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## CANDIDATES' ON AGAIN!

Agreement was reached during the FIDE General Assembly in October that the Candidates' semi-final matches should, after all, be played. Prior to the Manila meetings Korchnoi and Kasparov had met at Hercegnovi where both com peted in a one day lightning tournament ( 1 Kasparov $13 \frac{1}{2} / 16,2$ Korchnoi $10 \frac{1}{2}$, 3 Tal $9 \frac{1}{2} \ldots$ Kasparov beat Korchnoi in both games).
Although Rotterdam was still interested in hosting the two matches, London was the chosen venue. The two matches are being played on alternate days wit 100,000 Swiss franc prize fund for Kor or ... yes Riblit amount Both matches began both matches began sensationally! In io big the first game which rapidly ent into Kasarov's favourite 4 a ine in the Queen' Indian. In a sal of the normal roles, however, Korch noi played very quickiy while Kasparov ot into time trouble and went astray the ending Resu1t: a wi for Viktor in the endin n 52 moves.
The little match also started with a bang as Vassily Smyslov built up a huge position by the adjournment and went on to win in 65 moves. Doubtless the odds a Smyslov v Korchnoi final ca
mbing down at this point!
was unable to make any headway Korchnoi Kasparov's Tarrasch Defence and the game was drawn on move 31. In the othe match, however, Ribli wasted no time in equalising the scores by winning the second game.
The games received to date
KASPAROV - KORCHNOI (1), Queen's Indian: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 4 Nc 3 Bb 7 a3 d5 6 cxd5 Nxd5 7 e3 o6 8 Bb5t $6 \quad 9 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 710$ e4 Nxc3 11 bxc3 c5 $12 \operatorname{Bg} 5$ Qd6 13 e5 Qd7 14 dxc5 $0-0 \quad 15$ exb6 axb6 $160-0$ Qc7 17 Bb 5 Bxe5 18 Bh6 Bg7 19 Bxg7 Kxg7 20 Qd4+ Kg8 21 Ng5 h6 22 Ne4 Bxe4 23 Qxe4 Na6 24

Qe3 Oc5 25 Oxc5 Nxc5 26 Rfbl Rfd8 27 Bfl Rd6 28 Rb4 Kf8 29 a4 Ra5 30 g3 Ke7 $31 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{f} 532 \mathrm{Bb} 5 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \quad 33 \mathrm{Rd} 4 \mathrm{Rxd} 4$ 34 cxd4 Nxa4 35 Rxa4 Rxb5 36 Ra7+ Kd
 $2244 \mathrm{Kxb} 2 \mathrm{Rd} 2+45 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Rxf} 246 \mathrm{~K} 4 \mathrm{f} 4$
 50 Rh6 Ke 71 h 5 e $5+52 \mathrm{Kd5} f 3 \mathrm{O}$ SMYSLOV - RIBLI (1), Queen's Indian: 1 d4 Nf6 2 Nf3 e6 3 c4 b6 4 e3 Bb7 5 Bd3 d5 6 b3 Be7 7 O-0 0-0 8 Bb2 c5 $9 \mathrm{Qe} 2 \mathrm{cxd4} \quad 10$ exd4 Nc6 11 Nbd 2 Rc 8 12 Racl Re8 13 Rfd1 Bf8 $14 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 15$ Qe3 Bg 716 Ne 5 dxc4 17 bxc4 Ne7 18 Ndf3 Nf5 19 Bxf5 exf5 20 Qa3 Bh6 21 Ral a5 22 d5 5 Ne 423 d6 Bf8 24 Qb3 a4 25 Qxa4 Bxab 26 Qa7 Qc7 27 Qxc7 Rxc7 28 BC4 Nc5 29 Rabl f6 30 Bxc5 Bxc5 31 Na7 Re2 32 Nua 36 Nxc5 bxc5 34 Ne6 Re7 85 Rb6 Ra8 36 Nxc5 Be4 37 Rxf6 Rc $7-38$ Ne6 Rxe4 E3 Bc2 41 h4 (Adjourned)

$41 \ldots$ Rac8 43 h 6 Bf 544 $\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{f} 4 & 43 \mathrm{~h} 6 & \mathrm{Bf} 5 & 44 \\ \mathrm{Rg} 7+\mathrm{Kh} 8 & 45 & \mathrm{Rff} 7\end{array}$ g5 $46 \mathrm{Nd} 4 \mathrm{Rcl}+47$ Kh2 Bg6 48 Rf6 R1c5 49 Rd7 Rg8 50 Re7 Ras 51 Ne Ra6 52 Ree6 Bh5 53 Ne 5 Ra 754 Rf 5 Rb7 55 Rd6 Ra7 56 R6 Re7 57 Rbf6 Ree8 58 Nc4 8459 Ne5 gxf3 60 Rxh5 Rxg2+ $61 \mathrm{Kh} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 3+62 \mathrm{Kh} 4$ f2 63 Rxf4 Rgl 64 Rhf5 Rhl+ 65 Kg 3 , 1-0.
KORCHNOI - KASPAROV (2), QGD Tarrasch: $1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 2 \mathrm{c} 4$ e6 $3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 4$ cxd5 exd5 5 Nf 3 Ne 66 g3 Nf6 7 Bg 2 Be 78 0-0 $0-0 \quad 9 \mathrm{Bg} 5$ cxd4 10 Nxd4 h6 11 Be 3 Re8 12 a3 Be6 13 Qb3 Qd7 14 Nxe6 fxe6 15 Radl Bd6 16 Bc1 Kh8 17 Qa4 Qe7 18 e3 a6 19 Qh4 Rac8 20 e4 d4 21 Ne 2 e5 22 Bh 3 Rc 723 Bg 5 Kg 824 Bxf 6 Oxf6 25 Qxf6 gxf6 26 Nc 1 Na 527 Nd 3 Nb 3 28 bf 5 as 29 Kg 2 Kg 730 Kh 3 Ree 731 Nc $1, \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$. RIBLI-SMYSLOV (2), Bogo-Indian Def:
 $\begin{array}{lll}\text { dxe4 } & 9 & \text { Qxc4 } 4 \text { Qd5 } \\ \text { Oh5 } & 10 & \text { Qd3 } 0-0 \quad 11 \\ 0-0 & \text { Nc3 }\end{array}$ Qh5 $120-0$ Rd8 13 Qc4 Bd7 14 Rfel
 d5 Na5 19 Radl Nbc 420 Bc 1 e5 21 Nh 4 b5 22 Nf 5 Bf8 23 Qc2 Nd6 $24 \quad \mathrm{~g} 4 \quad$ Qf7 7 25 f4 Nxf5 26 exf5 exf4 27 d6 c6 28 Nxb5 Qc4 29 Nc3 Bxd6 30 Qxa4 Be5 31 Re4 Qxa4 32 Rxa4 Be8 33 Rxd8 Rxd8 34 Bxf4 Bxi4 35 Rxf4 Nb3 36 Rb4 Nd4 37 a4 Nc2 $38 \mathrm{Rb} 6 \mathrm{Ne} 3 \quad 39$ a5 Nc4 40 Ra6 Rb8 $41 \mathrm{Bf} 1 \mathrm{Ne} 542 \mathrm{Rb} 6,1$ - 0

$$
0
$$

## NEW ZEALAND CH'P PREVIEW

 Twenty-two entries were received for the 91st New Zealand Championship and fie selectors task of narrowing the have down tifficult one The must rating of the field 2242 is probably the hohest for eld, 22er, is probably into account the 75 -point , ijustment into account the 75 -point adjustment are: are:Paul Garbett (North Shore - 2374): joint defending champion with two previous titles; has had a very successful tournament year but has occasional inexplicable failures, e.g. his llth place in 1981/82.

Vernon Small (Christchurch Centre 2337): also a three-time champion but did not play last year; not very active this year but equal second (behind Garbett) in South Island Championship.
Ortvin Sarapu (North Shore - 2332): winner of $18 \mathrm{~N} . Z$. titles but did not play last year; equal second in 1981/ 82. This has not been a vintage year for Ortvin as his rating indicates. Sarapu has not won the Championship since way back in $1980 / 81$ but the target of 20 titles must still beckon! Ewen Green (Howick-Pakuranga - 2284): sixth in 1981/82, Ewen did not play last year but was joint champion in 1979/80. Variable results this year. David Gollogly (North Shore - 2283) sensationally shared title last year in his first Championship but hasn't played this year since February due to medical studies.
Robert Smith (Waitemata - 2278): completes a distinct top half ratingwise; had a superb result at 1982 Olympiad but has never matched this in a N.Z. Championship. Shared seventh
place in 1981/82 but did not play lagt year.
Jonathan Sarfati (Wellington - 2219) only one previous Championship, finishing a fine 4 th equal in 1981/82; young player with great experience and current North Island Champion.
Peter Stuart (North Shore - 2185): finished 6th equal last year with a best result of second (1972/73). Variable form during year.
Lindsay Cornford (Auckland - 2182): a jekyl1 \& hyde' player, equal 2nd in 1976/77. bat has not made the field since 1976/7. Had excesition in 1983 North ery strong opposilion in for Adrian lloyd (Canterbury - 2167): Adrian Lloyd (Canterbiry 2l67): and a consistent high placer in Sacfati) tournaments. First played in 1982/83 finishing ninth. Currently competing in Asian Junior Championship.
Philip Clemance (Civic - 2164): sol performer back on chess scene after several year away from the game. Good placings in North Island and South Island events as well as Wellington tournaments. One previous Championship ninth in 1977/78
Anthony Ker (Eastbourne - 2107): joint 1982/83 Premier Reserve winner and equal second in 1983 South Island Championship. Good result at Asian Team Ch'p. Could be the dark horse of 1983/84 in his first Championship. Youngest player in the field.

$$
B \quad H \quad B
$$

WRONG 显 STRIKES AGAIN!
In our October article (page 118) we missed a tactic! From diagram 5 (reproduced below) play commenced 1 Ke 3 Rf 7
 but Black has 1... ten! when the intended 2 Rh $6+\mathrm{Kxh} 5$ 3 Bf $3+$ Kh4 4 Kf4 'mating' is met by ....Rg4+!! drawing.
From the diagran therefore, White e.g. l...Re7

Rd6+ Kg7 3 Be4 Re8 $4 \mathrm{~h} 6+\mathrm{Kh} 8 \quad 5 \mathrm{Bf} 5$ Rf8 6 Ke4 Re8+ 7 Kf4 Rb8 8 Rd7 and we have diagram 6 although, as noted, 8 Re6! is even stronger.

## Can You See the Combinations?

Solutions on page 149


No. 1 White to move


No. 3 White to move


No. 5 Black to move


No. 2 White to move


No. 4 White to move


No. 6 White to move

## Letter

Dear Sir,
Having received the October issue of New zealand Chess today, I feel compelled to reply to two items contained therein which could easily undermine my reputation in chess circles.
The most serious is in the anonymous article on the Auckland Invitation tournament in which the unnamed writer states as fact that I did not play because of quote 'fear of losing rating points.' While this is partially correct, in its omission of details it is badly and incorrectly slanted, giving a bad impression. The simple fact is that last year I played in the unrated version of this tournament and found extreme difficulties in completing my games because of my journalistic second weekend. I consider that I
 be game last year at least partially because of the pressure lnposed upon me to complete games. I understand the last tor, of my even playing in the tournament because of my tight chedule! This year, with regard to these difficultes year, with regard to these difficulties, I decided not to play because I but not when I am at a decided disadbut not when I am at a decided disadvantage in terms of conditions to the be noted that I have risked (and lost) rating points in both the North and South Island Championships this year so I am certainly more active than some other players.
On another matter, that of my playing and directing the Charles Belton tournament, I agree with the Editor that that is not an ideal situation. However, I would point out that I played only to prevent a bye because of an uneven number of players. And I did not hear any criticism of the running of the tournament throughout; I invite anyone with any criticisms to write to New zealand chess and air them publicly (although they certainly did not take them up with me at the time).
Finally, I hope that New Zealand Chess will continue, and perhaps even increase, its efforts to present balanced accounts of events in New

Zealand.

Yours faithfully, Bob Smith

The report on the Auckland Invitation tournament was written by the Editor; in cormon with most 'Local News' items, it lacked a byline. Mr Smith at least confirms the basis of what was, after all, a somewhat tongue-in-cheek comment - as we are sure most readers appreciated.
The criticism which Mr Smith attracted from several players arose from the fact that he accepted his invitation knowing full well that he could not possibly fulfil his obligations regarding the playing schedule. Any disadvantage arising from the ensuing situation was, it seems to us, suffered by those of Mr milhs opponents who were consequently bimed to play Mr smith at some other time more convenient to Mr Smith. We were alleged difficulty or impos about Mr amith it was entirely self-imposed Mr Smith - it was entirely self-imposed Ratings often assume a perhaps greater haver tance than they should and plagers the vary in He agree ${ }^{2}$ as active in rated events as most.
We believe that a bye is preferable to a playing director in events such as the Belton Memorial. However, Mr Smith's claim that he played only to avoid the bye lacks credibility when we remember that he both directed and played in 1981 (and 1982 although there were perhaps mitigating circumstances then) with an ODD number of players! With a non-playing director this year the Editor might not have been prevailed upon, at the last minute, to act as a deputy director if need arose; the draw for each round might not have been scribbled semi-legibly on newsprint; and we might have had a progress score wall-chart worthy of the tournament.
Having accepted Mr Smith's invitation to criticise, we can only add that his chess, under the considerable handicap of also directing, was of a much higher class and led to a deserved first place.

- Editor
he New Zealand chess team nearly didn't go to the Asian Teams Championship in New Delhi. After some members of the original team defected, NZCA decided to cancel the trip. Then the net was cast wider, and lower, in the search for prospective members, a young and not particularly strong team materialised, and it was all on again. We got to India, and spent quite a bit of the time there wishing we hadn't.
The team, in board order, was Jonathan Sarfati, Bernard Carpinter (captain), Michael Hopewell, Mark Noble, Anthony Ker and Michael Freeman. The tournament was scheduled for the middle of Sarfati's first-year university exams, but Victoria University co-operatively agreed to allow me to supervise four of his papers in New Delhi.
A pleasant couple of days in Singapore broke the long trip to India, but landing in the seething chaos of Bombay Airport in the middle of the night administered a sharp shot of culture shock. The shock deepened when we arrived in Delhi and were shown to the room (singular) in which the six of us
were supposed to live for the two weeks.
It was in the Jawaharlal Nehru Stadium where the play was to take place. The oom was not large. It was dirty and smelly, and had a broken wincow and a thriving mosquito colony. leaked and the bachioon tanty covered in wher no hot water in the whe actually), no soap, no towels, and not nough bedding. It was noisy too. We made many complaints and requests or in Inda more usually, hot all. Noble and oved into a at the additional room, similar to the first additional room, similar to the first quito bites on his first day in the room and Delhi belly on the second; four f us were to get sick in varying degrees and the other two seemed run down. One good point was the food although we had to pay for it ourselves
and some of the team would eat only ish, bread and ice cream.
Ten countries turned up in the end, notable absentees being Australia and Indonesia. The top three teams were obviously going to be the Philippines, led by Candidate Eugene Torre, China and India. Curiously, India did not have their strongest team. They had een hoping for an odd number of entrants, which would have allowed them to field two teams, and they had selected two teams of roughly equal strength instead of the usual top team and reserve team. When an even number of entrants arrived they played one of these teams, led by young IM Dibyendu Barua whose successes included a win ver Korchnoi.
The weaker teams seemed to be Brunei, Bahrain and Kuwait. The two Arab countries had expert assistance, however Bahrain had Filipino GM Balinas as their coach and Kuwait the Polish IM Filipowicz. The other teams were Pakistan, Bangladesh and Malaysia.
Our team agreed that we should each lay six of the nine rounds, and should try to equalise the strength of oppoition that each team member met lut Round 1

| Pakistan | 2-2 | New Zealand |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lodhi | 1-0 | Sarfati |
| Omar Khan | $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ | Carpinter |
| Chaudry | 0-1 | Hopewell |
| Hassain | $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ | Noble | Brunei 0, China 4; Kuwait $\frac{1}{2}$, India $3 \frac{1}{2}$; Brunei 0 , China 4, Kuwait $\frac{1}{2}$, India $3 \frac{1}{2}$; Malaysia 3, Bangladesh 1; Philippines

4, Bahrain 0.
We thought 2-2 against Pakistan was moderate result, but as the tournament progressed it became obvious they were actually pretty strong; they beat China and their young board two scored $2 \frac{1}{2} / 3$ against IMs. Sarfati had a bad day, I had an up-and-down draw after sacrihad an up-and-down draw after sacria good positional win, while Noble had a space advantage but reached a position where neither side could think of anything constructive to do.

