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2. ASIAN MASTERS TOURNAMENT, Aug/Sept 1976


IM norm $=10$
The two New Zealand representatives have both written reports. First Ortvin Sarapu:

In order to develop and expand chess in Asia and particulariy in ETDE Zone 10 (East Asia and Pacific) a series of Asian Master Tournaments has been planned. This was the second, the first being Singapore 1975. To bring Asian chess to the level of Europe and America in numbers of Inter national tournaments it is necessary to have at least one third of the players with titles in a tournament. Just how much importance is attached to this is shown by the presence of FIDE President Prof. Dr Max Euwe with Mrs Euwe, FIDE Vice President Mr F. Campomanes and FIDE Zone 10 President Prof. Lim Kok Ann at the tournament. Even undefeated ex-World champion Robert Fischer accompanied Mr Campomanes to Djakarta. Prof. Lim Kok Ann expressed in his message, "It is like business; only if we have capital can we make profits. Only j.f we have International Masters can we make more International Masters"
PERCASI, the Indonesian Chess Federation, has more than a miliion members and a great advance in chess has been made in the last ten years. Financial assistance from the National Sport Council of Indonesia and many others assures the future of chess in this part of the world.

The tournament was held in the excellent Hotel Horizon right on a Java Sea beach and all the players stayed at the hotel. In 1977 is planned another tournament in Ancol (a suburb of Djakarta) with four grandmasters from Europe; I have accepted a provisional invitation to compete.

## And Paul Garbett:

The 2nd Asian Masters Chess Tournament was for me a unique experience; the surroundings, atmosphere and audience were all strikingly different from a typical tournament in New Zealand or Australia. We stayed and played at the Hotel Horizon, a luxury hotel in the middle of a large recreation complex. Surrounded by fences and policed thoroughly at the gates, it included golf courses, swimming pools, a casino, restaurants, night clubs and so on. The area contrasted sharply with the intense bustle and squalor of Djakarta itself - an enormous city faced with the problem of an
influx of population from all over Indonesia in search of jobs and a hi
er standard of life．The Indonesians we met were very hospitable and friendly and it was obvious that for many of them the chess tournament was as great an event as it was for the players．Chess is extremely popular in Indonesia；we were told that it is the third most popular sport afleer bad－ minton and soccer．The audience were far more involved in the sames than ing excitedly amons themselves about the fames and burds for hours，talk－ when ion I found out to my cost whenever I aseed to play friendly samese

As for the tournament itself，Torre proved once again that he is by far the best player in Asia，producing some deep combinative play．of the other players $I$ found Lim from Singapore and Mascarinas from the Philippines the most impressive．Lim achieved half his IM norm in a tournament in Yugo－ slavia，finished in the first eight ini the last World Junior，and just miss ed out on his JM title by half a point in this tournament．His main strength was in calculation，while Mascarinas seemed to possess a fine positional sense．

For me the tournament was one of ups and downs； 4 out of the first 5 then 5 losses，and finally $3 \frac{1}{2}$ points in the last 4 rounds．I beat three of the six players who finished ahead of me（Lim，Bachtiar and Sampouw）but lasses to both Irajans killed any chances of an IM norm．

One bonus was meeting Bobby Fischer who stayed in Djakarta for a few days and who seemed in grod spirits and quite pleasant，despite the image the chess with fantastic ease．Hasan very kindly put ortvin and myself up for a few days between the time the tournament finished and our return．

While heat and the usual Asian stomach bugs made the tournament fairly exhausting，the experjence of 14 tough games and the many new acquaintances both made the trip really worthwhile．I am extremely grateful to members of the Forth Shore Chess Club and the Auckland Chess Centre for raising money to heip towards the cost of the trip．

Ortvin and Paul have both annotated games，for which see games section A further selection，without notes，follows．

Torre－Lim，Firc Defence：
 Ne8 9 Bft Bb7 10 Rei Nal？ 11 Ne4 dxe5 i2 Nxe5 Nxe5 13 Bxe 5 Qb 614 Bxg？ Nxg 15 Nc5：Rad8 16 Rgit é 17 c3 Bc8 18 Qci h5 19 Bf3 Qc？ 20 Qg5 सh7？ 21 Ne4！Ne8 22 Nf6＋Nxf6 23 Qxf6 c5 24 Re5！cxd4 25 Rxh5＋， $1: 0$
Ardiansyah－Torre，Sicilian Defence：

 15 exd5 Nd4 16 Bxd4 exd4 $17 \mathrm{~h}_{4}$ Qb6 18 Qxd4 Nd3＋ 19 Qxd3 Qxb2 20 O－O Qxal $21 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 8 \mathrm{22} \mathrm{Rd} 1 \mathrm{Qb2} 23 \mathrm{Bg} 4 \mathrm{Re} 8 \quad 24 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 6 \quad 25 \mathrm{Qc} 4 \mathrm{Re} 726 \mathrm{Nd} 3 \mathrm{Qd} 4$
 $33 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Bc} 3 \quad 34 \mathrm{Rf} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 435 \mathrm{Bd} 1 \mathrm{Be} 1 \quad 36 \mathrm{Rf} 3 \mathrm{Rxf} 3 \quad 37 \mathrm{Kxf} 3 \mathrm{Bd} 2,0$
Lim－Sardjono，Nimzoindian Defence：
 bxc3 Nbd7 9 cxd5 exd5 10 Ne5 Nxe5 11 dxe5 Ng4 12 f 4 d 413 exd4 cxd4
 fxe6 21 fxg6 hxg6 22 Qf3 Nf5 $23 \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 724 \mathrm{Exf5}$ exf5 $25 \mathrm{Bd5+} \mathrm{Kh} 726$ Rae 1 Bb 527 Bb 3 Rd 728 Rf 2 Rc 829 Qe 3 Rg 730 Bg 5 Qb 431 Rf 4 Bc 432 Rh4＋Kg8 33 Bxe4＋， 1 ： 0.

Harandi－Wotulo，Caro Kann Defence
 h5 Bh7 9 Bd3 Bxd3 10 Qxd3 e6 11 Bd2 Nf6 12 Qe2 Be7 13 0－0－0 b5 14 Ne5 Re8 15 Rhe 1 Nb6 16 Nxf7 Kxf7 17 Qxe6＋Kf8 18 Nf5 Nbd5 19 Nh4 Ke8 20 Ng6 Rf8 $21 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \mathrm{Rc} 722 \mathrm{Ba} 5 \mathrm{Qc} 823 \mathrm{Bxc7}$ Qxc7 24 Ne 5 Nf 425 Qxc6＋Qxc6 26 Nxc6 N6d5 $27 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Ng} 228 \mathrm{Re} 2,1$ ： 0.

Mascarinas－Harandi，Benoni：
 Nxc6 Qxc6 9 e4 b6 $10 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 711 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 812 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \quad 130-0 \quad 0-0 \quad 14 \mathrm{Nd5}$ exd5 15 Bxb4 dxc4 16 Qd4 Re8 17 Rac 1 Ne4 18 Rxc4 Nxg3 19 Rxc6 Ne2＋ 20 Kh1 Nxd4 21 Rxb6 Bxg2＋ $22 \mathrm{Kxg} 2 \mathrm{Re} 623 \mathrm{Rb} 7 \mathrm{Rg} 6+24 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Nc} 6 \quad 25 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{~d} 5$ $26 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \mathrm{Rd} 827 \mathrm{Rc} 7 \mathrm{Ne} 528 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \mathrm{Rd} 629 \mathrm{Ba} 5 \mathrm{Rf} 8 \quad 30 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{~d} 8 \quad 31 \mathrm{Bxf} 8 \mathrm{Rxf} 8$ 32 Rxf8 8 Kxf8 33 Rc5 Nd3 34 Rxd5 Nxf2＋ $35 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Ne}_{4} 36 \mathrm{Ra} 5 \mathrm{Ke} 737 \mathrm{Rxa} 6$ f5 $38 \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 39 \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{Ne} 540 \mathrm{Re} 6 \mathrm{Ne} 6+41 \mathrm{Ke} 5,1: 0$.

Choo Min Wang－Mascarinas，Reti：
$1 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 62 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 3 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 4 \quad 4 \mathrm{~d} 3 \mathrm{Nbd} 7 \quad 5 \mathrm{NbdL}$ e5 6 0－0 Bd6 7 c4 c6 8 Qc2 0－0 9 h 3 Be6 10 e 4 dxe 411 Nxe4 Nxe4 12 dxe 4 f6 13 Be3 Bc5 14 Rfe1 Qb6 15 Rad1 Rfd8 16 Bf1 a5 17 Rd2 Bxe3 18 Rxe3 Nc5 19 R 3 e 2 Bf？ $20 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 621 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{Bh} 522 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 623 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Rxd2} 24 \mathrm{Nxd2} \mathrm{Rd} 825 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Rd} 4 \quad 26$ $\mathrm{Nf1}$ Qd8 $27 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Nd} 328 \mathrm{Bf} 3 \mathrm{Nb} 4 \quad 29 \mathrm{Qb} 2 \mathrm{Rd} 3 \quad 30 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rxf} 3!31 \mathrm{Kxf} 3 \mathrm{Qd} 3+\quad 32$ Ne3 Qxe4＋ 33 Kg 3 Qf4＋ $34 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Be}_{4}{ }^{+}, 0: 1$.

## LOCAL NEWS

In the 1976 WELLINGTON INTERCLUB COMPETITION nine teams battled for the greater honour and glory of their respective clubs．The youth f Mark Evans，Stuart Cordue，Pat－ rick Cordue and David Beach was not regarded as the pre－tournament favourite by any except the most perceptive or partisan onlookers but，demonstrating that age and ex－ perience are a fatal impediment to a proper understanding of the game it demolished the opposition，win－ ning all its matches except for a draw against closest rivals Pencar row．
Scores：Civic I 24，Pencarrow 201 ，Hutt 18⿺⿸⿻一丿工八2，Civic II 18，Post ffice $15 \frac{1}{2}$ ，Wellington 15，Upper Hutt $14^{\frac{1}{2}}$ ，Kapiti 10，Polonia 8 ．

D．Beach（Civic I）－R．Cockcroft Hutt）： 1 e4 c5 2 c3 e6 3 Nf 3 Nc6 4 d 4 cxd4 5 cxd4 Qc7 6 Nc 3 67 Be3 Nf6 8 Rc1 Be7？（essen－ tial was 8．．．d5 although after 9 e5 followed by $\operatorname{Bd} 3$ and $0-0$ White would have had much the better game） 9 d5 Ne5 $10 \mathrm{Nb} 5 \mathrm{Nxf3}+11 \mathrm{Exf} 3 \mathrm{Qb} 8$
$12 \mathrm{Nc} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 8$（12．．．Kd8 13 Bb 6 and
14 Nxa6＋） 13 Nxa8 Qxa8 14 d 6 Bd8
$15 \mathrm{Qc} 2 \mathrm{Ba} 5+16 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{Bxd2}+17 \mathrm{Kxd2}$ Qa7 18 Qxc8＋Ne8 19 Qxe8＋！， 1 ： 0.

P．Cordue－B．Sinclair（Kapiti）： 1 e4 e5 2 Nf 3 Nc 63 d 4 exd4 4 c 3 dxc3 5 Bc4 Nf6 6 Nxc3 d5？（perhaps confusing this line with that in the Danish Gambit where d5 is good）？ exd5 Qe7＋ 8 Be 2 Ne 59 O 9 Bf 510 Nxe5 Qxe5 $11 \mathrm{Bb} 5+\mathrm{Kd8} 12 \mathrm{Re} 1 \mathrm{Qd6}$ 13 Qf3！Bg4？ 14 Qxf6！， 1 ： 0

The CANTERBURY CHAMPIONSHIP 1976 was an eight round Swiss．In a weak field the top three places predictably went to the three hjgh－ est rated players．Robert Morrison came a creditable lonely fourth to take the Intermediate Championship． There was a stampede for fifth：of the seven players on $4 \frac{1}{2}$ ，Bob Wat son＇s superior Gelbiuhs score gave him the Junior Championship；he de－ served this since he made up for his lack of book knowledge by the right blend of concentration and imagination．of the other players on $4 \frac{1}{2}$ Bob Colthart had most cause to complain，conceding 2 draws and 2 losses in four won positions！

This tournament was played at the Nelson Girls' College and featured the Nelson Club's usual good organisation. Although those players boarding a the school hostel expected only breakfast and lunch to be included in the tariff, it turned out they got dinner as well! Ted Stallknecht proved to be both capable and knowledgable as Director of Play. The field of 30 was divided into $A$ and $B$ grades and this division of players ensured that few easy games were to be had in the A grade making for a closely fought and tough tournament.
In the first round good wins were recorded by Van Dijk, Lynn and Small. The first upset occurred when the 1973 champion Jon Jackson defeated Stuart who was ranked second. Stuart had built up a winning position but one passive move in time trouble allowed Jackson to infiltrate both his rooks to the sixth rank and thus turn a one pawn deficit into a two pawn plus. Graham Haase had a hard struggle in a level Lasker Defence against Denis Boyce before eventually winning. Regus Neele after a promising Morra Gamor went astray losing to Philip Bates in 21 moves while Roger Perry obthined a clear plus from the opening against Roger Nokes but tried to open the game up on both sides of the board and gave away pawns at random. The warning that he was going to play attacking chess. Plenty of excitement in warning that he was going to play attackin
this game - perhaps the best of round one.

