

WINKING WORLD

*The Official Journal
of the
English Tiddlywinks
Association*

63

October 1994

CONTENTS

Editorial	1
The A-T Invitation	
by <i>Phil Clark</i>	7
the results	8
by <i>Charles Relle</i>	8
The Scottish National Pairs	10
Times League, by <i>Gavin Keyte</i>	11
Courier League, by <i>Ben Soares</i>	12
Palatino Final League, by <i>Ben Soares</i>	14
Helvetica League, by <i>Julian Porter</i>	15
The National Singles	
Blue League, by <i>Alan Dean</i>	17
Green League, by <i>Julian Wiseman</i>	19
Red League, by <i>Alan Boyce</i>	19
The Final, by <i>Ed Wynn</i>	21
The Kidderminster Invitation, by <i>Rob Cartwright</i>	24
A Complaint, by <i>Julian Wiseman</i>	25
Letters to the Editor	26
World Singles 40, by <i>Patrick Barrie</i>	30
World Pairs 13, by <i>Julian Porter</i>	32
Auntie Gertie's Problem Corner, by <i>Auntie Gertie</i>	34
The London Open, by <i>Charles Relle</i>	35
Stop Press	38
The NATwA Singles	39
Nick Inglis' World Ratings	40

EDITORIAL

I would like to be able to claim that this issue of Winking World, WW63 no less, provides a compendious guide to that major part of the history of the world that relates to tiddlywinks that came to pass between April and October of 1994. However in doing so I would be deceiving my public or, to put it more bluntly, lying. As my more observant readers will have already deduced from the contents page, this issue kicks off with not just one but *two* reports on a tournament that happened in January.

“What’s this doing here?”

“Why wasn’t the report in WW62, like it should have been?”, I hear you crying.

“For that matter,” says one who has just taken a peek through his personal private archive, “it *was* mentioned in WW62, so why the repetition?”

Well, you see, when I entered into the cosmic travail involved in bringing forth WW62 I had not yet received a write-up of the tournament in question¹ from Phil Clark, who had been deputed at the time to be the official scribe, so I composed a brief report myself. Imagine my surprise when a week later I received not only Phil’s report, but also one from Charles! As this is a democratic journal I decided to include both of them. Better late than never, as it were.

Of course, as this is the October issue of WW it must be the time of year when the huddled masses of ETwA throw off the yoke of oppression and elect a new bunch of mugs to be their leaders at the ETwA congress. Oh what fun that will be! What letting of blood and rolling of heads! On these grounds I thought it might be useful to remind you all of the names and addresses of the current inmates of the ETwA council, if only so as to provide handy targets for abuse.

¹Charles Relle’s charity invitation in aid of the A-T medical research trust. I can inform readers of WW62 that I am now aware of what the ‘T’ stands for, and if they read the reports, so will they be – Ed.

Post	Name	Address	Telephone	EMAIL [†]
Chairman	Charles Relle	26, Canadian Avenue, London. SE6 3AS.	081 690 2885	HESIOD @GN.APC.ORG
Treasurer	Gavin Keyte	30, Western Road, Grandpont, Oxford. OX1 4LG.	0865 793408	
Secretary	Patrick Barrie	123, Clare Court, Judd Street, London. WC1H 9QR.	071 278 0476	UCCA61B @UCL.AC.UK
Publicity Officer	Poss (E. M. Ellis)	Keble College, Oxford. OX1 3PG.		ELLIS@TEACHING %PHYSICS.OX. AC.UK
WW Editor	Julian Porter	Lincoln College, Oxford. OX1 3DR.	0865 57867	JDPORTER @MATHS.OX. AC.UK
Tournament Organiser	Simon Gandy	10, Band Lane, Egham, Surrey. TW20 9LN.	0784 472637	

† Written in the INTERNET convention. To get the JANET address reverse the order of the segments following the @ sign.

As I'm talking about elections, I'd like to say that I've found my year as Editor of this mag quite amusing, and I hope my successor does too. I only hope that she has a prose style rather more distinguished than mine. I'd also like to thank everybody who has contributed articles during my year as editor, or in any other way hepled me to get the thing together.

PATRICK BARRIE ÜBER ALLES

The Scottish National Pairs, now in its second incarnation, was bigger and better than ever this year, with a quite remarkably huge turn-out, not only of ETwAns but also of Scottish novices. Jo Mitchell was getting dreadfully excited about the fact that there were no less than five women playing in the tournament (will wonders never cease?), which she claimed was a first. I take issue with this, as I'm pretty certain that there were at least that many in the 1992 Teams of Four, but when I mentioned this to Jo she claimed that I was quibbling. Do any of you archive-hounds who've memorised ever single copy of WW know what the precise status of her assertion is, truthwise?

Though there were a lot of Scottish novices winking away (and they all seemed to do remarkable well) there were two less than were expected. This had somewhat drastic consequences, as the two who failed to turn up were booked to be partnered by Geoff Myers and Alasdair Grant. These two being forced to pair up it seemed that the tournament had a winner before it had even started (especially in view of the fact that last year's winners had announced that they did not want to win). What this means, then, is that blind chance and two ScotTwAns (who shall remain nameless) are to blame for the somewhat curious situation Geoff now finds himself in of having a challenge on the World Singles title, which is held by Geoff Myers and Andy Purvis. We await future developments with baited breath.

Rupert Thompson and Dave Clarkson won the non-qualifiers' competition with consummate ease, and appear to be considering defending their title next year. I think we should all congratulate the sages of ScotTwA (especially Ben Soares, who organised the thing, and Jo Mitchell, who told everybody what to do) for putting on such a well-run and enjoyable event and putting up with the hordes that suddenly descended on them from south of the border.

Readers of 'The Squopsman' will perhaps wonder at the degree of coincidence between the reports on the Scottish Pairs in that journal and this. The reason is that the editorial staffs made a multilateral decision to share reports on the qualifying leagues and the non-qualifiers' competition, but to have distinct reports on the final. Readers of gavin Keyte's Joycean report in the Squopsman will probably be relieved to

learn that the editor of *this* journal is considerably more conservative in his literary tastes and can see nothing wrong with a conventional linear narrative.

Next came the English National Singles, making its first appearance in the new spring-time slot. A fairly low attendance meant that there were only three (large) qualifying leagues. James Cullingham has suggested that this has something to do with the fact that in the spring-time it is natural to form into pairs. We have no comment on this theory, which seems too biological for words. Nevertheless, the thing saw a lot of high-quality winks, and in particular the first appearance of Julian Wiseman and Ed Wynn in the list of those who have qualified for the second day. Congratulations to both of them, especially given their final placings (third and fourth respectively). This wasn't a run-away like last year, the final result being that Larry Kahn edged out Patrick Barrie by one point.

Now, speaking of Dr. Barrie, I recall that it isn't very long since Andy Purvis remarked that he couldn't understand why it was that Patrick had never won a national tournament. Well, shortly after that remark was made Patrick won both the national singles and pairs, and he then took the logical next step by becoming World Singles champion. So, when his and Richard Moore's world pairs challenge came up the burning question was would he manage to complete the sequence? Well, no, actually. At the end of the challenge match Richard observed that their score was even lower than that he and Julian Wiseman had got.

Carrying on through the roster of events, the London comes next, being won by Relle and Mapley. Nothing much seems to have happened there, but then again as I didn't go, I wouldn't know, would I?

On the invitation front, we have a report on the Kidderminster invitation by Rob Cartwright (guess who won?), and Patrick has posted the following notification about rum doings in Cambridge to the winks dedicated USENET newsgroup, ALT.GAMES.TIDDLYWINKS:

Well the newsfeed here is now taking days to get anything from elsewhere, so I'm not sure whether this will escape safely. It's just a note to say that yet another CUTwC Long Vac tournament happened. There were fourteen participants (that inevitably awkward number when playing indi-

vidual tournaments). It was won by Matthew Rose, ahead of Nick Inglis, Patrick Barrie, Simon Gandy and everyone else in the field. The highlight of the winks was Droogs² playing singles and outplaying the pairing of Simon Gandy and Jason Westley to win 5-2 to the complete astonishment of everyone present. Other highlights weren't necessarily to do with the winks.

We also gather from the grapevine that the semi-mythical Stockport Invitation may have finally happened at some point in the course of the summer. However I, for one, won't believe it until I see documentary proof.

'I LOVE YOU, YOU LOVE ME ...'

Speaking of Stockport brings to mind the thought of its most famous citizen. As some of you may have heard, Geoff has brought the massive intellect that invented 'Thorpe's Ring', 'Thorpe's Square' and other horrors too numerous to mention to bear on the problem of why the dinosaurs became extinct³. He has developed a theory that, he claims, explains this, together with why there are so many different types of mammal and why Mars is red.

I asked Geoff to write up this remarkable theory for WW, intending to hand it over to Andy Purvis, winks' very own mammalogist, for critical commentary. As it turns out Geoff has decided *not* to issue preprints just yet, but all is not lost. My spies have obtained for me a brief summary of his ideas, which I am proud to present in these pages.

The theory is as follows:

- Rodents and insurance companies were selectively bred by the dinosaurs. The rodents ran the insurance companies.
- Dinosaurs were yellow and so had low insurance premiums.
- War was declared between the Terran dinosaurs and the Martian ones.

²James Hopgood, see 'A CUTwC lexicon' in WW62 - Ed.

