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## EDITORIAL

Once again in December we have fallen behind our usual publication date, the culprit this time being the Olympiad Despite the extra eight pages in this issue several items have had to be held over until the February issue. These include reports on the All-WeIlington Ch'p (won by Michael Roberts), the Tawa Labour Weekend tournament (won by Pat Cordue), the Auck1and Labour Weekend tournament (won by Peter Mataga and Michael Steadman) and the Bledisloe Cup (won by Canterbury). Paul Spiller's report on the Women's Olympiad suffered the same fate. Also we hope to have a full report on the Singapore Women's Zonal in February.

So much for the bad news, now for the good news - annual subscriptions for 1979 remain unchanged! With that we wish our readers all the best for Christ mas and the New Year, which brings us to

## CONGRESS 1978-79

For a while it really looked as though the tradition of annual congresses was going to end as no club appeared to be willing to host the event this year. Finally, on 27 September, the North Shore Club agreed to go ahead with plans for a modest Congress. The twelve players selected for the New Zealand Championship are B.R.Anderson ( $C^{\prime}$ bury), D.O.Beach (Civic), A.L.Carpinter (North Shore), P.A.Garbett (N.Shore), E.Green (nwk-Pakurana), K.Jensen (hamilton), C Laird (Civic), R.Nokes (Nelson), O.Sara pu (N.Shore), V.A.small ( $C$ bury), R.J. shore) ( Shore). Should be interesting!

## LETTER

Dear Sir,
Martin Sims is correct in saying that it is a bit late to dredge up last
year's Canterbury - Otago Bledisloe Cup match. We did not want to open up old wounds but we think an accusation that amounts to cheating requires some reply. First the mistakes pointed out by Mr Sims, i.e. Stretch - Glass and Sims Perry, plus two others (Haase - Baker and Palmer - Adams) are explained by the late withdrawal of G.Hall and the recruitment of L.Palmer, necessarily on a lower board. There was certainly no changing of board order to suit specific opponents. In fact, an examination of the telegraph messages exchanged shows that before play started Canterbury asked Otago, "Would you like our team?" and received the reply "We have it."

As the Editor correctly points out, Mr Sims was the Otago umpire as well as a Canterbury player, but in his former capacity made no attempt to inform the Otago club of the changes in Canterbury personnel, even though he himself was on a different board. In addition, despite a complete ban on chess books in the tournament hall (to remove any temptation brought on by the boredom of $8-10$ hours chess) we were surprised to behold the spectacle of the Otago umpire arriving with his own reference material.

A further interesting sidelight is that the game between Perry and Sims was the cause of the problems between Canterbury and Otago when the Otago umpire (Sims) and the Otago player (Perry) could not agree on the course of the game to adjudication.

On a happier note, we would mention that this year's clash was played with an exchange of umpires and the equanimity of pron $10^{\frac{1}{2}}$. $1^{1 / 2}$. On the night Canterbury 5 after adjuications; aco wh trasts atcely with last year's 10 Then Canterbury are meant to have "cheated".
J.W.H.Atkinson

Secretary, Canterbury C.C.

## 23rd OLYMPIAD - 1 Hungary, 2 USSR! <br> When, after the ninth round in which

 West Germany defeated the Soviet Union $2 \frac{1}{2}$ : $1 \frac{1}{2}$, the Russians' lead was cut to a haif point over the United States and West Germany it begen to look as though could be an upset. round ten and went ahead in round lieven, by which ahead in round second with the USSR. In round was equal the Hungarians took the lead with Tra second and the ussk only thirdHungary then held on and even increase its lead in the final round to record its third officiai olympiad victory and its first since 1928 (Hungary also won the "extra" 01ympiad at Manich 1936 )

Thus, finally the USSR has falled to win an olympiad in which it competed, having won twelve consecutively since
its debut in 1952 sometimes by massive margins (e.g. $8 \frac{1}{2}$ points in 1968). It is perhaps noteworthy that its smallest winning margins were in 1970 (1 point) and 1972 (11, points) when Kungary was second. But ..... we 've been skipping ahead.

The venue of the 23 rd Meat ${ }^{7}$ s and 8 th Women's olympiads was the tremendous River Plate Stadium in Buenos Aires, final. The River plate Club rooms ased for the Olympiads, however, were just not suitable for such an event. The two rooms used for play were long, natrow and low-ceilinged .... and thus stiflingly hot and noisy at times. The hundreds of spectators were not only cramped because of the narrow viewing space, but they couldn't really see the games properly because the clocks were placed on the spectators' side of the boards - and, technically anyway, "spectators" included each team's two non-players on any given day

The USSR team of Spassky, Petrosian, Polugaevsky, Gulko, Romanishin and Vaganian had an average rating (four highest rated players) of 2620 , well ahead of Hungary 2570, Yugoslavia 2558 , USA 2553 and West Germany 2540. Nevertheless, Karpov and Tal might have further strengthened the team had they not been tired after Baguio. Of course the USA also lacked Fischer:

New Zealand was seeded 37 th in the
field of 66 with an average rating of 2270, no account being taken of Small's supposed rating of 2385 nor of Anderson's (inactive) 2290.

I found it amusing that a number of Eegular competitors were not present in Buenos Aires - obviously (in most cases anyway) for lack of money. The list included East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Ftaly, Ireland, Cuernsey, Portugal, Greece, Turkey, Lebanon, Iran, Irac, Malta and Cyprus. On the other hand ting ware also some new faces, including the Peoples Republic of China and Sti Lanka. Two South American nations, Ecuador and Venezuela, introduced a new wist - rival delegations representing Wo Federations in each case. Eventually they sorted themselves out when left to providing some nt at various meetings.

ROUND ONE, 26 October

| SED ZEALAND | 0 | WEST GERMANY | 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| O.Sarapu | 0 | R.Hubner | 1 |
| M.Chandler | 0 | W.Unzicker | 1 |
| V.Small | 0 | J.Hecht | 1 |
| P.Stuart | 0 | O.Borik | 1 |

We fielded our top four although we did not know our opponent until shortly before play was due to commence. Sarapu adjourned in a better but probably drawn position and only time pressure before move 56 cost him the point. Chandler was 'techniqued' to death on board two. Small and Stuart both gained good positions but one bad move in each case was exploited ruthlessly.

Not all the top teams had things completely their own way. USSR and USA dropped two draws versus Wales and Paraguay respectively, while Hungary and Yugoslavia dropped half points to Scotland and Tunisia. The Peoples Repub1ic of China (seeded 44th) started with a 3 bang in beating Iceland (seeded 12 th) by : 1. Only two Philippinos had so far rrived so they only drew 2 : 2 with ndorra

ROUND TWO, 27 October

| SRI LANKA | 1 | NEW ZEALAND | 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S.Weeramantry | 0 | O.Sarapu | 1 |
| D.Aturupana | 1 | V.Small | 0 |

L.Goonetilleka 0
A.Parakama 0 P.Weir

A trifle disappointing insofar as Small gained a decided advantage before succumbing to a sudden kingside attack. Sarapu had a good win against Sunil Weeramantry, a player with considerable experience and some good results in England and America. Anderson and Weir won without difficulty, the former in only 17 moves.

England took a sole lead with $7 \frac{1}{2} / 8$, half a point ahead of Holland, Isxael and Bulgaria. The other top teams still had their problems, e.g. USSR 31/2, Argentina $B \frac{1}{2}$; Hūgary 3, Poland 1; Yugo slavia $2 \frac{1}{2}$, Australia $1^{\frac{1}{2}}$; USA $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$, Austria $1 \frac{1}{2}$; West Germany $2 \frac{1}{2}$, Chile $1 \frac{1}{2}$.

## ROUND THREE, 28 October

| NEW ZEALAND | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | LUXEMBOURG | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| M.Chandler | 1 | P.Milbers | 0 |
| P.Stuart | 1 | G.Kirsch | 0 |
| B.Anderson | 1 | R.Welz | 0 |
| P.Weir | $\frac{1}{2}$ | G.Fhilippe | $\frac{1}{2}$ |

Chandler soon won two pawns when Milbers went astray in an English; the Luxembourg player gained some initiative but Murray took the point before the adjournment with accurate play. Stuar won neatly after his opponent opened up the centre in an Advance French. Anderson won convincingly and Weir seemed to be doing likewise when he won the exchange - but his opponent's knight became very active and wiped off two pawns leaving a drawn position with $R+$ 3 P vs $\mathrm{N}+5 \mathrm{P}$ at the adjournment. This victory avenged our Haifa team which lost $1 \frac{1}{2}: 2 \frac{1}{2}$ to Luxembourg

Other results: England $2 \frac{1}{2}$, Argentina $1 \frac{1}{2}$; Hungary 3 , Holland 1 ; Spain 3 Israel 1; Bulgaria $2 \frac{1}{2}$, France 11/; Cuba 3, W. Germany 1; JSSR 3, Rumania 1; Yugoslavia $2 \frac{1}{2}$, Norway $1 \frac{1}{2}$; USA 3, Canada

Leading scores: England 10; USSR,
Hungary, Bulgaria, Cuba \& Spain $9 \frac{1}{2}$.
ROUND FOUR, 30 October

| AUSTRIA | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | NEW ZEALAND | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| K.Robatsch | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0. Sarapu | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| F.Holz1 | 0 | M.Chandler | 1 |
| F.Stoppel | 1 | V.Small | 0 |
| W.Wittmann | 0 | B.Anderson | 1 |

Undoubtedly the team's best match result of the 01ympiad. Sarapu appeared to be at a disadvantage but sacrificed
first a pawn and then the exchange for a strong attack and Robatsch was able to Find nothing better than returning the extra material for a drawn ending. In an already complex position Chandler sacrithed a pawn and eventually emerged at he time control with a clear if not inning advatage. A subsequent mistake the adjournment. er adjourne. Small lost a pawn in the ary midare-gane but appeared to have ent drawng chances by the adjourn ter. tise, A derson, failed Lo torise. Anderson faced a new move is extrat variation but consolidated opponent pawn with good derence; his hen overl in a piece in armears.

Bul
ba 1 : Spain 1,2, Hand $2 \frac{1}{2} ;$ USSR 3, Guba Spain $1 \frac{1}{2}$, Hungary $2 \frac{1}{2}$; USA 3 Holland $2 \frac{1}{2}$ Argentina $1 \frac{1}{2}$, Den Rogers Australia collected his cocon cars then he beat Tarjan Velimirovic in round two Korchnoi played his first for switzorland beating Chi Ching-hsuan. for Switzerland Zone 10 vs Europe clash. In another Rumania $2 \frac{1}{2}: 1$ Europe clash, Indonesia beat 12: \& France 11 ..... New Zealand 9.

ROUND FIVE, 31 October

| NEW ZEALAND | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | INDONESIA | $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| O.Sarapu | $\frac{1}{2}$ | H.Suradiradja | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| M.Chandler | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Ardiansyah | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| F.Stuart | $\frac{1}{2}$ | A.Bachtiar | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| B.Anderson | 0 | J.Sampouw | 1 |

Sarapu gained a positional edge but lost it with one poor move and Suradiradja (now a GM) actually had the advandefe when the draw was agreed. Chandler French the black side of a Tarrasch French accurately to achieve a drawn positional disadvante a considerable positional disadvantage by sacrificing piece and Stuart was unable to avoid pragedy riged a chance for a clear advad missed a chane resigned inmedian

England and the US
England and the USSR retained their shared lead by halving their individual moard one - Spassky'sting Spassky on 01 ympiad Other results: Hungary 2 USA , Bul. Other results: Hungary 2, USA

2, France 2; Denmark $2 \frac{1}{2}$, W.Germany $1 \frac{1}{2}$; Cuba 3, Holland 1

Leading scores: USSR \& England $14 \frac{1}{2}$; Hungary 14; USA, Bulgaria, Cuba and Poland 13 $\frac{1}{2}$; Denmark \& France $13 \ldots$. New Zealand $10^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

## ROUND SIX, 1 November

| BRAZIL | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | NEW ZEALAND | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| F.Trois | 0 | M.Chandler | 1 |
| H.Van Riemsdyk | 1 | V.Small | 0 |
| A.Segal | $\frac{1}{2}$ | P.Stuart | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| C. Braga | 1 | P.Weir | 0 |

Chandler (black) gained the advantage after Trois went in for dubious saw him probably axcellent technique zilian cracked up in time trouble. The board two game was the most interesting of the match; Van Riemsdyk ave up a pawn for adequate compenstion but lat pmoll sacrificed compensation but lat powerful attack. The Brazilian defend powerful attack. The Brazilian defended weathered the storm. Stuart equalised the black side of a Dutch but then overlooked a zwischenzug which cost him a pawn; good defence led to a drawn rook and pawn ending at the adjournment. In an equal position Weir gave up two minor pieces for rook but his attacking chances were insufficient.

In the top match Spassky beat Portisch to lead the Soviets to a $2 \frac{1}{2}: 1 \frac{1}{2}$ victory over Hungary. After Kavalek $v$ Miles was agreed drawn, England seeme abrupt change of fortunes near the time control saw Lein and Tarjan beat Keene and Mestel respectively - the final score was $2 \frac{1}{2}$ : $1^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Also: Cuba 1, Bul garia 3; Switzerland 1, Yugoslavia 3; W.Germany 2, Sweden 2; Poland 2, Philip pines 2; Canada $\frac{1}{2}$, Denmark $3 \frac{1}{2}$.

Scores: USSR 17; Bulgaria \& Denmark 16 $\frac{1}{2}$; USA \& England 16; Hungary, Yugoslavia \& Poland $15 \frac{1}{2} \ldots$... New Zealand 12

ROUND SEVEN, 2 November

| NEW ZEALAND | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | MALAYSIA | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| O.Sarapu | 1 | Tan Bian Huat | 0 |
| M.Chandler | 1 | Woo B.K. | 0 |
| V.Small | $\frac{1}{2}$ | C.Hon | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| B.Anderson | 1 | Foo L.C. | 0 |

This clear win brought us well on to the plus side with $15 \frac{1}{2}$ out of 28 at to the plus side with $15 \frac{1}{2}$ out of 28 at
initiative when an error by Tan sllowed a quick and decisive penetration. Chandler won two pawns but then got careless when he allowed a knight to get stranded when winning a third; eventually an opposite-coloured bishop ending was reached which required good technique to win. Small gained a clear ad vantage but wasted a move; Hon ia turn gained the edge but Yernon equalised again and the draw was agreed before the end of the session. Anderson's Benonj went ultra smoothiy with Black being allowed to realise all his opening aims and win thematically.

The Soviet Union widened its lead by beating Bulgaria $2^{\frac{2}{2}}$ : $1 \frac{1}{2}$, although Gulko lost to Padevski. Denmark continued its great run by tying Hungary 2 : 2 . Also Yugoslavia $1 \frac{1}{2}$, USA $2 \frac{1}{2}$; England $1 \frac{1}{2}$, Poland $2 \frac{1}{2}$; Argentina $2 \frac{1}{2}$, Iceland $1 \frac{1}{2}$,

Scores: USSR 19눈; USA \& Denmark 1812 W.Germany, Bulgaria \& Poland 18

New Zealand $15 \frac{1}{2}$.
ROLIND EIGHT, 3 November

| NEW ZFALAND | 1 | ARGENTINA. B | 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0.Sarapu | 1 | S.Giardelli | 0 |
| P.Stuart | 0 | A.Seidler | 1 |
| B.Anderson | 0 | F.Braga | 1 |
| P.Weir | 0 | R.Monier | 1 |

$\begin{array}{lll}\text { P.Weir } & 0 & \begin{array}{l}\text { F.braga } \\ \text { R.Monier }\end{array}\end{array}$
Argentina $B$ was allowed to compete hors concours to avoid having a bye. All their players were young with Giardelli (2315) and Seidler (2395) being very experienced. A bad result all the same. Sarapu continued his good form and took complete command in the latter stages of the session. Anderson won two pawns on the white side of a Pelican but his attempt at a quick mopping-up operation backfired completely. Stuart and Weir both quickly found themselves on the defensive and neither really looked like breaking out.

The USSR cemented its lead with a 3 : 1 win over the US while the Germans urged into second place with a similar margin over the host nation. In the no. 2 match two less fancied teams having a good tournament, Cuba and Denmark, dre 2 : 2. Also England 1, Hungary 3; Rumania 2, Bulgaria 2; Yugoslavia $2 \frac{1}{2}$, Poland 1 $\frac{1}{2}$. The Peoples Republic of China, having demolished Austria $3 \frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$ in the sixth round, now drew 2 : 2 with the Dutch, Liu disposing of GM Donner in 20 moves on board three.

Scores: USSR 22 $\frac{1}{2}$; W.Germany 21 ; Hungary \& Denmark 2012 ; Bulgaria 20; Yugoslavia, USA, Israel, Cuba, Poland \& Spain 191/2.... New Zealand $16 \frac{1}{2}$.

| ROUND NINE, 4 |  |  | November |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| FINLAND | 3 | NEW ZEALAND | 1 |
| H.Westerinen | $1 / 2$ | O.Sarapu | $\frac{1 / 2}{1}$ |
| H.Hurme | 1 | M.Chandler | 0 |
| E.Raaste | $\frac{1}{2}$ | V.Small | $\frac{1}{2 / 2}$ |
| K.Kivipelto | 1 | P.Stuart | 0 |

Drawing with black and losing with white just about tells the story here poor result overall, albeit against strong opposition. Sarapu got a cramped position from a Ruy Lopez but, with the queenside blocked, was able to move all his pieces (including two knights which seemed to be marooned on b7 and c7) to the kingside and, while Ortvin could not reak through, the Finnish GM could do nothing either. Chancler's chosen line s only good for equality according to theory - it turned out that Hurme's piece activity balanced Murray s better pawn structure; the rook and pawn enaame at the adjournment looked difficult or us but Murray was convinced it was drawn. Unfortunately the Finnish analyis produced a very nice winning variation. Small adjourned with an extra pawn but the presence of opposite coloured ishops made progress extremely difficult and he agreed to a draw after only few more moves. Stuart transposed moves in the opening and lost his advantage, finally getting into serious rouble through over-reaching in an equal position. Despite two consecutiv poor results, we were only $6 \frac{1}{2}$ points ehind the USSR. Austria's revenge over one 10 was achieved by a 4 : 0 win at the expense of Australia.

The Germans breathed fresh life into the fight for the medals by beating the USSR $2 \frac{1}{2}$ : $1 \frac{1}{2}$, Pfleger beating olugaevsky on board 3 while the other games were drawn. This was the Sowiets our th match defeat in il olympiads the others being against Hungary in 964 (22 1 1972 ) Othe 1964 Hungary (21, USA , 0 , Cuba ${ }^{1}$, Yugoslavia $1 \frac{1}{2}$ , Denmark 0 ,
Sand 2 , Poland 1
cores: USSR 24; USA \& W.Germany Israel, Cuba \& Swe$22 \ldots .$. New Zealand $17 \frac{1}{2}$.

## ROUND TEN, 6 November

| TUNISIA | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | NEW ZEALAND | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| S.Bouaziz | $\frac{1}{2}$ | O.Sarapu | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| R.Belkadi | 1 | M.Chandler | 0 |
| B.Kchouk | 0 | B.Anderson | 1 |
| S.El Hanadi | 0 | P. Weir | 1 |

The top board was an Exchange Ruy which reached an ending with 2 N vs $\mathrm{B}+$ which Ortvin held comfortably. Chandler was winning comfortably but blundered in time trouble and his position was beyond hope by the adjournment. Anderson won another clock-work Benoni and, with $71.43 \%$, could have been in line for a board prize. After one or two inaccuracies in the opening Weir took charge in the early middle-game and also won easily

The USSR was held to a tie by lsrael, Gulko again proving the weak 1ink in losing to Bleiman. Romanishin tried for several days to beat Grueafeld in a roo and pawn ending but eventually had to concede the draw. Other results: West Germany 2, Ilungary 2; USA $2 \frac{1}{2}$, Cuba $1 \frac{1}{2}$; Sweden $2 \frac{1}{2}$, England $1 \frac{1}{2}$; Bulgaria 1, Ice1and 3; Yugoslavia $2 \frac{1}{2}$, Argentina $1 \frac{1}{2}$.

Scores: USSR \& USA 26 ; W.Germany $25 \frac{1}{2}$; Hungary 25; Sweden 2.43: Israel, Iceland, Poland \& Spain 24 ..... New Zealand 20

ROUND ELEVEN, 7 November
NEW ZEALAND 1 ECUADOR
V.Small 1 D.Verduga
P.Stuart $0 \quad$ P.Fazos $\begin{array}{lll}\text { B.Anderson } & 0 & \text { C.Salvador } \\ \text { H. Weir } & 0 & \text { Friver }\end{array}$ P.Weir 0 J.Freile

For the second time in the space of four rounds we played without two of our top three boards and got badly beaten. This was clearly our worst result as Ecuador was definitely not as strong as Argentina $B$, but three of us played pathetically. Small scored a good win when Verduga accepted his exchange sacrifice in the endgame; instead Verduga could have returned the exchange for a difficult $R+2 P$ vs $R+3 P$ ending which was probably still winning for Vernon.

There were changes at the top when Sweden drew 2 : 2 with USSR, Schneider winning against Romanishin. Others: USA $2 \frac{1}{2}$, West Germany $1 \frac{1}{2}$; Hungary 3, Iceland 1; Israel $3 \frac{1}{2}$, Cuba $\frac{1}{2}$; Poland $2 \frac{1}{2}$, Spain $1 \frac{1}{2}$.

