



EXTRA INNINGS NEWSLETTER

The Official Publication of Extra Innings

"World Series Issue"

Oct., 1972

Vol. 2, No. 3

New Edition of 'EI' in 1973



Dazzy Vance who fanned 262 batters in 1924 moves right into company with modern fireballers like Koufax, Lolich, Ryan and others in the 300 club when he is normalized.

'Normalization' Major Feature of Next Edition

A major development in "real life" baseball games will be included in the next edition of "Extra Innings." This will be the "normalization" of players from all eras to conform with one standard. We have been working on this for more than a year and are now in the process of normalizing stars of the past and present to meet in competitions on an equal footing.

The developmental work has been done by John Swistak and Jeff Sagarin. John began developing the concept while an Air Force sergeant stationed in the Aleutians. He has since returned to civilian life (Rome, N.Y.), married and taken on a job. But, he's finding the time to continue work on this project.

Jeff Sagarin, having taken a year away from his post-graduate studies, has returned to Ohio State U. and still fills in spare time hours with efforts to bring normalization to its fullest realization.

It started this way: we recognized that the style of play in baseball has gone through many stages. We had a long era, ending after WW I, when the ball was dead, it could be doctored by the pitcher, and, despite high

batting averages, low ERAs prevailed as the offense was without significant power. Later we had a shift to the lively ball and both batting averages and home runs totals were high, and ERAs were also increased. Today's game finds the pitcher again dominant, with batting averages depressed and even HR totals less impressive than in the past, although the ball is still lively.

Among those who have adopted "EI" as their form of table baseball there have been those who have rolled back the ages to the dead ball era. While nostalgia may have motivated some, we are often told the purpose is to employ a full range of strategy; more steals, bunts, hit and run, etc.

Of course, most players deal with current teams. Yet, they look longingly at the offensive achievements of past players. While low scoring pitcher's duels are exciting, it's also fun to see those base hits bouncing off the dice.

We reasoned there must have been a point in baseball's past when a more satisfactory balance between offense and defense existed. We identified

(Continued on Page 2)

A revised edition of "Extra Innings" is being prepared for release next Spring. It will replace the present "second edition" which has been available to games players since April, 1971.

The new edition will include the numerous revisions which have been discussed in the newsletter, including the revised first and second roll chart presented in the July issue.

As we revealed in the July issue, we had been contacted by the Major League Baseball Players Association and ordered to discontinue using the names of members of that union or face legal action. Our conclusion at that time was to disassociate from the greedy and relate to the needy. We wrote Dick Moss, counsel for the MLBPA that we were withholding any further advertising of the game and that we would no longer offer prepared rosters using the identities of members of the MLBPA. However, since the principal difference between "EI" and other games is that it shows its owner exactly how to compute the data and make his own rosters, using any source of statistics he wishes, we could not prevent anyone else from compiling rosters for re-sale. We went a step further and projected that such rosters would be made available, but separately from "EI", and the proceeds derived would be donated to the National Association for Retarded Children.

Since writing to Mr. Moss in July we have not heard further. As we explained in our July newsletter, we don't consider Marvin Miller, Dick Moss or the players the opponents in this circumstance. They are entitled to get a piece of the action when that action requires the use of MLBPA identities. It is our point that when "EI" includes roster data, using names and records it is doing this as a convenience to the game's owner. Once someone has purchased "EI" he knows as well as we do how to convert stats to playing data. He's also confronted with a considerable amount of figuring. It takes us about 20 working hours to turn a season's stats into rosters for "EI." And we work fast. We use Mitch West's speed-up chart, October, 1971, newsletter, and a digital computer. Very few owners of "EI" would care to take that much time away from the actual playing of games. Of course, they might want to recreate a different league from old records. However, we think it is a suitable convenience factor

to simply make prepared rosters available for those who wish them.

We created the newsletter essentially to provide a way for owners of the games to obtain new rosters after each season, inexpensively. However, due to the uncertainties of the circumstances, we are divorcing the 1972 rosters from direct relationship to the newsletter and diverting proceeds derived from this to NARC.

