



# BULLETIN

Issue 135

September 1980

Price 30p

The News Bulletin of the  
SOUTHERN COUNTIES CHESS UNION

Published September, November, January, March, May and July

Editor: RJ Haddrell, 48 Southview Rd, Tunbridge Wells, Kent TN4 9BX: TW(0892) 32361  
All enquiries, orders and copy to the Editor. Copy deadline is the first of the month of publication.

Subscriptions: Annual subscriptions run from September, at the rate fixed annually by the Union. Single issues are sold at the cover price. Part year subscriptions may be taken out at the appropriate multiple of the cover price. Back numbers are usually available.

Southern Counties Grading List (published September in each year) is available from the Editor. The 1980 List costs £1.40, with a 10p reduction for bulk orders of 10 or more copies.

All prices include postage. Cheques should be payable to the Southern Counties Chess Union.

SCCU OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

President	AJ Douglas, 101 Hazelwood Rd, Hurst Green, Oxted, Surrey: 088 388 3367
Deputy President	J Poole, 19 Wolsey Rd, Moor Park, Northwood, Middx
Secretary	RCA Lee-Pentecost, 18 Longton Grove, Sydenham SE26
Treasurer	RJ Richmond, 25a Newmarket Rd, Cambridge CB5 8EQ
Grading Secretary	BG Locke, 51 Queensway, Horsham, Sussex RH13 5AP: Horsham 61802
County Match Controller	AJ Douglas
Individ. T Secretary	FC Manning, 44 Willow Rd, Wallington, Surrey: 01 647 0063
Fixture Secretary	NW Dennis, Boundary House, 230 Greys Rd, Henley on Thames, Oxon: Henley on Thames 6052
Junior Organiser	FC Manning
Curator of Equipment	FC Manning
Bulletin Editor	RJ Haddrell
Grading Programmer	HT Jones, Flat 2, 11 Guildford Rd, Tunbridge Wells, Kent: TW 35639

Executive Committee

The Committee consists of the above named Officers and the following:

AB Bamford	62 Darwin Court, Gloucester Avenue, London N1
EE Croker	3 Berridge Green, Edgware HA8 6EQ: 01 952 3129
BA Fewell	41 Station Rd, Harpenden 67227
JJ Lauder	37 Dora Rd, Wimbledon SW19: 01 946 0844
C Lean	47 Benslow Lane, Hitchin, Herts SG4 9RE: Hitchin 33248
D Mayers	Royal Hospital School, Holbrook, Suffolk: Holbrook 601
G Parker	Honeywood, Kiln Lane, Bourne End, Bucks
GL Smith	Chase Cottage, The Chase, Shenfield Common, Brentwood, Essex
NG Thomas	Hope House, Poringland, Norwich NR14 7NA: Framingham Earl 3408
JC Waldron	Droke, Wantage Rd, Harwell, Oxford: Harwell 273

Mr Lauder holds the office of Life Vice-President.

Auditor: RW Bonds, 119 Rochester Way, Blackheath, London SE3 8AU

One more Grading List issue. At the time of writing I am not certain, but it looks as though we shall be out much earlier this year. Contingency apologies in case we aren't. The bulk of Brian Locke's Grading Report, including a list of events graded, has gone into the Grading List itself this year at the (very sensible) request of the BCF. Some bits which wouldn't fit in the Grading List appear below.

A sneak preview tells me that my own new grade is one or two points lower than expected. Not worth worrying about, and I know which grading omissions are to blame anyway. But if your grade causes apoplexy, remember that you can find out which of your games were included by sending a small fee to Trevor Jones, the SCCU Grading Programmer: see his article below.

Quite a lot of games have gone ungraded this year. It's a lottery, really, and in my opinion a totally unacceptable one. It's high time all events (leagues as well as congresses) wanting their games graded were required to pay a fee, either to the Union or to the BCF. We could then concentrate on doing them, and ignore the non-paying events. Graders also should receive a fee (as some already do); we would then have more right to expect them to get the work done fully, and on time.

I know that some delay, how significant I don't know, has been caused this year by results submitted late from a league which contributes nothing to either Union or BCF funds. What's more, a lot of their results were for new players who had only played one or two games. New players are always the most troublesome and I very much doubt whether the one-or-two-game merchants are worth including. But late results, from a non-paying organisation, I would not have accepted at all.

Readers will note that an interim grading list is to be published by the BCF early next year. I believe this is an excellent thing.

#### SOME NOTES FROM THE GRADING SECRETARY

Following representations from organisers of congresses, particularly those held in the summer, the BCF proposes to publish a supplementary grading list in the early part of next year, which will emend grades published this autumn by inclusion of results from congresses played during the period 1st May to 31st October 1980. The qualification to appear in this list will be 18 games in the 18 months ended 31st October 1980 of which at least 8 games must have been played during the 6 months ended 31st October 1980. New players will not be included but some players who have records on our file which do not at present qualify to be published may by then have enough games to appear.

Some grading was received very late this year. Whilst the system is flexible enough to allow the results to be included, it does mean that checks on new players and correction of errors, as revealed by the computer, may have been skimmed or missed. We have done our best to get things right but there may be some errors or omissions due to this late receipt of certain grading.

Brian G Locke

Grading Secretary

(For list of events graded, see the Grading List itself.)

#### A MESSAGE FROM THE GRADING PROGRAMMER

Firstly I should like to thank the majority of county, league and congress graders who got most of their results in to the computer in good time, and (with a few notable exceptions) with reasonably neatly filled in forms. It must be remembered that punched cards are produced from these by ladies at Grieveson, Grant and Co who have no interest in chess and who are used to simpler forms for most GG programs. I must also thank Brian Locke for his help in handling the data received and for his ever willingness to discuss problems at length over the phone, usually between 10.30 p.m. and 11 p.m. at night! To the general public I must emphasise that, with the exception of a few major congresses that may in some cases pay nominal fees to their graders, all grading (including my own professional services as a programmer) is done by voluntary unpaid labour, often burning the midnight oil. The expenses cover postage, telephone, printing and the very reasonable charges made by Grieveson, Grant and Co for computer time and card-punching.

It is well known from the media that even people in the most highly paid jobs sometimes make mistakes, so it is not surprising that from such diverse unpaid labour there should be plenty of errors and inconsistencies going into the grading system. To anyone particularly upset with the product from any area of grading work (especially concerning the omission of certain major events from grading altogether, such as the London League or some National Club/Plate matches), the only real remedy is to offer to help with the work next year so as to spread the load away from those who are already hard-pressed to meet deadlines, and of course to show how much better you can do it than anyone else (if you can!). We individuals concerned with running

the SCCU grading system can never be responsible for getting events graded, although Brian Locke does of course make reasonable efforts to find graders for competitions not making their own arrangements.

For my own part, it is enough on the one hand to keep track of all the data forms coming in to the computer, to see that they are passed through for punching in the correct sequence, and to see that the right programs are run with the right data at the right time, and on the other hand to be continuing to improve the programs to provide better diagnostics of actual errors and inconsistencies (as opposed to omissions, which cannot be catered for), to facilitate the correction of errors that are brought to our attention, and to provide various supplementary services for the BCF, other Unions, and also individuals or organisations requesting them.