³Perhaps they didn't. Somebody purporting to be one has written to Auntie Gertie - Ed.

- In the course of this war, the Terran dinosaurs were wiped out by an iridium bomb dropped on them by the Martian dinosaurs.
- However, the victory of the Martian dinosaurs was pyrrhic, as just before the iridium bomb dropped the Terran dinosaurs had directed an iron bomb was dropped at Mars. This explains why Mars is red — it's rusty.
- All the insurance companies went bankrupt because they had to pay out the premiums on the Terran dinosaurs. As a result of this the rodents had nothing left to do but diversify.

I have a few questions about this theory, which I am making the basis of this issue's competition:

- How could creatures so stupid they needed a special brain just to wag their tails manage to genetically engineer rodents *and* insurance companies? How *do* you selectively breed an insurance company, anyway?
- What has the dinosaurs being yellow got to do with anything? For that matter, how does Geoff know that they were yellow?
- To whom precisely did the insurance companies have to pay the premiums on the dinosaurs, given that they were all dead and so there were no next-of-kin left?

The author of the first set of even vaguely plausible answers to these questions that is received by the editor will get to spend a week-end with Geoff Thorpe at the winks tournament of their choice.

HERE AND THERE

I'd like to draw your attention to the fact that CUTwC is celebrating its fortieth birthday next year, and is planning a fairly major celebration to mark this highly significant anniversary — there's a letter from Stew Sage that reveals all on page 27.

Finally, Alasdair Grant has suggested that WW should carry a regular feature listing outstanding challenges on world titles. I wonder what made him think of this?

The A-T Invitation

26, Canadian Avenue, Catford

15 January 1994

§1 : BY PHIL CLARK

Before receiving a letter from Charles Relle in the twilight of 1993 I had never heard of Ataxia Telangiectasia. It is apparently a disease which causes degeneration of the nervous system and Charles was seeking to raise money for a Medical Research Trust. Thus it was that eleven other players were invited to join Charles for a day's winks on the 15th January and pay for the privilege.

I could bore you with an account of the highlights (or lowlights) of each round, but suffice it to say that round one took some time to complete while round two saw more adventure and an asterisk on the score-sheet. Jon Mapley began well and continued in this boring fashion up to lunch, when his 23 points gave him a two point advantage over Tim Hedger.

Lunch was one of those affairs over which Lucullus himself might have presided but for which Charles gave a fair imitation. Excellent food and a succession of accompanying bottles ensured a convivial atmosphere and a spirited (sic) contest directing the biscuit wrappers towards the light-shade. All good things must, however, come to an end and towards mid-afternoon someone spoiled the fun by remarking that there were still seven rounds to play. Maybe there ought instead to be an invitation to lunch with a break in the middle for one or two rounds of winks.

The post-lunch session moved slowly into action, although since I was partnering Charles straight after lunch I was soon able to sit down again, Mapley and Rose being the profiteers. Jon suffered a rare reverse in round six against Matthew, who thus took a one point lead in the tournament. It remained very tight until the penultimate round when Jon took a six to Matthew's one and restored his advantage. Jon held on, with a five in the final round, to win the tournament on $55\frac{1}{2}$ points, with Matthew and Tim, who finished strongly, sharing second

place on 48. Charles came in fourth on $46\frac{1}{2}$, which represented a fine performance considering the effort he had put into the day.

Remembering that the objective of the day was to raise money it is pleasing to report that £375 was realised, with generous donations also coming from people unable to make the tournament. Thanks are due to Charles for his organisation and hospitality, from which I have just about recovered.

§2 : THE RESULTS

Name	Round											Tot	Pos
	Pre Lunch				Post Lunch				The Weariness of the Flesh				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
James Cullingham	1	1	2½	6	1	5	5½	1	1	3	4	31	9
Geoff Thorpe	1	5	4	1	6	6	6	5	1	6	3	44	5
Jon Mapley	6	5	6	6	7	1	6	6	1½	6	5	55½	1
Alasdair Grant	4½	2	6	1	6	2	1	6	6	3	2	39½	6
Julian Porter	1	6	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	3	23	12
Tim Hedger	6	6	3	6	6	2	1	1	6	6	5	48	2
Rupert Wilson	6	2	2½	1	1	2	1½	1	1	1	5	24	11
Cyril Edwards	4½	1	1	1	1	5	1½	2	6	6	2	31	9
Matthew Rose	2½	6	4½	6	7	6	5½	2	5½	1	2	48	2
Phil Clarke	2½	6	4	1	0	5	1	6	1½	4	4	35	8
Charles Relle	6	1	4½	6	0	5	6	6	6	1	5	46½	4

§3 : BY CHARLES RELLE

A-T is a rare genetic disease, and it affects the son of a former pupil at my school, Blackheath High School It shortens life expectation and makes sufferers very prone to cancer. The former pupil, Beverley Hodson, has set up a foundation for research into A-T and has already raised over half a million pounds for the three researchers in question. She herself was admitted to Newenham by my wife, so my family has a connection. Because of this I decided to have a tournament in January to raise money for the foundation. Before I describe the tournament, I

do want to say thank you to all the people, not only the participants, who contributed to the fund. As reported in WW62, £375 was raised: excellent for one day.

The tournament was held in Catford, and would have been an Individual Pairs for twelve players if Tony Brennan had turned up, but as he didn't the remaining eleven were each forced to play singles once. Of the eleven rounds four were played before lunch and a look at the score-sheet shews that by that stage Jon Mapley was in the lead, having scored 6, 5, 6 and 6, his partners being Tim Hedger, Geoff Thorpe, Alasdair Grant and James Cullingham respectively. Tim was second with 21 points, Matthew Rose third with 19 and Charles Relle fourth with $17\frac{1}{2}$. Charles was, perhaps, more concerned with lunch, as he was cooking it at the same time as playing. To quote Omar Khayyam: "Who is the Potter then, and who the Pot?"

Lunch, as hinted in WW62, was protracted, not least by the necessity of proving our potting skill in a competition (co-operative rather than competitive) in which the aim was to pot, by lung power, macaroon wrappers into the lamp shade. When so many had been successfully potted that darkness seemed to be falling the tournament resumed.

Never has the host won a tournament at Catford, but he was handily placed at this point. Alas for the game after lunch! Zero was his score and he dragged Phil Clark, his partner, to unseemly defeat. Up to that point Phil had had a satisfactory tournament, including a six-in-a-row pot-out partnering Tim against Charles and Cyril in the second round. These days it seems that Cyril is not at his best before opening time, as after the first four rounds he was trailing the tournament with an average of 1.88.

For how many rounds does a Catford lunch affect a player? As there were four rounds *before* lunch I have assumed that its effects would last for four more, so I have called the four games before lunch the *Pre Lunch* and the four games immediately afterwards the *Post Lunch*. The most remarkable of these effects was upon Geoff Thorpe, who averaged 2.75 in the *Pre Lunch* and 5.75 in the *Post Lunch*. His partners for this monumental effort were Alasdair, Matthew, Charles and the ghost of Tony. In the other direction went Tim Hedger, whose *Pre Lunch* average was 5.25, dropping to 2.50 *Post Lunch* and taking

him from second place to fifth.

After eight rounds Jon was still in the lead, Matthew was second and Charles third, edging out the gluttonous Geoff by half a point. How should one categorise the last three rounds? Presumably they are a test of stamina, so I have named them *the Weariness of the Flesh*. Tim stood the test best, partnering Cyril, Geoff and Matthew in turn to average 5.67 (parenthetically, the only other people to average four or better in these rounds were the over forty-five trio of Cyril, Jon and Charles).

And the result? Jon won with Tim and Matthew in joint second. However, the real winner was the A-T Medical Research Trust. Thank you all very much.

THE SECOND SCOTTISH NATIONAL PAIRS

University of St. Andrews
16th and 17th April 1994

The format for this tournament was as follows. On Saturday 16th all the pairs present were divided into two leagues (Times and Courier) of (roughly) equal size. Each league did an all-play-all competition.

At the end of the day the total scores for each pair were computed and the top four pairs from each league were carried through to the final (Palatino league), which was an eight pair all-play-all and was played on Sunday 17th. The winner of the tournament was the pair with the highest total score in this league.

The pairs who failed to qualify for Palatino league were entered into a non-qualifiers' competition (Helvetica league) played on Sunday 17th, which was a double all-play-all for four pairs.

Times League, by Gavin Keyte

When the pairs had finally been decided and the technically challenging “THERZNO” mat rotation had been fully explained, we set down to the serious business of not playing very well.

Andrew Dominey and Jon Williams started strongly with the first bye of the day. Emma Anderson and Julian Porter didn’t start so well — the clock was barely ticking before we were deciding the pairs for a practice game. Patrick Barrie once again shewed that he is the partner of choice for any novice (although they won’t know that at the time); he and John Wilson did well to get 6 against Rupert Thompson and Dave Clarkson. John Stevens and Tracey Black started with a zero against another strong pair, Matthew Rose and Stew Sage.

Gavin and Jon did the same again in the next round to Tracey and John — a little slower (but who isn’t these days?). Stew and Matthew were on the wrong end of a 7-0 as well — John (Wilson this time) doing the business and Patrick doing some more business. Julian and Emma notched up their first win — against Jon and Benedict.

