

WINKING



WORLD

The Official Journal of the
English Tiddlywinks Association

February 1992

Contents

Editorial Ramblings.....	<i>The Editor</i>	1
Whoever he might be		
The National Teams of Four.....	<i>Patrick Barrie</i>	2
No, I can't remember anything that happened either		
The NATwA Pairs 1991.....	<i>A Special Correspondent</i>	4
News from the other side of the pond		
World Pairs 11.....	<i>Gavin Keyte</i>	4
A report on a 22 hour marathon		
Auntie Gertie's Problem Corner.....	<i>Auntie Gertie</i>	6
Answers to problems even worse than Thorpe's ring		
World Masters 3.....	<i>Jon Mapley</i>	7
How to lose a tournament by playing the wrong colour		
Famous Winkers.....	<i>Patrick Barrie</i>	10
No, not the drinking game...		
The ETwA National Singles 1991		
<i>Blue division</i>	<i>Matthew Rose</i>	11
<i>Green division</i>	<i>Geoff Myers</i>	12
<i>Red division</i>	<i>Nick Inglis</i>	13
<i>Yellow division</i>	<i>Richard Moore</i>	14
<i>The final</i>	<i>Patrick Barrie</i>	15
Beady makes the breakthrough		
The 5th Somerset Invitation.....	<i>James Cullingham</i>	18
Featuring copious amounts of lemonade		
The 1st Japanese National Rotating Threesomes.....	<i>Patrick Barrie</i>	18
Featuring copious amounts of sake		
The 1992 Cambridge Open.....	<i>Simon Gandy</i>	19
A test of the CUTwC president's memory after the club dinner		
Letters to the Editor.....	<i>Correspondents</i>	22
Proposals for Revisions to the Rules.....	<i>Rules Sub-committee</i>	23
Otherwise known as rules proposals		
A Code of Conduct Revisited.....	<i>Patrick Barrie</i>	26
I thought etiquette was a type of glue until I discovered Smirnoff		
The N.I. World Ratings.....	<i>A BBC Micro</i>	28
Where "N.I." stands for "Not Important"		

Editorial Ramblings

This is my first Winking World and so it's traditional for me to go on about trying to maintain the high standard that previous editors have set, about trying to maintain the high standard that previous editors have set, about trying to maintain the high standard that previous editors have set.

Since the last Winking World, the annual ETwA coup d'état has come and gone. It was more revolutionary this year than usual as there was competition for all committee posts. The new ETwA committee are:

Chairman: Geoff Myers,
37 Quadrant Close, Hendon, London NW4 3BY
Secretary: Charles Relle,
26 Canadian Avenue, Catford, London SE6 3AS
Treasurer: Ian Gameson,
20 Green End Road, Chesterton, Cambridge CB4 1RX
Tournament organiser: Alex Satchell,
1 Waldemar Mansions, Waldemar Avenue, London SW6
(when he's in the country)
Winking World editor: Patrick Barrie,
31 Foxley Lane, Purley, Surrey CR8 3EH

The position of publicity officer is once again vacant (the competition at Congress was between two winkers who weren't present and didn't want the job!). Geoff becomes the first ETwA Chairman to be elected *in absentia*.

Equipment can be obtained from the treasurer, who would also no doubt be delighted to receive any outstanding membership subscriptions. Details of winkers' whereabouts is available from the secretary who keeps the ETwA address list up-to-date when people are competent enough to tell him where they live. Copies of the rules are available from some members of the committee, possibly also the rules sub-committee, or failing them, me. I've also got a stock of back-issues of Winking World available at a small cost for anyone who's interested. There are also copies of an 8 page booklet entitled "An introduction to tiddlywinks" kicking around which are excellent starting information for novices- these have a token charge, but in some cases can be distributed free at the discretion of ETwA in the interests of promoting the game.

Editorial policy for Winking World is to write as little as possible myself, so please submit any articles you feel will be of interest. A warm thank-you to all contributors to this issue, particularly Gavin Keyte for his account of the World Pairs match- an example of dedication to the art of reporting above and in this case beyond the calls of duty and human stamina.

Congratulations are due to Dave and Deja Lockwood on the birth of the latest member of their family (Jonathan Abbott, born 19 February). Other news is that Graham Hancock is now attempting to catch up Nick Inglis in the race to get acquainted with various constabularies throughout the land. Mind you, I'm not sure that "breaking and entering" was quite what he had in mind!

The National Teams of Four

University College, Oxford. 26-27th October 1991

by Patrick Barrie

And they're under tournament organiser's orders and they're away in the ETwA Handicap Fours, and it's The Elite Alternative over the first fence in the lead with a $23\frac{1}{2} - 4\frac{1}{2}$ win after handicap transfer over Citius Quam Lockwood, but that serves Mr. Mapley right for naming his team after American winkers. Now onto the lunch barrier, and they've all safely negotiated that one, what a surprise, and coming to the next, the traditional Queens'/CUTwC team of Betty's Boys make a mess of it and go down $6\frac{1}{2} - 21\frac{1}{2}$ to Er..err..errr..and..Dead Tetrad Alliance, and there's no prizes for guessing that a team with that much confusion must contain Ed Wynn. The old Purvis-Hedger combination in Vomit All Over Again also doing well against Enigma in that round, and now they move onto the next hurdle and Adonis shoot over with a 21 - 7 against We're Not Here to Enjoy Ourselves. Only a short-lived pleasure for Adonis, however, as they fall $6\frac{1}{2} - 21\frac{1}{2}$ at the next. The London-connected team of PINTS still keeping up their challenge at that fence with a $21\frac{1}{2}$ against Citius Quam Lockwood. Trouble at the next obstacle, however, as there seems to be a mass refusal at the so-called ETwA Congress, but they're back up and running now and it's Er..err..errr..and..Dead Tetrad Alliance in a clear lead, with PINTS heading the chasing group, and nothing much seems to be happening in the closing stages, and still nothing much seems to be happening, but the commentator may have gone too soon, and yes, suddenly there's some witty fractions appearing at the rear of the field, and in a great battle for last place, Enigma just overtake Citius Quam Lockwood by one twelfth of a point. Up front, the winner is Er..err..errr..and..Dead Tetrad Alliance, trained by Patrick Barrie, ridden by novice David M. Smith, with all the hard work being done by Ed Wynn and James Cullingham, second were PINTS, unbeaten in all but one match, with Betty's Boys just managing to hold on to third. An excellent race, well organised by ETwA and the OUTS club, and now it's back to the studio.

The Teams (and handicaps)

- A **Er..err..errr..and..Dead Tetrad Alliance**
Patrick Barrie (7); Ed Wynn (4); James Cullingham (3);
David M. Smith (0) [3 rounds only]
- B **PINTS**
Tim Jeffreys (6); Phil Scarrott (6); Tim Batham (2);
Cyril Edwards (4) [5 rounds only]
- C **Betty's Boys**
Richard Moore (7); Stew Sage (4); Dave Clarkson (2); Jonathan Williams (0)
- D **Vomit All Over Again**
Andy Purvis (7); Tim Hedger (4); Julian Porter (0); James Orwell (0) [3 rounds only]
Rupert Wilson (3) [1 round only]

E Adonis

Charles Relle (7); Chris Wilson (3); Simon Julier (2);
Jon Mainwaring (2) [4 rounds only]

F The Elite Alternative

Alex Satchell (6); Alan Boyce (5); Nick Jones (0); Christine Wiggins (0)

G We're Not Here to Enjoy Ourselves

Nick Inglis (7); Simon Gandy (6); Chris Webb (0); Andrew Twells (0)

H Enigma

Jon Carlaw (4); Paul Lewis (2); Elizabeth Whalley (2) [4 rounds only];
Geoff Myers (7) [3 rounds only]; Kath Mumford (1) [3 rounds only]

I Citius Quam Lockwood

Jon Mapley (7); Gavin Keyte (4); Gavin Orpin (0); David Fox (0) [4 rounds only];
Robin Smale (3) [2 rounds only]

1991 Teams of Four

Opponents	Score
Running Total	

															Ave.	Pos
A	bye	–	C	21½	B	20½	E	21½	D	17	F	18	G	14		
	–		21½		42		63½		80½		98½		112½		18.75	1
B	G	19½	F	16	A	7½	I	21½	bye	–	D	17½	C	17		
	19½		35½		43		64½		64½		82		99		16.50	2
C	D	15½	A	6½	I	19	F	16	G	12	H	21	B	11		
	15½		22		41		57		69		90		101		14.43	3
D	C	12½	H	19	F	17	bye	–	A	11	B	10½	E	16		
	12½		31½		48½		48½		59½		70		86		14.33	4
E	H	17½	bye	–	G	21	A	6½	F	13½	I	11½	D	12		
	17½		17½		38½		44½		58½		69½		81½		13.61	5
F	I	23½	B	12	D	11	C	12	E	14½	A	10	H	12		
	23½		35½		46½		58½		73		83		95		13.57	6
G	B	8½	I	16½	E	7	H	14¾	C	16	bye	–	A	14		
	8½		25		32		46¾		62¾		62¾		76¾		12.79	7
H	E	10½	D	9	bye	–	G	13¼	I	10	C	7	F	16		
	10½		19½		19½		33½		43½		50½		66½		11.01	8
I	F	4½	G	11½	C	9	B	6½	H	18	E	16½	bye	–		
	4½		16		25		31½		49½		66		66		11.00	9

NATwA Pairs 1991

Ashburn, Virginia, 2nd November 1991

by A Special Correspondent

Rick Tucker has kindly sent me the scores from the NATwA Pairs, which was played at Jim Marlin's house. Five pairs entered, and it's interesting to note that each pair included one previous NATwA Pairs champion. The scoresheet shows that going into the last round Larry & Sunshine (*) needed 5 off Dave & Rick to force a tie, but could only manage 1, while a good performance by Ferd & Indian in the closing stages was enough to share second place. As a result of their victory Dave & Rick got a challenge against the World Pairs champions which is reported below.