At present the only supplementary service available is to print out selected input data, which it should be appreciated comes in three kinds: (i) grading scores (games and points) for existing players; (ii) alterations (to name, date, age, last year's results) for existing players; (iii) grading scores and full details for players new to the SCCU system, or re-entering after a lapse of 2 or more years. The standard services offered are:

(A) £1.40 (the current price of a Grading List) for the itemised input, by league, congress etc, for up to 5 players. This will be run on the computer as part of a larger job as soon as possible after the beginning of each new month up to January.

(B) £7 (5 times A) for the same as A but for up to 35 players and in a job run specially for you.

Except for new players, information is held only by reference numbers as printed in the graders' Master List. As part of the service being offered, I will have to look up these numbers for any names being requested, which all takes time. Special terms are available for anyone able to supply reference numbers instead of names; also for printing all the grading input for one particular event, or several events grouped together for grading purposes.

During the year, I hope to develop a more sophisticated program to print out Master List type details for all players in a specified club or group of clubs. The rough estimated cost for this is £10, but it all depends on how long the program takes to run once it is written.

Players sometimes send me or Brian Locke a complete list of games they played during the season, most often purporting to show that their grade should be higher than it is, or that it should be published when it hasn't been. Firstly, speaking for myself, I must say that I have no time to pay any attention to such lists during the summer months (roughly May to September). But that aside, these lists can only serve to pinpoint events that have not been graded - unless you are prepared to pay the fee for an itemised input listing. The omission of results should be taken up with the organiser or local grader concerned; even if it turns out that the results were input but wrongly (e.g. wrong reference number) we still have to refer back to the grader to get it right. An itemised listing, however, could show that someone else's games have been attributed to you or that something totally ridiculous (e.g. missing a final zero) was given to you somewhere. In this case we would of course publish a correction to your grade in a subsequent Bulletin. There would be no question of refunding the £1.40.

There are plans afoot for an appeal system against grading, for a larger fee (probably around £3, but subject to further BCF deliberations). This fee would be refunded if your grade proved to be wrong by a specified number of points - probably 3 or 4 - as the result of an error, though not if it resulted purely from the omission of a whole ungraded event.

In the winter months, provided I have the time, I am prepared to do my own calculations on lists of results sent to me by players; but there would be a fee of £4 which would be split 50-50 between me and the Union. (Fees for the services mentioned earlier go entirely to the Union.) You should note, anyway, that such lists can be graded out of context only if your opponents have reasonably firm grades based on a fair number of games.

Finally I would like your comments on this proposal:

"Bearing in mind that 'new players' cause the most problems in punching time and corrections, thus delaying the whole Grading List production and making more work, the Union should not accept 'new player' results from any league or congress not making appropriate financial contributions to the BCF or SCCU."

HT Jones

Flat 2, 11 Guildford Rd, Tunbridge Wells, Kent TN1 1SW: TW 35639

Ed: You can have my comments now. Omit everything up to and including the word "work", and also the words "new player" where they occur thereafter, and I'll vote for it. Junior events excepted.

**ESSEX:** County Championship was won by K Warren 6½/7 from IJ Myall 6... 26 played.  
County Lightning Championship 1 G Novik 6/7; 2 SM Kalinsky 5½... 20 played.  
Essex League Division I 1 Upminster (for the 3rd successive time); 2 Wanstead (12 teams). Division II 1 Harlow; 2 Brentwood (13 teams). Division III 1 Loughton; 2 Barking (13 teams). Division IV 1 Grays; 2 Barking "A" (13 teams).  
Essex KO Trophy: Upminster beat Writtle 4-2 in the final, winning the trophy for the 4th successive year.  
Essex Commercial League: 1 Fords; 2 May and Baker. Results from HI Wolverton

**NORFOLK:** An anonymous letter on BCF stationery, believed to be in Paul Buswell's handwriting, reports:

League Championship Play-off 18.7.80 - Norfolk and Norwich 1, Norwich Anonymous Golden Star 3

Division II (unofficial) Play-off: 1 Fakenham 6/8; 2 Gorleston "B" (Dwarfs) 3½; 3 NAGS "B" 2½

We noted in the last issue that there appeared to be a Division II Central but no Division I Central. Our correspondent confirms that this is indeed the case. We must admit that it isn't as odd as we thought at first. Pity. Poetry turns to prose.

**KENT:** The new Summer Quick-play tournament is now down to the Final between Tunbridge Wells and Folkestone. 20 teams entered, and the tournament seems to have been a considerable success.

**SURREY:** Final competition results - Alexander Cup Streatham beat Wimbledon 6-4 in the final. Surrey Trophy 1 Streatham 9/10; 2 Wimbledon I 8½... Beaumont Cup 1 Redhill I 8½/10; 2 Coulsdon 8... Ellam Trophy 1 Wimbledon IV 8½/10; 2 S Norwood 7½... Centenary Trophy 1 Dorking 9/10; 2 Horley 8... Minor Trophy S Norwood beat Stoneleigh 3½-2½ in the final.

We note with interest that County plans to have an Executive Committee of 51 members have been rejected.

#### CONGRESS RESULTS

**CHARLTON** at Thames Polytechnic, 11-13 July 1980

Open 1-2 JC Pigott (Streatham), CW Pritchett (Islington) 5½/6; 3-8 LS Blackstock (Charlton), AJ Stebbings (Charlton), J Kinlay (Islington), R Bellin (Gt Yarmouth), RM Webb (Denby), IR Watson (Central YMCA) 5... 137 played. Grading 175-190 T Pelling (Mushrooms) 4½; U175 DLL Springate (Medway); U18 NJ Pelling (Romford), B Jacobs (Slough) 4

Major 1-2 JB Norden (Hampstead), JA Brown (Hayes) 5½/6; 3-8 D Morris (Chelmsford), VF Jansen (Richmond), HE Oliver (Aberdare), DG Thakrar, JH Lewin (Tunbridge Wells), ES Lee (Wanstead) 5... 156 played. Grading 135-150 WP Tickner (Petts Wood); U135 H Tassell (Maidstone), P Thomas, AR Henry, M Kemper 4½; U14 JM Emms 4½

Minor 1-3 U Wong (Charlton), CG Ward (Meopham), JS Beyunes 5½/6; 4-6 AD Sim, M Smithson, S Leroy 5... 137 played. Grading U110 NR Hackers 5. U14 JE Duggan 4; U12 PJ Rossiter, Karina Holly 3½; U10 R White 2½

**EVENING STANDARD** 25-27 July 1980 at the West Centre Hotel, London (910 played)

National Bank of Dubai Open 1-7 MG Chandler (N Zealand), P Littlewood (Daventry), JS Speelman (Hampstead), L Ftacnik (Czechoslovakia), Z Pavicic, B Rogulj (both Yugoslavia), A Haik (France) 5/6; 8-22 JDM Nunn, B Kurajica, S Kagan, SM Taulbut, R Bellin, D Strauss, MJ Franklin, R Weemaes, CW Baker, JC Pigott, GC Flear, CK Giam, AC Kosten, KC Arkell, ME Page 4½...