In the round before lunch no-one took advantage except Sage and Rose, old hands at this sort of thing, who took full advantage of the bye. They were back at the Wine Bar before Gavin and Jon had left, having given Nipper and Benedict a sound kicking in the mean time.

After five rounds it was all to play for, with only Sage and Rose sure to go through although Keyte and Mapley and Barrie and Wilson were looking good (well, confident anyway).

It was in round six that two things I have long suspected were confirmed:—

- Patrick Barrie state that he is irrelevant to which Julian Wiseman said, “No, *I’m* irrelevant, but curiously so.” ABSOLUTELY!
- Close observation of Rupert Thompson shewed that, even though he was playing red, he became more yellow as the game progressed.

Times League											
Pair		Opponents							Tot	Pos	Tie Break
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G			
A	Gavin Keyte Jon Mapley	-	7*	6	3	7*	3	7*	33	1 =	2
B	Stew Sage Matthew Rose	0*	-	6*	7*	7*	7*	6	33	1 =	1
C	Rupert Thompson Dave Clarkson	1	1*	-	5	2*	1	7*	17	5	
D	Jon Williams Andrew Dominey	4	0*	2	-	3	4	6	19	4	
E	Julian Porter Emma Anderson	0*	0*	5*	4	-	4	1	14	6	
F	Patrick Barrie John Wilson	4	0*	6	3	3	-	6	22	3	
G	John Stevens Tracey Black	0*	1	0*	1	6	1	-	9	7	

Well, the stops were duly pulled out by Jon and Gavin — their thirteen points in the last two rounds of the day helped force Rupert and Dave into the runners up league for Sunday. Nipper and Benedict finished strongly with their three wins of the day in rounds five, six and seven to squeeze into the final from nowhere.

Other finalists from the league were Patrick and John — doing very well to in three out of seven, maximise their PPL and come third in the group — and Matthew and Stew who topped the league on number of wins (hence their first position in the tie-break needed for the next day's seeding) as well as PPG.

Courier League, by Ben Soares

There was certainly a strange mix of pairs in this league; The 1993 champions had nobly returned to defend their title, Andy Purvis was partnering StATS' latest recruit Iain Forsythe who started the tournament having only played two games a week before, and as a result of the non-arrival of two expected StATS players Geoff Myers and Alasdair

Grant were teamed up to make a last minute dream ticket (but see below). Jo Mitchell and Elizabeth Whalley were playing together as the first all-female team in a National Pairs since as long as my Winking Worlds go back (April 1991).

After the lunch break some tension became apparent in the partnership of Geoff and Alasdair. Alasdair was claiming that he couldn't make 6 inch squops on a regular basis, and promptly shot himself in the foot with a marvellous 6 inch squop to virtually wrap up the game. Later in the same game there was a most memorable outrage, but I forget what it was now.

Courier League										
Pair		Opponents							Tot	Pos
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
A	Richard Moore Julian Wiseman	-	2*	3	7*	7*	6	5½	30½	1
B	Anthony Heading Richard Hunt	5*	-	1½	4	1*	1	5	17½	6
C	Graham Turnbull Ben Soares	4	5½	-	4	1	4	2	20½	4
D	Jo Mitchell Elizabeth Whalley	0*	3	3	-	0*	1	2*	9	7
E	Alasdair Grant Geoff Myers	0*	6*	6	7*	-	5	4	28	2
F	Scott Talbot Geoff Thorpe	1	6	3	6	2	-	1	19	5
G	Andy Purvis Iain Forsythe	1½	2	5	5*	3	6	-	22½	3

Richard and Julian were looking good at the beginning of the day, with no losses and two 7's after lunch. In their match against Graham and Ben in round 6 Julian's impressive run of five yellows in about twenty-five seconds flat made it clear that they were intent on a pot-out and left us wondering how many points we could salvage. However the sixth St. Ruled⁴ and was immediately pounced upon by Ben. Gra-

⁴ScotTwAish for a scrunge - Ed.

ham started a counter-pot with red, while Richard made some valiant attempts to free Julian's big yellow. Ben hung on to his squop, so Richard decided to pot a few greens to come ahead of him. The fifth red came off a blue in round four and was potted in round five to give a 4 – 3 to Graham and Ben.

The partnership of Andy and Iain did extremely well, coming a convincing third in the league and hence qualifying for the final. In view of Iain's lack of previous experience this means that he may well be StATS' secret weapon of the future. Other qualifiers were Julian and Richard, Geoff and Alasdair (who not unexpectedly came first and second respectively) and Graham and Ben.

Palatino Final League, by Ben Soares

The Final was marked by some inconsistency. Whether this was due to midnight hikes through St. Andrews car parks in pursuit of accommodation or the lack of snooker on Scottish Match of the Day perhaps we will never know.

Before lunch the clear leaders were Stew Sage and Matthew Rose. After lunch their clearly stated policy of potting-out and then returning to the pub began to make its mark and they failed to beat the other three likely-looking pairs, dropping down to an eventual third.

Last year's winners, Richard and Julian, seemed to be intent on potting-out in every game, which didn't seem to always work in their favour. Still, it's good practice for the ETwA singles!

Graham and Ben started the day with a string of 1's, and were contemplating paddling in the afternoon, but a final fling in the last two rounds cheered us up no end! A lucky good shot which subbed the offending wink turned the game around against Andy and Iain, while against Richard and Julian we were bold enough to initiate a red pot-out attempt which (however) wasn't completed. Luckily the remaining blues hung on to the greens, so we got the 4 – 3.

Contrariwise, Andy and Iain started with a string of wins against their most difficult opponents, but were tripped by Stew and Matthew. Unfortunately for them, they didn't seem to get back into the swing of

winning. Their first win was against Geoff and Alasdair who weren't completely demoralised, as is evinced by their going on to win every other game and hence the championship. **We are not worthy.** Alas the highest all-Scottish pair didn't make it into the top quarter and so don't gain a challenge on the World title.

Palatino League											
Pair		Opponents								Tot	Pos
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		
A	Stew Sage Matthew Rose	-	1	3	2*	6*	4	6	6	28	3
B	Gavin Keyte Jon Mapley	6	-	1*	3	3	6	6	6	31	2
C	Richard Moore Julian Wiseman	4	6*	-	0*	2*	6*	3	1*	22	5
D	Alasdair Grant Geoff Myers	5*	4	7*	-	1	6	6	6	35	1
E	Andy Purvis Iain Forsythe	1*	4	5*	6	-	1	1	3	21	7
F	Patrick Barrie John Wilson	3	1	1*	1	6	-	6	3½	21½	6
G	Graham Turnbull Ben Soares	1	1	4	1	6	1	-	1	15	8
H	Jon Williams Andrew Dominey	1	1	6*	1	4	3½	6	-	22½	4

One interesting event which occurred earlier in the day, during the game of Patrick and John against Nipper and Benedict, was a crud or boondock or something like that by John which resulted in the table rebounding and destroying a completely separate pile! Further experimentation by StATS on the same table has shown that a large amount of fist-mat contact is necessary during this shot.

Helvetica League, by Julian Porter

While the pairs who had qualified for the final settled down to busi-

ness at the other end of the room those of the non-qualifiers who had bothered to turn up were galvanised into some semblance of sentience by Jo Mitchell. In the small hours of that morning Ben Soares had strained his collection of strange fonts to the utmost in producing rotations for a four pair all-play-all twice, which turned out to be quite serendipitous as there were seven people available and the promise of one more in the not-so-distant future.

Things were not made any simpler by the fact that a process of attrition seemed to have affected partnerships, so new pairings had to be decided. Fortunately this arranged itself without Jo having to shout at us very much and the competition actually managed to start.

Helvetica League											
Pair		Opponents								Total	Pos
		A		B		C		D			
A	Dave Clarkson Rupert Thompson	-		5	4	6	6	6*	4	31	1
B	Geoff Thorpe Paul Grocott	2	3	-		6	1	6*	1	19	2
C	Elizabeth Whalley Julian Porter	1	1	1	6	-		2	6	17	3 =
D	Jo Mitchell† Richard Hunt	1*	3	1*	6	5	1	-		17	3 =

† In the first game of A v D Jo Mitchell Played singles.

I can't actually remember anything particularly unusual happening in the course of the winking, so I won't bother to talk about that as I don't suppose anybody is very interested in it anyway. Let the scores speak for themselves, or not, as the case may be. Suffice it to say that pairs C (Elizabeth and Julian) and D (Jo and Richard) tactfully arranged things such that there was a draw in third place while Rupert and Walter dug for victory.

On the other hand lunch was quite memorable, mostly due to Geoff deciding to eat two meals *simultaneously*, Julian being spurred by this

example to eat two *consecutively* and Jo drinking her coffee through some sort of biscuit.

When the whole thing was over and done with She who must be obeyed presented the winners (Rupert and Walter) with their prize, consisting of a glass bowl of some deeply significant sort, whose name has temporarily eluded me. Rupert was so taken with it that he announced that he would return to defend his title next year.

In conclusion I would like to say that I wholly fail to comprehend why the road leading to the Wine Bar should be uprooted every Sunday.

NATIONAL SINGLES, 1994

Queens' College, Cambridge
30th April and 1st May 1994

Blue League, by Alan Dean

Kahn, Dean, Scarrot and Hedger were the players seeded to go through, but with Keyte and Grant also in the group it looked to me that only Kahn would have a reasonably easy path to the final.