Scores: USA 281 $\frac{1}{2}$; USSR \& Hungary 28 Israel 2712 ; W.Germany 27; Sweden $\&$

In retrospect perhaps this result was a blessing since, having dropped good position to make a final charge to a respectable placing over the last three crucial rounds

ROUND TWELVE, 8 November

| NEW ZEALAND | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | JAPAN |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| O.Sarapu | 1 | H.Takemoto |
| M.Chandler | 1 | T.Sakurai |
| V.Small | 1 | Y.Ozaki |
| P.Stuart | $\frac{1}{2}$ | K.Oda |

An expectedly decisive result to put us back over $50 \%$. Sarapu sacrificed a pawn for a very nice win in a knight v bishop ending. Chandler won very quickly after winning material. Small gained a big positional plus when his opponent adopted a Benoni set-up but played very passively; eventually the pre up ag up paws, winnig just before the adjournment. Oda s irregular opening Stuart ald interes ideas and

Hungary now reach a drawn ending.
Hungary now moved into the lead by thrasting Sweden $\frac{1}{2}$ 2 and USA each won $2 \frac{2}{2} \cdot 1 \frac{1}{2}$ versus Poland been worse for the US as Kavalek bril liatlye for his liantly saved his endgame against Dzhin Yugoslavia 2 West Ypain 2, West bermay 2, Cuba Sain 2 ..... Canada 4, France 0.

Scores: Hugary 312 ; USA 31; USSR Eng1 and Pol, Yany Cana 29, Rumania 28 ..... New Zealand $24 \frac{1}{2}$.

## ROUND THIRTEEN, 9 November

| PERU | 1 | NEW ZEALAND | 3 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| M.Gonzalez | $\frac{1 / 2}{2}$ | O.Sarapu | $1 / 2$ |
| C.Vasquez | 0 | M.Chandler | 1 |
| J.Vasquez | $\frac{1}{2}$ | V.Small | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| C.Robbiano | 0 | P.Weir | 1 |

Peru rested its board one, new GM Orestes Rodriguez Vargas, as he had $80 \%$ and was in line for the top board prize. Unfortunately for him, Korchnoi pipped him on the post in the last round. Sarapu looked to be in all sorts of difficulties and had to give up a piece for two pawns. Ortvin got a surprising amount of compensation, later regained the material, and only agreed to a draw
with the approach of time trouble Chandler won a pawn but allowed his opponent adequate counterplay and he only won when Vasquez cracked under tine pressure. Small agreed to his draw fairly pite maintaining a developmencal advanpite maintaining a developmental avantage. Weir's opponent made an incorrect capture early on and peter won a brief

> ctical melee. With only ont
fight for first pound remaining, the Hught for first place is still intense. Hengary retained its half point lead by placed the USA in second the USSR dis placed the USA in second place by beat$2: 2$ with Poland. Also West Germany 2 England 2; Yugoslavia 2 West Germany Rumania 2, Spain 2.

Scores: Hungary 34; USSR 3312 ; USA 33; W.Germany 31; Israel 3012; Yugoslavia, Holland, Switzerland Rumania, Poland, England \& Canada 30 ..... China $28 \frac{2}{2} \ldots$... Philippines \& New Zealand $27 \frac{1}{2}$ .... Australia \& Indonesia 27.

ROUND FOURTEEN, 11 November
NEW ZEALAND 2 PHILIPPINES
O.Sarapu
M.Chandle
V.Small
B.Anderson
E.Torre R.Rodriguez R.Mascarinas

Perhaps the main interest lay in which of the zone 10 countries would inish on top. The Peoples Republic of China had a one point lead over the ing Cuba ng cuba. One of the Aussies commented hefore the last round started that perhaps we had started our run too early or so thines were looking way an hour and a New Zeal and win linct possibility. Torrearedificed位 qued to ho however played actively as thera required and fot the upper hand since ost of the goa hat to lave next morning it would not have been ossible for Sarapu to play an adjour ame and Torre thank draw offer. In fact Ortvin could force perpetual check if he wished so woild normally have sealed and then sought the in at leisure; later analysis revealed a probable win. Rodriguez just did not seem to know what he was doing in the
opening, using most of his time on his first ten or so moves by which time Murray, with black, had a clear edge. With Rodriguez having five minutes for about 20 moves, the win for Chandler was only a matter of time (no pun intended). Small won a pawn but it was a RP which unfortunately bestowed no real winning chance in the adjourned rook and pawn ending. Anderson committed himsel to an attack on Bordonada's weakened king's position but when the Philippino parried all the threats, Bruce 's piece ecame passive wh ggressive

Hungary beat third seed Yugoslavia : 1 while the Soviet Union could only manage $2 \frac{1}{2}$ : $1 \frac{1}{2}$ against holland and the , at the adjour had after Korchnoi had beaten Kavalek erhaps it was unfortunace for the Amercans that Korchnoi had not alred the US the top board one prize! Even so the us coula still have come second they had wor . 2 West Germany and Israel agreed 2. 2. West Germany and Is ael agreed fourth and fifth positions. Rumania up our an . 1 the in and Denmark, $2 \frac{1}{2}$ : $1^{\frac{1}{2}}$ winner over Austria finished a remarkable seventh - the Danes, with two IM's and an average rating (top four) of 2416 , had been seeded 17 th.

In the battle for Zone 10 supremacy the Peoples Republic of China held the powerful Cuban team to 2 : 2 to remain in top spot, one point ahead of the Philippines, New Zealand and Indonesia The Australians could only tie $2: 2$ gainst Chile and so remained a half point below.

## FINAL SCORES, 23rd OLYMPIAD

Sums of opponents' scores were officially used to break ties.

| 1 | Hungary | 37 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | USSR | 36 |  |
| 3 | USA | 35 |  |
| 4 | West Germany | 33 |  |
| 5 | Israel | $32 \frac{1}{2}$ | 442.5 |
| 6 | Rumania | $32 \frac{1}{2}$ | 422.5 |
| 7 | Denmark | 32 | 440.5 |
| Poland | 32 | 437 |  |
| Spain | 32 | 430.5 |  |


| Switzerland | 32 | 426 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Canada | 32 | 422.5 |
| England | 3112 | 452.5 |
| Bulgaria | 31/2 | 437 |
| Holland | 31/2 | 432.5 |
| Yugoslavia | 31 | 438 |
| Sweden | 31 | 437.5 |
| Argentina | 31 | 418 |
| Cuba | 3012 | 437 |
| Austria | $30 \frac{1}{2}$ | 417 |
| Peoples Rep. of China | 301/2 | 413.5 |
| Mexico | $30 \frac{1}{2}$ | 393.5 |
| Finland | 30 | 421 |
| Colombia | 30 | 401.5 |
| Phflippines | 291/2 | 407 |
| New Zealand | 291/2 | 396 |
| Indonesia | 291/2 | 394 |
| Brazil | 291/2 | 393.5 |
| Iceland | 29 | 423 |
| Chile | 29 | 417 |
| Australia | 29 | 408 |
| Norway | 29 | 398 |
| (Argentina B | 281/2 | 413 |
| Paraguay | 281/2 | 411.5 |
| Scotland | 28 | 404.5 |
| Venezuela | 28 | 401.5 |
| Syria | 28 | 373 |
| France | $27^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 425 |
| Uruguay | 271/2 | 381.5 |
| Dominican Republic | 271/2 | 380.5 |
| Sri Lanka | 271/2 | 373.5 |
| Hong Kong | $27 \frac{1}{2}$ | 367 |
| Wales | 27 | 403.5 |
| Peru | 27 | 399.5 |
| Guayana | 27 | 369 |
| Japan | 27 | 359 |
| Luxembourg | 27 | 353 |
| Faroe Islands | 27 | 346 |
| Belgium | 261/2 | 374.5 |
| Guatemala | 261/2 | 358 |
| Morocco | 261/2 | 356 |
| Tunisia | 26 | 390 |
| Ecuador | 26 | 381.5 |
| Bolivia | 26 | 368 |
| Trinidad \& Tobago | 26 | 356.5 |
| Jordan | 26 | 327.5 |
| Jamaica | 251/2 |  |
| Puerto Rico | 25 | 373 |
| Malaysia | 25 | 365.5 |
| Libya | 231/2 | 321 |
| Mauritania | 231/2 | 319.5 |
| Andorra | 22 $\frac{1}{2}$ |  |


| 61 | US Virgin Islands | 22 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 62 | Bermuda | $20^{\frac{1}{2}}$ |  |
| 63 | Zaire | 16 |  |
| 64 | United Arab Emirates | $12^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 328.5 |
| 65 | Brit. Virgin Islands | $12^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 327.5 |

Considering purely our final score and placing this was a very good result better even than at kaifa since, not only were seven of the leading teams here absent from Haita, but also the centage. Notwithstandint centage. Notwithstanding this, pexsonal experience of a swiss systen olympiad Iottery these home to me just what a only the eve Basically infly the last few round have any grea influence on a teain's final placing excepting the top few and bottom tew of course. This is illustrated by the fact hat a mere $5 \frac{2}{2}$ points covered the after ten rounds Ioland two examples. but then lost its remaining lying 8 th ut then lost its remaining matches and many of the top teams during an played many of the top teams during a fantastic as in 14th place with only three round a - bot pluce with to 36 hh coring a mere 2 points in atcer atches. The en poin in its last tead too much into bare scores.

Without any doubt it wase
orm shown by Ortvin and Murray wine orst contributed to our final result the can percent our nough. Nobody else showed consistent forg. Nobody else showed consistent siderably stronger opposition than two reserves but could have been expect ed to do better Vernon started off with 4 losses and a not very convincing draw but then gradually played himself into form while I started off oll ent haywire - the only excuse I can think of is a surfeit of blacks 6 out f 8 . Bruce started off like a house on fire with three straight wins but sub sequently became rather erratic and ost several games from very good posi tions. Peter Weir, in his first olympiad, also played well at times but never really struck good form. I give the individual results below in brief:

4 P.W.Stuart
B.R.Anderson

14
31.25

6 P.B.Weir
$7 \quad 3 \quad 3$ 55.56

It is certainly worth mentioning that Sarapu's percentage was bettered by only nine other board ones while Chandler had the fifth highest percentage on board two.

The leading scorers at each board were as follows

Board 1:
V.Korchnoi (Swit) 9 / 11

2 O.Rorchnoi (SWit)
O.Rodriguez (Peru)
U.Andersson (Swed)
J.Timman (Holl)

8 / 10
$1.8 \%$
J.Timan (Holl) 10 / 14 71.4\%
S.Weeramantry (SL) $10 / 14$ / $71.4 \%$

Board 2:
A.Kuligowski (Pol) $10 / 13 \quad 76.9 \%$
P.Biyiasas (Can) $9 / 12 \quad 75.0 \%$
Y.Rantanen (Fin) 8 / 11 72.7\%
Z.Ribli (Hung) $9 / 13669.2 \%$
M.Chandler (NZ) $\quad 7 \frac{1}{2} / 11 \quad 68.2 \%$

Board 3:

| 1 | G.Tringov ( $\quad$ uig) |  | 11 | 77.3\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | İ.Polugaevsky (USSR) |  | / 11 | 72.7\% |
| 3 | G.Sax (Hung) | $8 \frac{1}{2}$ | / 12 | 70.8\% |
| 4 | H.Pfleger (W.Ger) |  | / 10 | 70.0\% |
| 5 | L.Day (Can) |  | / 11 | 68.2\% |
| 6 | T.Catlan (Syria) |  | / 14 | 67.9\% |
| Board 4: |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | G.Bordonada (Phil) | 7 |  | 77.8\% |
| 2 | J. Bellon (Spain) | 10 | / 13 | 76.9\% |
|  | C.Braga (Brazil) |  | / 11 | 72.7\% |
|  | C.Silva (Chile) |  |  | 70.8\% |
|  | L.Piasetski (Can) | 7 | / 10 | 70.0\% |
|  | M.Suba (Rumania) | 9 | / 13 | 69.2\% |

## Board 5 :

1 J.Tarjan (USA)
9늘 / $1186.4 \%$
M.Birnboim (Israel) 6 / 8 75.0\%
S.Garcia (Cuba)
K.Oda (Japan)
J.Ferreira (Para)
(O.Romanishin (USSR)

(M.Perez (Dom.Rep.) | $6 / 8$ |
| :--- |
| 8 | $\begin{array}{lll}8 & 11 \\ 7 & 10\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{l:l}6 & 1 \\ 61 / & 9\end{array}$ $6 \frac{1}{2} / 10$

$6 \frac{1}{2} / 10$ $72.7 \%$
$70.0 \%$
$66.7 \%$ oard 6:

| 1 | J.Turner (US Vir IS) | $6 \frac{1}{2} /$ | 7 | $92.9 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Chang Wei Ta (China) | $6 \frac{1}{2} /$ | 8 | $81.3 \%$ |
| 3 | Navarro (Mexico) | 6 | 8 | $75.0 \%$ |
| 4 | J.Nunn (England) | $8 \frac{1}{2} /$ | 12 | $70.8 \%$ |

Chang Wei Ta (China)
Navarro (Mexico)

## K.Robatsch - O.Sarapu, English: 1 c 4 nfe

 2 Nc 3 e5 3 Nf3 Nc6 4 e 3 Re7 5 d 4 NI 6 Nxd4 0-0 7 Be 2 Re8 $80-0$ d6 9 Nxc6 bxe6 10 Bf3 $3 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 11 \mathrm{~b} 3$ Rb $8 \quad 12 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \quad \mathrm{Bf} 8$ 13 Qd2 Ng4 $14 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \quad 15 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Qh} 4 \quad 16 \mathrm{f}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\mathrm{Ng} 6 & 17 & \mathrm{Bf} 3 & \mathrm{~d} 5 & 18 & \mathrm{cxdj} \mathrm{Bc} 5 \quad 19 \text { Ne4 Rxe4 }\end{array}$ 20 Bxe4 Nxf4 21 Bd4 Bxd4 22 Rxf4 Qxf4 23 Qxd4 Qg5 24 Kh 1 cxd5 25 Bxd5 Rd826 Qc4 Be8 27 Bf3 Qxe3 28 Qxc7 Rd7 29 Qb8 g6 30 b 4 Kg 731 b 5 Rd 2 , $\frac{1}{2}$ : $\frac{1}{2}$.
B.Anderson - W.Wittmann, Ruy Lopez:

1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 BbS f5 4 Ne3 fxe 4 5 Nxe4 d5 6 Nxe5 dxe 47 Nxc6 Qd5 8 c Qd6 9 Qh5 g6 10 Qe5+ Qxe5 11 Nxe5+
 15 Nf. 4 O-0-0 $160-0 \mathrm{Ne} 717 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{l}$



Kb7 $31 \mathrm{Rd7}+\mathrm{Kb} 5225+\mathrm{Ka} 33 \mathrm{RxC7}$ $34 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{Ra}$

P.Stuart - A.Bachtiar, English: 1 e 4 es 2 Nc3 Nf6 3 Nf3 Nc6 4 e3 Be7 5 Be2 $0-0 \quad 6 \quad 0-0$ d $6 \quad 7$ d $4 \mathrm{Re} 8 \quad 8$ d5 $\mathrm{Nb} 8 \quad 9$ e4 Nbd7 10 Rbl as 11 Nd2 Nf8 12 a3 Ng6 13 g3 Bh3 14 Rel Qe8 15 b4 b6 16 Nb axb4 17 axb4 Rf8 18 Be3 Ne8 19 Ral Rxal 20 Qxal f5 21 exf5 Bxf5 22 Nd Nf6 23 f3 his 24 Nde4 h4 25 Nxf6t Bxf6 26 g4 e4 27 gxf5 exf3 28 Bd 3 Ne 529 Qd1 Nxd3 30 Qxd3 Bxc3 31 Qxc3 Qxf5 32 Qd2 Qg4+ $33 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{f} 2 \quad 34 \mathrm{Bxf} 2 \mathrm{Qf} 3+35$ $\mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Qg} 4+36 \mathrm{Khl}$ Qf3+ $37 \mathrm{Kgl} \mathrm{Qg} 4+$, $\frac{1}{2}$ : $\frac{1}{2}$.
M.Chandler - F.Holzl, Sicilian: 1 e4 c5 2 g 3 Ne6 $3 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{~d} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 5$ c 3 e5 6 4 d 67 Mh 3 Nge 7 8 0-0 0-0 10 exd5 Nxd5 11 Nc 4 exf4 12 Nxf4 Nde7 13 Be3 b6 14 Bf 2 Bb 715 at Nc 74 Rab8 17 Qe2 Rfe8 18 a5 Nxa5 19 Nxa5 Bxg2 20 Nxg2 bxa5 21 Ra4 Bf6 22 Re4 Red8 23 Ne3 Bg7 24 g4 4 Qd 725 Nc 4 Nd 5

 $\lg 2 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 33 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \mathrm{Nxe} 4 \quad 34 \mathrm{Nxd7} \mathrm{Rxg} 5 \quad 35$ Rxe4 Rxg2+ 36 Kxg2 $\operatorname{Bg} 737$ Rc4 Re7 38 Nxc5 a3 39 bxa3 Bf8 40 d4 Kf7 41 Kf3 g5 $42 \mathrm{Nd} 3,1$ : 0.
F.Trois - M.Chandler, English: 1 Nf3 Nff c4 c5 3 Nc3 d5 4 cxd5 Nxd5 5 e 3 g 6 6 d4 $\mathrm{Bg} 77 \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{Nxc}^{2} 8 \mathrm{bxc} 3 \mathrm{0} 0$ - $90-0$ 710 Qe2 Nc6 11 Ba 3 b 6 13 Rfdl Na5 14 Ва6 Вха6 15 Oxa6 Rfd8
$16 \mathrm{e}_{4}$ Qc6 17 Bxc5 bxc5 18 Qxa5 cxad 19 cxd4 Qxe4 20 Rel Qf4 21 Qc7 Qxe7 2 Rxc7 e6 23 Kfl Bf6 $29 \mathrm{Rc} 2 \mathrm{Kg} 730 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 31 \mathrm{Ne} 5$ Bxe5 32 dxe 5533 Ra $5 \mathrm{Ko6} 34 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Rb}$ $35 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Kf5} 36 \mathrm{ga} \mathrm{Rbl} 37 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{gxf} 4+38$ gxf4 39 Kf 2 Rb 440 Ra 3 Rxf4t 41 Kg 2
 Re4 45 a4 Ra3 46 Ra2 h4 47 Ra3 h3 $48 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Kf} 4,0$ : 1.
0.Sarapu - Tan S.H., Petroff Defence: 1. $\mathrm{e}_{4}$ e5 2 Nff Nf6 3 d3 d6 4 Be 2 Be 7 5 0-0 0-0 6 c3 Na6 7 h3 c6 8 Be3 Nc 7 9 Nbd2 Ne6 $10 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Oc} 7 \quad 11 \mathrm{Qc} 2 \mathrm{Re} 8 \quad 12$
 $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Nxg5 } \\ 16 & \text { Bxg5 Re7 } \\ 17 & \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nh} 5 & 18 & \text { dxe5 }\end{array}$ dxe5 19 Rad1 h6 20 Bxe 7 Qxe7 21 Rd2 Rad8 22 Redl Rxd2 23 Qxd2 Nf6 24 Qe3 c5 25 Bd5 Nyd5 26 exd5 f5 27 d6! Qd8 28 Nue5 Ref 29 d 7 Be4 $30 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{~g} 5 \quad 31 \mathrm{Qe} 2$ kf8 32 Qh 5 Re6 33 Rd6, 1 : 0.
V.Smal1 - D.Verduga, Benoni: 1 nf 3 g6 e4 Bg7 3 d 4 c5 $4 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 5 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Na} 6 \quad 6$ -0 Rb8 7 a 4 Nf6 8 Nfd2 $0-0$ ONc3 Nb4 10 Ne4 b6 11 Bg5 Re8 12 f3 h6 13 Be Bb 714 Qd2 e6 15 dxe6 Rxe6 16 Bxh6 Bxh6 17 Oxh6 Nxc2 18 Rad1 Nd4 19 Bd3 Qf8 20 Qxf8+ Kxf8 21 Ne3 Bc6 22 Bc4 Ree8 23 Wb5 Bxb5 24 axb5 Rb7 $25 \mathrm{kf2}$ Rc8 26 h4 Ne8 27 Nd5 Nc7 28 Nxe7 Rbxc7 29 h. 5 gxh5 30 Rh 1 Kg 731 Rxh 5 Rh8 32 Rxh8 Kxh8 $33 \mathrm{Rh} 1+\mathrm{Kg} 734 \mathrm{Rh} 5$ a6 35 bxa6 Ra7 36 Rd5 b5 37 Rxd4! cxd4 (37...Rxa6 38 Bxb5 Rb6 39 Rd2 Exb5 $40 \mathrm{Rxd6} \mathrm{Rxb} 2+41 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \pm) \quad 38 \mathrm{Bxb} 5$ ff6 39 Ke 2 d 40 exd5 Kes 41 Bc 4 Kd 6 42 b 4 Ra 843 Kd 3 Rb 844 Kxd 4 Rxb 445 $4 \mathrm{f} 646 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Ra4} 47 \mathrm{~g} 5 \mathrm{fxg} 548 \mathrm{fxg} 5$ Ral $49 \mathrm{~g} 6 \mathrm{Re} 150 \mathrm{~g} 7 \mathrm{Re} 8 \quad 51 \mathrm{a} 7,1: 0$
I.Rogers - J.Tarjan, Sicilian: le4 c5 2 c3 d5 3 exd5 Qxd5 4 d 4 e6 5 Nf3 Nf6



 Bd6 $20 \mathrm{Ob} 5 \mathrm{Ne} 7 \quad 21$ Bxb $7 \quad 0 \times \mathrm{b} 7 \quad 22 \mathrm{Ne} 5$ Nf5 $23 \mathrm{Qe} 2 \mathrm{~N} 42424 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Ne} 4 \quad 25 \mathrm{Nb} 5 \mathrm{Be}$ | $\mathrm{Nf5}$ | 23 | Qe 2 | Nh 4 | 24 | f 4 | Ne 4 | 25 | Nb 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 26 | Be 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ \text { Ng4 Qe7 } & 30 \text { Rel Bxd4 } 31 & 38 \text { Bxd4 Ne2t } & 32\end{array}$ Rxe2 Qxe2 33 Nxh6t gxh6 34 Qxe2 Rxclt 35 Kh2 Ng6 36 f5 Rc4 47 fxg6 Rxd4 38 gxf7+ Kf8 39 Qe5, 1 : 0.

