

70

Volume XI.  
Number 4.



March 1961  
Price 6d.

**TABLE  
TENNIS  
DIGEST**

*Official Magazine*

OF THE

**LIVERPOOL & DISTRICT TABLE TENNIS LEAGUE**

# TABLE *Digest* TENNIS

All correspondence must be addressed to the Editor "Table Tennis Digest", "Polwarth", 21 Chatsworth Rd., Ainsdale, Southport

Published during the months of Nov., Jan., Feb., March and April. Season subscription 3s.9d. post free

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Editor: Eric Caird

J. C. McKim and J. D. Pattison

---

Vol. XI

March, 1961

No. 4

---

## "BARTY"

IT is with deep regret that we have to record the passing away on the 12th March 1961 of our President, Mr. C. E. Bartholomew—"Barty" to us all.

In many organisations, the office of President is a purely nominal affair, requiring nothing of the holder other than his name on the letter-heading and a letter of good wishes to be read out each year at the Annual General Meeting. The Liverpool League has indeed been fortunate for many years past, in that Mr. Bartholomew has never seen the office of President in this light. To the contrary, he has regarded it rather as a means of continuing his interest in our affairs without laying himself open to the charge of interfering in our activities. His quiet guidance and sage advice were always readily available to the officials of the League who in times of stress could always turn to him without fear of rebuff. His vigour and keen participation in local events belied his 90 years and lasted right up to the time of his death.

Indeed, it was only a few short months ago that the Chairman had the great personal pleasure of presenting to Mr. Bartholomew on behalf of members of the League, an illuminated address, expressing appreciation of his services over the past 30 years. It was as recent as the beginning of the current season, that "Barty" announced his President's Award (details of which were given in our November issue) and it is good to know that this innovation will be continued.

We extend to the members of Mr. Bartholomew's family, our deepest sympathy in their sad loss and know they will be comforted and fortified by the sure knowledge of the affection and high esteem in which their father was held.

His memory will be perpetuated not only by the cup which bears his name but by the ideals and traditions which he has sought to maintain over such a long period.

We dislike clichés but make no apology for saying on this occasion that truly Liverpool table tennis is the poorer for his passing.

## Question Box

Set by Don Cameron & John McKim

1. The winner of the toss before a game can choose any of three things—what are they?
2. What is the Stamp Award of Merit and who so far have been its recipients?
3. The Liverpool League enter for two cups on a National basis each year—do you know them?
4. Who was the first Men's Singles World Champion?
5. Must the table top be made of wood?
6. Where and when are the next World Championships to be held—who will represent England?

(Answers on page 6)

## Now We Know

**WE** were interested to note that with the World Championships taking place in Peking, the Chinese People's Republic (perhaps not coincidentally) have brought out their own make of ball which they have named "The Double Happy Ball".

The sales blurb which accompanied the launching of the new product officially described the new ball as being both rounder and whiter than all other makes.

So now we know! After all these years—it is not the bat, nor the table nor our failing eye-sight—it's the ball which is at fault.

Rounder and whiter!

Sounds like somebody has been using 'Brand X'.

Thought—would not "slap-happy ball" have been a better name?

***You can rest assured***

with

**THE**

**SEA and BEACON**

**Insurance Companies**

**DERBY HOUSE . EXCHANGE BUILDINGS  
LIVERPOOL, 2**

**Telephone CENTral 0792 (3 Lines)**

## Another Successful Season

(by J. McCAIG)

WITH escape from relegation by the Ladies' 1st team, and no less than three divisional championships by the Men's 'A' team, the Ladies' 'A' team, and the Juniors' 1st team, it can rightly be claimed that all in all, our league teams have, between them, enjoyed another good season. The fixtures have now virtually been completed, only two games remaining to be played, neither of which will affect the issue one way or the other. One of the two matches outstanding is that between the Men's 'A' team and Mid Cheshire, and I feel that this encounter will only provide another two points for the Liverpool team and also better their sets average.

### Overwhelming Superiority

When one considers that the record of our Men's 'A' team reads Played 6, Won 6, Sets for 52, Sets against 8, it will be realised that some of the opposition has been fairly poor. This has in fact been the case in some of the matches, but not in all. The overriding factor in the games I have watched, has been the extra determination of our own players, and I have been most gratified to see Vic Chesham, David Ferguson and Les Mulholand go into matches with the obvious intention of winning. There has been a fine team spirit between them during the season, and Peter Rumjahn, their non-playing captain, can be proud of these three players who have been largely responsible for winning Division 2 West for the second season running.

### A shaky finish

For some unaccountable reason the Ladies' 'A' team seemed to develop a large dose of nerves and managed only one point from their final two matches. Their lead at the head of their division was, however, sufficiently long to avoid any worry that they might lose their hard won spurs at the post, and so once again they are Ladies Division 2 champions. The major share of the honours must go to Mrs. Gladys

Rimmer, Mrs. Myra Lovelady, and Mrs. Pauline Lawrenson, who between them have done the lion's share of the work.

### Juniors too

Perhaps the most impressive of the three championship wins goes to the Junior 1st team who, under non-playing captain Alex Gould, have wrested the title from Warrington. Opposition in the junior division has been rather stronger than in the senior divisions (excepting the 1st division of course), and John Ball, Roy Smith and Robert Eden can be well pleased with themselves. Smith finished with an average of 86%, a most enviable record. Ball and Eden were not very far behind, and between them have been good ambassadors for the Liverpool League. Regrettably, Smith and Ball have now completed their junior careers, and I shall be most interested to see whether either, or both can challenge for a place in either of our senior teams in due course.

