



THE SQUOPSMAN

No.1.

June 1993

TOMBSTONE MARKS ScotTWA'S RETURN FROM THE GRAVE

Sat 17th April 1993

THE GREEK LEAGUE

Eleven o'clock approached. No more than the clicks of agitated squidgers and the rustle of beads filled the library with no books and the reading room with no readers(?). Winkers eyed up their opposition, "the hard one first," said Mapley. A small wrinkly old biddy standing on a box in Indianapolis croaked, "Gentlemen, start your cars..." and the Greek League of the Scottish National Pairs was off!

A gentle first round with a full house of 4-3's ensued before Jon & Charles, Nick & Tony, and Geoff & Julian eased into the first of many 6-1 wins. It was not until round 3 that Goeff & Julian brought home the first of only three Greek pot outs - a 7-0 against StATS pair Jeremy Money and Darren Higgins.

This first round after lunch at the Wine Bar also revealed that Patrick Barrie's volume control had stuck on maximum; the shot by shot commentary was clearly audible as far as Auchtermuchty. As the wins moved to 6's and 5.5's, it became evident that the gentle start was nothing to do with adapting to the sea air and indeed nothing that a few pints of 80/ could not solve. The other pot outs were in round 4; a 7-0 for Charles and Jon against Bruce & Graham (Turnbull)², with a close final wink battle for 2nd place, Jon repeatedly suffering from St Rules Tower

By Bruce Turnbull

Syndrome - reaching the top and jumping off. The other was Nick and Tony's 6-1 put down against Patrick and John Stevens who were seriously starting to look like 2nd day contenders.

Round 5 saw James Cullingham and Ed Wynn start to pick up their ppg after their harder matches earlier in the day, but it was to prove too late in the day for the 5th seeds to see their way into Sunday's play.

In the final round (Turnbull)² abandoned their usual tactics of an erratic bring in, and then drawing their opponents winks in to become squopped up in rounds. The new tactic of not becoming squopped up in rounds pulled off a final flourish of a 4-3 win against Alasdair Grant and Ray Schöne.

Nick Inglis and Tony Heading came home first for the day without a lose, followed by Charles and Jon, 0.5 behind. Also through to Sunday were two StATS players John Stevens and Julian Cole, paired with Patrick Barrie and Goeff Myers, respectively.

THE ROMAN LEAGUE

(This bit by Ben Soares)

I've been told to write something about the Roman League. It's bad enough with finals and everything but there we are. I had a lovely one in Functional Analysis the other day, but you won't really want to know about

that. I can't really say that I can remember that much unless I lie dreadfully. So here goes.

Our top two pairs were Richard Moore & Julian Wiseman (who went on to do quite well) and Matthew Rose and Stew Sage. Due to a miscalculation by Ben (*that's me folks!*) we had the top two seeds in each league playing each other first. Richard and Julian came out on top with 6 points. Meanwhile, down on table 3, Ben was successfully freeing Julian Porter's last remaining unpotted wink to pave the way for a 7-0 pot-out to Elizabeth & Julian. Still, I don't play this game to win (just as well, really).

Stew & Matthew went on to get four pot-outs, although in Ben & Jo's game against them in round 5, there were (more or less) 24 free winks flat on the mat after a few minutes, but an unspoken mutual decision seemed to suggest someone should try and squop something.

Andy & Tim were having lots of fun with only 4 points in 3 games (bettered only by Jo & Ben with 2 points in 3 games), but managed to squeeze into quarter-finals with a 7-0 in the last round, whilst Julian & Elizabeth lost 0-7 to Matthew and Stew (a 2 would have put them equal with Tim & Andy).

Julian & Richard were playing consistently. Against Jo & Ben they had a very well engineered 7-0 pot-out ("they might have squopped us up or potted out ...

or both"). It was almost like being a patient on an operating table!

Chris & Rupert were also doing well. During their last game news came to them that they had a chance to get into the quarter finals. However, I don't think this changed the result, 6 points to them, and into Sunday.

David & Sarah valiantly battled through the day, but despite three 0s enjoyed themselves and even turned up to watch the final. (Might I point out that noone would dare beat Sarah 7-0 in a StATS meeting without fear of being tickled to death).