When we created "Extra Innings" we trod upon some toes. We did it deliberately. In fact, we only designed "EI" to give ourselves a game to play that could use any players from any era and did not force a dependence upon one company to keep our competitions alive with coded data we were forced to purchase from them each year we wished to extend our competition. Obviously, it is good business to create ancillary values. The best customer is a captive customer who can't go anyplace else.

However, the market place is large. There's plenty of room to cater to the "do-it-yourself" trade. That's what we are doing. When we say in our advertising, "you never have to buy another thing," we mean it. If you don't wish to buy prepared rosters, you don't have to. What you are buying is time and rather inexpensively at that.

We believe that the MLBPA decided to cut themselves in on the "real life" market as it existed several years ago, before "EI" came along and put a foot to everyone's applegart. Because we have projected an image of quality in the appearance of our advertising, our response material, our newsletter and our second edition of "EI", we also created an impression of bigness.

As we have explained in our frank and forthright way, we don't care for bigness. Some of you may have read Keith Henricson's windy editorial in "All Sports Digest" on the subject of MLBPA and table games. He piously supports the efforts of four people who depend upon the sales of their games products (Big League Manager, Negamco, etc.) to provide a living income. He puts down ventures such as ours as being part time projects. He also fails to identify two of the four selfless people supported by the profits of their games ventures as himself and his wife.

We have spent a lot of time over the past months determining what we would do in the future. As we said in the July newsletter, the easiest thing would be to close

(Continued on Page 2)

Oct. 1972 - Vol. 2, No. 3
Edited and Published by
Jack Kavanagh, designer of
'Extra Innings'

From The Bench

The subject for this issue's editorial almost ended up in the "Heard From The Grandstand Managers" section. However, it opens an area for consideration that affects table gamers.

Here's a post script from a letter re-ordering the newsletter: "P.S. My son wants me to mail in this order today... so I'm doing it. Frankly, I am appalled at the high price tag you place on the newsletter... 92¢ each issue, 8 pgs. each issue, printed on newsprint paper. Also, for soliciting in August for 1973 issues. I guess sports enthusiasts consider it worthwhile. I wish you much success... continued success, I should say. If my son is any example, he looks forward to Extra Innings, and others must do the same."

The point here is not whether the newsletter is over priced. It is the relationship young games players have with their families who support their purchases. And, when young games players grow older and marry they'll have problems explaining such expenses to their wives.

It is a matter of values. Frankly, we don't make a profit on the newsletter. Its circulation doesn't attract advertising income. We produce the newsletter because we enjoy doing it.

However, the writer of the post script quoted above is really wondering about the monies spent on games and related expenses. We think that the purchase of a quality game is the most inexpensive investment in entertainment which can be made. We too have our "appall point." It is reached when we hear of the sums spent at the box office for concerts, motion pictures, ball parks and other places where the value is of the moment.

A good game is a great investment. It can last for years. It can be the basis of a life-long hobby. It opens doors to friendships.

We are particularly enthusiastic about sports games. Of course, the same viewpoint can be held for the purchase of a chess set, a set of wood working tools, model kits, etc. But, we like to think that every copy of "Extra Innings" we ship out is starting some person out on a hobby which will fill up many hours with a fascinating involvement with a game which creates all the suspense, excitement and fulfillment of real life competition. We've never dozed off in the middle of a game of "Extra Innings", but have slumbered through the middle innings of many a televised ball

game and even found our head nodding at the ball park.

We also consider "Extra Innings" as a tool. The owner is free to handle competitions as he wishes. Re-play entire seasons; mix teams from various eras; use only the super stars; play elimination contests; match a favorite team against a variety of opponents, etc.

There are those who enjoy compiling extensive statistics and presenting them in neatly typed pages. There are so many ways of practicing this hobby that it is evident that it meets many needs.

We know "EI", and other real life games, brings the playing field to crowded city apartments and to isolated farm houses. That it brings a touch of home to servicemen around the world. All it takes is space to roll the dice, consult the charts and you have all the realism that could be contained in Yankee Stadium or under the roof of the Astrodome.

