, and would apparently suffer no penalty under the current rule. Being unable to play is not the same as forfeiting a shot.

(v) In Rule 1(c) it is wrong to be categorical about the number of games a pair may or may not play against each opponent. "...each pair normally plays one game against each opposing pair" seems reasonable.

The proposed new versions of Rules 3, 7, 11 and 12 follow. Because rule 11 contains the most complex proposals, it is dealt with first. After this is a table showing how the new rule would operate in practice. Geoff Thorpe, typically, has come up with a case where the results are strange; this is included by way of light relief. The changes to rules 3, 7 and 12 are more minor. In what follows, bold text indicates new wording.

11. SQUOPPING UP AND FREE TURNS.

(a) When all the unpotted winks of one partnership are squopped, the opposing partnership is obliged to free at least one of the squopped winks. Before doing so, the squopping partnership may play **one turn per wink on the field of play which was neither squopping nor squopped after the shot which caused this Rule to be invoked.** These are

called "free turns", and are shared between the two colours in normal rotation, even if a colour cannot play at a particular turn.

(b) A freeing shot is a shot which leaves an opponent's wink unsquopped, one which pots the sixth wink of any colour (after which Rule 8 applies) or a shot which terminates the game according to Rule 6(b). One must be played no later than the first shot of the turn following completion of free turns, except when the number of free turns is zero and the first of the squopping partnership has no playable winks. In this case his partner must free on his first shot. N.B. A shot which is forfeited owing to Rule 7(a) is always counted in the timing of a freeing shot, and the playability of a free wink.

(c) Free turns cease whenever a freeing shot is played. Thereafter, until their opponents have a turn with a playable wink, the squopping pair must leave an opponent's wink free after each shot played. This wink must be of the same colour as the wink free prior to the shot, unless the other colour is given an opportunity to play first. If both squopped colours become free, the first to play must be left free after each shot.

(d) If a freeing shot is not played as required by section (b), or a wink is squopped contrary to section (c), the turn in which the offence occurs is terminated, and the offended partnership is awarded a "free wink". For the first shot of the turn immediately following the failure to free, the player due to play the next colour shall nominate a playable wink of any colour and play it as if it were his own. If this shot fails to free any of the squopped partnership's winks, free turns are recounted and start immediately. If in the playing of the free wink any of the nominated colour is potted, it will ultimately count for the opposition, but the player may continue the turn, playing any wink of his own colour freed by the previous shot. If a wink of the nominated colour leaves the field of play, the player forfeits the next shot due to be played with his own colour.

If the failure to free occurs on the final turn of the fifth round after expiry of the time limit, one time limit point is deducted from the total of the colour which won the squidge-off, and added to the total of the colour which would have been entitled to the free wink.

(e) If the time limit expires during free turns, it is deemed to have expired at the moment before the first playable shot (including a free wink) of the squopped pair, and Rule 9(b) applies from then.

A SUMMARY OF THE VARIOUS POSSIBILITIES WITHIN RULE 11

(In all cases, Red and Blue are squopping Green and Yellow. The freeing shot is playable by Blue)

<i>Situation</i>	<i>Existing Interpretation</i>	<i>Proposed Interpretation</i>	<i>Reason for Change</i>	<i>Implication of not changing</i>
1. Blue frees one or more greens, or both green(s) and yellow(s).	Green plays.	Green plays.	N/A	N/A
2. Blue frees one or more yellows.	Red may squop, but must leave one yellow free at the end of the Red turn.	Red may squop, but must leave one yellow free after every shot of the Red turn.	Existing Rule allows Red to play a shot which pots red and squops the only yellow, obliging Red to free with his extra shot.	Once a colour is free, it seems wrong to resquop it. Also, if Red also sent himself off, he wouldn't get the extra shot.
3. Blue pots, freeing one or more greens.	Blue may squop, but must leave one green free at the end of the Blue turn. Explicitly, Blue can't free a yellow to squop Green.	Blue may squop, but must leave one green free after every shot of the Blue turn.	Existing rule allows Blue to play a shot which pots a further blue and squops green up, obliging Blue to free with his extra shot.	Once a colour is free, it seems wrong to resquop it. Also, if Blue also sent himself off, he wouldn't get the extra shot.
4. Blue pots, freeing one or more yellows.	Blue may squop all the yellows, assuming Red will free one. Unclear is whether Blue can free a green to squop yellow up (probably implicit).	Blue may squop, as long as he leaves a green or a yellow free (as soon as Green is free, it takes precedence) after every shot of the Blue turn.	Existing Rule actually allows resquopping to take place. Clarification of colour precedence is seen to be helpful.	Once a colour is free, it seems wrong to resquop it. If given the chance for the first colour, it should play.