### 'A' team not far behind

The juniors second string have also had a goodish season, well led by the ever keen Joe Ellison. As with the 1st team, Rodney Myers, Reg Gray and Alan Tolson have formed an almost unchanged team throughout the season, and provided they win their outstanding match with Warrington, should finish runners-up to their seniors.

### Senior teams finish well

The concern felt all round for the safety of the Ladies' 1st team, has, happily, proved unjustified, the last match against Blackpool resulting in a convincing win by 8 sets to 2. Miss Mansell, Mrs. Moya Jones and Miss Willcox represented the league and for Mrs. Jones in particular it was a happy night, for not only did she win all her sets, but amongst her victims was Miss Kay Benson, one of the Lancashire County selectors. Need I say more!

The men's 1st team will, like the ladies', finish up about midway in the table, and can look back on a pretty good effort.

# CANDID COMMENTS

by The Editor

**E**LSEWHERE in this issue under "Letters to the Editor" is a communication from Jimmy Green in which he confesses himself (perhaps not for the first time) to be "properly confused". Having made that admission, Mr. Green proceeds to take us to task in respect of last month's Candid Comment wherein we criticised the Management Committee regarding the proposed forfeiture of sets by offending clubs.

That Mr. Green should devote a considerable amount of his time and talent to criticising the *Digest* for criticising the Management Committee in respect of a decision which they had not then taken, is evidence of Mr. Green's admitted confused state. But that is not all—having commended the Management Committee on their decision, Mr. Green promptly confuses us all by saying "... however good these players may be, they should follow those forms of conduct usual amongst civilised people, and if they don't, **get shut of them**", which is precisely the policy which we in the *Digest* have been pursuing and in respect of which Mr. Green has launched his vitriolic attack.

So much for Mr. Green.

Turning now to the problem of teams playing short. Let us say right away that we sympathise with the Management Committee in the predicament in which they find themselves and are at issue with them only in relation to the severity of the penalty which should be imposed. We are, and will remain, unrepentant that the "fining" of clubs by the imposition of a 10-0 forfeiture of sets is an unsatisfactory solution—a contention borne out by other contributors to this month's issue of this magazine.

Several writers have expressed their distaste at the prospect of winning a divisional championship by courtesy of the Management Committee but this is only part of the problem as we see it. We suggest that penalties of any kind should satisfy three basic requirements, namely:—

- (a) punish;
- (b) deter;
- (c) be of equal severity to several offenders.

One has only to look at the League Tables to see that in very few cases do these several conditions apply.

Can it be said, for instance, that the forfeiture of two matches at 10-love a-peice is either a punishment or a deterrent to a club languishing at the foot of a League Table and already certain of relegation?

Or, that the penalty is of equal severity between clubs who are contenders for promotion and those in a comfortable mid-way position having no interest in promotion or relegation?

How would the Management Committee deal at the end of a season with a Club or team which has offended in, say, the last half dozen matches of that particular season? In the event of the Management Meeting falling at so late a date as to make it impracticable to forfeit the "next two matches" because less than two remain to be played, would the punishment carry forfeit of the first two matches of the following season?

Is it right to argue that if a Club plays short on, say, four occasions and forfeits "the next two matches at 10-0 a-peice" it should then forfeit the next four matches if it offends on subsequent occasions, and then perhaps the next eight matches should the offence be continued? At what stage would the Management Committee feel that the forfeiture of points becomes a farce?

These questions are posed, not with the idea of poking fun at the Management Committee, but rather in the hope that the greater thought which has been given to this matter might be of some assistance to that body in the formulation of future policy. They are practical points which should not be overlooked simply because the theoretical stages outlined previously have not so far been achieved.

## ON THE LIGHTER SIDE

One of our questions in last month's Question Box brought quite a few interesting letters and comments. We refer to that in which we asked who was the oldest player in the League and for the name of the player who has been playing the longest in the League. As perhaps was not unexpected, the first into the lists was our old friend Jimmy Green who ran true to form by ringing up the Editor and laying claim to having been a member of the League two years before it was formed! Having heard Jimmy's story, we can vouch for its accuracy!

On a more serious note, we have a good claim to stardom from Frank Moore who also includes Edna in his calculations, thereby taking the matter a stage further—into the husband and wife category. We give Frank's letter in full elsewhere—we are just wondering what reaction this might have on other husband and wife partnerships. What, for instance, do the Crafter family have to say on the subject, particularly as they now have a most promising daughter adding lustre to the family name.

Finally, we have had a most delightful letter from a lady who unfortunately wishes to remain anonymous—a request which in the circumstances, we felt bound to honour—who writes to inform us: "I am 65 years of age but for goodness sake don't publish this or my teenage colleagues will present me with a pair of crutches! I cannot claim to have played the longest in the League, as I only started to play table tennis four years ago". Well, well, well . . . 65 years of age and only took up table tennis at the tender age of 61. There is hope for us yet, but more particularly for the Liverpool League as long as this sort of spirit abounds. Well done, our correspondent.

## ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

These words have an ominous ring in most circles, conjuring up in the mind's eye, the picture of a few of

the faithful, huddled round a table, valiantly endeavouring to perform the necessary tasks on behalf of the missing majority.

This perhaps is not a true picture of the Annual General Meeting of the Liverpool League, in that most clubs are usually represented at that function if only to avoid the penalty of the monetary fine for non-attendance but it can hardly be said that the function is exactly invigorating. Perhaps this year will be the exception. We hope it will be.

