## NHoosier Backgammon Club

February 2005

Out With The Thai'd<br>by Jake Jacobs

My punning title may be in very bad taste. Thailand, after all, suffered a terrible loss in the recent tsunami. My own loss in the semifinals of the Last Chance was not nearly so terrible. But my loss also happened in Thailand, and tasteful pun is probably an oxymoron anyway, so out with the Thai'd it is.

## Jake (Black) doubles trailing 3-4 to 7.



My opponent was English Tom. Tom Grant has lived in Thailand for quite some time, but he was born in England, and is English Tom to distinguish him from German Tom and Swiss Tom and any other Toms who might pass through Pattaya sowing nomenclatural confusion in their wake.

I lecture on this score, and am presumed to know something about it, but my cube handling this game proves I need to stay awake next time I give the lecture. In the old days, using JellyFish, I might have justified (to myself) my double here. The cubeless num-
bers from Snowie find me winning $56.4 \%$, with $7.9 \%$ being gammons, while losing $1.7 \%$ backgammons and $15.8 \%$ gammons. If our options were only cube never turned, or cube always turned we would much prefer doubling - cubing wins close to $1 \%$ more matches under those conditions. We also note that 20 numbers are very, very good for us, non-hitting aces are bad but not THAT bad, and only nine numbers range from THAT bad to TERRIBLE. So, we are winning the game, we have a majority of market losers, and when we lose we lose a high proportion of gammons; all are indicators of a cube turn at this score.

Snowie disagrees, and believes cubing to be a significant blunder. The key is in our first condition in the last sentence above: we don't have a majority of market losers. What we have is a lot of numbers that lead to market loss if White rolls poorly, but if you plug in our twenty hitting numbers, to see how Snowie evaluates them, you'll find that the best play's aggregate equity usually approaches market loss without achieving it. Said more clearly: if we hit this roll, we may or may not lose our market, but the average result of all our hits is nearly, but not quite, a double out, i.e. and efficient cube. It is better to wait than to double.

Part of my mistaken double was based upon the unlikelihood of a recube.

## White redoubles to $4 ?$



Not only was I recubed, but I was even more wrong about this one than I was about the first. I was probably off on my estimate of my winning chances without hitting a second blot, and also on my chances of obtaining a second man. I guessed perhaps $10 \%$ for the former, and added around $6 \%$ in extra chances from successfully picking up the second man. Sixteen percent is short of the eighteen percent needed to take, so I passed. Actually, I win almost twenty-eight percent here! Even if the builder on the deuce has closed the acepoint Snowie says this would not be a double, that I would still win slightly over twenty percent. (I would reopen the acepoint if possible during the bearoff.) I would even have a slim take if White had two men on his acepoint (no chance of picking up another man, but only twelve men born off by White).

I'd like to tell you that I overcame my errors, and went on to win the Last Chance. I'd like to tell you that, but I didn't. Tom won the Crawford game and advanced to the final, losing to Marvin Khattar of Sweden.

## 53rd Indiana Open Free Lecture by Joe Sylvester Labor Day Weekend 2005

| HBC Standings <br> February 2005 |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Sean Garber | 196 |
| Rick Steele | 155 |
| Scott Johnston | 142 |
| Terry Bateman | 122 |
| Larry Strommen | 100 |
| Butch Meese | 56 |
| Chuck Stimming | 52 |
| Scott Day | 36 |
| Jim Curtis | 24 |
| Mary Ann Meese | 18 |
| Woody Woodworth | 16 |
| Dan Moore | 10 |
| Eric Luecking | 8 |

\footnotetext{



| Player of the Month of January 2005 was Sean Garber with $\mathbf{1 9 6}$ gammon points. |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| January 5 |  | January 12 | January 19 |