<i>Situation</i>	<i>Existing Interpretation</i>	<i>Proposed Interpretation</i>	<i>Reason for change</i>	<i>Implication of not changing</i>
5. Blue pots, freeing both green(s) and yellow(s).	Blue may squop as many winks as leaves one of either Green or Yellow free at the end of the Blue turn (if yellow, situation 2 takes effect).	Blue may squop, as long as he leaves a green free after every shot of the Blue turn.	Clarification of colour precedence is seen to be helpful.	If given the chance for the first colour, it should play,
6. The squop-up occurred by Blue or Red squopping a green which had just been played off the field of play. After free turns, Blue frees a green.	It is unclear whether Green has "forfeited the next shot due to be played by Green", and therefore whether he must miss it now and, if so, whether Red or Blue can resquop before Green "is in the position to be played with a legal shot".	Green going off the mat is his own fault. Whilst totally squopped, he is barred from playing, so the first opportunity for him to forfeit his next shot is after he has been freed. Green is still given the opportunity to play. His inability to do so should not preclude Blue and Red from resquopping.	Clarification of a point not covered in the Rules.	Players may disagree if the situation arises.
7. Blue played a blue off the field of play on his previous shot. He is unable to play at the freeing turn, and Red is squopped.	It is "postponement of the freeing turn", but this was incorporated specifically to prohibit a partner deliberately squopping the only wink capable of playing the freeing shot.	The fact that a squopping colour has gone off the mat is his own fault. Red is unable to play, and Blue commits a failure to free when he misses his shot.	Clarification of a point not generally recognised as being covered in the Rules.	Players may disagree if the situation arises.

Intermission - The "Free Wink" and Thorpe's Ring

by Geoff Thorpe

It has been suggested that after a failure to free the offended partnership should be given a "free wink". This would allow them to play an opponent's wink as if their own.

Consider a Thorpe's Ring situation. One green in the pot, one free blue, and 22 winks in a circular pile. Currently $4\frac{1}{2}$ - $2\frac{1}{2}$ to Green and Yellow. The blue has to free and is well away from the pot. Bombing the pile passes the advantage to green who plays next, so blue tries to pot and misses. Green with the "free wink" can only play the free blue ! If he goes for the pile, the opponents play first and may get the advantage, so green boondocks the blue.* Blue has a free go and we're back where we started!

(The Chairman of the Sub-committee has this to add: "If it goes off the mat, green must miss with his next shot, so blue might try to bomb the pile, and go off the mat himself. Green passes, blue passes, green takes the free wink again, bounces off the pile into the pot, freeing only yellow. Zero free turns, and yellow must free. He pots, failing to free... Watch out for next week's exciting episode..." Thank-you, Jon. Thank-you very much - Ed.)*

The Rules Proposals, Part II

In addition to the proposals concerning Rule 11, there are some (more straightforward) proposed changes to three other Rules:

3. THE MAT (Second Paragraph)

The mat should be placed on a hard smooth horizontal surface so that the whole of the mat's surface is itself horizontal. If there is no such surface available, the players may agree to play on a less satisfactory surface. If this surface measures less than 6 feet by 3 feet, any wink coming to rest on any part of the mat unsupported by the underlying surface may be moved the shortest distance onto the playing surface, consistent with it being the same distance from the pot and not within 10 cm of any other wink, as in Rule 7(a), with no penalty. Nothing but winks and the pot may be placed on the field of play, unless all the players agree otherwise. This does not preclude a player from resting on the mat in order to play a shot.

7. THE BOUNDARIES

(b) The pot.

The pot may only be held if it is likely to be moved accidentally by a player or squidger. It may not be moved during a game except by winks in motion, and if it is so moved it must immediately be replaced at the centre of the mat. Any wink moved when the pot is moved by a wink in motion is replaced in its former position. Any wink coming to rest wholly or partly under the base of the pot, or the place on the mat where the pot is to be replaced in accordance with this Rule, is moved the minimum distance necessary for it to be touching the base of the pot but not beneath the base of the pot when the pot is correctly placed.

If a wink comes to rest in a position where it is unsquopped but supported by the pot so that part of the wink is higher than the rest, it is moved to lie touching the pot but no longer supported by it. It squops any wink within the range of its required movement.

If any wink comes to rest in a position where it is both supported by the pot and squopped, it is left as it lies. If it is subsequently freed but remains supported by the pot, it is moved as above. To move a wink under this rule does not constitute a shot.

12. FOUL SHOTS AND FOUL PLAY.

(a) Any player squidging a wink contrary to Rule 5(b) must, if requested by his opponents... etc., etc.

The words "or 11" after "5(b)" have been deleted as the newly drafted Rule 11 no longer provides the Foul Shot remedy for a failure to free.

A Squidge Too Far...

It is with great sorrow that *Winking World* notes the passing of Chanel Mapley, Jon's trusty potting squidger, at a recent winks demonstration.