The early rounds produced few surprises, with only two games from the first twenty not resulting in a 6-1 or 7-0, as the top half of the seedings played the bottom half. Shocks were provided by Tim Hedger's 6-1 defeat by Dave Clarkson and Elizabeth Whalley's discovery, after about 10 minutes of her game with Alan Dean, that there remained (according to Alan's watch) about 23 hours and 50 minutes to play! It transpired that Alan, using his digital watch for the first time in a winks tournament, had set it going backwards instead of forwards.

By the time all the top seeds had had one bye, after round six, all eleven players were in their seeded positions. The narrow gap between Larry Kahn at the top (on 31) and Gavin Keyte in fourth (on 27) with Alasdair Grant and Tim Hedger close behind (on 26 and 23 respectively) suggested that the second half could be quite interesting.

It was looking, by the end of round ten, that Larry was certainly going through (on $50\frac{1}{2}$) but one of Dean, Hedger, Keyte and Scarrot

(44, 43, 40 and 39 respectively) must not. Other contenders looked unlikely now, with the closest being Alasdair Grant on $33\frac{1}{2}$. In the end it was Gavin Keyte who was the unfortunate near miss for qualification, despite good wins over both Alan Dean and Phil Scarrott.

BLUE LEAGUE														
Player		Opponents											Tot	Pos
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K		
A	Larry Kahn	–	3	$4\frac{1}{2}$	3	6	6	7*	5*	7*	6	6	$53\frac{1}{2}$	1
B	Alan Dean	4	–	6*	1	2	6	6	5	6*	6	6	48	2
C	Phil Scarrott	$2\frac{1}{2}$	1*	–	6	1	$4\frac{1}{2}$	6	6	6	6	6	45	3
D	Tim Hedger	4	6	1	–	6	4	4	1	6	6	6	44	4
E	Gavin Keyte	1	5	6	1	–	1*	3	6	6	6*	6	41	5
F	Alasdair Grant	1	1	$2\frac{1}{2}$	3	6*	–	6	1*	6	6	7*	$39\frac{1}{2}$	6
G	James Cullingham	0*	1	1	3	4	1	–	1*	6	4	5	26	8
H	David Clarkson	2*	2	1	6	1	6*	6*	–	2	6	4	36	7
I	David Carslake	0*	1*	1	1	1	1	1	5	–	$4\frac{1}{2}$	6	$21\frac{1}{2}$	9
J	Kilian Anheuser	1	1	1	1	1*	1	3	1	$2\frac{1}{2}$	–	1	$13\frac{1}{2}$	11
K	Elizabeth Whalley	1	1	1	1	1	0*	2	3	1	6	–	17	10

The final positions were almost exactly in accordance with the seeding, with only seventh / eighth and tenth / eleventh reversed. Larry could easily have won all his games; he was certainly playing well enough, but he slipped up twice. Against Tim Hedger, he knocked enemy winks out from below a pile in the final shot, when attempting a squop, and this game Tim a lucky 4–3 escape. Also, against Alan Dean, Larry had complete control, with a squop up by the start of rounds, but in round four Alan managed to break up a pile, leaving three free winks at about eight inches from the pot, all of which he potted in round five to scrape a 4–3 win. These two losses during the qualifying stage equal the number of games Larry has lost on day one of the Singles over the whole of the last ten tournaments (he lost to Keith Seaman in 1987 and Gary Shrimpton in 1988).

Speaking of records, Alan Dean is now the only person to have played in every ETwA Singles tournament: Jon Mapley shared this honour until he failed to attend this year (for his wife's ordination, I

think), but then Jon has played in every National Pairs and Alan has missed one of those.

Green League, by Julian Wiseman

Well, winks schminks. In the green league sundry games were played, with varying degrees of playful bonhomie and antagonistic maliciousness. Such are the joys of The Game. Eventually, some qualified and went on to varying degrees of glory and disgrace in the Druids. Such is the joy of The Game.

GREEN LEAGUE													
Player		Opponents										Tot	Pos
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J		
A	Richard Moore	-	0*	7*	0*	6	6	7*	6	7*	6	45	3
B	Matthew Rose	7*	-	6	3	6	6	6*	7*	6	6	53	1
C	Julian Wiseman	0*	1	-	7*	6	7*	7*	6*	2	7*	43	4
D	Ed Wynn	7*	4	0*	-	6	4	6	6	6	7*	46	2
E	Ben Deane	1	1	1	1	-	5	1	6*	5	7*	28	6
F	Cyril Edwards	1	1	0*	3	2	-	6	1	5*	7*	26	7
G	Rupert Thompson	0*	1*	0*	1	6	1	-	1*	5*	6	21	8=
H	Andrew Dominey	1	0*	1*	1	1*	6	6*	-	6*	7*	29	5
I	Andrew Young	0*	1	5	1	2	2*	2*	1*	-	7*	21	8=
J	Harry Parkes	1	1	0*	0*	0*	0*	1	0*	0*	-	3	10

Red League, by Alan Boyce

The biggest surprise in this league was that the top four seeds qualified for the second day. Patrick, Charles and Nick are quite used to this but it came as a shock for Alan, who last achieved this in 1983.

In the first round Alan beat Chris Andrew in a squop-up, a result that turned out to be very important later on. There were also big wins for Charles and Patrick, who inflicted the first of four successive zeroes

on Andrew Garrard. Nick got off to a slow start with a 3 against Stew. The second round saw fairly decisive wins for the top four, though Nick only managed 4 againsts Chris Andrew, which left him trailing the leaders.

RED LEAGUE													
Player		Opponents										Tot	Pos
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J		
A	Patrick Barrie	-	3	3½	5	2*	3	5	6	6	7*	40½	3
B	Charles Relle	4	-	4½	5½	6	6	4	6	5½	7*	48½	1
C	Nick Inglis	3½	2½	-	2	6	4	3	6	6	7*	40	4
D	Alan Boyce	2	1½	5	-	6	6	6	6	3½	7*	43	2
E	Stu Collins	5*	1	1	1	-	0*	6	2	4	4	24	6 =
F	Chris Andrew	4	1	3	1	7*	-	7*	4	6	6	39	5
G	Stew Sage	2	3	4	1	1	0*	-	5*	6*	2*	24	6 =
H	Jon Williams	1	1	1	1	5	3	2*	-	1	6	21	9
I	Chris Goddard	1	1½	1	3½	3	1	1*	6	-	6	24	6 =
J	Andrew Garrard	0*	0*	0*	0*	3	1	5*	1	1	-	11	10

Lunch followed, during which Alan contemplated the prospect of taking on Stew Sage in the next game (a time when he has fallen foul of many a pot-out). As it turned out Stew landed one of each colour next to Alan's winks, so he squopped him up. Nick, Charles, Patrick and Chris Andrew also won their games, and in round four Charles, Patrick, Alan and Nick carried on winning, leaving a gap of eight points between them and Stu Collins and Chris Andrew.

Round five saw the top players taking on each other for the first time. Charles took 5½ off Alan, having missed potting at the end of round five. In a shock result Patrick only got 3 in his encounter with Chris Andrew, but the gap between qualifiers and non-qualifiers widened to ten points.

In round six Alan and Patrick came together. Patrick achieved a squop-up, freed all of one colour, potted five, then passed to give himself time to boondock. This went horribly wrong, dislodging one of his own winks from atop a tripton. Alan squopped the sixth wink from three inches and managed to defend it to salvage two points. During this

round Andrew Garrard shewed that he had learned something from being potted-out against all those times by inflicting one on Stew.

Chris Andrew continued to close the gap between himself and the leaders in round seven when he picked up 6 from Andrew Garrard while they were throwing points away all over the place. Stu potted-out against Patrick while Alan and Chris Goddard fought out a draw with all four colours in equal first place. Charles got $4\frac{1}{2}$ against Nick.

Round eight saw the threat from Chris Andrew recede, despite the fact that of the top four only Alan managed to get a 6, Patrick and Nick drew and Charles got 4 against Stew. By this stage Charles was certain to qualify while Nick and Alan each needed $1\frac{1}{2}$ and Patrick 2 to secure their places. Alan was playing Nick and Patrick Charles. Half-way through these games they were all disconcerted to hear that Chris Andrew had got 7 against Stew, meaning that these games were *serious*. Alan and Nick spent the remainder of their game in messy piles, trying to ensure that one of their opponent's colours was worse than their own better one and succeeded, Alan coming out on top with 5. Patrick took 3 off Charles to secure his place.

Congratulations to Charles, who won all of his games, and commiserations to Chris Andrew, who finished only one point behind Nick and $1\frac{1}{2}$ behind Patrick.

The Final, by Ed Wynn

Most of the usual suspects were rounded up and put into the Old Kitchens, Queens' College, Cambridge. (The windows had been sealed up, years in advance, to punish people on just this sort of occasion.) In a risky, reverse-psychology move, however, the Top Cat had stayed away. Bunnies were let loose in the top paddock. As one of them — and a recent and temporary convert to the game's seriousness — I was unable to appreciate how untraditional it was that the day's play started late. I leave others to recall previous matches. In fact, I am forced to leave them to recall this match, because not much of it remains with me. The bunnies escaped whomping, the lunch break was restrained, and I don't think I'd be giving away too much of the plot if I told you that Larry won and Patrick was fastest donkey-doodah.