NATwA Pairs 1991	Dave & Rick	Larry & *	Ferd & Indian	Bob & Mac	Jim & Brad	Total
Dave Lockwood & Rick Tucker	— —	2 6	5 4	5 6	6 $5\frac{1}{2}$	$39\frac{1}{2}$
Larry Kahn & *	5 1	— —	4 $2\frac{1}{2}$	6 3	6 4	$31\frac{1}{2}$
Ferd & Indian	2 3	3 $4\frac{1}{2}$	— —	1 6	6 6	$31\frac{1}{2}$
Bob Henninge & Mac McAvoy	2 1	1 4	6 1	— —	1 3	19
Jim Marlin & Brad Schaefer	1 $1\frac{1}{2}$	1 3	1 1	6 4	— —	$18\frac{1}{2}$

World Pairs 11

Queens' College, Cambridge, 21st & 22nd November 1991.

by Gavin Keyte

I travelled from Oxford two days early for the Singles for THIS! The only remarkable thing about this match was how long and dull it was.

Before the first game got under way, there were the usual wranglings about dominant (?) corners, dominant (?) colours, etc. In the end it was decided to alternate both of these as well as the old and new style pots and failure-to-free rule interpretations. Someone even suggested alternating partners. So with the old pot, dominant corners and their choice of colours, how could Dave & Rick possibly lose the first game? Well, read on...

1st Game After sending off his second bring-in and then subbing under his own pile, Dave must have felt rather as if it was not his day. He was right. Andy was on doubletons all over the place and Geoff contentedly sat on a quadruplet for the last twenty minutes of the game. Not much of a contest this one: 6-1 to Andy & Geoff.

2nd Game Q. With one of his reds squopped by Dave's green, who suggested "Pot five?" A. Andy (not hard was it?).

The voice of sanity prevailed, however, and he freed the 6th before failing to pot-out. Dave tried it as well, but he failed to pot any at all (thanks to a bounce-out). Then a sensible game developed around a pile with one of each colour under it, and it was only Dave's inability to get many winks close to the pile that meant he got first place by potting in rounds: 4-3 to Dave & Rick.

3rd Game Andy's pot-out was stopped before even he had thought of it by Dave squopping his third green. Bringing in a guard, Dave subbed under his squop and Andy took it. Geoff made an 18" squop to take out a blue (Rick) attacker so Rick squopped the pile from the baseline instead. Dave finally got on the pile after Geoff, but sent himself off when blowing it, allowing Andy & Geoff to recover in rounds for a 6-1 win.

4th Game (after dinner in the Red Bull). Despite sending off another bring-in, Dave's greens behaved well enough for a pile to develop over two of Geoff's reds. Andy managed to blow the pile and then took a tripleton just before rounds. Geoff blew another pile ending zero but Dave squopped two piles to put the Americans back on top. Andy freed one of Dave's greens with an attempted pile flip, then missed the pot, but Rick's miss in round 5 allowed Geoff to free a blue to get joint 2nd for Andy and $1\frac{1}{2}$ points from the game.

5th Game A linear pile containing four blues (Rick) developed near to the pot. Rick managed to free some blues and Andy & Geoff missed some squops to leave the Americans on several doubles. In rounds, however, scrappy play from everyone allowed Geoff to pot four in round 5, getting 1st place ahead of Dave who had four in and two squopped. 5-2 to Andy & Geoff.

6th Game (next day in the Erasmus Room). I'm afraid that I didn't see much of this game because I fell asleep¹. ["Possibly the most telling comment so far", Anon]. Anyway, Dave & Rick won 6-1.

7th Game (now moved to the Armitage Room). Andy & Geoff needed $2\frac{1}{2}$ to retain the title and never looked likely to get less than 5 unless Dave blitzed. Geoff squopped one of Dave's reds with a green, then Andy took a triple and made one pile out of it. Some good squopping by Geoff in particular and two unlucky subs had the Americans down to one wink apiece. Despite getting on the pile, Dave & Rick were squopped up in round 3. Andy's tricky freeing shot, however, left two blues and a red free. Rick potted one blue, but then missed a squop onto green. Green took the red, Andy potted one and though Geoff missed a pot it was a safe $5\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$ win.

¹ According to some reports, Gavin also fell asleep in the 3rd game!

World Pairs 11	Game Scores							Total
Andy Purvis & Geoff Myers	6	3	6	$1\frac{1}{2}$	5	1	$5\frac{1}{2}$	28
Dave Lockwood & Rick Tucker	1	4	1	$5\frac{1}{2}$	2	6	$1\frac{1}{2}$	21
Length of game (mins.)	47	56	46	63	64	63	45	6 hours 24 mins

It should be noted that the dominant (?) corners lost every game, as did the preferred pot and also the blue/red combination. From a spectator's point of view, games lasting an average of 55 minutes are very, very boring. Also, if I wanted to see bloody Purvis ranting all over the place I would have gone to an OUTS meeting.

P.S. Thanks to Rick for proving that at least one American is vaguely normal.

Auntie Gertie's Problem Corner

Yes, tiddlywinks' longest running agony aunt is still answering your problems...

Dear Auntie Gertie,

During a recent pairs match, my partner was bored to death by our opponents' slow play, and collapsed head-first into the main pile. We were unable to mutually agree a position for the disturbed winks, my partner no longer being in a position to agree anything. Because of this, our opponents were left with no option (so they claimed) but to enforce a 7-0 win for deliberate interference with winks. Were they right to do so?

Love, hugs and kisses,
R.T. Ficial

Dear R.T. Ficial,

I think you'd be hard-pressed to describe this as "deliberate interference" as your partner was clearly not conscious of his/her actions at the time. There is, however, a dangerous precedent that might be set in this case: would collapsing into a pile unconscious in an alcoholic haze be treated similarly? I suggest you refer the matter to the rules sub-committee, so we never need hear of it again. A.G.

World Masters 3

Queens' College, Cambridge, 22nd November 1991.

by Jon Mapley

Following a request from Dave Lockwood, and enthusiastic support from most of the eligible (National Singles winners) British players, the little-held World Masters made a welcome reappearance on the Friday before the Singles in the Erasmus room. Charles was busy at work, and Keith couldn't be persuaded to extend his annual winkend to three days, so once again there were seven participants, everyone agreeing to the inclusion of Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck (Richard & Nick).

After much lobbying and opinion-gathering, a 3-game knockout was decided upon, the draw being made randomly, except that Nick and Richard were not eligible for the bye, nor to play each other, and to give the Americans a chance, Larry and Dave were also separated.

First pick saw Dave draw a yellow, meaning "one of the other players" and Larry then chose blue for Scotland (i.e. Nick). Alan drew green (proceed directly to the semi-finals, do not collect £200) and Jon picked red for Richard, leaving Andy with the second yellow and the happy task of continuing from where he and Geoff had left off the night before.

Alan justified his place (so he claimed) by getting the needed six in a series against Gavin (who had come along expecting to spectate). All the real matches looked like producing 4-3's until Jon practised what he preached by potting off the chandeliers to scrape a $5\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$. The Yanks went one point ahead, in matches which continued to be American-dominated, Larry scoring 6 and Dave 5, but Richard came back strongly to shade the lead with a well-earned 6. The shape of the semi-finals looked clear, as the biggest winner was due to play the narrowest, with the bye playing the one in the middle.