"But surely you can't pot them when they're that close to the pot?"

"Yes you can. You just need a bit more downward pressure... Ah..."

That might slow him down a bit.

The 1990 Cambridge Open

Queens' College, Cambridge. 3rd - 4th February, 1990
by Andy Purvis

The weekend began for me in the way of all Cambridge Open weekends; I woke up with no idea where I was. But I can certainly recommend The Mill.

It looked as though there would be a very large turnout; OUTS reckoned on bringing eight, and there was a chance that some people from the newly-formed Exeter club might make it. In the event, the foul weather kept the numbers down a bit but even so 45 people played at least one game. As always, players were allowed to miss up to two rounds and still win. This makes it much easier for people travelling from some distance.

Ah yes, the first round... While Jon (solo) was being held to 4 points by Ian Gameson and Stu Collins, Alex and I were potted out against by Dave 'Stoshman' Smith (who ?), who'd outplayed us through most of the game. Mark Bedworth was playing his first ever game, but had to wait until the second round for his first ever points (a very creditable 3 with Salter against Mapley and Sage). Dave Smith then paired up with James Cullingham to beat Alex and Geoff Thorpe 6-1, and go into a one-point lead at the start of that great Cambridge Open institution, lunch.

As I was still dreadfully hung over I was on the lemonade, so I only watched as Peter and Graham, their livers screaming for mercy, started amigossing the scrumpy. By the end of the announced lunch break, they'd had five...

A dozen or so winkers decided to miss the two rounds after lunch (others were saving their two permitted byes for after the CUTwC Dinner), so it was a slightly depleted couple of rounds. There was no let-up in the flow of odd results though. Julian Wiseman, playing singles, took 6 off Geoff Myers and Alan Boyce. Dave Smith took a couple of sixes and was about 3 points clear after four rounds. Jon was second, but other possible contenders were contending no longer; Mike was 12th, just ahead of defending champion Tim, Charles was 17th, and I was equal 29th, just ahead of Geoff Myers.

Then the long-lunchers returned to the fray, happily replete. Dr. Sage, in particular, was as replete as a newt. He felt that he'd probably never had a gallon of real ale at lunchtime before. When the draw had been made, he went over to his partner (Jackie), saying "I think I'd better apologise in advance..." Of Graham and Peter there was no sign, just some interesting news - they'd left The Mill, and gone on to The Red Bull. The Tournament Leader, meanwhile, was showing his unparalleled mastery of the game's subtleties, playing his next match with the colours in the wrong order, and eventually going down 4-3 to two Oxford novices. A six for Jon gave him a share of the lead, but Stosh replied with a 7-0 (partenering Julian against Matthew and Stu). Mike moved into third with a couple of sixes. Tony and I worked a 7-0 over Steve Phillips, so I shot up the table to 24th place.

1990 Cambridge Open

Opponents	
Partner	Score

A	Kristian Armstrong	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	W, a
										D 6
B	Patrick Barrie	C, O	O, s	i, m	I, d	d, e	J, W	Y, s	N, f	d, s
		o 7	Y 2	e 4	k 6	i 6	F 1	L 3	G 6	q 1
C	Mark Bedworth	B, o	X, g	---	H, c	J, X	---	---	---	---
		O 0	h 3		i 6	L 1				
D	Liz Bertoya	---	---	---	---	---	---	W, a	T, X	N, g
								A 6	g 1	R 6
E	Alan Boyce	f, j	F, j	q	V, n	U, j	i	U, q	L, d	a, f
		J 3	p 1	b 1	- 1	c 4	m 1	r 6	i 6	G 5½
F	Simon Braidman	g, h	E, p	P	P, p	a, k	J, W	S, e	---	X, e
		L 1	j 6	K 4	l 6	V 5	B 1	N 1		n 1
G	Jon Carlaw	---	N, W	H, a	Z, f	b, p	e, g	O, h	N, f	a, f
			R 2½	N 3	m 1	Z 6	k 1	l 4	B 6	E 5½
H	Jim Carrington	T, e	V, c	G, N	C, i	T, h	P, b	c, p	W, n	J, Z
		Y 1	T 3	a 4	c 1	N 2½	h 5	i 6	I 3½	p 5
I	Jackie Carter	---	J, K	W, o	B, k	S, s	O, n	K, d	W, n	P, h
			P 4	j 1	d 1	g 1	Y 1	J 1	H 3½	- 4½
J	Rob Cartwright	f, j	I, P	d	R	C, L	B, F	K, d	b, o	O, Y
		E 3	K 3	n 6	N 6	X 6	W 6	I 1	e 1	b 7
K	Stu Collins	X	I, P	P	q, s	R, n	l, q	I, J	---	---
		N 3	J 3	F 4	X 6	P 0	f 0	d 6		
L	James Cullingham	g, h	i, o	V, f	a, j	J, X	N, j	Y, s	E, i	H, p
		F 1	l 6	k 3	W 2	C 1	X 6	B 3	d 1	Z 2
M	Clive Dixon	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
N	Ian Gameson	X	G, R	H, a	R	T, h	L, X	S, e	B, G	D, R
		K 3	W 2½	G 3	J 6	H 2½	j 1	F 1	f 1	g 1
O	Simon Gandy	B, o	B, Y	---	---	---	I, Y	G, l	---	J, b
		C 0	s 5				n 6	h 3		Y 0

