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## COMMONWEALTH CH'P

New Zealand was represented in the Novag-sponsored Commonwealth Championship from 15 th to 28 th January in Melbourne by three players. Our best result was achieved by IM Ortvin Sarapu who finished equal fifth in the twentyplayer field with $6 \frac{1}{2} / 11$ while Vernon Small and Paul Garbett were eighth equal a half point further back.
Australian IM Ian Rogers won the title on countback from his compatriot Greg Hjorth. Top seed Murray Chandler (England) tied for fifth in a disappointing result while equal second highest rated players GM Keene (England) and IM Johansen (Australia) tied

## or third.

There will be a full report in our April issue.

## ASIAN JUNIOR CH'P

New Zealand representative Mark Noble, who held second place at one tage, finished in fifth place at the 1982 Asian Junior Championship held in Baguio City just before Christmas.

## AUSTRALIAN JUNIOR CH'P

When the top two players from the 1982 New Zealand Schoolpupil Championship were unable to play in the Austraship were unable to play in the AustraJanuary) the third and fourth placeJanuary) the third and fourth plac getters, Ben Alexander and
Hopewell, got their chance.
Michael Hopewell finished in clear fourth place with $7 \frac{1}{2} / 11$, a half point behind the triple winners. Ben Alexander did not fare as well, scoring 6 points for equal twelfth.

## USSR v NEW ZEALAND

## A number of readers have expressed

 wish to see our team's games from the first round at Lucerne. Here they are, without notes.KARPOV - SMALL, Sicilian Taimanov: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf 3 e6 3 d 4 cxd4 4 Nxd 4 $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll} \\ \mathrm{Ne} 6 & 5 & \mathrm{Nb} 5 & \mathrm{~d} 6 & 6 & \mathrm{c} 4 & \mathrm{Nf} 6 & 7 \mathrm{Nlc} 3 & \mathrm{ab} & 8 \mathrm{Na}\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\text { Nc6 } & 5 & \mathrm{Nb} 5 & \mathrm{~d} 6 & 6 & \mathrm{c} 4 & \mathrm{Nf} 6 & 7 \mathrm{Nlc} 3 & \mathrm{a} & 8 & \mathrm{Na} \\ \mathrm{Be} 7 & 9 & \mathrm{Be} 2 & 0-0 & 10 & 0-0 & \mathrm{~b} 6 & 11 & \mathrm{Be} 3 & \mathrm{Bb} 7 & 12\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\text { Be7 } & 9 & \mathrm{Be} 2 & 0-0 & 10 & 0-0 & \mathrm{~b} 6 & 11 & \mathrm{Be} 3 & \mathrm{Bb} 7 & 12 \\ \text { Qb3 } & \mathrm{Nd} 7 & 13 & \mathrm{Rfd} 1 & \mathrm{Nc} 5 & 14 & \mathrm{Qc} 2 & \mathrm{Qc} 7 & 15 & \mathrm{Qd} 2\end{array}$
 19 Nd4 Qb8 20 Na4 Ned7 21 b4 Rc8 22
 d5 26 exd5 Bd6 27 g 3 exd5 28 c5 bxc5 $\begin{array}{llllllll}29 & \text { bxc5 } 5 \text { Bf8 } 8 & 30 & \text { Bd } 4 & \text { Qa8 } 8 & 31 & \text { Nd } 3 & \text { Bc6 } 6 \\ 32\end{array}$
 Nc6 36 Nxc6 Bxc6 37 Nb 4 Bb 738 Bb 3 Re7 39 Qf4 Qd8 40 a5 Nh5 41 Qf5 bff 42 Qd3 Bxd4+ 43 Qxd4 Nf6 44 c6 Bc8 45 Bf1 Qd6 46 Qc5 Qxc5+ 47 Rxc5, $1-0$. SARAPU - KASPAROV, Sicilian Najdorf: 1 e4 c5 $2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{~d} 4$ cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 $5 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{a6} 6 \mathrm{Bc} 4$ e6 $7 \mathrm{Bb} 3 \mathrm{Be} 7880-0$ b5 9 a3 0-0 10 Be3 Bb7 11 f3 Nc6 12 Nf2 Pfe8 16 Ne2 Ne5 17 Rd4 Qd7 15 Qe4 $19 \mathrm{Bcl} \mathrm{Rf} 82 \mathrm{Ne5} 17 \mathrm{Na} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 718 \mathrm{c} 3$ 22 NC4 19 BC1 BRE 20 22 K 2 gb Nb 3 Bg 24 Na 2 d 525 Nxc 4 Reds 26 Rbl Bc6 27 exas Bxas 28 Be3 Red8 29 Bb 20 35 Qe2 Rd8 35 Qe2 Rd8 36 Bf2 h5 37 Qel Rd7 38 Ba 4 Rb7 39 Qd2 Be5 40 Bdl Bh2+ $41 \mathrm{Kf1} 1 \mathrm{Bd} 6$ Be3 Bxe3 46 Qxe3 Rxb2, $0-1$.
POLUGAEVSKY - NOKES, Modern Benoni:
 5 cxd5 d6 6 Nf3 $36 \quad 7 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 8$ e $40-0$ $9 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Re} 8 \quad 10 \quad 0-0 \mathrm{Nbd} 711$ Qc2 Ne5 12 b 3 $\mathrm{g} 5 \quad 13 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{~g} 4 \quad 14 \mathrm{Nd} 1 \mathrm{Nh} 5 \quad 15 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{gxf} 3$ 16 Nxf3 Nf6 17 Bb5 Rf8 18 Nxe5 dxe5 19 Rf3 Qb6 20 Bc4 Kh8 21 Ne3 Rg8 22 Khl Bd7 23 g 3 Nh5 24 Nf5 5 Bxf5 $\quad 25$ Rxf5 Qh6 26 Qf2 Nf6 27 Qf3 Ne8 28 Bxe5 Bxe5 29 Rxe5 Qg7 30 Qf4 Nd6 31 Rel Rad8 32 Re7 b5 33 bfl e4 34 e5 Nc8 $35 \mathrm{Rxf} 7 \quad \mathrm{Qg} 6$ Continued on page 24

## Can You See the Combinations?

Solutions on page 28

a b c d efgh
No. 1 White to move

$a b c d e f g h$
No. 3 Black to move

$a b c d e f g h$ No. 5 Black to move

a b c d efgh No. 2 White to move

$a \quad b \quad c \quad d e f g h$
No. 4 White to move

$a b c d e f g h$ No. 6 White to move

Editor's note: while both authors collaborated on the whole report which follows, David Gollogly was mainly responsible for the round-by-round story while the Editor wrote most of the introductory part and conclusion.
The 90th New Zealand Championship was organised by the Otago Chess Club without the benefit of sponsorship wich has normally been available fo number of years. For both writer this was our first Dunedin Congress and unfortunately, if we can be permitted a little snivel this early in our ceport, we neglected to cake the Auck hie informin able in 3000 on sugest the s some 3000 miles from the South Pole but to us it seemed much closer! Three r four blankets and bedcover with the few days distinctly chilly place To days.... distinctly chilly place. o be fair er was also sone rather good wil 10 , of ntil after the sun rose!
The hen the sun rose
an was not as pacious as le might have been but, umber of competitors this year, it was dequa copor dequate. Apropos of Robert Sin ast Coneress, the were certainly last Congress, there certain arailedibles, including sandwiches, only open for about half an hour per loud as for most Congresses before last year's.
The Tournament Director was former ampionship player John Harraway who id much more than direct the two tour id much more than Joun two naments. Ever-helpful, John was stayed in the on-site hostel accommodaion.
As already intimated, the Congress did not attract as many players as usual; undoubtedly a factor was the high cost of travel from the North Island centres where the majority of the country's chess players reside. Nevertheless, thirty-two out of the total of fifty-eight competitors came
from the North Island. Outside of the host club there was reason to be disappointed with the response of the other South Island clubs - just five
players from Canterbury and one from players from Canterbury and one fro
Timaru! imaru!

The field for the New Zealand Championship was certainly the weakest for a good many years. This was partly due to the expense involved but also onts For erap Vernon spall were playing in the Corno commanealt Championship tournament thile Robert Smith only returned from the 0lymiad a few days bere Christ , Jon as. Jonathan Sarfati left entering thus missed out while Tony Love (for the second time!) failed to send the enty foe with his entry love was lucky, however, f the twelve players in the Champione ohip field, withdrew at the Champion hip in order to be able to assist the runing of the Congress; Love with he reed in the Premier Reserve, then found himself in the Chamionship.

It was hard to go past Richard
Sutton, Paul Garbett and, perhaps, Mark Sutton, Paul Garbett and, perhaps, Mark eve, how over each of them. Sutton, the highest rated player in the field had already rated player in the field, had alrea (1962/63, 1970/71\& 1971/72) but had tot played in a tournament of this calibre since the Burroughs internatio nal in Wellington nearly four years ago; nal in Wellington nearly four years ago; sistency through the eleven rounds? Paul Garbett, twice winner of the title (1973/74 \& 1974/75), has had some very poor results since then, e.g. llth place last year. Levene, the second seed, had only played in one previous Championship where a very bad start saw him with no chance to finish better than fourth equal; with his style any result is possible for Mark.
In terms of play at this level, only Tony Dowden and Peter Stuart could really be expected to mount a challenge,
the former in particular having the advantage of playing in Lucerne a month earlier. Players such as David Gollogly Lloyd had all had some excellent results in lesser events but lack of experience was likely to tell.

So much for the theory
see what happened in practice!
now let's

Gollog 1

## Round 1-28 December

Gollogly Garbett

Sutton Sicilian, Scheveningen 1-0 (60)

Turner

| Slav Defence |
| :--- |
| - Levene |$\quad 1-0$ (38)

Lloyd
Slav, Exchange

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { - Dowden }  \tag{2}\\
& \text { English Opening }
\end{align*}
$$ Queen's Carpinter

After Garbett declined Gollogly's respectful draw offer on move 12 , it transpired that White had a large advantage which eventually netted two pawns and the game.

Sutton gradually assumed the inftiative and went on to win but neither player had noticed a snap win for Spiler on move 17!

Levene handled his favourite Dragon well and won all Turner's pawns for an exchange, though both players had earlier missed an equalising try for White. Lynn looked out of touch and lost quickly.

Stuart-Dowden was a cautious draw unlike Lloyd-Love in which, after 26 moves, the following position was reached:


There followed 27 Bxf8 Rxdl+ 28 Rxdl?? (28 Bxdl was necessary) 28 ...Rxdl+ 29 Bxdl Qxf8? (Love had missed 29...Qh3! winning a piece after the forced 30 Be 2 Bxe 231 QCl
Kxf8), $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$
SUTTON - SPILLER, Slav Defence:
1 d4 d5 2 c4 c6 3 Nf3 e6 4 Nbd 2 Nf 6 e3 Nbd7 6 Bd3 Bd6 7 0-0 0-0 8 0c2 e5 9 cxd5 cxd5 10 dxe5 Nxe5 11 Nxe5

Bxe5 12 Nf3 Bb8 $13 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 4 \quad 14 \mathrm{BC} 3$ $\begin{array}{llllllll}\mathrm{Bxe} & 12 & \mathrm{Nf} 3 & \mathrm{Bb} 8 & 13 & \mathrm{Bd} 2 & \mathrm{Bg} 4 & 14 \\ \mathrm{Re} 8 & 15 & \mathrm{Bf} 5 & \mathrm{Bxf} 3 & 16 & \mathrm{gxf} 3 & \mathrm{~g} 6 & 17 \\ \mathrm{Bh} 3\end{array}$

17...Nh5? (Both players missed 17
$\cdots .0 c 7$ 18 f4 d4!) 18 Qd2 Qh4 19 Qd4 (xd4 20 Bxd4 f5 21 Rfd1 Bd6 22 f4 $\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{Kf7} 7 & 23 & \mathrm{Bg} 2 & \mathrm{Nf} 6\end{array}$ 24 Bxf6 Kxf6 25 Bxd5 Ke7 26 Bxb7 Rab8 27 Bd5 Rxb2
28 Вb 3 Rc8 29 Rd4 Rc6 30 Radl Rcb6 $31 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \mathrm{Kd} 732 \mathrm{Rd} 5 \mathrm{a6} \quad 33 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Ke} 7 \quad 34$
 Rd6+ Rxd6 38 Rf7 mate, 1 - 0.
GOLLOGLY - GARBETT, Sicilian: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4
 Bd7 9 a4 Be7 $10 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 11$ a5 $0-0$ $12 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Nb} 4 \quad 13 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Be} 6 \quad 14 \mathrm{Rf} 2 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 15$
 Bxf6 19 Nd4 Be8 20 Nxe4 dxe4 21 c3 Nd5 22 Rxe4 Nxb6 23 axb6 Qc5 24 Khl Qxb6 25 Qe 2 Bg 626 Rxe6 Qc5 27 Bxb 7
 Rexa6 Rbb8 34 Ra 8 Bf 735 Bg 2 Bg 836 Rxb8 Rxb8 $\quad 37 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Rd} 8 \quad 38 \mathrm{Ra} 4 \quad \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 39 \mathrm{Kgl}$ Kg7 $40 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 41 \mathrm{~d} 5$ Rd6 42 Rd4 Be6 $43 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 44 \mathrm{Rb} 4 \mathrm{Kf} 7 \quad 45 \mathrm{Rb} 7 \mathrm{Kf} 646$ Kd4 Bf5 47 Rc7 Rd8 48 Rc6+ Ke7 49 Be4 Bxe4 50 Kxe4 Kf7 $51 \mathrm{Ke} 5 \mathrm{Re} 8+52$ Re6 Ra8 53 Rf6+ Kg7 54 Rb6 Re8+ 55 Re6 Ra8 56 Re7+ Kf8 $57 \mathrm{~d} 6 \mathrm{Ra} 3 \quad 58 \mathrm{Kf} 6$ Rd3 59 Re6 Kg8 $60 \mathrm{Ke} 7,1-0$.
TURNER - LEVENE, Sicilian Dragon: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Ne3 $\mathrm{g} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 6 \quad 8$
 Oc 715 Nde2 Rc8 16 Bxc4 Rxc4 14 h5 18 hxg fog 19 Nf $4 d 720$ Nx $g 4$ Be 21 e5 dxe5 22 Rh2 Rxa 23 Nxe6 Qxe6 Qxc31) 23 Oxa2 24 Qd3 23 bxe (23 exc3.) $26 . . .24$ Qxc2+ $29 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \mathrm{Qxe} 4+30 \mathrm{Kdl} \mathrm{Qf}^{28} \mathrm{Ke}$ Rde2 $0 \mathrm{Ob} 3+32 \mathrm{Rc} 2 \mathrm{Qbl}+33 \mathrm{Bcl} \mathrm{N}^{2}+34$ Kel $0 \mathrm{~b} 4+35 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \mathrm{Nec}+36 \mathrm{Kc} 1 \mathrm{Ne} 3+34$ R2 Nd4 +38 Kd Qb3+ $39 \mathrm{KdL} \mathrm{Qb}+37$ 39 Ke4 Qf3 mate

Round 2-29 December
Gollogly (1) - Sutton (1)
 Levene (1) - Lloyd (ictian, Kan $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (19) 4

Sicilian, Pelikan $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (15)

- Stuart ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )
Love ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

$$
\text { Sicilian, } 2 \text { c } 3 \text { 直 }-\frac{1}{2} \text { (12) }
$$

Dowden ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) - Lynn (0)
King's Gambit $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (57)
Garbett (0) - Carpinter (1)
Pirc Defence $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (41)
Dowden - Lynn was the longest and most entertafning game in a round of draws; errors abounded and either side could have won. Garbett obtained a superficially attractive position from the opening but Carpinter's ugly pawn structure proved effective. In equal last position after two games, Paul was looking set for another disastrous Congress.