THE FINAL															
Player		Opponents												Tot	Pos
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L		
A	Matthew Rose	-	2	1	1	6	2	6	0*	0*	2½	6	6	32½	9 =
B	Charles Relle	5	-	1	4	4	3	4	6	1	3	5	5	41	5
C	Larry Kahn	6	6	-	6	4	7*	6	6	5	6	1	1	54	1
D	Ed Wynn	6	3	1	-	4	6	2	1*	1	6	7*	4⅔	41⅔	4
E	Richard Moore	1	3	3	3	-	4	6	6*	0*	1	6	4	37	6
F	Alan Dean	5	4	0*	1	3	-	6	1*	5*	6	5	0*	36	8
G	Alan Boyce	1	3	1	5	1	1	-	2	6	6	5	1½	32½	9 =
H	Julian Wiseman	7*	1	1	6*	1*	6*	5	-	3	6	4	4	44	3
I	Patrick Barrie	7*	6	2	6	7*	2*	1	4	-	6	6	6	53	2
J	Phil Scarrott	4½	4	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	-	1*	2*	23½	12
K	Tim Hedger	1	2	6	0*	1	2	2	3	1	6*	-	6	30	11
L	Nick Inglis	1	2	6	2⅓	3	7*	5½	3	1	5*	1	-	36⅕	7

The first round saw five 6-1's and one 5-2 and few surprises; by and large the top of the table fell on the bottom like wolves doing origami. Rose, Moore, Kahn and Barrie were strong starters, but Matthew took the fifth round badly, sustaining a full frontal 0 from Julian. (Julian thereby broke his rather pleasing 6, 1, 6, 1 alternation, so he can't have been all that pleased.) Ed potted out against Tim, putting the greens (for the sake of argument) in the back of the net. Some turns later, with the last yellow and the last blue in the finishing straight, Tim had potted a couple of reds and then missed, when a colour-order crime was detected. The rules seemed to give Ed the choice of continuing with yellow, or disinterring all the reds and then continuing with yellow, or some such. These options were rejected as being too harsh, and Ed nobly allowed Tim to dig out the reds and start again with blue. Tim was so unnerved by this that he missed, and Ed got seven. Smugness favours the fortunate. (Half of the pot-outs that day were 7-0's, which must say something.)

At the end of the eighth round, Patrick was six points ahead of Larry. (After that, they were never more than a point apart.) Charles had risen to third place by the simple expedient of getting points, but Julian was equal third and the rest of the pack was close behind. A

couple of the games in the ninth round drifted on a bit, causing an event which Richard called the 'Champagne Moment', but which Nick called something a little less cheerful; an event which can now be seen to have been inevitable in the history of winks. When Judgement Day comes, and we sit around de-briefing the Creator, we could well ask why it had to crop up in the Singles. However, His choice for the terrestrial architect of His whim will seem entirely natural, I believe: it was Charles. This is what happened:

The game between Tim and Julian had reached rounds, and (it was later said), there was everything to play for. The game had taken some time, perhaps partly because Julian had some storm-clouds on his medical horizon. In fact, he had to interrupt the game to pick up some confectionery from the nearest pharmacist. Tim, meanwhile, leant against a nearby wall, contemplating the situation and attempting telekinesis on the more complicated piles. Unfortunately, there was a little too much 'tele' and not enough 'kinesis': Charles, looking for a free mat for potting-practice, saw an abandoned mat, and duly caused havoc. Plink, plonk, boggle. By the time he had been stopped, the state of play had changed somewhat, although it was difficult to pinpoint the exact changes. Julian and Tim seemed happy to call it a draw, or toss a coin, or give up the game, but a pile reconstruction was attempted. Play continued, and the eventual score was 4-3; it seems only right not to record who won.

To be honest, little after that matters. Julian took 3 points off Patrick — not literally, scoring doesn't work that way — to leave himself a point and two-thirds behind Ed, and Patrick a point behind Larry, going in to the final round. Patrick and Larry both got 6 points, and the World Championship was the winner in the end. Julian overtook Ed for third place — well done to both of them, especially Ed. An ominous sign that Geoff's powers were fading was that he walked in around the time of the penultimate round, but didn't even qualify. Even omnipotence has its limits.

The Jolly Tumbling Sailor Invitation

Kidderminster

11 June 1994

by **Rob Cartwright**

Player		Partner												Tot	Pos
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L		
A	Jon Mapley	-	6	<u>4$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	3	5	6*	6	0*	2*	<u>5$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	<u>1</u>	3	42	4
B	Patrick Barrie	6	-	4	7*	<u>6</u>	2	4	4	6	6*	5	1	51	1
C	Charles Relle	<u>4$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	4	-	6	1	1	<u>1</u>	4	6	6	1	1*	<u>35$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	8
D	Alan Boyce	3	7*	6	-	3	1	3	6	<u>1</u>	4	1	3	38	6
E	Mike Surridge	5	<u>6</u>	1	3	-	5	6	1	<u>1$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	3	6	3	<u>40$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	5
F	Alasdair Grant	6*	2	1	1	5	-	7*	2	4	2	1	<u>6</u>	37	7
G	Jim Carrington	6	4	<u>1</u>	3	6	7*	-	5*	5	2	<u>2$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	4	<u>45$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	3
H	Rob Cartwright	0*	4	4	6	1	2	5*	-	1*	<u>6</u>	0*	6	35	9
I	Tony Brennan	2*	6	6	<u>1</u>	<u>1$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	4	5	1*	-	6	1	1	<u>34$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	10
J	Ian Gameson	<u>5$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	6*	6	4	3	2	2	<u>6</u>	6	-	4	3	<u>47$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	2
K	Cyril Edwards	<u>1</u>	5	1	1	6	1	<u>2$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	0*	1	4	-	1	<u>23$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	12
L	Phil Clark	3	1	1*	3	3	<u>6</u>	4	6	1	3	1	-	32	11

Some players had to leave at the end of the tenth round, so their scores for round eleven are 'virtual' in the sense that they are the scores that their putative partners in that round actually obtained. Though the totals and final positions were worked out using the scores for all eleven rounds the scores arising from games in round eleven have been underlined in the table above so as to distinguish them.

As usual in this invitation event there were twelve players and the preliminary phase was held in the Wyre Forest leisure centre. A sell-out crowd of the Clark family added to the atmosphere (my first thought was that the boffins had made a major breakthrough — either they

had perfected cloning⁵ or Phil had unwittingly got caught in the Movie “Honey I shrunk the Winker” — as the resemblance of young Alec to his Pater is quite remarkable). Another face new to the tournament was that of Alasdair Grant.

The first few rounds were probably quite interesting — frankly I don’t remember the order of play and the result sheet doesn’t help much — but two facts emerged.

- The centre hadn’t bought in a barrel of anything just for us.
- Some of us were much more interested in watching England vs South Africa (even though, as Mike Surridge put it, they — the South Africans, that is — are obviously cheating {**expletive deleted**} apart from Brian Moore) than in waiting for some four to finish the ludicrously drawn-out game.

I remember being reasonably well-placed after lunch, but in typical post-prandial fashion got the wrong end of two pot outs to scupper any chance of glory. Phil achieved his stated ambition of not coming last in his own event, and the winner was Patrick Barrie⁶ with a yawn-inspiring 51 points. It’s interesting to note the range of PPG’s — Patrick’s was 4.636, while Phil (placed eleventh) had one of 2.909. The last few Cambridge Opens have had winning PPG’s of well over 5.

Thanks as usual to Phil for superb organisation and hospitality, and to all the players for keeping this one of the highlights of the winking year.

A Complaint

In which Julian Wiseman recalls the singles

It was at about this time that my bad news became public; my job was about to change in a ridiculous manner. Previously I had a job in London, which had the excellent merit of being a safe several hundred miles from Malvern. Not, I add, that I object to the rolling hills and

⁵Surely in that case Clark junior would be a little *larger* – Ed.

⁶Surprise, surprise – Ed.

drifting fog of England's green and pleasant land, or even that I regard the proximity to the Worcester Royal Infirmary as dangerous *per se* (surely it has been rendered safe by becoming a trust?). Nor, (lest it be libellously suggested,) is there any objection to the principality and its myths and legends.

No, despite the news being bad, the job was to remain in London (although some would argue that this is bad enough). Nor is the distance from Malvern to London likely to change by as much as a short squop in the near future (although some would attempt tectonic pedantry). It was simply that one of the main 'features' of Malvern might have been coming to London.

Well, now the news is available is all its gory detail: Anthony James Robert Heading, aka Scruffy Little Urchin, has new employment. Not only in London, not only in the city, not only for my employers, but only one door from my desk. Not, (lest once again the libel lawyers start to foam at the mouth) that there's anything wrong (well — much wrong) with the SLU, it's just that I only have the knack of appreciating him in small doses (in this the relationship may well be symmetric).

And in any case, what in the world is the SLU doing in the city — he wouldn't recognise the Financial Times even if he tried to swat a fly with it; let alone a collared inverse floater. What is the world coming to? Surely the end is nigh?

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

AN HYDRODYNAMICAL SUGGESTION

Sir,

May I please through your columns invite A. Well-Wisher ('A Gerontological Enquiry', Letters WW 62) to jump down his wishing well?