Round two provided no upsets but one incident. Small took a stroll Round two provided no upsets but one incident. Small took a stroll
round the playing room after making his move, then came back and made his round the playing room after making his move, then came back and made his hos , onl more moves before playing it again. Nokes joined Small in the lead by beat ing moves bith a fine kis-side attak nors in the Van jk $v$. queenside. Perry tied up Neele and won impressively. Stuart won a pawn in the opening and won comfortably against Cornelissen.

Round three: a tame draw between Small and Nokes saw them retain the lead. Van Dijk had a hard game before beating Boyce, Lynn had a good win against Perry, and Bates produced a pretty mate versus Baker. Jensen blundered against Jackson but managed to draw. Stuart won a pawn against Haase and eventually converted it into a win. Cornelissen played a skilful endgame to beat Neele.

In the fourth round Small got into difficulties against Stuart in the opening, sacrificed a pawn, but made no headway until Stuart's time pressure when he missed a clear drawing chance - after that Stuart's extra pawn made the win simple. Jensen mastered Nokes's King's Gambit, winning the exchange, but later gave it all away - first a knight then two moves later a rook! Van Dijk won a pawn in the opening versus Jackson and won easily. Perry $v$ Boyce, Foord $v$ Haase and Bates $v$ Lynn were all drawn, the last mentioned only after an exciting endgame.

Leaders: Nokes 3装; Stuart and. Van Dijk 3.
Round five saw Nokes lose his only game when his little endgame trap in a slightly inferior position rebounded allowing Stuart to win a pawn and his fourth consecutive game. Small and Van Dijk drew after 26 moves when it became clear that neither player could attempt anything constructive without compromising his position. Haase unleashed a nice kingside attack
against Bates. Jensen outplayed Lynn in the opening; after careful consideration about resigning Lynn found a saving move and a few moves later won the exchange - the game was eventually drawn. Jackson beat Foord in 17 moves.
Leaders: Stuart 4; Nokes and Van Dijk 31 ; Small, Haase, Lynn and Jackson 3.

In round six the first game completed was a rapid 60 mover between the locals Lynn and Cornelissen; Lynn won a pawn in the opening and converted it into a win while some players were still considering their loth move! former under slight pressure b btuart before the adjournment but it was the former under slight pressure before the draw was finally agreed. Acter a draw Small survived Jokson's attack rachine an endine with rook and draw. Small survived Jackson s attack reaching an ending with rook and knight $v$ bishop and 4 pawns; eventually the pawns all fell. Boyce's dashing kingside attack overpowered Knegt.

Leaders: Stuart 4 $\frac{1}{2}$; Small, Nokes, Van Dijk and Lynn 4; Jensen, Haase and Bates $3-\frac{1}{2}$.

After round seven the field spread out as the leaders played amons themselves. Stuart saddled Lynn with a passed IQP, survived the latter's brief piece activity, and neatly won the ensuing knight endgame after avoiding Lynn's last gasp stalemate swindie. After winning the opening struggle Van Dijk erred and Nokes was quick to wind the game up. Small gained the advantage against Jensen but forced matters prematurely with an unsound combination which gave up two minor pieces for a rook. Jensen was able to stifle Small's short-lived attempt to regain a piece and thus came into contention for a prize for the first time. Cornelissen surprised Haase and the latter was somewhat fortunate to escape with a draw. Jackson again showed aggression sacrificing a bishop against Boyce; his central pawn mass proved too strong.

Leaders: Stuart 51 $\frac{1}{2}$; Nokes 5; Jensen $4 \frac{1}{2}$; Small, Haase, Van Dj.jk, Lynn, Jackson and Foord 4.

Round eight - a dramatic/farcical finish! First game to finish was Small $v$ Foord in which the former touched a piece by mistake, to move which would cost the exchange at least, so he resigned immediately. Lynn went all out for a win against Nokes, meeting the latter's King's Gambit in novel fashion, and soon having the Canterbury player in all sorts of accept on pain of mate. Then, just as Lynn should have been reaping the rewards of his fine play he blew the game with a disastrous blunder. Stuart, unable to play an adjourned game session on the Saturday morning because of travel difficulties and therefore almost certain to lose one way or another, played the opening very carelessly and soon had to jettison the exchange and a pawn. Superficial play by Jensen, however, allowed Stuart a strong initiative which eventually recouped all the lost material. Then, with a forced draw available, Stuart blundered into a mate in three on his 40 th move - again the result of time trouble. Thus Nokes had snuck into the lead at the end and Jensen joined Stuart jn second place.

In retrospect Roger Nokes was a somewhat lucky winner but in the final analysis he took his many chances when they presented themselves. His opening play was suspect, in several games causing him to emerge materially or positionally down, but bad mistakes by his opponents were quickly punished by his tactical skill. The soundest player in the tournament was Peter Stuart who showed his ability to convert a slight edge into a pawn advantage in a number of games then skilfully winning the endgames. The
clock was his worst enemy. Kai Jensen played great attacking chess but let mistakes creep into his game which cost him points. Top seed and Olympic representative Vernon Small played reasonably well over the first six rounds but his last two games will make him want to forget this tournament quickly. Jon Jackson displayed some dashing sacrifices - some successful, some not. Van Dijk played steadily and was always handy to the leaders. Probably the player that played above himself was Denis Boyce; higher rated players struggled for points against him and he was responsible for a couple of nice mating attacks.
$\left.\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllll} & & & & & & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5\end{array}\right)$

The B grade was impressively won by Nelson player Simon Earle who is at presenting attending university in Wellington. Earle surprised the locals with the great improvement he showed. Mark Lancaster, another ex-Nelson player, was expected to win this grade but he mixed his games and finished in the middle of the field.

Scores: S.R.Earle (Nelson) 7; W.Gibson (Canterbury) 6; D.Pfahlert \& B.Petrie 5; Mrs E. Bowler, M.Lancaster \& W.Lester 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ D.Schulz, L.Wall \& M.White 4; G.Scarr 3六; R.L.Strickett $2 \frac{1}{2} ;$ D. Borreli 1; J.Bowler $\frac{1}{2}$.

Small - Baker, Alekhine Defence:
 $0-0 \quad 9 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 6 \mathrm{t} 10 \mathrm{Qe} 2 \mathrm{dxe5} 11 \mathrm{dxe5} \mathrm{Nd} 412 \mathrm{Nxd} 4$ Qxd4 13 Re 1 Be6 14 Bxe6 fxe6 15 Nac Rf5 16 Nf 3 Qc 417 Be 3 Qxed 18 Rxe2 Nd5 19 Bg5 Raf8 20 Rd h6 21 Bet Kh7 22 Nd4 Rxe5 23 Rxe5 Bxe5 24 Nxe6 Rf6 25 Ng5t hxg5 26 Rxd5 Rf5 $27 \mathrm{Kf1}$ Bf6 $28 \mathrm{Rd7} \mathrm{Rc} 529 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 430 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Kg} 731 \mathrm{Rd} 5 \mathrm{Rc} 6 \quad 32 \mathrm{Kd} 3$ Rd6 $33 \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{Rxd5} 34 \mathrm{Kxd5} \mathrm{Kf} 7735 \mathrm{Kc} 5 \mathrm{Ke} 636 \mathrm{Kb5} \mathrm{~b} 637 \mathrm{Kc} 6 \mathrm{Be} 538 \mathrm{Bxg5}$ Bd6 $39 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Kf5} 40 \mathrm{Kd5} \mathrm{Kf} 641 \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{Ke} 642 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Kf} 643 \mathrm{hy} \mathrm{Ke} 644 \mathrm{Bd} 4 \mathrm{c} 5$ $45 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Bc} 7 \quad 46 \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 8 \quad 47 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{gxh} 5 \quad 48 \mathrm{gxh} 5 \mathrm{Kf} 6 \quad 49 \mathrm{Kd} 5 \mathrm{Kf} 5 \quad 50 \mathrm{Be} 3$ e6+ 51 Ka6, 1:0.

## Jackson - Stuart, Sicilian Defence:


 Bc6 $15 \mathrm{Nc} 30-016$ Rad1 Ne5 $17 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{Rfd8} 18 \mathrm{Bg} 5$ Bxg5 19 Qxg5 f6 20 Qh5 Qf7 21 Qxf7+ Kxf7 $22 \mathrm{f}_{4}$ Ng6 23 Rd2 e5 24 Bf 37 exfl 25 Bh5 fxg 326 hxg $3 \mathrm{Ke7} 27$ Bxg6 hxg6 $28 \mathrm{Red} 1 \mathrm{a5} 29 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Ke} 6 \quad 30 \mathrm{Kf} 3$ a4 31 bxa4 Bxa4 3
 Nd5+ Bxd5 38 exd5 Ra? $39 \mathrm{Re} 2+\mathrm{Kf8} 40$ Re 6 g 541 Rexd6 Rda8 42 Re 6 Kf 7 43 g4 f4 $44 \mathrm{Rec} 6 \mathrm{Kf8} 45 \mathrm{Rg} 6 \mathrm{Kf7} 46 \mathrm{Rxg} 5 \mathrm{Rxa6} 47 \mathrm{Rb} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 848 \mathrm{Rbxg} 7 \mathrm{Ra} 4$ $49 \mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Ke} 7 \quad 50 \mathrm{Rxa8}$ Rxa8 51 Kxf 4 and White won.

Jensen - Foord, Sicilian Defence
 Kh1 d5 9 e5 Nd7, 10 Qe2 Ng6 11 f4 $0-0 \quad 12$ Be3 Bxe3 13 Qxe3 Qc7. 14 N 1 d 2 $\mathrm{b} 615 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 516 \mathrm{Bc} 2 \mathrm{Na} 417 \mathrm{Rab} 1 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 18 \mathrm{Nd} 4 \mathrm{Nc} 519 \mathrm{~N} 2 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Rac} 8 \mathrm{Cl} 20 \mathrm{Ng} 5 \mathrm{~h} 6$ 21 Nxf7 Kxf7 22 f5 Nxe5 23 fxe6 Kg8 24 exd7 Ncxd7 25 Bb 3 Rxfl +26 Rxfl

 Qg6+, $\frac{1}{2}$ : $\frac{1}{2}$.