## New Zealand 3-1 Kuwait Hopewell 1-0 A1-Rashed Noble $\quad 0-1 \quad$ Al-Qallaf $\begin{array}{rrr}\text { Ker } & 1-0 & \text { Bin Ali }\end{array}$

India 4, Brunei 0; China 4, Malaysia 0 ; Bahrain $\frac{1}{2}$, Bangladesh $3 \frac{1}{2}$; Philippines 2, Pakistan 2. The Philippines , with Mascarinas on board two in poor bly
Hopewell and Ker crunched through quickly with aggressive play. Freechess all the first session, sealed anti-positional shocker and self an anti positional shocker and self destructend session. Noble's rapidity in played some imaginative chess but Mark played some imaginative chess but Mark winning move on his score sheet.
Unfortunately he crossed it out, found himself plagued by a quite unreasonable number of passed pawns, and couldn't quite find a swindle.

## Round 3

Brunei $\quad \frac{1 / 2}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$ New Zealand
$\begin{array}{ccc}\text { Hj Damit } & \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} & \text { Carpinter } \\ \text { Hopewell }\end{array}$
Hj Halim 0-1 Ker
Jaafar 0-1 Freeman
Kuwait 0, Philippines 4; Bangladesh $\frac{1}{2}$, China $3 \frac{1}{2}$; Pakistan 2, Bahrain 2;
Malaysia $\frac{1}{2}$, India $3 \frac{1}{2}$.
I accidentally fell into a grotty position but recovered and nearly won. Hopewell quickly won a pawn while keeping a good position. Ker blew a fuse in a winning position and found his queen pinned to his king but, with some adjournment help from Noble, won a strange ending with rook plus two pieces versus queen and extra pawns. Freeman was always dominant.

Round 4
New Zealand $\frac{1}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$ Malaysia
Sarfati 0-1 Liew
Carpinter 0-1 Hon
$\begin{array}{rrr}\text { Noble } & 0-1 & \text { Tay } \\ \text { Freeman } & \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} & \text { Goh }\end{array}$
Bahrain 0, China 4; Philippines 4, Brunei 0 ; Pakistan 3, Kuwait 1; India , Bangladesh 2.
A bad day. Sarfati and I both found
that one careless move is all that is needed to spoil a good position, while Noble was the exchange up when he donated a rook to a one-mover. Freeman was probably losing at the adjournment but his opponent unwittingly repeated the position three times.

Round 5

## Bangladesh $\quad 1 \frac{1}{2}-2 \frac{1}{2} \quad$ New Zealand Murshed $\frac{1,-1 / 2}{2}$ Sarfati Alam Khan $0-1$ Hopewe11 $\begin{array}{cc}\text { Hassan } & 1-0 \\ \text { Haque } & 0-1\end{array}$

Malaysia $\frac{1}{2}$, Philippines $3 \frac{1}{2}$; Brunei 0 , Pakistan 4; Kuwait 21 $\frac{1}{2}$, Bahrain 11/2; China 3, India 1. Mascarinas again the first the first meeting among the big three tinued his 100 per cent record to tinued his 100 per cent record to score his country's sole point against Sarf

Sarfati was pleased to score his first half-point, with Black against IM Murshed, who offered the early draw when he realised he had overpressed Hopewell's opponent had no idea what to do against the King's Gambit and was positionally squelched as Michael marched to $4 / 4$.
Noble seemed to be doing all right in a most unclear position until an enemy invasion by queen and bishop mated him before he could queen his advancing before he could queen his advancing adjournment and lost at the second. However, there followed a free day during which Ker, Noble and Sarfati found some imaginative swindling attempts; in the third session Rezaul Haque made two blunders and Ker only one, so the match swung our way.
The standings after five rounds were: China $18 \frac{1}{2}$, Philippines $17 \frac{1}{2}$, Pakistan 14, India 14, New Zealand $11 \frac{1}{2}$, Bangladesh $8 \frac{1}{2}$, Malaysia $7 \frac{1}{2}$, Kuwait 5, Bahrain 3, Brunei $\frac{1}{2}$. Our points total was all right but we had not yet played any of the big three.

The four-man Philippines team was well led by Torre, who had scored 100 per cent although he was looking quite unhealthy, but were handicapped by Mascarinas' erratic play. China had six players (plus an interpreter and manager) but were playing their top
four almost all the time.
The first rest day followed, on which
we were provided with a rough but worthwhile four-hour bus trip to the beautiful Taj Mahal and the huge Agra Fort.

## Round 6

| New Zealand |  | $0-4$ |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Carpinter  <br> China  <br> Hopewell $0-1$ <br> Qi Jin Xuan  <br> Noble $0-1$ | Li Zu Nian Jiang Chuan <br> Yreeman | $0-1$ | Lian Jing Rong | Bahrain 0, India 4; Kuwait 2, Brunei 2; Pakistan $1 \frac{1}{2}$, Malaysia $2 \frac{1}{2}$; Philippines

$3 \frac{1}{2}$, Bangladesh $\frac{1}{2}$
Our only whitewash, perhaps not surprising in view of the strength of the opposition (all rated around 2400 ) but disappointing nonetheless. I attacked Qi Jin Xuan, found a nice manoeuvre he had missed, but railed to work out complicated tactical win found by Noble afterwards. Insufficient preparation saw Hopewell lured into an opening variation his opponent had already used to crushing effect earlier in the tournament. Noble opened the h-file only to see his opponent get there first and Freeman suffered a hallucination in a position that was inferior but not clearly lost.

## Round 7

## India 3-1 New Zealand <br> Barua 1-0 Sarfati. <br> Thipsay 1-0 Carpinter Mohanty $\frac{12}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ Noble

Malaysia 4, Kuwait 0; Brunei 2, Bahrain 2; Bangladesh $1 \frac{1}{2}$, Pakistan $2 \frac{1}{2}$; China 2 2; Bangladesh 1
Torre won yet again, with Black in a Ruy Lopez, but Mascarinas lost and the other two games were drawn, leaving China with a healthy points lead
Our performance was more respectable than in the previous round. Sarfati had difficult manoeuvring game in a closed Giuoco Piano but adjourned with what looked like a satisfactory position. However, it was not as good as we thought and a slip allowed Barua to infiltrate and mate with queen and infight.
I had an equalish position against Thipsay and a big time advantage, then general debilitation caused my brain to cease functioning. Noble was grovelling in the middle game on the black side of
a QGD Exchange but grovelled extremely well and was nearly winning at the second adjournment. Ker always had the upper hand but couldn't get through.

## Round 8

| Bahrain |  | $\frac{1}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$ | New Zealand |
| ---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Farooghi |  | $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ | Sarfati |
| Al-Gashra | $0-1$ | Carpinter |  |
| Ajlan | $0-1$ | Ker |  |
| Dhaif | $0-1$ | Freeman |  |

Brunei 0, Malaysia 4; Kuwait $\frac{1}{2}$, Bangladesh $3 \frac{1}{2}$; Pakistan $2 \frac{1}{2}$, China $1 \frac{1}{2}$;
Philippines 2, India 2.
Pakistan struck again and indeed nearly scored $3 \frac{1}{2}$ but the Philippines were held by India and remained a point behind the Chinese. Torre maintained his 100 per cent score against Barua but Ihipsay did the same against Mas carinas. Yap beat Mohanty and Rafiq Khan beat De Guzman
Sarfati had another closed Giuoco Piano and when his position started going sour accepted his opponent's respectful draw offer. I won the exchange but then my head went fuzzy again and I played very badly until Freeman got me some coconut biscuits and I started seeing things again. Ker's pressure eventually netted a pawn. Freeman calculated some nice tactics and felt disappointed when his opponent preferred to lose simply.
Round 9
New Zealand $1 \frac{1}{2}-2 \frac{1}{2}$ Philippines $\begin{array}{rll}\text { Sarfati } & \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} & \text { Torre } \\ \text { Hopewell } & \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} / 2 & \text { Mascarinas } \\ \text { Ker } & 0-1 & \text { Yap }\end{array}$

$$
\text { Ker } \frac{1}{\text { Freeman }} \frac{1 / 2}{\frac{1}{2}} \text { De Guzman }
$$

3, Pakistan 1 Malaysia 3, Bahrain 1; Bangladesh 3, Brunei 1.
So China won by $2 \frac{1}{2}$ points and qualify for the World Cup; this was the first time the Philippines had not won the championship. India beat Pakistan to make sure of third, though Thipsay surrendered his 100 per cent score when Omar Khan held him to a draw
Sarfati had his moment of glory when he held Torre to a draw. The grandmaster, who had scored $8 / 8$ before this game, had the initiative but Sarfati defended resourcefully. Hopewell seized the initiative with a pawn sacrifice and the pressure was enough to win the pawn
back; things went a little awry in the ending, but it was still a clear draw Ker suffered his first loss when he failed to come to grips with his IQP position in a Sicilian with 2 c 3 d 5. Freeman played imaginatively and pro-
bably had a plus in an unclear position when De Guzman accepted his draw offer. We had reason to be grateful to Brumei this round, as the point they took off Bangladesh enabled us to finish sixth.

Bxe4 35 Qb6 Qxe3 36 Qxd6 h6 (36...Qf3 $\begin{array}{llllll}37 & \text { Qe5 Kf8 } & 38 & \text { Qd6+ Ke8 } & 39 \text { Qbs+ Ke7 } \\ 40 & \text { Oc7+ Kf6 } & 41 \text { Of } 4+\text { Oxf4 } & 42 \text { gxf4 is }\end{array}$ winning for Black; Torre, short of time saw this but was afraid of the devastating but illegal move 39 bb5 mate!) 37 Qf4 Ba8 38 h 4 Qal 39 Qe3 Qbl 40 Qd4+ Kh7 41 Qa7 Bb7 42 Qe3 Kg8 43 Qd4 Qel, $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$.

CARPINTER-0. KHAN, Symmetrical English: 1 Nf3 c5 2 c4 Nc6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 e6 6 Nabs d6 7 Bf4 e5 8 Bg5 a6 9 Bxf6 gxf6 $10 \mathrm{Na3}$ f5 11 e3 Be6 12 Qh5 Qb6 13 Rbl Bg7 14 Be 2 e $150-0$ Bxc3 16 bxc3 Qa5 17 Nc2 Qxc3 18 Rfcl Qa2 19 Na4 Nxa4 20 exd4 Rb8 21 d5 Bd7 22 c5 dxc5 23 Rxc5 (23 Bxa6!?) Rc8 24 Rxc8+ Bxc8 25 Rdl Qxa2 26 Rc 1 Bd 727 Bc 4 Qb 228 Qg 5 b5 29 Be 2 Qe5 30 Rc 5 h6 31 Qcl Ke7 32 Qa3 Qd6 33 Qc3 Rg8 34 f3 Qf $6 \quad 35$ Qb4 a5 36 Qd2 Qb6 37 Qd4 Rc8 $38 \mathrm{~d} 6+$ Qxd6 39 Rd5 Qc7 40 fxe4 fxe4 41 Qxe4+ Kf8 42 Qd4 Be6 $43 \mathrm{Rxb5} \mathrm{Kg} 844$ Bd3 Rd8 45 Qe4 Ocl+ 46 Kf 2 Qd2+ 47 $\mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{a} 448 \mathrm{Re} 5 \mathrm{Rd} 4 \quad 49 \mathrm{Qa} 8+\mathrm{Kg} 750 \mathrm{~g} 3$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\mathrm{Rb} 4 & 51 & \mathrm{Qa} 7 \mathrm{Qb} 2 ?! & 52 & \mathrm{Rxe} 6 \mathrm{Rb} 7 & 53\end{array}$ Qxa4 fxe6 54 Qg4+ Kf8 55 Qxe6 Rf7+ $56 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{QcI}+\quad 57 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \quad$ Qg $5 \quad 58 \mathrm{Qc} 8+, \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$
CHAUDRY-HOPEWELL, Symmetrical EngTish 1 c4 c5 2 Nf 3 Nf 63 Nc 3 d5 4 cxd5 Nxd5 $\quad 5 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 7 \quad 0-0 \quad 0-0$ a3 Nc6 9 Qb3 Nxc3 10 dxc3 Na5 11 Qc2 Be6 12 Be3 Bb3 13 Qe4 Qc7 14 Nf 3 ba 518 Rcal Bc 619 Bh6 Rxd 10 Nxd Rd8 81 Redi Bc 619 Bh6 Rxd 20 23 Rad 22 Bxg 7 Kxg 7 26 Qur Qxa 27 Kf3 28 Kx 25 Ndl Nb 30 Ke3 f5 31 h4 Nc5 $32 \mathrm{f3}$ Kf6 33 Nf2 Na4 34 Nal 5535 hxg Kxg $536 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{~h} \quad 37$ e $438 \mathrm{f} 4+\mathrm{Kg}$ 19 K 40 Nf2+ 451
 Nf 2 Nd3 $43 \mathrm{~g} 4+$ (or $43 \mathrm{Nal} \mathrm{Kg} 4{ }^{44}$ gugzwang:) 43...fxg4 44 Nxe4 Nxb2 45
 5 Nd5 $49 \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{c} 3-50 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Nxf} 4+51$ Ke3 Kf5, 0-1.
Y. HASSAN-NOBLE, Philidor Defence: 1 e4 e5 $2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{Nc} 3$ Nbd7 5 Bc4 Be7 $60-0$ c 67 Rel Qc 7
 h5 $\quad 15 \mathrm{Be} 2 \quad \mathrm{~h} 4 \quad 16 \quad \mathrm{Bg} 4$ Nh6 $\quad 17 \mathrm{Bxc} 8$ Rxc8 18 Ng4 Rd8 19 Of3 Nf4 20 Radl b6 21 Rxd8+ Bxd8 22 Rdl Nxg4 23 Oxg4 Ne6

24 Rd3 Rh6 25 b4 a6 26 Qdl b5 27 axb5 axb5 28 Nb 1 Be7 29 Ra3 Nd8 30 Ra7 Qa6 31 Qg4 Qe6 32 Rxe7+ Qxe7 33 Bxg5 Qxb4 34 Bxh6 Qxb1+ 35 Kh 2 Qxc2 36 Qg8+ Kd7 37 Bg 5 Nb 738 Qxf7+ Kc8 99 Qe8+ Kc7 40 Qxe5+ Kb6 $41 \mathrm{Be} 3+\mathrm{c} 5$ 42 Qe6+ Ka7 43 Qc6 b4? 44 Bf4
(threat: 45 Bc7 winning) 44...Na5 45 Qb5 b3, $1-0$.