Spiller's temporary piece sacrifice simply led to a dead drawn ending. In the three 'grandmaster' draws Lloyd had a definite advantage while Gollogly and Love had rather smaller edges.
DOWDEN - LYNN, King's Gambit:
1 e4 e5 2 f4 exf4 3 Nf3 Be7 4 Nc3 d6 $5 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Bh} 4+6 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 4 \quad 7 \mathrm{Bxf} 4 \mathrm{c} 6 \quad 8 \mathrm{~h} 3$ $\mathrm{Ne} 712 \mathrm{Rgl} 6613 \mathrm{Bh} 2 \mathrm{O} 0-11 \mathrm{Ral}$ Ne7 $12 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{~h} 613 \mathrm{Bh} 20-0-0 \quad 14 \mathrm{Qe} 3$ Nxd5 18 Qd2 Nc 719 Keds 10 NxdS re5 18 Qd2 Ne7 19 e5 dxe5 20 Bxe5 ff6 24 Kbl Nd5 25 Re Qbes $26 \mathrm{Bf5}$ Bf6 $24 \mathrm{Kbl} \mathrm{Nd} 525 \mathrm{Rg} 3 \mathrm{Qb} 626 \mathrm{Bf} 5+$ kc7 27 Rb 3

27...Nc3+ 28
bxc3 Rxd2 29 Rxd Qg1+ 30 Kb 2 b 5 31 Rd7+ Kb6 32 Rxf7 a5 $\quad 33$ a4 b4 34 Rxf6 gxf6 35 cxb4 Qd4+ 36 Kbl Qxf4 37 bxa5+ $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Kxa5 } & 38 & \mathrm{Bg} 4 & \text { Qfll } \\ 39 & \mathrm{~Kb} 2 & \mathrm{Of} 4 & 40 & \mathrm{Rf} 3\end{array}$ Qd4+ 41 Kcl Qal+ $42 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Qxa4} 43 \mathrm{c3}$ Qa2+ 44 Ke 3 Qc4 45 Kf 2 c 546 Kg 3 Qf 7 $47 \mathrm{Rf} 5 \mathrm{~Kb} 648 \mathrm{Bf} 3 \mathrm{Qe6} 49 \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{~h} 5+50$ Kf4 h4? (Probably the last chance to win was 50...Qc4+ 51 be4 Qxc3; with his next few moves white sets up an impreg nable position) 51 Bd 5 Qd6+ $52 \mathrm{Ke4}$ Kb5 $53 \mathrm{c} 4+\mathrm{Kb} 4 \quad 54 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{Qg} 3+55 \mathrm{Rf} 3$ Qe5 56 Kd 2 f 557 Kdl Qd4+, $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ GARBETT - CARPINTER, Pirc Defence:
 $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}5 \mathrm{Be} 2 & 0-0 & 6 & 0-0 & \mathrm{c} 5 & 7 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{Na} 6 & 8 \mathrm{Nd} 2\end{array}$ Nc7 9 a4 a6 10 Nc4 Bd7 11 e5 dxe5 $12 \mathrm{Nb} 6 \mathrm{Rb} 813 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Na} 814 \mathrm{Nxa8} \mathrm{Rxa8}$

15 Bxc5 Re8 16 Bb4 Ne8 17 Ne4 Bf5 18 Nc3 Na6 19 a5 Qc7 20 Rel Rfe8 21 Ra Bd7 22 Bd3 f5 23 f3 b5 24 Khl Red8 25 Qe2 Be8 26 Qf2 Rb8 $27 \mathrm{Bc} 5 \mathrm{Nc} 8 \quad 28$ g4 fxg4 29 fxg 4 Bf7 30 Rf1 Rf8 31 Bb4 e4 $32 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Bxc} 3 \quad 33 \mathrm{bxc} 3$ e3 34 Qg 2 Qe5 35 Raal Bxd5 36 Rxf8+ Kxf8 37 Bf3 Bc4 38 Qg3 Qxg3 39 hxg 3 Nd 640 Rel Kf7 41 Rxe3, $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$.

## Round 3 - 30 December <br> Turner ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) - Gollogly ( $1 \frac{1}{2}$ ) <br> Modern Defence 0-1 (20)

| Lloyd (1) | - Spiller ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Slav, Exchange | $0-1 \quad(26)$ |
| Stuart (1) | - Levene (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) |  |

Lynn ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) English, Symmetrical 0-1 (40)

Pirc Defence 0-1 (46)
Carpinter (1 $1 \frac{1}{2}$ ) - Dowden (1)
English, Symmetrical 0-1 (38)
Sutton (1立) - Garbett ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )
Nimzoindian, 4 e3 0-1 (31)
An excellent round to be Black! In the clash of the favourites Sutton achieved a thematic central pawn advance but Garbett won in a complicated middle-game when, after mutual draw offers, Sutton erred in time trouble.
Levene sacrificed unsoundly but Stuart mishandled the defence in time trouble. Lynn achieved a probably won position and then allowed a two pawn advantage to become a one pawn deficit.
Dowden improvised in the opening and Carpinter missed a chance for a clear advantage although he still had slight pressure for most of the game until he blundered in severe time

L1oyd's position expired shortly after his book knowledge while Turner collapsed in the following position, overlooking a four-move sequence win-


Black has just played ...e5 and the game concluded: 16 0-0? a5 17 Qh4 $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { e4 } & 18 & \text { Bxe4 } & \mathrm{g} 5 & 19\end{array}$ Bxh7+ Nxh7 20 Qh5 Ra6, 0-1. With only two pawns for the

SUTTON - GARBETT, Nimzoindian Defence: d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 e3 0-0 5 Bd3 d5 6 a3 Bxc3+ 7 bxc3 c5 8 cxd5 exd5 9 Ne 2 b6 10 0-0 Ba6 11 f 3 Qe 7 $12 \mathrm{Ng} 3 \mathrm{Rd} 813 \mathrm{Ra} 2 \mathrm{Bxd3} 14 \mathrm{Qxd} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 6$ $15 \operatorname{Re} 2$ Qe6 16 Rdl Rac8 $17 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 18$ Reel Na5 19 Qe2 Nc4


20 e4 dxe4 21 fxe4 b5 22 Bcl Re8 23 Qf3 Rcd8 24 e5 Nd5 $25 \mathrm{Nf5}$ 27 Ne 3 Rd 528 Ne 27 Ng 5 Rd 528 30 Rxd4 $4 x C 5$ Rde4 Rxe5, $0-1$.

STUART - LEVENE, Symmetrical English: 1 c4 c5 2 Nf3 Nf6 3 Nc3 e6 4 d4 cxd4 5 Nxd4 a6 6 e3 $\mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{Be} 20-0 \quad 8 \quad 0-0$

 15 Qe2 Rfd8 16 Qf3 $\mathrm{Qc} 7 \quad 17$ Racl Ne5 18 Qe2 Qb8 19 e4 d5?! 20 exd5 Neg4 $21 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Bc} 5 \quad 22 \mathrm{Nc} 6 \mathrm{Bxf} 2+\quad 23 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rxc} 6$ 24 dxc6 Bc5 $25 \mathrm{Rxd8}+\mathrm{Qxd} 8 \quad 26$ Nd1 Qd6 27 Bxf6? (27 h3! $\pm$ ) 27 ...Nxf6 28 Nf2 e5 29 Rdl Qxc6+ 30 Qf 3 e4 31 Rd8+ Bf $8 \quad 32$ Qe3 $\quad \mathrm{h} 6 \quad 33 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{~g} 5 \quad 34 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Kg} 7$ $35 \mathrm{Ndl} \mathrm{Bc5} 36$ Qd2? ( 36 Qe2) $36 \ldots \mathrm{Cl}$ 37 Ra8 Nh5 38 Og2 Nxg3 39 Nc3? Ne2+ 40 Khl Nxc3, $0-1$

## Round 4-31 December

Gollogly (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) - Lloyd (1)
Ruy Lopez, Bird 1-0 (58)
Sutton ( $1 \frac{1}{2}$ ) - Turner ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )
Sicilian, Kan 1-0 (18)
Spiller (1年) - Stuart (1)
Sicilian, Taimanov $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (24)
Levene (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) - Lynn ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )
Latvian Gambit 1-0 (29)
Love (2) - Carpinter (11 ${ }_{2}$ )
Sicilian, 2 c 3 $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (17)
Garbett (1零) - Dowden (2) French, Tarrasch 1-0 (28)

Garbett won convincingly, stranding Dowden's king in the centre after a book pawn sacrifice (see annotated games). Turner's dubious opening was very well exploited by Sutton.

Gollogly produced his worst game of che tournament against Lloyd; two hideous mistakes saw White shed a pawn which was regained after some under-
standably overconfident play by Black. Another error in time trouble left whit with a difficult position which became drawish unless Lloyd tried something. Lloyd declined a draw offer ('Don'r be stupid ...."), then 'tried something' a few moves later, after which white nominally won but chess was the loger

Lynn returned to his round one form dropping two pieces. Love achieved nothing more than an equal ending from his habitual 2 c3 Sicilian while Stuart equalised against Spiller, the players soon drawing by repetition.

Thus 1982 ended with Levene and Col logly sharing the lead with $3 \frac{1}{2} / 4$, a full point ahead of Sutton, Garbett and Love.
SUTTON - TURNER, Sicilian Kan:
1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 a6 5 Bd 3 Be5 $6 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{Ba} 77 \mathrm{Ne} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 680-0$ Nge7 9 Qh5 Qc7 $10 \mathrm{Khl} \mathrm{Nb}_{4} 11 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Nxd}$ 12 cxd3 g6 13 Qh4 f5 $\quad 14$ Bd2 b5 $\quad 15$ Racl Qb6 16 Ndl Kf7 17 Bc 3 Od8 18 Qf6+, l-0.
SPILLER - STUART, Sicilian Taimanov: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 $4 \mathrm{Nxd}_{4}$ Ne6 5 Nb 5 d 66 c4 Nf6 7 Nlc 3 ab 8 Na3 Be7 $9 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{~B}_{0} 0 \mathrm{0} \quad 10$ 0-0 b6 11 Be 3 bb7 12 Qb 3 Nd7 13 Redl Nc5 14 Qc2 Nb4 15 Qd2 Qb8 16 Nc 2 Nxc2 $17 \quad 17 \mathrm{Qxc} 2$ Rfd8 18 Rd2 Qc7 19 Radi Rac8 20 f 3 Nd7 21 Qb3 Nc5 22 Qc2 Nd7 23 Qbl 3 Nc 5 $24 \mathrm{Oc} 2 \mathrm{Nd} 7, \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$.

## Round 5-2 January

Stuart ( $1 \frac{1}{2}$ ) -Gollogly ( $3 \frac{1}{2}$ )
King's Indian, Orthodox $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (16)
Lloyd (1) - Sutton (2 2 )
Réti System 0-1 (31
Lynn ( $\frac{1}{2}$ - Spiller (2)
French Defence $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (36)
Carpinter (2) - Levene (3 $\frac{1}{2}$ )
Modern Benoni $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (26
Dowden (2) - Love ( $2 \frac{1}{2}$ )
Hungarian Defence 1-0 (24)
Turner ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) - Garbett (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ )
Sicilian, Sozin 0-1 (30)
With both leaders drawing, Carbett and Sutton were able to narrow the gap to a half point. Gollogly s unambitious draw offer (his third in the 16 moves!) in an advantageous position was accepted while Carpinter-Levene reached a position in which both sides were con-
tent to repeat moves.
Garbett, helped by Turner's sever ime trouble, won instructively and Sutton took advantage of Lloyd's pas ive play with the white pieces.
Love saw Dowden's pseudo sacrifice but, surprisingly, allowed it and got a very difficult game, eventually osing. Lynn's risky gambit turned out ell enough to draw in the end.

LOYD - SUTTON, Réti System:
1 Nf3 d5 2 c4 c6 3 b3 Bg4 4 e3 e6 5 Bb2 Nd7 6 h3 Bh5 7 Be2 f6 8 cxd5 cxd5 9 Nd4 Bf7 10 0-0 e5 ll Nc2 Bd6 12 d3 Ne7 13 e4 d4 14 Nd2 Nc6 15 Na Be7 16 f4 $0-0 \quad 17$ f5 Rc8 18 Rf3 Bb4 19 Nabl Qe7 20 Nfl Bc3 21 Ba3 Nb4 22 Nxc3 Rxc3 23 Rg3 Rfc8 24 Bh5 a5 25 Nd2 Nc5 26 Bxf7+ Qxf7 27 Bxb4 axb4 28 Qe2 b5 29 Rd1 Rc2 30 Qel Ra8 31 Nf3 Raxa2, 0 - 1.
TURNER - GARBETT, Sicilian Sozin: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd 4 vf6 $5 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{Bb} 30-0 \quad 8$ $0-0$ Na6 $9 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Nc} 5 \quad 10$ Qf3 a6 11 g 4

 Rd3 Ne5 19 Nxc5 dxc5 20 f5 Bd6


21 Rxd6 Qxd6
22 Bxc5 Qd8 23 fxe6 fxe6 24 Qf7 + Kh8 25 h 4 Rc8 26 $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Rdl } & \text { Qc } 7 & 27 & \text { Qxc7 } \\ \text { Rxc } 7 & 28 & \text { Bd4 } & \text { Rd7 } 7\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Rxc7 } & 28 & \text { Bd4 } 4 \mathrm{Rd} 7 \\ 29 & \text { h5 } & \text { Red8 } & 30 \mathrm{~h} 6\end{array}$ Rxd4, $0-1$

DOWDEN - LOVE, Hungarian Defence:
e4 e5 $2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 63 \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{Be} 7 \mathrm{C}^{4} \mathrm{~d} 46$




 hxg5 22 hxg5 Bxd5? 23 Nxd5 Nd7 24 Ne7, $1-0$.

## Round $6-3$ January

Gollogly (4) - Lynn (1)
aro-Kann, Exchange $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (45)
Sutton (31 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ ) - Stuart (2)
Sicilian, Taimanov 1-0 (74)
Turner ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) - Lloyd (1)
QGD, Tartakower $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (28)
Spiller (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) - Carpinter (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Pirc Defence $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (21)
Levene (4) - Dowden (3) French, Closed $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (41)
Garbett (31 $)$ - Love ( $2 \frac{1}{2}$ ) Petroff Defence 1-0 (61)

Again the two leaders drew while their closest rivals won to leave a four-way tie for the lead just past the half-way mark of the tournament.
Garbett and Love played a variation they had previously discussed in a correspondence game; Garbett won a pawn ut Love made him work hard for the full point. A serious mistake by Stuart in tho vantage which he exploited with shar lay, eventually winning two pawns.
Dowden played riskily against Levene and both sides missed chances; the draw as agreed after both players had examined the adjourned position. Lynn urprised by playing a Caro-Kann with all the solidity he could muster and drew.

Spiller and Carpinter took no
chances, agreeing a draw in mutual time trouble in a sharp position.

