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## Editorial

Several articles which I had intended putting in this issue have had to be delayed until the next issue. These include the NZCA rating list (the up-to date version will definitely be printed in the December issue!), an article on in the December 1ssue.), an article on ing article ing article on endgame studies and mil Melnichero has been provided of Wellingto

## Letter

Dear Sir,
While I certainly do not wish to involve the Council or myself in any controversy regarding the selection of the Olympiad team, it should be pointed out that Mr Smith's references to the Council" in his letter published in the August issue are somewhat nisleading.

As Mr Smith should be well aware,
being a Councillor himself, the
selection was made by a panel of selectors comprising Messrs Ewen Green, Wolf Leonhardt, Paul Spiller and Don Storey. The Council gave no directives, nor made any recommendations, regarding the selection or non-selection of particular players.

Doubtless the selectors were guided by our Association rule that representative players must have competed in specified tournaments within the preceding two years.

Yours faithfully,
Peter W. Stuart,
For the Council of NZCA

## Hübner beats Portisch

(his issue see Overseas News), Robert Hubner has defeated Lajos Portisch in the semi-
final of the Candidates Matches.After 8 raws the match exploded in game 9 . Portisch made some weak moves allowing Hubner to fire back with a series of strong moves, including several sacrifices which gave Hubner a winning advantage. Game 10 was the best of the natch, again with Hubner winning. However when Hubner played cautiously in game ll, Portisch got a winning adjourned position. The following day he, however, misplayed it allowing Hubner to draw the game and win the match.
Hubner - Portisch (9), Sicilian Defence 1 e4 c5 $2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{~d} 4$ cxd4 4 Nxd 4 1 e4 c5 2 Nf 3 d 63 d 4 cxd4 4 Nxd 4

 $\begin{array}{lllll}12 \text { gxf6 bxc3 } & 13 & \text { fxg7 Bxg7 } 14 \text { bxc3 Qc7 } \\ 15 \mathrm{RbI} 0-0-0 & 16 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \text { Rhe8 } & 17 \mathrm{Rhgl} \mathrm{Bh} 8\end{array}$
 $18 \mathrm{f5}$ e5 $19 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{Nxe4} 20$ Bxe4 $0 \mathrm{Oc} 4+$
 $\begin{array}{lllll}24 \mathrm{Kcl} \mathrm{Ba} & 25 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Ra} 4 & 26 \mathrm{f} 6 \mathrm{Bd5} \\ 27 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{Bxc} 4 & 28 \mathrm{Rg} 4 \mathrm{Oa} 3+ & 29 \mathrm{Rb} 2 \mathrm{Be} 6\end{array}$ $30 \mathrm{Nc} 4 \mathrm{Qh} 3 \quad 31$ Nxe5+ dxe5 $32 \mathrm{Rd} 4+\mathrm{Bd} 5$
 $\begin{array}{lll}33 & \text { Rxd5+ Ke6 } & 34 \text { Rc5 Qh6+ } 35 \mathrm{~Kb} 1 \\ 36 & \text { Rc6 } 6+\text { Kf5 } \\ 37 & \text { Oe2 h6 } & 38 \mathrm{Rb} 3 \mathrm{Kg} 6\end{array}$ 39 Rf3 Qd4 40 Rb 3 Qd5 41 Qg4+, 1 Portisch - Hubner (10), Catalan: 1 c4 c5 2 Nf 3 Nff 3 Ne 3 e6 4 g 3 Nc6 5 Bg 2 d 56 cxd5 Nxd5 7 0-0 Be7 8 d 4 $0-0 \quad 9$ Nxd5 exd5 10 dxc5 Bxc5 11 Qc2 Bb6 12 Rdl Qf6 13 Bg 5 Qe6 14 Bf 4 h 6 15 Qd 3 Rd8 16 a4 Qe7 17 Bd 2 Bg 4 18 a5 Bc5 19 Rac 1 a6 20 Rel Rac8 21 h 3 Be $6 \quad 22$ e3 Bb4 23 Ra 1 Qd 7 24 Kh2 Bf5 25 Qb3 Bxd2 26 Nxd2 d 4 27 Nfl d3 28 Redl Qe7 29 Qa3 Nb4 30 e 4 Be6 31 Rd2 Rd4 32 Ne3 Rc5 33 Rad1 nds 34 Nd5 Bxd5 35 exd5 Qxa5 36 Qxa5 Rxa5 37 Rc1 Nc2 38 Rcd1 Nb4 39 Rc1 g6 40 Rc3 b6 41 f4 Ra4 42 Bf 3 b5 $43 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 4 \quad 44 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Kf} 8 \quad 45 \mathrm{Bdl} \mathrm{Rxc} 3$ 46 bxc3 Nxd5 47 Rxd3 Nxc3 48 Bc2 b4 $49 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{O}$ - 1.

Hlibner must now meet Korchnoi in the final. His present record against Korchnoi is $+1=5-4$ but his losses were in their first four encounters.

## Giles Bates at the World Junior

ships were layed in Dortmund, West ships were played in Dortmund, West competitors from fifty-five countries competed to find the best plaver in the world under 20 . Before the tournament world under 20 . Before the tourname Kasparov, only 17, but already 3 rd $=\mathrm{in}$ the Russian Championship and a GM with an elo rating of 2595: Those who might cause him problems were: Arnason (IM, 2435, Iceland), Morovic (IM, 2380, Chile), Short (IM, 2360, England), Negulescu (2410, Romania), Benjamin (2350, USA), Akesson (2230, Sweden), Tempone (Argentina), Karolyi (Hungary), and Dasailov (Bulgaria)

Dortmund is a very industrial city With its main claim to fame being the producing city in the world! The people also pride themselves on having $49 \%$ 'green areas' within the city. We played in one of these - a huge park with everything imaginable including a hall suitable for playing chess. The organisation was 'top notch' and they had obviously had a lot of practice. Only a few weeks earlier there had been a strong tournament where our own Murray Chandler came second. The only distress ing feature was the painful monotony of the 'Van der Valk' serial theme played before the beginning of every round. Public interest was immense and at the end of round 13 I even had the ego boosting experience of getting handcramp from signing too many autographs. After many laborious speeches in both German and English, play finally got underway half an hour late on Sunday. The two first round upsets were the defeat of Karolyi and Morovic by Zliger (Switzerland) and Kaspret (Austria) respectively.

After three rounds Kasparov, Arnason and Negulescu al.1 had perfect scores while I had drawn with Hansen (Denmark) and Rodas (Guatemala) while losing to Utut (Indonesia). In round 4 Kasparov dropped half a point to Negulescu and this allowed Akesson to catch them. I had another double-edged draw

By round six Kasparov was a whole point clear after beating Arnason and Akesson while Akesson, Tempone, Toro Nigeria I managed to lose the next game
from
a won to a drawn and then to a lost position. Round 8 saw Kasparov drop his second half point to Toro while Akesson and Negulescu were equal on 6 . Around this time Benjamin started to drop away badly, playing like a 'crippled bunny' I had scored $3 \frac{1}{2} / 8$.

Round 9: Short v Kasparov $\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$; Tempone v Akesson 0 - 1; Toro v Negulescu $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$. Scores: Kasparov $7 \frac{1}{2}$; Akesson 7 and Negulescu $6^{15}$.
Drama in round 10. Short played b6 against Akesson's c4 and won with cute Rh4. Toro went to adjournment trying to win a tricky knight and pawn versus three pawns ending. Forgetting the time, Toro arrived back to the game with 10 seconds left to play 10 moves. In the time scramble a drawn position was reached only for Utat to blunder.

Round 11 and Kasparov had to come at least 1st equal. Akesson lost again, this time to Morovic while Short and Karolyi drew. My last two games were timid draws. I was now on 5 points.

Round 12. Kasparov drew to win the tournament. Short came clear second when he beat Karolyi while Negulescu was held to a draw when Hjorth from Australia sacked the exchange. Tempone came up to third equal when he beat Toro. With a pleasant win agains Greece I lifted my score to $50 \%$. The leading scores: Kasparov 10; Short $8 \frac{1}{2}$; Negulescu, Morovic and Tempone 8.

Round 13: Hjorth v Short was a quick draw. Morovic v Negulescu $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$. So if Tempone won he would be 2nd equal with Short. However he lost to Bischoff of West Germany. Final scores: Kasparov 1012 ; Short 9; Morovic, Negulescu and Bischoff $8 \frac{1}{2}$. Due to a complicated time scramble I managed to win a worse position and so ended up with a very respectable 7 points and 17th equal.

As was expected, Kasparov was by far the best player with great opening knowledge and insight into the middlegame. Negulescu should have been the second best player but seemed to lack the will to win. Short was somewhat lucky, but at only 15 he should win the tournament one day. Solidarity in play seemed to work better than flashy brilliance with Tempone, Ioro and Negulescu compared to Arnason and Benjamin as good examples. Somewhat
surprisingly I didn't get annihilated in the opening but my biggest problem was trying to push home advantages against players who cling on more than most NZ players do.

The amount of experience and enthusiasm I obtained from this tournament was invaluable. I would like to thank my school, Christchurch Boys' High School for helping to finance this trip and Mr. Brian Winsor for his administrative assistance
G.BATES - S.JAMES (WALES), K.I.Attack: 1 Nf3 Nf6 2 g3 b5 3 Bg2 Bb7 4 0-0 e6 5 d3 c5 6 e4 Be7 7 c3 0-0 8 Nbd2 d5 9 e5 Nfd7 10 Rel Nc6 11 Nfl Nb6 12 d4 b4 $13 \mathrm{Ne} 3 \mathrm{bxc} 3 \quad 14 \mathrm{bxc} 3 \mathrm{Na}$ $15 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Nbc} 4 \quad 16 \mathrm{Ng} 4 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \quad 17 \mathrm{Bf} 1 \mathrm{cxd} 4$ 18 cxd4 Qb6 19 Ng 5 (If 19 Bd3 then f6) 19 ...Ba6? (If 19 ...h6 20 Nxh6t gxh6 21 Oh5 hxg5 22 Bd3 (22 Bxg5 Bxg5 23 Qxg5t Kh8 24 Qff 5 Kg8 25 Bd3 Qd8 26 Qh6 f5 27 exf( Rxf6) $22 \ldots f 5$ 23 Qg6t Kh8 24 hxg ) $20 \mathrm{Nf} 6+\mathrm{gxf} 6$ ? (If 20 ...Bxf6 21 exf6 g6 22 h 5 Qd8 23 hxg 6 hxg 624 Qf3) 21 exf6 Bxf6 22 Qh5, 1-0. (If 22 ...Bxg5 23 Qxg5t Kh8 24 Qf6t Kg8 25 Bh6 etc)
A.CORRAL (SPAIN) - G.BATES,
$1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 2 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 4 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{~d} 6$ 5 Nf3 e5 6 e4 Ne7 7 Be2 Nd7 (The game before had gone 7 ...0-0 8 h4) 8 09 No 5 Nf 6 ..O-O 40 Nel 45 10 5 12 Nf3 Nxe4 13 Nxe4 fxe4 14 Nd2 Nf5 $\begin{array}{llllll}12 & \text { Nf3 Nxe4 } & 13 & \text { Nxe4 fre4 } 14 & \text { Nd2 Nf } \\ 15 & \text { Nxe4 } 0-0 & 16 & \text { Bd3 (If } 16 \text { Nxc5 Ob6 }\end{array}$ $17 \mathrm{b4}$ a5!) 16 ...b6 $17 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 13$ Qel 17 b4 a5!) 16 ....be 18 Bd2 Bat 13 Qel (b4) 18 ...Qe 19 b4 Nd6. 20 a3 (1f 20 bxc5 Nxe4 21 Qxe4 Bf5 22 Qe2 e4) 20 .... Nxet 21 Qxfl Bf 22 (e2 BFS 23 Rel Nxe4 ing 24 Bxe4 27 OxC4 Qf 24 Bxe4 Or6 25 Bx 5 Bx5 28 …e3.) 24 Bxe4 378 Re8 28 QF2 Bf8 26 bxes bxcs 27 Bes Re8 28 (0f2 Bi8 30 Khl Kf7 31 Rfl Kf6 32 Bd2 Q 33 Ke 3 d6 34 Qt4! h5 35 Kan? (Re $33 \mathrm{Bc} 3 \mathrm{Ba6}$ ) 44 . ht 35 Kg 2 ? (Re missed in time-trouble - but it probably still a draw atter Res) 35 Bxe5 Rxe5 39 Re8 37 Rel Kg6
 Qxc4 41 Qeb+ Kg5 $42 \mathrm{Qg} 8+$, th -
Some other games from the event:
ARNASON - KASPAROV, Sicilian Defence: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d 4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 af 6 Be2 e5 7 Nb3 Be7 8 Be5 Nef 9 Bxf6 Bxf6 10 Od3 Ne 6

11 Nd5 Bg 512 O-0 Ne7 13 Nxe7 Qxe7 14 Rfdl Rd8 $15 \mathrm{Na} 50-\mathrm{O} 16 \mathrm{Nc} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5$ 17 exd5 Rxd5 18 Qf3 Rfd8 19 Rxd5 Bxd 5 20 Qf5 b5 21 Ne 3 Bb 7 22 Rdl Rxdl+ 23 Bxd1 g6 24 Qd3 Qb4 25 Qd7 Qe 7 26 Od3 e4 27 Qd2 Od8 28 Oxd8 +Bxd 8
 $32 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Kf} 633 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Bc} 8 \quad 34 \mathrm{Bdl} \mathrm{h} 635 \mathrm{Be} 2$
 Kc5 39 Be $85 \quad 40$ hxg 5 hxg 541 Bg 6 1442 gxf4 gxf4 43 Ng2 Kc4 44 Nxf4 Kb3 45 Bxe4 Kxb2 46 Bc6 Kxc3 $47 \mathrm{KE1}$ Kd2 $48 \mathrm{Bb} 5 \mathrm{Bf} 549 \mathrm{Nd5} \mathrm{Bd} 3+50 \mathrm{Bxd} 3$ xd3 51 Kel a4 52 Kdl a3 53 Kcl Kc $54 \mathrm{Ne} 3+\mathrm{Kb} 355 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Bc} 756 \mathrm{Kbl}$ 58 Nd5 Bd2, $0-1$.

KASPAROV - AKESSON, Queen's Indian Def: 1 d4 Nf. 62 c4 é 3 Nf3 b6 4 a3 Bb7 5 Ne3 d5 6 cxd5 Nxd5 7 e3 Be7 $3 \mathrm{Bb} 5+$ c6 9 Bd3 Nxc3 10 bxc3 Nd7 11 e4 c5 12 0-0 cxd4 13 cxd4 0-0 14 Qe2 Rc8 15 Bb 2 Oc 7 l l6 Qe3 Nf6 17 Ne 5 b 5 $18 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Ob} 6 \quad 19 \mathrm{Khl}$ b4 20 axb 4 Bxb 4 21 Rabl a5 22 ?e2 Qa7 23 f5 Qa8 24 d5 exd5 25 Ng4 Nxg4 25 0xg4 f6 27 Bxf6 Rxf6 28 e5 Rh6 29 f 6 Rc 7 30 e6 Od8 31 e 7 Rxe7 32 Exe7 Oxe7 33 Rbcl Od8 34 Qf5 Qb8 35 Qf7+ Kh8 $36 \mathrm{Rc} 7,1$
ZABIHI - UTUT, Kinọ's Indian Defence 1 Nf3 Nf6 2 c4 gf 3 Nc3 bg 74 é d6 5 d4 0-0 5 Be 2 e5 7 O-0 Nc6 8 d5 Ne 9 Nd2. Ne8 1 b4 5 11 12 bxa
 16 Ba h5 17 Nad Re6 13 Nc4 RgG
 22 cxd6 cxd6 23 Nb5 Ng6 24 Nbxd6 Nxdf 25 Nxd6 Qh4 26 Nxc8 ©h2t $27 \mathrm{Kl2} 2 \mathrm{R} 3+$ 31 Rb2 Rc 3295 Bxg 33 RL 3 Re 44 Rxe3 37 Rxe Nu 38 Qc5 ohl 39 Ke2 Nf4 37 Qxe3 Nu3 35 (2c5 Nh2t 36 Ke 2 Nf4 $40 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Ne}+41 \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{Nxc} 542 \mathrm{Rxh} 1 \mathrm{Rxh}$ 43 Bxcs Rcl+, 0 - 1.
AKESSON - SHOPT, Owen's Defence:
1 c4 b6 2 d4 é 3 e 4 Bb7 4 Bd3 f5 5 exf5 Bxg2 6 Qh5+ g6 7 fxs6 Bg 7 8 gxh7+ Kf8 9 Bg5 Nf6 10 Oh4 Nch 11 Ne2 Bxh1 12 Nd2 e5 13 Ng3 e4 14 Bxe4 Bxe4 15 Ngxe4. Rxh7 If Of 4 Nxd4 17 Bxff Bxff 18 Nxff Oe7+ 19 Nde4 Rh4 20 Ng $4+$ QE7 21 Qg 3 Re8 $22 \mathrm{Kfl} \mathrm{Qxc} 4+23 \mathrm{Kg} 2$ Ne5 $24 \mathrm{Qa} 3+\mathrm{dt}$, $0-1$.
Report and notes to the games provided by Giles Bates.