## KER-HAQUE, Scotch:

e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 d4 exd4 4 Bc4 Nf6 5 0-0 d6 (passive; more enterprising is 5...BC5, Max Lange, or 5.. Nxe4, Two Knights) 6 Nxd4 Nxd4 7 Qxd4 Be7 $8 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{-}} 9 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Kh} 810 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{~h} 6$ 11 Bh4 Ng8 12 Bg3? (White should have exchanged bishops and brought his $Q R$ into play with a clear advantage.
After Black's $f 5$, the bishop is rather useless) 12...c6 13 a4 Qa5 14 Khl f5 15 e5 Rd8 16 Rfel d5 17 Be 2 Be 618 Redl Bb 419 Nbl c5 $20 \mathrm{Qg} 1 \mathrm{c} 4 \quad 21 \mathrm{c} 3$ Bc5 22 Bf2 Bxf2 23 Qxf2 Ne7 24 Nd2 (Na3!? Qxa4 25 Nxc4 Qb3 26 Na6 Qxb2 27 Nb 5 ! is unclear) 24 ... Nc6 25 Nf 3 Qb6 26 Qxb6 axb6 $27 \mathrm{Nd4}$ Nxd4
(forced, otherwise the knight goes to b5 and c7/d6, tying Black into knots) 28 Rxa4 b5 29 a5 Kg8 30 Bf $3 \mathrm{Kf} 8 \quad 31$ Kg1 Ke7 32 Kf2 Ra6 33 Rddl Rd7 34
 41 Rdal Rab 39 h4 $84 \quad 40$ Bg 2 Ke 6 41 Kd4 Be8 42 Kc5 Bc 643 Kd4 Rda8 4 Bl Rd8 45 Rdl Rda8 46 Kc5 Rxa 40 Ral Ra4 51 Be 2 Ras 49 Kd4 Raas 53 b3 54 Bal 55 Rxa3 R 56 59 Bc21? Bre2 60 Prb7+ Kf8 61 Rxa 59 Bc2,? Bxc2. 60 Rxb7+Kf8 61 Kxc3 Rf3 $65 \mathrm{b7}$ Rxb7 66 Rxb Rxf 647 45 Ke8? 68 K6 61869 Kf7? 70 6 Re4 71 7+ Rxe7+2? 72 Rxe7 54 Re8+ Kd7 $74 \mathrm{Rg} 8,1-0$.

## DE GUZMAN-FREEMAN, Benoni

1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 c5 4 d5 exd5 5 cxd5 d6 64 e 36 c5 40 d5 699 Bh4 a6 The aiternative is 9 g5 $10 \mathrm{Bg} 3 \mathrm{Nh} 511 \mathrm{Bb} 5+\mathrm{Kf8} 12$ e5!? which as popular in the late 70 s . My move prevents this but allows white to play 10 Nd2 b5 11 Be2 preventing Nh5 \& Nxq3) 10 a4 (Naw the game proceeds down the main line but white does not have Bb5+) $10 . . \mathrm{g} 511 \mathrm{Bg} 3 \mathrm{Nh} 512 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Nxg} 313$ hxg3 Nd7 14 Be2 b6 (A new move. Usual is $14 . . . Q e 715$ a5. The time lost in preventing a5 Continued on page 149

## SOUTH ISLAND CH'P - Nelson, 22/27 August

|  | R. 1 | R. 2 | R. 3 | R. 4 | R. 5 | R. 6 | R. 7 | R. 8 | T'1 | SOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Garbett P.A. | W22 | W12 | W16 | W5 | D2 | D6 | W9 | W11 | 7 |  |
| Small V.A. | W17 | W27 | W19 | D23 | D1 | D7 | W16 | D6 | 6 | 39 |
| Lloyd A.J. | W39 | W29 | W15 | L6 | L5 | W13 | W18 | w9 | 6 | 36 |
| Ker A.F. | W40 | W25 | L5 | W20 | L9 | W17 | W26 | W15 | 6 | 341/2 |
| Clemance P.A. | w24 | W18 | W4 | L1 | w3 | L9 | W12 | D7 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 43 |
| Nokes R.I. | L10 | W21 | W38 | W3 | W17 | DI | D7 | D2 | 512 | 41/1/2 |
| Love A.J. | W32 | W13 | D20 | W15 | D23 | D2 | D6 | D5 | 51/2 | 39 |
| van Dijk P. | W45 | L9 | W39 | D14 | W19 | W26 | L11 | W16 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3212 |
| Smith R.W. | W28 | W8 | L23 | W10 | W4 | w5 | L1 | L3 | 5 | 421/2 |
| Chye M. | W6 | L16 | W13 | L9 | D29 | W19 | D20 | W23 | 5 | $36 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Dowden - R.A. | W31 | L19 | W41 | L17 | W38 | W22 | W8 | L1 | 5 | $35^{\frac{1}{2}}$ |
| Gibbons R.E. | W43 | L1 | W45 | D18 | W14 | D15 | L5 | W28 | 5 | 341/2 |
| van Ginkel J.P. | W42 | L7 | L10 | W4 1 | W30 | L3 | W24 | W27 | 5 | 331/2 |
| van Dijk T. | W44 | L15 | W40 | D8 | L12 | W31 | W28 | D22 | 5 | 32 |
| Green P.R. | w30 | W14 | L3 | L7 | W21 | D12 | W23 | L4 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | $39^{\frac{1}{2}}$ |
| Bates G.T.H. | W34 | W10 | L1 | D26 | W28 | W23 | L2 | L8 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 38 |
| Nijman A.J. | L2 | W33 | W25 | W11 | L6 | L4 | D30 | W26 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 37 |
| Wigbout M. | W38 | L5 | D28 | D12 | W24 | W27 | L3 | D21 | 412 | 35 |
| Weegenaar D.P. | W36 | W11 | L2 | D27 | L8 | L10 | W43 | W29 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 34 |
| Leese M. | D21 | W46 | D7 | L4 | D31 | D29 | D10 | W32 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3312 |
| Raines T. | D20 | L6 | W35 | D30 | L15 | W33 | W31 | D18 | 41/2 | 33 |
| Nijman B. | L1 | L45 | W42 | W39 | W25 | L11 | W38 | D14 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 32 |
| Jackson J.R. | W33 | W41 | w9 | D2 | D7 | L16 | L15 | L10 | 4 | 37 |
| Boyce D.A.L. | L5 | W36 | L26 | W32 | L18 | W43 | L13 | W30 | 4 | $31 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Jones C. | W47 | L4 | L17 | W44 | L22 | L38 | W45 | W39 |  | $26 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Lynn K.W. | L41 | W34 | W24 | D16 | W27 | L8 | L4 | L17 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 34 $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Whitehouse L.E. | W37 | L2 | W44 | D19 | L26 | L18 | W34 | L13 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 33 |
| Gloistein B. | L9 | W37 | D18 | W43 | L16 | W40 | L14 | L12 | 31/2 | 33 |
| Alexander B.M. | W35 | L3 | L30 | W45 | D10 | D20 | D32 | L19 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | $32 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Cornelissen R.L. | L15 | D43 | W29 | D21 | L13 | W41 | D17 | L24 | $3{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | $31 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Morrison M.K. | L11 | L44 | W37 | W40 | D20 | L14 | L21 | W43 | $3{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 3012 |
| Boyd K.M. | L7 | L38 | W36 | L24 | W44 | W39 | D29 | L20 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 291/2 |
| Beesley R. | L23 | L17 | D34 | W35 | L39 | L21 | W47 | W38 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 27 |
| Blundell K. | L16 | L26 | D33 | W46 | L43 | W37 | L27 | W42 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 26 |
| Nokes Mrs J. | L29 | Bye | L21 | L33 | L42 | W36 | D44 | W46 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | $22 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Schwass M.P. | L19 | L24 | L32 | D37 | Bye | L35 | W46 | W47 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 22 |
| Kelly S. | L27 | L28 | L31 | D36 | W46 | L34 | Bye | W45 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 21/1/2 |
| Cunningham P.D. | L18 | W32 | L6 | W47 | L11 | W25 | L22 | L33 | 3 | $31 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Scott D. | L3 | W47 | L8 | L22 | W33 | L32 | W40 | L25 | 3 | 31 |
| Mathieson J.s. | L2 | W42 | L14 | L31 | W45 | L28 | L39 | W44 | 3 | $28 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Grkow A. | W26 | L23 | L11 | L13 | W47 | L30 | L42 | Bye | 3 | 25 |
| Watson M.J. | L13 | L40 | L22 | Bye | W35 | L45 | W41 | L34 | 3 | $24 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Wilkinson E. | L12 | D30 | W46 | L28 | W34 | L24 | L19 | L31 | 212 | 291/2 |
| Allen Mrs E.g. | L14 | W31 | L27 | L25 | L32 | Bye | D35 | L40 | $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 26 |
| Jones H . | L8 | W22 | L12 | L29 | L40 | W42 | L25 | L37 | 2 | 32 |
| Stublberfield W. | Bye | L20 | L43 | L34 | L37 | W47 | L36 | L35 | 2 | 22 |
| Cole N . | L25 | L39 | Bye | L38 | L41 | L46 | L33 | L36 | 1 |  |

The anticipated report not having arrived in time for this issue, we at least give the full score table. Sorry about the lack of story!

## Local News

AUCKLAND LABOUR WEEKEND TOURN.
While 73 mm of rain fell outside a small field of 18 competed inside the Chess Centre at the annual Labour Weekend tournament, 22/24 October.
Paul Garbett, playing cautious and strong chess, won with $4 \frac{1}{2} / 5$ conceding a draw to Simon Fitzpatrick but decisively defeating me
Simon, a strong Chess Centre player and number three seed, came in second with 4 points and Brad Walsh came third. Perhaps the most spectacular result occurred in the very first round when Greg Spencer-Smith played the game of Elo poin and beat a player rated 500 could remember that player's name. In the under-1900 group a struggle was going on for the grade prize which was eventually shared by Bruce Wheeler Bob Johnstone, Richard Poor and Greg

## pencer-smith.

scores: R. 1 R. 2 R. 3 R. 4 R. 5
1 Garbett P.A. W4 W14 W3 D2 W6 $4 \frac{1}{2}$ 2 Fitzpatrick S. W16 D13 W9 Dl W4 4 3 Walsh B.G. W11 W12 Ll D5 W10 31/2
4 Poor R.L. L1 W16 W8 W1l L2 3
5 Spencer-

Smith G.J. W6 L10 W7 D3 D9 3 6 Metge J.N. L5 W17 W14 W10 L1 3 7 Johnstone R. L12 W18 L5 W14 W13 3 8 Wheeler B. W18 L9 L4 W16 W12 3 9 Stephenson J. D10 W8 L2 D12 D5 $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 10 | Hart R. | D9 | W5 W13 | L6 | L3 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | 11 Martin-Buss B. L3 D15 W18 8 L4 W17 ${ }^{2 \frac{1}{2}}$ 12 Bradley N.A. W7 L3 D15 D9 $\begin{array}{rlrrr}\text { L8 } & 2 \\ 3 & \text { Rudkins } & \text { L.R. W17 } & \text { D2 } & \text { L10 } \\ \text { D15 } & \text { L7 } & 2\end{array}$ 14 Schofield G. W15 L1 L6 L7 W18 2 15 Morrison M.K. L14 D11 D12 D13 D16 2 16 Mears G.W. L2 L4 W17 L8 D15 $1 \frac{1}{2}$

17 Bartocci K. L13 L6 L16 W18 L11 1
18 Henderson A.J. L8 L7 L11 L17 L14 0
Report: Nigel Metge

## TAWA LABOUR WEEKEND TOURNAMENT

This year's Labour Weekend tournament was again organised by the Tawa Club rht. event. The tournament ran smoothly f Bo Mitch Tle play divided into two grades, a 14-player A
grade and a 22-player B grade, the grade being noticeably weaker than nor mal with most of the top Wellington players overseas or studying for exams Round 1: Top seed Peter Hawkes met his nemesis Russell Dive, the game following an earlier encounter in which Hawkes sacrificed his queen on move 5 ; Dive, however, avoided prepared analysis and returned the queen. Dive's two bishops and four connected pawns proved too strong in the endgame for Hawkes's two rooks and two pawns. Greg Aldridge suffered defeat at the hands of Stan Yee, this game also following an earlier encounter
Round 2: Dive, Rowan Wood and Mark vander Hoorn all won to have perfect scores although van der Hoorn was lucky as Yee contrived to lose his extra pawn and the game in time pressure.
Round 3: Dive beat Borren when the latter exchanged pieces with reckless disregard for the resulting weakening of his position while Wood beat van der Hoorn who incorrectly sacrificed a rook which was accepted at the second opportunity. Ion won against Stracy with simple combination winning a pawn in the opening. Hawkes came back into contention with a good win over Yee and Charles Ker (substituting for big brother Anthony who was representing New Zealand in the Asian Team Ch'p) scored his point with a nice attack against Zyg Frankel. Leading scores: Dive $\&$ Wood 3 ; Ion $2 \frac{1}{2}$; Hawkes $\&$ van der Hoorn 2.
Round 4: The hopes of Wood and Ion were shattered by losses to Dive and Hawkes respectively. Wood's attack was just getting started when Dive exchanged which pit Wood most of his remoining paws. Hawkes and Ton continued their theoretical battle with the French
 rasen and lon lost two in return and Hawkes eme with two connected passed pawn which ensured the victory Scores now: Dive ; Wood \& Hawke 3; Aldridge, Ion Borren 2 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$.
orren $2 \frac{1 / 2}{2}$
Round 5: Dive reached a rook endin with an extra pawn and was happy to first the point thus guaranteeing clear first place. Hawkes won quickly with a
nice kingside attack against Wood. Yee beat Ion to end the latter's hopes of third place which went to Borren who
had a somewhat fortuitous win against Stracy. The final scores:
R. 1 R. 2 R. 3 R. 4 R. 5

1 Dive R.J. W2 W14 W3 W4 D5
2 Hawkes P.D.
3 Borren A.M.
4 Wood R.
5 Aldridge
W10
D8
W10 D8 L1 W12 W4
W14 W10

6 Yee S.
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { L6 } & \text { D11 } & \text { W12 } & \text { L1 } & \text { L2 } \\ \text { W5 } & \text { D1 }\end{array}$
W5 L7 L2 W13 W8
8 Ion G.J. $\quad$ W11 10 D3 W9 L5 W13
9 stracy D.M. W13 L2 L8 w10 L6
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrr}10 & \text { Cooper } & \text { P. R. } & \text { L3 } & \text { L4 } 4 & \text { W11 } & \text { L9 } \\ \text { L1 }\end{array}$
11 Boswell T.J. L8 D5 L10 D14 W12
12 Mullan A.B
13 Ker C.M.
L9 W13 L5 L3 L12 L 14
14 Frankel Z. L4 L1 L13 D11 L10
In summary Dive was a deserving victor. After beating Hawkes he played more solidly than usual and capitalised on his opponents' mistakes - and there were plenty of them!
The B grade was jointly won by Peter King and Nathan Goodhue. King, however, was unlucky not to win his critical game against Goodhue. He knocked over his king and replaced it on a different allowed Goodhue to regain a pawn and eventually draw the game.
Scores: 1-2 P.C.King \& N. Goodhue $4 \frac{1}{2}$;
3-5 G.Alexander, P.Dunn \& J. Herbert $3 \frac{1}{2}$; 6-9 G.Barrow, P.D.Cunningham, W. Ramsay \& G.Simpson 3; 10-12 S.Aburn, P.G.Monrad \& J.Phillips $2 \frac{1}{2} ; ~ 13-18$ J.Gilberd, M.A. Gordon, J.Hemela, P.Skurr, S.Styche \& C.H.Webber 2; 19-20 A.Archer \& I.Macri 1立; 21 M. Cooper 1; 22 S . Ker 0.
HAWKES - ION, French Tarrasch :
1 e4 e6 $2 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 4 \mathrm{Ngf3}$ a6 5
 dxe4 9 Nxc4 b5 10 Nce5 Nxe5 11 Nxe5 Bb7 $12 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 13 \mathrm{Rc} 1$ Nxe4 14 Bxe 7 Qxe7 15 Nc6 Bxe6 16 Rxc6 Nf6 (Or 16.. NC5 17 Bbl intending Qc2) 17 Rxa6 Rxa6 18 Bxb5+ Nd7 19 Bxa6 $0-0 \quad 20$ Oc2 Ra8 21 Qc7 Qc5 22 Qxd7 Rxa6 23 Qd8+ Qf8 24 Qxf8+ Kxf8, I - 0 .

## AUCKLAND C.C. CHALLENGERS TOURN

We alluded to this event in our october report on the Centre's Invitation Tournament but were wrong to say that the final scores were in doubt. Although justified, the two appeals were made too late to change the final results.

