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## EDITORIAL

Since regular Editor Bob Smith was going to be overseas until about two weeks after the deadline for this issue I am helping with its production. Furthermore, when I briefly discussed his October Editorial with him before he left for China, Bob suggested I also write the editorial for this issue and take the opportunity to give the Council's view of the matter

One point on which we do agree with Bob is that New Zealand should obviously have had at least four players in the team for China. A number of factors combined to cause the situation which has arisen. Unfortunately the Council did arisen. Unfortunately the Council did not have, five month

At a meeting of Asian Zone Presidents during the 1980 01ympiad it was proposed that this year's Asian Team Ch'p and the that this year's Asian leam ch $p$ and a few days apart to cut down travel a few days apart to cut down travel costs as far as possible. The Chinese
representatives tentatively agreed to representatives tentatively agreed to
host both events in November/December 1981. The invitation to the Asian Team Ch'p commencing on 1 November only arrived in late May and ascertaining the availability of players took a considerable further time since several possible contenders for the team were overseas.

The situation was further complicated by the uncertainty surrounding the time and venue of the Zonal tournament when the P.R.C. had to decline its organisation. We had reason to hope for news of the Zonal in July but this never materialised. Obviously if the two events 'fitted in' we wanted to field our two Zonal representatives, Murray Chandler and Vernon Small, in the Asian Team Championship as well.

When, late in July, we hadn't heard anything further regarding the Zonal, we gave the Zonal reps until 31 August to nake a final decision about the Asian Team Championship - another fairly long
lay to allow for the overseas commication problem. This still, however, left two months between finally settling the team and the start of the event.

The withdrawal of one of the two reserves came early in August and arose from the problem of training a replacement for the time he would be replat from work. We realised this problem existed but not its extent - I'm sure the Council could, and would, have arranged things differently if it had, for example, been given a definite deadline by the player concerned.
Further efforts to find a suitable
replacement at this stage also proved fruitless, a major reason being the coincidence of university examinations. The Council, therefore, strongly considered withdrawing our entry but the feeling of the three New Zealand resident players in the team that we should still go was accommodated. Of course, the late withdrawal of Craig Laird, ust three weeks before the team's departure, was the last straw.

Certainly there was always a strong possibility that Murray and Vernon would have to withdraw but we were covered against this eventuality with two reserves it was surely exceptional to have four players out of seven withdrawing
The October editorial was, the Council feels, strongly biased against the Council. It contained little factual information to allow readers to form their own opinions and it was in no way corstructive criticism.

In conclusion I would just add that the Council certainly does not disapprove f criticism per se and we do not believe that NEW ZEALAND CHESS should be purely mouthpiece for the Association or its Council - it must remain a medium for the exchange of views by all New Zealand chess players.

Peter Stuart
President, NZCA

## OLYMPIAD APPEAL:

New Zealand first competed in the World Team Championship at Siegen in 1970 following a policy decision of the New Zealand Chess Association in general meeting. The Olympiad was to be the Association's first priority as far as the application of available finance to overseas tournaments was concerned.

Since then New Zealand has competed in each biennial Olympiad and from 1976 in the Women's 0lympiad as well. The limited financial assistance to these teams from the Association has cone from raffles and Ministry of Recreation \& Sport grants. A considerably greate burden has been borne by the players themselves - in terms of 1981 dollars team members have contributed approximately $\$ 100,000$ towards the cost of New Zealand competing in the Olympiads!

The next 01ympiad is being held in the Swiss city of Lucerne from 31 October to 17 November 1982. We are launching this NZCA Olympiad Appeal to defray, as far as possible, the travel expenses
of our team members. We believe a Earget of $\$ 10,000$ from the appeal to be reatistic; naturally we hope that much of the balance required will be forthcoming from the usual sources.

All donations will be acknowledged in the pages of New Zealand Chess over the coming months. We hope biennial Olympiad appeals will become a regular feature.

The progress of New Zealand chess is dependent to a considerable degree on our continued participation in events such as the 01ympiad. The Council decision to appeal directly to all chess players was not taken lightly. It is many years since we have appealed nationally for such a cause but we recall very successful appeals in previous decades in aid of such players as Rodney Phillips and Ortvin Sarapu. We consider this cause to be worthy of YOUR support - and we hope you will agree! Kevin Kinchant nZCA COUNCILLIOR

## THE FOURTH ASIAN CHESS TEAM'S CHAMPIONSHIP : report by the editor

Twelve countries gathered in Hangchou the People's Republic of China, from November 2-11 for the Fourth Asian Teams' Championship.
New Zealand was among those, although for one reason or another (see editorials this issue and October 1981) we fielded only three players - one short of the necessary team of four.
The out and out favourites for the event were the Phillipines, with two Grandmasters and a back-up team of
International Masters and supporters.
They even arrived wearing track suits emblazoned with "Phillipines Chess Team" and their names
But of great interest was how China would measure up in the contest after encouraging results at earlier championships.
Well, in the hospitality department China measured up very well indeed.

After an initial dispute over the accomodation cost for the tournament of $\$ 25$ US a day(this is the first time such a charge has been levied, but it is likely-to be the rule rather than the exception in future), most teams were pleased(if not overwhelmed) by the organisational efforts of the

The very first night there was a 14 ourse banquet and opening ceremony; much wine and many speeches flowed, with a worthwhile?! new experienee being a particular white wine called mow-tie(phonetic spelling), a Chinese favourite with a kick like a mule!
Each team had an interpreter placed at its disposal and bus tours were arranged each day before the rounds.
Players had a choice of Chinese or Western meals(or even Muslim food).

The New Zealand team - myself, Bruce Watson and Tony Carpinter(captain) accompanied by 'Tony's wife, Jessie, opted for Chinese food and chopsticks
for the whole of the first week, with the result that I, Bruce and Jess all suffered from upset stomachs at various stages as our metabolisms adjusted. This despite the fact that we had already had a warm-up of sorts in Horlg Kong.
The hotel we were staying at was rather splendid after the disappointing accomodation of Hong Kong, although only double rooms were provided - so
I had to suffer Bruce Watson's smoking
while in turn he put up with the occas onal burst of song from the shower.
There was only one other problem with the room(the one I had anyway) : the
irst morning an intercom system gave a loud screech at 5.30 am - and there was no "off switch
A chat with the interpreter sorted that one out; after that all we had to contend with was the banging of the air-conditioning at 5.45 am each day:
However, on to the chess
The tournament was run in two preliminary groups for five rounds.
Three countries from each group qualiied for the "A" final, while the other six played off in the " B " final.
Points scored against teams in the same final in the preliminaries counted towards the final result, so that only three rounds were necessary in the finals eight rounds in all).
With only three players, New Zealand's chance of qualifying for the "A" final looked slim, so we decided to play boards one, two and three each round so that individuals got the toughest possible games.
As became apparent, it would have been better to name "phantom" players on boards one and five, giving us the flexibility to play $1,2,3$ or $2,3,4$.
Round One
The groups were divided into the Phillipines, Thailand, Australia,New Zealand, Malaysia and Kuwait; and China, India, Singapore, Hong Kong, United Arab Emirates and Japan
Right from the start, an upset:
While most of the favourites scored heavily, China was beaten $1 \frac{1}{2}-2 \frac{1}{2}$ by India after the latier took $1 \frac{1}{2}$ points from two long adjourned games.

The Phillipines and Malaysia posted 4-0 wins over Thailand and Kuwait respectively, and the United Arab Emirates surprised with the same score against Japan.
New Zealand salvaged just half a point gainst Australia.
Watson and Carpinter were soundly beaten after achieving reasonable positions, but I managed to draw against IM Ian Rogers in a game in which I thought I had an advantage most of the way.
But time trouble and lack of technique neant the win was missed(if there was one)

Nevertheless an encouraging start personally.

MITH - Rogers, Sicil
Notes by the editor.

## $\frac{1}{e 6} 6 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~b} 6$ !?

I had not seen this move before, but according to the Aussies the idea is to capture the light squares.

Bg5:? Thought up over the board. The idea is to capture the dark squares ( after 7...Be7) and perhaps embarass the black queen, which can no longer go to a5.
...Qc7 If 7...Be7 8 Bxe7 Qxe7 9 a3 followed by Nbd 2 and Ne 4 ; but possible is 7...f6? : as 8 ef gf 9 Ne5? seems to lead to nothing.

8 Nbd2 h6 9 Rcl Nc6 10 Bh 4 Bb 711 Bc 4 ot 11 bd3? Nit
11...Rc8 12 0-0 Qb8 13 a3?!

Better is Rel with the idea of $B$
13...Na5 Not 13...g5 14 Bg 3 g 4 l Bxd5 ed 16 e6 with attack

14 Bb 5 ab 15 Rc 8 Oxc8 16 Bd 3 b 517 Rel Nf4 18 Be4 BdS 19 Bxd5 ed?


20 Nfl Ne 421 Qc2 2 Nb 622 Qd2 Ne6 23 Rcl Qb7 24 Ne 3 Nc 425 Qc 3 g 5

If 25...b4 26 ab Bxb 427 Nxc 4 ?
It was about this stage that $I$, with six minutes left on the clock, began thinking deeply in Ian's time. While I waited for his move, I glanced at the clock and noticed both sides were merrily ticking away and I had less than two minutes left! Happily this problem was solved by replacing the clock and returning the lost time, but it did rather affect one's equanimity, particularly when the Chinese officials seemed to want to set the clock at 2 minutes he hour until lan and I protested During the tournament several faulty clocks surfaced

26 Bg 3 h 527 h 4 ? : Better is 27 h 3
27...g4 28 Ne 1 Bh6 29 b3 Nxe3 30 fe 0-0 31 Kh 2 Rb 832 b 4 Ra 833 Rc 2 Ng 734 Nd 3

36 Kh3 Bff 37 Oc7?: A time trouble move. 37 Qe1! is probably winning.
37...Qa738 Qc3 a5 39 Qel ab 40 ab Qa4 40...Qb6 1eads to an interesting attack via ...Qg6, but seems bad if white fin the correct reply moment)
$41 \mathrm{Rcl}(\mathrm{s}) \mathrm{Qa} 342 \mathrm{Rc} 3 \mathrm{Qal} 43 \mathrm{Bxg} 3 \mathrm{Qxel}$ 44 Bxel Ral 45 Rcl Rxcl 46 Nxcl Bh6: Setting up a few last tr

47 Ne 2 : $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ After $47 \ldots$... Bxe3 48 Bc 3 black can make no headway and white may even be slightly better after $g 4$ evicting the black knight.

## Round Two

Malaysia surprisingly took a point off the Phillipines while Australia just as surprisingly overwhelmed Thailand $3 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$.

China made up lost ground, beating the United Arab Emirates(U.A.E.) 4-0, while India could not repeat its form of the previous round, going down 1-3 to Singapore.
New Zealand just missed a maximum over Kuwait, with Watson and Carpinter winning and yours truly working hard to
draw after dropping a pawn in the opening
Watson's game was a consistent effort:
Watson - A.J. Alqallaf, French Defence 1 e 4 e 62 d 4 d5 3 Nc 3 de 4 Nre4 $4 d 7$ 5 Nf3 Ngf6 6 Nxf6 Nxf6 7 Bd3 c5 8 0-0 Cd 9 Nd4 Be 10 Bf $40-011$ Rel 8 Q13 Qb6 13 be5 Rac8 44 a4 Bc6 15 Qh3 g6 16 a5 Qd8 17 Nxc6 Rxc6 18 Redl Qc8 19 c4 Nd/ 20 Bc3 Bf6 21 Bxf6 Nxf6 22 b4 Rdo 23 (1) Kg 24 e5 ab 25 Bch R 20 Ba ND 31 BC4 Qb 732 Qb3

32...Nc7 33 g 3 Kf8 34 Qa4 Na6 35
axb 5
37
Bxb 5 38 Be2 Ke 39 a6 540 Ke 7541 56542 Bb 7 Kd 43 a8/Q Nxa8 44 Bxa8 and white won

For the Australians, both Rogers and board two Johansen had good wins:

CHAIVICHIT'(Thailand)-ROGERS (Australia)
 g3 0-0 6 Bg2 c5 7 cd Nxd5 8 e4 Nxc3 9 be Bg4 10 Bb 2 cd 11 cd Ne6 12 e $5 \mathrm{Qa} 5+$ 13 Qd2 Rfd8 14 Qxa5 Nxa5 15 0-0 Rac8 16 Racl Nc4 17 Bc3 Bh6 18 Rbl bó 19 Bb 4 Kf 820 Rbd1 as 21 Bc 3 Nxe5 22 Bd 2 Bxd2 23 de Bc 324 Rxd8 Rxd8 25 Rbl b5 26 h 3 Be6 27 Rb 5 Ba 228 Ng 5 a4 29 Ne 4 Bd4 30 Ra 5 Bb3 $31 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Bc} 2 \quad 32 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Bb} 2$ 33 é f5 $34 \mathrm{Nc} 5 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \quad 35 \mathrm{Kh} 1$ a $3 \quad 36 \mathrm{~g} 4$ $\mathrm{Rdl}+37 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Bcl} 38 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rd} 439 \mathrm{Kh} 4 \mathrm{Kg} 7$ 40 Ra 7 Bf 441 Rxa3 Bd6 $0-1$

JOHANSEN - SA-NGADSUP, Dutch Defence 1 c4 f5 2 Ne3 Nf6 3 g3 e5 4 Bg2 Nc6 5 e3 e4 6 d3 Bb4 7 Nge2 Ne5 8 de Nxe4 9 0-0 Bxe 310 Nxc3 Nxc3 11 bc Qf6 12 e4 fe 13 Be4 $0-0 \quad 14 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 7 \quad 15$ Qd3 g 6 16 Be3 Qd6 17 Bd5 Qe7 18 f5 g5 19 f6 Qd8 20 Qf5 $1-0$
The Thai player wandered away for almost an hour and was about to lose on time when he thought better of it and resigned instead.

## Kound Three

New Zealand was badly misled as to which plasers we would be facing in our
match against the Philippines.
With a noon deadline for team names to be submitted, I checked at the playing hall at about 10 to 12 to find no Philippines team list available.
but the Chinese official assured me that the name cards set up were the players they would field(perhaps he misunderstood).
Ten minutes later Tony also checked, with the same result.
So we continued preparing for Torre, Balinas, Mascarinas ... only to face Mascarinas, Maninang, Rodriguez when we arrived to play.
Nevertheless we took a pleasing point from the match, with both Bruce and Tony drawing and yours truly throwing away a easonable position against Mascarinas.
On board two Bruce achieved a fine position after his opponent walked into a prepared line, while Tony was always comfortable against Rodriguez.
In other matches Australia survived a protest to beat Kuwait 4-0, Thailand beat Malaysia 3-1, and China and India also scored 3-1 wins over Singapore and India.
Australian board four Chris Depasquale reached an easily wimning position and when board one Ian Rogers saw the two players swapping score sheets he assumed the result and wandered over to contribute to the post-morten, moving several pieces.
It was then he discovered that the game (ahem!) was still in progress and the Kuwait player was simply updating his scoresheet after a time seramble! Red-faced Rogers retreated and some time later, after the Kuwait player had lost a rook, he refused to seal a move nadged a protest.
After hours of talks during which the Kuwaitis demanded they be given the point on the grounds that lan had given advice to his team-mate, the Australians were warded the gane but lan received a re primand.
An honest mistake but one he was care ful not to repeat
R. MANINANG - B.R.WATSON, Sicilian 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d4 cd 4 Nrd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 Ne6 6 Ndb 5 Bb4 7 a3 Bxc $3+8$ Nxc 3 d5 9 ed ed 10 Bd3 $0-0 \quad 110-0 \quad$ d $4 \quad 12 \mathrm{Ne} 2 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 13 \mathrm{Bb} 5$ Bg 14 f3 0 Db 15 Bd3 Bd7 16 Khl Rad8 17 Qel Rfe8 18 Oh 4 Ne5 19 Nd 4 Nd3 20 cd Bc8 1 Nc 2 Rd 3 Oc 4 Red8 23 Nit R3d4 25 Qg 3 Rc4 26 Rel a5 27 Nc 2 Rd 328
b4 a4 29 Bh6 Nh5 30 Qh4 Oh6 31 Oc4 Rd2 32 Ne3 Qg 533 Qc5 Qc5 34 c5 Nf4 35 Redl Ne6 36 Racl Rdl 37 Rdl Rdl 38 Ndl Ne5 $39 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Kf} 840 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Ke} 741 \mathrm{Ke} 3{ }^{1} 2$

On board three Tony Carpinter's game against IM Rcdrigues reached the even position below after a fairly unadventurous middlegame.
Team mentor Florencio Campomanes (also Fide Vice-President) gave Rodrigues permission to agree the draw.


Round Four
In with a slight chance to qualify for the "A" finals, New Zealand was keen to field men on boards 2,3 and 4 for the last two rounds, but discovered this was impossible because of the original team order submitted.
But if we had put "phantom" players on boards one and five, we could have done this.
Watson won again this round while I and Tony drew.
In a slightly better position as black, I tormented my opponent for 109 moves
but could not win despite an extra pawn.
The following round my opponent played an abysmal game against Rogers and lost in only 17 moves!
In other matches Thailand squashed Kuwait 4-0, the Philippines was held to a 2 -all draw by Australia, China smashed Hong Kong $3 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$, Singapore beat Japan 3-1 and India beat UAE $3 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ 。

## Round Five

We could still qualify for the "A" group with our three-legged team if we beat Thailand 3-1.
We gave it a try, with Watson and Carpinter both scoring good wins.
On board one I turned down a draw offer in a reasonably even position, overpressed and lost in the second session after my opponent, Chaivichit, found an improvement on our adjournment analysis, which had show good drawing chances.