Larry continued on his merry way, with the day's first 7-0, and looking at the other matches, was already facing the prospect of playing Richard or Jon, who were knocking six bells out of each other in the most amicable way, of course. Both had potted some superb shots until, with the win there for the taking, Richard missed from two inches, and Jon held firm for a 4-3. This meant a fourth game, and an early blitz by Jon nearly went horribly wrong until he sank the sixth at the second attempt. This was at about the same time as Dave completed a workmanlike 6-1 over a now dispirited Andy, who seemed to have been enjoying the oohs and aahs from the next table slightly more than his own match.¹

The semis thus comprised the same four players as in the two previous Masters, with the match-ups completing the set of possible combinations.

It would be a brave man who bet money on Alan v. Dave going the distance, although the first game saw Dave controlling a number of scattered

¹ Following his defeat Andy was, however, able to give Dave the most delightfully barbed compliment: "That was the first time I've ever seen you play well".

piles, never giving Alan much to aim at, but being sufficiently involved himself not to attempt the big P-O¹. The second game was much more typical, and a desperate Alan was soon licking his wounds on the wrong end of a 13-1 scoreline: "a whole day off work for an hour's winks and one point!"

Meanwhile, although in National Singles Jon hasn't had much joy against Larry, his record in head-to-head is second only to Arye Gittelman. Both missed easy pots to win the first game, which ended in a tie, and the way Jon played games two and three was reminiscent of a boa-constrictor- nothing dramatic, but an inevitable outcome. Larry played well enough to keep the score to 4-3, 5-2.

Jon maintained this sequence in the final, inflicting Dave's first defeat with a 6-1 which was pretty close all the way. Game two began cagily. Jon's bring-in with green was good except for one near the edge, and when Dave landed a blue next to a red close to the five, he may have had fleeting visions of being engulfed in a verdant pile. Jon thought that it would be fun to complete the progression from his previous four scores, and ran the five, one of which had been on another, then brought the last, a big, next to a yellow, seven inches from the pot and a foot from any of Dave's winks. Drama? You want drama in this game? You got it. Dave brilliantly squopped both the green and the defending yellow from a good fourteen inches. It was the sort of shot that deserves to win a match from 1-6 down, and Jon started sizing up which yellow he would use to squop the blue. Hang on a minute, is everyone awake, did you say blue? Jon couldn't believe his luck as he asked Dave to retract and play red, and Dave couldn't believe by how much he missed when he played the correct colour. Jon then borrowed a shot from Bowls, playing a large yellow smack onto Dave's line with the abortively successful blue, which missed short, and the big green clattered the rim as it flew home. Alan was quite pleased with the final score.²

Quarter-finals					
Larry Kahn	4	6	7*	17	
Nick Inglis	3	1	0*	4	
Dave Lockwood	4	5	6	15	
Andy Purvis	3	2	1	6	
Jon Mapley	5½	1	4	6*	16½
Richard Moore	1½	6	3	1*	11½

Semi-finals				
Jon Mapley	3½	4	5	12½
Larry Kahn	3½	3	2	8½
Dave Lockwood	6*	7*		13
Alan Dean	1*	0*		1

FINAL				
Jon Mapley	6	7*		13
Dave Lockwood	1	0*		1

¹ According to the scoresheet, Dave did get a pot-out!

² Jon thus wins the right to make himself another yellow sweatshirt saying "World Masters Tiddlywinks Champion" that once again he will be too embarrassed to ever wear.

Addendum

One of the points I've made to the rules sub-committee is what happens in a game of Singles when, say, a player squidges blue when it is red to play, as happened in the final game of the World Masters. A careful reading of the rules does not distinguish between whether this is a foul shot (in which case, if accepted, it is green to play) or a shot out of sequence (in which case, if accepted, it is yellow to play). Jon adds the following comments.

The incorrect shot played towards the end of the final has raised some interesting questions within ETwA. Was it out of sequence or a foul shot? In the circumstances, I obviously chose retraction, but what if Dave had missed the green? In a Pairs game, if Dave had been playing red with (say) Patrick playing blue, if Patrick had played the shot, it is clearly a turn out of sequence, and I (we) would have been within my (our) rights to say, had it missed, that it was being accepted, and to have sunk the green immediately.

However, on this occasion, is Rule 1(b) right in stating that the Rules apply in all respects to Pairs and Singles alike? I don't think so, because in this instance, who is going to legislate that Dave is partnering himself, and somehow the two entities are discernable? My contention is that the correct player stepped up to the table to play a red turn, and simply played the wrong wink, i.e. a foul shot. This would be patently obvious had he played a yellow, so why should playing a blue be any different? I can see what goes through the mind of the player concerned must be different. He knows which two colours he controls, and the error is definitely playing the wrong turn rather than committing a foul as far as subconscious intent is concerned, but we cannot predetermine a player's intentions in this way. After I had asked Dave to retract, he joked that he had passed with red, and assumed I had done the same with yellow. This was hindsight, because at the time he played the blue, he and I both thought what a great shot he had achieved- there was no INTENTION to play either a foul or out of sequence, but it is what actually transpired which must be judged. This has to be that the right player played a wink other than his own- i.e. for the duration of that turn, blue is NOT Dave's wink, otherwise, had he correctly played red and potted a blue from under it he would be awarded an extra shot.

We will never know what happened had the blue missed. I would be interested to know Dave's views on this. Presumably it would have been close enough for me to have squopped it with yellow¹, and he would have had to try another blue with his next shot. To me, this seems much fairer than trying to claim I was accepting a blue turn. Dave made the mistake, not some mythical partner who didn't exist.

¹ ... assuming the blue hadn't squopped the close yellow while missing the green!-Ed.

Famous Winkers

By Patrick Barrie

In the words of Dave Lockwood, Winking World "has long been the premier winking journal in both the breadth and depth of material offered", and this is hopefully something that will be maintained during my editorship. In particular, there have been some delightful descriptions of current players in previous editions of *WW*, so this issue's silly competition is simply to name the famous winker. This quiz is not intended for the old hacks who can remember word for word every statement that's ever been made in *WW*, but for the younger players who have to use their imagination to guess the answer. For instance, you don't need to be an avid *WW* reader to realize that "the grand old man of tiddlywinks" has to be Charles Relle. In fact, he has been described thus on at least three separate occasions! Don't bother sending me any answers, because they're printed on Page 21 of this issue.

1. Who has been described as:
 - (a) "the Muhammad Ali of winks"
 - (b) "a disciple of the game's seriousness"
 - (c) "a man on the very edge of World Domination"
2. Who said (or, more pedantically, wrote):
 - (a) "Hoppity floppity wee, a winker's brain for me"
 - (b) "Ever since then I have been a devotee of the gastronomic deities Demeter and Dionysus and they have stood by me"
 - (c) "I've even told one girl that if she'll stop laughing long enough to play a couple of games I'll follow her to 8000 feet and go parachuting"
 - (d) "Lastly, of course, some of you newcomers may just be boring people generally"
 - (e) "Sir, Thanks for the lesson"
 - (f) "I knew I could never top such an act so I quit"
3. Which winker fits in the gaps:
 - (a) "The unaccustomed absence of _____ at least meant that all comments on the games were printable"
 - (b) "Our sympathy goes to _____ who had to miss the Hampshire Open when he damaged his back humping duty free liquor"
 - (c) "When it comes to looking miserable, there's none to match _____"
4. And finally, who:
 - (a) "... might not be the greatest player, but he is one of the nicest guys around and comes up smiling after a nine game losing sequence in a way we can all envy"
 - (b) "... is believed to be the reincarnation of a twelfth century Buddhist monk who had taken a vow of eternal silence"
 - (c) "... was responsible for organising, welcoming, driving, feeding, accommodating, playing and losing to the Americans in their 1973 tour"

The 1991 National Singles

Queens' College, Cambridge, 23-24th November 1991

The 1991 ETwA National Singles followed its now-established format of splitting up the 43 players into four all-play-all leagues, with the three highest finishers in each group going through to an all-play-all final the following day.

Blue Division *by Matthew Rose*

Being the first of the groups announced, the reading of the names caused the usual chuckling and comments of "I'm glad not to be in *that* group". There was certainly strength in depth, with over half the group having won the Teams of Four at least once, and the lowest player in the draw being the current Hampshire Open champion.

Early on it went largely according to plan for the top seeds, though not without frights from the impressive play of Messrs Reid, Thompson and Julier, all of whom deserved more points than they obtained in their first few tough matches. The main excitement of the first round was Tony Heading's round four pile-break against Phil Clark, in which Tony (using a squidger made with a pocket hacksaw in the luxurious surroundings of a British Rail carriage) sent at least six winks off the table- but it didn't help him very much.