I didn't really see much of Elizabeth & Julian during their matches, but I'd better say they almost got through or something like that. They lost a 7 to Stew & Matthew in the last game (one of Stew & Matthew's three 7s).

Nick (who may be coming to St Andrews next year [I hope we didn't put him off]) and our youngest competitor Nigel did very well, winning the majority of their games, and hopefully giving a bit of tiddlywinking enthusiasm to a younger generation in Scotland.

So there we are. That was the Roman league. I'll leave you with a quotation from my Graph Theory lecturer, which is really quite deep: "If you slightly inflate a cube, you get a slightly inflated cube." Back to Bruce.

Day 2: It's a Knockout!

The second day began (for more winkers than expected in 7 Fife Park) to the dulcet tones of Steeleye Span before winkers and hangovers were once more trundled down the road to the Union Building.

The second round had been declared a two game match seeded knockout with Greeks playing Romans in the quarter finals. The top four seeds went through with relative ease, though Nick and Tony were held

to a 4-3 win by Andy and Tim in the first game, before becoming squopped up twice in the second.

With Stew and Matthew 5-2 ahead going into their second game, John and Patrick fought back in a very tight game going down 4.5-2.5 in a well organised finish by Sage and Rose.

Richard, Julian W, Charles and Jon knocked up the same, more comfortable wins of 5-2 and 6-1 over Goeff & Julian C and Chris & Rupert respectively to move through and meet in the semis.

The Semi-finals

Nick and Tony won their first game giving Matthew and Stew much to do to catch up before lunch. However, with rounds underway, there were two main piles on the mat; one largely yellow on red and the other green on blue, with blue (Stew) squopped up. Yellow and green defended their squops as red put a wink into the pot from 18" leaving only one free to bomb the pile of squopped blues. Dislodging only a green, Nick and Tony had nothing left to do to win 6-1 and take their place in the final after lunch.

Richard and Julian led at lunch with a close 4-3 with the most striking match of the tournament to follow return from the Wine Bar. Winks were brought out into four separate territories and with nobody attempting a squop (the nearest being a good 7"), a race for the pot became inevitable. Jon (blue) made the decision to bring in his 6th wink for the counter pot, assuming that Richard would miss his 15" shot. Richard (green) however, managed the 7th turn pot out with ease, the long one going down on the second shot. The tie could no longer be saved, even with Charles second and Jon third, leaving only one wink on the mat. The number one seeds were out and the Roman League winners were through to the final.

The Final

Game 1

Nick won the squidge off playing red, Tony blue, Julian yellow and Richard green

After their stunning semi-final win, Julian and Richard were perhaps over eager to go for the quick potout in the first half of the final. They must have been encouraged by the repeated squop misses by red as 5 yellows were sunk in the pot. With both blue and red taking the final yellow, green started to play some spectacular long distance bombing attempts to free his partner, but to no avail.

As the battle grew around the final yellow, red and blue clearly had a great advantage, sucking in green after green to achieve a 6 free turn squop up. This was closely followed by a further 7 free turns, during which blue took charge of the squops and red manoeuvred for the pot out. Blue freed early before red once more squopped up again, this time for 8 free turns, during which he potted 5 and missed the 6th at the end of normal time. Blue freed green to enter rounds leaving red to pot out on his next shot. the inevitable yellow pot out followed, leaving 6 greens and 6 blues. Green then potted out with 5 blues left on the mat to give Nick and Tony a 5-2 lead worthy (if anything ever can become worthy!) of the way they turned the game round after a desperate start.

Game 2

corners change but colours stay constant, yellow squidges off

From the start Tony was unsure about his bringing in and with his second blue landing within a centimetre of two yellows, sucking in a red to form the first pile, comments such as "...a very sad position...", and "...the first death of the positional game...", started to fly between the Scots pair. With all winks brought in, the game suddenly became tighter with a 14 wink pile up forming, blue becoming squopped up and only one red and one yellow completely free.

Despite choruses (chori?) of "Shot!" from the other players, red's admirable attempts to take charge of the pile were all in vain.