J.Diez del Corral - L. Portisch, French: 1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 e5 c5 5 a3 Bxc 3+ 6 bxc3 Qc7 $7 \mathrm{Qg}_{4} \mathrm{f5} 8 \mathrm{Qg} 3$ cxd4 9 cxd4 Ne7 $10 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \quad 0-0 \quad 11 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{~b} 6$

h5 Nh8 $19 \mathrm{~h} 6 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 20 \mathrm{Nf} 4 \mathrm{Nxd} 4 \quad 21 \mathrm{Ra} 2$ Qb7 22 a4 Re6 23 Qe3 Nc2 24 Rxc2 Rxc2 25 Nxe6 Nf7 $26 \mathrm{Nd} 4 \mathrm{Ra} 227 \mathrm{Nxf5} \mathrm{Nxd6}$ 28 exd6 gxf5 29 Qg5t Kf8 30 Rel Qf7 $31 \operatorname{Re} 7,1$ : 0.
A.Miles - B.Spassky, Queen's Indian Def: 1 d4 Nf6 2 Nf3 b6 3 c4 e6 4 Bf4 Bb7 5 e3 Be7 6 h3 $0-0 \quad 7$ Nc3 d5 8 cxd5 exd5 9 bd3 c5 10 N 14 Ne5 a6 12 Qf3 Re8 13 Radi cxd4 14 Nxc6 Bxc6 15 exd4 b5 16 a3 $\mathrm{Ne}_{4} 17 \mathrm{Bbl}$ Qb6 18 Rfel Nxc3 19 Qxc3 b4 20 Qg3 bxa3 21 bxa3 Ba4 22 Rc1 Qu2 23 Bxh7+ Kxh7 24 Rxe Rxe 28 Q 59 Be5 Qb 21 Q85 23 Qf6 16 Re3 Kr8 3d Re5 35 Rd8 86 Rxd5 Re $37 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Rdl} 38 \mathrm{Rd} 8 \mathrm{Kh} 7 \quad 39 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Rd} 340 \mathrm{f} 4$ 37 Kh 2 Rdl 38 Rd8
G.Garcia - J.Timman, English: 1 c4 Nf6 2 Nc3 e5 3 Nf3 Nc6 4 d3 d5 5 cxdS Nxd5 6 e3 $3 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{Be} 20-0 \quad 80-0 \mathrm{Be} 69$ Bd2 f5 10 a3 a5 11 Qc2 $\mathrm{Nb} 6 \quad 12 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{Bf} 6$ 13 Rab1 Qe7 14 Bcl g5 $15 \mathrm{Na} 4 \mathrm{~g} 4 \quad 16$ Nd2 Nd7 17 Rel Rf7 18 Bb2 Qf8 19 Rbcl Be7 20 Nc3 Na7 21 d4 exd4 22 exd4 Nb 6 23 Bxg4 fxg4 24 Rxe6 Rd8 25 Qe4 Nc6 26 Ne 2 Bxa3 27 Bxa3 Qxa3 28 Rc5 Rdf8 $29 \mathrm{Rg} 5+\mathrm{Kh} 8 \quad 30 \mathrm{Rh} 5 \mathrm{Nd} 7 \quad 31 \mathrm{Qb} 1 \mathrm{Rg} 8 \quad 32$ d5 Nd8 33 Nc4 Qf8 34 Reh6 R8g7 35 Nf4 b5 36 Rxh7+ Rxh7 37 Rxh7+ Rxh7 38 Ng6t, 1 : 0 .
F.Trois - V.Korchnoi, Nimzoindian Def: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 e3 b6 5 $\mathrm{Ne} 2 \mathrm{Ba} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{a} 3 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{Nf} 4 \mathrm{O-0} 88 \mathrm{Bd3} \mathrm{~d} 6$



 $\mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 23$ Qe3 Qf8 $24 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Bf6} \quad 25 \mathrm{Nb} 5$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\mathrm{Qe} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 7 & 23 & \mathrm{Qe} 3 & \mathrm{Qf} 8 & 24 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Bf6} & 25 \mathrm{Nb} 5 \\ \mathrm{Bxb} 2 & 26 & \mathrm{Rxb} 2 & \mathrm{~d} 5 & 27 & \text { cxd5 } & \text { exd5 } & 28 & \mathrm{Nc} 7\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Bxb2 } & 26 & \mathrm{Rxb} 2 \mathrm{d5} & 27 & \text { cxd5 exd5 } & 28 \mathrm{Nc} 7 \\ \text { dxe4 } & 29 & \mathrm{Rc} 1 \mathrm{Re} 7 & 30 \text { Nxa8 } \mathrm{Red} 7 & 31 & \mathrm{~g} 3\end{array}$
 Oxal Rxdl+ 35 Kg 2 Rxb 136 Rc 2 Nd 4 , 0 : 1 .
A.Lein - L. Polugaevsky, Sicilian: $1 \begin{array}{llllllll}1 & \text { e } & \mathrm{c} 5 & 2 & \mathrm{~b} 3 & \mathrm{~d} 6 & 3 & \mathrm{Bb} 5+\mathrm{Bd} 7 \\ 5 & \mathrm{c} 4 & \mathrm{Bxb} 5\end{array}$ 5 cxb5 a6 $6 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~g} 68 \mathrm{Bb} 2$
 $12 \mathrm{~d} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 613 \mathrm{a4}$ Re8 14 Rfdl d5 15 Nd 2 Bh6 16 exd5 Nxd5 17 Nc4 Re6 18 g 3 Qd 7 19 Rel Rae8 20 Qf3 Nd4 21 Bxd4 exd4 22 Rxe6 Rxe6 $23 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 24 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 25$ Nd2 Ne3+ 26 fxe3 dxe3 27 Rd1 exd2 28 Rxd2 Qe7 29 Rf2 Re3 30 Qd5 Be5 $31 \operatorname{Rf} 3$ Re2+ $32 \mathrm{Rf} 2 \mathrm{Re} 3 \quad 33 \mathrm{Rf} 3 \mathrm{Re} 2+34 \mathrm{Rf} 2$ Bb8 35 d 4 cxd4 36 Qxd4 Re4 37 Q16 Qd7 38 Qc3 Be5 39 Qc5 Qg4 40 Qe7 Qxg $3+$

0 : 1
L.Polugaevsky - H.Pfleger, Catalan:
 1 c4 Nf6 2 Nf 3 e6 $3 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{~A}^{4} \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{c} 5$ cxd5 exd5 6 d4 Nc6 $70-0$ Be7 8 Nc3 12 b 3 Qa5 $13 \mathrm{Na} 4 \mathrm{Rfd} 8 \quad 14$ e 3 c $5 \quad 15$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { Bxf6 gxf6 } & 16 & \text { dxc5 Bxc5 } & 17 & \text { Qh5 Rac8 } & 18\end{array}$ Rfdl Bf8 19 Racl Qb4 20 Bxd5 Rxd5 21 Rxd5 cxb3 22 Rxc8 Bxc8 23 axb3 Bg4 24 Ru4 4 Oel+ $25 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Be} 2 \quad 26 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Ofl}+27 \mathrm{Kg}$

 Qxe3+ $34 \mathrm{Rxd} 3 \mathrm{Qxd3}+35 \mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{Qe} 3+36 \mathrm{Kh} 5$ Be7, $0: 1$ :
O.Jakobsen - W.Browne, Sicilian: 1 e 4 cs 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 a6 6 a4 e6 $7 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 8$ 0-0 Nc6 9 Kh 1 Qc7 $10 \mathrm{f} 4 \quad 0-0 \quad 11 \mathrm{Bf} 3 \mathrm{Re} 8 \quad 12 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 8$ 13 Qe 2 Nxd4 14 Bxd 4 e5 15 Ba 7 Ra 816
 b5 20 axb 5 axb $5 \quad 21 \mathrm{Ra} 7$ Qc6 22 Rd 2 b 4 23 Nd5 Bxd5 24 exd5 Qc4 25 Be 2 Qe 426 Bd3 Qxd5 27 Ba6 Qc6 28 Bxc8 Qxc8 29 Qf3 h6 $30 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 31 \mathrm{Bgl} \mathrm{d} 4 \quad 32 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Bc} 5$ 33 Ra 5 e4 $34 \mathrm{Qf4}$ e3 $35 \mathrm{Bh} 2 \mathrm{~b} 3 \quad 36 \mathrm{Qc} 7$ Bb6 37 Qxb6 bxc2, 0 : 1.
L.Portisch - I.Radulov, Catalan: 1 Nf3
 e6 6 c4 dxc4 7 Qa4 Bd7 8 Qxc4 cxa4 Oh4 Rc6 10 Nc3 Nxd4 11 Qxd4 Bc5 12 Bh6 gxh6 16 Qxf6 $0-0 \quad 17$ Ne4 Qb4 18 Qe5 Be7 19 a3 Qb6 20 Rd7 Bg5 21 b3 Qxb 322 Nxg5 hxg5 23 Qxg5+ Kh8 24 Radl Qc2 25 Qf6+ Kg8 26 Rid4 Qg6 27 Qf3 h5 28 Rxb 7 e5 29 Rh4 Rd8 30 Qxh5 Qxh5 31 Rxh5 f6 32 Rxa7 Rd2 33 e3 Rel+ $34 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \operatorname{Rdd} 135 \mathrm{Rf} 5,1$ : 0.
L.Kavalek - R.Hübner, Sicilian: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 Nc6 $3 \mathrm{d4}$ cxd4 $4 \mathrm{Nxd4} \mathrm{Qb} 65 \mathrm{Nb} 3$ Nf 66 Nc 3 e6 $7 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{Be} 78 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Oc} 7{ }^{9}$ $130-00$
 Be 2 Na 20 N 55023 Be5 24 N 5 dxc5 25055 b5 23 ab Ne5 24 Nxc5 25 25 18 26 Bxg 780 Qh $6+$ Kh8 30 e5 f5 31 exf6 Be6 32 Rae 36 f7 $1: 0$.

Our Women's team finished fourth in Final Group D, i.e. 28th in the field of 32 teams. Paul Spiller will report in our next issue. Also in the February 1979 issue will be a feast of brevities from both events!

## KARPOV KEEPS WORLD TITLE

We left off in the October issue when the score was 4:1 to Karpov after seventeen games. It would have been a brave man that predicted that a sudden death situation would arise. Yet, hat is precisely what happened as Korchno

The accoumodation worked out between Korchnoi's aides and the Soviets after the seventeenth game seems to have worked because the match now continued much more smoothly. Korchnoi kept his promise to his seconds to concentrate solely on chess

## GAME EIGHTEEN

3 September
Karpov adjourned with the advantage but Korchnoi carefully exchanged pieces until a drawn, though not chanceless ook and pawn ending was reached.
Karpov - Korchnoi, Pirc Defence: 1 e 4 d6 $2 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 5 \mathrm{Be} 20-0$ 6 O-0 Bg4 7 Be3 Nc6 8 Qd3 e5 9 d5 Nb4 10 Qd2 a5 $11 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 12 \mathrm{Bg} 5$ Qe8 13 Nh 2 Kh8 14 a3 Na6 15 Bh6 Bxh6 16 Qxh6 Ng8 17 Qe3 f5 18 exf5 Bxf5 19 Racl Nf6 20 g 4 Bd 721 f 4 exf4 22 Qxf4 Nc5 23 Rcel Nfe4 24 Qe3 Qe5 25 Nxe4 Nxe4 26 Bf3 Ng5 27 Qxe5+ dxe5 28 Bg 2 Rxfl+ 29 Nxfl Re8 30 Nd 2 a4 $31 \mathrm{Re} 3 \mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 32 \mathrm{Kf} 2$ $\mathrm{Re} 7 \quad 33 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 34 \mathrm{Rc} 3 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 35 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{hxg} 4$ 36 hxg4 Be8 37 c 5 bxc5 38 Ne 4 Nxe4 39 Bxe $4 \mathrm{Kf6} 40 \mathrm{Rxc5} \mathrm{Kg} 541 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{Rf7} 42$ Be 2 Rh 743 Bf 3 Rf 744 Rc 4 Rh 745 Rb 4 Re7 $46 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Bd7} 47 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Be} 8 \mathrm{~K}^{48} \mathrm{Kf2} \mathrm{Bd7}$ 49 Ke 3 e4 50 Bxe $4 \mathrm{Kxg} 451 \mathrm{Kf2} \mathrm{Kg} 552$ Bc2 Re5 53 Bxa4 Bxa4 54 Rxa4 Rxd5 55 Ke3 RbS 56 b4 Rest 57 Rd4 KR 18 Ra8 g5 59 Rc8 Re4+ 60 Kd5 Rest 61 Kc6 g4 $62 \mathrm{Rxc} 7 \mathrm{~g} 3 \quad 63 \mathrm{~Kb} 6 \mathrm{~g} 2 \quad 64 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \mathrm{Kf3}$, $\frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$.

## GAME NINETEEN <br> 7 September

This game was originally scheduled for the 5th but both players attended a party the previous night. Korchnoi, who had used his three time-outs allowed in the first 24 games, left early but Karpov and his entourage stayed till the end so the champion called a time-out.
Korchnoi - Karpov, Catalan: 1 c4 Nf6 2 g3 e6 $3 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 4 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 5 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{0} 0 \mathrm{0} \quad 6$ Nbd2 b6 $70-0 \mathrm{Bb} 78$ cxd5 exd5 $9 \mathrm{Ne5}$ Thd7 $10 \mathrm{Ndf3} \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 11 \mathrm{b3}$ a5 12 Bb 2 Ne 13 Rcl Re8 $14 \mathrm{Nxd} 7 \mathrm{Qxd7} 15 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \mathrm{Qe} 6$

16 Nd3 Bd6 17 dxc5 bxc5 18 e3 a4 19 $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { bxa4 Ba6 } & 20 \text { Rel Bxd3 } & 21 & \text { Qxd3 Rxa4 } & 22\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Qxa4 } \\ \text { Qb3 Raa8 } & 23 & \text { Rxe4 dxe4 } & 24 \text { Qxe6 Rxe6 } & 25\end{array}$ Q3 Ra4 26 Red1 f6 27 Kf1 Kf7 28 Rc2 a3 Ra4 26 Red 6427 Kr 6 $32 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 33 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{f} 5 \quad 34 \mathrm{~g} 5 \mathrm{Rd} 6 \quad 35 \mathrm{Rc} 2$ Rda6 $36 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{a} 7 \mathrm{~F}_{3} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \mathrm{Ra} 8 \quad 38 \mathrm{Rc} 7$ R8a7 $39 \mathrm{Rc} 8, \frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$.

## game TWENTY

10 September
Following the appearance of two Ananda Marga followers as part of the challenger's delegation during the nineteenth game, the jury met before game 20 and decided that henceforward they would not be permitted to enter the match site an exception being made for game 20 in view of the lack of warning. The people concerned had been convicted of attempted murder and were out on bail pending their appeal. Match organiser Campomanes had protested their presence on the
grounds that they were convicted felons.
Korchnoi again salvaged a draw after being in an inferior position at the adjournment, thus keeping alive his slim chances.
Karpov - Korchnoi, Caro-Kann Defence: 1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd2 dxe4 4 Nxe4 Nf6 5 Nxf6t exf6 6 Bc4 Nd7 7 Ne2 Bd6 8 $0-00009$ Bf4 Nb6 10 Bd3 Be6 11 c3 Nd5 12 Bxd6 Qxd6 13 Qd2 Rad8 14 Rfel g6 15 Radl Kg 716 Be4 Nc7 17 b3 Rfe8 18 вb1 Bg4 19 h 3 Bxe 220 Rxe2 Rxe2 21 Qxe2 Nd5 22 Qd2 Nf4 23 Be4 f5 24 Bf3 h6 25 h 4 Ne 626 Qe3 Nc 727 c 4 f 428 Qc3 Qf6 29 Qa5 Ne6 30 d5 cxd5 31 cxd5 632 Qa4 Nc5 33 Qxa7 Nd7 34 d6 Qxh4 35 Qc7 Qf6 36 b4 h5 37 a4 Kh6 38 b5 g5 39 Be6 Ne5 40 d 7 Kg 741 Re 1 Ne 6 42 Od6 g4 43 Kfl g3 44 Qe5 h4 45 as bxa5 46 b6 Qxe5 47 Rxe5 Rb8 48 b 7 Nd 8 49 Re8 Kf6 50 fxg3 fxg3 51 Ke 2 Kg 752 Bf3 a4 53 Re4 Kf6 54 Rxa4 Ke7 55 Rxh 4 Kxd7 56 Rf4 Kd6 $57 \mathrm{Rb} 4 \mathrm{Kc} 7 \quad 58 \mathrm{Rc} 4+$ Kd7 59 Bg4+ Ke8 60 Re4+ Kf8 61 Bd 7 Rxb7 $62 \mathrm{Re} 8+\mathrm{Kg} 763 \mathrm{Rxd} 8 \mathrm{Rb} 2+$, $\frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$.

## GAME TWENTY-ONE

13 September
In the fourth Queen's Gambit of the match the players followed game nine offered a piece. The offer was declined but Karpov continued aggressively until suddenly he ran out of ideas and the challenger gained the advantage. By the
adjournment, Korchnoi was a sound pawn $1 p$ and he went on to win, making the score $4: 2$ to Karpoy in the first to win six match
Korchnoi - Karpov, Queen's Garmit. 1 c4 Nf6 2 Ne3 e6 3 Nf 3 as 4 a4 Bel
 12 Bg $5 d 4$ is Qbl Bf5 14 Rd3 e4 15
 8 Nu3 Pa6 19 Rxd5 Re5 20 सa 208 Rxe5 Oxe5 52 Nuf5 Oxf $530-0$ Nes 21 24 Rdl 0e5 25 g3 at 26 Bb b5 27 $2 b 428$ Od5 Oxd5 20 20as 48 5 31 Rd8 Rxb2 32 Ra 33 Ra5 $34 \mathrm{Ra}+\mathrm{Kf7} 35 \mathrm{Nat} \mathrm{Rbl}+36 \mathrm{KG} 2 \mathrm{~B} 6$ $37 \mathrm{Ra} 7+\mathrm{Kf6} \quad 38 \mathrm{~b} 5 \mathrm{Bb} 8 \quad 39 \mathrm{Ra} 8$ Be $5 \quad 40$ Ne5 Bdo $41 \mathrm{~b} 7 \mathrm{Ke} 742 \mathrm{Reg} \mathrm{Be} \quad 43 \mathrm{ft}$ exf3+ $44 \mathrm{Kxf3} \mathrm{Kf7} 45 \mathrm{Reg} \mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{in}$

 $53 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \mathrm{Rd6} 54 \mathrm{e} 4 \mathrm{Rg} 1+55 \mathrm{Kf} 5 \mathrm{~g} 56$ $5 \mathrm{Rc} 1+57 \mathrm{Ke}$ Relt $58 \mathrm{H} 5 \mathrm{ad}+59$ Nd3 Rxd3+ $60 \mathrm{Kc}^{4}, 1: 0$.