London Women's Championship 1-3 S Caldwell, S Jackson, T Needham 3½/6

Cutty Sark Over 40 Veterans Championship 1 MJ Franklin

London Amateur (U180) Championship 1-2 R Granat (Wimbledon), JD Wager (Charlton) 5½/6; 3-7 D Abiaw (Fulham), T Cruse (Camden), H Erdogan (Lewisham), M Robertson (Lewisham), J Wingfield (Bedford) 5... 178 played

London Major (U145) Championship 1 PJ Rossiter (Portsmouth, age 11) 6/6; 2-3 M Pretlove (Islington), N Thomas (Northampton, age 13) 5½... 265 played

London Novice (U120) Championship 1 PR Bell (Ealing) 6/6; 2-4 AJ Aslett (Camberley), MG Michaelides (W London), JW Rayner (Loughton) 5½... 237 played

**AMERSHAM (17th BERKS AND BUCKS)** 22-25 August 1980 (156 played)

Invitation "Masters" 1 KI Norman 3½/5; 2-4 PC Girdlestone, MV Lambshire, GD Pearce 2½; 5-6 A Ashby, B Eley 2

Premier 1-4 KW Derrick, MJ Freeman, I McAllan, RCS Newton 3½/5...

Challengers "A" 1-2 PD Rooney, JD Wager 4/5; 3-4 DJ Faulkner, Mrs DM Wright 3½...

Challengers "B" 1 FB Ings 4½/5; 2 JP Knee 4; 3 AMJ Robbings 3½...

Reserves Sections: A 1 MJ Church 4½... B 1 C Swick 4½... C 1-2 DA Barrett, K Morris 4... D 1-2 DA Jarvis, P Thomas 4... E 1 J Beedle 4½... F 1-5 S Bird, A Melvin, G Parker, B Railes, G Weston 3½... G P Manning 4½... H MJ Nightall, AFM Foister 4...

Amersham Congress (Cont)Late Open 1-3 CD Gillam, AD Meakes, G Senior 4...Lightning Tournament 1-2 B Eley, R Smith

The Mrs J Stean Cup for the most promising U14 player went to Mark Nightall of Crowthorne who celebrated his 9th birthday during the Congress and was =1st in Reserves H. The Bucks Free Press Tripartite Shield was won by the High Wycombe Club, and the Bucks Examiner Cup by R Newton (=1st in the Premier).

Simultaneous: Brian Eley scored +16 =0 -1 (C Parkinson, Reading).

Results from AJ Cox

ESSEX: We have just received the first edition of the revived Essex CA Bulletin. It is edited by RJ Forey who expects to produce 10 issues a year (now there's an ambitious man). Readers in Essex and elsewhere can take out an annual subscription for £2 sent to him at 17 Warley Mount, Brentwood CM14 5EP. Chess does need County publications - the best of luck to Mr Forey.

We note that some recent changes in the Essex league rules involve "increases in deposits and fines". For things like defaults, we imagine, though we have no details. Do any other Counties operate cash penalty systems?

Essex Junior Championships - we don't know when - produced the following results: Under 18 1 I Robson 5½/6; 2 K Bowden 5... 23 played. Under 15 1 N Pelling 6/6; 2 B Lemmon 5... 13 played. Under 13 1-3 D Bakhshi, J Duggan, J Franklin 7½/9; play-off won by J Franklin. Girls 1 C Kemish... Under 11 1 M Revell 5½/6; 2 A Reeves 5... 76pl. Under 9 1 H Bakhshi 6/6... 56 played.

LLOYDS BANK JUNIOR (U18) INVITATION 21-25 Aug 1980

1-2 NH Bradbury (Borehamwood), AM Byron (Leicester) 7/8; 3-5 B Baer (Muswell Hill), DP Frost (Brighton), JR Richardson (Lewisham) 6; 6-12 NL Carr (Barking), RA Cotton (Exmouth), AJ Dunnington (Leeds), DR Feinstein (Streatham), JB Kirk (Pinner), N Thomas (Duston), IA Welch (Portsmouth) 5½; 13-24 CB Baker (Hampton), JA Brown (Orpington), SG Dighton (Wallington), NI Fox (Borehamwood), JG Gallagher (Wimbledon), W Giblin (Doncaster), PJ Heaven (Tunbridge Wells and Wales), SJ Homer (Wimbledon), DL Lee (Finchley), DP McCarthy (Plymouth), A Rizvi (Pakistan), DJ Watts (Pinner) 5... 93 played. Age group awards to the following SCCU players: U17 DR Feinstein; U15 JB Kirk; U13 NL Carr; U10 M Hennigan. Girls: Anita Rakshit and Cathy Forbes.

Results from Leonard Barden, to whom thanks for promptitude.

(Mr Cox of Amersham was even prompter. If only all would follow their example!)

ON THE LAWS

(instalment 137)

Sorry to revert to this subject, but I have just made a Discovery. I had always assumed, in my innocence, that "The Laws of Chess and their Interpretations" (Pitmans, by arrangement with the BCF) was complete up to the date of publication. I've just found it isn't - there are a number of Interpretations which don't seem to have got in.

Notably Article 14 on the use of the clock. I used to think that in normal chess, as opposed to 5 minute chess, a flag fell when it fell. Not so, apparently. An Interpretation of 1974 says that the flag is considered to have fallen when the arbiter observes the fact; or in his absence, when the player has made a claim. (There seems to be no stipulation that this claim must be correct, but we can probably take that as read.)

Further Interpretations (1979) make it clear that the arbiter cannot impose a "retrogressive" loss on time. In other words, once the time-control move is passed it's too late to discover by detective work on the clock that your opponent must have lost on time. "Question: 'After sealing his move and stopping his clock, a player noticed that his opponent's flag had fallen. The Arbiter ruled that the claim was too late, and the game should be continued.' Answer: 'The Arbiter's decision was correct.' " To make sense of this we must assume that the opponent had made exactly the number of moves required for the time control, and not more. Then the fact that his flag is down proves that he didn't "complete" the last move before his flag fell; which means (Article 14.4) that he lost on time. Only he didn't, because it wasn't spotted immediately. I find this very strange.

In another case, a player resigned and then discovered that his opponent had already lost on time. The arbiter ruled that the loss on time should stand, but the Rules Commission subsequently disagreed with him.

Conclusion: a loss on time is not as "irrevocable" as a checkmate or stalemate. It won't count if it's not discovered until afterwards. Moral: watch your opponent's clock like a hawk! (Immoral rider: if your own flag drops, keep quiet about it.)

The other omissions from the Pitmans book - as far as I have noticed - are of small importance.

