



BULLETIN

Issue 189

September 1989

Price 70p

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, not guaranteed flexible,
is the first of the month of publication.

Subscriptions: Annual subscriptions run from September, price £3.00. Part-year
subscriptions pro rata. Single issues are sold at the cover price. Back numbers are
usually available.

Grading Lists (September 1989) can be had from HM Cath, 6 Northwood Avenue, Purley,
Surrey CR2 2EP: 01 660 6252. Details: -

	By post	Collected*
SCCU List: SCCU players, 15+ games in last 3 seasons	£3.40 (£3.25)*	£3.10
BCF List: all English players, 10+ games	£6.00	£5.70

* Phone first if collecting. Discount rates asterisked are for orders of five or
more Lists to be sent by post to the same address. Discount orders cannot be mixed.

All prices include postage and packing as appropriate. Make cheques payable to SCCU.

SCCU OFFICERS

President	*G Parker, 1 Thames Close, Bourne End, Bucks SL8 5JE: tel. 06285 22297
Deputy President	office vacant
Secretary	*CE Majer, 18 Longmead, Woolmer Green, Knebworth, Herts SG3 6JH: tel Stevenage (0438) 812781
Treasurer	*WA Suttill, 7 Lonsdale Rd W11 2BY: tel (work) 01 582 5550
Grading Secretary	HM Cath, 6 Northwood Avenue, Purley, Surrey CR2 2EP: 01 660 6252
County Match Controller	*FC Manning, 44 Willow Rd, Wallington, Surrey 01 647 0063
Individual T Secretary	FC Manning
Fixture Secretary	CI Howell, 16 Claire House, Lesley Place, Buckland Hill, Maidstone 670169
Junior Organiser	*PE Morrish, 3 Elmside, 55 Stoneyfields Lane, Edgware, Middx HA8 9SG: 01 959 1758
Curator of Equipment	FC Manning
Bulletin Editor	*RJ Haddrell
Match Captain	RCN Lee-Anderson, 18 Longton Grove, Sydenham SE26: tel (work) 01 928 9222 ext 3395
Minute Secretary	C Lean, 47 Benslow Lane, Hitchin, Herts SG4 9RE: H (0462) 33248

* Officers marked with an asterisk are also members of the SCCU Management Board.

The EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE consists of the Officers, plus the following County Delegates
(or their deputies).

Berks	(?)CT Callow, 12 Chiltern Rd, Little Sandhurst, Camberley, Surrey GU17 8NB: Crowthorne (0344) 773045
Bucks	AJ Cox, 5 Chilcombe Way, Lower Earley, Reading, Berks RG6 3DA
Cambs	(?)RJ Richmond, 26 Ilex Rd, St Ives, Huntingdon, Cambs PE17 6AL: St Ives (0480) 63414
Essex	JA Philpott, 50 Cranston Gardens, Chingford, London E4 9BQ
Herts	C Lean, 47 Benslow Lane, Hitchin, Herts SG4 9RE: H (0462) 33248
Kent	RCN Lee-Anderson
Middx	R Brown, 139 Claude Rd, Leyton E10 6NF
Oxon	LR Millin, 12 Rowel Drive, Begbroke, Oxford OX5 1SE: Kidlington 6634
Surrey	SA White, 47 Wolsey Drive, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT2 5DP: 01 549 6744
Sussex	Dr DJ Opie, 21 Fairfield Way, Haywards Heath, W Sussex RH16 1UT: Haywards Heath (0444) 451541

Life Vice-President: JJ Lauder, Flat 8, Alwyne Mansions, Alwyne Rd, Wimbledon,
London SW19 7AD

Auditor: vacant

Facts we try to get right. Opinions, unless otherwise attributed, are the Editor's.

SCCU EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive met on Friday 8th September 1989. Your Editor wasn't there, having mistaken the date, but he has secured some details from people with better-organised diaries. Apologies for errors caused by hasty telephone-scribbling.

(1) County matches: BCF stage. The BCF had proposed financial penalties for defaulting without adequate notice: £5 per board, or £50 for a complete match. (Ed: so what's the penalty for defaulting 11 boards?) In default of payment, the county (or team?) would be excluded from the BCF stage in the following year. The Executive could see no objection to these proposals, and they were in fact passed at the BCF Council Meeting 16.9.89. Don't know whether Council spelt out the answers to the parenthetical questions.

