

Volume XIV.

Number 3.



FEBRUARY, 1964

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", 83 Lark Lane, Liverpool 17.

Published during the months of November, January, February, March and April.

## EDITORIAL BOARD :

Editor : **Albert Montgomery.**

**J. Green (News), T. H. Edge (Features), J. McKim, A. Upton and D. Cameron**

---

Vol. XIV

February, 1964

No. 3

---

## EDITORIAL

In my last Editorial I asked you all to forget the past and to look at the future, which appears to me to be the only progressive attitude to adopt. However, there is one trend which has evolved in the recent past, and has nearly reached its climax. That is the extinction of those clubs run solely for table tennis. I think I am right in saying that there are now only four such clubs left in the League, although there are another few who are partially independent insofar that they do conduct their own affairs, but rely on renting premises from other clubs for one, two, or three nights per week.

The other clubs are all 'works' sides or are subsidiaries of clubs catering primarily for other sports such as lawn tennis or cricket. The specialist clubs do not survive without many headaches in these days of rising costs. Rising subscriptions to meet additional expenses make recruiting of new members far from easy, so it seems that it is to the organisations with a variety of interests that we must look for future members of the League. It is a great pity that these independent clubs are on the wane, but it is a result of "progress".

It is a matter for deep regret that so many members of the L.B.A. table tennis section are lost to the sport when they reach the maximum age for the L.B.A. clubs, and it seems to me that, whilst the L.B.A. do a magnificent job of work amongst the youngsters, a senior club, run by these clubs on the same premises for those no longer eligible, so that these lads might continue as long as they wished, would be a boon, not only to the lads themselves, but also to the League, to whom they would otherwise be lost.

I suppose that all of these difficulties would be resolved if there were no money problems, for this, I am sure, is the real reason for the decline of the specialist T.T. clubs, and their reduction in numbers is a great loss to the game. The past few seasons has seen the demise of Victoria Park and Litherland, and the merging of Oakhill and Linnets with other sports organisations (among others). However, I feel quite confident that, whatever form the teams may take, or from whichever type of organisation they may come from, our game will continue to flourish on a competitive level for many years to come in Liverpool.

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR E.T.T.A.**

At the E.T.T.A. Special General Meeting held in London on January 18th, sweeping changes were made in the controlling Council of the E.T.T.A. At present an Executive, consisting of the usual Officers, plus about a dozen elected Members control the affairs of the organisation in a similar fashion to the Committee of our own League. Under the new set-up which was passed at this Meeting, a small group of 3 Officers and 4 elected Members will deal with the day to day running of affairs, and a National Council, consisting of one representative from each county will meet at least three times a year to govern broad policy.

**NO INCREASE IN FEES!**

Resolutions put forward at this meeting which would have increased fees were defeated, but a change in the fees structure was passed. At present we pay 9/- for each Club in the League, plus 2/6 for each additional team entered, plus a levy of 6d. per head in players. The new fees are a straight 8/- per team with no levy. This will represent a small saving of about £1 per annum to our League.

Another change passed at this Meeting was to authorise a County to use the votes of any League in the County which did not claim them at an A.G.M. Thus doing away with the proxy vote system which has been in operation until now.

**MICKLESFIELD MEDALS****REVIVED.**

The Micklesfield Medals competition is being re-introduced into the League this season. This is a competition between representative teams picked from each of the four 3rd divisions, each division playing against each of the others ~~once~~ only. The Committee have approached players who are actually playing in the various divisions to ask them to be responsible for selecting the teams and arranging the matches, and the following have agreed to help in this way—Division 3A, Mr. E. Jane (English Electric); Division 3B, Mr. T. H. Edge (Crawfords); Division 3C, Mrs. I. Sturgeon (Beauclair) and Division 3D, Mr. J. A. Lambert (English Electric). The Committee have laid down no rules regarding selection except that no more than one player from any one Club can play for any one team. We have asked that these matches be played during March, and I would ask all Club Secretaries to co-operate with the Selector for their division in the provision of information regarding their players, and in the provision of venues for their matches. The draw for these matches is: 3A v. 3B, 3B v. 3D, 3C v. 3A, 3D v. 3C, 3C v. 3B, 3D v. 3A. If the people concerned can arrange the matches and allocate venues early, I am sure our Editor will publish these details in the next issue.

**OBITUARY.**

Members of the League will have learned with deep regret of the death of Mrs. Micklesfield, wife of Mr. Fred Micklesfield, a former Vice-President of the League and donor of the "Micklesfield" Medals, and we tender our sincere condolences to Mr. Micklesfield and his Family in the great loss which they have sustained.

**YOUTH TEAM WELL SET.**

January has been a quiet month for fixtures with neither Ladies' teams engaged at all. The "A" team match v. Blackpool was postponed and rearranged as you will see from the fixture list below. With the Men's 1st team also idle, and the "A" team registering a convincing 9-1 win against the Business Houses "A", the spotlight must turn to our Youth team. Despite a long journey up to Barrow, and fielding two reserves the team chalked up another excellent win by 9 sets to 1. Reg Gray (LPAS) and Eddie Birch (Wavertree Labour) came into the side at short notice to join Alan Tolson and acquitted themselves well. The Youth team must now have a great chance of winning the division. Matches against Blackburn and Burnley during February will settle the issue one way or the other.