												Partners	Opp's				
												Adjusted	Score				
A	---		---		---		---		Pl.	W.	D.	L.	Tot.	Ave.	Pos.		
									1	1	0	0	6	6.000	-	3.500	2.567
																5.067	
B	E, P		P, e		O		H, b		13	8	0	5	53½	4.115	7	3.534	3.264
	-	5	Z	6	a	1	j	5½								3.862	
C	---		---		---		---		4	1	0	3	10	2.500	-	3.932	3.693
																2.477	
D	---		---		---		---		3	2	0	1	13	4.333	-	3.523	3.482
																4.303	
E	B		I, N		J, o		Z, n		13	6	0	7	43½	3.346	17	3.570	3.462
	P	2	l	6	T	6	h	1								3.273	
F	l, o		G, o		P, g		M, e		12	6	0	6	35½	2.958	23	3.555	3.191
	c	4	g	1	i	5½	p	0								2.622	
G	V, W		F, g		L, e		f, l		12	8	0	4	47⅔	3.972	8	3.639	3.348
	L	5½	o	6	s	4	g	1								3.750	
H	R, X		V, a		b, d		B, j		13	7	1	5	50½	3.885	9	3.277	3.526
	q	6	s	6	X	6	b	1½								4.022	
I	a		E, l		N, V		P, W		12	4	1	7	32⅙	2.681	27	2.797	3.300
	b	7	N	1	q	1	Q	6								2.832	
J	N, n		L, b		E, T		V, i		13	5	0	8	43	3.308	18	3.381	3.330
	s	1	f	1	o	1	c	1								3.197	
K	i, j		c, d		f, n		N, o		11	5	0	6	35	3.182	20	3.445	3.396
	T	6	W	1½	l	1	q	4½								3.105	
L	V, W		J, f		G, s		X, Y		13	5	0	8	44½	3.423	14=	3.857	3.359
	G	5½	b	6	e	3	s	5								3.104	
M	---		---		---		F, p		1	1	0	0	7	7.000	-	3.333	2.739
							e	7								6.322	
N	J, s		E, l		I, q		K, q		13	3	0	10	36⅓	2.795	25	3.469	3.805
	n	6	I	1	V	6	o	2½								3.116	
O	---		---		B, R		---		6	3	0	3	20	3.333	-	3.583	3.616
					-	6										3.407	

1990 Cambridge Open

P	Alasdair Grant	---	J, K	F, K	F, l	R, n	H, h	X, n	---	I
			I 4	- 3	p 1	K 0	b 2	j 4		h $2\frac{1}{3}$
Q	Graham Hancock	---	k	---	---	---	---	f, g	---	---
			q 1					V 1		
R	Tony Heading	V, k	N, W	---	J, N	K, P	c	---	---	N, g
		s 4	G $4\frac{2}{3}$		- 1	n 7	d 7			D 6
S	Paul Hoffman	---	---	---	---	I, g	---	F, N	---	---
						s 6		e 6		
T	Nick Inglis	H, Y	V, c	---	---	H, N	V	Z, b	D, g	o, r
		e 6	H 3			h $4\frac{1}{2}$	s 6	o 4	X 6	c $2\frac{1}{2}$
U	Andrew James	---	---	---	---	E, c	---	E, r	---	---
						j 3		q 1		
V	Tim Jeffreys	R, s	H, T	L, k	E	a, k	T, s	f, g	---	W, i
		k 3	c 4	f 4	n 6	F 5	- 1	Q 1		j 2
W	Gavin Keyte	---	G, R	I, j	a, j	Y, l	B, F	A, D	H, I	V, j
			N $2\frac{1}{3}$	o 6	L 2	m 4	J 6	a 1	n $3\frac{1}{2}$	i 2
X	Jon Mapley	K, N	C, h	Z, c	q, s	C, L	N, j	P, j	D, g	F, n
		- 4	g 4	l 6	K 6	J 6	L 6	n 3	T 6	e 6
Y	Sean Mayes	T, e	O, s	---	---	W, m	O, n	B, L	---	J, b
		H 1	B 2			l 3	I 1	s 4		O 0
Z	Richard Moore	---	---	X, l	G, m	b, p	a, o	T, o	---	H, p
				c 1	f 6	G 6	p 7	b 3		L 2
a	Tim Morley	---	---	G, N	L, W	F, V	Z, p	A, D	h, r	E, G
				H 4	j 5	k 2	o 0	W 1	p 1	f $1\frac{1}{2}$
b	Geoff Myers	---	e, r	q	o	G, Z	H, h	T, o	J, e	O, Y
			- 4	E 1	e 2	p 1	P 2	Z 3	o 6	J 7
c	Steve Phillips	---	H, T	X, l	C, i	U, j	R, d	H, i	---	o, r
			V 4	Z 1	H 1	E 4	- 0	p 1		T $2\frac{1}{2}$
d	Andy Purvis	l	m, n	J, n	B, k	B, i	c	I, J	E, i	B, q
		i 2	f 6	- 1	I 1	e 1	R 7	K 6	L 1	s 6