We were also asked for our reaction to a Lancashire proposal that matches should be over 5 hours, plus a half-hour (each) QP finish; rather than 6 hours plus adjudication as hitherto. Your Editor has not noted the SCCU answer, though he can't believe it was unfavourable, and the proposal was later passed by the BCF Council.

There was also some discussion of a fares equalisation scheme for the Finals. One BCF suggestion involved an increase from £15 to £25 in the entry fee for the BCF stage. Your Editor didn't know there was an entry fee. The Executive decided it didn't want to know about fares equalisation schemes because they were too messy; and the BCF Council later deferred the issue. The BCF Director of Home Chess is understood to have stated that all counties favour a central venue for the Finals. (Your Editor, who is on his county's committee, didn't know the county had discussed it.) The SCCU Executive felt that Birmingham would be a better venue than Derby, but it's Derby again next year.

(2) County matches: SCCU stage. Fred Manning said that all the missing adjudications had finally been done, and all but one or two very late ones had been included in the current season's grading. (See page 6 for details.)

Some counties had made noises about playing 16-board matches. The Executive, while accepting that this might be OK in some circumstances, thought it should be discouraged. Your Editor is unsure about the circumstances it might be OK in, and the method of discouragement. He knows of one or two matches in which the sides have already agreed to play 16 boards.

(3) SCCU Individual Championship 1990 will be at Southend; the other British Championship qualifying places will go to Surrey and Upminster. It was agreed that the SCCU nominee from Southend, whether he is the SCCU Champion or not, will get his British entry fee paid.

(4) Juniors. The SCCU Junior Championship is very doubtful for this season because no sponsor has been found yet (and the BCF Squad event is moving to Uppingham). It seems possible that Essex may not take part in the SCCU events. (Later: they're not playing in the "Metropolitan" league, so the league will probably be a jamboree 2.3.89.)

(5) Grading. The BCF List has appeared on schedule at the beginning of September. Once again Yorkshire have been omitted because they supplied no data; by mistake this year, apparently, and it seems they may be in next time. Some congresses have submitted no results, and there was a suggestion that ungraded congresses should not be reported in the Bulletin in future. This idea was shelved, partly (we like to think) because the Editor wasn't there to comment.

The Gaffney List (largely, but not entirely, quick-play) is to be discontinued.

(6) Dates. SCCU Executive: 9th March and 18th May 1990. SCCU AGM (Council) 30th June.

BCF ANNUAL COUNCIL MEETING

was held on the 16th September 1989. "It was long." Apart from things mentioned above, the quotable ones seem to be: -

(1) Direct Membership. The BCF secured approval to introduce this from January 1990. Details were vague, but the suggested fee is somewhere around £20. Counties will get 10% (we think) commission, and Unions 2½%. Unions and Counties would have to appoint their own Direct Membership Co-ordinators. (Read: The BCF delegates the donkey work to the Unions, who delegate to the counties, who delegate to the clubs...)

(2) County matches: BCF stage. Thelma Milner-Barry's proposal on womens chess (see 188:2) was deferred until the April meeting.

(3) Grading. Council approved an SCCU proposal that congresses not submitting their results for grading should be excluded from the Leigh Grand Prix in the following year. It noted that the new grading list contained no list of congresses graded; this will be rectified next year.

(4) Officers. Notable appointments: new BCF President is John Poole; Director for Home Chess is Bryan Fewell; Junior Director is John Littlewood.

BCF Council meets again on the 7th April (finance, in Birmingham) and the 15th September ("annual", in London).

Just a thought on the BCF Grading List. One of our members at Tunbridge Wells Chess Club is new to the List. I graded 23 internal club games for him this year, and he will have had two or three other games graded by someone else (must have had, in fact, because his published grade isn't exactly what I made it). That makes a grade calculated on 25+ games, all played this year. Pretty reliable as grades go? You'd think so, but it comes out in the List as a D grade ("based on 15 or more games in the last three seasons, of which at least 5 were in the most recent season"). A new player with 29 games this year gets the same classification as someone with 5 games this year and 10 the year before last. One more game, and he'd have been an "A". Scope for an extra category?

RJH

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Richard,

A few comments prompted by SCCU Bulletin 188 July 1989:

Editorial. If organisation of county matches is getting more problem-prone, would it be better if, below the Championship, we re-organised into teams of 12 players? It is easier to organise 12 players than 20, and this would give more flexibility to matching the number of teams to the market for Saturday afternoon. There might also be scope for non-county teams to enter, e.g. a team representing a large club or a local league, thus making the competition more interesting than the present rather limited range of teams in the lower divisions. Larger counties might also be able to organise two or three teams of 12 where they can only manage one of 20, and extra captains might be easier to find with a smaller workload. Teams might also be more intimate (i.e. both more friendly to play in and easier to organise) if they tended to represent different localised areas within counties, quite apart from single-club teams.

