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## Editorial

With this issue I will have completed one year as editor of New Zealand Chess. It has been an enjoyable year for me but rather a hectic one. The most difficult task of the editor is getting an issue out on time with the maximum amount of up-to-date news. Overseas news is the trickiest because it invariably arrives the day before you had planned taking the copy into the printers!

The new editor of New Zealand Chess (as from the April 1981 issue) will be Robert Smith and all contributions should now be sent to his address at: 9 James Laurie Road,
Henderson,
Auckland 9.
Robert has already had considerable journalistic experience and is well known in Auckland for his T.V.
appearances! I wish him the best of luck and hope he will get the continued support of the chessplayers of New Zealand.

In conclusion I would like to extend my thanks to the sub-editors; Peter Stuart for the Overseas News, Tony Dowden and Michael Freeman for their reports from the South Island and Ortvin Sarapu for the annotated games, as well as to all those chessplayers who have contributed during the year. The success of the magazine will continue to depend on such contributions!

Paul Spiller.

## Local News

Tony Dowden reports from Dunedin: Final Otago Chess Club results for 1980 Otago Senior Championship: I T.Dowden 2 D.Watts, $3 \frac{\text { Anampl }}{\text { A. }}$
Otago Intermediate Championship:
1 P.Cullen A.Knowles R.Gonin tago Junior Championship: I T.Stiles,
Perpetual Handicap: 1 J.Sievey, 2 J.Gibb

## 3 P. Sinton.

Swiss (CleIland Trophy): 1 G. Haase $6 \frac{1}{2} / 8$ 2-3 J. Sievey \& M. Foord 6, 4 D. Cameron 5 . A game from the Swiss:
G.HAASE - D.WEEGENAAR, Bird's Opening: $1 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 62 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 74 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{O} 0$ $5 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{~b} 66 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{O}-0 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 8 \mathrm{~d} 3 \mathrm{Nbd} 7$
9 Nbd2 e5 10 Nh4 Bxg2 11 Nxg2 Qe7
12 e 4 Nh 5 ? 13 f5 d5 14 Kh 1 dxe4
15 Nxe4 Rad8 16 Qe2 Nhf6 17 Ne3 c5
18 a4 Nb8 19 Qf3 Nc6 20 Nxf6+ Qxf6
21 Qe4 Qd6 22 Rf2 Nd4 23 Rafl gxf5
24 Nxf5 Nxf5 25 Rxf5 f6 26 Kg 2 Qe6
27 Qg4 Kh8 28 Qe4 Qe8 29 Qf3 Qg6
30 Rf2 Rfe8 31 h 4 Kg 832 h 5 Qh 6
33 Bc3: Bh8 34 Bd2 Qg7 35 Be3 Rd6
36 Kh3 Rde6 37 Qe4 Qf7 38 Qg4+ Kf8
39 Qe4 Qd7 40 as R6e7 41 Kh 2 Rf 7
42 Bh6 Ke 743 Qxe5+ fxe5 $44 \mathrm{Rxf} 7+\mathrm{Ke} 6$
$45 \mathrm{Rxd} 7 \mathrm{Kxd} 746 \mathrm{Rf} 7+\operatorname{Re} 7 \quad 47 \mathrm{Rxe} 7+\mathrm{Kxe} 7$
48 axb6 axb6 49 Kg 2 Ke6 $50 \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{Kd5}$
51 Be3 Ke6 $52 \mathrm{Ke} 4,1-0$.

The final of the BLACKBURN CUP for 1980 was played between Papatoetoe Chess Club and Tawa Chess Club on 1 November

At the conclusion of the final game the match score was $6-6$, however Tawa won on countback with victories on boards $2,3,4,5$ and 9 with draws on boards $6 \& 7$

Full results with Papatoetoe playing white on odd numbered boards were
TAWA PAPATOETOE RESULT

1 K.Hollis
G.Aldridge
C.Fraser

4 J.Usmar
6 R.Dive
R.Mitchell

8 M.Small
A.Aldridge

10 T.Powe11
11 P.Skurr
12 R.Carter
D.Storey
S.Hart
D.Brunton
P.Luten
A.Haddock
T. Wong
R. Hampton
L.Petty
J.Bates
T.McRae
C.Goldworthy
T.Galloway

0-1
$1-0$
$1-0$
$1-0$ $1-0$
$\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ $1 / 2-1 / 2$
$\frac{1 / 2}{2}-\frac{1 / 2}{2}$
$0-1$
$0-1$
$0-1$

Solutions on page 32


No. 1 White to move


No. 3 White to move


No. 5 White to move

No. 4 Black to move


No. 2 Black to move


No. 6 BTack to move

## Burroughs Computers New Zealand Championship 1980~81 <br> Report by P.Stuart

The 88th New Zealand Congress, sponsored by Burroughs Ltd, was organised by he Canterbury hess Club and play
Visition 1 factlities geil table-teris elbow? I had't until in pleasant surroundings - the only now) drawback was that Christchurch was most definitely not part of those surroundings; in fact pheard several local lngs, in fact, heard several local playars from any theless I think the thirty-odd visitors theless 1 the College had a very staying at the College had a very enjoyThe playing
The playing room was rather too small for the number competing but the open air analysis room' worked out okay in the almost total absence of rain during the tournament, at least in daytime.

It must be mentioned, however, that the Canterbury Chess Club organisers were aware of the shortcomings of the Lincoln set-up but were severely handi-

88th BURROUGHS COMPUTERS NEW ZEALAND CHAMPIONSHIP, 28 DEC, 1980 - 9 JAN. 1981

| 1 | Nokes | R.I. | Canterbury | $\times$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Sarapu | 0 | North Shore | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\times$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| 3 | Small | V.A. | Canterbury | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\times$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| 4 | Dekker | K. | North Shore | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1 | $\times$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| 5 | Green | E.M. | Howick-Pakuranga | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | 1 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 6 |
| 6 | L.evene | M | North Shore | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | x | 1 | 0 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 6 |
| 7 | Aptekar | L. | Pacific | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 0 | $x$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 8 | Watson | $B . R$. | North Shore | 0 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\times$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 9 | Smith | R.W. | Waitemata | 0 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\times$ | , | , | 1 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 10 | Stuart | P.W. | North Shore | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $x$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 5 |
| 11 | Jackson | J.R. | Nelson | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\times$ | 1 |  |
| 12 | Anderson | n B.R. | Canterbury | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | x | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ |

The number of entries for the 1980/1 Burroughs Computers New Zealand Championship was again disappointing - just twelve, the actual number required. Paradoxically, recent history suggests that higher prize funds actual

There were five former champions (including the three defending champions) competing as well as three playing in the Championship for the first time, these latter being Kees Dekker (a
capped by the fact that the World Veteran Games were on in Christchurch at the same time and suitable playing sites incorporating accommodation ust not
just not available
A new event at Congress this year as a North Island v South Island occer match organised by Tony Dowden i lished player on the field - although nuing ing aying very little! The North Island inner with two poals each 40 winner with two goals ea

There was also a bridge match with five or six hours play virtually every night between Premier Reserve and Championship players - I do not wish to well on the results except to observe that the Championship pair held rather poor cards and that none of the four who usually played bridge had especially good chess results!
recent arrival from the Netherlands) Mark Levene and 'Burglar' Bruce Watson.

The tournament turned out to be the strangest New Zealand Championship in which I've played. No player was able to really break away from the rest of the field. After five rounds a single point covered eleven players and at the end only two points separated first and (instead of losing) I would have been
equal third instead of tenth! This illustrates the intensity of the compe tition with ten of the twelve competitors having a chance of sharing in the prize money until the very end. The main reason for all this was the large number of draws, a record $50 \%$ exactly. The majority of these were genuine ames although there were sufficient of the non-fighting variety to prompt Kees ekker to comment on players travelling 1000 kilometres or more and then not laying chess!

The progress scores below show the course of the tournament
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11\end{array}$

## Nokes

Sarapu
Small
Dekker
ren
Aptekar
Tatson
Smith
Stuart


In winning his first New Zealand itle Roger Nokes played very carefully and solidly - he was in fact the only player to go through undereated. Only ance before (the five player event of Chas ions ! This 'now 1ready visible in the 1980 South Tsland hempions the curret tournand Champlonship. In the current tournament hen seemed to have the worst of thing painst Smith who adjourned a pawn up against Smith who adjourned a pawn up. ger, ich, pedin his yai hill there:

SMITH - NOKES, Sicilian Defence le4 c5 2. Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 g6 $40-0 \mathrm{Bg} 7$ 5 Bxe6 bxc6 6 d3 Nf6 7 Ne3 $0-0 \quad 8 \mathrm{Bg} 5$ h6 9 Bf4 Kh7 10 e5 Nd5 11 Bd2 Nc 7 12 Ne4 Ne6 13 Вc3 Ва6 14 b3 f5 15 exf6 exf6 16 Rel d5 17 Ng 3 Bc 818 h 4 h5 19 Bd2 Qd6 20 Nge2 Bd7 21 Qc1 Rae8 22 Nf4 Nd8 23 Qa3 Nf7 24 d4 Bg4 25 dxc 5 Qc7 26 Nd 4 Ne 527 Nd 3 Bc 828 Bf Qf7 29 Radl Bd7 30 Qcl Re7 31 Qd2 Rfe8 $32 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Qf} 8 \quad 33 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Bc} 8 \quad 34 \mathrm{Bxe} 5$ fxe5 35 Nxc 6 Re6 36 Nb 4 e4 37 fxe4 dxe4 38 Nf 4 Qxc5+ $39 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{e} 740 \mathrm{Nbd5}$

Re5 41 Ne 3 Rf 842 g 3 g 543 hxg Rxg5 44 Rh2 Bh6 45 Rel Qe5 46 Qds Qe7 47 Qd4 Bb7 48 c4 Qf7 49 Qd6 Rxg 50 Nfg2 Bxe3 51 Qd1 Bh6 52 Rxh5 e3 53 Rxh6+ Kxh6 54 Qd6+ Rg6 55 Qh2+
Kg7 56 Qe5+ Qf6, $0: 1$
Nokes's second win came the following day when Jackson self-destructed but his third win came after Watson found himself positionally completely lost and therefore sacrificed a piece for a check or two before giving up That was in round eight and Nokes was a clear leader for the first time. Three more not very strenuous draws allowed two of his rivals to catch up but not surpass his score.
NOKES - WATSON, Sicilian Taimanov: 1 e 4 c5 2 Nf 3 e $6 \quad 3 \mathrm{~d} 4$ cxd4 4 Nxd 4 Nc6 5 Nc3 a6 6 Be3 Qc7 7 Bd3 Nf6 $0-0 \quad$ Bb4 $49 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 10 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{~b} 5 \quad 11$ a4 Nxd 12 Bxd4 Be5 13 Bxe5 Qxe5+ $14 \mathrm{Kh1} \mathrm{~b} 4$ 15 Nb 1 Bb 716 Nd 2 Rc 817 Qe 2 e 5 l xe5 Qxe5 19 Rf5 Qxb2 20 Rbl Qc3 2 e5 Ng4 $22 \mathrm{hxg} 4 \mathrm{hxg} 4+23 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{~g} 3 \quad 24$ N1 Re6 25 Nxg Rg 26 Qf2 b3 27 xb3 Qalt 28 Bfl Qxa4 29 Rxb7, 1 : 0

Ortvin Sarapu chalked up his eightenth title (ho-hum!) but not in the same convincing fashion as usual. His first win came in round four (after quiet draws with Green, Nokes and Levene) when Jackson chose the wrong middle-game plan. This, however, was followed by his loss to Watson and very nearly a loss to Small. Over the last ive rounds Sarapu played much better with good wins versus Anderson and Aptekar while Dekker and I both donated material to the cause.
SARAPU - ANDERSON, Ruy Lopez: 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 d6 c4 Bd7 6 Nc3 g6 7 d4 exd4 8 Nxd g7 Be3 Ne6 10 Nxc6 bxc6 11 0-0 15 12 Qd2 Re8 13 Bc2 Ng4 14 Bf 4 Qb 5 Bd3 Qb4 16 Racl Ne5 17 Be 2 Be 618
 55 fo 646 Rh4 Be3 Bd 24 h3 Rad
 $06632 \mathrm{Bf2} \mathrm{Nd7} 3330 \mathrm{O} 734 \mathrm{Od2} 5$ 35 exf5 Rxf5 36 0xa5 Ra8 37 Qd 2 f 36 Qxa5 Ra8 37 QbS QxbS Rd3 Bb4, 1 :

Likewise Vernon Small only really came to life in the second half of the tournament. His position against Dekker
in round one was not as safe as he apparently thought but this crushing defeat was to be his only one. His single win in the first six rounds was nice one against me but later wins against Levene and Jackson brought him closer to the lead. The game versus Jackson featured a ulce 「inish - with $\mathrm{R}+\mathrm{B} v \mathrm{Q}$, Vernon had to sacrifice his rook in order to force home a passed pawn. Only in the last round with a good positional lictory over old rival ruce for the first time ther lead for the first SMALL - STUART, Birmingham Defence: 1 e4 a6 2 d4 b5 3 Bd3 Bb7 4 Nf 3 Nf 6 Qe2 e6 6 0-0 c5 7 c3 d5 8 e5 Nfd7 Be3 Nc6 10 Nbd 2 Be 711 Rfel b4 12 Racl Qb6 $13 \mathrm{Nf} 1 \mathrm{a5} 14 \mathrm{dxc} 5$ Bxc5 15 c 4 Bxe3 16 Nxe3 d4 17 c5 Nxc5 18 Nc4 Qa7 19 Nd6+ Ke7 20 Rxc5 Qxc5 21 Nxb7 Qb6 22 Nd6 Rad8 23 Qe4 Na7 24 Qg4 Kf8 25 Ng5 Rxd6 26 exd6 Qxd6 27 Qf3 Qc7, 1:0. LEVENE - SMALL, Sicilian Taimanov: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d 4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nc6 5 Nb 5 d 66 Bf 4 e5 7 Be 3 Nf 688 Bg 5 a 6 Bxf6 gxf6 10 N5c3 b5 11 a4 b4 12 6 Bg 13 Nd2 $0-0 \quad 14$ Bd3 Be6 15 Qh5 19 exd5 Nxd5 20 Nxd5 Bxd5 21 f4 Rfe 8 22 Rael bl 23 fxe 5 Rxe5 24 Rxe5 fxe5 5 Ne4 bxc 26 Bxc2 Qc 67 28 h 3 Qe6 29 Qf 2 Rb 8 30 b3 Rb4 31 Qe 32 Qf2 Bxe4 33 Qxf7 +Kh 834 Bxe 4 Oxe4 35 Qe8t Kh7 36 Qe6 0g6 37 Od5 Rd4 38 b 79 Rel 0640 Ka e 41 Qf R4 42 Rbl e 243 Re 1 Rxb 344 Qxe2 Qxe2 $45 \mathrm{Rxe} 2 \mathrm{Rb} 446 \mathrm{Ra} 2 \mathrm{Rbl}+47 \mathrm{Kf} 2$ 48 Pxb2 Bxb2 49 Ke 3 Kg 650 Kf5 51 Kf 3 Be5 $52 \mathrm{~h} 4,0$ : 1 .
SMALL - ANDERSON, Ruy Lopez:
1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 5 0-0 Be7 6 Bxc6 dxc6 7 d3 Nd7 8 Nbd2 $0-0 \quad 9 \quad \mathrm{Nc} 4 \mathrm{f} 6 \quad 10 \mathrm{Nh} 4 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 11 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 12$ $34 \mathrm{Nb} 8 \quad 13 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 614 \mathrm{Nfd2} \mathrm{~g} 5 \quad 15 \mathrm{Re} 1$ Be6 $16 \mathrm{Nf} 1 \mathrm{Qe} 8 \quad 17 \mathrm{Ng} 3 \mathrm{Rd} 8 \quad 18 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{Rf} 7$ 19 Ne3 Bf8 20 Qc1 Rfd7 21 Bc 3 Nd 422 Bxd4 cxd4 23 Nef5 Bb4 24 Rfl Qf8 25 Qdl Kh8 26 Qe2 Qf7 27 Rfcl c6 28 Qf3 Qg6 $29 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 8 \quad 30 \mathrm{Nh} 5 \mathrm{Rf} 7 \quad 31 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 2$ $32 \mathrm{Rd1} \mathrm{Bf} 433 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rd} 8 \quad 34 \mathrm{Qe} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 7 \quad 35$ Qel Qf7 36 Nhg7 Bxf5 37 Nxf5 h5 38 Qe2 h4 39 as Kh7 40 Ra4 c5 41 Rc4 Qd7 2 Ra1 QuS 43 b3 40 (2el Re8 48 Kf3 Re6 46 Ke2 Re7 70 M1 Kh8 48 Raa4 Re6 49 202750 Oc 75 Rxc6, $1: 0$.

There was also a triple tie for fourth place among Dekker, Green and Levene. Kees Dekker served notice that he was not going to be the 'tournamen bunny' with his neat finish against Small on the very first day.
DEKKER - SMALL, Sicilian Scheveningen: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nc6 $5 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{a} 66 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{0} 0 \mathrm{Nf} 68$ Be3 Be7 9 f4 0-0 10 Qel Bd7 11 Og3 Nxd4 12 Bxd4 Bc6 13 Radl Qc7 14 Bd3 $65 \quad 15$ e5 dxe5 16 fxe5 Nd7 17 Ne 4 Bxe4 18 Bxe4 Rad8 19 c3 Bc5 20 Kh 1 Bxd4 21 cxd4 Nb6

22 Qh4 g6 23 Rd3 Rd7 24 Qh6 Qd8 25 Rf6 Rxd4 26 Bxg6, 1 : 0.


A similar win when Smith overlooked combination in round four saw him close to the lead through the first ix rounds but later losses to Sarapu and Levene held him back. He was also losing to Jackson in round ten but numerous errors by the latter in a rook and pawn ending completely reversed that situation and in the last round he won a piece from Watson.
DEKKER - SMITH, Sicilian Kan: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf 3 e6 3 d4 $\operatorname{cxd} 44 \mathrm{Nxd}_{4}$ $665 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Qc} 7 \quad 6 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{~b} 5 \quad 7 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Bb} 78$ Bf3 d6 9 Be3 Nf6 10 a3 Nbd 110 Nfd5? 15 exd6 Bxd6


16 Ndxb5! axb5 17 Bxb6 Nxc 318 Bxc7 Nxe2 19 Bxd6 Bxf3 20 Rxf3 Rxc2 21 Rd 1 Kd 7 22 f5 Kc6 23 fxe6 2xe6 24 Bf8 Rxb2 25 h3 Rg8 26 Kc8 28 Ra6 Rxf8, 1 : 0

Almost everyone contributed to Ewen Green's prize either by agreeing to his short draws or letting him of the hook in won positions. If Lev Aptekar had not rejected Ewen's draw offer and gone on to win that game,

Green would doubtless have had fourth prize to himself.

Mark Levene had a horrible start and was winless in equal last position after seven rounds. Things changed after that, however, with Anderson giving him pawns and then a queen in round eight. He outplayed Dekker in the opening to win a pawn in round nine and won conclusively from Aptekar in the last round. Mark also beat Smith in the penultimate round but was lucky here since Smith played most of the game very well indeed, only to blunder a piece in time trouble. Nevertheless this was a remarkable re covery from $11=$ to $4=$ in the space of just four rounds. Perhaps his most interesting game was the following draw: LEVENE - JACKSON, Closed Sicilian: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d3 Nc6 4 g 3 d 5 s
 9 e5 Qc7 10 Qe2 h6 111 c3 a5 12 Nf1 16 Qe 3 d4 17 0-0 14 Bf4 g5 15 hxg 5 Ng 6 19 Qe3 d4 17 cxd4 Nxd4 18 Nxd4 Nxf4 19 gxf4 Rxd4 23 Ra 21 Ng 3 Bxg 22 Kxg2 Qb7+ 23 f3 hxg5 24 fxg5 Qd5


26 Rh1 Rxhl 27 Kxh1 Bxe5 28 Ne4 Rb4 29 Rcl Bd4? 30 Qf4 e5 31 Qxf7 Qxf7 32 Nd6+ Kd7 $\begin{array}{lllll}33 & \text { Nxf7 } & \mathrm{Ke} 7 & 34 & \mathrm{Nh} 6 \\ \mathrm{Ke} & 35 & \mathrm{Rel} & \mathrm{Bc} 3 & 36\end{array}$ Ke6 35 Rel Bc3 36 Re2 a4 37 Rg 2 axb 3 38 axb3 Rh4+ 39 $\mathrm{Kgl} \mathrm{Bd4+} 40 \mathrm{Kfl}$
Be3 41 Ng 4 Bxg5 $42 \mathrm{Nf} 2 \mathrm{Kf5} 43 \mathrm{Ne} 4 \mathrm{Bf} 4$ $44 \mathrm{Rg} 8 \mathrm{Rh} 1+45 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Rbl} 46 \mathrm{Rf} 8+\mathrm{Ke} 647$ Rf6+ Ke7 48 Rxb6 Rb2+ 49 Kdl Be 350 Kel Bd4 $51 \mathrm{Rb} 7+$ Ke6 $52 \mathrm{Kdl} \mathrm{Be} 3 \quad 53$ $\mathrm{Rb} 6+\mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{5} 5 \mathrm{Ke} 1 \mathrm{Bd} 4 \quad 55 \mathrm{Rb} 7+$ Ke6 56 Kdl Be3, $\frac{1}{2}$ : $\frac{1}{2}$.