All of us who are table gamers find it necessary to defend our passion for these games to parents, associates, wives and, sometimes to our own children. I've overheard my daughter explaining Daddy's disappearance to the basement to her friends. "He plays a baseball game with dice," she says, lamely. Her friends accept this in the same terms of understanding as though I'd gone off to stuff an owl.

One advantage a middleaged designer of a game which sells mostly to teenagers, is that he has been a teenager himself. We had our trials with our own parents in our teens when we designed the baseball game which was the basis for "EI" back in 1933. We continued a solitaire league through college, four years of military service and for the early years of marriage. We had to defend our hobby every step of the way. But, other than the costs of notebooks we used for boxscores, it was a hobby which needed no further input of money.

When measured against the investments of those whose hobbies are in more conventional areas (stamp, coin, etc. collecting); crafts, etc. it was the bargain of all times.

We are sure that acceptance of your involvement in this most fascinating hobby is a trial to many who play these games. We can only tell you that there are many who understand and, through the newsletter, you have ties that bind us all together.

New Edition of 'EI'

(Continued from Page 1)

down shop. We need "EI" as much as Howard Cosell needs modesty lessons. Our regular occupation keeps getting more and more demanding. We work at our job with the retarded in Rhode Island an average of 60 hours a week and wish we had more time for that purpose. We launched "EI" when we were in the administration of Providence College and much less pressed by our job.

So, we sat down and weighed the circumstances. The risk of our investment is no problem. While our profits to date would just about afford us a trip to Fenway Park, we aren't in the hole either.

It will require putting in some fresh capital to print and advertise a third edition and bring it to the market next Spring. But, we expect we'll recover that and, if we don't, we won't end up on the welfare roles.

Frankly, we don't know what risk we are running from legal actions by the MLBPA, egged on by our competitors (Midwest Research being specifically

excluded from this charge as they are most pleasant and ethical competitors).

But we balance the risks and the drain on spare time with the realization that "EI" is providing a lot of pleasure to a lot of people. More than that, it has freed table game players from slavery to other games. We are particularly pleased with the many new friendships which have resulted from marketing this game. We find their interest very rewarding and stimulating. Through further development of the game, much of it the result of input from "EI" players, we find our creative juices flowing at a time of life when they might be going dry.

So, when you add up the plus and minus factors we find we can't let the competition narrow the field. We can't let the MLBPA force this game off the market. You see, that's what it's all about. Those companies which are in the market would rather make a royalty arrangement with the players (and pass the cost along to their captive customers) and keep new games out of the market.

Normalization-Major Feature

(Continued from Page 1)

this period as the decade immediately following WW II, from 1946 through 1955. It was a very significant era.

In the post war return to the good life, minor league baseball boomed and provided a great source for fully developed players. There were more minors in action than at any time before and, God knows, since. We had the advent of television (death knell to the minors, but a means of bringing the game to those outside the then major league circuits.) Also, we had the start of expansion, although it was limited to moving franchises to cities which appreciated them more (the St. Louis Browns to Baltimore; the Braves from Boston to Milwaukee). Yet, the majors were still no further west than St. Louis. Today's debilitating night flights and changes from one time zone to another didn't effect the players. A sleeper jump from New York to Chicago provided the players rest and the opportunity to talk shop.

The most important development was the arrival of the black player. Naturally the best came first: Jackie Robinson, Don Newcombe, Campy, Willie Mays, Hank Aaron, Larry Doby, etc. They all broke in during that decade and contributed to making it the high water mark of competition.

The averages of that span, 1946-55 seemed to provide the basis for the best of all competitions. Now, how to move the Mantles, Robinsons, Koufaxes, Drysdale, Wills, etc. back; how to move Matty, Alexander, Ruth, Wagner, Cobb, Speaker, etc. ahead? No need to move rosters full of great stars like Musial, DiMaggio, Feller, Spahn and others, as their careers included that desired span.

What we have done is to average out the ten years of our selected decade for all departments. That becomes the base.

We then compare any player's superiority over his own contemporaries in a given season and adjust it to give him the same

average in any department in the decade of 1946-55.

