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NEW ZEALAND CHESS is published bi-monthly (February, April, June, August, October \& December) by the New Zealand Chess Association
Unless otherwise stated, the views expressed may not necessarily be those of the Association.

## ADDRESSES

All articles, letters to the Editor, etc should be sent to the Editor, P.W.Stuart, 24 Seacliffe Avenue, Takapuna, Auckland 9. Unpublished manuscripts cannot be returned unless a stamped, addressed return envelope is enclosed
Subscriptions, changes of address and advertising enquiries should be dfressed to the Administration tion P O Box 8802 Symonds Street tion, P.O.Box 8802, Symonds Street Auckland.

## DEADLINES

The deadline for both copy and advertising is the 15 th of the month preceding the month of issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES
These rates are annual and are in New Zealand dollars

```
Surface mail
New Zealand
Other countries
```

Alrmail
Australia \& South Pacific
North America \& Asta (excl Middle East)
Europe, South America,

ADVERTISING RATES
Full page $\$ 40$, half-page or column \$20, half-column $\$ 10$.
Club Directory Iisting (one year) $\$ 6$. change in 1isting $\$ 2$.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Thanks are due to IBM for their writer used to produce this magazine

## CLOCKS \& SETS

pre-devaluation prices
The devaluation of the New Zealand dol lar will mean substantial price increases on all imported chess equipment and books. Our last shipment of clocks arrived just before devaluation; the next lot will be at the higher price.

LOOPING chess clock
$\$ 89.00$
BHB Standard chess clock
$\$ 39.00$
JANTAR (Russian) chess clock \$35.00
CHESS SETS - plastic, matt finish,
9.5 cm king height $\$ 10.00$

Quantity discounts available on application to Administration Officer.

## BOOKS

The New Zealand Chess Association stock a wide range of titles on all faceta of chess. A free catalogue is available on request. Now is the time to buy!

## STATIONERY

SCORE SHEETS (104 moves) 500 for $\$ 11.50$
SCORE PADS (50 games) $\$ 1.50$
ADJOURNED GAME ENVELOPES 25 for $\$ 1.00$ 100 for $\$ 4.00$ 500 for $\$ 18.00$

SWISS PAIRING CARDS 100 for $\$ 6.00$
The only NZCA-sanctioned
cards for rating purposes,
for up to 11 rounds.
CHESS PRINT TRANSFERS
For 50 diagrams 4 cm square,
as used in New Zealand Chess
From New Zealand Chess Association,
P.O. Box 8802, Symonds Street, Auckland.

Postage \& handling charge
$5 \%$ on all orders under $\$ 50$
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## WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS

The 1984 World Chess Championship match between Anatoly Karpov and Gary Kasparov will be played in Moscow commencing on 10 September. Three games will be played each week and GM Svetozar Gligoric will be Chief Arbiter.
It is interesting to reflect that
this will be the first World Championship match in Moscow for fifteen years; the last one saw Boris Spassky lift the title from Tigran Petrosian in 1969 This year's match will doubtless lack the 'colour' of the contests of 1972, 1978 and 1981 with the Western press less interested in an all-soviet clash From a chess point of view, hower, Karpov-Kasparov match is surely much more interesting than the involving Viktor Korchnoi. We make no predictions about

## oscow!

The 1984 Women's World Championship tch between Maya Chiburdanidze and Irina Levitina will take place in Volgograd starting on 11 September.

## DR SMALL

Vernon Small recently completed his PhD, having previously qualified B.A. (1976) and M.A. (1st class hons., 1978) at Canterbury University.
Dr Small majored in English and the title of his thesis dissertation was "The Authorial Persona: A Truth Conditional Account." Vernon explains this as 'an attempt to explain the perception of the authors in literary texts by recourse to the truth conditions (what makes them true and in which world, this real one or a fictitious one) rather than to the details of the author's life. Personae are, broadly speaking, representations of authors; masks if you like.' Sounds all rather esoteric to-me!

## SOUTH ISLAND CH'P

The 1984 South Island Championship, sponsored by IBM, will be held at
Christchurch Boys High School from 20th
to 25th August. Prizes total \$1200.
ury bury ing an IBM computer

か

## NORTH ISLAND CH'P

The Hastings \& Havelock North Chess Club has offered to host the 1985 North Island Championship next May. This event has not been held in Hawkes Bay since 1966.

## OLYMPIAD TEAMS

The Council has announced the following teams for the Men's and Women's Olympiads to be staged in Thessaloniki starting on 18 November. The selectors were Messrs R.E.Gibbons, W.Leonhardt,
P.W.Stuart and M.G.Whaley.

Men: 1 Vernon Small, 2 Ortvin Sarapu, 3 Robert Smith, 4 Mark Levene, 5 David Gollogly.
Women: l Fenella Foster, 2 Winsome Stretch, 3 Vivian Burndred, 4 Lin Carline-Powell.
Among those unavailable were Paul Garbett, Richard Sutton, Roger Nokes and Katrine Metge. The Council appointed Mr Stuart Men's Team Captain and FIDE Delegate.

## APPEAL DONATIONS

Donations to the 01ympiad Appeal received so far (all from Auckland) are: Belton Memorial Tournament (see p. 82) \$180; Ian McIntyre \$20; Jim Miller \$10; Lou Rawnsley \$5; Peter Stuart $\$ 50$; George Trundle $\$ 100$.
The total stands at $\$ 365$

## Can You See the Combinations?

Solutions on page 99


No. 1 White to move


No. 3 White to move



No. 6 White to move

## BOOK REVIEWS

HOW PURDY WON
Frank Hutchings \& Kevin Harrison Horwitz Grahame (1983), hardback.

The late C.J.S. Purdy was the most famous and skilled chess player to emerge from this part of the world. Apart from winning the inaugural World Correspondence Championship, he was a most original thinker and writer on all subjects pertaining to chess. Purdy was not afraid of cones. Purdy excellent articles are to be found in the magazines he edited.
However, what about this book? For the player who wishes to improve his analytical skills it is a must. For someone who wants a collection of very interesting games which reach a high degree of accuracy, this book is the answer. For a beginner or average player who wishes to improve his/her game, the serious study of these games using the excellent annotations would do wonders.
How Purdy Won deals with Purdy's correspondence chess career which culminated in his win of the World Championship. The majority of the 44 annotated games have Purdy's own notes - in the original descriptive notation of course.

Review by Peter Goffin

CHESS ENDINGS FOR THE PRACTICAL PLAYER
Ludek Pachman
Routledge $\&$ Kegan Paul, softback.
Ludek Pachman, the former Czechoslovakian but now West German grandmaster is justly renowned for his opening books and treatises on the middle game, his Modern Chess Strategy being a classic.
Now Pachman has turned his attention to the endgame. Chess Endings for the Practical Player was first published in German in 1977, the English translation appearing fn 1983.
This book deals lucidly with most basic endings and provides an excellent course for the average club (or even stronger) player who wishes to improve his endgame play without becoming bogged down in a morass of detailed
examples and exceptions. Instead the basic ideas and strategies are explained through 280 well selected example positions, making this an eminently readable book - a comparative rarity for manuals on the endgame.
One small niggle (perhaps not the fault of the author) is the practice of putting notes to moves by White after Black's reply - but one soon learns to look half a move ahead!