## Van Dijk - Jensen, Pirc Defence

 Re8 9 Nge2 as 10 Ng3 Ba6 11 Bd3 e5 12 dxe 5 dxe5 13 h 4 Qe? 14 h 5 Nfd 15 hxg 6 fxg6 16 Qh2 Nf8 $17 \mathrm{Rd} 1 \mathrm{Nbd7} 18 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \mathrm{Nc5} 19 \mathrm{Qg} 1$ Nce6 20 Nce2 c5 $21 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{c} 4 \quad 22 \mathrm{Bc} 2 \mathrm{Qf7} 23 \mathrm{Qf} 2 \mathrm{Nff}_{4} 24 \mathrm{Nf1} \mathrm{NBe6} 25 \mathrm{Nxf4} \mathrm{exf} 4 \quad 26 \mathrm{Bd} 4 \mathrm{Nxa4} 27$ cxd4 b4 28 Ba4 Rec8 29 Rc2 bxa3 30 bxa3 Rab8 31 Rb2 c $3 \quad 32$ Rxb8 Rxb8 33 $\mathrm{Bc} 2 \mathrm{Qa} 234 \mathrm{Qh} 4 \mathrm{Rb} 1+, 0$

Nokes - Bates, Trompovsky Attack:
1 d4 Nf6 2 Bg5 e6 $\quad 3$ e4 Be7 4 Bxf6 Bxf6 5 Nc 3 c5 6 Nb5 cxd4 7 Nxd4 a6 $8 \mathrm{Ngf} 3 \mathrm{Qc} 7 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{O} 0 \quad 10 \mathrm{O} 0 \mathrm{Rd} 811 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{~d} 512 \mathrm{Qe} 2 \mathrm{e} 513 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{~d} 4.14 \mathrm{Rac} 1$ Bg4 $15 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{dxc} 316 \mathrm{Rxc} 3 \mathrm{Qd6} 17 \mathrm{h3} \mathrm{Bxf} 3 \quad 18 \mathrm{Qxf3} \mathrm{Nc} 6 \quad 19$ a3 b5 20 Rfc 1 Nd 4 $21 \mathrm{Nxd}_{4} \mathrm{Qxd4} 22 \mathrm{Qg} 4 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 23 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 24 \mathrm{Bbl} \mathrm{b}_{4} 25 \mathrm{axb}_{4} \mathrm{Bxb} 426 \mathrm{Rg} 3 \mathrm{Bf8} 27$ Bat Ra7 28 Rd5 Qxb2 29 Rc6 RXd5 30 exd5 Qde 31 Rc8 E6 32 h5 g5 33 Qf5 Qd1+ $34 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Qxh} 5+35 \mathrm{Rh} 3$ Qg6 36 Qxe5 Rd7 S? Qe8 Qa6+ $38 \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{Rb} \quad 39 \mathrm{Re} 3$
 Q.Qd6 was correct
Qf7

Stuart - Small, English Opening:
1 c4 e5 2 Nc 3 Ní6 $3 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 6 \mathrm{H}_{4}$ e4 Bc5 5 Nxe5 Bxf2+ 6 Kxf2 Nxe5 7 d 4 Neg4+ $8 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 9 \mathrm{~h} 3$ Nh6 10 QP3 Nhg8 11 Bd3 Na7 12 Be3 Ne? 13 g $40-0$

 26 Radl G6 32 Nxc6 Nxc6 33 Bf4 Rf7 34 Bf3 Ref8 35 Bxc 6 Rxf4 36 Rd4 R4f6? ( $36 . .$. $\operatorname{Bxg} 4$ ! =) $37 \mathrm{Bd} 5 \mathrm{Bf7} 38 \mathrm{Bxf7}+\mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{xf} 7 \quad 39 \mathrm{Rd} 8+\mathrm{Kg} 740 \mathrm{R1d2} \mathrm{Re7}$ it R 2 d 7 Rff7 42 Rxe7 Rxe7 $43 \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{Kf} 6 \quad 44 \mathrm{Rd} 6+\mathrm{Kf7} 45 \mathrm{Kf} 5 \mathrm{Rc}$ ? $46 \mathrm{Ke} 5 \mathrm{Re} 5+47 \mathrm{Rd} 5$ Rc7 $48 \mathrm{Ka} 6 \mathrm{Rc} 849 \mathrm{Kd7} \mathrm{Rg} 850 \mathrm{~g} 5 \mathrm{Kg} 651$ b4 Rf8 $52 \mathrm{c} 5 \mathrm{bxc} 5 \quad 53$ bxc5 Rf2 54 c6 1 . 0

Nokes - Jensen, King's Gambit:

 Rxg5 Qh6 21 Rxg8+ Nxg8 22 Bg3 Nd? 23 Bb5 Ne7 24 b4 f5 25 Bxd7+ Kxd7 26 e5 Nxd5 27 Qxf5 + Qe6 28 Qd3 Rh3 29 Ne 4 Nf 4 ? $30 \mathrm{Qb} 5+\mathrm{Kd8} 31 \mathrm{Bxfl}$ Rh4? $32 \mathrm{Bg} 5+, 1$ : 0.

Small - Van Dijk, Ruy Lopez:
e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 $50-0$ Be7 6 Bxc6 dxc6 7 Qe1 Be6 $8 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{Na} 7 \mathrm{~g} \quad \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{f} 610 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 611$ Qe3 Qe7 $12 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 13$ dxe5 Nxe5 14 Nxe5 fxe5 $15 \mathrm{Qg} 3 \mathrm{Bd} 716 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{c} 6 \quad 17 \mathrm{Rad} 10-0 \quad 18 \mathrm{Bc} 1 \mathrm{Rf} 719 \mathrm{Rd} 3 \mathrm{Bc} 7 \quad 20 \mathrm{Rfd} 1$


Haase - Nokes, Sokolsky
1 Nf3 d6 2 b4 e5 3 Bb2 Nf6 4 c4 Be? 5 g3 0-0 6 Bg2 Nbd7 7 O-0 h6 8 d3 Re8 9 Ne 3 Bf 810 a4 Rb8 11 a5 c6 12 Nd 2 d5 13 cxd5 cxd5 14 Qb 3 d 15 Nd 5 b 616 a6 Nxd5 17 Bxd5 Qe? $18 \mathrm{Ne} 4 \mathrm{Nf6} 19 \mathrm{Nxf6}+\mathrm{Qxf6} 20 \mathrm{Rfc} 1 \mathrm{Bd} 6$ 21 Rc6 Bd7 22 Rxd6 Qxd6 23 Bxf7+ Kh7 24 Bxe8 Rxe 825 b5 Qc5 26 Rc 1 Qxb5 27 Qxb5 Bxb5 28 Rc 7 Bxa6 29 Rxa7 Bc8 $30 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Kg} 631 \mathrm{Ba3} \mathrm{Kf} 632 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{~h} 5, \frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$.

Jackson - Small, Sicilian Defence



 27 Nxd5 exd5 28 Bxd5 Be6 29 Rxb7+Kc8 30 Bxe6+ Kxb7 31 Bxf7 Nh8 32 Bxh5

 4. Kes Kgs 46 Bet

 Be2 0-0 9 O-0 a6 $10 \mathrm{Re} 1 \mathrm{Qc} 711 \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{~b} 612 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Rd} 813 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \mathrm{Qb7} 14 \mathrm{a3} \mathrm{Bd} 7$ 15 Nfl Rac8 16 Ne3 Ne5 17 Bxe5 dxe5 18 Qce Bc6 19 f3 Bc5 20 Bfl b5 2
b4 Bxe3t 22 Rxe3 bxc4 23 Bxc4 Qb6 24 Qf2 Bxe4? 25 Rxe

 Rxf3+, 1 : 0.

## 3. WINSTONES TOURNAMENT

Report: Tony Carpinter
The third Winstone's Open Tournament was run by the North Shore Chess Club on $14 / 15$ August. The format was the common one for Auckland weekend events: a fast time limit ( 45 moves/90 minutes, plus 15 minutes to finish the game) and five rounds in the two days. Upsets seem to occur easily in this type of event and this factor together with a generous prize fund attracted an entry of 56 players. Most of the Auckland regilars were there, with a sprinkling of outsiders like Roger Nokes (Christchurch), Kai Jensen (Hamilton) and a Tauranga contingent.

The three Saturday counds went according to plan for the top seeds with two exceptions, both involving the improving David Johnstorie. In round two he played well to reach a won position agains lar the rull pin, and in rand ter, Kai Jensen, Rofer Nokes and Paul Beach.

Round 4 proved crucial. Green had few problems with Beach but the other games were more exciting, Sfilth took too much time savouring Jensen's hideously anti-positional Modern, let his advantage slip, then had his flag fall. Nokes won Carpinter's queen for insufficient material and still had a crushing position when he walked into a one mover axid lost his queen, of the others, wohnstone wor again while storehouse dropped away by losing to
local schoolboy David Evans. In the last round Green (4) v Jensen (4) and Cocal schoolboy David Evans. ( $3 \frac{1}{2}$ ) were the pairings to decide the tournament. The first game produced a fairly quick draw. In the other Carpinter won a pawn and then chickened out in the face of some pressure and a draw offer Not exciting for the spectators but, after all, a loss would have cost any of theee players, except Johnstone, a large sum.

So Green, Jensen and Carpinter were first equal with $4 \frac{1}{2} / 5$ and shared $\$ 340$ Green played the best chess and perhaps had the easiest draw. All of those on $4 / 5$ played some good chess and lacked a little Juck. The grade prizes ( $\mathrm{J}_{4} 0$ each) were won by D.Johnstone, P. Spiller \& F. Beach (joint top 1800 1999), B.MoIvor (1600-1799), D.Evans (1400-1599) and A.Kasmara (Unrated). The latter three displayed better form than was expected.

Thanks for the success of the tournament are due to Winstone Ltd for their generous sponsorship and Peter Stuart who directed efficiently with help from Michael Whaley and Bill Wilson.

## Results in detail:

1-3 E.Green, K.Jensen \& A.Carpinter $4 \frac{1}{2} ; 4-8$ R.Nokes, D.Johnstone, P.Garbett, P.Spiller \& P. Beach 4; 9-13 R.Smith, M. Barlow, B.McIvor, A.Kasmar * R.Gibbons $3 \frac{1}{2}$; 14-26 P.W.Power, T.Stonehouse, J.Arbuthnott, R. Davies R.Lanning, D.Evans, A.Sykes, J.Fekete, K. Burgess, R.Mills, G.Lander, M.Morrison \& R. Roundill 3 ; $22-43$ I.Mitchell, A.Johnstone, G.Ion, I.McIntyre,
 D. Gollogly, J.Ross, A.Johnston, S.Giles, M.Howard, F.Zyp, P. Hoffmann \& M W. Stretch 2; 44-47 A.J.Henderson, N. Bradley, Miss G.Jones \& T. Ball $1 \frac{1}{2}$; 8-53 Mrs E.Gibbons, H.McAven, D. Rawneley, I.Torok, H.De Kock \& Mrs D. Green 1; 54 Mrs S.Mills $\frac{1}{2} ; 55-56$ J.Osborne \& J.M. Donnelly 0.

Garbett - D.Johnstone, Nimzowitsch Defence:
e4 Nc6 2 d4 e5 $3 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{Nce7} \quad 4 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{Ng} 6 \quad 5 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Bc} 5 \quad 6 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Nf6} 7 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 8$ h3 0-0 9 Bg5 h6 10 Bd2 Nh5 11 Na 4 Bb6 12 Nxb 6 axb6 13 g 3 f 514 Nh 4 Nhf4! 15 Nxf5 Nxe2 16 Qxe2 Bxf5 17 exf5 Rxi5 $180-0$ Qf6 19 Kg 2 Raf8 20 Rac1 Rf3 21 Rc3 e4 22 Be1 Qf5 23 Rh1 Ne5 $24 \operatorname{Re} 3 \mathrm{Nd} 3 \quad 25 \mathrm{Rhfl} \mathrm{Nf} 4+$ ! 26 gxf4 $\mathrm{Qh} 3+27 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Qg} 4^{+}$- $28 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Qh} 3+(28 \ldots \mathrm{Rf5}$ ! wins much more quickly) $29 \mathrm{Kg1} \mathrm{R8xf4} 30 \mathrm{Rxf3}$ Qg54+ 31 Rg 3 ( 31 Kh 2 Rxf3 is worse) $31 \ldots$ Qxe2 32 $\mathrm{Bc} 3 \mathrm{g5} 33 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{Qxa2} 34 \mathrm{Bd} 4 \mathrm{Rf} 3 \quad 35 \mathrm{Rg} 4 \mathrm{Rf} 436 \mathrm{Rg} 3 \mathrm{Kf} 737 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qe} 2 \quad 38 \mathrm{Rh} 1$ Rg4 39 Rxh6 Rxg3+ $40 \mathrm{Kxg3}$ Qd3+ 41 Be 3 Kg 742 Re6 Qxb3 and Black won.

Nokes - Spiller, Richter-Veressov Attack:
1 d4 Nff 2 Bg5 d5 $3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Bf5} 4$ Bxf6 exf6 5 e3 c6 6 Bd3 Qd7 7 Nge2 Bd6 8 Ng 3 Bxd3 9 Qxd3 $0-0 \quad 10$ 0-0-0 Na6 11 Qf5 Qe6 12 Nce2 g6 13 Qf3 Nc7 $14 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{f5} 15 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Qe} 716 \mathrm{hxg6}$ fxg6 $17 \mathrm{Nf4}$ Qg5 18 Nge Rae8 19 Qh3 Rf7 20 Rdg1 Ne6 21 g3 Qf6 22 Rg2 Qg? 23 Rgh2 Ng5 24 Qg2 Ree? 25 Rh6 Kf8? 26 Nxg6+ Qxg6 27 Rxg6 hxg6 28 Nf 4 Kg 729 Qh2, 1 : 0.