AGM (2): Grading. How can Leigh status be tied in practice to grading since I presume Leigh input must be done fairly quickly whereas grading can wait to the end of season. Even with the best intentions an expected grader might not materialise, or might fall ill or move away too late to find a substitute.

AGM (4): County matches (BCF). How about adding also a board for a blind player, one for any other disabled player, one for a junior, one for a non-smoker, one for a non-car-driver, and one for someone graded under 123? All of these people, as well as the ladies, can play in any regular team if they are good enough (or to avoid one of the many defaults). Or they could even invent a new team and offer their services as captain if they can find others to join them - easier of course if my 12-board suggestion is adopted!

Yours sincerely,
H Trevor Jones Tunbridge Wells

Dear Richard,

4th Kings Head London Open: 10-11 June 1989

Do I rise to the bait? Well, fish did, for me, and good ones too, early on a fine Saturday morning a few days ago, the last day of a week spent on a canal boat. So, I shall too. May in fact be instructive.

Rules do have to be read, whether with reluctance or enthusiasm (same issue page numeral one!), the Leigh Grand Prix rules being no exception.

The Leigh rules (rule 21) require that within a fortnight of the end of any qualifying tournament, organisers are required to supply names and totals of players with qualifying scores (4/5 or more in our case) and prize amounts and totals direct to Leonard Barden via the BCF. This we do. Rather than producing two lists of results, one for general circulation and one for Leonard Barden, I produce one list to save time and pencil lead. Clubs are not shown for qualifying participants sine not requested nor shown on the Leigh leader boards. Clubs are of course shown for prize-winners and

these include some of the Leigh qualifiers.

Our main cash prizes are, by the way, always shared equally where there are two or more players on the winning score. Thus all with $4\frac{1}{2}$ were shown and with club. I accept, though, that had there been three players in any of the sections with $5/5$, then players with $4\frac{1}{2}$ would not have been shown with that score unless they had won a grading prize. In that case, should there have been two players with $4\frac{1}{2}$ in line for the grading prize, one only would have been featured after operation of the tie-break.

So, no apologies for the way we present our results. I am happy though in future to add to the Leigh lists the score for players with $4\frac{1}{2}$, where, on the rare occasion, they are not shown amongst the prize-winners. Clubs I can very easily add.

You have, by the way, misread our results sheet. The three players in the open and the Under 160 came joint first and thus share equally the first, second and third prizes.

On another tack (your comments on page one), the Leigh rules do not indeed specifically state that events have to be graded for qualifying events, only that events have to be affiliated tho the National Chess Organisation in which they are situate or to be actively seeking affiliation. There are exceptions but subject to the approval of the national organisation concerned. It makes sense to me that in fact it should be a condition that such events be included in national grading and, at my request, the BCF office is taking this up with the director concerned.

Yours sincerely,
Tony Suttill London W11

Am puzzled by the month time-lapse in the heading of your report on our tournament.

Ed: - Slip of the brain. And yes, I misread the top prize-winners in the Open and U160. But at the risk of seeming obtuse, I don't see how Tony's fulfilling the Leigh conditions in his Barden-list. Not if the requirement's "names and totals". Is LWB expected to work the scores out by comparing the two lists, same as I did? Wouldn't it be simpler to just tell him them? Or go down to 4 points in the "general circulation" list and save even more pencil lead?

Sorry, I know the Editorial Last Word is a nasty beast. (But dammit!) I have inserted my own comments in the next letter. This is an even nastier beast, but letters from Paul Buswell always seem to invite it! What I do appreciate is that he seems to read the Bulletin from cover to cover. His first point was not for publication, but in case I forget to put a private note in his envelope the answer's yes.

Richard,

(2) For shame: page 188:6 "amalgamating" Lincs & SH? The county of Lincoln was partitioned cruelly by the Local Govt Act 1974 into administrative Lincs and (part of) administrative Humberside. [Thought he'd rise to that one.]

(3) Consistent Kent III - their BCF semi-final and Final teams were identical! [I was already kicking myself for not spotting that before going to press. Don't rub it in.]