There has been some reaction to James Scholes's article on adjudication appeals in the last issue. You may remember that he gave a position (of his own, actually) from a recent appeal, and commented on a rather surprising oversight on the adjudicator's part. The first reaction, oddly enough, came from his opponent. The position: 4r1k1/pp2P1pp/2b5/2n2R2/3p1P1P/P2P2PB/qr1B1Q1K/2R5; White to play. (White JE Scholes, Black F Parr)

Dear Mr Haddrell,

I am writing about the position sent in by Mr Scholes, as his opponent in the game perhaps the one most interested in his comments.

I think the given result (Black win) was correct and in my opinion the best answer to 1 R-Q1 was ...N-N6; then if

- (a) 2 R-B8+, RxR; 3 B-K6+, R-B2; or
- (b) 2 R-K5, NxR. Now:

- 1) 3 R-K2, N-B6+
- 2) 3 RxN, RxR; 4 B-K6+, K-R1 (4...QxB; 5 QxR, Q-N5)
- 3) 3 B-K6+, QxB; 4 RxQ, N-B6+; 5 K-N2, NxP+; 6 K-B1, RxQ+; 7 KxR, N-B4 (7...R-K5; 8 N-K6, N-N5); 8 P-N4, N-K6; 9 R-KN1, B-Q2 and the combination of K-B2 and N-K6 makes the white R look very insecure.

Alternatively in 3): (3 B-K6+) K-R1 and now:

- i) 4 BxQ, N-B6+; 5 K-R3, RxQ; 6 R-B5, B-Q2 ( 6 B-B7, NxR; 7 BxR, B-N7+; 8 K-R2, N-B6 mate)
- ii) 4 RxN, RxR; 5 R-KB5, RxQ; 6 K-R3, QxB
- iii) 4 R-B5, N-B6+; 5 K-R1 (5 K-R3, QxB; or 5 K-N2, RxQ+) NxP+; 6 K-N1, NxR; 7 BxQ, RxQ; 8 KxR, RxP

One point I would comment on is the fact that the judge has disclosed his analysis, this surely is unusual. It all reminds me of the cricketer who was given out and as he walked past the umpire said, "I wasn't out, you know." To which the umpire said, "You read tomorrow morning's paper!"

Regarding your query about how appeal adjudicators decide - as an adjudicator for 30 years I've always understood that the order should be: - (1) The analysis should be examined and if not correct it is rejected; (2) If the analysis does not include vital lines or moves it is rejected; (3) Now and only now should the analysis of the original judge be studied - they do make occasional errors.

Yours sincerely,  
Frank Parr Ewell

JES: The analysis I submitted to the adjudicator differed at move 8 in the main line of (b)3 above (8 R(1)-K1) and came to a different conclusion (draw). I did not wish to dispute that indeed 1...N-N6 is the critical line; my main point was my annoyance with the adjudicator's oversight.

Dear Mr Scholes,

I was interested to read your comments on adjudication appeals in the July SCCU Bulletin. I have only been an adjudicator (Surrey League) for one year, and have not been involved in any appeals in that league. However I did have an interesting experience just over 2 years ago in Manchester.

It was the decisive game in the final of the Manchester League's knock-out tournament, between Bolton and Manchester University. The University (black) needed a draw for the University to win the match, a loss would mean a replay. Adjudication only took place after an adjournment session, so was a fairly rare occurrence in Manchester.

Ⓜ							Ⓚ
					P	Ⓟ	
	R		Ⓟ	K		P	Ⓟ
				Ⓟ			
				P			P
Ⓝ							
	Ⓟ						

Although black is a Bishop and Pawn up, he obviously has no winning chances (as long as the white R remains on the b file and the white K on c6, d5 or e6, to answer ...d5 by Kxd5). So the analysis only needs to consider white's 4 main winning tries. Black's defence in each case consists of avoiding zugzwang, and often getting in ...d5 at an appropriate moment.

We were fairly confident that the initial adjudication would come back a draw, but prepared appeal analysis in case it did not. When the result surprisingly came back as a win for white, we immediately sent off our appeal analysis as follows.

(next page)

Analysis

There are 4 possible winning tries.

(1) Playing Ke7 to support the f pawn's promotion. To do this the R should be on b3 (the black R will be on c8 or f8: obviously not on a8 because of Rxa3). But e.g. after 1 Rb3, Rf8; 2 Ke7 black has 2...d5+; 3 Rxa3, bl=Q; 4 Kxf8, Qb4+; 5 Ke8, Qxa3; 6 exd5, e4 drawing.

(2) Playing the K across to attack the b pawn and the B. But if the K crosses the b file behind the R it allows ...bl=Q+, while if it crosses in front of the R (e.g. R on b3, K on b5) at the very worst black can answer Ka4 by ...Ra8+, driving the K away, and a well timed ...d5 may even win. Finally, if it approaches via c2, black has ...Rc8+; Kbl, Rcl+; Ka2, Ral+; Kb3, bl=Q+ winning.

(3) Playing the K to c7, then Rb8 to exchange R and queen the f pawn. But after Rb8, Rxb8; Kxb8 black queens first with check.

(4) So the only serious winning attempt is R-b7-e7-e8, played with the aid of zugzwang. For this to work the white K must be on d5 to prevent ...d5 and ...bl=Q, and the black R must not be on f8, because black could simply answer Re7 by ...bl=Q and white has no check on e8. An example of the plan successfully carried out is: 1 Kd5, Rc8; 2 Rb7, Rf8??; 3 h5! and black is in zugzwang. However in this line black easily defends with 2...Rc5+; 3 Ke6 (not 3 Kxd6, Rb5+ wins) Rc8 and white has made no progress.

To try to achieve the winning zugzwang (White: Kd5, Rb7, Ph5; Black: Rf8, with black to play) white can try a more subtle plan. Black's main defences will be: (a) with the white P on h4: drive the K from d5 by ...Rc5+ or ...Ra5+; (b) with the white P on h4: drive the K from d5 as above, or set up the zugzwang position with white to play.

The only reason white can come close to achieving his goal is that he can play Rb3 at an appropriate moment. With the R on b3, the black R cannot be on a8 (because of Rxa3) and also the K cannot be checked away from d5 by ...Rc5+, because of Kxd6, and then ...Rb5+ would lose to Rxa3.

So white's best try is:

- 1 Rb3 Rf8 not 1...Rc8 because of 2 Kd5, Rf8 (2...Rd8; 3 Rb7, Rf8; 4 h5 zugzwang);  
     3 Rb7 and black must play ...h5, allowing 4 Rb3, Rc5; 5 Rf3, Rf8;  
     6 Rf5, Rxf7; 7 gxf7 wins
- 2 Kd5 Rc8 not 2...Rd8; 3 Rb7, Rf8; 4 h5 zugzwang
- 3 Rb7 Rc5+
- 4 Ke6 Rc8

We now pointed out the answer to these white tries: (a) 5 Re7, Rf8; 6 Re8?? d5 winning for black; (b) 5 h5, Ra8; 6 Kd5, Rf8 with the reverse zugzwang-type position; (c) 5 Rb3, Rf8 - back to square one.