Review by Peter Stuart

SAHS
Editor: Aivars Gipslis
The first issue of the magazine Sahs, sometimes also called Shakhmaty Riga, appeared in June 1959. At that time Mikhail Tal was Riga's foremost chess master and everyone agreed that his chess wizardry should be chronicled While Tal's presence influenced the initiation of the magazine, it was Grandmaster Aivars Gipslis' efforts that made the journal what it is today - one of the best in the world!
The magazine has been a success since its inception and is now avallable in over 50 countries. It is published twice a month in Latvian and Russian using algebraic notation. Its circulation is Shakhmatny Bulletin $(30,000)$ or Shakhmaty $v$ SSSR $(60,000)$. The list of contributors is extensive: Kasparov, Tal, Botvinnik, Bronstein, Larsen, Hort, Adorian and other grandmasters and wellknown theoreticians contribute regularly. Apart from games there are sections on women's chess, correspondence chess, chess composition and how to improve.
The staff of Sahs can tap a large data base containing over 200,000 games and countless articles on opening theory, all arranged in easily accessible form and kept up to date. Thus the reader is assured that infor ation presented in the magazine is not only
current but also accurate.
Sahs' logo 'Gens una sumus' reflects the high goals Aivars Gipslis and his staff have set and exemplifies dedica-
on to excellence in chess.
Congratulations to Aivars Gipslis and the staff of Sahs for a continued job ell done on their silver anniversary! Review by Val Zemitis

## 3rd Phillips \& Drew/GLC Kings-London '84

by the Editor

| 1 | Karpov | USR | G 2700 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Polugaevsky | USR | G 2615 |
| 3 | Chandler | ENG | G 2515 |
| 4 | Timman | NLD | G 2610 |
| 5 | Seirawan | USA | G 2525 |
| 6 | Ribli | HUN | G 2610 |
| 7 | Korchnoi | SWI | G 2635 |
| 8 | Vaganian | USR | G 2630 |
| 9 | Miles | ENG | G 2615 |
| 10 | Speelman | ENG | G 2495 |
| 11 | Andersson | SWE | G 2630 |
| 12 | Torre | PHI | G 2565 |
| 13 | Nunn | ENG | G 2600 |
| 14 | Mestel | ENG | G 2540 |

The organisers of the third Phillips Drew / GLC Kings tournament set themselves the aim of holding the best chess tournament in the world. Whether or not they succeeded is a moot point but certainly London 1984 will go down as one of the most memorable and sigificant events of the year.
All fourteen players were grandmasters, their average FIDE rating being 2591 making this a category 14 tournament. It may well not prove to be the strongest event in 1984 but most of the players invited (the original four teen invitees all accepted) are well known for their fighting chess which made for great spectator interest. course, the greatest fighter of all, the Kasparov, was not in the field, the extransers apparently opting for the extra status brought by the prein 1986 Kasparov will bin. Perhap iktor Korchoi was there, hod ikior Kors the first occaion in than ten years that Karpov and Korchno號 event.
The apparent domination by Anatoly Karpov in the cross-table above is not misleading despite a shaky start which aw him blunder a pawn in the first round - luckily Ulf Andersson, h1s pponent, failed to take it and the game petered out into a draw. From the second round onwards the World Champion at least a share of the lead; fro his only other hiccup, a loss to Torre
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 & 13 & 14\end{array}$


In round eleven, had no effect as none other than Viktor Korchnot came galloping up to defeat Anatoly's nearest challenger, Murray Chandler. Thus Karpov naintained his one point lead and was able to coast home with draws against Ribli and Nunn
The real boil-over was caused by Chandler's terrific performance in coming home in second equal place after dogging Karpov's footsteps most of the way. Murray was seeded second last with an expected score of 5 points, a tally he had equalled after just seven rounds. After five rounds his performance rating was over 2800; in order he had beaten Torre, lost to Karpov, beaten Nunn, beaten Andersson and beaten Ribli The Hungarian looked to be doing well but an unforced error allowed Murray to unleash a devastating finish. Two very exciting draws versus Timman and Polugaevsky were followed by a win over Speelman and a loss to Miles. Then came the slaughter of vaganian, the loss to Korchnoi and, finally, draws with Seira wan and Mestel. It can be noted that hander salis of six wins was the ame as Karpould anage more than four.
Lev Polugaevsky was, like Chandler, rorpov until hund keeping pace with kame in round ten when his only los alipped The
These three dominated the tournament two or three others. Yasser seming from was equal third with Chandler after the
ninth round (with 6 points) but then lost consecutive games to Nunn and Andersson. Similarly Rafael Vaganian reached $5 \frac{1}{2} / 9$ before losing two in a row - to Chandler and Timman. The Dutchman now has a lifetime score of 5:0 (and all with the black pieces) against Vaganian. It was Timman, in fact, who turned in a solid performance to take sole fourth place despite breaking a leg on the first rest day in a friendly soccer match between the players and a GL (Greater London Corporation) team. Timman the cast and bandages earned
Korchnoi took a long time to get into gear, the first of his two wins get coming until round tine when hemp slig 1 il Nunn's Modern Benoni. For his round eight clash with Karpoy he arrived eight clash with Karpov he arrived a briefly for his tardy apparance and the pair shook hands, a spontaneous gesture which drew applause from the large crowd of spectators - an estimated 600 .

Another disappointment was Andersson whose three consecutive losses early in the tournament must be a rare event Indeed. Also Nunn's last place tie would not have been expected and this may have jeopardised his automatic qualification (on rating) for the 1985 Interzonals.

In the following selection of games we have made use of GM Raymond Keene's annotations from the superbly produced tournament bulletin.
POLUGAEVSKY - SEIRAWAN, Nimzoindian: $1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \mathrm{~N}^{2} \mathrm{c} 4$ e6 $3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \quad 4 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{c} 5$ Na5 58 Pf4 Ne5 10 Qd 46 Nxd6+! Bxd6 $120-0-0$ Nxc4 13 0xc4 $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Nxd6+! Bxd6 } \\ \text { Bxf4 } \\ 12 & 0-0-0 & \text { Nxc4 } \\ 13 & \text { Qxc4 }\end{array}$
 20 Qf6 Be4 $21 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{Oc} 7+22 \mathrm{~Kb} 1 \mathrm{Bxd} 3+$ 20 Qf6 Be4 21 Bd3 Qc7+ 22 Kbl Bxd3+

 Rxd6 ${ }^{2} 33$ Rxg7+ Kh8 34 Rxf7 Rh6 35 Rb 7 a6 36 a3 Rf8 37 Rg6 Rxg6 38 fxg6 $\mathrm{Rxf} 4 \quad 39 \mathrm{Rb} 6 \mathrm{Ra} 4 \quad 40 \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{txg} 6$ Kh6 $42 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Kg} 743 \mathrm{Rd} 6 \mathrm{Rc} 4+44 \mathrm{Kd} 3$, 1-0.
KARPOV-CHANDLER, QGD Tarrasch:
1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 c5 4 cxd5 exd5 $5 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 7 \quad 0-0 \quad 0-0 \quad 8 \mathrm{Nc} 3$ Ne6 9 dxc5 Bxc5 10 Bg5 d4 11 Bxf6

