## Made in Germany. Not a bad thing tohave stamped on your next flight.



The more you fly
(8) Lufthansa

GERMAN AIRLINES Royal Insurance Bldg 109-113 Queen St.
Auckiand, N.Z. Tel.: 31529 P.O. Box 1427

## NEW ZEALAND CHESS

Registered at Post Office Headquarters, Wellington as a magazine.


Joint winners of the "World Cup" tournament, Montreal 1979.

World Champion Anatoly Karpov (above) and Mikhail Tal (right).


NEW ZEALAND CHESS is published bi-monthly by the New Zealand Chess Association, P.0.Box 8802, Symonds Street, Auckland. Months of issue are February, April, June, August, October and December. Unless otherwise stated, the views expressed may not necessarily be those of the Association.

EDITOR: Peter Stuart, 24 Seacliffe Avenue, Takapuna, Auckland 9.
ASSOCIATE EDITORS: Tony Dowden (Otago), Ortvin Sarapu IM, Vernon Small (Canterbury) and Tim Spiller (Wellington).

All contributions should be sent to the Editor's address.

DEADLINES: The deadline for both copy and advertising is the 6th of the month preceding the month of issue.

ADVERTISING RATES: $\$ 30$ per full page, $\$ 15$ per column or half page, $\$ 7.50$ per half column.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: These are annual and are in New Zealand dollars.
New Zealand $\$ 4.00$. Overseas (surface mail) $\$ 5.00$.
Airmail: Australia \& South Pacific $\$ 6.00$; Asia \& North America $\$ 7.50$; South America, Europe \& Africa $\$ 8.50$.
Note: All enquiries regarding advertising or subscriptions should be sent to All enquiries regarding advertising or subscriptions should be sent to
the Administration Officer, New Zealand Chess Association, P.O. Box 8802 , Symonds Street, Auckland.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: Thanks are due to IBM for their donation of the IBM Selectric typewriter used to produce this magazine.

NEW ZEALAND CHESS

## Vol. 5 No. 3

June 1979

## Olafsson Slams Boycotts

At a press conference in FIDE headquarters in Amsterdam on 26 April Fridrik Olafsson, the President of the
World Chess Federation, took a firm stand on possible boycotts of individual players by tournament organisers or
federations.
"I would advise any chess organisation intending to launch a boycott to seriously reconsider their stance", said larsson. Any such actions can only damage the image of chess in the world and have adverse effect rity of Fibe.
He was replying to allegations that certain chess federations are preventing V.Korchnoi, former challenger for the orld char in major incernational evention to aso continued by drawing attention to a petition signed by fifty players from the loged withdrawal of an invitation for alleged withdrawal of an invitatios
Korchno to play in Banja Luka was heavily criticised. Olafsson agreed that any such withdrawal of an invitation was FIDE He aid that it was his intention to issue stern reprimands and possible to issue stern reprit whe penalties gain uilty of this.
Olafsson then stunned the audience of assembled journalists by producing evidence of another similar boycott, instituted by the Biel International Tournament. Biel had issued an invitaquently withdrawn it.
The withdrawal of two Soviet players from the Lone Pine event is mentioned elsewhere in this issue. The majority of the Lone Pine competitors signed the letter to Olafsson which follows.
Dear Grandmaster olafsson,
As you probably know, Grandmaster Victor Korchnoi, with whom we are partici-
pating in the Louis Statham Master-Plus Tournament in Lone Pine, California, received an invitation for the international tournament of Banja Luka (Yugoslavia) and accepted the invitation to play. Six weeks before the start of the tournament he got a letter from the organisers cancelling his participation. The letter stated: "Many foreign chess players want to revoke their participation in the tournament because you are taking part in it. It is obvious that my foreign players refers to soviet layers Grandmaster petrosian and Master Kasparov, as well as Grandmaster mejkal gary).
We appeal to you as FIDE-President, as one of the Ieading Grandmasters and as one of our colleagues in chess to take onfidence that you will do your utmost foud future boycotts in the national chess world.
it is the first boycott in the ress world that is politically motihess worl that is politicall motithe second best player in the world the second best player in the world. This boycott clearly indicates that the Soviet Chess Federation wants to exclude player who has proved recently in Baguio City to be of World Champion
arpov's level from tournament play
We protest strongly against this
We protest strongly against this
deplorable method of boucotting because deplorable method of boycotting becau we see it as our duty to defend the principles of sportsmanship, and of our motto, Gens una Sumus' To keep silen sible for this boycott.
We trust that you will take the necessary steps to stop those who are trying to ruin international chess by actions like these.
Yours Sincerely,
Players of Lone Pine

## LETTERS

NATIONAL(?) JUNIOR CH'P
Dear Sir,
We have a COMPLAINT. The Canterbury Chess Club received on Wednesday llth April a number of entry forms for a New Zealand Junior tournament being held in Wellington. Entries closed on Thursday 12th April - one day later! The tournament started on the Friday.

This extremely short notice meant that Canterbury juniors were denied the opportunity to compete in this event Do the organisers of this tournament consider Canterbury's juniors so weak as not to warrant informing about the tournament in time, or maybe they didn't want us competing for some reason ... or is it just gross incompetence?

Michael R. Freeman David J.A. Cairns Warwick Norton Neil Gunn Mark Fleming M.G.Williamson Adrian Lloys Adrian Lloyd
Giles Bates Giles Bates

## Dear Sir,

The juniors in otago were pleasantly surprised the other day when some entry forms for the New Zealand Junior arrived. However, the short-lived pleasure turned to dismay when they realised that they had 1 day in which to enter and 2 days to get to Wellington: of course, impossible these days - planes and trains must be booked weeks in advance.
This is an inexcusable lapse made by the Civic Chess Club. How can they claim that a tournament is National when some of the best players are overlooked? otago may not totally dominate New Zealand junior chess - but for its size has a better standard than any other centre with 3 Players who have represented New ealand in international junior tournaments. Perhaps the New Zealand Junior should really have been called the 'Wellington' Junior (did Auckland Wellington Junior (did Auckla receive any entry forms?)
Wake up Civic!!
D. Watts
A.J. Love
W. Petch
S.g. Aimers

- I cannot speak for all the Auckland Clubs but at least two that I know of received entry forms considerably earlier. In fact, two Auckland junior entered and finished in the top two places (1 M.Steadman, 2 P.Mataga) Editor.

CORRESPONDENCE CHESS RESULTS
New Zealand Correspondence Chess Assn Trophy Tournament results for the 1978/ 79 season notified by 30 April. Outstanding games are for adjudication and the final scores should be available for the August issue.

NEW ZEALAND CHAMPIONSUIP: Lynn 1 Smith; Stuart 1 Lynn; Smith $\frac{1}{2}$ Stuart.
CHAMPIONSHIP RESERVE: Knegt I french, 1 Roundill, 1 Barnard; Heasman t/ Knegt, 1 Kinchant, 1 Guptili, I Luey; Luey 2 Guptill, 1 Roundill; Kinchant 1 Guptill 1 Barnard; Barnard 1 Guptill, 1 French: Freeman 1 Barnard.

CLASS 2: Millar 1 Hull; Davies 1 Lovelock, 1 Cooper, 1 Steadman, I Johnstone, 1 Hignett, 1 Rogers; Hull 1 Hignett; bishop 1 Davies; Rogers 1 Millar, Mataga I Van Oeveren.
CLASS 3 RED: Brumby $\frac{1}{2}$ Billing, 1 Watt Brightwell $\frac{1}{2}$ Else; watt 1 Brightwell. Billing 1 Hagan, 1 Frost.
CLASS 3 BLUE: Stringer 1 Brightwell Smith 1 Whitlock; Ion 1 Bowler; Peterson $\frac{1}{2}$ Brimble, 1 Ion; Whitlock $\frac{1}{2}$ Stringer; Brightwell I whitlock.
CLASS 3 GREEN: De Groot 1 Fisher, 1
CLASS 4 RED: Brown $\frac{1}{2}$ Morgan; Jones $i$ Brown, 1 Gumuner, 1 Cox, 1 Morgan; Cox thaxwell; Seccombe 1 Billinghurst: Fraser 1 Maxwell.
CLASS 4 GREEN: Lockwood I Alexander; 'Connor 1 Ansley; Boyden 1 Ansleg: Cribbett 1 o'Comnor; Alexander 1 O'Connor; Ansley 1 Anderson; King 1 o'Connor.

CLASS 5: Brohm $\frac{1}{2}$ Tiurnbull.

Can You See the Combinations?
Solutions on page 76


No. 1 White to move


No. 3 White to move


No. 2 White to move


No. 4 Black to move


No. 5 Black to move

## MONTREAL - World Chess Challenge Cup 1979

The "Man and His World Chess Challenge Cup", to give the event its full name, was played in Montreal from 10 April to 7 May 1979. The tournament was conceived by Chess lournaments lnc., an organisation formed by Lubomir Kavalek, Ivan Passer (a Hollywood film director) and New York lawyer Michael Zivian. The basic idea behind the formation of CTI was to raise chess to the level it deserves with the emphasis on the rights of the players, and at least one annual World Chess Challenge Cup.
while it may have been possible to hold this first WCCC in the United States, the less commercially oriented Montreal was eventually chosen. Planning of the event took nine months. For the first time in history, the players were each guaranteed $\$ 2000$ for their agreement - even if the tournament failed to come off. In the event, this became the highest rated tournament (Category 15, average rating 2622) since the introduction of the FIDE rating lists and, many will argue, the strongest tournament ever.

The format was a double round-robin with ten players (needless to add, all Grandmasters) and the tournament was directed by GM Svetozar Gligoric.

The ten players, with nationality and current ratings, were

| Anatoly KARPOV USSR | 2705 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lajos PORTISCH Hungary | 2640 |
| Boris SPASSKY USSR | 2640 |
| Jan TIMMAN Netherlands | 2625 |
| Bent LARSEN Denmark | 2620 |
| Mikhail TAL USSR | 2615 |
| Vlastimil HORT Czechoslovakia | 2600 |
| Robert HüBNER West Germany | 2595 |
| Lubomir KAVALEK United States | 2590 |
| Ljubomir LJUBOJEVIC Yugoslavia | 2590 |


| The prizes were: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| lst | \$25,000 | 6th | \$8,000 |
| 2 nd | \$18,000 | 7th | \$7,000 |
| 3rd | \$15,000 | 8th | \$6,000 |
| 4th | \$12,000 | 9th | \$5,000 |
| 5th | \$ 10,000 | 10th | \$4,000 | In addition, there was a $\$ 1,000$ brilliancy prize donated by Roger Lemelin, President and Editor

The Hungarian, Portisch, took the lead as early as round three with wins over Hort and Hübner and a draw with

Ljubojevic. He maintained his sole lead through round five when he had 4 points with Karpov, Ljubojevic and Tal on $3 \frac{1}{2}$. These four all drew in round six but in the seventh round the two Soviets had a quick draw while Ljubojevic beat Hort to join Portisch in the lead on 5 points. In the eighth round, however, Ljubo lost to Karpov, Tal beat Kavalek and Portisch drew with Timman so Karpov, Tal and Portisch now shared the lead. The World Champion then beat Kavalek while his closest rivals all drew. Thus, the scores at the half-way stage were: Karpov 6 $\frac{1}{2}$, Portisch \& Tal 6, Ljubojevic $5 \frac{1}{2}$, Hübner 5, Timman $4 \frac{1}{2}$, Hort 4 , Spassky $3 \frac{1}{2}$, Larsen $2 \frac{1}{2}$, Kavalek $1 \frac{1}{2}$. The spread of points in such an even field was rather surprising. Only the three leaders were still umbeaten; only Kavalek lacked a win.
When the second half got under way, Tal immediately tied the lead by beating Spassky (making the score 2:0 in their mini match'). Karpov, however, regained his sole lead in the next round with his second win over Timman.
In the only decisive game of round 12 , Bent Larsen scored an important win over Karpov with the black pieces and the scores now were: Karpov \& Tal 8, Port isch $7 \frac{1}{2}, ~ L j u b o j e v i c ~ 7, ~ H u ̈ b n e r ~ 6 \frac{1}{2}, ~ H o r t ~$ $5 \frac{1}{2}$, Timman 5 , Larsen $\&$ Spassky $4 \frac{1}{2}$, Kavalek $3 \frac{1}{2}$.
In the thirteenth round, all three leading contenders won their games, Tal beating fubner, Karpov defeating Spassky (another $2: 0$ ) and Portisch accounting for Larsen (also 2:0). By this time the others had been left behind although Kavalek beat Ljubojevic and was leading the 'second half' with $3 / 4$.
Apart from Kavalek winning again, all games were drawn in round fourteen. The scores: Karpov \& Tal $9 \frac{1}{2}$, Portisch 9, Ljubojevic $7 \frac{1}{2}$, Hübner \& Timman $6 \frac{1}{2}$, Hort 6, Kavalek $5 \frac{1}{2}$, Larsen \& Spassky 5 . Portisch had just drawn with Karpov and now he met Tal - for his first and only loss of the tournament. Meanwhile, Karpov could only draw against Hort so Tal was in the lead with three rounds to go. Ljubojevic lost to Spassky leaving portisch with a pretty firm grip of the third prize. Kavalek notched up his third consecutive win at the expense of arsen.

Karpov, with the white pieces, made some effort to beat Tal in their indivi dual clash but the latter equalised without too much difficulty. Ljubojevic tightened his hold on fourth place by winning his sixteenth round game versus Hort (another 'double') while Spassky mproved his position with a full point 101 $10 \frac{1}{2}$, Portisch ${ }^{2}$, Ljubojevic $8 \frac{1}{2}$ Timman 71/2, Hübner, Kavalek \& Spassky 7, ort 62, Larsen
After round seventeen the lead was again tied as Karpov beat Ljubojevic while Tal drew with Kavalek. Spassk made it three in

## against Larsen.

The last round was, on the whole, peaceful with several games, notably those involving the leading bunch, over Larsen-Hort clash where the was the the full point - and an $\$ 1000$ t If we consider the second half as separate tournament, the results are rather startling - first half woode spooner Kavalek 'won' with $6 \frac{1}{2} / 9$ ahead of Tal 6 and Karpov 51 $\frac{1}{2}$. Spassky was another 'improver' finishing next on and ther 4, Ljubojevic $3^{\frac{1}{2}}$, Hübner $\&$ Larsen 3 . The scoring was somewhat closer than in the first half.
Most of the brief comments in the following games were taken from the excellent tournament bulletin - in which every game was annotated either by Gligoric or one of the contestants.