## Sykes - Carpinter, Gruenfeld Defence:

 8 Ne2 Nc6 9 O-0 b6 10 f 4 e6 11 Be 3 Bb ? $12 \mathrm{Qd2} \mathrm{Na5} 13 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{f} 514 \mathrm{Qc} 2$
 h4 21 Ne 2 fxe4 $22 \mathrm{Bb} 1 \mathrm{Bd} 523 \mathrm{Rf} 1 \mathrm{Ne} 424 \mathrm{Rdd} 1 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \quad 25 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Rxb} 1,0$ : 1.

## Barlow - Beach, Nimzoindian Defence:


 e4 f4 $15 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \mathrm{e} 516 \mathrm{Be} 1 \mathrm{Qh} 517 \mathrm{Bf} 2 \mathrm{Rf} 6 \quad 18 \mathrm{Rfd} 1 \mathrm{Rh} 6 \quad 19 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 6 \mathrm{~K} 20 \mathrm{Kh} 2$ Rf8 21 Qa4 Bc8 22 c5 Nxc5! 23 dxc5 Rxg2+! $24 \mathrm{Kxg} 2 \operatorname{Bxh} 3+25 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Bd} 7+$ $26 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qh} 3+27 \mathrm{Kg} 1$ Bxa4, $0: 1$.

Smith - Jensen, Modern Defence:
 $\mathrm{Nf7} 9 \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 8 \quad 10$ 0-0 e6 11 exf5 gxf5 $12 \mathrm{Rfe} 1 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 13 \mathrm{Bd} 3$ Qf6 14 Ne 2 Ng6 15 Nf 4 h 516 Nxg6 Qxg6 $17 \mathrm{Nh} 4 \mathrm{Qh} 7 \quad 18 \mathrm{Bf} 40-0 \quad 19 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 20 \mathrm{Re} 3$ Nh8 21 Rael Bf6 22 Nf3 Ng6 23 Bg5 Kh8 24 Bxf6 Rxf6 25 Ng5 Qh6 26 Rxe6!? Qg7 $27 \mathrm{Rxf6}$ Qxf6 $28 \mathrm{f4} \mathrm{Kg}$ ? $29 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{~h} 4,30 \mathrm{Kf2} \mathrm{Rh} 8 \mathrm{z} 31 \mathrm{Rg} 1 \mathrm{hxg} 3+$ 32 Rxg3 Rh5 33 Nf 3 Kf 834 Ng 5 Qd6 $35 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Rh} 8 \quad 36 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nxf4} 37 \mathrm{Ne} 5$ 0 : 1 (time)

CAN YOU SEE THE COMBINATIONS?
(SOLUTIONS ON P.110)
No. 1
White to move


No. 3


No. 5
Black to move


White to move


White to move


No. 6
Black to move


Although not a great number of games reached the endgame stage, there were a few interesting examples which form the basis of this article. Strangely enough they all involve either William Lynn or the writer - and whose styles could be further apart?

Where better to start than the game between these two:


Stuant y Lynn after Black's 25th
White has an undeniable advantage in pawn structure. Although passed the d-pawn is immobilised and, together with the a-pawn, provides a convenient target. Black's pieces, all is not lost. Piay continued:

$$
26 \text { Bd4! }
$$

A dual purpose move defending c 3 against an incursion by the enemy knight and also threatenjng to win the a-pawn immediately by 27 Ne3.

$$
26 \quad \ldots \quad \text { Bc5? }
$$

But this quite the wrong idea;
the exchange of bishops magnifies
the importance of the potential outside passed pawn that White will obtain on the queenside. Correct was 26...Ng5! followed by Ne6 when the white bishop has no good
squares yet should not be given up for the knight, e.g. 26...Ng5! 27 Kf1 Ne6 28 g3 Nxd4 $29 \mathrm{Nxd}_{4} \mathrm{Kf} 8$ 30 Ke 2 g 6 ! (limiting the knight) 31 Kd 3 Ke ? and it is not clear that White can progress any further since the bishop can control all the white king's entry squares.

$$
27 \quad \operatorname{Bxc5} \quad \operatorname{NXc5}
$$

$28 \quad \mathrm{Nb} 4$
Forcing the d-pawn further into the lion's den. Clearly, on $\mathrm{d}_{4}$ this pawn will be more accessible to the white pieces than the black.

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
28 & \ldots & d L \\
29 & \mathrm{Ke1} & \text { d } \\
30 & \mathrm{Ke} 2 & K f r
\end{array}
$$

eless would be $30 \ldots \mathrm{Ne}_{4} 31$ Nxa6 Ne3+ 32 Ka3 Nxa己 33 Kxá4 winning easily.

$$
31 \quad \text { Nc6 }
$$

$$
\mathrm{Ne}_{4}
$$

or $31 \ldots$ Ne 632 g 3 ! and the d-pawn soon falls, but not here $32 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 4+$ unnecessarily allowing Black one of the kingside pawns. The text threatens Nc3+ winning the important a pawn, so ....

$$
32 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \text { ! }
$$

Giving up the f-pawn but in addition to the d-pawn White will win the a pawn. Much inferior would be 32 a4 allowing the black king time to reach the centre, e.g. 32 ...Nc5
$33 \mathrm{Nxd} 4 \mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{Kd2} \mathrm{Ka} 6{ }^{2} 35 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Ka} 5$.

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
32 & \text { Mx. } & \mathrm{Nxf2+} \\
33 & \mathrm{Ke} \\
34 & \mathrm{Nb4} & \mathrm{Ke} \\
& \mathrm{f5}
\end{array}
$$

Also hopeless was $34 \ldots a 535$ Nc6 a4 36 bxa4 when the black king must immediately head for the queenside leaving White a free hand on the other wing. Black prefers counterplay on the kingside but this is too late to influence the result.

| 35 | Nxa6 | f 4 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 36 | Nc5+ | Kf5 |
| 37 | Nd3! | f 3 |

Setting a little trap which will, however, cost Black his knight.

## $38 \quad 54+$

Obviously not 38 Nxf2?? fxg2 and the pawn queens. After winning the knight White will easily stop the black pawns. The rest needs no ex-
38...Nxg4 $39 \mathrm{hxg}^{+} \mathrm{Kxg}_{4}{ }_{4} \mathrm{O} \mathrm{Ke} 3$
 44 a7 h2 $45 \mathrm{Nf} 2 \mathrm{~g} 5 \quad 46$ a8Q $94 \quad 47$
 soon mated.

The second position occurred after Black's 22nd move in the game Stuart $v$ Nokes:


Here too White stands a Iittle better, thanks to his more active bishops which give him chances on the queenside.

First 23 Bb 8 would be just fine f. Black had to reply $23 .$. Eg7, but in fact he would play 23. . Be5t $24 \mathrm{Kf1}$ Bd4 drawing with ease after 25 b3 Bd7!

$$
23 \quad . .
$$

## a4

Very bad would be 23...b4 because of 24 a4! and the black apawn falls.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
24 & \mathrm{Bc} 6 \\
25 & \mathrm{Kf2}
\end{array}
$$

Ba. 6

The king must approach along the black squares; with his next Black hopes to cut the white king's water off.

| 25 | Bh6 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26 | Be3! | Bf8 |

Black cannot afford to exchange dark squared bishops since White would then win easily by marching his king to $\mathrm{b}_{4}$ and helping himself to two pawns, e.g. 26...Bxe3+ 27 Kxe 3 Kf8 28 Kd2 Ke7 29 Kc3 Kd6 30 Bd5 f6 31 Kb 4 followed by 32 Ka5, or in this 30 ...Kc5 31 Bxf7
g5 32 g 3 with an eventual f3-f4 creating a passed pawn.

$$
27 \quad \mathrm{Ke} 1
$$

## $04 ?$

Impatience! Blackly vainly tries, by tactical means, to liquidate all the queenside pawns. Instead Black should have continued quietly $27 .$. Bd6 $28 \mathrm{Kd1}$ ( $28 \mathrm{Kd2?} \mathrm{b4!} 29$ axb4 Bxb4 +30 Kcl a3 31 bxa3 drawn, but not 31 b 3 ? Bd3! 32 Bd 5 a 233 k2 Bb1! and Black wins) 28...Kf8 29 Kc 2 Kg 730 Kc 3 when Black can hold the position.

28 Bc 1 !
Not 28 axbly allowing Black to justify his previous move: $28 .$. Bxb4 ${ }^{+} 29$ Bd2 a3!

| 28 | $\ldots$ | bxa3 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 29 | bxa3 | f5 |
| 30 | Bxa4 | Kf7 |

As so oiten happens Black gains a slight initiative after losing material; White's pieces are temporarily out of play. The win

| 31 | Bc6 | Ke6 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 32 | a4 | Bc5 |
| 33 | Bb5 | Bb7 |
| 34 | exf5+ | Exf5 |
| 35 | Ke2 | Kd5 |
| 36 | Be3 | Bd4 |
| 37 | Bxd4 |  |

Following the basic principle exchange pieces when materially up, pawns when materially down. Black could hardly have avoided this exchange since $36 .$. Bd 6 would have given the a-pawn a free run to af.

## 37 38

g3!
Kxd4
An immediate 38 g4 could be met by $38 \ldots$..fxg 439 fxg 4 KeL.

| 38 | $\ldots$ | $f 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 39 | 54 | $e 4$ |
| 40 | fxe | Bxe |
| 41 | h4 | Bb? |

Black had sealed his 41 st but resigned without resuming play, which could have concluded 42 Kf 2 Bd5 43 a 5 Kc5 44 Bd 3 h $6 \quad 45$ g5 hxg5 46 hxg 5 and Black cannot stop both pawns.

The third position arose after 32

Every move a forcing move; now White must lose a pawn since Bb 2 is threatened.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
44 & 25 \\
45 & d 4 ?!
\end{array}
$$

After this White must tread very carefully. The immediate 45 b 6 ! secures a draw with relative ease, e.g. 45...axb6 (not 45...a6 46 b? Bg2 47 Rb 3 Bb 848 Rb 6 h 549 Rxa 6 winning, or in this $46 \ldots$... $\mathrm{Bd}^{2} 4$ ? Rc3! Kf6 48 Rc8 also winning for White, thanks to the presence of the a-pawns) 46 axbs Bge 47 b Kf6! $48 \mathrm{Rb} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 8 \quad 49 \mathrm{Rc} 3 \mathrm{Be} 5 \quad 50$ Rb3 B68 =.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
45 \\
46 & \ldots \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

Bc?
Thus the pawn advance is now held up, necessitating the king's help but the monarch arrives just in time


Instead of 48...h4 Black could also try $48 \ldots$... Bd? with the idea of keeping out the white king but this too does no better than draw with correct play: 49 b6 axb6t 50 axb 6 Bb8 51 d5 h4 52 Ra8! h3 53 Rxb8 $\mathrm{h} 254 \mathrm{~b} 7 \mathrm{~h} 1 \mathrm{Q} 55 \mathrm{Rg} 8+$ ( 55 Ra 8 ? Q5 $1+$ ! and Black soon wins the bpawn and with it the game) 55...Kxge $56 \mathrm{~b} 8 \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{Kf7} 57 \mathrm{Qb} 7$ ! Qh3 $58 \mathrm{Kd6!}$ ! (or 58...Ke8 $59 \mathrm{Qb} 8+$ ) $59 \mathrm{Qxd7}$ $0 \mathrm{xd7}+60 \mathrm{Kxd7} \mathrm{~g} 4=$.

$$
49 \text { Kc6! }
$$ 51 d5 (no better is 51 Rå, e.g. $51 \ldots \mathrm{~h} 3 \quad 52$ Pxb8 h2 $53 \mathrm{b7}$ h1Q 54 Rg8 + Kxg8 $55 \mathrm{~b} 8 \mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{Kh} 7$ winning) 51...Bf5! (making way for the gpawn; this position is the same as that after 51...h4 in the preceding note except for the bishop being much better placed on $f 5$ instead of on d7) 52 Ra8 ( 52 26 h3 wins for Black) 52...h3 53 Rxb8 h2 54 b7 11Q 55 Ra8 (with the bishop on 55 , $55 \mathrm{Rg} 8+$ would simply leave White a piece down) 55...Qc1+! 56 Kd 6 Qf4+ $57 \mathrm{Kc} 6 \mathrm{Qc} 4+58 \mathrm{Kd6} \mathrm{Be} 4$ ! and Black wins, e.g. 59 b8Q Qxd5+ 60 Ke ? Qxa8' 61 Qe $5+\mathrm{Kh} 762$ Qh2+ Kg8 etc 49 h3!?