The results are often electrifying. Ruth's 60 HRs become 85. Yaz's .301 in 1968 moves up to a .335. Terry's .401 in 1930 drops back to .356. What we have done is account for the factors which prevailed. What results is a fascinating form of table baseball which provides not only "real-life" simulation but realistic stimulation.

When Three Finger Brown goes against Bob Gibson or Tom Seaver, it's a real match up.

We have developed this phase of "Extra Innings" slowly, wishing to time it for inclusion in the next edition of the game. Also, we wanted to polish the game as fully as we could. We wanted a more definitive way of having pitchers issue walks and strike out batters; a better way to rate players for defense, etc. We believe the third edition of "EI", strictly in the game sense, will present the most playable form of table baseball ever conceived. We are confident that large numbers of players will adopt the normalized form. Even those who wish to use only contemporary players will be able to offset the depressed offensive statistics, if they wish. Somehow, we don't think that today's fan is totally satisfied with the low run scoring which prevails.

We will continue to present data for "EI" without making the normalization adjustments, of course. Special rosters (such as a new H of F supplement) will present normalized data for those who like that form of play. In the newsletter we will present selected players from the past. One thing about normalizing is that it requires a player be treated on a single season basis rather than a career total's approach. This means we would use Ruth's most potent season, but could also use Hack Wilson's fabulous 1930, although his marks will be reduced to compensate for the fact that the full league statistics were inflated offensively.

Sacrifice Bunts

We made a discovery. It will not be classified with Izaak Newton getting clonked on his batting helmet with an apple, but cleared up a statistical circumstance we'd had difficulty in correlating with observation of actual play.

We start with the assumption that the sacrifice bunt will achieve its objective, to move a base runner one base while giving up a time at bat, more often than not. Otherwise, even the most tradition-bound managers would have ceased calling for it.

But, we're also aware of the overwhelming number of times we have watched bunt attempts missed, fouled off or taken for a strike when the batter pulls back.

While watching an exercise in futility at laying down a bunt by a major league pitcher, it dawned on us that his first two failures would never become statistics. He hasn't succeeded or failed until he has completed his turn at bat. And, it is more often the circumstance that, having failed on his first two strike attempts, the batter will now hit away, rather than risk bunting foul on the third attempt, and being "automatically out." In that circumstance, it is simply a time at bat, with a hit or an out resulting. That rationalizes the awareness that bunt attempts fail far out of proportion to their statistical success. A batter may succeed on his first try, his second try or, if he risks it, his third try. But his failures on the first two attempts are immaterial so far as stats are concerned. What they do is create the illusion among spectators that major leaguers are inept bunters. Actually, given the challenge of tapping a ball somewhere out of the grasp of a charging third baseman and first baseman; of the pitcher keeping it high in the strike zone; of making contact at all; it's a significant accomplishment.

Obviously, as followers of "Extra Innings" would realize, we couldn't resist applying this concept of the sacrifice to the game. Elsewhere in this issue of the newsletter you will find a new sacrifice bunt chart. It provides for a three step approach to the sacrifice. We have had to be arbitrary about assigning the probabilities of success on each attempt, lacking any definitive data.

We have estimated the probabilities of success as being 40 per cent each time attempted; 30 per cent of failure; and 30 per cent of the attempts being fouled off or taken as a strike or missed. We've described all of these inconclusive actions, which do not conclude the turn at bat, as foul balls, as this is the most frequent result.

At this point we called on the mathematical wizardry of Jeff Sagarin to predict the eventual results. Jeff, who could reduce a post game shower to a formula, if you provided him the water

temperature, dimensions of the cake of soap and the player's life time statistics for minutes spent adjusting the water taps, has tackled the problem and provided the following:

Let S equal probability of a successful bunt; F equal probability of an unsuccessful bunt; fb equal probability of a foul ball. To determine the probability of an eventual successful bunt we get FIRST ROLL $x S$ plus SECOND ROLL $(fb)S$ plus THIRD ROLL $(fb)^2 S$ equal $S (1 \text{ plus } fb \text{ plus } fb^2)$.