There was yet another tie for seventh through ninth. Lev Aptekar was right in the title hunt until the last two rounds when he crashed badly, losing both. Lev, however, seemed mainly intent on stifling any vestige of play by his opponent and this led to too many sterile positions and a rather traumatic missed wi against me in round eight. Aptekar did score the following important win though:
GREEN - APTEKAR, Czech Benoni:
1 d4 c5 2 d 5 e5 3 c4 d6 4 Nc 3 Be 75 g3 Nf6 6 Bg2 0-0 7 e4 Na6 8 Nge2 Nc7 $90-0 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \quad 10$ a4 a6 $11 \mathrm{Od} 3 \mathrm{Nfe8} 12 \mathrm{Rbl}$ b5 13 axb5 axb5 14 cxb5 $\operatorname{Nxb5} \quad 15$ Nxb5

Ba6 16 Nec3 Nc7 17 Ral Bxb5 $18 \mathrm{Nxb5}$


 Re1+ $31 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 32 \mathrm{Bd7} \mathrm{Oe}+\mathrm{Qe8} 33 \mathrm{Kh} 5$


Bruce Watson gave his reputation as a burglar rather a hammering, perhaps because he didn't really need to burgle in this tournament. After losing to me in the third round Bruce told me "he'd have to start winning" - well, he was shamefully burglarised by Green the following day but then scored a nice win against Sarapu and happily accepted Levene's piece blunder in round six.
SARAPU - WATSON, Nimzoindian Defence
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 e3 0-0 5 Bd3 d5 6 Nge2 dxc4 7 Bxc4 4 e 3 0-0
 Nd5 12 0-0 Nxe3 13 fxe3 b6 14 Qe2 $\mathrm{Bb} 715 \mathrm{Radl} \mathrm{Qe} 716 \mathrm{Ba} 2 \mathrm{Rad8} \quad 17 \mathrm{Bb}$ Kh8 18. Qh5 g6 19 Oh6 f5 20 Ba2 2 Nb 8 21 Rfel Nd7 22 e4 f4 23 Rfl e5 24
 Qxg7+ Kxg7 28 Rf2 Ne5 $29 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{~g} 5 \quad 30$ Rfd2 $\mathrm{h} 5 \quad 31$ Be6

31...f3 32 bf5 Rxd2 33 Rxd2 $\mathrm{g}_{4}$ 34 hxg 4 hxg 435 g3 Rh8 36 Rd5 Rh3 37 Bxg4 f2+ $\begin{array}{llll}38 & \text { Kxf2 } & \mathrm{Nxg} 4+\mathrm{t} \\ \mathrm{Kf} 3 & \mathrm{Nff} & 40\end{array}$ Kf3 Nf6 40 Rg5+ $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Rf7 } & 41 & \text { e5 } & \mathrm{Rh} 5 & 42 \\ \text { xh5 Nxh5 }\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Rxh5 } & \text { Nxh5 } & 43 & \mathrm{Ke} \\ \text { Ke6 } & 44 \mathrm{~g} 4 & \mathrm{Ng} 3+\end{array}$ 45 Kd4 Ne2+ 46 Nxe? Bxe2 47 g5 Bh 48 a4 Kd7 49 b4 Bf7 50 a5 Kc6 51 Ке4 Веб 52 ахb6 ахbб 53 g 6 Kb 554 Kf4 Kxb4 $55 \mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{Kc} 5 \quad 56 \mathrm{Kf} 6 \mathrm{Kd} 5,0: 1$.

The third $50 \%$ scorer was Robert Smith who kept a fairly low profile results-wise until he won two of his last three games including the one versus Ortvin who carelessly gave away a pawn in a most un-Sarapu-like manner Robert had much the worst of things in his first two games, losing material in each but discovering at the adjournment that the material deficit was meaningless. This good fortune was balanced, however, by his time-trouble blunder against Levene and an almost certain dropped half-point when he sealed the wrong move against Green.

I started off okay but, despite galning excellent positions against Dekker and Anderson at least, couldn't win another game after round three. Like almost everybody else I too had a wee drop of luck, swindling draws from Smith and Aptekar in lost endgames; I must confess I found it most enjoyable! My game with Robert had an amusing finish; earlier I had twice had draw offers refused but $I$ made no further offers in the final session. Finally while I was away from the board Robert clearly exasperated at the win eluding him, swept the remaining pieces off the board and stopped the clocks. Obviously he was making a unilateral draw declaration but, as this seemed a trifle irregular, I asked him whether he was resigning and that, otherwise, he couldn't do what he'd just done! Giving the best impression of greased lightning I've seen in a long time, Smith then reset the position, made a move and restarted my clock. We then agreed the draw in the normal manner.
STUART - WATSON, Symmetrical English: 1 c 4 .c5 $2 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{Bxf6}$ exf6
 9 Nge2 $\mathrm{f} 5100-0 \mathrm{Rb} 811 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \mathrm{~d} 612$ 6613 Qd2 Ne6 14 Rfd1 Ba6 15 dxc5 dxc5 16 Qd7 Qc7 17 Qxc7 Nxc7 18 Rd7 Be5 19 Nd5 Nxd5 20 Bxd5 Rba8 21 Bxf7+ Kg7 22 Rxa7 Rxff 23 Rab 24 Bxc3 25 Rxc3 Rfd 26 Rxb6 Rxa2 27 Rcl da $28 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \mathrm{Rab2} 29 \mathrm{Rb} 5 \mathrm{Rc} 20 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{~h}$ 1 Kg 2 Rc 3 R2 Rxc5 Rxe3 33 b 4 Ree2 5 54 Rec2 Re6 Ro4 38 Reb 40 C 40 b7) 40 (40 b7:) $40 \ldots \mathrm{Rg} 4+41 \mathrm{Kh3}$ Rbb4 42 Rb $46 \mathrm{Kbl} 1 \mathrm{~g})$ 46 c 64150
 Kf3 Rgb4 53 c7 R4b3 h2 56 Rf8+, 1 : 0.

Jon Jackson was one of only three players (the others were Levene and Watson) to never share the lead but was always likely to score an upset win with his aggressive style and uncompromising attitude. His only win was certainly
very nice:
JACKSON - ANDERSON, Giuoco Piano:
1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bc4 Bc5 4 c3 Qe7

 Nd8 13 Ba 3 Nd7 14 d4 f6 15 dxe5 fxe5 16 Nd4 exd4 17 e5 Nf7 18 exd6 Qf6 19 dxc7 Bc5 20 Rel+ Kf8 21 Bxc5 Nxc5 22
exd4 Nd7 23 Ne5 Ndxe5 24 dxe5 Nxe5 25 Qd5 Ng6 26 b6 Kg7 27 Radl Rf $8 \quad 28$ Qc5 a5 29 Rd6 Qf4 30 Red 1 Bg4 31 f 3 Bf5 532 Rd8 0 Qb4 43 Qd4+ Qxd4+ 34 Rlxd4 Ne7 35 Rxa8 Rxa8 36 Rd8 Rc8 37 84 Bg6 38 Be6, 1 : 0.

Finally we come to the strangest result of the tournament. Bruce Ander son started off alright and was just half a point off the pace after five rounds. In round six he was winning easily against Green but never quite clinched the point and eventually lost Obviously, Bruce was a broken man afte this setback and his resistance in some of his remaining games, all of which h lost, was slight.

Unfortunately the standard of play was not high, the number of allusions to blunders in the above account possibly already having alerted the reader to this fact. As Ortvin Sarapu said at the prize-giving, a "sin-bin" article is not really on the cards this y he could fill the whole magazine!
Nevertheless, still a very interesting Nevertheless,
tournament.

## STATISTICS

As already mentioned, exactly $50 \%$ of the games were drawn. Of the remairder, White won 18 and Black 15 , giving White an overall $52.27 \%$ which is somewhat lower than average

In a tournament so riddled with draws it is not surprising that the record of eight draws was equalled by three players - Nokes(!), Green and Stuart.

Other points of statistical interest lie in this year's event producing the third triple tie for first place in the last six years and equabling the lowest winning score of 7 points which first occurred in 1975/76. Sarapuls five wins brought him a lit.tle closer to Kelling's record of 186 wins in N.Z. Championships; the top three are Kelling (36 Ch'ps) 186, R.J.Barnes (28) 173, and Sarapu (23) 169.

Aptekar played the longest games a total of 534 moves at an average of 48.6 per game. He was followed by Smith 510, Jackson 499, Stuart 477 .... Green 324 (average 29.5).

Now for a few more games and positions.

NOKES - SARAPU, French Defence:

1 e4 e6 $2 \mathrm{~d} 3 \mathrm{c} 53 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 64 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Nge7}$ $5 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{~d} 56 \mathrm{Nbd} 2 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{O}-0 \mathrm{Bg} 78 \mathrm{Qe} 2$ $0-0 \quad 9$ Rel $\mathrm{Qc} 7 \quad 10$ e5 b $6 \quad 11 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{Ba} 6 \quad 12$

 19 Rad1 a5 20 Be3 d4 21 Bf4 Nb8 22 Ng5 Bxg2 23 Kxg2 Qc6+ 24 Kgl Nd 725 h4 a4 26 h5 h6 27 Nf 3 axb3 28 axb3 g5 29 Bd2 Ra8, $\frac{1}{2}$ : $\frac{1}{2}$.
WATSON - DEKKER, see diagram


18 Qb5? (Allowing a quiet but potent combination to unfold; 18 Qc2 would be about =) 18...Qc7 (As well as 19...Rxd2 black threatens 19...a6 trapping the queen) 19 Na4 Qc2! 20 Qxb7 (Worse are 20 Qa5 Ne4! or 20 Racl Rxd2! 21 RxC2 Rxdl+ 22 Bfl Bh3 winning 20...Kf8! 21 Qxa7 Rxd2 22 Rdc1 Qf5 23 Rc7 Bd6 24 Rxf7+ Bxf7 25 Qa5 Rxe2 26 Qxd8+ Ne8 27 Rfl Bc7 28 Qh4 Rxa2 and Black won in another 9 moves.
APTEKAR - SARAPU, Symmetrical English: 1 Nf3 Nf6 2 b3 g6 3 bb2 Bg7 $4 \mathrm{c} 40-0$




 22 Rggl a5 23 Rd2 Rc8 24 Rcl Rff8 25

 32 h 4 Rb 443 Rxb 4 axb4 34 Qxb4 Rxa2

 Bd1 Nc5 $42 \mathrm{Rd} 4 \mathrm{Ra} 2 \quad 43 \mathrm{Bf} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 2 \quad 44 \mathrm{Rxb} 4$ Nd $345 \mathrm{Rd} 4 \mathrm{Nxf} 2 \quad 46 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 47 \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{Kf} 6$ 48 Rc4 Nd 349 e4 Nxb4 50 exf5 Kxf5 51


 Ne3 $61 \mathrm{Rf} 2 \mathrm{Rh} 3+\quad 62 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Nxc} 263 \mathrm{Rxc} 2$

 Re5 70 Rdl+ Ke6 71 Ral Re4 72 Kf 3 d 5 $73 \mathrm{Rh} 1 \mathrm{~h} 4 \quad 74 \mathrm{Rh} 2 \mathrm{Ke} 5 \quad 75 \mathrm{Rh} 1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \quad 76 \mathrm{Ral}$ Re3+ 77 Kf2 Ke4 78 Rh1 h3 79 Ral Rf3+ $80 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{~d} 3+81 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Rf} 2+82 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 2+83$ Kb3 h2, $0: 1$.
APTEKAR - JACKSON, King's Indian Defence:

 9 Nel Qe7 $10 \mathrm{Nc} 2 \mathrm{Ng} 41 \mathrm{l} 3 \mathrm{Nh} 6 \quad 12 \mathrm{Nc} 3$
f5 $13 \mathrm{Nd} 5 \mathrm{Od} 7 \quad 14 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \mathrm{Nd} 8 \quad 15 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{exf}$



 b5 Nd6 30 bxc6 bxc 6 b5 Nd6 30 bxc 6 bxc6 31 cxd5 cxd5 32

 Nxd4 Ra4 42 Rbs Raxd4 43 Rxd4 Rxd 44 Rc5 Qd7 45 Qb3+ 0e6 46 Ryc8+ 14: 0 . SMAL


21 Nxd6!? (A little combination based on the overloaded Pe7; it can also be played the ther way: 21 Rxf6 exf6 22 Nxd6 but the pawn advantage may well not be nough for a win in view of White's vulnerable queenside pawns) 21...Bxc3 22 Nxc4 Qxc4 23 Qxc4 Rxc4 24 bxc 3 Nc5! (Although Black is now the exchange and a pawn down he will regain several pawns) 25 Rd8 +Kg 726 Rc8 b6 27 Rc6 Rxa4 28 Rxb6 Nxe4 29 Rb7 Kf8 $30 \mathrm{Ra} 7 \mathrm{Nxc} 331 \mathrm{Rc} 7 \mathrm{Nd} 5 \quad 32 \mathrm{Rc} 8+\mathrm{Kg} 7$ 33 Rc1 Ra2! 34 g 3 (If 34 c4, then 34 …Nou. 35 c5 Ne2; the rook \& knight find it difficult while white's rooks th4 35 dif No to Rooperate) $34 .$. Nb4 $35 \mathrm{Ra8} \mathrm{Nc} 6 \mathrm{C}$ Ra7 K 8 Kg 2 Ne5 $38 \mathrm{Rd} 8+\mathrm{Kg} 739 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{f} 640 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Kf7}$
JACKSON - SARAPU, Sicilian Defence: 1 e4 c5 $2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 63 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{cxd} 4 \quad 4 \mathrm{Nxd} 4$ Nf6 5 Nc 3 g6 6 Nxc6 bxc6 7 e5 Ng8 8 BC4 Bg7 9 Qf3 (Better is Qe2 combined with Bf4, $0-0-0$ and later h4-h5 with the rook still on hl) 9...f5 10 Bf4e6 $110-0-0$ Qc7 12 Rhe1 Rb8 13 h 4 Nh 6 14 a3 Nf7 15 Qe3 h6 16 Qg3 g5 17 hxg5 hxg5 18 Rhl Rg8 19 Bxg5 Bxe5 20 Qd3 Rxg5 $21 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Qb6} 22$ вb3 Qxf2 23 Bxe6 dxe6, 0 : 1.
NOKES - SMALL, Sicilian 2 c3: 1 e4 c5 2 c 3 d5 3 exd5 $\mathrm{Qxd5} 4 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nc} 6$ 5 Nf3 e6 6 Bd3 $\operatorname{cxd} 4 \quad 7$ cxd4 $\mathrm{Nf6} 8$ 0-0

 Levene - aptekar, Closed Sicilian: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d3 Nf6 4 g 3 d 5


Nfa7 9 h4 Nc6 10 Rel $0 c 711$ Qe2 h6 $12 \mathrm{Nf1} 0-\mathrm{O}-0 \quad 13 \mathrm{~N} 1 \mathrm{~h} 2 \mathrm{~Kb} 814 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{Ba6} 15$




 Qa3 $\mathrm{g} 5 \quad 36 \mathrm{hxg} 5 \mathrm{hxg} 5 \quad 37 \mathrm{Bxg} 5$ Bxf
 Oa2 Ned6 $42 \mathrm{Na} 5+\mathrm{Kb} 743 \mathrm{Og}, 1$ : 0

是

## Women's Championship

The entry for the Burroughs Computers New Zealand Women's Championship was even more disappointing than last yeara total of only five including only one from the North Island. Of course the olympiad precluded the entry of three members of the 1980 team - one was still overseas and the other two were unable to take further holidays so soon afterwards.
It was therefore decided to hold a double round-robin which still left each player with rather too many rest days, situation which worsened in the second af wath the withdrawal through illness of Canterbury's Diane Watson.
he race between Elisabeth Allen (Timaru) and Jackie Sievey (Otago) was always very close with the former enjoythe a the journey. The otago youngster, how ever, won their mutual return clash in the final round to win the title by just half a point.

Olympian Anne Flower (Civic) took the third prize and Joanne Nokes (Canterbury) the fourth.

|  | Sie |  |  | Nok | Wat | T'1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J.Sievey | $\times \times$ | $\frac{1}{2} 1$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 11 | 1 - | 6 |
| E.Allen | $\frac{1}{2} 0$ | $\times \times$ | 11 | 11 | 1 - | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| A. Flower | $\frac{1}{2} 0$ | 00 | $\times \times$ | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ |  | 3 |
| Nokes | 00 | 00 | $0 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |  | 112 |
| Watson | 0 | 0 | 0 - |  |  |  |

JACKSON - SMITH, King's Indian Defence
 5 d5 $0-0.6$ e $4 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{a} 6 \quad 8 \mathrm{Bd} 3$ e5 $9 \mathrm{a4} \mathrm{Nbd} 7 \quad 10 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Ne} 811 \mathrm{Bf} 1 \mathrm{Nc} 7 \quad 12$ h4 Nf6 $13 \mathrm{Nh} 2 \mathrm{Bd7} 14 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 15 \mathrm{Be} 3$
 $19 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{~b} 420 \mathrm{Nd} 1 \mathrm{Qh} 4+21$ bf 2 Qxh5 22

 Rxf3 29 Nxf3 Qxhl+ $30 \mathrm{Bg} 1 \mathrm{Rf8} 31$ $0-0$-0 Rxf3 32 Bxe5 Qh3 33 Be3 a5 34 Rg1 Rg3 35 Kb 2 Na , $0: 1$.

## N.Z.Master Title to Small

Vernon Small completed his New Zealand Master title qualification when he shared first place in this year's New Zealand Championship. His nine points were acquired as follows:

South Island Ch'p 1975
North Island Ch'p 1977
South Island Ch P 1979
Co-N.2. Champion 1979/80
Small thus becomes one of even living New Zealand Masters other six are R.G.Wade, O.Sarapu, A Feneridis, R.J.Sutton, B.R.Anderson and P.A.Garbett.