Thus New Zealand was relegated to the B" final, while Thailand squeezed into the A group half a point ahead of Malaysia.
Most other qualifiers were already decided.
Australia and the Philippines, already certainties, beat Malaysia 3-1 and Kuwait $4-0$ respectively, while China beat Japan $3 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ and India defeated Hong Kong 3-1.
Singapore, agreeing three quick draws, suffered the ignomy of a $1 \frac{1}{2}-2 \frac{1}{2}$ loss to JAE after their board four lost.
I should perhaps mention that some rounds earlier one of the Sirigapore players had to return home ill, with his place being taken by Zone 10 President Dr Lim, long since retired from international competition!

CARPINTER - KUAKUL, Queen's Gambit 1 d 4 d 52 c 4 e6 3 Nc3 Nf6 4 Bg 5 Be 75 cd Nxd5?! 6 Bxe7 Qxe7 7 e4 Nf6 8 Nf3 $0-09$ Qd2 b6 10 e 5 Nd5 11 Nxd5 ed 12 Bd3 h6 13 0-G c5 14 Rfel Rfd8 15 Radl Nd7 16 Bbl Nf8 17 h3 Ne6 18 a3 c4 19 Kh2 Bd7 20 g 3 Nf 821 Ng 1 Rac 822 Rc 1 b 5 23 f4 f5


So the final scores were: Group A hilippines and Australia 16, Thailand $9 \frac{1}{2}$, Malaysia 9, New Zealand 8, Kuwait $1 \frac{1}{2}$; Group B - China 15 $\frac{1}{2}$, India 13, Singpore $11 \frac{1}{2}$, Hong Kong 8 , UAE $7 \frac{1}{2}$, Japan fints roup playing in the A finals and the others contesting the $B$ finals.

Final Round One
The leading teams all started well with China scoring $4-0$ over Thailand, the Fhilippines beating Singapore $3 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ and Australia beating India 3-1.
In the B final New Zealand scored maximum 3-1 over UAE, Malaysia only drew 2-all with Japan and Hong Kong beat Kuwait $3-1$ (the Kuwaiti player I drew with finally vindicated himself by winning on board one!).
Scores(with preliminary results in-
cluded: Group 1 - Philippines $9 \frac{1}{2}$, China and Australia $8 \frac{1}{2}$, India $4 \frac{1}{2}$, Singapore $4 \frac{2}{2}$ $4 \frac{1}{2}$, Thailand $\frac{1}{2}$; Group 2 - Hong Kong $8 \frac{1}{2}$, Malasia 8, New Zealand $7 \frac{1}{2}$, JAES $5 \frac{1}{2}$, Japan 4 , Kuwait $2 \frac{1}{2}$.

## Final Round Two

Another convincing win for New Zealand, $2^{\frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}}$ over Hong Kong.
I beat my 2330 -rated opponent in 24 moves, while bruce also won on board two and Tony drew in an opposite col oured bishop ending after winning pawn

Our adjournment analysis proved poor in dismissing Tony's position as drawn, but he found a try upon resump-tion only to miss the winning line later!
In the big games Australia heic China 2-all after Johansen ground down Qi lingxuar in several sessions, the Phil ippines stumbled to a $2 \frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ win over Inda after GM Balinas lost his second Galinas tossed a pawn for balitas tossed a pawn for no conceivable reason in an apparently drawn position) and Singapore beat IFailand $2 \frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ de
pite a loss by the tiring Dr Lim.

ROGERS (Australia) - LIU WENZHE (China) 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 g6 3 Ne3 Bg7 4 e4 d6 5 Be2 0-c 6 Nf3 c5 7 dc dc!? 8 Be3 b6 9 h3 Nc6 10 0-0 Bb7 11 a3 Ob 812 Qc2 Rd8 13 Rfdl e6 14 Rabl Qc7 15 Nb 5 Qb8 16 Bg5 Nd4


17 Nfxd4 Bxe4 18 Bd3 Bxd3 19 Rxd3 ed $20 \mathrm{Hxd4} \mathrm{Gm} 724 \mathrm{Rbdl}$ $\begin{array}{lll}22 & \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Rd} 7 & 23 \mathrm{~b} \\ 54 & \mathrm{Nb} 5 & \mathrm{Rad} 825\end{array}$ Rxd7 Rxd7 26 Rxd7 Rxd7 Rxd7 26 Rxd7 Nde 0c6 29 b5 28 Nde Qc6 29 b5 ab 30
cb Oa8 31 Nxf7 Nf6 32 Ne5 Qxa3 33 Nxg Qb? 34 Qd8+ KF7 35 $37 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Kf7} 38$ Qb6 Ne5+ Ke6 36 Nf3 $\mathrm{Qbl}+37 \mathrm{Kh}$
Ne4 39 Oc $7+\mathrm{Kg} 840 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 1 \cdots 0$

TORRE (Philippines) - M. AARON(India) 1 d4 d5 2 Nf3 Nf6 3 c4 dc 4 Nc3 a6 5 e 4 e6 6 Bxc 4 b5 7 Bd3 Bb7 8 e5 Nd5 9 Bg5
 13 a4 Nd7 14 Nd2 Nb 615 Qc2 h6 16 ab ab 17 Bxb5 c5 18 Ne 4 Bd5 19 Nxc5 Rac8 20 Bd 3 Rxc5 21 dc Qxc5 22 c 4 Bc 623 Rfel Rd8 24 Qc3 g6 25 Be4 Ba4 26 Qa3 Qxc4 27 Qe3 Nd7 28 Qxh6 Nxe5 29 Qg5 1-0

Scores going into the final round: Group l-Philippines 12, China $10 \frac{1}{2}$, Australia $1 \mathrm{O}_{2}^{1}$, Singapore 7 , India 6 , Thai land 2; Group 2 - Malaysia $11 \frac{1}{2}$,
New Zealand 10 , Hong Kong 10 , UAE 6 , New Z $\in$ aland 10 , Hong
Japan $5 \frac{1}{2}$, Kuwait 5 .

## Final Round ?

Both Australia and China had a real hance of bridging the $1 \frac{1}{2}$ point gap the Fhilippines had opened up.
Chitia played the leaders and Australia was expected to beat Singapore on performances to date.
But it was not to be
China beat the Philippines $2 \frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ after the second dispute of the tournament.
Andrico Yap and Ye Jiangchuan were nvolved in a mutual time scrane oard four, during which Yap jettisoned several pawns but had attacking
chances.
However after move 40 Yap and captain Campomanes alleged that a Chinese official told the Chinese board 4 (in Chinese) that the time control had been reached. Ye immediately stopped his blicz play nd consolidated to a winaing position. The Pailippines' protest was at first overruled by the cher arbiter ground that Yap had not kept proper coresheet, but the matter in full scale reconstruction fin the from the players' scores in the gae (!) the players scores jof oyer(.), accoras
But the game was nevertheless awarded But the game was nevertheless awaríd only match defeat of the tournament.
Meanwhile, Australia's winning chances Meanwhile,
Looked good.
Rogers blundered an exchange and lost soon after the adjournment sescion resumed, but Viner won quickly, Johansce as a pawn up and Iordari also won a pawn with an easily winning position If Australia took both the remaining games against Singapore they would tie the Philippines and win the tournament on countback(they had not lost a match) But unfortunately things went wrong for Oz: Jordan allowed a dangerous exchange sacrifice, played a few careles noves and found himself lost after the adjournment despite hopes of wriggling out; Johansen allowed his win to degenerate and despite struggling for vs a rook and bishop, could not win.

So the Philippines won their 4 th Asian Championship in succession, hals a poin and ad Australia third another point back New zealand was still doing its We scored an and needed fong kong to beat Mal $2^{2}$ - 1 y Unfortunately it, losir board four threw away a
ion(oh, fickle finger!).
In other matches India crushed Tha In other matches $4-0$ and Kuwait woke up to beat UAE $2 \frac{t}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$.

LIU WENZHE(China) - TORRE(Philippines) 1 e4 e5 2 Nff 3 Nc6 3 Bb5 54 Ba4 Nf6 5 0-0 Be7 6 Rel b5 7 Bb 3 d6 8 c3 0-0 9 d4 Bg' 10 Be 3 ed 11 cd d5 12 e 5 Ne 4 13 Nc3 Nxc3 14 be Na5 15 Be 2 Nc4 16 Qd3 g6 17 Bh6 Re8 18 Bb3 a5 19 a4 c6 20 h3 Be6 21 g 4 Rb 822 Ra 2 b 423 cb Rxb 424
 Bc2 Qb6 25 Bg5 Bf8 26 Kg 2 C 527 Nh 4 cd 28 Bf6 Nb2 29 Qd2 d3 30 Bbl Nc 431 Qd3 Re8 32 Ne5


LI Zunian (China) - Maninang(Philippines) 1 d 4 Nf 62 c 4 e6 3 g 3 d 54 Nf 3 Be 75 Bg 2 $0-060-0$ dc 7 Qc2 a6 8 a4 Bd7 9 Rdl Bc 6 10 Nc3 Bb4 11 Bg5 Bxc3 12 bc Nbd7 13 Ne5 Bxg2 14 Kxg2 h6 15 Nxd7 Qxd7 16 Bxf6 $g f$
 Kh 721 Qf 3 Kg 722 Qg4+ Kh7 $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$

SMITH(NZ) - SHIRAKI(Japan), Bird's 1 f4 d5 2 Nf3 Nf6 3 e 3 g6 4 b3 Bg7 5 Bb2 0-0 6 Be2 c5 7 0-0 Ne6 8 Ne5 d4? 9 Nxc6 be 10 Na3 Nd7 11 d3 e5 12 Ne4 f5 13 bf3 Qc7 14 ed! ed 15 Qel! Nb6 16 Qa5 Be6 17 Qxc5 Rac8 18 Rae1 Bxc4 19

Re7!
19...Qd8 20 dc Rf7 21 Rxf7 Kx 72 Rd1 Nd7 23 Bd5+: Ke8 $24 \mathrm{Rel}+\mathrm{Be} 525$ 2xd4 cd 26 QxdS 1-0

## KARPOV 6, KORCHNOI 2

## by Peter Stuart

Anatoly Karpov has retained his World Championship title by defeating viktor Korchnoi in their first-to-win-six-games match in Merano, Italy. The match, which began on lst October, effectively ended 19 th November when Korchnoi sealed his 41 st move of the eighteenth game in a hopeless position which he later resimed by telephone.

Unlike in 1978, Korchnoi proved unable to bounce back into contention after early setbacks and the eighteen games of this match made it the shortest for the World Championship since Lasker retired because of illness after Capablanca. Of course the rules were changed in 1978 and Karpov's 1 ! points in the current match would not have been sufficient in the old best-of-24 format

The match was played against the background of the Korchnoi family's attempts to leave the Soviet Union, FIDE President Eridrik OlaEsson was apparently assured by the Soviets that Korchnoi's wife and son would be allowed to leave but no date was set. During the match Korchnoi complained that in every game, Karpov had two pieces more than him, his wiEe Bella and son Igor, Perhaps now that the match is aver, and the Soviet representative triumphant, we might see sone action.

We gave the first three games in the October issue. In game four the challenger equalised with Petroff's Defence but then fatally weakened his kingside to make the score 3-0
KARPOV - KORCHNOI (4), Petroff Defence e 4 e5 2 Nf3 Nf6 3 Nxe5 d6 4 Nf 3 Nxe4 5 d4 d5 6 Bd3 Be7 7 0-0 Nés 8 el Bf5 9 Bb5 bf6 10 Nbel2 0-0 11 Nf Ne7 12 c 3 Ng6 13 Bd 3 Na6 14 Bxf5 Nxf5 15 Qb3 b6 16 Qb5 a6 17 Qd3 $\mathrm{Qd}^{2}$ 8 Ng 3 Nxg 319 hxg 3 a5 20 Bg5 Bxg5 1 Nxg5 Rfe8 22 b3 Rad8 23 Nf3 f6 24 Nd2 Kf7 25 Nfl h5? 26 Rxe8 Rxe8 27 028 Ne 3 Ne 729 Rel g6 30 Of 4 34 g 3 c6 65 c4 f5? 36 Qe3 Ng6 37 c 5 Qd8 38 Ne 5 bxc5 39 Nxc6 Q\&6 40 0e6 cxd4 41 0xd5 d3 (S) 42 Dd $7+01743$ Ne7 Kh7 $44 \mathrm{Rg} 2 \mathrm{Re} 845 \mathrm{Rh} l+\mathrm{Nh} 4+46$ gxh4 Qxe7 47 Qxf5 $+\mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 48 \mathrm{hxg} 5 \mathrm{Qb} 7+$


In the fifth game Korchnoi gained a small advantage and eventually won a parti but the rook \& pawn ending reached by the adjourament was a dead draw. KORCHNOI - KARPOV (5), Queen's Gambit: 1 c4 e6 2 Nc3 d5 3 d4 Be7 4 Nf3 Nf6 5 Bg5 h6 6 Bh4 0-0 7 Rel b6 8 cxd5 Nxd5 9 Nud5 exd5 10 Bxe7 Qxe7 11 g 3 Ba6 12 e 3 c $5 \quad 13$ dxc5 bxc5 14 Bxa6 Nxa6 15 Oxd5 Nb4 16 Oct Qf6 $17 \mathrm{Nh}_{4}$ Qxb2 18 ©-0 Qxa2 19 Qxa2 Nxa2 20 Rxc5 Rfe8 21 Ras Nel 22 Nf5 Rc 723 Nd4 Rb8 24 Ral Nd3 25 Rfd1 Ne5 26
 Kg 730 Ra 5 Nc 631 Nxe6 Rxc6 32 Rxa 7 Rxa7 33 Rxa7 Rc2 34 e4 Rc $3 \quad 35 \mathrm{Ra} 2$ Kf6 36 f. $3 \mathrm{Rb} 3 \quad 37 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 3 \quad 38 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Rb} 3$ 39 Rabt Ke 740 Ra5 Kf5 41 Rd5 Ra3 42 $\mathrm{Rd} 6+\mathrm{Kg} 743 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Rb} 34^{4} \mathrm{Rd} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 545 \mathrm{Ke}$ Ra 546 Kf 4 Kal 47 Rd 5 Rg 148 Ra 5 Rh 49 Ra 7 Rb 150 Ra 4 Rgl 51 e 5 Rbl 52 Ke4 Rel+ $53 \mathrm{Kd5} \mathrm{Re} 354 \mathrm{Rf} 4 \mathrm{Ra} 3 \quad 55 \mathrm{~g} 4$ Ra5+ $56 \mathrm{Kd}_{4} \mathrm{Ra} 4+\quad 57 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Ra3+} 58 \mathrm{Kf} 2$ $\mathrm{Ra}+59 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Ra} 560 \mathrm{Re} 4 \mathrm{hxg} 461 \mathrm{fxg} 4$ Ra3+ 62 Kf 2 Rh 363 g 5 Ra 364 Re 3 Ra 4 $65 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 4 \quad 66$ е6 £xe6 67 Rxé Ra4 68 Rī $6 \mathrm{Rb} 4, \frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$.

Korchooi gained his first win in the ixth gatue after sacrificing a pawn for a strong initiative. Although this was a "logical." result, the game could so easily have gone the other way. Korchnoi's $39 . . .0 d 5$ was a time-trouble blunder ( $39, ., 0 e 5$ was good) and Karpov's 40 Nfl likewise. Instead Karpov had missed the simple and very effective 40 Ne 2 ajriost certainly wimning for White. KARPOV - KORCHNOI (6), Ruy Lopez 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nef 3 Bb 5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 5 0-0 Nxe4 6 d 4 b5 7 Bb3 d5 8 dxe5 Be6 9 c3 Be5 10 Nbd 2 0-0 11 Be2 Br 15 Be3 34 16 Ne] 3 Bxd4 17 exd4 as 15f6 19 Ne2 Nb 20 Pbl 7 2l exf $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Qxf6 } & 19 & \mathrm{Ne} 2 & \mathrm{Nb} 4 & 20 \mathrm{Bbl} \text { Qe7 } 21 \\ \text { Rfe8 } & 29 & \mathrm{Nf} 4 & \mathrm{Bf} 7 & 23 & \mathrm{Oc} 1\end{array}$

23...c5 24 dxc 5 Qf6 25 Bxe4 Rxe4 $26 \mathrm{Ne} 2 \mathrm{~d} 4 \quad 27 \mathrm{Ng} 3$ Ree8 28 Qd2 Nc6 29 Bg 5 Qe5 30 Rac 1 d3 31 Rfdl Bg 6 32 Be 3 Re6 33 Bf4 Qf6 34 Re 1 Rae8 35 Rxe6 Rxe6 36 Rb1 h5 37 h3 h4

38 Bg5 Qd4 39 Be3 Qd5? 40 Nfl? Be4 41 b4 Bxg2, $0: 1$.

Korchnoi's minimal advantage in game seven came to nothing except a relative ly early draw while in game eight the challenger equalised in the middlegame but had to defend very accurately the endgame after the exchange o queens - including two bouts of severe time trouble.
KORCHNOI - KARPOV (7), Queen's Gambit: 1 c4 e6 2 Nc 3 d5 3 d 4 Be 74 Nf 3 Nf 6 5 Bg5 h6 6 Bh4 0-0 7 Rc1 b6 8 cxd5 Jxd5 9 Nxd5 exd5 10 Bxe7 Qxe7 11 g3 Ва6 12 e3 c5 13 dxc5 Bb7 14 Bg 2 bxe 5 15 0-0 Nd7 16 Qb3 Rfb8 17 Qa3 Qe6 18 Rfdl a5 19 Nel a4 20 Nd3 d4 21 Bxb7 Rxb7 22 exd4 cxd4 23 Rel Qd5 24 Rc 2 Nf8 25 Nf4 Qa5 26 Ree2 Qb5 27 Qf3 Rab8 28 h 4 Qf5 $29 \operatorname{Re5}$ Qf6 30 Qd5 Rxb2 $31 \mathrm{Rf5}$, $1 / 2: \frac{1}{2}$.


