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## ESSEX LEAGUE ~ DIVISION 1

Played 18th March, 1980 at Wanstead
$W \& W$ had black on the odd numbered boards

|  | Wanstead \& Woodford |  | $v$ | May \& Baker |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Alan J. Potter 158 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $v$ | Dr. T. Hart 178 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 2 | I.D. Hunnable 178 | 0 | $v$ | K.W. Clow 149 | 1 |
| 3 | P. Pritchard 171 WECU | 1 | $v$ | Dr. R.F. Chapman 126 | 0 |
| 4 | T.D. Whitton 167 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $v$ | R. Gerrish 128 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 5 | Dr. D.C. Hick 169 | 0 | $v$ | A. Gentry 128 | 1 |
| 6 | A.S. Kinder 164 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $v$ | A. Tite - | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 7 | G.W. Fernie 147 | adj | $v$ | N. Walden - | adj |
| 8 | E.S. Lee 138 J | 1 | $v$ | D. MacIndoe 109 | 0 |
| 9 | S. Skelsey - | adj | $v$ | S. Egan 123 | adj |
| 10 | G.T. Goading 125 | 1 | $v$ | Dr. C.J. Francis - | 0 |
|  | $4 \frac{1}{2}+2 \mathrm{adj}$ |  |  |  | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ |

On relative gradings, this match should have had a similar score to the Wickford game ( $7 \frac{1}{2}-2 \frac{1}{2}$ ) but every now and then we like to give ourselves a scare. Here, seemingly one of those occasions, we apparently at one stage were losing.

Alan Potter showed what a resilient character he is, coming back after oneor two recent disasters to share the point with Terrence Hart who, we understand is a former Junior international. Alan picked his way carefully through a tricky opening and reached a $R \& P$ ending with a highly unusual pawn formation which neither player could turn to advantage. Ian Hunnable got a knight trapped after a good opening. Paul Pritchard made capital out of pressure against the king, finally overwhelming the monarch. Terry whitton was apparently lucky to share the point when later analysis showed Gerrish had sufficient to play for the win. Gentry posted a knight in the heart of Dave Hick's defence and used this to good advantage in prising a way in. Edward Lee attacked powerfully on the king's side causing MacIndoe much perplexity in the process. George Gooding essayed the Morra Gambit and persecuted weakness in Black's Q-side in merciless fashion ultimately turning on the black king (game follows).

In the two games for adjudication: George Fernie is perhaps a little lucky still to be playing but now seems perfectly safe and can even look for a win. Stuart Skelsey has an even more positive winning chance after keeping the advantage through a complex and fluid middlegame.
Game No. 66 Board 10 G.T. Gooding v Dr. C.J. Francis Sicilian - Morra Gambit $1 \mathrm{e4}, \mathrm{c5} ; 2 \mathrm{d4}, \mathrm{cxd4} ; 3 \mathrm{c3}, \mathrm{dxc3} ; 4 \mathrm{Nxc3}, \mathrm{Nf6;} 5 \mathrm{e5}, \mathrm{Ng} 8 ; 6 \mathrm{Nf3}$, e6; 7 Bc4, Nc6; 8 0-0, a6; 9 B95, Qc7; 10 Qe2, d6; 11 exd6, Bxd6; 12 Nd5, Qb8; Black has already got in a knot - perhaps ...Qa5 was his best chance. $13 \mathrm{Nb6}$, Ra7; 14 Rid1, Nge7; 15 Be'j, Winning the exchange. $15 \ldots 0-0 ; 16 \mathrm{NxcB}, \mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{CB}$; 17 Bxa7, Qxa7; The queen has successfully zig-zagged its way on the black squares from d7 to a7! 18 Rac1, Qb8; And now starts on its way back! 19 Rc3, N8e7; 20 Red3, Rd8; 21 Bxe6! fxe6; 22 Qxe6+ Kh8; 23 Rxd6, Re8; $24 \mathrm{Ng} 5, \mathrm{h6} ; 25 \mathrm{Nf7+} \mathrm{Kh} 7$; 26 Nxh6! Quite ruthless. $26 \ldots$ Rf8; If $26 \ldots 9 \times h 6 ; 27$ Qf7 + Kh8; 28 Rxh6 mate. $27 \mathrm{Nf7}_{2}$ Resigns.