TAL - SPASSKY, King's Indian Defence: I Nf3 Nf6 2 c4 g6 3 Nc3 Bg7 4 e4 d6 5 d4 0-0 6 Be2 e5 7 0-0 exd4?! (Normal is 7...NC6 or 7...Nbd7) 8 Nxd4 Re8 9 f3 c6 10 Khl ! (Thus White avoids all his opponent's tactical threats) $10 . . . \mathrm{d} 511$ cxd5 cxd5 12 Bg 5 ! dxe4 13 fxe4 Nbd7 14 Ndb5 Re5 (Black sacrifices for some counterplay) 15 Bf4 Nxe4 16 Bxe5 Bxe5 17 Nxe4 Qh4 18 h 3 Qxe4 19 Qb3 (Gligoric gives 19 Nd6 Bxd6 20 Qxd6 Qxe2 21 Rael as winning more easily, e.g. 21.. Qxb2 22 Re8+ Kg7 23 Rxf7 with a mating attack, or 21...Qc4 22 b3 Qc5 23 Re8t Kg7 24 Qxc5 Nxc5 25 Rcl winning material 9....Nf6 20 Bc4 Qh4 21 Bxf7+ Kh8 22 Rf3 Bf5 23 Ne3: Ne4 24 Nxe4 Bxe4 25 Qc4 Rd8 26 Rafl Kg 727 Be6 Rd2? (Overlooking the dual threat of White's next) 28 Qc5 Bxf3 29 Qxe5+ Qf6 30 Qxf6+ Kxf6 31 Bg4 Rxb2 32 Rxf3+, 1 : 0.

KAVALEK - HÜBNER, Caro-Kann Defence: 1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd 2 dxe4 4 Nxe Bf5 5 Ng 3 Bg 66 h 4 h 67 Nf 3 Nd 78 h 5 Bh7 9 Bd3 Bxd3 10 Qxd3 Ngf6 11 Bd2 e6 12 0-0-0 c5 13 Rhel Be7 14 d5!? Nxd5


15 Rxe6:? (White would have excellent compensation for the pawn after 15 Nf5 Kff 16 Nxe7 Qxe7 17 c4 $N 5$ f6 18 Bf4) $15 \ldots$...fxe6 16 Qg6+ Kf8 17 Qxe6 19 Ne5 Qc8 $\quad 20$ Ng6+ (20 Qd3 followed by Rel would have given Black more problems - Gligoric) 20... Kf 21 Nxh8+ Qxh8 22 Rel Re8 23 Qd3 B5 24 Nf5 Qh 25 g4 a6 26 c4 Bf8 27 Rxe8 Kxe8 28 Qf3 Qg8. 29 Qc6+ Kd8 30 Ba5 Qxc4+ 31 Kbl Qe4+ 32 Qxe4 Nxe4

HORT - LJUBOJEVIC, Sicilian Najdorf: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 Nf6 4 Nc 3 cxd4 Nxd4 a6 6 Be 2 e5 7 Nb 3 Be 78 a 4 Be 6 0-0 0-0 10 f 4 exf4 11 Bxf4 Ne6 12 Kh1 Rc8 13 Bf3 Ne5 14 Nd5 Bxd5 15 exd5 Nfd7 (Black has an excellent position after several inaccuracies by his opponent) 16 c 3 Bg 517 Bg 4 ? ( After the exchange of dark-square bishops Black is clearly better; 17 Bg 3 was preferable) 17...Bxf4 18 Rxf4 Rc4 19 Rxc4 Nc4 20 Qd4 Nde5 21 Be2 Qc7 22 a5 Rc8 23 Nd2 Nxd2 24 Qxd2 Re8 25 h3 g6 26 Qd4 Nd7 27 Bf3 Qc5 28 Qxc5 Nxc5 29 b4 (It was better to play 29 Kgl first) 29 $\ldots$ Nd3 30 c4 Nxb4 $31 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \mathrm{Nd} 3 \quad 32 \mathrm{Rxb} 7$ Nc5 $33 \mathrm{Rc} 7 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 34 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Kf} 8 \quad 35 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Rb} 8$ 36 Rce Ke7 $37 \mathrm{Rc} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 638 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 3+39$ $\mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Rb} 7 \mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{Rc} 8 \mathrm{Ke} 5 \quad 41 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 3+42 \mathrm{Kc} 2$ Kd4 43 Rc6 Re3+ 44 Kd 2 Ra 345 Kc 2 Ra2+ $46 \mathrm{Kbl}, 0: 1$. Hort actually sealed his 46 th move, but resigned without resuming as he must give up the exchange to avoid being mated after 46.. f2 47 Rxd6 Kc3 48 Rb6 Nb3
KAVALEK - KARPOV, Ruy Lopez: 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb 5 a6 4 Ba 4 Nf 6 0-0 Nxe4 6 d4 b5 7 Вb 3 d5 8 dxe5 Be6 9 Qe2 (as Karpov played in the 12th natch game at Baguio) 9...Be7 10 Rdl $0-011$ c4 bxe 412 Bxc4 Be5 13 Be 3 xxe3 14 Qxe3 Qb8 15 Bb 3 Na 516 Nbd 2 Karpov played the slower 16 Nel in the uoted game) 16...Qa7 17 Nd4 Nxd2 18 Qxd2 Qb6 19 Bc2 c5 20 Nf5 Bxf5 21 Bxf5 Rad8 22 b3 (Later, against Tal,

Kavalek played 22 Rel and a draw was agreed after 22...Nc6! in an unclear position) 22...Rfe8 23 Rel c4 24 Qg 5 Qc7 25 é f6 26 Qh4 g6 27 e7: Rd6 (27...Rxe7? 28 Qxf6)


28 Qg 3 ? (Much better was 28 Reb! Rxe6 29 Bxe6t Kg 7 30 Bxd5 with advantage after either 30...Qxe7 31 h3 or 30...Qe5 31 RdII 28...Rxe7 29 Exg6 hxg6 30 Qxg6t Kf8 $31 \mathrm{Qh} 6+\mathrm{Rg} 7 \quad 32 \mathrm{Re} 3$ 533 Qh8t Rg8 34 Qe5 Qd7 35 Rf3 Qe6 36 Rxf5t Ke7 37 Qf4 Ne6 38 bxc4 dxc4 39 Rbl Rb8 40 Rcl Nd 441 Re5, $0: 1$. SPASSKY -- TAL, Queen's Indian Defence d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 4 e3 Bb7 5 Bd 3 d5 6 b3 bd6 7 D-0 $0-0 \quad 8 \mathrm{Bb} 2$ Nbd7 9 Nbd2 Qe7 10 Rcl Rad8 11 Qc2 c5 12 cxd5 exd5 13 dxc5 bxc5 14 Qc3 Rfe8 15 Ffdl d4 16 exd4 cxd4 17 Qa5 On 17 NXd4, Tal had considered 17... Bxh2t $18 \mathrm{Kxh} 2 \mathrm{Ng} 4+$ and either 19 Kgl Qh4 20 N4f3 Qxf2t $21 \mathrm{Khl} \mathrm{Re5} 22$ bf5 Ne3, or $19 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Qe} 5+20 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Qe} 3+21 \mathrm{~N} 4 \mathrm{f} 3$ Ndf6 with a strong attack though no clear win) 17...Ne5 18 Nxe5? (Tal gives 18 Rel as the only possible defence) 18 ..Bxe5 19 Nc4 for 19 Nfl Nd5 20 Ng3 vf4 21 Bfl h5 with a strong attack at no material cost - Tal) 19...Rd5 20 Qd2 (or 20 Ba 3 Qe6 21 Qd2 Bxh2+ 22 Kxh Rh5t $23 \mathrm{Kgl} \mathrm{Rhl}+124 \mathrm{Kxhl}$ Qh3t and
nates next move - Tal

20...Bxh2+! 21 Kxh2 Rh5+ 22 Kgl (Black also mates after $22 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 4+$ ) 22...Ng4, $0: 1$. There is no defence to the twin threats of $23 \ldots$...Qh4 and 23 ...Rhit.

KARPOV - LARSEN, Scandinavian Defence: 1 e4 d5 (Larsen refers to this as 'a good variation of the Caro-Kann') 2 exd5 Qxd5 3 Ne3 Qa5 4 d4 Nf6 5 Bd2 Bg4 6 Be2 Bxe2 7 Ncxe2 Qb6 8 Nf3 Nbd7 $90-0$
 Qc2 Qc7 14 Rfel b6 (After a quiet start Karpov has gained a slight edge thanks to his space advantage which he now attempts to increase - but at the cost of a bad bishop) 15 a5 Rfb8 16 a6 b5

17 c5 Nd5 18 Ncl Re8 19 Nd3 Rad8 20 g3 Bf 621 Ré $4 \mathrm{Nf} 8 \quad 22 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Rd} 7 \quad 23 \mathrm{Kg} 2$ Red8 $24 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Re} 8 \quad 25 \mathrm{~g} 5 \mathrm{Bd} 8 \quad 26$ Nfe 5 Rele 27 Bf4 Qc8 28 Bg3 f6 29 Nf3 Rf7 30 Qd2

30...fxg5 (According to Larsen, this surprised Rarpor) 31 Nxg5 (31 hxg5 was generally conceded to be better but Larsen liked his chances aftex 31...Rf5; White is hindered by the necessity of protecting the pawns on a6 and b4) $31 \ldots$...Rf5 32 Ra3 Ng6 33 Nf 3 Ref8 34 Nfe5 Nxe5 35 Rxe5 Rf3 36 Ral? (Better is 36 Qe2 when $36 \ldots$ R3f6 is prom.sing for Black, e.g. 37 Re4 BC7 38 39 Rxe6 Rxf2t: Larsen) 36 Oxf3 (else 39 Df7) 39 Rxf3 40 Qxis 41 Rdl 0 ...d4 foilow to 44 Karsen 45 Rue6 646 Na3 27 Rf3 4488 49 Kg 3 Ocl 50 Nh 30 c 451 g 5 h 552 Re $4+53 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{~b} 354 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \mathrm{Qe} 2+55 \mathrm{Nf} 2$ $4+53 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{~b} 3 \quad 54 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \mathrm{Qe} 2+55 \mathrm{Nf} 2$
TAL - HÜBNER, Caro-Kann Defence

- 4 c $6{ }^{2}$ d4 d5 3 Nd2 dxe4 4 Nxe4 Bf 5 5 Ng3 Bg6 $6 \quad 6$ h4 h6 7 Nf3 Nat $7 \quad 8$ h5 Bh7 9 Bd3 Bxd3 10 Oxd3 Ngf6 11 Bf4 Qa5+ 12 Bd2 Qc7 $130-0-0$ e6 14 Ne4 $0-0-0$ 15 g 3 Nee 4 (Afterwards, Hübner said that Tal's system gives white nothing - but his reason for thinking so will have to wait for another game; Black will need to improve before move 22. Perhaps Petrosian's 15...Nc5 16 NXC5 Bxc5 is better) 16 Qxe4 Nf6 17 Qe2 c5 18 dxc5 $3 x c 519$ Rh4 Kb8 20 Bf4 Bd6 21 Rxd6 Rxd6


22 Ne5: (In the tournament bulletin Gligoric writes, "This reminds me of the Tal of the late 50 s and early 60 s bat now, in this game, it is reinforced by Capabianca's simplicity") 22...Ka8 (22...Nd5 23 Nxf7 Nxf4 24 Rxf4 wins) $23 \mathrm{Nc4}$ Ne8 24 Rg 4 Qe 725
Nxd6 Nxd6 26 Rxg7 (A pawn up now, White
still has the initiative) 26...Nf5 27 Rg4 Rd8 28 Be5 f6 29 Bc3 e5 30 b3 a6 31 Kb 2 Qe6 32 Qc4 Qe8 33 Rg6 Rc8 34 Nb 548 Rxf6 a5 39 Bd6 Nxd6 40 Rxd6 e4 $41 \mathrm{Qd} 2,1$ : 0.
TIMMAN - KARPOV, English:
1 c4 Nf6 2 Nc3 e5 3 Nf3 Nc6 4 e3 Be7 5 d4 exd4 6 Nxd4 $0-0 \quad 7$ Nxc6 bxc6 8 Be2 d5 9 0-0 Bd6 10 b3 (Better was 10 cxd5 cxd5 $11 \mathrm{b3}$ ) $10 . . . \mathrm{Qe} 711 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{dxc} 4$ 12 bxc4 (Black now gets a strong attack; 12 Bxc4 ox 12 Qa4 may have been prefer 15 ) $12 . .$. Rbs 13 Qci Ng4 14 g3 Re8 18 fxe $3 x 19$ Rf2 Qh6 20 Bd4 Oh2t 21 Kg Qxat $22 \mathrm{Kd2}$ Qg2 23 MD 2 B MONTREAL 1979

## Kar Tal Por Lju Tim Spa Hor Kav Hub Lar

## Karpov

Tal
Portisch
Ljubojevic
Timman
Spassky
Hort
$\begin{array}{lllllllllllllllllll}0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \times x & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1\end{array}$

Nd3 Bxd3 25 Kxd3 Rbd8 26 Bf1 Qe4+ 27 Kc3 c5 28 Bxc5 Qc6 $29 \mathrm{~Kb} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 8+30 \mathrm{Ka}$ Re5 $31 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \mathrm{Qb} 6,0: 1$.
TAL - PORTISCH, French Tarrasch:
1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd2 c5 4 exd5 exd5 $5 \mathrm{Bb} 5+\mathrm{Bd} 76$ Qe2+ Be7 7 dxc5 Nf6 8 Nb 3 O 0 0 9 Nf 3 Re 810 Be3 a6 11 Bd 3
 Bf8 15 Nxc5 Bxc5 16 Qf3 Bxe3+ 17 Nxe3 Rc8? (Safer was 17...Bc6) 18 Bf5 Rc5 19 $\mathrm{Rd} 4 \mathrm{Bc} 6{ }^{20} \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{Rb} 521 \mathrm{a} 4 \mathrm{Rb} 622 \mathrm{aS} \mathrm{Rb} 5$ 23 Q44 b6 24 Bd3 bxas 25 Bxbs axb5 Rd3 axb4 27029 Be6 33 Rd3 34 RE4 Qe6 35 Owe fxa
 Rxe5, 1 : 0 .
10 Larsen $\quad \frac{1}{2} 1 \quad 0 \frac{1}{2}$

## LOCAL NEWS

The AUCKLAND CHESS CENTRE'S Summer Cup tournament, an eight round Swiss, was won by Robert Smith with a 7-1 tally. Second equal in the 45-player ield were Robert Davies, Peter Mataga, Michael Steadman $\alpha$ Simon Van Dam on 6 and Nigel Metge was a solitary sixth with 51/2 points. Then came K. Kinchant, P.Koloszar, R.Mathias, I.Stonehouse, D. Storey, G. Mrundle \& B.Winslade 5 , R. Gibbons, T.Put, C.Rose \& Raylor 4 D.Bulmer, H.Dixon, G.Falk, M.Garland, S.Giles, B.Hipkins, M.Morrison, W.Por ter, M. Sin il M. Hopewell, N. Hopewe 11 , J.McClory, Downey, W.Hope \& S.Martin 3; J.Alexander, D. Crompton \& J.Wieboldt $2 \frac{1}{2}$; J. Falvey \& J.Wardrop 2; M.Christensen,
L.Davies \& K.Liversidge 1.