In the final position Black defuses the danger e.g. 32 Rxf6 Rxd5 33 Ra6 Rd8 34 Rxa4 with a drawr ending.

KARPOV - KORCHNOI (8), Giuoco Piano 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 BC4 BC5 4 C3 Nf6 5 d3 d6 6 Nbd2 a6 7 0-0 0-0 8 Bb3 Ba 79 h 3 Be 610 Bc 2 d 511 Rel dxe4 12 dxe4 Nh5 13 Nfl Qxdl 14 Rxdl Rad8 15 Be3 f6 16 Bxa7 Nxa7 17 Ne3 N£4 18 h. 4 Bf7 19 Ne 1 Ne 820 f3 Ne6 21 Nd 3
 $25 \mathrm{Bc} 2 \operatorname{Rfd} 8 \quad 26$ a4 Kf8 $27 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Rd} 6 \quad 28$ 64 Ne 729 Ne 3 Rc6 30 Ra 3 Nc 831 axb 5 axb5 32 Nb 2 Nb 633 Kf 2 Rxd1 34 Bxdl Rd6 $35 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Be} 836 \mathrm{Ra} 5 \mathrm{Rd} 8 \quad 37 \mathrm{Ke} 1 \mathrm{c} 6$ 38 Ra6 Rb8 39 Bdl Ne8 40 Nd3 Nc7 41 Ra5 Ra8 (S)


42 f4 exf4 43 gxf4 Nb6 44 Bf 3 Rd8 $45 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Na}_{4} 46$ Ra7 Rd7 47 Kd 2 Ne 6 48 Rxd7 Bxd7 49 Bg4 g6 50 f5 gxf5 $\begin{array}{llll}51 & \text { Bxf5 } & \text { Kg7 } & 52 \\ \text { Nf8 } & 53 & \text { Bxd7 } & \text { Nxd7 }\end{array}$ 54 e6 Ndb6 55 Nf4 Kf8 56 Kd 3 Nc 8
57 Ng 4 Ke 758 Nh 6 Kd 659 Kd 4 Ne 760 Nf7+ Kc7 61 Nh5 c5+ 62 bxc5 Nc6+ 63 Ke3 Nxc5 64 Nxf6 Nxe6 65 h5 Nf8 66

Ke4 Kb6 67 Ng5 h6 68 Nf7 Ne6 69 Ne8 Ne5+ 70 Ke 3 Na 471 Kd 2 b 472 cxb 4 Nxb4 73 Nxh6 Ne5 74 Nf5 Nd5 75 h6 Ne4+ 76 Kd 3 Ng 577 Kd 4 Kc 678 Nfg 7 Ne $779 \mathrm{Nf6} \mathrm{Ng} 680 \mathrm{Nf5}$, $\frac{1}{2}$ : $\frac{1}{2}$.

Karpov adopted a new(?) defensive idea in the ninth game, going into a type of Queen's Gambit Accepted on move seven. Korchnoi's recapture with the pam on move ton was a mistake and Karpov built up a winning position with pressure against the isolated pawr. KORCHNOI - KARPOV (9), Queen's Gambit: 1. c4 e6 2 Nc3 d5 3 d4 Be7 4 N£3 Nf6 5 Bg5 h6 $6 \quad 8 \mathrm{Bh} 40-0 \quad 7 \mathrm{Rcl}$ dxc 468 e 3 c5 9 Bxc4 cxd4 $10 \mathrm{exd}_{4} \mathrm{NC} 6110-0$ Nh5 12 Bxe? Nxe7 13 Bb 3 Nf6 14 NeS Bd7 15 Qe2 Re8 16 Ne4 Nxe4 17 Qxe 4 Bc6 18 Nxc6 Rxc6 19 Rc3 Qd6 20 g 3 Rd8 21 Rdl Rb6 22 Qel Qd7 23 Rca3 Ra. 24 Qe4 Qc6 25 Qf4 Nd5 26 Qd2 Qb6 27 Bxd5 Rxd5 28 Rb3 Qc6 29 Qc3 Qd 30 f 4 D 631 Rb 4 b 532 a4 bxa4 $33 \mathrm{Qa3}$ a5 34 Rxa4 Qb5 35 Rd2 es 36 Ixes Res Qal Qe8 38 dxes Rxd $40 \mathrm{Ra}+\mathrm{Kh} 741 \mathrm{Qbl}+\mathrm{g} 642 \mathrm{Qfl}$ Qc5t 43 Khl Qd5+, $0: 1$
Depressed after losing with white in game 9, Korchnoi took his second timeat; the challenger's seconds admitted that morale was low and reckoned that Korchnoi was working too hard at analyis and tiring himself out before he got to the board. Korchnoi equalised in game 10 in the dullest game so far. Game eleven saw a return to the 5 Bf f the 1978 match and another draw while game twelve saw Karpov starting ith 1 c4; a verbal draw offer by the hampion on move 46 provoked an outburst from Korchnoi who was later arned by the match jury against a repeticion after Karpoy had complained that he had been insulted in Russian. KARPOV - KORCHNOI (10), Giuoco Piano: 1 é4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bc4 Bc5 4 c3 Nf6 5 d3 a6 $60-0$ d6 7 Rel Ba7 8 Bb3 9 Nbd2 Be6 10 Nt Bxb3 14 Be3 De6 1 12 Nef 16 Racl Bxe3 17 Rxe3 Rad8 18 Rd7 19 Kfl Kf8 20 Rdl h6 21 18 Nxe5 Nxe5 22 Nxe5 dxe5 23 Rxd7 Nxd7 24 Ke 2 Ke 725 Nfi b5 26 Nd2 c5 27 Rg3 Rg8 28 b3 Nb8 29 a 4 Nc6 30 axb5 axb5 $31 \mathrm{k} 4 \mathrm{Kf} 7 \mathrm{~K}^{2} 32 \mathrm{Rf} 3+$, $\frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$.
KORCHMOI -- KARPOV (11), Queen's Gambit ${ }_{1}$ c4 e6 2 Nc3 as 3 d'4 Be7 4 Nf3 Nf6 5 Bf4 0-0 6 e3 c5 7 dxc5 Bxc5 8 Qc2
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { Nc6 } & 9 & \mathrm{Rd} 1 & \mathrm{Qa} 5 & 10 & \text { a3 } \\ 12 & \mathrm{Be} 7 & 11 & \mathrm{Nd} 2 & \text { e } 5\end{array}$ 12 Bg5 d4 13 Nb 3 Qd 3 l 14 Be 2 a5 (varying from the 14...h6 of game 9 at
Baguio 1978)


15 exd4 a4 16 Nxa4 Nxd4 17 Nxd4 exd4 18 b3 Qa5+ 19 Qd2 Bxa3 20 Qxa5 Rxa5 21 Bxf6 Bb4+ 22 Kfl gxf6 23 Rxd4 Re5 24 g 4 b5 25 cxb5 Bb 7 26 f3 Rfe8 27 Bd1 Rxb5 $28 \mathrm{Kg} 2 ? \mathrm{Kg} 7$
(28...Bel! leaves white very tied up) $29 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Ba} 5 \quad 30 \mathrm{Rf} 1 \mathrm{Re} 7 \quad 31 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 32$ Bc2 Rc7 33 Rc4 Rxc4 34 bxc4 Rb4 35 c5 Bc6, $\frac{1}{2}$ : $\frac{1}{2}$.
KARPOV - KORCHNOI (12), Grünfeld Def.: 1 c4 Nf6 2 Nc3 d5 3 cxd5 Nxd5 4 Nf 3

 15 e $5 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 16 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Rfd} 8 \quad 17 \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 8 \quad 18$ Be3 Rab8 19 Qe2 Bc6 20 Bxa6 cxd4 21 $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { cxd4 Bxa4 } & 22 \text { Nd2 Qc6 } & 23 \text { Rec1 Qa8 } & 24\end{array}$
 Nd7 28 Ne4 Bxe4 29 Rxc8 Oxc8 30 Bxe4 Qc4 31 Bd3 $\begin{array}{lllllll} & \text { Qc3 } & 32 & \text { Bxb5 Nb6 } & 33 \text { Qd3 }\end{array}$ Nd5 $34 \mathrm{Bf} 2 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 35$ Qxc3 Nxc3 36 Rb 3 Nd1 37 Rd3 Nxf2 38 Kxf2 Rb8 39 Bc 4 $\mathrm{Rb} 2+40 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 4 \quad 41 \mathrm{Rc} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 8$ (S) 42 $\mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \quad 43 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Bf} 844 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 445 \mathrm{Rcl}$ Ba3 $46 \mathrm{Rc} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 447 \mathrm{Rcl}, \frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$.

Game 13 saw an Exchange Variation of the Queen's Gambit and Korchnoi gained a firm grip in the middlegame on the kingside. Karpov was forced to give up is queen and resigned without resuming KORCHNOI - KARPOV (13), Queen's Gambit: 1 c4 e6 2 Nc3 d5 3 d4 Be7 4 cxd5 exd5 5 Bf4 c6 6 e3 Bf5 7 g4 Be6 8 h3 Nf6 9 Bd3 c5 10 Nf3 Nc6 11 Kfl $0-0 \quad 12 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 813 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \operatorname{Re} 8 \quad 14 \mathrm{dxc} 5$ Bxc5 15 Nb 5 Bf8 16 Nfd4 Nxd4 17 Rxc8 Qxc8 18 exd4 Qd7 19 Nc7 Rc8 20 Nxe5 fxe6 21 Rel a6 22 g 5 Ne 423 Og 4 Bb 4 $24 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Rf} 8 \quad 25 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Qf} 7 \quad 26 \mathrm{Be} 5 \mathrm{Nd} 2$


27 a3 Nxf3 28
g6 hxg6 29 Bg 3
Be7 30 Rf2 Nel+ Bxf2 Nxd3 33 Bf7 34 Nxd 33 Qxe6t 35 Oxd 5 Bg 6 Nxb 35 Qxas Bf6 36 Bxd4 $\mathrm{g} 5{ }^{37} \mathrm{Qb} 3$ $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Bxd4 } & 38 \\ 39 & \text { Qe } 8+6 \\ \text { Kg7 } & 40\end{array}$

Be5+ Bxe5 41 Qxe5+ Kh7 42 Qxb2, 1 : 0.
With the score now 4:2 Korchnoi was now back in the match but, after taking his second time-out, Karpov struck back was new and Korchnoi erred l6th allowing Karpov a red bady on his ning a pawn. Korchnoi adjourned in a totally hopeless position without resuming KARPOV - KORCHNOI (14), Ruy Lopez: 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 5 0-0 Nxè4 6 d4 b5 7 Bb3 d5 8 dxe5 Be6 9 Nbd 2 Nc 510 c 3 d4 11 Bxe6 Nxe6 $\begin{array}{lllll}12 & \text { cxd4 } & \text { Ncxd4 } & 13 \text { Ne4 Be7 } & 14 \mathrm{Be} 3 \text { Nxf3+ } \\ 15 \text { Qxf3 } & 0-0 & 16 \text { Rfd1 Qe8? }\end{array}$


17 Nf6+ Bxf6 18 exf6 Qc8 $\quad 19$
fxg7 Rd8

 $\begin{array}{lll}24 \mathrm{Rd} 7 \mathrm{Rxd} 7 & 25\end{array}$ Qxa8+ Rd8 26 Qxa6 Qe2 27 Rf1 Rd1 $\begin{array}{lll}28 & \text { Qa8+ Rd8 } & 29 \\ \text { b4 } & 30 \text { Qa4 } 6 \\ \text { Od3 } & 31\end{array}$
 Rxc2 f5 $35 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Kf} 7 \quad 36 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Rd5} 37 \mathrm{gxf5}$ Rxf5 $38 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \mathrm{Rf} 6 \quad 39 \mathrm{Rd} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 40 \mathrm{f} 5$ Rxf5 41 Re7 Nxg7 $42 \mathrm{Rxg} 7+\mathrm{Kh} 843 \mathrm{Rc} 7$ Kg8 $44 \mathrm{Bxc} 5 \mathrm{Rg} 5+45 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Rg} 646 \mathrm{Be} 3$, 1 : 0 .

There now followed three more draws Game 15, the first game in which Karpov did not transpose to the Queen's Gambit, was always drawish. At adjournment the challenger insielessy drawn yet the gained a slight on sealing. Karpo and Korchnoi customary time trouble. Althoush in champion was reckoned Althoug the advantage he offered the draw a slight only five minutes play in the siter session after Korchni's sealed move. Game 17 was perheps dullest of the match with many trad of pieces leading quickly to a drad ending.
KORCHNOI - KARPOV (15), English 1 c4 Nf6 2 Nc3 e5 3 Nf3 Nc6 4 g 3 Bb 4 $5 \mathrm{Nd} 5 \mathrm{Bc} 5 \quad 6 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{O}-0 \quad 0-0 \quad 8$ e3 Bg4 9 h3 Bxf3 10 Bxf3 Nxd5 11 cxd5 Ne7 12 b3 Qd7 13 Bg2 c6 14 dxc6 Nxc6 15 Bb2 d5 16 Bxe5 Nxe5 17 d4 Bd6 18 dxe5 Bxe5 19 Rc 1 d4 20 Rc5 Bf6 21 Rd5 Qc7 22 exd4 Rad8 23 Qcl Qb6 24 Rxd8 Rxd8 25 d5 g6 26 Bf3 $\mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 27 \mathrm{Re} 1$


 Bd1 Qe4+, $\frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$. $24+39 \mathrm{Bf} 3$ Qe5 40
KARPOV - KORCHNOI (16), Ruy Lopez: 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 5 0-0 Nxe 46 d 4 b5 7 Bb3 d5 8 dxe5 Be6 $9 \mathrm{Nbd} 2 \mathrm{Nc} 510 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{~d} 4 \quad 11$ Bxe6 Nxe6 12 exd4 Nexd4 13 Ne 4 Be 714 Be 3 Nf 5 15 Qc2 $0-0 \quad 16$ Neg5 Bxg5 17 Nxg5 g 6 18 Nxe6 fxe6 19 Rael Qd5 20 b3 Rac8 21 Bc5 Rfd8 22 h3 Qc6 23 b4 Rd7 24 Rd1 Rcd8 25 Rxd7 Rxd7 26 Rel Qd5 27 a4 Nh4 28 f3 Nf5 29 axb5 axb5 30 Qe2 $34 \mathrm{c} \quad 3 \mathrm{Rcl} \mathrm{Rd} 8 \quad 32 \mathrm{Be} 3$ Qd5 33 Bf 2 c 6 34 Qe1 Qb3 35 Ral Qb2 $36 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \mathrm{Qa} 2 \quad 37$
 Bc5 h6 41 Qe3


41,..Oc2 (S) Qxh6 Black (Aa 42 sufficient gains play to hold ther play to hold the
..d4!) $42 \ldots 85$ $\frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$. Most of the grandmasters present in Merano
predicted a draw but were surprised at the apparent ease with which Korchnoi achieved it!
KORCHNOI - KARPOV (17), Queen's Gambit: 1 Nf3 Nf6 2 c4 e6 $3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 4 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Be} 7$ 5 Bg5 h6 6 Bh4 0-0 7 Rcl dxc4 8 e3 seconds later said this (Korchnoi's challenger nine) 10 ... Bd7 71 have played in game 13 Bre7 Nexe 714 Ne2 Nc6 12 Nb 3 Nd 5 16 Bf3 Ne7 17 Bxc6 Nxc6 18 Qxd8 Rfyd $19 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Rac} 8 \mathrm{Cxc6}$ Nxc6 18 Qxd8 Rfxd8 Rhel Rxc2+ 23 Rxc2 8 Re2 Ne7 22

Game 18, which was to be the la game of the match opened yet again with an Open Ruy Lopez. Karpov's l3th move was new but had been considered by the Korchnoi camp in their preparation.
an hite this Korchnoi thought for nearly an hour over his reply. Karpov's accurate and straightforward play comined with Korchnoi's time-trouble galned the champion his sixth win and victory in the match
KARPOV - KORCHNOI (18), Ruy Lopez:
1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 5 0-0 Nxe4 6 d4 b5 7 Bb3 d5 8 dxe5 Be6 9 Nbd2 Nc5 10 c 3 d4 11 Bxe6 Nxe6

12 cxd4 Nexd4 13 a4 Be7 14 Nxd4 Nxd4 $15 \mathrm{Ne} 4 \mathrm{Ne} 6 \quad 16$ Be3 $0-0 \quad 17 \mathrm{f4} 4 \mathrm{Qxd1} \quad 18$ Rfxdl Rfb8 19 Rd7 Bf8 20 f5 Nd8 21 $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { a5 } & \mathrm{Nc} 6 & 22 & \text { e6 fxe6 } & 23 & \mathrm{f} 6 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \quad 24 & \mathrm{Rxc} 7\end{array}$ Rc8 25 Racl Rxc7 26 Rxc7 Rd8 27 h 3
 31 Nxc5 gxf6 32 b4 Rd8 33 Rxa6 Kf7 $34 \mathrm{Ra} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 635 \mathrm{Rd} 7 \mathrm{Re} 836$ a6 Ra8 37 Rb7 Kf5 38 Rxb5 Ke5 $39 \mathrm{Rb} 7 \mathrm{Kd5}$ Rf7 f5 $41 \mathrm{Rf6}, 1$ : 0 .