## GAME TWENTY-TWO

15 September
For only the second time in the match, Korchnoi played the French Defence - a defence most people experted him to use more often. Karpov met it with the Tarrasch as usual, Rorchooi varying from the sixteenth gane on his sixti move. Karpov was on top altex the challenger gave up his isolated dpawn but let his advantage slip through playing too quickly; Korchnoi was eventually able to force a draw by offering his knight for Karpov's remaining pawns. Karpov - Korchnoi, French Defence: 144 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd2 554 exd5 exds Bb5+ Bd7 6 Qe2+ Be7 7 dxc5 Nf6 Nxe5 Qa5+ 12 Qd2 Qxb5 13 0-0-0 b6 xd7 Nbxd7 15 Kb 1 Ne4 16 Qd3 Qxd3 il Rxd3 Ndf6 18 h3 Nc5 19 Rddl Ne6 20 3 b5 21 Nd4 a6 22 Nc2 a5 23 Rd 3 Rab8 24 Rhdi h6 $25 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Rbc} 8 \quad 26 \quad \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{~d} 4$ 27 cxd4 Nd5 28 Rf1 b4 29 Bd2 $\operatorname{Re} 7 \quad 30$ f5 $5 \mathrm{Ng} 5 \quad 31 \mathrm{Ne} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 632 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{Nxh} 3 \quad 33 \mathrm{~d} 6$ Rd7 34 Nd5 Nxd5 35 Rxd5 Ra8 36 Be 3 Ng 537 Bb 6 Ne 438 Rfdl á 39 R 5 d 4 Re8 40 Rxb4 Rxd6 41 Rxd6 Nxd6 42 Bc Relt 43 Kc 2 Ne 844 Ba 5 a 345 Rb 8 Re 7 $46 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \mathrm{Re} 2+47 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{axb} 2 \quad 48 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{Re} 7$ 49 a4 Rd7+ 50 Kc2 Kh7 51 Rxb2 h5 52 gxh5 Nd6 53 Ra2 Nxf5 54 a5 Nd4+ 55 Kc3 Nc6 56 a6 Rd5 57 Bf4 Rf5 58 Bd6 Rd5 59 Bg 3 Rg 560 Bf 2 Rxh 561 Kc 4 $\mathrm{Na} 5+62 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 663 \mathrm{Ra} 4 \mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 64 \mathrm{Kc} 4$

Na5+, $\frac{1}{夂}: \frac{1}{2}$
GAME TWENTY-THREE
17 September
Korchnoi tried 5 bf4 in the ocd again and Karpov reverted to the 10 Be7 of game nine rather than the $10 \ldots$ Re8 of game twenty-one. Both sides got assed pawns but the ending was drawn. orchnoi - Karpov, Queen's Gambit: c4 ${ }^{2}+66$ Ne3 e6 3 Ne3 d5 4 d 4 Be 7 Bft 0-0 6e3 e5 7 dxe5 Bxc5 8 Qc2 Th6 $9 \mathrm{Rdl} \mathrm{Qa5} 10$ a3 Be7 11 Nd 2 e5 $12 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{~d} 4 \quad 13 \mathrm{Nb} 3$ ob6 14 Bxf6 Bxf6 1 Jd5 Qd8 16 Bd3 g6 17 exd4 Nxd4 18 Ned4 ext4 19 Nxf6t Qxf6 20 0-0 Be6 21 Rfel Rac8 22 b3 Rfd8 23 be4 Rc7 24 Dd2 Bg4 25 f3 Be6 26 a4 b6 27 a5 b5 28 axb5 Bxb3 $29 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \mathrm{Bd} 5 \quad 30$ b6 axb6 31 xet. Re 632 Rxc6 Bxe6 $33 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{Bd7} 34$ 16 Bf5 35 Qfi $4 \mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 36$ Bxf5 Oxf5 37 xff gxif 38 Ral d 3 39 Kf2 Re8 40 Ra 2 Re7 41 Rd2 Ref, $\frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$.

## GAME TWENTY-FOUR

19 September
The match goes into its third month. s in the previous game, Korchnoi's utside passed pawn conferred no advantage over Karpov's extra centre pawn. Karpov - Korchnoi, Ruy Lopez: l e4 es 2 Nf3 Ne6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 5 0-0 Nxe4 6 d4 b5 7 Bb3 d5 8 dxe5 Be6 3 Be7 10 bc 2 Nc5 11 h 3 0-0 12 Rel d7 13 Nd4 Nxd4 14 cxd4 $\mathrm{Nb} 7 \quad 15 \mathrm{Nd} 2$ © $5 \quad 16$ dxc5 Nxc5 17 Nf3 Bf5 $\quad 18$ Be3 Rac8 19 Rel Bxc2 20 Rxc2 Ne6 21 Rd2 fdy 22 Qb3 Rc4 23 Redl Qb7 24 a3 g6 25 Qa2 a5 26 b3 Rc $3 \quad 27$ a4 bxa4 28 bxa4 Re4 $29 \mathrm{Rd} 3 \mathrm{Kg} 730 \mathrm{Qd} 2 \mathrm{Rxa4} 31$ Bh $6+\mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 32$ Rxd5 Rxd5 33 Qxd5 Oxd5 34 Rxd5 bf $8 \quad 35 \mathrm{Bxf} 8 \mathrm{Kxf} 8 \quad 36 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Ke} 7$
 $\begin{array}{lllllll}\mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{~h} 6 & 4 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Ral} & 42 & \mathrm{Nc} 4 & \mathrm{Nc} 6 & 43 \mathrm{Re} 5\end{array}$ $\mathrm{Kd} 744 \mathrm{Nb} 6+\mathrm{Kc} 745 \mathrm{Nc} 8 \mathrm{Kxc} 8, \frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$.

## GAME TWENTY-FIVE

23 September
In the first true English of the match (despite Korchnoi's habitual 1 c 4 ) both players were soon in unfamiliar territory and using more time than usual. Korchnoi gained the advantage but was unable to win the rook and pawn ending eventually reached.
Korchnoi - Karpov, English: 1 c4 Nf6 2 Nc3 e5 5 g 3 Bb4 4 Qb3 Nc6 5 Nd5 Bc 5 6 e3 $0-0 \quad 7 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Nxd} 58$ cxd5 Ne 79 Ne d6 10 0-0 c6 11 d4 exd4 12 exd4 Bb 6 Bf3 Rab8 17 a5 Bc7 18 Qc 3 Rfc8 19

Nf4 Bd8 20 Rfel Qf8 21 Qb3 Bg $5 \quad 22$ Ne2 Bf6 23 Radl c5 24 Be4 Od8 25 Qa $\mathrm{Bg}^{2} 26$ dxc5 Rxc5 27 b 4 Rc 728 Qb 3
 $32 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qf6} \quad 33 \mathrm{RbI} \mathrm{Ba} 4 \quad 34 \mathrm{Nf} 4 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 35$
 Re5 39 Rxcl Rxcl $40 \mathrm{Nxg} 6+\mathrm{Kg} 741 \mathrm{Ne} 7$ $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { R8c4 } & 42 & \text { Bxc4 } & \text { Rxc4 } & 43 & \text { Qxd6 } & \text { Rc } 3 & 44 & f 4 \\ \text { Qxd6 } & 45 & \mathrm{Nff5}+ & \mathrm{Kg} 6 & 46 & \mathrm{Nxd6} & \mathrm{Bb} 3 & 47 & f 5+\end{array}$ Kg7 $48 \mathrm{Ne} 8+\mathrm{Kf} 849$ Nx6 $6 \mathrm{Bb} 30 \mathrm{f5}$ Kf8 51 NE4 Rc4 52 Re5 50 Nh5+ 54 Kf3 Rd2 $55 \mathrm{Re} 7 \mathrm{Red} 56 \mathrm{Rab} \mathrm{Ra} 2+$ 57 Rb6 Rxa5 58 Rxh6 $545 \mathrm{Rxb}^{2} \mathrm{Ra}$ Rcl b3 61 Pbl Be4 62 Re4 Pat 63 Kat Re2 64 Nd 3 Bxd3 $65 \mathrm{Ked} 4 \mathrm{Ra} 2 \mathrm{~K}^{2} \mathrm{Kd} 4$ $\mathrm{Kg} 767 \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{Ra} 268 \mathrm{Kf4} \mathrm{Ra4} 69 \mathrm{Rxb} 3$ $70 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Re} 5 \quad 71 \mathrm{Kh} 5 \mathrm{Ra} 572 \mathrm{Rf} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 5 \mathrm{73}$ $7 \mathrm{Rb} 174 \mathrm{f} 6+\mathrm{Kh} 775 \mathrm{Rb3} \mathrm{Rg} 76$ 77 Rhi Pg? 78 Ral Rh $2+79 \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{Kg}^{2} \mathrm{Rg}$ $\operatorname{Ra} 8 \mathrm{Rg} 2+, \frac{1}{2}$ : $1 / 2$

## GAME TWENTY-SIX

26 September
Karpov played the English for the second time and the same result - a fairly quick draw.
Karpov - Korchnoi, English: 1 c4 e5 2 Nc3 d6 3 g3 $£ 54$ Bg2 Nc6 5 d3 Nf6 6 e3 Be 77 Nge2 $0-0 \quad 8 \quad 0-0$ Qe8 9 f4 Bd8 bxc4 14 dxc4 e4 15 Nxf6t Bxf6 13 Bxf6 Rxf6 17 Rel a5 18 b5 Nd8 19 Rf2 Nb 720 Bfl Ne5 21 Ne3 Bf7 22 Nd5 Bxd5 23 cxd5 Nd3 24 Bxd3 exd3 25 Qxd3 Qxb5 26 Qxb5 Rxb5 27 Rxc 7 Rf7,

## GAME TWENTY-SEVEN

28 September
With probably his best win of the uatch, Karpov apparently put the final outcome of the match beyond doubt with the score now $5: 2$. Karpov had sealed his 41 st move, but Korchnoi resigned ithout resuming
Korchnoi - Karpov, English: l c4 Nf6 2 Ne3 e5 3 Nt3 Nc6 4 g3 Bb4 5 Nd5 Nxd5 6 cxd5 Nd4 7 Nxd4 exd4 8 Qc2 Qe7 9 Bg2 Bc5 10 0-0 $0-0 \quad 11$ e3 Bb6 12 a4 dxe3 13 dxe 3 a5 $14 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \quad \mathrm{Bc} 5 \quad 15 \mathrm{Bc} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6$ 16 Qd2 b6 17 Rfel $\mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 18$ e4 Rfe8 19 Kh1 c6 20 e5 cxd5 21 Bxd5 Rad8 22 Qf4 Qf8 23 Qf3 dxe5 24 Bxe5 Bg4 25 Qxg4 Rxd5 26 Bc 3 Red8 27 Kg 2 Bd 428 Racl g6 29 Qe2 Qd6 30 Bxd4 Rxd4 31 Qb5 Rb4 $32 \mathrm{Re} 8+\mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 33 \mathrm{Rxd} 8$ Qxd8 34 Qe2 Qd5+ 35 f3 Rxa4 36 Rc2 Rd4 37 Qe3 b5 38 h4 h5 39 Qe2 a4 40 Qe3 b4 41 Rf2 Rd3, $0: 1$

## game TWENTY-EIGHT

30 September
Korchnoi broke back immediately in winning with the black pieces - only the second time he has done so against Karpov. This was the eighth Open Ruy and Korchnoi's score with it ( $+1-2=5$ ) now looked rather more respectable. The challenger spurned a draw by repetition before the adjourment and sealed in a strong position. His sealed move was not the best but had the element of surprise Score: Karpov 5, Korchnoi 3
Karpov - Korchnoi, Ruy Lopez: I e4 e5 Nf3 Ne6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 5 0-0 Nxe4 6 d4 b5 7 вb 3 d5 8 dxe5 Be6 9 c 3 Ne5 $10 \mathrm{Bc} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 4 \quad 11 \mathrm{Re} 1 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 12 \mathrm{Nbd} 2 \mathrm{Qd} 7 \quad 13$ $\mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 6 \quad 14 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Bh} 5 \quad 15 \mathrm{Bf} 5 \mathrm{Ncd} 8 \quad 16 \mathrm{Be} 3$ $25 \quad 17$ Bc5 a4 18 Bxe7 0xe7 19 Nbd 2 c 6 $20 \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{Ng} 5 \quad 21$ Qe2 g6 22 Bg 4 Bxg 423 hxg4 Nde6 24 Qe3 b5 25 Nxg5 Qxg5 26 Qxg5 Nxg5 27 gxh5 Rxh5 28 Nfl Rh4 29 Radl Ke7 30 f3 3 Ne $631 \mathrm{Ne} 3 \mathrm{Rd8} .32 \mathrm{Ng} 4$
 36 Nc 2 Rc 437 Rd 3

37...d4 38 g 4 Ng 739 Nxd 4 Ne 640 Redl Nxd4 41 cxd4 Rxb4 $42 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 43 \mathrm{~d} 5$ $\mathrm{Rb} 2+44 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rxa} 245 \mathrm{Re} 3 \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{~K}_{4} 46$ e6 Ra3 47 Re 2 fxe6 48 Rxe6+ Kf7 49 Rdel Rd 7 50 Rb6 Rd3 51 Ree6 R3xd5 52 Rxg6 a3 $53 \mathrm{Rbf6}+\mathrm{Ke} 754 \mathrm{Re} 6+\mathrm{Kf} 855 \mathrm{Ref6+} \mathrm{Ke}$ $56 \mathrm{Re} 6+\mathrm{Kd} 8 \quad 57 \mathrm{Ra} 6 \mathrm{Rb} 7 \quad 58 \mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Kc} 759$ $\mathrm{Rg} 7+\mathrm{Rd} 760 \mathrm{Rg} 5 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{6l}$ Rxc5+ Kb8, $0: 1$.

## GAME TWENTY-NINE

Korchnoi makes it two in a row and narrows the gap to $4: 5$. The challenger avoided the sharp lines currently in vogue against Karpov's chosen variation the emerged with more active pieces. At he

Tal，predicted a draw．
Korchnoi－Karpov，English： 1 c4 Nf6 2 Nc3 e6 3 e4 c5 4 e5 N88 5 d4 cxd4 6 Qxd4 Nc6 7 Qe4 d6 8 Nf 3 dxe5 9 Nxe5 Nf6 10 Nxc6 Qb6 11 Qf3 bxc6 12 Be2

 Bxcé Qxc6 20 Radl Rac8 21 Qg3 Bd6 22 Qh4 Be7 $23 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Kf8} 24 \mathrm{Qf2} \operatorname{Rxd} 125 \mathrm{Rxd}$ Qc7 26 Qg3 Qxg 327 hxg 3 h 528 Kf 2 Ke $29 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 30 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{a} 6 \mathrm{31} \mathrm{Na} 4 \mathrm{Rc} 632 \mathrm{Rh} 1$ Bd 633 Bf2 Nd $7 \quad 34$ g4 hxg 4 35 Rh $8+\mathrm{Ke}$ $36 \mathrm{fxg} 4 \mathrm{~g} 5 \quad 37 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{f} 6 \quad 38 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Kf7} \quad 39$ $\mathrm{Rh} 7+\mathrm{Ke} 8 \quad 40 \mathrm{Ne} 4 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 41 \quad \mathrm{Rh} 6 \mathrm{Kf7} \quad 42$ $\mathrm{Rh} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 8 \quad 43 \mathrm{Rh} 8+\mathrm{Kf} 744 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{Nf} 8 \quad 45$ Rh1 Kg6 46 Rdl f5 $47 \mathrm{Nf} 2 \mathrm{BC6} 48 \quad \mathrm{BC} 3$ Nd7 49 gxf $5+$ exf5 $50 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Nb} 6 \quad 51 \mathrm{Kf} 9$ Be7 52 Ba5 Rf6 53 Kg 2 Exg4 54 Nxg 4 Re6 $55 \mathrm{Kf3} \mathrm{Bf} 6 \quad 56 \mathrm{Nxf6} \mathrm{Rxf} 6 \mathrm{t} 57 \mathrm{Kg4}$ Nc8 58 Bd8 Rf $4+59 \mathrm{Kg} 3$ Rf $5 \quad 60$ a 4 Kf 7 61 Rd 3 Re 562 kg 4 Kg 663 as Re4t 64 Kf3 Rf4t 65 Ke3 Rh 4666 Rd $5 \mathrm{Rh} 3+67$ $\mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Rxb} 3 \quad 68 \mathrm{Rxc} 5 \mathrm{Rb} 869 \mathrm{Re} 6+\mathrm{KfS} 70$ Rxa6 g4 $71 \mathrm{Rf} 6+\mathrm{Ke} 472 \mathrm{Be7} \mathrm{Rb} 2 \mathrm{t} ~ 73$ ce3 Rb7 $74 \mathrm{Bh} 2 \mathrm{Rli} 7 \quad 75 \mathrm{Bb} 8 \mathrm{Rb} 7 \quad 76 \mathrm{Bg} 3$ Rbl $77 \mathrm{Rf} 4+\mathrm{Ke} 3 \quad 78$ Rf8 Me7 79 a6

## gAME THIRTY

10 October
Karpov again tried the English， varying from knowi theory on move ten． After cautious play on both sides the draw was agreed short
was due to be resumed
Karpov－Korchnoi，English： 1 c 4 Nf6 2 Nc3 d5 3 cxd5 Nxd5 4 g3 g6 $5 \quad \mathrm{Bg} 2$ Nxc 3 6 bxc3 Bg7 $7 \mathrm{Nf3} 0-0$ 8 $0-0 \mathrm{cy} 9 \mathrm{Rb} 1$ Ne6 13 Qa4 Nas 14 d3 b6 12 Bh4 Bb7 16 Bh6 Bxh6 14 2xhe Bxes 18 Bb1 Rb8 16 B2 10 Red 21 R 22 Rdb2 Nc 623 Qd2 Ne 524 Of4 Nd7 25
 Qxd6 exd6 29 Br Rd 10 a Ra4 Ra7 32 Kfl Ke7 $33 \mathrm{Kel} \mathrm{Kd7} 34 \mathrm{Kd}$ 55 Kc 2 Ra 8 Kef4 Ke6 37 H 4 Rb 8 $38 \mathrm{Re} 4+\mathrm{Kd} 739 \mathrm{Ra} 4 \mathrm{Ra} 840 \mathrm{Rf} 4 \mathrm{Ke} 641$ Rc4 Ra7 42 Re $4+$ ， $1 / 2: \frac{1}{2}$ ．

## GAME THIRTY－ONE

12 October
Korchnoi＇s momentum continued as he won again to level the scores at 5：5． Although the challenger had an advantage at the adjournment，it looked as though the champion could hold his position． Afterwards Korchnoi commented，＂Its like a lottery；one game will decide who will be champion．In this case Fischer was
right．＂Of course Fischer maintained that，at 9：9（in a＇first to win teu＇ situation）the champion should hold his title．
Korchnoi－Karpov，Queen＇s Gambit： 1 c4 é 2 Nc3 a $5 \quad 3$ d 4 Nf6 64 cxd5 exdS $5 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 6$ e3 $0-0 \quad 7$ Bd3 Nbd 7 Nat 8 Re8 9 Qc2 c6 10 0－0 Nf8 11 Exf6 Byf6 12 b4 Bg $4 \quad 13$ Na2 Rc 8 14 Bf5 Exf5 15
 Rful Nf6 19 a5 ab 20 Na4 Bf8 21 Nc5 Re7 22 Kfl Ne 823 Ke 2 Nd 624 Kd 3 Rce 8 25 Rel g6 26 Re2 f6 27 Rael $\operatorname{Rh} 628$
 $3 £ 8 \quad 32$ f3 Rd8 33 Ndb 3 Nb5 34 Rfl Bh6 35 f4 Bf $8 \quad 36 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Nd} 6 \quad 37$ Rfel h6 38 Rf1 Rb8 39 Ral Rbe8 40 Rael Rb8 41 e 4 uxe 442 Ndxe 4 Nb 543 Nc 3 Rxe2 44 Rxe2 xe5 $45 \mathrm{bxc} 5 \mathrm{Rd} 846 \mathrm{Nxb} 5 \mathrm{axb} 5 \quad 47 \mathrm{f} 5$


47．．．gxf5 48 gxf5 Rg8 49 Kc 3 Re8 50 Rd2 Re4 51 Kb 4 Ke8 52 a6 bxa6 53 Ka 5 $54 \mathrm{~Kb} 6 \mathrm{~b} 455 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{cxd5} 56$ Rxd5＋Kc8 $57 \mathrm{Rd} 3 \mathrm{a} 5 \quad 58 \mathrm{Rg} 3 \mathrm{~b} 3 \quad 59 \mathrm{Kc} 6 \mathrm{~Kb} 8 \quad 60$
 Kb5 a4 64 Rxf6 Rf4 65 Rxh6 a3 66 Ra6t $\begin{array}{llllll}\mathrm{Kb} 8 & 67 & \mathrm{Rxa} 3 \mathrm{Rxf} 5 & 68 \mathrm{Rg} 3 \mathrm{Rf} 6 \\ \mathrm{Kc} 7 & 70 & \mathrm{Rg} 7+\mathrm{Kc} 8 & 71 \mathrm{Rh} 7,1 & 1 \\ 0 . & 0 .\end{array}$

## GAME THIRTY－TWO

17 October
Death was exceeding sudden as Karpov got the necessary win at the first oppor tunity．Korchnoi played a variation＂he had never analysed and made bad moves we have never seen＂claimed Stean latér．A itterly disappointed Korchnoi refused o look at the position and the match ended the following morning when GM Keene，the challenger＇s chief second， informed Arbiter Filip that Korchnoi would not resume the adjourned thirty－ second game and would not sign the score sheet．

Karpov－Korchnoi，Pirc Defence： 1 e 4 d6


 Qd3 a6 14 Radl Rb8 15 h 3 Nd 716 Qe3 Ba8 17 Bh6 b5 18 Bxg7 Kxg7 19 Bfl Na8 23 axbs axb5 21 Ne 2 Bb 722 Ng3 26 Qxe 5 Ra 24 Bd5 Qa8 25 dxe5 $26 \mathrm{Bxe} 5 \mathrm{Nxa} 30 \mathrm{Bxb5} \mathrm{Ra} 7 \mathrm{Be}^{28} \mathrm{Nh} 4 \mathrm{Bc}$ 29 Be 2 Be6 30 C4 Nb4 31 Qxc5 Qb8 32 Bfl Rc8 33 Qg5 Kh8 $34 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \mathrm{Nc} 6 \quad 35$ Qh6


As usually seems to be the case in these matches the play did not come up to expectations－indeed the standard play was probably worse than any other post－war title match．Certainly it
is hard to see how either player at Man－ ila could possibly have resisted Fischer were he still on the throne．