Qxf6 12 Nd 5 Qd8 13 Nd 2 Re 814 Rcl Bb6 15 Rel Be6 16 Nf 4 Bxa 2 IA sugest ion of Miles after 16...Qd7 17 Qa4 Rac8 18 NC4 Bd8 19 Nxe6 Qxe6 20 Qb 5 proved good for white in the game MilesKasparov, Niksic 1983] 17 b3 [Spraggett - Chandler, Hong Kong 1984, went 17 Bxc6 bxc6 18 b3 Ba5 19 Rc2 2 Bxb 320 Nxb 3 d3 21 Nxa5 dxc2 22 Qa1, the game ending Nxb3 d3 [Miles's analusis 2 Bxb3 19 na du [Miles's analysis went this far and he assessed the position as unlear 20 Rxc6! Hut not 20 Nxa3 Bxe Bxel 21 Rcl d2 22 Rbl 523 NdO [A 0 保 ta mors afterwards agreed which, the players afterwards agreed, white stands somewhat better]


24 Nbc5 Rad8 25 $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Bxb7 } & \mathrm{h5} & 26 & \mathrm{Bf} 3\end{array}$ Qf5 $27 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{~h} 4 \quad 28$ g4 Qg5 29 h3 Rd4 $30 \mathrm{Qb} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 31 \mathrm{e} 3$ Rdd8 32 Ne 4 a 4 33 Qxa4 lAs Keene points out, 33 Qxf7+ is also very strong] 33...Qe7 5! Rxd3 35 Nf6t Kf8 36 0xh4 Qd8 34 g5! Rxd3 35

TIMMAN - KARPOV, Scotch Game
1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 d4 exd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nxc6 bxc6 6 e5 Qe7 7 Qe2 Nd5 8 c4 Ba6 9 Qe4? [Preferable are 9 Nd or 9 Nc 31 9 ....Nb6! $10 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \quad 0-0-0 \quad 11$ c5 Bxfl 12 cxb6 Ba6 13 bxa7 Kb7 [Another strange position has arisen fro Timman's dubious ninth move novelty. Black's king proves quite safe and his bishop pair soon takes command]

$14 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{f} 6!15$ f4 fxe5 16 fxe5 Re8 17 Bf4 Qh4+ $18 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Qh} 5 \quad 19 \mathrm{Rc} 1$ Ka8 $20 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5!21$ $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Qe3 } & \text { g5! } & 22 & \text { Bxg5 } \\ \text { Bb4 } & 23 & \text { Kf } 2 & \text { Rhf8 } 8+\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{Bb} 4+ & 23 \mathrm{Kf} 2 & \mathrm{Rhf} 8+ \\ 24 \mathrm{Kg} 2 & \mathrm{Rxe} & 25\end{array}$ $24 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rxe5} \quad 25$
$\mathrm{Qxe5} \mathrm{Qf} 3+\quad 26 \mathrm{Kh} 2$ Qf $2+$, 0 - 1 .
ANDERSSON - CHANDLER, QGD Tarrasch: 1 Nf3 d5 2 d4 c5 3 c4 e6 4 cxd5 exd5 $5 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 66 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{0} 0 \mathrm{O}^{-0} 8 \mathrm{dxc} 5$ Bxc5 9 Bg5 Nc6 10 Nc3 d4 11 Bxf6 Qxf6 12 Nd5 Qd8 13 Nd2 Re8 14 Rc Bb6 15 Rel Be6 16 Nf4 Qd7 17 Nxe6 Qxe6 18 Nc4 Rad8 19 a3 Ne5 20 Nxe5

Qxe5 21 Qd3 Re7 22 Rc4 g6 23 Bf 3 Kg 7 24 b4 h5 25 a4 a6 26 a5 Ba7 27 Rb 1 h4 28 b5 axb5 29 Rcb4 Rc8 30 Rxb5
 d3 34 e3? In time trouble white presses too hard; 34 exd 3 Rxd3 35 Rxb7 was best and probably drawn] 34 ...d2 35 Rdl Bxe3! 36 fxe3 Rexe3 37 Bg4 f5 38 Rxb7+ Kh6 39 Rxd2 fxg4 40 Rdd7? (Over looking that his mate threat disappears with the capture of the f-pawn but Black is better anyway) 40 ...Rcl+ 41 Kf2
Rf3+ 42 Ke 2 Rxf4 43 a6 Rc2+, $0-1$. inishes as seen in the following three positions.
CHANDLER - TORRE, after 27...Re7-e6
 28 Nf6+! Rxf6 29 exf6 Rxel+ 30 Kb 2 [black is a piece up - but mate is unavoidable] 30.. $85 \quad 31 \quad \mathrm{Qc} 8+\mathrm{Kh} 7$ 32 Qf8 Kg6 33 g 4 $1-0$ [33...Kxf6 34 Rf5 5 Ke6 35 Qxf7+ Kd6 36 Rd5 mate].
CHANDLER-RIBLI, after 32...Bb7-e4?

$33 \mathrm{Rb} 6!$ [Ribli had obviously overlooked this apart from the threat of Rbs, now unobstructed now unobstructed thus 33 iagonal thus $33 \ldots$... $0 \times 6634$ ive] 33...Bxc2+ is immediately decisivel 33 ....Bxc2 (The abject retreat be a better tryl $34 \mathrm{Kxc} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 7+35$ Rb\&+!, 1 Ka 0
CHANDLER - VAGANIAN, after 28...Qe8-f7

$29 \mathrm{Rb} 7!$ Qxb 7 [Black has nothing better than to
give up his queen, e.g. 29...Nd7 30 Rxd7 Qxd7 31 dxc6t or 29...Ne7 30 Rxe7 Qxe7 31 d6t or $29 \ldots$... 88 30 d6 an overwhelming position for whitel 30 dxc6+ Qf7 31 Bxf7+ Kxf7 32 c7 Ra7 33

Qc6 Ne8 34 Qd7+, l-0.
KARPOV-MILES, Ruy Lopez
1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Ne6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 $50-0 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 6 \mathrm{Rel}$ b5 $7 \mathrm{Bb} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 8$ c3 $0-0$ 9 h3 Bb7 10 d 4 Re8 11 a4 $\mathrm{Bf} 8 \quad 12 \mathrm{~d} 5$ $\mathrm{Na} 5 \quad 13 \mathrm{Ba} 2 \mathrm{c} 6 \quad 14 \mathrm{Na} 3$ cxd5 15 exd5 bxa4 16 Qxa4 Nxd5 17 Ng 5 ! IOn 17 b4 Miles planned 17...Nxe3 18 Qxa5 Qxa5 19 bxa5 Nxa2 20 Rxa2 $f 6$ followed by ...d5 with compensation for the materiall 17 ...Re7 18 b4! Nxc3 19 Qc2! g6 20 Qxc3 Re8 21 Qg3 Nc6 22 Qh4 h5 23 Qe4 Bg7 lQxg6 cannot be prevented as 23...
$\mathrm{Kg7}$ fails to 24 Bxf7! Rxf7 25 Ne6+1 24 Qxg6 d5 25 Qh7+ Kf8


26 Ne4! Re6 [The knight is immune because of 27 Bh6 27 Nc5 Rg6 28 Nxb7 Qd7 29 Qxh5 Nxb4 30 Na 5 Nd 3 31 Bd2 Qa4 32 Qf5!, 1-0.