The up to date list of those players who have gained N.Z. Master points during the last 20 years is as follows:
8 D.I.Lynch 2 G.M.J.Hall
6 W.A.Fairhurst
A.G.Kerr

5 L.H.Cornfor
L.H.Cornfor

4 L.Aptekar
M.G.Chandler
A.R.Day
C.A.Evans
E.M.Green
G.G.Haase

3 D.H.Beach
L.Esterman
P.Harraway
C.Laird
P.W.Stuart
A.L.Wilkinso
K.W.Lynn
R. Wansink

1 B.A.Carpinter R.Chapman D. J.Cooper M. R.R.Foord I. D. Hayes R. Howard .Howard J.R.Jackson .J.Jensen M.Levene R.S.Wilkin

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dowden R.A. } \\ & \text { Lloyd A. } \end{aligned}$ | c |
| :---: | :---: |
| Van Dijk T. | Nel |
| Love A.J. | 0 |
| Frankel Z . | UH |
| Hopewe11 M.G | A |
| Power P.W. | NS |
| Whitlock H.P. | Wa |
| Haase G.G. | 0 |
| Weegenaar D.P. | 0 |
| Van Dijk P. | Nel |
| Cornford L.H | $A$ |
| Cooper D.J. | N |
| Post M. | c |
| Cameron B. | c |
| Ker A.F. | Pac |
| Clements T.C. | C |
| Johnston A.J. | UH |
| Bennell D.J. | Par |
| Gibbons R.E. | A |
| Wilson R.T. | c |
| Aldridge G . | Twa |
| Davies G. | c |
| Schuster D.F. | $c$ |
| Nijman A.J. | C |
| Hopewell N.H. | A |
| Nijman B. | c |
| Leese M. | c |
| Pomeroy D.M. | ${ }^{\text {AU }}$ |
| Von't Steen R. | $o$ |
| Langrish T.A.G. | C |
| Ferguson R.T. | UH |
| Borren A. | HV |
| Hollis W.K. | Tw |
| Thomson 0.N. | c |
| Cribbett P.F. | c |
| Dalziel 'I.J. | 0 |
| Hampton R . | C |
| Blundell K. | PN |
| Stewardson P.L. | CB |
| Potini G. | C |
| Turner M. | C |
| Bennett P.E. | UH |
| Foord M.R.R. | $\bigcirc$ |
| Burridge D. | c |
| Fraemohs P. | c |
| Brannigan K.L. | c |
| Stiles T.D. | 0 |
| Cameron S.M. | c |
| Flower G.C. | Civ |
| Watson M.J. | c |
| Cameron D. | 0 |
| Bell D.I. | Wan |
| Williams G.M. | 0 |
| Symmans H.L. | UH |

PREMIER RESERVE 1980/8I
R. 1 R. 2 R. 3 R. 4 R. 5 R. 6 R. 7 R. 8 R. 9 Rl0 Rll T'1 SOS

W49 W26 W5 W11 W2 D3 W12 W10 L4 W20 D8 9
W14 W36 D10 W18 L1 W21 W19 W11 D3 W12 D4
W27 W35 D18 D6 W10 D1 L11 W4 D2 D13 W12 W23 D25 W43 L10 D12 W33 W14 L3 W1 W11 D2 W42 W29 L1 W44 L19 L14 W38 D34 W30 W18 W11 W21 D44 W16 D3 D7 L12 W25 D13 L8 W27 W20 L28 W39 W25 W27 D6 L10 W15 D19 £11 W31 W18 W50 D43 D34 L9 W27 L25 W39 D42 W6 W10 D1 L43 W50 D17 W8 D16 W44 L10 W29 L18 W26 W19
 W47 W22 W13 L1 W20 D19 W3 L15 W38 W41 W31 D4 W6 L1 W28 W10 $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { L2 } & \text { L3 }\end{array}$ W32 W30 L11 L19 W34 D15 D18 D6 W42 D3 D16 L2 W24 L25 W38 W51 W5 L4 L30 D29 W36 W25 W12 L10 D 30 W26 DI8 D13 L7 W25 L35 W29 W33 W48 D33 L6 W43 D9 L18 D26 W45 D22 W35 D13 D31 D21 D9 D25 D36 D47 D37 D32 D34 W43 W30 W39 W28 D3 L2 D15 W16 D13 D20 W9 L5 L7 L33 W48 W35 W13 W5 D11 L2 D7 L20 W34 L9 W46 D34 D44 W42 Lll D28 W2l D18 W19 L1 L6 L6 D17 W54 W36 W30 L2 L20 D35 L25 W44 W42 W53 L11 D32 D28 W42 D26 L29 W38 D16 D33 W35 L4 D37 W52 W32 L33 D29 L30 W40 L31 W39 W34 L36 L14 L38 L45 Bye W53 W55 D48 D41 W49 W46 W37 D4 L7 D17 D46 W8 L6 L15 W21 W42 L14 W40 L1 D28 L15 W41 D22 D16 W46 D27 L9 D32 L3 W45 W14 L7 L8 D37 W41 W33 D26 L6 D31 W7 L18 D26 D22 W31 D20 W33 L12 D36 D30 L10 W51 L5 L42 D37 W40 D23 W22 L9 D14 L15 W45 W55 L13 D15 W47 L21 D42 W23 W14 L5 D28 L17 D17 W52 D33 L12 L28 D45 D40 W39 W23 L. 7 D27 L13 W55 D22 L23 D52 L38 W51 D17 D45 W41 D26 W19 D16 D31 D34 W23 L4 L28 L27 W37 D22 L15 W41 D20 D8 D33 L13 D46 W44 D5 D17 L19 L23 W45 L3 L19 D41 D37 W51 D46 D21 W15 L16 L22 W24 L2 D47 L2 11 D17 W52 L42 W43 D28 L. 14 D37 L25 D23 D40 D29 D35 D27 D17 D44 L33 W48 D36 L10 L12 W24 L14 W50 W32 L5 L22 L40 Bye W54 L18 L7 W55 W40 L44 W43 L8 L31 W52 L23 W50 L26 W49 D37 L39 L29 W50 D31 L23 W38 D47 D43 L34 W46 L12 D35 L26 W49 L27 W47 D24 L32 Bye L5 W51 W29 L20 D22 D30 W36 D8 L13 L25 L21 W9 D8 L4 L16 10 W54 D6 D20 L5 W39
 L20 L41 W48 W50 D25 D34 D35 f
 L16 L19 L46 Bye L45 W54 W49 D24 L43 L37 W53 L1 L40 L51 D55 W53 L41 L48 Bye W54 L24 W52 L8 L9 W45 L46 L38 L40 Bye L54 W53 W55 L39 L29 L42 W49 W54 L14 L35 L32 L52 Bye L53 W55 Bye L31 L23 W53 D32 L36 L43 W51 L39 L54 L49 L22 L47 Bye L52 L49 L24 W54 D55 L50 W51 L48 L.44 Bye L21 L51 D55 L48 L53 W50 L49 W52 L38 L30 L32 L39 D49 D54 Bye L24 D53 L47 L50 L51
$8^{\frac{1}{2}}$

## BURROUGHS PREMIER RESERVE CH'P

A slightly smaller
than in recent years entered the 1980-81 Burroughs Computers Reserve Che 1980-81 Tony Love topped the seedings with his 2006 rating, ahead of fifty-four his

The peaceful countryside setting and the large junior entry resulted in a large number of draws, especially among the younger players who didn't seem to know how to win.

The early rounds contained the usual number of upsets with L.Cornford and W. Power losing in round one and Love being held to a draw by Ari Nijman in round two. Round three saw Tony Dowden demolish Z.Frankel with the King's Gambit and P.Van Dijk beat D.Cooper to become the only players on 3 points. D. Weegenaar and A.Lloyd drew as did
T.Van Dijk and A.Johnston to stay just behind.
. Dowden assumed the lead for himself after round four by beating P.Van Dijk with the exchange Ruy Lopez. D.Weegenaar scored his first ever wir over T Love while A.Lloyd demolished Johnston.

Dowden continued on his winning way in round five when Lloyd overextended on the Kingside and the Black pieces filled the empty spaces. Tom Van Dijk yet again won Weegenaar's queen. D.Bennell slipped into second equal on four points with a win over Frankel. Bob Gibbons gave P.Van Dijk a piece in the opening.

Round six saw Dowden drop his first half point when T.Van Dijk played the alkbeer Counter Gambit and drew the resulting rook and pawn ending. Frankel lost again, this time to Martin Post. Lloyd just managed to beat Russel Wilson Weegenaar gave Power his second Ioss while Bennell was lucky to draw with P.Van Dijk.

Lindsay Cornford tried a book trap against Dowden in round seven but fell into his own trap and lost everything. Son shone over Dad when Van Dijk beat Van Dijk. Scores after seven rounds: Dowden $6 \frac{1}{2}$; Lloyd, P.Van Dijk, Weegenaar $5 \frac{1}{2}$; Love 5 .

Round eight saw Dowden and Lloyd win again over Weegenaar and P.Van Dijk. Weegenaar just played moves without analysing properly and lost an exchange. Lloyd mated P.Van Dijk in the time scramble. T.Van Dijk disposed of Love after the adjournment. S.Cameron just
manad to gain a point over the bye. Love threw the tournament wide open again in round nine by easily disposing catch. Hloyd lost his chance to atch up though by struggling to draw do to to Cornford to slide down the
his unbeat is unbeaten record with his ninth draw opponents threw away he win.
In the penultimate round R.Gibbons played 2 ...Qh4+ against Dowden's King's Gambit and won two pawns but was lost by move ten. Cornford gave Lloyd a piece wite Weegenaar continued his declin a loss to H. Whitlock.
Llcyd and Love agreed a quick draw in the last round so Dowden drew with Frankel's Centre Counter proved place for P Van Dijk equal. Tom Van Dijk joined these much rat wher drawn rook and bishop resigned in a after everyone artel Hopell jul when Gibbons played the same lin points King's Cambit as against King s sambit me result.
Iony Dowde
place. His tactical deserved his first place. His tactical awareness proved too throughout. opposition and he lead ed the rita ed the rest to get near him. Lloyd's second place was a good result capping an excellent year for him

Tom Van Dijk and Zyg Frankel both managed to foot it with the juniors while Tony Love should have done better in this field.

David Weegenaar's play showed great improvement, though his behaviour still lags behind. P.Van Dijk started well, but crashed near the end

On the grade front, A.Ker took the under 1750 with G.Davies and G.Aldridge second equal. M.Post and B.Cameron shared the under 1625 while T.Clements took the under 1400 with D.Schuster 2nd
A selection of games follows:
T.DOWDEN - Z.FRANKEL, King's Gambit:

1 e4 e5 2 f4 exf4 $3 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{~h} 6$
 $\begin{array}{lllllllll}5 & \mathrm{~d} 4 & \mathrm{gS} & 6 & \mathrm{~g} 3 & \mathrm{~g} 4 & 7 & \mathrm{Nh} 4 & \mathrm{f} 3 \\ 9 & 8 \mathrm{Bf} \\ \mathrm{Na} 3 & \mathrm{Bg} 7 & 10 & \mathrm{c} 3 & \mathrm{a} 6 & 11 & \mathrm{Qb} 3 & \mathrm{Qf} 6\end{array}$
12 0-0-0 Nge7 13 e5 dxe5 14 dxe5 Na5

15 Bxf7+ Qxf7 16 Rd8+ Kxd8 17 Qxf7 Bxe5 18 Bxe5, $1-0$
A.LLOYD - T.DOWDEN, Pirc Defence

1 d4 g6 2 e4 d6 3 Nf3 Nf6 4 Nc 3 Bg 7 5 Be? $0-0$ 6 $\quad 6$-0 c6 7 a4 Qc7 8 h. 3 e5 9 Rel exd4 10 Nxd4 Re8 11 Bf 3 Nbd 7
 hó 15 f4 Ned7 17 f5 Ne5 18 Nf3 NEd7 19 Rf1 Nxf3 20 kxf3 Ne5 21 Bxe5 Bxe5 22 fxg5 fxg6 23 Bc4+ d5 24 exd5 Kh8 25 Qd2 g5 26 dxc6 Qxc6 27 Be2 Rad8 23 Qel Qc5+ 29 Kg2 Bxc3 30 bxc 3 Bxf3+ 31 Kxf3 Qe3+, 0 - 1.
L. CORNFORD - T.DOWDEN, Modern Defence: 1 e4 d6 2 d 4 Ní $6 \quad 3$ Nc 3 g6 4 Bc 4 Bg 7 5 Qe2 Nc6 6 e5 Nh5 $7 \mathrm{~g}_{4}$ Nxd4 8 Qe4 Bxe5 9 gxh5 BE5 10 Qxb7 Nxc2+ 11 Kf $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Nral } & 12 & \text { Bh6 Rb8 } & 13 & \text { Qd5 e6 } & 14 & \text { Bb5 } \\ \text { Ke7 } & 15 & \text { Od2 } & \text { Rg8 } 8 & 16 & \text { Nf. } 3 \text { Nc } 2 & 17 \\ \text { hxg6 }\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Ke7 } & 15 \text { Qd2 Rg8 } & 16 \text { Nf3 Nc2 } 17 & \text { hxg6 } \\ \text { Rxg6 } & 18 \text { Ba4 Rxb2 } & 19 \text { Nxe5 dxe5 } & 20 \mathrm{~h} 4\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Rxg6 } 18 \mathrm{Ba} \\ \mathrm{Od} 3+, & 0-1\end{array}$
T.DOWDEN - T.LOVE, Sicilian b3:

1 e4 c5 2 b3 Nc6 3 Bb2 e6 4 Nf 3 d 6 5 Bb5 Bd7 $60-0$ Nf6 7 Bxc6 Bxc6 8 es Nd7 9 Rel d5 10 d4 $\mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 11 \mathrm{Nb} 220-0$ $12 \mathrm{dxc} 5 \mathrm{Nxc} 513 \mathrm{Nd} 4 \mathrm{Qd} 7 \quad 14 \mathrm{~N} 2 \mathrm{f} 3$ Rac8 15 Kcl Rfde 16 Qe2 a6 17 a4 Qe8 18 Bc 3 b 619 Nxc 6 Rxc6 20 Bb 4 Nxb 3 21 Bxe7 Nxcl 22 Qxa6 Qxe7 23 Rxcl Qb4 24 Nel Rde8 25 g 3 hí 26 Nd 3 Qd2 $27 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \mathrm{Rxc} 228 \mathrm{Rxb} 6 \mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{c} 429 \mathrm{Rb} 3 \mathrm{Qdl}+$ $30 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rxf} 2+31 \mathrm{Nxf} 2 \mathrm{Qxb} 3 \quad 32 \mathrm{Qa} 8+\mathrm{Kh} 7$ 33 Qe8 Qb7 34 Qf8 Re8 35 Qa3 Kg 8 36 Qf3 Ra8 37 Nd3 Qb3 38 Nc5 Qxf3+ 39 Kx£3 Ra5. 0-1.
D. WEEGENAAR - T.LOVE, Grunfeld Defence: i d4 Nf6 2 c 4 g6 3 Nc3 d5 4 Nf 3 Bg 7
 9 Qxf3 dxc4 10 Bxc4 Nbd7 $1110-0$ e5 12 Rfdl exd4 13 exd4 Nb $6 \quad 14$ Bb 3 Re 8 15 Bg5 Od6 16 Bft 4 Qd7 $17 \mathrm{Be} 5 \mathrm{Nbd5}$ 1.8 Na' b6 19 Racl Rac8 20 Ne3 Nxc3 21 bxc 3 Nd 522 c 4 Nc 723 Bxg 7 Kxg 7 $24 \quad \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 25 \quad$ Qc $3+\mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 26 \quad \mathrm{Qc} 2 \quad \mathrm{a} 6 \quad 27 \quad$ a4 2528 Od2 Red8 29 Re3 Ne6 30 Rel Nd4 31 Bd 1 Kg 732 Rce $3 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 33 \mathrm{Qb} 2 \mathrm{Rb} 8$ $34 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Qd} 6+35 \mathrm{~g} 3$ Q $£ 6 \quad 36 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rx} 3$ 37 txe3 Nf5 38 Qxfft Kxf6 39 e 4 Nd4 40 e5t Ke7 41 g4 Kd8 $42 \mathrm{Rfl} \mathrm{Rb8}$ $43 \mathrm{Rf6} \mathrm{Rb} 7 \quad 44 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \quad 45 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 7$ $46 \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{Kf} 8 \quad 47 \mathrm{h4} \mathrm{Kg} 748 \mathrm{Rc} 6 \mathrm{Rb} 8$ 49 Rf6 $65 \quad 50 \mathrm{hxg} 5 \mathrm{hxg} 5 \quad 51 \mathrm{Bf} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 7$ 52 d 6 Rd 7533 Kd 5 Rd 854 Be 4 Rd 7 55 Rf5 Rd8 56 Be4 Rd7 57 RE2 Rd8 $58 \mathrm{Rh} 2 \mathrm{Rg} 8 \quad 59 \mathrm{~B} \ddagger 5 \mathrm{Ra}$ R $8 \quad 60 \mathrm{Kh} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 8$ $61 \mathrm{Rh} 5 \mathrm{Nf} 3,1$ - 0.
T.DOWDEN - R.GIBEONS, King's Gambit:
e4 e5 $2 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Qh} 4+3 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Qe} 7 \quad 4 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{exf4}$

 12 Nxc $7+$ Kd7 13 Nxe6 fxe6 14 0xg4 Nc6 $15 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{Qa}+16 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \mathrm{Nd} 417$ dxe6+ Nxe6 18 Nf 5519 Rh3 Re8 20 Ne5 +Kd 8 $21 \mathrm{Bg} 5+\mathrm{Kc} 8$ 22. d74, 1 - 0 on move 28. M.TURNER - D.COOPER, Ruy Lopez:

1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 f5 4 d3 fxe4 5 dxe4 Nf6 6 O-0 d6 7 Nba 2 Be6 8 c 3 a6 9 Ba4 Qd 710 h3 h6 11 Rel g 5 $12 \mathrm{Bb} 30-0-0 \quad 13$ Bxe6 Qxe6 14 Qb 3 Qe8 $15 \mathrm{Nfl} \mathrm{g} 4 \quad 16 \mathrm{ixg} 4 \mathrm{Nxg} 4 \quad 17 \mathrm{Ng} 3 \mathrm{~Kb} 8$ 18 Qd1 Rg8 i9 b4 Be7 20 a4 $496 \quad 21 \quad b 5$ Nxf2 22 Kxf2 Qxg $3+23 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{~d} 5$ : 24 bxc6 Bg5t 25 Kd 3 dxe4t 26 Kc 4 Rxdi 27 Rxdl exf3 28 gxf3 Qxf3 29 Bxg5 Qxc6t, 0-1 D. WEEGENAAR - M.LEESE, Ruy Lopez: 1 e4 e5 2 Nf 3 Ne6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 5 Qe2 d $6 \quad 6$ с 3 Bd7 7 0-0 Be7 8 Rd1 0-0 d4 Qe8 10 Bc2 Bg4 11 d5 Nd8 12 h Bh5 13 a $4 \mathrm{Kh} 8 \quad 14 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Ng} 8 \quad 15 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 6$ 16 Nbd2 f6 17 Nfi h5 $18 \mathrm{Ng} 3 \mathrm{hxg}^{4}$ 19 hxg 4 Nf 720 Nh4 Nfh6 21 Kg 2 Bh 25 Nhf5+ Bxf5 26 Nxf5+ Nxf5 27 Rh7+ 1- 0 .