In terms of time this was the long－ est world championship match，lasting 94 days；well ahead of the 75 days taken by Capablanca and Alekhine for their 34 games．Karpov＇s share of the prize money ras US $\$ 350,000$ while Korchnoi＇s share was US $\$ 200,000$

One can only wonder just how much effect the psychological goings－on had on the two competitors．My own guess is that Korchnoi was the most affected by these disturbances while Karpov＇s weak pay at times car be put down to playing ry quickly in order to or play on the
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共要

## 宸

## FIDE CONGRESS HIGHLIGHTS

The FIDE Congress was，of course， held concurrently with the olympiads in Buenos Aires．

NEW MEMBERS：the Federations of Sri Lanka，Gambia，Mali，Mauritius \＆Sey－ chelles（atlases out！）had been provisio－ nally admitted by the Bureau and were definitely admitted by the General Assembly．Uganda was discussed sepa－ rately and was admitted after a vote to bring the membership up to 106 ．

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION：Voting on the first ballot was Mr Rabell Mendez 31， He lafe toping hallot resulted in Olafsson＇s rith 57 votes against Rabell Mendez＇

## NEW TITLES：

INTERNATIONAL GRANDMASTER：V．Bagirov （uSSR），J．M．Bellon－Lopez（Spain），P．Biyi asas（Can），I．Dorfman（USSR），R．Hernan－ dez（Cuba），B．Ivanovic（Yugo），S．Marja－ novic（Yugo），A．Mikhalchishin（USSR），I． Nemet（Yugo），S．Nikolic（Yugo），J．Nunn （Eng），S．Palatnik（USSR），O．Rodriguez－ Vargas（COI），K．Rogoff（USA），D．Sahovic （Yugo），M．Suba（Rum）\＆H．Suradiradja （Indo）．

INTERNATIONAL MASTER：Lukov \＆Boho－ sian（Buig）；J．Hernandez（Cuba）；Lanc \＆Meduna（Czech）；Bellin \＆Speelman （Eng）；van Wijgerden（Holl）；Horvath （Indo），Mirnbson（Ice）；Bachtiar joweyk skro joway（Rum）； reana（num），lim seng ioo（sing），Sanz （Swed）；；attas（USZ）；Leror Mnat－ anian A Petrosian N Popov，Uil Zaichil $\&$ M．Tseitlin（UCSR）；Bjelalac， Cebalo Despotevic Djuric ， Kosanski，P．Popovic Simic（Yugo）

NEW ZONE：By a narrow margin it was decided to split the present Zone 11．（Mediterranean／Africa）into two parts．The new Zone 11 would comprise Albania，Cyprus，Greece，Italy，Malta， Portugal，Turkey and Yugoslavia．The new Zone 12 （Africa）would comprise． Algeria，Gambia，Ghana，Libya，Mali， Mauritania，Mauritius，Morocco，Nigeria， Seychelles，Tunisia，Uganda，Zaire and Zambia．

GENERAL ASSEMBLIES：It was unani－ mously decided to revert to annual General Assemblies．

## South Island Ch'p-Anderson's 8th

## Report: Vernon Small

The 1978 Radio Avon South Island Championship was won comfortably by Bruce Anderson for a record eighth time. Going into the last round, Bruce held a handy one point lead over Peter Mataga. The possibility of an exciting finisin was renoved when first Mataga and chen Anderson fell to Nokes and Jackson.
of course bruce was the pre-tournament favourite, but there was an impressive number of supporting acts in ex-champions Nokes, Jackson, Van Dijk, Perry and Foord; aiso the well performed but under-rated Chris Baker could always be relied on to provide an interesting side show .... especially for comoisseurs of the time scramble. In the last couple of years the South Island has begun to produce a crop of fine juniors, so interest was high in the performance of Tony Love, Michael Freeman and David Weegenaar (Otago) and Warwick Norton, Giles Bates, David Cairns, Ken Mackley, Adrian Lloyd and flammond williamson (Canterbury). Strangely -t was the last and lowest rated of these, Williamson, who made the st sion.
Entries were boosted by Auckianders Mataga, Livingston, Austin and Poneroy who stayed on after the University tournament held previous weekend.
The Canterbury ciub who organised the tournament, again came up against the perennial Christchurch problem of "no sponsorship". Despite vigorous attempts by Secretary John Atkinson, agreement with Radio Avon for free publicity was the best that could be publicity was the best that could
done. Fortunately, the Teachers' Training College provided a very cheap venue and the ever efficient Teddy Stallknecht offered his services free of charge. Thanks are due to both these "institutions" without which the club would have picked up a healthy tab.

## ROUND BY ROUND

The most notable upset in the first round was a fine victory by Giles Bates (the youngest of the Bates trio comprising Giles, older brother Phillip and ather Prof. Richard) over the second seed Roger Nokes. Roger's play in this
game can partly be explained by a sojourn in Nelson for most of this year which may have left him a littie short of "match fitness".
G.Bates - R.Nokes, Sicilian Defence: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 Bd3 (The Kopec system recentiy analysed in 'ChESS' and welcomed as a refuge froma theory in several of Giles's games) 3...Nc6 4 c 3 Rel b6 9 d4 e6 (It is now a sort of Geller "quiet sustem" Modern if white plays $10 \mathrm{Nbd2)} 10 \mathrm{Bg} 5!\mathrm{Oc} 7 \mathrm{~N}$ 12 Nfl Rac8 13 Rcl Ne7? (This is bly passive, perhaps alack shoul horri for the imponderables of 13 should play cxd4 15 cxd4 Nb4 or 15 Nxd4 Nxd4 16 cxd Bxe4:) 14 Ng 34 or $15 \mathrm{Nxd4}$ Nxd4 16 cxd4 cxat 17 cxd4 g5 18 Nxg5! (Tempting strong, and unnecessary; simply 18 e 5 presents a whole heap of problems, 9 presents a whole heap of problems, e.g.
$19 \ldots g \times f 419 \mathrm{Bh} 7+\mathrm{Kxh} 720 \mathrm{FxC} 7 \mathrm{Fxc} 7$
21 exdb) $18 . . . \mathrm{e} 5 \quad 19 \mathrm{Bb} 3$ QdS $20 \mathrm{Nxf7} 7 \mathrm{Rxf} 7$ 21 Bxf7+ Kxf7 22 Bxh6 0h8 23 Bxg 7 Oxy 24 Rxc8 Bxc8 25 dxe5 Nxe5 26 Rdl Be6 27 b3 d5 28 0f4+ 0f6 29 0xf6t Kxf6 30 exd5 Bxd5 31 f3 Bc6 32 Rd6+ Kg5 33 Ne2 N7g6 $34 \mathrm{~h} 4+\mathrm{Kxh} 4 \quad 35 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Nxf4} 36$ Nxf4 Kg4 $37 \mathrm{Ng} 6,1: 0$.

Tom Van Dijk played a rice piece sacrifice on Bill Gibson, but followed it up inaccurately; Gibson reciprocated, blundering the piece back and after 81 moves both were lucky to escape with a raw. After two draws with Bill in Canerbury champs, I was asked by Murray $f$ her whe ther I would draw with him f he changed his name to Gibson; thanks to Tom for showing it is not just my列.
Mike White scored a good win over baker, but the other favourites won comfortably.
C.Baker - M.White, English: 1 c4 Nf6 2 g3 g6 3 Bg 2 Bg 74 Nc 3 e5 5 d 3 O 0 4 d6 7 Nf3 Re8 $80-0$ Nc6 $9 \mathrm{Rbl} \cdot \mathrm{Bd} 7$ 10 h 3 Qc8 11 Kh2 Nh5 12 fxe5 Nxe5 13 Nd5 c6 $14 \mathrm{Nf} 4 \mathrm{Nxf3}+15$ Rxf3 Nf6 16 e4 g5 17 Ne2 g4 18 hxg 4 Bxg4 19 Rf2 Nh5 20 Qfl Qe6 21 Nf4 Nxf4 22 Bxf4 Bd4 23 Rc 2 Kg 724 Bd 2 Qe5 25 Qf4? Qh5+, $0: 1$.

In round two Anderson scored a decep-
tively easy win at the expense of $M$. Greeman who swapped all the way to a Lost ending. Van bijk won a strange game from Weagenaar while tim Spiller accepted Horton's delayed Beniko, obtained two queenside passed pams, puched them, and won. Hijnan aborted a Grunfejd to give Jackson a free point, Love overhelmed Mackley, Bates could not repeat Bis first round effort and lost to Mataga who did nothing until move 40 fter grabbing two pawns
M. Freeman - B.R.Anderson, English: 1 d4 Nf $6 \quad 2 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 5 \mathrm{Bg} 2$ 0-0 $\quad 6 \quad 0-0$ cxd4 7 Nod4 Nc. 6 g Nc3 Nxd 4 9 Qxd4 d6 10 Qd2 Rb8 Il 53 a6 12 Bb 2 $65 \quad 13$ Nd5 Nxd5 14 cxd5 Bxb2 15 Qxb2 (b6 16 Racl $8 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 17 \mathrm{Rc} 2 \mathrm{Rfc} 8 \quad 18 \mathrm{Rlc} 1$ b4 19 e3 Rxc2 20 Rxc2 Rc8 21 Bfl Exc2 22 Qxc. 2 bb5 23 Bxb5 Qxb 524 Oć 2d3 $25 \mathrm{Qb} 7 \mathrm{Qb} 1+26 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qe} 4+27 \mathrm{Kgi}$ Kg7 28 Oxa6 Qxd5 29 Qb6 Qd2 30 Qb7 e6 31 Qe4 Qc3 32 Kg 2 d5 $33 \mathrm{Qd} 4+\mathrm{Oxd}_{4}$ 34 exd4 g5 $35 \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{f} 6 \quad 36 \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Kg} 6 \quad 37$ f4 h5t $38 \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{Kf5} 39 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{~g} 4+40 \mathrm{hxg} 4+$ 1xg4t 41 Ke3 e5 42 fxe5 fxe5, $0: 1$. T. Var Dijk - D. Weegenaar, Queen's Gambit: 1 d4 e6 2 c4 Nf6 3 マ£3 d5 4 Nc 3 Be7 $5 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Nbd} 7 \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{e} 3 \mathrm{c} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{dxc} 4$ Bxc4 b5 9 Bd3 bb7 10 0-0 $0-0 \quad 11 \mathrm{RcI}$ Re8 $12 \mathrm{Bb} \operatorname{Re} 813$ Qd3 Nf8 14 Ne 5 ab 15 Bxf6 Bxf6 16 f4 c5 17 Rf2 cxd4 18 exa4 b4 19 Ne2 Rxcl+ 20 Nxc! Re7 21 Qe $35525 \mathrm{~N} 4 \mathrm{Nd7} 26$ Exes g6 24 Qe8 28 hxg6 29 Ras Kn 27 hJ Qc7 31 Rc 2 Qb5 32 Re $\mathrm{Kd7} 33 \mathrm{Rel} \mathrm{Kcb}$ 34 Bd3 Ra4 35 Qe2 5 136 b3 0a3 37 Rcy $\mathrm{Kd7} 78 \mathrm{Bb} 5+\mathrm{Kd} 8 \quad 39 \mathrm{f} 2 \mathrm{Be} 49$ 48

There was a lot of incident in round three, most sad of which was Lloyd $v$ Jackson. 14-year old Lloyd defended a difficult position well, only to blunder a rook when time ran short .... three pawns up; but he is certainly a playe to watch in the future Williamson showed for the first time, beating Foord from the black side of an Exchange
French. Baker hit the comeback trail and Gloistein went on a sacrificial orgy to give Borrell his first win. Mataga shook off his lethargy to register a good win R.L.Perry - P.A.Mataga, French Defence: 1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nc3 $3 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \quad 4$ e 5 c5 5 a3 Bxc $3+6$ bxc 3 Ne7 7 Qg4 Qc7 8 Qxg7
 dxc3 12 Qd3 $\operatorname{Bd} 7 \quad 13 \mathrm{~h} 3$ d4 14 g4 $0-0-0$

15 Ng 3 Na 516 Bg 2 Bc 617 Bxe6 $\mathrm{Qxcc}^{2} 18$ $0-0$ Nc4 19 Né NdS 20 Nd6+ Rxd6 21 exd6 Nde3 22 sxe3 Nxe3 23 d $7+$ Kd8 24 Rf2 Rh8 25 Kh 2 Rxh3, $0: 1$.
With reverse pairings operating, Spiller's Low racing deserted him giving him Anderson who won in just 21 moves.

Leaders: Anderson, Jackson, Love, Mataga \& Williamson 3; kite 2 2

Round 4: a seasation: Boctom rated schoolboy Williamson took the wole lead by defeating Thite atter the latren sacrificed needlessly in a better posiHon. Anderson was lucky to draw with ataga but Jackson v Love was a level 3truggle. Perry had his second loss in a cow, this time to Spiller in only 18 moves. Baker had a nail-biting kingside vs queenside attack in a time scramble of emerge the winner over tioyd. P.A.Mataga - B.R.Anderson, King's•Gambit: ${ }^{1}$ e4 e5 2 f4 exf4 3 Nf3 d5 4 exds Nf6 $5 \mathrm{Bb} 5+\mathrm{c} 6 \quad 6$ dxc6 Nxc6 7 d4 Bd6 8 Qe2+ Be6 9 Ng 5 0-0 10 Nxe6 fxe6 11 Bxch bxe6 12 Qxe6t Kh8 13 (0-0 Qc? 14 Nd2 Rae8 15 Qb3 Re2 16 Qd3 Rfe8 17 Nc4 f3 18 Oxf3 Bxh2+ $19 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 20$ NeS Re4 2 Kgl Rh4 $25 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 4 \quad 26 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 27 \mathrm{Rad} 1 \mathrm{~h} 4$ 28 Rd8+ Kh7 29 Of5 5 Oxf5 30 Rxf5 Rxg3+ $1 \mathrm{Khl} \mathrm{Kg} 632 \mathrm{Rc} 5 \mathrm{Rh} 3+33 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rg} 3+$, $\frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$.
C.Baker - A.Lloyd, English: 1 c4 Nff 2 33 e5 3 Bg2 Nc6 4 Nc 3 e6 5 e4 Be7 6 3 0-0 7 f4 d6 8 Nf3 Oc? $9 \quad 0-0$ a6 10 3 R5 Ne $15 \mathrm{~g}^{2} 635$ Qel Rds 13 Nh4 Bf
 18 Nd 6 as 19 Be 20 Bxd 4 cxd 1 gJ Qb6 22 Nf 3 Nc 723 Og 3 Ne6 24 $\mathrm{Bd} 728 \mathrm{Ng} 2 \mathrm{Nc} 5 \quad 29 \mathrm{Nel} \mathrm{Ra} 8 \quad 30 \mathrm{Ng} 2 \mathrm{a}$ $31 \mathrm{~b} \mathrm{Nxb}^{2} 32 \mathrm{axb} 3 \mathrm{a} 2 \mathrm{Na}^{2} \mathrm{Ral} \mathrm{Na}^{2}$ a3 Bxh5 Oxb 35 Nh4 Be8 36 Na 4 Kh 73 Bx96+ fxg 638 f7 Bc 639 Nag6 Bxe 440 Qh4+ Kg7 41 Qh6 mate, 1 : 0.

Leaders: Williamson 4; Anderson, Jackson, Love \& Mataga $3 \frac{1}{2}$.

In round five Anderson demolished Williamson with an opening trap and hataga joined him in the lead after a arce with that most 'gutty' of competi tors, Jon Jackson. Mataga played the exchange French and offered a draw after ust seven moves; whatever the reason it so upset Jon's natural sense of fighting chess that he blundered a pawn
next move and a resourceful defence could not save him. The ultra book clash Nokes $v$ Love was a disappointment with Love giving a piece early. Baker showed real determination in grinding out a win after a death-defying piece grab. Lloyd displayed positional maturity in quelling the volatile Boyce but Norton could make no headway versus his drought in a deluge of bits.

Leaders: Anderson \& Mataga 4 4 ; Nokes, Baker \& Williamson 4; Jackson, Van Dijk \& Love 3iz.

In the sixth round the important clash was again disappointing; both players displayed a lack of theoretical knowledge in a crucial line and then Nokes miscalculated badly allowing Anderson to take a lead he did not relinquish.
B.R.Anderson - R.Nokes. Pirc Defence: 1 e4 d6 2 d 4 Nf6 3 Nc3 g $6 \quad 4 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Mbd} 7$ 5 f 4 h6 6 Bh4 Nh5 (Recommended by Keene and Botterill; Anderson chooses the most energetic reply) $7 \mathrm{f} 5 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 8 \mathrm{Bc} 4$ (Theory favours 8 fxg 6 fxg6 9 BC4) 8. Nb6? (Not good at all; correct was 8. Nf4 intending g5 and c5 attacking the black squares) 9 Bb3 Nf4 10 Qf3 g5 Il Bg3 (11 Bf2, followed by g3, looks evern more promising ) $11 \ldots$...e5? (11...Bxd4 was essential - to create counterplay) 12 dxe5 Bxe5 13 Nge2 Nxe2 14 Bxe5 Ngl? (After the correct 14...dxe5 Black's position is passive but sturdy, e.g. 15 Qxe2 Qf6 $160-0-0$ Ba with ...0-0-0 follow 15 Qhs Rn7 16 Bg3 17 0-0 Qe7 18 Rhxgl dxe4 1916 Qc5 20 Nee Qa5 21 Bxc7 BE5 22 Nab Kis 23 Nx


Love's bare technique was too much for Williamson. Van Dijk and Jackson fought to a standstill. Norton and Spiller had gnod wins over Lloyd and Livingston while Baker again won by what looked like sheer willpower. The fenale entrant, Elizabeth Bowler, scored her second point in a wild tac tical skimish.

Leaders: Anderson 5 $\frac{1}{2}$; Baker 5; Love and Mataga $4 \frac{1}{2}$; Nokes, Jackson, Van Dijk, Norton, Spiller \& Williamson

In the penultimate round Anderson assured himself of at least first equal
y beating Baker in one of the most interesting games of the tournament:

## B.R.Anderson - C.Baker, Sicilian:

1 e4 c5 2 Nf 3 e6 3 d 4 cxd4 $4 \mathrm{Nxd4} \mathrm{Nf} 6$
 $0-0$ Вb 710 Вf3 Nc6 11 Nb 3 Be7 12 Be3 $0-0 \quad 13 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Rab} 8 \quad 14 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Nd} 7 \quad 15 \mathrm{~g} 5 \mathrm{Na} 5$ 16 Nxa5 bxa5 17 Bg2 f5 18 gxf6 Nxf6 19 Qd3 Kh8 20 Rad1 Bc6 21 b3 Qb7 22 $f 5$ exf5 23 Rxf5 Ng4 24 Na5 Bxd5 25 Rxd5 Nxe3 26 Qxe3 Qc7 27 Qd2 Rf6 28 Rf5 Rxf5 29 exf5 Rb4 30 Qd5 h6 31 Qe6 Qxc2 32 Re1 Bf8 33 Bd5, $1: 0$.

Mataga started pushing Love around right out of the opening and never let up. Nokes and Norton indulged in a 4th uly display which finally saw Nokes's undoubted tactical imagination hit top
R.Nokes - W.Norton, Sicilian: 1 e4 c5 2 $\mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{~d} 4$ cxd4 $4 \mathrm{Nxd} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 5 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6$ 6 Be3 $\operatorname{Bg} 7 \quad 7$ f 3 Nc6 88 od2 $0-0 \quad 9$ Bc4 Bd7 $10 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \quad 11 \mathrm{Bb} 3$ Ne5 12 h 5 Nxh5 13 g4 Nf6 14 0-0-0 Ne4 15 Bxe4 Rxc4 16 Nde2 Qa5 $17 \mathrm{Bh} 6 \mathrm{Bh} 8 \quad 18 \mathrm{Bxf} 8 \mathrm{Kxf8}$ 19 Kbl Qe5 (Later, in a lightning game, Norton tried 19...Be6) 20 Rhel g5 21 Nc1 Be6 22 Nd3 Qa5 23 e5 Nd5 24 Nxd5 Qxd5 25 exd6 Re4 26 dxe7+ Kxe7 27 c4 Rxc4 28 Ne5 Qxd2 29 Rxd2 Rc5 30 Nd3 Rc7 and White won.

Jackson's luck held and a faulty combination gave him a win over Tim Spiller Perry resigned like a gentleman again, this time to Van Dijk. Roger seems to be ny or that strin position y an Mres ousy. M. ise in insanity Williamson continue is fail this time losing to Cairns.號, oyce sacrific bluffed Post into losing
D.A.L.Boyce - M.Post, Sicilian: 1 e4 c5 2 f4 d6 3 Nf3 Nc6 4 c3 d5 5 e5 Bf5 6 d4 e6 $7 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Qa5} 80-0 \mathrm{Bxb} 19 \mathrm{Rxbl}$ Qxa2 $10 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{c} 411 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Qa5} 12 \mathrm{f} 5$ exf5 13 Rxf5 Nge7 14 Rxf7? Kxf7 15 Bh5+ Ng6? ( $g 6$ and Ke 8 ) 16 Qf3+ Kg8 17 Rfl Qc7 18 Qxd5+, $1: 0$.

Lloyd defaulted this and the last round through illness. Leaders after 7 rounds: Anderson 61/2; Mataga 5 $\frac{1}{2}$; Nokes, Jackson, Van Dijk \& Baker 5.