Lloyd agreed a draw in the following position:


Turner had enjoyed the initia tive for some time but, spotting the loss of a piece, offered a draw which was accepted. Of course, 28 .. Rd7 wins the piece because of the
back rank mate threat. This game seemed to affect Adrian's play; henceforth, with nothing to lose, he played rather wildly with varying success.
LEVENE - DOWDEN, Closed French:
1 e4 e6 2 d3 d5 3 Nd2 Nf6 4 Ngf3 b6
 $\begin{array}{llllllllll}0-0 & 9 & \text { e5 Ne8 } 10 & \mathrm{Nfl} & \mathrm{f} 6 & 11 & \mathrm{Bf} 4 & \mathrm{~g} 5 & 12\end{array}$ exf6 Bxi6 $13 \mathrm{BCl} \mathrm{B}^{2} 14 \mathrm{~N} d 2 \mathrm{hs} 15$ Ne Ng 716 c 4 Ne 717 Qb3 Bb7 18 cxds Nxd5 19 Ne4 Nxe3 20 Bxe3 bd4 21 h 3 gxth 22 bxh3 Bas 23 Qc2 Bxe3 24 Rxe3 fl 25 Bxfs exfs 26 Nc3 4427 ReS H4 28 Khe 45 R 52 37 Re5 Kh7 38 h5 Re 39 Ne4 Bxh5 40 Qh4 Rh6 41 Qe $7+\frac{1 / 2}{2}$

SUTTON－STUART，Sicilian Taimanov： 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Ne6 5 Nc3 Qc7 6 g3 a6 7 Bg 2 Nf 68 $0-0$ d 69 Rel Bd7 10 Nxc6 bxc6 $11 \mathrm{Na4}$ Rb8 12 c4 c5 13 Nc3 Be7 14 f4 Bc6 15 e5 Nd7？（15．．．dxe5 16 fxe5 Rd8 17 Qe2 Nd7 is unclear according to ECO） 16 exd6 Bxd6 17 Nd5！Bxd5 18 cxd5 e5 19 Bh3 f6 20 Qg4 Nb6 21 fxe5 Bxe5 22 Bf4 0－0 23 Bxe5 fxe5 24 Qe6＋Kh8 25 d6 Qf7 26 Qxf7 Rxf7 27 Be6 Rf8 28 Rxe5 Rfd8 29 Rd 1 Nd 730 Bxd7 Rxd7 31 Rxc5 Kg8 32 Rc 7 Rdd 833 Rd 2 Rb 634 d7 Kf7 $35 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \mathrm{Ke} 7 \quad 36$ Rxd8 Kxd8 37 ff2 Rh6


38 Ke3 Re6t 39
Kf4 Rel $40 \mathrm{Kf5}$ g5 Rf7＋ 43 Ke6 Re7＋ 44 Kf5 Rf7＋ 45 Ke4 Re7＋ 46 Kd4 Kxd7 $47 \mathrm{Kd5}$ $\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{h} 6 & 48 \mathrm{~h} 4 \\ 49 \mathrm{hxg} 5 \\ \mathrm{he} \\ 50\end{array}$ Kc5＋Kc7 51 a
Re5＋ 52 Rd 5 Re 253 b 3 Rg 254 Rf 5 g 6 $55 \mathrm{Rf} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 856 \mathrm{~Kb} 6 \mathrm{Rg} 3 \quad 57 \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{Rg} 458$ Ka5 Rxg5＋ 59 Kxa6 Rg4 60 Ka5 Kc8 61 $\mathrm{Rg} 7 \mathrm{~g} 5 \quad 62 \mathrm{~b} 5 \mathrm{Rh} 4 \quad 63 \mathrm{Rxg} 5 \mathrm{Rf} 4 \quad 64 \mathrm{Rg} 7$ Rh4 65 b6 Kb8 $66 \mathrm{~Kb} 5 \mathrm{Rh} 5+67 \mathrm{Ka} 6$ $\mathrm{Rh} 8 \quad 68$ a5 $\mathrm{Rf} 8 \quad 69 \mathrm{Rg} 5 \mathrm{Ka} 8 \quad 70 \mathrm{~Kb} 5 \mathrm{Rh} 8$ 71 a 6 Rb 872 Rh 5 Rg 873 a 7 Rc 874 Ka6， 1 － 0 ．

## Round 7－4 January

Carpinter（3）－Gollogly（4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Pirc Defence $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$（17）
－ynn（11 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$－Sutton（4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ）

$$
\text { Blackmar-Diemer Gambit } 0-1 \text { (20) }
$$

Stuart（2）－Turner（1）
English Opening 1－0（31）
Dowden（3i⿱亠䒑口儿 ）－Spiller（3）
French，Advance 1－0（43）
Love（ $2 \frac{1}{2}$ ）－Levene（ $4 \frac{1}{2}$ ）
Lloyd（1 $1 \frac{1}{2}$ ）－Garbett（4 4 ）
English，Symmetrical
$\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$（18）
Sutton emerged as the clear leader with his win over Lynn when the latter＇s BDG failed to get off the ground．His three co－leaders all had quick draws； al tha and Carpinter held minimal edges although Carpinter missed a try for versus Love squlised but no more versus Love＇s novelty

Dowden kept in touch with the leaders as Spiller，in his usual time trouble， relentlessly converted a winning posi－ tion at move 29 into an untenable one at the adjournment．Stuart won the exchange with a nice combination．

LYNN－SUTTON，Blackmar－Diemer Gambit： 1 d4 d5 2 e4 dxe4 3 Nc3 Nf6 4 f3 exf3 5 Nxf3 Bg4 6 h3 Bh5 7 g4 Bg6 8 Bg2 Nc6 9 0－0 e6 10 Bg5 h5 Il Qd2 hxg4 12 hxg4 Qd7 13 Rael 0－0－0 14 Bxf6 gxf6 15 Ne 2 e5 16 Nh 2 Bh 6 Qc3 exd4 18 Bxc6 bxc6 19 Qc4 Be3＋ 20 Kg2 Be4＋， 0 － 1.
STUART－TURNER，English Opening：
1 c4 Nf6 $2 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 4 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \quad 0-0$ $5 \mathrm{Nf3}$ d6 6 0－0 e5 $7 \mathrm{~d} 3 \mathrm{c} 6 \quad 8 \mathrm{Rbl} \mathrm{Bf} 5$ 9 Bg5 h6 10 Bxf6 Bxi6 11 Na2 Bg7 12 16 Rfcl d5 17 bxc6 bxc6 Rf7 18 a4 Rd7
 21 Rxc6 Bxd5 22 Qc3 Qe8 23 Rc7 Rd8 24 Rb 5 Qe6 25 Qa5 Bf6 26 $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Qxa7 } & \text { e4 } & 27 & \mathrm{Rb} 8 \\ \text { e3 }\end{array}$ 28 fxe 3 Bg5 29 $\mathrm{Rxd} 8+\mathrm{Bxd} 8 \quad 30 \mathrm{Rd} 7$
Qb6 31 Qxb6，－ $1-0$
Round 8－5 January
Gollogly（5）－Dowden（4 $4 \frac{1}{2}$ ）
French，Tarrasch $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$（35）
Sutton（ $5 \frac{1}{2}$ ）－Carpinter（ $3 \frac{1}{2}$ ）
Pirc Defence $1-0$（30）
Turner（1）－Lynn（1古）
Vienna Gambit 1－0（20）
Lloyd（2）－Stuart（3）
Sicflian，Taimanov $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$（29）
Spiller（3）－Love（3）
Pirc Defence $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$（15）
Garbett（5）－Levene（5） Sicilian，Dragon 1－0（47）
Accurate dynamic play saw Sutton dismantle Carpinter＇s Pirc in a queen－ less middlegame（see annotated games）． Garbett scaled Levene＇s Dragon in the tournament while the best games of advantage for most of thegly held the den again escaped with a draw．
again escaped with a draw．
Lloyd gained a clear advantage versus GRBETT－LEVENE，Sicilian Dragon：

Stuart but couldn＇t find a winning plan while Turner beat lynn in a predictably fighting game．Lloyd lost his bottle， offering another quick draw－but for GARBETT－LEVENE，Sicilian Dragon 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 g6 6 Be3 $\mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{f} 3$ Nc6 8 Qd2 0－0 9 g4 Nxd4 10 Bxd4 Be6 11 Nd5 Bxd5 12 exd5 Qc7 13 g5 Nh5 14 0－0－0 Bxd4 15 Qxd4 Rfc8 16 Rd 2 Qa 517 Kbl Qc5 18 Bh3 Qxd4 19 Rxd4 Rc7 20 Rel f5 21 gxf6 Nxf6 22 Rgl Rf8 23 f 4 Kg 7


24 f5 Re5 $\times \mathrm{g} 6 \mathrm{hxg6} 26$ Rh8 27 b4 Rc3 28 Rxg6t Kf8 29 Rc7 30 h3 a6 31 Kb2 Rh5 32 Be6 Rh8 33 Rf4 Вe $\begin{array}{lll}34 \text { a3 b5 } & 35 \text { a4 }\end{array}$ Nd7 36 axb5 axb5 37 Ra3 Nb6 38 Ra6 $\mathrm{Rb} 7 \quad 39 \mathrm{~Kb} 3 \mathrm{Kd} 8 \quad 40 \mathrm{Rf} 7 \mathrm{Ke} 8 \quad 41 \mathrm{Rg} 7$ $\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { Kf8 } 8 & 42 & \mathrm{Rg} 3 & \mathrm{Ke} 8 & 43 & \mathrm{Ra} 5 & \mathrm{Nd} 7 & 44 \mathrm{Ra}+\mathrm{t}\end{array}$ Nb8 45 h 4 Kd 846 Rc 3 Rxh4 47 Rc8 mate， $1-0$ ．
TURNER－LYNN，Vienna Gambit：
1 e4 e5 2 Nc3 Nf6 3 f4 d5 4 fxe5 Nxe4 5 d3 Nxc3 6 bxc3 d4 7 Nf3 Be5 $8 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{O}_{0} 9 \mathrm{0} 0$ Nc6 10 Qel Qe7 11 Qg3 f6 12 exf6 $0 \times f 6 \quad 13 \mathrm{Ng} 5 \mathrm{dxc} 3+14$ Be3 Qe7 15 d4 Rxfl＋ 16 Rxfl Nxd4 17 Bc4＋Be6 18 Nxe6 Nxe6 19 Bxe6＋Qxe6 20 Bxc5， 1 － 0.

Love（31）

## Round 9－7 January

－Gollogly（ $5 \frac{1}{2}$ ）
Sicilian，Morra 0－1（29）
Dowden（5）
－Sutton（ $6 \frac{1}{2}$ ）
Carpinter（3 $3 \frac{1}{2}$ ）－Turner（2）
Pirc Defence $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$（27）
Lynn（11 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$
－Lloyd（2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ）
Queen＇s Pawn 1－0（37）
Levene（5）
Sicillan，Pelikan 1－0（27）
Stuart（32
Garbett（6）
Réti System $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$（16）
Sutton forged further ahead with his ixth consecutive win，his experience and superior understanding of synmetri cal king pawn openings in evidence
short draw of minor theoretical inte－ rest．Gollogly and Love，two players with numerous chicken draws to their credit，contrived to produce a fighting game；a barely recognisable Love ad－ kings his kingside pawns，leaving both kings vuln his Love anyway
Levene quickly obtained a decisive bind and won as he pleased．Lloyd 1 m － provised while Lynn attacked competent y regicter won a par in the opening but then relaxed，alth resolute play． material with resolute play
DOWDEN－SUTTON，Bishop＇s Opening 1 e4 e5 2 Bc4 Nf6 3 d3 c6 4 Nf3 Be7 5 0－0 d6 $6 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Nbd} 77 \mathrm{a} 40-0 \quad 8 \mathrm{Rel}$ Qc7 9 Ne3 a5 10 Be3 Ne5 ll Bxc5 dxc5 $12 \mathrm{Nh} 4 \mathrm{Ne} 813 \mathrm{Nf} 5 \mathrm{Bf} 6 \quad 14$ Qf3 g6 15
 Ne6 $19 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 4+20 \mathrm{Kfl}$ Bd7 21 Ne 2 b 5


22 axb5 cxb5
23 Bd5 Ra6 24 Ng 3 $a 4 \quad 25 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad \mathrm{Qg} 5 \quad 26$ Rf6 28 Nef 5 29 Nxg 7 Kxg 7 Re 29 Nxg7 Kxg7 30 Nf5＋Kf8
gxf5， $0-1$,

LOVE－GOLLOGLY，Sicilian Morra
1 e4 c5 2 d4 cxd4 3 c3 d3 4 Bxd3 Ne6


 16 fxe6 fxe6 17 Bh6 Rg8 18 g5 Nh5 19 Qf3 $0-0-0 \quad 20$ Qf 7



 （2）WMAN 负 $\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{Na} 4 & \mathrm{Qc} 7 & 28 \mathrm{Rc} \\ \mathrm{Bc} 6 & 29 & \mathrm{Recl} \text { ？}\end{array}$ Bc6 29 Recl
Qxf7， $0-1$.

LYNN－LLOYD，Queen＇s Pawn：
1 d4 Nf6 2 Nc3 c5 3 dxc5 e6 4 Bg5 Bxc5 5 e4 Qb6 6 Qd2 Bb4 7 Bxf6 gxf 6 8 Bd3 Nc6 9 a3 Be7 $10 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 11$ 14 ge $0-0-0$ Rel Ne5 13 Nxe5 fxe5 14 g 8 0 18 R 19 BL 12 Bxd7 Rd8 21 Qxd5 Oc7 22 Bf5 Rxc2＋ 23
$\mathrm{Kb} 1 \mathrm{Bf} 8 \quad 24 \mathrm{Rb} 3 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 25 \mathrm{a} 4 \mathrm{Rc} 5 \quad 26$ Qd2 Qc6 27 a5 h5 28 axb6 axb6 29 Qe2 b5 $33 \mathrm{Oa} 2 \mathrm{Ob} 7 \quad 34 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \quad 35 \mathrm{Be} 6 \mathrm{Qe} 7 \mathrm{le}$ Ra6+ 27 Qa5+, $1-0$ Ra6+ Kc7 37 Qa5+, 1 - 0.

Round 10-8 January
Gollogly ( $6 \frac{1}{2}$ ) - Levene (6)
Sicilian, Dragon 1-0 (40)
Sutton ( $7 \frac{1}{2}$ ) - Love ( $3 \frac{1}{2}$ )
Sicilian, Dragon $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (40)
Turner (21 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) - Dowden (5)
French, 2 Nc3 $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (46)
Lloyd (2立) - Carpinter (4)
Pirc Defence 1-0 (29)
Stuart (4) - Lynn (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ )
English Opening $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (69)
Garbett ( $6 \frac{1}{2}$ ) - Spiller (32
French, Tarrasch 1-0 (31)
Love slowed Sutton's progress in a sharp Dragon; Love's thematic exchange sacrifice gave equality at least.
Garbett played a new move in a similar pawn sacrifice variation to his game against Dowden in round 4, and won In a similar manner.

Gollogly, with an eye on third place, offered two early draws but Levene, needing the full point, declined and played his typical attacking chess,
only to be left with fatal weaknesses.
Animated play gave Lloyd his first win - though by no means his first won position - against a tiring Carpinter. Dowden lost a pawn and was struggling throughout but the coup de grace eluded Turner. Lynn's sensible half emerged to draw with Stuart, though both sides had better chances in an interesting knight endgame.
TURNER - DOWDEN, French Defence:
1 e4 e6 2 Nc3 b6 3 d4 Bb7 4 Bd3 Bb4

 $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { Qh5 Qe8 } & 13 & \text { Qxe8+ Kxe8 } & 14 & \text { f3 } 3 & \mathrm{Ng} 5 & 15 \\ \text { Nxd5 } & \mathrm{Nh} 3+\quad 16 & \mathrm{gxh} 3 & \text { exd5 } & 17 & \text { a3 } & \mathrm{Be} 7 & 18\end{array}$




 | 28 h 4 | 32 | Nxh 4 | $\mathrm{Rxg} 2+$ | 33 Kg 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| gx | Na 6 | 34 |  |  | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { gxh4 } & 32 & \text { Nxh4 } & \text { Rxg2+ } & 33 & \text { Kxg2 } & \text { Na6 } \\ \text { Ng6 } & \text { Nc } 7 & 35 & 34 \\ \text { Bxh6 } & \text { Nxe6 } & 36 & \text { c3 } & \text { Rg8 } & 37\end{array}$ $\mathrm{Kh} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 838 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Ng} 5+39 \mathrm{Bxg} 5+\mathrm{Kxg} 540$ Ne7 Rh8 41 Nxc6 Rxh5+ $42 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rh} 2+\quad 43$ $\mathrm{Kf} 1 \mathrm{Rh} 1+44 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rh} 2+45 \mathrm{Kfl} \mathrm{Rhl}+46$ $\mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rh} 2+, \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$.

With one round to go the top three had sorted themselves out: Sutton 8; Garbett \& Gollogly 71/2. With no need to ${ }_{71}$ lok over their shoulders, the pair on $7 \frac{1}{2}$ could go for a win singlemindedy. the only question was what would happen in the game Leven

$$
\text { Round } 11-9 \text { January }
$$

Spiller (3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) - Gollogly (71 ${ }^{\left.\frac{1}{2}\right)}$
Sicilian, Closed 0-1 (68)
Levene (6) - Sutton (8)
Giuoco Piano 1-0 (66)
Love (4) - Turner (3)
Pirc Defence 1-0 (66)
Dowden ( $5 \frac{1}{2}$ ) - Lloyd ( $3 \frac{1}{2}$ )
English Defence $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (68)
Carpinter (4) - Stuart (4 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2} \text { ) }}$
English, Symmetrical $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ (13)
Lynn (3) - Garbett (7 $\frac{1}{2}$ )
Blackmar-Diemer Gambit 0-1 (21)
The last round did Indeed see a real fight on most boards. Only Carpinter and Stuart resisted the urge.