(4) 188:6 "There was a considerable number..." Fowler might approve (I've not looked) but "were" sounds easier on the ear. [I agree that Fowler's opinion isn't important, and I'm easy on the grammar. Oddly enough, "was" sounds better to me if euphony is all we're talking about; and that's why I wrote it. (Yes, it was a conscious decision.) I would often say "there was a few...", not because "a few" is singular(!) but because it's easier to get your tongue round. My tongue anyway. Doubt if I'd have the courage to write it. Better rein this note in before it develops into a monograph.]

(5) 188:7. If a county is dumb enough to elect/appoint an incompetent, why shouldn't the county suffer for its corporate mistake?

(6) 188:1 Leigh rules/grading. The most obvious example is that Q-play events, not gradeable conventionally, attract Leigh G Prix points. [The (spurious) rule I quoted in Issue 185 made an exception for QP events. I said that at the time but didn't bother to repeat it in the July issue.]

(7) Please put in a mention that Leigh National Club (sections Open/U175/U150/U125) entry forms are available from BCF office, 9a Grand Parade, St Leonards on Sea TN38 ODD.

(8) 188:3. Prescot & Knotty Ash.

Cheers
Paul Buswell St Leonards

Dear Richard,

Mr Croft's comment on the gradings (188:6) is only part of the story, I suggest, behind Kent's narrow loss in the 3rd Teams National Final. The experience of Sussex in the Minor Counties Final was exactly the same, $7\frac{1}{2}$ - $8\frac{1}{2}$, against a team we outgraded. I believe the major factor was the enormous travelling handicap necessitated by the BCF's imposition of venue.

In previous years, all rounds including the Final have been played at venues arranged (and paid for) by the two sides, thus tending to equalisation of travelling and costs. In 1989 the BCF directed all Finals to be played at Derby, a decision few, if any, captains were aware of until too late a stage. Derby was chosen, I understand from the Director of Home Chess, because the National Club Finals were being played at the same venue the next day.

In only one of the four Finals was this remotely sensible for both sides, viz Warwick v Lancashire: in two other Finals, Sussex v Lincs & South Humberside and Kent III v Notts III, the imbalance was grossly to the disadvantage of the two southern counties. The ultimate nonsense was the spectacle of Essex and Middx First Teams being forced to travel well over 100 miles north for the privilege of contesting the Championship Final.

The Sussex team, with one exception, travelled as a group from St Pancras, arriving there for 10 a.m. from various starting points in Sussex. To reach Derby by 1 p.m., everyone had to leave home by 7.30 a.m., and incurred travelling costs of at least £20. Naturally, no one was eager to make an 8-hour round trip by car; naturally, several regular players could not reasonably take part - to ensure the connection, Hastings players would have needed to leave on the 6.30 a.m. train.

It is understandable that several Sussex players were well below normal grading form, and the last Sussex player to finish, after 6 hours play, had been in action for 12 hours. Most of the Sussex team reached home by midnight.

The finalists of the sponsored NCC finals the next day had all expenses paid, plus a buffet reception. The BCF has refused any refund of excess expenditure, despite the income of well over £300 generated by the £15 entry fee for the final stages. (The Home Chess Accounts state an expenditure of £289 on the championships - a breakdown will be interesting - and no income stated from competing teams.)

As a concluding piece of effrontery, the Director of Home Chess proposes to play next season's finals at Derby on June 23rd 1990.

Yours sincerely,
Paul Watson Sussex Chess Association

Quote from Herts CA annual Newsletter:

"For the first time the 1989 finals of the Counties Championship and the finals of the Leigh Interests National Club Championships were played over one weekend... This proved to be a tremendous success, with some very close results." - Bryan Fewell (now, but not then, BCF Director of Home Chess). Bryan adds, incidentally, that there was a QP tournament each day "so spectators could both watch and play chess". Don't know how many spectators there were.

In case you missed it above (quite a long way above):

LEIGH NATIONAL CLUB (Open/U175/U150/U125): entry forms are available from BCF office, 9a Grand Parade, St Leonards on Sea TN38 ODD (0424 442500). Closing date is 1st October. (Ed: The deadline is usually extended, which means you can probably squeeze in if you're not reading this until the end of September. But in fairness to the BCF, get your entry in on time if it's humanly possible.)

ROUND THE COUNTIES

HERTS competitions 1988-9 (in addition to the club leagues reported last time): Capel Cup (county championship we assume: 12-player Swiss, until one dropped out) was won by Paul Byway with 4/5 on tie-break from Kevin Clark. Burn Trophy (KO) was won by DJ Faulkner. Russell Trophy (KO) was won by Barnet who beat Hilltop on board count in the final; Sharp Trophy (also KO) by Hilltop who beat Stevenage 4-2. An SGM will debate proposals to "favour" adjournments rather than adjudication in the county leagues.