KORCHNOI - NUNN, Modern Benoni: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 Nc 3 exd5 $5 \mathrm{cxd5} \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 8 \mathrm{Qa} 4+$ Bd7 $9 \quad \mathrm{Qb} 3 \quad \mathrm{Qc} 7 \quad 10$ e4 $0-0 \quad 11 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Nh} 5$ 12 Be3 f5 13 exf5 gxf5 14 Be2 f4 15 Bxc5 f3 16 Bxf3 Rxf3 17 gxf3! [A new move arising from Korchnoi's preparation for his match against Kasparovj 17 ...Qxc5 18 Qxb7 Bxc3 19 bxc3 Nf4

$20 \mathrm{Rgl}+\mathrm{Kf7} 21$ Ne4 Qxd5 22 Qxd5 $24 \mathrm{c}^{4} \mathrm{Ne} 7{ }^{25}$ 24 c4 Kxd avoids the .. pleasant threat of a rook check on 6 a rook check on
26 Ne 4 Bxe4 27 fxe $4 \mathrm{Nd} 7 \quad 28 \quad \mathrm{f} 4$
Nf6 29 e5 Ne4 30 Rd 4 Kf 5 ? [30...Nc5 gave better chances of holdingl 31 Rg 7 Nc6 $32 \mathrm{Rf} 7+$ Ke6 $33 \mathrm{Rdd} 7 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \quad 34 \mathrm{Ke} 2$ $\mathrm{Rb4} \quad 35 \mathrm{Rxh} 7 \mathrm{Rxc} 4 \quad 36 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{Ra} 4 \quad 37 \mathrm{Ke} 3$ Kf5 38 Rdf7+ Ke6 39 Rc7 Kd5 40 Rhd7+ Kc5 41 Rd8, 1 - 0.

VAGANIAN - TIMMAN, Queen's Indian 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 $4 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Bb4}$ Bg5 h6 6 Bh4 Bb7 7 e3 g5 8 Bg3 Ne4 9 Qc2 Bxe3+ 10 bxc3 Nxg3 11 fxg3 [A fairly new idea - White hopes for an attack along the f-fileJ 11...g4 12 Nh4 Ne6 13 Bd3 Qf6 [13...Qg5 has been-
tried but found wanting] 14 Qe 2 h 515 $\mathrm{Rbl} \mathrm{Ne} 7 \quad 16$ e 4 e5 $17 \mathrm{Rfl} \mathrm{Qg} 7 \quad 18 \mathrm{Qe}$ d6 $19 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Qh} 6 \quad 20 \mathrm{Rb} 2 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 21 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{Bc} 8$ 22 a4 Bd7 23 a5 $\mathrm{Qxe3+} 24 \mathrm{Kxe3} \mathrm{Nc} 825$ Ral 0-0 26 axb 6 Nxb6 27 Rba2 a5 28 Nf5? [Correct was 28 Rxas Rxa5 29 RxaS Ra8 when black has enough for the pawn 28 Puf5 29 exf5 Kg7 [Not 29. f6! kingsidel 30 Rxa5 Rxa5 31 Rxa5 Pa8 $32 \mathrm{Rb} 5 \mathrm{Ra} 633 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Kf} 634 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \mathrm{Nc} 8 \quad 35$ $32 \mathrm{KM} 736 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{N8} 837 \mathrm{Rb} 7 \mathrm{Kg} 738 \mathrm{Kd} 2$ Re2t 39 Bc2 4 [Finally the passed Ra2 39 Bc 2 eve tance is short-lived] 40 Rb 8 Ne 741 hug 4 hug 42 Re8 Kf6 43 Kcl e 344 hxg $\mathrm{Ral}+45 \mathrm{Rbl}$ Nuf5 46 kb 2 e 247 Rh1 Nxg3, $0-1$.
CHANDLER - SPEELMAN, French Tarrasch: I e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd2 a6 $4 \mathrm{Ngf3} \mathrm{c} 5$ 5 exd5 exd5 $6 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{c} 4 \quad 7 \mathrm{~b} 3$ cxb3 8 axb3 $\mathrm{Nc} 6 \quad 9 \mathrm{O} 0 \mathrm{Bb4} 10 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{Nge7} 11 \mathrm{Ne5} \mathrm{Bf5}$ 12 Ndf3 Rc8 13 Bd3 0-0 14 Bxf5 Nxf5


hxg5 25 Nf3 Bd8 26 c 4 dxc4 27 Rxc4 Rb8 $\quad 28$ Rc5 $54 \quad 29$ Ne5 $\mathrm{Bb} 6 \quad 30 \mathrm{Nc} 4 \mathrm{Qf} 6$ 31 Rce5 Rbd8 32 d5 f4 33 Nxb6 $0 \times x 634$ Rh5 g6 35 Rg5 Rd6 36 Re6, $1-0$ [time]. MILES - POLUGAEVSKY, Sokolsky Opening: $1 \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 62 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 4 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{0} 0$ 5 e3 d6 6 d4 Nbd7 7 Qb3 c5 8 Be2 b6 9 Nbd2 e6 $100-0 \mathrm{Bb} 711$ bxc5 dxc5 12 a4 Ne4 13 Nxe4 Bxe4 14 Rfdl cxd4 15 exd4 Qc7 16 a5 Rab8 17 Qe 3 Bxf3 18 Qxf3 bxa5 19 Bc 3 e5 $20 \mathrm{Qg} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 3 \quad 21$
 Nxd3 25 Rxd3 Qxe4 26 Radl gxf4 27 Khl Qe6 28 Qf3 a3 29 Qe4 a2 $30 \mathrm{Rd} 6 \quad \mathrm{Qg} 4$ $31 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Qg} 3 \quad 32 \mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{~d} 3 \mathrm{Qg} 6 \quad 33 \mathrm{Qc} 4 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \quad 3$ Bal Qe6 35 Qxf4 Rfb8 36 Kh 2 Rxal? [Black wins easily after the preparatory 36...h6; the text, however, allows pe petual check] 37 Rds+ Rxd8 38 Rxd8 B1 41 Kxh1 Q

Several more games from this tournament (all annotated by Ray Keene) will be found in the Games section starting on page 103.

## 11th WINSTONE'S CHESS TOURNAMENT

## Over $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 2 0 0}$ in prizes

## 15/16 September 1984

St Joseph's Church Hall, Takapuna
FORMAT: Five-round Swiss in two grades with time-control of 45 moves in $1 \frac{1}{2}$ hours plus 15 minutes to complete the game. The B-grade is restricted to players rated under 1700 on the latest NZCA Rating List.

RATING: Both grades will be rated by NZCA.
SCHEDULE: Saturday rounds commence at $9: 30 \mathrm{am}, 2: 00 \mathrm{pm} \& 6: 30 \mathrm{pm}$. Sunday round start at 10:00am and 2:30pm. Players meeting at 9:15am on the Saturday.