At this stage Cyril was playing the most impressive winks of the top players, scoring 6's far easier than Andy, Patrick or Matthew, whilst Rob was having one of those days... Tony, meanwhile, had decided that double-pot

	<i>Blue Division</i>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	Tot.	Pos.
A	Andy Purvis	—	6	4	7*	5½	7*	6	5	6*	7*	6	59½	1
B	Patrick Barrie	1	—	6	6	6	7*	7*	6	5½	5*	6	55½	2
C	Matthew Rose	3	1	—	6*	6	6*	6	6	7*	7*	6	54	3
D	Rob Cartwright	0*	1	1*	—	1	6*	6	5½	3	3	3	29½	6=
E	Cyril Edwards	1½	1	1	6	—	5	6	6	6	6	6	44½	4
F	Anthony Heading	0*	0*	1*	1*	2	—	1	1	3	4½	5	18½	11
G	Alasdair Grant	1	0*	1	1	1	6	—	4	5	5	6	30	5
H	Phil Clark	2	1	1	1½	1	6	3	—	6	2*	6	29½	6=
I	Nick Reid	1*	1½	0*	4	1	4	2	1	—	2*	3	19½	9
J	Rupert Thompson	0*	2*	0*	4	1	2½	2	5*	5*	—	4	25½	8
K	Simon Julier	1	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	4	3	—	19	10

against anyone seeded higher than him was the order of the day, and had a consistent run of failures that ended up with him falling to the foot of the table with a crash. Tony's tactics led to some rather choice words from an unnamed bearded Wet which are not even publishable in this reputable journal!¹

With Phil, Tony and Alasdair all failing to take enough points in earlier rounds, qualifiers were going to be from Cyril and the top three seeds. When the four clashed, Patrick and Andy crushed Matthew and Cyril respectively, to virtually secure their places. Matthew then beat a desperately unlucky Cyril 6-1 and took 3 off Andy in a very close game, whilst Patrick's 6-1 over Cyril made the last round irrelevant for qualification purposes.

However, there were good performances from the lower seeded players, all of whom won games, and from Alasdair in edging out the more experienced Wets to come in fifth, some distance behind Cyril.

Green Division by Geoff Myers

With a two-times former National Singles Champion seeded sixth (Keith Seaman), green division appeared to be top-heavy. Simon Gandy and Jon Mapley both started impressively amassing 32 points from five games, but then both lost their next game. This allowed the other contenders to catch up so that after six games, the top six were clear of the rest with only five points separating them.

However, Geoff Myers had had some early problems, losing 3-4 to James Cullingham in a game that included a squop by James off the front of a singleton to land plumb on top of a three wink high pile- a tenuous pile duly disappeared just before rounds (as is traditional) and James won the ensuing potting race. In the following round Stu Collins went for a pot-out, got the difficult pots but missed an easy one, allowing Geoff to get the squop-up; however, Geoff potted incompetently until round five when he scraped a win.

Gradually Keith dropped out of the race but Alex Satchell managed to stay in touch. Meanwhile Alan Boyce had been producing a useful set of scores and entered the last round one point ahead of Simon; Jon was a single point ahead of Alan, and Geoff needed a point and a half to make sure of qualifying even if bizarre things happened in the other games.

Jon played Geoff in the final round and was clearly feeling the pressure: Geoff was somewhat surprised to see Jon jumping in triumph and doing a dance of celebration on taking a doubleton, especially since the game was just five minutes old. Jon's worries were misplaced as he scored six with a solid squop-up. Against Alex, Simon managed a pot-out but with qualification riding on the position of his second colour he had an attack of the yips. The disease, however, must have been contagious since Alex allowed Simon to get six points, thereby narrowly denying Alan, who like many others in the past found it impossible to take more than four off Keith.

¹ If I find out what they were, I might publish them!- Ed.

Generally the standard of play in the group was variable, and no-one was able to take charge of the division, as demonstrated by Jon's low winning total of 51 points.

	<i>Green Division</i>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	Tot.	Pos.
A	Geoff Myers	–	1	6	3	6	7*	5½	3	6	7*	6	50½	2
B	Jon Mapley	6	–	1	2	4	6	6	6	7*	7*	6	51	1
C	Simon Gandy	1	6	–	6*	2	2	6	7*	7*	6	6	49	3
D	Alex Satchell	4	5	1*	–	2	4½	1½	4½	6	6	6	40½	5
E	Alan Boyce	1	3	5	5	–	4	6	6	6	6	6*	48	4
F	Keith Seaman	0*	1	5	2½	3	–	4½	6	5	5	5	37	6
G	Stu Collins	1½	1	1	5½	1	2½	–	6	1½	6	6*	32	7
H	James Cullingham	4	1	0*	2½	1	1	1	–	6	7*	3	26½	8
I	Gavin Orpin	1	0*	0*	1	1	2	5½	1	–	4	2	17½	10
J	Andrew Milligan	0*	0*	1	1	1	2	1	0*	3	–	2	11	11
K	Martin Dennett	1	1	1	1	1*	2	1*	4	5	5	–	22	9

Red Division *by Nick Inglis*

"So Tim Hedger's coming to the Singles", people said. "Do you really think he's got a chance of qualifying?" "Let me put it this way", I usually replied, "I certainly wouldn't want him to be in my group." It was therefore inevitable that we both ended up in the Bowett room with its bright lights and narrow bouncy tables (don't you just hate it when that happens?). Realistically, though, this looked like a fairly reasonable group where Dave Lockwood and I ought to qualify, but where third seed Ed Wynn had four former qualifiers and Chris Andrew snapping at his heels.

One of Tim's problems in the Singles has been his first game: 3-4 losses to Nigel Parsons and Andy Davidson in '86 and '87, and a 2-5 loss to Paul Moss in '88. Sure enough Chris Andrew extended this sequence with a 6-1 victory. The first real shock was Andrew Lester's 5-2 win over Ian Gameson (who had lost 3-4 to Stew Sage in round 1). This was some compensation for Andrew who had played pretty well for two 1's against Nick and Dave (the latter after Dave had struggled long and hard to work a pot-out). Chris, meanwhile, had had an up and down sort of sequence (6,1,3,5), but really came up with the goods in round 5 beating Dave 4-3. "Surely Dave won't fail to cope", we thought and, of course, we were right. At any rate it gave a chance for the Inglis juggernaut to overtake the Lockwood steamroller and I got so excited that I blitzed Ian in round 7 (I think this surprised Ian almost as much as it surprised me!).

In round 8 Ed's challenge faded with a second consecutive 1, whereas Rick Tucker beat Ian 6-1 (Dr. Gameson's strategy of keeping the Sunday free to spend with his newly enlarged family had become all too clear) and Tim beat Dave 5-2. This left me $4\frac{1}{2}$ points clear with Dave, Rick and Tim all within a point of each other, followed by a big gap to Chris. Round 9 saw Dave beat Ian 6-1, but Tim and Rick got 1's (against me and Ed) and Chris revived his hopes with a 6-1 win over Stew.

I'd now qualified barring the odd 0, so I wasn't too concerned when I started to slide towards what seemed an inevitable 1-6 against Rick. With no mobile winks left I was on the point of giving up, but couldn't be bothered. Somehow I managed to niggle my way back into this game late on, and ended up winning 6-1 without apparently having done anything (Dave Clarkson was watching this and I don't think he could quite believe it). At the same time Chris was losing 5-2 to Andrew, while Dave and Tim were picking up 6's. That pretty much settled it: Rick needed 6 off Tim to force a play-off and didn't get it. Dave and I had a match to decide the group leadership, and a thoroughly silly game it was too, with honour sort of satisfied when Dave ruined my 100% record, but let me finish top. In an inspired piece of result-fixing three players managed to tie for last place (9th equal sounds so much better than 11th). Commendably this trio also had the tact to finish below Dr. Sage.

Red Division		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	Tot.	Pos.
A	Dave Lockwood	-	4	6	6	6	2	6	3	6	7*	6*	52	2
B	Nick Inglis	3	-	6	5*	6	6	6*	$5\frac{1}{2}$	6	6	6	$55\frac{1}{2}$	1
C	Ed Wynn	1	1	-	1	6	1*	6*	2*	4	5	7*	34	6
D	Ian Gameson	1	2*	6	-	1	1	3	6	4	6	2	32	7
E	Rick Tucker	1	1	1	6	-	2	6	4	6	6	6	39	5
F	Tim Hedger	5	1	6*	6	5	-	5	1	6	6	6	47	3
G	Stew Sage	1	1*	1*	4	1	2	-	1	5	3	6	25	8
H	Chris Andrew	4	$1\frac{1}{2}$	5*	1	3	6	6	-	6	6	2	$40\frac{1}{2}$	4
I	James Orwell	1	1	3	3	1	1	2	1	-	3	4	20	9=
J	Jonathan Williams	0*	1	2	1	1	1	4	1	4	-	5	20	9=
K	Andrew Lester	1*	1	0*	5	1	1	1	5	3	2	-	20	9=

Yellow Division *by Richard Moore*

It was one of those draws which make those who have already popped out of the hat groan at each new name to emerge. Two world champions, one past and one present, three other former qualifiers, and such "rabbits" as Phil Scarrott and Gavin Keyte. Aargh! And of course it was an odd-numbered year,

so Geoff Thorpe would qualify... why do people continue to quote this statistic? Geoff was *knocked out* in 1989.