## Can You See the Combinations?

Solutions on page 144


No. 1 White to move


No. 3 White to move


No. 5 White to move


No. 2 White to move


No. 4 White to move


No. 6 Black to move

## Local News

Tony Dowden reports from Dunedin: Otago Chess Club Championships: The senior title has been won with a round in hand by 19 year old University student Tony Dowden. Second place is still very unclear with about half a dozen players in with a chance.

Round 2 results: A Grade: R.A. Dowden $3 / 4$ (loss to Kwok); M.R.Foord $2 \frac{1}{2}$
D.W.Watts 2; G.Aimers $1 \frac{1}{2} ;$ A.Kwok 1 .
D.W.Watts 2; G.Aimers $1 \frac{1}{2}$; A.Kwok 1 . 4 $\frac{1}{2} / 5$.
Two senior Championship games:
D. WEEGENAAR - M.FOORD, Ruy Lopez: D. WEEGENAAR - M.FOORD, Ruy Lopez:
1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 5 0-0 b5 6 Bb3 Be7 7 Rel d6 8 c3 $0-0$ 12 Nb 2 c 513 Na 7 Cc 5 Na
15 b 3 Ncb 616 Ng 3 Rae 817 Nf5 Bc 8
15 b3 Ncb6 16 Ng3 Rae8 $17 \mathrm{Nf5} \mathrm{Bc} 8$
18 Nxe7+ Rxe7 19 Nh4 4620 Re3 Rff
21 Nf5 Re8 22 Rg3 Kh8 23 Qh5 Ref8
$24 \mathrm{Nh} 4 \mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 25 \mathrm{f} 4$ exf4 26 e5 f5
g6 27 Rxg6l wins) 27 Nxf5! Rxf5
28 Bxf5 Rxf5 29 Qxf5 fxg3 30 Qe6+ Kf8
31 Bh6!: (The only way to win. If
31, Bg5 Nxe5 is adequate) 31 ...Nxe5 32 Rfl+ Nf 34 Qr6 gxh6 (Nothing better) 34 Qh8+ Ke7 $35 \mathrm{Rxf} 7+\mathrm{Kxf} 7$ 36 Qxh7+, 1-0.
T.DOWDEN - D.WATTS, Sicilian Defence: $1 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{e} 4 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7$ 5 Bc4 Nc6 $60-0$ e6 7 Qel!? Nge7 8 Nh4 f5 9 exf5 d5 10 Bb5 exf5
11 Bxc6+ bxc6 12 d3 0-0 13 Khl Ba6
$14 \mathrm{Na} 4 \mathrm{Qd6} 15 \mathrm{Rf} 2 \mathrm{Rf} 6 ?$ ! (15 ...Bf6 is better) $16 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Kf} 717 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~h} 618 \mathrm{Ne} 5+$ Kf8 (18 ...Kg8 is better) 19 b 3 c 4 20 Nc5 Bc8 21 Ba3 Qc7 22 Nxg6+: Rxg6 23 Rxe7:, 1 - 0.

## OTAGO PREMIER

This innovative round-robin tourney, which ran for 6 months, was extremely successful and ensured the participation of almost all of Otago's strongest
players. The tournament weakened the Otago Championship field to some extent and the early withdrawals of Perry, Petch and Weegenaar from the Premier weakened the field slightly - perhaps a better scheduling can be worked out for next year.

As can be seen from the cross-table, Kai Jensen narrowly won ahead of Sutton and Love. Several good games were played in this interesting event.
$12345678901 \mathrm{~T}^{11}$

 2 Love A.J. $\frac{1}{2} \times 1011 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 11117 \frac{1}{2}$ 3 Sutton R. $00 \times 111111 \frac{1}{2} 1117 \frac{1}{2}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}4 & \text { Lichter D. } \\ 5 & 1 & 0 & \times \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 6 \\ 5 & \text { Dowden R. } & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \times & \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 6\end{array}$ 5 Dowden R. $0000 \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} 111111111 c c$ 6 Paris P. $1000 \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} 11 \frac{1}{2} 15 \frac{1}{2}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllllllll}7 & \text { Haase G. } & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \times & 1 & \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 1 & 4 \frac{1}{2} \\ 8 & \text { Lichter J. } & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \times & 1 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} & 3 \frac{1}{2}\end{array}$ | 8 | Lichter J. 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\times$ | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | Watts D. | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\times$ | 1 | 0 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}9 & \text { Watts D. } & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \times & 1 & 0 \\ 10 & 2 & 2 \\ 10 & \text { Dalziel I. } \\ 11 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \times & \frac{1}{2} & 2\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}10 & \text { Dalziel I I. } \\ 11 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \times \frac{1}{2} & 2 \\ 1 & \text { Foord M. } & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 1 & \frac{1}{2} & \times & 2\end{array}$ D.WATTS - I.DALZIEL, Nimzoindian: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c 4 e6 6 Nc3 Bb4 4 e3 b6 $1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6{ }^{2}$ c4 e6 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 e3 b6



 18 h 4 Nbd 7 la g5 hxg5 20 hxg 5 Ne 4
 21 g 6 : Ndf6 (21...Nxd2 22 exf7+ Kxf7
23 Oh5 mates) 22 Ncxd5: Bxd5 23 Nxd5 0xd5 24 oxf7 +1 - 0 . Well judged! Qxd5 24 gxf7+, 1 - 0 . (Well judged 25 Rxe4! Nxe4 26 Bc4 Oxc4 27 Rxc4 Nxa2 28 Od5+ Kf8 29 Rc2 Nbl 30 Oa2 Nxa3 31 bxa $3+-1$
T.DOWDEN - R.SUTTON, King's Gambit:

1 e4 e5 2 f4 exf4 3 Bc4 c6?! 4 Nc3 Qe7 5 Qe2 h6 6 h4 b5 $7 \mathrm{Bb} 3 \mathrm{~b} 4 \quad 8 \mathrm{Nbl}$ Nf6 9 d3?! ( 9 e5!) d5 10 e 5 Ng 4 11 Bxf4 a5 12 Ba 4 Qe6! 13 Na 2 BC 5 $14 \mathrm{Nh} 3 \mathrm{0} 0 \mathrm{0} 1500-0 \mathrm{Ra} 716 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Re} 7$ 17 d 4 Ba 7 . 18 Rdel? : c5 19 dxc5 Bxc5 20 Bd2 Ba6 21 Bb5 Bxb5 22 Qxb5 Qc6 23 Qd3 Rfc8 24 Kbl Nd7 25 Qf5 Qe6 26 Qxe6 fxe6 27 Nf4 Nf2 (Both sides were now in timetrouble) 28 Rhfl 1 Ne 4 29 Be3 Bxe3 30 Rxe 3 Rf7 31 Ng 6 Nf 8 32 Nxf8 Rexf8 33 Rdl 5534 hxg 5 hxg 5 35 a3 g4 36 Nd4 Nc5 37 axb4? ( 37 NC6) 37 ....axb4 38 Ne6 Rf4 39 Rd4?? Rf1+, $0-1$.
T.DOWDEN - J.LICHTER, French Defence: l e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 e5 b6 4 c3 Qd7


 $\begin{array}{llllll}12 & \mathrm{Bg} 5 & \mathrm{Be} 7 & 13 & \mathrm{Bxe} \\ 15 \mathrm{Na} \text { ! } \mathrm{c} 6 & 16 \text { Rael Kf8 } 8 & 17 \mathrm{Kh} 1 & \mathrm{Kg} 7\end{array}$
 18 f5 Qg5! 19 f6+ Kg8 20 h3?. ( 21 eez!) Qh6 24 Ne2 Kh8 25 Nc2 Nf5 26 Kh2 Rg8 27 Rg 4 Qh 528 Rfg 1 Nh6 29 Rg 5 Qh 4 30 Qf3! c5 $31 \mathrm{Nf} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 8 \mathrm{~N}_{3} 32 \mathrm{Ne} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 5$ 33 Nxf5 exf5 34 dxc5 bxc5 35 Nxd5 Ne6 36 R5g3 Rd8 37 Ne7 Rd2+ 38 Rlg2 Rxg2+ 39 Qxg2 Qe4 40 Rxg6: Oxg2+ 41 Rxg2 Rh4, 1 - 0 .
.LICHTER - G.HAASE
1 e4 e5 2 Ne2 Nc6 3 Nbc3 g5 4 d4 exd4 5 Nxd4 Bg7 6 Be3 Nge7 7 Bc4 d6 8 Od2 96 0-0-0 Bd7 10 Nd5 Nxd5 11 Bxd5 Qe7 12 h 3 Rb8 13 f4 0-0 14 Rhel Nxd4 15 Bxa4 Be6 16 E5 Bxd5 17 exd5 Qd7 18 Bxg7 Kxg7 19 f6+ Kxf6 20 Qh6 Rbe8 21 g4 Rxel 22 Rxel Re8 23 gj+ Kf5 $24 \mathrm{Rf} 1+\mathrm{Ke} 5 \quad 25$ c4 b5 $26 \mathrm{Qg} 7+\mathrm{Ke} 4$ 27 Rel + Kf3 28 Qfb+ Kg3 29 Rg1 + Kh4 30 Qf4+ Kh5 31 Qf3+ (31 Rg4 wins instantly, but David was in his usual horrific timetrouble) 31 ...Kh4 32 Qf2+ Kh5 33 Rg4 Qxg4 34 hxg4+ and $1-0$. A.LOVE - K.JENSEN, Sicilian Defence: 1 e 4 c5 2 Nf 3 Nf6 3 e 5 Nd5 4 Nc3 e 6 Ne4 f5 6 exf6 Nxf6 7 Nxf6+ Qxf6 d4 cxd4 $9 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Bb} 4+10 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{Bo5}$ 11 Bd3 Ne6 $120-0$ h6 13 Qe2 d5 14 a3 $0-0 \quad 15$ b4 Bd6 16 b5 Ne5 17 Nxe5 Qxe 8 Qxe5 Bxe5 1914 Bd6 20 Bb4 Rd 24 Ral K6 25 Rae 15 Bxa 23 axb 4 a 27 Pfal Rb7 28 Rxas Rxas 99 Rxa5 30 Ra4 Kd6 31 Rxat K×5 32 Ra4 Bd7
33 Ra6 Bxb5 34 Bxb5 Pxb5 35 Rea
3 Ra6 Bxbs 34 Bxb5 Rxbs 35 Rxe6 Rbl+
Kf2 Rdl 40 Kf3 Rfl +41 Kg 2 Rc
42 Kf 3 , $\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$.
R.SUTTON - K.JENSEN, 乌Qeen's Pawn:

1 e3 g6 2 d4 Nf6 3 Nff 3 Bg 7 a ge $0-0 \quad 5 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 6 \mathrm{dxc} 5$

This leads to surprising problems as Black can now prevent the natural developing move Ne3.
6 ...iłe4 7 Nbd2 Nxc5 8 Rbl a5 9 Nol4

White must untangle himself.
g ....Nc6 10 N2f3 e5 11 Nc ?
The natural 11 Nb 5 is met with
11 ...e4 12 Nfd 4 Nb 4 , and White would have to choose between giving up the a pawn and enduring the check on d3.
$11 \ldots$...d6 12 0-0 Bf5 13 2d2
To meet the threatened $13 \ldots$...Nb4.
13 ...ge7 $1^{4}$ Rcl?
A minor oversight which should have lost a pawn. Yet White's position is very difficult.
$14 \ldots$...dd 15 RbI Rfd8?
Too ambitious. Better was 15 ....Ndb4 winning the a-pawn.
$15 \mathrm{e}^{4}$ !

## And not 16 Bxa5 Rxa5 17 Bxd3 Bxd3

 18 Qxd 3 e4.16 ...Bxe4 17 Bg 5 f6 18 Bxd3 d5!?
Introducing complications. Unsatisfactory was $18 \ldots$...Bxd3 19 Qxd3 fxg5 because the extra pawn is offset by Black's many weak squares and bad bishop.

## 19 cxd5 Bxd5 20 Ne 3

The alternative, also interesting, was 20 Bd 2 . Black can probably win his piece back with 20 ...Bxa2 21 Ral Rxd3 22 Rxa2 Rad8 threatening 23 ...e4.

20 ...Bxa2 21 Ral e4
Possibly 21 ...Nb4 was better.
22 Qa4! Nb4
Since on 22 ...Rxd3 23 Oxa2+ Kh8
24 Nel White has an exchange for the 2 pawns.

23 Bxe4 b5
If Black captured at once on $\mathrm{e}^{4}$,
24 Rxa4 would be possible.
24 2xb5 $2 \times \mathrm{xe} 425$ Rxa2!
But it is possible anyway, since now 25 ...Nxa2 26 Qb3+ Kh8 27 Qxa2 fxg5 28 Nxg5 gives White the familiar
Philidor-type attack.
25 ...Rab8 26 Qa! fxg5 27 Nxg5 Qe5 28 Nf3 De6 29 Ra3 Bxb2

The material is equal again. Both players were now short of time.

30 Rb3 Nc6 31 Rxb8 Rxb8 32 Ng5 Qf6 33 Oh4 Rb7 3 ! Nd5 Od4 35 Nf4 Ne5 36 Oh 3 Od8

The back-rank check was threatened.
37 neft Ka7 39 Ne4 Re7 39 2f6 +Kg 8 40 Ne6 0e8 41 N405?

Black's position has held up against the attack, and it was essential that White now retreat with 41 N6g5 or N6c's

$$
41 \ldots \text {...h6 } 42 \text { Rd1 }
$$

This was the combination White presumably envisaged on his 41 st move. There is a flaw however.
42 ...hxo5! 43 Rd8 Qxd8 44 Nxd8 Nf3t $457 \times f 38 \times f 6,0-1$

Notes by Kai Jensen.

