

HAMPSHIRE CHESS ASSOCIATION

BULLETIN NO: 2 of 1961/62

17th August, 1961.

I am pleased to report that in response to my appeal, subscriptions are coming in steadily, and that a number of people have sent donations in addition. I am especially pleased with the number of encouraging letters that I have also received from those who have subscribed. Thank you all for your co-operation.

Vice-Presidents enrolled since my last Bulletin are as follows:-

Miss M. Brooks, J.H. Brown, Mrs. E. Bullows, E.W. Chandler, P.M. Collins, W.J. Eaton, Miss M.M. Elliott, J.E.C. Grant, P.M. Hodgson, T.E. Hollington, G.W. Kilmister, A.S. La Lond, S.H.C. Lucas, W. Makar, C. Mansfield, P.L. Marshall, H.R. Moir, H.L. Parsons, A.J. Peters, H. Pollard, W.H. Pratten, D.A. Rawden, W.W. Rose, E. Taylor, Sir George Thomas, L.E. Vine, Dr. B.G. Wells and G.C. Yorke.

Whilst on the subject of money, I might add that the actual deficit that I inherited was in the region of £35, as the deficit shown in the 1960/61 Accounts did not include certain sums owing in respect of 1960/61 expenditure. If we work off this deficit during the current season (and I think we shall), I feel that we shall have done very well.

In any case, I am quite sure that when it is realised that the only way to get hold of this excellent Bulletin is to become a Vice-President, there will be a further influx of 10/6's !

Incidentally, you may care to pass the word around that ONLY MEMBERS OF THE HAMPSHIRE CHESS ASSOCIATION (i.e. V.Ps., Private Members, or players registered by Clubs who affiliate) WILL APPEAR ON MY GRADING LISTS IN FUTURE.

Counties and District Correspondence Chess Championship 1961

Subject to successful appeals against adjudications etc., the final scores in this competition are as follows:-

<u>Hants I</u>		<u>Hants II</u>	
P.A. Ursell	0	H.G. Dell	1
M.E. Ventham	0	G.W.S. Goggin	$\frac{1}{2}$
R.C. Mitchell	0	A.F. Garner	0
Cmdr. A.J. Peters.	0	A.R. Cooper	0
A.M. Edmonds	1	P.M. Hodgson	$\frac{1}{2}$
D.A. Rawden	0	E.G. Potter	0
P.L. Marshall	$\frac{1}{2}$	A. Bacon	0
L.E. Vine	1	S.H. Newsome	0
A.S. La Lond	$\frac{1}{2}$	R. Barton	1
A.C. Barton	0	H.J. Draper	1
E.W. Chandler	$\frac{1}{2}$	H.R. Moir	$\frac{1}{2}$
R.S. Learmouth	1	C.W. Brading	0
H.L. Parsons	$\frac{1}{2}$	M.G. Ford	$\frac{1}{2}$
J.P. Price	0	R. Tyack	0
S.L. Russell	1	H.C. Smith	0
H.C. Bailey	0	J.E. Smith	1
L. West	$\frac{1}{2}$	D. Saunders	$\frac{1}{2}$
C.H. Henshaw	1	B. Keen	1
G.L. Pritchard	1	P.L. Smith	0
H. Pollard	1	G. Yates	1
Dr. B.G. Wells	0	J.H. Jones	0
D.M. Heywood	1	R.L. Paige	1
S.H.C. Lucas	0	M.A. Jupe	1
G.W. Farmer	0	Mrs. K. Phelan	$\frac{1}{2}$
A.F. Brameld	1	F. Gay	0
S.C. Noke	1	W. Rose	0
T.E. Hollington	$\frac{1}{2}$	D.A. Bloxson	0
W. Makar	0	E.J. Canty	1
A.D. Crossin	0	S. Shepherd	$\frac{1}{2}$
J.E.C. Grant	0	R. Ralls	0
	<u>13</u>		<u>12$\frac{1}{2}$</u>