Yours senescently,
Charles Relle.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO CUTWC

Sir,

I wonder if I might make use of a few inches of your organ?

As you know, CUTwC was founded on January 16th 1955, and with it the modern game was born. To mark the Fortieth anniversary of this occasion, CUTwC is organising a celebration on the week-end of January 14th and 15th 1995. The approximate plans are as follows:

- | | |
|--|--|
| Saturday 14th, 10 am – 1 pm | Winks world record attempts, sponsored in aid of the Alzheimer's Disease Society. (This repeats something CUTwC successfully did in 1989). Tables will be available for friendly games during this session. |
| Saturday 14th, 2.30 pm – 6.30 pm and Sunday 15, 10 am – 5 pm | Fortieth Anniversary Open. This will be a randomly drawn pairs like the Cambridge Open, but won't really be random. Less experienced players will be drawn with more experienced players and there will be handicaps. We hope that this will make it possible for those who haven't played for some time, as well as novices, to compete on near equal terms. We hope this may attract some former players back to the game. A normal Cambridge Open will be held later in the year. |
| Saturday 14th, 7.30 pm | Fortieth Anniversary Dinner in Queens' Old Hall. |

All are welcome. CUTwC will be contacting as many people as possible in due course. If you have addresses for those involved in the game long ago, ideas for other things to do this week-end or want further information, please contact me at Queens'.

Yours faithfully,
Stew Sage.

AN ART CRITIC WRITES

Sir,

With regard to the game that was being played on the cover of this journal until (and including) WW61, I fail to understand *how* the tombstone depicted on the cover of WW61 was made. It seems unlikely that it was made other than by a shot by yellow. If this is the case then that shot should be retracted as yellow has played out of turn. Chastisement is, I believe, in order.

Yours,
St. Andrew.

A GRAMMARIAN'S NIGHTMARE

Dear Sir,

During the second day of the Singles, for which (ahem) I managed to qualify, I came across a procedure for deciding by chance the allocation of *both* the corners and the colours of a game of winks: all six winks of at least one colour are put at one corner, and then one player rolls a coloured dice to decide which colour he shall play. This is a quick and relatively foolproof procedure.

Petty and small-minded though it is to care about such things, they matter to some people. I would therefore like to heartily endorse the procedure; I hope that it, or something like it, will become common practice in serious games. It's not that *I* care about colours or corners; I care that my opponent might care. I do not want to give him an unwarranted psychological advantage through politeness, inattention, or wishywashiness. As someone else said, 'it takes the emotional blackmail out of it.' I'm almost sure he said 'emotional', though I can't think what he meant. Anyway, that's my point.

The point might equally be made concerning squidge-offs: there is an advantage in playing last in a squidge-off, because you can see how well you have to do. If you need only keep your wink on the table, then that is easily achieved. If you need your wink in the pot, you can alter your shot accordingly. I seldom begrudge an opponent the right to play last, unless it seems clear that he is merely delaying to pick up the advantage. What can be done about squidge-offs? The remedy of insisting on simultaneous shots is impractical. To carry out another

random draw is too tedious. All I can advocate in this case is an appeal to fair play, perhaps through a convention specifically mentioned in the rules, like the one concerning play out of turn. In the case of colours and corners, however, the small effort of the above procedure seems to me to be justified.

Yours, etc.,
Ed Wynn.

PS: I am aware that some winkers are female, of the 'rule' against split infinitives, and of the now outdated pedantry concerning the word 'dice'.

THE PERILS OF BEING A TOURNAMENT ORGANISER

Dear Sir,

Has Sage caught Headingitis? In trying to finalize the date for the NATwA Pairs I needed info from Stew on the CUTwC tour dates. So I kept pestering him via EMAIL (which I know he doesn't read much) plus using general posts to ALT.GAMES.TIDDLYWINKS. Finally, I got a regular airmail letter from him with details about the tour. The very next morning, I get an EMAIL message from him asking, "Did you receive the letter I sent with the tour information?" You figure it out.

Larry Kahn

A SPACE FILLER

Dear Sir,

Given that ALT.GAMES.TIDDLYWINKS has proven such an outstanding success⁷ I would like to suggest that tiddlywinks take advantage of the opening up of the "information superhighway".

In particular, I am interested in the possibility of setting up some pages relating to winks on the World Wide Web. Does anybody have any idea of how this could be done, or indeed have the inclination to set about doing it?

Yours solipsistically,
Julian Porter

⁷This is a lie - Ed.

WORLD SINGLES 40

Angevin Room, Queens' College, Cambridge
13 June 1994

by
Patrick Barrie

There was only one spectator for most of this match, and he was partially legless and had to go to hospital during the first game. This means that the duty of increasing the bulk of Winking World has fallen on me. It would be nice to report that modesty forbids me from writing an accurate account of the match. However, the actual quality of play was such that it is in fact principally self-respect that is governing the composition of this article. My memory of the event, softened by the passage of time, has reached the stage that my creative imagination can come into play to write an entirely subjective report showing me in a better light than might otherwise have been the case. Still, history is made to be rewritten and so I shall claim that I squopped slightly better than Geoff in the first three games; we then had a couple of blitz games for **Tradition's** sake, and ended up with a messy game of fluctuating fortunes.

Geoff Myers	3	1	1	7*	1*	4	17
Patrick Barrie	4	6	6	0*	6*	3	25

The first game was close at the start before I picked up a doubleton away from Geoff's other winks. Geoff didn't attack well and had an unlucky sub leaving five of his winks solidly under two of mine. Just as Geoff was running out of options, he chose to bomb the pile playing a yellow off a pile containing two blues and another yellow. His top wink barely moved, but the two blues flew up in the air to score direct hits wreaking havoc on both ends of the pile simultaneously. Despite this I still had the better position, and come rounds Geoff's yellows were out of it but green had a chance of pinching points. Green ended up on nine tiddlies from three in the pot. My red's were already on 10 tiddlies in round five but, worried that yellow might make a squop to take them

down to nine, I went for a long pot and duly squopped myself. This error was compounded when I missed a blue pot off a singleton ending the game for first place, and so it finished up with red and green joint first and a 4-3 scoreline.

I was always ahead in game two, largely due to a more consistent bring-in than Geoff, and achieved a squop-up with plenty of time to go. A conversion to pot-out never looked realistic, and so I played out for a 6-1 win. In the third game too I was ahead at the start, getting several of Geoff's greens under early on. I only ever had one yellow under, however, and this came free some way through the game. It wasn't an easy pot-out position with several different winks under attack, and Geoff missed with three in the pot. There was a sequence of good squops from both players to keep the game alive for a while, but I achieved a squop-up in rounds and just had time to get enough winks in the pot for another 6-1 win.

Geoff's been known to pot his way out of trouble on occasions before, and I gave him a golden chance in game four. He had five reds flat on the mat and ideally placed; his sixth red was on a doubleton of yellows, while my winks were somewhat scattered. I had a big green all of two inches from the red on the yellows, and my green shot was (yes, you guessed it) to knock his red completely flat, and the inevitable 0* - 7* followed. I was able to get revenge in the next game where, rather to my surprise, I successfully made a distant squop and a distant knock-off with one colour to allow my other colour to achieve a seventh-turn pot-out. Pot-squop clearly does still work on occasions, and it earned me a 6* - 1* win and a 22-13 lead in the match.

The sixth game was interesting and close, but of lower quality than the previous games as we both squopped erratically and missed several opportunities to build an advantageous position. I particularly remember playing a click-dock that sent the enemy wink an impressive four inches from a doubleton. Geoff got his act together rather more at the start of rounds, and played a nice break-up of one end of a pile in round 2 giving me only a single blue and a single red at the edge of the mat and a singleton near the pot, while Geoff had two greens and a yellow flat near the pot and control of the piles. With a 1-6 loss likely, I decided to be adventurous. My blue shot ending round 2 from the edge finished high up on an effective tripleton, while my red shot in round

3 from the edge got a knock-off to free an effective doubleton. Geoff missed both squops that might have preserved his advantage, and suddenly his greens were struggling for first place while his yellows looked like only coming fourth. Ending round four I had a trivial squop with blue on a pile for a near-certain 5-2 win, which I managed to miss completely. The error wasn't that costly, as ending round five I had a similar length squop to ensure that yellow finished fourth; this time I made no mistake, giving me the three points necessary to prevent a seventh game.

All in all, an interesting experience that has given the tea-lady in the chemistry department at UCL further ammunition to (attempt to) embarrass me. The match was played in an excellent spirit and was over in under three hours, the only major cause of delay being deciding who should have the honour of rolling the multicoloured die to determine corners and colours.

WORLD PAIRS 13

30, Western Road, Oxford

25 June 1994

by

Julian Porter

The evening before this was due to happen I telephoned Andy Purvis to ask him what time it was going to start. I did this because I had a suspicion that if I didn't do the report for WW nobody else would. Andy gave me the necessary information and then confided that he and Geoff were going to be 'stuffed'. Let us take a look at the actual scores:

Geoff Myers	7*	7*	6	4½	4	28½
Andy Purvis						
Patrick Barrie	0*	0*	1	2½	3	6½
Richard Moore						

Judging from this, if Andy ever tells you to 'beware the Ides of March' you can be pretty certain that that is the one day of the year on which

you can safely go out of doors without causing great misery for your insurance company.