7th Winstone Open, 6-7 Sept.

|  |  |  | R. 1 | R. 2 | R. 3 | R. 4 | R. 5 | T'1 | Sos |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Small V.A. | C | W12 | w9 | D2 | W3 | W7 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ |  | \$170 |
| 2 | Green E.M. | HP | W18 | D5 | D1 | W4 | W6 | 4 | 16.5 | \$90 |
| 3 | Sarapu 0. | NS | W1I | W17 | W6 | L1 | W8 | 4 | 15.5 | \$90 |
| 4 | Levene M. | NS | D15 | W14 | W5 | L2 | W12 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 15 | \$25 |
| 5 | Cornford L.H. | A | W16 | D2 | L4 | W21 | W14 | 312 | 14 | \$25 |
| 6 | Power P.W. | NS | W24 | W7 | L3 | W10 | L2 | 3 | 15 |  |
| 7 | Weir P.B. | NS | W23 | L6 | W13 | W9 | L1 | 3 | 14.5 |  |
| 8 | Lloyd A. | C | D21 | W15 | D10 | W17 | L3 | 3 | 13 |  |
| 9 | Spiller P.S. | HP | W22 | L1 | W25 | L7 | W13 | 3 | 12.5 |  |
| 10 | Stuart P.W. | NS | W20 | D13 | D8 | L6 | W18 | 3 | 12 |  |
| 11 | Hart S . | Pap | L3 | W26 | L12 | W20 | W17 | 3 | 11 |  |
| 12 | Kinchant K.D. | A | L1 | W22 | W11 | D14 | L4 | $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 15 | \$16.67 |
| 13 | Sidnam G. | A | W19 | D10 | L7 | W15 | L9 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 13.5 |  |
| 14 | Notley D. | AU | W25 | L4 | W20 | D12 | L5 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 12 |  |
| 15 | Vermeer W.J. | AU | D4 | L8 | W24 | L13 | W21 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 11.5 | \$16.67 |
| 16 | Moratti S.C. | NS | L5 | L18 | W22 | D24 | W23 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 9.5 | \$16.67 |
| 17 | McIvor B.W. | GR | W26 | L3 | W18 | L8 | L11 | 2 | 13 |  |
| 18 | Hopewell M.G. | A | L2 | W16 | L17 | W25 | L10 | 2 | 12.5 |  |
| 19 | Spain G. | Wpa | L13 | 120 | W26 | L23 | W25 | 2 | 7.5 |  |
| 20 | Brimble M.T. | Wai | L10 | W19 | L14 | Lll | D22 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 12 |  |
| 21 | Shead D.B. | Ns | D8 | L25 | W23 | L5 | L15 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 11.5 |  |
| 22 | Hartley J. | UH | L9 | L12 | L16 | W26 | D20 | $1{ }^{1 / 2}$ | 10.5 |  |
| 23 | Roundill R.L. | NS | L7 | D24 | L21 | W19 | L16 | $1{ }^{2}$ | 10 |  |
| 24 | Henderson A.J. | NS | L6 | D19 | L15 | D16 | L26 | 1 | 11 |  |
| 25 | Milne D.J.o. | - | L14 | W21 | L9 | ¢18 | L19 | 1 | 11 |  |
|  | Potini G. | UH | L17 | L11 | L19 | L22 | W24 | 1 | 9.5 |  |

B - GRADE:
9.5

- $\quad 4 \frac{1}{2} \quad \$ 100$

2-6 D.M.Pomeroy (AU), N.H.Hopewell (A), B.M.Winsor (NS) ${ }_{4}$
7-11 G.E.Trundle (A), N.A.Bradley (NS), P.D.Cunningham (Pen), W.F.Crombie (Ham) \& R.G.Steel (NS)
12-21 J.Mathias (A), M.K.Morrison (A), A.J.Meader (Air), M.T.Sims (UH), J.Veldhuizen, P.D.Bourke, A.Hardman .T.S (UH), J.Nelailan (Ham), P.A.Spencer-Smith (NS), L.P.Grevers (NS) \&

## 22-24 R.Hampton (Pap), R.G.Watt (NS) \& C.S.Dowler <br> $2 \frac{1}{2}$

25-34 M.J.S.Verhøeff, R.Calder (Ham), H.Palmer (Otu), C.G.Robbie (NS), W.R.Stretch (NS), G.M.Jones (NS), G.G.Rencer-Smith, P.F.Van der Mey (NS), R.Kappes (Ham) G.Spencer-Smith, P.F.Van der Mey (NS), R.Kappes (Ham)
$\& \quad 2$

35-38 J.K.Boyd (NS), D.Hall (NS), J.Kinchant (A) \& R.G.Wi11iams (Wai)

39-42 A.Langdon (Wpa), L.G.Edmonds (HP), J.G.Keith (NS) \& P Locke (HP) P.Locke (HP)

43 B.K.Stewart (Air)
44 B.H.Andrew (NS)
$\frac{1}{2}$
0

Abbreviations used: C = Canterbury, HP = Howick-Pakuranga, NS = North Shore, $\mathrm{A}=$ Auckland, Pap $=$ Papatoetoe, $\mathrm{AU}=$ Auckland University, Wpa = Waipa, Wai $=$ Waitemata, UH = Upper Hutt, Ham = Hamilton, Pen = Pencarrow, Otu = Otumoetai \& Air = Air New Zealand.
A selection of games follows:
M.LEVENE - D. NOTLEY, Caro-Kahn:
 5 Nc3 Nc6 6 Nf3 e6 7 cxd5 Nxd5 8 Bd3 Be7 9 0-0 0-0 10 Rel Bf6 11 Be 4 Nxc 3 $12 \mathrm{bxc} 3 \mathrm{Bd7} 13 \mathrm{Rbl} \mathrm{Qc} 7 \quad 14 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Bxg} 5$ 15 Nxg5 ho 16 Bh7+ Kh8 17 Bc2 Rae8 18 Qd3 f5 19 Nf3 Bc8 20 Ne5 Nxe5 21 Rxe5 Rd8 22 Rbel Qc6 23 Bb3 Rfe8 24 Qe3 Bd7 25 h3 b5 26 Qd3 Rc8
 $30 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Bc} 8 \quad 31 \mathrm{~d} 5$ Qd7 32 dxe6 Qd2 E.GREEN - M1.LEVENE, Benoni:

1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 Nc3 exd5 5 cxd5 d6 6 e $4 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 8$ e5 dxe5 9 fxe5 Nfd7 10 e6 fxe6 11 dxe6 $0 h 4+$ 12 g 3 Bxe3+ 13 bxc3 Qe4+ 14 Qe2 Qxe2+ 15 Bxe2 Nb6 16 Bh6 Bxe6 17 Nf3 N8d7 18 Ng 5 Bd5 $19 \mathrm{O} 00-0-0 \quad 20 \mathrm{Bg} 4 \mathrm{Kc} 7$ 21 Nf7 Bxf7 22 Rxf7 Ke6 23 Bf $3+\mathrm{Kb} 5$ $24 \mathrm{Rbl}+\mathrm{Ka} 625 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \quad 26 \mathrm{Bxb} 7+\mathrm{Ka} 5$ 27 Re 7 Nexc4 28 Bg 7 a6 29 Bc 6 Na 4. 30 Bxh 8 Rxh8 31 Bxa4 Na3 32 Rc1 Kxa4 33 Rxc5 Kb4 34 Rc6 Kb5 35 Rcc 7 h5 $36 \mathrm{Rc} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 437 \mathrm{Rb} 7+\mathrm{Kc} 638 \mathrm{Rb} 4,1-0$. A.LIOYD - O.SARAPU, King's Pawn: 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Be2 Nf6 4 d3 Bc5 5 c3 Bb6 6 b4 d6 7 0-0 Be6 8 a4 a6 $9 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{~h} 610 \mathrm{Bh} 4 \mathrm{~g} 5 \quad 11 \mathrm{Bg} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 7$ 12 Nb 2 Ng 613 Qc 2 Nh 514 Nc 4 Ba 7 15 Rfdl g4 16 Nel Qf6 $17 \mathrm{Bfl} \mathrm{Nhf4}$ 18 b5 h5 19 Qd2 h4 20 Bxf4 Nxf4 21 d 4 g 3 22 Ne 3 Rg 823 Kh 1 a5 24 d 5 Bd7 25 f 3 gxh 226 c 4 Nh 527 Nd 3 Bd 4 28 Ra2 Qg5 29 Nf5 $\operatorname{Bxf5} 30$ Qxg5 Rxg5 31 exf5 Bgl 32 g4 hxg 3433 Bg 2 Rxf 34 Rc2 b6 35 Ncl Nf4 36 Ne 2 Nxe2 37 Rxe2 Ke7 31 Re4 14 Ra 43 Rec 2 Kf6 44 Re2 Rhn 4515 $43 \operatorname{Rec} 2 \mathrm{Kf}$ V.SMALL - P.WEIR, Catalan
l Nf3 d5 2 d4 Nf6 3 g3 e6 4 Bg 2 Be7 5 0-0 0-0 6 c4 c5 7 cxd5 exd5 8 Ne3 Nbd7 9 b3 b6 10 Bb 2 Bb 711 Rc 1 Rc8 12 Qd3 Ne4 13 Rfdl f5 14 dxc5 Ndxc5 15 Qbl Bf6 16 Nd4 Qe8 17 e3 Bg5 18 Rel a5 19 Nf3 Bh6 20 Rcdl Rcd8 21 Bal Qe6 22 Nb5 Rf7 23 Nbd4 Qe7

24 a3 Re8 25 b4 axb4 26 axb4 Na6 27 b. 5 Ne 5 28 Nef Bxe6 29 bxe6 Qd6 30 Qxb6 Rbs 31 Qas Re7 32 Nd 4 g 6 33 Qa2 Ree8 34 Nf 3 Nb 335 c 7 Qxc 7


## Inlaid Chesshoard <br> \section*{MAHOGANY KAURI CHESSBOARDS FOR SAIE}

45 mm squares with satin polyurethane
finish. Sections 9 mm thickness on 5 mm base ... framed. Finished weight is one kilo.

Price ......... \$25 post paid.
If not satisfactory, money refunded on return of board, post paid within two weeks.

Write to CHESSCRAFT
2 KNOX PLACE,
GREERTON,
TAURANGA.

## 

A new book has recently been released on the New Zealand Chess scene. Entitlon the New Zealand Chess scene. Entitl ed ThE POWER OF CHESS TACTICS it been the result of some intensive research by Lev Aptekar, the 1975 coNew Zealand Champion. Lev, formerly a chess coach in Kiev (USSR) has used compile hundreds of the best examples from Master play to illustrate thes from Master play, to illustrate the elements
This is a book which will assist in the development of combinative insight the development and to lay the foundation for further overall treatment has been thoroughly overal treatmen has skill thoroughly The Association would Tike to me Assoctation would like to Tactics' would be particularly suited as a follow on from the Merit Award Scheme.
Books available from NZCA or L Aptekar 7 Stamford St, Avalon at $\$ 3.50+25 \mathrm{c}$ post

## Correspondence Chess: Life at the top

Much attention has deservedly been given lately to very strong chess to
aments, such as Amsterdam (IBM) and Bugojno, whilst in the Correspondence Chess world tournaments of similar hess world tournaments of similar have received skant attention. Top leve 1 international correspondence tournaments take three to four years to play, plus nother year to finalise the adjudications. This time factor is why
nformation on events comes through at a dribble, compared with the flood for over the board events. At the moment two World Championship finals are under way, with a third due to start later this ear.
Two brevities from the World Champ. X J.SVENIGGSEN - A.MUHANA, Dutch Defence d4 e6 2 c4 f5 3 g 3 Nf 64 Bg 2 c 5 5 Nf3 cxd4 6 Nxd4 Bc5 7 O-0 Nc6 $8 \mathrm{Nc} 2 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 9 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~h} 4 \quad 10 \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{hxg} 311 \mathrm{hxg} 3$ Ng4 12 Bd 6 Qg5! - 13 Nel Nce5 14 Nf 3 Qh6 15 Bxe5 Nxe5 16 Rel Bxf2+!, $0-1$ K.ENGEL - J.ESTRIN, English Opening: 1 c4 Nf6 2 Nc3 d5 3 cxd5 Nxd5 4 Nf3 6. 5 Qa4+ Bd7 6 Qc2 Nb6 7 d 4 Bg 7 8 e4 0-0 9 Be3 Nc6 10 d5 Na5 11 Rd 1 g4 12 Nb 5 f5 $13 \mathrm{~b} 4,1-0$.

For many years the Finnish Correspondence Chess Federation (FCCF) has been actively participating in the
tournaments of the International C.C.
Federation (ICCF). In 1977 they launched their own tournament under the patronage f ICCF president Hans-Werner Von Massow followed by another in 1978 in memory of Eino Heilimo, the first president of the FCCF. Both are strong by correspondence standards, and unusual in that they also contain players better known for their ver-the-board activities. In the first tournament FIDE Grandmasters Forintos Hungary) and Hecht (West Germany) are playing as well as Peter Markland of England. In the second event FIDE GM Suttles (Canada) and IM Ojanen (Finland) are playing. In the first tournament both Hecht and Markland have obtained the ICCF IM title. Markland needs only one point from adjudication of his remaining games to clinch the GM title. Some games from the first and second ino Heilimo memorials
.DIASCONESCU - H.HECHT, French Defence:

$\begin{array}{lllllll}2 & \text { cxd } 4 & \mathrm{~h} 5 & 13 & \mathrm{Nxh} 5 \mathrm{Rxh} 5 & 14 \mathrm{Ng} 3 \mathrm{Rh} 8\end{array}$
 Na6 19 Be3 Ncb4 20 Rh2 Res 21 Kg 1 Rc3 22 Qel Rc2 23 Rd2 Qc7 24 Of2 @c3 25 Rel Be7 26 Rxc? Rxe2 27 Nxc? Nxc? 28 Re2 Nxe3 29 Rxe3 Nb4 30 Re2 Bd 8 31 Nel Bb 632 Rd 2 Ke 733 Kf 2 Rc 8 34 Ke3 Rc1 35 Nd 3 Nc $2+$, $0-1$.
I. MOROSOV - K.OJANEN, Sicilian Defence: 1 é 4 c5 2 NE 3 Nc6 3 d 4 cxd $4 \quad 4$ Nxd4 $\mathrm{g}_{6} 5 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 76 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 67 \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{O}-0$ 8 Bb3 Ng4 9 Oxg4 Nxd4 10 Od1 Nxb3 11 axb3 a5 12 Bd4 Ra6 13 Bxg7 Kxg7 14 Na5 Re6 15 Qd4+ f6 16 b4 axb4 0.KOSINKEN - K.KAUHONEN, EngTish: c4 e5 2 Nc3 Nf6 3 g3 Bb4 4 Bg 2 0-0 5 Nf3 Nc6 $60-0$ Re8 $7 \mathrm{Nel} \mathrm{Bf8} 8$ d3 d6 9 Nc 2 Ne 710 e 4 c6 11 Ne 3 g 6 $12 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 13$ d5 c5 14 f4 ext4 15 gxf4 Nh5 16 f5 Kh8 17 Bd2 Ng8 18 Qf3 Bd7 19 Ng4 a6 20 a4 Qh4 21 Qh3 Qxh3 22 Bxh3 Ngf6 23 Nf2 Rad8 24 Rael Bc8 25 Nd3 Nd7 26 fxg6 fxg6 27 Bg5 Bd4+ 28 Kg2 Ndf6 29 e5 dxe5 30 Rxf6 e4 31 Rffl exd3 32 Bxd8, $1-0$.

In a recently concluded tournament, in memory of Henk Perfors, organised by the Dutch Federation, two players ained the ICCF GM title: Martas Berta f Hungary and Dick Smit of the Nether lands. A game from this event:
J.BOEY - M.BERTA, French Defence
e4 eb 2 at ob 3 e5 c5 4 c3 Qb6 5 Nf3 Bd7 6 Be2 Bb5 7 c4 Bxc4 8 Bxc4 b4+ 9 Nbd2 dxc4 10 a3 Qb5 11 Qe2 Ne6 12 Nxc4 Qa4 13 dxc5 Bxc5 14 Qe4: Kf8 15 0-0 Nge7 $16 \quad \mathrm{b4}$ ! Bb6 17 Nd 6 Rb8 $18 \mathrm{Ng} 5 \mathrm{Nd} 819 \mathrm{Ngxf7}$ : Nxf7 20 Qf4 Nf5 21 Nxf5 exf5 22 e6: : (The point of the combination) 22 ...Ke7 23 Qxf5 Qe8 2.4 exf7 Qxf7 25 Qe5+ Qe6 26 Qxg7+, l-0.

In the next issue I will write on the three main ICCF events apart from the world championships: The 01mpiads, Baltic Team Cup and the Europear Championship.

Report by Peter Corbett

Late News: The World Cadet Championship has been won by the Soviet junior Valery Salov (born 1965) with 9/ll.

## Games Section

Jonathan Adams has submitted this game for publication with these comments: "The following wild game was played in round 4 of the 1980 Wellington inter-club B-grade tournament. Before the game I was told that we (Civic) needed to win our match against Tawa by $3-1$ to win the tourney If they won by a similar margin, they uld win the tournament.
Editor's comment: I have added a few notes of my own to this game (in italic type) where appropriate.
J.ADAMS - R.MITCHELL, French Defence:

1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 a3
An aggressive line which seems to be rarely played in New Zealand.
$4 \ldots 3 \times \mathrm{Cl} 3+5$ bxc3 dxe4 60 g 4 Nf6 Qxg7 Rg8 3 Qh6 c5

Perhaps best. Playable alternatives are 8...b6; 8...Rg6 and 8...Nbd7

9 Bg 5
A11 the books recommend 9 Ne 2 , but this logical move should not be bad.

9 ...Rg6 10 Ọh4 cxd4
Probably a mistake. I expected $10 .$. Nc6.