KENT Summer Quick-play competition has just been won by Charlton who regrettably beat Tunbridge Wells, the holders, in a close Final. This is Charlton's fourth win in five years.

CHILTERN LEAGUE 1988-9: Final table (from Berks Junior fixture list again)

	Bu	O	H	Br	Bu18	Br18	Bu	O	H	Br	Bu18	Br18	GP	MP
1 Bucks II		15½	10½	13	12½	12½		8½	10	13	13	12½	121	8½
2 Oxon II	4½		13	10	13½	13½	11½		9	11	12	9½	107½	7
3 Herts II	9½	7		11	16	12	10	11		7½	16*	12*	112	6½
4 Berks II	7	9	9		12½	12	7	9	12½		13	17	108	5
5 Bucks U18	7½	6½	4	7½		14½	7	8	4*	7		15	81	2
6 Berks U18	7½	6½	8	8	5½		7½	10½	8*	3	5		69½	1

* only one match played: score counts twice

17th CHARLTON CONGRESS at Charlton House, 21st - 23rd July 1989

Open (64 entered) 1 GC Crawley (Richmond) 5½/6; 2-4 NR Davies (Wrexham), PG Large (Mitcham), JC Benjamin (Richmond) 5... Grading 180-190 AL Mack (Hayes Kent), JD Wager (Charlton), AN Raof (Hendon), W Stanton (Islington) 3½; 170-179 IAJ Galloway (Birmingham Univ) 4; U170 MC Page (Waltham Forest), DC Okike (Kings Head) 3½. Junior

U18 TC Gavriel (Barnet) 3½
Under 160 (82 ent) 1 K Yusof (Derby) 5½/6; 2-4 MA Phillips (Charlton), RJN Camp (Hayes Kent), DC Eden (Dartford) 5... Grading 140-150 RC Hyde (Charlton), DC Ball (Fulham), CICH Wallace (Kings Head) 4½; 130-139 C Reeve (London) 4½; U130 JE Vigus (St Dunstons College) 3½; Ungraded AD Archibald (Finchley) 4. Junior U18 P Griffiths (Athenaeum) 3½

Under 125 (73 ent) 1-2 D Gunter (Wimbledon), WJ Dillon (Kings Head) 5/6; 3 P Grant-Ross (Kings Head) 4½; 4-6 M Huba (Kings Head), D Ryan (Hayes), AD Hargreaves (Whitstable) 4... Grading 100-115 CS Jones (Hendon) 4; U100 L Evbuomwan (Wimbledon), GV Sullivan (Islington), M Ioannides (Milton Keynes) 3; Ungraded A Gountintas (London) 6 it says here. Highest Charlton VE Bioletti. Junior U14 S Tomlinson (St Claves), J Walton (Hayes) 4; U12 MR Taylor (Beckenham), ME Taylor (Sittingbourne) 3½; U10 KCC Mah (Wanstead) 3.

Results TR Jefferies

20th ANNUAL THANET CONGRESS at Broadstairs 1-3 September 1989

Open (33 ent) 1 CG Ward (Sevenoaks/Leicester Univ) 4½/5; 2-4 MJ Basman (Chessington), SW Giddins (Chatham), S Le Blancq (Jersey) 4... Thanet Prize DJ Horton 3

Under 156 (37 ent) 1 Z Mehmet (Lewisham) 4½/5; 2-3 HEJ Dobson (Lewisham), RT McCorry (Thanet: Thanet Prize) 4; 4-6 MA Bone (Ashford), H Grist, S Harwood (both Southend) 3½

Under 121 (44 ent) 1 W Dillon (Deptford) 4½/5; 2-5 KA Andrews (East Grinstead), DR Ewens (Ramsgate), JB Farrell (Metropolitan), NBW Wijngaarden (Netherlands) 4...

Congress Prizes: Ladies S Jackson (London: 3 pts, Open); Over 60s NBW Wijngaarden; Junior ME Taylor (Sittingbourne: 3½, U121); Undefined, but he's also a junior, P Fenn (Sittingbourne: 3, U156).

Results MR Croft

JUNIOR NEWS

LLOYDS BANK BCF JUNIOR SQUAD CHAMPIONSHIPS were held in London 27-28 May 1989. * denotes Champion.