Another try was 49...Bi4 saving the piece for the time being but this also leads to a draw: 50 b6 axb6 51 a6! (but not 51 axb6 h3 5267 h 253 Ral Bf3+ winning) 51 $\ldots \mathrm{Bb} 8 \mathrm{52} \mathrm{Kb7!} \mathrm{~h} 3 \quad 53 \mathrm{Kxb} 8 \mathrm{h2} 54$ a7! (54 Ra1 Bf3 55 a7 h1Q 56 Rxh1 Bxh 157 a8Q Bxa8 58 Kxa8 Kry! 5 Kb ? by and the resulting Q P ( Q ending gives Black an excuse to play on $54 . . . h 1$ win kith his king while the bishop sacrifices itself for the d-pawn.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
50 & \mathrm{Kxc} 7 \\
51 & \mathrm{Ra} 1 \\
52 & \mathrm{Kb8}
\end{array}
$$

White can also draw by 52 b6!? axb6 53 axb6 9554 Kd.6! (but not $55 \mathrm{Kxb7} \mathrm{~g} 456 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{~g} 3 \quad 57 \mathrm{~d} 6 \mathrm{~g} 258$ d7 and now not 58...g1Q 59 Rxg 1 hxf1Q $60 \mathrm{~d} Q \mathrm{Q}=$, but 58...h1Q! 59 Rxh1 Exh1Q+ etc) 54...E4 (simpler is $54 .$. Bb7! $55 \mathrm{Kc} 7 \mathrm{BA} 556 \mathrm{Kd6}$ Bb7 ete) 55 d5 g3 56 b7 g2 57 b8Q 10! (57...h1Q? 58 Ra7+ wins for White) 58 Ra7+ Qxa7!! 59 Qxa7+ Kg5! with a draw because White has no checks and cannot prevent Black queening.

## 52

Also good enough for a draw is $52 . . \mathrm{hiQ} 53$ Rxh1 Bxh1 54 Kxa7 g5 $\begin{array}{ll}55 & \text { b6 } \\ \text { b8Q } & \text { g } 19\end{array}=$

53 Kxa?

## $\begin{array}{ll}54 & b 6 \\ 55 & a 6\end{array}$

The pawns must support each ther; 55 b? would lose: 55... Bxb7 $56 \mathrm{Kxb} 7 \mathrm{~g} 2 \quad 57$ a6 h1Q 58 Rxh1 gxh1Q winning.

| 55 | ... | g2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56 | b7 | g1Q |
| 57 | Rxgl | hxg19 |
| 58 | b8Q | Qxd4 ${ }^{+}$ |
| 59 | Qb6 | Qd7+ |
| 60 | Kb8 | Qe8+ |
| 61 | Kc7 |  |

$\frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$


Position after Black's 36 th move in the game Lynn v Perry.
White's extra pawn is hardly nough to win owing to Black's marvellous rook.
White's first task in any winaing attempt is to clear a path for his king to enter the game and this little skirmish occupies the next few moves

$$
37 \quad \text { h3 }
$$

h5!
Aiming to close the gate by h5h4, thus forcing White to permit h4, thus forcing white to permit
the exchange of a pair of pawns.

| 38 | h4 | Kf6 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 39 | Kh2 | g5 |
| 40 | hxg $5+$ | Kxg5 |
| 41 | Kg3 | Rb1 |
| 42 | Kf3 | Rb2?! |

Not yet a decisive mistake but Black should have taken the opportunity to play 42...h4
hich would keep the white pawn on g? where it is under fire.

43 g3
Kf5
Black must prevent the opposing king from reaching the queenside where it could do a lot of damage

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
44 & \text { Rd3 } & \text { Ke5 } \\
45 & \text { a5!? } &
\end{array}
$$

White still has no way to make real progress. If 45 Ke 3 then 45 ..Rg2 and the king must return, and if 45 Rd5+ Ke6! 46 Rxh5 then 6...Rxb3+ $47 \mathrm{Kf4} \mathrm{Rb} 4$ drawing comfortably, e.g. 48 Rc5 b5!? 49 7 - 18 K $50 \mathrm{Rh7}+\mathrm{Kg} 851 \mathrm{Pxb} 7 \mathrm{Rc} 5+52 \mathrm{Kg} 6$ Rc6+ also drawing.

| 45 | Kej | Kf5 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 46 | Ke3 | Ke5 |
| 47 | Rd5 | Kf6? |

The losing move. Black had to play 47...Keб preventing a check on the sixth rank. After (47... Ke6) $48 \operatorname{Rxh} 5$ ( $48 \operatorname{Rd} 3 \mathrm{Ke} 5$ repeats) 48...Rxb3 $+49 \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{Rb} 450 \mathrm{Rh} 6+$ (50 Re5 Kd6 51 Re8 Kd7) 50...Kf7 $51 \mathrm{Rh} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 652 \mathrm{Rc} 7 \mathrm{~b} 5$ ! 53 axb 6 Rxb6 54 g 4 a5 $55 \mathrm{Re5}$ a4 56 Ra5 Rb4 57 Rab+ Kg7 $58 \mathrm{Kf5}$ Rxc4 Black holds the draw.

| 48 | Rd6 + | Kg5 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 49 | Rb6 | Kg |
| 50 | Rxb7 | Kge3 |
| 51 | Rg7 + | Kh4 |

Surely better, though insufficient to save the game, was 51...Kh3 e.g. 52 c5! Rxb3+ $53 \mathrm{Ka4}$ h4 54 c6 Rb1 55 c7 Rc1 $56 \mathrm{Kd5} \mathrm{Kh} 25$ ? Kd6 h3 58 Rg8 Rd1+ 59 Kc6 Rc $1+$ 60 Kb 7 Kh1 61 c 8 Q Rxc8 62 Rxc8 h2 63 Rh8 and White wins easily.

With this variation in mind, the rest of the game requires no comment:
$52 \mathrm{c} 5!\mathrm{Rxb} 3+53 \mathrm{Kd} 4 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \quad 54 \mathrm{c} 6$ $\mathrm{Rc} 1 \quad 55 \mathrm{Kd} 5 \mathrm{Kh} 3 \quad 56 \mathrm{Kd} 6 \mathrm{~h} 4 \quad 57 \mathrm{c} 7$ $\mathrm{Rd} 1+58 \mathrm{Kc} 6 \mathrm{Rc} 1+59 \mathrm{Kb7} \mathrm{Rb} 1+60$ Kxa6 Rc1 $61 \mathrm{~Kb} 7 \mathrm{Rb} 1+62 \mathrm{Kc} 6 \mathrm{Rc} 1+$ $63 \mathrm{Kd} 7 \mathrm{Rd} 1+64 \mathrm{Ke} 8,1$ : 0.

The final position is from Van Dijk v Stuart, after White's $42 n d$ move.


It might be thought that Black has much the better of it with a protected passed pawn and N v B in a blocked position. But in leaves it a weakling) and the knight has nowhere to go, Black being so cramped. I must confess that during the adjournment I had viewed the outcome of this game very pessimistically, but after finding my $42 n d$ over the board became more cheerful - at least the knight would have a future

$$
42
$$

Not only providing egress for the knight but taking away from hite an important tempo move hle may well have become vital adack played any other (necessarily passive) variation.

## 43 f5

Striking on the kingside before the knight can do any damage on the other flank. Unconvincing was 43 Re 4 Nc5 44 Rxc4 Nxe6! 45 dxe6 h4 46 Re4 h3 47 Re1 h2 48 Rh1 Ke7.

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
43 & \ddot{y y y} & \operatorname{gxf5} \\
44 & \text { Bxf5 } & \text { Rg? } \\
45 & \text { g6 } & \text { Ne5! }
\end{array}
$$

Of no use is 45...Nc5 when 46 BC2 protects the queenside and is ollowed by 4 R Rhl or 17 Re4. Black had calculated that after the text the kingside pawns would be liquidated and that he could return to the queenside in time to prevent a debacle there.

46 Rh 1
Ke7

Of course 46...Nxg6?? would lose a piece after 47 Rg 1

$47 \quad$ Rxh5<br>Nxg6

Best, for if 48 Rg5? Kf6 49 Rxg6 + Rxg6 50 Bxg6 Kxg6 the king \& pawn ending would be won for Black, e.g. 51 Ke 2 Kff 52 Kf 3 Ke 5 $53 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Kxd5} 54 \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{Kc} 555 \mathrm{Ke} 4$ d5+ $56 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Kd6} 57 \mathrm{Kf} 3$ (or $57 \mathrm{Kd4}$ Ke6 58 Ke 3 Ke 5 ) 57...Ke5 58 Ke 3 $\mathrm{d}_{4}+$ ! 59 cxd4 Kd 5 and the rest is plain sailing.
48
49
Rh7 ${ }^{+}$
Rxg6

The king is a strong piece in he endgame and must head for the action; the passive 49...Kd8 ould be very bad. While it may appear that wince he has penetrated e ereater since he his is soon first with wron - Black even seen to be wrons black pawn, al omes out wis is win

## $50 \quad \mathrm{Rb}$ ?

No different effects from 50 Rc 7 Rg4 51 Rc6 Ke5 52 Rxb6 Rg1+ 53 Ke2 arriving back in the game after 52 Rxb6.

## EDITOR'S MAIL BAG

Dear Sir,
Firstly I would like to congratulate Roger Nokes on an entertaining report about the Australian Junior Championship. However it was often factually inaccurate and I would particularly like to refute the insinuation that I 'threw' my game against Guy West in round 9. Guy West is a friend and clubmate of mine but neither of us would ever consider rigging the re sult of a game against anyone. That a person with $8 / 8$ would forego the opportunity of a 'picket fence' by throwing a game against a person with little chance of a prize is in itself unlikely. That the game which follows was played after the players had agreed a result is ridiculous. It would be an interesting exercise to try to find the 'numerous wins which anyone could have found'. Solutions and comments are given below.
G. West - I.Rogers: 1 e4 e5 $2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 63 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 64 \mathrm{~d}_{4}$ exd4 $5 \mathrm{Nd} 5 \mathrm{Nxd5}$
 Qe5 Bxd5 13 Qud4 0-0 14 Rxe? Qxe7 15 Bxd5 Rae8 16 Bb3 Qe2+ 17 Kc 3 Nc6





Solutions: 16...c5! wins, e.g. 17 Qf4 Qe2+ $18 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \operatorname{Re} 419 \mathrm{Ng} 1 \mathrm{Rc} 4+20$
$50 \quad \cdots$
$\mathrm{Rg} 1+$

I had expected 51 Kc 2 and had planned to continue 51...Ra1 52 Rxb6 Ke5 53 Kb 2 Rxa. 4 when the rook is trapped but Black draws after either $54 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \mathrm{Kxd5} 55 \mathrm{~b} 6$ Kc6, or $54 \mathrm{Ra} 6 \mathrm{Kxd5} 55 \mathrm{~b} 6 \mathrm{Kc} 6$.

| 51 | —. | Ke5 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 52 | Rxb6 | Ra1 |
| 53 | $\operatorname{Ra6}$ | Rxa4 |
| 54 | b6 | Rac + |

Gaining a tempo to return the rook to the b-file.

| 55 | Ke 3 | Rb2 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 56 | Rxa5 | Rxb6 |
| 57 | Ra4! |  |

The safest way to draw. Downright bad would be 57 Kf 3 ? Rb3 or 57 Ra3? Rb3 when Black wins. And after 57 Kd 2 White has greater difficulties (57...Rb2+ 58 Ke 3
$\mathrm{Rc} 259 \mathrm{Ra} 3 \mathrm{Rh} 260 \mathrm{Ra} 5 \mathrm{Rh} 3+\quad 61$ Rc2 K9 Ra3 Rhe probably still draws.

| 57 | $\ldots$ | Kxd5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 58 | Ra5+ | Ke6 |
| 59 | Kd 4 | Rc 6 |
| 60 | Rh4 | Ra6 |
|  |  |  |

Qxc4 Qe1+ 21 Bd2 Qe5+, analysis by correspondence IM J.Kellner a month after the game.
19...d5+ probably wins; definitive analysis welcome.
20...Qxf2 loses to 21 Bxf7+ but was probably the best chance.

Ian Rogers
Ivanhoe, Victoria

## LOCAL NEWS, contd

Scores: 1 V.Small 7 pts; 2 R. Nokes $6 \frac{1}{2}$; 3 J.Jackson 6; 4 R. Mor rison 5; 5-11 R. Colthart, R. Freeman, W.Gibson, J.Hunter, K.Mackley, 4. 13-16 R. Aldous , kinson, G.Scarr \& T.Scott 3. 20-21 D. Borrell \& C.Reeves 2; 22 M.Sinclair 1.