In a momentary lack of judgement, red sent one off the table, allowing green and yellow the breathing space to work on the smaller piles and open up the main group thus releasing yellow to strengthen their position.

As red once more started to attack, green unintentionally played the most remarkable shot of the tournament, just inside time; his wink clipped a large yellow, raising it to a near vertical position, flanked by two blues, though supported by only

one; the top edge was deemed to be the one distant to the pot. As the crowd grew, Patrick, knowledgeably, declared it the first "tombstone" to be seen in a national competition.

In round one, blue, trying to play his small wink, not squopped by the tombstone, accidentally clipped the large yellow, flattening it. The umpiring decision was that it had to be replaced as it constituted a separate pile from the little blue. The combined efforts of the world pairs champions failed to resurrect the wink so Nick pushed his way through the crowd to deftly prop it up, daring anyone to challenge its new angle.

As the tension mounted umpires were called to judge almost every shot, the players (bar one) taking their opportunities to "bugger off to Cleethorpes for a waz". As all four concentrated on taking control of the large pile, blue managed "only" the doubleton of yellows on top, leaving yellow only one tiddly ahead of blue and red (green being in the commanding position in round 5).

Green passed in round 5 leaving red an 8" pot to draw the final.

Another St Rule's shot meant that yellow could pass to end the game with no potted winks; blue 1, green 6, red 1, yellow 2. The 6-1 win snatched the Scottish Pairs for Julian and Richard by just one point in a thrilling final.

Saturday 17 April.

ROMAN LEAGUE

Team	Pair	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Total	p.p.g.	Position
A	R.Moore J.Wiseman	\ 6	6*	7*	4.5	7*	5	6*	41.5	5.929	1	
B	S.Sage M.Rose	1	\	6*	5	6	7*	7*	7*	39	5.571	2
C	A.Purvis T.Butterworth	1*	1*	\	6	6	7*	2	2	25	3.571	4
D	B.Soares J.Mitchell	0*	2	1	\	1	5	0*	2	11	1.571	7
E	C.Rudd R.Wilson	2.5	1	1	6	\	5	5	5*	25.5	3.643	3
F	D.Jackson S.Watson	0*	0*	0*	2	2	\	3	1.5	8.5	1.214	8
G	E.Whalley J.Porter	2	0*	5	7*	2	4	\	3	23	3.286	5
H	N.Reid N.Money	1*	0*	5	5	2*	5.5	4	\	22.5	3.214	6

GREEK LEAGUE

Team	Pair	α	β	γ	δ	ε	ζ	η	θ	Total	p.p.g.	Position
α	J.Mapley C.Relle	\	3	6	6	7*	6	5.5	6	39.5	5.643	2
β	N.Inglis A.Heading	4	\	6	6	6	6	6	6*	40	5.714	1
γ	J.Cullingham E.Wynn	1	1	\	5.5	6	4	1	3	21.5	3.071	5
δ	A.Grant R.Schoene	1	1	1.5	\	3	6	4	3	19.5	2.786	6
ε	B.Turnbull G.Turnbull	0*	1	1	4	\	3	1	1	11	1.571	7
ζ	D.Higgins J.Money	1	1	3	1	4	\	0*	1	11	1.571	7
η	G.Myers J.Cole	1.5	1	6	3	6	7*	\	1	25.5	3.643	4

0 J.Stevens
P.Barrie

1 1* 4 4 6 6 6 \ 28 4.000 3

Sunday 18 April.

QUARTER-FINALS			SEMI-FINALS			FINAL
Moore	5:6	-				
Wiseman						
v						
Myers	2:1	-	Moore	4:5*	-	
Cole			Wiseman			
			v			
Mapley	5:6	-				Moore 2*:6
Relle						Wiseman
v			Mapley	3:2*	-	
Rudd	2:1	-	Relle			
Wilson						
						v
Inglis	4:6	-				
Heading			Inglis	5:6	-	
v			Heading			
Purvis	3:1	-				
Butterworth			v			Inglis 5*:1
						Heading
Sage	5:4.5	-				
Rose						
v			Sage	2:1	-	
Stevens	2:2.5	-				
Barrie		Rose				

FROM THE CHAIRMAN'S BIN

by the Chairman's Binman.