Actually, more or less everything went according to the seeding, including the top six placings. But there were one or two incidents on the way. Early in the second round, intrepid news-hound Dr. Barrie turned up to ask if there had been any upsets yet. There was a noise of wink in pot, and Alan was able to reply, "Well, Gavin's just potted out against me... does that count?"

Partly because of this, Alan actually lay fifth at lunch, but the non-seeds began to lose their way soon thereafter. By the end of round six, Larry, Alan and Richard were ten points clear. By dint of losing to Alan and Larry, Richard nearly managed to contrive some interest, since he therefore had to avoid the 0-7 in the last round against Tim Jeffreys to prevent a play-off game between them. But in fact a seventh-turn blitz gave him a 7-0. So that was that.

Except to point out that the miracle of scoresheet asterisks allows us to calculate that 31.1111111111111111111111111111% of the games were pot-outs. That's nearly a third. Who says putting little stars next to your scores is for boring nargs?

Yellow Division		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	Tot.	Pos.
A	Larry Kahn	-	6	6	5½	6*	6	5½	5½	6	7*	53½	1
B	Alan Dean	1	-	6	6	6*	6	6	2*	6*	6	45	2=
C	Richard Moore	1	1	-	7*	6*	6*	6	6*	6	6	45	2=
D	Tim Jeffreys	1½	1	0*	-	6	6	3	1*	6	5½	30	4=
E	Phil Scarrott	1*	1*	1*	1	-	5½	6	5	3½	6	30	4=
F	Geoff Thorpe	1	1	1*	1	1½	-	6	5*	6	6*	28½	6
G	Jon Carlaw	1½	1	1	4	1	1	-	7*	2	1	19½	9=
H	Gavin Keyte	1½	5*	1*	6*	2	2*	0*	-	2	2*	21½	8
I	Jon Marchant	1	1*	1	1	3½	1	5	5	-	1	19½	9=
J	Chris Wilson	0*	1	1	1½	1	1*	6	5*	6	-	22½	7

The Final by Patrick Barrie

And so after their exertions qualifying for the final, eight recent Cambridge graduates gathered on the Saturday night in the Ancient Druids for round zero, along with a large number of those who hadn't quite made the final. Strangely enough, there was little sign of the four other finalists, the washed-up world champions, past and present, who would join them in mortal combat the next day. One suspects when a couple of Americans did appear at the end of the evening that they gained a favourable impression of what British tiddlywinks is all about.

Apart from the antics of Tony Heading who continued to lose absolutely everything in splendid fashion, the major battle in round zero was between Andy Purvis and Tim Hedger. Andy had spotted that Tim was his opponent in the first round the next day, and so was trying to drink him under the table, for old times sake as much as anything. The plan was only partially successful- the pools panel was forced to adjudicate a score-draw following their unconvincing attempts at walking in a straight line. Come the first round proper the following morning, it was Tim who achieved a messy squop-up, but Plan 47 together with an accidental pile bomb got Andy 2 points.

Elsewhere in round 1, Geoff Myers and Jon Mapley started as they meant to go on with 6-1 victories over Dave Lockwood and Matthew Rose respectively. There was a good result for Simon Gandy too, who got $4\frac{1}{2}$ - $2\frac{1}{2}$ against Larry Kahn, in a game full of little piles whose result hinged upon Larry accidentally freeing a doubleton when a large wink rolled.

In round 2 Geoff and Jon emulated each other's results in the previous round, i.e. 6-1 wins over Matthew and Dave. Larry also went down again, this time 2-5 to Tim, so that neither American had managed a win at this stage. Andy demonstrated a zoologist's unsurpassed ability at simple arithmetic by miscounting in his game against Simon, successfully making a shot in round 5 thinking it would give him $3\frac{1}{2}$ when in fact it left him 3-4 down, when a couple of pots would have given him a win. Richard Moore had managed two wins at this stage with a 4-3 over Nick Inglis and a 5-2 over Patrick Barrie.

Larry got his act together in round 3 with a 7-0 against Alan Dean, while Patrick was dealt with in similar fashion by Geoff. Geoff's tactics in the latter game were a glorious throw-back to the days of double-pot based on a rather better bring-in than his opponent. Despite Patrick managing to squop one each of his colours, two turns later all 12 of Geoff's winks were in the pot. Dave also got a win in this round with a nerve-wracking 4-3 after Simon had potted 5 greens against him. Judging by the exclamations I heard from this table Simon must have freed and Dave squopped the sixth wink on more than one occasion. Simon managed to tie up red sufficiently in rounds to prevent the pot-out and share first place. Lunch was now taken with Jon having scored three 6's saying it was his best start he'd ever made to the Singles final since... well, the last time he won it, but he was still one point behind Geoff.

Geoff continued on his merry way after lunch with a straightforward 6-1 over Nick, but Jon could only manage 5 points in a struggle against Patrick, and even this was only due to Patrick missing pots from 9" with both colours in round 5. Tim took a useful 6-1 off Dave to move up to 3rd, leaving the defending champion languishing in last place at this stage.

In round 5 both Geoff and Jon came unstuck simultaneously, Geoff in a 1-6 squop-up to an inspired post-lunch Andy, and Jon 1-6 to Larry. However, both quickly returned to winning ways and they matched each other point-for-point in the next three rounds with scores of 6-1, 6-1 and 4-3. In the case of the 4-3's, both games (Geoff v. Richard and Jon v. Simon) were really close squopping battles with the result always in the air until the end of rounds. The pressure was now on. It had also been noticed by now that Geoff and Jon weren't due to play each other until the very last round of what was increasingly

looking like a two-horse race. Horsemear himself was some $8\frac{1}{2}$ points back in joint 3rd with Simon, who kept seeming to make outrageous/brilliant squops whenever I saw him play.

Round 9 was to prove decisive. Jon had one of his usual classic encounters with Alan and only emerged with 2 points, while Geoff was having a really good squopping battle with Simon. As the winks gradually converged into a large pile Simon chose to blow it, possibly overlooking the fact that this would free all six of Geoff's yellows. Geoff duly potted five, then missed the sixth long, but despite blue chipping a red fairly close Simon couldn't capture it. Geoff needed no second invitation and took a 7-0 to open up a 7 point gap at the top of the table with only 2 rounds to go.

In round 10 Geoff was held to a 5-2 against Alan, a score which didn't quite imply final victory. He watched, while having nightmare visions of chasing Jon's winks all round the mat in the final game, as Jon completed a 6-1 (against Tim) to leave Jon requiring a 7-0 against Geoff. In the last game Jon never looked like making a pot-out and eventually went down 1-6. Larry's late charge up the table (28 points from his last 5 games) ended up pipping Jon for 2nd place. Lower down the table there was an excellent 4th place for Simon, a remarkable 6th place for Tim on his come-back, and a highly respectable set of results for Matthew in his first final. Others played well without quite stringing the points together. Patrick propped up the table this year- I had one of those delightful days when winks defy the laws of science to

	<i>The Final</i>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	Tot.	Pos.
A	Andy Purvis	-	1	3	6	6	4	1	6	4	5	3	2	41	5
B	Larry Kahn	6	-	6	6	5	5*	6	1*	7*	4	$2\frac{1}{2}$	2	$50\frac{1}{2}$	2
C	Nick Inglis	4	1	-	7*	5*	1	1	1	4	3	1	5*	33	9
D	Patrick Barrie	1	1	0*	-	1	5*	2	0*	3	2	1	5	21	12
E	Matthew Rose	1	2	2*	6	-	4	1	1	1*	6*	6	4	34	8
F	Dave Lockwood	3	2*	6	2*	3	-	1	1	6	$5\frac{1}{2}$	4	1	$34\frac{1}{2}$	7
G	Jon Mapley	6	1	6	5	6	6	-	1	2	6	4	6	49	3
H	Geoff Myers	1	6*	6	7*	6	6	6	-	5	4	7*	6	60	1
I	Alan Dean	3	0*	3	4	6*	1	5	2	-	$4\frac{1}{2}$	1	1	$30\frac{1}{2}$	11
J	Richard Moore	2	3	4	5	1*	$1\frac{1}{2}$	1	3	$2\frac{1}{2}$	-	5*	4	32	10
K	Simon Gandy	4	$4\frac{1}{2}$	6	6	1	3	3	0*	6	2*	-	6	$41\frac{1}{2}$	4
L	Tim Hedger	5	5	2*	2	3	6	1	1	6	3	1	-	35	6

disappear and three foot bombs (whether by myself or my opponents) always seemed to stabilise the most tenuous of piles. Indeed, I even briefly reverted to my bygone days of pot-out merchant towards the end- it worked against Dave, but failed against Nick.