Final placings of Counties (again subject to appeal):-

<u>Division 1 (Ward-Higgs Trophy)</u>			<u>Division 2 (Sinclair Trophy)</u>		
1.	Glos. 1.	20 $\frac{1}{2}$ points.	1.	Leicestershire	24 points.
2.	Suffolk	19 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.	Notts.	22
3.	Worcs 1.	19 $\frac{1}{2}$	3.	Yorks. 2	18 $\frac{1}{2}$
4.	Lancs 1	18 $\frac{1}{2}$	4.	Kent	18 $\frac{1}{2}$
5.	Somerset	16	5.	Glamorgan	18
6.	Cheshire 1.	16	6.	Wilts	17 $\frac{1}{2}$
7.	Sussex.	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	7.	Staffs	17 $\frac{1}{2}$
8.	Oxfordshire	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	8.	Isle of Man	17
9.	Devon	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	9.	Northants.	16 $\frac{1}{2}$
10.	Essex	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	10.	Lancs. 2	16 $\frac{1}{2}$
11.	Worcs.	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	11.	Cheshire 2	16 $\frac{1}{2}$
12.	HANTS. 1	13	12.	Lincs.	16
13.	Cambs.	13	13.	Glos. 2	15 $\frac{1}{2}$
14.	Surrey	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	14.	Durham	15
15.	Bucks	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	15.	Northumberland	14 $\frac{1}{2}$
16.	Middlesex.	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	16.	Warwickshire	14 $\frac{1}{2}$
			17.	Cornwall	14
			18.	Herts.	14
			19.	Dorset	13
			20.	HANTS. 2	12 $\frac{1}{2}$
			21.	Monmouthshire	12 $\frac{1}{2}$
			22.	Surrey 2	12 $\frac{1}{2}$
			23.	Cumberland, west & F.	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
			24.	Berks.	11
			25.	Norfolk	10
			26.	Salop/Herefordshire	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
			27.	Bedfordshire	6 $\frac{1}{2}$

Whilst we did not cover ourselves with glory, our No: 1 team managed to stay in Division 1, which is the main thing.

There is one very bright spot, however, which is that our County Secretary, S.L. Russell, has won the Boyd prize for the best game in the whole competition. A magnificent achievement which will be as pleasing to all of you as it undoubtedly was to Mr. Russell.

County Championship

Hampshire were not amongst the trophy winners in the season just ended. We must pull our socks up next season - with the talent that we have available, I am sure we could do better if we could regularly turn out our strongest team.

Final Tables in the S.C.C.U. Championship were:

	<u>North Section</u>						<u>South Section</u>				
	P.	W.	D.	G.	P.		P.	W.	D.	G.	P.
Essex	6	5	1	78 $\frac{1}{2}$	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	Surrey	6	6	0	79	6
Middx.	6	5	0	77	5	Surrex	6	4	1	71	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Cambs.	6	4	1	70 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	Oxon	6	4	0	66	4
Herts.	6	2	1	54 $\frac{1}{2}$	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Kent	6	3	0	63	3
Suffolk	6	1	2	44 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	Hants.	6	2	1	60	2 $\frac{1}{2}$
Norfolk	6	1	0	45	1	Berks.	6	1	0	38	1
Beds.	6	0	1	50	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	Bucks.	6	0	0	43	0

Championship Final - Surrey 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ Essex 11 $\frac{1}{2}$

In the 'Montague Jones' and 'Stevenson' competitions (which is decided by eliminating the scores of the winners and runners-up in the above Tables), the final line up of teams in the Southern Section was:-

	G.	P.
Oxon	47	4
Kent	51	3
Hants	41 $\frac{1}{2}$	2
Berks	31	1
Bucks	29 $\frac{1}{2}$	0

Oxon then met their counterparts in the Northern Section (Cambs.) for the 'Montague-Jones' Trophy and drew 10 - 10. Cambs. won an elimination rule.

The score in the match Kent v. Herts. for the 'Stevenson' (i.e. the two runners-up in the amended table) is Kent 10 Herts 5 (with 5 for adjudication).