To determine the probability of an eventual unsuccessful bunt we get FIRST ROLL F plus SECOND ROLL $(fb) F$ plus THIRD ROLL $(fb)^2 F$ plus $(fb)^3$ equals $F (1 \text{ plus } fb \text{ plus } fb^2 \text{ plus } fb^3)$.

However, that analysis assumes that the batter will still be bunting with two strikes. If the batter does not bunt, having gotten two strikes on him, we get: Success Probability equals $S (1 \text{ plus } fb)$ Failure Probability equals $F (1 \text{ plus } fb)$.

Or, to put another light on it, probability that batter will get two strikes on him and thus give up the attempt is $(fb)^2$.

Thus, $1 - (fb)^2$ of bunt attempts will ever reach conclusion, if we assume the batter won't bunt with two strikes.

At this point I think Jeff peeked at the end of his slide rule and proposed a change in the basic assumption (40 per cent success, 30 per cent failure and 30 per cent foul balls) and converted it to 33 per cent success, 16.5 per cent failure and 50 per cent foul balls. Using fractions $1/3$, $1/6$ and $1/2$ we achieve for an eventual successful bunt attempt the probability $1/3 (1 \text{ plus } 1/2 \text{ plus } 1/4)$ equals $1/3 (7/4)$ equals $7/12$ (58.3 per cent). For failure probability $1/6 (1 \text{ plus } 1/2 \text{ plus } 1/4)$ plus $(1/2)^3$ equals $1/6 (7/4)$ plus $1/8$ equals $7/24$ plus $3/24$ equals $10/24$ equals $5/12$ (41.7 per cent). The foregoing is to assume the batter will try a third bunt with two strikes on him.

However, if the manager now despairs of getting a successful result, and instructs the batter to hit away, the probabilities of having reached a conclusion which has resulted in a successful or unsuccessful bunt try are: Success equals $1/3 (1 \text{ plus } 1/2)$ equals $1/3 (3/2)$ equals $1/2$, Failure equals $1/6 (1 \text{ plus } 1/2)$ equals $1/6 (3/2)$ equals $1/4$ with two strikes occurring $(1/2)^2$ equals $1/4$ of the time, forcing the batter to hit away. In this case, a bunt attempt will come to a conclusion $1/2 \text{ plus } 1/4$ equals $3/4$ of the time and $1/2 \times 3/4$ equals $2/3$ equals 66.7 per cent will be successful.

That is, the percentage of bunts that come to a conclusion in two attempts will be 75 per cent and two thirds of those bunts will be successful.

From a playing point of view, when the manager opts to try a sacrifice bunt, he can predict a probability of having his strategy work two thirds of the time in the

first two attempts. If the batter is still alive, now with two strikes on him, and the manager wishes to keep the bunt sign on, on the third try the probability of success drops to 58.3 per cent (and the probability of an out now is 41.7 per cent).

These probabilities are as they result cumulatively from the start. By the time the third effort is reached the first two are past history. We cannot obtain the same end result of all three steps if we leave the probabilities of each step unchanged. Therefore, for step three we must replace the circumstances. Remember, by the time we have reached the third try (if it is to be made) foul balls now are failures as they are automatic outs. Therefore, the chart presents a success probability on a roll from 1-1-1 to 4-3-6 (.5833 - see Master Chart) rather than the 4-1-1 thru 5-6-6 (.333) which represented success on the first two tries. As the manager you don't get a shot at a .5833 success until you've run the risks of .333 per cent of a put out on each of the first two rolls.

So, when you elect for a sacrifice try, you can assume that 66.7 per cent of the time you

will achieve your goal in two rolls. If the batter is "still alive" you have a reduced chance of success (down from 66.7 per cent to 58.3 per cent). You may elect to cancel the bunt try and hit away.

However, a batter with two strikes on him, has a lower expectancy of getting a base hit than a hitter who can elect to lay off a pitch in order to get one more to his liking. So, to add realism, and some "gamesmanship," we now reduce the batter's hitting range by six lines. This drops a batter by 28 percentage points, for this one turn only. If you, the manager, take off the bunt sign, after the batter has acquired two strikes, you are also reducing his hitting effectiveness.