I was going to call this column "from the chairman's toilet", but decided that you can occasionally find something of value in a bin.

ScotTWA Pairs - The Thankyou's

Thankyou to all who came and supported the Pairs, especially Jo Mitchell who masterminded the whole caboodle. Thanks also to the St Andrews Students' Association for the rooms and rocky tables (we've suggested that they buy new 6' x 3' ones). Thankyou to Ben Soares who prepared the leagues, and for designing the 'wipe clean' membership cards. Thankyou to Julian Wiseman and Richard Moore, and Nick Inglis and Tony Heading for a thrilling final, and being the ScotTWA Pairs champions, and Scottish Champions respectively. Good luck to all involved in the future World Title challenges.

ScotTWA Pairs - The Format

At the start of the tournament, we had only a vague idea of how long games would actually take, or exactly how many pairs

would attend. The safest decision was therefore to begin with two All-Plays-All pools, then play the second round by ear. The knockout format seemed the most flexible option, getting the maximum number of players (at least initially) into the second round.

Although IFTWA and ETWA seemed to take charge of the format from the knockout in, it was all more or less as I had envisaged. Top players from the Greek League played lowest qualifiers from the Roman League and vice versa. This gave top pairs best chance into the semis and final - in the end no great upsets happened and the result almost ran to the initial seedings.

The two games per round gave a sense of urgency to the games. A good win would place considerable pressure on the opposing pair for the second half of the tie.

In recent weeks there's been a number of articles on USENET alt.games.tiddlywinks about formats (I have tried to submit an article or two (honest) but my

computing incompetence seems to be no match for the system). I've decided to use this space to draw together some of the ideas, and give a few thoughts of my own.

The two games per round knockout format, by its structure, requires a different approach to matches. Certainly in the second half of a tie, there's no point salvaging a few points -you must do better than your opponents. A 7-0 (or even a 6-1) in the first half of a tie as good as seals the result. It's thought that this must lead to a large number of pot-outs. However there were only two successful attempts in the whole second day. In any league you're just as likely to find numerous pot-outs; it's the number of 6's and 7's that separate the top few pairs. The only way to reduce pot-outs (if that's what you want) would be to count wins, losses and draws, and then use points as a secondary rank. Of course this is pointless (no pun intended) in winks, unlike football, rugby etc., where the share of seven points can distinguish a decisive result from a close match.

The knockout format has the disadvantage of a ragged end. Discarding players at the end of each round is awkward to fit in with a losers' final, which would need to be some kind of random pairs. Such a plate competition didn't happen this year, largely due to a lack of availability of StATS players. If players are coming from hundreds of miles away - and do please come again! - they should get to play as many games as we can fit in. A possible solution to these is to have play-offs for the lower ranks. But this idea was not popular this year when neither of the semi-final losers would allow the other the satisfaction of coming third...

I don't think that a knockout, following first round leagues, is a poorly balanced format. The top ranking pairs after the first round were ensured an 'easier' draw to the final. Each pair in the final had played, and beaten, five of the top eight pairs to get there. In most other sports, such a tournament would consist of pools matches followed by a knockout. So the Pairs was using an established sporting format.

I agree that it was nice to have a final this year. A sizeable audience was able to enjoy the considerable tension of attempted, then counter-, pot-outs, never mind the re-erection of a tombstone. The two halves of the tie were certainly worthy of being a final. But the closing rounds of a league can produce just as much excitement, even if not in the battle for the trophy. The Open Golf, for instance, doesn't need to be match play coming up the 18th to the R&A for a tense finish. If the top pairs aren't drawn against each other until the end, you can still have the same 'second half' of the final. Personally, I'd like to see league matches on both days of next year's ScotTWA pairs, but ultimately that's a decision for the membership.

ScotTWA Pairs -The After Effects

The Pairs has, without doubt, been an immense learning experience for the StATS players. For instance, middle or long term tactics were an unknown quantity. By the end of the first day even the all-StATS pairs were beginning to think ahead, and concentrate on

positioning. Now in club matches, pot-squop has all but disappeared, though 'choosing the right shot' had somewhat eclipsed the need for pace. Only Tim Butterworth refrains from using tactics - as a matter of principle...