The appeal analysis concluded by refuting some of the sillier winning tries (i.e. losing tries) and summed up how black would defend against zugzwang-based tries.

However our appeal was rejected. We had not considered the move 5 Rb5 in the above analysis. The appeal adjudicator demonstrated that this elegant move forced the zugzwang against all R moves. The idea is to protect the K on d5 against checks along the rank on move 6, e.g. 5...Ra8; 6 Kd5, Rc8; 7 Rb3!, Rd8; 8 Rb7, Rf8; 9 h5 zugzwang. The move 7 Rb3 in this variation denies black the two squares he would like for his R (7...Ra8 loses to 8 Rxa3, and 7...Rc5+ loses to 8 Kxd6).

Very pretty. But it misses the thematic defence by black: a well timed ...d5.

- |         |                                |  |                     |
|---------|--------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 5 Rb5   | d5!                            | 13 h5                                  | Rg5+                |
| 6 Kxd5  | i) 6 exd5, e4; 7 d6, e3; 8 d7, | 14 Kd6                                 | or 14 Rf5, g6 drawn |
|         | Rf8 wins for black             |  | Rxh5                |
|         | ii) 6 Kxe5, dxe4; 7 Kxe4       | 15 e5                                  | Rh1                 |
|         | bl=Q                           | 16 e6                                  | Rd1+                |
| 7 Rxb1  | Rc5+                           | 17 Kc7                                 | Rel                 |
| 8 Kc6   | not 8 Kd6, Rb5+ wins for black | 18 Kd7                                 | Rd1+                |
|         | Rc6+                           | and if white tries to win he may lose: |                     |
| 9 Kxe5  | or 9 Kf5, Rf6+; 10 Ke5, Rxc6   | 19 Ke8                                 | g5                  |
|         | transposing                    | 20 Rf7+                                | Kg6                 |
|         | Rxc6                           | 21 e7                                  | h5                  |
| 10 Rb8+ | Kh7                            | 22 Kf8                                 | Rel                 |
| 11 f8=Q | Bxf8                           | 23 e8=Q                                | Rxe8+               |
| 12 Rxf8 | Rg4                            | 24 Kxe8                                |                     |

and the R+P ending is drawn, e.g. (next col.) and the white K is too far from the Ps

When we were informed that our appeal had been rejected, we were also told who the appeal adjudicator had been (I was rather surprised at this, since I thought that it was normal practice not to reveal who had adjudicated any game).

I decided to write to the adjudicator to ask whether he had looked at 5...d5 and, if he had, what win was there for white in that line. Subsequent developments are rather unclear. It appears that he had not looked at this line originally, but, when



we pointed it out to him, he agreed that it was sufficient to draw. He immediately wrote to the league secretary, asking him to correct the result to a draw.

The league secretary wrote back to him 3 weeks later, to say that the result must stand (a decision which I can understand) but the reason given (that it was too long after the original match, not the more acceptable reason that a decision on an appeal must be final) was totally incomprehensible since at no time did the University take action more than one day after hearing the decision (original adjudication or appeal).

The appeal adjudicator wrote to me, saying that he was not at all happy with the outcome, but that it was up to me to take the matter further, if there was any way to do so. I wrote to the league secretary, giving the facts, and querying the reference to it being too long after the original match. Unfortunately he did not reply to me, and I decided not to take the matter further.

Incidentally, following the result of the appeal, a replay was arranged (for about 2 weeks after the end of the university term) and Bolton emerged as easy winners.

The general conclusions to be drawn from this incident are:

(1) The appeal adjudicator should be a strong player (in this case he was only of similar grading to the University's board 2 or 3), or preferably a panel of 3. It is very unlikely that 3 strong players, or even 3 weak players, could all overlook the obvious move 5...d5.

(2) It should be made clear to clubs whether the appeal decision will be (a) based exclusively on the appeal analysis (e.g. if it fails to mention 5...d5 it must be automatically rejected). This would obviously be unworkable if applied strictly, since the analysis would have to mention every legal move.

(b) based mainly on the appeal analysis (e.g. if there is a refutation to the appeal's suggested line of defence, but there is another, successful line of defence which was overlooked in the original adjudication, then the appeal should be rejected).

(c) A new adjudication of the position, making use of the appeal analysis where relevant.

I think that it should be (b), i.e. the club should bear the burden of producing the main core of the analysis, but the appeal could succeed even if some details were left out.

(3) It should be made clear whether the appeal adjudication is absolutely final.

My only other comment on appeals does not relate to the Manchester incident. Clubs should be given a realistic length of time to submit their appeal analysis. This year I submitted an appeal after an adjudication in a National Club match, which took 5 days to reach Rhyl by first class post, and was therefore not considered because it exceeded the time limit.

Yours sincerely,

Simon Gillam (Streatham and Brixton CC)

Dear Richard,

Responding to Mr Scholes's challenge in the last issue I would have submitted my adjudication from last season's Cambs I v Berks match - had I been able to find it! I have noted a marked deterioration in the quality of BCF adjudications in the past couple of seasons. We had serious doubts about one third of the Cambs I adjudications last season. Two Cambs I matches were decided on appeal. Berks appealed successfully on the above mentioned game to draw the match 10-10. Only an administrative mix up prevented a counter-appeal on board 9. No such mistake was made against Surrey and we squeezed the extra half point for the match.

No less than 12 of the 36 matches (45, surely? - Ed) in the Championship were 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ -9 $\frac{1}{2}$  or 10-10 last season. Bucks would have avoided relegation had they got an extra half point against Oxfordshire. Two more half points in the right place would have seen Essex rather than Kent qualify for the final stage. A top class adjudication service is vital.

I find adjudication after 40 moves highly unsatisfactory, and blitz finishes unacceptable for county matches. I think there is a great deal to be said for the practice in the MCCU of playing 15 moves in 15 minutes after the first time control.

Yours,

Robert Richmond Cambridge

Ed: And that, gentle reader, is all you're getting on adjudications in this issue.\* It contains more chess than the previous 12 issues put together. Nothing like a bit of variety, but don't expect it every time. Further correspondence on the subject will be welcome, but will probably not get published until late in the season when county match results are slack.

\*: Not quite! See next page.

So, to change the subject: doesn't the second paragraph of Robert Richmond's letter reinforce a passing opinion I ventured in the last issue? Namely that leagues would ideally be decided on games rather than matches. The result of any game between evenly matched opponents must be to some degree a matter of chance (e.g. who happened

to be on form, or who happened to make his mistakes in the least critical places). Doubtful adjudications add another element of uncertainty. In a league decided on games (180 games per county, in the Championship) the chances will even themselves out pretty well. But bring match points into it, and if a large number of matches are close you'll get the random element transferring itself to matches as well. This is more serious because counties only play 9 matches.

And to prove that someone agrees with me:

Dear Mr Haddrell,

I share your preference for Game Points. See what a difference there would be at the foot of the Championship section. I must of course declare my interest as a Bucks player in spite of being "exiled" in Berks. (Incidentally Mr O'Brien may be assured that my credentials are impeccable!)...