## Titles Galore!

Many titles were awarded or confirmed during the FIDE Congress in Malta. There were 15 new GMs, 58 IMs, 86(!) FMs, 3 WIMs and 78 IAs
We will content ourselves with the games of the 15 Grandmasters: Flesch (HUN), Ftacnik (CZ), Grunfeld (ISR) Jusupov (USSR), Kasparov (USSR), Kuligowski (POL), Kupreichik (USSR) Mednis (USA), Panchenko (USSR), Rashkovsky (USSR), Ree (NL), Seirawan (USA) Soltis (USA), Speelman (ENG) \& Timoshenko (USSR)

An inportant change was made to the FIDE Rating rules: a player who wins a rated tournament cannot lose rating points.
ALGEBRAIC NOTATION: As from list Jan. algebraic notation will be obligatory in tournaments and matches in the FIDE cycle for the individual World Championship - and thus the oniy recognised
notation system in FIDE.
$t$
$t$
$+$

## THE OLYMPIADS

 introductionAs anticipated the Chess Olympiads held on the small island of Malta during November and December turned out to be the biggest ever held with 82 teams competing in the Mens Olympiad and 42
teams competing in the Womens Olynpiad.
The organisation of the Olympiads, an especially massive task this time considering the number of players
delegates and reporters, was undertaken by the Maltese Chess Federation with the backing of the Maltese Socialist Govt. which had to guarantee U.S. $\$ 300,000$ to FIDE. A lot of help came from outside Malca - the Yugoslavian Chess Federation provided match arbiters and other officials while Bob Wade and a group of English chessplayers took on the task of producing the daily bulletins. B.H.Wood of England provided all the clocks and the chess sets used at the 01ympiad. The accomodation was sponsored by the FEST'A travel company and other local sponsorship was found in the form of Rank Xerox Image Systems, ICL etc.
Naturally there were many problems facing the organisers in Malta - many of these, however, were sorted out after the initial days of chaos
THE RACE FOR FIRST
The strong Hungarian tean headed by GM Lajos Porcisch took an early lead in the Olympiad with a $4-0$ victory in the first round against Scotland followed by a $3 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ victory against Norway and a 3-1 victory against Sweden. In reply to this the USSR team could only score $2 \frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ against the Venezuelan team in round one but followed this up with $3 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ victories against Greece and Austria. The surprisingly poor form of GM's Folugaevsky and Tal helped to contribute to Hungary's early lead and oth these players were later dropped from the soviel tean in favour of Geller alashov and Kasparov.
After 8 rounds Hungary lead by a lear point with $22 \frac{1}{2}$, followed by Russia nd Yugoslavia on $21 \frac{1}{2}$.
ROUND 9
The USSR could only take 2 points off Czekos lovakia (Karpov beating Hort and Polugaevsky losing to Smejkal). In the top match Hungary beat Finland $3 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$
again when took over the second place again when they defeated England $2 \frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$. Miles defeated Ljubojevic after both players had rattled off the first twenty moves or so at lightning speed. Further back Holland defeated Sweden 3 - 1 , Romania defeated Poland 3-1 and Israel defeated Colombia by $3-1$. Leading 3 Scores: 1 Hungary 26; 2 Yugoslavia 24 ;

LJUBOJEVIC - MILES, Sicilian Dragon:
1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 Nc3 g6 6 Be3 Bg7 7 f3 0-0 8 Qd2 Nć 9 Bc4 Bd7 $10 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \quad 11$ Bb 3 h 5
12 O-0-0 Ne5 13 Bg5 Rc5 14 f 4 Nc 4
15 Qd3 b5 16 e5 $5 \mathrm{Ng} 4 \quad 17 \mathrm{Ne} 4 \mathrm{Re} 8$ 18 exd6 f6 19 Rhel exd6 $20 \mathrm{Nxd6} \mathrm{Kh} 7$ 21 f5 Nxd6 22 fxg6+ Kh8 $23 \mathrm{Bf4} \mathrm{Ne} 5$ 24 Bxe5 fxe5 25 Nf 3 e $4 \quad 26$ Qxd6 exf3 27 Re7 Bg4 28 Qe5


28 ... Qxdl+ 29 kxdi £2+ $30 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Rfd} 3+$

ROUND 10
Hungary could only manage $2-2$ against the strong Dutch team (limman Portisch, Sosonko $\frac{1 / 2}{2}$ Ribli, Ree 0 Sax, Langeweg 1 Farago). Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia had four quick draws while ussk demolished Ice.land 3, Karpor managed to get his revenge against Frdrik Olafsson after his defeat at the hands of Olafsson a few weeks before in the Buenos Aires Clarin Tournament. England won 3 - l against Finland but Miles was held to a draw by Ractanen, who gained his final GM norm in Malta. Argentina and Bulgaria drew againsi USA and Rumania. Israel defeated Cuba $2 \frac{1}{2}$ $1 \frac{1}{2}$ while Australia held Sweden to a 2 2 draw. Leading scores: 1 Hungary 2712; 2 USSR 26 $\frac{1}{2}$; 3 Yugos lavia 26; 4-6 England, Czechoslovakia \& Bulgaria 24. F.OLAFSSON - KARPOV, English: 1 c4 e5 2 Nc3 Nf6 3 Nf3 Nc6, 4 e 3 Bb4 5 Qc2 Bxc3 6 Qxc3 Qe7 7 a3 a5 8 b3 d5 9 d4 exd4 10 Nxd4 Nxd4 11 Qxd4 $c 5$

$150-0$ Rfd8 16 Rel Nf6 $17 \mathrm{f3}$ Bd3 18 Bd1 b5 19 e 4 Nd5 20 Bd2 Nc7 21 Rac1 Ne6 22 Be 3 Rac8 23 Be 2 h 6 24 Qd2 Bxe2 25 Qxe2 c4 26 bxc4 bxc4 27 Rc3 Nd4 28 Qf1 Nb3 29 Rxc4 Qxa3 30 Rxc8 Rxc8 31 Qa6 Rc2 32 Qa8+ Kh7 33 Qd5 Qb2 34 Qxf7 Rxg2+ 35 Kfl Rg6 $36 \operatorname{Re} 2 \mathrm{Qb} 1+37 \operatorname{Re} 1 \mathrm{Qa} 2,0-1$.
ROUND 11
This round provided the spectators with the interesting clash between the USA and the USSR. Karpov and Kasparov beat Alburt and Shankovich, Balashov drew with Tarjan and Tal suffered defea at the hands of Seirawan. Hungary was satisfied with four quick draws against Czechoslovakia which allowed the Russian team to close the gap to just $\frac{1}{2}$ a point. The matches between Yugoslavia - Holland and Bulgaria - England ended in a draw. Rumania defeated Israel but Gheorghiu, still playing badly, lost to Liberzon. Leading scores: 1 Hungary $30 ; 2$ USSR 2912 3 Yugoslavia 28; 4 Rumania 27; England, Holland, Czechos lovakia \& Bulgaria all 5 th $=$ on $26 \frac{1}{2}$.
KARPOV - ALBURT, Alekhine's Defence: 1 e4 Nf6 2 e 5 Nd5 3 d4 d6 4 Nf3 Bg4 $5 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Nc} 6 \mathrm{c}^{2} \mathrm{Nb} 67$ exd6 exd6 8 d5
 $12 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{~g} 613 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Ng}^{4} 14 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Qf6} \mathrm{l}$ Re1 19 Bfl Nh6 20 Qxa5 Nf5 21 Rdl Kb 8 $19 \mathrm{Bf} 1 \mathrm{Nh} \mathrm{Re}^{22} 23$ Ob5 Nc8 $24 \mathrm{Rb} 3 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 25$ a5 29727 c5 dxc5 28 Bb 5 c 6 Qe7 26 Qa6 31 axb6 Nf3+ 29 Rxc6 Bda+ 32 Rxf3 Relt 33 1 - 0.

## ROUND 12

The top pairings for this round were Hungary - Rumania and USSR - Argentina! For Hungary Sax and Pinter beat their opponents and Portisch had the upper hand against Gheorghiu but eventually drew. Ribli drew with Suba. Meanwhile the USSR, now playing without Tal or Polugaevsky, won by $3 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$, Geller dropping the $\frac{1}{2}$ point. Yugoslavia won - 1 against beat Holland and bent right back to the by $2 \frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$. USA wity top with a 4 - 0 victory against
Incidentally, Denmark was the only top Incidentally, Denmar a granmaster since team playing without in the Olympiad Larsen ref is the top scores because it is FIDE rated. TSS 33 ; 3

Yugos lavia $30 \frac{1}{2} ; 4$ USA 29 $\frac{1}{2}$; 5-6 England \& Czechoslovakia 29.
GHINDA - SAX, Sicilian Defence:
1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 $5 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{Bb} 5+\mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 8 \mathrm{Qe} 2$ Ne6 9 O-0-0 Rc8 10 Bxc6 bxc6 11 £4 $0-0 \quad 12$ e5 dxe5 13 fxe5 Nd5 14 Nxd5 cxd5 15 e6 fxe6 16 Nxe6 Qb6 17 Nxg7 Rf2 18 Qd3 $\mathrm{Kxg} 719 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \mathrm{Bf5} 20 \mathrm{Be} 3$ Bxd3 21 Bxf2 Qf6, $0-1$.

## ROUND 13

USSR and Hungary took $2 \frac{1}{2}$ - $1 \frac{1}{2}$ against Rumania and Bulgaria. USA - Czechoslovakia, Sweden - England, and Yugoslavia Argentina all ended in draws. Iceland beat Holland $2^{\frac{1}{2}}-1^{\frac{1}{2}}$ the surprise being Timman's loss to the young Icelandic IM H.Olafsson. Denmark moved up by defeating West Germany by 3-1. Scores before the last round: $1-2$ Hungary \& USSR $35 \frac{1}{2} ; 3$
 Czechoslovakia 31; 7 Denmark $30 \frac{1}{2}$.

## ROUND 14

The race for first place provided a very exciting finish. USSR had to play Denmark and Hungary Iceland. Karpov had a small advantage, but after Jakobsen missed a clear draw the game was adjourned. Geller and Balashov won their games without difficulty against Hoi and Fedder. Kasparov agreed a draw in an unclear position against Ost Hansen after a surprising incident. Kasparov had sacrificed the exchange, but it was unclear how much he had in return. When both players had about 10 minutes left, Ost Hansen offered a draw, and Kasparov went to see his captain, Baturinsky.But he could not find him! When he finally found him, he was told to refuse, but on returning he found his clock with less than two minutes left and took the draw anyway - only to be scolded for so doing!

It looked as though Hungary could win 4 - 0 against Iceland at one stage of the match however Sax made a mistake against Petursson and had to be happy with a draw. Portisch, Ribli and Pinter beat H.olafsson, Arnason and Hjartarsson to make it $3 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$. When Karpov managed to win his adjourned game USSR and Hungary were equal with 39 points. The tie was broken by sum of the opponents scores which meant USSR with $449 \frac{1}{2}$ took first place ahead of Hungary on 448 Yugoslavia took third place

## Women's Olympiad

As with the Men's Olympiad, the Women's Olympiad turned out to be an extremely close race between Hungary and the USSR. In the last six rounds $(9-14)$ Hungary took 14 points from a possible
18 but the Soviet Union scored 14六!
After 8 rounds both teams had 18
points. In round 9 USSR beat Poland 2-1 and Hungary defeated Spain 2-1. USSR and Hungary were still equal after round 10 when they defeated respectiveIy England and Holland 3-0.

USSR took 3 points once again in the llth round against Australia while Hungary could only win $2-1$ in the match against Israel. In round 12 USSR drew all games against China, and when Hungary beat France 3-0 they were in front. The USSR managed to win all its games against the USA team in round 13 Hungary won 2-1 against Yugoslavia. Before the last round USSR had $30 \frac{1}{2}$ and Hungary 30

In the last round Hungary had a difficult opponent in China. Veroci won on top board but Ivanka and Angyalosine drew after respectively 49 and 46 moves against $W u$ and An. USSR had to play Yugoslavia. World Champion Chiburdanidze won against Markovic - GaprindashviIi and Aleksandria drew. Thus the USSR just managed to retain its crown by the slenderest of margins!

## FINAL STANDINGS:

1 USSR 32 $\frac{1}{2}$; 2 Hungary 32; 3 Poland 26 $\frac{1}{2}$; 4 Rumania 26; 5-6 China and West German 24; 7-8 Israel and Yugoslavia $23 \frac{1}{2}$; 9-10 Brazil \& Bulgaria 23; 11-12 Argentina \& Spain 22 $\frac{1}{2}$; 13-16 Australia, England, USA \& France 22; 17-24 Canada, Columbia, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Holland, Sweder \& Dominican Republic 21步; 25-27 India, Ireland \& Wales 21; 28-29 New Zealand \& Scotland $20 \frac{1}{2}$; 30-32 Denmark, Mexico \& Switzerland 20; 33-35 Austria, Finlan \& Egypt 1912; 36-37 Belgium \& Japan 19 38 Malta 15; 39 Puerto Rico $14 \frac{1}{2}$; 40 U.A.E. 13 $\frac{1}{2} ; 41$ US Virgin Islands 4; 42 Nigeria 1.
BEST SCORES:
Board 1: Chiburdanidze (USSR) 11 $\frac{1}{2} / 13$
Board 2: Gaprindashvili (USSR) $9 \frac{1}{2} / 12$
Board 3: Nutu (Rum) 712/10
Board 4: Ioseliani (USSR) 7 $7 \frac{1}{2} / 9$
A selection of games

GAPRINDASHVILI - GARCIA PADRON,Modern
 5 Nf3 e5 $6 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Ne} 77 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{O}-0 \quad 8 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{f}$
 12 Oc2 4413 Bd2 h6 $14 \mathrm{Nh} 3 \mathrm{Ng}_{4}$ 15 0-0-0 Nh4 16 Qd3 Nxg2 17 Rdg1 f3 18 Nxf4 Nxf2 19 Qe2 Nxh1 20 Ng 6 , 1 - 0 CHIBURDANIDZE - POLHRONIADE, Pirc Def.: 1 e4 d6 2 d4 Nf6 3 Nc3 g6 4 g 3 Bg 7 5 Bg2 0-0 6 Nge2 e5 7 h3 exd4 8 Nxd4 Nbd7 9 0-0 Re8 10 a4 Nc5 11 Rel a5 12 Bf4 Nh5 13 Be3 Nf6 14 f 3 Bd 7 15 Qd2 Nh5 $16 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 17 \mathrm{Bf} 2 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 18 \mathrm{f} 4$ Nh7 19 b3 Ne6 20 Rad1 Nxd4 21 Bxd4 Be6 22. Bxg7 Kxg7 23 Qd4+ Kg8 24 Nd5 Qc8 25 e5 dxe5 26 Rxe5 Bxd5 27 Bxd5 c6 28 Bc4 Nf8 29 Rdel Rd8 30 Bxf7+, 1-0.
PQLIHRONIADE - ERENSKA, Sicilian Def.: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 $5 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 5 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{a6} 7 \mathrm{Qf} 3 \mathrm{Qb} 6 \quad 8 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{Qc} 7$ $\mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{~b} 5 \quad 10 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Bb} 7 \quad 11 \mathrm{g5} \mathrm{Nfd7} 12 \mathrm{Be}$ 16 Rh2 45 b4 14 Ne 2 Nbd 715 Ng 3 Rc 8 19 cxd3 h6 20 Rf2 Bxe4 21 dxe4 Ob7 22 Rdl Nb8 23 f5 hxg5 24 fxé 4 Qb 7 $25 \mathrm{Na5}$ Qe7 $26 \mathrm{Be} 5 \mathrm{~g} 4 \quad 27$ Qxg4 Nd7 28 Qg6+, 1 - 0.
The next game won the Brilliancy prize for women:
VEROCI - GLAZ, Sicilian Defence:
1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d 4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 Bb4 6 e5 Nd5 7 Qg4 Kf8 8 Bd3 d6 $90-0$ Nxc3 10 bxc3 Bxc3 11 Rb 1 dxe5 $12 \mathrm{Nb} 5 \mathrm{Ba} 5 \quad 13 \mathrm{Ba} 3+\mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 14 \mathrm{Rfd} 1 \mathrm{Qf} 6$ 15 Nd6 Bd7 16 Rxb7 Bb6 17 Be4 Qxf2+
18 Kh1 h5 19 Qg5 Qe2 20 Bf3 Qxc2
21 Nxf7 e4 22 Rel Qd3 23 Ne 5 Qxa3 $24 \mathrm{Rc} 8+\mathrm{Q} f 825 \mathrm{Rxf} 8+\mathrm{Kxf} 8 \quad 26 \mathrm{Ng} 6+\mathrm{Kg} 8$ 7 Bxe4, $1-0$.

CALDWELL - SZMACINSKA, Ruy Lopéz 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 5 d4 exd4 6 O-0 Be7 $7 \mathrm{Rel} 0-0 \quad 8$ e5 Ne8 9 Bf4 b5 10 bb3 d5 11 Nxd4 Nxd4 12 Qxd4 c6 13 Qd3 f5 14 a4 Be6 15 c 3 Nc7 16 axb5 axb5 $17 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Qd} 7 \quad 18 \mathrm{Qg} 3$ Rxal 19 Rxal Ra8 20 Rxa8 Nxa8 21 Qe3 $c 5 \quad 22 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 7 \quad 23 \mathrm{Bc} 2$ Na6 24 h 3 b 4 25 Qe2 Qb7 26 Ng 5 Bxg5 27 Bxg5 bxc 3 28 bxc3 d4 29 cxd4 cxd4 30 g 4 Qc 8 31 gxf5 Bxf5 32 Bxf5 Qxf5 33 Qc4+ Kf8 $\begin{array}{llll}34 \mathrm{Bc} 1 \\ 37 \mathrm{fg} 6+ & 35 \mathrm{Kfl} \text { Qbl } 36 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qb} 7+ \\ 38 & \mathrm{Ba}+\mathrm{Kg} 7\end{array}$ $37 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 38 \mathrm{Ba} 3+\mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 39 \mathrm{Qxd4} \mathrm{Qb} 3$ 40 e $6+\mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 41 \mathrm{Qd} 8+, 1-0$.

$\longrightarrow$

| 39 | Fortugal |
| :--- | :--- |
| 40 | Calgium |
| 41 | lreland |
| 42 | Thailand |
| 43 | Pakistan |
| 44 | Dominican Republic |
| 45 | Indonesia |
| 46 | Mongolia |
| 47 | Paraguay |
| 48 | Trinidad E Tobago |
| 49 | Turkey |
| 50 | Malaysia |
| 51 | Scotland |
| 52 | Japan |
| 53 | Guyana |
| 54 | Luxembourg |
| 55 | Algeria |
| 56 | New Zealand |
| 57 | Lebanon |
| 58 | Tunisia |
| 59 | Egypt |
| 60 | Utd Arab Emirates |
| 61 | Malta |
| 62 | Zimbabwe |
| 63 | Puerto Rico |
| 64 | Malta B |
| 65 | Janaica |
| 66 | U.S. Virgin Islands |
| 67 | Hong Kong |
| 68 | Guernsey |
| 69 | Jordan |
| 70 | Cyprus |
| 71 | Kenya |


|  |  | :32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:10 | $31: 52$ | 12:32 | 2:24 | 2:56 | 3:36 | 1:07 |  |  | 2:57 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 31 | 112:29 | 12:38 | 3:53 | 112:56 | $\frac{1}{2}: 37$ | 3:70 | $\frac{1}{2}: 39$ | 1: $2: 27$ | 3 : |  |  | 1:22 |
|  | 212:28 | 3:68 | 0:09 | 2:59 | 2:53 |  |  | 2:27 | $3: 56$ | $2 \frac{1}{2}: 4$ | 2:41 | $1 \frac{1}{2}: 36$ | 1 $\frac{1}{2}: 30$ |
|  | 4:82 | 21: 58 | . 10 | 4:75 | :33 | 2:52 | 2 | $1 \frac{1}{2}: 30$ | 1:72 | 2:40 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ : | 21:57 |  |
|  |  | 11:10 | 4:62 |  |  | 1:3 | 2:2 |  | :2 |  |  |  |  |
| $4: 82$ | 2:06 | :1 | $3: 56$ | :32 | :30 |  |  |  |  | 42 | 31:62 | 21:27 | $1:$ |
| 7 | 97 | $2 \frac{1}{2} \times 3$ | $3: 29$ | 112 | 2:07 | $1 \frac{1}{2}: 2$ | 112: | 3:47 | 0:1 | 3: | $2 \cdot$ |  |  |
| 0:08 | 4.67 |  | 崖 |  | $\frac{1}{2}:$ |  | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ : |  | 2:5 |  |  |  |  |
| 0:38 | 2:30 | 21: 5 | :73 | $3: 6$ |  | 21: ${ }^{2}$ | 2:59 | :28 | 112:60 | 3:6 |  |  | 21:57 |
| 0:06 | 4:80 | 3:5 | $1 \frac{1}{2}: 22$ | $\frac{1}{2}: 38$ |  | $3 \frac{1}{2}: 6$ | 2:4 | 1:44 | :5 | 2:60 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ : 5 |  |  |
| 3ı:65 | 11:03 | 0:5 | 2:50 | $2 \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}$ |  | $\frac{1}{2}: 18$ | $2: 6$ | 12:7 | 2:49 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 312:70 | 4:6 | 2:36 | 1:25 | $4: 48$ | 2:26 | 21 123 | :0 | 23:17 | 2:09 |  | 13 | ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}: 27}$ |
| 16 | $\frac{1}{2}: 40$ | $1 \frac{1}{2}: 4$ | .6 | 1: $\frac{1}{2}$ 63 | 32:66 | 2:43 | . 47 | 21: 5 | $\frac{1}{2}: 53$ | 23: |  |  |  |
| 1.15 | 212:75 | $1: 6$ | $3:$ | 1:41 | 2:42 | : 5 | 1:6 |  | 32:52 | 2.6 |  |  |  |
| :23 | 31:79 | 1:49 | 1:27 | $1 \frac{1}{2}:$ | 4:55 | 2:7 |  | 21: ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ |  | 2:64 |  |  |  |
| 5 | :65 | 1: $1: 69$ | 21: 277 | 21: 68 | 0.54 | 21: $1: 66$ |  | 1-37 | . 75 | 2:7 |  |  |  |
| 31:55 | 0:12 | 4:50 | 1:45 | 2:40 | 2t. 4 | 1:22 | 2:27 | 11/2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| +:12 | 2:66 | 32:72 | 21 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1-2:48 | 2:63 |
|  | $3 \frac{1}{1}$ | 1-1:43 |  |  |  |  | 2:4 |  | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}: 2$ | 212:4 | 1:4 |  |
|  |  |  | 2:50 | 2:58 | . 31 | 21 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}: 63}$ | 21: $2: 65$ | : 40 | $2 \frac{1}{2}: 4$ | :4 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 11: 53 |  |
|  | $3 \frac{1}{1}: 7$ | 3:53 | 1:34 | :48 | $2: 318$ | $\frac{1}{2}: 49$ | 2:50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | 32: 69 | 2:28 | 0:44 | 4:18 | :5 | 112 | $1 \frac{1}{2}: 30$ | 1:6 | $3 \frac{1}{2}: 7$ |  |  |  |  |
| :36 | 2:72 | 59 |  | 21: 52 | $1 \frac{1}{2}: 6$ |  |  | $1 \frac{1}{2}: 5$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | :73 |  | $2 \cdot$ | $2 \frac{1}{2}: 7$ | 1:6 | 2: 271 |  | $\frac{1}{2}: 52$ |  |  |
|  | 3:55 | 0:51 | 3:80 | 2:70 | :18 | 21:73 | 11: ${ }^{1}$ :60 | 1:72 | 22: 69 | 1:48 | 2:74 | 21:79 |  |
| 07 | 2:57 | 1:60 | 11: 176 | 212:69 | $\frac{1}{2}: 52$ |  | $2 \frac{1}{2}: 8$ | 21: | 21: 67 | 1:73 | 2t |  |  |
| :32 | 0:47 | $2 \frac{1}{2}: 71$ | 1:52 | 2.17 | 21: 79 | 2:69 | 2:78 | , 6 |  |  |  | 3:68 |  |
| 0:31 | 31: 81 | 1:42 | 1:53 | 1: $2: 55$ | $1 \frac{1}{2}: 75$ | $2 \frac{1}{2}: 77$ | $2 \frac{1}{2}: 7$ | 3:62 | 1:6 | 2:72 | 1:48 |  | - 180 |
| 29 | 1 ${ }^{1}: 62$ | 21: $5: 5$ | :72 | 17: $: 66$ | 2:77 | $2: 67$ |  | 31: | $1 \frac{1}{1 \frac{1}{2}}$ |  | 1:70 |  |  |
|  | 交:51 | 2:77 | 4:81 | 2: | 3:73 | 2:54 |  | 11: 50 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0:4 | :6 |  |  | 2: |  | 2:75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| $28 \frac{1}{2}$ | 406 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $28 \frac{1}{2}$ | 395 |
| $28 \frac{1}{2}$ | $391 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $28 \frac{1}{2}$ | 390 |
| $28 \frac{1}{2}$ | $372 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 28 | 399 |
| 28 | $397 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $27 \frac{1}{2}$ | $402 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $27 \frac{1}{2}$ | 397 |
| $27 \frac{1}{2}$ | $370 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $27 \frac{1}{2}$ | $364 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $27 \frac{1}{2}$ | $350 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 27 | $423 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 27 | 363 |
| $26 \frac{1}{2}$ | 369 |
| $26 \frac{1}{2}$ | 369 |
| $26 \frac{1}{2}$ | 351 |
| 26 | 401 |
| 26 | $389 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 26 | $357 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $25 \frac{1}{2}$ | 391 |
| $25 \frac{1}{2}$ | 379 |
| $25 \frac{1}{2}$ | $376 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $25 \frac{1}{2}$ | $369 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $25 \frac{1}{2}$ | 357 |
| $25 \frac{1}{2}$ | 352 |
| $25 \frac{1}{2}$ | $348 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $25 \frac{1}{2}$ | 333 |
| 25 | 349 |
| 25 | 345 |
| 25 | 333 |
| $24 \frac{1}{2}$ | 366 |
| $24 \frac{1}{2}$ | $318 \frac{1}{2}$ |