The columns of the *Digest* during this season have been flooded with complaints and outcries of one kind or another. All well and good—that is what we are here for and we are delighted to give vent to such feelings. But the real place to let off steam of this nature is the Annual General Meeting, when all Clubs (or most of them) are represented, and offending rules can be changed, providing that the argument is reasonable enough to persuade other people to give it their support. We ourselves feel most strongly that several changes should be made at this year's Annual General Meeting and to this end are putting a substantial portion of next month's *Digest* at the disposal of those Clubs who would care to use it as a medium for publicising rule changes or any other matters which they want to raise at the A.G.M. in May as we feel that in so doing, we shall give every individual in the League an opportunity of knowing what is in other people's minds as a result of which the suggestions can be pondered over in an atmosphere of sweet reasonableness and finally if thought appropriate, supported and carried at the Meeting. This facility of course, extends to the Management Committee should they so desire.

To all our readers, we would say in conclusion that the rules are made not only **for**, but **by** you and **YOU** are the only ones who can alter them, and then, only in Annual General Meeting and not by moaning and groaning either to the *Digest* or to one another.

# TIDYING UP

(by John McKim)

A SPECIAL General Meeting was held at the Liverpool Y.M.C.A. on 17th February to discuss rule amendments proposed by the Committee. A large number of rule amendments were put forward by the Committee, but all of these amendments were alterations to the form of the rules and did not alter the substance of them.

I am pleased to say that all the proposals were carried so the rules in your handbook next season will have a completely new look. You may at first find a little difficulty in finding any particular rule but I think you will agree that the new style is a big improvement.

The Committee have felt for some time that the rules were untidy and badly in need of a complete revision so last year a Sub-Committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Hebson took the existing rules apart and drafted the proposals which were submitted to the General Meeting.

In your handbook at present, if you were new to the duty of Club Secretary or Team Captain, you would have to look at Rules 15, 19, 20A, 21, 23, 24 and 25 at least to obtain all the necessary information to conduct a League match. Under the new form of the rules all this information and much more, is contained in Match Regulations which are all grouped together. Similarly, all items dealing with penalties and finance are grouped together.

It is most probable that at the A.G.M. in May the rules will be altered again. Playing short and

not arriving for matches has been on the increase this season and many people have expressed concern at this state of affairs and doubtless various suggestions to cope with the problem will be put forward at the A.G.M.

### Rules do not combat bad manners

It is hard to see, however, how rules can be made to combat bad manners, because turning up late without prior consent or not turning up at all, is just plain bad manners, and a direct insult to your opponents and your own team. We can and do fine the clubs, but this is not effective, as we have proved this season. We can, and have, suspended clubs, and whilst this has undoubtedly had an effect on the clubs suspended, it has not compensated their opponents for being deprived of the games they were entitled to expect as members of the League.

We cannot take action against the individual players in all cases as quite often when a team plays, short only four names appear on the card, and if we cannot penalise the player every time it would be unjust to penalise the player in some instances and the club in other cases.

### Solution Important

Let us hope that this state of affairs can be improved next season for the benefit of table tennis in general and for your benefit in particular. Whether the solution comes from the Committee or the clubs matters little—the important thing is that it comes!

### Question Box — Answers

1. He can serve or choose ends or require his opponent to make first choice.
2. An award made to any person or club for outstanding services in connection of the late Bill Stamp—former Hon. Organising Secretary and Treasurer of the League. Only two awards have so far been made—one to our late Chairman, Jack Hughes, the other to our present Hon. Secretary, John McKim.
3. The Willmot Cup for men and the J.M. Rose Bowl for women.
4. Fred Perry (Lawn Tennis Player) 1929-30.
5. No—any material providing it satisfies other conditions.
6. Peking, China, April 1961. Ian Harrison, Brian Merrett, Jeff Ingber, Diane Rowe, Jean Harrower.

# AROUND THE DIVISIONS

(by our Special Correspondents)

## Division 1

	P	W	L	D	F	A	Pts
Balfour . . . . .	22	18	3	1	147	73	37
Rafters . . . . .	23	17	3	3	155	75	37
Liverpool YM . . . . .	23	17	4	2	145	85	36
Bohemians . . . . .	24	15	3	6	143	97	36
Bootle Y.M. . . . .	23	16	4	3	149	81	35
Anfield . . . . .	24	9	11	4	123	117	22
Oakhill . . . . .	23	10	11	2	112	118	22
Linnets . . . . .	21	6	9	6	99	111	18
L'pool YM A . . . . .	23	6	13	4	103	127	16
Victoria Park . . . . .	22	6	12	4	95	125	16
Litherland . . . . .	23	6	13	4	86	144	16
Victoria Pk A . . . . .	23	6	15	2	98	132	14
Bath Street . . . . .	21	3	13	5	84	126	11
Waterloo Pk . . . . .	23	0	21	2	47	183	2

**B**Y making Balfour forfeit two valuable points, the Management Committee have re-opened the Championship race. What was a foregone conclusion last month is now building up to a grand-stand finish with the odds still in favour of Balfour. Their task is a hard one as their remaining matches include clashes with Bootle Y.M., Liverpool Y.M. and Rafters, three of our best teams. Even if Balfour are pipped on the post there can be little or no satisfaction for any team winning the title under these circumstances.

At the other end of the table there is another great battle taking place—the fight for survival. Not until the last week of the season will it be known which team will accompany Waterloo Park to Division Two.

Litherland have made a fine recovery, winning four of their last five matches. Victories over Oakhill, Waterloo Park, Linnets and Victoria Park 'A' have doubled their points tally, and they now have a good chance of retaining their status.

Bath Street are now in the danger zone and they will need a good points return from their outstanding fixtures. Their position is not as bad as it appears for they have played fewer matches than their nearest rivals and can still reach safety by virtue of their own efforts.