In terms of technique, everyone was inspired by the consistency in potting and squopping, never mind the variety of pile shots (at last we find out exactly what the John Lennon Memorial Shot is!). In the following fortnight, we had the most intensive winks sessions as yet seen in St Andrews. This was damped down only by the oncoming flood of exams, but I still see a more eager attitude to practising! With the prospect of Nick Reid coming to St Andrews next year, the chances are excellent for improving standards.

So the Pairs has had a very positive effect on StATS - the only downside is that we get frustrated when not playing to the standard we feel we should be at. Could there be some confusion as to who it was that was playing so many good shots during the tournament?

REFLECTIONS IN TIDDLYWINKS

by BruceTurnbull.

"Ce sont au fond toujours les même systemes, qui, à différent époques, se présentent à l'esprit, revêtus seulement de form différentes; puis, confondant la forme avec le fond, on porte sur le tout un jugement défavorable..."

The systems which confront intelligence remain basically unchanged through the ages, although they assume different forms; thus, through mistaking form for basis, one conceives an unfavourable opinion of the sequence.

This observation rings true through all areas of nature and life; man's inability to comprehend fully, erects barriers of approximations over which a fellow thinker must first hurdle to approach true comprehension. In what I hope will be the first in

F. Hofer, Histoire de la Chimie a series of articles, I intend to suggest a new hurdling technique so that the reader may come one step closer to the "Theory of Everything".

In order that one may approach any give situation from the appropriate angle, one must first consider and postulate on the nature of this "Theory of Everything".

As humans, we may probably best approach this from an egocentric point of view. So what is it that touches every

corner of our lives, that is the concern of our every breathing moment, that plays on our subconscious as we sleep? What is it that troubles both great World leaders and humble undergraduates alike?

It is not a question of how we style our facial hair, nor one of whether the chiroprapist will find time to fit in a quick file and polish before the next tournament. No it is something more fundamental than that. Indeed, is it not that most noble and worthy sport of tiddlywinks

itself, to which I refer? I would propose that it is Winks that is our key to the "Theory of Everything".

But I hear you cry that I witter rashly and that such declarations can not be made without evidence in support. I ask you to look around you and see the wood despite the trees, for Tiddlywinks is reflected everywhere you may turn.

As but an illustration, I should outline the undisputed (at least until now) links between:

Tiddlywinks and 16th Century Anglo - Scots Border Relations

These were Sir Walter Scott's "Days of Romance"; a time when nobleman and farm labourer would ride, side by side, daring forays across the Border, with only the light of the moon and generations of knowledge to guide them swiftly across moorland and marsh.

But as we know today, "there is no such thing as a friendly game." The times were hard. Deadly feud between families was rife; many a small holder would meet his end on the point of a lance or perish as his house was razed to the ground. Lawlessness was the norm, with increased lawlessness in the frequent times of war.

Even for the period in general, the Border was rough. The Borderers' way of life was widely misunderstood and at best ignored, in much the same way that today's winkers battle on against the derision of such

morons as those who run the Aberdeen Athletics Union. Nevertheless, the central governments at the time felt it necessary to discipline the people on the unruly perimeters of their fields of play. So a group of six respected men were selected, an IFTwA rules committee to oversee the six respective Border "Marches" and to bridge the laws of Scotland and England.

Their job was never destined to be an easy one; rarely were troubles simply Scot against Englishman, for allegiances were clan based and therefore local rather than national, often crossing the Border. It was more a case of opposite corners playing together, tactically looking after each other on their appropriate sides of the pot. Even once the red Grahams had been separated from the blue Grahams, there was much work still to be done.

Though the Borderers cannot claim to have invented the protection racket, they, nevertheless, gave the world the terms "blackmail" and to be caught "red-hand". Whether the terms "squop" and "boondock" will still be used 450 years hence, is not mine to say, but the unquenchable desire to express oneself through ballad and lament lives on.