The deciding game:
Nokes - Small, Sicilian 1 e4 c5 $204 \mathrm{cxb}_{4} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{4}$ e5 $\mathrm{Ne}^{2} 5 \mathrm{Nb} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 4 \mathrm{Be} 6$ e $6 \quad 7$ a3 Qb6
 Be2 a6 $14 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{Qc} 7 \mathrm{~F} 15 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Bc} 5+16$ Kh1 Ne? 17 Qg4 g6 18 axb4 Bb6 19 Ba3 Qd7 20 b5 a5 21 f5 Nxf5 22 Bxf5 exf5 23 e 6 fxg $4 \quad 24$ exd7+ Kxd7 25 Rxf7 + Ke6 26 Rxb7 Rb8 27 Re7+ Kf6 28 Rd7 Rhe8 29 Bb2+ 24 $30 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Re} 1+31 \mathrm{Kg} 2$ Re2t 32 Kg 1 Pxc2 and Black won.

The NORTH SHORE CLUB CHAMPIONSHIP was narrowly won by Paul Garbett, $\frac{1}{2}$ point aliead of Tony Carpinter and Peter Stuart. Garbett forged ahead in the middle of the tournament when the runners-up conceded a few draws but a loss to Metge in the last round aimost let the others catch up.

Scores: 1 P.Garbett 11; 2-3 A. Carpinter \& P. Stuart $10 \frac{1}{2} ; 4$ W.Leonhardt $9 \frac{1}{2} ; 5 \mathrm{M}$. Whaley $9 ; 6 \mathrm{~N}$. Metge $7 \frac{1}{2} ; 7$ M. Barlow $6 \frac{1}{2} ; 8$ W.WilMotg 5 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2} ;} 9-10$ D. Gollogly \& G. Waite $4 \frac{1}{2} ; 11$ W. Green \& R.Johnstone $3 \frac{1}{2}$; 13 M.Livingston $2 \frac{1}{2} ; \quad 14 \mathrm{~T} .0^{\prime}$ Connor $1 \frac{1}{2}$.

A close race in the 13-player B grade eventually saw Wayne Knightbridge take the title with $11 / 12$, followed by R.Roundill $10 \frac{1}{2}$, P. Snel-
son 10, P.Hoffmann 8 $\frac{1}{2}$. The two $11-$ player C grade divisions were won 10) and these (wo 10) and the two dsew off match 2 : 2.

Garbett - Leonhardt, Sicilian: 1 e4 c5 $2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~d} 63 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{Nf6} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 3$ Ne6 5 Be2 Qc7 $60-0$ Bg4 7 h 3 Bd7 $8 \operatorname{Re} 1$ e 59 Na 3 a 610 Nc 4 b 5 11 Ne 3 g6 (probably better was 11 $\ldots \mathrm{Be} 7$ to be followed by 0-0 with a Ruy Lopez type position) 12 a4 $\begin{array}{llllllll}\mathrm{b} 4 & 13 & \mathrm{~d} 4 & \mathrm{cxd} 4 & 14 & \text { cxd4 } & \mathrm{Bg} 7 & 15 \\ \mathrm{Bd} & \mathrm{a} 5 & 16 \mathrm{Rc} 1 & 0-0 & 17 & \mathrm{Bd} 3 & \mathrm{Qa} 7 & 18\end{array}$ Bda a5 16 Rc 1 O 017 Bd 3 Qa 718 Nc4 Ne8 19 d5 Nd4 (after this Black has too many weaknesses; better was 19...Ne?) $20 \mathrm{Nxd4}$ exd. 21 Bf4 Qb8 22 b3 Ra7 23 Qf3! Be5 24 Bh6 Ng7 25 Qd1 Rc8 26 Qd2 Ne8 27 Rfl! Rcc7 $28 \mathrm{f4}$ Bh8 29 Qf2 (the win of the advanced d-pawn is now assured) 29...Qd8 30 e 5 dxe 5 31 fxe5 Bc8 32 d6 Rc5 33 Qxd 4 Rc6? 34 Qxa7, 1 : 0.

Waite - Stuart, Sicilian:
 24 a6 8 Na3 Be6 9 Eg $5 \operatorname{Rc} 810$ Bc4 Be7 11 Bxf6 Bxf6 12 Bxe 6 fxe 6 13 Nc4 Nal 14 Ne3 $0-0 \quad 15$ O-0 Bg5 16 Qd3 Qe8 17 Ncd1 Qh5 (with threats of $\mathrm{Nf} 3+$ and $\mathrm{Ne} 2+$ ) 18 f 3 $\mathrm{Bf} 4 \quad 19 \mathrm{~h} 3 \quad 0 \mathrm{~g} 5 \quad 20 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \quad 21 \mathrm{Ra} 3$ Nc5 22 Qde Qg3 23 Qc2! (23 b4? Nxe4 24 fxe4 Qh2t 25 Kf 2 Bxe3 + 26 Kxe 3 Rxf1 winning) 23 ...Rf6 24 64 Rh6! 25 bxc5 Rxh3 26 Ng 4 (to prevent the mate after $26 \ldots$...Rh1+) 26...Rh4 (26...h5!) 27 Qfi2 Rxg4 28 Qxg3 Rxg3 $29 \mathrm{cxa6} \mathrm{Ra} 8 \quad 30 \mathrm{Rb} 3$ Rxd6 31 Rxb? Rac 32 Rb2? (time trouble, but after the better 32 Nf2 Black wins easily by h5-h4-h3 $32 . . \mathrm{Rgxg} 2+\quad 33 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Rh} 2+\quad 34 \mathrm{Kg}^{1}$ Rxb?, 0: 1

In the 1976 otago university CHAMPIONSHIP a last round time trouble blunder against J.Adams
resulted in Malcolm Wong having to share the title with V. Dare. These A. Balme $2 \frac{1}{2}$ N and W J Adams $1 \frac{1}{2}$ \& A. Balme $2 \frac{1}{2}$, N. Dodd 2, J.Adams $1 \frac{1}{2}$ R.Jackson

Wong - Dodd, closed Sicilian: 1 e4 c5 2 NfS d 63 ds Nc6 4 c3
 $8 \mathrm{Nbd2} \operatorname{Bd} 7 \quad 9$ a $4 \mathrm{a} \quad 10 \mathrm{Re} 1 \mathrm{Re} 8(11$ Nf1 b5?! (better preceded by Rb8) 12 e5! Ng4 13 exd6 exd6 14 Rxe8 ${ }^{+}$ Qxe8 15 axb5 axb5 16 Rxa8 Qxa8 $17 \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{Qb} 818 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Nge5} 19$ Nxe5
 Nd 2 Nb ? (better was 25...Qc3) 26
 Bf4 (more exact was 29 04 Na6 30 Bd? followed by qe 2 ......xab given White more problems) 31 dxc6 Nd4 32 c 7 Ne 633 Bff (threatening $\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{Nd} 4 & 32 & \mathrm{c} & \mathrm{Ne} 6 & 33 \\ \mathrm{Bf} 4 \\ \mathrm{Bb7} \text {; } & \text { if (threatening } \\ 33 . \ldots \mathrm{Nxc7} & 34 \text { Qa8+ wins the }\end{array}$ Bb7; if $33 . . . N x c 7$
knight), $1=0$.

BLEDISLOE CUP: thetwo first round matches in the 1976 competition resulted in clear cut wins for Auck land (over Wellington $14 \frac{1}{2}-5 \frac{1}{2}$ ) and Canterbury (over Otago 13-7) and these two will meet in the final.

|  | AUCKLAND |  | WELLINGTON |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | R.Sutton | 1-0 | A.Feneridis |
| 2 | E.Green | 1-0 | R. Cockeroft |
| 3 | W. Leonhardt | 1-0 | R. ${ }^{\prime}$ Callahan |
| 4 | P. Stuart | 0-1 | B. Deben |
| 5 | A. Day | $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ | D. Beach |
| 6 | R. Smith | $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ | B. Law |
| 7 | A. Carpinter | 0-1 | Z. Frankel |
| 8 | G.Turner | 1-0 | A. Borren |
| 9 | P.W.Fower | $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ | P. Clark |
| 0 | T. Stonehouse | 1-0 | A. Dominik |
| 1 | G. Russell | 1-0 | R.Teece |
| 12 | B. Hart | 1-0 | N. Cook |
| 3 | P.Goffin | 1-0 | J.B.Kay |
| 14 | R.Gibbons | 1-0 | G.Malarski |
| 5 | B.McIvor | 0-1 | M.Evans |
| 6 | P. Spiller | 1-0 | P.Lamb |
| 17 | W. Forrest | 0-1 | P. Cordue |
| 18 | W.Wilson | 1-0 | W.Alp |
| 19 | P. Mataga | 1-0 | J.Mazur |
| 0 | J.Cater | 1-0 | M.Roberts |

Wellington captain Bill Poole
Euggests a second time control for these matches, citing the fact that most games in this match vassed 10 moves around 8:30-9:15.

This would be 10 moves in 30 minutes.

|  | CANTERBURY |  | OTAGO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | V.Small | $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ | P.Paris |
| 2 | G. Hall | 1-0 | G. Haase |
| 3 | B. Anderson | 1-0 | A.Love |
| 4 | J. Jackson | 1-0 | R.Perry |
| 5 | C. Baker | $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ | D.Lichter |
| 6 | P. Bates | 1-0 | J.Lichter |
| 7 | J.Johnston | 1-0 | M. Foord |
| 8 | L.Palmer | 0-1 | J.Adams |
| 9 | A.Pool | $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ | M. Sims |
| 10 | R.Bates | 1-0 | R.Glass |
| 11 | R.Colthart | 0-1 | H. Chin |
| 12 | A.Nijman | 0-1 | M.Freeman |
| 13 | W.Gibson | 1-0 | T. Dowden |
| 14 | R. Freeman | 1-0 | M.White |
| 15 | J.Hunter | 0-1 | H.Kieviet |
| 16 | B.Gloistein | 1-0 | M. Wong |
| 17 | G.Scarr | 1-0 | R. Thomson |
| 18 | J.Atkinson | 0-1 | D. Colquhoun |
| 19 | R.Scott | $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ | v. Dare |
| 20 | D. Borrell | 1-0 | D. Watts |

An unofficial board 21 matched a Canterbury computer against Otago player R.Strickett and the infernal machine won.

## COMBINATION SOLUTIONS

No.1: Zukertort - Blackburne, London 1883: 1 Qb4! R8c5 2 Rf8 ${ }^{+}$ Kxh7 3 Qxe $4+\mathrm{Kg7} 4$ Bxe5 $+\mathrm{Kxf8} 5$ BE7+, 1 : 0.

No.2: Vasiukov - Dzhindzhikhashvili, 1972: 1 h 7 ! Kf7 2 Rb 8 Rxh 7 3 Rb ?, 1 : 0 .

No. 3: Yudovich - Katalimov,1968: 1...Bg5! 2 h 4 Bd8 3 Qg 1 Qi3 +4 Kh2 Bxh4, 0 : 1.

No.4: Spielmann - L'Hermet, Magdeburg 1927: 1 Qxh6! Exh6 2 gxh6 Kf8 3 Rg8 5 h8Q mate.
No.5: Rahsin - Zhuravlev, 1973: 1...Qe3+ $2 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Rxh} 2+3 \mathrm{Kxh} 2$ (3 Nxh2 Qe4+ draw) Qxe2+ $4 \mathrm{Kh} 3 \mathrm{Rh} 8+$ 5 Nh4 Rxh4+!, drawn. Yes, not all combinations lead to mate!
No.6: MacDonnell - Boden, London 1869: 1...Qxf3 2 gxf3 $\mathrm{Bh} 3+3 \mathrm{Kgl}$ Re6 4 Qc2 Rxd4! (also 4...Ne5 leads to mate) 5 Bxd4 Nxd4, $0: 1$.