## Division 2

	P	W	L	D	F	A	Pts
Waterloo Dk . . . . .	23	19	2	2	170	60	40
Rafters A . . . . .	23	16	4	3	145	85	35
Beauclair . . . . .	24	16	6	2	151	89	34
Balfour A . . . . .	23	16	6	1	143	85	33
Bootle YM A . . . . .	23	15	5	3	135	95	33
Victoria Pk B . . . . .	23	13	5	5	130	100	31
Bohemians A . . . . .	23	12	8	3	135	95	27
RAFA . . . . .	23	10	9	4	122	108	24
Oakhill A . . . . .	24	4	14	6	91	149	14
Bath St. A . . . . .	23	5	15	3	94	136	13
Cadwa . . . . .	23	5	16	2	77	153	12
Anfield A . . . . .	23	4	16	3	74	156	11
Litherland A . . . . .	23	2	17	4	72	158	8
Lucem . . . . .	21	3	17	1	69	141	7

**W**ATERLOO DOCK lost their second match of the season to their closest rivals, Rafters 'A', due mainly to doubles scored by Casselman and Blackmore. Lovelady and Tobin added a set apiece, and there it was—6-4. But then Bootle Y.M. threw a large sized monkey wrench into the works by dishing out a 7-3 hiding to Rafters. Victoria Park 'B' have slipped into third place right on the heels of Rafters, and as I write there is only one point in it, Beauclair and Bootle Y.M. being only a point behind again. Four teams covered by two points and all chasing the Dock who may still be overtaken. This is better than the well-known one horse race. While the Dock are still favourites for promotion, to forecast the probable runners-up is best done by pulling one name out of the hat.

At the other end of the table another scrap is going on between four teams to avoid the drop to Division 3. Cadwa appear to have saved themselves, and with the help of young Mr. Eden next year may prove the team they were a few years back, but there are still headaches at Bath Street, Anfield and Litherland. Lucem seem doomed despite a valiant last half fight. Last month Jack Seddon's loyalty to Waterloo Dock was mentioned. How about the loyalty of Jim Rimmer to Lucem? Ever since the formation of the Wirral League Jim has appeared in the Lucem



## Around the Divisions — continued

team—helping them to win promotion to the 1st Division, and remaining with them in the darker days, while so many others have been and gone. While he knows that his ability could gain him a place in most 1st Division sides, he has stayed with his own Club throughout, and one has the feeling that however far Lucem may descend in the League, Jim Rimmer will be there with them. Loyalty may not win medals, but it does win admiration!

J.R.G.

### Division 3

	P	W	L	D	F	A	Pts
University	25	21	0	4	174	76	46
Fairlawn	23	17	4	2	158	72	36
L.P.A.S.	22	15	3	4	138	82	34
Rafters B	22	13	4	5	127	93	31
Bootle YM B	23	14	9	0	131	99	28
Linnet A	23	12	10	1	124	106	25
Linacre	23	10	9	4	130	100	24
Balfour B	21	10	9	2	108	102	22
L'pool YM B	24	9	11	4	123	117	22
Eng. Electric	23	8	10	5	116	114	21
Cadwa A	25	5	14	6	108	142	16
Victoria Pk C	24	6	17	1	88	152	13
Harold House	26	3	19	4	71	189	10
Wtrloo Pk A	23	0	23	0	41	189	0

**C**ONGRATULATIONS to the University team of L. Rosenbloom, M. Snyder, C. Crossley, I. Prosser, D. Rodway, with occasional help from R. Charman, J. Stoddart and R. Howard, for proving beyond all doubt that they are the best combination in the Third Division. Unfortunately, three of their team at least will not be able to play for University in the Second Division next season, but no doubt recruits will come along to take their places.

The battle for second place, at the time of writing, is in a most interesting stage. Either Fairlawn or Police could win the promotion place and accompany University into Division 2. Bootle Y.M. 'B' have dropped out of the hunt after two successive home defeats against the Police and the University, and also losing at Linnets 'A'.

The vital promotion game between Police and Fairlawn at Anfield Road, ended in a draw. A. Heague (Police) won his two events beating P. Whalley and L. Carter, while E. Mooney (Fairlawn) won his two,

defeating D. Gould and R. Hough, both in the third game. However, Gould and Hough won their other games and with J. Moneyenny's victory over Whalley, completed their five successes. B. Leeson, J. Leeson and L. Carter won one each for Fairlawn and so managed to take one vital league point.

Waterloo Park 'A' knew at the start of the season that they were in for a tough time. The loss of established and experienced players has considerably weakened all their teams yet they have made an effort to fulfil their fixtures. I hope their 'A' team players, in particular, captained by A. Turner, have enjoyed their games, in spite of losing so regularly, and perhaps in a lower division next season they may taste the fruits of victory once again.

Victoria Park 'C' have now succeeded in escaping relegation and recent wins over Waterloo (6-4), Cadwa 'A' (6-4) and Harold House (8-2) have ensured that the team will continue to hold its Third Division status. B.L.

### Division 4

	P	W	L	D	F	A	Pts
Sefton Gen.	23	21	0	2	167	63	44
Lussac	23	17	4	2	144	86	36
Bohemians B	23	16	4	3	156	74	35
Victoria Pk D	22	15	4	3	135	85	33
Wtrloo Dk A	23	8	7	8	126	104	24
Linnet B	23	11	10	2	124	106	24
Anfield B	23	10	9	4	122	108	24
L.P.A.S. A	22	8	10	4	104	116	20
Balfour C	22	6	12	4	86	134	16
Bath St. B	22	7	14	1	92	128	15
Oakhill B	23	5	13	5	96	134	15
Cadwa B	22	6	14	2	101	119	14
Litherland B	23	4	17	2	68	162	10
Bootle YM C	23	2	19	2	63	167	6

**B**ARRING an epidemic of broken legs Sefton assured themselves of winning this Division by beating Lussac by a fair margin of 7 sets to 3, giving themselves a 5 point lead for the run-in. Lussac seem well set to accompany them upwards, but they cannot afford to be complacent about it yet.