The only player who could catch Bruce was Pater Mataga, but he seemed to be completely bemused by Roger Nokes at
his pasty, trappy, tactically meanest:
R. Mokes - P.A.Mataga, Modern Defence:

1 P4 c6 2 d4 th 3 Ne3 86 $4 \mathrm{Nf3} \mathrm{Bg} 7$ 5 Ped Mbdy 6 at a5 (whas plan is reaily only of value if it secures b4 for the
 At the outer blge of the avant-garde there is weakness; Nf 6 wuld be more sagacious) 10 Be 3 Na6 11 d5 f5? (And this is an extra weakness he cannot afford) 12 Nd 4 fxe 4 ( $0-0,0-0,0-0$ ) $\begin{array}{lllll}13 \text { axc6 bxc6 } & 14 & \text { Nxc6 } & 0-0 & 15 \text { Nxe7 Qxe? } \\ 16 \text { Bxb6 NF5? } & 17 & \text { Od5 Kh8? } 18 \text { Qxe } 4\end{array}$ 16 Bxb 6 NE5? 17 Qd $5+\mathrm{Kh} 8$ ?? 18 Qxe4 (It's hard to give this move a "??" but it really deserves it; $18 Q \times a 8 \quad B b 7$ I9 Qxa5 is so easy ....) Be5 19 Bg4 BD 44 Qds 24 Qud5 $0 \times d 525$ Rxd5 Rxf 23 f4: Bxd5 24 Qxd5 Qxd5 25 Rxd5 Rxf 26 Rxf 4 Bxi4 $2 \%$ Bxhs Bes 28 Bg4 Rb
 $32 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 33 \mathrm{Bd} 4 \mathrm{Kf} 6 \quad 34 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{f} 4 \quad 35$ 366, 1 : 0.

Meanwhile, in a see-sawing game Jackson finally emerged the winner with an extremely piquant finish over a Bruce Anderson who may have lost some of his drive once first place was sewn up.
J.R.Jackson - B.R.Anderson, Guioco Piano: le4 e5 2 Nf3 Ne6 3 Bc4 Bc5 4 c3 Qe7 5 d4 Bb6 6 Bg5 Nf6 7 d5 Nb8 8 d6 cxd6 9 Na3 a6 10 Nc2 Nc6 11 Nh 4 Bxf2+ 12 Ke2 Bxh4 13 Bxh4 d5 14 Bxd5 d6 15 Ne3 h6 $\quad 16$ Bxf6 gxf6 $17 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 18$ Nf5 Bxf5 $19 \mathrm{gxf5} \quad 0-0-0 \quad 20$ Qb3 Qc 7 21. Bxf7 Kb8 22 Bd5 Ne 723 Rhg1 Rh7 24 Rg2 Nxd5 25

Qxd5 Ob6 26 Kd 3 Rc 727 Qb3 Qa5 28 Rg8 Rec8 29 Rg7 Re7 30 Rxc7 Qxc7 31 Qd5 Qg7 $32 \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{Qg} 2+33 \mathrm{~Kb} 3$ Qxh2 34 Qe6 Qg7 $35 \mathrm{Kcli} \mathrm{h} 5 \quad 36$ Qxf6 Qb6t 37 Kc 2 Ka 7 $38 \mathrm{Qh} 4 \mathrm{Rg} 8 \quad 39 \mathrm{f6} \mathrm{Rg} 2+\quad 40 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \mathrm{Kxd} 2+41$ Kxd? Oxb $2+42 \mathrm{KeI}$ Qxc3t $43 \mathrm{Kf1}$ Qd3+ $44 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{~Kb} 8 \quad 45 \mathrm{f} 7 \mathrm{Qe} 2+46 \mathrm{Qf} 2,1: 0$.

Van Dijk got a great position but Fittered it away and the ever batuling Baker joined those on second equal. And long after the prizes were cistriwuted, Nijman and 6. Freeman were $s$ till draving ne of the longest games ment.

In retrospect Bruce was a deserving winner; his preparation was obviously the best and he did not suffer from the urge to give pieces displayed by his Nokes was the most impressive and would have was the most impressive and would that first round debacle As usul, Jack on was brillant back hal by son Waser was always there Matara , Bakly was alwave Lhere. Mataga was boring if ective, Love is capable etter for tut needs to develop more determination in simple positions. M Freeman, Cairns and Bates show plenty of promise.
Generally the standard of the games between the top players was a little disappointing for the spectators, but the good showings of so many junious more than made up for this.

SOUTH ISLAND CHAMPIONSHIP - Christchurch, 21/25 August 1978

|  |  | R.1 | . | , 3 | , | , | , 6 | , |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Anderson B.R. | W20 | W10 | w7 | D5 | Wl1 | W4 | w3 | L2 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| 2 | Jackson J.R. | W24 | W9 | W28 | D6 | L5 | D8 | W7 | W1 | 6 | 39 |
| 3 | Baker C. | L18 | W25 | W15 | W28 | w7 | w5 | L1 | W8 | 6 | 37 |
| 4 | Nokes R. | L15 | W23 | W33 | W29 | w6 | L1 | W13 | W5 | 6 | 36.5 |
| 5 | Mataga P.A. | W23 | W15 | W16 | D1 | W2 | L3 | W6 | 14 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 42.5 |
| 6 | Love A.J. | W35 | W22 | W8 | D2 | L4 | W11 | L5 | W14 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 38.5 |
| 7 | Spiller T. | W26 | W13 | L1 | W16 | L3 | W19 | L2 | W22 | 5 | 39 |
| 8 | Van Dijk T. | D21 | W17 | L6 | W22 | W18 | D2 | W16 | L3 | 5 | 37.5 |
| 9 | Nijman A. | W32 | L2 | L14 | W31 | D15 | W18 | W21 | D10 | 5 | 33.5 |
| 10 | Freeman M. | W37 | L1 | D22 | D19 | D14 | W34 | W15 | D9 | 5 | 32 |
| 11 | Williamson H. | Bye | W35 | W12 | W18 | L1 | L6 | L14 | W24 | 5 | 32 |
| 12 | Foord M. | W25 | D18 | L11 | L21 | W23 | D14 | W22 | W20 | 5 | 31.5 |
| 13 | Norton W. | W27 | L7 | W20 | D14 | D21 | W28 | L4 | W19 | 5 | 30.5 |
| 14 | Cairns D. | W36 | L16 | W9 | D13 | D10 | D12 | W11 | L6 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 37 |
| 15 | Bates G. | W4 | L5 | L3 | W33 | D9 | W30 | L10 | W21 | 4/2 | 37 |
| 16 | Perry R.L. | W33 | W14 | L5 | L7 | W29 | D21 | L8 | W25 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 33 |
| 17 | Weegenaar D. | D19 | L8 | L21 | L26 | Bye | W33 | w30 | W28* | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 25 |


|  |  | R. 1 | R. 2 | R. 3 | R. 4 | R. 5 | R. 6 | R. 7 | R. 8 | T'1 | SOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | White M. | W3 | D12 | W19 | L11 | L8 | L9 | D31 | W29 | 4 | 36 |
| 1.9 | Livingston M.J. | D17 | W21 | L18 | D10 | W32 | 17 | W28* | L. 13 | 4 | 33 |
| 20 | Boyce D.A.L. | L1 | W37 | Li 3 | W35 | L28 | W32 | W29 | L12 | 4 | 29.5 |
| 21 | Gibson W. | D8 | 119 | W17 | W12 | D13 | D16 | L9 | L. 15 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 37.5 |
| 22 | Mackley K. | W34. | L6 | D10 | L8 | W26 | W24 | L12 | L 7 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 35.5 |
| 23 | Morrison M.K. | L. 5 | L. 4 | W25 | D30 | L12 | L27 | W37 | W34 | 31/2 | 30.5 |
| 24 | Van't Steen R. | L2 | D32 | D31 | W34 | D30 | L22 | W27 | L11 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 30 |
| 25 | Bumn D. | L12 | L3 | L23 | W36 | W33 | D31 | W34 | L16 | 31/2 | 30 |
| 26 | Gloistein B. | 1.7 | D27 | L34 | W17 | L22 | L29 | W36 | W31 | 31/2 | 27.5 |
| 27 | Pomeroy D.M. | 143 | D26 | L29 | L32 | W36 | W23 | L24 | W35 | 33/2 | 26.5 |
| 28 | Lloyd A.J. | W29 | W31 | L2 | L3 | W20 | L13 | f | f | 3 | 35.5 |
| 29 | Post M. | L28 | W30 | W27 | L.4 | L16 | W26 | L20 | L18 | 3 | 31.5 |
| 30 | Freeman R. | D31 | L29 | D32 | D23 | D24 | L15 | L17 | W36 | 3 | 27 |
| 31 | Austin P.M. | D30 | L28 | D24 | L9 | W37 | D25 | D18 | L26 | 3 | 26.5 |
| 32 | Scart G.E. | L9 | D24 | D30 | W27 | L 19 | L20 | L35 | Bye | 3 | 26 |
| 33 | Perry K. | L. 16 | W36 | L4 | L15 | L25 | L17 | Bye | W37 | 3 | 26 |
| 34 | Borreil D. | L2? | Bye | W26 | L24 | W35 | L. 10 | L25 | L23 | 3 | 25.5 |
| 35 | Watson M. | L6 | Lil | W37 | L20 | L34 | Bye | W32 | L27 | 3 | 25 |
| 36 | Bowler Mrs E. | L14 | L33 | Bye | L25 | L27 | W37 | L26 | L30 | 2 |  |
| 37 | Cole N. | L10 | L20 | L35 | Bye | L31 | 136 | L23 | L33 | 1 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## National Schoolpupils Ch'p

The 1978 event was held from 28th to 31 st August in the rooms of the Canterbury Chess club. The pre-toumament favourites were Fatrick Cordue (Wellington), the defending champion, and Tony Love (Otago), the runner-up in 1976 Tony, along with Giles Bates, Warwick Norton (both Canterbury) and Michael Freeman (Otago) had spent the previous week limbering up at the South Island tournament. Both Aucklanders, Foy Mathias and Graham Walden, were new to this event but Jonathan Sarfati (Wellington) at 13 years, was already making his third attempt.

By the end of the tournament two points stood out - the ease of Patrick's win and the number of draws, 17 in all rick's success was his matient of Pat black pieces; his favourite King's Indian/Pirc openings provided him with $3^{\frac{1}{2}}$ points out of four.

Round 1: This round saw everyone playing his provincial fellow. All the games were drawn but only the Canterbury pair were friendly

Round 2: Cordue took the lead after Norton went astray. Freeman entered a rook and pawn ending but only drew
while the other two games were fairly quiet.

Round 3: The draws continued to flood in with Freeman beating Bates in the only decisive game. Cordue was not able to destroy Walden's Alekhine's Defence while Mathias-Sarfati was agreed drawn in mutual time trouble.

Round 4 saw Cordue emerge with a one point lead over the rest of the field point lead over the rest of the field rifice proved too much for Mathias while rifice proved too much for Mathias while fourth draws.

Round 5 saw the fall of Tony Love; he built up an excellent position versus Mathias but blundered badly and lost. Walden gave Freeman a gift point. Bates looked to be going well against Cordue ut decided to split the point as did Sarfati and Norton

Round 6: Love continued his selfestrotion when he gave Cordue a pawn d to opening - this was nicely conver ooked to boint by Patrick. Sarfati but agreed to a draw during the adjournment. Norton recorded his first win while Bates-Walden was agreed drawn
after several mistakes by both sides. Standings before the last round were: Cordue $4 \frac{1}{2} ;$ Freeman $3 \frac{1}{2} ;$ Bates, Norton \& Sarfati 3; Mathias \& Walden $2 \frac{1}{2}$; Love 2.

Cordue made sure of first place alone by defeating Mathias in one of the best games of the tournament. This left Norton-Freeman and Sarfati--Bates as the vital pairings to decide second place. Jonathan became ill before the last round and his play suffered as a result The other game is annotated below.

The final standings:

## 12345678

Cordue P.L. (W) $\times \frac{1}{2} 11 \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2} 15 \frac{1}{2}$ Bates G. (C) $\frac{1}{2} \times 0 \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1$ Freeman M. (0) $01 \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2}$ Norton W. (C) $0 \frac{1}{1 / 2} \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1 \quad 31$ 5 Sarfati J. (W) $\frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ 6 Love A.J. (0) $0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times 1003$


The Director of Play was Vernon small, assisted by Philip Bates and Bill son - all three did an excellent job. I have only one complaint: the
schedule by which rounds 4, 5 and 6 were laycd without a session's break; this Eype of time-tabling should not occur in national tournament. What about the prizes? - Editor
W.NORTON M.FREEMAN

Sicilian, Najdorf
1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 $4 \mathrm{Nxd4}$ ff6 5 Nc3 a6 6 Bg5 e6 7 f4 Qb6 8 Qd2 Qxb2 9 Rb1 Qa3 10 e5!?

GM Michaei Stean says, This natural ttacking thrust, once thought to refute the Poisoned Pawn variation, has itself been refuted' - I wonder.

10 ... dxe5 11 fxe5 Nfd7 12 Bc4
white has a prepared novelty up his leeve. Instead, 12 Ne4 h6 13 Bb5!? is very complicated
$12 \ldots$ Qa5! 13 0-0 Bc5
Thus far each player had used one minute. White's next, however, set Black thinking. Stean gives 14 Rxf Nxe5 -+ or 14 Kh 1 Bxd 415 Qxd4 Nc6 with advantage to Black.

## 14 Nd5:? Bxd4+

lack has two alternatives
i) $14 \ldots$ Qxd2?: $15 \mathrm{Nc} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 816$ Nxe6t Kg8 17 Bxd2 Nxe5 (17...Bxd4+ 19 Nxd4 Nxe5 19 rbel Nbd7 20 Bxf $7+N x f 7 \quad 21$ Re8t NEg 22 Bb 4 wins for white) 18 Nxc5 Nxc4 19 Rbel h6 20 Bc 3 and White stands well
2) 14 ...Nc5!? 15 Qxa5 Bxd4 +16 Kh 1 Tras 17 Nc7t Kf8 18 Bxe6 Nre5 (18. . Nf6 29 Nuas Breb 20 exf6 gxf6 leaves black's pieces rather uncoordinated while 18... S? LI $3 x f 7$ Bxe 520 fbel wins for white BxIf:? ( 19 Bxc8 Rxc8 20 weot \& NxCh llows Black to survive) 19...Nyf7 20 *bel Bd7 21 Nxas is very unciear

## 15 Qxd4 Nc6

Of coutse, not $15 \ldots$ exd $163 \times 45$ 0-0 6: эxe6 18 Bxét Kh8 19 Bиб: 196 3xe8 Ne6 21 Rxf6 Rxf6 22 Bxg7+ Kxg 723 Rxb $7+$ Kaf 24 0e4+ when white wins

16 Qf4 Ndxe5 17 Rbel Qc5+
17... O-0 loses to $18 \mathrm{Nf} 6+$ and after 17...h6 18 Rxe5 hxg 519 Oxf7+ Kd8 20 Rdl White is also winning.
.18 Kh1 Qxc4 19 Nc7+Kf8 20 Nxa8 h6: 21 Nb6

21 Bh4 Qxf4 22 Rxf4 Ng6 gives Black goodi chances.
$21 \ldots$ hxg5 22 Nxc4 $9 x f 423$ Nxe5 Nxe5 24 Rxe5 Bd7: 25 Rxf4 Ke7 25 Rc5 BC6 27 Rd4 Rh6

At last Black has developed his remaining pieces and there is little that either side can attempt.

28 Kg 1 Rg 629 Rd 2 Rg 430 h 3 Rf 4 $31 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 32 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{f} 6, \frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$.

Neither side can make any progress Any improvements would be welcomed preferably not over the board:

FOR THE COLLECTOR of Australasian chess literature, John van Manen (NSW) has published (1978) what I found to be a most interesting annotated bibliography entitled THE CHESS LITERATURE OF AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

Listings in this booklet include books, bulletins, periodicals and pamphlets. Naturally the New Zealand section is less extensive than the Australian, although there are 35 NZ items listed.

Price is $\$ 5.00$ and orders should be sent to the Editor.

## NZCA RATING LIST

This list incorporates the following events, the results of which were received by 0 November, namely New Zealand Championship \& Premier Reserve 1977/78, Auckland Open Easter), Civic Easter Tournaments, North Island Ch'p, Auckland Centre Rating Tournament, National Schoolpupils Ch'p, Upper Hutt Club Ch'ps and Auck1and Labour Weekend Tournament.

The lateness of the list is due entirely to our never receiving, from the Civic Chess Club, the Swiss Rating cards for the Premier Reserve. Finally, in desperation ers from the plis

This list includes only those players active during the last two years. For rovisionally rated players, the number of games played follows the rating.


## Sarapu Annotates....

Ortvin Sarapu IM provides notes to two recent games. The first, played in August, was from an interclub match in ackland and the second game was played in the twelfth round of the olympiad in Buenos Aires.

R.W.SMITH<br>0. SARAPU

English opering
1 c4 Nf6 $2 \mathrm{Nc}_{3}$ e5 3 g 3
With this move White is playing a kind of Dragon variation with colours reversed.
$3 . .$. c6
The Keres variation - Black challenges the centre with his pawns.

## 4 d4

A logical continuation here is 4 Bg 2 as Cardoso played against me in our 1967 match in Auckland. After 4...d5 5 cxd 5 cxd5 6 Qb3?: Ne6: 7 Nxd5 Na4 8 Oc4 Nxd5 9 Bxd5 b5! 10 Bxf7+ Ke $7110 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{Nc} 2+12$ Kd1 Nxal 13 Qxa8 Qc7! 14 Bb3 Be6! Black was winning

Korchnoi - Keres (1957) went 4 Nf3 45 Nd4 d5 6 cxd5 exd5 7 d3 Be5 8 Nb 3 Bb4 $9 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \quad 0-0100-0$ with an even game.
$4 \ldots$ exd4 5 Qxd4 d5 6 cxd5 cxd5
The white queen is badiy placed and Black has free play.

## 7 Bg2

On 7 Eg5 follows 7...Ne6: 8 0a4 44 $0-0-0$ Bd7 10 Bh3 Be7 11 Bxf6 Bxf6 12 Bxd7+ Qxd7 13 e3 0-0-0 14 Nge2 d3: and black is winning - analysis by Keres. Passive is 7 Nf3 Ne6 8 Qa4 d4! 9 Nb 5 Be 5 10 Bg 2 0-0 11 0-0 a6 $=+$, Uhlmann Gligoric 1956.

7 ... Nc6 8 Qa4 d4! 9 Ne4 Bb4+
In my game with Naranja (Auckland Zonal 1967) I played here 9...Nxe4 10 Bxe4 Bb4+ 11 Kfl Qb6 12 a3 Be7 13 h 4 Be 14 b4 0-0 15 Nh3 Ne5 16 Bb2 Nc4 17 Bc 1 Bf6 with a big advantage.

10 Bd 2
In the Burroughs tournament earlier this year Cardoso preferred $10 \mathrm{Kfl} 0-0$ 11 Bg. 5 Be7 12 h 4 Bf5 13 Nxf6+ Bxf6 14 Rd1 Bxg5 15 hxg5 Qb6 with a better game for Black.

10 ... Bxd2+ 11 Nxd2 0-0 12 Bxc6? White has a very difficult position already. On $12 \mathrm{Ng} f$ follows the strong 12...d3., yet this would be better than taking the pawn. Alekhine used to say, "A dying man will eat anything!" It is not clear that after $12 \mathrm{Ngf3} \mathrm{~d} 313 \mathrm{e} 3$ White should lose his inferior position. $12 \ldots$ bxc6 13 Qxc6 Rb8 14 Qci

Defending the twin threats of Bb7 and Rxb2, but getting further behind in development.

14 ... Qd5: 15 f3
After long deliberation. On the natural 15 Ngf 3 follows Re8 or even Bh3 or Ba6 - all very strong moves.
$15 \ldots$ Ba6 16 b3 Rfe8 17 h4 d3. 18 e4 Rbc8

Bringing the last inactive piece into play. Black could sacrifice even here with advantage.

19 Qd1 Nxe4! 20 fxe4 Rxe4+! 21 Kfl
After 21 Nxe4 Qxe4+ $22 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 2+$ wins the queen or mates.
$21 . . . \operatorname{Re} 222 \mathrm{Ngf3} \mathrm{Rc} 2 ., 0: 1$.
There is no defence against the threat of Rcxd2. On 23 Rh2, Rxh2 24 Nxh2 Qh1+ 25 kf2 $\mathrm{Qxh} 2+26$ Ke 3 Qxg $3+$ wins the easy way

As my notes show, this variation has been with me for a long time. It is not enough to look up in the book and memorise a line of play. One has to play many games with it as well. Then, positions and combinations repeat themselves in the same or similar settings.

## 0.SARAPU H.TAKEMOTO

## Sicilian Defence

1 e4 c5 $2 \mathrm{Ne} 2 \mathrm{~d} 63 \mathrm{Nbc} 3 \mathrm{Nf6} 4 \mathrm{~g} 3$ Nc6 5 Bg 2 e6 $60-0 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{~d} 4$

White can also play 7 d 3 and the Closed Sicilian is to White's advantage as Black's development is not the best way to meet the Closed variation without g6 and Bg7.

10 Bg5:

Detcer than 10 Pf4 Ne5! as the text Chreatens to weaken Black's kingside paws by gaff.
$10 \ldots{ }^{10}{ }^{11} 8 \times f 6 \mathrm{Bxf6} 12 \mathrm{Nd} 4 \mathrm{Nxd4}$ 13 OxdA OC7 14 Khi Bd7 15 f 4 OC5

The champion of Japan did not like to face White's attack and is after corplications.