**JUNIORS ALSO ?**

The Junior team could emulate the Youth team, but will they? Despite a clean sheet so far, the team faces three tricky fixtures with Wirral, Bolton and Stockport. If the lads can win these games they will most certainly win the division, and at the same time will have well earned the honour.

**FORTHCOMING ATTRACTIONS.**

Attendances at inter-city matches continues to be negligible despite the prior notice in these columns. However, here is the final list of home fixtures for this season together with venues. DO TRY and make an effort to support the League teams. It would be appreciated by the organisers, and most certainly by the players.

<b>Saturday, 15th February.</b>	JUNIORS v. Wirral at Linnets.
<b>Friday, 21st February</b>	YOUTH v. Burnley at Wavertree Labour.
<b>Friday, 21st February</b>	LADIES "A" v. Blackpool at Beauclair
<b>Friday, 28th February</b>	MEN'S "A" v. Wirral "A" at Eng. Electric
<b>Friday, 6th March</b>	MEN'S 1st v. Manchester at Liverpool YMCA.
<b>Saturday, 14th March</b>	JUNIORS v. Stockport at Bath Street.

**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**

# With Women in Mind

A FEW days ago, in conversation with the Women's Representative, Miss Amy Bell, she gave as her opinion that there is little or no real interest in the Women's Division these days. As the conversation progressed, she offered the thought that, some ten years or so ago, we had two Women's divisions, and that in those days it was exceptional to have women playing regularly in the mixed divisions instead of in the Women's, but that now it has almost reached the position where the boot is on the other foot—that more and more of our female strength plays solely in the mixed divisions, to the detriment of the Women's division. Giving chapter and verse for her assertion, she demonstrated that, (about) ten years back, there were certainly less than five women active only among the men—other playing merely as reserves, but with prior call among their own sex. Now, there are so many girls playing in the mixed divisions only, that they very nearly total the same number as are doing duty on the 'women's' behalf.

Being of an inquisitive nature, I checked the records, and find that there are a large number of women playing solely amongst the men these days, a further band doing regular duty in both spheres, and, as was so truly said, not even a full Women's division.

The Women's division can sort itself out into three groups. One very little band regularly fight out League and Cup battles—a second regularly lose to the top group and clobber the lower—and a third who are on to a hiding to nothing every week, who can only aspire to winning even a couple of sets from each other. Which has led to a position of lack of any real interest, with so few equal struggles for ANY side, that just so many match nights are a waste of an evening.

There must surely be some solution to this ever-increasing problem. By the time our conversation had reached this point, it had become general among several active League members, and between those present, opinions seemed divided on the

actual scheme to revive the dying women's division, which can be summarised as follows:

(a) to abolish the women's division altogether, all women to be 'ranked' according to ability among their male colleagues;

(b) to make it compulsory for women to play in the women's division—in addition to the mixed divisions if they choose, but the women's division to take priority;

(c) To introduce a rule change to make it compulsory for any club with six or more women members to enter a women's team;

(d) to make it compulsory for women to play in the women's division—not in the mixed, even as reserve. (Needless to say, this came from a male!).

Now, these were suggestions made more or less on the spur of the moment, during a general discussion, and it may be that one of these can command the support of our female players, but this is a case where I think it fair to say that the WOMEN themselves should offer their views, either individually or in groups, so the Editor asks (nay, beseeches) them to write their own particular views on this subject, which must be of great importance to them. There is no doubt that the division is falling in standard year by year. There is a vast reduction of the 'stronger' women players in the women's teams this year even as opposed to last, and it is an obvious assumption, that each successive season will further reduce the strength. It is a matter of fact that one member of the division, one of the stronger incidentally, assured me over the phone that, so little are she and her colleagues in this division nowadays, that they are going to press their club to drop the women's team altogether, to save wasting match nights. It might be sensible from their point of view, but it doesn't help their colleagues.

Now then, girls, give us your views and comments on the situation. See if YOU have any bright ideas regarding your own affairs, and if some solution can be reached, get your club to propose any rule amendments required to the A.G.M.

# An Inferential Puzzle

Set by Don Cameron

A	B	Games			Sets
		1	2	3	
1	1				
1	2				
2	1				
2	3				
3	2				
3	4				
4	3				
4	5				
5	4				
5	5				

Complete the above Score Card from the information supplied below. No game went to more than 21 points, and no set went to three.

- Jack lost to Fred.
- Tom lost a set by the same scores as that which he won.
- Only a number 3 (I forget which one) won both his sets.
- A's Captain beat Joe.
- Dick was the only player to lose both his sets, and gathered 40 points spread equally over his games.
- Bert beat Tom 18, and 19.
- Bill, playing for "A" lost a set 19 and 19.
- Sam beat Harry.
- Fred scored 64 points, the points in his losing set being equally divided.
- The respective Captains played at the same number in the team, and played each other.
- Harry lost a set 15 and 16 against the number 4.
- Joe beat Sam 15 and 16.
- Jim exactly reversed his scores in his two sets.
- "A's number 5 (Jack) beat his opposite number 10 and 10, and scored 28 points in his other set.
- "A's total points in all 1st games (column 1) and "B's total points in all 2nd games (column 2) were equal at 172.
- Joe scored 70 points.