So Geoff becomes the first of the younger generation to win the ETWA Singles- indeed he's the first new name on the trophy since Larry's first win back in ~~1320~~ 1984. He also ends the run of recent American success in the tournament. He ended up with 60 points from 11 games with only one loss, which is a truly superb performance in that field. The World Singles challenge he gets as a result of his win is richly deserved, particularly as he's twice got within half a point of getting a challenge previously.

At the other end of the room while the final was in progress was the Singles Plate, for those who had been knocked out on the first day. This was played on an adjustable handicap basis with randomly drawn pairs. The winner at the end of the day was Keith Seaman with a string of impressive results. I'm told there were also good performances from Gavin Keyte, Ian Gameson and Rick Tucker, and quite possibly lots of other people as well.

The 5th Somerset Invitation

The Somerset Wagon, Chilcompton, 2nd-3rd January 1992
by James Cullingham

What aspect of this tournament was most noteworthy? Was it the Thursday night, when Tim's finesmastership of 'nurdle boondock' led to copious consumption of beer? Was it the Friday lunchtime, when certain people needed three pints of lemonade? Was it the cautionary tale of the dangers of using an industrial belt-driven machine for sexual gratification? No.

Thanks, however, to Terry and Sally Sage, and to Stew, for a fine weekend. Matthew won, which just goes to show, really.

The 1st Japanese National Rotating Threesomes

Tachigawa Grand Hotel, Tokyo, 8-15th February 1992
by Patrick Barrie

The University of London threesome (Patrick Barrie, Jane Hawkes and Harold Toms) competed successfully in this inaugural competition. Sadly due to a slightly delayed flight, they were slightly late for the tournament start and so disqualified from winning, even though they were unbeaten over the whole week. Cynics may point out that they were the only team entered, but this should not hide the fact that this was undoubtedly the best winks performance ever by at least two of the London team.

The 1992 Cambridge Open

Queens' College, Cambridge, 1-2nd February 1992

by Simon Gandy (aged $23\frac{1}{4}$)

This year's C.O. saw 37 winkers from all over the place, including one from Australia, competing for the crown of "World (Cambridge Division) Winking Champ". The current holder, sporting an "interesting" haircut, had emerged from the netherworld, though he didn't attend the Club Dinner, ostensibly because he didn't have a D.J.

In the first round, this former star managed but a two in a heavyweight contest partnering Dr. Sage against Dr. Inglis and Charles, while sixes were notched up by Alan Dean (playing singles), and Andrew Milligan, partnering the unknown Jon Mapley (or was it Jon Mapley, partnering...?).

Anyway, Mr. Milligan proved he was no flash in the pan, by helping Geoff Myers to a 4-3 victory over Stu and Jim in the following round, putting him equal third with James Cullingham and Jon Mapley. Meanwhile, Alan Dean had taken a clear lead, with a $5\frac{1}{2}$ partnering Nick Inglis, who was thereby second.

Lunch ensued, with various winkers retiring to various pubs, and several players were unavoidably detained, for reasons totally unclear. Had they turned up for round 3, they would have experienced the arrival of Geoff Thorpe, and seen him take top spot on the leader board with a six partnering Jon. Alan also got a six, to stay second, while James got a seven against Andrew, rather lowering his p.p.g.

In the next few rounds, Geoff shared the lead with first Jon, then Richard Moore, whose run of 7,7,6,6 to end the first day put him a close second to Geoff, with Jon in third place in front of Phil Scarrott, who'd been merrily potting out for a large part of the afternoon. A spurious but impressive result from lower down the table was when CUTwC novices Milligan and Nipper¹ took five from their treasurer who was partnering Alan Boyce. Let's hope that (if selected) they repeat that form in the Varsity Match (not that I'm biased).

It not being my task to relate the events of the evening's jollities, we move on to the second day. A salutary lesson in the art of the game, for the school-boys reading this article, was provided by that veteran of the game (hope he doesn't mind that!) Geoff Thorpe. Despite leading the field at the end of the first day, he attended the Dinner, and had the odd drink or seven, yet was there for the next morning to take two consecutive sixes off second-placed Richard Moore, who, for reasons that genuinely escape me, was not at the dinner. Richard's position was taken by Jon and Phil, who exchanged second place during the morning, Jon holding it over lunch after a seven with Andy.

The first game of the afternoon saw Geoff consolidate his lead with a victory, partnering Andy, against Jon and Robin Smale, allowing Phil to regain second by taking a six with Tony Heading, but still over half a p.p.g. behind Geoff. In the next two rounds (his last before the long drive home) Geoff took a further two fives to win the tournament by the clearest margin for a long while;

¹ Nipper = Jonathan Williams, Ed.

Nick's computer programme also informs us that he had a "tougher-than-average" draw, too, so there can be no grumbles from the rest of us- we have a fully deserving winner, who rather than pacing himself, simply outsprinted a top-class field.

As regards the lower places, a run of late good results from Tim Hedger and Andy, combined with a one for Jon in round 12 and a zero for Phil in the very last round- a final gesture of defiance from last year's winner- meant that they took second and third place respectively.

And that was that, really.

The results table below gives not only the obvious statistics, but also the average p.p.g. of a player's partners and opponents throughout the weekend. This enables one to assess whether a player had a lucky or unlucky draw on average. Also included for interest is an "adjusted" p.p.g. figure which takes the draw into account; this is calculated on the basis of one of Nick's traditionally very confusing algorithms.

Note that normal Cambridge Open rules prevent any player absenting himself from more than two games gaining a recognised final position. This year Geoff Thorpe received a special exemption from this rule as he had (a) mistakenly understood that there would only be 13 rounds, and (b) had a long way to drive home.

Pos	Player	p.p.g.	Total	Pl.	W	L	Pars.	Opps.	Diff.	Adj.
1	Geoff Thorpe	5.333	58 ² / ₃	11	10	1	3.814	3.790	-0.266	5.466
2	Andy Purvis	4.472	53 ² / ₃	12	10	2	3.601	3.315	0.417	4.237
3	Jon Mapley	4.410	57 ¹ / ₃	13	8	5	3.463	3.684	-0.404	4.612
4	Phil Scarrott	4.286	60	14	9	5	3.479	3.546	-0.113	4.342
5	Matthew Rose	4.125	49 ¹ / ₂	12	6	6	3.548	3.473	0.103	4.074
6	Patrick Barrie	3.731	48 ¹ / ₂	13	10	3	3.515	3.759	-0.502	3.982
7	Charles Relle	3.708	44 ¹ / ₂	12	7	5	3.570	3.650	-0.231	3.824
8	Nick Reid	3.679	51 ¹ / ₂	14	8	6	3.787	3.540	0.207	3.575
9	Alasdair Grant	3.500	45 ¹ / ₂	13	6	7	3.422	3.564	-0.205	3.602
10	Gavin Keyte	3.250	39	12	5	7	3.802	3.483	0.336	3.082
11	David Clarkson	3.208	38 ¹ / ₂	12	5	7	3.393	3.303	0.287	3.065
12	James Cullingham	3.125	37 ¹ / ₂	12	5	7	3.629	3.483	0.162	3.044
13	Robin Smale	2.988	41 ⁵ / ₆	14	4	10	3.636	3.557	0.021	2.978
14	Jim Carrington	2.893	40 ¹ / ₂	14	4	10	3.266	3.448	-0.131	2.958
15	Jon Carlaw	2.786	39	14	5	9	3.136	3.500	-0.365	2.968
16	Phil Carmody	2.071	29	14	2	12	3.644	3.467	0.210	1.966

	Player	p.p.g.	Total	Pl.	W	L	Pars.	Opps.	Diff.	Adj.
	Geoff Myers	5.389	48 ¹ / ₂	9	8	1	3.821	3.269	0.783	4.997
	Nick Inglis	4.500	49 ¹ / ₂	11	8	3	3.116	3.423	-0.231	4.615
	Tim Hedger	4.500	49 ¹ / ₂	11	8	3	3.881	3.558	0.264	4.368
	Richard Moore	4.364	48	11	7	4	3.434	3.425	0.084	4.322
	Mike Surridge	4.312	34 ¹ / ₂	8	5	3	3.880	4.030	-0.680	4.653
	Stu Collins	4.000	36	9	4	5	3.464	4.040	-1.116	4.558
	Alan Dean	3.786	26 ¹ / ₂	7	4	3	3.381	3.284	0.313	3.629
	Tony Heading	3.700	37	10	6	4	3.432	3.514	-0.096	3.748
	Simon Gandy	3.611	32 ¹ / ₂	9	5	4	3.405	3.324	0.256	3.483
	Julian Wiseman	3.591	39 ¹ / ₂	11	5	6	3.988	3.610	0.269	3.457
	Ian Gameson	3.500	7	2	1	1	2.679	3.312	-0.444	3.722
	Andrew Milligan	3.182	35	11	6	5	3.579	3.201	0.676	2.844
	Jonathan Williams	2.714	19	7	2	5	3.292	3.316	0.159	2.635
	Stew Sage	2.571	18	7	4	3	3.389	3.718	-0.548	2.845
	Chris Andrew	2.357	16 ¹ / ₂	7	2	5	4.107	4.153	-0.700	2.707
	Jon Marchant	2.250	9	4	1	3	2.758	2.879	0.500	2.000
	Alan Boyce	2.056	18 ¹ / ₂	9	2	7	3.361	3.536	-0.210	2.160
	Simon Dean	2.000	14	7	1	6	2.930	3.126	0.178	1.911
	Rupert Thompson	2.000	2	1	0	1	3.625	3.444	0.237	1.881
	Julian Porter	1.900	9 ¹ / ₂	5	1	4	3.805	4.017	-0.729	2.265
	Ed Wynn	1.600	8	5	1	4	3.365	3.376	0.113	1.543

Winner of the Limerick Open Cambridge competition:

I don't see why limericks should rhyme.
 They don't really need to scan either.
 This pointless submission
 To outmoded capitalist dogma
 Is completely passé.