The NORTH SHORE CHESS CLUB'S Summer Cup tournament was also played during February/April as an eight round Swiss There were 49 players. Top seed Paul Garbett conceded just two draws, to Stuart and Hart, in scoring $7 / 8$ while the next two seeds, Peter Stuart and Tony Carpinter, were second equal with $6 \frac{1}{2}$. Sharing fourth were Gavin Ion and Dick Roundill on 6, then: B.Hart, D Gollogly \& N. Bradley $5 \frac{1}{2}$; C.Belton, G Pitts, P.Snelson, L.Talaic, D.Lamb, S Moratti, S.Richardson, T. $0^{\prime}$ Connor 5; D. Shead, R.Lannie \& B. Stanton $4 \frac{1}{2}$; D Evans, R.Steel, C.Robbie, P.Wilcock Continued on page 61

## 5th Rank Xerox Easter Open，Dunedin 1979

TONY DOWDEN reports

The 5th Rank Xerox Easter Open attracted 22 entries－ 18 locals， 3 from Canterbury，and Chris Marshall， the top seed（ruch to his surprise！） representing the deep，deep south from the Invercargill Chess Club．Once again the tournament was very pleasant to play in and Director of Play Bob Glass did his job unobtrusively and with his customary efficiency．It was disappoint ing that some of the top players could not play－in fact the five highest rated players in Dunedin were conspicu－ ous by their absence．This was rectified somewhat by the entry of most of the South Island＇s top juniors（who，by the ，weren＇informed about the North Island.... oops，New Zealand Junior until one day before it actually began！） uiors filled eight out of the top places．Ex－champion hony Love proved the ost experienced la short tournur and then easing up with two draws．
Round one was accident free－all the higher rated players won．In round two the combination of Good／B1ack Friday and a full moon had its effect on the good guys $\cdot \mathrm{A}$ mach improved David Weegenaar held Chris Marshall to a well gcound out draw．lony Dowden lost to kocl h＇in a vargin better end the game into a marginally better ending and took full advantage of a time trouble blunder a pawn netted the hole par．Wisk draw in a raw in a gase fortuating fortunes Round three－Marshall played badly Round three Marshall played badly and la lew ith Noto Von＇Steen outplay rave on the black side of Rubinstein rench and olained an easily won ending rench obed a eaily wot ut then ble his go ki little fight his hining ganes．Dowden was very severe Wilson beating himin 12 mes．
Round four saw the clash of the
ound four saw the clash the ebtained a very good position after ificing two pawns but didn＇t kter sac－ fini it off．Love defended excel－ ently and won easily in the ensuing
time scramble．Weegenaar continued his good run，annihilating a deflated Von＇t Steen

In round five Love drew with Norton in a Morra Gambit．Freeman showed that he had been following the recent World Championship match when he sat down to play Weegenaar wearing a top hat with an insult inscribed on it and． all things（we are not sure what possessed him！）he chewed on a piece of garlic！！：A much subdued Weegenaar played the theory of the white side of a 6 Be 2 Najdorf Sicilian accurately，so Freeman （rather surprisingly）offered him a draw which was snapped up．Marshall，Dowden and Fleming all won－at the expense of Von＇t Steen，White and Post respective－ position．were now in a challenging position．Dowden was actually lying
，
In the last round Dowden piked agains ove an－move draw．Weegenaar，Free－ man and Marshall closed in with a ven－ geance，all winning and hence causing a four－way tie for second．Marshall played ndeservedly fit ploughed through a wolly o．Wed White loughed through a woolly－minced White leming Fleming to death．Duncan Watts and illam Petch deservedly shared the top grade prize．Victor hay，the type of guy everyone likes to see getting a prize， Shared the second grade prize with young ony stiles who alchough he had some tably in the corpany of alt players．

Scores（ $0=0$ Otago， $\mathcal{C}=$ Canterbury， ＝Invercargill）：l A．J．Love（0）5／6； －5 C．Marshall（I），M．R．Freeman（C），D． Weegenaar（ 0 ）\＆R．A．Dowden（ 0 ） $4 \frac{1}{2}$ ； －9 W．Norton（C），M．Fleming（C），W． Petch（0）\＆D．Watts（0） $3^{\frac{1}{2}} ; 10-16 \mathrm{R}$ ． Von＇t Steen（0），M．White（0），D．Cameron （0），G．Aimers（0），I．Dalziel（0），P． Sinton（0）\＆M．Post（C）3；17－19 A． Knowles（0），A．Stiles（0）\＆V．Hay（0）2； 20 S．Campbell（0） $1 \frac{1}{2} ; 21$ M．Wilson（0） ； $22 \mathrm{~K} . S m i t h(0) \frac{1}{2}$ ．
FREEMAN－LOVE，French Advance
e4 c5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 c3 e6 4 d4 d5 5 e5 Qb6 6 Bd3 cxd4 7 cxd4 Bb4＋？！ 8 Nb5 Oxe5 0 Nxd4 10 Nxd4 Qxd4 11

Nd6＋Kf8 15 Nxb7 Bb6 16 Qg3 Bd4！ 17 Rfel Ne7 18 Nd6（with the idea 19 bg5 B＇ 19 Qx1 550 Qx mate）18．．． 6b5！ 19 Racl gs 20 Bd2 Nc6 21 Bb5（2 White causes more problems but perhaps hite has already given Black too much Kg7 24 Rc7 Rhd8 25 Mb Be5 26 Rxe5 Qxe5 27 Oxe5 Nxe 528 Nxd8 Rxd8 29 Rxa7 4430 Kfl？（White could put up more resistance with 30 b3 intending ag2） 30 Nd31 31 Be3 b5 intending 31 $33 \mathrm{b4} \mathrm{Nf} 34 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{Kg} 635 \mathrm{Rc} 6+\mathrm{Kf5} 36$ $3 \mathrm{b4} \mathrm{Nf} 44 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{Kg} 635 \mathrm{Rc} 6+\mathrm{Kf5}$ $7 \mathrm{~g} 4+\mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{fxe} 3 \mathrm{dxe} 3 \mathrm{la} \mathrm{Rat} \mathrm{Kf3}$ 0 ：1．
NORTON－MARSHALL，Caro－Kann Defence： 1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 Nf6 5 c5 b6 6 b4 a5 7 b5 e5！ 8 c6 exd4 9 Qxd4（ 9 Bf4！）9．．．Be5 10 Qe5＋Be6 11 Be2 Ra7！ 12 Bf4 0－0！ 13 c7？！Rxc7 14 Qxc7 Qxc7 15 Bxc7 Bd4 16 Bxb6 Bxal 17 Bxa5 Rc8 $18 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{~d} 4 \quad 19$ a4？Rc1＋ 20 Bdl Bc3 21 Bxc3（ 21 bb 6 is no good either） 21．．．dxc3 $22 \mathrm{Ngf} 3 \mathrm{c} 2 \quad 23 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Nd} 5$ ！ 0 ： 1 ．

## 甾 甾 背

LOCAL NEWS contd from p． 59
I．McIntyre，L．Brownlee，R．Fraser，R．B． Johnstone，P．Van der Mey，L．Grevers，J， Miller \＆M．Flewellen 4；B．Winsor，G． Keall，J．G．Keith，G．Jones，G．Schrader， K．Wong，W．Porter，M．Prescott，J．Willi－ ams，M．McLennan，L．Upson 3；A．Gales， J．Manning \＆S．Lamb 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ；P．Manning，J．K． Boyd \＆M．Rogers 2；G．Wickman 1.
GARBETT－STUART，Dutch Defence： 1 d4 e6 $2 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{f} 5 \quad 3 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Nf} 64 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Nc} 6$ $5 \mathrm{Ngf3} 3 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 6 \quad 0-0 \quad 0-0 \quad 7 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 8 \mathrm{Ne} 5$ 12 Bxb 7 Nxb 713 c 4 d 411 Na 3
 Qxf4 Bf6 19 Rad1 cxd4 20 Bxd4 Bxd4 21 Rxd4 Ob5 22 Rfdi Nc5 23 Qe5 Oc6 24 b4 Ne4 25 b5 Qe8 26 Nd6 Nxd6 27 Rxd6 Rf6 28 Rd7 h6 29 Rc7 Rf7 30 Rc6 Re7 31 Rdd6 Kf7 32 e 4 fxe 433 Qf4＋ Kg8 34 Qxe4 Kf7 35 Qd4 Kg8 36 f 4 Qf 7 37 Rd8＋Rxd8 38 Qxd8＋Kh7 39 Rc8 Rd7 40 Qh8＋K＇g6 $41 \mathrm{Rd8}$ Qe7 42 Rxd7 Qxd7 43 Qa8 QdIt $44 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qe} 2+45 \mathrm{Kgl}$ Qxa2 46 Qe4＋Kf7 47 Qb7＋Kf6 $48 \mathrm{Qd7} \mathrm{Qe} 2$ 49 Qe8 Qel + ，$\frac{1}{2}$ ：$\frac{1}{2}$ ．

In Otago Philip Paris and Tony Love
played a match with the first to win 6 games the winner．The match was aban－ doned，however，with the score at PARIS 3，LOVE 1 and 4 draws

PARIS－LOVE，Petroff Defence 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nf6 3 d4 exd4 4 e5 Ne4 5 Qxd4 d5 6 exd6 Nxd6 7 Bd3 Nc6 8 Qf4 g6 9 Nc3 Bg7 10 Be3 Be6 ll 0－0－0 Qf6 12 Qa4 h6 13 Bd4！？Qf4＋ 14 Kbl Bxd4 $15 \mathrm{Ne} 2 \mathrm{Qf6}$（15．．．Qg4！？） 16 Nexd4 Bd7 17 Rhel＋Ne7？ 18 Qa5 b6 19 Qe5 Qxe5 20 Nxe5 Kd8 21 Bb c5 22 Nxf7＋ Nxf7 23 Ne6＋， 1 ： 0.
LOVE－PARIS，French Defence：
1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd2 c $5 \quad 4$ Ngf 3 Nc 6 5 Bb5 cxd4 6000 Bd6 7 Rel Nge7 8 e 5 Bc7 9 Nxd4 $0-0 \quad 10$ Nxc6 Nxc6（better was $10 \ldots .$. bxc6 intending ．．．c5） 11 Nf 3 13 c 4 d 4 ： 14 Bb 1 Be 8 ： 15 b3（no bett was 15 Od3 f5 16 exf6 Quf6 17 （no better was 15 Qd3 f5 16 exf6 Qxf6 17 Qh7＋Kf7 and White has nothing） $15 \ldots \mathrm{~F} 516 \mathrm{Ba}$ better） 18 Re 2 Rd 7 （After 18．．．Bc3 followed by ．．．Nb4 and ．．．d3 White gets compensation for the exchange） 19 Bc 2 Bh5 20 Bd6！（White seizes his only chance for counterplay）20．．．Bb4？！ （This does nothing to prevent white＇ next three moves which give him adequate counterplay； 20 ．．．Rxd6 seems very good as long as Black plays ．．．Nb4 before recapturing on 06 －a point missed by both players during the game） 21 c 5 Bc 3 22 Rdl Nb4 23 Qc4 Bxf3 24 Qxe6＋Rf7 $25 \mathrm{gxf} 3 \mathrm{Qg} 5+26 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Qh} 5 \quad 27 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Og} 5+$ $28 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Qh} 529 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qg} 5+30 \mathrm{Khl}, \frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$. Notes by A．J．Love．

The Auckland Chess Centre＇s annual AUCKLAND EASTER OPEN produced a field of 40 players this year although there was an absence，other than a few，of Auckland s stronger players．Conse－ quently，there were very few games of quality，although David Beach played
Theren well to win with $6 \frac{1}{2} /$ ． The first round s results showed tha seven of the field lightly were losing to their lowly ranked apponce Peter Weir，being notable in this res pect， round game to come third equal
Robert Smith lost only
Robert smith lost only once，to Beach， point ahead of Weir and Hilton Bennett． Scores： 1 D．H Beach（AU） 612 2 R．W．

Simith (Wai) 6; 3-4 P.B.Weir (NS) \& H.P. Bennett (Ham) 5; 5-11 B.R.Watson (AU), J.N.Metge (Av), D.G.Notley (Pap), L.D. Rawnsley (Hip), G.Sidnam (A), R.E.Gibbons (A) \& P.Koloszan (A) 412 ; 12-18 D.J.H. Storey (A), K.D.Kinchant (A), R.B.Johnstone (NS), G.J.Ion (NS), P.B.Goffin (A), T.i. Stonehouse (A) \& W.F.Porter (A) 4; 19-25 M.T.Brimble (Wai), B.Winslade (A), W.Crombie (Ham), D.M.Brunton (A), W.J.Vermeer $(A D)$, L.Rudikins (Pap) \& R.W.Watson (AU) 3 $\frac{1}{2}$; 26-27 N. Hopewell (A) \& S.Van Dam (A) 3; 28-35 S.Hart (Pap), A.Johnston (NS), N. Sharples (HP) A.J.Henderson (NS), J. Wieboldt (A), M. Hopewell (A), R.Hampton (Pap) \& S.J. Delowe (HP) $2 \frac{1}{2} ; 36-38$ C.Green, M.J. Tatson (A) \& M.Sinclair (A) $1 \frac{1}{2} ; 39-40$ M. Carland (A) \& K.Bartocci (A) 1 .

The two Dunedin clubs met in a match on 11 April:

OTAGO OTAGO UNIV.

| 1. A.J.Love | 0 | $:$ | K. Jensen |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | R.A.Dowden | 0 | $: 1$ | R.Wansink |
| 3 | M.M.Foord | 1 | $:$ | 0 |
| R.L.Perry |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | G.G.Haase | 1 | $:$ | 0 |
| M. Wong |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | D. Weegenaar | 1 | $: 0$ | R.Ong |
| 6 | M. White | 0 | $: 1$ | M. Wilcox |
| 7 | R.von't Steen | $1: 0$ | N. Dode |  |
| 8 | H.Chin | $1: 0$ | M. Delary |  |

With ten minutes to the time control, Otago University's high-powered team was leading three games to two. The players who had finished clustered around the remaining games and the Otago位 rate breathing of defending University players broke the silence. Three timescrambles, and three varsity players were struggling to reach the control Roger Perry was the first to crack. Malcolm Foord had sacrificed a piece early on but looked to be losing until Roger's clock took a hand. With seconds left, Perry blundered his queen and immediately resigned. On board four Otago veteran Haase had completely outplayed Wong and was sitting on an extra rook when his opponent's flag fell. The score was now Otago 4, University 3. Down on board 7 Dodd was two pawns up against Otago Club Captain von't Steen in a queens and rooks middle game. Von't Steen had all the pressure, however, and the clock was on his side.

One pawn came back and then, as Dodd was completing his 40th move, his flag fell with a crash that was heard all over the room. Victory for the Otago Chess club in a match that everyone agreed had been a thriller
LOVE - JENSEN, Ruy Lopez:
1 e4 e5 2 Nf. 3 Ne6 3 Bb5 f5 4 Ne3 Nd4

 $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Be7 } & 12 \text { exf } 5 \text { Bxf5 } & 13 \text { Rhel Qg5t } \\ 14 \mathrm{~Kb} 1\end{array}$

 18 dxes Bxe5 19 f4 Btb 20 Qt2 d5 2 ! WONG - HAASE, King's Indian Attack:
1 NE3 d5 $2 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{~d} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7$ 5 0-0 Nc6 6 Nbd2 $0-0 \quad 7$ c 3 e5 8 Qc2 Bg4 9 h 3 Bef 10 b 4 ' (White must claim his share of the centre with 10 e4) 10 ...h6 11 b5 e4 12 Nel (This is passive - 12 bxc6 exf3 13 Nxf3 would give White a slight plus) 12...Ne7 13 Kh2 Qd7 14 Rbl Rad8 15 c4 Nf5 16 Nb3 b6 17 a 4 dxc4 18 dxc4 Qd1 19 Ba3 Qxe2 $20 \mathrm{Nxc} 2 \mathrm{Rfe8} 2.1 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Nd} 6 \quad 22 \mathrm{c} 5 \mathrm{Bxb} 32$ Rxb3 Nc4 24 Bcl Nd2 25 Bxd2 Rxd2 26 b4 bxcs 27 Nc6 Nd 28 Rc1 Rxe2 29 Kg3 Ra2 30 Rxc5 e3 31 Rxd5 e2 32 Rbl Ra1, $0: 1$.