											Partners	Opp's
											Adjusted	Score
P	B	B, Z	F, i	I, Q	Pl.	W.	D.	L.	Tot.	Ave.	Pos.	
	E 2	e 1	g $1\frac{1}{2}$	W 1	11	2	0	9	$21\frac{5}{6}$	1.985	29	3.038 3.370
												2.085
Q	---	---	---	P, W	3	1	0	2	8	2.667	-	3.140 2.896
				I 6								2.243
R	H, q	n, q	O	---	9	5	0	4	$33\frac{2}{3}$	3.741	-	4.138 3.066
	X 1	i 2	B 1									2.988
S	---	---	---	---	2	2	0	0	12	6.000	-	3.808 3.066
												5.412
T	i, j	X, j	J, o	a, d	11	8	0	3	53	4.818	1=	3.715 3.737
	K 6	k 3	E 6	- 6								4.948
U	---	---	---	---	2	0	0	2	4	2.000	-	3.932 3.693
												2.477
V	G, L	H, s	I, q	J, c	12	6	0	6	$40\frac{1}{2}$	3.375	16	3.251 3.594
	W $1\frac{1}{2}$	a 1	N 6	i 6								3.594
W	G, L	c, d	Z	I, Q	12	4	1	7	$33\frac{5}{6}$	2.819	24	3.153 3.291
	V $1\frac{1}{2}$	K $1\frac{1}{2}$	j 0	P 1								2.784
X	H, q	T, k	b, d	L, s	13	10	0	3	60	4.615	4	3.684 3.613
	R 1	j 4	H 6	Y 2								4.636
Y	---	---	---	L, s	7	1	0	6	13	1.857	-	4.064 3.472
				X 2								1.546
Z	---	P, e	W, j	E, h	9	6	0	3	44	4.889	-	3.525 3.333
		B 6	- 7	n 6								4.709
a	I, b	H, s	p	T	11	3	0	8	$22\frac{1}{2}$	2.045	28	3.095 3.341
	- 0	V 1	c 6	d 1								2.089
b	a	J, f	H, X	B, j	12	5	0	7	$41\frac{1}{2}$	3.458	13	3.317 3.631
	I 7	L 6	d 1	H $1\frac{1}{2}$								3.680
c	l, o	K, W	p	V, i	11	5	0	6	30	2.727	26	3.356 3.491
	F 4	d $5\frac{1}{2}$	a 6	J 1								2.790
d	e, f	K, W	H, X	T	13	6	0	7	$44\frac{1}{2}$	3.423	14=	3.406 3.775
	g 6	c $5\frac{1}{2}$	b 1	a 1								3.745

1990 Cambridge Open

c	Charles Relle	H, Y	b	i, m	o	B, i	G, k	F, N	b, o	F, n
		T 6	r 3	B 4	b 2	d 1	g 6	S 6	J 1	X 6
f	Matthew Rose	E, J	m, n	L, k	G, m	o, q	l, q	Q, V	B, G	E, G
		j 4	d 6	V 4	Z 6	- 5	K 0	g 6	N 1	a 1½
g	Stew Sage	F, L	C, h	---	---	S, s	G, k	Q, V	T, X	D, R
		h 6	X 4			I 1	e 6	f 6	D 1	N 1
h	Dave Salter	F, L	X, g	---	---	H, N	P, b	G, l	a, p	I
		g 6	C 3			T 4½	H 5	O 3	r 6	P 2½
i	Alex Satchell	l	L, l	B, e	H, c	d, e	E, m	c, p	L, d	V, j
		d 2	o 1	m 3	C 6	B 6	- 6	H 6	E 6	W 5
j	Phil Scarrott	E, J	m, n	W, o	L, W	E, c	L, X	X, n	---	W, i
		f 4	d 6	I 1	a 5	U 3	N 1	P 4		V 2
k	Gary Shrimpton	R, s	Q, q	V, f	I, d	F, V	e, g	---	---	---
		V 3	- 6	L 3	B 6	a 2	G 1			
l	Dave Smith	d, i	i, o	Z, c	P, p	W, m	K, f	O, h	---	---
		- 5	L 6	X 6	F 6	Y 3	q 7	G 4		
m	Ed Stephens	---	d, f	B, e	Z, f	Y, l	i	---	---	---
			n 1	i 3	G 1	W 4	E 1			
n	Mike Surridge	---	d, f	d	E	K, P	I, Y	P, j	H, I	X, e
			m 1	J 6	V 6	R 7	O 6	X 3	W 3½	F 1
o	Geoff Thorpe	C, O	L, l	I, j	b, e	f	Z, p	Z, b	J, e	T, c
		B 7	i 1	W 6	- 5	q 2	a 0	T 4	b 6	r 4½
p	Rupert Wilson	---	F, j	---	F, l	G, Z	a, o	H, i	h, r	L, Z
			E 1		P 1	b 1	Z 7	c 1	a 1	H 5
q	Julian Wiseman	---	k	E, b	K, X	f	K, f	E, r	---	d, s
			Q 1	- 6	s 1	o 2	l 7	U 1		B 1
r	Peter Wright	---	b	---	---	---	---	U, q	a, p	T, c
			e 3					E 6	h 6	o 4½
s	Ed Wynn	V, k	B, Y	---	K, X	I, g	V	B, L	---	B, q
		R 4	O 5		q 1	S 6	T 6	Y 4		d 6