In retrospect Karpov did as much as he had to win the match and his share For the prize fund - about NZ $\$ 200,000$. For the most part he played with great for the challenger's really had to wait

Korchnoi's gis s blunders.
orchnour fost thre in games one, and another cost three early points also quickly punished Korchnoi was affected by how much situation can never be by family's rest of us, but the fict the conditions were NOT thet remains that players: while Karov sath have won anyway, that nagging doubt will always be that nagging doubt.

## MORE FROM OVERSEAS

Still on the subject of World titles, the WORLD JUNIOR CHAMPIONSHIP, held in Mexico during August/September, was won by Yugoslavia's Ognjen Cvitan with $10 \frac{1}{2} /$ 13 despite his losing in the first round. Ehlvest (USSR) was second on 10 and then came Short (ENG) 9; Hjartarsson (ICE), Salov (USSR) \& Corral (SP) $8 \frac{1}{2}$; Tempone (ARG) 8.
Here's how the tournament winner Crushed England's top junior: CVITAN - SHORT, Queen's Indian Defence: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 4 a3 c5
 Qe7 9 Bd3 Nxd5 10 0-0 Nc7 711 Nc 3 Od8
 $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Nc6 } & 14 & \mathrm{f} 4 & \text { Nxe5 } \\ 15\end{array}$ fxe5 Be7 16 Qe2 h6 17 Qh5 Rf8 (DIAGRAM)
18 Bxh6 gxh6 19 Rxf7 Rxf7 20 Rfl Ng5 21 Bc4 Kf8 22 Rxf7+ Nxf7 23 Nf6, 1 : 0.


A1so the WOMEN'S WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP is being held concurrently with the

Karpov-Korchnoi match. Nana Aleksandria lost heavily $3 \frac{1}{2}: 8 \frac{1}{2}$ to Gaprindashvili in the 1975 match so Chiburdanidze had be a strong favourite in 1981, The challenger has, however, carried the fight to her more illusire first three gaining advantages in the first three games before finally winning the next. Then Chiburdanidze came back inco the match with wins in games 6 , but the match wasn $t$ over sio the sandria won games 10 and 11 to tie the scores.
CHIBURDANIDZE-ALEKSANDRIA, Sicilian: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf 3 d 6 3 d4 $\mathrm{cxd} 4 \quad 4 \mathrm{Nxd4}$ $\mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 5 \mathrm{Nc} 3$ a6 6 Bg 5 e6 7 £4 Qb6 8 Qd2 Qxb2 9 Rb 1 Qa3 10 f5 Nc6 11 fxe6 fxe6 12 Nxc6 bxc6 13 e5 dxe5 14 Bxf6
 18 Nxf6 + Bxf6 19 c4 Ra7 $200-0$ Rf7 7 21 Qd6 Be7 22 Qxe5 Rxfl+ 23 Bxfl Rh7 $24 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \mathrm{Kd} 7 \quad 25 \mathrm{Qd} 4+\mathrm{Bd} 6 \quad 26 \mathrm{Qa} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 8$ $27 \mathrm{Rxc} 8+\mathrm{Kxc} 8 \quad 28$ Qxh7 Bc5+ 29 Kh 1 $\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{Qxa} 2 & 30 & \mathrm{Qh} 8+\mathrm{Kc} 7 & 31 & \mathrm{Qg} 7+\mathrm{Kb} 6 \\ 32 & \mathrm{Qg} 5\end{array}$ Qb2 33 Qd8+ Ka7 $34 \mathrm{Qc} 7+\mathrm{Qb7} \quad 35 \mathrm{Qe5}$ Qe7 36 Qxh5 Qd6 37 Qh7+ Kb6 38 Qbl Bb4 $39 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{a} 5 \quad 40 \mathrm{~g} 5$ od $4 \quad 41 \mathrm{c5t}$ (S)
 $45 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Qe} 3 \quad 46$ Bxc6 Kxc6 $47 \mathrm{~g} 7 \mathrm{Qf} 3+$ $48 \mathrm{Kgl} \mathrm{Qg} 4+, 0$ : 1
CHIBURDANIDZE - ALEKSANDRIA (7), Bird's $\begin{array}{llllllllllll} & & \text { Bg } 2 & \text { hi }\end{array} 4$ Opening: 1 g3 d5 2 f4 hs 6 heg 7 Bxh1


 $\begin{array}{lrlllllll}\text { Bxf3 } & \text { Nf6 } & 15 & \text { Qa4 Nf5 } \\ \text { Bxc5 } & 18 & \text { bxc5 Ne7 } & 19 & \text { fxe5 } & \text { Oxe } & 20 & \text { Qd } 4\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Bxe5 } \\ \mathrm{Ng} 6 & 21 & \mathrm{Rbl} & 0 \times d 4 & 22 & \text { Bxd4 } \\ 0-0-0 & 23 & \mathrm{Kd} 2\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\mathrm{Ng} 6 & 21 & \mathrm{Rbl} \text { Qxd4 } \\ \mathrm{Nd} 7 & 24 & \mathrm{Bxg} 7 \mathrm{Nxc5} & 25 \mathrm{Rhl} \\ \mathrm{Nd} 7 & 26 \mathrm{Rh} 5\end{array}$
 $30 \mathrm{~g} 5 \mathrm{Nxf3}+31$ exf3 Rd7 $32 \mathrm{Rf} 6 \mathrm{Nf} 8 \quad 33$ $\mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 34$ Bd $4 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 35$ Be5t Kd8 $36 \quad \mathrm{f} 5 \mathrm{Ke} 8$ 37 Rh6 Rd8 38 Rh8 f6 69 Bxf6 Rd6 40 37 Rh6 Rd8

A very strong Soviet team won the WORLD YOUTH TEAM CHAMPIONSHIP in Graz, Austria, 17-28 August. Leading scores: 1 USSR $32 \frac{1}{2} / 44$; 2 Eng1and $30 \frac{1}{2} ; 2$ Hungary $28 \frac{1}{2} ; 4$ USA $26 \frac{1}{2}$. The USSR team comprised GM Kasparov, GM Kochiev, GM Jusupov, IM Psakhis, IM Dolmatov \& IM vladimirov.

The tournament at SOCHI in September was won by GM Vitaly Tsesbkovsky (USSR) with $10^{\frac{1}{2}} / 15$. He was followed by: 2 GM Polugaevsky (USSR) 10; 3 Vaiser (USSR)

9娄; 4-5 GM Gufeld (USSR) of IM Pinter (HUN) 9: 6-7 GM Panchenko (USSR) \& IM Haritono (USSR) 81/2; 8 Dvoiris (USSR) 8 ; 9-10 IM Pribyl (CZ) \& IM Espig (DDR) 7 $\frac{1}{2}$; 11 GM Westerinen (FIN) 7; 12 Sarubin (USSR) $6 \frac{1}{2}$; 13-14 Lukov (BUL) \& IM Tseitlin (USSR) 6; 15 GM Lengyel (HUN) $4 \frac{1}{2}$; 16 Stefanov (RUM) 2.

MANILA, 14-28 August: 1 GM Vaganian (USSR) 10/11; 2 GM Smejkal (CZ) 9; 3 GM Geller (USSR) 8; 4 GM Torre (PHI) 7; 5-6 Yap (PHI) \& IM Mascarinas (PHI) 6; GM Balinas (PHI) 5; 8 IM Ravisekhar (IND) 4 IM Ardiansjah (RI) 3: 11 IM Maninang (PHI) 2 $\frac{1}{2}$; 12 IM Ramos (PHI) $1 \frac{1}{2}$.

Korchnoi was still playing tournament chess in August - just five weeks before his match against Karpov! This time it was the Oude Meester GF in JANASBURG where, although impressive in some games, Korchnoi dropped $2 \frac{1}{2}$ points to Nunn in the quadrangular event. Swede Ulf Andersson took first prize of approx. $\$ 37,000$ with a last round win against Hubner


This was the first ever category 16 ourament, with an average rating of 2629 - the previous highest was Montreal 1978 (category 15, 2623) - but the event will not be rated by FIDE.
KORCHNOI - NUNN, King's Indian Defence: 1 c4 Nf6 2 Nc3 g6 3 e4 d6 4 d4 4 Bg 75 Be 2 0 066 Nf 3 Nbd 77 0-0 e5 8 Qc2 a5 9 Rd1 exd4 10 Nxd4 Nc5 11 Ndb5 Re8 12 $\mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 13 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 6 \quad 14 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Nh} 5 \quad 15 \mathrm{Bfl}$ f5 16 exf5 gxf5 17 Bf2 Rf8 18 g3 Nf6


19 Qxf5? Ng4! 20 Qxg4 Ng 521 Qh5 Be8 22 Qxg5 Qxg5 23 Nxc 7 Rxf 324 Nxa8 Rxf2 25 Kxf2 Qc5+ 26 Kg 2 Bxc 3 27 Nc7 Bg6 28 Nd5 Be4+ 29 Kh 3 Bxb2 $\begin{array}{lll}30 \text { Rab1 Qf2 } \\ \text { Oxb2 } & 32 & \mathrm{Nf} 4 \\ \mathrm{Bf5} 5+\end{array}$
33 g4 Qf2, $0: 1$.
Korchnoi lost to Hubner with his French Defence (conspicuous by its ab-
sence in Merano!) but gained his revenge in the following game:
KORCHNOI - HUBNER, Queen's Indian:

1. d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 bb 4 Nc3 Bb? 5 Bf4 Be7 6 Qc2 Nh5 7 Bd? d5 8 cxd5 exds 9 g3 0-0 10 Bg2 Nf6 11 0-0 Re8 12 Nes ab 13 Qb3 Nbd7 14 Radl b5 15
 Rel Nxe4 19 Bxe4 g6 20 Rce Nfg 21 23 Bc 3,1 : 0 HUBNER - NUNN, King's Indian Defence 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 g6 3 Nc3 Bg7 4 e 4 d 6 5 Nf3 $0-0 \quad 6 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Nbd} 7 \quad 70-0$ e 58 Re 1 c6 9 bfl a5 10 dxe5 dxe5 ll Na4 0e7 12 Qce Rd8 $13 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \quad 14 \mathrm{Nxc5}$ Qxe5 15 Be3 Qe7 16 Radl Rxdl 17 Rxdl Bef 18 Nxe5 Bxh3 19 Nxc6 bxc6 20 gxh 3 Nxe4 21 Bg2 f. 522 b3 Re8 23 Bxe4 fxe4 24 Qd2 Qh4? 25 Qd7 Rf8 26 Oe6t Kh8 27 Rd7 Qb5 28 Qe7 Qe5 29 Qxf8+, $1: 0$.

TILBURG, 1-16 October:

|  |  | 123456789012 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Beljavsky | $\times \frac{1}{2} 01 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1111$ | 2 |
| 2 | Petrosian | $\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times 11 \frac{1}{2} \frac{3}{2} 1$ | 7 |
| 3 | Portisch | $1 \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} 10 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 011 \frac{1}{2}$ | $6{ }^{1}$ |
| 4 | Timmart | 0 $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1201 \frac{1}{2} 1$ | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 5 | Ljubojevic | $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 01 \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 111 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| 6 | Andersson | 迷 $\frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times 1 \times \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} 1$ | 51/2 |
| 7 | Spassky | $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times 11 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ | 51/2 |
| 8 | Kasparov | $\frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} 10 \times 1 \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2}$ | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 9 | Sosonko | $0011 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 0 \times 0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 10 | Larsen | $0 \frac{1}{2} 0001 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1 \times 01$ | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 11 | Hab | $0 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} 1 \times \frac{1}{2}$ | 4 |
| 12 | Miles | $00 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} x$ | 3 |

The average rating of the all-GM field was 2604, making the tournament category 15

Reljavsky, Petrosian and Timnan shared the lead more or less consistently from round 6 onwards. Beljavsky beat Timman in the last round while Petrosian drew quickly with Ljubojevic and Portisch was unable to beat Spassky. Reljavsky introduced several theoretical novelties which helped him win at least three games including the vital last round clash. Petrosian was helped along when Kasparov erred in time trouble in a superior position, something whic
BELUAVSKY - HUBNER, Sicilian Najdorf: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf 3 d $6 \quad 3$ d 4 cxd $4 \quad 4$ Nxd 4 f6 5 Nc3 a6 6 Bg5 e $6 \quad 7$ f4 Qb6 8

 2 Nxf6+ Bxf6 19 c4 Bh4+?! 20 g 3 Be 7 $210-0$ Ra7 22 Rb 8 Re 723 Qd3 Bc5+ 24
Khi Ke7
 $30 \mathrm{Qa} 3+\mathrm{Kd} 5 \quad 31 \mathrm{Bb} 3+\mathrm{Ke} 4 \quad 32 \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{Kf5}$ 33 QE3+ Kg5 $34 \mathrm{gxh} 4+\mathrm{Rxh} 4 \quad 35 \mathrm{Qg} 3+$,

KASPAROV - SOSONKO, Queen's Gambit: 1 d4 Nff 2 c4 e6 3 Nf 3 d5 4 Ne 3 Bb 4
 $\mathrm{g} 5 \mathrm{~g}^{\mathrm{Bg} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 4} 10 \mathrm{Bb} 5+\mathrm{Kf} 811 \mathrm{dxc} 5$ ! Nxe3 12 bxe3 Bxe $3+\quad 13$ Ke2 Bxal 1.4 Qxal $\mathrm{E} 6 \quad 15 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{~g} 4 \quad 16 \mathrm{Nd} 4 \mathrm{Kf7} \quad 17 \mathrm{Bda}$ Nal 18 Qc3 Ne5 19 Nh5 Qe7 20 Nabt Ki8 $21 \mathrm{Rd} 1 \mathrm{bb} 22 \mathrm{Bc} 2 \mathrm{Ba} 6+23 \mathrm{Kel}$ Bc 24 Nxc4 dxc4 25 Rd6 Re8 26 Bxe5 fxe 5 27 Oxce 4 Q17 28 Qe 4 g 329 Fxg 3 , 1 .
SOSONKO - LARSEN, O1d Indian Defence: $\frac{1}{2}$ d4 NEG 2 c4 d6 $3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Nbd7} 4$ a 4 e5 5 Nf $3 \mathrm{Be} 76 \mathrm{Be} 20-0 \quad 70-0 \mathrm{c} 68 \mathrm{Rbl}$ 12 Be 3 bc Br8 10 Rdt ab 11 b 4 Qc 7 12 Be3 b5 13 h3 exd 4414 Nxd4 bb 715 18 Rxb4 Ne5 19 c5 dxc5 20 d6 Qd7 $21 \mathrm{Rf}_{4}$ Racs 22 g. 4 Qeb 23 Qd2 Red8 24 Qa5 R66 25 Rxd6 Rxd6 27 Nxd6 HUBNER - PORTISCH, Ruy Lopez: 1 e4 e5 2 NE3 Ne6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 (0-0) Be7 6 Rel b5 $7 \mathrm{Bb} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 8 \mathrm{c} 3$ 0-0 9 h 3 Bb 710 d4 Re8 11 a4 $\mathrm{t} 6 \quad 12 \mathrm{Nbd} 2 \mathrm{Bf} 8$ 13 Bc 2 exd4 14 cxd4 $\mathrm{Nb} 4 \quad 15 \mathrm{Bb} 1 \mathrm{Od} 7 \quad 16$ Ra3 Rad8 17 axb5 axb5 18 Rae3 c5 19 d5 g6 20 Nfl Bg7 21 Bd2 Na6 22 Ng 3 b4 23 Nh 4 Kh8 $24 \mathrm{Ng} f 5 \mathrm{gxf} 525 \mathrm{Nxf5} \mathrm{Rg} 826 \mathrm{Rg} 3$ c7 27 Ree3 Nce8 28 Ref3 Ra8 29 Ocl Ral 30 Bxh6 Nh7 31 Nxg7 Nxe7 32 b3 Oe7 33 $\mathrm{Kh}_{2} \mathrm{f} 634 \mathrm{Rg} 4 \mathrm{Nh} 535 \mathrm{Rh} 4 \mathrm{Qe} 5+36 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Bc} 8$


37 Qc2 (DIAGRAM)
37...c4! 38 bxc 4 $\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{Ra} 3 & 39 \mathrm{Rb} 3 \\ \mathrm{Rcl} \\ \mathrm{Rxb} & 41 \\ 4\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lll}\mathrm{BC} 1 & \mathrm{Rxb} 3 & 41 \text { Qxb } 3\end{array}$ Bb 2 2 5 45 Bd4 b $3!46$ Bxh3 Nf4 47 Qf 3 Nxh 348 Ba4 Rxis 449 Bxd7 $\mathrm{Nelt}, 0: 1$

## Can You See the Combinations?

Solutions on page 150


No. 1 White to play


No. 3 White to play


No. 5 White to play


No. 2 White to play


No. 4 White to play


No. 6 White to play

## BORROUGHS' SOUTH ISLAND CHAMPIONSHIP

REPORT : ADRIAN LLOYD and PETER CRIBBETT

The Borroughs' South Island Championship, played ini Christchurch from August $24-29$, resulted in a relatively easy vin for Paul Garbett, who went half a point clear of the field in round five and never looked hack.
Johnathon Sarfati, another from the North, played impressively to take second piace with $6 / 8$.
As a result of this invasion we have been blessed with five 1981 co-South Island Champions.
In the order of countback they are: Adrian Lloyd, Bruce Anderson, Peter Van Dijk, David Weegenar and Hanmond Williamson.