16 Qxc5:
Also good was 16 Qd3 with an attack on e6 by f4-f. 5 etc, but i saw a chance to sacrifice a pawn for the positionally won endgame which follows.
$16 \ldots$ dxc5 17 e5 0-0-0 18 f5:!
Black is forced to accept the sacrifice as on $18 . . . e x f 5$ follows 19 Nd5.
$18 \ldots$ fxe5 19 f6 Bd6 20 Radl Bb5 21 Rfel Kc7 22 Rd2 Bc6 23 Redl h6?

In order to stop the threat of Ne 4 gs after the bishops are exchanged. Now White has the possibility of forcing a passed pawn on the kingside

24 Вхс6 Кхсб 25 Ne4:
This endgane must be lost for Black - his bishop is hopelessly bad.

25 ... Bc7 26 Rxd8 Rxd8 27 Rxd8 Bxd8 28 c 4 !

Black's king is also restricted by his own pawn chain.

28 ... Kd7
It is Black's turn to sacrifice a pawn, but accepting the pawn would allow the bishop to come alive via b6 to d 4 .

29 h 4 :
Not only threatening to procure a passed pawn but also threatening h5 to stop the black king going via h 7 to g 6 and f 5 .
$29 \ldots$ h5 $30 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Ke} 8 \quad 31 \mathrm{~g} 5 \mathrm{Ba} 532$


I could have played here 34 Ng 3 , but there is no hurry. With the text White has the threat, in a king and pawn ending, of a5 combined with attack on $c 5$ by the king
$34 \ldots$ Kf8 35 Ng 3 !
DIAGRAM


The king and pawn ending is lost for Black despite his extra pawn! Most unasual in king \& pawn endgames. This is the reason I preferred this game to cther more tactical or attacking games in Buetros Aires

After 35 ...Bxg 36 Kxg 3 Kg 8 ( $36 .$. Kes is no better - also 37 a5!*) 37 a5 bxa5 38 Kf3 Kh7 39 Ke 4 Kg6 40 b3 a4 41 bxa4 a5 $42 \mathrm{Kxe} 5 \mathrm{Kh} 743 \mathrm{Kd6} \mathrm{Kg} 644 \mathrm{Kxc} 5$ Ki5 45 Kd6 e5 46 cs and white wins as he queens with check
*Even more instructive is the variation (35...Bxg3 36 Kxg3) Kes!, e.g. 37 41 bxat 542 Ke3 17 kfl Iating aince black cannot continue 43 KC6 becauce of 44 66! 43 Ke8: 45 Kxe5 Kal 46 Kf4 Ke8 47 Ke4! Kde 48 Ke3 Kd 49 Kf31 (triangulation again) 49. Kas 50 Ke1 the same position as 9...kab 50 кe4 (the same position as Rove) 50 ...Kd 51 Kf4 Kds Ke5 \& 53 Kd6 +-) 52 66t fug6 53 Kg5 4 Kog6 kf8 55 Kxh5 and finally the 4 Kxg6 Kf8 55 Kxh5 and finally the win is ciear - Editor.

## 36 Nxh5 Bd4

At last the bishop is in the game but too late to save it.
$37 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{e} 4 \quad 38 \mathrm{Ng} 3$ e3 39 Ne 2 a5 40 Kg4 Kg8 $41 \mathrm{Kf} 3,1: 0$.

Black actually sealed, but resigned ithout further play. On 41...Kh7 ther ollows 42 Nf 4 Kh 843 Ng 2 Kh 744 h 5 ? the knight to e5 and will win the b- or f-pawn as well.

## Local News

 Twenty-two teams competed in theAUCKLAND SECONDARY SCHOOLS TEAM CH'P Northern Zone winners were Auckland $33 \frac{1}{2} /$ 42 followed by Lynfield College $26 \frac{1}{2}$. In the Southern Zone Mr Albert Gramar The 42 narrowly headed Kings College 33. The semi-final $1 \frac{1}{2}$ and 3 , Kings $2 \frac{1}{2}$, Gramar 2\% College $4^{\frac{1}{2}}: 1^{\frac{1}{2}}$. llege 4 $4 \frac{1}{2}$.

Rutherford High easily wo the ${ }^{\text {B- }}$
de while the INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS grade while the
was won by Henderson quite convincing1y.

The 1978 OTAGO CLUB CHAMPIONSHIP has been won by Tony Love, a seventh former at a local Dunedin high school. By wining round two and finishing second in ound three Love is assured of the titie ith one round remaining. The championhip is decided by adding each play ther rounds.

The third round saw a return to fo f last year's champion Philip Paris ter a dismal performance in round .

Round two resurs $2 \frac{1}{2}$; R.L.Perry \& M. R.R.Foord 2; M.White 1

Round three: P.o.Paris 4/5; A.J.Love 1, M.R.R.Foord 3; G.G.Haase $2 \frac{1}{2}$; R.Van't Steen 1; D.Weegenaar 0.
Paris - Haase, Vienna Gambit (2nd round) e4 e5 2 Nc3 Nf6 3 f4 d5 4 fxe5 Nxe4 5 d3 Bb4 6 dxe4 Qh4+ 7 Ke2 Bxc3 8
 Ke3 Bxf $3 \quad 12 \mathrm{Bb5}+\mathrm{c6} \quad 13 \mathrm{gxf3} \mathrm{cxb} 514$ Qxe4 Qh6+ $15 \mathrm{Ky2}$ Qc6 16 Qxc6 Nxc 6 $\operatorname{Rg} 1 \mathrm{Rg} 8 \quad 18$ a4 $\mathrm{bxa}^{2} 19 \mathrm{Rxa4} 0-03 \mathrm{Bd} 4$ $\mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Rd} 5 \quad 21 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{a6} 22 \mathrm{Kf3} \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 23 \mathrm{Bd4}$ Rgd8 24 Rdl R8d7 $25 \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{Ra} 5 \quad 26 \mathrm{Rdal}$ Rxa4 27 Rxa4 Kd8 28 f5 Ke8 29 f6 Rd $30 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Kd} 7 \mathrm{3l} \mathrm{Bc} 5 \mathrm{Ke} 6 \quad 32 \mathrm{Bd} 6 \mathrm{Ra} 8 \mathrm{~B}$
 $37 \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{~g} 5 \quad 38 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Rg} 8 \quad 39 \mathrm{Ral} \mathrm{g}^{4} 10 \mathrm{~K}$ g3 $41 \mathrm{RgI} \mathrm{g} 2 \quad 42 \mathrm{Bc} 7 \mathrm{a4} 43 \mathrm{Rdl} \mathrm{Nd} 4$ ?
 47 Ke4 Qg4+ $48 \mathrm{Kd3}$ Oxd4+ 49 exd4 a2 $50 \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{alQ} 54 \mathrm{Kd3}$ Qu5 $55 \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{Qf3} 0$ : 1 Kd4 Qh4+ 54 Kd 3 Qxh5 $55 \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{Qf3}, 0: 1$.

With over 50 entries this year, the AUCKL AND CENTRE CHAMPIONSHIPS were played in four grades. Robert Smith won a
relatively weak A-grade despite losing to fast improving Michael Steadman. Bob Davies finally turned in a consistent performance more in line with his real strength than weekend results would indicate.

123456789012
R.W.Smith R.E.Davies P.B.Goffin M. Steadman C.A.Rose C.A.Rose
P.Spiller G.J.S.S.Law G.J.S.Law G.Trundle
P. Koloszar P.Koloszar
K.Kinchant D.Storey T.J.Free

26 e5 Nd5 27 NSe4 Rcd8 28 Nd6 Ob6+ 29 Wh2 Reb 30 Nge 4 Qe3 31 Qxe3 Nxe3 32 Rel Nas $33 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{~kg} 7 ?$ ? (Time pressure; correct was 33,..f6t with chances for
both sides 34 Nc 5 ke ? 35 f5 f6 36 NeGt Rxe6 37 Exe6, i : 0.

Ron heasey conceded only three draws in winning the B-grade with $11 \frac{1}{2} / 13$ ahead of G.Pitts $10 \frac{1}{2}$ and R.Lannie 10 .

The two divisions of the C-grade each provided two finalists, the play-off. scores being R.Watt and P.R.Wilcock $4 \frac{1}{2} / 6$, S.C.Moratti 2, B.M.Winsor 1

The 1978 PHILIPS TOURNAMENT in Wellington attracted 68 players who competed in 17 groups of four with Philips products as prizes. In fact more than hal the entrants won prizes

Group A: L.Aptekar \& A.Feneridis 2, D. Beach $1 \frac{1}{2}$, M.Evans $\frac{1}{2}$. Group B: E.Deben P. Hawkes \& M.Wigbout 2, R.O'Callahan 0 . Group C: P.L.Cordue $2 \frac{1}{2}$, B.Carpinter 2, Z.Frankel 1, D.Goodhall $\frac{1}{2}$. Group D: B Law \& M.Roberts 2, J.Sarfati \& A.Borren 1. Group E: C.Cowan 3, W.Beutner $1 \frac{1}{2}$, R. Kent 1, T.Spiller $\frac{1}{2}$. Group F: R.Shuker, F.Foster \& M.Noble 2, S.Severinsen 0 . Group G: B.Foster, J.Nysse \& J.B.Kay 2, B.Emslie 0. Group H: L.McLaren 3, G. Marner 2, D.Haak 1, P.Chin 0. Group I: D.Cunningham 3, A.Grkow 2, A.Ladd 1, M Sinclair 0. Group J: K.McGrath \& B. Dinkgreve $2 \frac{1}{2}$, J.Hartley 1, A.Frear 0 Group K: D.Scott $2 \frac{1}{2}$, D.Paul \& P.Reid $1 \frac{1}{2}$, N.Marner $\frac{1}{2}$. Group L: S.Hill 3, M.Sims , R.Clover I, B.Delany 0. Group M: K. Feneridis $2 \frac{1}{2}$, L.Stonehouse $1 \frac{1}{2}$, J.Phillip , T.Hughes 0. Group N: K.Chandler \& A. Swanink $2 \frac{1}{2}$, K.Sims \& N.Papp $\frac{1}{2}$. Group 0: M.Staples \& S.Choat 2, I.P.Stinson $1^{\frac{1}{2}}$, R.Papp $\frac{1}{2}$. Group P: A.Ker 3, N.Cunningham 2, J.Blaikie 1, B.Anderson 0.

As expected the AUCKLAND INTERCLUB competition was easily won by the North Shore 'A' team comprising (usually) 0 . Sarapu, P.Garbett, P.Stuart, M.Whaley, .Hensman \& D.Gollogly. Auckland 'A was a very clear second even after being held to a 3 : 3 tie by North Shore 'B in the last round. University was expected to provide a strong challenge to these two but they never recovered from Instead, Auckland 'B' played steadily to narrowly head home the main bunch

Scores: North Shore 'A' 41. Auck and 'A' 34ㄴㄹ; Auckland 'B' 24; HowickPakuranga 2312; University 22; Waitemat North Shore 'B' 21; Papatoetoe 18 $\frac{1}{2}$; Birkdale North $10 \frac{1}{2}$.

## CORRESPONDENCE CHESS RESULTS

NZCCA Trophy Tournament results noti fied before 31 October:

45th N. 2 . Championshtp: Van Dijk 1 anderson, 1 Lynn; Lynn 4 Beach, 1 Stuart Van Dijk, 1 Anderson, I Eletcher; Smith Fletcher, 1 Beach; Anderson 2 Flet cher; Stuart 1 Fletcher, 1 Anderson. Leaders: Lynn $5 \frac{1}{2} / 8$, Van Dijik $5 \frac{1}{3} / 6$; Stuart /5; Smith 3/4.

Championship Reserve: Luey 1 Kinchant; Rice 1 Ter Horst, $\frac{1}{2}$ Roundill, $\frac{k}{2}$ Guptill, 1 Kinchant; Heasman 1 Baynard inchant 1 French; French 1 Roundill. Class 2: Mataga 1 Rogers; Cooper ishop, L Lovelock; Hull 1 Steadman. Millar 1 Cooper; Hignett 1 Johnstone,
Mataga; Bishop 1 Johnstone; Lovelock Mataga; Bishop 1 Johnstone; Lovelock ignett.
Class 3 Red: MCAuliffe 1 Billing, 1 Thomas; Brightwell I Thomas, 1 Hagan, Bailey, 1 Billing; Billing 1 Bailey, Watt, Frost Hagan Frost Wat Watt, 1 Frost Hag ailey.
Class 3 Green: Mazur $\frac{1}{2}$ Wilcock, 1 Newell; Melville 1 Martin, I Salter, 1 Nell, 1 Heremaia, 2 Fisher; De Groot saltor Partion 7 Salter. eremaia; Passmore 1 Salter
Class 3 Blue: Whitlock 1 Montgomery Peath I Peterson ith 1 MoBert 1 Bowler MoBeath 1 Horgo De Groot l witlock Whitlock: Ion McBeath.
Class 4 Red: Maxwell 1 Brown; Gumer 1 Morgan; Fraser 1 Gummer.

Class 4 Green: Ansley 1 Dainty, 1 ing; Anderson 1 King, 1 Dainty, 1 Reed 1 Burton; King 1 Burton, 1 Martin, Martin $\frac{1}{2}$ O'Connor, 1 Boyden; Dainty $\frac{1}{2}$ 'Connor, 1 Ferguson; Alexander 1 King Lockwood 1 Burton; Cribbett 1 Alexander.

Class 5: Stynman 1 Absolum, 1 McCormick; Brohm 1 Corbett; King 1 Absolum McCormick 1 Wilson, 1 Absolum; Wilson Corbett; Jones 1 Corbett, l Kingdon, Absolum.

## Overseas News

First we give the crosstables of the three strongest international tournaments of 1978．Ail the players bar Ivanovic were GM＇s－and Ivanovic has since got the title！
BUGOJNO（Yugo）， 26 Feb－ 16 March

|  |  | 1234567890123456 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Karpov | 2725 |  |
| Spassky | 2630 | 1／2 $\times \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Timman | 2585 | $1 \frac{1}{2} \times 1 / 2 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 00111 \frac{1}{2} 011 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Ljubojevic． | 2605 | $01 \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2} 000 \frac{1}{2} / 21 \frac{1}{2} 1118812$ |
| Tal | 2625 | $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Hor | 2620 | $00 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times 0 \times \frac{1}{2} 111 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 11 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Larsen | 26 | $0010 \frac{1}{2} 1 \times 1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 11 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Balashov | 2590 | $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 00 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ O $0 \times 1 / 211 / 2$ |
| нüb | 2595 | $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 011 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1$. |
| 10 Miles | 2565 | $00 \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 11 Ivkov | 2515 | $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 11 / \frac{1}{2} / \frac{1}{2} 00^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times 1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 000061 / 2$ |
| 12 Portisch | 2630 | $0 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 00 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2} 116 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 13 Byrne | 2550 | $\frac{1}{2} 01 \frac{1}{2} 0000 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times 1 / 21 \frac{1}{2} 66$ |
| 14 Vukic | 2480 |  |
| 15 Bukic | 2500 | $0000 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 11 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} 5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
|  | 2565 | $\frac{1}{2} 01 / 200 \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2} 0010{ }^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2}$ |

NIKSIC（Yugo）， 6 － 20 June

|  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Category 13 （2568）$G=5 \frac{1}{2}$
TILBURG（2nd Interpolis）， 31 August－ 15 September

| Portisch | $2630 \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ 1 $111 / \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 0011 / 2$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Timman |  |
| Dzhindzhikhashvili | $2550 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times 10 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Hübn | $25950 \frac{1}{2} 0 \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1}$ |
| Mile | $25650 \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2} \times 00 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Browne | 2550 0 $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1 \times 1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Hort | 2620 1／2 $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 10 \times 1 / 20$ |
| 8 Spassky | $2630 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times 0 \times 11 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Larsen | 2620 I |
| 10 Ljubojevic | $260510 \frac{1 / 201 / 201 / 2}{}$ |
| 11 Sosonko |  |
| 12 Ribli | 2585 直 $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} 0100 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ |

Bugojno was briefly re－ ported in the April issue Here，we give three games from each of the other two events．
Timman－Ribli，Sicilian． 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd 4 Nf6 5 Nc3 a6 6 Bg5 é 7 f4 Qb6 8 Qd2 Qxb2 9 Rb 1 Qa3 10 f5 Nc6 11 fxe6 fxe6 12 Nxc6 bxc6 13 e5 dxe5 14 Bxf6 gxf6 15 Ne4 Be7 16 Be 2 h $5 \quad 17$ Rb3 Qa4 18 Nxf6t Bxf6 19 c． 4 Bh4t 20 g 3 Be7 $210-0$ Bd7 22 kb 7 Rd8 23 Bd 3 Bc5＋ 24 Kh 1 Rg 825 Be 2 Ke7 26 Bxh5 $\operatorname{Rg} 727$ Oh6 Qxc4 28 Qxg7t Kd6 29 Qf 6 Bd 430 Rfb 1 Qd 331 R 6 b 3 Qf5 32 Qxd8 Qxh 533 Qb $8+$ Kd5 34 Qc7 Qh7 35 Rel Qf7 $36 \mathrm{Rd} 3 \mathrm{Kc}^{4} 37 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \mathrm{Bc} 3 \quad 38$ Qxd7 Qf3＋ $39 \mathrm{Kgl}, 1: 0$ ．
Uhlmann－Ljubojevic，Eng－ 1ish： 1 c 4 c5 $2 \mathrm{Nf}_{3} \mathrm{~g}^{6} 3$ $\mathrm{d}_{4} \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 4 \mathrm{e}^{4} \mathrm{cxd} 4 \quad 5 \mathrm{Nxd4}$ Ne6 6 Be3 d6 9 Nc3 ab Oc 711 Ndb5 axb 512 Nxb5 Oc6 13 Nxd6＋Ke7 14 Qb4 Kf6 15 f4 g5 16 fxe5t Kg6 17 Nxf7， 1 ： 0.
Guliko－Portisch，R．Lopez： 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Ne6 3 Bb 5
 6 Rel b5 7 Bb 3 d 68 c 3 $0-0 \quad 9 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 410 \mathrm{Be} 3 \operatorname{exd} 4$ 11 cxd4 Na5 12 Bc 2 C 5 dxc5 dxc5 14 Nbd 2 Nc 615
 $\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{Be} & 18 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{Qb} 6 \\ 19 & \mathrm{Ng} 5\end{array}$ Rfd8 20 Qf3 Nd7 21 e5 g6 22 Qg 3 NE8 23 Ne4 Bxb3 24 $\begin{array}{llllll}\mathrm{axb} 3 & \mathrm{Ne} 6 & 25 \mathrm{f4} & \mathrm{Nd} 4 & 26 \mathrm{f5}\end{array}$ Nxf5 27 Nf6t Kh8 28 Bxf5 gxf5 $29 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Rg} 8 \quad 30$ é c 4 31 Kh1 $4{ }^{32}$ Qc $3 \mathrm{Rg}_{3} 35$ Nh5 f6 34 Bxf6 Bxf6 35 Qxf6 1 ： 0 ．

Larsen－Hort，Queen＇s Gam－ Larsen－Hort，Queen＇s Gam $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { bit：} 1 & \text { c } 4 & \text { c5 } & 2 & \text { Nc3 } \\ \text { e3 Nf } & \text { Ne6 } \\ 4 & \text { Nf3 e6 } & 5 & \text { d } 4 \\ \text { d }\end{array}$ 6 cxd5 exd5 7 Be 2 Bg 48

12 Nxe4 dxe4 13 Bxc4 exf3 14 Qxf3 Qf6 15 d5 Qxb2 16 dxc6 Qe5 17 cxb $7 \mathrm{Rd} 8 \quad 18$ Radl Rxd1 19 Rxdi $0-0 \quad 20$ Rd5 Qalt 21 Kh2 Be6 22 Qfe Bxd5 23 Bxd5 Qf6 24 Qxb4 Qd8 25 Qc． 5 Qb $8+26 \mathrm{~g} 3$ Rd8 27 a 4 g5 28 e4 ReS $29 \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 30 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Kg} 731$ Be6 Re6 32 b5 f6 33 Qf5， 1 ： 0.
Portisch－Sosonko，Nimzoindian Defence： 1 d 4 Nf 62 c4 e6 $3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \quad 4$ e3 c5 5 Bd3 Nc6 6 Nf3 d5 $740-0$ 0－0 8 a3 Bxe 3 9 bxc3 dxc4 10 Bxc4 Qc7 11 Ba2 e5 12 Qc2 Bg4 13 dxe5 Nxe5 14 Nel Rad8 15 f3 Be6 16 c4 4 Q5 17 Bb2 Rd2 18 Qcl Na3 19 Qc3 Qxc3 20 Bxc3 Rxa2 21 Rxa2 Bxc4 22 Rd2 Nd5 23 Nxd3 Nxe3 24 Ke2 $f 525$ Rel Ne4＋ 26 fxe4 Bxd3 27 Rxc5 Bxe4 28 Rc7 be6 $29 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Re} 8 \quad 30 \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{~h} 6$ 31 Kxf5 Rxe3 32 Rd8 + Kh7 33 Rec 8 Re4t 34 Kff $4 \mathrm{Re} 235 \mathrm{Rh} 8+\mathrm{Kg} 636$ Rhe 8 Bd 337 Rxe2 Bxe2 $38 \mathrm{Rc} 7,1: 0$.