											Partners	Opp's	
					Pl.	W.	D.	L.	Tot.	Ave.	Pos.	Adjusted	Score
e	d, g	B, Z	G, s	F, p	13	6	0	7	47	3.615	12	3.850	3.561
	f 1	P 1	L 3	M 7								3.501	
f	d, g	L, b	K, l	G, g	13	8	0	5	47½	3.654	11	3.574	3.579
	e 1	J 1	n 6	l 6								3.695	
g	e, f	G, o	F, i	f, l	11	5	0	6	34½	3.136	21	3.619	3.971
	d 6	F 1	P 1½	G 1								3.548	
h	---	---	---	Z, n	8	4	0	4	30⅚	3.854	-	3.400	3.369
				E 1								3.773	
i	K, T	n, q	P, g	J, c	13	8	0	5	55½	4.269	6	3.289	3.569
	j 1	R 2	F 5½	V 6								4.444	
j	K, T	T, k	Z	H, b	12	6	0	6	36½	3.042	22	2.994	3.690
	i 1	X 4	W 0	B 5½								3.485	
k	---	X, j	---	---	7	2	0	5	24	3.429	-	3.554	3.438
		T 3										3.340	
l	F, c	I, N	f, n	G, g	11	8	0	3	53	4.818	1=	3.481	3.419
	o 3	E 6	K 1	f 6								4.747	
m	---	---	---	---	5	1	0	4	10	2.000	-	3.954	3.724
												1.997	
n	J, s	R, i	K, l	E, h	12	8	1	3	56½	4.708	3	3.256	3.507
	N 6	q 5	f 6	Z 6								4.837	
o	F, c	F, g	E, T	K, q	13	7	0	6	48	3.692	10	3.775	3.552
	l 3	G 6	J 1	N 2½								3.617	
p	---	---	a, c	M, e	9	2	0	7	18	2.000	-	2.996	3.484
			- 1	F 0								2.237	
q	R, X	R, i	N, V	N, o	11	5	0	6	35½	3.227	19	3.780	3.696
	H 6	n 5	I 1	K 4½								3.283	
r	---	---	---	---	4	3	0	1	19½	4.875	-	3.491	3.168
												4.547	
s	N, n	V, a	L, e	X, Y	11	9	0	2	48	4.364	5	3.647	3.542
	J 1	H 6	G 4	L 5								4.332	

Peter and Graham made it back for the last round. Peter did rather better, perhaps due to the cup of coffee which that nice lady in The Red Bull had given him... Dave only managed a 4-3, but second-placed Mapley and third-placed Surridge teamed up gloriously to lose 3-4 to Grant and Scarrott, so the top three remained unchanged at the end of Saturday's play. However with Dave going to the CUTwC Dinner, Jon and Mike looked to be favourites. Even so, Stosh and his performance were the subjects of comment (this from a sizeable ex-CUTwC worthy - "If I lost 58 lbs, grew a stosh, and caught Mad Cow Disease, I'd be Stosh").

Dave took his two byes on Sunday morning. Jon took two sixes while Mike fell back, Nick and Ed Wynn now sharing third place. Sunday lunch was an altogether tamer affair, but the game after lunch is still the game after lunch, so Stew (and I) beat Charles (and Matthew) 6-1. Dave and Geoff Thorpe could only manage 3 off Braidman and Phillips, but Jon went down 6-1, partnering Tony Heading against Jim and Julian. In round 11 things went nigh-on perfectly for Dave; he won 6-1 while Jon (in second) and Nick (third) clashed, Jon and Phil beating Nick and Gary 4-3. Round 12 wasn't so kind. Dave, armed only with a CUTwC Secretary, had to face the might of Surridge and Rose, and went down 6-1. Jon partnered Jim to an important 6-1 over Geoff and myself. This put Jon in the lead, ahead of Dave and Nick, who had also won 6-1.