At the bottom, Bootle Y.M. are now doomed, but Balfour 'C' gained

**Around the Divisions — continued**

three valuable points and have pulled up to within two points of Cadwa and Litherland as I write. However, sets average is against them, and they will have to do something pretty drastic in the last few matches if they are not to taste 5th Division play next season. Their task is not impossible even though highly improbable at this late stage.

It is remarkable to see the difference in the number of players appearing in the top and bottom teams in this division. Sefton have called on only six players throughout, C. Bickerton having played three times as reserve. Lussac have had only seven players in their team, P. Blackburn and C. Goodall being the willing souls to turn up on the rare occasions that the regulars couldn't make it. But Litherland have had 17 players, Cadwa 12, Bootle 11 and Balfour 10, which seems to indicate that a settled team pulls together a lot better than does one composed of five individuals who may or may not play again together. It does seem that team troubles can account for teams struggling at the lower end of a league table.

L.P.A.S. are worth an honourable mention. While nicely placed midway in the table, they have been upset several times by duties, and it is more than probable that had they been in a position to put out their full team every week they would have been much higher. Yet, disappointing as this must be, they are, as they have always been, a good crowd to play against and a pleasure to meet. G.

**Division 5**

	P	W	L	D	F	A	Pts
Wvrtree Lab	22	22	0	0	193	27	44
L'pool C.C.	20	16	2	2	147	53	34
Rafters C.	21	14	6	1	126	84	29
Fairlawn A.	21	13	6	2	136	74	28
Wvrtree Bap.	21	13	6	2	135	75	28
L'pool P.O.	20	10	6	4	108	92	24
Nalgo	22	9	10	3	103	117	21
Bohemians C	21	8	10	3	97	113	19
Bootle Nalgo	19	5	10	4	86	104	14
Telecomms	22	5	13	4	85	135	14
Co-op.	20	2	16	2	60	140	6
Domstc Miss.	20	2	18	0	39	161	4
Wtrloo Pk B	17	0	16	1	15	155	1

**B**Y the time these notes are read, the 5th Division should be well sewn up. Wavertree Labour and Liverpool C.C. will be promoted and Domestic Mission and Waterloo Park 'B' will be relegated.

This has not been any easy season for the teams in this division. They have had to face up to two very good teams in Wavertree Labour and Liverpool C.C. and although the Cricket Club haven't run Wavertree very close, they have proved their class by leaving the rest of the division far behind.

The superiority of Wavertree Labour was underlined in the semi-final of the Rumjahn Cup, when they beat Liverpool C.C. by ten sets to nil. The star turn of this match was Pete Hurworth who beat A. McIntosh in straight games, 21-3, 21-8. Wavertree's strength is further underlined by the knowledge that the Cricket Club have beaten 3rd Division sides on their way to the semi-final.

Taking all this into consideration, plus the fact that Hurworth and Farquharson are currently representing the Business House League 1st and 2nd teams respectively in the Lancashire and Cheshire League, it seems hardly likely that any team below the 2nd Division will beat them.

Rafters 'C' are having a very successful season and will most likely finish the season in third position. Mrs. K. Casselman and Mrs. M. Lovelady are in regular attendance and are winning with monotonous regularity.

R.McE.

**Division 6**

	P	W	L	D	F	A	Pts
Wav. Lab. A	24	23	0	1	205	35	47
Fairlawn B	24	17	4	3	156	84	37
St. Edwds OB	21	16	3	2	143	67	34
Beauclair A.	23	15	4	4	161	69	34
Crawfords	23	12	7	4	140	90	28
L'pool YM C	21	11	4	6	131	79	28
University A	23	11	10	2	124	106	24
L.P.A.S. B	23	7	10	6	105	125	20
Bath St. C.	22	7	11	4	102	118	18
Stanley Hse	24	7	14	3	89	151	17
Cadwa C	23	6	15	2	96	134	14
Beauclair B.	24	3	18	3	64	176	9
St. Eds. OB A	22	3	19	0	51	169	6
Anfield C	23	2	21	0	38	192	4

**Around the Divisions** continued

**T**HE Hyde Cup semi-finals are now over, and Wavertree Labour are in the final as expected. The re-shuffle of the Y.M. team with their Nos. 4 and 5 playing at 1 and 2 did not have any effect, although Mal Coltman almost brought off the shock win of the season before going down deuce in the third to Trevor Owens, the Wavertree No. 1.

Crawfords drew with Brenka in the other semi-final and on the night of the re-play turned up to find themselves without any opponents. They have claimed a walk-over and though Brenka have appealed to the Management Committee, I think we shall see a Crawfords/Wavertree Labour final.

In the Brenka game, Bill Wood, of Crawfords, added another two scalps to his bag, and seems to be doing rather well. His record shows wins over several of the players listed in the divisional averages. Another player whose name does not appear in the top twelve is Lyn, of Stanley House, who is winning sets consistently. A pity he can't play more often because his club is capable of a better position with him as a regular.

Honourable mentions to G. Benson, of Crawfords, who inflicted on Ron McEvoy, of Wavertree Labour, one of his rare defeats in this division and to young Pat Lawrence, of Cadwa, who has improved so greatly since the season got under way. The Cadwa club have a fair number of promising young players, and should have no worries about their future playing strength. J.T.