The official scores were: 1 S.Fitz patrick 8; 2 J.R.Stephenson 7; 3-5 N.H.Hopewell, M.P.Dreyer \& D.G.Notley 6 $\frac{1}{2}$; 6-7 R. Hart \& R.Taylor 6; 8 G.J. Spencer-Smith 5; 9-10 Mrs K.Metge \& P.B.Goffin $4 \frac{1}{2} ; 11$ L.D.Rawnsley $3 \frac{1}{2}$; 12 J.E.Cater 1.
The two decisions by D.o.P. Jon Stephenson which became the subject of appeal had a major influence on the final placings, Martin Dreyer being regated from first to equal third and Ralph Har qual sixth.
The first case came in the round 4 game Dreyer-Fitzpatrick when, after 15 of illness with to cease play because resumption Dreyer should of courge, esuption. Dreyer should, course, ate though this the polnt (unfore te though this might have been for oly ful the that the gace should be ontinued from move 15 - and Dreyer The
The other poor decision concerned the round 9 game Hart-Goffin which Ralph was able to play as scheduled but Peter wasn't; in the limited time remaining before the last round the game remained unplayed and one would have expected that Hart would have been awarded a win by default as occurred in several other games - but o, a double forfeit was the decision It was particularly unfortunate that both these decisions were made against young and relatively inexperienced players who were, perhaps, not fully onversant with the right of appeal at least not until too late.
Had these two decisions not been taken, the final scores might well have been: J. Dreyer 7-2; 2-4 Hart, itzpatrick \& Stephenson 7. Considering played games only, Hart had the best percentage and the best perfornance rating!
As the games Stephenson-Fitzpatrick and Fitzpatrick-Hart were both won by default (by White in each case) it is hardly possible to discuss the merits of the various results except to say that there was obviously very little between the top seven players. Although on past form Fitzpatrick's victory was no surprise, he did not play as well as he is capable of playing.

## HASTINGS JUNIOR TOURNAMENT

This year's event attracted nearly 400 competitors to the Hastings City Council Chambers on Saturday 24 September and was held on a knockout system ith up to 32 boards per round.
Peterhead School was once again very prominent, winning seven titles and taking twenty-one awards. In all 22 primary and intermediate schools were represented. Six grades, 7 years to junior open, were held for both boys and girls.
Many family successes were recorded Hayley Miller (lst, 8 years) and Greg Miller (1st, 7 years); Stefan Rea (lst, 8 years) and Donel Rea (2nd, 10 years) aily (2nd years) and obinson (2nd, 1 years), Le Hawk (2nd, 10 years) and Linh Hawke (3rd, 9 ears)
Results of the Junior Open events Boys: 1 Ben Parker (Hereworth), 2 Ashley Stitchbury (Hereworth), 3 Peter Daniels (F1axmere Intermediate) \& Scott Boyes (Hereworth). Girls: 1 Laryhs Mako (Flaxmere Intermediate), 2 Janet England (St Mary's), 3 Rebecca Davis (St Mary's) \& Tricia Tahere (Flaxmere Intermediate).
Next year, to celebrate Hastings's centennial, the tournament will be held at the Hastings Indoor Stadium and will be a Hawkes Bay open junior tournament with invitations going to all primary and intermediate schools in the province.

## OBITUARY - PENCARROW CHESS CLUB

The Pencarrow Chess Club passed away recently, the victim of almost total disinterest. It is ironic that the club's demise occurred whilst its most famous son, Murray Chandler, was gaining his grandmaster title! Other top juniors produced by the club include our currently highest rated woman player enella Foster and, latterly, Anthony New who makes his debut
The young Eastbourne Club is located in the same area of Wellington.

## NTERCLUB MATCHES

On 2 August the CIVIC club defeated

TAWA by $8 \frac{1}{2}$ to $6 \frac{1}{2}$. The individual results (Civic names first) in board order were: L.J.McLaren 1, G.J.Aldridge 0 ; P.A.Clemance 1, R.J.Dive 0; P.D. Hawkes 0, D.M.Stracy 1; G.J.Ion $\frac{1}{2}$, C Fraser $\frac{1}{2}$; M. White 0, R.S.Mitchell l. L.Wall 0 , M.Lewis 1; R.Wood $\frac{1}{2}$, M. Small $\frac{1}{2} ;$ A.B.Mullan 1, G.Simpson 0 T. Raines 1, P.Skurr 0; D.S.Capper $\frac{1}{2}$ D. Bennett $\frac{1}{2}$; J.B.Kay 0, T.Powell 1; P.C.King 1, R.Rasman 0; B.Southgate 1 G.Mills 0; S.Aburn 0, S.Stych 1; J. Hemela 1, R.Munvary 0 .
HASTINGS \& HAVELOCK NORTH conclusive$1 y$ beat NAPIER $14 \frac{1}{2}-9 \frac{1}{2}$ in two twelveboard matches played in April and September to regain the Peter Bishop trophy.

In home and away matches for the Burnham Cup PALMERSTON NORTH defeated WANGANUI $12 \frac{1}{2}-11 \frac{1}{2}$. Palmerston North won the first leg 8-4 but the positions were almost reversed in the second 1 eg which was won by Wanganui $7 \frac{1}{2}-4 \frac{1}{2}$.
Results of the first match (Palmer ston North names first) were: D.J. Cooper 1, T.J.Boswell 0;' M.Chye 1, P. R.Cooper 0; R.Shuker l, P.Vetharaniam 0 ; M.Ha11 $\frac{1}{2}$, H.P. Whitlock $\frac{1}{2}$; E.Gibbons $\frac{1}{2}$, G.A.Hoskyn $\frac{1}{2}$; J.Blatchford 0, D.I. Bell 1; I.Whitson 1, D. Burnham 0; D Davey 0, S.L. Booth 1; Y.Lee 1, G.Redit 0; A.Reid 1, G.Forbes 0; S.Winder 0, C. Ward 1; J.Chapman 1, W. Boswell 0 . Results of the return match (Wanganui names first): T.J. Boswell 0, R.Shuker 1; .Vetharaniam 1, M.Hall 0; H.P.Whitlock 0, Y.Lee 1; P.R.Cooper $\frac{12}{2}$, E.Gibbons $\frac{1}{2}$; G.A.Hoskyn 1, A.Reid 0; A.Sangster 1, J. Blatchford 0; D.I.Bell 1, D.Davey 0 H.Jones 1 , S.storey 0 ; K.Vetharanian
 ©.Ward O, J.Chapman

群
The WANGANUI club seems to have been particularly active in arranging inter club matches. In another match Wanganu defeated TAWA $5 \frac{1}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$ on nine boards. The results (Wanganui names first): T.J. Boswell $\frac{1}{2}$, G.J.Aldridge $\frac{1}{2}$; P.Vetharaniam $\frac{1}{2}$, R.J.Dive $\frac{1}{2}$; P.R.Cooper 1, D.M Stracy 0; G.A.Hoskyn $\frac{1}{2}$, A.L.Aldridge 2; D.I.Bell O, M.Lewis 1; H.Jones 1, M.Small 0; K.Vetharaniam 1, G.Simpson 0 ; D. Burnham 0, P.Skurr 1; C.Ward 1, R. Robinson 0

WANGAMUI also defeated NEW PLYMOUTH
41

Wanganui names first): T.J.Boswell 1, D.A.Gifford-Moore 0; P.Vetharaniam 1 K. Hull 0; H.P. Whitlock 0, J.Billing 1; P.R.Cooper 1, S.Mancewicz O; G.A.Hos kyn 1, D.Clinton 0; H.Jones 0, D. Walker 1; D.I. Bell 1, C.Bolton 0; Tiet 1, B. Bowler 0; D. Burnham $\frac{1}{2}$, R. Crawford $\frac{1}{2}$; D.Shalav 0, B.Peterson 1 G.Redit 0 , T.Stern 1; C.Ward 1, J. C1inton 0 .

## OTAGO GIRLS VISIT AUCKLAND

The team of five girls was led by Jackie Sievey and also comprised Lisa Hansen (15), Susan Jones (15), Sarah Fitzharris (15) and Isabel McIntosh. We left Dunedin airport early on the Saturday of Labour Weekend; our first hassle came at Christchurch when, on boarding, we were told we were on the wrong plane!

Having arrived safely in Auckland we were greeted by teeming rain [At least it was warm rain! - Editorl and two fellow chess players. From the airport we went to the Auckland Chess Centre where we were to play five matches over the weekend. The rest of the afternoon was spent at the museum and planetarium and then it was off to meet our billeters on the North Shore.

That evening we played our first match against a North Shore women's team headed by Vivian Burndred; our games were closely scrutinised by Auckland mayor-elect Cath Tizard.
The next day was spent almost entire$1 y$ at chess and we played teams from Auckland Grammar, Rangitoto College and another women's team.
On the last day (Monday) we played the final match against Selwyn College and were later given an extensive tour of Auckland by Centre President Alan Hignett. Overall, a successful trip enjoyed by all.

The match results were: Otago 3 North Shore Women 2; Otago 3, Auckland Grammar 2; Otago 3, Rangitoto College 1; Otago 3, Mixed Women's team 2;
Selwyn College 2, Otago 1.

## WELLINGTON C.C. CHAMPIONSHIP

Greg Aldridge won the 1983 Wellington Club Championship, a half point ahead Club Championship, a half point ahead
beat McLaren but drew with Zyg Frankel. Jonathan Sarfati was a notable absentee.

## CANTERBURY C.C. CHAMPIONSHIP

Chris Marshall, the top seed, convincingly won the 1983 Canterbury Club Championship with a fine 9/11. Botto seed Mark Wilson caused a big surprise by coming in second, a full point ahead of defending champion Michael teese who started disastrously with losses to Marshall and Brian Nijman Joint N.Z. Schoolpupil Champion and Premier Reserve Champion Ben Alexander ould manage only a tie for fifth place. Scores: l C.J.Marshall 9; 2 M.C. Wilson 8; 3 M.Leese 7; 4 B.Nijman $6 \frac{1}{2}$; -7 B.M.Alexancer, M. Hampl \& O.N.Thomson 6; 8 A.W.Jordan 5눌; 9-10 B.Gloistein \& R.T.Wilson 4 $\frac{1}{2}$; 11 G.Davies 3; 12 R.Scott 0.

## UPPER HUTT C.C. CHAMPIONSHIP

This year's A grade Ch'p featured a very even field which was reflected in the closeness of the final scores. The early leaders were Simon Brown with $4 \frac{1}{2} /$ 5 and Gerald Carter with $4 / 5$ but Gavin Ion's consistency paid off as the two leaders faded.
Scores: 1 G.J.Ion 6六; 2 S.A. Brown 6; 3-4 A. Boughen \& 2.Frankel $5 \frac{1}{2} ; 5$ G. Carter 5; 6 A. Thompson $4 \frac{1}{2} ;{ }^{2} 7-8$ A.S. Drake \& J. Hartley 4; 9-10 A. Price \& R.T. Ferguson 2.

The B-grade was won by Andrew Grkow although the moral victory belonged to second-placed Donel o'Boyle who defaulted his first two games but then scored 7/7. M. Sims was third on $6 \frac{1}{2}$ followed by R. Corry on 6 .
F.Hince won the $C$ grade with $8 / 9$, a half point ahead of J.Kirkpatrick and A.Oliver took the D grade with $8 \frac{1}{2} / 9$. CARTER-ION, French Advance:
1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 e5 c5 4 c3 3 Nc6 5 f4 Qb6 6 Nf3 Nh6 7 Bd3 Bd7 8 Bc2 cxd4 9 exd4 Nb4 $10 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Nxc} 2+11 \mathrm{Qxc} 2$ Nf5 12 Qd3 h5 13 0-0 0-0-0 $\quad 14$ a4 Bb 15 Bd2 Kb8 16 a5 Bxa5 17 Nxd5 Bb5 18 Qb3 Nxd4 19 Bxa5 Nxb3+ 20 Bxb6 axb6 21 Nc3 Bxf1 22 Rxfl Nd2 23 Nxd2 Rxd2 24 f5 Rxb2 25 fxe6 txeb 26 Rf7 Rc8 27 Rxg7 Rxc3 28 h3 Rec2, $0-1$.

## Overseas News

## NIKSIC

Gary Kasparov scored a victory at Niksic in August/September which must be ranked with the greatest ever tournament wins when he spread-eagled a owerful feld in the Gligoric Commemo rative tournament, 'his l' not to be ince Svetozar Gligoric is not only lnce Suctozar bligore is in the very mul
The category 14 event had an averag
The category 14 event had an average represented a performance rating of approximately 2810! He had first place pecured with two rounds to go but place
erformance reminiscent of Fischer, he till played for the win in his last two games - and scored another two oints.
Bent Larsen returned probably his est performance since losing 0-6 to Fischer in the 1971 Candidates when he clinched second place with a round to pare. Portisch defeated Petrosian in with Spassky who was responsible for Kasparov's only loss when the Baku grandmaster faltered in a winning position.
The scores:
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 & 13 & 14 & 15\end{array}$

| 1 | Kasparov | USR | G 2690 | x | 10 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Larsen | EN | G 2565 | 0 | $\mathrm{x}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 3/2 | 1 | /2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | , | 1 |
| 3 | Spassky | USR | G 2605 | 1 | 3/2 $\times$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 |
| 4 | Portisch | HUN | G 2600 | 0 | 1/2 $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | Miles | ENG | G 2585 | 1/2 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | x | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | /2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 |
| 6 | Andersson | SWE | G 2640 | 1/2 | 0 年/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  | $x$ | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 7 | Tal | USR | G 2620 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | $x$ | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | \% ${ }^{2}$ | 2/2 | 1/2 |
| 8 | Timman | NLD | G 2605 | 0 | $0 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | x | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | /2 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 9 | Seirawan | USA | G 2605 | 0 | 01 |  | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | x | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | Ljubojevic | YUG | G 2645 | 0 | 1/2 $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1 | $x$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 |
| 11 | Gligoric | YUG | G 2505 | 0 | $0^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1/2 | 2 | x | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 |
| 12 | Petrosian | USR | G 2580 | 0 | 1/2 $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 13 | Nikolic P. | yUG | I 2540 | 0 | 1/20 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 |
| 14 | Sax | HUN | G 2570 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $0^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  | $x$ | 0 |
| 15 | Ivanovic B . | YUG | G 2515 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | /2 | 1 |  |

Obviously there had also to be some disappointing results; Andersson and Tal, after so many recent extra fine performances, may well be a little disappointed but second ranked (for the tournament) Ljubojevic was the biggest 'fallure'. On the other hand Gligoric, the lowest rated player in the tournament, scored a solid resul including a wif Andersson.
Now for some games, starting with two slashing wins by the tournament winner.
KASPAROV - PORTISCH, Queen's Indian Def.: $1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 2 \mathrm{c} 4$ e6 $3 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 7$ 5 a3 d5 6 cxas 10 Bd3 $5110-0$ Nc 6 12 Bb2 Rc8 13 Qe2 0-0 14 Radl 0 C 7 12 Bb 2 Rc 16 Qe 17 d5! 15 $4 \times 54519$ Bxh7+ Kxh7 20 Rxd5

$21 \mathrm{Bxg} 7!\mathrm{Kxg} 7$ $22 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \mathrm{Rfd8} 23$ Qg4+ Kf8
f6
25
25 26 Rxd7 Qc5 27 Qh7 Rc7 28 Qh8 Kf7 29 Rd3 Nc4 30 Rfdl Ne5 31 Qh7+ Ke6 32 Qg8+ Kf5 33 g4+ Kf4 34 Rd4+ Kf3 35
Qb3+, 1 - 0.
In view of Kasparov's close-to- $100 \%$ score with this variation, playing the Queen's Indian against him appears to Quedicate a death wish!