They sbared thixd equal place with Tony Carpinter, another to fail the title's residential qualification.
The field of 40 was reasonable by recent South Island standards
As in Nelson last year, the tournament attracted several championship players, top juniors, some more experienced competitors and the obligatory gaggle of schoolboys.
Geof Davies, who organised the tournament, came up against the perennial Christchurch problem of "no venue". After much effort on his part Adams House, a Christchurch Hostel, was secured.
It also provided very cheap acconmodation for visitors.
Although the venue proved ideal there was some disquiet amongst some because of a smoking restriction.

Vernon Smáll was Director of Play Thanks are due to bath these "institutions", without which the tournament
may not have been held.
Newspaper coverage, initially good, unfortunately faded into obscurity... there are still Cantabrians awaiting the final results

Round One
As usual the big fish ruthlessly ate the sinall fish, although there was one notable upset.
This dubious horour went to an off-
-form Eruce Gloisten, who lost to E. Wilkinson in a crazy but entertaining game.

Hammond Williamson and Bill Lynn also had trouble extending their jaws around two "puffer fish" in the form of $P$. Stewartson and R. Bennet, and were forced to swimu away only half satiated.

Rcund Two
Anderson was held to a draw by Van Ginke1. Williamson underestimated R. Bennett, losing in a vicious tactical mielee.

## Round Three

The thinning-out process took a backward step when the four top seeds Garbett, Carpinter, Anderson and Lloyd were teld to draws by Weegenar, $P$. Van jjk, G. Bates and Saffat respectively This left eight people tied for the lead on $2 \frac{1}{2} / 3$.

## Round Fcur

A sensation: Ninth seed David Weegenar fornd adequate compensation for enar found adequate compensation for ops in a sacrificial forced mate in five.
Garbett ground ciown Van Ginkel.
In a game of fluctuating fortunes Sarfati emerged victorious over Rates. For a player with little book knowedge Bob bentict survived well agains Bruce Andersion, but the latter's positional judgement eventually took its to11.

Round Five
Garbett crushed Sarfati to assume the sole lead.
Carpinter beat Haase and Anderson beat Cameron.
In Lloyd-Weegenar prophylaxis resulted inl a draw.
Warwick Norton drew with 1979-80 New Zealand Women's Champion Fenella Foster

Garbett's experiment with the Ruy Lopez exchange deferred posed no prob lems for Anderson and resulted in a draw.
Carpinter-Lioyd never held much for either side.
Bates beat Weegenar with an enterprising exchange sacrifice, while Norton scored a deceptively easy win over 1974 South Island Chanpion Malcolm Foord
Van Ginkel overwhelmed R. Wilson.

## Round Seven

Garbett beat Lloyd and Sarfati beat Anderson after Bruce arrived late, almiost having forgotten the round time. Willianson showed for the first time, beating Norton in a strange game.
Peter Van Dijk assured himself of at least fifth equal by drawing with Bates in one of the tournament's most interesting games.
Scores before the final round: Garbett 6/7; P. Van Dijk $5 \frac{1}{2}$; Sarfati, Carpinter, Bates 5; Lloyd, Anderson, Weegenar, Williamson, B. Cameron, A. Nijwan, W. Lynn $4 \frac{1}{2}$

## Round Eight

Garbett and Carpinter sat down to
Sarfati beat Peter Van Dijk and Lloyd won against gjles Bates too desperare attempt for second equal in a game that entertained the spectators
Bruce Anderson shook off his lethargy
o score a good win over Lynn
Weegenar profited when Ari Nijman aissed a conbination which would have fter
Fenella Foster, who played throughout the tournament with quiet contidence, "bagged" her first ex-New Zealand champion, Graeme Haase, to finish ninth equal on 5/8.

[^0]the previous two South Islands, produced another solid performance and Weegenar demonstrated he was not to be taken lightly.
Clearly Tony Carpinter suffered from his upset loss as none of the other place-getcers were willing to compen-place-getrers were willing
Hammond Williamson clawed his way through the field after "swiss gambiting" rounds field after
Generally the standard of play beween the top players did not disapooine the spectators and the good showings of so many juniors increased the interest.

## GAMES

F.A.Garbett - J. Sarfati, Queen's Cambit i Nf. 3 d5 2 c4 c6 3 d4 Nf6 4 Nc3 dc 5 a4 Bf5 6 e 3 e 57 Bxc4 Nbd7 8 0-0 Bd6 9 Qe2
 17 Rxa5 Bxb4 18 Nf5 Bc3 19 Rbl Oci 20 Ba3 Rfd8 21 Bd6 1-0
. Sarfati - H. WILL tamson, Ruy Lopez 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb 5 at 4 Ba4 Nf6 $50-0 \mathrm{Be} 76 \mathrm{Re} 1 \mathrm{~b} 57 \mathrm{Bb} 3$ d6 8 c 3 0-0 9 h 3 Nb 810 d 3 Nb 7711 Nb 22 c5 12 Nf 1
 $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { c h6 } 17 \text { Nxf7 Kxf7 } & 18 \text { cb+ dS } 19 & \text { ba Rxa }\end{array}$ Nxc3 24 d6+ Bd5 25 Bxb6 Oxb6 26 Bxd5+ Ncxd5 27 Rb 1 g 628 Ne3 Nxe3 29 Rxe3 Pxd6 30 a4 Rd8 31 a5 obs 32 Od3 Qxd3 33 Rxd3 Be7 34 Rxd8 Bxd8 35 Ral Nd7 36 a6 Nb 637 a7 Na 838 Rel $\mathrm{Bc} 739 \mathrm{~b} 5 \mathrm{1}-0$
D. WEEGENAR - G. BATES, Eirc
e4 d6 2 d4 Nf6 3 Nc3 a6 4 a4 g6 5 f4 Bg7 6 Nf3 $0-07$ Be2 Nc6 8 0-0 Bg4 9 d5 Nb4 10 Be 3 c 6 ll a5 cd 12 ed Bf5 13 Nd Bd7 14 Bf3 Re8 15 Rf2 Rc4 16 Rd2 Qe8 17 h3 Rxe3 18 be Qxe3 19 Kf2 Nfd5 20 Bxd5 Nbxd5 21 Rd3 Qe4 22 Raa 3 Nxe 323 Rxe3 e5 24 fe de 25 Ne 2 Bc 626 Kf 2 e 4 27 Re3 Qc5 28 g 3 Qf5 +29 Kg 2 Qc5 30 f4 Bd4 31 Kel Oxa3 32 Qxd4 Qf3+ 33 Kh2 Re8 34 Re3 Qf2+ 35 Ng 2 Qxc2 36 Rc 3 0-1
W. Norton - M. FOORD, Petroffs Defence 1 e4 e5 2 Nty Nf6 3 Bc4 Nxe4 4 Nc3 Nxc3 5 de f6 $60-0$ Nc6 7 Rel d6 8 b4 Qe7 9 Nd4 Nxd4 10 ca Beb 11 Qf3 0-0-0 12 d5


8c8 17 b6 Ka8 18 a6 cb 19 ab+ Kxb7 20 Re5 21 Rebl Qd8 22 Bxc 5 dc 23 Qa3 Be3 Rc5 24 0a6t Ka8 25 Rxb6 $1-0$
W. NORTON - P.A. GARBETT, Sicilian 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d 4 cd 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc 3 d 66 Be 3 a6 7 f4 Qc7 8 Qf3 b5 9
 13 Nf? hg $14 \mathrm{Nxg} 4 \mathrm{Nbd7} 15$ f5 e5 16 Nb 3 1517 Nf2 de 18 Nxe4 Rh4 19 Nbd 2 Ng 4 40 Nxe 321 Oxe3 BC5 22 Nxc5 Rg4+ 23 Kf2 Rg2+ 24 Ke1 Oxc5 25 Qxc5 Nxe5 $23 \mathrm{Kf2}$ Rg2+ 24 Kel Qxcs 25 KxC Ke 729 $\mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Rh} 830 \mathrm{Rg} 1 \mathrm{Kf6} 31 \mathrm{Rg} 4 \mathrm{Rh} 3+32 \mathrm{Bf} 3$ e4 33 Kd4 ef 34 Kxd4 Rxh2 35 Rd4 Kxf5 e4 33 Kd 4 ef 34 Kxd 4 Rxh2
H. WILLIAMSON - R. BENNETT, Ruy Lopez 1. 4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 5 -0 Nxe4 6 d4 ed 7 Rel d5 8 Nxd4 Bd6 5 Nxc6 Bxh2+ 10 Kh 1 Qh4 $11 \mathrm{Ne} 5+\mathrm{Kf} 8$ 12 Rxe4 Bf4+ $13 \mathrm{Kgl} \mathrm{Bh} 2+14 \mathrm{Khl}$ Qxe4 15 Kxh2 Qxe5+ 16 g 3 Qf5 17 c 4 Qxf2+ 18 Kh1 Oxg 319 Oxd5 Bg4 20 Nd 2 c6 21 Qe4 Re8 0-1
F. FOSTER - G. HAASE, Kings pawn 1 e4 e5 2 Nc3 Nf6 $3 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 44 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{O}-0$ 5 Nge2 c6 6 f4 d6 7 a3 Ba5 0-0 Bg4 9 d3 Nbd7 10 h 3 Bxe2 $11 \mathrm{Qxe} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 6+12 \mathrm{Kh} 2$ $\begin{array}{lll}\mathrm{Bd} 4 & 13 & \mathrm{f} 5 \\ \mathrm{Bxc} 3 & 14 \mathrm{bc} \text { d5 } 15 & \mathrm{ed} \text { cd } 16 \mathrm{~g} 4\end{array}$
 Radl Qa5 21 Bxe 4 Nc 722 g 6 hg 23 fg Nxe4 24 Qxe4 Rae8 25 Qc4 Ne6 26 Bd6 Nxe4 24 Qxe4 Rae8 28 Kh1 Rxf8 29 Rd3 Qe2 30 gft Nxf7 $31 \mathrm{Rxf7} 1-0$

WEEGENAR - CARPINTER reached the following position, when the former(white) found a crushing sacrificial combination.


Weegenar played
1 Rxg7! Kxg7 2 Nff5+ with a foreed mate (2...gh 3 Nxh5 + Kh6 4 QE6Kxh5 5 g4tf; 2. Kh6 3 Qf4+).

P A GARBETT - A. CARPINTER, Pirc 1 e 4 d 62 d 4 Nf6 3 Nc3 g6 4 Nf 3 Bg 7 5 Be2 0-0 6 0-0 Nbd7 7 a4 e5 8 de de 9 Be 3 a5 10 Bc4 Qe7 11 Qe2 c6 12 Nd2 Nc5 $13 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 614^{\mathrm{Nb}} 3^{1 / 2-3 / 2}$

ANNUAL INDEX (ConcTuded from page 160 ) NIMZOWTTSCH-LARSEN ATTACK -- 38,61,73 OLD INDIAN DEF - 75,145

PHILIDORS DEF - 152
PIRC DEF - $12,15,23,38,39,44,63,68$, $74,118,148,155$
PONZIANI OPENING - 23 QUEEN'S GAMBIT DECLINED - $26,31,45$, $48,63,76,80,81,86,98,99,106,112,115$, $121,123,129,140,141,142,143,145,138$

UUEN'S INDIAN DEfence - $23,27,46$,
$73,74,100,112,119,126,143,145$
QUEEN'S PAWN - 41,68,74
RUY LOPEZ - 4,5,12,15,27,44,75,86, $106,116,123,140,142,143,145,139,148$ SGANDINAVIAN DEF - 112
SCOTCH - 52,63
SICILIAN, Dragon - 13,14,23,27,47,117 Marocz7-65
Najdorf - 23,26,144,145
Pelikan - 68,77,91
Richter-Rauzer - 112,122
Scheveningen - $5,15,38,38$,
Sozin - 38
Taimanov - 4,5,44,71,74,79,
95,122,155
Closed - $6,8,28,68,113,152$,
other $-4,5,8,12,15,31,38$,
$41,74,78,102,106,112,117,122,127,131$ $135,137,152,155,157$
SLAV DEF - 38,96,100
TROMPOVSKY ATTACK - 51,96,152

*     *         *             *                 *                     * ${ }^{*}$ * ${ }^{*}$ ) LOCAL, NEW, Graham Pitts \& Ron Feasey
The C grade finalists were Peter Van Ther Mey, Merv Morrison, Gwen Jones and Gordon Schrader.
*     *         *             *                 *                     * 

NZ CHAMPIONSHTP - MORE WOMEN NEELED Only 6 women bave entered for the 1981-2 NZ Womeri's Championship (North Shore December 28 to January 9).
Shore December are needed and should enter by December 20.
The 6 so far are $V$. Burndred, $G$.
Jones, J. Kinchant, L. Martin, K.
Jotge, W. Stretch.
The 12 Championship players selected are: O. Sarapu, V. Small, P. Green, P. Garbett, E. Green, Ti. Watson, N. Metge G.W. Smith, R. Dowden, P. Stuart, J. Sarfati and P. Spiller.

## HOWICK-PAKURANGA OPEN <br> Sponsored by: <br> Papatoetoe Glass Co.

VENUE: PAKURANGA CULTURAL COMMUNITY CENTRE

DATES: FEBRUARY 21 \& 221982
PRIZES: 1st $\$ 150$, 2nd $\$ 125$, 3rd $\$ 100$ PLUS 5 grades with prizes of $\$ 30 \& \$ 15$ per grade

FORMAT: Seven-round Swiss ( 4 rounds on Saturday \& 3 rounds on Sunday with each player having one hour per game

ENTRIES: Entry fee is $\$ 10$. Entries close Friday, February 20 1982, al though late entries Check-in me accepted Check-in time 8.45 am
Contact P.D. McCarthy, 92 Ti Rakau
Drive, Pakuranga or phone $565-055$

COMBINATION SOLUTIONS (from page 146)

1. Gajdarov - Batakov, USSR 1977:

1 I Ng5! fg 2 Bxh7+ Kxh $73 \mathrm{hg}+\mathrm{Kg} 8$

2. Hubner - Penrose, England 1971:

1 Rxg6(1...Rxe5 2 fe hg 3 e6+-) $1-0$
3. Pois1 - Grgurich, Prague 1947: 1 Re5 Qd7 2 Rxe8+ Qxe8 3 d7: Qxd7 4 Qbe Kh7 5 Qh8+ Nxh8 6 Rg7 mate
4. Tietz - Judd, Carlsbad 1898: 1 Rxb5! cb 2 Rc8!! Qd5 (2...Rxc8 3 Qal+ e5 4 Bxe5+ Kg8 5 Nh6 mate; 2 ...Qxc8 RxfRxf8+ Kg 75 Bh6 3 Qal+!! e5(3...Rxal 4 Rxf8 Rxf8+ Kg 7 (5...Rxf8 6 Nxe5) 6 Rf7+! $1-0$
5. Parr - Waitkroft, Netherlands 1968 1 Rh5!: Qxd7(1...Qa6 2 Rxh6 + Bxh6 3 Ng 5 mate) $2 \mathrm{Ng} 5+\mathrm{Kh} 83$ Rxh6 mate.
6. Onescius - Gama, Rumania 1955:

1 Nxf3! ef 2 Qg7+!! $\operatorname{Rxg} 7(2 \ldots \mathrm{Kxg} 73$ $\underset{1-0}{\mathrm{gh}+-)} 3 \mathrm{Re} 8+\mathrm{Rg} 84 \mathrm{Rxg} 8+\mathrm{Kxg} 85 \mathrm{gh}$

SOUTH ISLAND CHAMPIONSHIPS - Nelson, August 24-29.