Answers to Famous Winkers Quiz on Page 10:

1 (a) Larry Kahn (WW51), (b) Stew Sage (WW50), (c) Alan Boyce (WW48). 2 (a) Ed Wynn (WW56), (b) Charles Relle (WW51), (c) Phil Clark (WW46), (d) Dave Lockwood (WW46/48), (e) Dave Lockwood (WW49), (f) Steve Carnovsky (WW35). 3 (a) Cyril Edwards (WW41), (b) Jon Mapley (WW46), (c) Richard Moore (WW52). 4 (a) Nick Inglis (WW44), (b) Keith Seaman (WW25), (c) Alan Dean (WW27).

Letters to the Editor

29th October 1991

Dear Sir,

I had to rise to the challenge. It didn't take long, but it needs an extremely fertile imagination.

Picture the scene: a persecuted Arab of Cockney extraction, Reg Diuq, is trying to save his skin at a trial in Uganda in the 1970's. He knows that the fearful dictator is suffering from an ugly boil on his neck. He offers to remove the boil, either by turning into Lon Chaney under a full moon, or by donating the sharpest implement in his possession, a circular plastic disc. Reg's situation is complicated by the fact that he is a multiple schizo, sometimes he thinks he's a limbo dancer, and occasionally he becomes Hitler's lover. The scene ends with Amin's decision on his (their) fate:

One vile werewolf, supple hot Reg Diuq, said "I, Eva, gave Idi a squidger to help pus flow ere we live." "No!"

Best wishes,
Jon Mapley

P.S. There was a young upstart called Cartwright
Whose winking games never would start right.
He was in such a hurry
From overnight curry
That all he could do was to pass wind in a most genteel fashion.

21st December 1991

Dear Sir,

I quote from Larry Kahn's report of the 1991 American Singles in WW57: "I only wish we had the final few games on tape; this is the kind of stuff we need to make winks a real spectator sport." Maybe it is, but we need *players* rather than spectators, and it is sad that America's best player seems to regard a good game as an ego trip rather than as an introduction to potential newcomers.

Yours sincerely,
Charles Relle

21st December 1991

Dear Sir,

I am excited by the advertisement from April Date in the Personal Column of your last issue. I feel more of this person needs to be exposed to public view. Please may we have a photograph on page 3 of WW58?¹

Yours salaciously,
Charles Relle

3rd February 1992

Dear Sir,

You may like to know that as a result of last year's London Open and Catford Invitation tournaments I was able to send a cheque for £110 to Lewisham Hospital Diabetes Day Centre, and that the total raised by my walk from Canterbury to London for Crisis at Christmas was £520. I should like to thank through your columns all those who contributed to the two causes.

Yours sincerely,
Charles Relle

Proposals for revisions to the rules

by the Rules Sub-committee

The following are suggested amendments to the rules, together with the rules sub-committee chairman's (Jon Mapley's) comments on the proposed changes. These proposals will be debated and voted upon at the next ETWA rules meeting, which is scheduled for the evening of the Saturday of the National Pairs (May 2nd).

FOUL SHOTS AND FOUL PLAY

Rule 12

(a) Any player squidding a wink contrary to Rule 5(b) must, if requested by his opponents, replace all the winks disturbed by his illegal shot and play a further shot as part of the same turn, which need not be the same shot as caused the illegality. If a shot judge rules a second or subsequent attempt as foul, the winks may again be replaced at the discretion of the opponents. Whatever they decide, the turn is at an end.

(b) (Second sentence) They cannot accept part and have part replayed or replaced.

Alan Boyce's article in WW55 suggested that ANY foul shot should carry the penalty of replacement and effective forfeiture of the shot. N.B. In all the

¹ Sorry, Charles, but Winking World is not a magazine for dirty old men!

versions discussed or proposed we are dealing with a single shot- you do not pull winks out of the pot from previous shots in the same turn!

When I discussed with Alan a suitable wording, he made it clear that he had only intended to exact the forfeiture if the shot had been judged illegal by a shot judge. The sub-committee welcomed this, but felt that it would lead to excessive demands for shot judges, which would be unacceptable in the current atmosphere of speeding up play generally. We liked the concept of a penalty for fouling, and felt that by giving one unpenalised chance, which may or may not have had a shot judge present, the penalty could then more fairly be seen to apply.

TIME LIMIT POINTS?

Rule 1(c), 10(a) & (b), and 13(a)

Replace the expression "Game point(s)" with "Point(s)".

Replace the expression "Time limit point(s)" with "Tiddly" or "Tiddlies".

I think the discussion has largely taken place already. One point made during the sub-committee's deliberations was "What's a tiddlywink?" "It's a scoring wink, whereas a squopped wink is just a wink."

NOMINATED AND ORIGINAL WINKS

Rule 5(c)

In each turn a player squidges once in sequence, with an additional squidge for each wink of his correct colour potted in that turn.

Rule 7(a) External. (only to be applied if the boundary/perimeter rule amendment below gets defeated)

If in any turn a player plays a shot which causes one or more winks of his correct colour to leave the field of play.....

Rule 11(d), 3rd sentence

If after the playing of the nominated wink no wink of the squopped partnership is free, free turns are recounted and start immediately.

The proposed amendments to the current wordings on extra shots for potting, forfeited shots for crossing boundaries, and the nominated wink rule itself are minor clarifications so that there is no doubt that a player's own colour is still his colour throughout the playing of a nominated wink, which could, in rare circumstances, be his partner's colour.

30 SECONDS AND BEYOND- To practise or not to practise?

Rule 9(a), add after 2nd sentence

At any time after 30 seconds have elapsed, until the delayed shot has been completed, at which point the delaying player must announce that he has played, the opponents are at liberty to practise on any available nearby mat.

Rule 13(b)

During the course of a game, no player may play any wink other than in his rightful turns in the game, except in the specific circumstances sanctioned in rule 9(a).

Andy Purvis' proposal caused a divide in the ranks of the sub-committee, but his case was well-argued, and the change is intended to speed up play by putting psychological pressure on the dawdler. If he hadn't played in two World Pairs against Dave, I doubt we would be considering this proposal, but that's progress, and there's a lot to be learned from history.

THE BOUNDARY PERIMETER RULE**Rule 7(a). External.**

If in any turn a player plays a shot which causes one or more winks of any colour to leave the field of play (i.e. any part of the wink to cross the boundary), these winks are positioned by the opponents of the player 22mm (a large wink's width) from any boundary. No wink positioned in this way may be placed closer than 10cm to any other wink, nor closer than 10cm to any baseline with unplayed winks behind it. If more than one wink of any colour has left the field of play as the result of a single shot, the player of the shot forfeits the next shot due to be played with his correct colour.

If the above proposal succeeds, delete the penultimate sentence of Rule 11(d). If the proposal fails, then it is necessary for consistency to consider the proposal outlined above in the nominated and original winks section.

The latest Private Member's Bill on hanging is proposed by Julian Wiseman. Is it natural justice that you should lose a shot for going off, if you gain one for potting? Is it, alternatively, a Draconian penalty for a piece of bad luck? Should it make any difference whether the wink is your own, or if there is more than one? Is the dramatic boondock that sends winks flying out of the window one of the main attractions for new players, or is there more skill in being able to send your opponent to within microns of the edge, so he is forced to play it as it lies? All these questions and more will be answered in next week's episode. The proposal is an adaption of the one hybrid which has stood the test of time- Sunshine's Perimeter Rule, which is repeated in essence in the first two sentences. The third sentence is Julian's own addition.