11 Rd1 Nc6
Here both players may have overlookd the possibility of 11 ...Qa5!? 12 Bxff Qxc3+ 13 Rd2 Qalt with at least a draw.Ed.

## 12 Ne 2

This move is rather troublesome for Black. There doesn't seem to be a good exchange sacrifice, so the reply is virtually forced

12 ...e5 13 cxd4 0a5+ 14 c3 Nxd4??
I hadn't even considered this. I was expecting 14 ...Nd5 with a totally different ball-game. But the text leads to some fascinating, wild lines, several of which I mis-analysed at the board. My reply was based more on intuition (that the sacrifice should be acceptable) than concrete analysis

15 Bxf6 Bf5
This game was played with the fast time-limit of 36 moves in $1 \frac{1}{2}$ hours. I
had used only 19 minutes, my opponent an hour and 5 minutes. Now I decided it was time for a think, and proceeded to hallucinate horribly


Obviously, if this is playable White must win. But is it?
The answer is no! Black wins by 16 ‥Rxf6! 17 Qh8+ Ke7 18 Qxal Nc2t
 tc, 20 Kcl Qxa $3+$ etc or 20 Nd4 Rxd4+ 21 Kxc2 (if 21 Bd3 Rxd3+ 22 Ke 2 Qa6) 21 ...Qa4t 22 Kb 2 Rxdl 23 Qxb7+ Kf6 winning.Ed.

## 16 ...Nc2+ $17 \mathrm{Kd2}$ e3+

This is a mistake. Black can continue as in the previous note with 17 Rxf6! or even the more bizarre 17 Rd8+!! 18 Bxd8 Rd6+ 19 KxC 2 Qa4 + 20 Kb 2 Bxh 721 Rxd6 e3 winning.Ed.

18 fxe3 Qd5+?
The crucial error. I was dreading 18 ...Rd8+, missing that after 19 Bxd8 Black does not win the queen with 19 ...Rd6+ 20 Nd4! (this is why e3t is a mistake.Ed.) Rxd4+ 21 exd4 Bxh7 because his own queen is en prise. of Course Black would win Her Majesty after the blunder 19 Nd4?? allowing 19 ...Rxg2+ etc. But Black has a much better choice: 18 ....Rxf6 19 Qh8+ Ke7 20 Qxa8 produces a position which almost defies accurate analysis, especlally over the board. Black is material down, but White s King is very exposed and 10 and Queen are out of play 20 ...Qbs would lose to $21 \mathrm{Na4}$, but 20...Qb, for example, looks interest ing. (Black should win after 20 ...Rd6+ 21 Nd 4 (forced) exd4 22 Qxb7+ Kf6.Ed.) 19 Kcl
Winning.
19 ...Qxdl+
Desperation.
20 Kxd1 Nxe3+ 21 Kc1 Rxf6 22 Qh8+ Ke7 23 Qxa8 Rb6 $24 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Nc} 4+25 \mathrm{Kel}$ Rb1+ 26 Kf 2 e4 $27 \mathrm{Nd4}$ e3+ 28 Kf 3 $\mathrm{Nd} 2+29 \mathrm{Kf4}$ e2 $30 \mathrm{Nxf5}+\mathrm{Kf6} 31 \mathrm{Qd8}+$ Kg6 32 पg5t, 1 - 0.

This game was played in the Auckland Interclub Tournament, between North Shore A and Auckland Chess Centre A teams. Mark considers it to be his best game played in New Zealand.
P.GREEN - M.LEVENIE, Pseudo Grunfeld

1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 c5 3 I!f3 g6 4 Nc3 cxd4 5 Nxd4 d5

If Black plays 5 ...Bg 7 then White could play 6 e 4 and we have transposed into an Accelerated Dragon with a into an Accelerated Dragon with a
Maroczy Bind. This way we have what I have called a Pseudo Grunfeld!

6 Qa4 4 ?
There is no refutation to Black's last move. White must play 6 e 3 or 6 cxd5 with an equal game. This way White loses a few tempi with his queen.
$6 \ldots$...Bd $7 \quad 7$ Qb3 Ncб
7 ...e5 looked good here but after 7 ....Nc6 I was better developed and taking no risks.

## $3 \mathrm{Nxc6}$

If 8 e3 then Na5:
8 ...Bxc6 9 Bg5?
A doubtful move. e3 or even better 9 cxd5 Nxd5 10 e4: would still have given White an equal game.

9 ...dxc4 10 Qxc4 Bg7 11 e4
11 e 3 is safer.
11 ...0a5 12 Bd2 0-0 13 b4?!
White should think of castling and play Be2 although after Rfd8 with Rac8 to follow, Black has a better game.
$13 \ldots$ Qe5 $14 \mathrm{f4}$
If 14 f 3 then 14 ...Rac8 and White is in a critical position.
$14 \ldots$ Qh5 15 Be 2 Ọh $4+16 \mathrm{~g} 3$ Qh3 17 Bf1 Qd7!?

17 ...Qc8 looked good but I didn't want to exchange Queens as long as the white King was in the centre, and I wanted to keep c8 for my rook.

18 Rd1
The threat was Bxe4!
18 ...Rac 8
Still threatening Bxe4
19 Be3 0e8

Threatening bxe 4 again.
20 गd3 e5! (see diagram)

## A very critical

 position. Here i is hard to forsee the exchange 'sac on move 23 after 21 b5, and also take into account Bc5 now or later. Now, Black threatens to open all lines against the
White King. After
21 Be5 exf4
a) Bxf8 I planned Bxf8! (22 ...Nxe4!? looks good but after 23 Bxo 7 , White can survive.) $23 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bxb} 424 \mathrm{O}-0 \mathrm{Bxc} 3$ (or Bc5+!) 25 Qxc3 Nxe4 and with 3 pawns for the exchange, Black should win. b) 22 Bg 2 fxg 3 ! with complications that favour Black.

21 Bg 2 : seems white's best chance and after $21 \ldots$...bs $220-0$ the game is complicated with chances for both sides

21 b5?
This loses by force.
21 ...exf4! 22 bxce. fxe3 23 cxb7 Rxc3!

White has a dangerous passed pawn on 67 but the position demands this sacrib7 but the position demands this sacri
fice in order to catch the white King in the centre

24 2xc3 Oxe4 (Best) 25 2b?
On 25 Rg 1 Black replies with 25 ... Qf 3 with Ne4 to follow. Now I could have played $25 \ldots \mathrm{Nd} 7$ and after 26 Bg 2 Qf5 27 Ras (only move) Bxb2 20 kxts gxfs black should win being a plece up. However, I got carri idea!
exfl=0 + .e2! 26 be=0 (only move)
I think 26 ...exdl=0+ 27 Kxdl pxhl also wins as White cannot defend the Bishop on fl without losing one of his Queens, but I saw a forced win after the text move

27 Kxfl 2xh1+ 29 Ke2 De4+ 29 Kf1
If Kd 2 then 29 ...Bh6+ wins.
29...?f3+ 30 Kel Me4!:

The actual move wasn't hard to see, but we have reached a unique nosition.

White has two Queens against a Queen, Bishop and Knight, but must lose one of his queens ending up a piece down in a hopeless position
31 Rd8 Bc3+!. 32 Qxc3 (Forced) Qh1+! $33 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Nxc} 3+$, $0-1$.

White resigned as he will eventually be a rook down or get mated

Notes by Mark Levene.
The following game was played in the 1980 Bledisloe Cup match between Otago and Auckland. Notes by Richard Sutton. R.SUTTON - O.SARAPU, Sicilian Defence:

$$
1 \mathrm{e} 4 \mathrm{c5} 2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 63 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{cxd} 4
$$

4 Nxd4 e5!?
A surprise, especially when coupled with a new move on his 9th.

5 Nb5 a6 6 Nd6+ Bxd6 7 Qxd6 Qf6 8 Qd1! Qg6 9 Nc3 d5!? 10 Nxd5 Qxe4+ 11 Ne 3

An insipid move, hoping to defend c2 and g 2 , develop his pieces and use his two bishops to effect. More likely to refute Black's play was 11 Be3!? Nd4! 12 Nc7+ Ke7 13 Nxa8 Nxc2+ 14 Kd2. Later, home analysis showed that in this terrifying position, White's prospects were quite good e.g. 14 ...Nxal 15 Bc5+ Ke8 $16 \mathrm{Nc} 7+$ Kd8 $17 \mathrm{Kc} 3+$ !, but it was hard to work it all out within the time control, especially against an opponent who had studied the position beforehand.
11 ...Nf6 12 Bd3 Qb4+ 13 Bd2! Qe7 14 Bc3! 0-0 $150-0 \operatorname{Re} 8$
If $15 \ldots{ }^{\text {e }} 16$ Bxf6 gxf6 17 Nd5 and 18 Bxe4!

16 Re1 Be6 17 Nc4?!
Consistent with his plan, but now Black could have put his opponent under pressure with $17 \ldots$...Bxc4 18 Bxc4 b5: 19 Bd3 b4 20 Bd2 Rad8!? - can White risk taking the a-pawn, and if he doesn't, what compensation will he have for Black's powerful centre?
17 ...Bxc4 18 Bxc4 Rad8?! 19 Qf3 Nd4 20 Bxd4 Rxd4 21 Bb3 e4

Not 21 ...Red8 22 Radl Rf4? 23 Qxb 7! !

22 Qe2 Red8 23 Rad1 Rxd1 24 Rxd1 Rxd1+ 25 Qxdl e3:

Already the contours of the ending have become apparent. White has a queen-side majority of pawns and his bishop is better than Black's knight. As a counter-measure, Black seeks to weaken White's king-side and install his knight on the strong e4 square. But as will be seen, this last idea is
fatally flawed.
26 Qe2! exf2+ $27 \mathrm{Kxf2}$ ! Ne4+?
28 Kel: Qe5
The threat was 29 Bd5
$29 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{~g} 630 \mathrm{Qe} 3 \mathrm{Kg} 731 \mathrm{Bc} 2!\mathrm{f} 5$
32 Bxe4 Qe7
Forced - if 32 ...Qxe4 33 Qxe4 fxe4 followed by Ke2-e3, eventually winning the e-pawn or 32 ...fxe4 33 Qd4 Kf6 34 Ke 2 with a similar outcome.

33 Qd4+ Kh6 34 Qe3+ Kg7 35 Qd4+ Kh6 36 Ke 2 fxe4 37 Qd5 Qh4

Otherwise 38 Ke 3 , but now the Queen gets out of play.

## 38 h3 b5?

His last chance was 38 ...Qf4:
39 Qxb7 Qcl with counterplay. White's 39 Qxb7 Qc1 with counterplay. White
best seems to be 39 Qd2 g5 40 Qd4! best seems to be 39 Qd2 g5 40 Qd4:
(Not 40 Qxf4 gxf4 with a good endgame (Not 40 Qxf

39 Qe5. a5 40 b3 a4 41 bxa4 bxa4 42 c4 Qd8

Forced, sooner or later, on account of the march of the c-pawn.

43 Qxe4 Qd6 44 Qd5 Qe7+ $45 \mathrm{Kd2}$
The King has no objection to walking with the black a-pawn to be picked up on the way.

45 ...Qa3 46 c5 Qb2+ $47 \mathrm{Kdl} \mathrm{Kg7}$
If 47 ...Qbl+ $48 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Qb} 2+$ ? 49 Qd2+ a typical Queen and pawn ending tactic.
$48 \mathrm{c} 6 \mathrm{Qb} 1+49 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Qb} 2+50 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{Qb} 1+$
The game goes to adjudication. But Black has no satisfactory reply to 51 Kc 3 : e.g.
a) 51 ...Qcl+ $52 \mathrm{Kb4}$ and if Black keeps on checking, White's King takes the apawn and then works his way around to d7 where he is immune from checks. Similar lines follow if:
b) 51 ...Qel+ 52 Kc 4 so Black's best chance is:
c) $51 \ldots$...a3 52 Qd4+! now

1) $52 \ldots \mathrm{Kh} 6$ ? $53 \mathrm{Qd} 2+\mathrm{Kh} 5 \quad 54 \mathrm{c} 7 \mathrm{Qb} 7$

55 Qe2+ Kh6 56 Qe3+ Kg7 57 Qe7+ Kh6 $58 \mathrm{Qf} 8+$ and $\mathrm{c} 8=\mathrm{Q}$.
2) 52 ...Kf8?? 53 Qb4+ etc
3) $52 \ldots \mathrm{Kf} 753 \mathrm{Qc} 4+\mathrm{Ke} 7$ ( $53 \ldots \mathrm{Kg} 7$, see line 4) 54 Qe2+: Kf7 55 c7 Qc1+
56 Kb 3 Qxc 7 ( $56 \ldots \mathrm{ObI}+57 \mathrm{Ka} 4$ and the checks run out) 57 Qc4+ with a winning King and pawn ending. If in this line $54 \ldots \mathrm{Kf} 855 \mathrm{c} 7 \mathrm{Qc} 1+56 \mathrm{Qc} 2 \mathrm{Qe} 3+$ $57 \mathrm{Kc4}$ : Qf4+ 58 Kb 5 and finds shelter. 4) $52 \ldots \mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 53 \mathrm{Qc} 4+\mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 54 \mathrm{c7}$ :
a) 54 ...Qcl+? $55 \mathrm{~Kb} 3 \mathrm{QbI}+56 \mathrm{Kxa3}+$ b) $54 \ldots \mathrm{Qb} 2+55 \mathrm{Kd3} \mathrm{Qb1}+56 \mathrm{Kd4} \mathrm{QgI}+$ ( $56 \ldots \mathrm{Qdl}+57 \mathrm{Kc} 5$ Qh5 $58 \mathrm{Qd} 5+-$ ) $57 \mathrm{Ke} 5 \mathrm{Qe} 3+58 \mathrm{Kd} 6 \mathrm{Qb} 6+59 \mathrm{Kd} 7$ etc.

The next two games were played in the 1980 Burroughs Computers South Island Championships and are annotated by Roger Nokes, who,incidentally, won the Championships with $6 \frac{1}{2} / 8$.
R.NOKES - T.VAN DIJK, Kings Ind. Attack

1 e4 e6 2 d3 d5 3 Nd2 c5 4 g 3 Nc 6
 Ne 8

This, and Black's next two moves rather took me by surprise. I was expecting Tom to play for the usual queen-side expansion that Black obtains from this choice of opening. Instead, he attempts to transform into a position characteristic of the Kings Indian Defence but with colours reversed.

9 Qe2 dxe4 10 dxe4 e5!?
Now we have a pawn structure similar to the normal K.I.Defence (with colours reversed) but Black has wasted a number of tempi and White has no problems of tempi and White has no problems taking control of d 5 which was weakened by Black's 8 th and 10th moves.

## 11 Nc4 Bf6

If Black plays Nd4 at any stage he will want to recapture with the c-pawn, not the e-pawn which only activates White's bishop on g2.

## 12 Rdl

White could also play 12 c3 and then RdI due to the vulnerability of Black's back rank.1.e. 12 c 3 Be6 13 Rd1 and Black must reply with a queen move as 13 ...Bxc4 loses to 14 Rxd8 Bxe2 15 Rxa8.

12 ...Qe7
Not $12 \ldots$...Nd4 13 Nxd4 $\operatorname{cxd} 4$ (exd4 14 e5 Be7 15 c 3 !) 14 c3! and Black's pawn on d 4 is only a weakness. $14 \ldots \mathrm{~F} 5$ is not possible due to 15 cxd4 bxc 16 dxes and wins.

13 c 3 Be6 $14 \mathrm{Ne} 3 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 15 \mathrm{Nd} 5 \mathrm{Ob} 7$ 16 Bg5?!