Adjudications EL 1 v Brentwood.... Our appeal for a win in Philip Gasper's game has been upheld giving us the match $5 \frac{1}{2}-4 \frac{1}{2}$. Thus we have
taken $2 \frac{1}{2}$ pts. from the top three boards all adjudicated. This is such an important result, for which in the end we had to put in some hard work that it is worth giving the full table:
22.1.80

|  | Wanstead \& Woodford |  | $v$ | Brentwood |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Alan J. Potter | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $v$ | K. Bowden | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 2 | P.T.R. Gasper | 1 | $v$ | L. Green | 0 |
| 3 | I.D. Hunnable | 1 | $v$ | I. Robson | 0 |
| 4 | A.T. Marshall | 1 | $v$ | F.R. Elliott | 0 |
| 5 | P. Pritchard | 0 | $v$ | R. Forey | 1 |
| 6 | W.T. Franklin | 1 | $v$ | P. Heath | 0 |
| 7 | T.D. Whitton | 1 | $v$ | J. Stock | 0 |
| 8 | Dr. D.C. Hick | 0 | $v$ | G. Lane |  |
| 9 | A.S. Kinder | 0 | $v$ | w. Coatman | 1 |
| 10 | S.R. Lee | 0 | $v$ | G. Daniel | 1 |
|  |  | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |  | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ |

## ESSEX KNOCK-OUT

ROUNO 2
Played 11th March, 1980 att Wanstead $W \& W$ had Black on the odd numbered boards

|  | Wanstead \& Woodford |  | $v$ | Writtle |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Alan J. Potter 158 | 0 | $v$ | I. Robson 168 J | 1 |
| 2 | I.D. Hunnable 178 | 0 | $v$ | F. Chin 154 |  |
| 3 | P. Pritchard 171 WECU | 1 | $v$ | P. Thompson 151 | 0 |
| 4 | T.D. Whitton 167 | 1 | $v$ | N. Amor 154 | 0 |
| 5 | W.T. Franklin 159 | 0 | $v$ | R. Rodie 145 | 1 |
| 6 | G.W. Fernie 147 | 1 | $v$ | P. Ohlson 120 | 0 |
|  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |
|  |  | Writtle win on tie break. |  |  |  |

Writtle have been a surprise side in this competition in recent seasons mainly because they are not well known in this part of the county. After the first session it seemed we were not to be caught out like that and were ready to put behind us our bad record in this competition. In the event it must be accepted a certain amount of chicken counting went on.

Bowden, the "other" Brentwood boy, was missing, but we were a few names short as well. Paul Pritchard was the first to finish having won a piece after only 10 minutes play with a long range fork - $Q$ at a5 checking king at e1 and winning bishop at 95. Bill Franklin, after a blistering start to the season has gone off the boil and added a second zero to go with his loss against Waltham Forest. After Terry Whitton's reliable point we led at adjournment by $2-1$.

Although Potter's game was doubtful, the other two, Messrs. Hunnable and Fernie, were both a pawn to the good and it seemed our passage into the next round was clear. But on resumption Hunnable played like a clown and gave up a piece. Robson surmounted the technical problems in his position to beat Potter. After that Writtle could afford to concede George Fernie's game because at 3-3 they took the match on tie-break having their wins on the higher boards. What can one say?