1 P.A. Garbet 2J. Sarfat 3 A. Lloyd 4 A. Carpinter 5 B. Anderson 6 P. Van Dijk 7 D. Weegenar 8 H . Williamson 9 G . Bates 10 J. Van Ginkel 11 F. Foster 12 B. Cameron A. Nijman 14 W. Lynn 15 W . Norton 16 R : Wilson 17 M. Post 18 T. Clements $\frac{19}{0} 0$. Thomson 20 M . Foord 21 G. Haase 22 B. Nijman $\frac{23}{24}$. Burridge 24 G. Davies 25 D. Pomeroy 26 M. Turner

| R1 | R2 | R3 | R4 | R5 | R6 | R7 | R8 | T'l | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W24 | W15 | D7 | W10 | W2 | D5 | W3 | D4 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| W20 | W17 | D3 | W9 | L1 | W8 | W5 | W6 | , |  |
| W26 | W11 | 1 D2 | W6 | D7 | D4 | LI | W9 | 51/2 | 42 |
| W16 | W12 | D6 | L7 | W21 | D3 | W10 | D1 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 41 |
| W19 | D10 | D9 | W34 | W12 | D1 | L2 | W14 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 38.5 |
| W18 | W22 | D4 | L3 | W24 | W21 | D9 | L2 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 38 |
| W35 | W28 | D1 | W4 | D3 | L9 | D12 | W13 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 37.5 |
| D27 | L34 | W31 | W19 | W13 | L2 | W15 | W12 | 51/2 | 33 |
| W32 | W13 | D5 | L2 | W27 | W7 | D6 | L3 | 5 | 39 |
| W40 | D5 | W25 | L1 | D14 | W16 | L4 | W22 | 5 | 34.5 |
| W29 | L3 | W35 | D13 | D15 | L14 | W20 | W21 | 5 | 33. |
| W39 | L4 | W28 | W22 | L5 | W23 | D7 | L8 | 4 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 35.5 |
| W37 | L9 | W18 | D11 | L8 | W29 | W24 | L 7 | 412 | 35 |
| D35 | W27 | L15 | D16 | D10 | W11 | W25 | L5 | 412 | 34 |
| W23 | L1 | W14 | D24 | D11 | W20 | L8 | D16 | 4/1/2 | 32.5 |
| L4 | W39 | D19 | D14 | W34 | L10 | W23 | D15 | 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ | 31.5 |
| W33 | L2 | L20 | W31 | d29 | W27 | L21 | W26 | 41/2 | 31 |
| L6 | W30 | L13 | W28 | L20 | D34 | W31 | W24 | 4 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 30 |
| L5 | W40 | D1'6 | L8 | W33 | L24 | W34 | W25 | 4 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 28.5 |
| L2 | W33 | W17 | L21 | W18 | L15 | L11 | W29 |  | 35 |
| W36 | D25 | D34 | W20 | L4 | L6 | W17 | L11 | 4 | 33 |
| W30 | L6 | W32 | L12 | L23 | W37 | W28 | L 10 | 4 | 31.5 |
| L15 | L24 | W37 | W35 | W22 | L12 | L16 | W32 |  | 29 |
| L1 | W23 | W26 | DI5 | L6 | W19 | L13 | L18 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 37.5 |
| W31 | D21 | L10 | L27 | w30 | W26 | L14 | L19 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 31.5 |
| L3 | W29 | L24 | D30 | W36 | L25 | W27 | L17 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 30 |

2.5
31.5

31
28.5
31.5

29
31.5
30

27-30 P. Stewartson, E. Wilkinson, D Pfah lert, A. Turner 3产; Tathi Jordan, J Mathieson, B, Alex ander 3; 34-37 R. , Morrison, 21, 38 B. K. Boyd 2.; 39 B. Gloistein 40 D. Came 40 D. Best $\frac{1}{2}$

## Tawa Labour Tournament

Report: Mike White

The 4th Tawa Labour Weekend Tournament sponsored by Fletcher Timbers was run in three grades.
It was encouraging for the Wellington chess scene that one of the strongest fields for some time turned out for the A grade, backed up by healthy fields in the other two grades.
Favourites for the tournament were David Beach and Lev Aptekar, with Jonthon Sarfati, Bernard Carpinter and Leonard McLaren likely challengers.

## Round One

The nearest thing to an upset occured in a tactical skirmish between Aptekar and Mark Noble. Noble won the exchange but some typically resourceful play by Lev saved the draw.

## Round Two

Only Beach, McLaren and Frankel remained on full points after this round.

Aptekar defeated Sarfati to be on 11/2. The DOP arrived at the writer's board to watch his flag, as usual perilously close to falling. But somehow Bell, with a useful time advantage and a crushing attack, managed to contrive to lose on time himself!

Round Three
McLaren continued his good form by beating Beach from the black side of
a Queen's Gambit.
Carpinter beat Ker in a rook endgame, while Sarfati and Hawkes in the middle of an unhappy tournament both lost to Gibson and Noble respectively.

## Round Four

Leonard McLaren produced another upset. This time the victim was Aptekar on the black side of a 2 f 4 Sicilian. Noble, who had started slowly with two draws, had his second win, beating Roberts after his opponent overlooked an earlier blunder.
Ker came up with the best finish of
the tournament in defeating Bell.
Points going into the last round: McLaren 4; Noble, Beach 3; Carpinter,

## Aptekar, Gibson $2 \frac{1}{2}$.

## Round Five

A knight sacrifice to queen a pawn clinched Noble a share of first prize th his opponent, Leonard McLaren.
Peter Hawkes wasn't too amused to find that after three losses in a row his last-round opponent was Sarfati. Never say die", he was heard to say as he unsoundly - and unsuccessfully acrificed a piece.
The last game to finish was a doubleedged rook and pawn affair between each and Aptekar. After both players had queened pawns, Beach couldn't force erpetual check after giving up a rook
the promotion race and resigned.
Bernard Carpinter shared third place ith Aptekar by beating Mike Roberts.
Bell gave a flawless display in winning his game - his opponent didn't turn up!

## Conclusion

Leonard McLaren was perhaps the more onvincing of the two winners and will e a threat in future tournaments.
Mark Noble finished well after a plow start and was the only undefeated player in the tournament.
The B grade was won by Russell Dive visithe ever-patient Martin Dreyer, lisiting from Auckland for the tournane. Marlin showed great determinfron,
The
The Junior grade, played over 8 P. Cooper from by another visitor, - Cooper from Wanganui.
complimented for Bob Mitchell must be minimented for their admirable organisation, coping with three tournaap simultaneously is not everyone's good humour but their diligence and petition
-
Full scores: 1-2 L. McLaren \& M. Noble 4/5; 3-4 L. Aptekar \& B. Carpinter 31/2; 5-7 D. Beach, A. Ker, J. Hartley 3; M. Roberts, . Romerts, 2 Frankel, C. Bell, W. Ramsay $2 ; 14 \mathrm{M}$. White $1 \frac{1}{2} ; 15 \mathrm{P}$. Hawkes ; 16 C. Cowan $\frac{1}{2}$.
grade: l-2 R. Dive, M. Dreyer 4; 3 . Sims $3 \frac{1}{2} ; 4-6$ A. Mullan, P. Connor R. Houpt 3; 7 D. Gifford-Moore $2 \frac{1}{2}$;
-10 M. Schwass, S. Booth, A. Brooks 2 1-12 I. Macri, J. Gilberd 11 $\frac{1}{2}$; 13-14 J, Gilmartin, T. Boswell 1.

Juniors: 1 P. Cooper 6/8; 2-4 M. MacLaren, P. Dunn, I. Pronk $5 \frac{1}{2} ; 5-6 \mathrm{D}$. Low, C. Ker $5 ; 7-8$ B. Cooper, G. Simpson $4 \frac{1}{2}$; 9-13 P. Skurr, K. Fink-Jensen, T. FinkJensen, R. Black, S. Knox 4 , 16 S. Clark 2 D. 18 Stephen-Smith 1

## Games

P. HANKES - D. BEACH, Philidor's Defence 1 e 4 e5 2 Nf 3 d6 3 d4 ed 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 g6 6 Be 3 Bg 77 Qd2 $0-0 \quad 8 \quad 0-0-0 \mathrm{Re} 8$ $9 \mathrm{f3}$ d5 10 Bh6 Bxh6 11 Qxh6 c6 12 g 4 Be6 13 Nf5 Bxf5 14 gf Qa5 15 fg hg 16 ed Nxd5 17 Bc4 Re5 18 Rhel Rxel 19 Rxel Nd7 20 Rdl Ndb6 21 Rd4 Qc5 22 Rh4 Qe3+ 23 Qxe3 Nxe $324 \mathrm{Bb} 3 \mathrm{Kg} 725 \mathrm{Ne} 4 \mathrm{Nf5} 26$ Rh3 Nd5 27 Bxd5 cd 28 Ng 3 Nd4 29 Nf1 Ne 30 Rh 4 g 531 Rb 4 b 632 Ne 3 Rh 833 Nxd5 Rxh2 34 Ra4 Rf2 35 Rxa7 Rxf3 36 Nxb 6 g 4 37 Rat 58 Nc4 g3 39 Ra7+ Kf6 40 Rf7+ $\mathrm{Kg} 541 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Rf} 2 \quad 0-1$
L. APTEKAR - M. NOBLE, Trompovsky Attack L. APTEKAR M. M5 3 Nc3 Bf5 4 Bxf6 gf 5 $1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nf6} 2 \mathrm{Bg}$ d 7 Oxd3 Nd7 8 Nge2 Qc7 e3 c6 6 Bd3 Bxd Kb 1 e5 11 e 4 de 12 Qxe4 $90-0-0 \quad 0-0-010$ en 15 Nc5 15 Q5!? 16 Be7 13 Ng 3 Kb 8 b 418 Ne 4 cd $19 \mathrm{Nxf6} 6 \mathrm{Bxf} 6$ Qg4 h5 17 Qf5 b4 21 Nf1 Ne4 22 Qf3 Qb6 23 Ne3 20 Qxf6 h4 21 Nf1 Ne4 Nxd5! Qxf2 26 Qd3: Nc3+! 24 Kal Nxdl 25 Nxde?! 29 be Rhd8 Rc5 27 Rxdl Rd6 28 c4 4 Rc8 31 Re4 Rcc6 32 Rbl + Rb6 $\quad \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$
. Mclaren - M. Noble, Philidor's Def. . Mclare nf3 d6 3 Bc4 Bg 44 c3 c6 5 d4 Oc7 6 Nbd2 Nf6 7 h3 Bh5 8 Qe2 h6 9 14 Qc7 6 Nbd2 Nf6 11 g 4 Bg6 12 Ng 3 Nxe4 13 Nxe4 d5 14 Nxe5 Bxe4 15 f3 Bh7 16
 Qc8 20 Kg 2 Nd 721 Bg 3 Re8 22 Qf2 Bxg3 $23 \mathrm{Kxg} 3 \mathrm{Oc} 7+24 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Re} 725 \mathrm{Rhe} 1 \mathrm{Rae} 826$ Rxe7 Rxe7 27 Rel Qd6 28 Rxe7 Qxe7 29 Qel Qxel 30 Nxel b5 31 ab cb 32 K£2 Nb6 33 Nd3 a4 34 Ke 2 ? Nc4 35 Kdl Nxb 2 ! 36 Nxb2 a3 $37 \mathrm{Kc} 1 \mathrm{a} 2 \mathrm{O}-1$
C. BELL - A. KER, Sicilian

 Bc 4
b 610 Kh 1 Bb 711
f 5
ef
12 NdS fe 13 de Re8 14 Bg 5 Nxd5 15 Bxd5 Bxg5 16 Nxg5 Qxg5 17 Rxf7 Qxd5! 18 Rxg7+ Kxg7 19 Qg3 Kh8 20 ed Ne5 21 Qh4 Nd7 22 Rd1 Re5 23 Qh6 Rf8 24 Qxd6 Rxd5! 0-1

## Auckland Labour

 Tournament by Nigel Metge - The entrepreneurial DOP, Bruce Win slade, ran a crisp tournament with some unusual features at the AucklateChess Centre. The score-sheets were all printed especially with the Chess Centre name and the competitors included
computer Voice Challenger.
Of the hopefuls, which included Baker, Lindsay Cornford, myself and iopewe 11 and I eventually shared first place with $4 \frac{1}{2} / 5$, followed by L. Rawnsley and R. McDonald on 4 ;
The quality of Michael's victories was particularly convincing.
The Voice Challeager did not do at all well, especially in endgames; how ever it did cause Colin Byford some problems when it cunningly won a piece, only to allow a perpetual check later

## Games

M. HOPEWELL - C. BAKER, Sicilian 2 c 3 1 e4 c5 2 c3 Nf6 3 e5 Nd5 4 d4 ed 5 Be4 Ne7?! 6 ed e6 7 Nc3 Nc6 8 Be3 Be7 9 Qg4 g6 10 h 4 h 511 Qg 3 Nb 412 Rc Ned5 13 Nge2 Nxe3 14 fe b6 15 0-0 Ba6 16 Bxa6 Nxa6 17 Ne4 0-0 18 Nf6+ Bxf6 19 ef Kh7 20 Qg5 Rg8 21 Nf4 Qf8 22 Qbs Nb 823 Rc 7 Qd 824 Qe5 Nc6 25 Qd6 Nb8 26 Nh3 Qf8 $27 \mathrm{Ng} 5+\mathrm{Kh} 8 \quad 28$ Qxf8 Rxf8 29 Rfc1 Kg8 $30 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Rd} 831 \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{a} 6 \quad 32 \mathrm{~kb} 7 \mathrm{~b} 5$ 33 Rec $7 \mathrm{Kf} 834 \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{Ke} 835 \mathrm{Kf4} \mathrm{Nc} 636$ Rxc6: be 37 Re7+Kf8 38 Rxf7+ Ke8 39 Re7+ Kf8 40 Nxe6+ Kg8 41 f7+ Kh8 42


The final of the Blackburn Cup was played(by telephone?) between Upper Hutt and Remuera on October 11, Antor Reid reports.

The match on 12 boards lasted nearly nine hours, including a 30 minute tea break.

Upper Hutt triumphed by $7 \frac{1}{2}$ points to Remuera's $4 \frac{1}{2}$, to take the trophy for 1981.

## Sarapu Wins 8th Winstone Open

## Report by Peter Stuart

This year's WINSTONE OPEN, the eighth in the series, had a moderate-sized ficld of 32 players. With almost half rated over 1900, nobody was promised more than one 'easy' game at the start.

The first round saw just one upset when sixth seed Stuart overlooked the loss of a pawn when over-pressing for a win - fortunately the win would have been problematical so Mark Brimble was quite happy to split the point. Never theless the first round draw led to visions of a repeat of my Waitakere Trust disaster when I also started with a non-availing semi-Swiss Gambit. form with Sapu looked to be in good Bob Gibbons who possibly now wished he was filling his frequent role of tournament director

The eight top-ranked competitors all won in the second round although Robert smith had a spot of good fortune when ten Whitehouse failed to draw an easily daw rook rook pawn ending. Sarfati was unable to handle peter Weir's unusual Alekhine Defence, Paul Spiller sacrificed a pawn to no avail against Paul Garbett, Bruce Watson won a pawn fairly early versus Michael freeman, and Michael Whaley trapped his own queen in a dubious position against Stuart -- exit my nightmare!

The third round sorted things out quite nicely. Serapu again attacked on the kingside and Peter Green was not able to stem the tide. The ondy other player to reach a possible three points was Smith who gained his third consecutive tournament over Garbett who mishandled the white side of a Modern Defence with ...ab. Weir and E.Green drew in 16 moves while watson dropped out of the top group in losing too stuart. The leading scores were now: Sarapu \& Smith 3; E.Green, Stuart Weir 2 $\frac{1}{2}$; Garbett, Watson, P.Green, Whaley, Sarfati, Spiller, Lynn \& White

The game between the two leaders in round four was a rather cautious affair with a brief middlegame followed by an even endgame which was agreed drawn on move 35. Ewen Green y Stuart started as
a Taimanov Sicilian which is covered by Batsford's "Sicilian Sozin" and in ECO as a Scheveningen! Stuart lost/sacri ficed two pawns for a considerable amount of counterplay but the game was ultimately drawn after both players probably missed better chances. Unlike Smith, Weir has yet to find the right recipe for Garbett who held on to his opponent's Siciilian Wing Garnitit pawn right through to the ending. Watson slipped furcher in the tournament standings with his loss to Spiller while Sarfati came up to third equal when Whaley unwisely exchanged queens to go into a lost knight ending - a certain amount of rust evident here as Michael has played little chess during the last few years. Going into the last round the leaders were: Sarapu \& Smith $3 \frac{1}{2}$; E.Green, Carbett, Stuart, P.Green Sarfati \& Spiller 3

The clash between the two top seeds saw Ewen Green equalise fairly soon from the black side of a sort of Closed Sicilian which Sarapu specialises in. Since, by this time, Smith already had the worst of it on the neighbouring board Sarapu offered a draw, being quite happy to share the first prize the priz, however, needed a win to make offer. His subsequent refusal of a second draw offer, by which time Sarapu tond a little better was followed by his eventually losing,

On the second board Smith gave Stuart hanging pawns but allowed them to become mobile; a piece sacrifice for two pawns gave him some short-lived counterplay but soon led to a technically won ending, the only real excirement coming the very end with Stuart in time rouble. This result confirmed Sarapu' sole possession of first place and gave tuart a share of second

Garbett had already scored a surprisingly easy win against Sarfati to reach four points and he was also joined by eter Green who won several pawns of Spiller

From the state of the position when he scoresheets ran out of moves I can only surmise that Weir lost on time to Freeman who thus equalled Smith's score
of $3 \frac{1}{2}$, a score which was also achieved by Michael Hopewell with his last-round win over David Goodhall.