Report: Kai Jensen

The first JENKINS TROPHY CHALLENGE MATCH for 1979 was played on 2nd May between North Shore (holder) and the Auckland Centre:

NORTH SHORE
1 O.Sarapu
2 P.A.Garbett
3 P.W.Stuart
4 A.L.Carpinter 5 W.Leonhardt 6 P.J. Hensman 7 D.A.Gollogly 6 S.Richardson* 9 T.Gilbert 0 C.P.Belton 11 J.W.P.Knegt 12 R.L.Roundil1 13 N.A.Bradley 14 G.J.Ion 15 R.A.Feasey 16 R.B.Johnstone 7 P.R.Snelson 1 D.B.Shead 19 G.L.Pitts 20 D.J.Evans

## AUCKLAND

A.R.Day
T.H.Stonehouse
M.K.Morrison*
P.W. Power
P.B.Goffin
P.A.Mataga M.Steadman R.E.Davies
S.Van Dam
K.D.Kinchant
0. Storchenegger
R.E.Gibbons
C.A.Rose
G.E.Trundle
H.A.Dixon
D.J.H.Storey
R.Mathias
D.M.Brunton
B. Winslade F. Zyp

The players marked by an * were substitutes. The intense rivalry between these two clubs promised another close match - the previous three matches produced a total of 30 points for each club and there appeared to be little between the teams this time. The scores were exceedingly close throughout the match and the final result was in doubt until late in the evening. A win on board 15 made the score $10: 9$ and the trophy was retained and when Wayne Power's sacrificial attack petered out to a draw the Shore team gained a narrow victory.

Earlier, things had not looked too
rosy for the holder on some of the lower boards, but one or two dramatic changes of fortune swung the tide.

In a repeat of the 1978 upset, top seed Michael Steadman failed to qualify for the New Zealand Schoolpupil Championship. In this year's AUCKLAND PROVINCIAL SCHOOLPUPIL CHAMPIONSHIP, however, he did manage equal second so he got a second chance which he took by winning the play-off $1 \frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$ against Milton Severinsen.

The 51-player tournament was won by Grant Sidnam with 7/8 including a win over Steadman. He conceded a draw versus Severinsen earlier in the tournament and another in the last round against Neil Morris.

Michael Hopewell (12) was a lonely 4th on 6 points ahead of R.Mathias, G.Tomlin, N.Morris, I, Hutton \& A.Kidd on $5 \frac{1}{2}$.

# SPANISH (Ruy Lopez) OPEN-O'Connell 

Batsford 1978.
Reviewed by Tom Van Dijk
Limp cover.
NZCA Price to Members $\$ 10.05$.

Those players who prefer open piece play and tactical twists from the start should try the Open Ruy Lopez rather than endure the 'tortures of the Spanish Inquisition' in the Closed Spanish. This message comes across very clearly in the latest addition to the Batsford Algebraic Opening Series, under the Editorship of R.G. Wade.

The Open Spanish has not been very popular since the treatment Keres and Stuyslov, playing white, gave Euwe wi the Moscow variation in the World Championship Tournament of 1948. It has reappeared on sporadic occasions but the only grandmaster who has shown a continuing preparedness to walk the tightrope of the Open has been Korchnoi, many of whose innovations can be found in this book.
of course one cannot expect to see Korchnoi's and Karpoy's latest variations here, but many double-edged and exciting moves are highlighted.
Set out in the methodical and attractive style pioneered by Euwe some forty years ago, the book combines detailed variations and analyses with general judgments and remarks that give variety to the text. The many diagrams make it possible to read without recourse to a chess set and a new feature is a useful
conclusion at the end of each of the nineteen chapters, summarising the variations discussed.
The book compares favourably with Keres', Larsen's and Pachman's writings on the subject. o'Connell's experience in writing and editing (e.g. Games of Robert Fischer and Karpov, Chess Yearbooks) has resulted in a clear, well organised book. This is more the result of good editing than of his own analysis Now and again, personal enthusiasms show through, e.g. in the exceedingly complex Dilworth variation which, in this book, merits eleven pages though it is rarely played.

A revival of this opening can be expected, and for those players who like the Open, the book is good value.

N S S

## 2nd WAITEMATA CHESS TOURNAMENT

## 30 June-1 July - Kelston Comm. Centre

 Five round Swiss, 45 moves in $1 \frac{1}{2}$ hours +15 minutes to complete the game.
## Prize Fund \$570.

 (after 23 June, $\$ 8.00$ )Entry forms: R.W.Smith, 9 James Laurie St, Henderson, Auckland, 8.

## Overseas News

The USSR ZONAL PLAY-OFF o decide which of Kuzmin Romanishin and Tseshkovsky would miss out on the Interzonals (in favour of robin but at the end all three players had 4 points Accordingly, a fifth round was played and this turned out to be a disaster for Romanishin who lost both bis games. Final scores: Kuzmin \& Tseshkovsky 5L2, Romanishin 4
Almost all places for the two Interzonals (in Riga is Rio de Janeiro, September/October 1979) are decided. Exceptions are USA (play-off between Shamkovich \& Mednis for the third place), Zone 2 (Zonal to be played at Lucerne in May-June) and a place for an extra Brazilian in the Rio event
The ELDE Bureau decided on the following division of players. Brazil: Portisch, Timman, Mecking Petrosian, Balashov, Sax aganian, Smejkal, Torre Ivkov, Velimirovic, Guil Garcia, L.Bronstein, Harandi, Hébert, Shankofrom Zodne 2 and 1 Brazilian. USSR: Polugaevsky, Larsen,「a1, Hort, Rib1i, Kavalek, jubojevic, Kuzmin, Tseshkovsky, Miles, Adorian, Tarjan, R.Hernandez, Gheo ghiu, van Riemsdyk, Bouaziz, rois, R Rodriguez + one player from Zone 2.
Larsen's dislike of hot climates has been pandered to - but no doubt there will be the usual squeals stronger than the other.

Spartacus Budapest beat the Italian 'Banco di Roma
team in their quarter-final match by $8 \frac{1}{2}: 3 \frac{1}{2}$ despite Mariotti's 2:0 versus Csom on top board. The last of the EUROPEAN CLUB CUP quarter-finals was won by Solingen (BRD) $6 \frac{1}{2}: 5 \frac{1}{2}$ over Sofia (BUL). The pairings for the semi-finals are Rotterdam v Spartacus and Solingen v Burevestnik.

Wales effectively decided the Group 2 qualification in the EUROPEAN TEAM CHAMPIONSHIP by losing 2:14 to England but 'only' $3 \frac{1}{2}: 12 \frac{1}{2}$ to West Germany. In the last match to be played the West Germans beat England $8 \frac{1}{2}: 7 \frac{1}{2}$ - not quite enough to qualify.

The eight teams for the final (to be played in 1980 in England unless an organiser offers to stage it in 19, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Sweden and Bulgaria.

Several b1ind players competed in a tournament at BELGRADE (18 January-2 February) won by (M Marjanovic (YUG) with $10 \frac{1}{2} / 13$ ahead of GM Szabo (HUN) $8 \frac{1}{2}$, GM Tringov (BUL) \& GM Matulovic (YUG) 8, GM Rajkovic (YUG) $7 \frac{1}{2}$, IM Pribyl (CZ) \& IM Ciocaltea (RUM) 7, GM Raicevic (YUG) \& IM Adamski (POL) 6 $\frac{1}{2}$, IM Todorcevic (YUG) 6, Cabarkapa (YUG) 5, Baretic (YUG) \& Dukanovic (YUG) $4 \frac{1}{2}, ~ D . K n e z e v i c ~(Y U G) ~ 1 \frac{1}{2}$.

The withdrawals of GM's Karpov (dying father) and Adorian (il1ness) after five rounds weakened somewhat Adorian (illness) after five rounds weakened somewhat
the MUNICH tournament, played in February-March. At that stage the World Champion was tied with Spassky for the lead.

1 Spassky USSR Balashov USSR 3 Andersson SWE 4 Hübner $B R D$ Stean $E N G$ Pachman BRD Robatsch $A$
8 Unzicker $B R D$
10 Sigurjonsson ICE
11 Pfleger $B R D$
11 Lau BRD
13 Lieb $B R D$
14 Dankert BRD Karpov USSR Adorian HUN
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Category 10 (2500) $G=8, I=6 \frac{1}{2}$.
With two players resting each day it was always
difficult to know precisely the leading placings. Nevertheless, there was an interesting finish. Hübner ( $8 \frac{1}{2}$ ) led with two rounds to play, although he Andersson (71/2) drew with Spassky (7) and Balashov ( $6 \frac{1}{2}$ ) beat Pfleger. In the final round Spassky beat Hübner, Andersson drew with Olafsson, and Balashov beat Lieb to bring about the four-way tie.
DANKERT - KARPOV, Sicilian: 1 e 4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 b4 cxb4 4 d4 d5 5 e5 Ne6 6 ${ }^{\text {a3 }} \mathrm{Bd7} 7$ axb4 $\mathrm{Nxb4} 8$ c3 Nc6 9 Bd3 h6 10 0-0 a6 11 g3 Nge7 12 Nh 4 g 613 Be3 b5 14 Nd2 Na5 15 Qf3 Qc7 16 Rfcl Bc6 17 Ng 2 Nc 418 Nb 3 as $19 \mathrm{Ne4}$ 20 BxL gxis 21 Qhs Qe7 22 Ncs 23 Nrd3 Kc8 24 Rcbl Qe8 25 Ra2 Be7 26 Qe2 550 Nd2 4131 Qe2 h5 $30 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{~h} 4 \quad 31 \mathrm{BC} 4 \mathrm{Qg} 4 \quad 32 \mathrm{Nf} 3$ kb8 33 Nc2 Bc6 34 Ne 3 Qg6 $35 \mathrm{Kh1} \mathrm{hxg}$
 Ngl Qhs 40 Ner 42 exb Qg4 46 Nf4 Qxal 47 N13 R13 48 NC
 Kc7 52 Na3 6353 Nb2 Nxb2, $0: 1$ SPASSKY - SIGURJONSSON, Queen's Indian Defence: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 4 e3 Bb7 5 Bd3 Be7 $60-0$ 0-0 7 b3 d5 $8 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{Nbd} 7 \quad 9 \mathrm{Nc} 3$ c $5 \quad 10 \mathrm{Qe} 2 \mathrm{cxd} 4 \quad 11$ exd4 Re8 12 Radl Bf8 13 Ne5 g6 14 f 4 Rc8 15 Rf2 Nb8 16 Qe3 Nc6 17 Be2 Bb4 18 Bf3 Na5 19 cxd5 Nxd5 20 Nxd5 Bxd5 21 Bxd5 Qxds 22 Ng4 Be7 23 Ba3 Qh5 24 h3 Bh4 25 Re 2 f 526 Ne 5 Rc 327 Qxc 3 Qxe2 28 Rcl Rd8 29 Qc7 Qf2+ 30 Khl Qxf4 31 Qf7+Kh8 32 Nf3, 1 : 0 .
ANDERSSON - ROBATSCH, English: 1 Nf3 Nf6
 b3 $\mathrm{Bg} 7 \mathrm{~B}_{7} 7 \mathrm{Bb} 20_{0} 0 \quad 8 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~d} 59 \mathrm{Nxd5} \mathrm{Nxd5}$ 10 Bxg7 Kxg7 11 cxd5 Qxd5 12 d 4 cxd4 13 Qxd4+ Qxd4 14 Nxd4 Bxg2 15 Kxg 2 a 6 16 Racl Ra7 17 Re2 Rfd8 18 e3 e5 19 Nf3 f6 20 g4 Rd6 21 Rfc1 Nd7 22 Rc6 Rxe6 23 Rxc6 Kf7 24 Nd 2 Ke 725 Ne 4 Rb7 26 b4 Rb8 27 Nc3 f5 28 Nd5+ Kf7 $29 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 30 \operatorname{gxf} 5 \mathrm{gxf} 5 \quad 31 \mathrm{Rd} 6 \mathrm{Rb} 7 \quad 32$ Kh4 $\mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{3} 3 \mathrm{Kxh} 5,1: 0$
SPASSKY - HÜBNER, Nimzoindian Defence:
 5 Nge2 Ba6 6 Ng3 $0-0 \quad 7$ e 4 Nc 688 Bd3 e5 9 d5 Na5 10 Qe2 Bxe3+ 11 bxc3 c6 12 Nf5 Ne8 13 f4 Qc7 14 fxe5 Qxe5 15 $0-0$ f6 16 bf4 Qxc3 17 Rac1 Qa3 18 d 6 Nb7 19 Ne7+ Kh8 20 e5 fxe5 21 Bxe5 Nf6 22 Bxh7 Nxd6 23 Qf2 Ng4 24 Qd4 Qe3+ 25 Qxe3 Rxfl+ 26 Rxfl Nxe3 27

Rf3 Nc8 $28 \mathrm{Ng} 6+, 1: 0$

At SAO PAULO (10-24 February) GM's Viktor Korchnoi and Ljubomir Ljubojevic shared first place with $10 / 13$, each conceding six draws. Korchnoi missed an easy win against his rival in round four and in the last round Ljubojevic caught up through beating Byrne while Korchnoi could only draw with the solid Gheorghiu. Other scores: 3-5 Gneorghiu (RUM), Andersson (SWE) \& Lein (USA) 8; 6 Stean (ENG) $7 \frac{1}{2} ; 7-10$ Panno (ARG), Rocha (BRZ) Segal (BRZ) \& Byrne (USA) $6 \frac{2}{2}$; 11 Sunye (BRZ) $4 \frac{1}{2}$; 12 Braga ( $B R Z$ ) $3 \frac{1}{2}$; 13 Filguth ( $B R Z$ ) 3; 14 van Riemsdyk ( $B R Z$ ) $2 \frac{1}{2}$
The tournament was category 10 (2489) $G=8 \frac{2}{2}, I=6$.
LJUBOJEVIC - KORCHNOI, French Defence 1 e4 e6 2 d3 d5 3 Nd2 c5 4 Ngf 3 Nc6
 9 e5 Nd7 10 Nf1 Ba6 $11 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \quad 12$ N1h2 b5 13 Bg5 b4 14 Qd2 c4 15 d4 c3! 16 bxc3 bxc3 17 Qf4 Nb4 18 Recl $\operatorname{Be} 219$ a3 Ne6 20 Rel Ba6 21 Qg4 Kh8 22 Qh5 Qe8 23 Bxe7 Nxe7 24 Ng5 h6 25 Bh3 Nc 26 NgI Nas 27 Qun 28 Redl 23 Bxa6 64 Nat 6 Ne4 36 Q84 1507013 Ne4 36 Qg4 h5 37 Qh3 Nc3 38 Rxd2 Rxd
 Rxe6 Oc5 +