LJUBOJEVIC - KASPAROV, King's Indian Attack: 1 e 4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d3 Nc6 4 g3 d5 $5 \mathrm{Nbd} 2 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{0} 0 \mathrm{Nge}$

$12 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{~d} 4 \quad 13 \mathrm{cxd} 4 \mathrm{cxd} 4 \quad 14 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{e} 5 \quad 15$ Ncl Be6 16 Re2 $0-0 \quad 17 \mathrm{Bel}$ f5 18 Nd 2 f4 19 f3 fxg3 20 Bxg3 g5 21 hxg 5 Ng6 22 gxh6 Bxh6 23 Nfl Rg 724 Rf 2 Be 3 25 b3 Nf4, 0-1.
LARSEN - SAX, King's Indian Defence:
 $5 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~d} 66 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 67 \mathrm{O}-0 \mathrm{Rb} 88 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{a} 6$ 513 dxc6 Nxc6 14 c5 dxc5 15 Bxc5 Qa5 16 b4 Oc $7 \quad 17 \mathrm{Ng} 5 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 18 \mathrm{Nge} 4 \mathrm{Nme4}$ 19 Nxe4 Qd8 20 Be3 Ne5 21 Re5 Be6 22

 $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Rxc8 } & \text { Qxc8 } & 26 & \text { Rc5 } & \text { Rg4 } & 29 \\ \text { Rxd8 Nxd8 } & 30 & \text { Qxe7 } & \text { Ne6 } & 31\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { Qe4 Rd8 } & 29 & \text { Rxd8 Nxd8 } & 30 & \text { Qxe7 Ne6 } & 31 \\ \text { Bd6 } & \text { Bxe2 } & 32 & \text { Qxf7 Bc4 } & 33 & \text { Bh3 Nxc5 } & 34\end{array}$ Bxc8 Bxf7 35 bxc5 Bxa2 36 c6, 1-0.
GLIGORIC - TIMMAN, Nimzoindian Defence: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 e3 c5 $5 \mathrm{Nge} 2 \mathrm{cxd4} 6$ exd4 $0-0 \quad 7$ a3 $\mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 8 \mathrm{~d} 5$ exd5 9 cxd5 Re8 10 g3 Bc5 11 b4 Bb6 $12 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{a} 5 \quad 13 \mathrm{~b} 5 \mathrm{Qc} 7 \quad 14 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{Qc} 5 \quad 15 \mathrm{Rh} 2$ 416 Qd3 d6 17 Rcl Nbd7 18 Ne4

18...Nxe4! 19
$20 \quad 0 c$ $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Rxc5 } & \text { Nexc5 } 20 \text { Qc2 } \\ \text { Ne5 } & 21 \mathrm{Kdl} & \mathrm{Ned}\end{array}$ 22 Bc 3 Bf 523 Nd 3g6 24 g 4 Rac8 $25 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Nb} 4 \quad 26 \mathrm{Qb} 2$ Ncd3 27 Qd2 Nxd5, $0-1$.

PETROSIAN-LJUBOJEVIC, Nimzoindian: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 e3 0-0 5 Bd3 d5 6 Nge2 c5 7 O-0 Nc6 8 exd5 exd5 9 a3 Bxe3 10 bxc3 Re8 11 f 3 Bd
 fxe4 cxd4 19 Rb 4 Oc6 20 cxd4 Nxe4 21 Nxe4 Rxe4 22 Of 2 ! f5 23 d5 $0 \times d 5$ Bxe4 fxe4 25 Rd4 Qe6 26 Rxe4 Qg6 27 $\operatorname{Re} 7 \mathrm{Bb} 528 \mathrm{Qf} 7+$, 1 - 0.

IM Gennadi Zaichik gained a GM norm in winning in August at KECSKEMET; he scored an unbeaten $8 \frac{1}{2} / 11$ in the category 9 tournament.
Scores: 1 IM Zaichik (USR) 8 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$; 2 IM Hazai (HUN) 7; 3 IM Groszpeter (HUN) 612 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ 4-5 GM S.Garcia (CUB) \& GM Mikhalcisin (USR) 6; 6 IM Eslon (SWE) $5 \frac{1}{2} ; 7$ GM Plachetka (CZE) 5; 8-11 GM Barczay (HUN), IM Horvath (HUN), IM Lukacs (HUN) \& IM Szekely (HUN) 4 $\frac{1}{2} ; 12$ Karolyi (HUN) 312.

In the following game Black sacriices his queen on move 5 - but to no avail.
ESLON-HORVATH, Nimzoindian Defence: 1 d 4 Nf 62 c 4 e6 $3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \quad 4 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{c} 5$ 5 d5 Nxd5?! [It is doubtful whether this particular novelty will be seen Nxf2+ $9 \mathrm{Kcl} \mathrm{Kxd8} 10 \mathrm{Qg} 3 \mathrm{Ne}+8 \mathrm{Kd}$ $\mathrm{Re} 8 \quad 12 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{~d} 613 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Nxg} 314 \mathrm{OxO} \mathrm{Kc} 7$ Re8 $15 \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{gc} \mathrm{Na}_{16} 13 \mathrm{Bg} 2$ Nxg3 14 Qxg 3 Kc 18 Nf 3 Rg 819 Oxh7 e5 20 Rgl Rxg 1 Nxgl f5 22 Nf3 $\mathrm{Re} 8 \quad 23 \quad \mathrm{Ng} 5 \mathrm{e} 4 \quad 24 \quad 24$ $\mathrm{d} 5 \quad 25 \mathrm{Nf} 7 \mathrm{~d} 4 \quad 26$ Qd $6+\mathrm{Kc} 8 \quad 27 \mathrm{Ne5}$ Rxe5 28 Qxe5 Bel 29 Qf4 Ba5 26 Kc8 27 Ne5 Rxe Og5 f4 $32 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{~d} 3+33$ exd3 e $3 \quad 34 \mathrm{Kdl}$ Qg $54 \mathrm{f}^{32 \mathrm{hy} \mathrm{d3+}} 33$ exd3 e3 34 Kd 1-0.

The 7th Goglidze Memorial at TBILISI during August-September was won very convincingly by Viktor Gavrikov, an impressive $2 \frac{1}{2}$ points ahead of his nearest rivals. His 11 points was just right for a GM norm in his first international tournament!
Scores: I IM Gavrikov (USR) 11/15; 2-4 GM Henley (USA), oll (USR) \& IM Ubilava (USR) 8 $\frac{1}{2}$; 5-9 IM Adamski (POL) GM Gufeld (USR), GM Nogueiras (CUB), IM zaichik (USR) \& IM Sturua (USR) 8; 1012 IM Foisor (RUM), IM Mnatsakanian (USR) \& IM Velickovic (YUG) 712 ; 13-14 G.Georgadze (USR) \& GM Gurgenidze (USR) 6 ; 15-16 IM Kiarner (USR) \& IM Murshed (BAN) $4 \frac{1}{2}$.

In another concurrently run memorial ournament, this time for Tchigorin (the seventeenth such event), at SOCHI an all East European cast fought for the rubles and yet another Soviet player, Anatoly Vaiser, made his first GM norm. Vaiser and Sveshnikov, the 2 3 Sicillan man, tied for first place.
Scores: 1-2 GM Sveshnikov (USR) \& IM Vaiser (USR) 9/14; 3-4 IM drünberg DDR) \& GM Inkiov (BUL) 7 $\frac{1}{2}$; 5-8 GM Geller (USR), GM Ivkov (YUG), GM Panchenko (USR) \& IM Sokolov (USR) 7; IM Dvoiris (USR), GM Makarichev USR), IM Meduna (CZE), GM Romanishin (USR) \& GM Tseshkovsky (USR) 6 $\frac{1}{2}$; 14 IM Geller may not have collected too
nany rubles but he did score this nice
GELLER-PANCHENKO, Sicilian Scheveningen: 1 e4 c5 $2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{~d} 4$ cxd4 4 Nxd 4 $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}1 \mathrm{e} & \mathrm{c} 5 & 2 & \mathrm{Nf} 3 & \mathrm{~d} 6 & 3 & \mathrm{~d} 4 & \mathrm{cxd} 4 & 4 & \mathrm{Nxd4} \\ \mathrm{Nf} 6 & 5 & \mathrm{Nc} 3 & \mathrm{e} 6 & 6 & \mathrm{Be} 2 & \mathrm{Be} 7 & 7 & 0-0 & 0-0 & 8\end{array}$

 12 Bg 1 16 Qg 30617 Bxe5 Ne 418 xxe4 Qxe4 16 Qg3 Qc6 17 Bxe5 Nxe4 18


19 Bh5! g6 119 ..Qxe5 20 Exf7+
Kh8 $21 \quad$ Bxe8 $\quad$ Qxe8 $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Kh8 } 21 \text { Bxes } & Q x e 8 \\ 22 & \text { Rael } & \text { Qds } \\ 23 & 2 g 5 .\end{array}$ Bd7 24 Qxd8 Rxd8 25 Rd1 is decisive and 19...Rxe5? 20 Bxf $7+\mathrm{Kh} 821 \mathrm{Bd5!}$
is worse] is worsel $21 \mathrm{Bf3}$ Bc3
22 Bxb7 Ra7 23 Bc6 Ree 724 Rac Qxc2 25 Oh4 Rg7 26 Rfd1 Qe 37 Rd8 + Bf8 28 Rcd1 Bd7 29 Qf6, $1-0$.

At ALBENA (Bulgaria) in September GM Farago (HUN) won a close scoring touralment ( $62 \%$ of the games were drawn) 1th $7 \frac{1}{2} / 11$. He was followed by GM Gips is (USR) 7; GM Spiridonov (BUL) \& IM van der Sterren (NLD) 6 $6 \frac{1}{2}$; Lalev (BUL) 6; IM Danner (OST) \& GM Velikov (BUL) $5 \frac{1}{2}$; GM Spassov (BUL) \& IM Stoica (RUM) 5; GM Ermenkov (BUL) \& GM Radulov (BUL) $4 \frac{1}{2}$ IM Kruszynski (POL) $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Like West Germany, neighbour Czechoslovakia conducts an international championship every second year, alternating with the normal closed event. The tournament, of category 9 , was held in BRATISLAVA during September. Winner was Bulgarian IM Donchev who made a GM norm but the national title went to second placed GM Ftacnik.
Scores: 1 IM Donchev (BUL) 10/15; 2 GM Ftacnik (CZE) 912; 3 GM Knaak (DDR) 8- $\frac{1}{2}$; 4-5 IM Ghinda (RUM) \& IM Pribyl (CZE) 71 ner (USR) \& GM Smejkal (CZE) 7; 9 GM Lechtynsky (CZE) 6-12; 10-13 GM Plachetka (CZE), IM F.Portisch (HUN), IM Prandstetter (CZE) \& IM Sznapik (POL) 6; 14 IM Vera (CUB) $5 \frac{1}{2} ; 15$ Mokry (CZE) 5. Very much a tournament for socialist faithful - not even a representative from Yugoslavia!

East German Rainer Knaak's sharp style shows up to advantage in the following game when he aacrifices a plece in the endgame.
KNAAK - FTACNIK, Grünfeld Defence:
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 g6 3 Nc3 d5 4 cxd5 Nxd5 5 e4 Nxc3 6 bxc3 Bg7 7 Bc4 c5 $\begin{array}{llllllll}\mathrm{Ne} 2 & \mathrm{O}-0 & 9 & 0-0 & \mathrm{Ne} 6 & 10 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{~b} 6 & 11\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{a} 6 & 15 & \mathrm{Na} 3 & \mathrm{~b} 5 & 16 & \mathrm{Rb} 1 & \mathrm{Bb} 7 & 17 & \mathrm{Oc} 2\end{array}$
 Cx 318 Rb6 Rad8 22 Nd5 Be5 23 a4 e6 24 axb5 axb5

| E ER | 25 Bxb 5 exd5 26 |
| ---: | ---: | 25 Bxb5 exd5 2

exd5 Ne7? [After this Black seems to be lost. Instea 26...Na7! holds, e.g. 28 R3 ( 28 c 6 Nxc6) 28 Ra (28 0 Nxc6) Rc8 29 Ra3 Bxd5 30 Bxd5 Rxd5 31 Rxa Bd4! 32 Rd1 BxC
33 Rxd5 Bxa7 and the blak 27 dist immune so Black draws g5 Ne3 29 Bxd8 Rxd8 $30 \mathrm{Re} 1 \mathrm{Nxb1} 31$ Rxe5 Bc8 32 Re3! Be6 33 Rd 3 Rb 834 $7 \mathrm{Bxa} 35 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Kf8} 39 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Na} 240 \mathrm{c} 6$ 41 Rel [allowing 42 c6 in a hopeless position] $42 \mathrm{Rxb4}, 1-0$.

## Englishman James Plaskett won the

 Benedictine Cup at MANCHESTER in September, winning his last five games after dropping two points in his first our. Plaskett's score of 7/9 was sufficient for his second $G M$ norm.Sharing second place in the 50 -playe field were IM Gutman (ISR), IM Hebden (ENG), GM Razuvaev (USR) and GM Tarjan (USA), all on $6 \frac{1}{2}$. Next were GM Ciric YUG), IM Kudrin (USA) and IM Tisdall USA) on 6 while de Boer (NLD), GM Forintos (HUN), IM Hébert (CAN), Hodgson (ENG), GM Kraidman (ISR) and Thipsay (IND) finished equal ninth with $5 \frac{1}{2}$. A quickie:
TARJAN-HODGSON, Polish Defence:
 5 Nd 2 e6 6 Ng 53 Qb 67 dxe5 Bxe5 8 0-0 0-0 9 e5 Nd5 10 Bxh7+ Kxh7 11 $\mathrm{Ng} 5+\mathrm{Kg} 612$ Qg4 f5 13 Qh4 [With the threat $14 \mathrm{Qh7+J} 13 \ldots \mathrm{Nf} 614$ exf6 Na 15 fxg 7 Kxg $7 \quad 16$ Qh7+ Kf6 17 Ndf3 Bxf3, $1-0$.

A category 10 event in NEW YORK (September/ October) was won by West German GM Eric Lobron with $9 \frac{1}{2} / 14$. Strong Canadian IM Igor Ivanov was second with 9 points, a half point ahead of the American contingent of GM Byrne, GM Henley and IM Kudrin. Next were IM Spraggett (CAN) \& IM Zapata (COL) 1 ; then IM Bass (IISA), GM Lein 61. IM DI Mgy (USA) \& TM Hebden (ENG) 512: IM 62, IM DIugy (USA) \& IM Hebden (ENG) $5 \frac{1}{2}$; Zaltsman (USA) $4 \frac{1}{2}$; IM Burger (USA) 3.

The tournament was held in the Kavkasian Restaurant in Manhattan. No new titles norms were gained.

The Kostic Memorial at VRSHAC (September/ October) saw GM Tarjan (USA), GM Nikolic (YUG) and IM Agzamov (USR) tie for the top spot with $9 / 13$. The Soviet player was rather fortunate to escape with a draw in the last round against Bjelajac when a loss would have cost him not only a share of first prize but also the GM norm.
Equal 4th were IM de Firmian (USA) and GMs Ivanovic (YUG) \& Smejkal (CZE) on 9 points. Next were GM Adorian (HUN) \& IM Cebalo (YUG) 7; Rajkovic Duric (YUG) 6; GMs GUM) 412, TM Bjelajac (YUG) 3; Kapelan (YUG) $2 \frac{1}{2}$.