| 72 | Nigeria |
| :--- | :--- |
| 73 | Faroe Islands |
| 74 | Andorra |
| 75 | Libya |
| 76 | Br. Virgin Islands |
| 77 | Bernuda |
| 78 | Zaire |


| $23 \frac{1}{2}$ | 361 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $23 \frac{1}{2}$ | 355 |
| $23 \frac{1}{2}$ | $345 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $23 \frac{1}{2}$ | 344 |
| $23 \frac{1}{2}$ | 326 |
| 23 | 326 |
| 23 | $319 \frac{1}{2}$ |


| 79 | Monaeo | $20 \frac{1}{2}$ | 326 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 80 | Papua-New Guinea | $19 \frac{1}{2}$ | $329 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 81 | Uganda | $17 \frac{1}{2}$ | 302 |
| 82 | Angola | $13 \frac{1}{2}$ | $333 \frac{1}{2}$ |

## OLYMPIAD - Captains Report by P.Stuart <br> For the first time New Zealand sent <br> certainly not as good as in Buenos Aires

virtual five-man team instead of the by the Australians a practice followed main reason for this was the Ifmitation of free accommodation in Malta to six men and four women including team captains. The sixth board in the Men's tear, myself, could play in an emergency in addition to carrying out the captain's duties. With a Swiss tourney limited to thirteen or fourteen rounds (depending on the number of teams) a five-man team makes more sense as it gives each player more games and there is not the same need for reserves as there perhaps was under the old system where up to 23 rounds could be played.

Our aim was to give each player an equal chance to play himself into form over the first ten or eleven rounds before the crunch rounds at the end when we would ficld our strongest team. In a Swiss Olympiad we must always hope to peak right at the end - in 1978 we just about achieved this to perfection, peaking in round thirteen and then holding our place in the last round with a 2 : tie versus the strong Philippine tean to finish 25 th. Of course a fair measure of Juck is necessary to time things
correctly (it would be unthinkable to deliberately lose a match ir round 11 or 12 to avoid peaking too early!) and it is therefore probably too much to expect New Zealand to frequently emulate its buencs Aires success - after all the 25 th and 26 th teams at Malta fielded five grandmasters between them.! On the orher hand we should never be blind to the chance of an even better result.
nere was one major change to the pairing rules. Whereas previously colours were a main criterion in choosing pairings, this time they had no influence on the actual pairings at all c.f. NZCA's Swiss Rules. This made it well nigh impossible to arrange reasonable colour 'histories' for team members The situation for Sarapu (who had five consecutive whites at the end) and Small (6 consecutive blacks) was aggravated when their planned rest days were switched due to Vernon's slight illness. Unfortunately not even one player struck consistent form. As the results would indicate, Murray Chandler was our best player in MaIta but his play was
and he was not happy with his form either. Notwi happy with his form hed $50 \%$ with only two rounds to go and a moderate +1 in those rounds to go and would have put us around 35 th about twenty places higher than we actually finished after two disastrous results.

I should make mention at this point of the fiendish plot hatched by the Aussies (they firished behind us in Buenos Aires and obviously didn't want a repeat in Malta). The Australian team carefully caught colds some while before the olympiad and were still snuffiling sufficiently as the olympiad started to pass the disease on to us while not finhibiting their own play. It is significant that the first peopie we met in Malta were none other than Mr and Mrs Koshnitsky!

ROLND ONE, 20 November

| ALGERIA | $\frac{1}{2}$ | NEW ZEALAND | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cherrad | 0 | Sarapu | 1 |
| Siimani | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Small | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Kharchi | 0 | Aptekar | 1 |
| Bounedjar | 0 | Anderson | 1 |

Murray was not due to arrive until some hours after the round started so that settled the team selection for the first round. Sarapu and Anderson both won pawns but Aptekar, a bundle of nerves in his first international, had to give up his queen for two minor pieces so a litile assistance from his opponent was necessary for him to win. mall adjourned in a difficult position but a neat resource found during the adjournment eventually saw him come We to winning in the second session. (We later found out that Vernon had but because the aigerian in because the Aigerian team had put in the wrong board order for their players Slimani, their no.1, had to play nitor.) for the rest of the olympiad ditor.)
ROUND TWO, 21 November

| NEW ZEALAND | 0 | SWEDEN | 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Chandler: | 0 | Andersson | 1 |

Aptekar 0 Wedbers 1 Anderson 0 Renman

The Swedish four had an average rating of 2465 and were headed by one of the world's top players in GM Ulf Andersson but a $0: 4$ loss still had to rather disappointing. On top board Chandler was outplayed quite impressively but Sarapu and Aptekar were holding their own until late in the session. Sarapu actually lost this game on time - the clocks being used in Malta had one of those funny flag arrangenents where the flag goes up and down and up again so that you are wever sure wou are way it is going, unless perhaps you are used to them which Sarapu wasn t. Whle on the subject of clocks it could be mentioned that they didn' time very well either. Part way through one of our matches I tallied the timers and found four different totals with a ten minute spread
ROUND THREE, 22 November

| NEW ZEALAND | 4 | MALAYSIA | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Chandler | 1 | Liew | 0 |
| Sarapu | 1 | Foo | 0 |
| Smail | 1 | Cheah | 0 |
| Anderson | 1 | Kahman | 0 |

A convincing result, Chandler and Small winning comfortably, Sarapu with rather more difficulty and Anderson easily soon after the adjournment. The Malaysians did not suffer another such defeat during the olympiad.

## ROUND FOUR, 23 November

| INDONESIA | 3 | NEW ZEALAND | 1 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Handoko | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Chandler | $\frac{1 / 2}{2}$ |
| Suradiradja | 1 | Sarapu | 0 |
| Ardiansjah | 1 | Small | 0 |
| Gunawan | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Aptekar | $\frac{1}{2}$ |

A second disappointing result.
Chandler gained the advantage with the black pieces but Handoko gained a lot f counterplay which turned out to sufficient for the draw. As again Sweden Sarapu lost on time, the position being a probable draw. Sull also shourd have draw a rook and pawn ending which did
acrificed a pawn for a worthwhile initiative but was unwilling to take risks in such an event and settled for a balanced position. Only a iater mistake gave Gunawa a $R$ en $Q$ ending ut wo paws pach in which he was able to bild fortress. Auy winning attempt the Iodonesian would have entafled reat risk so a draw was agreed at the g reat risk so a draw was ag

ROUND FIVE, 25 November
BELGIUM 2 NEW ZEALAND
Meulders 0 Chandler
De Bruycker $\frac{1}{2}$ Sma11
Goormachtigh 1 Aptekar
Schumacher $\quad \frac{1}{2}$ Anderson
Chandler again won quite nicely,
Small drew very uneventfully and Anderson failed to make anything of a clear advantage in an Exchange Variation of the Queen's Gambit, the position being drawn at the adjournment. Aptekar achieved a very good position with the black pieces but another blunder saw him lose his third queen and this time there was no escape.

We had now scored $10 \frac{1}{2} / 20$, just over $50 \%$ which we were happy to maintain at this stage. Furthernore, the effects of jetlag should have been overcome by this time.
ROUND SIX, 26 November

| NEW ZEALAND | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | IRELAND | $1^{\frac{1}{2}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Chandler | 1 | Delaney | 0 |
| Sarapu | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Doyle | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Small | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Ludgate | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Anderson | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Curtin | $\frac{1}{2}$ |

Chandler continued on his winning way in fine style and now had scored $70 \%$. Despite having chances, nobody else could win. Sarapu reached a very blocked position which Doyle bravely tried to win only to come close to losing. Small had a space advantage but exchanges following the breaking open of the position left hinl with a minimally inferior ending when the draw was agreed. Anderson actually won two pawns but one was too far advanced to hold and the other was doubled so a draw resulted here too. The team now had +2 ( $54.2 \%$ ).
ROUND SEVEN, 27 November

NEW ZEALAND
Chandler
Sarapu
ITALY 3

Aptekar
Zichichi
Taruffi
AndersonLannacon

1
This was one match we never really looked like tying, let alone winning. fellow IM while headway against his inferior position fron the a distinctly before losing tactically versus IM Zichichi (Actuall. Chander reached rinning position against iu reached forced to play a repetition of moves was avoid losing on time - Ed, Andersen tade one horrible move which the eventual loss of a resulted in again played a most a pawn. Aptekar ghich played a most interesting game ending with both sides having passed wons the Italia' advanced Our adjournment analysis indicated good drawing chances but Taruffi varied from our analysis arly and then over-pressed In very final position Aptekar fappy to get raw for which he had, been the verlooked a he had been playing pectators) which would have given ood practical winning chances. Now pood practical wi ROUND EIGHT, 28 November

| GREECE | 2 | NEW ZEALAND | 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Skembris | 1 | ChandIer | 0 |
| Skalkotis | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Sarapu | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Pountzas | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Small | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Natsis | 0 | Aptekar | 1 |

Neither Sarapu nor Aptekar gained a good position from the opening with the white pieces but Lev recovered to win quite handsomely while Ortvin also came close to winning. Snall equalised quickly as black and the Greek's minute advantage at the adjournment carried with it no real prospects of a win. Nevertheless Pountzas played on, and on, and on .... into a third session. Greek captain Siaperas agreed with me that the game was hopelessly drawn and apologised profusely for his player's refusal to accept a draw. Still on $50 \%$.
ROUND NINE, 29 Novenber
NEW ZEALAND $1 \frac{1}{2} \quad$ MEXICO

Small $\begin{array}{lll}\frac{1}{2} & \text { Campos } & 1 \\ \frac{1}{2}\end{array}$ Aptekar 0 Villareal 1 - O Villareal Maya
At previous olympiads we have met Mexico three tines for three tied results so this match was definitely backward step. It started well, too, as Sarapu was doing okay early on, Small won a pawn and Aptekar aiso had a clear advantage. Sarapu, however, missed his way and adjourned in a much inferior rook and pawn ending which should never theless have been drawn. Despite our adjournment analysis showing that Vernon's raking bishop was better than his opponent's knight, Small exchanged the minor pieces a little later and the resultant rook and pawn ending ( 4 pawas to 3 on the kingside) was drawn. Aptekar, a pawn up, snatched a second nawn at the cost of allowing his opponent strong counterplay with an advanced passed pawn and a further mistake in time pressure saw him lose. Anderson won very well on board four but a match which started so auspiciously gave us scant return. We were now - 1 ( $48.6 \%$ ).

## ROUND TEN, 30 Novenber

| THALLAND | 3 | NEW ZEALAND | 1 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Chaivichit | 1 | Chandier | 0 |
| Simprayoon | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Sarapu | $\frac{1 / 2}{2}$ |
| Trisa-ard | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Aptekar | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Darakorn | 1 | Andersor | 0 |

Thailand had only a four-man team and three of their piayers were known to us. bearing in mind our previous results gainst the same country this result onfidence Ct pravi' a boost to our hence. Chander's opponent played finding ong weakly but later started fying one strong move after another. ave ony fter the second session hances but fle then he had orst of a probably drawr ending. Afterad Anray comented that Chaivichit ad appeared to improve by about 200 ame Sarapu had such the course of the mi f the oue the ipening that he declared to failed to win:" out and sarapu, since he hal still da
now maintained that he would only be half giving up chess: Aptekar missed a exchange sacrifice which may well have been winning - a little while later the same sacrifice was absolutely necessary to force the draw. Anderson also let a good position slif and, at the adour ment, was three pawns in arrears but ith threaten' his opponent's king position. O ajournment analysis could but onchusively force a draw but bruce, seeing a win , varied fon analysis arly in the second session only that his "win was a mirage and his position hopeless 46.25\%)

ROUND FLEVEN, 2 December
NEW ZEALAND $3 \frac{1}{2}$ GUYANA $\frac{1}{2}$
Chatider 1 Broomes M. 0
Small $\frac{1}{2}$ Broomes G. $\frac{1}{2}$
Aptekar 1 Wharton
Aderson Austin
An easy victory against opposition hich was clearly weaker. The only setback was on board two where Small's opponent, playing the white side of a Closed Sicilian, played very solidly
with the obvious aim of drawing by boring. Eventually the only break left was on the kingside but it failed to give Small any winning chances. Now we were back on $50 \%$ - falling so tar below $50 \%$ had never held any terrors for me since we would almost certainly bounce back up against similar opposition to that which we met in round eleven. Of course, it is better still to be playing well enough to avoid any such indignity in the first place
ROUND TWELVE, 3 necember
MONGOLTA 2 NEW ZEALAND
Miagmarsuren $\frac{1}{2}$ Chandler
Tumurbator $\quad \frac{1}{2}$ Sarapu
Jigiidsuren $\quad \frac{1}{2} \quad$ Small
Lkhagva $\frac{1}{2}$ Anderson $\frac{1}{2}$
A more solid performance against similarly rated opposition. Chandler had the edge but lost it just before the adjournment. There was a brief moment of penic just before the resumption when Murray noticed a promising winning try for his opponent but we found an answer
time and the draw was agreed shortly after. Likewise Small agreed to a draw early in the second session after having the advantage in the first session - by he adjournment, however, any winning
try was franghi with peril.
Anderson played his best game of the ournanent - to move 35 when he was inning comfortably, the exchange and a tawn up. The blunder of an important awn at this point through overlooking a perpetual check possibility for his mponent made the win much more difficult as the Monzolian had the only queenside paws ieft on the board. Bruce pent most of the following day proving pin all variations since win there and anocher against suitable pposition in the last round could well have gained him a FIDE Master norm. Eventuatly in the fourth session, Anderson eschewed the win of that queenside pawn in favour of a non-existent mating attack whereupon he succumbed to a forced repetition

Although this kept up our $50 \%$ the match result was not a satisfactory one given the advantage we appeared to have after four hours of play.

## ROUND THIRTEEN, 4 December

| SYRIA | 3 | NEW ZEALAND | 1 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Catalan | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Chandler | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Hakki | 1 | Sarapu | 0 |
| Bitar | 1 | Small | 0 |
| Arafeh | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Aptekar | $\frac{1}{2}$ |

If the previous round was disappoint ing this was a disaster, coming too close to the end to allow for a real recovery. Sarapu, on the white side of Sicilian Dragon, lost horribly in critical line when his opponent theoretical knowledge proved to be spot on. Small made a strong effort to wi but came unstuck and appeared to be losing at the adjournment although we did find some drawing chances. Syrian, however, played an inferior line which we had not analysed and vernon had a fairly easy draw but went badiy astra Aptekar's clear advantage disappeare into an opposite colour bishop ending. ROUND FOURTEEN, 6 Decenber

| NEW ZEALAND | 1 | PAKISTAN | 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Chandler | 1 | Farooqi | 0 |
|  | 0 | Zafar | 1 |

The early start to the round (13:30 hours instead of 15:00) made no difference to our play. Chandler played consistently throughout to win on top board but no-one else could emulate him Small missed a comfortable win and later may have been slightly behind on
position when he blundered a piece. Anderson sacrificed a pawn for what appeared to be a promising initiative but Steinitzian defence by his opponent saw the initiative disappear, along with a couple more pawns. Aptekar lost a pawn for nothing and a later desperate piece sacrifice failed to result in the hoped for perpetual check.

In the table of individual results below the bracketed figures show the number of whites and blacks.

|  |  | $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{W}-\mathrm{B})$ | W | L | D | $\%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Chandler | $12(6-6)$ | 5 | 3 | 4 | 58.33 |
| 2 | Sarapu | $11(6-5)$ | 2 | 5 | 4 | 36.36 |
| 3 | Small | $11(4-7)$ | 1 | 3 | 7 | 40.91 |
| 4 | Aptekar | $11(8-3)$ | 3 | 4 | 4 | 45.45 |
| 5 | Anderson | $11(4-7)$ | 4 | 4 | 3 | 50.00 |
| 6 | Stuart | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | It is very difficult to | explain |  |  |  |  |

It is very difficult to explain why this team performed so poorly. My own sychological, our thinking mainly psychological, our thinking being ing factors. First this three compell anyway, probably the stronge on paper have sent to an olymiad. secondly results in the int 21st (51.9\%) and 25th (52.7\%) ; thirdly, we were seeded 25 th ) and 2 the ccasions as to the warns of several teams I think the strength of opposing estimate some players tended to shose without opposing tearus, notably e knew). This is experience (as far as that New Zealand did rela by the fact gainst established teams (e, Greece, Mongolia) but failed dis. Ireland against some emerging ches nations notably Thailand, Syria and Pakistan
The first of those factors mention ove will probably not, hature, have any influence in the future. Bearing in mind my introductory
remarke we should probably have tried to forget the second factor and we should certainly have tried to ignore the third quite simply our seeding was totally wrong and our correct ranking would have been 37th; I have no idea how the mistake was made. Nevertheless the combination of all three points did make it difficult for our team not to set its sights fairly high.

Doubtless physical aspects come into it too. Quite simply the physical fitness of the team could be in doubt (although Bruce Anderson, for one, did train before the olympiad and was probably fitter than at either of his previous two Olympiads) but jetlag has been more consistently blamed even thout one of our worst results came neat the end when this was no longer a factor.

Perhaps the biggest problem faced by New Zealand teams competing in such evente is the lack of suitable tournatents in this country providing sufficiently strong opposition. We ar at a considerable disadvantage compared to, say, the European teams whose players, even if not professionals, have much re opportunity to meet strong opposition in both round robin and open Swles tournatents. I guess it all comes back to question of money!