With the unique situation across the Borderland, a unique set of laws had to be created. Perhaps the most striking of these was the form of self-policing known as the "trod". Following a raid, the party whose property had

been captured had the legal right to go in pursuit across the Border and retake the pile. Essentially the recapture of a squop in colour order was known as a "hot trod", whereas a "cold trod" was one after a time delay of, let us say, no more than a round. With disputes over who was the original owners of the property, trod and retrod could continue ad infinitum (or perhaps ad nauseam?) unless a more decisive ambush, from good grouping, could be arranged. It was not unknown for an attempted squop-up to be completely reversed for want of taking that one free rider who could muster an attack sufficient to smash a whole pile.

Obviously, kidnapping during a raid would reduce the risk of a successful trod, prisoners being held in the high walled fortresses, the "peel towers" - even the lunge was known in those far off days.

As the 16th century drew to and close, the central governments at last took control with a policy of docking the Border Reivers far into exile, to continue their battles in Ireland and as mercenaries on the Continent.

I could continue, but perhaps that is for another occasion and another era. Obviously the winkers' history is chronologically insignificant, but the essence of the game that is Tiddlywinks is a highly evolved reflection of both human nature and Nature herself. It may not be the "basis" which we seek, but the form is getting ever closer.

THE SEARCH FOR WINKERS

by Jo Mitchell.

It is over twenty years since the last known Scottish winkers club had its meagre funds seized by the S.R.C. but some still believed we could make contact with winking life between St. Andrews' city walls and Watford Gap. Spurred on by the possibility of a Marchant Trophy win for St. Andrews ScotTWA

set out to try every academic establishment in this bonny land...

We had high hopes for Aberdeen Uni (there had been rumours) but a "no" accompanied by the customary giggle was returned. Most other tries gave frighteningly similar results! At

last, in early December Bruce received a promising letter from Glasgow Uni indicating the possibility that, if an interested party were to inquire, the S.R.C. might be able to forward a message to the current president of UGTwAT!!! (This apparently stands for University of Glasgow Tiddlywinks Association Team.)

We wrote back by return post but in spite of numerous 'phone calls we are still waiting. We are hopeful.

Thanks to Charles Relle passing on my address, I was actually contacted by an ex-Secretary-General of the old Sco(t)TWA. Adrian Grant from Freuchie is now a regular at StATS meetings and is busily catching up with twenty year's worth of rules improvements(?) Unfortunately

Adrian has not seem or heard of another winker in many years. The search continues.

Our latest strategy idea was to take the winks to Scotland. Nigel Money has returned from the National Pairs armed with mat and winks with which to convert his school friends *before* they get to university. Ben's friend from home has taken winks to St. Andrews college, Glasgow and the postgraduate prospectuses to

all Scottish universities are on my bookcase!

Bruce is also attempting to contact old(er) Scottish winkers through the Alumni offices at likely universities. This may prove our biggest lead yet.

THE RATINGS

by Nick Inglis' computer.