The 7th Interpolis tournament at TILBURG in October boasted an all-GM cast with an average rating of 2615 - the first category 15 event this year. The scores:

23456789012

1 Karpov
2 Ljubojevic
3 Portisch
4 Vaganian
5 Sosonko
6 Polugaevsky
7 Spassky
8 Hübrer
9 Andersson
10 Timman
11 Seirawan

|  | ULD | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\times$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Like last year the World Champion won the terpolis tournament by a narrow margin but his result was not particularly convincing - he could manage only three wins and one of those was from a clearly drawn ending versus Polugaevsky. Karpov hardly displayed the panache sho by his rival Kasparov at the earlier Niksic tournament but nevertheless maintained his magnificent tournament record as World Champion.
It is hard to talk about surprises in such a
strong event but the high place gained by Sosonko (the second lowest rated player) deserves mention. Also Ljubojevic, ranked third in the World, returned to form after a disappointing result at Niksic. Portisch could have done even better had he not sealed a blunder in a winning position against Vaganlan, on the other hand he was quite lost against Sosonko who fold repetition

LJUBOJEVIC - VAN DER WIEL, Closed Sicilian: 1 e4 c5 2 Nc3 Nc6 3 $\mathrm{g} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \mathrm{D}^{5} \mathrm{~d} 3 \mathrm{~d} 66$ Be3 e5 7 Qd2 Nge7 8 Bh6 0-0 9 Bxg 7 Kxg 710 f4 Nd4 11 Nf3 Bg4 $12 \quad 0-0$ Qd $7 \quad 13$ Nh4 exf4 14 gxf4 f5 15 Rael Rae8 16 h3 Bh5 17 Nd1 d5 18 c3 Ndc6 19 e5 d4 20 c4 h6 21 a3 Nd8 22 Nf 2 Ne6 23 Bf3 Bxf3 24 Nxf3 b5 $25 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \quad 26 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Qc} 6 \quad 27$ Kg3 g5 28 hxg 5 hxg 529 cxb 5 Rxb5 30 Nxg5 Nxg5 31 fxg 5 f4+ $32 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Qf} 3,0-1$.
VAGANIAN-TIMMAN, Torre Attack: 1 d4 Nf6 2 Nf 3 e6 3 Bg 5 c 54
 10 Bf4 Bb7 11 c4 dxc4 12 Bxc4 Qc7 13 Bb5 a6 14 Bxd7+ Qxd7 15 Nd 2 g 516 Bg 3 Rd 817 Nf 3 $\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { Qc6 } & 18 & \text { Qe2 } & \text { h5 } & 19 & \text { h3 } & \text { g } 4 & 20\end{array}$ hxg 4 hxg 21 Nel Qe4 22 f3 gxf3 23 Nxf3 $\mathrm{Qg} 4 \quad 24 \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{Rg} 8$ 25 Rf2 Rd7 26 Nh2 Qg6 27 Nf3 Qg4 28 Nh2 Qh3 29 Khl Bh4 30 e4 Qd3 31 Qxd3 Rxd3 32 Re2 Rh8 33 Kg 1 Rg 834 Kf 1 Be 7 K Rael c4 36 Nf3 Rh8 37 Kf2 b5 38 Rd2 Bb4 39 Rxd3 Bxel+ 40 Nxel cxd3 41 Nxd3 Kd7 42 b4 Rh1 $43 \mathrm{Ne} 5+\mathrm{Kc} 744 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Ra} 1$. 45 Kh4 Rxa2, 0-1.
VAGANIAN-HUBNER, Q.G.A.:
$1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 2 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{dxc} 4 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nc} 3$ e5 4 e3 exd4 5 exd4 Nf6 6 Bxc4 Be7 7 $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { e3 } \\ \text { Nf3 } 3 & 0-0 & 8 & 0-0 & \text { Nbd7 } & 9 \text { Rel }\end{array}$ Bb3 c6 $11 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Bg} 4 \quad 12$ Qd3 Bxf3 13 Qxf3 Nfd5 14 Bxe7 Nxe7 15 Re5 Ng6 16 Re4 Nd7 17 Rd1 Qa5 18 Re3 $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Rad8 } & 19 \text { Ne4 Qc } 7 \quad 20 \mathrm{~h} 4 & \mathrm{~h} 6 & 21 \mathrm{Qg} 4\end{array}$ Kh8 $22 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Nf} 4 \quad 23 \mathrm{Rg} 3 \mathrm{~g} 5 \quad 24 \mathrm{hxg} 6$ fxg6 25 Rel Rde8 26 Rge 3 Nb 627 Nc5 Qc8 28 Qxf4, 1 - 0.

## NATIONAL RATING LIST, 1 November

The 1 November Rating List inc1udes the Commonwealth Championship (February) and all local rateable tournaments for which the results have been received by 31 October.

All players who have been active during 1982/83 are included. An asterisk indiates a provisional rating, i.e. one based on less than 25 games.

|  | Garbett P.A. | 2374 | 52 | Marshall C.J. | 1937 | 103 | Wheeler B. | 1783 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Sutton R.J. | 2343 | 53 | Free T.J. | 1925 | 104 | Cater J.E. | 1778 |
| 3 | Small V.A. | 2337 | 54 | Haase G.G. | 1924 | 105 | Williams B. | 1775 |
| 4 | Sarapu 0. | 2332 | 55 | Marner G. | 1923* | 106 | Gloistein B. | 1774 |
| 5 | Nokes R.I. | 2298 | 56 | van Ginkel J.P. | 1921 | 107 | Roundill R.L. | 1773 |
| 6 | Aptekar L. | 2296 | 57 | Wigbout M. | 1920 | 108 | Stracy D.M. | 1765 |
| 7 | Green E.M. | 2284 | 58 | Nijman A.J. | 1920 | 109 | Bojtor J. | 1764 |
| 8 | Gollog1y D.A. | 2283 | 59 | Norton W. | 1920 | 110 | Poor R.L. | 1763 |
| 9 | Kelly P.A. | 2281 | 60 | Spiller T.W.L. | 1919 | 111 | Post M.J. | 1759 |
| 10 | Smith R.W. | 2278 | 61 | Leese M. | 1919* | 112 | Borren A.M. | 1756 |
| 11 | Watson B.R. | 2272 | 62 | Whitehouse L.E. | 1906 | 113 | Moulin D.S. | 1755* |
| 12 | Levene M. | 2246 | 63 | Alexander B.M. | 1905 | 114 | Nijman B. | 1745 |
| 13 | Beach D.H. | 2222 | 64 | Aldridge G.J. | 1904 | 115 | Sims I.M. | 1743 |
| 14 | Green P.R. | 2216 | 65 | Hurley A. | 1900 | 116 | Hames A. | 1743* |
| 15 | Wansink R. | 2212 | 66 | Walden G.J | 1899 | 117 | Booth A.J. | 1739 |
| 16 | Sarfati J.D. | 210 | 67 | Lynn K.W. | 1893 | 118 | Notley D.G. | 1739 |
| 17 | Stuart P.W. | 2185 | 68 | Hall M. | 1887* | 119 | Corry R.J. | 1739* |
| 18 | Cornford L.H | 2182 | 69 | Cribbett P.F. | 1887 | 120 | Bridges N.F. | 1737 |
| 19 | Dowden R.A. | 2172 | 70 | Hart S. | 1886 | 121 | Okey K.M. | 1736 |
| 20 | Weir P.B. | 2171 | 71 | van der Hoorn M. | 1884* | 122 | Stretch W.R. | 1735 |
| 21 | Lloyd A.J. | 167 | 72 | Foster F. | 1883 | 12 | White M. | 1734 |
| 22 | Chye M. | 2165* | 73 | Dive R.J. | 1878 | 124 | Stephenson J.R. | 1734 |
| 23 | Clemance P.A. | 2164 | 74 | Downan I.A. | 1872 | 125 | Monrad P. | 1726 |
| 24 | Metge J.N. | 2162 | 75 | Dreyer M.P. | 1872 | 126 | Vetharaniam P. | 1724* |
| 25 | Love A.J. | 2157 | 76 | Hoskyn G.A. | 1868 | 127 | Boyce D.A.L. | 1722 |
| 26 | Leonhardt W . | 2149 | 77 | Goffin P.B. | 1867 | 128 | Waddle M.H. | 1722 |
| 27 | Bates G.T.H. | 40 | 78 | Drake A.S. | 1866 | 9 | Metge K.M. | 1716 |
| 28 | McLaren L.J. | 2129 | 79 | Roberts M.H. | 1864 | 130 | Johnstone R.B | 1716 |
| 29 | Hopewe11 M.G. | 2119 | 80 | Marsick B.H.P. | 1858 | 131 | Strevens C. | 1716 |
| 30 | Ker A.F. | 2107 | 81 | Adams D.T. | 1857 | 132 | Cornelissen R. | 1712 |
| 31 | Spiller P.S. | 2102 | 82 | Spencer-Smith G. | 1851 | 133 | Collins Peter | 1709* |
| 32 | Jackson J.R. | 2076 | 83 | Taylor R. | 1839 | 134 | Dolejs D. | 17.07 |
| 33 | Freeman M. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 71 | 84 | Spain G. | 1837 | 135 | Trundle G.E. | 1703 |
| 3 | Colquhoun D. | 2068* | 85 | Hopewell N.H. | 1832 | 136 | Mullan A.b. | 1703 |
| 35 | Steadman M.V.R | 2065 | 86 | Brimble M.T. | 1831 | 137 | Robinson J.P | 1696 |
| 36 | Feneridis A. | 2054 | 87 | Foord M.R.R | 1830 | 138 | Jones C. | 1695* |
| 37 | Carpinter B.A. | 2053 | 88 | Rose C.A. | 1821* | 139 | Davies G. | 1695 |
| 38 | Noble M.F. | 2038 | 89 | Kinchant K.D. | 1819 | 140 | Burndred V.J. | 1693 |
| 39 | van Dijk P. | 2032 | 90 | Whitlock H.P. | 1817 | 141 | Whitehouse C. | 1692* |
| 40 | Gibbons R.E. | 2005 | 91 | Martin B.M. | 1811 | 142 | Bennett P.E. | 1692 |
| 41 | Walsh B.G. | 2003 | 92 | Frankel Z . | 1809 | 143 | Hartley J. | 1690 |
| 42 | Scott M.J. | 1999* | 93 | Ong R. | 1804 | 14 | Kasmara A.H. | 1688 |
| 43 | White P. | 1989* | 94 | van Dam S. | 1802 | 145 | Snelson P.R. | 1686 |
| 44 | Cameron B. | 1981 | 95 | Sangster A. | 1802* | 146 | Boyd K.M. | 1676 |
| 45 | Weegenaar D.P. | 1980 | 96 | Carter G. | 1797 | 147 | Herbert J. | 1675* |
| 46 | Turner G.M. | 1976 | 97 | Ion G.J. | 1797 | 148 | Capper D.S. | 1673 |
| 47 | Hawkes P.D. | 1974 | 98 | Hart R . | 1793 | 149 | Cunningham P.D. | 1664 |
| 48 | van Dijk T. | 1959 | 99 | Rawnsley L.D. | 1792 | 150 | Jordan A.W. | 1664 |
| 49 | Power P.W. | 1957 | 100 | Turketo D. | 1790* | 151 | Lannie R.M. | 1663 |
| 50 | Field D.W. | 1957 | 101 | Adams J.M. | 1786 | 152 | Connor B.P. | 1662 |
| 51 | Fitzpatrick S. | 1938* | 102 | Thompson A. | 1785* | 153 | Fergusson R.' | 1661 |


| 154 | Thomson 0.N. | 1659 | 214 | Hampton | 1532 | 274 | Winter W. | 140 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 155 | Clements T.C. | 1659 | 215 | Grevers L.P. | 1530 | 275 | Wearing A. | 1404 |
| 156 | Bell C.M. | 1653 | 216 | Bradley N.A. | 1530 | 276 | Parkinson A. | 1401 |
| 15 | Burnham D. | 1653* | 217 | Banks G. | 1530* | 277 | Atkinson I.E. | 14 |
| 158 | Mitchell R.S | 1650 | 218 | Gilberd J. | 1529* | 278 | Cole G. | 139 |
| 159 | Aandah1 V. | 1650* | 219 | Sinton P.J. | 1523* | 279 | Cook F. | 1398 |
| 160 | Raines T. | 1645* | 22 | Stewart M.I | 1522* | 280 | Sutherland | 1397 |
| 161 | Wood R. | 1642 | 221 | Colthart R. | 1520 | 281 | Freeman B.W. | 1396 |
| 162 | Wilson M.C. | 1639* | 222 | Glavin G. | 1515* | 282 | Brown B. | 389 |
| 163 | Boswell T.J | 1638 | 23 | Young P . | 1515* | 283 | Dunn C . | 1386 |
| 164 | Brown S.A. | 1636 | 224 | Ker C.M. | 1513 | 84 | Mueller H . | 1384 |
| 5 | Mears G.W. | 1633 | 225 | Goodwillie | 1512* | 285 | Dunwoody M.L. | 138 |
| 166 | Cooper P.R. | 1632 | 226 | King P.C. | 1508 | 286 | Varga S. | $1382^{\text {² }}$ |
| 167 | Gifford-Moore D. | 1626 | 227 | Whibley P. | 1503* | 287 | Edwards R. | 379* |
| 168 | Grkow A. | 1626 | 228 | Blundell K. | 1502 | 288 | Winsor B.M | 1367 |
| 169 | Dunn P. | 1626* | 229 | Jones H. | 1502* | 289 | Redit G. | $63 *$ |
| 170 | Beesley R. | 1619* | 230 | Bell D.I. | 1501 | 290 | Borovskis | 361 |
| 171 | Turner M.G. | 1617 | 231 | Talaic L. | 1501 | 291 | Turner A. | 36 |
| 172 | Dixon H.A. | 1609 | 32 | Schuster D.F. | 1497 | 292 | Bird C. | 355* |
| 173 | Shardy Z . | 1609 | 33 | Henderson A.J. | 1496 | 293 | Reid P . | 54 |
| 174 | Aldridge A.L. | 1609 | 34 | Benbow M. | 1496 | 294 | Stewart B.K. | 1354 |
| 175 | Wilkinson E. | 1602 | 235 | Gibb J.L. | 1496* | 295 | Edmonds L.G | 1340 |
| 176 | Hampl M. | 1602 | 236 | Boughen A. | 1494 | 296 | Hill S. | 1336 |
| 177 | Price A.J. | 1601* | 237 | Brett K.W. | 1491 | 297 | Thorne G. | 333* |
| 178 | Baumgartner R. | 1601 | 238 | $0^{\prime}$ Connor J.A | 1489 | 298 | Myrteza D. | 324* |
| 179 | Morrison M.K. | 1600 | 239 | Hunter J. | 1487 | 299 | Thorby B. | 1323 |
| 180 | Martin-Buss B. | 1600* | 0 | Smith T. | 1482* | 300 | Corbett P.D. | 1321 |
| 181 | Kay J.B. | 1599 | 241 | Baldwin P. | 1480 | 301 | Jones W.D. | 1321* |
| 182 | Steel R.G. | 1599 | 242 | Turner G.c. | 1478* | 302 | Watson M.J | 1319 |
| 183 | Bennell D.J. | 1597 | 243 | Owens N. | 1477* | 303 | Hanse | $317{ }^{*}$ |
| 184 | McLaren M.S. | 1597* | 4 | rownlee L.R. | 1476 | 04 | bini | 1316 |
| 185 | Scott D. | 1594* | 5 | Rudkins L.R | 1474 | 05 | Chang A. | 1310 |
| 186 | Spencer-Smith P. | 1593 | 6 | Kelly s. | 1470* | 306 | Booth S.L. | 1309 |
| 187 | Byford C. | 1593 | 247 | Calder R.J. | 1469 | 307 | van der Mey P . | 1304 |
| 188 | Reyn I. | 1591* | 248 | Sievey J.C. | 1462 | 308 | Boyd J.K. | 1302 |
| 189 | Jackson R. | 1589* | 49 | Simpson G. | 1462* | 309 | Thomas M. | 293 |
| 190 | Houpt R. | 1580 | 0 | Levy R. | 1460* | 310 | Ware M. | 1282 |
| 191 | Mathieson 3.S. | 1576 | 51 | Allen E.G. | 1450 | 311 | Anderson | 127 |
| 2 | Watts D.W. | 1574 | 252 | oldridge C.B. | 1449 | 312 | Nokes J. | 1278* |
| 193 | Stanton R.A. | 1573 | 253 | Hipkins B. | 1447 | 313 | Williams R.G | $1274{ }^{\text { }}$ |
| 194 | Low D. | 1572* | 254 | Barrow G. | 1446 | 314 | Harris K. | 1272 |
| 195 | Tangijav J. | 1572* | 5 | Puddle E. | 1445* | 315 | Gonin R.C.E | 1271 |
| 196 | McRae S. | 1567* | 256 | Vetharaniam K. | 1439* | 316 | McRae J. | 1270 |
| 197 | Millar B. | 1566* | 257 | Allsobrook A. | 1436 | 317 | Foley B. | 270 |
| 198 | McIntosh A.D. | 1565 | 258 | Roeven G. | 1433* | 318 | Crawford A. | $1263^{*}$ |
| 9 | Petch W.H. | 1564* | 259 | Takhar R. | 1432 | 319 | Strickett R. | 1262 |
| 200 | Rowland N . | 1562* | 260 | Schwass M. P. | 1429 | 320 | Alexander G. | $126{ }^{\text {* }}$ |
| 201 | Bourke P.D. | 1561* | 261 | Dowler J. | 1429* | 321 | Bartocci K.D. | 1258 |
| 202 | Wilcock P.R. | 1560* | 262 | Carr S. | 1427* | 322 | Fink-Jensen K. | 1250 |
| 203 | Adams D. | 1558* | 263 | Bennett D. | 1425 | 323 | McCarthy T.R. | 1249* |
| 204 | Schofield G.s. | 1558* | 264 | Buis M.O. | 1421* | 324 | Scott H.M. | 1249* |
| 205 | McGowan G. | 1554* | 265 | Stiles A.D. | 1420* | 325 | Shields J. | 1244 |
| 206 | Ramsay W. | 1553 | 266 | Robbie C.G. | 1417 | 326 | McClory J. | 1238* |
| 207 | Adams C.B.M. | 1550* | 267 | McCarthy P.D. | 1417* | 327 | Jones G.M. | 1237 |
| 208 | Craigie A.B. | 1546* | 268 | Martin S.C. | 1416 | 328 | Gordon M.A. | 1237* |
| 209 | Sims M.T. | 1544 | 269 | Berry M.O. | 1416* | 329 | Dah1 G. | 1236* |
| 210 | Reid A. | 1542* | 270 | Uszakiewicz G. | 1415* | 330 | Solomon A | 1235* |
| 211 | Finke J. | 1540* | 271 | Martin L.M. | 1412 | 331 | Futter P.T. | 1233* |
| 212 | van den Heuvel A. | 1539* | 272 | Bigham J. | 1410* | 332 | Aburn S . | $1232^{*}$ |
| 213 | Brannigan K.L. | 1535 | 273 | Preston J.N. | 1406 |  | ed on |  |