The event itself attracted an huge audience (Me, with special guest appearances by Christine Wiggins and Gavin Keyte). I conscientiously wrote a shot-by-shot description of the actual winks, so as to help in preparing this report. Then I lost it.

Game One

Richard was rather unfortunate with his bringing in in this game. All of his winks landed about three millimetres from one of Geoff's or Andy's. Patrick said this was nothing to worry about (potting five with his sixth on the base-line) and was a classic example of pot-squop. When Patrick brought in his sixth Geoff and Andy tore themselves from their self-imposed task of squopping Richard and squopped Patrick instead. After a fierce tussle Geoff potted out.

Game Two

This was not quite so interesting. Basically Andy blitzed, though both Richard and Patrick had a chance to stop him from potting his sixth.

Game Three

I can recall nothing whatever about game three. I suspect that it involved several squops.

Game Four

This was a very strange game.⁸ At one point Andy and Geoff appeared to be on the verge of delivering the *coup de grace* and hence inflicting the lowest ever losing score in World Pairs on Patrick and Richard. What happened was that after rather a lot of scrappy squopping Geoff discovered that he had five flat winks (which he potted) and one on top of quite a large pile. Andy advised caution about potting this one, Geoff announced that he could pot it easily and, sure enough, five seconds later it was squopped.

Late in rounds it seemed pretty clear that Geoff was first, Patrick was going to come second and Richard could easily *equal* Andy but not actually *beat* him. This means that the score was probably going to be $4\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2}$. Now, if we add up Andy and Geoff's scores up to this point

⁸At one stage Richard announced in a pleased sort of way 'I've got a squop, I want that recorded' - Ed.

we see that

$$7 + 7 + 6 + 4\frac{1}{2} = 24\frac{1}{2}$$

which is one half of 49. As these things are played as best of seven games this meant that $2\frac{1}{2}$ was the lowest score that Richard and Patrick could get while avoiding curtains. Unfortunately Richard appeared to have convinced himself that they needed 3 and spent some time in round five mulling over how on earth he could set about beating Andy.

Half way through this game Christine Wiggins burst into the room and exclaimed 'what, it's still going on?', which seems a fitting comment; really.

Game Five

So, were Patrick and Richard going to go for the string of three 7's in a row that they needed to win? At first it seemed that they were, when Patrick brought in his first wink and then potted it in his next turn. Things became a little more complicated later on, and eventually they got 3, which was not enough to win, but at least meant that they did not set a new world record.

AUNTIE GERTIE'S PROBLEM CORNER

by
Auntie Gertie

Dear Auntie Gertie,

Earlier this year I tried to explain tiddlywinks to a friend of mine (who turned out to be quite good at it) and she asked, as we were nearing the end of a round in the first game we had played, what would happen if someone were to play out of turn. I promptly had an epileptic fit, and I have since discovered that any mention (or even the merest thought) of rule twelve brings on another one. Is there any way I can avoid this problem?

Yours hysterically,
Barney the Dinosaur.

Dear Barney the Dinosaur,

You would appear to have fallen into the error, common among winkers, of thinking that the rules of tiddlywinks were specifically constructed with the intention of causing as much human (or in your case, saurian) misery as possible. You are not alone in having developed a particular aversion to rule twelve, but yours is probably the first case in which there has been a concomitant observable physiological effect.

The only way you can get rid of this problem is to overcome your feat of the rules. Perhaps the best way of doing this would be for you to join the rules sub-committee, as then you will be able to see at first hand that, far from being fearful creatures of the night, its members are perfectly normal human beings (or in your case, dinosaurs). Once you have done that, and if you really feel strongly about it, you can set about re-writing rule twelve to suit your own tastes.

A.G.

THE LONDON OPEN

July 9th 1994

by
Charles Relle

Very many thanks to you, everybody who came to the London Open. As a result of your generosity, £140 has gone to the Lewisham Hospital Diabetes Day Centre, which we have supported now for four years. This has become traditional because the London Borough of Lewisham gives us the venue free in exchange for our support, so thanks go to the Borough too.

Thank you, especially, to the StATS players, three of whom played, for coming do far, and to Jo Mitchell, who was so exhausted by being chauffeur, or maybe chauffeuse, to the rest that she decided not to play. It was nevertheless gratifying to see four women in the championship, including Lesley Wilkins, who had previously shared a colour with Steve Phillips, but was now taking her first full hand in a tournament.

THE TEAMS			
[A]	Jon Mapley Charles Relle	[B]	Anne Austen James Cullingham
[C]	Ben Deane Andrew Dominey	[D]	Emma Anderson Gavin Keyte
[E]	Ben Soares Graham Turnbull	[F]	Patrick Barrie Harry Parkes
[G]	Steve Phillips Lesley Wilkins	[H]	Dave Salter Geoff Thorpe
[I]	Phil Clark Cyril Edwards	[J]	Matthew Rose Rupert Thompson
[K]	Simon Julier Phil Scarrot	[L]	Kilian Anheuser Chris Goddard
[M]	Simon Gandy Ed Wynn	[N]	Andy Purvis Elizabeth Whalley

The venue: we had been moved out of the Riverdale Hall in favour of a bouncy castle for the under fives, and were to play on the perimeter of an indoor bowling green. This, proclaimed as the biggest mat of all time, was tested for potting by one or two players. Otherwise, conditions were much the same: a ploughman's lunch was available at a reasonable price, there was a bar on site, open all the afternoon, and beer was cheaper than opposite the Riverdale Hall. I was told that a keg of Shepherd Neame would be provided specially for us, and we had to drink it all. I am glad to say we did not fail in the challenge.

At the start, we had a little difficulty in forming one or two partnerships, as it was not clear who was late and who, though expected, was not coming, but we got under way in good spirit, and established that the game between Simon and Ed and Andy and Elizabeth was going to count. This gave Simon and Ed the lead after the first round, for they won 7-0. In the next round Simon and Ed found themselves in a tussle with Matthew Rose and Rupert Thompson, and emerged with $2\frac{1}{2}$, while Andy and Elizabeth took on Phil and Cyril, scoring 6. Six - one was the most common score in the tournament, with 20 games out

of 55 (one pair had to leave early, so one game in the last round was not played), but the next most common was 4-3, with 14, which suggests that many of the games were very close. One such game was in the second round, in which Emma Anderson and Gavin Keyte made nearly all the shots that mattered against Jon Mapley and Charles Relle, and led until the last shot of round five. Jon, playing blue, had to transfer a wink from yellow to green to turn a 3-4 into a 4-3. He said firmly to his partner 'I'm not thinking of a Bristol', and made the five inch squop.

Emma and Gavin were less fortunate in their next game, against Ben Deane and Andrew Dominey, who potted out for a seven, a score also achieved in this round by Dave Salter and Geoff Thorpe against Killian Anheuser and Chris Goddard, who were struggling after a first round win over Steve and Lesley. At this point Matthew and Rupert were leading the tournament by half a point. This lead disappeared in round 4 when they played Jon and Charles, and allowed the latter to have six free winks near the pot. Charles was judging his intake of beer more carefully than in 1990, and sank six (winks), and Jon did the same in the next turn.

The new arrangement in the Riverdale Hall benefited at least one member of the tournament, Harry Parkes, who was accompanied by his wife and son. Adam Parkes also had fun on the bowling green, testing out the bias of Andy's tomato timekeeper. Harry and his partner, Patrick Barrie, were contributing to the statistics noted above, as all their games were 6-1 or 4-3 one way or the other. In this round they prevailed by 6-1 against Anne Austen and James Cullingham, who in the next round shared the only $3\frac{1}{2}$ - $3\frac{1}{2}$ with Killian and Chris.

By the end of the penultimate round, Simon and Ed had put far behind them a 1-6 against Jon and Charles, and had scored 6, 6, 7 and 6 to be within striking distance of the century partnership, who had been applying the principle of *festina lente*. Both pairs lost 5-2 in the last round, the former to Ben and Andrew, and the latter to Simon Julier and Phil Scarrott. A rather closer game in this round was between Patrick and Harry and Ben Soares and Graham Turnbull, which went to the latter pair 4-3. Ben and Graham must have been contesting vigorously all day, as five of their games had a 4-3 result. I do want to repeat that it was a pleasure to welcome them and their fellow members

of StATS, and indeed everyone to this tournament. Your generosity to the Diabetes Day Centre made it a rewarding as well as happy birthday for one whom some believe to be too old for the game.