The draw for the last round would clearly be important, as a big win for any one of these three could win the tournament. Dave teamed up with Matthew, and won a fairly quick 6-1 over Stew and Jon Carlaw. Nick was playing singles against me and Tim Morley, a CUTwC novice. This game looked interesting for a while, as we managed to collect five of Nick's reds into a pile, but Nick blew the pile nicely, and wasn't in much trouble from then on. He couldn't work a pot-out in time but, despite some great shots by Tim onto the pile in rounds, took six points to finish level with Dave. Jon, partnering Sean Mayes against Ed Wynn and James Cullingham, now needed anything over 5-2 for the tournament, but couldn't get there. In the end he lost 5-2, dropping down to fourth place behind Mike.

So Stosh had won, and deservedly so. He won eight of his eleven games, and two of his losses were only 3-4. Congratulations to him, and also of course to co-winner Nick. This is also Nick's first tournament win (aside from the Teams of Four), and these two are the first CUTwC winners of their own Open. Ed Wynn and Jon Carlaw both did very well, finishing 5th and 8th respectively, and there was a fine showing by Oxford's Gavin Keyte, who led the novices in with $33\frac{5}{6}$ points from 12 games.

Nick has calculated, for each player, the average p.p.g. of partners and opponents, excluding those games involving that player. He's used these scores to arrive at an "adjusted score" - the player's p.p.g. if his/her draw had been of average difficulty (ask Nick if you want to know the gory details of how he calculated this). I've put all of these on the scoresheet. I'm sure he didn't do this just because he's the sole winner on adjusted score. It turns

out that Stew's average opponent would have come 9th - a pretty tough draw - while James Cullingham drew the best partners. The stats also show that none of the leaders had an easy draw. Commiserations to Phil Scarrott, who had the toughest draw of all - his average partner would have come 27th !

Nick Inglis' World Ratings

Complete to the end of the Cambridge Open, 1990

Over the last couple of years, those of you not from CUTwC may have heard Cambridge winkers referring to the 'World Ratings'. What, you may have wondered (or maybe not), *are* these mysterious ratings ? At last the truth can be told.

Ever since becoming *Winking World* Editor in 1985, Nick Inglis has received a copy of the scoresheet from virtually every major tournament (except from the odd Hampshire Open here and there). In 1986 or 1987, he wrote a program that could use these scores to rank-order players. The ranking could clearly not be based purely on total numbers of points scored, as this would not account for different players having partners and opponents of different strengths. Nick took as his starting point many of the ideas used in the Elo system (which is used to rate chess players), adding modifications to cope with the pairs nature of winks. Since then, the program has been developed and refined, and is now quite a lot better than most people at seeding tournaments, though it has never been used for this purpose. For instance, in the National Singles of 1987, the ratings seeded second-years Geoff Myers and Richard Moore to qualify (which they duly did); virtually no-one else seeded them above 20th.

The system works by estimating, for each game in a tournament, the average score. This is done by taking the difference in ratings (in a singles game) or the difference in average ratings (in a pairs game) and using a complicated function to arrive at an expected score for the game. For example, a difference of 100 points suggests roughly a 4-3 win to the stronger player. The new rating of a player is given by

$$\text{New Rating} = \text{Old Rating} + K * (\text{Score} - \text{Expected Score})$$

where K is a number depending on the number, N, of games in this tournament and the number, M, of games in the past year. For instance, a game point is worth about 6 to 7 rating points if you've played 65 games in the past year, but only just over 4 if you've played 95. The M and N referred to are numbers of *rateable* games: a game is rateable for a player if:

- (a) the player is unrated
- or (b) the player's partner is rated.

Games in which a rated player partners an unrated player are only used to rate the unrated player.

The first tournament which was used in the ratings program was the 1985 ETwA Singles. This was ideal, as there was a field of 40, all of whom played at least nine games. The average rating of players in this tournament was set to be 2000. Since then, the following tournaments have been used whenever the results were available : World Singles, World Pairs, ETwA Singles, NATwA Singles, ETwA Pairs, NATwA Pairs, ETwA Fours, Cambridge Open, Hants Open, London Open, Silver Wink, Varsity Match and the Marchant Trophy. Some other matches have also sneaked in - CUTwC v. USA, WETS v. Rest of England. In fact, about the only things not in there are the Jubilee Trophy (shame !) and Invitation tournaments.