Under 10 (71 pl) 1-2 P Goldstein* (Middx), D Moskovic (Kent) 6/7; 3-5 J Goodall (Lancs), J Vigus (Kent), D Whitehead (Suffolk) 5½... Girls A Dyce* (Notts), L Burrows (Lancs), A Kieran (Kent) 4

Under 9 (73 pl) 1 A Greet* (Cornwall) 6½/7; 2-4 D Garner (Leics), P Finglass (Warwicks), J Houska (London) 6... Girls J Houska* 6; R Sheldon (Manchester) 5

Under 8 (50 pl) 1 A Hunt* (Oxon) 6½/7; 2-4 J Conlon (Berks), R Pert (Suffolk), M Smith (Wilts) 5½... Girls M Haslinger* (Middx) 4; E Walker (Essex) 2½

Under 7 (32 pl) 1 F Haslinger* (Middx) 8/9; 2 B Murray-Watson (Hereford) 7½; 3 G Extence (Lincs) 7... Girls V Jones* (Kent) 4½

Under 6 (incorporated in U7) 1-3 G Hassapis* (Middx), J Conlon (Berks), P Hewitt (London) 5½... Girls I Houska* (S London), R Kieran (Kent) 4½

LLOYDS BANK GIRLS SCHOOL TEAM CHAMPIONSHIP is Britain's largest all-female event. This year it was held at Sheen Mount School, Richmond. 160 players took part.

Under 18 1 Uppingham Community College (Rutland) 6½/9; 2 Ipswich High 5; 3 Godolphin and Latymer (W London) 3½; 4 Coloma Convent School (Croydon) 1

Under 13 (6 teams) 1 Oxford High 10½/12; 2 Uppingham Community College 10; 3 Woodford County High (Essex) 7½...

Under 11 1 Daneshill (Leatherhead) 10½/12; 2-6 Adamsrill (SE London), Honeywell (SW London), St Edwards ("Staffs"), St Stephens (SW London), Sheen Mount (SW London) 10; 7 Cheadle Hulme (Cheshire) 9...

RUSSELL TROPHY JAMBOREE at RGS Guildford 15.9.89

1 Whitgift 6½/8; 2 RGS Guildford 5½; 3 Tiffins 5... 8 teams of 8.

"TIMES" National Schools KO has 407 entries this year, slightly up on last time.

COUNTY LEAGUE TABLES 1988-9

Here we are at last. (And yes, we nominated Middx and Essex the wrong way round, but it didn't really matter since they both reached the BCF Final.) Interestingly, Kent in fourth place "won" the Championship on games! Cambs and Herts are tied on 3 match points, and before counting the games we have to eliminate their results against Berks because Herts scored 20 by default. Hence the figures in brackets. The one and only void match of the season, luckily, was between Cambs and Herts and made no difference to anyone else's position.

CHAMPIONSHIP

	M	E	Sx	K	C	H	Bu	O	Br	GP	MP
1 Middx		11	6½	11	11	13	11	18	12½	94	7
2 Essex	9		10½	10½	13½	11	12½	14	11½	92½	7
3 Sussex	13½	9½		6½	11½	11	12½	14½	14	93	6
4 Kent	9	9½	13½		7	12	15	15	13½	94½	5
5 Cambs	9	6½	8½	13		-	8½	17	15	77½ (62½)	3
6 Herts	7	9	9	7		-	13	14½	20d	79½ (59½)	3
7 Bucks	9	7½	7½	5	11½	7		9	11	67½	2
8 Oxon	2	6	5½	5	3	5½	11		15½	53½	2
9 Berks	7½	8½	6	6½	5	Od	9	4½		47	0

MONTAGUE-JONES

	Sy	K	M	Sy	K	M	GP	MP
1 Surrey I		12½	15		12½	10½	50½	4
2 Kent II	6½		10*	7½		18	42	2
3 Middx II	5	9		8½	2		24½	0

AMBOYNA/EBONY

	K	Sy	E	Sx	K	Sy	E	Sx	GP	MP
1 Kent III		12½	11	12		12½	10½	13½	72	6
2 Surrey II	7½		10	12½	7½		13½	9½	60½	2½
3 Essex II	9	10		10*	9½	6½		12	57	2½
4 Sussex II	8	7½	9		6½	10½	8		49½	1