Larsen－Hubner，English： 1 c 4 Nf6 2 Nf3 c5 3 Nc3 Nc6 4 g3 g6 5 Bg 2 Bg 7 $0-0$ 0－0 7 d3 a6 8 Bf4 d6 9 Qd2 Rb8 10 Bh6 b5 11 Bxg7 Kxg7 12 b3 Qa5 13 Rfdl Bb7 14 Racl Rfc8 15 exb5 axb5 16 d4 cxd4 17 Nxd4 Nxd4 18 Oxd4 Bxg2 19 Kxg2 Qb6 20 Qd2 Rc5 21 f3 Rbc8 22 a4 Qa5 23 axb5 Rxc3 24 b6 R8e5 25 b7 Rxb3 26 Qxa5 Rxa5 27 Rc7 Nd5 28 Rd3 Rb2 $29 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \operatorname{Rxd} 230 \mathrm{~b} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ Rxe2＋， $0: 1$

USA CHAMPIONSHIP，Pasadena， $4 / 26$ June： 1 Kavalek 10／14； 2 Tarjan 9；3－4 Mednis \＆Shamkovich 8；5－7 Byrne，Lein \＆N．Weinstein 7l ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ ； 8 Rogoff 7；9－10 Benko \＆Lombardy $6 \frac{1}{2}$ ；11－12 Soltis \＆ Zuckerman 6； 13 Christiansen 51／2；14－15 Commons \＆Regan 5.

GM Browne withdrew in the first round after a hassle over lighting thus forfeiting any chance of a place in an Interzonal this cycle．

TITOVO UZICE（Yugo）， 25 June－10 July： 1 Ljubojevic 10／13； 2 Smejkal 9； 3 Raj－ kovic 8； 4 Ermenkov 712 $; ~ 5-7$ Andersson， Bagirov \＆Kurajica 7；8－10 Kovacevic， Matulovic \＆Tringov 61 $\frac{1}{2}$ ； 11 Jansa $5 \frac{1}{2}$ ； 12－14 Jovcic，Radoicic \＆Todorcevic 3 $3 \frac{1}{2}$ ．

Category $10(2480), \mathrm{G}=8, \mathrm{I}=6 \frac{1}{2}$ ．
AMSTERDAM（18th IBM），12／29 July： 1 Timman 9 $9 \frac{1}{2} / 13$ ； 2 Ribli $8 \frac{1}{2}$ ；3－5 Dzhin－ 1 Timman $9 \frac{1}{2} / 13 ; 2$ Ribli $8 \frac{1}{2} ; \quad 3-5$ Dzhin－
dzhikhashvil1，Hort $\&$ Pfleger $7 \frac{1}{2} ; ~ 6-7$ dzhikhashvil1，Hort \＆Pfleger $7 \frac{1}{2} ; 667$
Andersson \＆Romanishin 7； 8 Ljubojevic

6六； 9 Langeweg 6；10－11 Adorian \＆ Miles 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ； 12 Ree 5； 13 Nikolac $4 \frac{1}{2} ; 14$ Browne $3 \frac{1}{2}$ ．Category 12 （ 2550 ），$G=7$ ． A．Jusupov， 1977 World Junior champi－ on，won Group B with $9 \frac{1}{2} / 13$ so making a GM norm．

BUDAPEST，12／29 August：I Nunn 10／15 final GM norm）； 2 Csom $9 \frac{1}{2} ; \quad 3-4$ Adorian $\&$ Kuzmin 9；5－6 Vadasz \＆Meduis $8 \frac{1}{2} ; 7-8$ Jansa \＆Malich 8 ．．．． 16 piayers

MONTILLA－MORILES（Spain），15／25 Aug－ 1st： 1 Spassky $6 \frac{1}{2} / 9$ ； $2-5$ Dellon，Miles， fort \＆Gligoric 6 ； 6 Ciocaltea $4 \frac{1}{2}$ ；7－8 Sanz \＆Visier $3 \frac{1}{2}$ ； 9 Rivas 3； 10 Harit－ ver 0 ．

WORLD UNDER－26 TEAM CH＇P（Mexico City）， 19 August－7 September： 1 England $26 \%$ ； 2 USSR 2512； 3 Cuba 24 $\frac{1}{2}$ ；4．USA 22立； 5 Brazil 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ ； 6 Canada $15 \frac{1}{2}$ ； Colombia 15； 8 Mexico 13； 9 Australia 12； 10 Scotland 8．A very small entry for this inaugural event．

WOMEN＇S WORLD CH＇P MATCH（Pitsunda USSR）， 19 August－5 October：17－year old Maya Chiburdanidze won the title by de－ feating Nona Gaprindashvili $8 \frac{1}{2}$ ： $6 \frac{1}{2}$ in the best－of－16 clash．Chiburdanidze won the 4 th， 5 th， 9 th $\& 13$ th games while Gaprindashvili took the 7th \＆1lth．The cormer champion missed a win in the 15 th game．

BHEL（India，GM Circuit），September： 1 Vasiukov（GM）10／12； 2 Torre（GM） $9 \frac{1}{2}$ ； 3 Lein（GM）9；4－6 Shirazi（IM），Sharif IM）\＆R．Rodriguez（IM）7； 7 Ravisekhar 612 ； 8 Thipsay 6； 9 Bordonada 5； 10 Kascarinas（IM）4；11－12 Hassan \＆Gha lib 3； 13 Liew 1.

WORLD JUNIOR CH＇P（Graz，Austria）， September：This event was dominated by the two Soviet entries Yusupov（defending champion）and the lesser known Dolmatov ith is compatriot．Then J．Fries－Nielsen （Den）9；G．Bjork（Swed）\＆G．Barbero （Arg）83 ${ }^{\frac{3}{2}}$ M．Sisniega（Mex）\＆J．Van der Wiel（Holl）8；N．Ristic（Yugo），K．Tibor （Hung），T．Toschkov（Bulg），O．Foisor（Rum） \＆G．Morrison（Scot）71／2． field. Tony writes that this was reckoned to be the strongest ever World Junior but adds, 'Perhaps they say this every ear.

SINGAPORE, 19/30 November, Froperly alled the "First Singapore Internatioal Women's Chess Tourrament", this event took the place of the Zonal which nobody came forward to organise. Participation was by invitation. After a very close struggie the final scores were: 1 N.Kellner (Aust) $4 \frac{1}{2} / 7$; 2-4 L.F.Chan (Sing), L.Pope (Aust) \& H.L.Tan (Sing) 4; 5-6 M.Watai (Japan) \& F.Foster (NZ) 3 $\frac{1}{2}$; 7 G.G.Padrigo (Phil) 3; 8 H.M.Marsuchin (Indo) $1 \frac{1}{2}$.

## RATINGS continued
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## FEATURES

Book Reviews
33, 141
an You See the Combinations?
30, 59
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## TOURNAMENTS

Aaronson Masters
Alic:-t
Alica-te
Amsterdam (IBM)
$\begin{array}{ll}149 & 49,73,149\end{array}$
42, 146
uck1 and
Auckland Interschools
147
146
Auckland Open Ch'p
48, 61
AuckIand Provincial Schoolpupils 72, 115
Auckland Star Businesshouse 197721
Auckland University Open
105
25
Australian Ch'p 1977/78
2, 95
Australian Junior Ch'p 38
Baguio City
Beersheba
Bhe 1
BIedisloe Cup
British Ch'p
121
118
149
Budapest (4th Tungsram) 149
ugojno
46,148
40
Bulgarian Ch'p 1977

87, 106
Canterbury 40-40 87, 106
Canterbury Provincial Schoolpupils 48, 84
Dortmund

East German Ch'p
Greek Ch'p
Groningen 1977/78
Hastings $1977 / 78$
Howick-Pakuranga Open
Hradec Kralove 1977/8 Hungarian Ch'p 1977 Ito (Zonal)
Jakarta
Kiel
Las Palmas
Leipzig 1977
Lone Pine
Maspalomas
Montilla-Moriles
Moscow Ch'p
New York 1977
N.Z. Ch'p 1977/78
N.Z. Corres.Ch'p
N.Z. Women's Ch'p
N.Z. Schoolpupils

Niksic
49,73

North Island Ch'p $\quad 148$
North Shore C.C. 58,146
Olympiad 41,74,122
Otago C.c. $21,58,115,146$
Otago Easter Open 60
otago Schoolpupils
Penang
Philips (Well.)
73
147
Premier Reserve 1977/8 18
Quito 1977
Restricted Rating
Reykjavik
1977/78
Santa Fe de Bogota
Singapore (Zonal)
South Island Ch'p
Tilburg
Titovo Uzice
Upper Hutt DB 40-40 USA Ch'p
USSR Ch'p 1977149
USSR Women's Ch'p '77 $\quad 1,40$ USSR Zonal
Waitemata C.C.
95
95
Waitemata Open
Wellington Queen's
Birthday Weekend 90
Wellington (Burroughs) 49
Wellington Interclub 116
Wellington Schoolpupils
Wijk-aan-Zee
Winstone Open

| 87 |
| :--- |
| 110 |

World U-26 Ch p 149
$\begin{array}{lr}\text { World U-26 'Team Ch'p } & 149 \\ \text { Yugoslav Ch'p } & 40\end{array}$

## MATCHES

Auckland v Otago

Beach v Evans
Beach v Evans
116
Gaprindashyili
Chiburdanidze v Kushir 149 Chiburdanidze Kushnir 41 Kavalat y Anderson 98,i31 Korchoo: y Spassky Hew Fipmenth y Hamiton 88 New flymuth $v$ Hamilton 88 North Shore ir Awek-n North Shore $\%$ Aucttago v C'bury 1977 an Tinaru v Otage

## GAMES

ADAMS D - Goliogly 18 ANDERSON - Baker 138, Cle mance 12 , Jensen 10 ,
Nokes 138, Perry 29
Smith 6, Stuart 14.
Wittman 129
APTEKAR - Gollog1y 81,
Laming 78, Smith 65,
Steadman 64, Sutton 54
ARDIANSYAH - Sharif 74 ,
Torre 74
ARNASON - Kuzmin 41
BAKER - Lloyd 137, white
BALASHOV - Miles 46
BASMAN - Weix 32
BATES G - Nokes 136
BEACH D - Evans 116,117 Jensen 86, Marshall 22
Whaley 18
BEACH P - Lane 78
BLOORE - B.Carpinter 19
Whaley 18
BOYCE - Post 138
BROWNE - Polugaevsky 41
Cardoso - Small 55
CARPINTER B - Chandler 85 CATER - Steadman 79
CHANDLER - Anderson 11 ,
Clemance 29, Holzl 129
Hon 74, Perry 6, Quinte-
ros 56, Small 54, Smith
8, Stuart 16, Torre 52
CLARKE - Short 119
CLEMANCE - Garbett 6,
Green 29, Jensen 13,
Laird 8, Pardoen 80,
Small 11, Wansink 82
COOPER - Plaskett 119,
Whiteley 119
CORDUE P - Watson 38
DEBEN - Feneridis 90, Jensen 108
diez del corral - Portisch
129
OORFMAN - Grigorian 2
ESTERMAN - Friedman 71
EVANS M - D. Beach 117
Jackson 85, Love 18
FOSTER b - G1emance 82
FOSTER F - Marsick 82
Stretch 17
FREE - Mataga 31
FREEMA: Andexson 137 Paris 60

Carbett - Anderson 15, Chandler 5, Green 7, Pery 11, Sarapa 10, Saith 13, 111, Whitcley 119
Carcta g - timman 130
COFFIN - Aptekar 80
collogly - F.Foster 78 ,
Haase 19
GReEn E - Anderson 12, Ba-
linas 27, Chandler 14,
54, Evans 88, Fuller 28,
Perry 8, Sarapu 5, Smith
10, Stuart 5,146, Sura-
diradja 52, Weir 110
GREEN P - D. Beach 90, Ca-
ter 83, P.Cordue 90 ,
Gollogly 79
gulko - Portisch 148
HAASE - D.Beach 18, Paris HENSMAN - Power 110
HON - O'Kelly 74
JACKSON - Anderson 139
JAKOBSEN - Browne 130
JENSEN - Chandler 12, Gar8ett 16 , Green 13 , K
6 , Small 8

KARPOV - Korchnoi 98-104, 131-135
Kavalek - Hübner 130 KORCHNOI - Karpov 98-104, 131-134, Spassky 2,3,39

LAIRD - Anderson 5, Chandler 7, Garbett 29, Green 9 , Sarapu 14, Smith 15,
Torre 27
LARSEN - Dominguez 96,
Hort 148, Hübner 149
LEIN - Polugaevsky 130
LEONHARDT - D.Beach 89
LOVE - Adams 115, Freeman
60, Paris 21, Weegenaar

MANINANG - Laird 27 MARSICK - Watson 106 MASCARINAS - Shirazi 53, Sutton 54
MATAGA - Anderson 137 Cornford 19
MATULOVIC - Ivanovic 41 MILES - Spassky 130 (138 NOKES - Mataga 139, Norton NORTON - Freeman 141

OKEY - Whitehouse 88
PANCHENKO - Miles 96 PARDOEN - Whitehouse 79 PARIS - Haase 146
PERER - Tatal 72, Jensen 5, Laird 13, Mataga 137, Sarapu 12, Small 72, Stuart 9, Van Dijk 60,91
POLUGAEVSKY - Pfleger 130 PORTISCH - Hübner 46, Radulov 130, Sosonko 149

QUINTEROS - Green 55, Sharif 56 , Shirazi 52 , Suradiradja 53

RADULOV - Inkiov 40
RAMSAY - P.Green 90
ROBATSCH - Sarapu 129
RODRIGUEZ 0 - Olafsson 96
ROGERS - Tarjan 129
ROUNDLL - Hensman 58, Howard 65

SAMPOUW - Shirazi 54 SARAPU - Anderson 9, Chandler 13,23, Clemance 22, Green 46,106, Jensen 11, Metge 111, Power (66), Sampouw 55, Savaldi 71, Scott 106, Small 21, Takemoto 144, Tan
SARFATI - Oliver 86 ( 129 SHARIF - Sampouw 53, Suradiradja 56
SHEAD - E.Green 106
Shirazi - Sarapu 56
SMALL - Anderson 7, Chandler 10,86, Feneridis 108, Garbett 14, E.Green 12, Laird 29, Torre 51, Verduga 129
SMITH - Clemance 9, Jensen

7, Perry 14, Sarapu 16, SPASSKY - Korchnoi 2, 3,24 SPEELMAN - Cooper 119 (39 SPILLER P - T.Spiller 19 STEADMAN - Davies 78, Sut ton 62
STEAN - Sax 96
STONEHOUSE - Davies 78,
Jensen 111, Mataga 11 STORCHENEGGER - Clemance 80
STUART - Arbuthnott 78, Bachtiar 129, Clemance 5, Garbett 8, Goffin 83 Jensen 15, Laird 10, Pardoen 83, Sarapu 7 Small 12, Whaley 58 SURADIRADJA - Chandler 52, Quinteros 74
SUTTON - Sarapu 65, Shirazi 57, Small 52, Watson (62)
taulbut - Lee 119
THOMAS - Weir 32 ( 148 TTMMAN - Karpov 46, Ribli TORRE - Green 51, Quinteros 52, Suradiradja 56 TROIS - Chandler 129, Korchnoi 130
UHLMANN - Ljubojevic 148
VAN DIJK - Haase 60, Weegenaar 137
VASIUKOV - Chistiakov 41
WANSINK - Vermeer 77
WATSON - Aptekar 64, Beach (D) 46, Byrne 38

WEBB - Garbett 7
WEIR - Metge 111
WHALEY - Marsick 18

## OPENINGS

ALEKHINE DEF: 13,38,46,78, 117
BENONI: 7,9,12,19,51,52, 129
LACKMAR-DIEMER: 81
CARO-KANN: 90,96,131
CATALAN: 9,56,130,131
DUTCH: $6,14,39,41,110,111$ ENGLISH DEF: 119
ENGLISH: $2,3,6,7,8,10,11$, $12,13,15,23,58,78,80,82$, $83,85,86,88,100,111,129$, 130,131,132,133,134,136, 137,144,148,149

FRENCH DEF: 2,3,8,10,17 21,24,39,78,79,81,82, $88,90,104,111,119,129$ 131,132,137
GRUNFELD DEF: 8,14,21,52, 108,119,146
GUIOCO PIANO: 139
HUNGARIAN DEF: 13
KING'S GAMBIT: $19,41,62,137$ KING' S INDIAN ATTACK: 16 , 38,106
KING'S INDIAN DEF: 2,10,12, 52,53,64,65,71,78,79,81, 119
MODERN DEF: $18,58,90,106$, 111,139
NIMZOINDIAN DEF: 5,27,28, $46,54,96,99,100,104,110$, 119,130,149
NIMZOWITSCH DEF: 27,32
OLD INDIAN DEF: 53
OWEN'S DEF: $15,52,86$ (129 PETROFF DEF: $18,74,80,106$, PHILIDOR DEF: 54
PIRC DEF: 18,51,77,85,131, 135, 138
POLISH DEF: 57
PONZIANI OPENING: 6,56
QUEEN'S GAMBIT ACC: 46
QUEEN'S GAMBIT DECL: 3,18,
32,39,46,83,90,98,101,
103,131,132,134,137,18
130 INDIAN DEF: 39,71
QUEEN'S PAWN: 5,58,82,88 RICHTER-VERESOV: 39,117
RUY LOPEZ: 7,10,11,13,14,15
$15,18,40,53,54,55,60,72$, 15, $8,40,53,54,55,60,12$, 4,86,98,99,101,12,103, $108,111,129,131,132,133$, 148
SCOTCH: 74,79
SICILIAN, Dragon:6,7,8,12, 22,29,65,138; RidchterRauzer: 41; Najdorf: 56,74,96,130,141,148;俗 6,9,11,14,16,27,54, 12 , 56,57,60,96; Scheveningen: 7,13,29,52,80,138: gen: 7, $\mathrm{Closed}: 8,55,60,102,106$, 129; Various: 5,7,9,12, 129; Various: 5,7,9,12, $18,29,46,53,64,71,74,18$, I15, DEF: 41,64
TROMPOVSKY ATTACK: 29
TWO KNIGHTS' DEF: 5,19
VIENNA GAME: $14,19,29,39$, 82,146

## A Selection From our Bookshelf.

THE CLASSICAL DUTCH
Robert Bellin
Batsford's partmer to THE LENINGRAD DUTCH, this book covers those lines where Black plays e7-e6. The Dutch is an aggressive weapon in the mould of the Sicilian with Black opting for an asymmetrical pawn formation.
Hardback
\$14.40
THE SICILIAN SCHEVENINGEN C.Pritchett The theory and practice of this popular variation are built around 34 complete games in a somewhat different and more readable approach, Hardback. \$14.95
FRENCH DEFENCE MAIN LINE WINAWER Moles
This important variation of the French ( $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ ) is examined in great detail with considerable emphasis on the strategic Ideas behind it. Many variations have been reassessed as previous judgments often derived from misconceptions of Black's aims. Hardback.

NIMZOWITSCH/LARSEN ATTACK Keene
One of Batsford's Specialist Chess Openings sertes, this book is devoted to systems with b2-b3 for White. A 1977
publication in figurine algebraic notation. Softback.
\$7.25
BENONI William Hartston
This third edition, in figurine algebraic notation, is a complete rewrite of the earlier books, incorpora ting material up to the end of 1976 . The material is divided into three parts - Modern Benoni (the greater part), Czech Benoni, and other Benoni systems. Softback.
$\$ 7.25$
KING'S FIANCHETTO DEFENCES Marovic/ Susic
A survey of openings where Black plays 86 and Bg7: Kigg's Indian Defence, Pirc Defence, Modern Defence, Grünfeld, etc.

SICILIAN: ...e5
Harding/Markland
This Batsford book examines three of the most controversial lines of the Sicilian Defence. The Boleslavsky ( 1 e4 56 Nf3 Nc6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc 66 Be 2 e5) challenged the old static notions of "weak" squares in the centre and so led a post-war revolution in open ing theory. Currently popular is the Lasker Variation (5...e5) particularly recommended by the authors. The older La Softback.
$\$ 6.80$
PRACTICAL CHESS ENDINGS Paul Keres
Not encyclopaedic in scope, this book leals with the principles of the more basic endings. Hence it is less technical nd more readable than most books on the endgame. Hardback

## KNIGHT ENDINGS

Averbakh \& Chekhover
This is the fifth volume to appear of Averbakh's great series on the endgame This English translation of the Russian original has been updated with the addition of 51 new examples. Altogether 267 examples of $\mathrm{N} v \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{s})$, $\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{P} \mathrm{v}^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, $\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{s}) \mathrm{v} \mathrm{N}$ etc. Hardback. $\$ 12.70$

## QUEEN \& PAWN ENDINGS

Averbakh
Covers only endings involving queens and pawns. This book gives a much fuller treatment on this subject than any other work, much of it the result of comparatively recent Russian research. This applies particularly to the ending of $Q+P \mathrm{v} Q$. As with KNIGHT ENDINGS, this English translation has been updated with the addition of more examples. Hardback.

ROOK ENDINGS
Levenfish \& Smysiov
Examines endings with rooks and pawns but not those with other pieces. Rooks and pawns are involved in perhaps as any as half of all endgames. This book ill give the reader a deep understandin of these positions. Hardback. \$14.50