Gentrally speaking the theoretical preparation of our players was very good indeed - more often than not the team gained clear advantages in the early stages, only to fritter them away toward the end of the session. Despite this our play was not as bad as the final placing might suggest and the fac that every one of our opponents (even those we hammered) finished above us shows how misleading the final results can be in such Swiss events.
A selection of games from the Men's Olympiad follows:
CHANDLER - ANDERSSON, Nimzoindian Def: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 e3 c5 5 Ne 2 cxd4 6 exd4 $0-0 \quad 7$ a3 Be7 8 d exd5 9 cxd5 Re8 $10 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Be} 5 \quad \mathrm{ll} \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{~d} 6$ $12 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{a} 6 \quad 130-0 \mathrm{Nbd} 7 \quad 14 \mathrm{Nd} 4 \mathrm{Ne} 5$ 15 Nce2 Bd7 16 b4 Ba7 17 Qb3 Rc8 18 Bf4 Nh5 19 Bd2 Nc4 20 Bc3 Ne3 21 Rfel Nxg2 22 Kxg 2 Qg5 23 Radl Re4 24 Bd2 Qg6 25 Be3 Rce8 26 Kh 2 h 6 27 Rgl Bxd4 28 Nxd4 Nf6 29 Nf3 Qf5 $30 \mathrm{~g} 4,0-1$.

CAMILLERI - DEBARNOT, French Defence: 1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 e5 c5 4 dxc5 Nc6 5 Nf3 Bc5 6 Bd3 f6 7 exf6 Nxf6 8 0-0 $0-0 \quad 9$ c4 Qd6 10 Nc 3 a6 11 Bg 5 Ng 4 ! 12 h3 Nd4! 13 hxg4 Nxf3+ 14 gxf3 Qg3+ 15 Kh I Qh3+ $16 \mathrm{Kgl} \mathrm{Rxf3} 17$ Qxf3 Qxf3 $18 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Qg} 3+19 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Qh} 3+20 \mathrm{Kgl}$ Bd 6 , 0-1.
KASPAROV - MARJANOVIC, Queen's Indian: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c 4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 4 g 3 Bb 7 5 Bg 2 Be 760000078 d5 exd5 8 Nh c6 9 cxd5 Nxd5 10 Nf5 Nc7 11 Nc 3 d 15 Re 1 Od 716 Bh 3 Kh 817 Ne 4 Bxb 2 15 Rel Qd7 16 Bh3 Kh8 17 Ne 4 Bxb 2
$\begin{array}{lllll}18 & \mathrm{Ng} 5 & \text { Qc6 } & 19 \mathrm{Ne} 7 \mathrm{Qf} 6 & 20 \mathrm{Nxh} 7 \mathrm{Qd4} \\ 21 \text { Qh5 g6 } & 22 \text { Oh4 Bxal } & 23 \mathrm{Nf} 6+, \mathrm{I}-\mathrm{O} .\end{array}$ SMALL - CHEAH, Sicilian Defence:
1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 $5 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 70-0$ 0-0 8 Bg 5 Nc6 9 Nb 3 a5 10 a4 Nb4 $11 \mathrm{Khl} \mathrm{b6}$ $12 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Bb} 7 \quad 13 \mathrm{Bf} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \quad 14 \mathrm{Rf} 2 \mathrm{Nd} 7$ 15 Nd4 Qe8 16 Ndb5 Ne5 17 f 5 h 6 18 Be3 g5 19 Bd4 Bxd4 20 Nxd4 Nd7 21 h4 gxh4 22 Qd2 Kh7 23 Qf4 Ne5 24 Qxh4 Rg8 $25 \mathrm{Ncb} 5 \mathrm{Rg} 5 \quad 26 \mathrm{f} 6 \mathrm{Rc} 4$ 27 b3 Rc5 28 Nf5 Rxf5 29 exf5 Nxf3 30 gxf3 Rxf5 31 fxe7 Qc6 32 Nd4 Qc3 33 Nxf5 Bxf3+ $34 \mathrm{Kh} 2,1-0$.
RIBLI - SEIRAWAN, Nimzoindian Defence: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 4 Nc3 Bb4 $5 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{Bh} 4 \mathrm{~g} 57 \mathrm{Bg} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 48 \mathrm{Qc} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 7$ 9 e3 f5 10 Bd3 Bxc3+ 11 bxc3 d6 12 d5 exd5 13 cxd5 Bxd5 14 Nd4 Q£6 15 f3 Ne5 16 Bxy5 Nba 19 Re4 Kb8 20 Nxd6 Ne5 21 Rxd8+ Be6 19 Be4 Rxd8 22 0-0 Bd7 23 Nd4 Ba4 24 Bxe5 1-0.
SCHNEIDER - GEORGIEV, Sicilian Defence: 1 e4 c5 $2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~d} 63 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{cxd4} 4 \mathrm{Nxd} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6$ 5 Nc3 a6 6 f4 e6 7 Bd3 Nc6 8 Nf3 Be7 9 0-0 Nd7 10 Khl b5 11 Qel Bb7 12 Qg 3 $0-0 \quad 13$ e5 Nb4 14 f5 Nxe5 15 Nxe5 dxe5 16 Bh6, 1 - 0
MEULDERS - CHANDLER, Grunfeld Defence:
1 d4 Nf6 2 c 4 g6 6 Nc3 d5 4 cxd5 Nxd5 $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}5 & \mathrm{e} 4 & \mathrm{Nxc} 3 & 6 & \mathrm{bxc} 3 & \mathrm{Bg} 7 & 7 \mathrm{Nf} 3 & \mathrm{c} 5 & 8 & \mathrm{Be} \\ 0 \mathrm{a} 5 & 9 & \mathrm{Od} 2 & 0-0 & 10 & \mathrm{Rcl} & \mathrm{cxd} 4 & 11 & \mathrm{cxd} 4\end{array}$ Qxd2+ 12 Nxd2 e6 $\quad 13$ Bb5 a6 14 Ba4 b5


21 Bxa. 6 Rxa. 622 Rc $7 \mathrm{Bb} 5 \quad 23 \mathrm{Rbl}$ Bd 3
24 Ral f5 25 f3 Rd8 $\quad 26$ e5 5 Bf8 $\quad 27$ f4 $24 \mathrm{Ral} 5525 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Rd} 8 \mathrm{Cl}^{26}$ e5 Bf8 27 f 4 $\begin{array}{lllllllll}\text { a3 } & 28 & \text { Rc3 } & \mathrm{Bb5} & 29 & \mathrm{Kf} 2 & \mathrm{Bc} 6 & 30 & \mathrm{Nc} 4 \\ 31 & \mathrm{Nb} & \mathrm{Rb} 8 & 32 & \mathrm{Nd} 3 & \mathrm{Be} 4 & 33 & \mathrm{Ke} 2 & \mathrm{Rb} 1\end{array}$ 34 Rcel Rxal 35 Rxal Bxg2 36 Nc5 Bxc5
 $40 \mathrm{Bb} 6 \mathrm{Kf} 7,0-1$.

LJUBOJEVIC - ALBURT, ATekhine's Defence: 1 e4 Nf6 2 e5 Nd5 3 d4 d6 4 Nf3 g6 5 Bc4 Nb6 $6 \mathrm{Bb} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{Ng} 5 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 8 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{f} 6$ $9 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 4 \quad 10 \mathrm{Nbd} 2 \mathrm{Nc} 611 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{Bh} 6 \quad 12 \mathrm{~h} 3$ Be6 $13 \mathrm{Nf} 1 \mathrm{Qd7} 14 \mathrm{f} 5 \mathrm{Bxcl} 15$ fxe6 Qxe6 16 Qxcl fxe5 17 dxe5 Nxe5 18 Nxe5 Qxe5+ 19 Qe3 Qd6 20 0-0-0 e5 21 Nd2 Qe7 22 Rhel e4 23 Nxe4 dxe4 24 Qd4, 1-0.
CHANDLER - DELANEY, Benko Gambit: $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}1 & \text { d4 Nf6 } & 2 & \text { c } 4 & \mathrm{c} 5 & 3 & \text { d5 b5 } & 4 \text { cxb5 a6 }\end{array}$ 5 Na 6 e4 g6 Ne3 bg7 8 be3 0-0 12 Nge2 613 dye6 fxe6 14 Nb 515 15 Nge 16 f4 5517 Rf8 $180-0$
 22 KhI Kh 823 Qh 3 Qg 624 Nd 6 Bxf 4 25 Nxf4 Rxf4 26 Rgl, $1-0$.
LJUBOJEVIC - TIMMAN, Pirc Defence: 1 e4 d6 $2 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 7$ 5 Nf3 0-0 6 вd3 Ne6 7 e5 dxe5 8 dxe5 Nd5 9 Bd2 Nb6 10 Qe2 Nb4 11 Be4 f5 12 exf6 exf6 13 a3 f5 14 axb4 fxe4 15 Nxe4 Bxb2 16 Rdl Bf5 17 Bc3 Bxc3+ 18 Nxc3 Qf6 19 Ne 5 Qe7 20 Rb 1 a 5
21 bxa5 Rxa5 22 Rfl Qc5 23 Qd2 Re8
24 Rdl c6 25 Rf3 Nc4 26 Qf2 Nxe5
27 fxe5 Qxe5t, 0-1.
KULIGOWSKI - NOGUEIRAS, English: 1 c4 e5 2 Nc3 f5 3 e3 Nf6 4 d4 e4 5 Nge2 g6 6 Nf4 Bh6 7 b4 Nc6 8 Rbl


 18 hxg6 hxg6 $19 \mathrm{Nh} 5+\mathrm{Kh} 620$ Nxe4, 18 hxg6
ANDERSSON - MILES, English Opening:
 $5 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{0} \quad 0-\mathrm{o} \quad 8 \mathrm{Nc} 3$ Na6 9 d4 d5 10 Ne5 e6 11 dxc5 bxc5 12 cxd5 exd5 13 Nd 3 Qe7 14 Na 4 Rac 8 15 Rcl Red8 16 Ba3 Ne4 17 Qel d4 18 Ndxe5 Naxc5 19 Nxc5 Bd5 20 Nxe4 Qxa3 21 Rxc8 Rxc8 22 Qd2 Bxe 423 Bxe 4 a5 24 Bd3 Qb4 25 Qf4 Re5 26 Bc4 Rf5 27 Qe4 Qd2 28 a4 h5 29 Qe8t Bf 8 30 Bd3 Re5 31 Qd7 Re5 32 h 4 Bg 7 33 Bc4 Rf5 34 Qe8+ Bf8 35 Bd 3 Rc 5 36 Qd8 Re5 $37 \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{Rf} 5 \quad 38 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{~g} 5$ 39 Bd 3 Re 540 hxg 5 Qxg 541 Qxd 4 Bg 7 42 Qc4 Re5 43 Qe4, I - 0.
UPTON - A.RODRIGUEZ, Ponziani: 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 c 3 Qe7 4 Bb5 Nf6 5 O-0 a6 6 Вxc6 dxc6 7 d4 Bg $48 \quad 8 \mathrm{Qb} 3$ Bc8 9 Nxe5 Nxe4 10 Re1 Nd6 11 c 4 Kd8 12 c5 Be6 13 cxd6 cxd6 14 Qb $6+, 1-0$.

## 1981 FIDE RATINGS - THE TOP 101

This list came into ef fect on 1 January 1981. The italicised figure is the gain or loss since the 1980 list. All players are GMs except those marked * (IMs) or ** (untitled).
Karpov USSR, -35 2690
Korchnoi SWI, -45
Portisch HUN, -5
Hubner BRD, +35 Spassky USSR, +20
Kasparov USSR, +30 Beljavsky USSR, +30 Polugaevsky USSR, - 15 Timman NL, +20
Geller USSR, +50 Mecking $B R Z$

Andersson SWE, +20
Larsen DEN, +25
Ljubojevic YUG, +15 Balashov
2600
Sosor
Gulko USSR
Miles ENG, +45
Petrosian USSR, - 30
Ribli GUN, -25
Panchenko USSR,+85
Alburt IJSA, +60
Hort $C Z,-20$
Kupreichik USSR, +40 Nunn ENG, +60 Yusupov USSR, +90 Vaganian USSR, -25
Sax hun, - 10
Browne USA, +15 Seirawan USA, +45 Ta1 USSR, - 150
Kavalek USA, -50 Krogius USSR Pinter* HUN, +15 Torre PHI, +30
Adorian $H U N,-5$ Dolmatov* USSR, +10 Gheorghiu RUM, -60 Kuzmin USSR, +15 Smyslov USSR, -5

Vasiukov USSR
Ivkov YUG, +10
Kochiev USSR, +5
Farago HUN, +30 Makarichev USSR, +40 Mihailcisin USSR, +45 Rashkovsky USSR, +15 Smejkal CZ, -20 Spee1man ENG, +45 Sveshnikov USSR: - 35 Georgadze USSR, -10 Gligoric rug, -35 Najdorf $A R G,+20$ Olafsson $I C E,-15$ Schmid $\operatorname{BRD}$ Tarjan URD, -5 Tseshkovsky USSR, -65
Evans USA, +5 Razuvaev USSR, +10 Ftacnik $C Z,+50$ Garcia G. CUB, +15 Lerner* USSR: +25 Panno ARG, -20 Christiansen USA, Gufeld USSR, + Marjanovic YUG, +25 Unzicker BRD, +5

Byrne IUSA, - 20 Cebalo* YOG, +4S Szabo HUN, +5 Timoshenko USSR, - 20
Bagirov USSR, - 55 Dorfman USSR: - 35 holmov USSR, - 30 fleger BRD, -20 uinteros $A R G$, - 10 Rogoff USA, -15 Tseitlin MS* ukic YUG, +45 Zhidkov* USSR, -i Csom HUN, - 10 Matanovic YUG, +5 Parma yug, -20 Psakhis* USSR, -35 Taimanov USSR, -10
Darga BRD
Eingorn** USSR, +25

2545 Kirajica YUG, - $10 \quad 2495$ Nei* USSR 2495 Petrosian A.* USSR, +60 2495 Schmidt POL, +65 2495 Shamkovich USA; -20 2495 Tatai* IT, +15 2495 Tseitlin M.D** USSR,-20 2495

With the low coefficient used for the rating list, most players only gained or lost a modest number of points - notable exceptions were Tal (-150) and P.Nikolic (+185). The latter is not to be confused with GM S.Nikolic who is rated 2375 !

The average rating of the top 100 is 2544.6 compared with 2548.05 last year and 2547.4 in 1979. In each of the two previous years there were, in fact, 100 players rated 2500 or more, but only 91 this year Of course, last year's top three lost 230 points beween them.
The lion's share of the players on this year's list (in common with other years) come from the USSR - 42. Then: USA \& Yugoslavia 11; Hungary 8; West Germany 5; England 4; Argentina \& Czechoslovakia 3; Netherlands 2; Brazil, Cuba, Denmark, East Germany, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Philippines Poland, Rumania, Sweden \& Switzerland 1 .

There are ten New Zealand names on the same list several others have unpublished (inactive) ratings. Chandler Sinall 2455
2345 Cre 2345 Garbett $\quad 2320$ Sarapu Laird Autderson Anderson
Aptekar 2310 2290

Carpinter 2240

## Candidates Final

For the second time in his chess career West German GM Robert Hübner has made the Candidate series but pulled out part way through a match. The first occasion was in the 1971 series quarter finals against Petrosian when, after six draws, Hubner lost the seventh game of the best-of-ten match and promptly withdrew.

The circumstances this time seem just as strange. Hubner apparently withdrew from the match against Korchnoi with the score standing at $4 \frac{1}{2}: 3 \frac{1}{2}$ to the former Soviet player and two games adjourned. We have not seen either of the adjourned games but presumably one or both were in Korchnoi's favour.
The match started sensationally with Hubner winning the first game with the white pieces but Korchnoi immediately levelled the scores in the second game. HUBNER - KORCHNOI (1), Caro-Kann Defence: 1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd2 dxe4 4 Nxe4 Bf5 $5 \mathrm{Ng} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nd} 78 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Bh} 7$ 9 Bd3 Bxd3 10 Qxd3 e6 11 Bd2 Oc $7 \quad 12$ $0-0-0$ Ngf6 $13 \mathrm{Ne} 4 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 14 \mathrm{Kbl} \mathrm{c5} 15$ Nxf6+ Nxf6 16 dxc5 Bxc5 17 Qe2 0-0 18 Ne5 Rfd8 $19 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Rac} 8 \quad 20 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Bb} 6$ (This move was criticised as very likely being the decisive error; $20 \ldots$ BdA was better) 21 Bc1 Nd7 22 Nxd7 Rxd7 23 g5 Rxd1 24 Rxdl hxg5 25 fxg5 Qc4 26 Rd3 e5 27 g6 fxg6 28 hxg6 Rc6 29 Qg2 e4 30 Rg 3 Rf 6 31 Rg 4 Qe6 (31...Qc6 gave better chances) 32 Rxe4 Rxg6 33 Qe2 Qh3 34 Qc4+ Kf8 35 b3 Re6 $36 \mathrm{Ba} 3+, 1$ : 0.
KORCHNOI - HUBNER (2), Symmetrical English: 1 c4 c5 2 g 3 Nc6 3 Nf3 g6 4 d4 0 exd4 $5 \mathrm{Nxd4} \mathrm{Bg} 7 \mathrm{~N} 62 \mathrm{Nf} 67 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{O} 0$
 15 Rel 616 la 17 Ral Kxg2 e6 53 P 719 Ne 3 Nd 720 Rxg 7 Na 721 Qr3 Qe7 19 Ne 3 Na 720 Bxg 7 Kxg 721 Q5 25 25 5 Na 46 5 Na Cxbs 26 8 Na Rbca 29 Qe2 dS 30 e5 Qxe5 31 Trc 8 Rxc 35 Re3 Ki6 36 Ne7 as 34 Nxc8 Rxc8 35 Rc3 Kd6 $36 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{f} 6 \quad 37$ Rdc

After a quiet draw in the third game Hübner again took the lead in game four when Korchnoi played listlessly on the white side. Then followed another quie draw.
HUBNER - KORCHNOI (3), French Tarrasch:

1 e4 e6 $2 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nd} 2$ c5 4 exd5 exd5 $5 \mathrm{Bb} 5+\mathrm{Nc} 66 \mathrm{Ndf3} \mathrm{cxd} 4 \quad 7 \mathrm{Nxd} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 78$

 18 Nxe4 Bxe4 19 Bd3 50 Nxe4 By 18 Nxe4 Bxe4 19 Bd3 a5 20 Bxe4 Rxe4 21 Bd4 Rxelt 22 Qxe1 Rb8 23 b3 Rb7 24 Qd2 c5 25 Be3 Rd7 26 Qd3 Qb6 27 Qf4 06 Qc6 34 Qe8 Qef 13 Qb8
KORCHNOI - HUBNER (4), Symmetrical English: 1 c4 c5 2 g3 Nc6 3 Nf3 e5 4 $\mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~g} 65 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 760-0 \mathrm{Nge7} 7 \mathrm{Nel}$ d6 8 Nc 2 Be6 9 d3 d5 10 b3 $0-0 \quad 11$ Rb1 Re8 $8 \quad 12$ e 4 dxe4 13 dxe4 Nd4 14 Ne3 Qd7 15 Ned5 f5 16 Bg5 Nxd5 17
 Rc7 21 exf5 gxf5 22 Be3 b5 23 Qd3 a6 $24 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{~b} 425 \mathrm{Bxd4}$ exd4 26 Ndl Bb 5 27 Rc4 fxg4 28 Bxg4 Qxd5 29 Ne3 Qg5 $30 \mathrm{Ng} 2 \mathrm{Re} 731 \mathrm{Qc} 2 \mathrm{Bxc} 432 \mathrm{Qxc} 4+\mathrm{Kh} 8$ 33 Qxa6 d3 34 Qxd3 Bd4+ $35 \mathrm{Khl} \mathrm{Ra7}$ 36 h 4 Qg 637 Qxg6 hxg6 38 h 5 gxh 539 Be6 Rxa2 40 f4 Ral 41 Rxal Bxal 42 Kh2 Kg7 43 Kg 3 Re 844 Bd 5 Re 245 Kf3 Rd2 46 Bc4 Bd4 $47 \mathrm{Nel} \mathrm{Kf6} 48 \mathrm{Ng} 2$ Rf2+ $49 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 250 \mathrm{Bg} 8 \mathrm{Rc} 3+51 \mathrm{Kh} 2$ B£2, $0: 1$.
HUBNER - KORCHNOI (5), French Tarrasch: 1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd 2 c5 4 exd5 exd5 $\begin{array}{lllll}1 & \text { e4 e6 } & 2 & \text { d4 } \\ 5 & \mathrm{db} 5+\mathrm{Nc} 6 & 3 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{c5} & 4 \text { exd5 exd5 }\end{array}$


 Be6 18 Ned4 Bf7 19 Rhel Rfe8 20 Re 2 g6 21 Nxc6 Nxc6 22 Rde1 Rxe2 23 Rxe2 $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { d4 } & 24 & 24 \\ \text { cxd4 } & \text { Bxd4 } & 25 & \text { Rd2 } 2 & \text { Be5 } & 26 & \text { Bxe5 }\end{array}$ Nxe5 $27 \mathrm{Nc} 5 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \mathrm{~F}^{28} \mathrm{Nxb} 7 \mathrm{Bxa} 2 \quad 29 \mathrm{Na} 5$ Nc4 30 Nxc4 $\mathbf{~ E x c 4} 31 \mathrm{Kbl}$ f5 32 g 4 fxg4 33 fxg4 Re7 34 Rd4 Kf8 35 h 4 $\frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{2}$.