Yugoslavia's top two players, GM' Gligoric and Ljubojevic, recently (6-20 March) played a 'friendly' match purse of US $\$ 13,000$, of which $60 \%$ to the winner. The match was hard fought with fev draws, as the results show: LJUBOJEVIC $1110 \frac{1}{2} 011 \frac{1}{2} 011 \frac{1}{2} \quad 5^{\frac{1}{2}}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { GLIGORIC } & 0 & 0 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}\end{array} \quad 4 \frac{1}{2}$

The third game (won by Gligoric) and the sixth (won by Ljubojevic) were rec
koned to be the best：
LJUBOJEVIC－GLIGORIC，English： 1 c 4 c 5 2 Nf3 Nf6 3 Ne3 e6 4 d4 cxd4 5 Nxd4
 Rd1 0－0 10 Bd4 Bb7 11 e3 Be7 12 a3 Nc5 13 Qa2 a5 $14 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Qb} 8 \quad 15$ e4 Nh5 $16 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Nf} 4 \quad 17 \quad 0-0$ f5 18 e5 d6 $\quad 19$ exd6 Bxd6 20 Kh 1 e5 $21 \mathrm{Bgl} \mathrm{e}_{4} 22$ fxe4 Nxe2 23 Nxe2 Bxe4 24 Ncd4 Rf6 25 Nf3 Rh6 $26 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Qb} 7 \quad 27$ Ned4 g5 $28 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{f} 4 \quad 29 \mathrm{Nb} 5$ Bf8 30 Bxc5 Bxe5 31 b4 g4！ 32 bxc5 gxf3 $33 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Qg} 7 \quad 34 \mathrm{Qf} 2 \mathrm{fxg} 2 \quad 35 \mathrm{Rfe} 1$ Qg4， $0: 1$ ．

## GLIGORIC－LJUBOJEVIC，Slav Meran： 1 d4

 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nc3 d5 4 Nf3 c6 5 e3 Nbd7 6 Bd3 dxc4 7 Bxc4 b5 8 Bd 3 a6 9 e4 c5 10 d5 c4 11 dxe6 cxd3 12 Rel Rd8 16 e5 Ng4 17 Ne4 $0-0 \quad 18 \mathrm{~h} 3$ Bxe4 19 Rxe4


19．．．Nxf2！！ 20 Kxf2 Bxg5 21 Nxg5 Qf5＋ 22 Qf 3 Qxg 5 23 Rd1 d2 24 Qe3？ （24 Qf4）Qf5＋ 25
 28 g4？Rc8 29 Oel 28 g4？Rc8 29 Qe1
Rd8＋ 30 Kcl Od3 3í b3 Rc8t 32 Kb 2 Qc2＋ 33 Ka 3 a5 34 e 6 b4＋ 35 Ka 4 Qce + 36 Kxa5 Qc5＋， $0: 1$.

A very strong DUTCH CHAMPIONSHIP was won by IM Ligterink with $10 / 13$ ，ahead of IM Ree and GM Timman on 9．Then GM Donner \＆IM van der Wiel 71 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2} \text { ；Baljon \＆}}$ GM Sosonko 7；van der Vliet，IM Böhm \＆ IM Langeweg 6；IM Hartoch $5 \frac{1}{2}$ ；van Dop
$4 \frac{1}{2}$ ；Hofland 4；van der Weide 2．

The YUGOSLAV CHAMPIONSHIP（ $10-25 \mathrm{Feb}$. was，this year，a 13 －round Swiss with 42 players．New champion was GM Nemet with 10 points．He was followed by IM Nikoloc，IM Rogulj \＆GM Vukic 8홀；IM Messing，IM Todorcevic，IM Kelecevic， GM Raicevic，IM Karaklaic \＆IM Nikolac 8；Z．Nikolic，GM Janosevic，GM Velimi－ rovic \＆IM Popovic 7 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ ；GM Kovacevic， GM Matulovic，GM Marjanovic，IM Antunac IM Bjelajac \＆Maksimovic 7；GM Planinc \＆Sprecic $6 \frac{1}{2}$ ．．．

Another quadruple tie occurred at the DUBNA tournament in March．GM Zaitsev， GM Razuvaev，GM Suetin（all USSR）\＆GM Sahovic（YUG）each scored $9 \frac{1}{2} / 15$ ．They were followed by GM Sveshnikov（USSR） GM Forintos（HUN）8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ；GM Rashkovsky （USSR）\＆IM Ungureanu（RUM）8；GM Pla－ hetka（CZ）\＆IM Gheorghiev（BUL） $7 \frac{1}{2}$ ； GM Knezevic（YUG）\＆IM Panchenko（USSR） ；Kaidanov（USSR）6；Lukacs（HUN）5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ； GM Farago（HUN）4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ；Gusev（USSR） 4.
The tournamient was category 9 （2457） $G=10 \frac{1}{2}, I=7 \frac{1}{2}$.
RAZUVAEV－FARAGO，Queen＇s Gambit： 1 d4 e6 2 Nf3 Nf6 3 c4 d5 $4 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 5$ cxd5 Nxd5 6 e3 Nc6 7 Bc4 cxd4 8 exd4 Be7 $90-0 \quad 0-0 \quad 10$ Rel Nxe3 11 bxc3 b6 12

 Bd5 16 Nh 7 Re 817 Bxh6！gxh6 18 Oxh6 f5 19 Re 3 Bxh4 $20 \mathrm{Rg} 3+$ ！Bxg 3120 | Kh 8 | $22 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \mathrm{Bh} 2+$ | 23 Khl | Rxf 6 | 24 | $\mathrm{Qxf} 6+$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Kg8 } & 25 & \text { Kxh2 Rac8 } & 23 \text { Khl Qxf6 } & 24 & \text { Qxf } 6+ \\ \text { Rhl Rc7 } & 27 & \text { Qg6t }\end{array}$ Kf8 28 Kg1 Rf7 29 Qg5 Rfe7 30 Rh8t Kf7 31 Qh5t， 1 ： 0.

ZAITSEV－PLACHETKA，Grünfeld Defence：




 Na5 19 Bd3 Rac8 20 f5 Rxcl 21 Qxe 1 Ne6 22 a3 Qa5 23 f6t exf6 24 exf6t Kf8 25 Qh6 + Ke8 26 Qxh 7 Ne 527 dxe5 Oc5＋ $28 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Rxd} 3 \quad 29 \mathrm{Qg} 8+\mathrm{Qf} 8 \quad 30 \mathrm{Qg} 7$ Rd2 31 Nf4，l ： 0 ．

Ex－World Champion Tigran Petrosian won the annual TALLINN tournament（March） with 12／16，a half－point ahead of Soviet GM＇s Vaganian and Tal．Petrosian＇s vic－ tory only came in the last round when he beat sax while the then leading Tal lost gainst Ivanovic；in fact，the Yugoslav M could be said to have decided the final placings as he lost to Petrosian zut beat both runners－up！Other scores： GM Bronstein（USSR）10；Veingold（USSR） GM Sax（HUN）9⿳亠口冋2 ；Zilberstein（USSR），IM Hartston（ENG），GM Knaak（DDR）\＆IM Lechtynski（CZ）8；IM Nei（USSR）\＆GM Christiansen（USA） $7 \frac{1}{2}$ ；Vooremaa（USSR） IM Vilela（CUB）6；Pitov（USSR）5－1 GM Ivanovic（YUG）5；IM Rantanen（FIN） $2 \frac{1}{2}$ ．Category 8 （2431），$G=12, I=8 \frac{1}{2}$ ．
ETROSIAN－SAX，Pirc Defence： 1 Nf3 g6 2 e4 Bg7 3 d4 d6 4 Nc3 Nf6 5 Be2 0－0 6 $0-0 \mathrm{Bg} 47 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 68 \mathrm{Od} 2$ e5 9 dxe5
dxe5 10 Radl Qc8 11 Qc1 Rd8 12 Rxd8＋ Qxd8 13 Rdl Qf8 14 h 3 Bxf3 $15 \mathrm{Bxf3}$
 19 Nd2 Bf8 20 QbI Qb5 21 Qc2 Nd8 22 Qb3 Qd3 23 Qc4 Qd6 24 Qe2 Qe6 25 Qd
 c 4 Nf6 33 cxb 5 axb 34 Ncb Qe3 32 40 No cxbs axbs 34 Qxbs Nxe4 35 0．5 Nf5 39 Qc2 1370 Qd7 42 a4 Nf5 43 Qe2， 1 ： 0

The 15 th BELGRADE WOMEN＇S TOURNAMENT （March）saw Nana Aleksandria（USSR）win－ ming with $10 \frac{1}{2} / 12$ ，a full point ahead of omen s World Champion Maya Chiburdanid e．Both players were undefeated．Third was Veroczy－Petronic（HUN）on 8 and equal fourth were Stadler（YUG）and van der Mije（ $N L$ ）on $7 \ldots . .13$ players．

The annual Louis D．Statham Masters－ plus Tournament at LONE．PINE was a nine round Swiss played 25 March to 4 April． This year 27 GMs and 22 LMs competed for the $\$ 45,000$ prize fund
The two Soviet GMs Tseshkovsky and Romanishin arrived to play but withdrew when Korchnoi was allowed to compete－ UISR players are boycotting events in which the recent Worla Championship
challenger participates．
Early favourites were Korchnoi and Larsen but the latter was beaten by the Anerican junior Yasser Seirawan in round cwo while Korchnoi was leading with berore losing in the fifth round to bardy！In the last two rounds Korchnoi drew with Diesen and Kaplan and finished llth＝with $5 \frac{1}{2}$ points．

The first clear leader was Sahovic who led after 6 rounds with 5 points and maincained his lead after round seven The Yugoslav GM lost to Liberzon the next day，however，and the Soviet emi gre shared the lead with Hort and Gligo－ ric．In the last round，Liberzon chose the Exchange variation against Hort＇s French Defence for an early draw while Larsen and Gligoric both played for the win ．．．．but drew after five hours．Of the group behind，only Gheorghiu caught up with a win against Tarjan．
Final scores：1－4 GM Gligoric（YUG） GM Hort（CZ），GM Gheorghiu（RUM）\＆GM Liberzon（ISR）6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ；5－10 GM Larsen
（DEN），GM Sahovic，GM Lombardy（USA），CM Sosonko（NL），IM Ree（NL）\＆IM Grunfeld （ISR）6；11－22 GM Tarjan（USA），TM Kap lan（USA），GM Korchnoi，GM Shankovic （USA），M Diesen（USA），GM Bisguier （USA），GM Lein（USA），Morris（USA），GM （USA）（BRD），Selrawan，GM Reshevsky USA）a Peters（USA）52，2．3－33 de Fir－ son（ICE）， （FNG）TM Jaltan（USA），IM Lister （NC），M Sigurjansson ，MM Ligterink （USA）GM Browne（USA）s GM Ga Benk
（YUG），G．Browne（USA）\＆GMajkovic
（YUG）5；34－44 Bradford（USA），Fedoro－ wicz（USA），van der Sterren（NL），GM Os tojic（YUG），iM Chandler（NZ），GM Quin－ vic（YUG），GM Christiansen（USA）IM van Riemsdyk（BRZ）\＆TM Weinstein（USA） $4 \frac{1}{2}$ Riemsdyk（BRZ）\＆JM Weinstein（USA） only Seirawan made a GM norm－this com pletes his IM qualification．De Firmian van der Sterren，Morris，Peters，Brad ford and Odendah1 acbieved IM norms，the first two thus gaining the title．
SEIRAWAN－LARSEN，English：i c4 f5 2 Ne3 Nf6 3 g 3 e5 $4 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 5 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~d} 66$ $0-0$ 0－0 7 d3 Kh8 8 Kbl a5 9 a3 Qe8 10 c 5 a 4111 cxd6 Bxd6 12 Nd 2 Ra 7 l 13 Ne4 Be5 14 b3 axb $3 \quad 15$ Qxb3 Ne6 16 e 3 Na5 17 Qb5 Qe7 18 Nxa5 Bd7 19 Qb3 Rxa5 20 Qxb7 Qd6 21 Rd1 Bxa3 22 d4 exd4 $23 \mathrm{Rxd} 4 \mathrm{Qc} 5 \quad 24 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{Ra} 7 \quad 25 \mathrm{Qb} 3$ Qe7 26 Nb5 Bxb5 27 Qxb5 Qe6 28 Qb8 Be5 29 Rd8 Qg8 30 Rxf8 Qxf8 31 Qxf8＋ Bxf8 $32 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 33 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \mathrm{Ral+} 34 \mathrm{Bfl}$ c5 $35 \mathrm{Bc} 3 \mathrm{Rdl} 36 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Kf7} 37 \mathrm{Bc} 4+\mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{Kl}^{38}$ Bxf6t gxf6 $39 \mathrm{Rb} 7+\mathrm{Rd} 740 \mathrm{Rb} 6 \mathrm{Rd6} 4$ Rb5 Rc6 42 Rb7＋Kd6 43 Rxh 7 Rb6 44 Ke5 Rb2 45 Rh4 Kas 46 bxf5 c4 47 Rd4 51 Rf5 Be 7 Rb4 49 Kf3 c3 50 Ra8 Rb $848 \mathrm{Kc} 6-55 \mathrm{Re} 8+\mathrm{Bc} 756 \mathrm{Rf} \mathrm{Kb}_{57}$ Rxf6 P 58 Re2 Pre 269 Kd7 60
 8f6 64 $41465 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{Re}^{2} 66 \mathrm{f3}$ Be 5 67 Rxe5t 1： 0

LIBERZON－KORCHNOI，Caro－Kann Defence 1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 Nc3 dxe4 4 Nxe4 Nf6 5 Nxf6＋exf6 6 Bc4 Nd7 7 Ne2 Bd6 8
 Bxf4 12 Nxf4 Bf5 13 c3 Qc7 14 Nd3 Rad8 15 Rel g6 16 Nc5 Nd5 17 Qd2 b6 18 Ne4 Kg7 19 Radl Nf4 20 g 3 Ne6 21 Nf2 c5 22 d5 c4 $23 \mathrm{Ba} 4 \mathrm{Nc} 5 \quad .24 \mathrm{Bb} 5 \mathrm{Bd} 3$ 25 Be6 Rd6 26 b4 Nd7 27 Nxd 3 cxd 328 Re7 Rxc6 29 dxc6 Qxe6 30 f4 b5 31 Qxd3 Nb6 32 Qd4 Na4 33 Re 1 Re 834 Re 3