ENTRY FEES: Open - $\$ 14.00$, B-grade - $\$ 12.00$ if received by 12 September. Entries at $\$ 2.00$ surcharge may be taken up until 9:00am on the Saturday

PRIZES: Open $-\$ 300, \quad \$ 200, \quad \$ 120, \quad \$ 80, \quad \$ 60, \quad \$ 40$ B-grade - $\$ 150, \quad \$ 100, \quad \$ 70, \quad \$ 50, \quad \$ 40, \quad \$ 30$ The prize fund of $\$ 1240$ is guaranteed.

The WINSTONE CHESS TOURNAMENT is organised by the NORTH SHORE CHESS CLUB. Entry forms and further information are available from the Secretary, North Shore Chess Club, P.O. Box 33-587, Takapuna, Auckland 9. As the tournaments are NZCA-rated, entry is confined to members of NZCA-affiliated clubs. The entry fees quoted above include the NZCA Tournament Levy of $\$ 1.00$.

## Kasparov v Smyslov

just for the record

Our June report gave only four of the games from the Candidates' Final, won $8 \frac{1}{2}: 4 \frac{1}{2}$ by Kasparov. Here are the other nine games.
SMYSLOV - KASPAROV (4), Queen's Gambit: $1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5{ }^{2} \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 63 \mathrm{c} 4$ e6 4 Nc 3 Be 7
 dxc4 9 Bxc4 a6 10 Qe2 b5 11 Bd3 Bb 7
 $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { g3 } 3 \text { Rad8 } & 16 & \text { Be3 } & \text { Bxe3 } & 17 & \text { Qxe3 } & \text { Qc5 } & 18 \\ \text { Rfe1 } & \text { Nhf } 6 & 19 & \text { a3 } & \text { Ng4 } & 20 & \text { Qxc5 } & \text { Nxc5 } & 21\end{array}$ Rfel Nhf6 19 a3 $\mathrm{Ng}_{4} 20$ Qxc5 Nxc5 21 Bc2
 21...f5 22 Ng 5 24 Bxdl Ne5 25 $\begin{array}{ll}24 \\ \text { gxf4 Ned3 } \\ 26 & 25\end{array}$ gxt 27 bxc 5 hxg 28 Re3 Nxf4 29 a4 $\begin{array}{lllll}28 & \text { Re3 } & \mathrm{Nxf4} & 29 & \mathrm{a4} \\ \mathrm{~b} 4 & 30 & \mathrm{Ne} 2 & \mathrm{Rc} 8 \quad 31\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{b4} 3 & 30 & \mathrm{Ne} 2 & \mathrm{Rc} 8 \\ \mathrm{Bb} 3 & \mathrm{Rxc} 5 & 32 & \mathrm{Nxf} 4\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Bb3 } & \mathrm{Rxc5} & 32 & \mathrm{Nxf4} \\ \text { gxf4 } & 33 & \mathrm{Bxe} 6+\mathrm{Kf8}\end{array}$ gxf4 33 Bxe6+ Kf8
$34 \mathrm{Rel} \operatorname{Re5} \quad 35 \mathrm{Bb} 3$ Rxe4 36 Rdl Ke 737 Kfl as 38 Rcl Kf 6 $39 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{~g} 540 \operatorname{Rc} 7 \operatorname{Re} 741 \operatorname{Rc} 5 \operatorname{Re} 5,0-1$.
SMYSLOV-KASPAROV (6), Queen's Gambit: $1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~d} 52 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{c} 4$ e6 4 Nc 3 Be 7 $50 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Br} 40-0 \mathrm{Rcl} \mathrm{Ne}_{4} 8 \mathrm{Bxe} 7$ Qxe7 9 e3 c6 10 Bd3 Nxc3 11 Rxc3 15 Bb5 Rd8 16 Bc6 Rb8 17 Qc 2 cxd4
 Rxd8+ Oxd8 22 Ng 3 Be6 23 b 4 Rc8 24
 Qd2 Nb8 $28 \mathrm{Ne} 4 \mathrm{Nd} 729 \mathrm{Ma} \mathrm{Nf6} 30 \mathrm{NufG}$
 $34 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Qb} 3 \quad 35 \mathrm{Qxb} 3 \mathrm{Bxb} 3 \mathrm{Kl}^{36} \mathrm{Bg} 4 \mathrm{Bc} 2$ $37 \mathrm{Bf} 5 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{~K}_{3} \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Be} 2 \quad 39 \mathrm{Bg} 4 \mathrm{Bf} 1$
 Kd6, $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$.
KASPAROV-SMYSLOV (7), Queen's Gambit: d4 d5 2 Nf3 Nf6 3 c4 c6 4 Nc3 e6 5 Bf5 $5 \mathrm{Nbd} 7 \quad 6$ e3 Qa5 $7 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \quad 8$ Qc2 $0-0 \quad 9$ a3 dxc4 10 Bxf6 Nxf6 11 Nxc4 Bxc 3+ 13 Oxc3 Qxc3+ 13 bxc3 c5 14 Be2, $\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$.
SMYSLOV - KASPAROV (8), QGD Tarrasch: 1 d4 d5 2 Nf3 c5 3 c4 e6 4 cxd5 exd5 $5 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 66 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Be} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{0} 00008 \mathrm{Nc} 3$ Ne6 9 Bg5 cxd4 10 Nxd4 h6 11 Be3 Re8 12 a3 Be6 13 Khl Bg 414 f 3 Bh 515 gg1 Qd7 16 Qa4 Bc5 17 Radl Bb6 18 Rfe1 Bg6 19 Qb5 Rad8 20 e3 Qd6 21 Nee2 Ne5 22 Qb3 Ba5 23 Nc3 Nd3 24 Re2 Nc5 25 Qa2 Bxc3 26 bxc3 Qa6 27 Red2 $\mathrm{Na} 4, \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$.

KASPAROV-SMYSLOV (9), Queen's Gambit: 1 d4 d5 2 Nf3 Nf6 3 c4 c6 4 Nc3 e6 5 Bg5 Nbd7 6 e3 Qa5 7 cxd5 Nxd5 8 Qd2 Bb4 9 Rcl e5 10 a3 Bd6 11 dxe5 Nxe5 12 Nxe5 Bxe5 13 b4 Bxc3 14 Qxc3 Nxc3 15 bxas Ne4 16 Bf4 $0-0 \quad 17 \mathrm{f} 3$ Nf6 18 e4 Re8 19 Kf2 a6 20 Be2 $2 \mathrm{Be}^{2}$ $21 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \operatorname{Re} 722$ Rhd1 Rae8 23 Rb 2 Bc 8 24 Rbd2 Rd7 25 Rxd7 Nxd7 26 g 4 Ne 5 $27 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Nd} 728 \mathrm{~g} 5 \mathrm{Ne} 529 \mathrm{Bd} 4 \mathrm{Ng} 6 \quad 30$ $\mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 8 \quad 31 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Rd} 8 \quad 32 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Be} 6 \quad 33 \mathrm{Bc} 3$ Rxd 34 Bxdl Nd7 35 f5 Bc4 36 h5 h6 37 gxh6 gxh6 38 e 5 Nc5 $39 \mathrm{Kf4} 4 \mathrm{Bd5} 40$ $5 \mathrm{Cl}^{2} 4 \mathrm{e}$ Kg 42 Nb 43 Ke c5 44 Bc3 Kf8, 1 - 0.