* match won

Adjudications

- C Bucks 9 11 Middx 15.10.88: 13 Bowley ½ Cawte; 14 Floyd 0 Barnes
 Cambs 17 3 Oxon 5.11.88: 3 Sharp 1 Bix; 6 Lee ½ Ansell (both results agreed)
 Oxon 6½ 13½ Essex 19.11.88: 18 Millin 1 Yates (Oxon appeal upheld). Oxon also
 appealed, unsuccessfully, on board 11.
 Berks 6½ 13½ Kent 3.12.88: 11 Crockart ½ Wager
 Essex 12½ 7½ Bucks 3.12.88: 5 Kenworthy ½ de Coverly
 Essex 11 9 Herts 28.1.89: 4 Kenworthy 0 Swanson; 12 Manley 0 Denton;
 14 Moore 1 Sinkinson
 Sussex 13½ 6½ Middx 28.1.89: 1 Denman ½ Berry; 5 Rutherford 0 Yerbury;
 12 Climie ½ Barnes
 Oxon 11 9 Bucks 11.3.89: 6 Wallace 0 Marsh; 19 Stayt 0 Ginger
 Sussex 11½ 8½ Cambs 11.3.89: 1 Denman 0 Hartston
- AE Kent III 11 9 Essex II 26.11.88: 5 Micklethwaite ½ Heppinstall
 Essex II 9½ 10½ Kent III 18.3.89: 3 Twitchell 0 Mehmet; 9 Rahaman 0 Dobson;
 14 Gibbons 1 Parsons; 16 Armitstead ½ Pilkington; 18 Harrison 0 Cole

Grading. All the adjudicated results have gone into the new Grading List, with the exception of one very late one: Kenworthy - de Coverly. I suspect that the Oxon appeal Millin - Yates will also have been too late, and I'm not sure about Lee - Ansell. Any results that have been missed should go in next time.

Oxon v Essex 19.11.88. An Oxon appeal against a loss on board 11 (Ansell - Crabb) was rejected by the BCF because of an incorrect diagram. The error was, as it happened, irrelevant. It transformed the appellant's first move from Kh2xRg2 into Kf2xRg2, or something like that. It is possible that Fred Manning may allow Oxon to re-submit. (For grading purposes only, please! Not for the league table!! I've lost count of the number of times I've re-edited it.)

Kent v Cambs 15.10.88. This was one of the gremlined matches: adjudication results were received in July and reported in the July issue. Ken Cleak, BCF Adjudications Secretary, tells me that he subsequently received an appeal from

Cambs against a loss on board 3 (Ady - Harley), but rejected it because the match was so stale. I think this is unfortunate. The Union's delays should not cost Mr Harley his right of appeal. Mr Cleak added that he would have rejected the original adjudications had he known at the time that the match had been played in October. Unless this is all a misunderstanding, he is surely applying the rules too strictly. The BCF's rules do say that an adjudication will be null and void if he thinks unnecessary delay has occurred. But this rule was clearly written with BCF competitions in mind. SCCU competitions are run by us, and we must retain the right to impose our own time limits. It cannot matter to an adjudicator whether a game was played yesterday or last Christmas but three. I suppose the BCF must have the right to refuse ancient games if they really want to, but we can't allow them the right to void our adjudications. The SCCU Executive, or someone, should spell this out clearly.

This is, incidentally, your Editor talking; though I fancy - see previous item - that Fred Manning might agree with me. Don't get me wrong: of course saving our adjudications up and sending 39 at once was unfair to Mr Cleak, and I would have seen his point of view if he'd thrown them all back and said "Find someone else to do them". That doesn't affect the Harley case, except in a camel's-back sort of way, and it isn't the issue.

It would be nice if the Harley appeal could be done, for grading purposes. He has a stronger case than Ansell. I don't think we'd be opening any floodgates: I've not heard of any other rejected appeals, and new ones would be out of time.

SCCU COUNTY MATCHES: DATES 1989-90

Teams:

Division 1 Bucks, Cambs, Essex, Herts, Kent, Middx, Surrey, Sussex (8 teams)

Division 2 Berks I, Kent II, Kent III, Middx II, Oxon I (5 teams)

Division 3 Essex II, Kent IV, Middx III, Surrey II, Sussex II (5 teams)