This looks involved, but actually is not as hard as it would appear. Anyway, it will give you something to think about.

# Around the Divisions

## DIVISION 1

—BY JIM GREEN

	P	W	L	D	Pts.
L'pool YMCA	15	13	1	1	127
Bohemians	16	15	1	0	125
Rafters	16	13	3	0	115
Anfield	15	9	4	2	89
L'pool YM 'A'	14	10	4	0	86
Cadwa	14	9	5	0	81
Oakhill	15	6	6	3	80
Linnets	15	6	9	0	69
Waterloo Dock	16	4	11	1	57
Bohemians 'A'	13	4	7	2	52
Balfour	13	5	8	0	52
Lucem	15	3	11	1	52
Rafters 'A'	14	1	13	0	30
Bootle YMCA	15	0	15	0	15

SINCE last month's notes much has happened to alter matters both at the top and bottom of the division. Champions, and current leaders, Liverpool YMCA having beaten their nearest rivals, Bohs. 7-3, then drew with Anfield, and went down 4-6 to Linnets. As I write they still lead the table by nine points, but we now have a case of a team having lost 1 and drawn 1 lying above a side with only 1 loss. An example of the peculiarities to be expected from this comical 'points system,' and should Bohs. win the last match of the season at home v. the YMCA, the position is such that, having only lost 1 they would finish second to a team losing 2 and drawing 1, SO, in order to establish that they ARE worthy to remain champions, the YM must win that one. Fred Karno must have thought this new system up!

Positions at the nether end have changed round a bit. Bootle YMCA and Rafters 'A' have dropped further behind and a gap of 20 points separates Rafters from Lucem, who are immediately above them. However, only two points cover Lucem, Pirates, Bohs. 'A' and Waterloo Dock, although Pirates have two matches in hand, which might be their salvation. Linnets, aided by fourteen points taken from the three leading sides, have widened the gap ahead of Waterloo Dock, and though not yet out of the wood, they do have more hope of survival than their fellow sufferers, for they still have these tough games to come. Ralph

Gannon, Gerry Cooklin and Ted Briscoe all became available just at the right time to do the maximum job for Linnets, and won 9 of the 10 points at stake between them. Frank Thomas carried on carving the opposition, with Ronnie Rumjahn (21-4, 21-11), Reg Hetherington, Bernie Hand, Bruce Cain (21-14, 21-13) and George Smith (21-19, 21-11) to his credit, only losing in the 3rd to the redoubtable Mandaluff in the three toughest matches of the season, and in many people's opinion Frank is playing better than ever.

Anfield, by their draw with YMCA issued a stern warning to the other semi-finalists that they are not going out of the Readman Cup without a struggle, and at full strength their line up is impressive. It is a great pity that they haven't been able to play throughout with this full side, or they might have been in a more challenging spot in the table. Oakhill, although now in no danger of relegation nor of championship honours, have been strengthened by the return of Peter Turtle, and will give even the best sides some troublesome moments. Cadwa, on paper a most impressive side, keep dropping silly points, and still battle out 4th place with L'pool YMCA 'A', who have dropped behind a bit over the last month. The YM team have much to thank Kenny Roberts and John Coveney for, for each has won 22 from 30 sets played—more than half of the team's total. The YMCA 'A' have suffered by reason of the withdrawal of one or two key players on personal grounds, other commitments, etc., but I still incline to the view that they will finish up in 4th spot, for they have some extremely able reserves in their 'B' team to fill the gaps.

Being an interested party I have no comments to make about Linnets win over YMCA, so will merely add as a footnote the remark of their captain Roy Jones, who, with a huge grin on his face said at the end, "we've not been beaten in the League in the last two seasons, and it has to be my own old club to do it now!" Together with a handshake for all of the Linnets side.

	P	W	L	D	Fts.
W'tree Lab. 'A'	14	14	0	0	126
RAFA	14	11	2	1	99
Cadwa 'A'	13	9	3	1	82
Linacre	14	8	4	2	79
Beauchair	14	8	5	1	77
Bath St. 'A'	15	5	7	3	72
Waterloo Park	12	7	5	0	66
English Elec.	12	6	3	3	64
LPAS 'A'	14	3	9	2	55
Liverpool P.O.	15	3	10	2	53
Oakhill 'A'	14	2	8	4	52
Fairlawn 'A'	14	2	10	2	42
Rafters 'B'	13	0	12	1	23

SINCE my last notes, the most apparent changes in our division have been firstly, Cadwa 'A' who have narrowed the gap between themselves and RAFA considerably. As there are still a fair number of matches to be played we could yet see RAFA overhauled. Secondly, another team to start gathering points rapidly are Waterloo Park who have been doing very well lately. I'm afraid, however, that short of a series of miracles they have left things rather late for this season.

On looking through the score-cards I notice that Frank Lacey of Linacre continues to confound his opponents. He claimed the only two victory for his side against Wavertree Labour, and it appears that even after ALL these years his awkward style has not been fathomed out. There must be, I suppose, an answer, but WHAT?