38 Rd3 Rc6 39 Rel fxg5 40 fxg5 h6 41 h4 hxg5 42 hxg 5 Na 443 Ree 3 Rc 444
 $51 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{f} 6 \quad 52 \mathrm{Kd} 4 \mathrm{fxg} 5 \quad 53 \mathrm{Rxg} 5 \mathrm{Kh} 654$ Rc5 Rf7 55 Rc6 Rf2 56 Rg8 Rf4t $57 \mathrm{Kd5}$ $\mathrm{Ne} 3+58 \mathrm{Ke} 5 \mathrm{Rg} 459 \mathrm{Rxa6} \mathrm{Nd} 160 \mathrm{Rc} 6$ $\mathrm{Nb} 261 \mathrm{Kd} 5 \mathrm{Na} 462 \mathrm{Ra} 8 \mathrm{Rg} 2 \quad 63 \mathrm{Ra} 5 \mathrm{Rg} 3$
 a4 Nd2＋ $68 \mathrm{Kd5}, 1$ ： 0.
GHEORGHIU－TARJAN，Queen＇s Indian Def： 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 Bb4＋ 4 Nbd2 b6 5 e3 Bb7 $6 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{c} 57 \mathrm{a} 3 \mathrm{Bxd} 2+8 \mathrm{Bxd} 2$ $0-09$ Bc3 Ne4 10 Bxe4 Bxe4 11 dxe5 bxc5 12 Qd6 Nc6 13 Qxc5 Rc8 14 Qd6 f6
 e4 Rb8 $19 \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{Bf} 720 \mathrm{~b} 5 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \quad 21 \mathrm{Bxe} 5$ fxe5 22 a4 Kf8 23 Rfcl Rbc8 24 a5 d6 25 b6 axb6 26 axb6 Rb7 $27 \mathrm{c5} \mathrm{Be} 8 \quad 28$ f3 Reb8 29 Nc4 dxc5 $30 \mathrm{Ra5} \mathrm{Ke7} 31$ Rxc5 Bd7 32 Nxe5 Kd6 $33 \mathrm{Ra5} \mathrm{Be} 834$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Nc4＋Kc6 } & 35 & \text { Rdl } \mathrm{Rf} 7 & 36 & \text { Rd6＋Kb7 } & 37 \\ \text { Ra7＋Kc8 } & 38 & \text { Rxe6，} 1 & \mathbf{l} & 0 .\end{array}$

Murray Chandler＇s $50 \%$ score included wins against GM＇s Rajkovic and Nikolic－ his opponents were 4 GMs and 5 IMs．
NIKOLIC－CHANDLER，Modern Defence： $\begin{array}{lllllllll}1 & \text { e4 d6 } & 2 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 & 3 \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 7 & 4 \mathrm{f} 4 & \mathrm{e} 6 & 5\end{array}$ Nf3 Ne7 6 Qe2 c5 7 d3 Nbc6 8 a3 0－0 9 0－0 Rb8 10 Qt2 Nd4 11 Ndl b5 12 Ba Nxis＋ 13 Qxf3 Ne6 14 c3 b4 15 axb4 cxb4 16 Bb1 bxc 317 bxc 3 Nd 418 Qe Na 79 Ral Nxc1 20 Qxcl 84 Bd7 25 exf6 Bxf6 26 Qel Bg7 27 Ba2 Kh8 28 Ng4


28．．．Rxc3：？ 29 Rxc3 Qxd4t 30 Re3 Qxg4 31 Bxe6 Qd4 32 Khl Bc6 33 Qg 3 Re8 34 Rfel Rf8 35 Bg 4 a5 36 Bf 3 Bb5 37 Rb3 Qc5 38 Reb1 Be8 39 Be2 a4 40 Rf 3 Rg 841 Qel Bc6 42 Rcl Qb6 43 Rh3 Re8 44 Qh4 h6 45 Rhc3 Bxg2＋ 46 Kxg2 Rxe2＋ 47 Kfl Re5 48 Rf3 a3 49 Qc4 Rg5 50 Rf2 Qe3 51 Rcc2 Qh3＋ 52 Kel Kh7 53 Ree2 Rgl＋ $54 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{a} 2,0: 1$.

Prior to Lone Pine Murray Chandler competed in the MARSHALL INVITATIONAL， a ten round Swiss played in New York． This strong tournament was won by 19 year－old American IM Michael Rohde who
made a GM norm in scoring 8 points．GM Shamkovich（USA）was clear second on $7 \frac{1}{2}$ while Meyer and Kaufman（both USA）came in equal third on 7 ．Then followed IM Formanek $6 \frac{1}{2}$ ；GM Ostojic，IM Zuckerman， Valvo，Rind \＆Goodman 6；IM Chandler， Plaskett \＆Fabio La Rota 5 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ ．．．．

GM Mark Taimanov（USSR）won the tour－ nament at BUCHAREST in March with $9 \frac{1}{2} / 15$ Other scores were：GM Suba（RUM），GM Ciocaltea（RUM）\＆IM Ghitescu（RUM） 9 ； GM Bellon（SP），GM Uhlmann（DDR）\＆Biri escu（RUM）8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ；IM Stoica（RUM）8；IM Haik（FRA）712；GM Barczay（HUN），IM Ro－ gulj（YUG），Bielczyk（POL）\＆Foisor （RUM）6䒜；Negulescu（RUM）6；IM Peev （BUL） $5 \frac{1}{2}$ ；IM Lanc（ $C Z$ ） 5 ．

SARAJEVO，11－27 March：1－3 GM Knezevic （YUG），GM Farago（HUN）\＆GM Kurajica （YUG）9亩／14； 4 GM Jansa（CZ）9；5－6 Arapovic（YUG）\＆Osmanovic（YUG）8； 7 Rajna（HUN）7논； 8 IM Mestrovic（YUG）7； 9 Dizdarevic（YUG）63 $\frac{1}{2}$ ；10－13 GM Raice－ vic（YUG），Maslesha（YUG），IM Kelecevic （YUG）\＆IM Doda（POL）5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ； 14 Lalic（YUG） 5； 15 IM Bouaziz（tUN）31 $\frac{1}{2}$ ．
Arapovic and Osmanovic made their final IM norms．

TRSTENIK（YUG），9－22 March： 1 GM Mar－ janovic（YUG）81 $\frac{1}{2} / 12$ ；2－3 GM Martinovic （YUG）\＆GM Rajkovic（YUG）8；4－5 IM Pytel（POL）\＆GM Ciric（YUG）7t Popovic（YUG）\＆IM Honfi（HUN）6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ；8－9 IM Inkiov（BUL）\＆GM Tringov（YUG）6； 10 Sellos（FRA）51／2； 11 IM Schüssler （SWE）4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ； 12 Bzenic（YUG）2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ； 13 Jele－ sijevic（YUG） 1.

3rd BANCO DI ROMA TOURNAMENT，18－29 March： 1 IM Pinter（HUN）71／2／11； 2 GM Mariotti（IT）7； 3 GM Csom（HUN）6年； 4－7 IM Toth（IT），GM Schmidt（POL），IM Tatai（IT）\＆Cappello（IT）6；8－9 IM Hug（SWI）\＆GM Keene（ENG） $5 \frac{1}{2}$ ； 10 GM Marovic（YUG）5； 11 Passerotti（IT） 3 12 Coppini（IT） 2

The lst ASIAN CITIES TOURNAMENT was
played in Hong Kong from 25 March to 1 April．The seven round Swiss was won by Singapore with $19 / 28$ ．Manila $18 \frac{1}{2}$ and Peking \＆Jakarta 18 were very close be－ hind．Then came Canton $16 \frac{1}{2}$ ，Hong Kong A 16，Shanghai $14 \frac{1}{2}$ ，Bangkok 14 ，Tokyo 10 Kuala Lumpur 9，Penang 81／2，Hong Kong B 6．Most teams were not at full strength．

At DORTMUND（BRD）GM Tamas Georgadze （USSR）won with $8 \frac{1}{2} / 11$ ahead of Juraj Nikolac．This was the second and final GM norm for the 47－year old Yugoslav．
Other scores：Nunn（ENG） $7 \frac{1}{2}$ ；Ghinda （RUM），Miles（ENG）\＆Jansa（CZ）6；Bou－ aziz（TUN），Schussler（SWE）\＆Borik （BRD）4 $4 \frac{1}{2}$ ；Gerusel（BRD）4；Perecz （HUN）3늘；Böhnfeldt（BRD） 3.
GEORGADZE－MILES，Sicilian Dragon：
1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 g6 6 Ве3 $3 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 7$ f3 $0-0 \quad 8$ Bc4 4 Bd 7 9 Qd2 Ne6 10 h 4 Re8 11 Bb3 h5 12 $0-0-0$ Ne5 13 Bg5 Re5 14 g 4 hag 415 Bxf6 Bxf6 $16 \begin{array}{lllllllll} & \mathrm{h} 5 & \mathrm{~g} 5 & 17 & \mathrm{Nd} 5 & \mathrm{e} 6 \\ 18 & \mathrm{Nxf6}\end{array}$ Qxf6 19 fxg 4 Rd8 20 Rhfl Qe7 21 KbI b5 22 a3 Be6 23 Qe2 a5 24 Rf2 Rb8 25 Nxc6 Rxc6 26 Qd2 b4 27 a4 Rf8 28 Rdf1 f6？！（28．．．Rc5＝） 29 Qe 2 Kg 7 K 0 Rdl Rc 5 $31 \operatorname{Rffl} \operatorname{Rfc} 832$ Qg2 Nd7 33 Rd4 Re5 34 Rfdl Rc6 35 Qf3 Nc5 36 Rfl Rc8 37 Rxd6！Rxe4 38 Rfdl Rel 39 h6＋Kg6 40 Rxel Qxd6 41 Bxe6 Nxe6 42 Qf5＋， $1: 0$.

Soviet GM Alexander Beljavsky won a tournament at BOGOTA（COL）in May with a fine $12 \frac{1}{2} / 14$ ．Two points in arrears was American GM Tarjan and a further point back in third place was IM G．Gar－ cia（COL）with 91／2．．．． 15 players．

Unrated 16－year old Garri Kasparov （USSR）walked off with the first prize at the international tournament in BANJA LUKA（YUG）ahead of 14 grand－ masters！Kasparov had already made a very good result in the USSR Ch＇p last December（see April NZ CHESS）－in this tournament he made his first GM norto
with two rounds to spare and went through the tournament undefeated．He actually turned 16 on the day of the first round when he drew with Petrosian． Scores： 1 Kasparov $11 \frac{1}{2}$ ；2－3 GM Ander sson（SWE）\＆GM Smejkal（CZ）9⿺𠃊⿳亠丷厂彡2， 4 GM Petrosian（USSR）9； 5 GM Adorian（HUN） $8 \frac{1}{2} ; 6 \mathrm{GM}$ Knezevic（YUG）8；7－8 GM

Matanovic（YUG）\＆GM Browne（USA）7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ； 9 GM Bukic（YUG）7；10－13 GM Marovic （YUG），GM Vukic（YUG），GM Marjanovic （YUG）\＆GM G．Garcia（CUB）6 $6 \frac{1}{2}$ ；14－15 GM Hernandez（CUB）\＆GM Kurajica（YUG）6； 16 Sibarevic（YUG） 4.
The tournament，played 13 April－ 2 May，was Category 10 （average rating 2487）．The GM norm was $10 \frac{1}{2}$ ，IM norm $7 \frac{1}{2}$ ． KASPAROV－BROWNE，Queen＇s Indian Def．：

 12 0－0 Nh5 513 Bd 2 Nhf $6 \quad 14$ Rfel Bf8 15
 19 h 3 Ngf6 $20 \mathrm{Bc} 3 \mathrm{Qc} 7 \quad 21 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Bc} 8 \quad 22$ Bfl g5 23 Nf 3 h $6 \quad 24$ Nc4 b5 25 axb5 axbs 26 e5 Nxd5 27 Nxd6 Bxd6 28 exd6 Qd8 29 Ne5 Nb4 30 Qd2 Nxe5 31 Rxe5 Rxe5 32 Bxe5 Nc6 33 Qe3 Nxe5 34 Qxe5 c4 $35 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Be} 6 \quad 36 \mathrm{Ra} 7 \mathrm{~b} 4 \quad 37 \mathrm{Be} 4 \mathrm{c} 3 \quad 38$ Bh7＋Kxh7 39 Qxe6， 1 ： 0.
KASPAROV－MARJANOVIC，Queen＇s Indian Defence： 1 d $4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 2$ c 4 e6 3 Nf 3 b $6 \quad 4$ a3 Bb7 5 Ne3 d5 6 cxd5 Nxd5 7 e3 Be7 8 Bb5＋c6 9 Bd3 0－0 10 e4 Nxc3 11
 Nc6 15 d5 Na5 16 dxef fxe6 17 Bg 3 Rc 8 18 Nes Bf6 19 Qg4 Qe8 20 Ng6 Bxal 21 Nxf8 Bo2 22 Nxe6 R 2 23 Qe2 B16 24 Nc Q17 25 e5 Qxc 726 Qxh5 Qc6 $27 \mathrm{f3}$ Be7 $31 \mathrm{Bl}+\mathrm{Qd5} 32 \mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{Ke8} 30 \mathrm{Bg} 6+\mathrm{Ka}$ 31 Rdl＋Qd5 32 Rxd5＋Bxd5 33 Qd3 Rcl＋ $34 \mathrm{Kf} 2,1$ ： 0.
KASPAROV－BUKIC，King＇s Indian Defence 1 c4 Nf6 2 Nc3 g6 3 d4 Bg7 4 e4 d6 Nf3 0－0 6 Be2 Bg4 7 Be3 Nfd7 8 Ng 1 Bxe2 9 Ngxe2 e5 $100-0$ a5 11 Qd2 Nc6 12 f3 exd4 13 Nxd4 Nc5 14 Radl Ne6 15 Ndb5 Re8 16 Qcl Qb8 17 Bh6 Bh8 18 Nd5
 fxe6 Rxe6 23 exd5 Re7 24 Bf4 Rd7 25 Nxd6 Qd8 $26 \mathrm{Nb} 5 \mathrm{Nc} 5 \quad 27$ Qe3 b6 $28 \quad \mathrm{~b} 4$ axb4 $29 \mathrm{axb} 4 \mathrm{Na} 630 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Qb} 8 \quad 31 \mathrm{~d} 6 \mathrm{Nxb} 4$ $32 \mathrm{Be} 7 \mathrm{Qb} 733 \mathrm{Rxf} 7 \mathrm{Kxf} 734 \mathrm{Rf} 1+\mathrm{Bf} 6$ 35 Bxf6， 1 ： 0.
Kasparov comes from Baku（Azerbaijan SSR）on the coast of the Caspian Sea．He has been a pupil of ex－World Champion Botvinnik for some years now．Botvinnik chess that when Kasparov joined his impressed with his ability to pursuas mpessed with his ability tions．Rasparov himself considers his weak．Kasp to be in defence and in the play of simple positions．

## Scotch Opening

In recent international tournaments players have been looking for openings where theory is either old or the line concerned not well analysed. The Scotch is one opening that has been receiving such attention of late.