Sutton played somewhat overambitiously though, as he said afterwards, who could resist winning rook and three pawns for two minor pieces? Probably he held the advantage at that point but Levene's pieces gradually became more active and Sutton eventual y lost after several mistakes (see annotated games).

Garbett made very short work of Lynn's Blackmar-Diemer to make sure of at least equal second very early in the session. Meanwhile Gollogly, playing the black side of a Closed Sicilian, was pleasantly surprised when Spiller sacrificed a pawn for nebulous compensation. Gollogly was winning comfortably when he blundered the exchange in time trouble but he soon picked up two more pawns for a technical, although protracted, win.

Dowden-Lloyd was always closely fought with the former trying his utmost to squeeze out a win but missing at least one winning chance in a knight ending.

Love won the exchange after some early complications and painstakingly broke down Turner's stern resistance over the next forty-odd moves.
SPILLER - GOLLOGLY, Closed Sicilian: l e4 c5 $2 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 64 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{~g} 6$

5 d3 Bg7 6 f4 e6 7 Nf3 Nge7 8 0-0 $0-0 \quad 9 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Nd} 4 \quad 10 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 11 \mathrm{Ne} 2$

 $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Nc8 } & 21 & \mathrm{~b} 6 & \text { Qxb6 } & 22 & \mathrm{Nf} 5 & \text { Qc7 } \\ 23 & 23 & \mathrm{Nxg} 7\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Kxg7 } & 24 & \text { Qalt e5 } & 25 & \mathrm{Ra} 5 & \mathrm{f} 6 \\ 26 & 26 & \mathrm{f} 5 \mathrm{Ne} 7\end{array}$
 Rbal Rxa5 31 Rxa5 d5 32 Ral dxe4 33 dxe4 Qd3 34 Qcl Bxe4? (34...Ra8 should be decisive) 35 Bh6 $\mathrm{Kf7} 36$ Bxf8 Kxf8 37 Oh6 + Ke8 38 Ra8+ Kd7 39 Bxe4 Kxe 40 Qf8?! (First exchanging pawns by 40 fxg6 gave better drawing chances) 40 Qxg4+ $41 \mathrm{Kfl} \mathrm{Qxf5+} 42 \mathrm{Kel}$ (with 40 ..
 be winning but his exposed king will cause some tec
cal problems)
42...Qbl+ 43 Kd2 Qb2+ 44 Kel $\begin{array}{lll}\mathrm{e} 4 & 45 & \mathrm{Rd} 8+\mathrm{Ke} 6\end{array}$ Rd8+ Kc7 50 Qe8 f5 $48 \mathrm{Qg} 8+\mathrm{Kd7} \quad 49 \mathrm{Rd} 8+\mathrm{Kc7} 50$ Qe8 54 Na R7 Nc6 52 Qe6 f4 53 Qf6 Qc4 54 Kdl Qb3+ 55 Kcl Qa3+ 56 Kdl Qb3+ Qa3+ Qb4 6158 Kdl e3 $59 \mathrm{Qb} 2+\mathrm{Kc} 560$ Rf6+ Kc5 64 Qa2 Kb6 62 Rf7 Nd4 63 Rxf4 e2+ 67 Kel Kd3+ 68 Qa2+ Kc3 66 Kxf4 e2+ 67 Kel Kd3+ $68 \mathrm{Kf2}$ elQ+,
0-1.
LOVE - TURNER, Pirc Defence:
$1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 2 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 4 \mathrm{e} 4 \mathrm{~d} 6$ 5 Nc3 0-0 6 Nge2 e5 7 0-0 Nc6 8 dxe5 dxe5 9 Bg 5 Be6 $10 \mathrm{Nd} 5 \mathrm{Nb} 8 \mathrm{I} 1 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Bxd5}$ 12 fxe5 Bc4 13 exf6 Qxdl 14 Rfxdl Bxe2 15 fxg7 Kxg7 16 Rd2 Bg4 17 e5 Nd7 18 Rfl Kg8 19 Bh6 Rfd8 20 h 3 Be6 21 Rfdl c6 22 Bg5 Kf8 23 Bxd8 Rxd8 24 a4 Ke7 25 a5 a6 26 Rd4 Rb8 27 Re Rg8 28 Kh2 Re8 29 h4 Rd8 30 Red1 Rb8 31 Rel Rd8 32 Kg 1 Rf 833 Bfl Rd 834 Rf4 Re8 35 Bc4 Bxc4 36 Rxc4 Ke6 37 Rb4 Nc5 38 Rd4 Nd7 39 Rd6+ $\mathrm{Ke} 7 \quad 40$ $\mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rf} 8 \quad 41 \mathrm{Rd} 4 \mathrm{Ke} 642 \mathrm{Rb} 4 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \quad 43 \mathrm{~g} 4$ h6 44 Kg 3 g 545 hxg 5 hxg 546 Rbe 4 Re8 47 R 4 e 3 Re 748 Rle 2 Re 849 Rb 3
 53 b5 Ra8 54 b6 Rc8 55 Re1 Rb8 56 Rd1 Nxe5 57 Rd5 f6 58 Rxc5 Kd6 59 Rc7 Nc6 60 Rf3 Ke6 61 Re3+ Kd6 62 Rd3+ Ke6 63 Rd5 Ne5 64 Rd1 Nc6 65 c5 Nxa5 66 Rd6+, 1 - 0.

Thus, after a really dramatic last round, we have two New Zealand champions, both from the North Shore club.

For Paul Garbett it was a real rags-toriches saga while David Gollogly's success must rank as the greatest upset Hace in 1961/62 of outsider Graham determinedly and did not played very start affect ais did not let his poor he beat all three of his high the way opponents Gollof his highest rated standing result deat stand the have been happy with roun he would He got away to a terrific start was always more the draws (even in better those he regarded as his most dangerous opponents; three of them spurned his draw offers only to go on to Gollogly went through as the only feated player All those draw offers however, tend to obscure the fact that his play was very good indeed and that he earned his share of first plat merit.

The hard luck story of the tournament obviously belongs to Richard Suton. His play was far from convincing in the first three rounds but then came a great streak of six wins which took him to a one point lead with but two ounds to play. Sutton did not expect hings to be easy over those last two rounds and deserves much credit for coming out fighting in the final round when a draw would have sufficed for at least a share of the title - a success which would have been fully deserved fer his excellent play in the middle the tournament.
Mark Levene looked to be in a fine challenging position at the midway point but, with his hardest games still come, he was unable to maintain the解 hile he beat Stuart and Sutton from probably lost positions, he scored several fine wins as well. Tony Dowden completed the list of prize winners; he handicapped himself in several games by playing obviously unprepared openings for which he often suffered for much of the game. Indeed he was arguably lost at one point in as many as eight games; that so many failed to nail him is a tribute to Tony's defensive resolve

Stuart's opening preparation was also inadequate and after his third round loss to Levene he lost interest to some extent and was disappointed with his modest total, a feeling doubt-

| Gollogly D A | North Shore |
| :--- | :--- |
| Garbett P A | North Shore |
| Sutton R J | Otago |
| Levene M | North Shore |
| Dowden R A | Otago |
| Stuart P W | North Shore |
| Love A J | Otago |
| Carpinter B A | Civic |
| Lloyd A J S | Canterbury |
| Spiller P S | Howick-Fakuranga |
| Lynn K W | Hamilton |
| Turner G M | Howick-Fakuranga |

In the final analysis the players finished very closely in order of their pre-tournament ratings with the glaring exception of Gollogly.
Perhaps there were a few more short draws than usual but the overall draw percentage of $45.5 \%$ was lower than in either of the last two championships. It would be natural, however, to expect ewer draws in a fren such as playing strengths

White won 21 games, Black 15 , and 30 re drawn. White's overall result was $54.5 \%$, a very normal margin over Black With many short victories, nobody worked terribly hard for his points; in fact nobody averaged as many as 40 moves per game. Tony Dowden came closest at 39.18. At the other extreme Bernard Carpinter was 'laziest' with just 278 moves at an average of 25.27 per game.

As far as openings were concerned, open or semi-open games were far more popular than closed openings. There were 46 KP openings ( $+18-7=21,62 \cdot 0 \%$ ), 11 QP openings ( $+2-5=4,36 \cdot 4 \%$ ) and 11 QP openings $(+2-5=4,36.4 \%)$
flank openings $(+1-3=5,38.9 \%)$.

Easily the single most popular debut was the Sicilian Defence, played no less than 18 times for $+6-4=8$. Amon the other semi-open games the Pirc Defence, played 8 times, scored $+3-1=4$ while the French Defence, played 7 times, scored $+3-0=4$ for White. The return for Black was even more meagre from the 9 symmetrical KP openings: +6 $-1=2$ for White. Thus the Sicilian was not only most popular with Black - it was also the most successful by a fair margin

The only other opening played more

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| $\times$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $8 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 0 | $\times$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | $8 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | X | 0 | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | X | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | X | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 6 |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | X | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 5 |
| 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}$ | X | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{2}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\times$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\times$ | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 4 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | x | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\times$ | 0 | 3 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | X | 3 |

than twice was the English which returned the comparatively poor figures of $+1-2=4$ for white - but this migh have been because of the players concerned in the opening!

Although we are loath to mention it, there was one other social event during there was one other social event during the Couth it or hot south fiold a the North Islanders had to lend their hosts four or five players! With a scoreline of $2-0$ to players! with a score the first spel1, a North Midway through the first spell, rout disputed goals (jerseys don't make the best goals!) allowed the South Island to sneak ahead 3-2 by the final Island to sneak ahead 3-2 by the final whistle. South Island stars were Watts (a fit big bugger!), David Bell(!) and Paul Garbett(!). Glenn Turner (in and Paul Garbett(). Glenn Turner (he pick of the North team. It is reported that the North team for next Congress will start training in February.

## THE A.G.M.

The Association's Annual General Meeting was held on 6th January 1983. The following officers were elected: President - P.W.Stuart; Vice-President - M.G.Whaley; Secretary - R.E.Gibbons; Treasurer - R.G.Stee1; Councillors P.B.Goffin, W.Leonhardt, P.O.Paris (Otago) \& B.M.Winsor.

There were several remits but all failed to gain the necessary majority.


Abbreviations: $A=$ Auckland, $C=$ Canterbury, Civ = Civic, $H P=$ Howick-Pakuranga, Tim $=$ Timaru, Twa $=$ Tawa, Wai $=$ Nouth, NS $=$ North Shore, $0=$ Otago, Pen $=$ Pencarrow

A rather meagre field of 46 players A rather meagre field of Rese the $1982 / 83$ Premier Reserve entered the $1982 / 83$ Premier Reserve
Championship．Although there was a reasonable representation from the North Island，very few Nelson or Canter－ bury players came．A dearth of＇name＇ players in the 1800－2000 bracket meant that it was going to be a very weak Reserve．

The top four seeds David Weegenaar， Greg Aldridge，Bruce Marsick \＆Anthony Ker were the only players rated over 1800．It lad appeared that Tony Love would run away with the tournament or perhaps even be excluded due to his rating being too high but the with－ drawal of Graham Haase from the Cham－ pionship precluded this，perhaps un－ fortunate，possibility．In the event it seemed that Weegenaar or All－ Wellington Champion Ker could easily tear the field apart－given a good start．

Actually，this is what happened， except Weegenaar then nosedived with a couple of losses and Ker was becalmed in the drawing doldrums．

Ben Alexander，creeping along with several draws，then beat Weegenaar and Mike White and was suddenly the leader． White reacted bady to this his first loss and only scored another half point from the remaining three rounds．

After eight rounds the leaders were Alexander 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ；White，A．Ker $\&$ Peter Cribbett 6．In round nine Alexander drew with A．Ker，Cribbett beat White and Weegenaar joined the leaders when young Charles Ker ran out of material to sacrifice．

In the tenth round Cribbett drew with Alexander while A．Ker beat Marsick Weegenaar drew with G．Aldridge but only after forcing Aldridge to play on for several pointless hours in a very simple bishop and pawn ending with level material that was totally drawn．Martin Sims came into prominence with his win over Chris Bell．The leading scores going into the last round were：A．Ker Alexander \＆Cribbett 71／2；Weegenaar \＆ Sims 7

Round 11 saw Ker beat Sims，Alexander Round 11 saw Ker beat Sims，Alexand
beat Malcolm Foord and Weegenaar beat Aandahl while Cribbett drew with Greg Aldridge．

Thus Anthony Ker and Ben Alexander shared first place，a half point ahead
of Cribbett and Weegenaar．Ker will qualify for next year＇s Championship by virtue of his higher tie－break score． His patient positional style will net him some points but he needs to learn to force the pace a lictle more．Ben Alexander was perhaps a little sur－ prised to find himself leading at various points and must be an excellent prospect for the future；he showed an extensive knowledge of opening theory and was severe on people who tried to beat him．

There were rather too many draws in this tournament，especially between some of the younger players，but naybe this was a good energy saving tactic because the＇old school＇of Marsick， Foord and Julius Bojtor never seriously challenged their younger rivals．

The New Zealand Women＇s Championship was unfortunately cancelled due to an extreme lack of entries．Katrine Metge and Liz Allen were the only women play－ ing in the Premier Reserve．It seems that women in New Zealand must create their own organisational body，perhaps along the lines of the Australian Women＇s Chess League，to make much future progress．

Metge played exciting and uncompro－ mising chess，showing that she would have been more than useful in the recent Women＇s Olympiad team had she been available．She won her clash with Allen as well as giving many of her victors nasty frights．＂She＇s a crazy man＂，I heard one of them nutter！

Charles Ker from Pencarrow played razor sharp chess of the variety that all young players should play in order to improve．Big brother Anthony will have to remember to look over his shoulder in the future．

The tournament was directed by John Harraway who did an absolutely splendid job，not only in his D．O．P．capacity， but also as＇babysitter＇to all th people staying at Selwyn College．
On the grade prize front Alan Ald ridge（1382）＇stole＇the under－ 1550 prize with $6_{2} / 11$ while B．Connor，A． Jordan，K．Boyd and D．Wats crossed to－ gether in second place．In the under luo grade M．Wilson was Brow d c．Mer cam ser hower， commiserations to ker who had $5 \frac{1}{2} / 8$ but lost

We follow with a selection of the most interesting games．

CONNOR－A．KER，Pirc Defence：
l e4 d6 $2 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Nbd} 7$ 5 Qd2 c6 6 0－0－0 Qa5 7 Nf3 b5 8 e5 b4 9 exf6 bxc3 10 Qxc3 Qxc3 11 bxc 3 Nxf6 12 Bxf6 exf6 13 d5 Bh6＋ 14 Kb Rb8＋ 15 Kal c5 $16 \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 17$ Rhel＋ $\mathrm{Kd} 818 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{f} 519 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \mathrm{Na}^{2} \mathrm{Rd} 3 \mathrm{~N}$ 21 NaS Re8 22 Rxe8＋Kxe8 23 bb3 Brs

 g4 31 Rxb8 Kxb8 32 Be8 Bxb2 33 Kxb g3 $34 \mathrm{hxg} 3 \mathrm{f3}, 0-1$
A．KER－BOJTOR，Scotch Game：
1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 d 4 exd4 4 Bc 4 Bc5 $50-0$ Nge7 6 c3 d3 7 b4 Bb6 8 Qb3 f6 9 a4 a6 10 Be3 Bxe3 11 fxe3 Ng6 $12 \mathrm{Bf} 7+\mathrm{Ke} 713$ Bxg6 hxg6 14 e5 Qg8 15 c 4 Qe6 16 exf6＋gxf6 17 Nc 3 Kd8 18 Nd5 Ne7 19 Nd4 Qe5 20 Nf3 Qd6 21 Nf4 g5 22 c5 Qc6 23 Nxd3 Qe6 24 Qxe6 dxe6 25 Radl Ke8 26 Nd2 Ng8 27 Ne4 Ke7 28 c6 b6 29 a5 Rh4 30 Ndf2 e5 31 g3 Rh6 32 Nc3 Be6 33 Nd5＋Bxd 34 Rxd5 Ké 35 Rd7 Rc8 36 Rfdl Ne7 37 axb6 Nxc6 38 b7 Rb8 39 Rxc7 Nxb4 40 Rd8 Rh8 41 Rxh8， 1 － 0.
WEEGENAAR－ALEXANDER，Sicilian Pelican： 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 e5 6 Ndb 5 d $6 \quad 7$ Bg5 a6
 Na3 Be6 9 Ne4 Rc8 10 Nas Bxas 14