The match was played in the Italian alpine town of Merano near the Austrian border and it began on 20th December despite the protests of Hubner who wished the start to be postponed until after the New Year so as to allow his seconds Hort and Sigurjonsson to spend the Christmas period with their familes. Also Korchnoi made protests about Florencto Camponanes as FIDE represen thili for the mateh as he saw the philippino as one or the reasons for Baguio Korchnoi's secons Kare Ste and Seirawan. The second were Stean be given in the next issue.

Other Overseas News

## GM ALEXANDER KOTOV +

The veteran Soviet Grandmaster Alexander Kotov died on 6th January 1981 aged 67. Kotov established himself as one of the top half a dozen players in the world during the years 1948 to 1953，his first place in the 2nd Interzonal，held in Stockholm and Saltsjobaden during 1952．Kotov won the 21－player tournament with $16 \frac{1}{2}$ points，three clear of the next competitors．

Kotov had just finished writing the script for a Russian film on Alexander Alekhine at the time of his death．

BUENOS AIRES（Clarin Tournament）， 17 0ct － 3 Nov．1980：For the first time since the 1978 World Championship mateh
Karpov played in a tournament and failed to win！In fact he could only manage a tie for fourth place，two points behind up－and－down Danish GM Bent Larsen who had assured himself of first place with two rounds still to play，with the pres sore off in los Coming ln second wion aims to challenge the World Champion everm Liubjevic who enjoyed one of h－form

Also 70 －year old Argentinian GM
Miguel Najdorf had a very successful tournament for one of his age，tying for sixth place in such a strong field excepting Giardelli all the players were grandmasters．The average rating was 2560 making the tournament category 13.

Scores： 1 GM Larsen（DEN） $9 \frac{1}{2} / 13$ ； 2 GM Timman（NL）9； 3 GM Ljubojevic（YUG） 8；4－5 GM Andersson（SWE）\＆GM Karpov （USSR） $7 \frac{1}{2}$ ；6－7 GM Najdorf（ARG）\＆GM Hort（CZ）7；8－10 GM Olafsson（ICE）， GM Balashov（USSR）\＆GM Kavalek（USA） 6 11 GM Quinteros（ARG） $5 \frac{1}{2}$ ； 12 GM Panno 11 GM 5： 13 GM Browne（USA）4； 14 Glardelli（ARG） 3.
HORT－LARSEN，Caro－Kann Defence
1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 Nc3 dxe4 4 Nxe4 Bf5 $5 \mathrm{Ng} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nd} 78 \mathrm{Bd} 3$ Bxd3 9 Qxd3 e6 10 Bd2 $\mathrm{Ngf6} 1110-0-0$ Be 712 Kb 1 c 513 Rhel $0-0 \quad 14 \mathrm{Ne} 4 \mathrm{Rc} 8$ 15 dxc5 Nxc5 16 Nxf6＋Bxf6 17 Qxd8 Rfxd8 18 Be 3 Rxdl＋ 19 Rxdl a6 20 c 3 Kf8 $21 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 22 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \mathrm{Ke} 8 \quad 23 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Ne} 4$

24 f3 Nd6 $25 \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{~b} 5 \quad 26 \mathrm{~b} 3$ Bf6 67 $\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { Rxde Bxe5 } & 28 & \mathrm{Rd} 3 \mathrm{Ke} 7 & 29 \text { a4 bxa4 } 30 \\ \text { bxa4 } & 31\end{array}$ bxa4 Bd6 31 Bb6 e5 32 Ba5 Ke6 33
 gxh5 37 gxh5 Rgs 38 Bd2 f5 39 Kb 4 $\mathrm{Rg} 340 \mathrm{Rb} 3 \mathrm{f} 441 \mathrm{Bel} \mathrm{Rh3} 42 \mathrm{Bf} 2 \mathrm{Kd} 6$ $43 \mathrm{c} 5+\mathrm{Kc} 644 \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{Rxh} 545 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{Rh} 2$ $46 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Rh} 1 \quad 47 \mathrm{Be} 1 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{kf} 2,0: 1$.
LJUBOJEVIC－BROWNE，Sicilian Najdorf： 1．e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc 3 a6 6 Bg5 e6 7 f4 Qb6 8 $\mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{Nbd7} 9$ Qe2 Qc7 $100-0-0$ b5 11
 Nxff 6

$\begin{array}{rrrr}15 & \text { e5 } & \text { dxe5 } & 16 \\ \text { xbb } 5 & \text { Qb6 } & 17 & \text { Nd } 6+\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Nxb5 } \\ \text { Bxd6 } & 18 & 17 \\ \text { Nxd6 }\end{array}$ Pxd6 19 Rxb7 Ra7 20 fue5 0b6 21 20 fxe5 Qb6 $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Bxa6 } & \text { Qxa6 } & 22 \\ \text { Qxab } & \text { Rxa6 } & 23 \text { exf6 }\end{array}$ Qxa6 кxab 23 exf6 $\begin{array}{llll}25 & \mathrm{Kc} 2 & \mathrm{Rc} 8 & 26 \mathrm{Kc} 3\end{array}$
 Nc1 f4 29 gxf4 exf4 30 Nd3 f3 31 Nf4 Kd6 $32 \mathrm{Nd} 5 \mathrm{Ra5} 33 \mathrm{Kd4}$ Rxc4t $34 \mathrm{Kxc4}$ KxdS 35 Rf R 305 Rh 140 Kb 4 Rh 2 $41 \mathrm{Ka} 3 \mathrm{Rh} 142 \mathrm{Ka} 4 \mathrm{Ral}+43 \mathrm{~Kb} 5 \mathrm{Ke} 544$ $41 \mathrm{Ka} 3 \mathrm{Rh} 142 \mathrm{Ka} 4 \mathrm{Ral+} 43 \mathrm{~Kb} 5 \mathrm{Ke} 5 \mathrm{~K}^{44}$

TIMMAN－BALASHOV，Queer＇s Gambit： 1 d4 Nf6 2 c 4 e6 3 Nf3 d5 4 Ne 3 Be 7 5 Bg5 0－0 6 e3 Nbd7 7 Rcl a6 8 exd5 exd5 9 Bd3 Re8 $100-0$ c6 11 Qc2 Nf8 12 Ree 1 Ne4 13 Bxe7 Qxe7 14 Bxe4 dxe4 $15 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{f} 5 \quad 16 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 17 \mathrm{f3}$ exf $3 \quad 18$ Nxf3 cxd5 19 Nxd5 Qe 420 Qxe4 Rxe4 21 Nd 4 Rae $8 \quad 22$ Rdl R4e5 23 Nf3 Re 4 24 Nd4 R4e5 25 Nf． 3 Re4 26 Nd2 Rh4 27 3 b5 28 Nf 3 Rh5 29 Nd 4 Rh5 30 Rf3 431 Nxf4 Rhe5 32 Rel Bc8 33 Nd3 Re4 34 Ne5 R4e5 35 b4 Nd7 36 Nd 3 Rg 37 e4 Ne5 38 Nxe5 Rgxe5 39 Rfe 3 Bb 7 40 Nb3 Bd5 41 Nc5 Bxa2 42 Ra3 Bd5 43 Kf2 R5e7 44 Rxa6 Bxe4 45 Rb6 Bd5 46
 Rb7 Rxb7 50 Nxb7 Ke6 51 Ke3 $\mathrm{Kd5} 52$ $\mathrm{Nc} 5 \mathrm{~L} 16 \quad 53 \mathrm{Ne} 4 \mathrm{Bf} 1 \quad 54 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \quad 55 \mathrm{Nc} 5$
 59 b6 Ke6 60 Ne4 h4 61 g 4 Kxb6 62 Jxg 5 Kc5 63 Nf3， $1: 0$.

BADEN BEI WIEN（Tungsram Tournament）， Oct．－Nov．1980：Although the Tungsram tournaments are usually played in Hungary，last year＇s event was played
in Austria and the 1981 event will be played in yet another country where Tungsram has interests．

The tournament was category 12 （2529） Beljavsky led most of the way but lost to Spassky in the penultimate round after spurning a quiet opening in favour of wild complications．This put Spassky a half point in front but the ex－World Champion was held to a draw by Adoria in the last round while Beljavsky beat Gheorghiu to catch up again．

Scores：1－2 GM Spassky（USSR）\＆GM Beljavsky（USSR） $10 \frac{1}{2} / 15$ ； 3 GM Nunn （ENG） 10 ；4－5 GM Byrne（USA）\＆GM Vaga－ nian（USSR）9； 6 GM Smejkal（CZ）81 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ 7－8 GM Liberzon（ISR）\＆IM Seirawan （USA）8； 9 GM Gheorghiu（RUM）71／2；10－ 12 GM Stean（ENG），GM Adorian（HUN）\＆ GM Miles（ENG）7； 13 GM Gligoric（YUG）
 BELJAVSKY－SPASSKY，Queen＇s Indian： $1 \begin{array}{lllllllllll}1 \\ 5 & \mathrm{Nf} 6 & 2 & \mathrm{c} 4 & \mathrm{e} 6 & 3 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~b} 6 & 4 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 7\end{array}$ $5 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Be} 760-0$ 0－0 7 d 5 exd5 8 Nh 4
 $12 \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{Bc} 5 \quad 13 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \mathrm{Bc} 6 \quad 14 \mathrm{Na} 4 \mathrm{~g}_{6} \quad 15$
 Nxd5 Bxd5 19 Bxd5 Rab8 20 b3 Rfe 821 Bf3 Qe5 22 Qd2 d6 23 Rfdl Rb6 24 Qa5 Re7 25 Rc4 Qb2 26 Ra4 h5 27 Qd2 Qe5 $28 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Rd} 7 \quad 29 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \mathrm{Rc} 7 \quad 30 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 31 \mathrm{Ra}$ Qd6 $32 \mathrm{Qb} 2 \mathrm{~d} 4 \quad 33 \mathrm{Rc} 4 \mathrm{Nd} 7 \quad 34 \mathrm{Qcl}$ a6 $35 \mathrm{Rc} 2 \mathrm{Rb} 5 \quad 36 \mathrm{Ra} 4 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \quad 37$ Qf4 Re7 38 Be4 Re6 39 Bd 3 Rf6 40 Qe4 Ng4 41 f3 Ne3＋ 42 Kf 2 Nxc 243 Bxc 2 Qd 744 Bd 3 Qh3 45 f4 R5b6 46 Bc4 Qh2＋ 47 Qg2 Rxf4＋ 48 gxf4 Qxf4＋ 49 Kgl Rf6 50 Rxa6 Qe3＋ 51 Kh2 Rf4 52 Qg 3 Qe4 53 Ra7 Rxh4＋ 54 Qxh4 Qxh4＋ 55 Kgl Qel＋ 56 Kg 2 h 4 5 Rxi7＋Kh6 58 Rf3 g5 59 Bd3 $\mathrm{Kg} 760 \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{~g} 4,0$ ： 1
NUNN－MILES，Sicilian Dragon：
1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 g6 6 g3 Nc6 7 Nde2 $\operatorname{Bg} 78$ Bg2 Rb8 9 a4 a6 $100-0$ b5 11 axb5 axb5 12 Nd5 0－0 13 Bg5 Nd7 14 Qcl Nc5 15 64 Ne6 16 Bh6 Ned4 17 Nxd4 Nxd4 18 Kh1 Bxh6 19 Qxh6 Nxc2 20 Racl Nd4 21 Rc7 Bd7 22 f4 f5 23 e5 Rf7 24 Rd 1 Ne6 $25 \mathrm{Ra} 7 \mathrm{Nf} 8 \quad 26$ Qh4 Kg7 $27 \mathrm{Nc} 7 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \quad 28$ exd6 exd6 29 Qxd8 Rxd8 30 Rxd6 Rc8 31 Rgl Kh6 32 Bfl Re7 33 Nd5 Rel 34 Nb6 Re6 35 Nxd7 Rxd6 36 Nxf8 Kh5 37 Rxh7＋ Kg4 38 Kf2 Rxf1＋ 39 Kxfl Kf3 40 Rd7 Re6 $41 \mathrm{Rd} 3+\mathrm{Ke} 442 \mathrm{Ke} 2,1: 0$.
JANETSCHEK－BELJAVSKY，Ruy Lopez：
1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6
 $513 \mathrm{Bg} 3 \mathrm{Nh} 514 \mathrm{Bc} 2 \mathrm{Na} 5 \quad 15 \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{Nc}$ 6 Nxe5 dxe5 17 Qxh5 exd4 18 Qxh6 Re8－ 19 cxd4


19．．．Re6 20 Qh5 Bra4 21 Ra Qf6 22 Bd3 Nb 2 23 Qe2 Rae8 24 Nd2 Nxa4 25 Qg4 Og6 26 Nf3 3 Bc 3 27 Re3 Bxe4 28 Bxe 4 Rxe4 29 Qxg5 Qxg 50 NxgS Rxe3 Bxc7 Bxb4 $33 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 34 \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{Rd} 3 \quad 35$ kg 2 Nc 536 Nf 3 b 437 Ne 5 Ra 338 Re 2 b3 39 Ne6 Bf6 40 Re8＋Kh7， $0: 1$. VAGANIAN－SMEJKAL，Grunfeld Defence： 1 d4 Nf $6 \quad 2 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 4 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{O}-0$ 5 Bg 2 ch 6 Ne 3 d5 7 exds exd． 8 Nes 12 Rf2 f6 13 exf6 Bxff 14 Re3 Pd7 15
 e4 dxe4 19 Nxe4 Rf8 20 Rd1 Rf5 21 Nc5 Bc $8 \quad 22$ b4 Rf8 23 b5 Nxd4 24 Bxd4 Rd8 25 ec 34 Bxd 4 －5 28 Bxe 5 Bh 39 Qc4 Rd5 30 N Kf8 $31 \mathrm{NC} 3,1: 0$ Kf8 $31 \mathrm{Ne} 3,1: 0$.

HASTINGS，Dec． 1980 －Jan．1981：For the first time in many years there was no representative of the Soviet Union， that Federation declining to reply to the invitation which listed six players There were，however，three former Soviet players in Alburt，Lein and Li－ berzon．The event was category 10 （2477）

Swede Ulf Andersson played solidly to go through undefeated in winning the traditional tournament．Lev Alburt made the early running，winning his first three games and scoring 6 points out of the first 7 but then lost to Brito and Ftacnik through trying too hard to avoid draws．At this point Andersson took over the lead and was never headed． Torre took second prize with a brilli－ ant finish against Peters in the last round which he entered tied with Lein． GM Scores．（ $⿴ 囗 十$ GM Torre（PAI）10； 3 GM Lein（USA）9 2 ， 4－6 Sum（BRZ）81： 7 （M 8． 8 IM Popovic（YoI） 71 ； 8， 8 IM Popovic iYOG）$\frac{1}{2}$ ；9－11 IM CM Speelman（ENG）7： 12 IM Mest （ENG）6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ；13－14 IM Peters（USA）\＆IM

Pinter (HUN) 6; 15 IM Bellin (ENG) 5; (0) Brito (BRZ) $4^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

New Zealand's Murray Chandler had a ind start when he lost to Liberzon, llburt and Anderson in the first three rounds; then came draws with Torre, Lein and Popovic. In his remaining nine games Yurray made up some ground with wins ver Pinter, Mestel and Brito as well as jraws with Peters, Bellin, Sunye
Speelman and Ftacnik.

COMMONWEALTH INITIATIVE
by GM Raymond Keene


Category 5

New Zealand top board, Fenella Foster. The match was drawn 2-2.
CHANDLER - GRUCHACZ, Nimzo-Indian 1 d4 e6 2 c4 Nf6 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 e3 c5 5 Ne2 d5 6 cxd5 Nxd5 7 g 3 cxd4 8 exd4 Bd7? (Too conservative. Black should proceed actively with 8 ...Nxc3! followed by ...Qd5.) 9 Bg2 Bc6 $100-000$ 11 Nxd5 Bxd5 12 Bxd5 Qxd5 $13 \mathrm{Nf4}$ Qd7 14 d5 exd5 $15 \mathrm{Nxd5} \mathrm{Bd} 6$ (If 15 ...Rd8 16 Bg5! f6 17 Bxf6!) 16 Qb3 Na6 ( 16 ...NC6 is more natural) 17 Be 3 Nc 5 18 Qc2 Qa4 19 Qe2 Rfe8 20 Rfdl Rad8 21 Rac1 b6 22 Rc4
 (Sacrificing a pawn to whip up a kingside attack) 22 ...Qxa2 23 Rh4 Bf8 24 Qh5 h6 25 Rg4 (Diagram) (With a murderous threat which Black, in desperate timetrouble, overlooks. He had to defend
his third rank with 25 ...Rd6) 25 ...Qb 3 ? 26 Nf6+ Kh8 27 Qxh6t, 1 - 0. DAY - TISDALL, Sicilian Defence: 1 e4 c5 2 f4 e6 3 Qe2 Nc6 4 Nf3 Nf6
 9 Nc2 bs 5 B2 Qc7 Na 5 N , smards against the threat of ...c4 and guards against the threat of ...c4 and avoids the counterplay which now
13 ...b4! 14 c 4 b3 15 Ne 3 bxa2 16 Rxa2 Nb 3 17 Nh3 (With 17 Bd2 White 16 Rxa2 Ab 17 h 3 with 17 baz to could induce hold on to the bishop since later whit can choose the moment to exchange)
17 ...Nd4 18 Qdl d6 $19 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{a} 5 \quad 20 \mathrm{Bc} 3$ Nd7 721 g4 4 Bc6 22 g5 Rfb $8 \quad 23$ Qh5 a4 Nd7 21 g4 Bc6 22 g5 Rfb8 26 bxa 3 Rb 8 27 Nfg4 Od8 (On 27 ...Rb3 28 f5 Rxc3 29 Ng 4 Qd8 (0nite breaks through decisively) 28 Bxd4! cxd4 29 Nc2 Nc5 30 Nxd4 Be8 31 f5! Bxg5 32 f6 Bxf6 30 Nxat Be 32 Nd2 33 is strong) 33 Nxf6+ gxf6 34 Bh 3 ? (This move order 33 Nxf6+ gxi6 34 Bh 34 Oh6! Nxd3 35 Bh 3 Ne5 36 RgIt Ng6 37 Nxe6! fxe6 38 Bxe6t Kh8 (or $38 \ldots$...Bf7 39 Bxf7 $+\mathrm{Kxf7}$ 40 Qxh7+ Ke6 41 Qxg6 Qh8 42 c5!) 39 Of8+!! Nxf8 40 Rg8 mates) 34 ...Kf8! 35 Qxh7 Qa5? (Desperately short of time, Black collapses: Necessary was $35 . . . \mathrm{Ke} 7$ ) 36 Bxe6 Nxe4 37 Qxe4 fxe6 38 Qxe6 Qa8+ 39 Kgl Rb 240 Qxf6+ Kg8 $41 \mathrm{Qf} 8+\mathrm{Kh} 7$ $42 \mathrm{Rf} 7+$, 1 - 0.

At the start of the final round at Brighton an exceptionally close situation had developed. Four players, Speelman, Taulbut, Chandler and Day were sharing the lead on $5 \frac{1}{2}$ points. The GM wheed an ill Goodman in the last game Tisdall and Chandter and Day were Tisdall and us and ing each other. As tournayt organ fizzled ing ig or rose splatid the result can te seen fram, ournatent table. Speelsan Coat Coodman rapidly, but Chandler's gane with Day was the bery last to finish, and this vi the la split the Competence Comper and 150 pounds in cash with Spee1man

To conclude here is Chandier's exciting last round game. Notes are by the winner.
DAY - CHANDLER, Flank Opening:
$1 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 2 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 3 \mathrm{~d} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 64 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6$ 5 Bg5 dxc4 6 Bxc6+ bxc6 7 dxc 4 Qd 4 8 Qb3

Having crippled my pawn formation at the expense of the bishop pair, Day understandably did not wish to play 8 Qxd4 cxd4 while on 8 Qa4 interesting is 8 ...Rb8.
8...Ng4!