Ratings after ETWA Pairs

	Past Year		Current Tournament							
	New R	Old R	Diff	RG	Pl	ppg	RG	Pl	TotSc	PerfR
Larry Kahn	2620	2620	0	49	61	4.861	0	0	0	----
Geoff Myers	2567	2601	-33	79	98	4.296	16	16	62\	2489
Andy Purvis	2564	2539	25	69	90	4.506	16	16	73\	2582
Patrick Barrie	2501	2450	51	79	108	4.654	16	16	92	2597
*Mike Surridge	2484	2444	40	27	27	5.444	16	16	85\	2477
Richard Moore	2476	2422	54	74	81	4.827	16	16	92	2569
Jon Mapley	2465	2450	15	66	77	4.641	16	16	85\	2463
Dave Lockwood	2443	2443	0	62	62	4.411	0	0	0	----
*Arye Gittelman	2410	2410	0	12	12	5.458	0	0	0	----
*Tony Brennan	2400	2400	0	4	4	4.250	0	0	0	----
*Chris Andrew	2390	2390	0	12	13	4.577	0	0	0	----
*Bob Henninge	2365	2365	0	26	26	4.115	0	0	0	----
Charles Relle	2342	2410	-68	71	79	4.462	16	16	63\	2205
Matthew Rose	2341	2365	-24	72	83	4.620	16	16	67\	2275
Nick Inglis	2338	2318	20	89	103	3.945	16	16	67\	2366
Brad Schaefer	2295	2295	0	44	44	3.602	0	0	0	----
Alan Dean	2270	2352	-81	56	56	4.277	16	16	63\	2146
*Charles Frankston	2258	2258	0	9	9	3.611	0	0	0	----
Phil Scarrott	2255	2240	14	68	69	4.217	16	16	64\	2265
Geoff Thorpe	2240	2157	82	66	67	3.502	16	16	64\	2358
Simon Gandy	2222	2251	-29	57	71	4.014	16	16	67\	2160
*Don Fox	2206	2206	0	12	12	3.125	0	0	0	----
Alan Boyce	2201	2204	-4	41	50	3.950	16	16	55\	2195
Julian Wiseman	2177	2186	-9	62	76	4.138	16	16	58\	2155
*Sunshine	2176	2176	0	12	12	3.417	0	0	0	----
Rick Tucker	2166	2166	0	46	46	3.674	0	0	0	----
*Jim Marlin	2128	2128	0	24	24	3.312	0	0	0	----
*Joe Sachs	2119	2119	0	14	23	3.000	0	0	0	----
*Jenny Hall	2115	2115	0	2	2	5.750	0	0	0	----
Rob Cartwright	2113	2086	26	44	44	4.170	16	16	64\	2124
Anthony Heading	2093	2100	-8	76	78	3.878	16	16	58\	2069
Stu Collins	2089	2073	16	48	50	3.590	16	16	49	2111
Alasdair Grant	2069	2088	-19	43	50	3.510	10	10	35	2033
*Jon Marchant	2068	2068	0	25	35	3.371	0	0	0	----
Ed Wynn	2064	2064	0	49	49	3.622	0	0	0	----
*Dave Salter	2044	2044	0	4	4	3.875	0	0	0	----
*John Breeze	2039	2039	0	7	7	3.857	0	0	0	----
Ian Gameson	2036	1970	66	31	41	3.463	16	16	67\	2052
Jason Westley	2018	2051	-33	31	31	3.435	10	10	35	1978
*Bill Renke	2011	2011	0	9	9	2.722	0	0	0	----
Ben Deane	2008	1974	34	63	64	3.341	10	10	34\	2097
*Heather Dean	1999	1999	0	3	3	2.333	0	0	0	----
Stew Sage	1996	1996	0	61	70	3.100	0	0	0	----
*Cyril Edwards	1994	1994	0	24	36	3.236	0	0	0	----
*Jim Carrington	1992	2106	-114	16	16	3.469	16	16	55\	1993
Tim Jeffreys	1988	1988	0	32	32	3.516	0	0	0	----
*Rupert Wilson	1982	1982	0	11	20	3.200	0	0	0	----
*Paul Woodman	1976	1901	75	27	27	3.704	16	16	73\	1982
Chris Wilson	1966	1865	101	58	58	3.259	16	16	64\	2065
David Clarkson	1963	2041	-77	39	50	3.710	16	16	62\	1889
*David Gamez	1941	1941	0	14	14	4.679	0	0	0	----
*Tim Hedger	1940	1940	0	6	6	3.417	0	0	0	----
Phil Carmody	1940	1974	-34	56	56	3.598	10	10	26	1879
*Christopher Rudd	1921	1921	0	9	9	3.167	0	0	0	----
*Phil Clark	1914	1903	11	21	21	3.000	10	10	20	1958
Jon Carlaw	1912	1912	0	38	38	3.368	0	0	0	----
Gavin Keyte	1903	1930	-27	58	62	2.742	10	10	17	1867
Rupert Thompson	1900	1852	48	47	58	2.845	10	10	34\	1975
Steve Phillips	1898	1987	-89	38	38	2.724	10	10	16	1780