Yours sincerely,

Alan Cox                      Shinfield

A short postscript to the Scholes - Parr position 3 pages back: GW Smith expresses sympathy for White. ("The adjudicator's line 1 R-Q1 N-Q2 2 Q-K2 QxP does seem very simplistic and of course 3 R-B7 is a killer. Obviously White did not submit analysis on this line - it looks wrong!") Mr Smith concludes that 1... N-N6 etc is drawn but there can obviously be two opinions about that.

#### JUNIOR TRAINING

We don't know how much readers have heard about the BCF's national training scheme. The Bulletin had heard very little until a few days ago. Anyway, it goes something like this:

There is to be a three-tier coaching team with the titles BCF National Coach; BCF Regional Coach; and Assistant BCF Regional Coach. They will coach, respectively, the National Junior Squad; County Junior squads; and other groups at an elementary level. (We have heard that there is a practical examination for coaches but have no details.) The whole scheme is to be under the direction of DC Jarrett, Director of Junior Chess. The BCF will foot the bill for coaches' fees and travelling expenses, hopefully with financial assistance from outside sources.

It is proposed to set up 16 "regional coaching centres", 4 in each Union. (The 4 SCCU ones are East Anglia; Essex; Surrey/Sussex/Kent; W Middx/Oxford/Bucks. We have no information on the other half of Middx.) The suggestion is that each centre could hold two events a year, combining training with competitive chess but with an emphasis on the former. Local organisers would liaise with the BCF on things like the number of coaches required. They would also be expected to find accommodation, in private homes, for the coaches.

In addition to the 16 regional events, two events specifically for girls are envisaged: one in the North and one in the South.

Last we heard, all but three of the proposed regional centres had said "yes" and proposed venues, and some had actually named dates and started on arrangements. We don't know where the four SCCU venues are for the initial events, because no one told us and we haven't the energy to enquire. (The BCF suggests that training events could be held in conjunction with congresses but we foresee practical difficulties.) We also don't know whether the SCCU events will be for selected stronger players or open to all comers; the BCF suggests the latter. We would be delighted to publish reports of such events when they have been held; the reactions of the customers themselves would be of particular interest.

One Union, we hear, has already set up a fund for junior training. This isn't the SCCU unless things have been happening in secret. Maybe it's something we should think about.

The National Junior Squad, incidentally, is under the management of Leonard Barden and comprises some 20 players, if our information is correct. (We had a feeling it was more.)

QUOTE from the latest issue of Westward Ho!, official bulletin of the WECU:

"At the (BCF) Council Meeting the West of England put amendments to the main proposals that Congresses that were affiliated to a Union or County and/or Congresses that only accept registered players be exempt was heavily defeated. The logic behind this vote is a little obscure."

The logic behind this sentence...?!? If the amendments were couched in such Carrollian terms I'm surprised anyone understood them, let alone voted for them.

Seriously, though, the WECU objects to the "double taxation" involved if its registered players compete in congresses outside the Union and thus have to contribute to congress-registration fees. (All congresses in the WECU will be graded next season, whether BCF-registered or not.) While I can understand their point of view, I don't see why there shouldn't be two separate charges: one for individual BCF membership, and another for grading. Giving it emotive names like "double taxation" doesn't make

it wrong. There's no special reason why individual registration has to entitle you to the benefits of grading; the BCF does provide other services. (Actually, grading is one service it doesn't provide - except in a very minor co-ordinating way. The Unions do the grading, and if you felt so inclined you could make out a case for grading fees going direct to them. But that's another story.)

I would welcome an end to the "double taxation" system, as a matter of fact Not because it's unfair, but because it's messy. Only I wouldn't end it the WECU's way; I would abolish individual registration and collect only on a payment-by-event basis, to include county leagues, inter-county matches, the lot. The administrative advantages would be tremendous. This would include all services, not just grading, and would go direct to the BCF.

I should emphasize, in case you hadn't guessed, that this is your Editor talking. My suggestion is not SCCU policy, and I'm not even sure that anyone agrees with it.

#### FROM THE COUNTY MATCH CONTROLLER

Jeff Douglas writes:

(1) Please will all county match captains let me have their lists of nominated players as soon as possible, and in any case before their first match.

(2) The "Deposit system" for adjudication fees seemed to work well last year and I would suggest that an appropriate deposit be forwarded to me for the coming season. Any deposit should be accompanied by a note showing (a) the team(s) it is intended to cover and (b) the name and status of the person issuing the cheque. e.g. Match Captain, County Treasurer, etc.

Cheques should be made payable to "BCF adjudications service".

(3) Remember to send in your results and claims promptly. Quite a lot of claims were discounted last year because they were not received in time! Adjudication claims must show the actual claim (e.g. White to win, Draw, etc.) It is not sufficient to just submit the position and leave it to the adjudicator.

(4) Remember it is the Match Captain's duty to ensure that players are properly eligible to be playing for their team.

Many of you will be aware that, at the Annual General Meeting in June, we attempted to introduce updated rules for the County Matches. Unfortunately time prevented this matter from being completed.

A Special General Meeting is being called for Friday 3rd October to finalise this matter and copies of the new rules will be circulated as soon as possible thereafter. An agenda for the meeting together with copies of the proposed rules has been circulated to all County Secretaries.

Good luck for the new season!

#### SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING

A separate mention, just in case you overlooked the important announcement in the preceding item. A Special General Meeting of the SCCU Council will be held on Friday 3rd October to finalise discussion of the new tournament rules. Will County delegates to the Council please ensure that they have received all the relevant paper work from their County Secretaries.

#### BCET SHIELDS

Nominations are invited for British Chess Educational Trust School Shield awards. The BCET awards Shields annually to schools for outstanding attainments. The normal procedure is for Counties to submit nominations to the Union, which will endorse the most deserving one - assuming that nominees are of the usual high standard - before passing it on to the BCET. (The Union may make more than one nomination, but rarely does.) Counties should note that, although awards have sometimes gone to leagues rather than individual schools, the Trust prefers to recognise individual school achievements.

Nominations will be considered by the Union Executive in November/December, and should reach the Union Secretary by the end of October. Please give the fullest possible information, including the name and address of the school organiser in case the Executive wishes to contact him. Allow the Executive plenty of time to make its decision.

#### ELEVENTH THANET CONGRESS 29-31 Aug 1980

Results from MR Croft

Open 1 B Eley 5/5; 2 RG Eales 4½; 3-5 MJ Franklin, A Jackson, AC Kosten 4... 52 pl. Thanet Prize GR Tidmarsh.

Major 1 JA Brown 4½/5; 2-7 D Donner, G Bressi, NR Calver, C Hann, VF Jansen, MR Wiltshire 4... 45 played. BCM Junior prizes: R Murray, MG Shephard 3

Minor 1-3 N Jones, H Phillips, P Shaw 4½/5; 4-7 I Hames, JW Shales, DJ Shurrock, G Zubrecki 4... 40 played. BCM Junior prize: Graeme Jenkins (age 9) 2½

Special prizes for outright winners discouraged pacific last-round draws.