Bruce Watson added some respectability to his performance with a nice queen sacrifice against Bob Gibbons to reach 3 points and he was joined by, among others, Mi

| 981 |  | R. 1 | , |  |  |  |  | Sos |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sarapu | NS | W22 | W6 | W4 |  | W10 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| Stuart P.W. | NS | D17 | W13 | W8 | D10 | W 5 | 4 | 4/2 |
| 3 Garbett P.A | NS | W15 | W9 | L5 | W14 | W11 | 4 | $14 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 4 Green P.R. | $A$ | W18 | W16 | L1 | W15 | W9 | 4 | 14/21 |
| 5 Smith R.W. | Wai | W20 | W19 | W3 | D1 | 2 | 31/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 6 Hopewell M.G. | $A$ | W23 | L1 | D7 | W26 | W1 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 4 |
| 7 Freeman M.R. | C | W28 | L8 | D6 | W18 | W14 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 13 |
| Watson B.R. | NS | W24 | W7 | L2 | L9 | W22 | 3 | 142 |
| 9 Spiller P.S | HP | W27 | L3 | W21 | 8 | L4 | 3 | $14 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 10 Green E.M. | HP | 29 | W21 | D14 | D2 | L1 | 3 | 4 |
| 11 Sarfati J.D | W | W32 | 14 | W24 | W13 | L3 | 3 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 12 White M. | Civ | L13 | W17 | W30 | L16 | W21 | 3 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 13 Whaley M.G | Air | W12 | L2 | W25 | L11 | 5 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 14/2 |
| 14 Weir P.B. | NS | W31 | W11 | D10 | L3 | L7 | 1/2 | $1{ }^{2}$ |
| 15 Lynn K.W. | Ham | L3 | W27 | W19 | L4 | D13 | $\frac{2}{2}$ | 1/2 |
| 16 Goodhall D.N.A. | Ham | W30 | L4 | 18 | W12 | 6 | 寿 | 14 |
| 17 Brimble M.T. | Wai | D2 | L12 | L26 | W25 | W23 | $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | $2{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ |
| 18 Howard M.I. | NS | L4 | W30 | 16 | L7 | 26 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 19 Whitehouse L.E. | Ham | W26 | L5 | L15 | W29 | 20 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1 |
| 20 Rawnsley L.D. | A | L5 | D26 | W32 | 23 | 19 | $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 0 |
| 21 McIvor B.W. | NS | W25 | 10 | L9 | 24 | L12 | 2 | 13 |
| 2 Gibbons R.E. | A | 11 | L23 | W27 | W31 | L8 | 2 | 2 |
| 23 Spain G. | Wpa | L6 | W22 | D31 | D20 | L17 | 2 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 24 Kinchant K.D | NS | L8 | W28 | L1 | L21 | W29 | 2 | $1{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ |
| 25 Buis M.O. | HP | L21 | 29 | L13 | L17 | W31 |  |  |
| 26 Bojtor J. | HP | 19 | 20 | W17 | L6 | L18 |  | 14 |
| 27 SpencerSmith G.J. | NS | L9 | L15 | L22 | W30 | D28 | 1/2 | 10 |
| 28 Ferguson R. | UH | L7 | L24 | L29 | W32 | D27 | $1 / 2$ |  |
| 29 Hart S. | Pap | L10 | L25 | W28 | L19 | L24 | 1 | 1 |
| 30 Reid A. | UH | L16 | L18 | L12 | L2 | N3 |  | 0 |
| 31 Johnstone R.B. | NS | L14 | D32 | D23 | L22 | L25 |  | 9 |
| 32 Pomeroy D.M, | AU |  | D31 |  |  | L30 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  |

32 Pomeroy D.M, AU L11 D31 L20 L28 L30 ¹/2
Club abbreviations used are: $\mathrm{A}=$ Auckland Centre; AGS = Auckland Grammar; Air = Air New Zealand: AU = Auckland University; $C=$ Canterbury; Civ $=$ Civic; Ham = Hamilton; HP = Howick-Pakuranga; NS $=$ North Shore; Pap = Papatoetoe; UH = Upper Hutt; $\mathrm{W}=$ Wellington; Wai = Waitemata; Wpa = Waipa.

Unlike other Auckland weekend events, the Winstone's comprises two separate tournaments. The Bgrade event was restricted to players rated under 1800 on the NZCA Rating List and 46 competed. Dual winners Richard Steel and Murray Stewart each their first four games and declined to
their arms too far in their with round clash to finish the Air New Zealand club. Next were Dr A.J.Henderson (A) , M.Dreyer (A), N.H. Hopewell (A) \& D.A.GiffordMoore (W) 4. Then came: 7-11 R.Hampton (Pap), M.Morrison (A), P.Bourke (AU), J.Gilmartin (UH) \& D.Edson (Ham) 3亩; 12-20 K.Metge (HP), J.M. Cockcroft (NS), A.B.Mullan (Civ), R.Takhar (Wpa), J. Borovskis (HP), J.Mathias (A), A.Drake (UH), M.Dun woody (Wpa) \& P.Futter (Pap) 3; 21-26 J.P.Robinson (Wai), J.Stephenson (NS), R.Calder (Ham), G.Schrader (NS), R. Hart (NS) \& B.Stewart (Air) $2 \frac{1}{2}$; 27-36 M.Schwass (Civ), B.Adler (AGS), L.G.Edmonds (HP), G.W.Lander (Wai), G.M. Jones (NS), C.Dowler (Air), T. McCarthy (NS), J.Hofsteede (UH), D.Hall (NS) \& B.Winsor (NS) 2; 37 A.J.Meader (Air), J. Dowler (HP), P.Van der Mey (NS) $1 \frac{1}{2} ; 40-45$ I. A. Brown (Air), D.Rawnsley (HP), D.J. Boyd (NS), C.Bell (UH), P.L. Roundill (-) \& J.M.Hillock (UH) 1 ; 46 J.K. Boyd (NS) 0.

The tournament, played over the weekend of $3 / 4$ October, was a real family affair for the Roundills. North Shore Club President Dick Roundill tried his hand at directing for a change and he coped prett well with a job which is quite demanding with such a field and limited time be tween rounds. He did make one mistake in making the draw - and it involved no other than Anton Reid, failed to notice! Mrs Roundill did an equally good job on the catering side bu son Philip didn quite match their efforts on the
playing side.

The tournament was opene by world-famous athletics senting Winstone Ltd.

Now for some games.
SARAPU-GIBBONS, Sicilian 2 f4:
1 e4 c5 2 Nc3 d6 3 I4 Nc6 4 Nf3 Bg4 5 h3 Bxf3 6 Oxf3 e6 7 Bb5 Qb6 8 0-0 a6 9 Bxeb Qxe6 10 f5 Nf5 11 d3 Be7 $12 \mathrm{Qg} 30_{0} 0-0 \quad 13 \mathrm{Bh} 6 \mathrm{Ne} 8 \quad 14 \mathrm{f} 6 \mathrm{Bxf6} \quad 15$ Rxf6 Kh8 16 Rafl Qd7 17 Qh4 gxh6 18 e5 dxe5 19 Ne4 Nxf6 20 Oxf6t Kg8 21 Rf3 Rfc8 22 Rg3+ Kf8 23 Qxh6+ Ke7 24 Qh4+ Kf8 $25 \mathrm{Rg} 8+, 1$ : 0.
SARFATI - WEIR, Alekhine Defence:
1 e4 Nf6 2 e5 Nd5 3 d4 c5 4 c 4 Nb4 5 d5 Qas 6 Ne3 d6 9 exd6 BEs 8 $12 \mathrm{Nge2} 0-13 \mathrm{Ng} 3$ Rf4 14 Qxf4 Bxd3 $15 \mathrm{Nh5} \mathrm{Bc} 2+16 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 6$ h4 1519 Og $5 \mathrm{Nf} 620 \mathrm{Kd1}$ ewd 21 cxd5 44 hs 19 Qgs 20 kad 21 cxd5 $\mathrm{Be} 2+22 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Rad} 823 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Rfe} 8+24 \mathrm{Kf} 4$ Qc7+, 0 : 1.
LYNN - WHITEHOUSE, Modern Defence:
$1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 2$ e4 d6 3 Nc 3 Bg 74 Be 3 Nd 7 5 Qd2 e5 $60-0-0$ exd4 7 Bxd4 Bxd4 8 Qxd4 Qg5+ 9 Kb 1 Qe5 10 Qc4 e5 11 Nt 3 Qf6 12 Qd3 Ke7 (Diagram)


13 e 5 Nxe5 14 $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Nxe5 } \\ \text { Qxe5 } & 15 & \text { Qd } 2 \\ \text { Be6 } & 15 & \text { f4 }\end{array}$ Be6 16 f4 Qc5 17
Bd3 d5 18 Rhel $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Bd3 } & \text { d5 } \\ \text { Ke8 } & 19 & \text { fhe } 5 \text { exf }\end{array}$
 Qd5 22 c4 $\mathrm{Qf}^{22} \quad 23$
 $\mathrm{Ne} 6+\mathrm{Ke} 727$ Qb4t Ke8 $28 \mathrm{Bc} 2 \mathrm{Rb} 829 \mathrm{Qd} 6 \mathrm{Nd} 7 \quad 30 \mathrm{Nc} 5$ Nxc5 31 Qxb8+ Ke7 32 Qxe5+, $1: 0$. GARBETT - SMITH, Pirc Defence:
1 Nf3 g6 2 e4 Bg 7 l 3 d 4 d $6 \quad 4 \mathrm{Be} 2$ Nf6
 9 d5 Ne7 10 Be3 Nd 711 Qd2 f5 12 exf5 gxf5 $13 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 14 \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{Kh} 8 \quad 15$ Reel Bd7 16 Radl Ng6 17 Nh2 Qe8 18 a5 Qf7 19 Nfl Rae8 $20 \mathrm{Ng}_{3} 3 \mathrm{Ng} 821 \mathrm{Qe} 2 \mathrm{Bh} 622$ Qh5 Qg7 23 Bxh6 Nxh6 24 Qg 5 Nf 725 Qd2 Nh4 26 Qe2 $44{ }^{27}$ Qhs fxg 38 Qxh4
 Rxc4 32 Rd2 Qg6 33 Qxg6 hxg6 34 g3 kg 735 Kg 2 Rd 4 and Black won in 78 E.GREEN - STUART, Sicilian Taimenov: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4


 $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { N1d2 } & \text { Nxb3 } 16 & \text { exb3 } \\ \text { Nh5 } & 19 & \text { Bxd4 } 4 \text { Od7 } & 20 \text { Bxh7+- Kxh7 } & 21\end{array}$ Qxh5+ Kg8 22 Be3 Rac8 23 Nc4 Qd 324 Qd1 Qe4 25 Qe2 Bd5 26 Nb 6 Rc 227

Nxd5 exd5 28 Qf3 Rxb2 29 Qxe4 dxe4 30 Rb 1 Rxb 131 Rxb 1 Rd 832 Kf 2 Rd 3 $33 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 34 \mathrm{Bb} 6 \mathrm{Kf} 8 \quad 35 \mathrm{Bc} 7 \mathrm{Ke} 8$, $\frac{1}{2}$ : $\frac{1}{2}$.
WEIR - GARBETT, Sicilian Wing Gambit: e4 c5 2 Nf 3 e6 3 b4 cxb4 4 d4 d5 5 e5 Nc6 6 Bd3 Nge7 7 0-0 Nf5 8 Bb2 Bd7 9 Nbd2 Qb6 10 Bxf5 exf5 11 c 4 bxc3 12 Bxc3 Be6 13 Rbl Qc7 14 Qb 3 Rb8 15 Rfcl Be7 16 Qa4 0-0 17 Bb4 Bxb4 18 Rxb4 Rfc8 19 Rb 5 Qd7 20 Rbc5 Rc7 21 Nb 3 Nxe5 22 Qxd7 Nxf3+ 23 gxf3 Rxd7 24 Rc8+ Rd8 25 Rxd8+ Rxd8 26 Rc7 Be8 27 f4 g6 28 Nc5 b6 29 Nd3 30 Ne5 Be6 31 Rb 7 Rd6 32 Kfl f6 33 Nd3 Rc6 34 Ke1 Bf7 35 Kd2 Rc4 36 Rxb6 Rxd4 $37 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 4+38 \mathrm{~Kb} 2 \mathrm{Kg} 739$ Rb5 a4 $40 \mathrm{Rc} 5 \mathrm{Re} 441 \mathrm{a} 3 \mathrm{~d} 4 \quad 42 \mathrm{Ra} 5$ Re2+ $43 \mathrm{Kcl} \mathrm{Bb} 344 \mathrm{Ra} 7+\mathrm{Kh} 645 \mathrm{Rd} 7$ Rc2+ 46 Kbl Rc 447 Nel Bdl 48 h 4 Be 2 49 Kb2 d3 50 Rxd3 Bxd3 51 Nxd3 Kh5, $0: 1$.
SARAPU - E.GREEN, Closed Sicilian: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Nc3 e6 4 d3 d6 $5 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 66 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{0} 00-0 \quad 8 \mathrm{Be} 3$
 Kh1 Rfe8 13 Nf3 Nxf3 14 Qxf3 Bc6 15 5 d5 16 fxe6 fxe6 17 Bf 4 Bd 618 Qe xf4 19 gxf4 d4 20 Nbl b5 21 a5 e $\begin{array}{llllll}22 \mathrm{f} \\ 25 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Qb} 7 & 26 \text { Rfel } \mathrm{Ng} 4 & 27 & \mathrm{Qb} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 3 & 28\end{array}$
 $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Rxb7 } \\ \text { Rxc3 Rxc3 } & 32 & \text { bxc3 } 3 \text { Rd8 } 33 \text { Rxe3 Rxd2 }\end{array}$ $34 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 35 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{Ra} 2 \quad 36 \mathrm{Rb} 3$ Вc6 37

 Bh5 g5 44 fxg6+ $\mathrm{Kg} 745 \mathrm{Re} 5 \mathrm{Ral}+46$ Kf2 Ra2+ $47 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Be} 248 \mathrm{Re} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 849$ Bxe2 Rxe2 50 a6 Ra2 $51 \mathrm{a} 7,1$ : 0. STUART - SMITH, English/Réti: c4 e6 $2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 7$ $50-0 \quad \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 6 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{O}-0 \quad 7 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{d5} 8 \mathrm{e} 3$ od 12 dxc 13 be 12 xd4 12 exd4 Rc8 16 Nbe 14 Rf d6 18 Rac1 Qb8 16 d5 Nf8 17 Bh 3 d6 18 Nd4 (Diagram)

18...Nxd5 19 cxd5...Nxd5 19 Rxcl 21 Rxc 1 Bc 5 $22 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Qh} 5 \quad 23 \mathrm{Nb} 3$ Bd6 24 Nfd4 Qxe2 25 Nxe2 Ba6 26 Ned4 Rc8 27 Rxc8 Bxc8 28 Nc6 a6 $\begin{array}{llll}29 & \mathrm{Bd} 4 & \mathrm{~b} 5 \quad 30 & \mathrm{Bc} 5 \\ \mathrm{Bxc} 5 & 31 & \mathrm{Nxc} 5 & \mathrm{Nd} 7\end{array}$ 32 Nxe6 fxe6 $33 \mathrm{Ne} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 734 \mathrm{Nxc} 8 \mathrm{Nc} 5$ $35 \mathrm{Nd} 6+\mathrm{Ke} 736 \mathrm{Ne} 4 \mathrm{Nd} 3 \quad 37 \mathrm{Bfl} \mathrm{Nb} 438$

Nc3 Kd6 39 a4 bxa4 40 Nxa4 a5 41 Bc 4 Ne6 42 Kfl Ne5 $43 \mathrm{Bb} 5 \mathrm{Kd5} 44 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 3$ 45 Kg 2 Nd 446 Bd 3 h 647 Kfl g 548 hxg $5 \mathrm{hxg} 5 \quad 49 \mathrm{Nc} 3+\mathrm{Ke} 5 \quad 50 \mathrm{Kel} \mathrm{Nb} 351$ Bc4 Ne5 52 Bb5 Kd4 53 Na 4 Ne 454 Ke 2 g4 $55 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \mathrm{Ng} 5 \quad 56 \mathrm{Be} 8 \mathrm{Ne} 457 \mathrm{Bh} 5 \mathrm{Nf} 6$
 Ng 5 Kd 662 Kd 3 Ke 563 Bb 3 Kf 564 Nf 7 Ne4 65 Ke3 Nc5 66 Bc2＋Kf6 67 Nd6 Ne6 68 Nc4 Kg5 69 Nxa5 and White won．

Bruce Watson was involved in two very nice finishes both following defensive lapses．

In the first position（diagram at left，top of next column）Bob captured the fatally poisoned pawn；punishment was swift and terrible： 28 Rxc5？Qxc5！！ 29 Oxc5 Rdl＋ $30 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Ng} 4+31 \mathrm{Kh} 3 \mathrm{Nxf} 2+$ 32 Kh 2 Rh 1 mate．
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## LOCAL NEWS

## AUCKLAND INTERCLUB TOURNAMENT 1981：

As in previous years virtually all of Auckland＇s top players played in at least some of the matches which were played at the Auckland Chess Centre on Sunday evenings from June through Sep－ tember．

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| N．Sh HP | A | NS | U | W | P | A | $\begin{array}{lccccccccc}\text { H．Shore A } & \times & 4 \frac{1}{2} & 4 & 4 \frac{1}{2} & 5 & 3 & 5 & 6 & 32 \\ \text { H－Pakuranga } & 1 \frac{1}{2} & \times & 4 & 5 & 4 & 4 \frac{1}{2} & 4 & 5 & 28 \\ & 2 & 2 & \times & 3 \frac{1}{2} & 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 271\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lcccccccccc}\text { Auckland A } & 2 & 2 & \times & 3 \frac{1}{2} & 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 27 \frac{1}{2} \\ \text { N．Shore } & 1 \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 2 \frac{1}{2} & x & 5 & 5 & 2 \frac{1}{2} & 5 & 22 \frac{1}{2}\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lccccccccc}\text { N．Shore B } & 1 \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 2 \frac{1}{2} & \times & 5 & 5 & 2 \frac{1}{2} & 5 & 22 \frac{1}{2} \\ \text { University } & 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & x & 3 & 4 \frac{1}{2} & 4 & 16 \frac{1}{2}\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\text { Waitemata } & 3 & 1 \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 1 & 3 & x & 4 \frac{1}{2} & 1 \frac{1}{2} & 15 \frac{1}{2}\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { Papatoetoe } & 1 & 2 & 1 & 3 \frac{1}{2} & 1 \frac{1}{2} & 1 \frac{1}{2} & \times & 4 & 14 \frac{1}{2}\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { Papatoetoe } \\ \text { Auckland B } & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 4 \frac{1}{2} & 2 & x & 11 \frac{1}{2}\end{array}$

North Shore A won their fifth title in as many years but，for the first time since the inaugural event in 1977，they failed to win all their matches，con－ ceding a tied result to lowly placed Waitemata in the last round－a match which Waitemata was rather unlucky not to win．

Second place was only decided in the last round when Howick－Pakuranga defeat－ ed perennial runner－up Auckland A by 4 ．
2 to edge ahead by just half a point．
The top individual scorers were： E．M．Green（HP） $5 \frac{1}{2} / 6$ ；P．W．Stuart（NS A） \＆R．Hampton（P） $5 \frac{1}{2} / 7$ ；0．Sarapu（NS A） 5／6；R．E．Gibbons（AK A）4 $\frac{1}{2} / 5$ ；P．A． Mataga（ $A k A$ ）\＆R．L．Roundill（NS A）4／4；

In the second position（above，right） Bruce had just played his rook from a4 to a2 eyeing the $\mathrm{f}^{2}$ square；instead， the rook should have gone back to a8 or perhaps a6．Play concluded quickly here too： 26 Rxc6！Rxc6 27 Qe8＋Qf8 28 Qxc6， $1=0$ ．
）

N．Metge（Ak A）\＆R．Taylor（HP） $4 / 5$.