In the 'Amboyna' Shield Competition (South Section), final scores were:-

	P.	W.	D.	G.	P.
Surrey	4	4	0	129 $\frac{1}{2}$	4
Sussex	4	2	0	103 $\frac{1}{2}$	2
Kent	4	2	0	101 $\frac{1}{2}$	2
Hants.	4	2	0	94	2
Bucks	4	0	0	71 $\frac{1}{2}$	0

Priority of Selection in County O.T.B. Matches

In my Bulletin No: 1, I said that V.Ps. would have priority in selection for all matches. It has been rightly pointed out to me (and in no uncertain fashion) that we must continue to field our strongest team for prestige reasons.

What I really meant was that between two players of equal strength who are willing to turn out for the County, then the person who helps to support the County financially should have priority over one that does not.

Lest it be thought that I have been obtaining money under false pretences, please accept the following offer as compensation for any lost hopes.

Free Annotations

As a further stimulus to V.P. recruitment Mr. W.H. Pratten has kindly volunteered to annotate 2 games played during the coming season by each Vice-President of the Association.

The only stipulations are:

- (a) Each score must be in a foolscap envelope, with another stamped and addressed envelope enclosed for the return -
- and (b) The first game must be sent in before Christmas and the second not later than 1st May next.

Issue of these Bulletins

I had thought of sending a 'complimentary copy' of these Bulletins to Club Secretaries, but have decided against it. Let them pay their 10/6d. like any other V.P. !

Please show this Bulletin to as many as possible of your Chess playing friends, however, as I think it will be a powerful recruitment medium.

How it Works (NO: 1) - THE B.C.F. AND UNION GRADING SYSTEM

The system, which is exactly the same as used in the Hampshire Grading List, is basically that the average strength of the player's opponents is combined with his percentage score against them in the grading period.

In working out a particular players performance for a season, I keep a card on the following lines:-

B. SMITH		Club	Grading No:
<u>Event</u>	<u>Opponent</u>	<u>Result</u>	<u>Opponents Grading No.</u>
C.	R. Jones	1	1,372
S/1.	A. Nother	$\frac{1}{2}$	1,400
1/C.	R. Snooks	0	1,525
1/L.	B. Brown	1	1,272
	etc.	etc.	
	etc.	etc.	
(No. of Games - 25)		<u>15</u>	<u>33,000</u>
Percentage results 60% average 1320			

Performance = average of opponents Grading Number
 + 10 times difference between actual
 - percentage performance and 50
 = 1320 + 100 = 1420

A player's actual Grading Number is based on two Seasons results, using a weighted average, etc.

$$\begin{array}{l} 1960/61 \quad 20 \times 1425 \\ 1961/62 \quad 30 \times 1320 \end{array} \quad \left. \vphantom{\begin{array}{l} 1960/61 \\ 1961/62 \end{array}} \right\} = 50 \times 1362$$

To obtain a Union Grading, a minimum of 30 games over 2 years, of which 10 must have been played in the more recent.

There is one important proviso - any wins against a player 500 or more below, or any losses against a player 500 or more above, must be ignored.

Lastly, the numbers are converted into Grading Categories, as follows:-

1a 2482 - 2403 1b 2402 - 2323
 2a 2322 - 2243 2b 2242 - 2163

etc. (with a gap of 80 between each category).

I am hoping to continue with further short notes on 'How it Works', the next probably being the B.C.F. Registration Scheme. The snag is that I am not too sure myself on this Scheme at the moment!

There is a surprising ignorance of these important matters amongst most Hampshire players and I propose to remedy this situation.

Next years 'Postal' Chess

I am about to enter two teams again for the 1962 C. and D.C.C.C. (See above), and shall be hard put to it to raise 60 players.

Will any player wishing to take part in this competition (who has not already given me his name) please get in touch with me without delay?

Playing strength is not vitally important now that we have two teams.

J.E.C. Grant
 (Hon. Treasurer)

"Fair Winds",
 2 Cams Bay Close,
 FAREHAM, Hants.