As I think that the leading lights of the division get, directly or indirectly, more than their fair share of space, in our small article, I de-

liberately picked a match between two of our lowlier brethren to go to watch, ie., Post Office v. Rafters "B". It was, I'm afraid, reasonably obvious why these sides are so far down the table. Post Office are suffering from a complaint, common in this League, which also afflicts yours truly . . . ANNO DOMINI! And while more real enthusiasm for table tennis was shown in this match than in most others I have seen this season, I regret to say that years have slowed down most of their players, and low cunning isn't quite enough. Rafters "B" who fortunately do not suffer to the same extent from this complaint are, with one or two exceptions, just not up to the standard required for this division. Incidentally, it was very pleasant to see "young" Jack McCaig in action again, and what is more, winning both his games. The match, which ended in a draw, never reached the heights in a playing sense, but it was a great example of the spirit in which our sport should be played. It is a great pity that this match could not be framed and passed on to those few teams who consider that Cups and Medals are the be-all and end-all of table tennis.

**News Editor's Notes.** When these notes were written the Rumjahn Cup semi-finals were not decided. Modesty forbade Jim Robinson from wishing the two sides, Wavertree Labour 'A' and RAFA good fortune in their efforts to win the Cup for this division, being a member of RAFA himself, so on behalf of the members of 2A we will wish them each a good match in which the better side wins.

**CHARLETT'S**  
*Funeral Directors*  
 48-50 LARK LANE, LIVERPOOL 17.  
 Telephone :  
 LARK Lane 2544 & 2443  
 PRIVATE CHAPEL                      DAY & NIGHT SERVICE



	P	W	L	D	Pts.
W'tree Labour	15	15	0	0	142
Anfield 'A' ....	15	10	3	2	91
LPAS	15	8	2	5	90
L'pool YM 'B'	15	9	4	2	89
Bath St. ....	14	8	4	2	83
University	16	5	4	7	82
Crawfords ....	15	7	7	1	79
Fairlawn ....	15	5	7	3	76
Bohemians 'B'	14	6	5	3	73
Cadwa 'B' ....	15	4	10	1	64
Linnets 'A' ....	13	3	7	3	48
Bath St. 'B'	15	1	13	1	29
Wat. Pk. 'A'	15	0	15	0	14

THE race for second place in this division (and ultimate promotion) is being headed at the moment by Liverpool YMCA 'B', with Bath Street and LPAS chasing them very hard. As is apparent from the League table, Wavertree Labour are just about walking home, and after defeating their two nearest rivals (YM 'B' and Bath Street) by 9-1 and 10-0 respectively, I don't think that anyone in the division will doubt their all-round superiority.

On the whole the matches in this division have been close, hard fought affairs throughout the season to date and there are at least half a dozen teams with little or nothing to choose between them as regards playing ability, which seems a far different story from the 4 third divisions (according to reports in the last Digest). Even relegation issues are still in doubt, for Linnets 'A' have a match in hand v. Bath St. 'B' and a convincing win can put three or four more teams in more danger than would seem at the moment.

A very close match between Bohs. 'B' and Anfield 'A' resulted in a

5-all draw, and the most interesting point of the match was the double victory of Bohs. veteran number 1, Alan Ryecroft, over Bill Jones and J. Brannigan, both in straight games.

Liverpool YM 'B' enhanced their promotion chances with a very good win over Fairlawn (8-2) but I think that Bobby Owens' appearance at No. 3 for the DM had a lot to do with that result! LPAS are playing consistently well, and seem to have got over their habit of just scraping home 6-4, and have had some bigger wins lately. 9-1 over Linnets 'A' and 8-2 over Crawfords certainly helps their points tally. The sole win for the YM 'B' side v. Wavertree Labour was scored by Bert Kewley over Fraser Farquharson, 23-21 in the 3rd. Fairlawn held Bath St. to a draw at Bankfield Road, and it was thanks to a good win by Alec Gould over the redoubtable Eddie Mooney which allowed Bath St. to go home with even the 5 points. Vic Chesham appeared at No. 3 in Bohs. 'B' and enabled them to hold the Police boys to a draw by means of an easy double over Dick Hough and Duncan Bracewell.

Reflections? Well it looks as though Waterloo Park 'A' are doomed but it is encouraging to find them turning out a team and fulfilling their fixtures, which seems to be the case throughout the division, and on the whole I think it fair to say that this is one of the most sporting divisions of the League. Bath St. 'B' look like accompanying them downwards without a dramatic revival, but their companions—not so easy to pick out at this stage of the proceedings.