SMYSLOV - KASPAROV (10), QGD Tarrasch: First 14 moves as in Game 8: 15 Nxc6 bxc6 16 Na 4 Qc8 17 Bd4 Qe6 18 Rc 1 Nd7 19 Rc3 Bf6 20 e3 Bg6 21 Kg 1 Be 7 22 Qd2 Rab8 23 Rel a5 24 Bfl h5 25 Recl Ne5 26 Bxe5 Qxe5 27 Rxc6 Bf6 28 R6c5 Qxe3+ 29 Qxe3 Rxe3 30 Rxd5 Rxf3 31 Be 2 Re 332 Bxh 5 Bxh5 33 Rxh5 g5 $34 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Rd} 8 \quad 35 \mathrm{Rc} 2 \mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 36 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Kg} 6 \quad 37$ $\mathrm{g} 4 \mathrm{Rd} 438 \mathrm{~h} 3, \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$.
KASPAROV - SMYSLOV (11), QGD Tchigorin:
 Bxf3 5 gxf3 Qxd5 6 e 3 e5 7 Nc3 7 Bb4 8 Bd2 Bxc3 9 bxc 3 Qd6 10 Rbl b6 11 f 4 exf4 12 e4 Nge7 13 Qf3 $0-0 \quad 14$ $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { Bxf4 Qa3 } & 15 & \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{f} 5 & 16 & 0-0 & \text { fxe4 } & 17\end{array}$ Qxe4 Qxe3 18 Be3 Qa3 19 Bd3 Qd6! 20 Qxh7+ Kf7 21 Rb5 Nxd4 22 Qe4 Rad8 23 Bxd4 Qxd4 24 Rf5+ Nxf5 25 Qxf5+ Kg8 26 Qh7+ Kf7, $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$.
SMYSLOV - KASPAROV (12), QGD Tarrasch: First 12 moves as in games 8 and 10: 3 Nxe6 fxe6 14 Qa4 Kh8 15 Radl Re8 $16 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{a6} 17 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Na} 518 \mathrm{f} 5 \mathrm{~b} 5 \quad 19$ Qh4 Ng8 20 Qh3 Nc4 21 Bc1 Bg5 22 fxe6 Bxal 23 Rxcl Ne3 24 Nxd5? [24 Rg1] 24 ..Nxfl 25 Rxfl Rf8 26 Nf 4 Ne 7 Qg4 g5! 28 Qh3 Rf6 [Eliminating White's ttacking chances] $29 \mathrm{Nd} 3 \mathrm{Rxf} 1+30$ Rf8 34 31 Qg4 Qd5t 32 e4 Qd4 33 h 4
 Bxd3 Qxd3, 0 - I.
KASPAROV - SMYSLOV (13): Queen's Gambit: 1 d4 d5 2 Nf3 Nf6 3 c4 c6 4 Nc3 e6 5 Bg 5 Nbd 76 e3 Qa5 $7 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \quad 8$ Qc2 -09 Be 2 e5 10 Bxf6 Nxf6 11 dxe5 Ne4 12 cxd5 Nxc3 13 bxc3 Bxc3 14 Rc Bxe5 15 dxc6 bxc6, 1/2 - $1 / 2$

International Ratings, 1 July

| The latest | IDE | ating | Arkhipov** | USR | 2560 | Tarjan | USA | 2505 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lists show | e int | erest- | Kudrin* |  |  | Utasi* | HUN | 2505 |
| ing changes. | aspa | ov \& | Kudrin ${ }^{\text {L }}$ * | USR | 2550 | Velimirovic | YUG | 2505 |
| Karpov still | it at | the | Lputyan* | USR | 2550 |  |  |  |
| top, both ha | ing go | ne up | Tukmakov | USR | 2550 | Cebalo* | YUG | 2500 |
| 5 points. Ti | an and |  | Christiansen | USA | 2550 | Csom | HUN | 2500 |
| Portisch, h | ver | have | Geller | USR | 2550 | Garcia-Palermo* | ARG | 2500 |
| bounced back | o ta | e the | Mestel | ENG | 2550 | Georgadze | USR | 2500 |
| next two spo | Or | he |  |  |  | Karlsson | SWE | 2500 |
| distaff side | Hungar | y's | Chandler | ENG | 2540 | Peters* | USA | 2500 |
| 15-year old | uzsa | Polgar | Dolmatov | USR | 2540 | Rivas-Pastor* | SPA | 2500 |
| has joined P | Crat | ling | Dorfman | USR | 2540 | Speelman | ENG | 2500 |
| in first pla | whil | e Maya | Smejkal | CZ | 254 | Stean | ENG | 2500 |
| Chiburdanidz | dropp | ed 10 | Spraggett* | CAN | 2540 | Eingorn** | USR | 2495 |
| points. |  |  | Larsen | DEN | 2535 | Evans | USA | 2495 |
| An * indic | S IM |  | van der Wiel | NLD | 2535 | Gligoric | YUG | 2495 |
| indicates un | tled; |  | Knaak | DDR |  | Henley | USA | 2495 |
| others on th | top |  | Kurajica | YUR | 2530 | Lobron | BRD | 2495 |
| 11st are GMs |  |  |  | USR |  | Malanfuk** | USR | 2495 |
|  |  |  | Schmid | BRD | 2530 | Najdorf | ARG | 2495 |
| Kasparov | USR | 2715 | Sveshnikov | USR | 2530 | Quinteros | ARG | 2495 |
| Karpov | USR | 2705 | Torre | PHI | 2530 | Vaise | USR | 2495 |
| Timman | NLD | 2650 | Pinter | HUN | 2525 | New Zealand |  | on |
| Portisch | HUN | 2640 | Popovic | YUG | 2525 | the 11st are: |  |  |
|  |  |  | Zapata* | OL | 2525 | Nokes 2310, S |  | 235, |
| Korchnoi | SWI | 2635 | Benjamin* | USA | 2520 |  | dith | 295; |
| Polugaevsky | USR | 2625 | Chekhov* | USR | 2520 | Sarfati 2265, | atson | 2260 |
| Vaganian | USR | 2625 | Dzindzihashvili | USA | 2520 | Aptekar 2240, | 110g |  |
| Ljubojevic | YUG | 2615 | Farago | HUN | 2520 | 2235, Anderson | 230, |  |
|  |  |  | Hjartarson** | ICE | 2520 | Stuart 2225, | man |  |
| Hubner | BRD | 2610 | Olafsson H.* | ICE | 2520 | 2220, Cornford | 220, | Dow- |
| Smyslov | USR | 2610 | Balashov | USR | 2515 | den 2220. |  |  |
| Hort | CZE | 2605 | Georgiev Kir.* | BU | 2515 | The top 14 pl | yer | on |
| Ta1 | USR | 2605 | Ivanovic B. | YUG | 2515 | the Women's lis | ar |  |
| Belyavsky | US | 2600 | Marjanovic | yUG | 2515 | Cramling (SWE) | 405, | Pol- |
| Ribli | HUN | 2600 | Panno | ARG | 2515 | gar (HUN) 2405, | Chib | rdan |
|  |  |  | Yrjölä* | IN | 2515 | idze (USR) 2375 | Gap |  |
| Andersson | SWE | 2595 |  |  |  | dashvili (USR) | 335, |  |
| Ftacnik | CZE | 2595 | Kovacevic | YUG | $\begin{aligned} & 2510 \\ & 2510 \end{aligned}$ | Brustman (POL) | 315, | Le- |
| Spassky | USR | 2590 | Nogueiras | CUB | 2510 | matchko (SWI) 2 |  | evi- |
| Yusupov | USR | 2590 | Petursson* | ICE | 2510 | Petronic (HUN) |  |  |
| Nikolic P. | YUG | 2585 | Razuvaev | USR | 2510 | Gurieli (USR) 2 | 90, | ose |
| Adorian | HUN | 2580 | Short* | ENG | 2510 | Ifani (USR) 229 | , Al | ksan- |
| Browne | USA | 2580 | Taimanov | US | 2510 | dria (USR) 2275 | Hun |  |
| Petrosian | USR | 2580 | Arnason* | ICE | 2505 | (BRD) 2270, Akh | ilov | kaya |
|  |  |  | Donchev* | BUL | 2505 | (USR) 2260, Mil | tino |  |
| Nunn | ENG | 2575 | Ehlvest* | USR | 2505 | (YUG) 2260. |  |  |
| Agzamov* | USR | 2570 | Gavrikov** | USR | 2505 | The full Men' | lis |  |
| Kavalek | USA | 2565 | Gheorghiu | RUM | 2505 | contains almost | 3800 |  |
| M1les | ENG | 2565 | Hansen* | DEN | 2505 | names while the | sepa |  |
| Psakhis | USR | 2565 | Ivanov* | CAN | 2505 | men's list has | 1m |  |
| Sax | HUN | 2565 | Kuzmin | USR | 2505 |  |  |  |
| Sedrawan | USA | 2565 | Lombardy | USA | 2505 |  |  |  |
| Sosonko | NLD | 2565 | Sokolov* | USR | 2505 | slx month period |  |  |