SLATER FOUNDATION BRITISH ISLES CHILDREN'S CHAMPIONSHIP

Wanstead, 29 - 31 Aug 1980

A word of explanation first. It had been hoped to run a European team event, but, possibly because of a clash with a French U15 event, a number of invitees declined. Scotland, Wales and Ireland accepted but the Irish had to drop out late because of illness; England then fielded three sides to make up the numbers.

Teams were of two players only. The English players were selected by Leonard Barden and arranged into teams, by areas, afterwards; hence the rather unusual areas represented.

Ten extra players were invited, hors concours, and the 20 played in a 6 round Swiss with team scores determined by addition.

We nearly forgot to say that it was an Under 14 event.

Team scores: 1 England "B" (London and Essex)  $9\frac{1}{2}/12$  - or it may have been  $9\frac{1}{2}/11$ , we believe they played each other; 2 England "C" (East and North-East)  $7\frac{1}{2}$ ; 3-4 England "A" (Midlands) and Scotland 6; 5 Wales 0.

Individual scores: 1 Neil Carr (England "B")  $5/6$ ; 2 Edward Lee (England "B")  $4\frac{1}{2}$ ; 3-5 Angus Dunnigton (England "C"), David Norwood, David Knox 4; 6-9 John Emms (England "C"), Malcolm Pridmore, Joe Hockaday, Ian Thomas  $3\frac{1}{2}$ ...

Financial support from the Slater Foundation, the Aaronson Foundation, BCF, Lyne, Frank and Wagstaff Ltd, Ilford Recorder.

Results from RA Wagstaff.

LLOYDS BANK MASTERS Finsbury Park, 20-28 Aug 1980

1-3 Gheorghiu (Romania), Chandler (NZ), Ligterink (NL)  $7/9$  (split in that order on tie-break); 4-6 Sax (Hungary), Lederman (Israel), Gutman (Israel, ex-USSR)  $6\frac{1}{2}$ ; 7-12 Shamkovich (US), Iskov (Denmark), Pritchett (Islington), Langeweg (NL), Law (Acton), Finlayson (Leicester) 6; 13-29 Bellin, Botterill, Hartston, Petursson, Pytel, Veroci, Fuller, Davies, Knott, A Lewis, D Lewis, Povah, Riedel, Strauss, van der Vliet, Pliester, Watson  $5\frac{1}{2}$ ... 100 played. IM norms: Gutman, Law, Povah, Watson.

LADY MASTERS: 1 WGM Z Veroci (Hungary)  $5\frac{1}{2}/9$ ; 2-3 WGM K van der Mije (NL), WIM S Makai (Hungary)  $4\frac{1}{2}$ ; 4 Clare Whitehead (Leek, Staffs) 4; 5 Susan Caldwell (Eltham, Kent)  $3\frac{1}{2}$ ; 6-8 Carey Groves (Portsmouth), Sheila Jackson (Liverpool), Teresa Needham (W London) 3... 12 played.

The women's tournament was incorporated in the main event - a world first for an international tournament - so that contestants played about half their games among themselves and half against the men.

30 Juniors competed with the help of Lloyds Bank scholarships. All three GMs lost to juniors: Gheorghiu to William Watson, Sax to Michael Pagden, and Shamkovich to John Cox. Stuart Conquest (13) beat IM Calvo. Peter Wells (15) drew with Sax and got a FIDE Master norm. Other FIDE Master norms: Cox, Davies, Jacobs, I Wells. Gheorghiu: "The British youngsters here include many promising talents. They are better than the Americans, and maybe as good as the Russians. The Lloyds Bank Masters is a valuable event because it gives them experience of world class competition."

Lloyds Bank Junior Invitation: results on page 4.

LLOYDS BANK BRITISH CHESS PROBLEM SOLVING CHAMPIONSHIP

1013 people sent entries for the initial stage, a problem published in at least 37 newspapers and bulletins up and down the country. Of these 699 were correct. Successful solvers proceed to the more difficult postal phase, and the Final for the best dozen or so will be held in London in January.

We are glad to see that first-stage entrants who got the position from the Bulletin scored a 100% success rate. Admittedly there were only three of them, but that's three better than last year. (We don't expect to compete with LWB's newspaper columns.)

GRADING TITLES

Brian Locke, SCCU Grading Secretary, wishes to point out (in addition to his comments on page 1 and in the Grading List itself) that the BCF last year introduced a series of national titles based on grading. These are:

British Expert: players on 200 or more in 2 consecutive years.

Candidate Expert: 175+ in 2 consecutive years.

These two titles will only be held while the player maintains the standard required. Other players are divided into classes based on current grade:

Class "A": 150 and over.

Class "B": 125-149

Class "C": 100-124

Class "D": below 100

We don't think these categories are very well known at the moment. The biggest Class is "B"; the BCF quoted a median grade of about 135 for the country as a whole last year, which squares very well with Mr Forbes's SCCU calculation published in the May Bulletin.

IS YOUR PROGRAM SHOWING?

A tournament for chess-playing microprocessors, arranged by the magazine Personal Computer World, took place 4-6 September. A full report, for buffs, will appear in the magazine. Fourteen machines took part, and the winner was a version (not commercially available) of Chess Challenger with 5/5; second Boris Experimental (a development of Sargon 2.5, also not available) 4; 3-4 Mike 3.0 and Rook 4.0 3... The last two shared the prize for non-commercial programs. Boris Experimental lost only to Chess Challenger and we understand a match was arranged immediately afterwards to prove who was really best. The tournament was played at 30 moves per hour.

Sargon 2.5 took part in the Evening Standard Major and Minor tournaments this year, and was awarded to the first prize winner in the Major. The same prize is offered by Competence for the best percentage score by 4 players from the same school in the Evening Standard London Junior (27-31 December). Value £300!

FIXTURE LIST

Late alterations to the list shown on the back page:

C: CE Mar 7 to Nov 22; EK Nov 15 to Dec 13

MJ: EBU Feb 21 to Jan 10; HSY Feb 21 to Apr 4

Match captains please note Cambs fixture Secretary has moved: Chris Howell, A3 Bishops Hostel, Cambridge 61557. There is still no captain for Kent's 4th team, so it is unlikely that Kent will compete in the Ebony.

BATSFORD JUNIOR SCHOLARSHIPS

Batsfords have awarded scholarships, in the form of £25 book vouchers, to 12 leading juniors selected by Leonard Barden and Bob Wade. The 1980 winners from the Southern Counties (ages in brackets) are: Daniel King (17), Bromley; Teresa Needham (14), London W10; Stuart Conquest (13), Hastings; Edward Lee (12), Barkingside.

GUERNSEY INTERNATIONAL

The BCF, with assistance from Guernsey Tourism and the Slater Foundation, is sending an U13 team to the 6th Guernsey International 19-25 October. Players are Edward Lee, Neil Carr, Robert Morrison (Forest Hill and Kent) plus two northerners.