## PARKFIELD MOTOR Co. Ltd.

OPEN EVERY DAY & EVERY NIGHT

Telephone :

Lark Lane 2204-5-6

1 AIGBURTH ROAD - LIVERPOOL 17

	P	W	L	D	Pts.
Balfour 'A'	14	13	1	0	120
Colonsay	14	13	1	0	103
Wav. Lab. 'C'	16	11	5	0	98
St. Mary's Coll	16	9	6	1	96
Maghull	14	10	4	1	87
Linnet 'C'	16	9	7	0	81
Stanley House	14	8	4	2	78
L'pool Jewish B	14	8	6	0	71
Oakhill 'B'	15	6	9	0	63
University 'A'	15	5	10	0	58
Eng. Elec. 'C'	15	4	11	0	55
LYCA	16	2	14	0	48
Anfield 'D'	15	3	12	0	45
Fairlawn 'B'	15	2	12	1	44

**T**HERE is no change at the top of the table this month. The Pirates have 'sunk' opposing vessels and their armaments prove far too heavy for those who are trying to make them lower their colours. New-comers, St. Mary's Old Boys, gave them a bit of a fright by taking 4 points from them, despite being without their regular No. 1, D. Buck. For the Pirates, Captain Lewis, and 1st mate Dick Burge each won two, and at No. 3 for St. Mary's, Tony Delamere scored a fine double over T. Holloway and Ray Tyler. Altho' I have had no official confirmation, rumour has it that as I write these notes, the Pirates struck their Jolly Roger to Wavertree Labour 'C', and if true and the source of the rumour usually gives correct information) Wavertree pulled off a worthy win. Even so, it now seems quite certain that with a merry 'Ho, ho, ho' the Pirates will sail in a 2nd division harbour at the end of this season.

The battle for second place carries on, with Colonsay deeping up their

challenge for second place, even though some of their wins have been by the narrow 6-4 margin. Wavertree gave them a scare with doubles from J. Hodges and Ron Evans saving the day for Colonsay. Second place is still wide open to 3 or 4 sides, and a couple of surprise results can completely reverse present positions. Which is as it should be, for the promotion race should not be sewn up too easily early on.

With the possibility of two 4th divisions next season, the middle teams now have to work hard to stay in the top half of the table, and here it would be a braver man than I to made any forecast, except to say that this news has added spice to mid-table matches. It certainly gives all teams outside the promotion race added incentive for it is virtually a second 'promotion' (or rather relegation) scrap to retain 3rd division status. Anfield show signs of rallying, and I expect them to lift themselves from the depths, but the leeway may prove too great a handicap to stave off 4th division play next season. LDCA are the only other side who seem with little hope of staying "up" but the rest promises a rare old battle from now on. Fairlawn got two hard-earned points v. St. Mary's, Barbara Hand beating Tony Delamere in two straight, and A. Lambkin beating T. Callaghan at 19 in the 3rd.

I'm sorry that we have no Hyde Cup representatives left, but maybe we'll win the Micklesfield medals instead.

## AIGBURTH LAWN TENNIS CLUB

(Associate with Linnets and Aigburth T.T.C.)

### MEMBERS WANTED

MEN & WOMEN — Also JUNIORS  
(From 14 years of Age)

Enquiries to:

Mr. W. Alexander (Hon. Sec.), 38 Allengate Rd., Liverpool 19.  
(Tel. CRE 1182).

	P	W	L	D	Pts.
Anfield 'B' ....	16	13	2	1	129
Linnets 'B' ....	16	13	2	1	127
Wav. Lab. 'B' ..	14	14	0	0	124
Sefton Gen. ....	16	12	3	1	110
Crawfords 'B' ..	16	8	7	1	98
Mossley Hill ..	14	9	3	2	95
Bath St. 'C' ....	16	8	7	1	86
Eng. Elec. 'B' ..	14	6	7	1	59.3
Orrell 'A' ....	15	2	12	1	42
Balfour 'B' ....	12	4	8	0	39
Crawfords 'C' ..	15	2	11	2	39
Coll. Tech. 'A' ..	15	2	11	2	35
Colonsay 'A' ....	15	2	12	1	33
Linnets 'F' ....	14	1	11	2	24

AT the top of the table the 'status quo' is maintained. Linnets 'B', Anfield 'B' and Wavertree Lab. 'B' teams all remain in their respective slots with Sefton keeping within range after passing the 'century'. Sefton suffered a blow on January 22nd when they crashed to Mossley Hill. However, this was no ordinary Mossley Hill, but a greatly changed outfit. They have signed on two ex-1st division players in the persons of 'Rock' Hudson, who bears a remarkable resemblance to film actor Stanley Baker (with the same determined look at the table) and Ian Morris, a most tenacious defender. Added to the enthusiastic

Mahen (an ex-Cambridge Blue) the Mossley Hill club now have a formidable top three-some.

The duel between Linnets and Anfield 'B' teams resulted in a narrow 6-4 win for the home side. Perhaps the unhappiest man of the evening must have been Tom Bunner. On the 26th November he lost his 100 per cent. record to Jim Green of Linnets 'F'. It was most unfortunate that he should meet the same 'old campaigner' on 8th Jan., this time representing the 'B' team and making it a double.

Colonsay 'A', a team placed rather low in the table seem to have made a prize signing in newcomer A. Guy. He won his side's only game against Anfield 'B', defeating Bunner, and losing in the third to Derbyshire. Yes sir, this new number two seems to be quite 'A Guy'!!

There are two items worthy of mention this month. The first, Alan Tolson who retained his 100 per cent. record, and the second, a rather doubtful offering, the Sefton number 5 (who shall remain nameless) for chalking up a 0-21 in a recent game, much to the disgust of his teammates!!