16 Bxb5＋axb 17 Qxb5＋Ke6 18 Rd1 Nxc $2+19 \mathrm{Kfl}$ Nd4 20 Qd5＋Ke7 21 Rxd 4 exd4 22 e5 Ixe5 23 Qxe5＋Kd 24 Qxd4 Rcl＋ 25 $\begin{array}{cccc}\text { Re2 } 24 & \mathrm{Rc} 2+ & 26 & \mathrm{Kf} 3 \\ \text { Qa4＋Kxd6 }\end{array}$ 28 Qa6＋Ke7 29
Rel＋Kf8 30 Qxh6＋Kg8 31 Re5 f6 32 Re8＋Qxe8 33 Qxd2 Qa8＋ $34 \mathrm{Kg}^{2}$ Qxa2 $35 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 36 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \quad 37 \mathrm{~h} 6+\mathrm{Kh} 8$ ， $0-1$. WEEGENAAR－A．KER，Pirc Defence： 1 e4 d6 2 d4 Nf6 3 Nc3 g6 $4 \mathrm{f4} \mathrm{Bg} 7$
 Bxb5 9 exf7＋Kd7 10 Nxb5 $\mathrm{Qa5}+11 \mathrm{Nc} 3$ cxd4 12 Nxd4 Bxd4 13 Qxd4 Nc6 14 Qc4 Qb6 15 Ne4 Qb4t 16 Qxb4 Nxb4 17 Kd 2 Rac8 18 c3 $\mathrm{Nd} 5 \quad 19 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Rhf} 8 \quad 20 \mathrm{~h} 3$ Ngf6 21 Ng 5 h 622 Nf 3 Rxf7 23 Rdl e6 24 Be3 Nh5 25 Bxa7 Nhxf4＋ 26 Kf2 Ke7 27 Rd2 b6 28 g3 Nh5 29 Re1 Rcf8 30 Rd3 Kf6 31 c4 Rxa7 32 cxd5 e5 33 Rb 3 Kg7 34 Rxb6 Raf7 35 Rb 3 Nf 636 Kg 2 Nxd5 37 Rdl $\mathrm{Ne} 738 \mathrm{Rxd6}$ e4 39 Nd 2
$\operatorname{Rf} 2+40 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Re} 2, \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$.
CRIBBETT－WEEGENAAR，Queen＇s Indian： 1 Nf3 e6 2 c4 Nf6 $3 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 7$ 5 0－0 Be7 6 Nc3 c5 7 d4 cxd4 8 Nxd4 Bxg2 9 Kxg2 0－0 10 b3 d6 11 Bb 2 Qc7 $12 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Qb} 7+\quad 13 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Nbd} 7 \quad 14 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \mathrm{Nc} 5 \quad 15$ Qc2 Rac8 16 Qbl Nfe4 17 Nxe4 Nxe4 18 Qal Bg5 19 Rcdl Qe7 20 Nf 3 Bh 621 e 3 f5 22 Nel Qg 523 Ba 3 Rcd 824 Qb 2 Rf 25 Rg 1 Qh5 26 Rd4 e5 27 Rd5 Rg6 28 b4 Bg5 29 Kg 2 Bxe3， $0-1$
FOORD－WHITE，Queen＇s Indian：
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 4 e3 Bb7

 12 cxd4 Nc6 $130-0$ Rc $8 \quad 14$ Qe2 Qd7 15 Rad1 Rfd8 16 d5 exd5 17 exd5 Na5 18 Ne5 Qd6

| 首显 曾 | 19 Bxh7＋Kf8 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 Bf5 Rc7 21 Nxf7 |
| ＋ | Kxf7 22 Qh5＋Kf8 |
| 1 会 2 | 23 Qh8＋Kf7 24 |
|  | Bf8 $26 \mathrm{Rfel}+\mathrm{Re} 7$ |
| Q | 27 Qh5t，1－0． |
|  |  |
| 答令晋 |  |

WATTS－K．METGE，Albin Counter Gambit： 1 d4 d5 2 c4 e5 3 dxe5 d4 4 Nf3 Nc6 $5 \mathrm{Nbd} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 4 \quad 6$ a3 Qe7 7 g 3 0－0－0 $8 \quad 8 \mathrm{Bg} 2$ 13 9 0－0 h5 10 exd3 Rxd3 11 Qa4 Rd8 12 Ne4 Bxf3 13 Bxf3 Nxe5 14 Bg 2 Kb 8 15 Be3 a6 16 Nc5 c6 17 Radl Nf6 18 Rxd8＋Qxd8 19 Rd1 Qc7 20 Nxa6＋bxa6 21 Qxa6 Be7 22 f4 Neg4 23 Bxc6 Qxc6， － 0 ．
STEPHENSON－McINTOSH，King＇s Gambit： 1 e4 e5 2 f4 exf4 3 Nf3 g 54 h 4 g 4 5 Ne5 Nf6 6 Nc3 d6 7 Nd3 Nh5 8 b3 Be7 $9 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Bxh} 4+10 \mathrm{Nf} 2 \mathrm{Ng} 3 \mathrm{ll} \mathrm{Rg} 1 \mathrm{~h} 5$ 12 d 3 Qf6 13 Bb 2 Qd4 14 Qd2 Qxf2＋ 15 Kxf2 Nxe4＋， $0-1$.
A．KER－B．FREEMAN，Pirc Defence：
1 e4 d6 2 d4 Nf6 3 Ne3 g6 4 Bg5 Nbd7 5 f4 h6 6 Bh4 Nh5 7 Nge2 Nxf4？？ 8 Nxf4 g5 9 Ne6！，l－0．
A．KER－ALEXANDER，Max Lange Attack： e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 d4 exd4 4 Bc4 Nf6 $50-0$ Bc5 6 e5 Ng4 7 Bf4 0－0 8 h3 Nh6 9 Bxh6 gxh6 10 c3 d6 11 cxd4 Bb6 $12 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Bf} 5 \quad 13 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 6 \quad 14 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{~h} 5$ 15 g 5 Qd7 16 Nd 5 Qg4＋ $17 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Kh} 8 \quad 18$ Rg1 Qe4 19 Rel Qg4 20 Rg 1 Qe4 21 Re Qg $422 \mathrm{Rg} 1, \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ ．

International Ratings, 1 January


## OVERSEAS NEWS

Naturally the 0lympiads in Lucerne dominated the chess scene towards the end of 1982 but we neglected to report in the last issue on two strong events held shortly before the Olympiads.

The first TV WORLD CUP, played September in HAMBURG was won in a special tie-break session by World Champion Anatoly Karpov.
There were two preliminary groups of four players, scores as follows. First preliminary group: Karpov (USR) $4 \frac{1}{2} / 6$, Nunn (ENG) $3 \frac{1}{2}$, Seirawan (USA) \& Bouaziz (TUN) 2. Second preliminary group: Spassky (USR) 51/2, Timman (NL) 3, Lobron (BRD) 2, Torre (PHI) 1 $1 \frac{1}{2}$.

Thus Karpov and Spassky met in a two game final, the former winning the first game while Spassky employed the King's Gambit to take the second; so, $1: 1$. A second two game play-off, with each player having only 15 minutes for each game, was won by Karpov $1 \frac{1}{2}$ : $\frac{1}{2}$.

The 6th Interpolis tournament (September/ October) in TILBURG had an al1-GM cast of category 14 (2599 average rating) :

123456789012
1 Karpov USR $\times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 11 \frac{1}{2} 110 \frac{1}{2} 11111$
2 Timman $N L \quad \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 111117$
3 Andersson $S W E \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 11 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 116 \frac{1}{2}$

5 Petrosian USR $0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1 \times 1 \times \frac{1}{2} 00111 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$





12 Larsen DEN $000001 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 11001 \frac{1}{2} 0 \mathrm{x} \quad 2 \frac{1}{2}$
Karpov won his first three games (against Hübner, Petrosian \& Torre) but then blundered in a winning position to Portisch. By the end of round six the World Champion led by a full point and he was never in danger of losing his lead although inman, in a form有 some bad resuls in 1o8,號 and
 The
The winner and runner-up each played one
KARPOV - HUBNER, Caro-Kann Defence:
1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd2 dxe4 4 Nxe4 Bf5 5

Ng3 Bg6 6 h4 h6 7 Nf3 Nd7 8 h5 Bh7 9 Bd3 Bxd3 10 Oxd3 Ngf6 11
 $14 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 15 \mathrm{~d} 5$ Nxe5 16 Bxe5 Ng4 $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}14 \mathrm{C} 4 & \mathrm{C} 5 & 15 & \mathrm{dS} \\ 17 \mathrm{Bxg} 7 \mathrm{Kxg} 7 & 18 & \mathrm{Qe} 2 & \mathrm{Bg} 5+\quad 19 \mathrm{Kbl}\end{array}$
 $\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{Nf} 6 & 20 & \mathrm{dxe6} \\ \mathrm{Rde} \\ \mathrm{Qg} 4 & 23 \mathrm{Qe5} \mathrm{Kg} 8 & 24 \mathrm{Rel} & \mathrm{Na} 7\end{array}$


25 Rxd7! Qxd7 26 Nf5 f6 27 Qd5+ Qxd5 28 cxd5 Bf4 29 g 3 Bc $30 \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{~b} 5 \quad 31$ Nxh6+ Kh7 32 Nf Rg 833 d 6 Ba 534 Re 6 Rg 5 Rxf6 Rxh5 36 d7 Rh2 37 Ne 3 $1-0$.

TIMMAN - TORRE, Ruy Lopez: 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4
 Bb3 d6 8 c3 $0-0 \quad 9 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Na} 510$ Bc2 c5 11 d4 Qc7 12 Nbd 2 cxd4 13 cxd4 Nc6 14 a3 Bd7 15 Nb3 a5 16 d5 Nb8 17 Bd2 a4 18 Nc 1 Rc 8 19 Bc 3 Na 620 Nd 3 Bd 821 Rc 1 Qa7 22 Qd2 Bb6 $23 \operatorname{Re} 2 \operatorname{Rc} 4$


24 Ndxe5! dxe5 25 Nxe5 Rcc8 26 Nc6 Bxc6 27 Bxf6 gxf6 28 e5! f5 (Timman later maintained that 28 Timman later maintained that of holding; after the text he is of holding; after the text he is
 $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Qh6+ } & \text { Ke8 } & 31 & \text { dxc6 } & \text { Nc5 } & 32 \text { Bxf5 } \\ \text { Ne6 } & 33 & \text { Bxe6 fxe6 } & 34 & \mathrm{c} 7 \text { Rxc7 } & 35\end{array}$
 Qb6 $38 \mathrm{Rf} 4+\mathrm{Kg} 739 \mathrm{Qe} 7+\mathrm{Kh} 840$ Rf8 +1 , 0 .

## The Quick and the Dead

by the Editor

As in every previous Olympiad, that in Lucerne last November produced a host of short games ranging from the sublime to the ridiculous.

Starting with the ridiculous, we give a selection of these brevities where retribution for error follows swiftly indeed.
GUTMAN - AZZOPARDI, Irregular Opening: Nf3 b6 $2 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 7 \quad 3 \mathrm{Bg} 2$ e5 4 0-0 d6 5 d 4 exd4 $6 \mathrm{Nxd4}$ Bxg2 7 Kxg 2 Qd 78 Qd3 Ne7 9.Nc3 Nbc6 10 e4 g6 11 Nxc6 Nxc6 12 Nd5 $0-0-0$ ?? (Allowing a simple combination winning a piece; after $12 .$. Bg 7 White would have a clear advantage but no forced win) 13 Qc3 Be7
14 Qxc6!, 1 - 0 .

CHIBURDANIDZE - SLAVOTINEK, Sicilian:
 Nc6 $5 \mathrm{Nb} 5 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{Nlc} 3 \mathrm{a} 6 \quad 8$ Na3 Be7 $9 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{O}_{0} 0 \quad 10$ 0-0 Qc7?! (It is not yet clear that c7 is the best square for the queen; 10...b6 is normal 11 Be3 b6 12 Rcl Bb7


13 Nd5!? (A
 tion in the EngWhite or Sicilian, hite utilises the atent pin on the -file) 13...exds 14 cxd Nxe4 15 c5?? 16 Qe
Black forgot that her opponet hat already regained the piece! Instead 16 ...Rfcg puts the onus back on white to prove her pawn sacrifice sound) 17 b4 Th:
This game was from the round one USSR v Australia match, yet Anne Slavotinek was described as a New Zealander in the round one bulletin - as if $0-4$ wasn't enough!

In the following games the losers' mistakes are less perceptible although the finales are no less devastating. The next two games came from the Neth erlands ${ }^{\prime} 3 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ victory over Austria
HOLZL - TIMMAN, Eng lish:
 d d4 c5 6 d5 b5!? 7 b3? (White careBessly opens the long diagonal for the

0-0) $7 \ldots$ bxc4 8 bxc4 Nxd5! 9 cxd5? (9 Ne5! at least confines the deficit to a pawn) 9...Bg7 10 Qd2 Bxal $110-0$ Qb6 $12 \mathrm{Na} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 13$ e $4 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 14 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Ba} 6$ 15 Rel Nd 716 h5 Qb4 17 Qf4 Ne5, - 1

VAN DER WIEL - DANNER, Sicilian Najdorf 1 e4 c5 $2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{cxd} 4 \quad 4 \mathrm{Nxd} 4$ Nf6 $5 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{a} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Nbd} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Ob} 6$ Qd2 Qxb2 9 Rbl Qa3 $10 \mathrm{Bxf6} 4 \mathrm{Qb} 11$ Nd5 Rb8 $12 \mathrm{Rb} 3 \mathrm{Qxa} 213 \mathrm{Qb} 4 \mathrm{a} 5 \quad 14 \mathrm{Qc}$ e6
 Qxb8 Kd8 (Black now gets mated) 18 Bxd7
Kxd7
19 Rxb7+1,

If the offensive weapon was a bludgeon in the last two games, then Swedish M Ulf Andersson uses a rapier against is Malaysian opponent in the next:
ANDERSSON - LIEW, Symmetrical English: 1 Nf3 Nf6 2 c 4 c5 3 g 3 Nc 64 Bg 2 d 5 5 cxd5 Nxd5 6 d4 Nc 77 Be3!? g6 8 Ne3 Bg7 9 dxe5 Qxdl+ 10 Rxd1 Bxe3+ 11 bxc3 $0-0 \quad 12 \mathrm{Nd} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 13 \quad 0-0$ Rfd8 14 Rb 1 e 5

(This seems
safe enough but Andersson has seen move further and refutes the text neatly. Necessary was 14...Rabs though Black's prospects remain unpleasant) 15 Rxb7!! exd4 16 Rxc7 dxe3 17 Rxd7 (The point which Liew overlooked - another victory for the Bg2!) 17...Rxd7 18 Bxc6 Rad 19 Bxd7 Rxd7 20 Rbl Rc 721 Rb5 Kg7 22 f4, 1-0

The Chinese player Liu perpetrated a fine swindle in this game:
GHEORGHIU - LIU, Modern Benoni:
d4 Nf6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 Nc 3 exd5

5 cxd5 d6 $6 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Nbd7} 8$ e4 $\mathrm{Bg} 79 \mathrm{Be} 20-0 \quad 100-0 \mathrm{Re} 8 \quad 11 \mathrm{a4} \mathrm{Ne} 5$ 12 Rel a6 $13 \mathrm{f4}$ Neg4 $14 \mathrm{Bf3} \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 15$ Nc4 Nxe4!? 16 Rxe4 Bd4+ 17 Rxd4 cxd4 18 Neff 4 f5 22 Nf2 d3 23 Qxd3 h4


24 Qxf5?? (With two bishops for rook white was winning quite comfortably but the Rumanian GM had overlooked a stunning reply. Simply 24 Bad was best) 24...Qgl+!, 0 - 1.