Although White has a positional edge Black has a solid if not active position. I felt uneasy about this continuation as White is exchanging his good bishop for Black's bad bishop.
16 Nel ?? with the idea of NC2, Ne3 and
16 Nel!? with the idea of NC2, Ne3 and f 4 when it is very difficult for Black to untangle his pieces
$16 \ldots$...xg5
It is difficult to judge the consequences of 16 ...Rd8 17 Bxf6 Nxf6 18 Nxf6+ gxf6 19 Nh4 although it seems incorrect for White to exchange his active pieces for Black's poorly placed active pieces for Black s poorly placed
pieces. The weakness of Black's doubled f-pawns is hard to profit from and White is burdened with a bad bishop.

The continuation $16 \ldots \mathrm{Bg} 4$ does not appear promising for Black although this is what I expected when I played 16 Bg 5 at the board. 16 ...Bg4 17 Bxf6 Nxf6 18 Nxf6+ gxf6 19 Qe3 Bxf3 20 0xf3! when 20 ...Kg7 allows 21 Rd6 and 20...0e7 allows 21 Bh3 both of which give Black a difficult which give Black a dhe move I gane. The at the board. Thus it appears simply Rd8 may be best for Black.

17 Nxg5 h6? !
Black further weakens his dark squares which he cannot afford to do if he intends swapping his white squared bishop. 17 ...Nd8 may be better but White can play f 4 with some infative. 17 ...Bd7 is another possibility.

## 18 Nxe6 fxe6 19 Ne 3

White has been able to transform his superiority into something concrete but has had to sacrifice his outpost at d 5 .

19 ...Nf6 20 Rd6 Rae8 21 Rad1 Qc7 22 Ng 4 ?

White is careless. In my desire to control d7 I overlooked a neat tactical possibility for Black. 22 R6d2 is probably necessary.

## 22 ...Nxg4?

Black misses his chance. Correct is 2 ...Nd4! then 23 cxd4 cxd4! (not Qxd6 24 dxe5 and White is winning nor is 23 ...Nxg4 possible as White can continue 24 dxe5 Nxe5 ( 24 ...Nxf2 loses a piece to 25 Rfl$) 25$ f4 Nc6 26 Rd7 Qc8 (26 ...Nd4? 27 Rlxd4 + -) 27 Qg4 with a powerful position for White.) Now White must choose between 24 Nxe5 and 24 f4. 24 Nxf6t fails to 24 ...gxf6 ( $24 \ldots$...Rxf6? 25 Qh5 + -) 25 Qg4+ Kf7! and White will not regain the exchange. On (a) 24 Nxe5 Qxd6 25 Ng6 black does not reply Rf7 26 e5 and White stands better but 25 ...e5: and Black is okay, although White has some play on the light squares. On (b) 24 f4 Black replies Nxg4 (not 24 Qxd6 25 fxe5) 25 fxe5 Nxe5 26 R6xd4 with approximate equality

23 Rd7. (see diagram)


Not 23 Qxg4? Na4! $23 \ldots 2 \mathrm{CB} \quad 24$ Qxg4 Re7 25 Rxe7 Nxe7 $\begin{array}{llll}26 \\ \text { Nc5 } & 28 & \text { Sh3 } & \text { Kh7 }\end{array}$ NC6 28 2
29 Qg4!
White finally wins a pawn.
29 ...Nd8 30 Qh5!
Nf7 31 Rxe6! Qd8
On 31 ...Rxe6 32 Qf5+ Kg 8 ( $32 \ldots \mathrm{~F} 6$ ? 33 Qf7+ or 32 ...Kh8 33 Qxf7! Rf6 34 Qxf6 Qxh3 35 Qxe5 + -) 33 Qxe6 Qd8 ( and not 33 ...Qxe6 34 Bxe6 and Bxf7 wins) 34 Qd7 which is similar to the game.
A1so 31 ...g6 loses to 32 Rxf6 and 31 ...Ng5 is met by $32 \mathrm{Bf} 5+\mathrm{Rxf5}$ ( if
32 ...g6 33 Re7+ and Qxh6 wins and
$32 \ldots \mathrm{Kg} 8$ loses to $33 \mathrm{Re} 8+$ ) $33 \mathrm{Qg} 6+\mathrm{Kg} 8$ 34 Re8+ wins.

32 Bf5+ Kg8 33 Rxf6 Qxf6 34 Qdl g6 35 Bh3 Qd6 36 Qxd6?!

Probably better is 36 Qd5.
36 ...Nxd6 37 Be6+ Kf8 38 Bd5 Ke7 $39 \mathrm{Kf} 1 \mathrm{Ne} 8 \quad 40 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Nf} 641 \mathrm{Bb7}$ (sealed)

41 f 4 is probably the correct response but before adjournment this was a rather commital course to take At adjournment it was difficult for White to find a winning plan against a set-up like; pawns on a5,b6,c5,e5,g5,h6 King on $\mathrm{f} 6 \&$ knight on d 6 for Black.

However in an adjournment time of two hours it is never easy to find the correct defence.
41 ....Ne8?
Already an inaccuracy. Best is g5. 42 f4 Kf6 43 Kf3 Nd6 44 Bd5 Ne8 45 Kg 4

Tempting Black to play h5 and fix his king-side pawns on white squares.

45 ...Nc7 46 Bc6 b5 47 h 4 a5?!
Black must play h5 like it or not.
48 h 5 exf4 49 gxf4 b4 $50 \mathrm{e} 5+\mathrm{Kg} 7$ $51 \mathrm{hxg6}$ bxc $3 \quad 52$ bxc3 $\quad \mathrm{Kxg} 6 \quad 53 \mathrm{f5}+\mathrm{Kg7}$ 54 Kf 4 Kf 7 5 5 Ke 4 Ke 756 Kd 3 h 5 $57 \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{~h} 4 \quad 58 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Ne} 859 \mathrm{Kxc5}, 1-0$.

A very enjoyable game despite its inaccuracies.
R.NOKES - R.SMITH, Trompovsky Attack:

Many of the games amongst the top seeds of this South Island Championship were surprisingly one sided affairs. In the round before this Vernon Small was unrecognisable as he crashed to Robert Smith, while in round 6 Vernon bounced back to inflict a crushing defeat on back Bruce Anderson as Robert finds some the same veln as Rober rather dubious continations in a very
sharp variation of the Trompovsky.
1 d4 Nf6 2 Bg5 c5 3 d5 Qb6 4 Nc Qxb2 5 Bd2 Qb6

Robert mentioned after that he had not prepared this line before the game. This is not the type of reply to the Trompovsky that one should choose on the spur of the moment.

6 e4 d6? !
This is the reply chosen by most of Vaganian's opponents (Vaganian being Vaganian's opponents (Vaganian being the Trompovsky regularly) but as can be seen from his games it has not fared very well. ECO gives $6 \ldots$...e5 leading to complex play.

7 f4 Bg4?
This is certainly not good. This bishop should be preserved for the defence.

8 Be2 Bxe2 9 Qxe2
The thrust $e 5$ is becoming more
powerful every moment. Perhaps Black should continue 9 ...Nfd7 10 e5 dxe5 11 fxe5 e6 although his position is hardly attractive.

## 9 ...Qa6? 10 Nb5 Kd8 $11 \mathrm{c4}$ !

White's solid central grip should now be decisive. Black has all sorts of problems developing his pieces.

## $11 \ldots g 6 \quad 12$ e5 Ne8 13 Nf 3 h 6

White was threatening 16 exd6 exd6 17 Qe7+ Kc8 18 Qxf7 +

16 Nxe5 Rf8 17 Bc3?!
At the time I wondered whether this was necessary but I decided a continual build-up could not be bad. However, White has an immediate win
18 Nac5 Ob6. 19 Ba5: and wins
8 Nxc5 Qb6 $19 \mathrm{Ba5}$ ! and wins.
The object of Bc3 was to allow
White to swap off Black's bishop, his only active and useful defensive piece once White moves his knight on e5.
17 ...Kc8! 18 Nd 3 Bxc3 19 Qxe 7 $\mathrm{Bd} 4+$

If $19 \ldots \mathrm{Bg} 7$ then White wins by 20 Nxc5 Qb6 (or Qf6) 21 Qxe8+! Rxe8 22 Rxe8+ Qd8 23 Rxd8+ Kxd8 24 Nxb $7+$ 22 Rxe8+ Qd8 23 Rxd8+ Kxd8 24 Nxb
with two passed pawns to the good.

## 20 Nxd4

Also possible is 20 Khl when Black can play Bg 7 as in the previous not or Rh8 when White wins by 21 0xf7.

20 ...Qd6 21 Nxc5 Qxe7 22 Rxe7 Nd6

Black has solved his immediate problems by exchanging queens at the cost of a pawn, but the ending is hopeless as he will find great difficulty developing his queenside pieces.

23 Nb5! Nxb5
Not Nxc4? 24 Rc7+ Kd8 25 Nxb7+ Ke8 $26 \mathrm{Re} 1+\mathrm{Ne} 527$ N5d6 mate.
$24 \mathrm{cxb} 5 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 25 \mathrm{Nb} 7 \mathrm{Nd} 7 \quad 26 \mathrm{Rc} 1+$ Kxb7 27 Rxd7+ Kb8 28 Rcc 7 a6 $29 \mathrm{Rb} 7+\mathrm{Kc} 830 \mathrm{Rdc} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 831 \mathrm{Rxf} 7$, 1-0.

This next game, with notes by Kai Jensen, was played in the Otago Jensen, was played in the Otago
Premier round robin tournament.
K.JENSEN - G.HAASE, Catalan:
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}1 \mathrm{c4} & \mathrm{Nf} 6 & 2 & \mathrm{~d} 4 & \text { e6 } & 3 \mathrm{Nf} 3 & \mathrm{~d} 5 & 4 & \mathrm{~g} 3 \\ 5 \mathrm{Ba} 2 & 0-0 & 6 & 0-0 & \mathrm{c} 6 & 7 & \mathrm{Nc} 3 & \mathrm{Nbd} 7\end{array}$ 8 b3 Re8 9 Bb2 Rb8 10 Oc2 b5 11 Rac1

Better was probably just c5 followed by b4. White can then break in the centre at leisure with 44.

## 11 ...bxc4 12 bxc4 Ba6! 13 Nd 2

 0b6?Immediately $13 \ldots$...Qa5 saved a tempo.
14 Rb 1 Qa5 15 Rfc 1 Rfc 816 Bal c5? !

Black would have done better to exchange rooks before playing this. As it is, White is able to exchange, and Tvert a lack plece form action. The complications that result, concer ing the central pawn exchanges, a slightly favourable to White

17 Rxb8 Nxb8 18 Nb3 Qb4 19 a3!?
If at once 19 cxds then $19 \ldots . . \operatorname{cxd} 4$ wins a piece.

19 ...Qb7
Not 19 ...Qxc4 20 Na5 Qxd4 21 Nxd5 but Black should have considered 19 ...Qxa3. After 20 cxd5 cxd4 21 Nxd4 Nxd5 22 Bxd5 exd5 23 Bb 2 things remain interesting.

20 cxd5 exd5 21 Nxc5 Bxc5 $22 \mathrm{dxc5}$ Rxc5 23 Rbl Qc8 24 Qb2! (see diagram)


A rather subtle fork, attacking the knight on b8 and pinning the knight on 66 , because of the because of the mate on g7. Now
the d-pawn falls.

24 ...Nbd7 25 Nxd5 Kf8 26 (Qb4 Nxd5 27 Bxd5 Kg8 28 Qd4 Nf6

There wasn't much else Black could do.

29 Qxc5 0xc5 $30 \mathrm{Rb} 8+\mathrm{Bc} 8 \quad 31 \mathrm{Bb} 7$ Qe7 32 Rxc8+ Ne8 33 Bc6, 1 - 0 .

To conclude the games section for this issue we have Korchnoi's fourth game win over Polugaevsky. Annotations and notes are provided by I.M. Ortvin Sarapu.

## L.POLUGAEVSKY - V.KORCHNOI, Queen's Ind:

 4TH MATCH GAMEOnly 3 years ago Korchnoi outplayed and convincingly defeated Polugaevsky in the same semifinal. But this time it was close and perhaps Polugaevsky was a bit
unlucky to lose the match. It can be said for sure that Polugaevsky has improved considerably (as his match against Tal showed). Korchnoi on the other hand did not impress as much as he did before.

The new (unpopular) rule is that when scores are even, then the player who won with Black qualifies. Korchnoi won this game (number 4) with Black and also game elght with the black pieces. This rule actually gave an unfair advantage to Korchnoi, who could afford to play for draws to win the match.

1 Nf3 Nf6 $2 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 7 \quad 4 \mathrm{Bg} 2$ e6 $\quad 5 \quad 0-0$ Be7 6 d4 $0-0 \quad 7 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 4$ 8 Qc2 Nxc3 9 Qxc3 f5

This old variation of the Queen's Indian Defence got the reputation of being very drawish and has been gradually disappearing from tournaments as White has avoided this line. It was Karpov who introduced some new 1ife Into this line of play

10 b3 Bf6 11 Bb2 d6 12 Radl a5!
Preventing White from gaining more space on the queenside.

13 Ne1 Bxg2 14 Nxg2 Nc6 15 Qd2 Qd7 16 d5 Nd8 17 Bxf6 Rxf6 18 dxe6 Nxe6 19 Ne3 Re8 20 Nd5 Rg6

There is still a bit of advantage left for White. His knight on d5 is better placed than Black's. The normal result from here should be a draw. Polugaevsky on the other hand is overpressing for a win.

21 e3 Qd8 22 f3!? Nc5 23 Nf4 Rf6 24 Rfe1 Rf7 25 Qc2 Nd7 26 Nd5 c6!?

And now Korchnoi is taking on the challenge. Both players have weakened their pawn formations equally.

27 Nc 3 Qf6 28 Qd2 Rfe7 29 Kg 2 Nc 5 30 Na4?

This looks and probably is an overambitious adventure. After the simple Re2 both sides can defend the position with a draw.

30 ...Nxa4 31 bxa4 Qf7 32 Qd4 Re5

33 Qxb6 Qxc4 34 Qb3 Oxb3 35 axb3 R5e6 $36 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Kf7} 37 \mathrm{Rd} 3 \mathrm{Ke} 738 \mathrm{RcI} \mathrm{c} 5$

This ending did not turn out as Polugaevsky expected. Black has three pawn islands to White's two. Korchnoi on the other hand has two weak white pawns to attack whereas Polugaevsky has only one target.

39 Rc4 Rh6 40 h 4 Rb8 41 Rf4 Rf6 $42 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 43 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Rb} 4$ ! $44 \mathrm{~h} \times \mathrm{g} 6 \mathrm{hxg} 6$ 45 Kg 3 Ke 646 gxf5 $4 \times f 5 \quad 47 \mathrm{Rxb4} \mathrm{axb4}$ 48 Rd 1 d 5

Now it is clear that Korchnoi has the upper hand. The threat of c 4 would ive him 2 connected passed pawns or force White to lose a pawn.

49 a5
Again Polugaevsky is forcing the play. It is difficult to find another active plan for White.

49 ...Rf8 50 a6 Ra8 51 Ral Kd6!
With the idea to play c4:
52 e4?
He must have analysed Kf4 here, but then after c4 53 Kxf5 cxb3 54 Rbl Rxa6 55 Rxb3 Kc5 (or Ra3 56 Rxb4 Rxe3) it is still unclear if White can hold the position. One thing is sure, that now Black wins.

52 ...fxe4 53 fxe4 c4 $54 \mathrm{Kf4} \mathrm{cxb} 3$ $55 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Kc} 556 \mathrm{Rc} 1+\mathrm{Kb} 5 \quad 57$ exd5 Rxa6 $58 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{Rh} 659 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \mathrm{Rh} 3+60 \mathrm{Kd} 4 \mathrm{Rc} 3$ 61 Rdl b2 62 Rbl Rc 263 d 6 Kc 6 64 Ke5 b3, 0 - 1

Excellent endgame play by Korchnoi.

When the score in this match reached 6-6 a play-off had to be played, and a new drawing of lots gave Korchno1 Wh1te in the first game. The match was decided in the games with Polugaevsky white and Korchnoi black, as all five decisions fell in them.