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

	P	W	L	D	Pts.
Crawfords 'A'	16	14	1	1	127
Coll. of Tech.	15	12	1	2	122
L'pool YM 'C'	16	12	2	2	104
L'pool Jewish	14	10	2	2	101
Balfour 'C'	16	9	5	2	100
Orrell	16	9	7	0	96
Bohemians 'C'	16	9	6	1	92
LPAS 'B'	15	6	7	2	86
Beauclair 'A'	16	8	7	1	85
Eng. Elec. 'D'	15	5	9	1	53
Lowlands 'A'	16	4	12	0	42
Linnet 'E'	14	0	11	3	28
Bradstones	16	0	14	2	23
Oakhill 'C'	15	0	13	2	21

THE position at the top of the table is still very close, with Crawford's 'A' holding on to a slender lead over Coll. of Tech. When the two sides met, Crawford's came out winners by a narrow 6-4 margin, thanks mainly to a double by R. Conley while G. Platt, for the Students, had two fine wins over T. Partington and C. Dingwall, who suffered one of his very rare defeats.

From the score cards it is easily seen that the rest of the division is a mixture of teams who win rather easily one week, losing just as easily the next, as instanced by the record of Beauclair 'A' who have beaten Oakhill 'C' ten sets to nil, and who have in turn been beaten by Orrell nine sets to one. Obviously, as has been pointed out in previous issues, this is not a happy composition for the division, and I'm sure that all would welcome a further split next year into two 3rd and two 4th. If this were put into effect, on the lines outlined in last month's issue, with the bottom seven teams going down, it gives us a much needed boost

right now, for very few points separate four sides, one of whom would have to be relegated—and even against the much weaker teams not one of these dare to let up for one instant.

Players who have chalked up their sides only win in 1-9 defeats include Mrs. E. Palmer (Beauclair), J. Ball (Bradstones), Miss Valerie Ball (Eng. Elec.), L. Cohen (Bohs.) and H. Hughes (Eng. Elec.), while Jimmy McLachlan (LPAS) earned two good wins when his team lost 7-3 to Crawfords, and although both were won narrowly in the third it was a notable achievement.

Liverpool Jewish, with two games in hand, look like taking over the 3rd berth in place of YMCA 'C', while LPAS 'B' could surely command a much higher spot were they able to turn out that side which represented them v. Crawfords every week.

Balfour 'C', Orrell, Bohs. 'C', English Electric 'D' and Beauclair 'A' all have that comfortable middle-of-the-table look, with no promotion or relegation worries, but these are the very sides who HAVE got that headache of filling up one of the top seven spots in case the proposed split does take place, so I expect even sterner battles hereabouts.

Now that a side is to be chosen to represent this division in the Micklefield medals competition, it will keep everyone on their toes trying to get into the team, and whoever might be chosen, we hope that they will show all other divisions which really IS the best division to play in.

### CONGRATULATIONS.

If one happened to be in the vicinity of Lark Lane on the 18th February and heard the strains of that familiar tune "For Me and My Girl" being repeatedly played on a record player, it would not necessarily mean that the repertoire had been limited to a single 'disc' but it would rather indicate that the lyric held some special significance for the Proprietors, Mr. and Mrs. Jim Green. Special indeed would be the appropriate word, for on that occasion they will be celebrating the anniversary of their Wedding Day, 25 years ago.

In tendering our sincere congratulations to you 'Jo' and 'Jim' I feel I am expressing the sentiments of all connected with Liverpool and District Table Tennis circles when we place on record an appreciation of service, both past and present, afforded by you to the League, and to express the heartfelt wish that when we are recording the 'Golden' event 25 years hence, the memories of your "Special Day" will be enhanced by the added blessing of better health.

A. E. UPTON,  
Chairman.

	P	W	L	D	Pts.
Anfield 'C'	13	10	3	0	105
St. Edward's	11	10	0	1	92
L'pool Jewish A	11	10	1	0	89
Eng. Elec. 'A'	11	9	1	1	86
Lowlands	12	7	5	0	67
Linnet 'D'	12	5	6	1	55
Beauclair 'A'	11	5	6	0	48
Lussac	13	3	10	0	47
Dom. Mission	12	3	9	0	40
L'pool YM 'D'	10	3	6	1	35
Lucem 'A'	11	2	9	0	23
Bradstones 'A'	13	0	13	0	9

Note.—Balfour 'D' withdrawn and record expunged.

**W**ITH Liverpool YMCA 'D' dropping out and rumours of a title contender going the same way, 'fings ain't wot they used to be'.

English Electric 'A' were the first team to take 5 points from St. Edward's, thanks mainly to Money (a hard-hitting reserve) and George Moon. Lawson and O'Keefe continued their brilliant form for St. Edward's. Liverpool Jewish went to town against the Pirates 'D', Dawn Lewis winning the only set for her side, and Lowlands proved their superiority in the 'lower third' by beating both Lussac and Linnets 7-3. Dixon was on top form winning his four sets, and Gower of Lussac is

also playing very well at present, winning doubles v. Lowlands and Lucem. Young Peter Wass, the Linnets junior, also has a long series of good doubles to his credit.