Therefore, via observation, the mathematical work of Jeff Sagarin, and the converting of this to game techniques, we feel we have provided another dimension to "Extra Innings." Whether you have followed this dissertation or not, just refer to the new sacrifice bunt chart. It's all laid out for you, along with new ways of retiring the batter when his attempt has been unsuccessful.

See chart on page four.

I Was There... by Bill Fitzpatrick

It was a great moment in Brooklyn baseball. The first night game to be played at Ebbets Field. It became memorable for all baseball fans because the first game played under the lights at Ebbets Field became Johnny VanderMeer's second consecutive no-hitter!

Yes, "I was there!" But I must qualify how I saw it. What I saw was the pitcher, batter, catcher, umpire and first baseman. Also the top of scoreboard in right field. I was standing on the roof of a garage behind the left field grandstand, squinting between the upper and lower tiers of the stands. This was in 1938 and I was 17.

A few weeks before that game, a friend and myself, walking home from high school, discovered that it was possible to get up on the roof of that garage.

Anyway, here was the first night game. I lived near the field and headed for the garage roof perch right after dinner. There must have been about 20 others up there all peering at the segment of action we could see.

Remember, this was 1938. Red Barber didn't arrive to broadcast Dodger games until the next year. There were no major league broadcasts in New York. We'd listen to the Newark Bears games on a New Jersey station to get the major league scores between innings. Obviously, there was no television.

So, picture the scene. No one with a transistor radio... they didn't have those yet, either. We watched the game and knew it was a shutout. Some of us even suspected a no-hitter. Oddly, I don't recall anyone being aware that Vandy had pitched a no-hitter his last outing in Boston. Frankly, we kept rooting for the Dodgers. We stayed on the roof until the final out, then

scrambled down to ask those leaving the park if it had really been a no-hitter. I still remember a man stamping along saying: "I dunno, they lost, that's all that counts!"

Actually, it wasn't until we read the account of the game in the morning papers that the full impact of the unusual event hit any of us. The crowds leaving Ebbets Field after the game seemed more bitter about the loss than impressed by achievement. But, that's the way it was in Brooklyn; we didn't go for that "it isn't whether you win or lose it's how you play the game" stuff. Winning was the whole thing, and for the years I was growing up, also a rare thing in Brooklyn baseball. I still remember a headline on the Brooklyn Eagle sports page, written in all earnestness, "Overconfidence May Cost Dodgers Sixth Place!"

If anyone ever asks me: "Where were you on the night of June 15, 1938?", I'll probably answer: "Watching the Dodgers lose to Cincinnati!"

And, if they ask me for a witness, I'll tell them: "The guy standing next to me on the garage roof was Jack Kavanagh... he invented some kind of a crazy baseball game later."

Editor's Note: I wrung this story out of my boyfriend friend, Bill Fitzpatrick. Bill, who splits his devotion between Aqueduct and Shea Stadium, a pale substitute for Ebbets Field, has an abiding hatred for Walter O'Malley who moved the Dodgers to L.A. In his office, Bill has a picture of his favorite equine performer, Citation. Once I sneaked a picture of O'Malley in and switched the photos, then waited for a reaction. Bill came in the office, glanced at the wall and grunted: "When I went out there was a horse's head up there..."

Sacrifice Bunt Chart

Runner on first or runners on first and second only.
Not to be used for a squeeze play with runner on third.

FIRST TRY	Foul Ball	1-1-1 thru 3-6-6
	Successful	4-1-1 thru 5-6-6
	Failure	6-1-1 thru 6-6-6
SECOND TRY	Foul Ball	1-1-1 thru 3-6-6
	Successful	4-1-1 thru 5-6-6
	Failure	6-1-1 thru 6-6-6
THIRD TRY (optional)	Successful	1-1-1 thru 4-3-6
	Failure	4-4-1 thru 6-6-6

Special data on successful attempts. On First try batter is retired pitcher to first baseman. On Second try, batter is retired pitcher to second baseman covering first base. On Third try, batter is retired third baseman to second baseman covering first base. If last two dice are the same on a successful attempt, base runner(s) safe on a fielders choice and batter reaches first base and is credited with a sacrifice.