After the match Korchnoi told that he preferred to meet with HUbner in the final, expecting a fair match while Portisch "behaves like the Soviets". Asked if he was not as responsible for the war of nerves each time he plays a former compatriot, Korchnoi replied:The Soviets are the first to attack. Their tactics are to make the match stretch out as long as possible. From AIPE Chess News. Ed.

## Overseas News

The new match format for the World Championship Candidates, according to Fischer who had been campaigning for change since his Candidates debut in 1959, would give non-Soviet players a much better chance in the onetuation. Neverthers, in tatives made the final and it was unt11 1971 that Fischer beca player from outst the USSR to 0 only in a semt-final but also become the challenger 1974 saw Karpov beating Korchnoi in a close match which eventually made the former World Champion when Fischer gave up his title without defending it.

Korchnol defected from the USSR after the IBM toumament in 1976 and in the following year became the second nonSoviet player to make the Candidates final, beating Spassky in a strange performance by both sides.

This year, however, sees new ground broken as BOTH finalists in the 1980 Candidate series represent the West!

Although Korchnoi scored a decisive ictory over Polugaevsky in 1977, the Russian's chances could not be underestimated this time as his convincing in over high-flying Tal in the quart final testified. In the event Korchnoi ked out a close $73_{\text {g }}$ : $63_{5}$ win after
 for the second time in the twelfth ast) ane of the matn part of the (and match. As Korchnoi had won both his games with the black pieces he could afford to split the two two-game mini matches to follow He drew the white pieces for the thirteenth game and this las drawn but a win agath with the lack pieces, in game fourter the the match Scores: the match. Scores:
KORCHNOI $\quad \frac{1 / 2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} 1 \quad 7 \frac{1}{2}$ POLUGAEVSKY $\quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2} 0 \quad 6 \frac{1}{2}$

Unfortunately the fourteenth game is not avallable yet but we give the scores of the other four decisive games.
POLUGAEVSKY - KORCHNOI (4), Queen's Indian Defence: 1 Nf3 Nf6 2 c4 b6 3 g3 $\mathrm{Bb} 7 \quad 4 \mathrm{Bg} 2$ e $6 \quad 50-0 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 6 \quad \mathrm{~d} 40-0 \quad 7$ Ne3 Ne4 8 Qc2 Nxc3 9 Qxc3 f5 10 b3
 14 Nxg2 Nc6 15 Qd2 Qd7 16 d5 Nd8 17 Bxf6 Rxf6 18 dxe6 Nxe6 19 Ne3 Re8 20

Nd5 Rg6 21 e3 Qd8 $22 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 5 \quad 23 \mathrm{Nf} 4$ Rf6 24 Rfel Rf7 25 Oc2 Nd7 26 Nd5 c6 27 Nc 3 Qf6 28 Qd2 Rfe 729 Kg 2 Ne5 $30 \mathrm{Na} 4 \mathrm{Nxa4} 31 \mathrm{bxa4}$ Qf7 32 Qd4 Re5 33 Qxb6 Qxc4 34 Qb3 Qxb3 35 axb 3 R5e6 $36 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Kf7} 37 \mathrm{Rd} 3 \mathrm{Ke} 7 \quad 38 \mathrm{Rcl}$ C5 39 Re4 Rh6 40 h 4 Rb8 41 Rf4 Rf6 $42 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 43 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Rb} 4 \quad 44 \mathrm{hxg} 6 \mathrm{hxg} 645$ Kg3 Ke6 46 gxf5+ gxf5 $47 \mathrm{Rxb4}$ axb4 48 Rd 1 d 549 a5 Rf8 50 a6 Ra8 51 Ral Kd6 52 e 4 fxe4 53 fxe4 c4 54 Kf4 cxb3 $55 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Kc} 5 \quad 56 \mathrm{Rc} 1+\mathrm{Kb} 5 \quad 57$ exd5 Rxa6 $58 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{Rh} 659 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \mathrm{Rh} 3+$ 60 Kd 4 Rc 361 Rdl b 262 Rb 1 Rc 26 d6 Kc6 64 Ke5 b3, $0: 1$.

POLUGAEVSKY - KORCHNOI (6), Queen's Indian Defence: 1 Nf 3 Nf6 2 c4 b6 3 g 3 Bb 74 Bg 2 e $6 \quad 50-0 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 6$ d4 $0-0$ 7 d5 exd5 $8 \mathrm{Nd4}$ Nc6 9 cxd5 Nxd4 10
 b5 14 Bf4 b4 15 Nc4 a5 16 e4 Ba6 17 Qc2 Bxc4 18 Qxc4 Nd7 19 Rfdl Nb6 20 Qb5 Qc7 21 Bh3 Rfb8 22 Qc6 QdB


23 e5 Nc4 24 exd6 Bxd6 25 Qxc5 b3 27 Rd 4 Rb 728 Rcl h 6 29 Qc3 Rab8 30 Qe3 Re7 31 Qf4 Re2 32 Rc6 Rb6 33 Qc1 Qf6 34 Qf4 Qd8 35 Rd 2 g5 36 Qd4 Rb4 $37 \mathrm{Qc} 3 \mathrm{Rel+} 38 \mathrm{Bfl}$ Bd3 Ral+ 42 Kg 2 Rdl 43 Ra 6 Qd 844 Qd4 f5 45 Ra 7 Qf 846 Qc3 a4 47 Qc 7 Qf7 48 Ra8+ Kg7 49 Qxd6 Rxd3 50 Qe5+, l : 0.

POLUGAEVSKY - KORCHNOI (8), Queen's Indian Defence: 1 Nf3 Nf6 2 c4 b6 3 g 3 Bb 74 Bg 2 e6 $50-0 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 6 \mathrm{~d} 4000$ 7 d5 exd5 8 Na4 Bc6 9 cxd5 Bxd5 10 Bxd5 Nxd5 11 e4 Nb4 12 Nc3 Bf6 13



16 e5 dxe5 17 Ne4 exf4 $18 \mathrm{Nh} 6+$ Kf8 19 Nxf6 Rel +21 Kg 2 Ne 5
 22 Rxf
$\mathrm{Rxf} 7+\mathrm{Ke} 8$
24 Rxf7+ Ke8 24 $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Rxg7 } & \text { Nxh6 } & 25 & \text { a3 } \\ \text { Rd8 } & 26 & \text { axb }\end{array}$ Rd8 26 axb4 Rd7 27 Rxd7 Kxd 28 f2 Rh1 29 Ke 2 Nf b3 Kd5 32 Ke 2 Ne 33 Kd Kc6 31

Bc3 Nc6 35 Rf1 Rh3+ 36 Kc 2 a6 37 Rf5+ Kd6 38 Rf6+ Kd7 39 Rf7+ Kc8 40 Rf8+ $\mathrm{Kb} 741 \mathrm{Rf5} \mathrm{Rh} 2+42 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{Rh} 3+(\mathrm{S}) 43$ $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrr}\text { Kc2 } & \mathrm{Ne} 7 & 44 & \mathrm{Re} 5 & \mathrm{Ng} 6 & 45 & \mathrm{Re} 4 & \mathrm{Rf} 3 & 46 & \mathrm{~g} \\ \mathrm{Rf} 5 & 47 & \mathrm{Bd} 2 & \mathrm{Kc} 6 & 48 & \mathrm{Rel} & \mathrm{Rf} 7 & 49 & \mathrm{Ral} & \mathrm{Kb} 5\end{array}$ $50 \mathrm{Rel} \mathrm{Ne} 751 \mathrm{Re} 4 \mathrm{Kc} 6 \quad 52 \mathrm{Rc} 4+\mathrm{Kd} 753$ Rd4+ Ke6 $54 \mathrm{Re} 4+\mathrm{Kd} 5 \quad 55 \mathrm{Rg} 4 \mathrm{Ng} 656$ $\mathrm{Rg} 1 \mathrm{Ne} 557 \mathrm{Rg} 2 \mathrm{Ke} 458 \mathrm{Bc} 3 \mathrm{Ng} 6 \quad 59 \mathrm{Bd} 2$ Nf8 $60 \mathrm{Re} 2+\mathrm{Kd5} 61 \mathrm{Bc} 3 \mathrm{Rf5} 62 \mathrm{Rd} 2+$ Ke6 $63 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \mathrm{Ng} 6 \quad 64 \mathrm{Rh} 2 \mathrm{Rf} 7 \quad 65 \mathrm{Bc} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 4$ 66 Bd2 Nd5 $67 \mathrm{Re} 2+\mathrm{Kf} 568 \mathrm{Rf} 2+\mathrm{Kg} 6$ $69 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Re} 7 \mathrm{7}_{7} \mathrm{Rf} 2 \mathrm{Ne} 3+71 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 572$ Bf4 Rd7+ 73 Kc3 Nd6 $74 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Nb} 5+75$ Kb2 Rf7 76 Re4 Kf5 77 Rel Nd4 78 Bcl Nf3 79 Rdl Rg7 80 Kc3 Nxg5 81 Rd5+ Kg4 82 Rd4+ Kh5 83 Rd5 h6 84 Kc 4 Rg6 85 Be3 b5+ 86 Kc5 Kg4 $87 \mathrm{Rd} 7 \mathrm{Ne} 4+88$ Kd4 Rd6+ 89 Rxd6 Nxd6 90 Kd5 h5 91 Bf2 h4 92 Bxh4 Kxh4 93 Kc6 Kg4 94 Kxc 7 Ne4 $95 \mathrm{~Kb} 6 \mathrm{Kf} 4,0: 1$.

POLUGAEVSKY - KORCHNOI (12), Queen's Indian Defence: 1 Nf3 Nf6 2 c4 b6 3 $\mathrm{g} 3 \mathrm{e} 64 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 7 \quad 50-0 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 6 \mathrm{~d} 40-0$ d5 exd5 8 Nh4 c6 9 cxd5 Nxd5 10 Nf5 Bc5 ll e4 Ne7 12 Nxg7 Kxg7 13 b 4 Bxb 4 14 Qd4+ f6 15 Qxb4 c5 16 Qd2 Nbc6 17 Bb2 Ва6 18 Rdl Ne5 $19 \mathrm{Na} 3 \mathrm{~N} 7 \mathrm{c} 6 \quad 20$ Qe3 Qe7 21 f4 Nc4 22 Nxc4 Bxc4 23 e5 fxe5 24 Bxe6 dxc6


25 Rd7! Oxd7 26 Qxe5+ Kf7 27 Qf6+ Qxe5+ Kf7 27 Qf6+ Kg8 28 Qg5+ Kf7 Re8 31 Rxe6+ Bxe6 32 Bf6 Bf7 33 Be5 Kd7 34 Bh6 ct 35 Kat $75{ }^{2} 56$ $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Qxh7 } & \text { c5 } & 36 & \text { Bxf8 } \\ \text { Rxf8 } & 37 & 0 g 7 & \mathrm{Ke} 7\end{array}$ 38 Qe5+ Kd7 39 g 4 Re8 40 Qf6 Bd5 $41 \mathrm{~g} 5 \mathrm{Re} 2 \quad 42 \mathrm{~h} 4$ (S) b5 43 Qf5 5 Kd6 44 Qf8+ Kc6 45 Qc8+ $\begin{array}{llll}\text { b5 } & 43 & \text { Qf5+ Kd6 } & 44 \\ \text { Kd6 } & 46 & \text { Qd8+ Kc6 Kc6 } & 47 \\ \text { Qa8+ Kd6 } & 45 & 48 \text { Qf8+ }\end{array}$ Kc6 49 Q 3 Ke 50 h5 31 48 52 Kf2 53 Qb2 Rh3 54 Kg 2 Rf5 55
 $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Qf6+ Kc7 } & 56 & \text { Qxf5 clQ } & 57 & \text { Qe5+ Kb6 } & 58 \\ \text { Kxh3 } & \text { b4 } & 59 & \text { axb4 } & \text { cxb4 } & 60 \text { h6 Ohl }\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Kxh3 b4 } & 59 & \text { axb4 cxb4 } & 60 \mathrm{~h} 6 \text { Qhl+ } & 61 \\ \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Odl}+ & 62 \mathrm{Kf5} & \mathrm{Oc} 2+ & 63 \mathrm{Kf6} \mathrm{~b} 3 & 64 \mathrm{h7}\end{array}$
 Qxh7 68 Qe3+ Kc6 69 Qxbl Qh8+ 70 Ke Qh4 71 Qf7 572 Q 44 1 : 0 .

While Korchnoi proceeds to his fourth Candidates final in the last five series, West German Robert Hubner qualified for his first in beating Portisch by the surprisingly convincing score of $6 \frac{1}{2}$ : $4 \frac{1}{2}$. This match, played in Abano Terme (Italy) started some time after
the Buenos Aires match and we lack the games at this stage. The scores:
HUBNER $\quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1111 \frac{1}{2} \quad 6 \frac{1}{2}$ PORTISCH $\frac{1 / 2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 0001 \frac{1}{2} \quad 4 \frac{1}{2}$

The venue for the final has not yet been decided but the match will be delayed (starting not later than 20 December) to allow the players to compete in the Malta olympiad.

Following difficulties in finding venues for these Candidate matches there is speculation that there will be a return to the double round-robin format used up to 1962 .

## 学

## 自

We reported briefly on the UNITED STATES CHAMPIONSHIP in the August issue. Here are the full scores: 1-3 Browne, Christiansen \& Evans 7 $7 \frac{1}{2} / 12$; 4-5 Seirawan \& Shamkovich 7; 6-7 Lein \& Zaltsman 6; 8-12 Benko, Biyiasas, Bradford, Byrne \& Peters 5; 13 Bisguier $4 \frac{1}{2}$.
A game with a nice finish BRADORD - BYRNE, English Opening: 1 Nf3 Nf6 $2 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 7 \quad 4 \quad 0-0$ Nc3 c4 Be7 6 b3 0-0 7 Bb2 c5 8 d6 Bxg2 12 dxe7 Oxe7 713 Kxg2 Rad8 14 Kg 1 Ne 6 dxe 7 Qxe 713 Kxg 2 Ka Radl e5 18 f3 Nf6 19 Qg5 Qe6 20 Qh4 Nd 421 e 3 Nc 222 Bc 1 Nb 423 d 4 e 4 24 dxc5 Rxdl 25 Rxdl bxc5 26 fxe4 fxe4 $27 \mathrm{Ba} 3 \mathrm{Qe5} 28 \mathrm{Na} 4 \mathrm{Nfd5} 29 \mathrm{Nxc} 5$ Nxe3 30 Nd7 Qd4 31 Qxh7+ Kxh7 32 Nxf8+ Kg8 33 Rxd4 Nbc2 34 Rxe4, 1 : 0 .

The US JUNIOR CH'P, an eightplayer round-robin, was won by 16year old Joel Benjamin, the youngest competitor, with $5 \frac{1}{2}$ points. Second was Douglas Root on 5 then Michael Wilder on $4 \frac{1}{2}$.

The annual LAS PALMAS tournament, 9-21 June, saw a triple tie among GMs Geller (USSR), Miles (ENG) \& Petrosian (USSR) for first prize with $8^{\frac{1}{2}}$ out of 11. Although all three were undefeated the trophy was awarded to Miles on tie-break points. Tqual fourth, on 7 points, were GMs Andersson (SWE) \& Sosonko (NL) then came: 6 GM Bellon (SP) 6; 7 GM G.Garcia
(CUB) $5 \frac{1}{2}$; 8 Fernandez (SP) $4 \frac{1}{2} ; 9$ GM Hernandez (CUB) 4; 10 Mestres (SP) 3; 11 Dominguez (SP) 212 $; 12$ Colon (SP) 1.

The 2nd COPENHAGEN OPEN (Politiken Cup) was played from 21 June to 1 July and featured a rather stronger field than last year's event. The 50-player Swiss was jointly won by GMs Smyslov \& four-way tie for third fir four-way tie for third featured IM Bednarski (POL), Brinck-Clausen (DEN), Then followed: 7 Fedder (DEN) $6 \frac{1}{2}$; 8-16 Then followed: 7 Fedder (DEN) 6 $\frac{1}{2}$; 8-16 GM Csom (RON), M Mestel (ENG), GM Pla(DEN) TM M (USA) , Mortensen (DEN), IM Morris (USA), J.O.Fries (DEN), D.Hansson (SWE) \& Akesson (SWE) 6.