## 000000000000000000000

The next item is slightly outside my guidelines for First Rank but you're going to get it anyway.
Game No. 67 "Phillips \& Drew" Simultaneous 2.4.80 J.D.M. Nunn GM v I.D. Hunnable Alekhine's Defence. $1 \mathrm{e} 4, \mathrm{Nf} 6 ; 2 \mathrm{e5}, \mathrm{Nd5} ; 3 \mathrm{d4}, \mathrm{d6} ; 4 \mathrm{Nf} 3$, dxe5; 5 Nxe5, 96; G Bc4, Be6; Being careful not to play the "natural" ...Bg7 when white
has 7 Nxf7, Kxf7; 8 Qf3+ etc. 7 Bb3, Largely reducing Black's chances of equalising through exchanges. Compare with: 7 0-0, Bg7; $8 \mathrm{Nd} 2,0-09 \mathrm{Ne} 4$, Bxe5; 10 dxe5, Nf4 etc. 7 .... c6; 8 0-0, B97; 9 Re1, $0-0 ; 10 \mathrm{Nd2}, \mathrm{Nd7;} 11 \mathrm{Ndf3}$, Heading for 95. Black accordingly seeks to clarify the situation regarding the e6 square. 11 ... Nc7; $12 \mathrm{c4}$, Nxe5; 13 Nxe5, f6!? The idea is .... Bf7 and a subsequent ...e5. 14 Nx 96 ?! I had lightly dismissed this possibility, but if the Grandmaster plays it, perhaps it's good? $14 \ldots$ hxg6; 15 Rxe6, Nxe6; 16 c5, A couple of moves back I had thought of ....Kh7 here, but after 17 8xe6, white threatens Qf3 and Qh3. Hence the continuation which holds onto the knight long enough to get the rook to h8 and the king to f8. $16 \ldots \mathrm{Kf7}$; $17 \mathrm{Qe} 2, \mathrm{Qd7}$; 18. Bd2, Rh8; 19: Re1, Kf8; 20 Bxe6, Qxd4; It seems white isn't getting enough for the exchange. 21 93, Rd8; $22 \mathrm{Bb3}, \mathrm{e5} ; 23 \mathrm{Bc} 3, \mathrm{Qd} 3 ; 24 \mathrm{Qg} 4, \mathrm{Qf5} ; 25 \mathrm{Qc} 4, \mathrm{Rd7} ;$ Now I worked out 26 Rd1, Qh3; $27 \mathrm{Rxd7}$, Qxh2+! 28 Kf 1, Qh3 29 Ke 2 , Qxd7. With this sort of thing in the air, white tries to close more lines. Ironically, this is what helps Black open them up! 26 h4, 95; If now 27 hxg 5 , Qf3 etc., and on 27 h 5 , 94 followed by ...Q Qxh5. 27 Bd1, A relief not to have to watch the threats on the a2-g8 diagonal anymore. But now white threatens Bg4.....or does he? 27... $9 \times h 4 ; 28$ B 4 , Several spectators (and Nunn?) thought I had made an oversight, but all's 0.K. $28 \ldots$ Qd3; 29 Qe6, hx93! Now 30 Qxd7 fails to $30 \ldots 9 \times f 2+31 \mathrm{~kg} 2$, ( 31 kxf 2 , Rh2+etc.) $31 \ldots \mathrm{fxe} 1=\mathrm{N}+32 \mathrm{Bxe} 1, \mathrm{Qxd7}$. 30 f3, Qc2; WHITE RESIGNS. The final finnesse is 31 Bd4, Rh1 +32 Kxh 1 , Qh2 mate. Sporting (and rare) of the Grandmaster to sacrifice at such an early stage, with no clear win in sight, and typical of Nunn's enterprising approach to this display. Consequently, a large number of interesting games resulted and all participants had an entertaining evening. Nunn took on 31 opponents, won 25 games, drew 3, lost 3, completing in 4 hours 10 minutes. My grateful acknowledgement to Bill Franklin (of Phillips \& Drew) who put an invitation my way.

## 0000000000000000000000000000

## LONDON LEAGUE ~ DIVISION 2

Played 5th March, 1980 at St. Bride's. Institute $W \& W$ had black on the odd numbered boards

Wanstead \& Woodford

| 1 | Alan J. Potter 158 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $v$ | M.V. Lambshire 199 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A.T. Marshall 190 | 0 | $v$ | S. Goodman 190 | 1 |
| 3 | I. D. Hunnable 178 | 0 | $v$ | M. Dymond 179 | 1 |
| 4 | P. Pritchard 171 WECU | 1 | $v$ | M. Bullock - | 0 |
| 5 | T.D. Whitton 167 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | v | D. Groffman - | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 6 | Dr. D.C. Hick 169 | 0 | $v$ | W.E.C. Richards 170 | 1 |
| 7 | A.S. Kinder 164 | 0 | $v$ | Mrs. D.M. Wright 168 | 1 |
| 8 | R.A. Wagstaff 156 | 1 | $v$ | R. Glew 162 | 0 |
| 9 | G.W. Fernie 147 | 0 | $v$ | R. Symmonds 145 | 1 |
| 10 | J.E. Duggan 109 J | 1 | $\checkmark$ | A. Marshall - | 0 |

Harrow are below us in the table and really there is no excuse for this failure, although on play over the board we would have won. (Of that more later.)

Alan Potter had an excellent result, the difference of 40 grading points not really noticeable (game follows). Alan Marshall after arriving late was set difficult problems with an exchange sacrifice. Hunnable, as black, failed to equalise. Terry whitton should also have lost having parted with rook for knight but somehow held out until forces had been reduced to a stage where white could no longer win. Paul Pritchard, in oneof his rare games with white, played an English, always held an edge and reached adjournment with a demonstrably won position. David Hick for once, as white, had an off night and failed to get enough in return for Milner-Barry's gambit in which Black took the second pawn as well. Roy wagstaff took advantage in exemplary fashion of some weak moves by his opponent as the game shows (below). John Duggan was blooded as a late substitute but it looked as though he was not yet ready for
this league when going a piece down at an early stage. But at this point, when he could have been excused for giving up, John started fighting like a tiger and overran the opposing king with pawns.