Rook endings occur far more frequent ly than any other type of endgame. This is a consequence of the fact that the rooks are usually the last pieces to be brought into play - and unless there is a completely open file, on to which the rooks naturally gravitate, the opportunities for their exchange are likely to be limited.

In this article we shall examine only positions with $K+R+P$ versus $K+R$. A good understanding of rook endings can only be gained when the student is already familiar with the basic positions since, otherwise, he will be unable to correctly evaluate the consequences of simplification from a more complex position.
Even with the limited material, we cannot possibly include all relevant examples; nevertheless we hope the average player will, after reading on, pick up more extra half points than he might otherwise have done!
For convenience we divide the subject matter into four sections: A the defending rook is in front of the pawn, $B$ the attacking rook is in front of the pawn, $C$ the defending king is in front of th pawn, and $D$ the defending king is cut off on a file
Note: the symbol '+-' indicates a won a drawn position.
A. DEFENDING ROOK IN FRONT OF PAWN

The 'golden rule' in rook endings is rooks belong behind passed pawns. From there the rook (whether it be deeng the queen the pawn advances. Conversely the as is poor blockader and, in front of passed pawn may have no moves at all Nevertheless the picture in the
ending is not all roses for the player with the pawn, the result usually hinging on which king arrives first Diagram 1 (Seyboth 1899) is a critical position (i.e. one in which the result depends upon which player has the move) White to move wins without trouble by $1 \mathrm{Kd} 6 \mathrm{~Kb} 5 \quad 2 \mathrm{Kc} 7 \mathrm{Kc} 5 \quad 3 \mathrm{~Kb} 7$ but Black, with the move, can hold the draw: $1 .$.


Kc5 $2 \mathrm{Kd} 7 \mathrm{~Kb} 63 \mathrm{Rbl}+\mathrm{Kc} 5$ ! [But not 3 ...Kxa7?? $4 \mathrm{Kc} 7+$ +, nor 3...Ka6?? 4 Kc 7 ! Rxa7+ 5 Kc6 +, in each case 4 Rb7 Rh [The only move, after which 5 Rb8 is no [The only move, after which 5 Rb8 pawn. Instead 4 . Kd5 would allow the white king to penetrate: $5 \mathrm{Rb} 5+\mathrm{Kc} 46$ Ra5 Kb4 7 Ral Kb5 $8 \mathrm{Kc} 7+$ + 15 Kc 7 Ra ! [Simplest, although $5 \ldots \mathrm{Rh} 7+6 \mathrm{Kc} 8 \mathrm{Rh} 8+$ 7 Kd7 Ra8! is also okay, but not $7 \ldots$... Rh7+? 8 Ke6! Rh8 9 Rb 8 +-1 $6 \mathrm{Kd} 7 \mathrm{Rh} 8=$.

## B. ATTACKING ROOK IN FRONT OF PAWN

Here the roles of the rooks are reversed. With the pawn on the seventh White can win only if he has a safe check threat. Diagram 2 illustrates.


There is no safe check and if White plays his king to c (to release his rook) Black checks it away from the pawn and then returns his rook to bl. The safe squares for the black king are h7 and g7; he will also draw if his king can approach (and win) the enemy pawn, e.g. BK at e6/e7, other pieces as in diagram 2 - Black draws by l....Kd7. With the black king on h6, g6 or e6 (instead of g 7 in diagram 1) White wins by a rook check followed by queening while Black to play would draw by moving his king to a safe square. Finally, with the black king on $f 7$ (or
e7) White to move wins by 1 Rh8! Rxb7 2 Rh7+ and 3 Rxb 7.
With the pawn on the sixth rank White may have more winning chances as his king has a shelter from checks on the square in front of his pawn. Even so the outcome usually depends on which king arrives on the scene first. Diagram 3 is another critical position:


Black to move can win the pawn: $1 .$. Kf6 2 Ke4 [0n 2 b7 the black king returns to g7-see diagram 2] 2...Ke6 3 b7 [Or $3 \mathrm{Kd} 4 \mathrm{Kd} 64 \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{Kc} 6=$; or 3 Rh8 Kd6 4 Rh6 + Kc5 =] 3...Kd7 [Or 3. Kd6, but not 3...Kf7?? 4 Rh8 +-] 4 Kd5 Kc7 $=$.
With White on move: 1 Ke5 Kf7 2 Kd6 $\mathrm{Rb} 23 \mathrm{Kc} 6 \mathrm{Ke} 74 \mathrm{Rh} 8 \mathrm{Rc} 2+\quad 5 \mathrm{~Kb} 7 \mathrm{Kd} 7$ [We have transposed to a type of position considered in section D] 6 Rh1 Rd2 7 Rcl Rd3 8 Kb8 Rd2 9 b7 [With the threat of Ra 2 and Ka 7 followed by queening] 9...Ra2. We have now reached a winning Lucena position - see diagram 11 in section $D$
With the pawn even further back the race between the kings normally decides with the superior side aiming to reach the Lucena position. If the pawn is nearer the centre the same principles apply though Black will often be better placed to draw.
Thus far the black rook has defended from behind the pawn; as already explained, it is not as well placed on the rank.


In diagram 4 White wins easily with 1 Rh8+ Kxh8 2 c 8 Q . Even with the move the second player is helpless against the threatened check, e.g. $1 . . . \mathrm{Rg} 7+2 \mathrm{Kh} 5$ ! stopping Black's intended Kg6.

Black can, however, hold the draw in
diagram 5; his king is shielded from checks by his rook while the white king can never approach the pawn without being checked away - thanks to the pawn being on the rook file.


White can try $1 \mathrm{Ke} 5 \mathrm{Re} 7+2 \mathrm{Kd} 4 \mathrm{Rg} 73$ Ke $3 \mathrm{Kg} 64 \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{Rf} 7+5 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 76 \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Kf} 6+$ or $1 \mathrm{Kc} 6 \mathrm{Kg} 42 \mathrm{~Kb} 6 \mathrm{Rg} 6+3 \mathrm{~Kb} 5 \mathrm{Rg} 7$ but can make no progress in either case.


The awkward placement of the black king in diagram 6 (Grigoriev 1934) is fatal: 1...Rf7+ [1...Rd7 2 Ke 4 transposes] 2 Ke3! [Only so! 2 Ke4? only draws: $2 \ldots$...Rd7! 3 Ke3 Kd5 $4 \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{Rf} 7+$ or $3 \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{Kd5} 4 \mathrm{Kf5} \mathrm{Rf} 7+\& 5 \ldots \mathrm{Rd} 7]$ 2...Rd7 3 Ke4 Re7t $4 \mathrm{Kd4} \mathrm{Rd7} \mathrm{[Or} \mathrm{4...Ke6} 5 \mathrm{Kc} 5$ Ke5 6 Kc6: Ke6 $7 \mathrm{~Kb} 6+-15$ Kc4 [Thus the white king reaches the queenside and Black will not be able to check him away from b6 as his own king is in the way] 5...Rc7+ 6 Kb5 Rd7 [Or 6...Rc5+ 7
C. DEFENDING KING IN FRONT OF PAWN

With his king on the queening square (or able to reach it) the rule for the defender is to keep his rook on his own third rank until the enemy pawn arrives on its sixth rank when the defending rook should move to its seventh or eighth rank. The reasoning behind this manoeuvre is straightforward. The rook on its third rank prevents the enemy king from reaching its sixth rank and setting up a mating threat which forces the defending king out from in front of the pawn. When the pawn reaches the sixth rank, however, the attacking king can no longer shelter from checks along the file so the defending rook moves to the rear.
This ending was analysed as long ago as the last decade of the 18th century by the Frenchman Philidor. Drawn positions such as that in diagram 7 are,
therefore, known as Philidor's position.
Philidor


1 d5 [Clearly White must advance his pawn to have any hope of winning] $1 . .$. Rb6 2 d6 [threatening to win by Ke6] 2 ..Rbl! 3 Ke6 Re1+ and Black draws by continually checking, e.g. 4 Kd5 Rdl+ $5 \mathrm{Kc} 5 \mathrm{Rc} 1+6 \mathrm{~Kb} 4 \mathrm{Rb} 1+7 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Rd} 1$ ! and the pawn falls.
Passive defence by the rook on the back rank does not work well as the next two examples show.


With a centre pawn (diagram 8) the win $t s$ as follows: 1 Ra4 Kb8 2 Rb4+ Ka8 [Or 2...Kc8 $3 \mathrm{~d} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 84 \mathrm{Rb} 8+$ ] 3 Kc7 Rh7+ $4 \mathrm{~d} 7+$ +.
In the similar position with a BP (diagram 9) White does not have the same mate threat available but still wins with a similar manoeuvre: 1 Rf7 Rh8 2 Rb7+ Kc8 [2...Ka8 3 Ra7+ Kb8 transposes] $3 \mathrm{Ra} 7 \mathrm{~Kb} 8 \quad 4 \mathrm{c} 7+\mathrm{Kc} 8 \quad 5$ Ra8+ winning the rook and queening.
This passive defence by the rook does, however, succeed against a RP or NP since the manoeuvres of the previous two examples are no longer possible.
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In diagram 10, after 1 Re7 Rh8 2 $\mathrm{Ra} 7+\mathrm{Kb} 83 \mathrm{Rb} 7+$ [But not 3 b 7 ?? Rh6+ winning for Black!] 3...Ka8, White must acquiesce in a draw.
D. DEFENDING KING CUT OFF ON A FILE

Under this heading we consider those positions where the superior side's rook prevents the defending king from reaching a square in front of the pawn Whether or not the superior side can win in these circumstances depends on whether he can reach what is known as the Lucena position, an example of which is shown in diagram 11. This ending was analysed as early as the 500 years 00 years many players still do not know it!


White can win but to do so must overcome some problems. First he must free his king fromits prison on c8 and, having succeeded in this, he must have a way to avoid the checks from the rook The first step is easily achieved by a rook check but before looking at the full solution we can note that, were the black rook on e 2 preventing this check, White would win simply by 1 Rbl followed by kb8.
So, from diagram 11: 1 Rel+ Kf7 [On l...Kd6? White has 2 Kd8 followed by queening] 2 Re4 [The standard winning method, but not the only one. The alternative win is: 2 Ral Ke 73 Ra 8 Rbl 4 $\mathrm{Rb} 8 \mathrm{Rcl} 5 \mathrm{~Kb} 7 \mathrm{Rbl}+6 \mathrm{Ka} 6 \mathrm{Ral}+7 \mathrm{~Kb} 5 \mathrm{Rbl}+$ 8 Ka4 and White queens when Black runs out of checks] 2...Rbl 3 Kd7 Rdl+ 4 Kc6 Rc1+ 5 Kd6 Rd1+ [Wh1te's threat was Re5-c5. If 5...Kf6 with the 1dea 6 Re5? Rxc7! =, then 6 Rf4+ Kg6 7 Rf8 Rdl + 8 Ke5 and again Black soon runs out of checks and the pawn queens] 6 Kc 5 ! Rc1+ 7 Rc4 Rxc4+ 8 Kxc4 +-.
The manoeuvre starting with 2 Re4 is universally known as 'bullding a bridge although the rugby term 'shepherding'
might be a more apt description． All analogous positions with a NP，BP or centre pawn are simflarly won．The RP，however，provides an exception as the attacking king can emerge on one side only and both black pieces can participate in the blockade．To be able Lo win with a RP on the seventh the enemy king must be no closer than the opposite bishop file，i．e．the f－file for an a－pawn．


From diagram 12 White wins narrowly （Black to move would be no better off since he can only mark time），the plan being to oppose rooks on the b－file thus allowing the king to escape from the corner： 1 Rhl Ke7 2 Rh8［opposing rooks on b7 does not work： 2 Rh7＋？Kd6 3 Rb7 Rh2 4 Kb 8 ？？Rh8 mate－I once won a game like this！］2．．．Kd6！［The best defence；White＇s task is easier after 2．．．Kd7，e．g． 3 Rb 8 Ra 24 Kb 7 $\mathrm{Rb} 2+5 \mathrm{Ka} 6 \mathrm{Ra} 2+6 \mathrm{~Kb} 6 \mathrm{Rb} 2+7 \mathrm{Kc} 5!$ and Black＇s checks are soon exhausted］ 3 Rb8 Ra2 $4 \mathrm{~Kb} 7 \mathrm{Rb} 2+5 \mathrm{Kc}$ ！［The escape route used in the last note is not available as the black king controls c5］ 5．．．Rc2＋ $6 \mathrm{Kd8}$ Rh2！［This mate threat gives White one more problem to solve $\ldots .$. and 7 Ke 8 ？Rh8＋ $8 \mathrm{Kf} 7 \mathrm{Rh} 7+9 \mathrm{Kg} 6$ Rxa7 is no solution；nor is $7 \mathrm{Kc} 8 \mathrm{Rc} 2+$ repeating，so ．．．．］ 7 Rb6＋Kc5 8 Rc6＋！ ［A1so winning，but less quickly，is 8 Rb 2 ！？but not 8 Ra 6 ？Rh8＋ $9 \mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{Rh} 7+10$ Kf8 Rh8＋ 11 Kg 7 Ra 8 followed by Kb5－b6 winning the pawn ］8．．．Kb5 9 Rc8 Rh8＋ $10 \mathrm{Kc} 7 \mathrm{Rh} 7+11 \mathrm{~Kb} 8+$＋．
With the WR at $d 1, B K$ at e7，other pleces as in diagram 12，B1ack draws： 1 Rhl Kd7 2 Rh8 Kc7 3 Rb8 R̉a2 4 Rb7＋ Kc8 $5 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \mathrm{Rc} 2=$ ．
The other exception to the Lucena position occurs with a BP or centre $P$ when the defending king is on the＇short side of the pawn and the rook can main－ tain lis checking distance on the other wing．From diagram lu White to move can above but Black can draw with the move：

1．．．Rh8＋ $2 \mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{Rh} 7+3$ Ke6 Rh6＋ 4 Ke 5 Rh5t 5 Kf 6 Rh6t and if White avoids further checks by 6 Kg 7 then 6 ．．．Rd wins the pawn
With the pawn further back the result depends on whether White can reach the Lucena position
The concept of＇checking distance＇is of ten important in rook endings．To have checking distance there must be three files（or ranks）between the rook and the enemy pawn．In diagram 14 Black does not have checking distance and White can win．

$1 \mathrm{~Kb} 5 \mathrm{Rb} 8+2 \mathrm{Ka} 6 \mathrm{Rc} 83 \mathrm{~Kb} 6 \mathrm{Rb} 8+4$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\mathrm{Kc} 7 \mathrm{Rb} 2 & 5 \mathrm{c} 6 & \mathrm{Rc} 2 & {[\mathrm{Or} 5 . . \mathrm{Ke} 76 \mathrm{Kc} 8]}\end{array} 6$ $\mathrm{Kb} 7 \mathrm{Rb} 2+7 \mathrm{Kc} 8 \mathrm{Ke} 78 \mathrm{c} 7$ and we have reached the Lucena position（diagram reach
11）．
If the defending rook can maintain checking distance then，for a pawn on the fifth rank，the defending king must be cut off two files from the pawn as in diagram 15.