The brilliancy prize was won by Jan Plachetka for the following game: PLACHETKA - RAVI KUMAR, Sicilian Kan: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d 4 cxd4 4 Nxd 4 a6 5 Bd3 Nf6 $60-0$ d6 7 e4 Be7 8 Nc3 0-0 9 b3 b6 10 Bb2 Bb 711 Qe2 Nbd 712 Rad Qc7 13 Bb 1 Re8 14 f 4 Rac8 15 Nf 3 Bf8 16 Kh1 Bc6? 17 e5 Bxf3 18 Rxf3 dxe5 19 fxe5 Ng4


20 Rxf7! Kxf7
21 Qxg4 g6 22 Ne4
Nc5 23 Nf6 Red8 24 Rfl Kg 725 Nxh 7 27 Rxf8 Rxf8 28 27 Rxf8 Rxf8 28
 Of1+ $\quad 32 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{OHCl}$ 33 Oxg6+ Kf8 34 33 Oxg6+ Kf8 34 Qf6+ Kg8 35 Qxe6 $+\mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 36$ Qf6 $+\mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 37$ e6, l: 0 .

Soviet IM Arthur Jusupov completed his GM qualification in winning the North Sea Cup tournament in ESBJERG Jusupov Played 4-19 July. Scores: 1 IM GM Savon (USSR) $7 \frac{1}{2}$; 4 -5 TM ( (DEN) \& IM Kristiansen (DEN) $6 \frac{1}{2}$. 6 ( Fuller (AUS) 6; 7-9 CM Plachetk (CZ) Fulier (AUS) 6;
IM Iskov (DEN) \& GM Csom Plachetka ( $H U N$ ) $5 \frac{1}{2} ; ~$
10 IM Iskov (DEN) \& GM Csom (HUN) $5 \frac{1}{2} ; 10$ N.J.Fries Nielsen (DEN) 4 $4 \frac{1}{2} ; 13$ J. 0 . Fries Nielsen (DEN) $3 \frac{1}{2}, ~ G M$, withdrew ill after scoring $2 \frac{1}{2} / 4$.

Again most of West Germany's strong
est GMs stayed away from the BRD CH'P. The 10 -round 24 -player Swiss saw a surprise winner in Eric Lobron who scored 8 points, one ahead of Feustel Kunstowicz \& Hermann on $7 \frac{1}{2}$. Then came GM Pachman, Bastian, Ostermeyer \& Dankert on 7 .

The West German team for the Olympiad comprises Hübner, Hort(!), Schmid Unzicker, Pfleger/Hecht and Lobron. The fifth board is not finally decided. GM Hort has been living in West Germany for some years now and has become residentially qualified to represent West Germany.

GM Miguel Quinteros scored a runaway victory in the 1980 ARGENTINE CHAMPIONSHIP with $11 / 13$, two full points ahead of Rubinetti. Then came Debarnot \& Schweber 8; Giardelli $7 \frac{1}{2}$; Panno 7; Najdorf, Szmetan, R.Garcia Hase $6 \frac{1}{2}$.
Lovers of attacking chess will appreciate this game:
RAGA - ROSSETTO, Modern Defence: $\begin{array}{llllllllll}1 & \text { e } 466 & 2 & \mathrm{~d} 4 & \mathrm{Bg} 7 & 3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 & 4 \mathrm{f} 4 \text { e6 }\end{array}$ 5 Nf 3 Ne 76 Be3 Nd7 7 Od2 a6 8 a4 $0-0 \quad 9$ g4 c5 $10 \quad 0-0-0$ Qa5 11 dxc5
 5 h 5 Bf 816 Qd2 Nb6 17 hxg 6 fxg6 8 Qh2 Re7 19 Ng5 h6 20 Nce4 Nxa4


21 Nf6+ Kh8 22 Qxh6+! Bxh6 $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Rh7+ Kf8 } 8 & 25 & \mathrm{Rh} 8+\end{array}$ $\mathrm{Kg} 726 \mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Kh} 6$ 27 Nf7+, 1 : 0.

## .and this:

NAJDORF - RUBINETTI, Benoni Defence: $1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 2 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 3 \mathrm{~d} 5$ e6 4 Nc 3 exd5 5 cxd5 d6 $6 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 78 \mathrm{Nd} 2$ $0-9$ Bg2 Nbd7 10 0-0 Re8 11 h 3 a 6 12 a 416 exe8+ 16 exis BxFs 17 Rel Na3 18 21 Oxc2 Bd4+ Nc2 Nxf2! 20 Kxf2 Bxc2 21 Qxc2 Ba4+ 25 Kel 23 Ne4 Rf8+ 27 Kf3 Qf2

This year's IBM tournament in AMSTERDAM, 26 June- 14 July , had, in addition to the usual GM and IM groups,
"Crown" group - eight top players meeting one another twice. This category 14 tournament had an verage rating of 2583 , making the GM-norm $7 \frac{1}{2}$, a core not obtained by either IM present althoug Dolmatov came within half a point

Karpov USSR
Timman $N L$
3 Sosonko NL
4 Hort CZ?
5 Dolmatov USSR
Ribli hun
v.d.Wiel NL

Looking at the crosstable we see yet another fine victory for the World Champion whose revenge win over Ribli in the second last round assured him of first prize. Timman was clearly in contention for most of the way while Sosonko scored his two wins in the final two rounds to bring himself up to third. At the other end of the table we find Bent Larsen with a shocking result RIBLI - KARPOV, Catalan: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 g3

 gxf4 Nd7 13 Rfdl Qc8 14 Ne4 c5 15 dxc5 Nxc5 16 Nxc5 Qxe5 17 Qxc5 Bxc5 18 Rac1 Rfc8 19 Ne5 Bxg2 20 Kxg2 f6 $21 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Bf} 8 \quad 22$ e3 g6 23 b 3 Bb 4 $24 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Kf} 8 \quad 25 \mathrm{Nd} 4 \mathrm{Kf} 7 \quad 26$ at bxa4 27 bxa4 Be5 $28 \mathrm{Rc} 4 \mathrm{Ba} 3 \quad 29 \mathrm{Rxc} 8 \mathrm{Rxc} 8 \quad 30 \mathrm{Rbl} \mathrm{Rc} 4 \quad 31 \mathrm{Rb} 7+\mathrm{Be} 7$ 32 Ra7 e5 33 fxe5 fxe5 34 Nf3 Rxa4 35 Nxe5+ Kf6 36 Nc6 Bc5 37 Rxh7 Ra2 38 Kf3 a5 39 h 4 a4 40 Ke4 Bf8 $41 \mathrm{Ra} 7 \mathrm{Bd} 6 \quad 42 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Rh} 2 \quad 43 \mathrm{Ra} 6 \mathrm{Kf} 7 \quad 44$ Ne5+ Bxe5 45 Kxe5 $\mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 46 \mathrm{Ra} 7+\mathrm{Kh} 647 \mathrm{Rxa} 4 \mathrm{Rxh} 4$ $48 \mathrm{Kf6} \mathrm{Rh} 549$ e4 Rh4 50 e5 Rh5 51 e6 Rf5+ 52 Ke7 Kg7 $53 \mathrm{Kd} 6 \mathrm{Rf} 8 \quad 54 \mathrm{Ra} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 6 \quad 55 \mathrm{Rd} 7,1$ : 0. KARPOV - VAN DER WIEL, Sicilian, Richter-Rauzer: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 Ne6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 d6 6 Bg5 e6 7 Qd2 a6 $8 \quad 0-0-0 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 9 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \mathrm{l} 10$


$\begin{array}{llllll}15 & \mathrm{Be} 2 & \mathrm{Rb} 8 & 16 & 14 & \mathrm{b4} \\ \mathrm{Nb} 1 & \mathrm{Ng} 4 & 18 & \mathrm{Bxa} & 17 & \mathrm{~g} 6\end{array}$
Rgfl Nxe3 20 Qxe3 Ne7 21 $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Rgfl Nxe3 } \\ \text { f5 gxf5 } & 22 & 20 & \text { Qxe } \\ \text { exf } 5 & \text { e5 } & 23 & \text { f6 }\end{array}$ exd4 24 Rxd4 Be6 25 fxe7 Bg7 26 Re4 Qa5 Diagram

27 Rxe6 Qxa6 28 Rxf7 Kxf7 29 e $8 \mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{Rbxe} 8 \quad 30$ $\mathrm{g} 6+\mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 31$ Rxe $8+\mathrm{Bf} 832$ Qe6t, 1 : 0.
LARSEN - TIMMAN, English Opening: 1 c 4 e5 2 g3 Nf6 3 Bg2 d5 4 cxd5 Nxd5 5 Nc 3 Nb 66 d 3 Be 7 7 Nf3 Nc6 8 0-0 0-0 9 a 3 Be6 10 b4 f6 111 Bb 2 Qe8 $12 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Qf7} \quad 13 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \mathrm{Rfd} 8 \quad 14 \mathrm{Nb} 5$ Bd5 $15 \mathrm{Bxd5}$ Nxd5 16 e4 Nb6 17 Nb 3 a6 18 Nxc7 Rac8 19 b5 Rxc7 20 bxc6 Na4 21 Bal Bxa3 22 Rb 1 b 523 Na

Bc5 24 Rcl Rd6 25 d4 Bxd4 26 Bxd4 Rxd4 27 Qc2 Nb6 28 fdl Nc4 29 Nb 3 Rxdl+ 30 Qxd1 Qe8 31 Qd5+ Kh8 32 Nd2 $\begin{array}{llll}33 & \text { Nxc4 } & \text { Qxc6 } & 34 \mathrm{Ral} \text { bxe4 } \\ 35 & \mathrm{Rxa6} & \text { Oxa6 } & 36 \\ \text { Od } 8+\mathrm{Kh} 7 & 37\end{array}$ 35 Rxa6 Qxa6 36 Qd8+ Kh7 37

Finally, we give Karpov's round thirteen win which, in the matter of style, is a good partner for Ribli's win already given.
KARPOV - RIBLI, Symmetrical English: 1 c4 c5 2 Nf3 Nf6

 Bd7 11 Nd4 Qd6 12 Nxc6 Bxc6 $\begin{array}{lllllll}13 & 11 & \mathrm{Nd} 4 & \text { Qd6 } & 12 & \text { Nxc6 } & \text { Bxc6 }\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}13 \text { Bxc6 Qxc6 } & 14 \mathrm{Rc} \\ \text { Rxc5 } 5 & \text { Qxa2 } & 16 & \mathrm{Rb} 5 & \mathrm{~b} 6 \\ 17 & \mathrm{Qal}\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Rxc5 } & \text { Qxa2 } \\ 18 & \mathrm{Rxal} \mathrm{Rfb} 8 \\ \text { Oxal } & 19 \mathrm{Ra} 6\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Qxal } \\ \text { Kf8 } \\ 20 \mathrm{Rb} 4 \mathrm{Be} 5 & 21 \\ \mathrm{Rba} 4 \mathrm{~b} 5\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}22 \mathrm{Ra} 2 \mathrm{Rb} 7 & 23 \mathrm{~b} 3 & \mathrm{Bb} 8 & 24\end{array}$ $\mathrm{Bc} 5 \mathrm{Ke} 8 \quad 25 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Kd} 7 \quad 26$ e4 e6 $27 \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{Kc} 8 \quad 28$ d5 exd5 $\quad 29$ exd5 Rd7 30 d6 Rd8 31 Kg 2 Kd7 $32 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Kc} 8 \quad 33 \mathrm{Re} 7 \mathrm{Rd} 7$ $34 \mathrm{Ra} 2 \mathrm{a} 535 \mathrm{Rc} 2,1: 0$.

Also the GM group was not weak - category 9 (2459): 1GM Unzicker (BRD) \& IM Ree 7 4 IM Langeweg (NL) 61/2; 5-6 IM Bohm (NL) \& IM Ligterink (NL) $5 \frac{1}{2}$; 7-9 GM Rogoff (USA), IM van Wijgerden (NL) \& Borm (NL) 5; 10-11 GM Smejkal (CZ) \& IM Sznapik (POL) 4; 12 Hofland (NL) 31/2.

Once again Hans Ree just issed a GM norm by a half point. Surprising was Smejkal's poor result.

The 1980 World Open, played July 2-6 in PHILADELPHIA, attracted 876 players including 9 GMs and 13 IMs. There was a five-way tie for first among GM Dzhindzhikhashvil) (ISR), GM Christiansen (USA), GM Miles (ENG), GM Gheorghiu (RUM) \& IM Day (CAN) $\frac{1}{2}$, these players sharlng $\$ 820$ out of a tor prizes for the
place: GM Alburt ( - ), GM Browne (USA), GM Biyiasas (USA), GM Benko (USA), IM Fedorowicz (USA), Blocker (USA), IM Schneider (SWE), Kogan (-), IM Hébert (CAN), Rind (USA), Kudrin (USA) \& Gruchacz (USA) - all 7 points.
Dzhindzhikhashvili exhibited an enormous capacity for punishment,
spending most of his time away from the chess board at the backgammon or poker tables - at one stage he did not return to his room for three days and during this time defeated Seirawn in a lug nover: Kogan, one more Soviet enigre, round after beating Lein and Alburt but then lost to Miles who thus overtook him at the post.

GINSBURG - DZHINDZHIKHASHVILI, Closed Sicilian: 1 g3 c5 2 Bg2 Nc6 3 e4 g6 4 Ne2 Bg7 5 c3 e5 $60-0$ Nge7 $7 \mathrm{Na} 3 \mathrm{O}_{0}$ 8 Nc2 d5 9 d3 Be6 10 f4 dxe4 11 dxe4 Bc4 12 Bd2 Qd3 13 Rf2 Rad8 14 Ned4 exf4 15 Nel fxg3 16 Nxd3 gxf2+ 17 Nxf2 cxd4 18 Qc2 Be6 19 Khl dxc3 20 Bxc3 Nd4 21 Qbl Nec6 22 Qfl Ne5 23 b3 h5 24 Rdl Ng4 $25 \mathrm{Rd} 3 \mathrm{Nxf} 2+26$ Qxf2 Nxb3 27 Qe2 Rxd3 28 Qxd3 Ncl 29 Qe3 Bxe3 30 Qxc3 Re8 31 Qe3 Nxa2 32 h3 b5 33 Qxa7 b4 34 e5 b3 35 Qb7 Rcl+ 36 Kh2 Rc2 37 Kg3 Ne3 38 Be4 Nxe4 39 Qxe4 Rc3+, 0 : 1.

The quadrangular tournament at PUERTO MADRYN (ARG) would be a rare bird today GM tournament without prizes!
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}1 & \text { Miles } & E N G & \mathrm{x} & \mathrm{x} & 1 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} \\ 2\end{array}$

4 Quinteros $\begin{array}{llllllllll}A R G & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & x & x & 1\end{array}$
The lack of prize money might explain why, in the last round, Miles sacrificed one plece too many against Ljubojevic, against whom he previously enjoyed a 4:0 personal record. The tournament was played during July.

A total of 910 players took part in the 9 th Evening Standard Chess Congress at the West Centre Hotel in LONDON, $25-$ 27 July. The E1200 National Bank of Dubai prize, the richest open tournament award on the British chess calendar, was at stake but nobody could win it out-
right. There were 2 GMs and a dozen IMs in the field for the Open, but th upsets started in the very first round when 22-year old Tony Kosten of Southampton defeated the $\# 2$ seed with a brilliant attack

KOSTEN - KURAJICA, Sicilian Scheveningen: le4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 d6 6 g4 h6 7 g5 hxg5 8 Bxg5 a6 (Usual is $8 . . . N c 6$ but grandmaster Kurajica opts for more complex strategy against a lower ranked oppo nent) 9 Qd2 b5 10 a3 Nbd 711 f 4 Bb 7 12 Bg 2 Qc 713 0-0-0 Nb6 14 Qe 2 Nc 4 15 h 4 Rc 816 Rd 3 (Stopping ...Nxa3) 16...Be7 17 Bh3 Qb6 18 Nd5! (The typical sacrifice in such positions, made famous by Tal. Whether sound or not -see the next note!- there are great practical difficulties for the defender) 18...exd5 19 exd5 Rc7 20 Rel b4 21 a4 b3 22 Nf5 bxc2 23 Qxc2 Ne5? (Trying to hold his material, Black under-estimates the Nf5's value in attack; better was 23...Ne3!) 24 Re3 Rxc3 25 bxc3 Ng6 26 Nxg7+ Kf8 $27 \mathrm{Ne} 6+$ ! (The second sacrifice a-laTal: if 27...fxe6 28 Qxg6 with triple threats of dxe6, Bxe6 and Bh6+) 27... Kg8 28 Nd4 Nxd5 29 Be6! (Now the threat is Qxg6+) $29 . . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ 30 Qf5 Nf6 31 Bxf7! Kxf7 32 Rxe7+ Nxe7 33 Qxf6+ Kg8 34 Qe6+ Kg7 35 Qxe7+ Kg6 36 Qf6+ Kh5 37 Qxh8+ Kg4 38 Qe8, 0 : 1 (time). Even though White sacrificed rive pieces he is material up at the end!