The outcome of the match rested on boards 7 \& 9 . Andrew Kinder got the better game and though missing chances to secure the result in the first session, adjourned with good winning chances. George Fernie adjourned a piece down for two pawns in a position that defied accurate analysis - it could have gone any way! Both games were due to be resumed at the same time. Andrew however made an oversight - not on the board, but in his diary - and failed to appear; a tragedy since apparently Dinah Wright was on the point of resigning. George now was left on his own, having to win to save the match. He had to decline an offer of a draw (which would have won the match had Andrew's win accrued) and go for broke trying to push his pawns. In such circumstances one's play tends to become somewhat desperate and Symmonds took advantage by surrendering his extra piece for several pawns to convert to a winning $R \& P$ ending. Andrew tends an abject apology.
Game No. 68 Board 1 M.V. Lambshire v. Alan Potter Pirc's Defence Notes by Alan Potter $1 \mathrm{d4}$, d6; $2 \mathrm{e} 4, \mathrm{Nf6;} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 3, \mathrm{g6;} \mathrm{4} 93, \mathrm{Bg} 7$; $5 \mathrm{Bg} 2, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$; 6 Noe2, e5; 7 h3, Slow. $7 \ldots$ Nc6; 8 Be3, If 8 d5 either a) 8 ... Ne7 with a solid position or b) 8 ... Nd4; $9 \mathrm{Nxd4}$, exd4; 10 Ne 2 , (not 10 Qxd4, Nxe4) 10 ... Re8 with an interesting but unclear position. 8... b6; 9 0-0, 8b7; 10 Re1, Re8; 11 Qd2, Na5; A try for some initiative but now this knight remains a ring-side spectator for a long time. $12 \mathrm{b3}$, exd4; $13 \mathrm{Bxd4}$, c 5 ; Perhaps 13 ... NcG is better. But not ...B or $N$ xe4 both of which lose a piece: 13 ... Bxe4; 14 Bxff, and 13 ... Nxe4; 14 Nxe4, Bxe4; 15 Bxg7, K $\times$ g7; 16 Qd4+ etc. 14 Bxf6, Qxf6; 15 Rad1, Rad8; 16 Nb5, 16 Nd5 is more solid than this adventurous move. $16 \ldots$ Bxe4; $17 \mathrm{Nxd6}$, Interesting is 17 Bxe4, Rxe4; $18 \mathrm{Nxd6}$, when perhaps $18 \ldots$ Rd4; $19 \mathrm{Nxd4}, \mathrm{Rxd6} ; 20 \mathrm{Re} 8+\mathrm{Bf} 8 ; 21 \mathrm{Qh6}, \mathrm{Qg7} ; 22$ Qxg7+ Kxg7; $23 \mathrm{Nf5}+\mathrm{gxf}$; 24 RxdG, BxdG. $17 \ldots$... Rxdf; This seemed simpler than the complexities arising from $17 \ldots$ Qe7 when perhaps 18 Nf 4.18 Qxd6, Qxd6; $19 \mathrm{Rxd6}, \mathrm{Bx9} 2 ; 20 \mathrm{Kxg} 2, \mathrm{Bc} 3$; $21 \mathrm{NxC3}, \mathrm{Rxa1;} 22 \mathrm{Rd} 1,22 \mathrm{Nd5}$ might retain some initiative e.g. $22 \ldots$... Re2; 23 Ne 3 , when both Black's pieces are badly placed. $22 \ldots$... Rxd1; $23 \mathrm{Nxd1}$, Nc6; DRAW AGREED.

Game No. 69 Board 8 R.A. Wagstaff V. R. Glew Nimzoindian Defence Notes by Roy Wagstaff $1 \mathrm{d4}, \mathrm{Nf6} ; 2 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{e6} ; 3 \mathrm{Nc} 3, \mathrm{Bb4} ; 4 \mathrm{Bd} 2, \mathrm{O}-0 ; 5 \mathrm{a} 3, \mathrm{Bxc} 3$; $6 \mathrm{Bxc3} 3, \mathrm{d5} ; 7 \mathrm{e3}, \mathrm{dxc4}$ ? $8 \mathrm{Bxc4}$, Nbd7; $9 \mathrm{Nf3}$, $\mathrm{b6} ; 10 \mathrm{O} 0$, $8 \mathrm{Bb7}$; $11 \mathrm{Rc1}$, Nd5; Too anxious to break the pair of bishops. $11 \ldots$... Bd5; to equalise first is better. $12 \mathrm{Qe} 2, \mathrm{c5} ; 13 \mathrm{Rfd} 1, \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{c} 3 ; 14 \mathrm{Rxc3}, \mathrm{Qe7} ; 15 \mathrm{Bb5}, \mathrm{cxd4}$; $A$ futile attempt to avoid an isolated c-pawn - overlooking White's reply. 16 Rc 7 , $\mathrm{Bxf3}$; or $16 \ldots$ Bc8; 17 Rxd4, Qd8; 18 Qc2 etc. 17 Qxf3, Qg5; 18 Bxd7, dxe3; 19 Qxe3, Qff; 20 Qc3, QP4; 21 Bxe6, Not really expecting a mate. $21 \ldots$ Rad8; Black hastens his own finis in 4 moves. $22 \mathrm{Rxd8}$, Rxd8; 23 Rc 8 , $Q d 6 ; 24 \mathrm{Rxd8}+\mathrm{Qxd8} ; 25$ Qc8, Resigns.