## GAMES SECTION

Ortvin Sarapu annotates two of his Djakarta games:
O.Sarapu E.Torre Modern Defence

| 1 | d 4 | $\mathrm{c5}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | d |  |
| 3 | e 4 | g 6 |
| 4 | f 4 | Bg 7 |
| 5 | Nf 3 | $\mathrm{d6}$ |
| 6 | NeS | Nf 6 |
| 7 | $\mathrm{Be2}$ | $0-0$ |

Somehow I had the feeling that I had been in this position before; by transposition we have reached the position I had in the 1967 Interzonal against Suttles and Ivkov. ith suttles it started 1 e4 g6 2 4 Bg 73 f 4 c 54 d 5 d 65 Nf 3 Nf6 6 Nc 3 O 07 Be 7 . Keene's book 'Modern Defence' handles this and related variations.

$$
7 \text {... Na6 }
$$

Suttles also played this move, but Ivkov continued 7...a6 8 a4 e6. Keene considers 7...e6 to be best while Wade suggests 7...b5 when 8 es leads to great complications without a clear picture o who will stand best at the end

$$
\begin{array}{rlr}
8 & 0-0 & \mathrm{Nc} 7 \\
9 & \mathrm{a} 4 & \mathrm{~b} 6 \\
10 & \operatorname{Re} 1 & \mathrm{Bb7}
\end{array}
$$

Suttles continued here 10...a6 and the game ended in a draw after both players sacrificed their queens: 14 Nas 04715 No6 13 16 bes 47 e5 exc 18 exf6 19 bxcz Nb5 20 Bd2 Nxc3 Bxc 3 Bxc3 22 Pxe7 Qxe7 23 Nxe7 Rxe7 $24 \mathrm{Rb1} \mathrm{Bf5} 25 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Re}+\mathrm{N}, ~ 26$ Qxel Bxel 27 Exf5 Bd2 28 fxe6 fxg6 29 Bg4 Bxf4 30 Be $6+\mathrm{Kg} 7$ drawn in 42.
$11 \quad \mathrm{Bc} 4$
a6?
Torre later regretted this move and suggested 11...e6 instead, with the idea 12 dxe6 fxe6.

## 12 Ra3!

After this White has a positional advantage. Torre did not exect it and had completely over
$\begin{array}{ll}12 & \cdots \\ 13 & \text { dxe6 }\end{array}$
$e 6$
Nxe6
Now, on 13...fxe6, follows 14 Rb 3 d5 15 Rxb6 in White's favour.

$$
14 \quad \mathrm{Nd} 5
$$

b5!?

A desperate pawn sacrifice to get counterplay; Black cannot permit Rd3 when he would be losing.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
15 & \operatorname{axb} 5 \\
16 & B x b 5 ?
\end{array}
$$

axb5

There are two ways for White to win' a pawn. I disregarded 16 Rxa8 Qxa8 17 Nxf6 $\mathrm{Bxf6} 18$ Bxe6 fxe6 19 Qxd6 Bxe4? overlooking the simple co Qxeb+ winning a piece. After the text Black has active piece play for the pawn, perhaps just enough to balance the position but not more.

| 16 | $\ldots$ | Nxd5 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 17 | exd5 | Nd4 |
| 18 | Bc4 |  |

Now my intended 18 Nxd4 Bxd4+ 19 Be3 Rxa3 20 bxa3 Qb6! is good for Black.

| 18 | $\ldots$ | Rxa3 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 19 | bxa3 | Qa5 |
| 20 | $\operatorname{Re7}$ | Qc3 |
| 21 | Qd3 |  |

The alternatives $\mathrm{Nxd}_{4}$ and Rxb7 are not better. At the cost of doubled pawns White shakes off for the time being the threats to his position.

| 21 | $\ldots$ | Nxf3+ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 22 | gxf3 | Qa1 |
| 23 | Re1 | Bc8 |
| 24 | Bd2 | Qf6! |

Black regroups his pieces. On 24 ..Qb2 follows 25 Qb3; if White can exchange queens he will be winning.

## 25 24!

A pawn sacrifice to restrict
Black's play or even take over the initiative. The passed pawn, when advanced to 26 , will create threats of sacrifices on the 8 th rank.

| 25 |  | Bf5 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 26 | Qe2 | Qb |
| 27 | 25 | $\mathrm{Bd} 4^{+}$ |
| 28 | Kg2 | Qxc2 |
| 29 | a6 |  |

White has a very strong passed
pawn only two moves away from queening.

$$
29 \text {... Ra8! }
$$

By now both players were getting short of time. Torre sets a trap here: 30 Qe8+ Rxe8 31 Rxe8+ Kg7 32 a7 Qxd2+ 33 Be 2 Qel! and mate follows 34 a8Q with $34 \ldots$...Qg1.


32 Bb5?
After this Black has no trouble winning. In time trouble I could not work out all lines of the queen sacrifice 32 Rci Re8 33 Qxe8+, e.g. $33 \ldots$...Qxe8 34 Rxc3 Qe 35 a7 Qd2+ (or $35 \ldots$ Qa1 36 Bb 8 etc) $36 \mathrm{Kg} 9 \mathrm{Qe} 1+37 \mathrm{Bf} 1 \mathrm{Bh} 3 \quad 38$ a8Q+ Kg7 39 Qa6 and White wins.
Black, however, can improve on this line with $36 .$. Bh $3 \quad 37$ a8Q + Kol with threats of Qg2 mate as well as Qe1+ (but 38 Bf1 parries both as before - Ed.).

Therefore 36 Kg 3 may be better for White. Here Black can draw with $36 . . Q^{1+}$ etc if he so de sires; or $36 \ldots \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 37 \mathrm{abQ}+\mathrm{Kg}$ ? when 38 Qd8? loses the queen after 38...h4+1, but 38 Bd8! saves both king and queen.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
32 & \text { Qe3? } \\
33 &
\end{array}
$$

Qxf4
Still thinking of a queen sacriijece on e8 or exchange of queens. Better was 33 Rd1 giving, in time trouble, many more difficulties.
$\begin{array}{ll}33 & \text { B.. } \\ 34 & \end{array}$
Qb4

With the idea 34...Rxa6 35 Qe8+ Kg7 36 Bxd6 etc, but Black has a simpler answer.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
34 & \text { Bxa8 } \\
35 &
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Bxe } 1 \text { ! } \\
& \text { Qb2+ }
\end{aligned}
$$

The beginning of the final attack on the white king with a fine combination at the end.

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
36 & \text { Kf1 } & \text { Be3 } \\
37 & \text { Qe2 } & \\
38 & \text { Kf2 } & \text { Bh3+ } \\
39 & \text { Kel } & \text { Qd4+ } \\
40 & \text { Qd1 } & \\
41 & \text { Ke2 } 1+ \\
& & \text { Bc3+ } \\
& 0: 1 & \text { Bf1+! }
\end{array}
$$

Torre: "A very good game". For myself, 1 do not mind losing games such as this. The most interesting variations, which did not occur in the game, gave it great beauty. Torre deserved that special prize.

> O.Sarapu Sardjono Ruy Lopez

| 1 | e4 | e5 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | Nf3 | Nc6 |
| 3 | Bb5 | 26 |
| 4 | Ba4 | Nf6 |
| 5 | d.4 |  |

Yes, that move again! I have used it for over 30 years with good results; it is hard to change specially if you know that your opponent is not prepared for it.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 5 \\
& 6
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\ddot{0} 0
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{exd} 4 \\
& \text { Bc5? }
\end{aligned}
$$

Correct is 6...Be7. The square $c 5$ should be reserved for the $N$ after e5 Ne4 then Nc5.

| 7 | e5 | Nd5 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 8 | Bb3 | Nde7 |
| 9 | Ng5! |  |

This second pawn sacrifice gives white second pawn sac

$$
\begin{array}{rlr}
9 & \ldots & \text { Nxe5 } \\
10 & \mathrm{f4} & \text { d5 }
\end{array}
$$

After long deliberation. On 10 ...h6, 11 fxe5 hxg5 12 Bxf7+ is a..h6, 11 fxes hxg5

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
11 & \text { fxe5 } \\
12 & \text { Kh1! }
\end{array}
$$

It is time to change from attack
to consolidation. Very tempting was the attacking continuation 12 Qh5 but after 12...h6 13 Nxf7 Qe8! White's attack is finished.

| 12 |  | h6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | Nf3 | Nf5 |
| 14 | c 3 | dxc3 |
| 15 | Nxc3 | c6 |
| 16 | Qd3 | Re8 |
| 17 | Bd2 | Be6 |
| 18 | Bc 2 | ¢6 |
| 19 | Ne 2 | Bf8 |
| 20 | $\mathrm{Nfd4}$ | c 5 |
| 21 | Nxf5 | Bxf5 |
| 22 | Rxf5! | gxf 5 |
| 23 | Qxf5 |  |

Now White again attacks with a small sacrifice.

| 23 | Mf |  | Bg7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 24 | Rfi |  | Qc? |
| 25 | Qh7+ |  | Kf8 |
| 26 | Nf4! |  |  |
|  |  | $1: 0$ |  |

There is no defence against Ng6+.

## ****

The following interesting struggle is annotated by Paul Garbett also from Djakarta.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { P.Garbett J.S.Sampouw } \\
\text { Ruy Lopez }
\end{gathered}
$$

| 1 | e4 | e5 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | Nf 3 | Nc 6 |
| 3 | Bb 5 | a 6 |
| 4 | Ba 4 | $\mathrm{Nf6}$ |
| 5 | $0-0$ | $\mathrm{b5}$ |
| 6 | Bb 3 | Be 7 |
| 7 | $\mathrm{~d} 4!$ |  |

This move causes Black problems and is one reason why the usual move order is $5 \ldots . \operatorname{Be}$ \& $6 . . . b 5$.

$$
7 \quad . . . \quad 0-0 ?
$$

Such a bad mistake is surprising from Sampouw.

$$
\mathrm{Nxe}_{4}
$$

But not 8...Nxe5 9 dxe5 Nxe4 10 Bd5.

| 9 | Bd5 | Nd6 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 10 | Nxc6 | dxc6 |
| 11 | Bxc6 | Rb8 |

Black appears to have no compensation for the pawn. Yet Sampouw now plays very energetically and
somehow gains the initiative.

## $12 \quad \mathrm{Bf} 4$

12 Nc3 Nf5 $13 \mathrm{Nd5} \mathrm{Bd} 6$ did not feel right but may be the correct idea.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
12 \\
13 & \cdots \\
c
\end{array}
$$

13 Nc3 seems best and if $13 . . . N c 4$ then 14 Nd5.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
13 & \ldots \\
14 & Q C 2
\end{array}
$$

$$
\text { If } 14 \mathrm{~b} 3 \text { ?, then } 14 \ldots \mathrm{Na} 515 \mathrm{Bf} 3
$$ b4!

| 14 | ... | Rb6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | Bf3 | g5! |
| 16 | Bg 3 | Bg? |
| 17 | b3 | Nd6 |
| 18 | Rel | Nf5 |
| Not 18...f5 19 Be5. |  |  |
| 19 | Nd2 | Nxg 3 |
| 20 | fxg3! |  |

A good defensive idea. Sooner or later Black should be able to establish his queen on $h 5$ and rook on h6. This will be easier to meet if White's king has an escape square.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
20 & \cdots \\
21 & \mathrm{Be} 4 \\
22 & \text { Bd3 }
\end{array}
$$

54
5
f 5

Wins back the pawn, but the question is whether Black could have developed pressure worth more than a pawn.

| 23 | Kh 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Not 23 | Qb2? | Rxc3. |

Sets a trap but misfires and leads to simplification favourable to White.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
28 & \mathrm{Na} 5! \\
29 & \text { Qxc } 3
\end{array}
$$

Rh6
Thwarting Black's plans; but not 9 Nxb7? Rxh2+! 30 Kxh2 Rf6 \& wins.

| 29 | A. | Qxc3 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 30 | Rxc3 | Re4 |
| 31 | Rxc7 | Rd6 |
| 32 | Nc4 |  |


| 32 |  | Rd3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33 | Kg1 | Rid8 |
| 34 | Kf2 | R3d7 |
| 35 | Rxd? | Rxd7 |
| 36 | Ne3 | Rd2+ |
| 37 | Re 2 | Rd4 |
| 38 | Ke1 | Rd6 |
| 39 | Rd 2 | Rh6 |
| 40 | Nf1 | K f7 |
| 41 | Kf2 |  |

The game was adjourned here. It is difficult for White to make any progress.