If last dice ends in a six, and is not a "double number", batter reaches first base and is credited with a hit. All runners advance one base on the sacrifice try.

Special data on unsuccessful attempts (not foul balls).

If the third dice ends in:

One: Runner out. If more than one runner, the lead runner is out, other advancing to second base. If put out at third base, runner out, pitcher to third. If put out at second base, runner out, pitcher to short stop.

Two: Runner out. If more than one runner, the lead runner is out, other advancing to second base. If put out at third base, runner out, first baseman to third baseman. If put out at second base, runner out, pitcher to shortstop.

Three: Runner out. If more than one runner, the lead runner is out, other advancing to second base. If put out at third base, runner out, catcher to third baseman. If put out at second base, runner out first baseman to shortstop.

Four: Batter strikes out. No advance.

Five: Batter fouls to catcher. No advance.

Six: Double Play. If more than one runner on base, lead runner is doubled off. If runner doubled off second, put out catcher to shortstop. If runner doubled off first, put out pitcher to first baseman.

ERRORS: (As sacrifice attempt replaces First Roll action on batter, it is necessary to include error possibility in the Sacrifice Bunt Chart).

Any failure (not including foul balls on first two tries) which ends in "double figures" on last two dice, 1-1, 2-2, 3-3, etc. replaces the described action with an error as follows:

1-1 Error on pitchers throw, all runners advance one base extra, batter reaches first.

2-2 Error on pitchers throw to first base. Runners advance on

sacrifice credited to batter, and batter is safe at first on error.

3-3 Error on catchers throw, if more than one runner, lead runner advances two bases, other runner one base. If only one runner, advances one base. Batter reaches first safely on error.

4-4 Error on catchers throw. Runner(s) advance two bases, batter reaches second on catchers throwing error.

5-5 Error on first basemens throw, all runners advance one base extra, batter reaches first.

6-6 Error on third basemens throw, all runners advance one base extra, batter reaches first.

Editor's Note: Before daring to print the foregoing, I sent the article to Jeff Sagarin for reaction. He belabored me with his slide rule! We'll print Jeff's rejection in the "Hot Stove" issue (Jan. '73) as it will fuel the Franklin through many a wintery night for those of mathematical persuasions. Basically, Jeff objects to my changing "conditional probabilities" in mid-stream.

1972 Rosters Out In January

Newsletter subscribers will receive 1972 rosters, but not in October as we have done in past seasons. While these rosters will now be produced independently of "EI", that is not the reason for the delay. We want to give you the fullest rosters possible. When "EI" was designed the game was keyed to batting averages, power factors and ERAs. These were available from unofficial stats at a season's end.

We supplemented with individualized pitcher's batting lines and separated players who'd performed with more than one team in the season, in January. We also undertook defensive ratings at that time.

As we have progressed toward the third edition of "EI" we have dealt with, or planned for, playing features which require fuller statistics than are available at the end of a season.

Many of you received the 1948 AL rosters with the July issue. That is the form we have now decided to use for future rosters. Two teams to a page, pitcher's individualized hitting stats, etc. DP and Error data. Also, the new rosters will rate players for running ability both for steals and advancing on base and will give ABs as well as GP.

Heard From The Grandstand Managers

"Keep up the good work. I devoutly hope your plan on the rosters is acceptable to Brethern Miller, Moss, et al. The donation plan (to NARC) is splendid for it allows me to do something socially useful with a bit of my hobby money.

"A field school is Des Moines, Iowa, this summer took me away from my game for about a month, so my Cubs are just starting August. I'm using TSN stats for roster updating and enjoying the games tremendously.

"Now, one suggestion: in light of Jeff Sagarin's suggestion about keying the ERA Adjustment Chart to the specific season, I've been looking through the Baseball Encyclopedia. It seems to me that it would be better to list the Hall of Fame pitchers in terms of lines plus or minus on the hitter, rather than just by ERA. In other words, a 1906 pitcher with a 2.61 ERA was about average (0-0-0), while a 1930 pitcher with a 3.67 was considerably better than average (0-1-0). Of course, this gets difficult with career records, but it seems incongruous to me to have some Hall of Famers actually adding lines to the hitter, when in their day they almost certainly didn't. It might soothe some Red Ruffing fans puzzled by his 3.80.