Even the Queen's Indian, long regarded as ultra drawish, produces exciting chess these days; here is one rief example:
CHRISTIANSEN - LIGTERINK, Queen's Indian: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 4 e3 Ba6
 9 e5 Ne4 10 Bd3 Nxc3 Nc3 c6 8 e4 d5
 Redl Qe7? (Even after the better 15 Nd7 White has the advantage)


16 b4! d4 (On 16...Bxb4 17 Bxb4 Qxb4 White has the standard mating combination starting with 18 Bxh7+, e.g. 18...Kxh7 19 $\mathrm{Ng} 5+\mathrm{Kg} 620 \mathrm{Rd} 4$ etc) 17 Bd 2 Nd 7 (Tantamount to resignation but 17...Bxb4 loses as before) 18 bxc5 Bxf3 19 Qxf3 Nxe5 20 Bxh7+ 1-0.

While it was no upset that the USSR eat England in round nine, the margin was somewhat surprising - 31 $: \frac{1}{2}$ ! The Soviets were ruthless with the white

## pieces:

KASPAROV - NUNN, Modern Benoni
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nc3 c5 4 d5 exd5 5 cxd5 d6 6 e4 g6 $7 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 8 \mathrm{Bb} 5+$ Nfa7 9 a4 Na6 10 Nf3 $\mathrm{Nb} 4 \quad 110-0$ a6 12 Bxd7+ Bxd7 13 f5! 0-0 14 Bg 5 f 6 5 Bf4 gxf5? (Black's opening has not been successful but the end comes quickly after this; better was 15...ec7) 16 Bxd6 Bxa4 17 Rxa4 Qxd6 18 Nh4! fxe4 19 Nf5 Qd7 20 Nxe4 Kh8 (20...b6 was the last chance for resistance) 21 Nxc5, - 0 (Black loses the exchange after 21...Qxd5 22 Qxd5 Nxd5 23 Ne ).

BELJAVSKY - STEAN, Sicilian Najdorf: 1 e4 c5 $2 \mathrm{Nf3}$ d6 3 d4 cxd4 $4 \mathrm{Nxd4}$ Ne6 $5 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{ab} 6 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{eb}^{7} \mathrm{I4} \mathrm{Qb} 68$ Qound Bel javsky won against pinter's round Beljavsky won against pinter's 9 …ㄷ. 13 Brf6 14 Rabl 0315 dxc5 13 Bxi6 gxf6 14 Rabl Qa3 15 Ke7 17 Rfal Mate is is unavoidable).

Now for a New Zealand example
DOWDEN - RAMON-FORTUNE, Sicilian 2 c 3 . 1 e4 c5 2 c 3 b6 3 d4 Bb7 4 Bd3 e6 5 Nf3 Nf6 6 Nbd2 d5 7 e5 Nfd7 8 Qe2 Nc6 9 a3 c4 10 Bc2 $0 \mathrm{Qc} 7 \quad 11 \mathrm{Ng} 5 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 12$ Qf3 Nd8 13 Qg4 Bg7 14 Ndf3 $0-0$ (Setting the stage for a vicious attack) 15 Bf4 Re8


16 Nxh7!? Kxh7 16 Nxh7!? Kx 0-0-0 Nf8 (Black brings up what reinforcements can - but atL of the white pieces can participate in the attack) 19 h 5 Kg8 $20 \mathrm{~h} 6 \mathrm{Bf6} 21$ 22 exf6 Qd7 23 Ne5 Qe8 24 7+! Rxh7 22 exi6 (Qd 23 NeS Qe8 24 hopeless ( 24 . Nxh 25 Oh4 Kh8 26


We wind up with a typical sacrificial attack on the king:
MILES - BROWNE, Queen's Gambit
1 Nf3 c5 2 c4 Nf6 3 Nc3 e6 4 e3 Nc6
 9 Bb2 0-0 10 Rcl d4 11 exd4 Nxd4 12 c5 Nxf5 + 13 Qxf3 Bd7 14 Bd3 Bc6 15 Ne4 Nxe4 16 Bxe4 Qc7 17 0-0 Rad8?? (Hastening to complete his development, the American overlooks a nice combination; Black should have exchanged the bishops first)


18 Bxh7+! Kxh7
19 Qh5+ Kg8 20 Bxg7! Kxg7 21 Qg5+ Kh8 22 Qf6+ Kg8 23 Rc4,

The 'average player' can take consolation that more than the odd grand master suffered a debacle in this selection of brevities!

## GAMES

The following five games were played in the recent New Zealand Championship at Dunedin.
D.A.gollogly - M.LEVENE

## Sicilian, Dragon

1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 g6

Levene's Dragon is widely respected; the main lines of the Yugoslav Attack in particular produce the kind of combative positions on which he thrives. It is, therefore, perhaps surprising that both Mark's losses in the Championship should result from Dragons.
Significantly, in both these games White chose a solid line in which active moves were likely to rebound.

## 6 g3

A quiet positionally motivated move which generally offers white excellent chances for a small advantage, often based on a timely Nd5. If Black swaps on d5 White recaptures with the e-pawn when the Bg2 is excellently placed, fixing the weakness on e7 and supporting an outpost on c6 should Black move the b-pawn. Moreover Black can rarely achieve d6-d5, a common equalising move in the Sicilian.
I hoped to surprise Mark with 6 g 3 but he played his next three moves rapidly and it was $I$ who fell behind on the clock.
6...Nc6 7 Bg2 Bd7

White has two main lines, 7 Bg 2 and Nde2. After 7 Bg 2 Black usually simplifies with 7...Nxd4. The text induces transposition to the second, more comlicated, line
8 Nde2 Qc8
Typical Levene; Black institutes his own 'Yugoslav Attack'. This setup looks artificial but after the game Mark said - rommended by Levenfish.
$90-0 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 10 \mathrm{Nf} 4$
Before either side could claim any advantage I offered a draw with a view to securing third place.
10...h5?!

It is axiomatic that one side cannot win by dint of willpower alone. White has played solidly so far and such unjustified aggression, espectally from the second player, must lead to disadvantage. White will eventually place a plece on $g 5$ which Black can now dislodge only by f7-f6 which would seriously weaken e6 and g6, a factor which would be accentuated if Black proceeded with the exchange of white squared bishops. Indeed, Black's kingside later proves weaker than White's.

11 h4 0-0 12 Ncd5 Nxd5 13 Nxd5
13 exd5 is inappropriate here as Black can provoke f3 interrupting the bishop's influence on d5. Now I somewhat hesitantly offered a second draw, with some advantage to back my claim!

$$
\text { 13...Bg4 } 14 \text { f3 Bh3?! }
$$

Consistent but inadyisable; White's kingside is never under serious threat despite the absence of the Bg 2 . Better was 14 ...Be6 15 c 3 though White still has a clear advantage.

15 c3 Qd7 16 Bg5 f6?
After this final weakening it is doubtful that Black can survive. 16.. Bxg2 17 Kxg2 Rfe8 leaves Black with a
difficult but perhaps tenable position difficult but perhaps tenable position.

17 Be 3 Bxg 218 Kxg 2 f 5
Provoking a crisis, much in Mark's style though not surprisingly the complications favour White.
Kh7 ${ }^{19}$ exf5 Rxf5 22 Nf4 Nd8 20 Bg5 Raf8 21 Qb3


Mark criticised this move in the post mortem and later produced the double exchange sacrifice $22 .$. . Rxg5!? Rxf4 24 gxf4 Qf5. White's rook make poor defenders and a convincing
refutation is difficult to find. This may have been Black's best chance but neither side realised that such desperate looking measures could be required. White should still win with careful ${ }_{26} \mathrm{Rg} 1$. possible line is 25 Qxb7 Qxf4 26 Rg1

23 Qc2
Now the white square weaknesses are glaringly obvious; Black cannot defend against the blunt threats of 24 Nxg 6 or 24 Nxh5 followed by g3-g4.
23...Qe8 24 Nxh5 Qc6

Pointless, but 24...Qf7 25 Nxg7 Rxf3
26 Qe2 Rxf1 27 Rxfl Qxg7 28 Rxf8 Qxf8
29 Qxe7+ is an easy win
25 Nf 4 Qe 8
There was nothing better - 26 Nxg6 was threatened. The loss of a pawn has created further kingside weaknesses which are readily exploited. My main concern was the clock.
26 Rae1 Be5 27 Qb3 Qd7 28 Nd5 e6 29 Ne3 R5f7 30 Qc4 Nc6 31 Ng4 d5 32 Qd3


Desperation, but $34 .$. R5f7 35 h 5 is the end. Mark continues until the time control is reached.

35 Nxf5 Rxf5 36 g4 Rf8 37 h5 Qd5+ $38 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Kh} 839 \mathrm{hxg} 6 \mathrm{Qxa} 240 \mathrm{Qe} 2,1-0$.

Notes by David Gollogly

## P.A.GARBETT - R.A.DOWDEN

French Defence, Tarrasch
$\begin{array}{rlllllll}1 & \text { e4 } & \text { e6 } & 2 & d 4 & \text { d5 } & 3 & \mathrm{Nd} 2 \\ 5 & \mathrm{Nf} 6 & 4 & \text { e } 5\end{array}$ Nfd7 5 Bd3 c5 6 c3 Nc6 7 Ngf3
A pawn sacrifice favoured by John Nunn which leads to a livelier game for White than the usual 7 Ne 2
7...cxd4 8 cxd4 Qb6 $9 \quad 0-0$ Nxd4 10 Nxd4 Qxd4 11 Nf3 Qb6 12 Qc2 h6

The alternative is $12 \ldots$ Qc5 when White can either recapture the pawn with 13 Bxh7 or play 13 Qe2 with better development and prospects on the c-file.

## 13 Bf4

This is more subtle than 13 Be3. White wishes to play Rcl before playing Be3 as Black will not then be able to
interpose with Bc5. However, 13 Be3 is also dangerous. An interclub game Garbett-Spiller (June 1982) went 13 Be 3 Bc5 14 Rfel! Bxe3 15 Rxe3 Nc5 16 Bfl! Bd7 17 Rc1 Ne4 18 Rb 3 Qc6 19 Qbl Qa4 20 Rxb7 Ng5 21 Rcc7 Rd8 22 Nxg5, 1 - 0.

## 13...g5!?

Black disrupts White's immediate plan of delaying Be3 but at the cost of giving up his chance to castle.
Courageous but possibly unwise.

## 14 Be3 Bc5 15 Rfel!

As in the interclub game mentioned above. Black will be compelled to swap on e3 and the white rook becomes dangerously active.

## 15...Bxe3 16 Rxe3 Nc5 17 Be2?

A strange mistake as I had played the correct Bf1! in the above game. After 17 Bf1, when Black plays 17...Ne4 White is free to play 18 Rb 3 as f 2 is defended by the queen. After 17 Bfl Bd 7 18 Rcl Ne 4 (not $18 \ldots \mathrm{Rc} 8 \mathrm{l} 19 \mathrm{Rc} 3$ ) 19 Rb 3 Qe6 20 Qbl White should be winning.
17...Bd7 18 h 4 !?

Risky but White did not want to let Black consolidate his position with Rc8 and Ke 7 .
18. . Ne4?

Black misses his chance. I was afraid of $18 \ldots$ Rc8! which gives Black good play. If then 19 Rc3 Ke7! is most sound threatening Ne4. If 19 Qb 1 , hoping for $19 . . . \mathrm{Ne} 420 \mathrm{Bd} 3$ transposing to the game, then 19...Ke7! is again best as, if White captures on g5, Black gets a kingside attack. Best may be 19 Rfl guarding f2 and freeing the other

19 Bd3
Now White is fine.
19...Rc8 20 Qbl g4 21 Bxe4 dxe4?

Best was 21...gxf3 22 Bxf3 but, with lack' king marold in the centre, be bright
22 Nd2 Qd4
Not 22...Bc6? 23 Nc4.
23 Nxe4 Qxe5 24 Qd3!
The point behind 19 Bd3. White's pressure in the centre is deadly; the
24...Qxb2 25 Rdl Rd8 26 Re2!

This clinches it. The point is that Black's queen must defend both f 6 and b7; now it must give up one of them.
26...Qg7 $27 \mathrm{Nd6}+\mathrm{Kf} 8$

If $27 . . \mathrm{Ke} 7$ then $28 \mathrm{Nf5}+$.
28 Nxb7, 1 - 0.
Notes by Paul Garbett

## P.A.GARBETT - P.S.SPILLER

French Defence, Tarrasch
1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd2 Nf6 4 e5
 $0-0$ Be7

Probably a good move as, if White wishes to persist with his gambit, he must play 9 Rel which may slow him down 9 cxd4 Nxd4 10 Nxd4 Qxd4 11 Nf3.

9 Rel cxd4 10 cxd4 Nxd4 11 Nxd4 Qxd4 12 Nb3!?

A theoretical novelty, played partly because I wasn't too happy about what Paul Spiller might have prepared after 12 Nf 3 ; but 12 Nb 3 has its advantages anyway. It prevents $12 \ldots \mathrm{Qb} 6 \quad 13 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Bc} 5$ anyway. It prevents $12 \ldots \mathrm{Qb} 6 \mathrm{ll} \mathrm{Be}^{13 \mathrm{Bc} 5}$
because of 14 Nxc5 Nxc5 15 Rc 1 . It also because of 14 Nxc5 Nxc5 15 Rcl . It also
allows White's queen to attack with $0 g 4$ or Qh 5 in some cases. On the debit side it leaves Black's queen with the active option of Qa4 which is impossible after 12 Nf 3.

## 12...Qh4

It is unclear whether this is better or worse than an immediate 12...Qa4.
$13 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Qa} 4 \quad 14 \mathrm{Bc} 2 \mathrm{Qc} 4 \quad 15 \mathrm{Be} 3$ !
Important to contest the centre.
15...Nxe5

The alternative was to let White play Bd4 with a very strong grip on the position.

## 16 Bd4 Nf3+?!

Perhaps this knight is needed for defence but 16...Nc6 17 Bxg 7 Rg 818 Bc 3 is very bad also - Black has problems finding a square for his Rg8 to hide on, Perhaps $16 \ldots$...Ng6 is the best chance for survival although White is clearly better.

17 Qxf3 Qxc2 18 Bxg7 Rg8 19 Bf6 Bxf6 20 Qxf6 Qg6 21 Qd4 Bd7 22 Rac1!

On 22 Qxd5 0-0-0! Black seems to survive. Now he must stop Rc7.
22...Bc6 23 Na5 Qg4 24 f 4 h 5


25 Nxb7!
A winning sacrifice based on the problems Black has defending e7. Less clear-cut was 25 Nxc6 bxc6 26 Rxc6 h4 27 Re3.
25...Bxb7 26 Rc7 Bc8

Black was in bad time trouble but found the only move. Now, if 27 Qc5 or 27 Qf6, then $27 .$. Bd7.

27 Qxd5! Qxf4
If $27 . . . \mathrm{Rb} 8$ then 28 Qd6.
28 Qc6+ Kf8 $29 \mathrm{Rxc} 8+\mathrm{Ke} 7 \quad 30 \mathrm{Rc} 7+$ Kf6 31 Rf 1 , 1 - 0.

Notes by Paul Garbett

## R.J.SUTTON - B.A.CARPINTER

Pirc Defence

1 e4 d6 $2 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nf6} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~g} 64 \mathrm{Nf} 3$ Bg7 $5 \mathrm{Be} 20-0 \quad 6 \quad 0-0 \mathrm{c} 5$ !?