A game that completely converted me (personally) to the new points system was English Electric's 8-2 win over Beauclair 'B' when interest was maintained up to the last point. Even though the score was 8-2 we saw a great win by M. Collins over Black. The other set winner was Mercer.

As there are very few matches to comment on, due to the holidays, here are a few half-yearly facts and figures. Lawson of St. Edward's has a 100 per cent. record at the half-way stage, playing continuously at number 1. Team-mate Smith has lost but two sets, as has Birch of Anfield, and, incidentally, this Anfield team has played unchanged to date. At the opposite end of the scale, Linnets have called on a cool eighteen players.

With 12 wins, J. McVey (Dom. Mission) is showing fine form in a team struggling for points, and at this stage Birch (Anfield) despite his 2 lost sets has won more than anyone else with 24 from 26 played.

**WOMEN'S DIVISION**

By AMY BELL

	P	W	L	D	Pts.
Crawfords	15	10	3	2	104
Cadwa	13	11	0	2	104
Bath St.	13	10	3	0	99
Bohemians	13	12	0	1	97
Linnet	13	6	4	3	80
Rafters	12	6	3	3	74
Anfield	13	6	4	3	72
Cadwa 'A'	13	4	7	2	68
Balfour	13	3	8	2	49
Cheshire Lines	13	5	8	0	42
English Elec.	14	0	12	2	27
Bohemians 'A'	10	2	8	0	21
Linnet 'A'	13	0	12	1	16

**B**ATH Street are putting up a very strong challenge to Bohs. and Cadwa for the championship, and we may yet find a new name at the head of the table at the end of this season. Strangley, on the old system of points, they would provide

no real menace, having lost matches which the other teams have won, but it seems now that, if either Bohs. or Cadwa are going to fight off this somewhat unexpected opposition, they will both have to turn out full strength sides far more often than they have done to date. Crawfords, also in a challenging position, will be considerably weakened in the very near future by the loss of Muriel Cox, and I feel that the handicap thus imposed puts them out of the hunt for this year.

Cheshire Lines are having none too good a time on their return to the League, but after so long out of the game, top form could hardly be expected, and they will probably provide far sterner opposition next season.

Mabel Francis is having a good

season. After many battles between herself and Judy Crafter over the last few seasons, Judy emerging the winner each time, Mabel has at last laid her hoodoo and beaten her doughty opponent for the first time. Another interesting result was the revenge win of Betty Black over Joyce Randall, but when on form Betty can beat most players, so this, though most satisfactory from her point of view, is not very surprising.

Rafters are having a bad time this year. Even with the added strength of Eileen Mansell, they are far lower than has been their experience for some years, and Jean Reynolds has not been as successful as has been her normal lot. Perhaps their position can be due to so many of their players having given up the game this year, and we hope that

next season will find them once again at full strength. But I have noticed far less interest in the division this season than previously—with teams finding more and more matches either too easy or too hard, and apart from that rather jovial atmosphere always associated with our division, the tense feeling of match play is sadly lacking. The solution is not quite as easy to find, but I feel that the return to our division of those who have 'opted' for men's divisions only, would substantially help in restoring the division to its former position. It seems strange that, having been introduced to the sport in our sphere, so many now consider that they are too good to play against women, but I know that, if many returned to us, we would have stronger sides to play far more often.

## Letter to the Editor

14 Greenhill Ave.,  
Liverpool 18.

The Editor,  
Table Tennis Digest.

Dear Sir,

### The Devastation of the Facts.

A letter appeared in the last issue of the "Digest" entitled "The Devastation of the League." It would, I think, have been more aptly titled "The Devastation of the Facts."

Mr. Gordon criticises the new set-up of the League at some considerable length. He is, of course, entitled to his views, and free to express them, but I feel that his criticism would have carried more weight had he taken the trouble to get his facts right!

Mr. Gordon does not stop there, however. He accuses the Committee of sneaking the rule change through the A.G.M., and accuses the Club representatives present of voting on this resolution without knowing what it was all about. If Mr. Gordon really believes this to be a fact, he is more to be pitied than blamed, but in my opinion these particular allegations must be answered.

Mr. Gordon states (and I quote) "My impression is that few people took the Committees ideas seriously, and they regarded McKim's article

as quixotic—of passing interest only." He further states (I quote again). "This illuminating article is well worth closer inspection." What a very great pity that Mr. Gordon did not take his own advice and examine the article carefully, for he would have found a paragraph which stated that the Committee were putting this scheme to the A.G.M. Surely this is sufficient to make people take the article seriously and to show them that it was not some quixotic idea of the McKim fellow, but was a definite proposal being put forward by the Committee.

Mr. Gordon then goes on, "What did happen at the A.G.M." and "I am convinced that in voting for the amendment the bulk of the members present did not relate it in any way to the abortive system outlined in the "Digest." They voted for the amendment because it seemed the sensible thing to do." It is a matter for the deepest regret that Mr. Gordon spent so much time composing this article instead of attending the A.G.M. He would soon see that Club representatives do not vote for an amendment without knowing all about it! And NEVER because it appears the sensible thing to do. On this occasion Mr. Hebson (the Vice-Chairman) went to great pains to inform the Meeting of the

exact intentions of the Committee, and in fact, referred them to the "abortive" article of the April "Digest." After a long discussion, and when all present were in possession of ALL the facts, the scheme, *in its entirety* was given the 'go ahead' by the Meeting.