Black to move draws：1．．．Kb7 2 Rcl Rh4＋［Black has checking distance and the white king can hide nowhere but on c5－which would allow the black king
to cross over the e－file］ 3 Ke5 Rh5t 4 Ke6 Rh6＋ 5 Kd7 Rh7＋ 6 Kd6 Rh6＋ 7 $\mathrm{Kc} 5 \mathrm{Kc} 7=$ ．It is clear that if the king approaches the checking rook then as soon as it reaches the g－file the rook goes to the d－file winning the pawn．
White to move wins： 1 Rb1［Cutting off the black king at a distance of two files from the pawn］1．．．Rd8［On 1．． Rh4＋White now has 2 Kc5 Rh5 3 Kc6 Rh6 4 d6 etc］ $2 \mathrm{Kc} 5 \mathrm{Rc} 8+3$ Kd6 Rd8＋ 4 Kc6 Rc8＋ 5 Kd 7 winning as in No． 13.
品 彩

学

## ASIAN TEAM CH＇P contd

is not critical and $I$ did not wish to commit the queen yet） 15 g 4 Ne 516 g Qf6（Intending 17．．．Bxg4 18 Bxg4 Nd3＋ 19 Ke2 Nxf2 wimning） $170-0 \mathrm{~h} 518 \mathrm{gxh}$ g4？！（18．．．Bh3 looks better．At the time I felt de Guzman would sacrifice the exchange for control of the white squares and an extra pawn） 19 Kg 2 Rxh5 20 Rh1 Rh3 21 Nc4 Nxc4 22 Bxc4 Qh6 23 Qcl Qh7 24 Rxh3 Qxh3＋ 25 Kgl Bd 4, $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ ．
A quick post－mortem turned up 26 Ne 2 Be5 27 Nf4 Qh8 28 Nd3 Bd4 29 Qf4 Ke7 30

Rel f6 and Black is better with Bd7 and b5 coming up．Notes by Michael Freeman
H O O

## COMBINATION SOLUTIONS

1．Helms－Rosenbaum，New York 1940： 1 Rf8＋！Kh7（1．．．．Kxf8 2 Rf1＋Kg8 3 e7＋wins） 2 e7 Qxe7 3 Rxe8， 1 － 0.
2．Bogoljubov－Sultan Khan，Prague 1931 1 Rd5＋！（White missed this and the game was later drawn）1．．．Nxd5 2 Be2＋Ka5 3 Ra7＋Ra6 4 Rxa6 mate
3．Pleci－Endzelins，BuenosAires 1939： $1 \mathrm{Ne} 5+$ ！fxe5 2 Nd6＋！Kg6（2．．．Bxd6
Adams－Simonson，U．S．Ch＇p 1940： 1 Rxg7＋Kf8 2 Rg8＋！Kxg8 3 Rgl＋ Kf8 8 － $\mathrm{Bg} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 5 \mathrm{Bf} 6+\mathrm{Kf} 8 \quad 6 \mathrm{Rg} 8+$ Kxg8 $7 \mathrm{Qg} 2+$ and mates in two．
5．Mandl－H．Johner，Zurich 1930： 1．．．Ng3＋！ 2 hxg3 hxg3＋ 3 Kgl Nf 2 4 Rxf2 Rh1＋！ 5 Kxhl gxf2 wins．
6．Hromadka－Opocensky，Kaschau 1931 ： 1 Rxd5＋！cxd5 2 Nd3＋！exd3 3 f4 mate．

## HOWICK－PAKURANGA OPEN

SPONSORED BY PAPATOETOE GLASS CO．

VENUE：Pakuranga Cultural Community Centre．

DATES：February 18th and 19th， 1984

PRIZES：First $\$ 150$ ，second $\$ 125$ ，third $\$ 100$ PLUS five grades with prizes of $\$ 30$ and $\$ 15$ in each grade．

FORMAT：Seven－round Swiss（four rounds on the Saturday and three rounds on the Sunday）with each player having one hour per game．

ENTRIES：Entry fee is \＄11．Entries close on Friday，17th February 1984 although late entries at $\$ 14$ may be accepted．Check－in time 8：15 am．

CONTACT：For further information－Claude Stelco， 9 Tangelo Place，Bucklands Beach，phone 534－1503（evenings）．

## ANNUAL INDEX, VOLUME 9

Note: Only the first page number is given where an article covers consecutive pages. Tournaments from 1982 are indicated by an asterisk. Games are indexed under WHITE players only. Issues begin with the following page numbers: February 1, April 29, June 53, August 77, October 101, December 125.

## FEATURES
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## TOURNAMENTS - OVERSEAS

## Aarhus

Albena
Amsterdam (OHRA)
Amsterdam (OHRA)
Asian Junior Ch P (Baguio City)
Australian Junior Ch'p
Australian Junior Ch'p
Biel
Bratislava
British Ch'p
Buenos Aires
Cuban Ch'p
Dortmund
East German Ch'p
European Team Ch'p (P1ovdiv)
Hamburg (TV World Cup)
Hastings 1982/83


GAMES - LOCAL
APTEKAR - Sarfati 69

BATES - Love 66
BOSWELL - Al exander 108, Martin 108
BOYD - Sutton 67
CAPPER - McLaren 79
CARTER - Ion 138
CHRISTCHURCH v Nelson 94
CLEMANCE - Hawkes 110,
Levene 65, T.Spiller 25
CONNOR - A.Ker 15
CORNFORD - Levene 63, Sar
fati 62, P.Spiller 82,
Watson 62
CROWDEN - - Weegenaar 15
DOWDEN - Love 7, Lynn 5,
Sutton 9
108 - E.Green 38, A.Ker 108
EVANS - Yee 69
FOORD - White 15
FREEMAN M. - Metge 107, 112
GARBETT - B.Carpinter 5,
Dowden 21, Levene 9, P.
Spiller 22, Watson 107
GOLLOGLY - Garbett 4, 38, Levene 20, Marshall 41 G00DWILLIE - Garnett 85 GREEN E. - Garbett 107 HAMPL - B. Nijman 68
HART - Hampl 108
HAWKES - Dive 110, Ion 136 ION - Foster (80)
KER A. - Alexander 15, 108,
Bojtor 15, B.Freeman 15,
Sarfati 79, Wigbout 25
LEESE - Small 68
LEONHARDT - Garbett 114,
Stephenson 107
LEVENE - Dowden 7, McLaren 65, Sarfati 61, Sutton 23 LLOYD - Love (4), Sutton 7 LOVE - Foord 66, Gollogly 9, Sutton 67, Turner 11
LYNN - E.Green 107, M. Hopewell 106, Lloyd 9, Sutton 8
MARTIN - Dowden 66, Love 67, Scott 67
McIARN - Dreyer 109 Mclaren - Dive 80 , Noble 69, Monrad 110
METGE - Alexander 61, Corn-
ford 62, P. Green 113, P.
Spiller 106
MULLAN - A. Ker 110
NELSON - Christchurch 94
NELSON - Christchurch 94
POWER - Hart 111
SARAPU - Cornelissen 61,
SARAPU - Cornelissen 61,
Cornford 62, Smith 37 ,
Cornford 62, Smith 37,
106, Spencer-Smith 106,

Watson (107)
SARFATI - Gibbons 63, Mc-
Laren 79, Metge 61, Noble 69, Sarapu 62
SMITH - M. Hopewell 38, 111,
Levene 82, Watson 61
ILLER P. - Gollogly 10
Sarapu 62, Smith 62,
Stuart 6, 113
TEADMAN - P.Green 113,
MTEPHENSON -
TEPHENSON - McIntosh 15,
Power (107)
Green - Gollogly 41, P.
Green 112, Levene
Turner 8, Weir 70
SUTTON - Bates 66, B.Car-
pinter 22, Garbett 6, P.
Spiller 4, Stuart 8, Turn-
er 6 , Weegenaar 70
TURNER - Dowden 10, Garbett 7, Gollogly (5), Levene 4, Lynn 9, Watson 62
VAN DIJJ T. - B.Nijman 68
WALSH - Sarapu 107, Watson 63
WATSON - E.Green 106, McLaren 61, Sarapu 82
WATTS - K.Metge 15
WEEGENAAR - Alexander 15,
A.Ker 15

WEIR - Johnstone 85

## GAMES - OVERSEAS

ANDERSSON - Larsen 73, Liew 18 [Stean 19 BELYAVSKY - Kasparov 29,54, BROOMES - Khan 35
BURNDRED - Landry 44
CARPINTER B. - O.Khan 133 CHANDLER - Gufeld 71, Johansen 34, Lobron 115, Rogers 34, Suba (72), Sunye 115
CHALDRY - M. Hopewell 133
CHIBURDANIDZE - Slavotinek 18 CHRISTIANSEN - Ligterink 19 DE GUZMAN -Freeman 133
DOWDEN - Belyavsky 24,
Ramon-Fortune 19
DROR - Geller 28
ESLON - Horvath 140
EVANS - Hellwing 27
Garbett - Keene 51, Schepel
(35)

GELLER - Panchenko 141
GEORGIEV - Dlugy 120
GHEORGHIU - Liu 18
gligoric - Timman 140
GUTMAN - Azzopardi 18


116,120,133 BLACKMAR-DIEMER: 8, 106 BOGO-INDIAN DEF: 125 CARO-KANN DEF: $17,25,82$, DUTCH DEF: 34, 61,97 ENGLISH - 1...c5: 6, 18, 54, 8,55, 70, 79, 82, 116; other: 54,112
FRENCH GAMBIT: 107
$22,28,65,79,104,136$; 0ther: 7, 10, 24,70,114 138
GIUOCO PIANO: $23,61,67,108$ UNFELD DEF: 45, 54, 62,
UUNGARTAN DEF: 7
IRREGULAR: 18
KING'S GAMBIT: 5, 15, 94
KING'S INDIAN ATT: 113,139 KING'S INDIAN DEF: 41,54,
66, 108, 140
MODERN DEF: 68
NIMZOINDIAN DEF: 6,29,
NIMZOWITSCH-LARSEN: 62,82 HILIDOR DEF: 133

66, 110
QUEEN'S GAMBTT ACC: 120, 142 QUEEN'S GAMBIT DEC: 19, 29,

QUEEN'S INDIAN DEF: 15,19 , $55,63,72,113,120,121$, -125,

QUEEN'S PAWN: 9,106
RETI SYSTEM: 7
$63,67,68,69,72,94,110$, 111
CANDINAVIAN DEF: 34, 110 Cotch: 15, 25, 79, 108, 133 9, Maroczy: 73, 66, 67; 1, 18, 19, 26, Najori 124. 19, 26, 35, 69, 115, 88; Sozin: 7 Rauzer: 62, 112; Scheveningen: 4, 141; Kan: 6; Pelikan: $6,8,18,62,107$; closed. $10,37,38,62,132,142$;

## CLUB DIRECTORY

The annual fee (six listings) for this column is $\$ 6$ payable with order to the New Zealand Chess Association, P.O.Box 8802, Symonds Street, AUCKLAND
AUCKLAND CHESS ASSOCIATION: Contacts - President, Peter Stuart, phone 456-377; Secretary, Paul Spiller, 59 Uxbridge Road, Howick, phone 534-5579.
AUCKLAND CHESS CENTRE: meets Mondays \& Thursdays at clubrooms, 17 Cromwell St, Mt Eden, phone 602-042. Contact: Nigel Metge, phone 278-9807. Schoolpupil coaching on Friday evenings. Full recreational facilities - TV, pool room \& library.
HOWICK-PAKURANGA C.C. meets Tuesdays 7:30 pm (children 6:30-7:30) at Howick Bridge Club, Howick Community Complex, Howick. Contact: Claude Stelco, 9 Tangelo Place, Bucklands Beach, Auckland, phone 534-1503

NORTH SHORE C.C. meets Wednesdays 7:30 pm (tournament \& casual play) in St Josephs Church Hall, cnr Anzac St \& Taharoto Rd, Takapuna. Postal address: P.O.Box 33-587, Takapuna. Contact: Peter Stuart, phone 456-377 (home). Visitors welcome
REMUERA C.C. meets 7:30 pm on Wednesdays at the Auckland Bridge Club, 273 Remuera Road, Remuera. Contact: K.Williams, phone 543-762 (evenings).
WAITEMATA C.C. meets $8: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ Thursdays at Kelston West Community Centre, cnr Great North \& Awaroa Roads. Postal address: P.0.Box 69-005, Glendene, Auckland 8. Contact: George Williams, phone $834-6618$ or R.W.Smith, phone 836-8555.

HASTINGS \& HAVELOCK NORTH C.C. meets 7:00 pm Wednesdays at the Library, Havelock North High School, Te Mata Road, Havelock North, Hastings. Contact: Mike Earle, phone 776-027.
PALMERSTON NORTH C.C. meets 7:30 pm Tuesdays at the IHC Workshop, Cook Street, Palmerston North. Contact: J.Blatchford, 64 Apollo Parade, Palmerston North, phone 69-575.

CIVIC C.C. meets 7:45 pm Tuesdays at St Peter's Church Hall, Willis Street, Wellington. Contact: Mike White, phone 730-356.
HUTT VALLEY C.C. meets 7:30 pm Tuesdays at the Hutt Bridge Club, 17 Queens Road, Lower Hutt. Contact: Mrs Mary Boyack, phone 678-542.
PENCARROW C.C. meets 7:30 pm Thursdays (for seniors) at Louise Bilderbeck Hall, Main Road, Wainuiomata. Contact: Brian Foster, phone 648-578.
UPPER HUTT C.C. meets $7: 45 \mathrm{pm}$ Thursdays in the Supper Room, Civic Hall, Fergusson Orive, Uper Hutt Contact: Anton Reid, 16 Hildreth Street, Upper Hutt, phone 288-756.

CANTERBURY C.C. meets every Tuesday and Wednesday at $7: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ at the Clubrooms, 227 Bealey Avenue. President Geoff Davies, phone 524-518. Correspondence to P.0.Box 8014, Riccarton, Christchurch 4.
CHRISTCHURCH CHESS CENTRE meets Tuesdays at $7: 45 \mathrm{pm}$ at 314 Worcester St. Annual subscription \$5. Contacts: Vernon Small, phone 558-696 or Roger \& Joanne Nokes, phone 583-027.
NELSON C.C. meets 7:30 pm Thursdays at the Memorial Hall, Stoke. Contact: Tom van Dijk, phone Richmond 8178 or 7140 . Visitors welcome
OTAGO C.C. meets 7:30 pm Wednesdays \& Saturdays at 7 Maitland Street, Dunedin. phone (clubrooms) 776-919. Contact: Tony Dowden, 21 Queen Street, Dunedin, phone