Carpinter had played this against Garbett in an earlier round. Garbett then took space in the centre with 7 ds but Carplnter manoeuvred well around game. I consulted the Encyclopaedia of game. I consulted the Encyclopaedia exchange of pawns and the anted take tactical advantage of Black's backward development and weakening of his ward development and weakening of his queensid

7 dxc5 dxc5 8 Qxd8 Rxd8 9 Be3 b6 10 Rfd1 Nc6

ECO would have Black meekly surrender the two bishops with 10 ...bd 711

Ne5 but Carpinter is made of sterner stuff than that.

11 Rxd8 Nxd8 12 Rd1
White has temporary control of the d-file, particularly the squares $d 7$ and d5 through which the rook and knight want to come. This involves the advance e5 after which the e-pawns will be traded.
12...Bb7

Black has little choice since attempts to develop along the c8-h3 diagonal do not seem to turn out well for him, e.g. 12...Ne6 13 Bc 4 Ng 414 Bcl Nd4 15 Bd5 Rb8 16 h 3 intending 17 Bf4. A different timing might have been thought better: 12...Nc6 intending 13 Bb 5 Bb 714 e5 Ng4 15 Rd 7 Rb 816 Rxb 7 Rxb7 17 Bxc6 Rc7 gaining a pawn with good chances. However, this gives White time for 13 h 3 and, if Black attempts to prevent the pawn advance by 13...e5, then 14 Rd 6 and 15 Bg 5 takes advantage of the open file.

13 e5 Ng4 14 Bg5 Nc6
If $14 .$. Nxe5 15 Nxe5 Bxe5 16 Rd 7 eventually recovering the pawn with a supertor rook position since $16 \ldots \mathrm{f} 6$ 17 Bh6 Bd6 (or 17...Kf7 18 Nd5 Bxd5 19 Rxd5 with good play for the pawn) 18 Bc4+ Kh8 19 Bf8 Bc6? 20 Bxe7! turns out well for White.

15 Rd7 Rb8 16 Nd 5 Ncxe5
There was little joy in 16...e6 17 Nf6+ Bxf6 18 exf6, e.g. 18...h6 19 h3 hxg 520 hxg 4 and Black has no activity.

## 1

This weakening in the king's sector seems essential to loosen the grip of the dark squares and also to relieve the knight of the unpleasant threat $\mathrm{f4}$.

20 Bh4 g5 21 Bg 3 Be4 22 c 3


The ability of White to make this
move is in strong contrast to the fixed character of the black queenside pawns

We were now in a very difficult and intriguing position; for example, if Black plays the natural looking 22... Bd3 23 Bxd3 Nxd3 24 Bd6, there is no way he can rid himself of the discovery which will hang over him for some moves to come, for on 24...Rd8 comes 25 Nc6+ Rxd6 26 Rc8+ and mates next move.

Black's best seems to be 22...Rd8! 23 f3 Bh7 24 h4! Rd2 25 Bb5. Now if he plays the natural $25 . . . \mathrm{Rxb} 2$ then 26 Nc6! Bf6 (26...Nxc6 27 Bd6+ and wins) 27 Nxe5 Bxe5 28 Bxe5 Rxb5 29 Bf6 Ke8 30 Re7+ Kf8 31 Rd 7 and mates. Better here is $25 .$. Nd3! 26 h 5 ! and now, after 26 ...Nxb2?, there is a quite extraordinary mating combination: 27 Rc8+ Kxe7 28 Re8+ f6 29 Be5+ Kf5 30 g 4 mate. Who said there is no beauty in chess once the queens are exchanged? Obviously this is not a forced combination but an enticed one and Black could avoid it if he saw it.
Unfortunately Carpinter, who had been defending excellently up to this point, now missed the 22...Rd8! line and his position goes rapidly downhlll.
22. . Rb7? 23 Rxb7 Bxb7 $24 \mathrm{Nf5} \mathrm{f} 6$ ?

Blocking in the bishop, when the fight becomes hopeless. Better was $24 .$. Nd7 25 Bb 5 ! Nf6 26 Be 5 though White has a strong initiative.

25 f4 Nc6 26 Nd6 Ba8 27 Bf3 a6 28 Nc8 b5 29 Nb6 Bb7 $30 \mathrm{Nd7+}, 1-0$.

Black must lose two pawns without any alleviation of the miserable plight of his pieces.

Notes by Richard Sutton

## M.LEVENE - R.J.SUTTON

Giuoco Piano
1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bc4 Bc5 4 c3 Bb6 5 0-0 Nf6 6 d3 0-0

White plays a system similar to a Closed Ruy Lopez with Black's bishop on b6 instead of e7; thus Black's queenside play is much slower here although e has more play in the centre.
7. Nbd2 d6 8 Bb3 Be6 9 Bc 2 а6 10 Rel!?

If White wants to avoid the storm
that is coming， 10 h 3 is better．
10．．．Ng4！？ 11 Re 2 Bxf2＋！？
Black gets rook and three pawns for the knight and bishop but it was very difficult to assess whether White will have enough counterplay．

12 Rxf 2 Ne 313 Qe2 Nxc2 14 Rbl
 Nxd4

If $17 . .$. exd4 then 18 Bb 2 regains the d－pawn．
$18 \mathrm{Nxd4}$ exd4 19 Qg4
This position is a bit deceptive． Although Black has a slight material advantage，White＇s minor pieces can be－ come very active if Black is not care－ ful and the pawn on b3 stops the queen－ side mass in the meanwhile．

19．．．Qc8 20 Qg3 Qe6 21 Bf 4 ！f5？！
On 21．．．Qxb3， 22 Bh6 is too strong but maybe a slower approach such as 21 ．．．f6 is better when Black＇s position is more solid than in the game and he will advance his queenside pawns sooner or later．

22 Nd2 fxe4 23 dxe4 Rf7 24 e5！ Now White has the initiative．

24．．．dxe5 25 Bxe5 Raf8 26 h3 Qh6？！ Better was 26．．．Qd7
$27 \mathrm{Re} 2!\mathrm{Re} 7$ ？
Not $27 .$. Re8？as 28 Bxg7！would follow，but 27．．．Qh5，27．．．Qe6 or $27 .$. Qb6 is better，although I feel White is at least equal now．

28 Bf4！Qf6 29 Bg5 Rxe2 30 Bxf6 Rxf6 31 Qg5！

After 31 Qd3，Rff2 seemed unclear．
31．．．Rd6
Now，on 31．．．Rff2 follows 32 Qd8 ${ }^{-}$ Kf7 33 Qxc7＋Kg6 34 Qb6＋！and wins．

32 Nc4 Rd7 33 Qg4 Ree7 $34 \mathrm{Ne5!} \mathrm{Rd8}$

35 Qh4 Ree8 36 Qf4
The queen and knight cooperate nicely．

36．．．Rf8 37 Qc1！c6 38 Qc4＋Rd5 39 Nd3！Rd8

If $39 .$. a 5 then 40 b 4 is strong．
40 Kfl a 5
If $40 .$. Rd 6 then 41 Kel b5 42 Qb4！ and White has a strong bind．

41 Kel Kh8 42 Kd 2 R5d6？
Blundering the exchange．After $42 .$. Rf8（with the idea ．．．g5 to prevent Nf4）then 43 g 3 intending Nf 4 and if 43 ．．．g5 then 44 Qcl with the Idea Qel activating the queen，but Black might still have sufficient drawing chances．
Editor＇s note：As this game was played in the last round there was no adjourn ment；the same applies to the game Spiller－Gollogly．As it was several players came close to missing their evening flight out of Dunedin！

## 43 Ne 5

Now White is winning．
43．．．h6 $44 \mathrm{Nf7} 7 \mathrm{Kh} 7 \quad 45 \mathrm{Qd3}+\mathrm{Kg} 8$ 46 Nxd8 Rxd8 47 Qc4＋Rd5 48 Qe2 Kf7 49 Qe4 d3 $50 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{~h} 551 \mathrm{Qf} 4+\mathrm{Kg} 652$ Qc7！Rb5 53 Qd6＋Kg5 54 Qe7＋Kg6 55 Qe6＋Kg5 56 Qf7！hxg4

If $56 . . \mathrm{Kh} 6$ then 57 Kxd 3 with the idea Ke4－f4 and g5＋winning．

57 Qxg7＋Kh5 58 Qxg4＋Kh6 59 Qe6＋ Kg5 $60 \mathrm{Kxd} 3 \mathrm{Kh} 561 \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{Kg} 5 \quad 62 \mathrm{Kf} 3$ $\mathrm{Rf} 5+\begin{array}{llll}63 \mathrm{Kg} 3 & \mathrm{Rb} 5 & 64 \mathrm{~h} 4+\mathrm{Kh} 5 & 65 \mathrm{Qf} 7+ \\ \mathrm{Kh} 6 & 66 \mathrm{Kg} 4,1-0 .\end{array}$

One has to admire Richard for play－ ing so sharply in the last round when he only needed a draw to come first equal！

Notes by Mark Levene

## USSR v NEW ZEALAND contd from page 1

 36 bxc4 bxc4 37 Bxc4 Nb6 38 Bd3， $1-0$. DOWDEN－BELJAVSKY，French Advance： Nf3 Bd7 6 a3 a5 7 Bd3 Nc6 8 0－0 a4 9 dxc5 Bxc5 10 Nbd 2 f6 11 Qe2 Nge7 12 b4 axb3 13 Rbl fxe5 14 Nxe5 Nxe5 15 Qxe5 0－0 16 Qe2 e5 17 Qxe5 Ng6 18 Qxd5＋Be6 19 Qh5 Rxf2 20 Rxf2 Bxf2＋ $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 21 Kh1 Rd8 } \\ \text { Qxd3 } 22 \text { Nc4 Qa6 } & 23 \text { Qe2 Rxd3 } 24 \\ 25 & \text { Qd8＋Nf8，} 0-1 .\end{array}$

## Local News

PHILIPS TOURNAMENT
The Hutt Valley Chess Club hosted the resurrected Philips Tournament on the weekend of $26 / 28$ November．The format was a series of six－player round robins．

For a while nobody seemed interested in winning the A－grade with each player dropping a game at some point．In the end Mark Noble proved the most consis tent and took first prize．Max Wigbout and Peter Hawkes shared second with the former getting the best game prize for his win over Ker．The performance of Rumanian emigrée Victoria Goga aroused some interest；she beat Feneridis and at one stage was winning a $R \& P$ ending against Hawkes－she eventually lost．

Fenella Foster and S．Yee shared the B－grade while Russell Dive took the C－ grade．Dive could justifiably be called the＇wild man of Wellington chess＇such are the bizarre positions he seems to steer most of his games into．

As well as the cash prizes for first and second in each grade；there were numerous LPs as consolation prizes． Wigbout＇s best game prize was a＇Maitre D＇while Wanganui＇s Paul Cooper may have to wait a little to savour his prize for best game in the tournament＇s lower half－a shaver．

Bob Teece was DOP and a friendly team was on hand to serve refreshments． It is hoped that the Philips Tournament will continue，taking the Anzac Weekend slot in 1983.
Scores：A－grade－ 1 M．F．Noble $3 \frac{1}{2} / 5$ ； 2－3 P．D．Hawkes \＆M．Wigbout 3； 4 A．F． Ker $2 \frac{1}{2} ; 5$ A．Feneridis 2； 6 V．Goga 1. B－grade－ $1-2$ S．Yee \＆F．Foster 4／5； 3 G．J．Aldridge 3； 4 S．A．Brown 2； 5 A．M． Borren $1 \frac{1}{2} ; 6$ 2．Frankel 1．$\quad$ C－grade－ 21，4－5 ， 2 2，4－5 W．Ramsay \＆M．P．Schwass 2； 6 B．P．Connor $1 \frac{1}{2}$ ．D－grade－1－2 A．B． rilan 21 ．A． 2． 6 R ， 6 R．Stanton $1 \frac{1}{2}$ ．E－grade $-1-3 \mathrm{~N}$ ． eie 3； 5 M van Mer Hoorn 11． 6 V Boil O F M P．King $2^{\frac{\text { F－grade }}{\frac{1}{2}} ;}{ }^{3}$ C．M．Ker $2 ; 4$ R．Cooper $3 / 4$ ；${ }^{2}$ －Klng 2， 5 C．M．Ker J．N．Preston 1.

A．KER－WIGBOUT，Scotch Game：
l e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 d4 d5？！ 4 Nxe5
dxe4 5 Bb5 Nge7 6 Nc3 a6 7 Bxc6 Nxc6 8 Nxc6 bxc6 9 Nxe4 Be7 10 0－0 0－0 11
 15 Qf3 Qd7 16 Be3 a5 17 Radl Bf7 18 Rd2 Bf8 $19 \mathrm{Re} 1 \mathrm{a}_{4} 20 \quad \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 5 \quad 21$ Qdl Qf7 22 a3 f5 23 Bf2 Rxel 24 Qxel Bd $25 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Re} 826 \mathrm{Qf} 2 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 27 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{~h} 4 \quad 28 \mathrm{Nf} 1$ Qh5 29 Rel Re6 30 Bcl Rg6 31 g 3 hxg 3 $22 \mathrm{Nxg} \mathrm{Qh3} 3 \mathrm{Re}^{2} \mathrm{Rg} 434 \mathrm{Qe} 3 \mathrm{Be} 4 \mathrm{C}$ Qf2 g5 36 Rxe4 fxe4 37 Qa2＋Kg7 38 Qe6？Rxg3＋， $0-1$.

的 的
WANGANUI C．C． $\mathrm{CH}^{\prime} \mathrm{P}$
One of the strongest and most even fields ever contested the 1982 A－grade Championship for the G．F．Francis Trophy The new champion is Gordon Hoskyn who conceded just three draws．Scores： 1 G．Hoskyn $7 \frac{1}{2} / 9$ ； 2 T．Boswell $6 \frac{1}{2}$ ； 3 P．R． Sapian 5； 6 H．P．Whitlock 52； 5 ．Vetha
 Shalav 1 Shalav 1 ．

The B－grade（Alf Ratliff Memorial rophy）was won by K．Vetharaniam and the C－grade（Frank Jacobs Memorial Shield）was won by D．Berry

## CIVIC C．C． $\mathrm{CH}^{\prime} \mathrm{P}$

Philip Clemance dropped just half a point in winning the Civic Chess Club＇s 1982 A－grade Championship．Scores： 1 P．A．Clemance $8 \frac{1}{2} / 9$ ； 2 T．W．L．Spiller $7 \frac{1}{2}$ ； 3 D．H．Beach 6浆； 4 P．D．Hawkes 6； 5 A．B Mullan 5；6－7 M．White \＆L．Wall 4； 8 P G．Robin 0.