*Robin Smale	1890	1890	0	13	13	3.115	0	0	0	----
Nick Reid	1890	1930	-40	49	57	3.430	10	10	26	1834
*Darren Higgins	1890	1890	0	7	7	1.571	0	0	0	----
*Jeremy Money	1890	1890	0	7	7	1.571	0	0	0	----
*Steve Harbron	1886	1886	0	16	18	3.333	0	0	0	----
*Raymond Schoene	1869	1869	0	7	7	2.786	0	0	0	----
James Cullingham	1867	1856	11	90	90	2.967	16	16	49	1894
*Elizabeth Whalley	1842	1842	0	27	27	2.815	0	0	0	----
*James Orwell	1842	1842	0	26	26	3.038	0	0	0	----
*John Stevens	1830	1830	0	9	9	3.611	0	0	0	----
Simon Julier	1812	1812	0	31	33	3.167	0	0	0	----
*Dave Rickard	1798	1798	0	15	15	2.867	0	0	0	----
*Marg Calhoun	1791	1791	0	12	12	2.125	0	0	0	----
*Tim Batham	1778	1778	0	14	14	3.393	0	0	0	----
*Nigel Money	1774	1774	0	7	7	3.214	0	0	0	----
*Graham Turnbull	1759	1759	0	7	7	1.571	0	0	0	----
Andy Milligan	1756	1807	-52	57	57	2.728	10	10	18	1681
*Poss Ellis	1737	1737	0	25	25	2.560	0	0	0	----
*Julian Cole	1725	1720	4	19	19	2.237	10	10	14	1769
*Ben Soares	1721	1721	0	14	14	2.619	0	0	0	----
*Bruce Turnbull	1714	1759	-45	17	17	1.500	10	10	14	1726
Jon Williams	1697	1755	-57	52	52	3.202	10	10	18	1629
Dave Carslake	1694	1633	61	38	39	2.346	10	10	23	1797
*Andrew Busby	1667	1667	0	9	9	1.833	0	0	0	----
Andrew Dominey	1652	1610	42	47	48	2.656	10	10	23	1743
*Barnaby Hoyal	1635	1635	0	14	14	2.357	0	0	0	----
Chris Goddard	1623	1623	0	42	42	2.758	0	0	0	----
Paul Roberts	1616	1702	-85	40	40	2.475	10	10	16	1538
*Paul Lewis	1604	1604	0	14	14	2.250	0	0	0	----
*Naveed Chaudhri	1594	1594	0	21	21	2.048	0	0	0	----
*MP Rouse	1576	1576	0	5	5	0.800	0	0	0	----
*Tom Allen	1574	1574	0	14	14	3.071	0	0	0	----
*Han Kim	1556	1556	0	2	2	3.500	0	0	0	----
*David Jackson	1542	1542	0	7	7	1.214	0	0	0	----
*Sarah Watson	1542	1542	0	7	7	1.214	0	0	0	----
Kate Woolfitt	1533	1598	-65	32	32	2.490	10	10	17	1504
*Chris Strong	1519	1519	0	3	3	0.333	0	0	0	----
*Sophie Agrell	1518	1518	0	10	10	1.700	0	0	0	----
*Tim Butterworth	1498	1543	-45	19	19	2.289	10	10	14	1510
*Ed Porter	1486	1486	0	23	24	1.854	0	0	0	----
Julian Porter	1480	1480	0	49	49	2.612	0	0	0	----
*Kevin Hall	1475	1475	0	14	14	2.679	0	0	0	----
*Helen Emes	1458	1458	0	15	15	3.233	0	0	0	----
Simon Dean	1424	1418	6	46	46	1.989	10	10	20	1467
Andrew Garrard	1422	1422	0	31	31	2.548	0	0	0	----
*Andy Strong	1422	1422	0	4	4	0.000	0	0	0	----
*Jo Mitchell	1382	1378	4	23	23	1.652	10	10	14	1427
*Andrew Young	1382	1382	0	26	26	1.865	0	0	0	----
*Joseph Goodman	1359	1359	0	5	5	2.600	0	0	0	----
*Brian Yamasaki	1353	1353	0	7	7	2.643	0	0	0	----
*Christine Hall	1115	1115	0	3	3	1.667	0	0	0	----