Snippets courtesy of Sep Newsflash:

Laws of Chess and their Interpretations: an authoritative FIDE text, available from the BCF @ £2. The Pitmans publication is out of print.

BCF Yearbook 1980-81 comes out 1st Oct with luck; orders to BCF. £2.15 incl. p and p

BCF Assistant Coaches: A course for AC certificates will be held 18-19 Oct 1980 at Batsfords 9.30-17.30. Instructors Bob Wade and Nigel Povah. Inquiries to Derek Evans, National Junior Training Co-ordinator, 47 Dalehouse Lane, Kenilworth, Warwicks. Fee £8 for course and written and practical exam. (We would welcome reports!)

SCCU BULLETIN

Complimentary copies are being sent to all known editors of county publications and we would welcome reasonably frequent copies in exchange. Drop us a line if we've missed you. (If you see this, that is.) All local organisers are reminded that the Bulletin is hungry for news. We try to send a free copy to anyone supplying publish-  
al news, assuming he isn't a subscriber already.

According to a recent BCF survey, 29 Newsflash subscribers from the SCCU want full details of county match results to be continued in that publication. Paul Buswell has said he intends to cut back anyway. so they will presumably require another source of information. If you are one of them, how about a regular Bulletin subscription? We publish all SCCU county results in full, and not just the top division.

CONGRESS DIARY (Some non-SCCU omitted for want of space)

- Oct 3-5 CHELMSFORD Open, U161 - PC Elliot, 17 Hearsal Ave, Chelmsford  
 4-5 THETFORD - D Lamont, 15 St Johns Way, Thetford, Norfolk  
 5 BEDFORDSHIRE at Dunstable - K Liddle, 1 Lime Tree Close, Sundon Pk, Luton  
 11 HACKNEY FESTIVAL QUICKPLAY - T Morrison, 55 Carleton Rd, London N7  
 12,19 ESSEX JUNIOR CHAMPIONSHIPS - Try R Julian, Nicholas School, St Nicholas Lane, Laindon, Basildon  
 19-25 GUERNSEY INTERNATIONAL Open - Chess Festival Sec, PO Box 23, St Peter Port  
 25-26 HERTFORDSHIRE at Hitchin: Open, U161, U131, U18, U13 (Sun only), U11 (Sat) - Congress Sec, 7 Kipling Close, Hitchin, Herts  
 25-26 KENT JUNIOR CLOSED U18, U16, U14, U11, U11 Girls, U10, U9 - DJ Brown, 32 St Johns Rd, Petts Wood, Orpington  
 26 BASINGSTOKE - RE Boxall, 91 Campsie Close, Basingstoke RG22 5DQ  
 30 ESSEX JUNIOR U11, U9, Girls - Try R Julian as 12, 19 Oct  
 Nov 7-9 BASINGSTOKE - RE Boxall as Oct 26  
 7-9 RGS GUILDFORD JUNIOR - We don't know what sort of event but try AJW Thorn at the Royal Grammar School  
 Dec 27-31 EVENING STAND.LONDON JUNIOR U21, U18, U16, U14; U12/10/8 must qualify - AC Corfe, 464 Mutton Lane, Potters Bar EN6 3BB

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: BCF Newsflash for Aug and Sep; Essex CA Bulletin for Sep; Surrey Chess News for July; Westward Ho! grading issue

SCCU FIXTURE LIST 1980/81

This list was correct on the 7th August 1980 though there may be subsequent alterations. The home team is named first.

Teams competing:

Championship: Berkshire, Cambridgeshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Kent, Middlesex, Norfolk, Oxfordshire, Surrey, Sussex

Montague-Jones: Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire II, Essex II, Herts II, Kent II, Middlesex II, Suffolk, Surrey II, Sussex II

Amboyna: Essex III, Kent III, Middlesex III, Surrey III, Sussex III

Ebony: Berks II, Essex IV, Kent IV, Surrey IV (but Kent's entry is in doubt)

Date	<u>CHAMPIONSHIP</u>	<u>MONTAGUE-JONES</u>	<u>AMBOYNA</u>	<u>EBONY</u>
Oct 4		SySx, BuM, KBd, CH		
11	HK	SkE		
18	OC, MSy, NBr, ESx		SySx, EM	
25		SxE, BdC, MK		BrK
Nov 1	CSx, BrE, KN, SyH, OM		SxE, KSy	
8		BuSx, KSy, CM, SkBd, EH		
15	MC, HO, NSy, EK, SxBr		EK, MSx	
22		SxH, BdE, MSk, SyC, BuK		EK, SyBr
29	CBr, KSx, SyE, ON, MH		KM, SyE	
Dec 6		SyBu, HSk		BrE
13				KSy
Jan 17	HC, NM, EO, SxSy, BrK		SxSy, ME	
24		KSx, CBu, SkSy, EM, HBd		ESy, KBr
31	CK, SyBr, OSx, ME, HN		ESx, SyK	
Feb 7		SxBd, MH, SyE, BuSk, KC		SyE
14	NC, EH, SxM, BrO, KSy		KE, SxM	
21		CSx, SkK, EBU, HSy, BdM		KE, BrSy
28	CSy, OK, MBr, HSx, NE		MK, ESy	
Mar 7	CE	SxM, SyBd, BuH, KE, CSk		
14	SxN, BrH, KM, SyO		SyM, KSx	
21				
28		SkSx, EC, HK, BdBu, MSy		EBr, SyK
Apr 4			SxK	
11			MSy	

It would be helpful if Counties agreeing to change these dates could inform the Editor.

JUNIOR FIXTURE LIST

40 board County matches (U18):

Nov 15	Kent v Essex, Middx v Surrey	)
Dec 6	Kent v Middx, Surrey v Essex	)
Feb 7	Surrey v Kent, Middx v Essex	)

Jamborees:

Feb 21	Metropolitan Counties U18 (20 bds)	)
Mar 7	SCCU U18 (12 bds boys, 6 bds girls)	)
* Apr 11	SCCU U14 (20 bds)	)

All at Highbury Grove School

BCF Jamborees:

Mar 14	National U14 team championship (Rugby)
Apr 11	National U18 team finals

Other events:

Oct 24-26	North London Junior Team Championship
Dec 27-31	Evening Standard London Junior
Jan 17	Evening Standard prizegiving, with GM simul

\* Mar 20-22 SCCU/BCF Junior Squad Junior Championships: U21, U16, U10/12

\* Apr 3-5 " " U18, U14, National Girls U18

Apr 24-26 North London Junior

Apr 27 NLJ Quickplay

\* These dates have been changed since advertised in the last issue.

We also have some dates for County internal junior championships: Essex 12 and 19 Oct, plus 30 Nov U11, U9 and Girls; Kent 25-26 Oct; Surrey 27-29 Mar.

Peter Morrish, without whose help the above Junior list would have been hard to compile, is doing his best to co-ordinate congress dates - adult as well - and would like to hear from you if you are planning a congress. His address: 3 Elmside, 55 Stoneyfields Lane, Edware HA8 9SG.