The B－grade was won by H．Dixon with $7 / 8$ ahead of B．Southgate $\&$ P．King on 6 ． Then came K．Fink－Jensen 5；L．Abbey $4 \frac{1}{2}$ ； I．O＇Neill 4；D．McDonald 1i⿱亠䒑𧰨 ；B．Thorns $\&$ T．Fink－Jensen

The Civic C．C．Lightning Champion－ ship was won by Leonard McLaren． From the A－grade Championship：
CLEMANCE－T．SPILLER，Caro－Kann： le4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 Nc 3 dxe 44 Nxe4 $\mathrm{Bf} 5 \quad 5 \mathrm{Ng} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{ht} \mathrm{h} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Na} 7 \quad 8$ h5 Bh7 9 Bd3 Bxd3 10 Qxd3 e6 11 Bf4 $\begin{array}{llllllll}\mathrm{Ngf6} & 12 & 0-0-0 & \mathrm{Be} 7 & 13 \text { Rhel } 0-0 & 14 \mathrm{Kbl}\end{array}$ Qa5 15 Bd2 Qc7 16 Nf5 Bd8 17 Nxh6＋！？ gxh6 18 Bxh6 $\operatorname{Ng} 4 \quad 19$ Bxf8 Nxf2 20 Qe2 Nxd1 21 Bh6 Nxb2 22 Kxb2 c5？（22． Bf6） $23 \mathrm{Ne5} \mathrm{Nxe5} 24$ dxe5 Qb6＋ 25 Kcl Qb4 26 Rfl Qd4 27 Kb 1 Ba5？？ $28 \mathrm{Rf4!}$

## CHESS IN ISRAEL

## MARK EVANS

Chess in Israel isn't as professional as might be expected, given the country's playing strength, its relative proximity to Europe, its history of hosting big events (such as Olympiads), and the continuing influx of emigre talent. Indigenous talent in Jerusalem, for instance, has been supplemented by a battalion of Lev Aptekars - horrendous thought baring out the popular view of the Soviet Union as a land populated atirely by chess masters.
Concealed at home beneath a blanket of grandmasters, these players only come to light if they can get out of the place. Yet in the 9 months 1 lived near the city, and a bevy of Levs notwithstanding, there was littl chess activity in Jerusalem outside the usual club scene.
Tel Aviv and Beersheva seem to be marginally more go-ahead although, aside from international events, money - or the lack of them - are al recognisable by NZ standards
Beersheva were the runners-up in ast year's final of the National Cup, srael's premiere team competition. Incidentally, and apropos of nothing n particular, Beersheva lies in the iddle of the Negev Desert - strange and illuminating to see clusters of modern apartment blocks sitting in a sea of sand.
Tel Aviv is a bastion of the weekend Wiss, staple diet of amateur chess. One such tournament last Novenber attracted 56 players, including an IGM and $3 \mathrm{IMs}$. GM Yehuda Gruenfeld steamed through the field with $5 / 5$.
I've filched one of his wins from Shaimat, along with notes by the editor. For the record, Shahmat, fficial magazine of the Israel Chess Federation, is on a par with $N Z$ Chess n terms of content, maybe a little ahead in quantity of material, but behind in the quality of its paper, printing, and presentation.

WITMAN - GRUENFELD, Sicilian Najdorf: $[$ e4 c5 2 Nif 3 d 6 $8 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 9 \mathrm{O}-0 \mathrm{~b} 510 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 7 \quad 11 \mathrm{Be}$
$0-0 \quad 12$ a4 b4 13 Nd5 Nxd5 14 exd5 a5 15 c4 (or 15 c3 Ba6!) bxc3 16 Nxc3 f5 17 Rcl? ( $17 \mathrm{f4}$ is required to avoid ..f4 by Black) Ba6 18 Nb 5 f 4 ! 19 gxf4 exf4 20 Bd4 Bxb5 21 axb5 Bf6 22 Be4 Bxd4 23 Qxd4 Ne5 24 Rc6 Qh4: (24...Nxc6? 25 dxc6 and white is better) 25 Rxd6 (White is ignoring the strong attack
 looming on him diagram)

25 ...Rf5: : 26 Bg 2 Rg 527 f3? (27 Qe4 much better avoiding Black's next sacrifice. It also prevents protected) 27 the black queen is unprotected) 29 . $\cdot \mathrm{Rxg} 2+\quad 28 \mathrm{Kxg} 2 \mathrm{Qg} 3+$
$30 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Qg} 3+31 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Nxf} 3$
32 Rxf 3 (forced) Oxf3+ $33 \mathrm{Kgl} \mathrm{Qg} 3+34 \mathrm{Kfl}$ (forcea) (xis+

I query the editor's note to White's 27 th, since after 27 Qe4 Qh3 White looks to be lost.

I can't claim that this article gives a complete picture of chess in Israel since, living on a Kibbutz, my oppor tunities for first-hand observation were limited. It was difficult to get time off during the cotton harvest and there were problems with transport. Also, Kibbutz volunteers spend a fair amount of their free time boozing and wenching so there was a question of priorities.
I managed one competition game, standing in as a reservist for a friend on a Jerusalem University team in a second-division match against Patah Tikva. Looking for adrenalin, to blow the valves and so on after a long lay off, I settled for an obscure gambit learnt the hard way from Craig Lair a long time ago. Useful to stay a little off the beaten track when you get too lazy to keep up with theory
In this case the opposition chewed up a lot of time trying to find his way through an interesting opening, got the time-trouble jitters and blew it. 0ld story.

1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 c3 Nc6 4 d4 Nf6 5 Be2 cxd4 6 cxd4 Nxe4 7 d5 Oa5 8 Nc3 Nxc3 9 bxc3 Nd8?
(against Craig I tried 9 ....Ne5 and lost - in addition to, not because of) $100-0$ e5 11 dxe6 fxe6
(at first sight 11 ...Nxe6 looks better, but after 12 Nd 4 White can and the open b-file or $f 5$ and the open e-file, depending on BIack's response Black can try for an early endgame but the pawn sac remains good, eg: 11 ...Nxe6 12 Nd4 Nxd4 13 Qxd4 Qe5 14 Rel Qxd4 ((if $14 \ldots$...Be 6 or $14 \ldots$...Bd 7 15 Qb4; or $14 \ldots$ Be7 $15 \mathrm{Bb} 5+$ ! Qxb5 16 Qxg7 Rf8 17 Rxe7+! Kxe7 18 Bg5+ Ke8 19 Qf6 etc)) 15 Bb $5+$ Kd8 16 Re8+ $\begin{aligned} & \text { c. } 7 \\ & 17 \\ & \text { cxd } 4\end{aligned}$ a6 18 Bc4 b5 19 Bd5)

12 Bf4 e5?! 13 Rel?! Be7
(White provoked B1ack's l2th with this position in mind, since black couldn go in for 13 ...ext4 14 Bbst Kf7 15 Qd5+, but maybe White's best was 13 Bg3 Be7 14 Bc4 Be6 15 Qb3)

14 Bxe5?! dxe5 15 Nxe5 Вe6!?
Not 15 ... Qxe5 16 Bh5t. The key position arises after 15 ...0-0 16 Bc4+ Kh8. Both players thought Black would be skittled, eg: 17 Qh5 Qb6 ( ( $17 \ldots$ Bf5 18 Ng6t wins the queen) ) 18 Bd3 Qxf2+ 19 Khl Bf5 20 Rfl Qh4 21 Ng6+! Bxg6 22 Rxf8+ Bxf8 23 Qxh4 Bxd3 24 Rdi, which is all very nice but there's a hole - $18 \ldots$...Qh6! and now what? Quick pressure against g 7 , after ...Kh8, is another idea down the tubes - 17 Nf7+ Nxf7 18 Rxe7 Ng5: 19 Qd 4 Nf $3+$ ! $20 \operatorname{gxf} 3$ Qg5t etc so maybe White should aim for the h-file - 17 Ng6t hxg6 18 Rxe7 Qc5 ((preventing 19 Qd4)) 19 Qe2 ( (with the threat $20 \mathrm{Re5}, 21 \mathrm{Rh} 5+$ !) ) 19 ...Rxf2 20 Qxf2 Qxe7 21 Rel Qg5 22 Re8+ and 23 QE8, and then again maybe t's all rubbish!

16 Bc4 Rc8??
Black must castle, returning the
piece - 16 ...0-0 17 Bxe6 Nxe6 18 Qd7; but not 18 Qb 3 Qb6 19 Qxb6 axb6 20 Nd7 Kf7! )

## 17 Bxe6 Nxe6 19 ఇd7+Kf8 19 Qxe6,

 1-0.There were endless bouts of casual chess to be had, sessions of 6 hours or more in the Kibbutz coffee house appropriately; mostly involving drub bings at the hands of the resident champ. This character, by name of Chaim Dror, is a student of statistics and a Kibbutanik of sorts, venerated in local folklore for the feat of demolishing six neighbours in a simultaneous blindfold display whilst solving a newspaper crossword and conducting a game of whist.
Not an original idea, perhaps, but still impressive and it caused quite a splash among his fellow agrarians Maybe Pillsbury, or was it Black burne, took on more opponents, but bet he never tackled a crossword puzzle in Hebrew.
Away from the board Chaim comes across as large, very large, affable, ingenuous, and generous. Very generous. I don't know what he's up to these days but it's difficult to imagine Chaim in his horn-rim specs leaping around the hills of Lebanor with an Uzzi machine-gun.

It's difficult to imagine Chaim leaping anywhere. We met one evening while he was on his rounds as the rostered guard, a boring but necessary job - earlier in the year the PLO attacked the bus which ran between the Kibbutz and Jerusalem, the ambusti occurring on a road behind the Kibbutz. Chaim came ambling out of the dusk, a book tucked under his arm and a WWII vintage carbine dangling from his shoulder.

Hello, who comes?" he asked, the old joke presented with an ear-to-ear grin - which was quite a big grin because his ears are a long way apart.

Me. And you mean - halt, who goes?"
Nobody goes. We both arrive." The
irrefutable logic of English as a
second language.
"Aha. Where's the magazine for the
rifle?"
"The what?"
"The thing with the bullets."
"Here ... somewhere ..." (Chaitn
started to rumnage through his pockets) "but it doesn't matter," he added, opening his book. "look here, this is a magazine, yes? .... and this game Arafat wanders down the you do if Yasser Arafat wanders down the road? Hit him over the head with the latest wrinkle
"Maybe .... does he play chess?"
The game which follows was played on board one in a 33 -board match pitting a team drawn from members of Kibbutzim in Northern Israel against a side from the south. The match, an annual event, was hosted by Kibbutz Shfaim in December 1981. Chaim's opponent, Uzi Geler, is a former Isracli champion.

DROR - GELER, French Tarrasch:
1 e4 e6 2 d 4 d5 3 Nd2 Nf6 4 e5 Nd7

5 Bd3 c5 6 c3 Nc6 7 Ne2 Qb6 8 Nf3 cxd4 9 cxd4 f6 10 exf6 Bb4+ 11 Nc 3 Nxf6 12 0-0 $0-0 \quad 13$ a3 Bd6 14 Re 1 Bd 7 15 b4 Kh8 16 Na 4 Qc $7 \quad 17$ b5? (Overlooking the point behind Black's last two moves; better was 17 Bb 2 and if .. Rae8 18 Rc 1 ) $17 . . . \mathrm{Nxd4!} 18 \mathrm{Nxd} 4$ Bxh2+ 19 Khl es! 20 Nt3 (Or 20 Kxh2
 exf3+ doesn't help) $20 \ldots \mathrm{Ng} 421$ Ra2
e4 22 Bxe4 dxe4 23 Ng 5 (Hoping for 23 e4 22 Bxe4 dxe4 23 Ng5 hoping for 23
$\ldots . . N x f 2+24$ Rxf2 Rxf2 25 Qh5. If instead …NXf2+ $24 R x f 2$ Rxf2 25 Qh5. If instea
23 Rc2 Nxf2t 24 Rxf2 exf3, but 23 Rxe 4 23 Rc2 Nxf2t 24 Rxf2 exf3, but 23 Rxe4
was a better try although it leaves f2 was a better try although it leaves f2 looking ripe for multiple contusions)
23...Bgl! $24 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 2+25$ Rxf2 Bxf2 26
 Nh3 Qh' 30 Rxd8 Rxd8 31 Qf 3 Be 42 Qb3 Rd1+!, $0-1$ (For if 33 Qxdl Qxh3 mate, or $33 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Bgl}+34 \mathrm{Khl} \mathrm{Bd4+} 35 \mathrm{Kh} 2$ Be5t 36 g 3 Rhl mate).

LOCAL NEWS continued from page 25 $\mathrm{Qg} 1+29 \mathrm{~Kb} 2,1-0$.

## 1982 CLUB CHAMPIONS

We have received only brief details of the following club championships.

## HUTT VALLEY

C1ub Champion: Mark Noble.

## NORTH SHORE

Lightning Champion: Paul Garbett. Junior Champion: Karim 0'Driscoll

## TAWA

Club Champion: Greg Aldridge.

## UPPER HUTT

Joint Club Chatrpions: Simon Brown Ross Ferguson \& Zyg Frankel.

## WAITEMATA

Club Champion: Robert Smith (second, John van Pelt). Reserve Champion: Ceorge Williams. Junior Champion: N. WELLINGTON

Club Champion: Arcadios Feneridis
(ahead of Sarfati and McLaren).

## $\star \quad \star \quad \star$

## COMBINATION SOLUTIONS

1. H.Johner-P.Johner, Frankfurt 1905: 1 Be4!!, 1 - 0 (1....Bxe4 $2 \mathrm{h3}+\mathrm{Kg} 3$ 1 Be4!!, $1-0$ (1...Bxe4 $2 \mathrm{h3}+\mathrm{Kg}^{3} 3$
3 Bel mate, or l...Rxe4 $2 \mathrm{h3}+\mathrm{Kg} 33$ Rf3 mate; the 'Nowotny' theme of problem composition).
2. Gunsberg-Sellon, London 1887 1 Qxg7+! Kxg7 $2 \mathrm{Nf} 5+\mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nh} 6$ mate.
3. Meitner-Sch1echter, 1886: 1...Rh6! 2 Bxh6 gxh6 \& wins. White is helpless against the threat of Ke7 and Rg8+.
4. Maczucki-Kolisch, Paris 1864 1 Qd8+! Kxd8 2 Bg5+ Ke8 3 Rd8 mate,
5. N.N.-Kostic, Cologne 1909: 1...Ne4 2 Bel Qf2+!! 3 Bxf2 Nd2 mate.
6. Anderssen-Hillel, Breslau 1859: 1 Bg5! Qxg5 2 Qf5+! Qxf5 3 Rxd8+ Kxd8 4 Re8 mate.

## TOURNAMENT VENUES

The 1983 NEW ZEALAND JUNIOR CHI' (Easter) will be organised by the Canterbury C.C. and the 1983 NORTH ISLAND CH'P by the Hamilton C.C. More later!

## CLUB DIRECTORY

The annual fee (six listings) for this column is $\$ 6.00$ payable with order to the New Zealand Chess Association, P.O. Box 8802, Symonds Street, Auckland, 1.

AUCKi,ANL CFNTRE meets Nondays \& Thursdays at clubrooms, 17 Cromwell St, Mt Eden, phone 602-042. Cortact: Nigel Metge, ph 278-9807. Schoolpupil coaching Friday evenings. Full recreational facilities - TV, pool room, library.

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

EEMUERA C.C. mieets 7.30 Wednesdays at the Auckland Bridge Club, 273 Remuera Rd, Remuera. Contact: K. Williams, phone 543-762 (everíngs).

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

WAITEMATA C.C. Reets 8 pm Thursdays at Kelston West Community Centre, cnr Ct North \& Awaroa Fds. Fcestal address: P.0. Box 69005 Clendene, Auckland 8. Contact: George Williams, phone $834-6618$ or Nick Bridges $836-9146$.
H.ASTINCE \& HAVELOCK NORTH C.C. meets 7 pm Wednesdays at the Library, Havelock North High School, Te Mata Rd, Havelock North, Hastings. Contact: Mike Earle, phone 7/6-027
PALMERSTON NORTH C.C. meets 7.30 pm Tuesdays at the IHC Workshop, Cook St, Palmerston North. Contact: J. Blatchford, 64 Appollo Pde, Palmerston North, phone 69-575.

CIVIC C.C. meets 7.45 Fm. Fridays at the Aro St Cormunity Centre, Aro St, Wellingtor. Contact: Grant Robinson, phone 726-348.
HUTT VALLEY C.C. meets 7.30 pm Tuesdays at the Hutt Bridge Club, 17 Queens Rd Lower Hutt. Contact: Mrs Mary Boyack, phone 678-542.

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

UPFER HUTT C.C. meets 7.45 pm Thursdays in the Supper Room, Civic Hall, Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt. Contact: Anton Reid, 16 Hildreth St, Upper Hutt, phone 288-756.

NELsCN C.C. meets 7.30 pm Thursdays at the Nemorial Hall, Stoke. Contact: Tom van Lyk, phone Richmond 8178 or 7140 . Visitors welcome.

OTAGO C.C. meets 7.30 pm Wednesdays \& Saturdays at 7 Maitland St, Lunedin, phone (clubrooms) 776-919. Contact: Malcolm Focrd, 39 Park St, Dunedin, phone 776-213.

AUCKlA AD Chess ASSOCThTION. Contacts: Presicient, Peter Stluart, phone 456-377 Secretary, Paul Spiller, phone 534-5579.