Another present from Jon Mapley:

There was an old winker named Thorpe
Whose antics made everyone gawp.
Twenty-four in a ring
Seemed to be his big thing-
Most tricky with winks that don't warp.

A Code of Conduct Revisited

by Patrick Barrie

It's been a while since the last *WW* article on tournament behaviour- Jon Mapley wrote one several winking generations ago- so it seems appropriate to provide a gentle reminder of some aspects of the game's etiquette¹. This is partly due to a few minor incidents I've witnessed in the last year; thankfully I can't remember any major incidents in that time, so this is more by way of preventative medicine than anything drastic. While the views in this article are necessarily my own, I have discussed the points with the game's administrators. Some of the points are provided for in the current rules, while the others are generally understood. Experienced players teaching novices should remember to try to impress some of these principles on them.

1. If playing a pile and your intentions are not obvious, tell your opponents what you intend to do, and they can call a shot-judge if necessary. Note that you can also call a shot-judge on your own shot if you're not absolutely certain that you're going to play it legally.
2. When playing a shot, do not rest your arm on winks (particularly piles)! This happens surprisingly often, particularly for some people's potting attempts. While winks in different piles to the one played do get replaced if *accidentally* disturbed, the rules state "You must make *every* endeavour not to disturb winks other than those you are playing (other than those inevitably hit by the follow-through of the squidger)". The penalty for *deliberately* disturbing winks is an immediate 7-0 loss!
3. On a similar note, if you are likely to hit with your squidger a pile beside the one you are playing, you should use a smaller squidger.
4. Only hold the pot if it is going to be hit by squidger or the hand holding the squidger.
5. Only winks, the pot and the person playing the shot are allowed onto the mat. Keep your spare squidgers etc. *off* the mat. You should ask your opponents' permission if you want to leave the watch timing the game on the mat.
6. You are permitted to turn/clean/remove fluff from under your own winks when it's your turn (provided they are neither squopped nor squopping), but note that you can't remove fluff from under opponents' winks.
7. Stand back from the table when it's not your shot: give your opponents light and breathing space. In particular, don't lean over the mat.
8. When winks are disturbed in flight note that the rules now state that the winks are placed in a mutually agreed position *or* left as they lie at the discretion of the offended pair. This rule is intended principally to keep the winker playing the shot out of the way, but can also apply to opponents (who should in

¹ Jon's comment on reading a preprint of this article: "plagiarism is the sincerest form of flattery".

any case be standing back) and when rolling winks hit squidger-boxes and the like (which shouldn't be on the mat in any case).

9. Be wary of talking to your opponents when it's their turn to play, and certainly be silent when they are lining up and playing the shot. This is to protect the fine dividing line between light-hearted banter and gamesmanship. If you want to make a comment it's best to save it until your turn.

10. Do attempt to play your shots at a reasonable speed, though all winkers accept that certain positions may require lengthy consideration. While your opponents can stop the clock every 30 seconds, they shouldn't need to do so every single shot.

11. Deliberate time-wasting is not permitted, so you should play at your normal speed even when, say, you're hoping your opponents won't have time to convert the position into a pot-out. The rules do in principle allow extra time to be added on in the event of deliberate time-wasting.

12. In the event of the two-minute rule being in force in rounds, tell your opponents when 90 seconds have elapsed. This gives them 30 seconds (plenty of time!) to play their shot before the forfeiture stage.

13. Don't call for umpires excessively, just on the off-chance that a close decision may go in your favour.

14. Avoid telling the umpire who is playing which colour if at all possible.

15. Remember that the umpire's decision is final. If you don't like the decision, you have to stick with it, though you can insist on a different umpire next time one is required.

16. When umpiring squop decisions, always look from both sides of the table. Lights and magnifying glasses can be useful when available.

17. As a general guideline when umpiring, if you're not certain that a wink is definitely squopped after a careful look, you should give it the benefit of the doubt and pronounce it free (the "Mapley Principle").

18. If you're spectating then keep out of the way of the players and don't make any comments/suggestions that can be overheard by them.

This list is by no means fully comprehensive. All the above points can be summarized in the single sentence "Play by the rules, and be polite and considerate to your opponents".

Finally, I personally always comment when I see someone about to play out of turn, and I always let the shot be taken back if I didn't notice before it was played. This, however, is not part of the rules, or even generally accepted etiquette, so is completely down to an individual's instincts. Similarly I allow "accidental" shots of single winks to be replayed. It is, however, almost impossible to distinguish between genuine and "accidental" shots on piles, so these are generally accepted. Remember that even if no wink moves, an attempt to move a wink irreversibly does constitute a shot.

Nick Inglis' World Ratings

Here are the seasonally adjusted ratings that are completely unsponsored by the company that employs Matthew Rose. They're up to and including the scores from this year's Cambridge Open. I've also listed the ratings at the time of WW57 which missed the last issue. As ever, these ratings are only made possible by the efforts of Nick in carefully collecting and patiently feeding every result into his computer. Don't forget that these ratings are completely unofficial, and if anyone starts taking them too seriously then Andy will stop printing them.

Player	Player's Rating		Games in past year:		
	Current	At WW57	Rated	Total	p.p.g.
Larry Kahn (U.S)	2602	2594	51	51	4.706
Geoff Myers	2595	2560	85	85	4.806
Jon Mapley	2554	2434	79	87	4.506
Dave Lockwood	2486	2523	76	76	4.283
Andy Purvis	2477	2491	83	95	4.375
Nick Inglis	2385	2347	68	80	4.113
<i>Bob Henninge (U.S.)</i>	2339	2342	18	18	3.056
Mike Surridge	2333	2317	37	37	3.824
Charles Relle	2332	2328	47	55	3.991
Patrick Barrie	2325	2394	74	80	4.250
Richard Moore	2325	2322	71	77	3.959
Tim Hedger	2312	—	44	44	3.875
Matthew Rose	2296	2234	47	47	4.117
Alan Dean	2294	2374	59	59	3.729
<i>Keith Seaman</i>	2276	—	18	18	4.528
Simon Gandy	2272	2166	60	72	3.521
<i>Sunshine (U.S.)</i>	2269	2360	15	15	3.967
Geoff Thorpe	2231	2065	32	32	4.177
Rick Tucker (U.S.)	2208	2020	40	40	3.812
Cyril Edwards	2173	1973	35	35	4.329
Alex Satchell	2160	2161	41	55	3.973
Ian Gameson	2141	2102	48	48	3.917
Graham Hancock	2129	2129	30	30	3.600
Phil Scarrott	2101	2005	74	74	3.867
Ed Wynn	2100	2068	47	47	3.766
Stu Collins	2077	2036	50	50	3.457
Alan Boyce	2068	2051	51	65	3.274
<i>Rob Cartwright</i>	2059	2170	25	25	3.347
Dave Smith	2054	2054	31	31	3.237
Jim Carrington	2053	2106	45	45	3.211
David Clarkson	2044	1902	31	33	3.545
Julian Wiseman	2034	2016	41	41	3.561
Tim Jeffreys	2024	2075	53	60	3.225
<i>Chris Andrew</i>	1993	1842	24	24	3.264

Alasdair Grant	1992	1990	42	42	3.143
Gavin Keyte	1982	1957	73	81	3.235
Mac McAvoy (U.S.)	1902	1908	15	15	2.200
Stew Sage	1896	1948	51	57	3.237
Anthony Heading	1891	2065	25	25	3.020
Phil Carmody	1891	1970	52	52	2.740
James Cullingham	1888	1778	73	73	3.199
Rupert Wilson	1886	1886	23	25	3.487
Phil Clark	1861	1816	33	33	2.864
Jon Carlaw	1859	1952	49	49	2.857
Chris Wilson	1845	1815	54	54	2.704
Jon Marchant	1812	1887	48	48	2.819
Rupert Thompson	1805	1799	37	37	3.014
Robin Smale	1799	1821	42	42	2.865
Nick Reid	1774	1696	55	55	2.545
Jonathan Williams	1759	—	31	31	2.516
Elizabeth Whalley	1717	1789	23	23	3.145
Simon Julier	1680	1626	68	68	2.890
James Orwell	1652	—	24	24	2.375
Andrew Milligan	1636	—	21	21	2.190
Julian Porter	1539	—	17	17	2.559
Gavin Orpin	1516	—	30	30	1.717
Simon Dean	1369	1337	15	22	1.727

Winking World is the official journal of the English Tiddlywinks Association, and is currently edited by Patrick Barrie of 31 Foxley Lane, Purley, Surrey CR8 3EH. It is issued free of charge to E.Tw.A. 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.

Membership of E.Tw.A. costs £5 (or £2.50 to students and the unwaged) and entitles the member to regular newsletters outlining forthcoming events, to reduced entry fees at E.Tw.A. tournaments, and also gives the member the prestigious right to vote on any proposed rules changes. Membership fees should be sent to the treasurer, Ian Gameson.