This game was later awarded the Ha 1 Shaper 100 brilliancy prize. It was the second successive year that Kura jica has lost to a young English opponent in the first round - Flear beat him in 1979.

With Kurajica out of contention and top seed John Nunn conceding three draws, the National Bank of Dubai Open finished in a seven-way tie.

Scores: 1-7 Chandler ( $N Z$ ), P.Littlewood (ENG), Speelman (ENG), Ftacnik (CZ), Pavicic (YUG), Rogulj (YUG) Haik (FRA) 5/6; 8-22 Nunn (ENG), Kurajica (YUG), Kagan (ISR), Taulbut (ENG), Bellin (ENG), Strauss (USA), Franklin (ENG), Weemaes (BEL), Baker (ENG), Pigott (ENG), Flear (ENG), Giam (SIN), Kosten (ENG), Arkell (ENG) \&
Page (ENG) $4 \frac{1}{2}$.
Report \& annotations: MURRAY CHANDLER

The annual BIEL (SWI) Chess Festival continues to grow, over 900 players ments this year from 19 July to 1 August The GM year from 19 July to 1 August. ith $8 \frac{1}{/}$ points required for CM norm Gith 82 points required for a $M$ norm Grinf in thared the and Grunfeld shis is how the Israeli gained his GM title:
GRUNFELD - ShAMKOVICH, Caro-Kann
1 e4 c5 2 d4 d5 $3 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{dxe} 44 \mathrm{Nxe4} \mathrm{Bf} 5$ $5 \mathrm{Ng} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 6 \quad 6 \quad \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nd} 7 \quad 8 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Bh} 7$ 9 Bd3 Bxd3 10 Qxd3 Ngf6 11 Bd2 e6 12 O-0-0 Qe7 13 Qe2 $0-0-0 \quad 14$ Ne5 Nb6 15
 Bd6 19 Nf 1 b 4.20 Ne3 Rb5 21 N 3 c 4 Rd 8 22 Rhfl Bf $8 \quad 23 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{~Kb} 8 \quad 24 \mathrm{~g} 5 \mathrm{Nd} 5 \quad 25 \mathrm{~g} 6$ f5 26 Nf7 Re8 27 Qf3 Nf6 28 Rfel Ra5 29 Re5 b5 30 Ne 3 Rd 731 Qe 2 Qa 532 d 5 cxd5 33 Nxd5 Qa6 34 Nxf6 Rxdl+ 35 Qxdl gxf6 36 Qci Exe5 37 Qxe8+ Qc8 38 $\mathrm{Qxb} 5+\mathrm{Qb} 7 \quad 39 \quad \mathrm{Qxb} 7+\mathrm{Kxb} 7 \quad 40 \quad \mathrm{Nd} 8+\mathrm{Kc} 8 \quad 41$ Nxe6 exf4 $42 \mathrm{Kcl}, 1: 0$.

The BRITISH CHAMPIONSHIP, played 4-16 August remained unresolved when IM Bill August remained unresolved when IM Bill place with 8/11. A play-off will decide the 1980 champion but will not take the 1980 champion but will not take place until the New Year due to the the title twice already but Nunn has yet to win it.

$$
\text { The } 10
$$

The leading scores were: 1-2 LM Hart ston \& GM Nunn 8; 3-4 Rumens \& IM Speelman $7 \frac{1}{2}$; $5-8$ Basnan, IM Bellin, IM Chandler \& IM Taulbut 7; 9-12 Franklin,
Fuller, Lee $\&$ McNab $6 \frac{1}{2}$.
Murray Chandler was close to the lead throughout and would, in fact, have tied for first if he had won his last round game. Dave Rumens, however, had different ideas:
RUMENS - CHANDLER, Sicilian, 2 † 4 :
 5 0-0 d5 6 cxd5 Qxd5 7 Nc 3 Qd7 8 Ne5 Nxe5 9 fxe5 a6 10 d 4 cxd 411 Bc 4 dxc 3 12 Bxf7+ Kd8 13 Qe2 cxb2 14 Bxb2 Qb5


28 Od7+ Kb8 $29 \mathrm{Bb} 6,1: 0$.

Still in England, the 4th Lloyds Bank Chess Masters was played from 20 to 28 August in LONDON with 3 GMs and 14 IMs among the 100 competitors. New Zealand's defending champion Murray Chandler came within a whisker of retaining his title when he shared first p.lace with $7 / 9$ but lost out on tiebreak points to GM Florin Gheorghiu, the top seed and an expert in these Swiss events. Gert Ligterink, also on 7 points, took third place and a third share of the fll 100 prize money.

Again British juniors made their presence felt strongly - William Watson (18) beat Gheorghiu in round 2 while Sax lost to Michael Pagden (20) in the same round. The third GM, Shamkovich, was outplayed by John Cox (18) in round 4

Gutman, who emigrated to Israel a few months ago after being Latvian and Baltic champion as well as openings adviser to Tal, won his first five games but then lost unluckily to Gheorghiu in round 6. After round 7 Gutman, Pritchett \& Law led with $5 \frac{1}{2}$ but the winning trio came from behind over the last two rounds, Chandler beating Gutman and then Shamkovich.

Scores: 1 GM Gheorghiu (RUM) 7/9; 2 IM Chandler (NZ) 7; 3 IM Ligterink (NL) 7; 4-6 GM Sax (HUN), IM Lederman (ISR) \& Gutman (ISR) $6 \frac{1}{2}$; 7-12 GM Shamkovich (USA), IM Iskov (DEN), IM Pritchett (SCO), IM Langeweg (NL), Law (ENG) \& Finlayson (ENG) 6; 13-29 IM Bellin (ENG), IM Botterill (ENG), IM Hartston (ENG), IM Petursson (ICE), IM Pytel ( $P O L$ ), WGM Veroci (HUN) FM Fuller AUS), … 5 . The Lloyds Bank Lady Masters was incorporated in the main event, the title being won by Zsuzsa Veroci on $5 \frac{1}{2}$. Next were WGM van der Mije (NL) and WIM Makai (HUN) on $4 \frac{1}{2}$.

The 9 th South African Open Championships held in Port Elizabeth, July 1-1 were won jointly by Charles de Villier and GM Kraidman of Israel. Scores: 1-2 de Villiers \& GM Kraidman 9 $2 / 11$; 3 IM Hamann 9; 4 Walker $7 \frac{1}{2} ; 5-7$ Strugo, Aalbersberg \& Kroon $6 \frac{1}{2}$...eta.

## MODERN CHESS

 THEORY eDITOR: GRANDMASTER KEENE
## 12 ISSUES OF MODERN CHESS THEORY A

 YEAR (Subscription year running from July of 1980 until June [98IJCONTRIBUTIONS BY THE WORLD'S BEST CHESS PLAYERS: MILES (In Issue 1 Miles explains how he beat Karpov with 1...a6!?), NUNN, SPEELMAN, SIGURJONSSON (Hübner's second, who will be writing special articles on Hübner's candidate matches), EUWE, CHANDLER (Who will be analysing openings from the New York Tournament) \& GIPSLIS with expected articles from TIMMAN, KASPAROV, HORT \& KARPOV later in the year.

MODERN CHESS THEORY deals with all aspects of opening theory: specialist articles, reviews of openings at major tournaments such as the Candidates matches, New York 1980 London 1980 \& a digest of important innovations from the world's magazines and book reviews of works dealing with the openings.
Send E14.50 Airmail to M.C.T., 12 Burton Avenue, Carlton, Nottingham NG4 IPT, ENGLAND.

## Correspondence Chess Results

 NZCCA TROPHY TOURNAMENT results from the 1980/81 events:NZ Championship: Alp 1 Knegt; Taylor 1 Brimble; Smith 1 Sims; Freeman 1 Sims, $\frac{1}{2}$ Taylor

Reserve Championship: Lovelock 1 Steadman, $\frac{1}{2}$ Millar, 1 Roundill; Millar $\frac{1}{2}$ Roundill; Borren 1 de Groot, 1 Lovelock; Ter Horst 1 Roundill, 1 Steadman; Van Oeveren 1 Marsick, 1 Ter Horst
Class 2: Stringer 1 Scott, 1 Cooper 1 Hignett, $\frac{1}{2}$ Smith; Frost 1 Mitchell, 1 Hignett; Bishop 1 Hignett; Scott 1 Hignett; Haak 1 Cooper.

Class 3 Red: Clarke 1 Dunwoody, 1 De Groot; Langly 1 Dunwoody.

Class 3 Blue: Preston 1 Haworth, 1 Usmar; Haworth 1 Peterson, 1 Salter, 1 Morati; $O^{\prime}$ Brien 1 Salter, 1 Duff, 1 Haworth; Usmar 1 Salter; Moratti 1 Salter; Allen 1 Peterson; Anderson 1 Salter, 1 o'brien.

Class 3 Green: Steel 1 Pickering, $\frac{1}{2}$ O'Connor; McGrath 1 Lewis; King 1 Hartley, 1 McGrath.

Class 4 Blue: Turnbull 1 Turner, 1 Sharples; Van der Hoorn 1 Rickit.

Class 4 Red: Lees 1 Ferguson, Meader; Sims 1 Ferguson, 1 Brohm; Cox 1 Lees; Meader 1 Cox, 1 Gummer, Brohm 1 Lees; Ferguson 1 Gummer.

Class 5: Caukwell 1 Purvis, 1 Frost, 1 Trenn; Parker 1 Wilson, 1 Trenn, 1 Frost; Takhar 1 Frost, 1 Parker; Wilson 1 Purvis; Langdon 1 Purvis; Purvis 1 Belcher, 1 Takhar.

## Combination Solutions

1. Beyer - Wade, New Zeal and 1940: 1 Bh6 Be5 2 Nxe4! Bxf6 3 Nxf6+ Kh8 $4 \mathrm{Bg} 7+\mathrm{Kxg} 7 \mathrm{5}$ Nxe8+, 1 - 0.
2. Knuszinski - Bielczyk, Poland 1970: 1 Qxd6! Nxf5 (1 ...c6 2 Qe6)
2 Oxe5t, 1-0
3. Perez - Ivkov, Havana 1962:

1 Bxe4: fxe4 2 Rd6+ Ke7 3 Re6+!, $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$. (3 ...Kf8 4 Re8+ Kg7 5 Rxg8+ Kxg8 $6 \mathrm{Kxgl} \Rightarrow$
4. Rico - Ballbe, Gijon 1955:

1 Bc5+: Qxc5 2 Rg8+ Kf7 (2 .. Kxg8
3 Qxg6t) 3 Qxg6t Ke6 4 f7+, 1-0
5. Stuart - Sidnam, Auckland 1980

1 Nf5. (White actually played
1 Bxe5 which led to a draw) 1 ...Rxf5. 2 exf5 Nxf3 (2 ...Qxf3 3 Qxf3 Nxf3
$4 \mathrm{Re} 2+-13 \mathrm{Bxg} 7+!\mathrm{Kxg} 74 \mathrm{Qe} 7+1 \mathrm{Kg} 8$ 5 Rxg3+ fxg $3 \quad 6 \mathrm{Rxg} 3+\mathrm{Rg} 6!\quad 7 \mathrm{Qd} 8+!\mathrm{Kg} 7$ 8 f6+ Kf7 9 Qe7+ Kg8 10 0e8 mate.
6. After the continuation 1 Bxe5 Qxe5 2 Nf.5? from diagram no. 5:

2 ...Rxf5! 3 exf5 Bxh2!! 4 Rel Bg3+ 5 Kgl Od4+ 6 Rf2 Bxf2+ 7 Qxf2 Qxf2+ 8 Kxf2 Kg 8 and wins.

Unfortunately I have not been able find space in this issue for an article on endgame studies and compositions. Mr Emil Melnichenko of Wellington (an international endgame study composer) has sent me some most interesting material, which hopefully will be included in the next issue. To whet the readers appetite, I have included this study from Mr. Melnichenko's collection.


White to play \& win
This pawnless position resolves to a mid-board and economical (all White's pieces being instrumental in the inale) mate, involving 2 self-blocks of Black. Solution in next issue.

NZCA RAFFLE: Figures shown below are the total number of raffle books sold by clubs affiliated to NZCA.

1 AK. Chess Centre 134 Wellington 20
2 North Shore
3 Howick-Pakuranga
4 Upper Hutt
5 Otago
6 Waitemata
7 Glen Eden (Sch)
8 Tawa
9 New Plymouth
10 Air New Zealand
11 Waipa
12 Canterbury
13 Civic

115 NZ News 94 Pen 43 Nelson 41 Palm. North 16 40 Invercargill 15 39 ChCh Boys 15 30 Ak . Uni. 29 Rangitoto 29 ChCh Police 11 26 Wanganui 26 Hutt Valley $\begin{array}{rr}10 \\ 6\end{array}$ 20 Hamilton

## CLUB DIRECTORY

The annual fee (six listings) for this column is $\$ 5.00$ payable with order to the New Zealand Chess Association, P.o. Box 8802, Symonds Street, Auckland.
AUCKLAND CENTRE meets Mondays \& Thursdays at clubrooms, 17 Cromwell Street, Mt Eden, phone 602 042. Contact: Nigel Metge, ph. 4444170 . Schoolpupil coaching Friday evenings. Full recreational facilities - TV, poolroom, library.

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 565 055, 92 Ti Rakau Drive, Pakuranga, Auckland.
NORTH SHORE C.C. meets Wednesdays 7:30 pm (tournament and casual play) in St Joseph's Hal1, cor Anzac St \& Taharoto Rd, Takapuna. Postal address: P.o.Box 33587, Takapuna. Contact: Peter Stuart, phone 456377 (evenings).
PARNELL C.C. meets 7:30 pm Wednesdays in Social Hall, Foundation for the Blind, 545 Parnell Road, Auckland. Contact: Terry Free, 23 Pasadena Ave, Pt Chevalier, Auckland, phone 868103.
CIVIC C.C. meets 8.00 pm Fridays (Juniors $7.00-8.00 \mathrm{pm}$ ) at St Johns Ambulance Hall, Vivian Street, Wellington. P.O. Box 2702 Wellington. Contact: Ross Bloore, Phone 739576.
UPPER HUTT C.C. meets 7:45 pm Thursdays in Supper Room, Civic Hall, Fergusson Drive Upper Hutt. Contact: Anton Reid, 16 Hildreth Street, Upper Hutt, phone 288756.

OTAGO C.C. meets $7: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ Wednesdays \& Saturdays at 7 Maitland Street, Dunedin, phone (clubrooms) 776 919. Contact: Malcolm Foord, 39 Park Street, Dunedin, phone 776213.

NELSON C.C. meets 7:30 pm Thursdays at the Memorial Hall, Stoke. Contact: Tom van Dyk, phone Richmond 8178 or 7140 . Visitors welcome.
N.Z. CORRESPONDENCE CHESS ASSN: Secretary-Treasurer: J.W.Maxwel1, 82 Tireti Road, Titahi Bay, Wellington.

PENCARROW C.C. meets 7:30 pm Thursdays (for seniors) at Louise Bilderbeck Hall, Main Road, Wainuiomata. Juniors: 7:00 pm - 8:15 pm at Baths Lounge, Swimming Baths, Moohan St, Wainuiomata. Contact: Brian Foster, phone 648578.