"Incidentally, I'm toying with the notion of a great losers league. I'd take the 1899 Cleveland Spiders, the 1962 Mets and two to six other teams of that sort, giving one of them a chance to be a pennant winner. Now that's got to be one of the flakiest notions you've ever come across."

Darrell Holtz, Jr. Berrien Springs, MI.

You've been out-flaked. Bill Bickel set up the losers league several years ago. Same idea. Don't know that he finished a league competition.

You're right on target with a valid criticism of rating H of F pitchers by ERAs. See page one story about Normalized Players and Teams. That'll be a feature of the third edition and will solve the incongruities. A pitcher will be rated by his superiority to the league in a given season. We've been nibbling away at this and Koufax and Gibson are right in there with Matty, Alex, Johnson, etc. But, the surprise is Dazzy Vance of 1924. His 2.16 when the league was 3.86 is quite a spread. Jeff Sagarin and John Swistak have been chomping at the bit to get into this.

Space is a problem with this issue. We have a number of letters which raise interesting points. In the spirit of brevity, I'll capsule the content of letters and indulge myself in lengthy answers.

Matt Sutko of Cleveland covered much territory in a four page letter. Among his numerous points he urged we abandon our plan to reprint the 1941 AL rosters, urging we substitute with the 1956 NL when Milwaukee edged out Brooklyn and Cincinnati. We've heard from others who, like Matt, pointed out I was foisting the glory year of my own youth on the "under 30 set" which makes up the bulk of games

players. O.K., you win.

Matt also pointed out that the game was getting more complex than those who make up their own rosters can handle. He asks the option to exclude certain refinements which require time to work out. We've been somewhat concerned about this ourselves. Essentially, we look upon the alterations we've projected through the newsletter as experimental. When we wrap up the third edition most will be retained; others will be modified; some new wrinkles will be added. But, we will divide the play of the game into a basic form and what we've called "The Pro Level."

Harry Conover, New York City, sent in a great account of a game played between the Tigers and A's, anticipating somewhat the AL '72 playoffs. Vida Blue and Mickey Lolich took the mound for an anticipated pitcher's duel that ended 15 innings later with both benches emptied and Blue and Lolich knocked out of the game as Oakland edged out Detroit, 9-8. Harry's accompanying text and boxscore deserve the meager immortality of our newsprint. Some future time. Harry is hard at work on his own game design, a hockey game. Sounds great and maybe hockey fans will finally get a game that meets expectations. Harry phoned recently to ask if we had a copyright on our Master Chart, which converts three dice combinations into decimal equivalents. No, we assured him, we wouldn't consider that any more qualified for copyrighting than the multiplication table. A number of games players have used the Master Chart for games design of their own or to make adaptations to "EI" and other games. Welcome!

Michael Zimmerman, Toronto, has written to say he has had to discontinue "Coaching Lines". Pressures of school, etc. have made it difficult for him to meet press deadlines. We hope he'll resume some day.

Steve Spisak, Lexington, Ky., questions the value of the home team advantage: Bill Quinn, now of Cincinnati, having moved from Columbus, O., praises it as a factor in his play. We'll go back to that gimmick in the future.

There have been a number of inquiries about fatigue factors effecting pitchers in the late innings. This is another puzzler. If you base a pitcher's performance on his season's ERA, and use the Adjusted ERA Chart, you are using a constant factor which derives from all innings he has worked. To rationalize that a pitcher grows weary in the late innings must be balanced by assuming a better than ERA performance when he is a fresh pitcher. We'd prefer to leave it to the judgement of those playing the games. You can make any arbitrary rule you wish. Add six lines to the batter's range for each inning after the seventh; twelve lines for each extra inning worked; something like that. But, it's one of those things that lacks statistically deliniation.

All letters received by "EI" are answered. We try to reprint the most provocative letters and our replies in the newsletter.