**Division 7**

	P	W	L	D	F	A	Pts
Crawfords A	24	22	1	1	191	49	45
L'pool CC A	23	20	2	1	172	58	41
Wav. Lab. B	23	19	2	2	153	77	40
Rafters D	23	14	7	2	139	91	30
Nalgo A	23	11	6	6	132	98	28
Eng. Elec. B	24	9	8	7	124	116	25
Eng. Elec. A	23	11	10	2	119	111	24
Fairlawn C	23	10	11	2	110	120	22
Linnet C	23	7	11	5	109	121	19
Bootle YM D	22	7	12	3	95	125	17
Tech. Studs.	23	5	14	4	87	143	14
Lewis's	24	3	19	2	81	159	8
Crawfords B	23	3	19	1	57	173	7
Oakhill C	23	2	21	0	51	179	4

**I**N Division 7 we still have Liverpool Cricket Club 'A' and Crawfords 'A' heading the table. However, both these teams dropped a point last month. Cricket Club drew at Wavertree Labour 'B' with L. Hogg and J. Branagan winning both of their sets and P. Quinn winning both of his for Cricket Club.

Crawfords 'A' drew with Linnets 'C' in a match in which not one set went to three, W. Griffiths and K. Dutch won two each for Linnets while G. Benson and R. Conley won two each for Crawfords.

When the two English Electric teams met the two Captains had to play each other in the final set of the match. It was won when W. Sill, of the 'B' team, beat J. Coleman, of the 'A' team, with the score 21-13, 34-32. The result of the match was a draw.

At the bottom of the table, Lewis's have picked up a few more points which should keep them in Division 7. Lewis's rise leaves Crawfords 'B' and Oakhill 'C' at the bottom.

The eventual winners of the division now seem certain to be decided in the last match between Cricket Club and Crawfords 'A' at Liverpool C.C. It should be a very close thing but I think Cricket Club will just make it. G.M.

**Division 8**

	P	W	L	D	F	A	Pts
Brenka	18	18	0	0	169	11	36
University B	21	16	2	3	151	59	35
Brenka A	18	15	2	1	137	43	31
Colonsay	21	12	6	3	134	76	27
Wtrloo Pk C	21	11	6	4	119	91	26
Litherland C	23	11	12	0	113	117	22
Wav. Lab. C	21	10	9	2	115	95	22
L'pool CC B	23	9	12	2	119	111	20
L.Y.C.A.	20	7	10	3	104	96	17
Linnet D	22	7	14	1	94	126	15
Sefton A	21	4	16	1	51	159	9
Harold Hse A	22	3	17	2	38	182	8
Litherland D	22	2	18	2	24	196	6

**I**F the Editor permits, this is where I blow my top! Five teams have dropped out of this division this season. Co-op 'A' and Lewis's did so early on, and had good reason for so doing, since they could not guarantee to field a full team every week. Sefton is more difficult to

**Around the Divisions — continued**

understand, since they have got quite good reserve strength even though Bickerton is badly hurt (I wish him a speedy and full recovery). Harold House have done this for the second season in succession, and the Management Committee might be well advised to seriously consider any future application from this team, whose record over the past ten seasons shows a decided inclination to drop out unless successful. A poor spirit one would think, and I feel that this team can hardly be held up as an example for others to follow. But the one which is completely inexcusable is Litherland 'D'. They came in at a late stage, played about 5 matches without attempting to pull up arrears, and then, just dropped out again. This might be overlooked

had Litherland not got enough players, but in their 'C' team there have been 18 players this season, and of these, 13 MUST BE RESERVES who were eligible to play for the 'D'.

All players of these teams having paid for the *Digest* will receive their copy and I hope that the members of the Litherland 'D' team will be pleased with my reaction to their stupendous efforts in this division.

I have left no space for any comments on the doings of the clubs loyal to the division, but I hope that next month's effort will be enough to make up for this deficiency.

Although it is not usual to put one's name to these notes, I feel that the Editor may be persuaded to let me do so in view of the above. Jim Green

## Women's Notes

(by Eileen Mansell)

### Women's Division

	P	W	L	D	F	A	Pts
Rafters . . . . .	22	20	1	1	165	55	41
Bohemians . . . . .	20	17	0	3	165	35	37
Cadwa . . . . .	20	17	1	1	163	37	36
Bath St. . . . .	22	15	5	2	151	69	32
Oakhill . . . . .	22	14	5	3	147	73	31
Wvrtree Lab. . . . .	20	12	7	1	120	80	25
Linnet . . . . .	21	8	10	3	114	96	23
Cadwa A . . . . .	21	10	11	0	100	110	20
Orrell . . . . .	20	8	10	2	107	93	18
Bibbys . . . . .	22	6	11	5	98	122	17
Bohemians A . . . . .	20	7	13	0	83	117	14
Huntley & P . . . . .	22	5	17	0	73	147	10
Waterloo Pk . . . . .	21	4	17	0	57	153	8
Rafters A . . . . .	21	2	19	0	29	181	4
Bootle Nalgo . . . . .	22	0	22	0	8	212	0

**T**HE season is fast reaching its climax and the top of the table is still in the balance. Rafters, Bohemians and Cadwa are all in the hunt and I could not predict at this point what will happen. The three teams are very evenly matched and they have been level pegging nearly all season. They have dominated the league for quite a few years and I can see no reason why they wont continue to do so for some little time to come.

Oakhill are not far behind but unfortunately they have not any reserves to fall back on.

Linnetts and Bath Street are all doing well but I cannot see them overtaking any of the leading three teams. However, the future can take care of itself.

The standard is very high so it is up to those younger players to put in some hard practice and try to raise it to a much higher level.

There have been one or two individual surprises in the League. B. Pinnington, of Huntley & Palmers, had a thrilling match with Pauline Lawrenson, of Cadwa, scraping home 23-21 in the third game—this, unfortunately for H. & P., was their only win of the match. Lil Upton and Lil Jenkins, of Orrell, both defeated Doris D'Arcy in their match against Rafters.