	<u>Championship</u>	<u>Montague-Jones</u>	<u>Amboyna/Ebony</u>	
Sep 23			ESx SyM	Re-printed from last time. Asterisks mark altered dates.
30		MO		
Oct 7		K2K3*	SxSy KE	
14	SyK SxC HE MBu			
21		K3M BrK2		
28			ESy KM	Essex II have withdrawn from the Amboyna/Ebony for want of a match captain. We have left their fixtures in the table just in case they get resurrected.
Nov 4	KSx CH EM BuSy			
11		OK2 K3Br		
18	SyC SxE HBU MK			
25		K2M BrO	ME SxK	
Dec 2	ESy BuSx KH CM			
9		OK3*	SyK MSx	
16		MBr		
Jan 6		OM		
13		K3K2	SxE MSy	
20	SySx KC HM EBU			
27			SySx EK	
Feb 3		MK3 K2Br		
10	MSy SxH BuK CE		MK	
17		K20 BrK3	SyF	
24			EM KSx	
Mar 3		MK2 OBr	KSy	
10	SyH KE SxM CBU			
17		BrM K30	SxM	
24				
31	Minor Counties play-off	Second Teams play-off	Third Teams play-off	

Ed: - I said last time that the Third Teams play-off would run into trouble if Kent IV finished above Middx III in the third division. This is because the rules would then stipulate a play-off between Kent III and Middx III (the only other eligible teams); and this is a nonsense because we aren't allowed to nominate two Kent teams. Someone came up with the idea of holding this play-off anyway, and nominating Middx plus whichever Kent team scored more points against them. Against the rules of course, but what sensible solution isn't? The objection is that Middx would have no interest in the match; they're going to get nominated in 2nd place whatever happens. I still think the answer is a play-off between the two Kent teams, but the main thing is that someone should make a decision, and announce it, before the problem arises.

A couple of games from the Lloyds Bank:

White M Adams, Black V Smyslov

1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd2 c5 4 exd5 exd5 5 Ngf3 Nc6 6 Bb5 Qe7+ 7 Be2 Qc7 8 dxc5 Bxc5 9 Nb3 Bb6 10 O-O Nge7 11 Bg5 O-O 12 Qd2 f6 13 Bf4 Qd8 14 c4 dxc4 15 Bxc4+ Kh8 16 Qc3 Bg4 17 Rad1 Qc8 18 Rfel Ng6 19 Bd6 Re8 20 Bg3 Bxf3 21 gxf3 Nce5 22 Bd5 Qxc3 23 bxc3 Nc6 24 h4 Rxe1+ 25 Rxe1 Rd8 26 Kg2 Nge7 27 Be6 h6 28 h5 Nc8 29 c4 Re8 30 Re4 a6 31 c5 Ba7 32 Bd5 Rxe4 33 fxe4 N8e7 34 Bd6 Nc8 35 f4 Nd8 36 e5 fxe5 37 fxe5 Nxd6 38 cxd6 Bb8 39 Nc5 g6 40 Nd7 Ba7 41 e6 Nxe6 42 Bxe6 gxh5 43 Kh3 Kg7 44 Kh4? (44 a4 or Bd5 wins) Bf2+ 45 Kh3 Be3 46 Ne5? Kf6 47 d7 Bb6 48 Bd5 Kxe5 49 Bxb7 Kd6 50 Ec8 $\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$. The last few moves were played in a mutual time scramble.

White G Hassapis, Black V Smyslov

1 d4 d5 2 Bg5 Bf5 3 Nf3 h6 4 Bf4 Nd7 5 e3 e6 6 Bb5 c6 7 Bd3 Bxd3 8 cxd3 Ngf6 9 O-O Nh5 10 Qc1 Nxf4 11 exf4 Bd6 12 Nc3 O-O 13 Re1 Rc8 14 b4 Bxb4 15 Rb1 Bxc3 16 Qxc3 b6 17 Rb2 c5 18 dxc5 Rxc5 19 Qd4 Qc7 20 Re1 Rcl+ 21 Rxcl Qxcl+ 22 Nel Qxel+ and here White played 23 f2-f1 but we don't think it counted. Your Editor does not understand this game.

CONGRESS DIARY

- Oct 1 20th WARLEY QUINBORNE in Birmingham. U135; Age U16. J Lewis, 405 Court Oak Rd, Harborne, Birmingham B32 2DX 021 427 4988
- 20-22 DORSET at Weymouth. Open; U156; U126. AD Rookes, 6 Milton Close, Weymouth Dorset DT4 7NB 0305 774044
- 21-22 HERTS CA at Hitchin. Open; U165; U145; U125; U105. JG Jones, 9 Lancaster Avenue, Hitchin, Herts SG5 1PA: Hitchin 54171

No doubt there are other congresses. They haven't sent leaflets.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: BCF Newsletters for July and August; Herts CA Newsletter 1989; Pergamon CHESS for September; "Sussex Chess" 1989