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
41 & \because & K e ? \\
42 & \mathrm{Kgl} & \operatorname{Rd} 6
\end{array}
$$

Black can afford to swap rooks hen the white king is on $g 1$ as hen he reaches the queenside first.

| 43 | Kf2 | Rh6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 44 | $\operatorname{Rd} 4$ | Ke6 |
| 45 | Nd2 |  |

This was a calculated gamble, as there seemed no other way to try for a win. With best play Black could now regain the pawn


The crucial moment. Now $46 \ldots$ Bxg2 loses to $47 \mathrm{Nc} 4^{+} \mathrm{Kf6} 48 \mathrm{Rd} 6+$ K 549 Rxh6 Kxh6 $50 \mathrm{Kf4} \mathrm{Ke} 65$ Id , or 51 Ne 3.
But 46...Bd5! draws, e.g. 47 Nc4 Ke6 and Black regains his pawn.
$46 \quad$ Nxe4
Rxg

Sampouw thought he could gain
three connected passed pawns which would more than compensate for the knight, but he'd failed to perceive White's next. The ending after 47 White's next. The ending after 4 .
$\begin{array}{ll}48 & \text { Rd2 } \\ 49 & \mathrm{Kf} 2\end{array}$
Rg 1
Re 1

Black looks lost and now puts up dispirited resistance:

50 Nd6 h5 $51 \mathrm{Nc} 4+\mathrm{Kf} 652$ Ne3 Ra1 53 Ng 2 Kg 554 Rc 2 Rb 155 Ne3 Ral 56 Kg 2 a 5 ? 57 Rf 2 h 458 Rxf5+, 1:0

## ****

The following last round game from the South Island Championship deciced first place. Notes are by William Lynn
R.Nokes

## K.W.Lynn

King's Gambi

| 1 | e4 | $e 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | $f 4$ | exf4 |
| 3 | Nff 3 | 85 |
| 4 | Bc4 | d 6 |
| 5 | $0-0$ | $\operatorname{Be} 6!$ |

Innovation? Not really; White's move order is wrong. 5 d 4 was better. When playing a gambit line the emphasis is always on correct move order.

| 6 | Bxe6 | fxe6 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 7 | Nd4 | Qe7 |
| 8 | Qh5+ | Kd7 |
| 9 | Nc3 | Bg7 |
| 10 | Nb3 | Nc6 |
| 11 | Qd1 |  |

White has to retire his queen to force a natural move.

| 11 | $\ldots$ | Rf8 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 12 | d4 | h5 |
| 13 | d5 | Ne5 |
| 14 | Nd4 | exd5 |
| 15 | Nxd5 | Qf7 |
| 16 | Nb5 | a6 |

The fork would lose: 16...c6? 17 Nb6+ axb6 18 Qxd6 +Kc 819 Na Nb6+ axb6 18 Qxd6+ Kc8 $19 \mathrm{Na7}$ mate, or black queen for two knights.

17 Nbxc7
So White regains his gambit pawn but his knights are now immobilised.

$$
17
$$

$18 \quad c 4$
Rather surprising that White lets his e-pawn go; of course he always Re8

| 18 | M. | Qxe4 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 19 | Qa4 | Nc6 |
| 20 | Qb3 |  |

The threat of $\mathrm{f}^{2}-\mathrm{f} 3$ must be parried.
20
Khi
Bd4+

The most urgent move; $21 \ldots h 4$ is too slow.


22
...
E4!!
The only follow-up; the queen cannot be taken because of mate in two.

$$
23 \quad \mathrm{Bf} 4
$$

Interesting was 23 Qxb? gxf3, Black gambling on being able to survive while threatening mate himself.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
23 & \times & \text { gxf } \\
24 & \text { Qxf3 }
\end{array}
$$

Already 24 Rxf3 would lose two inor pieces for a rook after 24 ...Rxf4.

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
24 & \ldots & \text { Qxf3+ } \\
25 & \operatorname{Rxf} 3 & \operatorname{Rc} 8
\end{array}
$$

Reluctantly played (releasing the pin) ; better was 25... Ba?! to be followed by Bb8.
$26 \quad c 5$
Striving for tactical counter-
chances.
$\begin{array}{ll}26 & \quad . \\ 27 & \mathrm{Rc}\end{array}$
Bxc5

Of course, not 27...Rxc7? 28 Nxc7 Kxc7 29 Rxc5.

Also to be avoided was 27...Nd4 28 Rff1 Ne2 on account of 29 Rxc5 when White is winning, e.E. 29... wxe5 30 Nb6+ Kd8 31 Ne $6+$ ! Ke7. Nxc8 + Kxe6 33 Rel Kf5 (33...Kd7 34 Nb6+ Kc6 35 Rxd2 Kxb6 36 Re8 and 33...Nf6 34 Rxe2+ Kf5 35 Ne7+! Kxf4 36 Rf2+ Kg5 37 Ri5both win for White) 34 Rxe2 Kxf 35 Re 8 followed by Ne7, or $29 .$. Nxf4 30 Nb6 $+\mathrm{Kd8} 31$ Ne6 + Nxe6 32 Rxc8+ etc - Edj.tor.

## 28 Be 3

The last resource.

$$
28 \text {... Rh??? }
$$

Complete madness! Correct was 28...Bxe3 29 R.f7+ (29 Rxe3 Rxc7) 29...Nge? 30 Nxe? Nxe? or $30 .$. Bxcl when Black wins.

| 29 | Bxal |  | Nxa7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 30 | Nb6 |  | Ke7 |
| 31 | Ned5+ |  |  |
|  |  | $1: 0$ |  |

The winner, also the annotator of the following game writes, "This game, with its profusion of errors and half-baked ideas, is of little value. Such interest as it has lies in its complications and for this reason annotation tends to err on the side of excess". We leave it to the reader to judge.

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\text { M.Evans } & \text { S.Ivancic } \\
\text { Wellington Interclub } \\
& \text { King's Gambit } \\
1 & \text { e4 }
\end{array}
$$

In their book on the King's Gamit, Korchnoy and Zak comment, "No a very popular continuation; its basic aim is to avoid the well studied theoretical variations." If this was in fact his intention then Black succeeded, his move

$$
4 \quad d 4
$$

Ng6
$K$ and $Z$, and other sources, give Rlack's last a ? on account of the continuation 5 h 4 Be 76 h 5 Nn 47 Bxf4 d5 8 Nxh4 Bxh4+ 9 g 3.

Bc 4
d6
One move too late. Black could now play 6... Be7 with equal chances since 7 h5 Nh4 8 Bxf4? obviously loses to 8...NXg2+. Instead, White could try 7 Nc 3 when $7 \ldots$...Nxh4 (7... Eg4!) 8 Nxh4 Bxhl ${ }^{+} 9$ Kfi gives Black room to blunder, e.g. 9...g5? 10 Bxf4 Exf4 11 Qh5, or 9...Qg5? 10 Na5. During the game I was mainly preoccupied with trying to assess the variations arising from 6...Bg4. As the exchange sacrifice 7 hb Nh4! 8 Rxh4 Bxf3 looked jinadequate the intended reply was 7 Nc3. Now 7...Nxh4:? 8 Ne5! looked Sood for White, e. ́. 8....Bxal? Bxi, Ke? 10 Nate is an trap common to such positions Waiting for a reply, a thought occurred: What happens if, after take the how ho mi ht not ap take he h-pawn? he might not apereciale the pre, queen sacrife cnding in mate. Indeed, being a Philistine, he will probably setle on something prosal $\begin{aligned} & \text { or even 7...Bxf3." }\end{aligned}$ or even
Black moved and put an end to these belated deliberations. It vellinf in alther paths.

| 6 | $\cdots$ | $h 5!?$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 7 | Ng5!? | Bg4! |
| 8 | Bxf7+ | Kd7 |
| 9 | Qd3 | Kh6? |

Sad. Black's enterprising play ende in a pawn down with a ruined position. Perhaps when he gave up the right to castle at the 7th move (7... Be6 was playable) Black had aimed to reach this position but now became fearful of the reply 10 Qb5+ (but not 10 Rxh4 Qxg5 11 g 3 because of $11 .$. Qe 7 and 1 ? ...fxg3). Blocking the check with io...Nc6!? leads to murky complications. Black would have to allow for at least two continuations neither of which exhausts the
possibilities of the position:

1) 11 Rxht a6 12 Qd5 Nb4
Qc4 (13 Be6t Ke8! 14 Qc4 d5!- Ed Qc4 (13 Be6+Ke8! 14 Qc4 d5!- Ed.) 13...Qxgs 14 g3 Qe7 with an unclear position.
2) 11 d5 a6 ( $11 \ldots$ Nxg2+ may be playable, but nat $11 \ldots$ Qxg 5 ? 12 dxc6+ winning the queen) 12 dxc6+ bxc6 and now White has a number of possibilities including the attempt then chasin extra plece wilh 3 qu? 13 .. Rbs chasing the queen fails after ...Rba 14 QazRac
if, however, Black does not fancy (apter 9 Nxh , he could try reply 11 Pxhy car be met by. The reply 1 .....c 11.....Qxeb i? Nxe6 Qe7 :

| 10 | Bxg6 | Rxg6 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 11 | Bxf4 | Kc8 |
| 12 | 25 | Qe8 |
| 13 | $0-0$ | Ic6 |
| 14 | Nc3 | dxe5 |

In any event Black cannot prevent the openine of lines

| 15 | Rae 1 | Ba6 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 16 | dxe5 | Bc5+ |
| 17 | Kh1 | Ne7 |

Now, if the e-pawn was on e6 and he bishop was out of the way on g3, White would win immediately by Rf8!,

$$
18 \quad \operatorname{Bg} 3 \quad \text { Nc } 6
$$

Curses! Now the bishop has to be hased away from the a3-f8 diagonal 19 Qd5

Be?
On 19...Bib White's preparations would have to be more elaborate. 20 e6 Exg5
Not forced, but Black's position as, in any case, little future 21 Rf8! Bxeб
Since 21...Qxf8 allows mate in two, Black could resign.

| 22 | Rxe8+ | Bd8 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 23 | R1xe6 | Rxg3 |
| 24 | Rxd8+ | Nxd8 |
| 25 | $R e 8$ |  |

## TIGRAN PETROSIAN

Vik.L. Vasiliev
This biography provides a unique and authoritive pic ure of the life of a top-class professional chess The book includes fully annotat games, 1969 . otes by Petrosian, but mainly annotated by Alexei Suetin, Petrosian's openings adviser

## ALEKHINE‘S DEFENCE <br> R.G. Eales and A.H. Williams

Robert Fischer is only the last of a long line of play ers who have turned to Alekhine's Defence as an firm grasp of the important features without being verloaded...' William Hartston, British Chess Magazine.

SICILIAN ACCELERATED DRAGONS
D.N.L. Levy
A comprehensive analysis of the very modern, razo harp, counter attacking variations that arise in the 2 N -KB3 N-OB3 3 P-O4 PxP $4 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ by the fian chetto development of Black's king's bishop: 4 P-KN3 followed by...B-N2

LEARN FROM THE GRANDMASTERS $\$ 5.75$

A galaxy of stars ( 10 grandmasters including Tal, Korchnoi, Larsen...) have contributed previously unpublished material to fit an original concept each player annotates two games in depth - one of his own victories which has stood out in his memory for some reason - and one win by another player which has created a deep impression on the annotator.

THE CHESS PLAYER‘S BEDSIDE BOOK $\$ 9.90$ Edited by Raymond Keene \& Raymond Edwards An anthology of articles covering a multitude of aspects on chess. Unlike most anthologies the articles are original, having been specially commiss ioned. Indeed they are more than original - each contributor being allowed to choose his own subject. The contributors are: H. Bohm, R.N Coles, C.J. Feather, A. Soltis, S. Gligoric W. Heidenfeld J. Littlewood A Altston, K.J. O'Connell and Sir R. Robinson.

THE BATTLE OF CHESS IDEAS $\$ 8.45$ Anthony Saidy

Considered only as a collection of chess games, this is the cream. But in its explanation of chess thoughts, the book bids to become a classic. Crikically examines ten great living players and their best games and shows how they illustrate important ideas in chess. Here are Botvinnik, Reshevsky Spassky and Fischer, presented by a writer who has done across the-board battle with most of them.

## BOTH SIDES OF THE CHESS BOARD Robert Byrne and Ivo Nei

For the serious player it provides the definitive account of the epic 1972 world title match between Bobby Fischer and Boris Spassky. But equally important, this book recreates at the highest level, the basic struggle -at once psychological, strategic and tactical - that is being waged on either side of the chessboard. Also includes Fischer's games from the Candidates' matches.

THE KING'S INDIAN DEFENCE $\$ 14.00$ Leonard Barden, William R. Hartston and Raymond D. Keene

On the publication of the first edition in 1968, C.H.O'D. Alexander described this publication a 'a welcome and important event in the chess world. Now revised and completely rewritten to work of reference to any player who wishes to rais the standard of his game.

## THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF CHESS OPENINGS VOLUME C <br> $\$ 12.40$

This is the first of five volumes, covers all openings after 1 e 4 e 6 and 1 e 4 e 5 . The World Chess Federation system of international figurine notation is used throughout. The contributors to this volume are grandmasters Barcza, Robert Byrne, Gipslis, Hort, Ivkov, Keres, Korchnoi, Larsen, Parma, Tal, Poluga Pab. This is the This is the ausitative reference