It was therefore interesting to see its appearance in the recent New Zealand Championships, Peter Weir playing it twice. Whilst the results obtained by White in the Championship and Premier Reserve were not outstanding, I felt the opening well worth analysing. The first part of this article is centred on the Weir-Sarapu game.

| 1 | e4 | e5 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | Nf3 | Nc6 |
| 3 | d4 | exd4 |
| 4 | Nxd4 |  |

Black now has three main continuations: 4...Qh4!? was not played at Congress but is very interesting, 4...Bc5 featured is very interesting, 4...Bc5 featured times in the Premier Reserve, and 4... Nf6 as in this game.

| 4 | ̈x | $N f 6$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 |  |  |

White can of course play 5 Nc3 but this is not considered in this article.

| 5 | $\ldots$ | bxc6 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 6 | 5 | 0e7 |

In Cater-Roberts (Premier Reserve) Black played 6...Ne4 to which Jim replied 7 Bd3 which promises no advantage. Correct is 7 Qf3! when Black can choose between 7...Qh4 8 g3 Ng5 9 Qe2 Qe4. 10 Bxg5 Qxh1 11 Nc3 h6 12 Bf4 Qxh2 13 Ne4 Be7 14 0-0-0 0-0 15 Qf3 which gave White the advantage in Gusakov-Efimov 1959, 7...Nc5 8 Bc4 Qe7 (8...Ne6 9 0-0 Qh4 10 Nd2 and White is better, WadeBalanel 1954) 9 0-0 Ba6 10 Bxa6 Nxa6 11 Nd2 Qe6 $12 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 13 \mathrm{Bb} 20-0 \quad 14$ Ne4 with a small advantage for White in Boey-Sigurjonsson 1968, and 7...Ng5 8 Qg3 (8 Qc3!?) 8...Ne6 9 Bd3 d5 10 0-0 and White is better, Bednarski-Prameshuber 1964.

| 7 | Qe 2 | Nd 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Worth | considering is | 7...Ng8: |
| 8 | $c 4$ | Nb 5 |

Unusual; more common is 8...Ba6 9 Nd2
(9 b3 has been played but Black got the better chances in Radulov Rukavina 1972 after 9...0-0-0 10 Bb2 f6 II Nd2).


After 9 Nd 2 (see diagram) Black has three main replies: 1) $9 \ldots \mathrm{Nb} 4 \quad 10 \mathrm{Nf} 3$ c5. (10...d5 11 a3 Bxc4 12 Qal Bxfl 13 Kxfl Na 514 Qa $\mathrm{Nb} 815 \mathrm{Bg} 5, E C O)$ 1 a3 Nc6 with equal chances, Barczay
 $12 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{f} 6 \quad 13$ вb2 Re8 14 0-0-0 fxe5 15
 White is on the way to obtaining a winning advantage, Kozlov-Suleimanov 1969; $0-0-0 \mathrm{Bg} 713 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Rhe} 814$ ff 2 d 6 Bb7!?) 15 5 , with a for White in Narodizk-Makarov 1962.

9 Nd2
d5!?


I have been unable to find any reference to Sarapu's move. Maybe Ortvin found the move over the board, or perhaps it came from one of his old Russian sources.
A couple of other tries here are:

1) $9 \ldots . \mathrm{Qe} 6 \quad 10 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 11 \mathrm{Bb} 20-0 \quad 12$ Qe4 d5 13 exd 6 cxd6 14 Bd 3 a5 15 0-0 Qxe4 16 Bxe4 d5 with an equal position in Hennings-Gligoric 1967;
2) $9 . . \mathrm{Bb} 7 \quad 10 \mathrm{~b} 30-0-0$ (better is 10 ..Qe6 as in Tringov-Parma 1967) 11 Bb 2 with the idea of castling queenside and following with $f 4$ giving White slightly better chances.

| 10 | exd6 | cxd6 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 11 | Ne4 | Be6 |
| 12 | Bf4!? | Nxc4 |
| 13 | b3 | Bd5! |
| 14 | bxc4 | Bxe4 |

White has a difficult position - it is hard to get the Bfi into play and the king out of the centre.

15
0-0-0


16 Bxd6?
This is bad as the sequel shows. White must try to block the a3-f8 diagonal the only try is 16 c5!? and now:
2) $16 \ldots . . \mathrm{d} 5$ ? 17 Qab+ Qb7 (17...Kd7 18 Qb7+ Ke8 19 Qxc6t Rd7 20 Bd6 is good for White, or $19 \ldots Q d 720 \mathrm{Bb5}$ !) 18 Qa5: and again White wins;

- 3) $16 . . . \mathrm{Qb} 717$ Qa6 Qxa6 18 Bxa6+ and the black king sets up a pin whichever way it moves allowing white to castle with good play;

4) $16 \ldots$...Bg6 17 Qxe7 Bxe $718 \mathrm{Ba} 6+$ also gives White play for the pawn; 5) 16...Bd5!? 17 Qxe7 Bxe7 18 Ba6+ Kd7 $190-0$ and White may have a little play for the pawn.
After the game continuation B1ack gained a good position as follows:

| 16 | $\ldots$ | Qxd6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 | Rxd6 | Bxd6 |
| 18 | Qxe4 |  |
| Perhaps | 18 | c5 was |
| 18 | $\ldots$ | better try. |
| 19 | Qxe8 | Rhe8 |
| 20 | Ke2 | Rb4+1 |
| 21 | Kf3 | Rd8 |
| 22 | Re2 | Rd2 |

The ending is very favourable for Black. Weir-Sarapu (NZ Championship 1978 -79) concluded:
23 Ral Bc5 24 a4 Kc7 25 Rf1 a5 26 h4 f5 27 h5 g5 28 Bd1 h6 $29 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \quad \mathrm{Bxf} 2+$ $30 \mathrm{Rxf} 2 \mathrm{f4}+31 \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{Rxd1} 32 \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{Rh1} 33$ Kf5 Rxh5 34 Re2 Kd6 35 Re6 +Kc 536 Kg6 Rh2 $37 \mathrm{Re} 5+\mathrm{Kb} 438 \mathrm{Re} 6 \mathrm{c5} 39 \mathrm{Rb} 6+$ Kxc4 40 Rb5 Rxg2 41 Rxa5 f3 42 Ra7 Rg4, $0: 1$.

The Pawns are minions in the game, Which sometimes rise in rank and fame. Five steps from commoner to queen, With many hazards in between.

The Knight he jumps from place to place, For forks elusive he will chase. He gets there in a devious way,
His lord and master to obey.
The Bishop moves diagonally,
His path is straight and clear to see No pacifist this pious one,
He kills for vantage, not $\overline{\text { cor }}$ fun.
The Rook he guards the rank and file, For straight lines only are his style. He'll guard his king throughout the play But endgames are the Rook's forte.

The Queen no fragile female she Emancipated, strong and free. She' 11 move in any line you please, Her power not easy to appease.

The King controls the mode of play, His movements slow, it's fair to say. Hie fights his battles from the rear His life in jeopardy and fear

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\mathrm{B} & \mathrm{~g} \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

DRAWING LINE MISSED


In the GolloglySpiller endgame (diagram, left) we pointed out that, h4 h6?, the win was very easy for White.
Also unavailing was $31 . .$. Kc6, but Peter Mataga has pointed out that 31...a5, instituting his own minority attack, saves Black. After 32 bxa5 bxa5 33 a4, Black can draw by either $33 .$. Kc6 34 h5 Kd6 35 h6 Kc6 36 c5 f5 37 gxf5 gxf5 38 Ke5 Kxe5 39 Kxf5 Kd5!, or $33 . . . h 5!? 34$ gxh5 gxh5 35 Ke4 Kc5 36 Kf5 Kxc4! 37 Kg6 Kb4 38 Kxh5 Kxa4 39 Kg 6 Kb 3 and Black is saved only by the presence of the pawn blocking the al-h8 diagonal. Other tries for White meet with no greater success.

## Annotated Games

The first three games were played in the Howick-Pakuranga Open Tournament, played in February. Notes are by Richard Sutton.

## E.M.GREEN C.LAIRD <br> \section*{Slav, Exchange}

1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 c6 3 Nc3 d5 4 cxd5
Green's favourite response to the Slav Defence, and it poses a nice positional question for Black: should he maintain the symmetry and risk unfavourable tactics by ...Bf5, or should he submit to the slight positional disadvantage of keeping his light-squared bishop behind his pawn structure with ...e6 and Bd7? Laird chooses the latter option on his sixth move.
4. . cxd5 5 Nf3 Nc6 6 Bf4 e6 7 e3 Bd6

I have always tended to distrust this nove despite the $=$ in ECO. The exchange of Black's good bishop must emphasise the relative weakness of his light-squared bishop and his difficulties on the square c5; but I cannot say that the alternative 7...Be7 is a bed of roses for Black either, so if Laird thinks he can get away with the text, good luck to him!
8 Bg3
Also playable are 8 Bxd6, 8 Ne 5 or 8 Bg5.
8...Bxg3 9 hxg 3 Bd 7

It is unusual for Laird to try to solve his opening problems tactically rather than positionally. He could have simply castled (on his eighth move) postponing the exchange until after White's 0-0; and after the exchange he should have used d6 for his queen (prefaced by ...a6) - the b6 square is much less satisfactory.

## 10 Bd3 Rc8 11 Ne5! Qb6 12 Qe2?!

A natural mistake - the attempt to preserve the bishop pair turns out badly for him. But why bother? After 12 Rb 1 : Nb4 13 Nxd7: Nxd3+ 14 Qxd3 Kxd7 15 $0-0$, threatening 16 Na4, White is doing wel1. Even better may be 12 Nxd7 Kxd7 3 a3! Qxb2?? 14 Na 4 and wins.
12...Nb4! 13 Bb 1 ? Bb5! 14 Qd2

Forced - the capture on b5 loses to

$$
\text { 14...Вa6 } 15 \text { a3 Qa5 } 16 \text { f3 }
$$

How else can he untangle his pieces? And White now threatens 17 axb4 Qxal 18 Kf2 with enough compensation for the exchange possibly.

## 16...Nc6!?

Black wavers between the tactical (using his time advantage) and the positional (pressure on the c-file), but it is difficult to see a more aggressive continuation though $16 \ldots \mathrm{Bc} 4$, intending ...Bb3, may be more logical.
17 Nxc6 Rxc6 18 Kf2 h5?!
This aggression, after his last positional move, does not appear justified. White's kingside is well protected - the weaknesses are all on the queenside. Even as a prophylactic against g3-g4 (which is not particularly fierce), 18 ...h5 has the drawback of creating weaknesses on the black squares. I would have preferred 18 ...Kd7 followed by 19 ..Rhc8 and 20...Qc7.
19 Bd3
Even better may be 19 Bc 2 , intending $20 \mathrm{Rhcl}, 21 \mathrm{Bd}$ and 22 b 4.
19...Bc4 20 Bxc4 Rxc4 21 Rhcl! h4? Futile - $21 . . . \mathrm{Kd7}$ was becoming essenial to ward off White's sudden initiative on the queenside.
22 gxh4 Rxh4 23 b3 Rc6 24 Rc2 Nh5?


25 Racl!
A fine move, emphasising the split in Black's forces. Black now declines the pawn on a3, for fear no doubt of 25
..:Qxa3 26 Nb 5 Qe 7 27 Rxc6 bxc6 28 $\begin{array}{lll}27 \text { Rxc6 bxc6 } & 28 \\ \text { Rxc6 Qg5 } & 29 & \text { Qc1: }\end{array}$ with desperate complications, White's next, however, kills Black's counterplay and begins strong play on the queenside.
25...Qc7?! 26 Ne2 Nf6 27 Rxc6 bxc6 28 Qb4 Rh8 29 Qc5 Kd7 30 Nf 4 Qb6 31 Nd3! Qxc5? 32 Rxc5 Rc8 33 Ne5+ Ke8 34 Rxc6 Rb8 and White won

White was desperately short of time but still managed to win the endgame. The position is theoretically won for White of course, but the rest of the game was not recorded.

## C.LAIRD P.A.GARBET <br> Sicilian Defence

1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 c3 Nf6 4 Be2!?
A typical Laird opening - slow, seemingly unambitious, but with long tera prospects which should not be underestimated. What is more, it has been carefully culled from ECO for its trappy' potential if Black is a tactical player. One envisages the following train of thought in Black's mind: "I obviously cannot take on 24 because Qa4t wins my knight. But by 4...Nc6 I renew the threat; he will try 5 d 4 Nxe4? 6 d5! and after my knight on c6 moves, 7 Qa4+ again wins the Ne4. But after 5 d4 cxd4 6 cxd4 Nxe4 7 d5, there is the intermediate move 7...Qa5+ after which White's Qa4+ is no longer on and I can move the Nc6. Here goes!

In this last line, however, Basman Stean, Hastings 1973/74, continued 8 Nc3 Nxc3 (8...Ne5 9 Nxe5 dxe5 is better) 9 bxc3 Ne5 10 Nxe5 Qxc3+ 11 Bd 2 Qxe5 $120-0$ Qxd5 13 Rbl and Stean found himself in great difficulty because of his lack of development and the dual threat of $14 \mathrm{Bf3}$ and $14 \mathrm{Bb} 5+$.
But Garbett may also have seen ECO;
his reply supposedly gives him a slightly better game. Laird's assessment, however, is different.
4...g6 5 0-0 Bg7 6 Rel 0-0 7 Bf1 Nc6

By postponing ...Nc6, Black has given White time to consolidate the defence of the e-pawn without making such ungainly moves as Bd3 or Qc2. Moreover, if Black aims for the thematic ...d5, White establishes a pawn chain with e5 and d4. Laird carefully waits to see just what plan Garbett will adopt.

## 8 h3 a6 9 a4 d5

Black plays it anyway: Another plan is 9...Rb8 and if 10 Na 3 (preventing b5), at least the knight is not wellplaced to carry out the principal plan of d 5 , so $10 \ldots \mathrm{Bd} 7, \ldots \mathrm{Qc} 7$ and $\ldots \mathrm{Rfc} 8$ uld be in order

10 e5 Ne8 11 d4 cxd4 $\quad 12 \mathrm{cxd4}$ Bf5 Garbett realises that 9 a4 has slightly weakened the white squares and he envisages tactical use of that fact - he aims at both b3 and c2, and if 13 Nc 3 , then $13 . . \mathrm{Nb}_{4}$ is troublesome for White But White's next slows up this plan considerably so Black may have done better to play 12...Ob6 13 Nc 3 Nc 7 with flexi ble play.

13 Qb3! Na5 14 Qb4 f6
Black's pieces are not well placed to exploit this break. Better is $14 \ldots$...Nc 6 15 Qa3 (15 Qb3 Na5; 15 Qxb7? Na5 16 Qb4 Rbs and 17...Nb3) 15...Qb6, but Black is still intrigued by those white squares.

15 Bd2 b6 16 Nc3 fxe5 17 Nxe5
If 17 dxe5, then 17...Bxh3?
17...Qd6 18 Qxd6 exd6


19 Nxd5!!
Faced with two threats (19...Nb 3 and 19...dxe5), White ignores them both! The fact is that Black is start ing to suffer from is lack of development, e.g. (19 Nxd5) dxe5 20 Nxb6 Nb3 21 Bc4+ Kh8 22 Bxb3 Rb8 23 a5 exd4 24 Bf4 Rb7 25 Bd5 Ra7 26 Bb8 winning.
19...Nb3 20 Nxb6 Nxd2

If 20...dxe5, then $21 \mathrm{Bc} 4+$ as in the last note, but there seems to be no clear winning line after 20...Nxal.
21 Nxa8 dxe5 22 dxe5 Nxf1 23 Kxf1 Rf7 24 Rad1?!