Mr. Gordon then turns his attention to voting. He says the Committee's views on ballots are clearly stated by Mr. Caird in his January 1963 edition of the "Digest." Do you realise, Mr. Gordon, that Mr. Caird has not been a member of the Committee since 1952-53?

On the subject of the mass vote, which Mr. Gordon claims must be

written into our constitution, this should be quite easy to arrange. Simply send your proposed rule alteration in, Mr. Gordon. Instruct your Club's representative NOT to enlighten the Meeting of the reasons for the proposed changes, and no doubt the members present will vote for them unanimously on the basis that "it seems the sensible thing to do."

Closing date for rule amendments is May 1st. Don't miss the boat again, Mr. Gordon, will you?

Yours faithfully,

J. C. McKIM,  
Beauclair T.T.C.

43-45, Lark Lane,  
Liverpool 17.

The Editor,  
*Table Tennis Digest*. Jan. 23rd, 1964.

Dear Sir,

Your footnote to the article by Tom Gordon in the *January Digest* states "We would point out that the articles written by Mr. McKim are written on the instruction of the Management Committee after full discussion and majority agreement as to their content." Since all six members of the Editorial Board are also Management members, this statement must be accepted as true.

In the same issue, in an article by Mr. McKim headed "The Points System" I find it stated clearly and categorically that "a glance at the final League tables for the past few seasons will show that League positions remain the same whether you work on the old or new system of points." On reading this I turned to LAST season's tables in the back of my handbook, and find that, throughout the League there were no less than THIRTY-ONE teams whose positions would have been different had the new system been in force! *This is serious!* Either Mr. Cameron was wrong in his tables (which I cannot believe) or they were printed wrongly, which throws the blame back on to the proof-readers, OR the STATEMENT made by Mr. McKim on behalf of the Committee is so much hogwash! Personally, I do not blame Mr.

McKim, for whom I have a high regard, but the Committee who "fully discussed and agreed on the content of the article."

Again, in the same article we find "the points system appears to have been well received." BY WHOM? Certainly NOT by the vast majority of the 1st division players, for, from talks held during 1st division matches I have found that most of the players therein think that *this system stinks!* In addition, I have attended many 2nd and 3rd division matches this year as spectator, and have found opinions very divided on the subject, but again I have found that most people dislike this new system intensely. So, I ask the question—"why was the statement printed, and why, without a complete enquiry throughout the whole League. Did the Committee instruct John McKim to write it?"

On the same theme I read "the few examples of this system giving a false League position were, of course, meaningless, as the contributors must have been well aware." One of these contributors was my revered father! Daddy, you're slipping to write one thing, then to agree with the Committee that what you wrote was just so much breadcrumbs and breambait!! I would never have thought this of you!

Labouring my point, I ask players to examine the half-way tables printed in the last *Digest*, and to

re-arrange them on the old system—you might be surprised. BUT you will be far less surprised than I was to learn that the Management Committee instructs that so much misleading balderdash is to be printed, allocating this unpleasant task to Mr. McKim, so that HE gets the come-back! *This is quite unfair to him, for they (including my beloved paternal relative) are passing a most unsavoury "buck" right back into his lap. It is not his baby, so why should he nurse it?*

One last point. Did you read also, 'it is almost unheard of for two teams to finish at the top or bottom of a division with an exactly similar number of sets won'? I remember Rafter 'A' and Balfour 'A' finishing

joint League Champions with equal points won, sets for and against (season 1953-4). I am far younger than the Committee members, so how is it that none of THEM remembered this?

On behalf of League members generally, may I request that the Committee do NOT pass the buck to Mr. McKim in this manner in future? Let official statements be factual, true, and unquestionable. Please do NOT print as the truth what can be so easily easily proven completely UNTRUE.

Yours sincerely,

TONY GREEN,  
(Linnets & Aigburth T.T.C.)

---

## The Fixture Secretary Requests

**T**HE Fixture Secretary requests that every team check their League record, and to report to him if there is any variation from the League tables as printed.

**CLUBS SHOULD NOTE ALSO,** that, having received a "follow-up" letter from the Fixture Secretary with regard to outstanding matches, no reply having been received within 14 days from the date of posting. The matter will be reported to the Management Committee who have the power to inflict a suitable penalty.

The attention of every League member is drawn to League Rule 19, match regulation 12. No match may be postponed by a "home" team excepting in the event that their club room is not available or unless the match clashes with a Cup match, and ONLY in the event of Cup commitments may an 'away' team postpone a match. Further, before ANY

match is postponed, the Fixture Secretary.

The number of matches 'outstanding' make this announcement necessary, and with the utmost reluctance, the rules will have to be observed very strictly in future. It may be that matches have been played, but no score-card submitted. In such cases on receipt of the 'follow-up' letter, the home side should submit a duplicate card.

**All Matches must be played before the official end of the season, i.e., Friday, 17th April and after that date if any matches are outstanding the defaulting team MAY forfeit the match 10-0, unless special dispensation has been granted to play a particular match later, but circumstances will have to be quite exceptional for such permission to be given.**