Played 21st March, 1980 at St. Bride's Institute $W \& W$ had white on the odd numbered boards

## Wanstead \& Wloodford $v$ Ilford



Ilford were, one supposes, hoping we would do them some favours to
salvage their desperate position at the bottom of the table, but with only three wins ourselves we needed this win (if only to salvage some self-respect!) Jim Pascoe seems to be enjoying a good season and riddled Marshall's position with gaping holes. Paul Pritchard missed a winning chance somewhere along the way, but at the last Roles was hit by a tragic instance of chess "blindness" when he allowed an unstoppable passed pawn on h6. Terry whitton encountered all sorts of problems in answering the Polish Defence and never quite answered them all. Roy Wagstaff however, built up a fine attacking position and at one stage was presented with such an array of good moves that it was difficult to choose which way to win! John Duggan, given another game after his fighting win against Harrow, turned in another good result as will be seen from the play from the diagram on the left.

Two games were left at the close. George Fernie had a
 Q-side majority against Helps' central majority. It seems that on resumption, Helps didn't make quite the best play and the outside majority carried the day. This result gave us the match, which is just as well since Andrew Kinder's adjourned position thought to be winning may be just the opposite.
Game No. 70 Board 10 R. Grant v. J.E. Duggan The diagrammed position arose after White's 31st from a Caro-Kann. Play continued: 31 ... Re6; 32 Rf 2 , h5; 33 g3? This helps Black's attack. White would do better to get his bishop back into play. $33 \ldots$ Rh6; 34 Rg 2 , h4; 35 Rxh4, Rhxh4; 36 gxh4, Rxf4; 37 BC1, Qxh4; The rook is safe because of ...Qe1 mate. $38 \mathrm{Bd2}$, Re4; 39 Qd1, Bd8; $40 \mathrm{Qf} 3, \mathrm{Qh} 7 ; 41 \mathrm{Re} 2, \mathrm{Bh} 4 ; 42 \mathrm{Bf} 4, \mathrm{Q} 96+43 \mathrm{Kh} 1, \mathrm{Be} 1$; Threatening Rxe2 winning the c-pawn. 44 Rg2, Qh7; 45 Bg 5 , Rg4: Snuffing out White's counterplay but also and active measure to win the
 to play $49 \mathrm{Be7}, \mathrm{Bxc3} ; 50 \mathrm{Bc5}$, although Black wouldstill win with his passed pawns. Now White's pawns disappear with startling rapidity. $49 \ldots \mathrm{Bxc} 3 ; 50 \mathrm{Be7}$, Bxd4;
 Clearance sale - everything must go! $57 \mathrm{Bc1}, \mathrm{Bxa5} ; 58 \mathrm{Kf1}$, 864 ; The a-pawn is the winner! WHITE RESIGNS.

## ESSEX LEAGUE ~ DIVISION 2

Played 25th March, 1980 Away

Wanstead \& Woodford
1 R.A. Wagstaff 156
2 S.R. Lee 138 J
3 E.S. Lee 138 J
4 S. Skelsey -
5 K. Jones 143
6 G.T. Gooding 125
7 J.E. Duggan 109 J
8 J. Franklin 113 J

|  | $v$ | Billericay |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | $v$ | G.D. Hillyard 203 | 1 |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | $v$ | J.V. Ripp 175 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 1 | $v$ | C. Oppenheim 128 | 0 |
| 1 | v | B. Locke - | 0 |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | $v$ | I. Fuller 121 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | $v$ | R. Neil 117 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 1 | $v$ | H. Pidoux - | 0 |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | v | C. Newman 125 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |

Hillyard, formerly of Brentwood is undoubtedly the strongest player in Division 2. Ripp used to play for Romford. A good end to the season for the seconds.