Giving up a pawn to get the rooks aggressively into play, but it was not necessary and allows a strong posting for Black's Bf5
24...Bc2 25 Rd8 Bxa4 26 Nb6 Bb5+ 27 Kg 1 Rb 7

A very interesting position. If Black could activate his pieces he would probably not have to worry about the slight material deficit, particularly in view of his two bishops. To that end, 27..
Nc7 might have been more efficacious.
28 Nd5 Bf8 29 Rcl Be7 30 Nxe7+ Rxe7
$31 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Kf} 732 \mathrm{R1c} 8 \mathrm{~g} 5 \quad 33 \mathrm{gu} \mathrm{gxf4} 34$ gxf4 Ke6 35 Kf 2 Kf 536 Ke 3 Re 6

Black's frantic efforts to blockade the pawns are gradually proving insufficient; he cannot keep a black rook from the f-file for ever

37 Rb 8 Re 738 Rb 6 Re 639 Rb 7 Rh 6
Desperation, but Laird has prepared a very precise finish in this event.

40 Rxb5! Rxh3+ 41 Kd4 axb5 42 Rxe8 Kxf4

The e-pawn is now unstoppable, but to have allowed White to keep his connected passed pawns would have been slow agony.

43 Rf8 8 Kg 544 e6 Rh4+ $45 \mathrm{Kd5}$ Rhl 46 e7 Rd1t 47 Kc 5 Rel 48 e80 Rxe8 49 Rxe8, 1 : 0 .
M 罗 留

A welcome visitor to New Zealand was Jacques Mounier of the Olympic Club in New Caledonia; he finished a creditable fourteenth. In the following game, how ever, he found Steadman's accuracy in positional and tactical chess too much for him:

## J. MOUNIER <br> M. SteAdman

## French Defence, Winawer

l e4 еб 2 d4 d5 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 e5 c5 5 a3 Bxc3+ 6 bxc3 Qa5

More usual is either 6...Ne7 or $6 .$. Qc7, but Steadman selects less wellknown lines, puts his own thoughts into them and (what is most important) has faith in his ability to play them - a dangerous combination'

## 7 Bd2 Qa4

Putting positional considerations before tactical ones, Black hastens to prevent 8 a 4 and also to threaten the pawn at e2, thus rendering at least one major piece inactive in defending it. Indeed, 7...Ne7 would now be bad owing to 8 Qg4! and Black's queen is misplaced as compared with the normal line 6...Ne7 7 Qg4 Qc. 7 etc.

## $8 \mathrm{Qg4}$.

An interesting alternative is 8 Nt 3 Ne7 9 dxc5!? Nd7 10 Nd4! a6 11 Qh5 and the opening up of the position is to White's advantage.
8...g6

Theory prefers this to 8...Kf8 9 Qdi! and Black's inability to castle makes it difficult for him to find tactical coun terplay (Fischer Hook, Siegen 1970).
9 Kd1?
Obviously 9 Qdi allows Black to capture the d-pawn (which was immune in the previous note because of $9 . . . c x d^{\prime} 410$ cxd4 Qxd4?? 11 Bb4+)

But it is dangerous to leave the king in the centre. Better was 9 Rcl! since Black (assuming he intends ...0-0-0) would be unwise to take the a-pawn.
9...Nc6 10 Nf3 h6!

Fine positional play; there is now no haste to develop, so unwelcome intruders are kept off 85

The pressure on White's centre hinders logical manoeuvring such as Nel and $\mathrm{E}_{4}$ and it is not easy to find other targets for White, while Black need only complete his development need only comfiring more bullets at the centre.
13...Nge7 14 Rel 0-0-0 15 Rbl!? CA 16 Bf1 Qxa3
Now possible because White's rooks are hard to connect and his minor pieces are blocked off from the queenside, but Black must be careful; White's idea is 17 Bel Qxc3? 18 Re3 Qa5 19 Ra3 with attacking perspectives.

17 Bc 1 ! Qa2! 18 Rb 2 Qa5 $19 \mathrm{Kd} 2 ?!$
White ties up his own pieces, but his position is already difficult.
19...Nf5 20 g 3 Rdf8 21 Rbl f6 22 exf6 Rxf6 23 Bh3?

Now White succumbs to a brilliant combination which has many pretty branches.

23...Nfxd4!! 24 Nxd4 Rxf2+ 25 Kdl There are some triking alterna tives:
) 25 Ke 3 Rhf 8 threatening 26.. oxcs mate) 26 Bb 2 2) 25 Ne 2 Ne 5 ! 26 2 Ne2 26 Kxe2 (26 Nxe2 Ne5

26 Qxe2 Nxd4) 26...Ne5 27 Rb 5 Qal. Black wins in all variations.
25...Qxe3, $0: 1$.

White resignis, his flag falls, etc, etc. His knight cannot move, while if 26 Be 3 , then $26 \ldots$ Nxd4 and mates on c 2 . Whice's play and then used his owr wieces play and then used his own pieces to their utmost efficiency leaves Stery profoun fresth Bul althoug steaded finished rith overall and claimed the writer's scalp, he did not with higher rated players. This is ithiy a rated players. This is
once he acquires it, this gifted player will go a long way.

Harking back once again to the Congress over the New Year, this interesting Evans Gambit was played in the Premier Reserve tournament. Notes are by Michael Freeman.

## M.FREEMAN J.SARFATI

## Evans Gambit

1 e4 e5 2 Nf 3 Nc6 3 Bc4 Bc5 4 b4
White gambits a pawn in favour of quick development and attacking chances.

$$
\text { 4. . B B } \times 4 \quad 5 \mathrm{c} 3 \quad \mathrm{Ba} 5 \quad 6 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{Qb} 3
$$

## Qd7

Another important alternative is $7 .$. Qe7 8 d5 Nd4! 9 Nxd4 exd4 10 Qa4t Kd8 11 Qxa5 Qxe4+ 12 Kd2 Bf5 13 Na Qxg2 which is very unclear.

## 8 dxe5 Bb6

3...dxe5 gives white an advantage after $90-0$ Bb $6 \quad 10$ Rdl Qe $7 \quad 11$ a 4 a6 (11...Na5? 12 Bxf7+ wins for White) 12 a5 Bc5.
9 Nbd2 Na5 10 Qc2 Nxc4 11 Nxc4 dxe5 12 Nfxe5 Qe6 13 Ba3 Ne7!
The old line was $13 \ldots$...Nf 6 but after $140-0-0$ ! Bd 715 Qb3 Rd8 (15...0-0-0? 16 Nxf7!) 16 Rd6:! cxd6 17 Nxd6+ Kf8 18 Ndxf7+ and now:

1) $18 \ldots \mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 19 \mathrm{Nxd} 8 \quad \mathrm{Bxd} 8 \quad 20 \mathrm{Rdl}$ QxbJ 21 axb 3 is winning for white, e.g. 21...Nxe4 22 Rxd7 $\mathrm{Bg} 5+23 \mathrm{f4}$ ! Bxf4+ $24 \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 25 \mathrm{Ng} 6$;
2) 18 Ke8 $19 \mathrm{Nd} 6+\mathrm{Kf} 8 \quad 20 \mathrm{Nxd} 7+$ Ke7 for $20 \ldots 0 \times d 727 \mathrm{Nf5}+\mathrm{Ke} 822$

Nxg7+ Qxg7 23 Qe6t and mates) 21 Nxb7+ Kxd7 22 Rdl + Kc7 23 Qxe6 Rxdl+ 24 Kxdl Kxb7 25 Qe7+ and White will win.
140-0-0!?
14 Qa4+ Bd7 15 Nxd7 Qxd7 16 Nxb6 exb6 17 Qxd7+ Kxd7 $180-0-0+$ Ke8 19 Be7 Kxe7 20 Rd 3 is the alternative for sood endgame players.

## 14...0-0 15 f4 Re8?!

If 15 ...Qf6 then 16 f5. Black has problems in developing his white-square bishop.


16 Nd6!? Rf8 17 Ndxf7 Rxf7?!
Better 17...Be3+ 18 Kbl Rxf7 19 Nxf 7 Kxf7 which is unclear, while both have chances after
$18 \ldots$... $3 \times f 4 \quad 19 \mathrm{Nd} 8$ Qxe5 (19...0b6t 20 Bb4 Bxe5 21 Qb3+ Kh8 22 Nf7+ and 22...Kg8 23 Nh6 $\mathrm{Kh} 824 \mathrm{Nf7}+$ draws, or 22...Rxf7 23 Qxf7 Be6 24 Qxe7 BxC3 is hetter for Black) $20 \mathrm{Qb} 3+\mathrm{Kh} 821$ Nf7+ Rxf7 22 Qxf 7 Ng 823 Rhfll, or $22 \ldots$ Be 6 23 Qxe 7 or $22 \ldots \mathrm{Bg}_{4} 23$ Qxe7.
18 Nxf7 Kxf7 19 Kbl Nc6
Better 19...g6:
20 Rd5 Qุf6 21 f5 Ne5 22 Qb3 Ke8 23 Rhd1

Black is now lost whatever he plays, e.8. $23 . \ldots \mathrm{ch} 24 \mathrm{Rd} 8+\mathrm{Bxd} 825 \mathrm{Qg} 8+$, or 23...Nd7 24 Re5+:
23...Bd7 24 Rxe5t, $1: 0$.

A typical Evans Gambit game where lack is unable to find his way through the complications.
M. 쓱 씀

The following game (between a New Zea ander and an Icelander!) was played in lander and an Icelander!) was played in by Paul Spiller.
P.S.SPILLER

B. JONATANSSON

## French Defence, Tarrasch

1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd 2 c 54 exd5 exd5 5 Naf3 $\mathrm{Nf6}$
More common is 5...Nc6 followed by Bd 6 and Nge7.

6 Bb5＋Bd7 7 Bxd7＋Nbxd7 8 0－0 Be7 9 dxc5 Nxc5 10 Nb 3
An alternative here is $10 \mathrm{Nd} 4 \quad 0-0 \quad 11$ Nf5 $\mathrm{Re} 8 \quad 12 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 6 \quad 13 \mathrm{Be} 3 \quad \mathrm{Qc} 7 \quad 14 \mathrm{c} 3$ with an advantage in Geller－Stahlberg 1953.

$$
10 \ldots \operatorname{Ncd} 7 ?
$$

Better was 10 ．．．Nce 4 or $10 . . .0-0$ ． 11 Nbd4？！
Correct was 11 Nfd4：
11 ．．．0－0 12 Nf5 Bc5 13 Qd3 Qb6 14 b3！？Rfe8
If $14 \ldots$ ．．．Ne4， I was going to play 15 Bb2 Nxf2 16 Rxf2 Bxf2＋ 17 Kf 1 when White has kingside threats，e．g．17．．． 618 Ne7＋Kf7 19 Nxd5 Qc5 $20 \mathrm{b4}$ ，or $17 . .10$ Nxd5） 20 Bxf6 hxg 51 0h3 g6 20 Nxd5） 20 Bxf6 hxgs 21 Qh3＋etc robably best would $10 . . \mathrm{N} 5$ xdJ Rad8 19 Nett hite retains attacking chances．

$$
15 \text { Bb2 Re4 } 16 \text { h3 }
$$

Preventing ．．．Rg4 after 17 Ng 5 ．

$$
16 \text {... Rae8? }
$$

Necessary was $16 . . . \mathrm{h} 6$ to stop Ng5．I ight have continued 17 Nd 2 with the idea $\lg 3$ ．

17 Ng5！Bxf2＋
The move Black was relying on： 18 Rxf2？Rel＋．But ．．．
18 Kh 1 Re 2
Better was 18．．．Rel to meet 19 Nxg 7 with 19．．．Rxfl＋and 20．．．Rel


19 Nxg7！
Very strong．Now 19．．．Kxg7 leads to mate in two and if 19．．．R8e3 then 20 Qf5：，or 19．．．R8e7 20 Nf5．
In time trouble， Black gets mated．
19 ．．．Ne4 20 Nxe8 Ng3＋ 21 Kh 2 Nxf1＋ 22 Rxfl Rxe8 23 Qxh7＋Kf8 24 Qxf7 mate， 1 ： 0 ．

是且息
自宣昷宜

## Combination Solutions

1．Kavalek－Bednarski，Skopje 1972： g6：hxg6
2．Horowitz－Kevitz，New York 1931： 1 Qg5：g6 2 Qh6 gxf5 $3 \mathrm{Rg} 4+$ fxg 4 4 Bxh7＋Kh8 5 Bg $6+\mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 6$ Qh7＋Kf8 7 Qxf7 mate．
3．Rellstab－Nowarra，1940： 1 Rxf8＋！Kxf8 2 Ng6＋！hxg6 3 Qh8 Kf7 4 Qxg7 mate．
4．J．Rodriguez－Vaisman，Bucharest 1974：l．．．Nf2＋！ 2 Bxf2（2 Kh2？Qxh4 ＋）2．．．Qh3＋！ $3 \mathrm{Kgl} \mathrm{Qg} 4+4 \mathrm{Kh} 2$ Qh3＋，$\frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$ ．
5．Saigin－Vistanetskis，USSR 1969： 1．．．Ng4！ 2 hxg4 Rf3！ 3 Nf5（3 gxf3 Qxg3－＋）3．．．Rxb3 4 Bxb3 Qb6， 0 ： 1
6．Weissgerber－Rellstab，Pyrmont 1933： 1 Qd8＋Kg7 2 Rxg5 ${ }^{\text {！}}$ hxg $53 \mathrm{~h} 6+$ Kxh6 4 Oh8 +Rh 75 Oxh7 mate．

昌 昌

## MICROMATE－180

digital Chess clock

Fantastic Computerized Clock Now Available－U．S．\＄219．95 Send Funds or Enquiries to

## CLUB DIRECTORY

The annual fee（six listings）for this column is $\$ 5.00$（not $\$ 6$ as advertised in the April issue）payable to the New Zealand Chess Association．

HOWICK－PAKURANGA C．C．meets Tuesdays 7：30 pm（children 6：30－7：30）at Howick Bridge Club，Howick Community Complex，Howick．Contact：Peter McCarthy， phone 565055 ，address 92 Ti Rakau Drive，Pakuranga，Auckland．
NORTH SHORE C．C．meets Wednesdays $7: 30 \mathrm{pm} \&$ Sundays $1: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ in St Joseph＇s Hall，cmr Anzac St \＆Taharoto Rd，Takapuna．Postal address P．O．Box 33 587， Takapuna．Contact：Peter Stuart，phone 456377.
OTAGO C．C．
meets 7：30 pm Wednesdays \＆Saturdays at 7 Maitland St，Dunedin， phone（clubrooms） 776919 ．Contact：Malcolm Foord， 39 Park Street，
Dunedin，phone 776213 ．

PARNELL C．C．
meets $7: 30$ pm Wednesdays in Social Hall，Foundation for the B1ind Pt Chevalier，Auckland，phone 868103 ．

## LATE NEWS

NORTH ISLAND CHAMPIONSHIP：This tournament，held in Hamilton 14－19 May was won by Paul Garbett $6 \frac{1}{2} / 8$ ．Equal second on 6 were Ewen Green，Vernon Small，Kai Michael Steadman．Report in August issue．

AN R．MITCHELL，former NZCA and Auckland Centre secretary，died on the morning of Tuesday 22 May after a long illness．

WORLD JUNIOR CHAMPIONSHIP，Skien（Norway）， 27 July－ 10 August．New Zealand will be represented by Michael Steadman，current NZ Junior Champion．

MICRO GENERAL CORPORATION P．0．Box 17746
Irvine，Ca． 92714 USA