It is only this "beginners attack" on f2 that exposes White's opening as slightly over-ambitious. The point is that 9 e 3 is very weakening after 9 ...Qe4 10 f 3 Qg 6 and 9 Nh 3 ? Ne5 wins a pawn. So White gives up his second bishop, only this time at the cost of his own pawn structure.

$$
9 \text { Be3 Nxe3 } 10 \text { fxe3 Qf6 } 11 \text { Nc3 g6 }
$$ 12 Nf3 Bh6 13 Qa3!?

Initiating far-reaching complications. 13 ...Qe6 14 Qxc5 Bxe3 15 Nd4 Qf6 16 Ne 4

Not 16 Qxc6+ Qxc6 17 Nxc6 Bь7. At this point Lawrence offered a draw, evidently considering the following exchange sacrifice to be very dangerous, but it wasn't until a long think and $22 \ldots$. Rd8: later that I decided to continue.

16 ...Qxd4: 17 Qxc6+ Kf8 18 Qxa8
$18 \ldots \mathrm{Qb} 2 \quad 19 \mathrm{Rd} 1 \mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 20 \mathrm{Qd5} \mathrm{Bb} 7$
22 Kfl Rd8! (Diag.


With this second offer of rook for offer of riece Black's obvious pressure turns to something more tangible - viz 23 Oxd8 Bxe4 24 Rg 1 Qc5! with additionQc5: with additionmating. Day finds the only resource, albeit one I had underestimated.

23 Qc3+ Qxc3 24 Nxc3 Rc8.'
Instead 24 ....Rxd1+ 25 Nxdl Bc5 26 Rg 1 Bxgl is a very comfortable but probably drawn ending for Black, but by probably drawn ending for Black, but by having already beaten an ailing Goodman.

## 25 Nd5 Bc5 26 e 4 e6 27 Ke2?!

The two raking bishops still give Black more than enough compensation for the exchange, but more resistance was offered by 27 Kg 2 . White can also try to save his piece by $27 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \quad 28 \mathrm{Rbl}$ Rxc4 29 a3! as suggested by chief arbiter and kibitzer Ray Keene, when Black must find 29 ...a5! 30 axb4 Rxc 3 and the threat of $31^{\ldots} \ldots$ Bxe 4 gains me two pawns for the exchange. After Day's choice, however, White's pawn centre is threatened with liquidation.

27 ...exd5 28 exd5 Ba6 29 Kd 3 Ba 3 Now White must relinquish further material to stay alive.

30 Rcl Bxc1 31 Rxc1 Kf6 $32 \mathrm{Kd4}$ Ke7 $33 \mathrm{c} 5 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \quad 34 \mathrm{~d} 6+\mathrm{Kd} 7 \quad 35 \mathrm{Kd5} \mathrm{Rb} 5$. $36 \mathrm{Re} 1 \mathrm{Bb} 7+37 \mathrm{Kd4} \mathrm{Rb} 4+38 \mathrm{Ke} 5$

Or 38 Kc 3 Re4 blocks the e-file.
38 ...f5 $39 \mathrm{Kf6}$ Be4 40 Kg 7 Rc 4 41 Kxh7 g5 42 h4 gxh4 43 gxh4 Rxc5 $44 \mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{Kxd6} 45 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Ke} 5 \quad 46 \mathrm{~h} 6 \mathrm{f} 4 \quad 47 \mathrm{a} 4$ 0n $47 \mathrm{~h} 7 \mathrm{Rc} 7+$.
47 ...f3 $48 \mathrm{Rfl} \mathrm{Rc} 7+49 \mathrm{Kg} 8,0-1$.
One of my favourite games, and of the type that is only possible because of such fighting resistance by the defender

## CHESS RECORD FAIIS

A world chess record of 34 years fell on December 17 when Stuart Conquest of Hastings, England, who is only 13 years of age, became the youngest player ever to defeat an internationally recognised master in a set match. Conquest won 2-0 against Nigel Povah, 28, who holds the World Chess Federation (FIDE) Master
title and has a rating (elo) of 2385 .
The occasion was the annual Lloyds Bank challenge match where a talented young British player meets a recognised expert. Previous events in the series
have included Nigel Short's $6 \frac{1}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$
victory at age 12 against Chess 4.6 , the world champion computer; and Ian Wells's 2-1 win at age 15 against Alexander Kotov, the veteran Soviet Grand Master.

The previous age record for a match win over a master was set by Arturo Pomar, of Spain, then 14, who in 1946 beat Jacques Mieses, a Grand Master aged 80. Pomar is now himself a Grand Master and Spain's leading player

Conquest was lucky in the first game when, after missed chances on both sides , Nigel Povah overstepped the time limit in a winning position. But the schoolboy won impressively in the return where a classical central pawn break gained decisive material.
This game went as follows
S.CONQUEST - N.POVAH, Benoni Defence: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 Nc3 exd5 5 cxd5 d6 6 e4 g6 7 f4 8 Bg 7 8 Nf3 0-0 9 Be2 Re8 10 Nd2 c4 11 a4 Na6 12 0-0 Nc5 13 Bf3 a6? (Up to here the game is book, but now the active move is 13 ...Bh6!) 14 Kh 1 Qc 715 e5! dxe5 16 fxe5 Nfd7 (If 16...Qxe5 17 Nxc4 Qb8 18 Be3 with strong pressure) 17 Nxc4 Nxe5 18 d6 Qd8 19 Be3! Nxc4 20 Bxc5 Be5 21 Rel Bg7 (If 21...Qh4 22, g3 when black cannot play Bxg3 because his rook is pinned) 22 Re7 Bf8 23 Nd5 Nxd6 (If 23...Bxe7 24 dxe7 followed by Nf6+) 24 Nf6 $6+1$ - 0.

Stuart Conquest, youngest-ever champion of the celebrated Hastings club, has already received help from Lloyds Bank's annual chess sponsorship programme. He was among 30 boys and girls awarded scholarships to the Lloyds Bank Masters in London, where he defeated the former Spanish men's champion IM Ricardo Calvo. Conquest recently finished 3rd equal in the 1980 Lloyds Bank Jersey Open, at which he tied with the 1979 British
men's champion, IM Robert Bellin, drawing their individual game.

Grand Master Raymond Keene directed the match in Brighton. He commented "In the second game it looked as if the master had been White and the inex ienced junior Black. Povah seemed hesitant and unable to form a plan, while Conquest, playing with admirable panache for one so young, brushed him aside with
"emptuos ease
Qualitatively if not quantatively the result was superior to Pomar's win over Mieses and to Ian Wells's defeat of the ageing Kotov in last year's Lloyds Bank challenge match"

There is special emphasis on chess for women and schoolgirls in the Lloyds for women and schoolgirls in the Lloyds Bank chess programme, and for the first time the challenge match also included Groves, 18, of England, who did well in Groves, 18, of England, who did well in the 1980 Lloyds Bank Lady Masters, took Foster who flew in from the chess olympics in Malta. Their four-game series was tied 2-2.

CHESSBOARDS
Wood inlaid, mahogany surrounds, with 2 inch squares. SPECIAL PRICE to clubs and Magazine subscribers.
\$ 8.50 - FREE DELIVERY Auckland Area only.
PHONE: TITIRANGI 5646

## THE LABYRINTH OF CHESS ATTACK

 by Lev AptekarLev Aptekar's second book is a natural follow-on from his first book 'The Power of Chess Tactics'. Typical positions, which have repeatedly occurred in master practice are used to show the methods of attack. Write to
L.Aptekar, 7 Stamford Street, Avalon.

## Alberic O'Kelly $\dagger$

The Chess World was saddened by the death of FIDE GM Aiberic o'Kelly, ICCF GM and World Correspondence Champion 1959-62, in Brussels on the third of October 1980.

Born on the 17th of May 1911, 0'Kelly had a chess career spanning forty years, with numerous successes to his name. He was the perfect model for the phrase 'gifted amateur', prefering to play for a love of the game rather than as a means to provide his living. O'Kelly was a Belgian Count and possessor of an immense personal fortune.

For many years o'Kelly was a minor European Master, when in the five years following the end of the Second World War he shot to the heights of chess, winning several major tournaments. When in 1949 FIDE instituted international titles for chessplayers, o'kelly was included in the first award of the title International Master', followed by the award of the International Grandmaster title in 1956. He won the Belgian Championships seven times, as well as
representing Belgium at the Chess
Olympiads eight times.
As a FIDE arbiter he controlled the world championship matches of: 1966 and 1969 as well as the candidates final of 1974. A well. known chess author, his best works were, 'Petrosian:Weltmiester' (Berlin 1965), and the first of the now huge batsford contemporary chess opening series:'Sicilian:Flank Game' (London '69). In chess opening theory he was one of the pioneers of the Pirc and Modern Defences back in the late 1940's. A quaint variation of the Sicilian Defence is named after him ( 1 e 4 c $5 \quad 2$ Nf3 a6!?).
o'kelly's main fame, however, came in the field of Correspondence Chess, by witnning the 1959-62 World Championship he gained the title of International Correspondence Grandmaster.

ICCF WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP 1959-62

| o'Kelly | ${ }^{1}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dubinin | $\times 1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1001 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| Lundquist | $0 \times 011 \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2}$ | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Salme | $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1 \times \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} 0$ |  |
| Napolatino | $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ 0 $\frac{1}{2} \times 0 \times 1$ 1 |  |
| Secchi | $00011 \times \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| Endzelkins | $01 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} \times 1 \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1$ | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Kjellander | $\frac{1}{2} 001 \frac{1}{2} 0 \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| Balogh | $0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 000 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times$ |  |
| Garner | 000000000 |  |

Some games from the event:
O'KELLY - GARNER, Queen's Gambit $\frac{1}{5} \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 2 \mathrm{c} 4$ e6 $3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 64 \mathrm{Bg5} \mathrm{Be} 7$ 5 Nf 3 Nbd7 6 Qc2 c6 7 e 3 o-0 8 Rd1 Re8 9 a3 dxc4 10 Bxc4 Nd5 11 Bxe7 Qxe $7 \quad 12$ Ne4 h6 13 O-0 N5f6 $14 \mathrm{Ng} 3 \quad \mathrm{~b} 5$ 15 Bd 3 Bb 7 I 6 e4 Rec8 17 e 5 Ne 8
 Vxly 422 Qf4 Ng6 23 Bxg6 fxg6 24 Nxg4 Kg7 2.5 Ne4 Re7 $26 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \mathrm{Bc} 8 \quad 27 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Qg} 5$ 28 Qxg5 hagg 29 Kg 2 a5 30 Rh 1 Kg 8
 $0^{\prime}$ KELLY - ENDZELKINS, King's Indian: 1 d4 Ne6 2 c. $4 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 4$ e4 d6 f3 0-0 6 Be3 e5 7 d5 c5 8 g 4 Ne 8 $9 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{f5} 10$ gxf5 gxf5 11 exf5 Bf6 12. Ne4 Bxf5 $13 \mathrm{Ne} 2 \mathrm{Ng} 7 \quad 14 \mathrm{~N} 2 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{Na6}$ 15 Qd2 Ne7 16 Bd3 Qd7 17 h5 Kh8 18 0-0-0 Bxe4 19 fxe4 a6 20 Rdgl b5 21 b3 bxc4 22 bxc4 Rab8 23 h6 Ne8 $24 \mathrm{Rg} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 825 \mathrm{Rxg} 8+\mathrm{Kxg} 826 \mathrm{Qg} 2+\mathrm{Kh} 8$ 27 Rg 1 Qf 723 Be 2 Na 829 Bh 5 Qf 8 30 Rfi Qe 731 Qf2 Nac7 32 Kc 2 Kg 8 33 Qf5 Rd8 34 Bg 5 Bxg 535 Rg 1 Kh 8 36 Rxg5 Ra8 37 Rg 1 Rb 838 Rfl Kg 8 39 Qg4+, 1-0. Peter Corbett

## Games

Here is Robert Sinith's win over Ortvin Sarapu in the 1980/81 Championship. Notes are by the winner.
O.SARAPU - R.W.SMITH, Sicilian Defence: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 c4 Nc5 4 Nc 3 d6 Petter is 4 ....Nf6 5 e5?! Ng4 6 Qe2 d6

5 Be2 Nf6 6 0-0 Be7 7 b3 0-0 8 Bb2?!

Better is 8 d4 cxd4 9 Nxd4 with an advantage to White.

8 ...d5! 9 e5!?
9 exd5 exd5 10 cxd5 Nxd5 11 Nxd5 Qxd5 12 Bc4 Qh5 with at least equality for Black.

9 ...Ng4 10 cxd5 exd5 11 d 4 cxd 4 12 Nxd4 Ncxe5:

Not 12 ...Ngxe5 13 Nxc6 Nxc6
14 Nxd5 advantage White or 13 ...bxc6
14 Nxd5 Qxd5 15 Qxd5 cxd5 16 Bxe5 with advantage to White.

13 Nf3
If 13 £4 Ne3 14 Qcl Nxfl 15 fxe5
g5: 16 Qxfl Be3t 17 Khl Bxd4. Ortvin apparently rejected $13 \mathrm{f4}$ because of $13 \ldots$...Ne3 14 Qc1 Neg4 15 h 3 Nxfl 16 hxg 4 Ng 3.

## 13 ...Be6

Not 13 ...Nxf3+ 14 Bxf3 Nf6 15 Nxd5 ith advantage to White

14 Nxe5 Nxe5 15 f4?!
15 Nxd5 Qxd5 16 Qxd5 Bxd5 17 Bxe5=
15 ...d4!
Not 15 ...Nc6 16 f5 Bd7 17 Nxd5 with advantage to White.

16 Ne 4
Better is 16 fxe5 dxc3 17 Bxc3 Qxdl 18 Raxd1 Rfd8 with a small plus for Black.

16 ...Nc6 17 f5 Bd5 18 Bf3 Bxe4 19 Bxe4 Bf6

White now has no attack and Black is a sound pawn up

20 Rc 1 Qb 6
Threatening d3+ and Bxb2
21 Kh1 Rfe8 22 Qf3 Ne5 23 Qf4 h6:
Creating a Luft, threatening Bg5 and indirectly forcing the white rook off the "c" file.

24 Rcdl Rad8 25 BbI Nc6
Back to the old position except that White's pieces have been forced back and Black's rooks occupy the central files.

26 h 3 Re 227 Bc 1 Rde8 28 Qg 4 Kh 7 $29 \mathrm{Qh} 5 \mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 30 \mathrm{Qg} 4 \mathrm{Kh} 731 \mathrm{Qh} 5 \mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{e} 7$ 32 Bf 4 Nb 4

Preventing Bd6 and with the possibility of N to $\mathrm{d} 5-\mathrm{c} 3$.

33 Bd2 Qb5
Perhaps better is Nxa2!? and if 34 Bxa2 $Q$ a 6 with the threat of Rxd 2 and Qxfl: also 34 Bd3 Re5 35 Bf4 Rc5 keeps the extra pawn; the move played ...Qb5 the extra pawn; the $\mathrm{Qxf1}$.

34 a4 Qd5 35 Qf3 Qxf3 36 Rxf3?
Timetrouble. 36 gxf3 makes Black's task harder, although he is still a task harder, although he is solid pawn up and after 36 ...Nc 6 37 Bd3 may even be able to play R2e3:? 38 Bxe3 dxe3 because of the immediate threat of $e 2$.

36 ...Rxd2! 37 Rxd2 Re1+ 38 Kh2 Rxb1 39 g 4 d 340 Rfxd3 Nxd3 41 Rxd3 Kg8 $42 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rc}, 0-1$.

COMBINATION SOLUTIONS

1. Ljubisavljevic - Albano, Italy 1973: 1 Nd6! Nxd6 2 Rh8+! Qxh8 3 Rxh8+ Kxh8 4 Ne6t Kh7 5 Qg7 mate. 2. Titenko - Murei, Moscow 1963: 1 ...d2+! 2 Kxf 2 d 1 Q 3 Re6+! (3 c8Q allows perpetual check) 3 ....Kd3! 4 c 80 Qd2+ 5 Kgl ! Qcl+! 6 Qxcl stalemate. (there is no perpetual after 5 ...Qdit 6 Kh2 $0 d 2+7$ Kh3).
2. Wagner - Rellstab, Swinemunde 1930:
 2 Qe3 h5 3 Qe5t, 1 - o
3. Bruchner - B.Koch, Berlin 1954 1...Rf3+: 2 Kxh4 Ne7 3 g6 Nxg6+ 4 Kg5 Rh6!, 1 - 0. Mate on $f 5$ cannot be avoided.
4. Ivanovic - Barreras, PTovdiv 1976:

1 f5! gxf5 (1 ...Rxd8 2 f6+Kh6 3 Rxd8 Nc6 $4 \mathrm{Rh} 8++-12 \mathrm{Rg} 3+\mathrm{Kh} 7$ 3 Rdl ( 3 ....Ng6 4 Rhl Kg 7 K 5 Rhgl Rc 6 e6 + -; 3 ....Rc6 4 e6 + -), 1 - 0 6. Chahojan - lurkenishvili, USSR 1971: 1 ...Qd3! 2 Qxd3 (2 Rxd3 exd3 - +) 2 ...exd3 $3 \mathrm{RbI} \operatorname{Bxg} 4,0-1$.

CORRESPONDENCE CHESS RESULTS:
NZCCA TROPHY TOURNAMENT results from the 1980/81 events:
NZ Championship: Chapman I Talbot, 1 NZ Championship: Chapman I Talbot,l Brimble, 1 Taylor; Freeman 1 Brimble; Taylor 1 Alp, $\frac{1}{2}$ Heasman; Talbot 1 Alp mith 1 Brimble 1 Coop albot.
Reserve Championship: Lloyd 1 Van everen, 1 Steadman, 1 Millar, 1 Roundall tor 1 Steadman, 1 Millar, 1 Rouna ill, $\frac{1}{3}$ Ter Horst, $\frac{2}{2}$ de Groot. Steadman $\frac{1}{2}$ de Groot, $\frac{1}{2}$ Millar. de Groot 1 Milla 1 Van Oeveren, 1 Noble, 1 Ter Horst Millar 1 Van Oeveren. Borren 1 Van Borrand Miock, Millar Lovelockl Van oneveren. everen

Class 2: Mitchell 1 Jones, 1 Smith $\frac{1}{2}$ Hignett. Cooper 1 Smith. Bishop 1 Cribbet. Scott 1 Smith. Haak $\frac{1}{2}$ Jones. Jones 1 Smith, 1 Frost. Cribbet 1 Hignett, 1 Stringer. Jones 1 Stringer.

Owing to lack of space these results will be continued next issue.

## CLUB DIRECTORY

The annual fee (six listings) for this column is $\$ 5.00$ payable with order to the New Zealand Chess Association, P.O.Box 8802, Symonds Street, Auckland.
AUCKLAND CENTRE meets Mondays \& Thursdays at clubrooms, 17 Cromwell Street, Mt. Eden, phone 602 042. Contact: Nigel Metge, ph. 4444170 . Schoolpupil coaching Friday evenings. Full recreational facilities - TV, poolroom, library.
HOWICK-PAKURANGA C.C. meets Tuesdays 7:30 pm (children 6:30-7:30) at Howick Bridge Club, Howick Community Complex, Howick. Contact: Peter McCarthy, phone 565 055, 92 Ti Rakau Drive, Pakuranga, Auckland.

NORTH SHORE C.C. meets Wednesdays $7: 30$ pm (tournament and casual play) in St Joseph's Hall, cnr Anzac St \& Taharoto Rd, Takapuna. Postal address: P.o.Box 33587, Takapuna. Contact: Peter Stuart, phone 456377 (evenings)

PARNELL C.C. meets $7: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ Wednesdays in Social Hall, Foundation for the Blind, 545 Parnell Road, Auckland. Contact: Terry Free, 23 Pasadena Ave, Pt Chevalier, Auckland, phone 868103.

CIVIC C.C. meets 8.00 pm Fridays (Juniors $7.00-8.00 \mathrm{pm}$ ) at St Johns meets 8.00 pm Fridays (Juniors $7.00-8.00 \mathrm{pm}$ ) at St Johns
Ambulance Hall, Vivian Street, Wellington. P.0. Box 2702 , Ambulance Hall, Vivian Street, Wellington. P.0.
Wellington. Contact: Ross Bloore, Phone 739576.

UPPER HUTT C.C. meets 7:45 pm Thursdays in Supper Room, Civic Hall, Fergusson Drive Upper Hutt. Contact: Anton Reid, 16 Hildreth Street, Upper Hutt, Upper Hutt. Co
phone 288756.

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

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

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

HASTINGS C.C. meets $7: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ at Room Wi (rear prefab), Hastings Boys' High School, 800 Karamu Road South, Hastings. Contact: Mike Earle, phone 776027