The 1981 BLEDISLOE CUP tournament turned out to be a complete fiasco． First only Auckland and Wellington entered in time and were accordingly drawn to play the final．Then Welling－ ton found themselves unable to schedule the match before the deadline of 31st July．After applying for and receiving an extension of time to the end of September，Wellington arranged to play Auckland on 26 September but then defaulted the match the day before， being unable to raise a team！Thus Auckland retains the trophy without having to play a match．

Still on the subject of matches，the 1981 HUTT VALLEY \＆WAINUIOMATA INTER－ INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS TEAM TOURNAMENT was also recently completed．Organised by the Hutt Intermediate School，the overall competition was won by St．Ber－ nards with $22 \frac{1}{2}$ points followed by Nae－ nae 22 and Taita 17．The Form 1 section was won by Naenae 13，then St Bernards 12 and Hutt third while the Form 2 section saw a tie for first between St Bernards and Taita 102 with Naenee and Parkway equal third on 9 points． Report：R．S．Teece

In the last JENKINS TROPHY match for he year North Shore scored a convincing 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ： $6 \frac{1}{2}$ victory over rival Auckland Centre on 30 September．This was North Shore＇s eighth successful defence of the challenge trophy since they won it in 1978 and the winning margin was the greatest in matches between the two clubs for at least ten years．

## NORTH SHORE－ $13 \frac{1}{2}$ <br> AUCKLAND－ $6 \frac{1}{2}$

1 O．Sarapu 1：0 A．R．Day 2 P．A．Garbett $\frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$ J．N．Metge 3 A．L．Carpinter 0：1 L．H．Cornford 4 P．W．Stuart 1：0 M．V．R．Steadman 5 P．B．Weir 0：1 P．A．Mataga 6 W．Teonhardt 1：0 L．D．Rawnsley 7 B．R．Watson $\frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$ M．G．Hopewell 8 M．G．Whaley $1: 0$ N．H．Hopewell 9 T．P．O Connor＊0：1 P．White 10 K．D．Kinchant $\quad \frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$ B．Winslade 11 S．J．Richardson 0：1 J．McIntosh 12 B．W．Mctvor 1：0 C．A．Rose 13 G．L．Pitts 1：0 K．Bartocci 14 R．T．Roundill 0：1 M．K．Morrison 15 R．B．Johinstone 1：0 P．Downey 16 R．A．Feasey 17 D．B．Shead 18 P．R．Snelson 1：0 C．Byford 19 J．M．Cockeroft 1：0 R．Moulin 20 D．T．Lamb

1：0 D．Burdett
On board one White＇s counterplay proved insufficient to compensate for Black＇s positional advantages： DAY－SARAPU，Sicilian 2 ff ：
 5 Bxd7＋Qxd7 6 Ne5 Qc7 7 d3 Nf6 8 Nc3 Ne6 9 Nxe6 Qxc6 10 Qe2 d4 11 Nd c4 12 O－0 Re8 13 Bd2 Be7 14 e5 Nd5
 bxc3 dxc3 19 Bcl go 20 Rns BcSt 21 Qe7 25 22 Rn4 Bb 23 Bh6 24 Qe7 $25 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 6 \mathrm{~K} 26 \mathrm{Nh} 3 \mathrm{Kd}, 27$ Re1 Kc8 28 R．3 32 Q 20 Re2 Re8 Rxe3 15 35 h3 26 Nd4？ $5!0: 1$ Rxe3 h5 35 h 3 Ne6 36 Nd 4 ？g5！， $0: 1$

Almost sixty players competed in the three grades of the NORTH SHORE CIUB CHAMPIONSHIPS for 1981.

With eight New Zealand Championship contenders from the last few years the eleven－player A－grade event was perhaps the strongest ever．For three－quarters of the tournament four players were right in the hunt－the same four who had already won the title in previous years．Towards the end，however，Peter

Stuart and Paul Garbett both dropped points before drawing their last round encounter．This left Tony Carpinter and which saw Carpinter the victor by a half point．The scores：

## 12345678901

1 Carpinter A．$x \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1111111119$ Green E．$\quad \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} 11111 \frac{1}{2} 11181$ 3 Garbett P．$\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} 11101111117 \frac{1}{2}$ 4 Stuart P．$\quad 00 \frac{1}{2} \times 01111116 \frac{1}{2}$ 5 Weir $P$ ． $0001 \times 0111116$ 6 Dekker K． $00001 \times 101115$ 7 Watson B． $001000 \times 1 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} 3$ 8 Kinchant K， $0 \frac{1}{2} 00010 \times 0012^{\frac{1}{2}}$ 9 Power P．W， $000000 \frac{1}{2} 1 \times 102 \frac{1}{2}$ 10 Richardson S． $000000110 \times \frac{1}{2} \quad 2 \frac{1}{2}$ 11 Lanning R． $000000 \frac{1}{2} 01 \frac{1}{2} \times 2$

The clash between the two top scorers came late in the tournament and was quite exciting．The very light annotations were done very hurriedly by Ewen＂off the top of his head＂and without doing any deep analysis．
A．CARPINTER－E．GREEN，Queen＇s Gambit： 1 d4 Nf6 2 Nf3 e6 3 c4 c5 4 e3 d5 5 Ne3 a6 6 a3 dxc4 7 Bxc4 b5 8 Ba2 Bb $90-0$ Nbd7？！（ $9 . . . N C 6$ ） 10 Qe2 Be7 11 Rd1 cxd4？ 12 Nxd4！？（White is clearly better；also good was 12 exd4） $12 \ldots 0-0$ $13 \mathrm{b4}(13$ e4！）Qb8 14 Bb 2 Rd 815 Racl Qa7（and Black has gained equality） 16 Nf3 Rac8 17 e4？！Qb8 18 h3 Nb6（Now Black has a slight edge which he gradu－ ally increases over the next nine or so moves） 19 Rxd8＋Rxd8 20 e 5 Nfd5 21 Rd1 h6 22 Nxd5 Nxd5 23 Bbl Nf4 24 Rxd8＋Qxd8 25 Qc2 g6 26 Bcl （DIAGRAM）


26．．．Nxh3＋ 27 gxh3 Bxt3 28 Bxh6？ Qd5？（Black wins 29 Qd3！Qxe5 30 Qxf3 Qel＋ 31 Kh 2 Bd6＋？！ 32 Kg 2 Qxbl 33 Qf6 Bf8 34 Qd8 Qe4＋ 35 Kgl Qel＋ （Reaching the time control） $36 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qe} 4+37 \mathrm{Kfl}, \frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$ （White actually sealed his 37 th move and the draw was agreed without resump－ tion；neither player has better than the perpetual check）．

The B－and C－grades were each played in two divisions with two from each qualifying for the play－offs．The B－ grade qualifiers were Brian McIvor，Bob （To page 149）
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## Matches

Aleksandria v Ioseliani
Aleksandria v Litinskaya 1980
Chiburdanidze v Aleksandria
Chiburdanidze v Aleksandria
Karpov v Korchnoi
1980 122,140
Korchnoi v Hubner 1980
North Island v South Island
North Shore v Auckland Centre
North Shore v Howick-Pakuranga
Oxford v Cambridge
Tawa v Papatoetoe 1980
Upper Hutt $v$ Palmerston North
Upper Hutt v Pencarrow
Upper Hutt v Remuera

## Gamps-IDCA

aAVELAID - Garbet
ADAMS - Dowden
APTEKAR - Jackson 8, Noble 152, Sarapu 8 BARNARD - Sabel 41
BELL - Johnston 35, Ker 152
CARPINTER A - Freeman 86, E. Green 157
CHAPMAN - Earle 53, Taylor 50
CORNFORD - Dowden 12, Jackson 79
DAY - Sarapu 157
DEKKER - Small 5, Smith 5
DOWDEN - Frankel 11, Gibbons 12, Love 12 FENEREDIS - Sarfati 113
FIELD - Spiller 81, Weir 38
FOSTER - Haase 149, Hurley 68
GARBETT - A. Carpinter 149, Love 68, Reyn 86, Sarfati 148 , Smith 155 , Weir 68
GREEN E - Aptekar 6, Goffin 68, Stuart 155 Green P - Garbett

AASE - Dowden 81, Weegenaar 1
Gardman - N. Hopewell
HART S - Smith
HOPEWELL N - Dowden 51, McLaren 115,
HOPENELL M - Baker 152
HOSKYN - Vetheranian
JACKSON - Anderson 7 Sarapu 8 , Smith 9
JENSEN - Love 75, Norton 75
ELLY - Taylor 74

- Foster 114 , McLaren 115

LEVENE - Aptekar 8, A. Carpinter 38,

$$
\text { Jackson 6, Small 5, } 44
$$

LLOYD - Dowden 12, Sarfati 64, Takhar 63, Wa1sh 63
OVE Borren 52 Sutton 75
LYNN - Sarfati 68, Whitehouse 155
MCLAREN - Aptekar 113,Walsh 64 ,Noble 152
MARTIN - Gonin 113 ,Walsh 64 ,Noble 152
NOBLE - Lloyd
NOBLE - Lloyd 4 , Satson 4, Sapu 8, Small 8 64
NORTON - Haase 75 , Foord 148, Garbett 149
POWER - Storey
OBINSON - Stuart
RUSSELL - Garbett
SARAPU - Garbett 112 , Anderson 4 , Watson 6 Smith 31 ,Gibbons 155,E. Green 155
SARFATI - Aptekar 113,Weir 155,WilliamAptekar
son 148
SIDNAM - Lloyd 64, Weegenaar 65
SMALL - Anderson 5,44, Chandler 77,Garbett 88 ,Nokes 44 ,Sarapu 38 , Smith 8,Stuart 5
SMITH - Anderson 52,Nokes 4,Spain 112, Spiller 112, Weir 127
SPAIN - Smith
SPILLER - Devlin 117 Garbett 112, Baumgartner 81
SUART - Smith 155, Watson 7
SUTTON - Jensen 75
TURNER M - Cooper
VAN DAM - Watson
WALSH - Lazarovich
38
WATSON - E. Green 112
WILLIAMSON - Bennett $\quad 149$
WEEGENAAR - Bates 148, Leese 12, Lo
12, Lloyd 63, Sievey 91
WEIR - Dowden 68, Cornford 78, Garbett
55, Johnston 68

## Games-overseas <br> dorian - Tisdall

AMBROZ - Tal
ANEERSSON - Miles
ARNASON - Keene
BASTIAN - Korchno


RASHKOVSKY - Beljavsky RIBLI - Seirawan 23, Stajcic122 ROGERS - Liu SARFATI - Hornung
CHTRID - Georgiev
SMALL - Cheah 23, Darakorn 44
SMITH - Rogers 135, Shiraki 139
( Korchnoi 99,Larsen 145, Timman
TRZELECKI - Antunes 73
SvESHNIKOV - Langweg
TAIMANOV - Browne 47, Psakhis 73
TARJAN - Gutman 26 Korchnoi 119 Larsen 119
ORRE - Aaron
UPTON - A. Rodriguez
VEROCI - Glaz
UKKIC - Ivanovic
WATSON B - Alqallaf

## Openings

BARCZA-LARSEN DEF - 112
benko gambit - 23,5
ENONI DEF - 6,30,50,72,81,113,118
BIRMINGHAM DEF - 5
BISHOPS OPENING - 39,125
BUDAPEST GAMBIT - 112
CARO-KANN - $25,26,64$
CATALAN - 46,99
DUTCH - 72,105,136
ENGLISH, 1...c5-7,8,23,25,45,48,68,

$$
\ldots e 5-13,142
$$

$$
\text { Jinawer - } 35,41,115
$$

$$
\text { Tarrasch - } 25,45,61,68,81,102
$$

$$
\text { Tarrascn } \begin{aligned}
& \text { Other }-23,68,121,136
\end{aligned}
$$

GRUNFELD - 12,23,27,47,63,75,142,136
GIUOCO PLANO - 7,141
KING'S INDIAN ATTACK - 47,122,126
KING'S INDIAN DEFENCE - 8,9,31,44,63,
KING'S PAWN - 64,149
LATVIAN GAMBIT
MODERN DEFENCE - 12,15,155

Concluded on page 149

## CLUB DIRECTORY

The annual fee(six listings) for this column is $\$ 6.00$, payable with orde New Zealand Chess Association, P.o. Box 8802, Symonds St, Auckland

AUCKLAND CENTRE meets Mondays \& Thursdays at clubrooms, 17 Cromwell St, Mt Eden phone 602-042. Contact: Nigel Metge, ph 278-9807. Schoolpupil coaching Friday evenings. Full recreational facilities - TV, pool room, library.

HOWICK-PAKURANGA C.C. meets Tuesdays 7.30 pm (children 6.30-7.30) at Howick Bridg Club, Howick Community Complex, Howick. Contact: Peter McCarthy, phone 565-055, 92 Ti Rakau Drive, Pakuranga, Auckland.

NORTH SHORE C.C. meets Wednesdays $7.30 \mathrm{pm}($ tournament and casual play) in St Joseph' Hall, cnr Anzac St \& Taharoto Rd, Takapuna. Postal address: P.o. Box 33587, Takapuna Contact: Peter Stuart, phone 456-377(evenings).

PARNELL C.C. meets 7.30 pm Wednesdays in Social Hall, Foundation for the Blind 545 Parnell Rd, Auckland. Contact: Terry Free, 23 Pasadena Ave, Pt Chevalier, Auckland, phone 868-103

CIVIC C.C. meets 7.45 pm Fridays at the Aro St Community Centre, Aro St., Wellington. Contact: Grant Robinson, phone 726-348.

UPPER HUTT C.C. meets 7.45 pm Thursdays in Supper Room, Civic Hall, Fergusson Drive Upper Hutt. Contact: Anton Reid, 16 Hildreth St., Upper Hutt, phone 288-756
oTAGO C.C. meets 7.30 pm Wednesdays \& Saturdays at 7 Maitland St., Dunedin, phone (clubrooms) 776-919. Contact: Malcolm Foord, 39 Park St., Dunedin, phone 776-213.

NELSON C.C. meets 7.30 pm Thursdays at the Memorial Hall, Stoke. Contact: Tom Van Dyk, phone Richmond 8178 or 7140 . Visitors welcome.

PALMERSTON NORTH C.C. meets 7.30 pm Tuesdays at the IHC Workshop, Cook St., Palmerston North. Contact: J. Blatchford, 64 Appollo Pde, Palmerston North, phone 69-575

PENCARROW C.C. meets 7.30 pm Thursdays(for seniors) at Louise Bilderbeck Hall, Main Rd, Wainuiomata. Contact Brian Foster, phone 648-578.

HASTING S C.C. meets 7.00 pmat the Library, Havelock North High School, Te Mata Rd, Havelock North, Hastings. Contact: Mike Earle, phone 776-027

Waitemata C.C. meets 8.00 pm Thursdays at Kelston West Cormunity Centre, enr Gt North Awaroa Rds. Postal address: P.0. Box 69005 Glendene, Auckland 8. Contact: George

HUTT VALLEY c.C. meets 7.30 pm Tuesdays at the Hutt Bridge Club, 17 Queens Rd, Lower Hutt. Contact: Mrs Mary Boyack, phone 678-542.

REMUERA C.C. meets 7.30 pm Wednesdays at the Auckland Bridge Club, 273 Remuera Rd Remuera. Contact: K. Williams, phone 543-762(evenings).


[^0]:    Conclusion
    In retrospect Paul Garbett was a deserving winner, never looking likely to lose the lead.
    Of the others, Bruce Anderson(already the winner of eight South Island Championships), seemed to have a more casual attitude.
    Johnathon Sarfati added another good result to his year
    Lloyd, who has placed 2nd= and 4 th in