Muriel Cox and Mabel Francis have both claimed Joyce Randell's scalp this season—this shows the improvement of both Mabel and Muriel as neither have beaten Joyce before.

Old rivals meet again in the final of the Bartholomew Cup which this year will be between Bohemians and Cadwa. In view of the even strength of both these sides, it is more than likely that a re-play will be necessary.

## A MUG'S GAME

(by Ray Hebson)

"ONLY a mug would waste time and money entering for a tournament without any hope of winning!"

Words to this effect are frequently heard during a League tournament. The observation is usually made with great emphasis and appears to give its perpetrator considerable satisfaction, as though it were the result of some very deep and original thinking. In fact the idea embodied in the remark is neither original nor confined to table tennis. Happily the matter can be put in its true perspective, as it is current editorial policy for the *Digest* to be broadened to take in affairs other than local table tennis. So let us transport ourselves, in imagination, to one of the amphitheatres of ancient Rome. Listening carefully outside the changing-room, we hear one gladiator say to another: "Only a mug would take part in combat without any hope of winning!"

How very true! A gladiator who was defeated but not killed in combat was at the mercy of spectators, who would decide by voting whether he should live or die.

Re-attuning our minds to the present time and to the sport of table tennis, we find nothing in the regulations of either the Open or the Closed which puts a player in peril of his life if he loses. The Merseyside Open regulations do not mention losers (except that losing semi-finalists in the Men's Singles are entitled to prizes) while the

Liverpool Closed regulations say that a loser may have to umpire the next set and that first-round losers in some events are eligible for the Consolation Singles.

How do we compare, as regards enlightenment, with the ancient Romans? As a loser, would you rather

- (a) umpire and possibly be consoled,
- or
- (b) die?

Our venue for this year's Closed will again be Dingle Vale School, as our appeal last year for alternative suggestions brought forth no response. It is unfortunate that the school hall lacks the magnificence of the amphitheatres of old, some of which were huge and would hold up to 80,000 spectators; but our ambitions are modest, and one-hundredth of that number watching the Closed would satisfy us very well. So even though it is too late to enter for this year's Closed it is still possible to come and watch. On Finals Night (April 8th) we hope to have an interval, during which the canteen will be open and players, spectators and officials can meet each other before parting for the close season. If you do come as a spectator the organisers will be happy to see you. It is not necessary to justify your non-playing presence, so don't bother telling everyone that only a mug would waste time and money entering for a tournament without any hope of winning.

## THE SPORTS SPECIALIST

TABLE TENNIS EQUIPMENT A SPECIALITY  
Championship Tables, Bats, Balls, Nets, Shoes and Clothing.

All makes of named Bats and Tables supplied.

# JACK SHARP Ltd

TELEPHONE . . . . ROYAL 4793/4

VISIT OUR SHOWROOMS:-

**36-38 Whitechapel, Liverpool 1**

## Letters to the Editor

Dear Sir,

It is more in hope than anger that I sit down to write a letter to the *Digest* to suggest a way out of the present "state" of Liverpool table tennis. Reading through the February issue the outstanding point is that a club has been penalised for repeatedly failing to turn up with a full team and the Secretary has stated the case for new rules to penalise these offenders. The Management Committee ruling has been criticised by the Editor, but why? Whatever decision the Committee arrived at would have been criticised; could they not have banned the particular team from playing for the rest of the season?

Further on in the *Digest* it appears that Waterloo Park 'B' are incapable of turning up with a full team. And so the sorry tale continues, players turning up after night school, players failing to arrive, not one member of a team present before 7.45 or 8 p.m., etc.

What is the solution? I think it is simple—Rule 23 states, however it is read—that the starting time is sometime between 7.30 and 8 p.m., and the present trouble is a natural progression of this ruling. Therefore I suggest a clear ruling "that the starting time shall be 7.30 p.m. (or any other realistic time) and all games of absent players will be claimed after this time. Three such offences to entail automatic disqualification from Liverpool Table Tennis for the remainder of the season." Yes, we would lose 20-30% of the League players but isn't it worth it to prevent the present chaos from continuing?—and continue it will, until we get to the real root of the trouble.

As a footnote, I would like to forestall the player who says "Oh yes, but I can't arrive before 7.45 p.m. because of work". Then, Sir, the answer is simple—you can't play League-Table Tennis.

Yours faithfully,

G. C. Vick,  
Victoria Park T.T.C.

Dear Sir,

It is with regret that I feel that the following facts should be brought to your notice.

On arriving at Norwood Community Centre at 7.25 p.m. for the match against Litherland which was scheduled to start at 7.30 p.m., we were greeted by the caretaker who showed us into the room where the match was to be played. As there were no members of the opposing team present, I enquired from the caretaker if any of them had been to the room. He replied that "they usually arrived about 8 p.m." My colleagues and I set up the table which was lying in the corner of the room and waited for the opposition to arrive (an unusual course for a visiting team). At 8 p.m., two of the opposing players arrived, but as the Captain was not present they were unwilling to fill in the card. At 8.20 p.m. (by which time I confess that I was more than somewhat annoyed by the whole affair), we again asked the Litherland players who were present to fill in the card, which they did.

After three of the games had been played with balls belonging to the Lussac Club (there being none supplied for use by the Home team), a further member of their team arrived at 8.40 p.m. All the games possible involving only three of their players were played, the other two members of the opposition failing to arrive at all.

Yours faithfully,

P. Blackburn,  
Lussac, T.T. Secretary

Dear Sir,

Now you have got me properly confused. In the January issue I read an attack on the Management Committee for not getting tough. In the next issue an attack on them for GETTING tough. Please elucidate.