Pair	Round (Opponent - Score)								Tot	Pos
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
A	F - 6	D - 4	M - 6	J - 7	C - 6	N - 4½	H - 4½	K - 2	40	1
B	E - 3	G - 3	N - 1½	F - 1	L - 3½	K - 4	J - 1	D - 2	19	13
C	K - 3	E - 4½	D - 7	H - 2½	A - 1	J - 4	N - 4	M - 5	31	5
D	I - 6	A - 3	C - 0	E - 3	F - 4	H - 2	L - 2	B - 5	25	9
E	B - 4	C - 2½	G - 3	D - 4	J - 2	L - 4	I - 1	F - 4	24½	11
F	A - 1	H - 3	I - 3	B - 6	D - 3	G - 6	M - 1	E - 3	26	8
G	L - 2½	B - 4	E - 4	M - 1	I - 1	F - 1	K - 0	bye	13½	14
H	J - 1	F - 4	L - 7	C - 4½	N - 1	D - 5	A - 2½	I - 6	31	5
I	D - 1	N - 1	F - 4	L - 6	G - 6	M - 0	E - 6	H - 1	25	9
J	H - 6	M - 4½	K - 6	A - 0	E - 5	C - 3	B - 6	N - 1	31½	4
K	C - 4	L - 7	J - 1	N - 1	M - 1	B - 3	G - 7	A - 5	29	7
L	G - 4½	K - 0	H - 0	I - 1	B - 3½	D - 3	E - 5	bye	17	12
M	N - 7	J - 2½	A - 1	G - 6	K - 6	I - 7	F - 6	C - 2	37½	2
N	M - 0	I - 6	B - 5½	K - 6	H - 6	A - 2½	C - 3	J - 6	35	3

STOP PRESS

I have been informed by the ETwA secretary that at the next ETwA AGM (i.e. the one happening at the teams of four, so either it'll be today or you missed it) there will be a proposal to change the constitution of ETwA.

The proposed constitutional change is that in future all rules changes will require a two-thirds majority to be accepted, rather than a simple majority, as is currently the case.

Prior notice to members of this change will, of course, be advertised to members by newsletter.

NATwA SINGLES 1994

The score-sheet for this event has come my way, so I thought I'd bung it in. As far as I can gather the thing consisted of two all-play-alls, held on successive days, with Sunshine only taking part in the first of them. Larry's PPG is quite impressive.

Player		Opponent									Tot	PPG	Pos
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I			
A	Dave Lockwood	—	1	1	6	6	6	6	7*	6	66	4.400	3
		—	1	2	6*	2*	7*	—	7*	2*			
B	Bob Henninge	6	—	1	2	6	6	5½	6	6	77	5.133	2
		6	—	5	5	6	6	—	5	5½			
C	Larry Kahn	6	6	—	6	7*	7*	6	7*	6*	91	6.067	1
		5	2	—	7*	7*	6*	—	7*	6			
D	Rick Tucker	1	5	1	—	5½	6	4	6	1	51	3.400	4
		1*	2	0*	—	6	—	5½	6	1			
E	Jim Marlin	1	1	0*	1½	—	6	1	7*	4	47½	3.167	5
		5*	1	0*	1	—	7*	—	6	6			
F	Marg Calhoun	1	1	0*	1	1	—	1	1	1	15½	1.033	8
		0*	1	1*	1½	0*	—	—	3	2			
G	Sunshine	1	1½	1	3	6	6	—	6	6	(30½)	(3.813)	—
		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—			
H	Chris Strong	0*	1	0*	1	0*	6	1	—	1	35	2.333	6
		0*	2	0*	1	1	4	—	—	2			
I	Joe Sachs	1	1	1*	6	3	6	1	6	—	49½	3.300	7
		5*	1½	1	6	1	5	—	5	—			

Nick Inglis' World Ratings

Here they are, as always. Players with less than thirty rated games are italicised and those with less than fifteen have been omitted entirely. Because of this I had to omit the entry of Emma Anderson and John Wilson into the ranks of the rated. I thought I would mention them specifically, because as you can see from the record of their first appearances

Player	Current Rating	Previous Rating	Rated Games
Emma Anderson	2001	—	6
John Wilson	2032	—	2

their initial ratings were *rather* startling. Of course they've gone down a bit since then.

Player	Current Rating	Rating in past year		Games in past Year		
		High	Low	Rated	Total	PPG
Geoff Myers	2628	2680	2567	65	74	4.736
Larry Kahn (U.S.)	2579	2620	2443	85	86	5.029
Andy Purvis	2555	2564	2487	98	122	4.209
Patrick Barrie	2504	2601	2332	92	101	4.259
Jon Mapley	2464	2531	2434	48	49	4.500
Dave Lockwood (U.S.)	2452	2553	2443	49	50	4.540
Bob Henninge (U.S.)	2404	2404	2239	35	36	4.352
Matthew Rose	2392	2466	2268	83	92	4.364
Charles Relle	2372	2457	2342	79	81	4.469
<i>Brad Schaefer (U.S.)</i>	2331	(2365)	(2288)	27	28	4.411
<i>Sunshine (U.S.)</i>	2320	(2389)	(2196)	21	22	4.068

Player	Current Rating	Rating in past year		Games in past Year		
		High	Low	Rated	Total	PPG
Nick Inglis	2306	2362	2200	52	52	3.901
Richard Moore	2301	2476	2301	82	91	3.654
Alan Dean	2298	2359	2253	56	58	4.078
Ed Wynn	2283	2283	2005	62	72	4.141
Julian Wiseman	2263	2263	2120	62	63	4.270
<i>Chris Andrew</i>	2262	(2262)	(2232)	19	19	4.000
Simon Gandy	2256	2323	2197	34	34	4.588
Alan Boyce	2230	2230	2068	35	35	3.814
Phil Scarrott	2223	2294	2203	62	62	3.790
<i>Tim Hedger</i>	2202	(2231)	(1862)	27	27	3.741
Rick Tucker (U.S.)	2202	2237	2097	42	43	3.554
Geoff Thorpe	2197	2273	2148	74	74	4.097
<i>Anthony Heading</i>	2195	2195	2001	23	24	4.542
<i>Joe Sachs (U.S.)</i>	2188	(2257)	(2188)	29	29	3.448
<i>Jim Marlin (U.S.)</i>	2143	2216	2114	22	22	3.250
<i>Rob Cartwright</i>	2137	(2137)	1988	19	19	4.395
<i>Stu Collins</i>	2105	2182	(2025)	29	29	4.052
Alasdair Grant	2098	2098	1946	46	46	4.315
<i>Tim Jeffreys</i>	2071	(2071)	1988	18	18	3.917
<i>Chris Wilson</i>	2069	(2069)	1811	29	34	4.015
Ben Deane	2047	2048	(1772)	62	72	3.264
Gavin Keyte	2046	2060	1903	114	114	3.842
Cyril Edwards	2017	2152	(1959)	47	48	3.469
<i>David Clarkson</i>	1976	(2041)	1911	22	22	3.818
Rupert Thompson	1955	2029	1829	83	86	3.424
Andrew Dominey	1952	1952	(1595)	68	68	3.191

Player	Current Rating	Rating in past year		Games in past Year		
		High	Low	Rated	Total	PPG
James Cullingham	1951	1966	1855	76	76	3.419
<i>Nick Reid</i>	1942	1942	1855	18	18	3.722
Jon Williams	1923	1938	1697	68	69	3.058
<i>Heather Dean</i>	1918	(2214)	(1918)	17	20	2.750
Stew Sage	1915	1996	1831	60	67	3.291
<i>Phil Carmody</i>	1912	1990	1912	15	28	2.607
Paul Woodman	1908	(1976)	1908	30	30	3.306
Ben Soares	1876	1914	(1655)	44	46	3.370
Graham Turnbull	1874	1969	(1776)	33	35	3.267
<i>Dave Clark</i>	1854	(1932)	(1854)	21	21	3.310
Dave Carslake	1843	1899	(1522)	43	44	3.057
Andrew Young	1811	1828	(1382)	37	37	3.054
<i>Phil Clark</i>	1801	(1914)	(1801)	16	16	2.750
<i>John Wilson</i>	1795	2032	1795	15	15	3.533
Chris Goddard	1783	1795	1623	33	33	2.742
Andy Milligan	1753	1824	1687	36	38	3.224
Simon Julier	1742	(1937)	1710	42	42	2.714
Paul Roberts	1735	1752	1616	60	60	2.717
<i>Chris Strong</i>	1725	(1725)	(1624)	15	15	1.233
<i>Marg Calhoun (U.S.)</i>	1680	(1779)	(1680)	21	22	1.250
Julian Porter	1665	1730	1407	46	53	2.623
Elizabeth Whalley	1639	(1878)	1536	79	80	2.394
<i>Poss Ellis</i>	1620	(1737)	(1620)	26	26	2.192
Kilian Anheuser	1613	(1877)	1613	54	54	2.454

Player	Current Rating	Rating in past year		Games in past Year		
		High	Low	Rated	Total	PPG
<i>Ed Porter</i>	1610	(1620)	(1486)	18	18	2.167
<i>Christine Wiggins</i>	1603	(1887)	(1600)	27	27	2.500
<i>Alasdair Paton</i>	1596	(1881)	(1596)	21	21	2.024
Richard Hunt	1588	1588	(1472)	38	38	2.921
Jo Mitchell	1564	1564	(1382)	37	37	2.392
<i>Anne Austen</i>	1552	(1614)	(1552)	22	22	2.591
<i>Harry Parkes</i>	1380	(1490)	(1369)	27	27	2.296
<i>James Hopgood</i>	1368	(1602)	(1368)	26	26	1.462

Winking World is the official journal of the English Tiddlywinks Association (ETwA). It is issued free of charge to all members of ETwA and costs £1 to non-members. Material published in Winking World is not copyright, but any person quoting from it is asked to acknowledge the source.

Membership of ETwA costs £5, or £2.50 to students and the unwaged. Members are entitled to regular newsletters, outlining forthcoming events, entry to ETwA tournaments at a reduced charge and the right to vote on any proposed rules changes. Cheques (payable to "the English Tiddlywinks Association") should be sent to the treasurer, to whom all enquiries about purchase of equipment should be directed.