As players play more games, so their ratings become increasingly reliable. Ratings based on just one or two performances tend to be much more erratic. For this reason, in the list that follows, I have excluded all the players with fewer than 15 rated games in the past year, and italicised all those with fewer than 30.

I'd like to thank Nick for his help in writing this article (and of course for taking the time to keep the ratings up-to-date), and I hope to include the ratings as a regular feature in future editions.

Player	Current Rating	Games in past year		
		Rated	Total	p.p.g
Larry Kahn (U.S.)	2611	76	76	4.809
Dave Lockwood (U.S)	2547	54	54	4.611
Richard Moore	2449	74	78	4.374
Jon Mapley	2440	72	85	4.139
Geoff Myers	2425	68	82	4.526
Mike Surridge	2418	48	59	4.297
Andy Purvis	2397	64	75	4.180
Jim Carrington	2353	58	59	4.356
Charles Relle	2339	93	95	4.023
Nick Inglis	2307	63	77	3.818
<i>Peter Wright</i>	2306	21	21	4.119
Jim Marlin (U.S)	2297	35	35	3.586
Alan Boyce	2268	58	59	4.161
<i>Keith Seaman</i>	2267	17	17	3.676
Alan Dean	2264	52	52	3.702
Patrick Barrie	2242	54	71	3.751
Graham Hancock	2240	59	59	4.144
Alex Satchell	2214	58	68	4.279
Tim Jeffreys	2196	73	76	3.388
Matthew Rose	2148	54	55	3.976
Rob Cartwright	2144	78	78	3.641
Geoff Thorpe	2140	50	60	3.517
<i>Tony Brennan</i>	2105	16	16	3.750
Gary Shrimpton	2097	36	37	3.122

Player	Current Rating	Games in past year		
		Rated	Total	p.p.g
Anthony Heading	2096	59	69	4.075
Steve Chamberlin	2061	40	40	2.675
Jon Carlaw	2056	37	38	2.939
Julian Wiseman	2044	40	41	3.317
Phil Scarrott	2035	44	58	3.468
Stew Fenton	2034	34	34	3.603
<i>Rick Tucker (U.S)</i>	2033	22	22	2.386
<i>Dave Smith</i>	2018	24	24	3.792
Stew Sage	2002	59	63	3.238
Phil Clark	2001	45	45	3.578
Simon Gandy	1997	34	39	3.662
<i>Dave Salter</i>	1994	15	16	2.896
Ed Wynn	1974	49	50	2.690
Heather Dean	1950	32	32	3.516
<i>Steve Harbron</i>	1887	24	24	2.937
<i>Dave Hull</i>	1875	25	25	2.660
Ian Gameson	1864	40	40	3.158
Steve Phillips	1862	51	68	2.755
Alasdair Grant	1847	39	39	2.996
Stu Collins	1804	54	55	2.509
James Cullingham	1749	34	35	2.786
<i>Gavin Keyte</i>	1737	24	26	3.468
Jon Harris	1735	30	30	2.117
Simon Braidman	1720	39	39	3.038
<i>Nick May</i>	1686	19	19	2.421
<i>Margo Outhwaite</i>	1603	23	23	2.739
<i>Rupert Wilson</i>	1593	19	20	2.475
Jackie Carter	1532	36	42	2.028
<i>John Duffield</i>	1530	19	19	1.518
<i>Sean Mayes</i>	1412	15	15	1.900

The highest British rating yet achieved was 2517 by Jon Mapley; this straight after he won the World Singles and the 1987 ETwA Pairs in quick succession. Alan Dean is the only other Briton to top 2500 - he reached 2503 after the 1988 Teams of Four.

Although these ratings are hopefully interesting, please remember that they don't matter. There's no trophy for being top, and they aren't used in the seeding or handicapping of any tournament. They are completely unofficial. I hope we don't get anyone playing for their stats in the way that a few Americans seem to. If we do, I'll stop printing them !

Forthcoming Tournaments

National Pairs - Southampton University, April 28th & 29th

London Open - Pinner Community Centre, July 7th

National Teams of Four - Oxford University, October 27th & 28th

National Singles - Cambridge University, November 24th & 25th

Winking World is the official journal of the English Tiddlywinks Association, and is edited by Andy Purvis of Merton College, Oxford OX1 4JD. It is issued free of charge to members and costs 75p to non-members. Material published in *Winking World* is not copyright, but anyone who quotes from *Winking World* is asked to acknowledge the source.

Winking World 55 will (hopefully) appear at the National Teams of Four. Please send any material for it to the Editor by September 13th.

Membership of the English Tiddlywinks Association costs £5 per annum (£2 for students and the unwaged). In addition to *Winking World*, members receive regular newsletters. Also, tournament fees at ETwA tournaments are lower for members than for non-members. Anyone wishing to join ETwA should send their subscription to the Treasurer, Patrick Barrie of Emmanuel College, Cambridge CB2 3AP.