We all know that among our number there are a few who set themselves above all criticism, above all League rules, and above all expressions of normal decent behaviour. These odd forms of

### Letters to the Editor — continued

life do not turn up to matches or amble in at any old time which suits themselves, without apology. **THESE ARE THE ONES WHO SHOULD BE CONDEMNED.** The Management have decided to impose heavier forms of penalty for such offences, and crikey, what a squeal goes up! Good show. The majority are right behind them, merely because table tennis would be far better off without these bigheads (or alternatively, ill-mannered louts). However good these players may be, they should follow those forms of conduct usual amongst civilised people and if they don't, get shut of them.

Having regard to the forms of penalty imposed by the Management, possibly they have been mistaken, but at least they have shown a determination to clean the game up, and for that we should be grateful, not abusive. And there is the old saying that "the man who never made a mistake, never made anything". Sure they make mistakes — who doesn't? But the people to abuse are the offenders who create the necessity for the penalties in the first place, NOT the people trying to clean up. For I believe that the Committee will learn by their errors and will impose penalties equally strict as the recent ones, but perhaps in such a way as to affect no other Clubs.

I rather care for the underlying assumption that the Management are infallible and should never err. It comes to my mind that they are ordinary people, elected by the Clubs to run the affairs of the League within the framework of the rules which we have made.

They are not supermen, and they deserve all the backing possible from every right-minded member of the League for showing their teeth.

This is not to be taken as a precedent. For years I have been using the Committee as a sort of "Aunt Sally" and will probably do the same at some future time, but NOT when they are trying to clean up the game in Liverpool for the better enjoyment of the better-mannered players in the League. So, for once, count me on the side of the Angels.

Jim Green,  
Linnets T.T.C.

Dear Sir,

I first registered with the League for North Liverpool T.T.C. season 1929/30. The following season I was introduced to the Fairfield T.T.C. (now Oakhill) by the late Mr. L. E. Forrest, who founded the Club. The war came, Oakhill closed down and I registered for L.P.A.S. with Renny Crafter. I reopened Oakhill T.T.C. in 1945/46 and was registered up to last season. This makes 30 years playing in the Liverpool and District Table Tennis League.

Regarding Edna:— Edna joined Oakhill T.T.C. during season 1935/6 and registered the following year. The war years intervened, also two years not registered, which makes 19 years registered and still playing.

The aggregate for both of us has reached 49 years registered. I guess I'm not the oldest in years, but at 54 last season, you know, it could be.

Frank Moore

*We supply:—*

BUKTA Table Tennis Shirts in all colours.  
Johnny Leach, Barna, Bergman etc. T.T. Bats,  
Sandwich Bats. Tournament and Club Tables,  
Nets and Posts.

*in fact* **EVERYTHING FOR TABLE TENNIS**

**HENRY WHITTY & SON**

LIMITED

**15 BASNETT ST., LIVERPOOL 1**

Open All Day Saturday

Telephone ROyal 3011

Letters to the Editor -- continued

Dear Sir,

In reply to Question Box in the Table Tennis Digest for February, may I "stake my claim" in answer to Question 6(a).

I am 65 years of age, but for goodness sake don't publish this or my teenage colleagues will present me with a pair of crutches! I have no claim to No. 6(b) as I only started to play table tennis four years ago.

Yours faithfully,  
Name and address supplied.

Dear Sir,

Reference Jim Green's letter in last month's issue, I shall not be joining his Fan Club if he again misconstrues what I write:—

1. I did not say showers are a "must" for changing in, I suggested it was not hygienic to go home in playing clothes. It is not healthy either especially on winter nights—showers would be a help.
2. The phrase "lower garments" which J.G. finds amusing was taken from a previous article in the *Digest* by a distinguished correspondent on the correct attire for both sexes. Furthermore, changing, to my way of thinking, constitutes a complete "strip" not easily achieved in some of the "spots" in which J.G. does his quick-change act.
3. Ladies are generally more correctly attired than the men, they seldom change however no doubt due to the primitive surroundings which J.G. finds so convenient.
4. Mr. Green is quite right in saying that lack of facilities is an excuse for not changing, but here I am safe in the very good company of the majority of League players who are already changed, apart from pumps, on arrival, doubtless preferring the cleanliness, safety, warmth of their homes to the dismal, dusty, damp, dark dungeons of places like the cellars of Bootle Town Hall.

Harold Cohen,  
Liverpool C.C.

Dear Editor,

I agree with your remarks regarding the Management Committee's decision of forfeiting points for continual shortage of players and the Committee do not seem to think on the lines of "COMPETITION". Points given away like this tends to reduce enthusiasm to either gain promotion or escape relegation, and some clubs benefit unfairly.

A similar instance occurred when two of Waterloo Dock's players were unable to get to the venue due to dense fog, and when all possible games had been played, the score stood at 5-1 in the Dock's favour and because the card was signed by both Captains at 5-5, the Committee ruled that in accordance with Rule 25, the match should stand as a draw. Both teams considered this very unfair, and as the matter was reported the day after the match, a replay was expected. This "point" could have a marked effect on both promotion and relegation battles. (I have correspondence available should you wish to read it.)

The Committee should appreciate that points have to be earned fairly, and the enjoyment in any sport is the "COMPETITION" and no club wants "GIVE AWAY POINTS".

Divisional Notes for Division 2 wanted to know how long Waterloo Dock team had been together. The present team has only been together for five years but when we first entered the Liverpool League in 1948, three players—J. Seddon, L. Burrows and C. Dunn were playing then and are still playing in the first team. Of the other two, A. Byrne has been in the team for nine years and L. Sille for five years.

I only hope the Management Committee's decision regarding the incompleting match does not prevent our gaining promotion to Division 1, after journeying from the North Region 13 years ago.

Yours faithfully,

J. C. Seddon,  
Hon. Sec., Waterloo Dk T.T.C.