## The Countrywide North Island Ch'p

|  |  | Club | R. 1 | R. 2 | R. 3 | R. 4 | R. 5 | R. 6 | R. 7 | R. 8 | T'1 | SOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Smith R W | Wai | W30 | W13 | W19 | W8 | D3 | W4 | D2 | W6 | 7 |  |
| 2 | Sarfati J D | W | W21 | D10 | D6 | w7 | W22 | D8 | D1 | W14 | 6 | 41 |
|  | Green P R | A | W23 | D29 | W24 | W10 | D1 | D6 | W16 | D4 | 6 | 40 |
| 4 | Hopewell M G | A | W37 | W15 | D16 | W18 | W12 | L1 | W9 | D3 | 6 | 40 |
| 5 | Dive R J | Twa | W35 | W9 | L8 | W27 | D16 | D18 | W25 | W20 | 6 | 3412 |
| 6 | Ker A F | HV | w7 | W22 | D2 | D16 | W14 | D3 | W8 | L1 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 43 |
| 7 | Ker C M | HV | L6 | W39 | W21 | L2 | W30 | D13 | W17 | W16 | 51/2 | 361/2 |
| 8 | Clemance P A | civ | W31 | W14 | W5 | L1 | W19 | D2 | L6 | D9 | 5 | 43 |
| 9 | Vetharaniam P | Wan | W40 | L5 | W26 | D13 | W11 | W12 | 14 | D8 | 5 | 39 |
| 0 | Alexander B J | c | W36 | D2 | W20 | L3 | D15 | W23 | D12 | D18 | 5 | 38 |
| 1 | Gibbons R E | A | W17 | D24 | W29 | L12 | L9 | W22 | D13 | W21 | 5 | 351 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ |
| 2 | Anderson B R | Che | W37 | D43 | W28 | W11 | 14 | L9 | D10 | W25 | 5 | 351/2 |
| 3 | Lynn K W | Ham | W46 | L1 | W41 | D9 | D17 | D7 | D11 | W23 | 5 | 351/2 |
| 4 | Foster F M | Wnm | W44 | L8 | W46 | W25 | L6 | W21 | W18 | L2 | 5 | 331/2 |
| 5 | Boswell T J | Wan | W42 | L4 | D17 | W33 | D10 | L25 | W37 | W26 | 5 | 321/2 |
| 6 | Aldridge G J | Twa | W47 | W25 | D4 | D6 | D5 | W19 | L3 | L7 | 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ | 3912 |
| 7 | Vetharaniam K | Wan | L11 | W32 | D15 | W28 | D13 | D20 | L7 | W33 | 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ | 361/2 |
| 8 | Carpinter B A | Civ | W26 | D28 | W43 | 14 | W24 | D5 | L14 | D10 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 361/2 |
| 9 | Turner G M | Wan | W50 | W41 | L1 | W23 | L8 | L16 | W27 | D28 | 41/2 | 31 |
| 0 | Whitehouse L E | Ham | 141 | W33 | L10 | W48 | W47 | D17 | W34 | L5 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 29 |
| 1 | Shuker R | PN | L2 | W36 | L7 | W38 | W27 | L14 | W31 | L11 | 4 | 351/2 |
| 2 | Goodhue N | ${ }^{\text {HV}}$ | W39 | 16 | W35 | W29 | L2 | L11 | L26 | W34 | 4 | 34 |
| 3 | Cooper P R | Wan | L3 | W38 | W37 | L19 | W31 | L10 | W35 | L13 | 4 | 331/2 |
| 4 | Forbes G | Wan | W32 | D11 | L3 | W43 | L18 | D26 | L33 | W41 | 4 | 32 |
| 5 | Stephenson J R | A | W48 | L16 | W47 | L14 | W41 | W15 | L5 | L12 | 4 | 32 |
| 6 | Trundle G E | A | L18 | W49* | L9 | D35 | W32 | D24 | W22 | L15 | 4 | $31 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 7 | Boswell W J | PN | L12 | W45 | W31 | L5 | L21 | W46 | L19 | W35 | 4 | 31 |
| 8 | Robinson J P | Wai | W49 | D18 | L12 | L17 | W33 | L34 | W36 | D19 | 4 | $30 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 9 | Hal1 M | PN | W38 | D3 | L11 | L22 | 135 | D42 | W44 | W37 | 4 | 29 |
| 0 | Wood R J | Civ | Ll | 146 | W39 | W42 | L7 | L36 | W45 | W38 | 4 | $28 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 1 | Billing J | $N P$ | L8 | W44 | L27 | W46 | L23 | W47* | L21 | W39 | 4 | 261/2 |
| 2 | Hoskyn G A | Wan | L24 | L17 | D49 | W40 | L26 | D38 | W42 | W36 | 4 | 26 |
| 3 | Whitlock H P | Wan | D34 | L20 | W40 | L15 | L28 | W41 | W24 | L17 | 3112 | 31 |
| 4 | Morgan B | Wan | D33 | L35 | W44 | 147 | W43 | W28 | L20 | L22 | 31/2 | 26 |
| 5 | Bell D I | Wan | L5 | W34 | L22 | D26 | W29 | D37 | L23 | L27 | 3 | 321/2 |
| 6 | Booth S L | Wan | L10 | L21 | 142 | W45 | W39 | W30 | L28 | L32 | 3 | 29 |
| 7 | Beesley R | Ham | L4 | W42 | L23 | D41 | W48 | D35 | L15 | L29 | 3 | 29 |
| 8 | Ward C | Wan | L29 | L23 | W45 | L21 | D42 | D32 | W43 | L30 | 3 | $27 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 9 | Copp J | Wan | L22 | L7 | L30 | Bye | L36 | W48 | W46 | L31 | 3 | 24 $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 0 | Stynman F | Ham | L9 | Bye | L33 | L32 | 144 | 145 | W48 | W46 | 3 | 21/1/2 |
| 1 | Carline-Powell L N | NS | W20 | L19 | 113 | D37 | 125 | 133 | W49 | L24 | 21/2 | 301/2 |
| 2 | Blatchford J | PN | L15 | L37 | W36 | L30 | D38 | D29 | L32 | D43 | 21212 | 2812 |
| 3 | Sangster A | Wan | W45 | D12 | L18 | L24 | L34 | D44 | L38 | D42 | 21/2 | 271/2 |
| 4 | Simmons J R | Civ | L14 | L31 | L34 | D49 | W40 | D43 | L29 | D45 | 21212 | 261/2 |
| 5 | Cooper M | Wan | 143 | L27 | L38 | L36 | Bye | W40 | L30 | D44 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 22 |
| 6 | Watson M J | A | L13 | W30 | L14 | L31 | W49 | L27 | L39 | 140 | 2 | 30 |
| 7 | Morrison M K | NS | L16 | W48 | L25 | W34 | L20 | L31* | - | - | 2 | 291/2 |
| 8 | Pacitto D | Wan | L25 | L47 | Bye | 120 | L37 | L39 | 140 | W49 | 2 | 21娄 |
| 9 | Mackay M | Wan | L28 | L26* | D32 | D44 | 146 | Bye | 141 | 148 | 2 | 21 |
| 0 | 0ldridge C B W | $N P$ | L19 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |

Smith R W
$\begin{array}{ll}2 & \text { Sarfati J D } \\ 3 & \text { Green P R }\end{array}$
4 Hopewell MG
Dive R J
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Ker } & \text { A F } \\ \text { Ker } \\ \text { C }\end{array}$
Clemance PA
Alexander B
Gibbons $R$ E
Anderson $B R$
Lynn K W
Foster FM
Boswell T
Aldridge G J
Vetharaniam $K$
Carpinter B
Whitehouse LE
Shuker R
Goodhue $N$
Forbes G
Trundle G E
Trundle G
Boswell W J
Hall M
Booding J
Billing ${ }^{\mathrm{J}}$ Hoskyn A
Whitlock H P
Morgan B
Bell D I
Beesley R
Ward C
Copp J
Stynman
CarIfne-Powell L
Blatchford J
Sangster A
${ }^{\text {Simmons }}{ }^{\mathrm{J}} \mathrm{R}$
Watson M J
Pacitto D
Mackay M
oldridge C BW

Wellington Queen's Birthday Weekender

## by J. D. Sarfati

This year's Queen's Birthday Weekend tourney was run (for the fourth year in a row) by the Wellington Chess Club on behalf of the Wellington Chess League as a 5-round Swiss in three grades. The time control was 36 moves in $1 \frac{1}{2}$ hours and 24 moves per hour thereafter. N.Z. Junior co-champion Jonathan Sarfati was Director of Play, ably assisted by Reg Woodford. His first action, which I hope sets a precedent, was to act on the question from a player about smoking by putting it to a democratic vote (since the Laws give the director discretionary powers to interpret the laws; states that a player is 19.1 (c) which distract or a play tor is distract or annoy the opponent in any ban on smoking in the tournament hall. The smokers respected the vote and med the vote and
The A-grade was quite strong by ington standards, quite strong by Well rgtond and Anthony Ker followed by Leonard Mctaren, former N. 2 . Champion Arcadi Feneridis, then Mark Noble and Russell Dive. Sixteen players in all.
The first round produced no upsets a all except Ross Corry ( 15 th) beating Gavin Marner (7th).
Round two saw the top three seeds Rlus Dive (6th) leading with $2 / 2$. In the third round Clemance and Dive adjourned a quite interesting game, finally agreeing the draw before round four. McLaren played well to achieve a won queen ending at the adjournment an outside passed pawn up - versus Ker. The two 'leaders' McLaren ('3') and Clemance ( $2 \frac{1}{2}$ ) were paired on top board in round four. The former duplicated Bogoljubow's inadequate opening as wite against Capablanca at New York 1924; his queenside was likewise massacred. Ker ('2') played well to obtain good winning chances versus Dive (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) by adjournment.
The adjourned game session, however, was to have a major bearing on the final results. McLaren composed an easy helpmate problem which Ker solved; lucky whole point gained. Then Dive ured Ker into an ingenious drawing Ine (suggested by Zig Frankel). Thus
the leaders with one round to go were: Clemance \& Ker $3 \frac{1}{2}$; Dive \& (surprising
1y) Peter Collins 3
The final round saw Ker play a Grob against Clemance for the second time; once again Philip gained a pawn and the better position but again Clemance managed to lose, this time after making four mistakes in a row to go from a technical win to a difficult win to a position where Ker had adequate counter chances to a position where White's queen and knight infiltrated to force mate or win of the queen.
Dive swindled Collins in the latter's time pressure and won the exchange but still allowed drawing chances before winning.
McLaren (2) versus Noble ( $2 \frac{1}{2}$ ) was a pairing which undoubtedly upset both after their poor showing hitherto ell 16 greed a 16-move draw with Noble (Black) McLaren's insipid opening play.
So Anthony Ker won with $4 \frac{1}{2}$ ( $\$ 90$ ) while Russell Dive was second ( $\$ 60$ ) and Phille Russell Dive was second ( $\$ 60$ ) and Phillp clemance third ( $\$ 30$ ). While it is an magazine that winners are never criti cised (hence the phrase 'deserving wisner' is heavily overworked). I say that what distinguished Ker's play was that he took care never to make the last mistake in any game! Dive was happy with his result but not his play while Clemance must be disappointed that his only bad mistakes cost him the tournament.
The B-grade featured a number of upsets. Top seed Bob Mitchell lost in the first round to an underrated Gerard Barrow (7th) while second seed Charles Ker lost in round two to John Tangiiau (6th - another underrated player) and had his Grob smashed by Barrow in round three. Mitchell and Tangiiau (loss to Dunn) drew in the last round to tie for first place while Barrow could have joined them if he had found a perpetual check against Sims after the latter had gained a second queen. The Novag Constellation (owned by Noble) caught David Bennett in a book trap but in its other games played indifferently, scoring $1 \frac{1}{2} / 4$ including a win by default.

Nevertheless, one of the strongest computers I have seen.
The scores:

| A-grade |  | R. 1 R. 2 R. 3 R. 4 R. 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Ker A.F. | W4 | W5 | W7 | D2 | 3 |  |
| 2 | Dive R.J. | W11 | w8 | D3 | D1 | W4 |  |
| 3 | Clemance P.A. | W15 | W6 | D2 | W7 | L |  |
| 4 | Collins P. | L1 | W10 | W1 | W8 | L2 |  |
| 5 | Noble M.F. | W10 | L1 | D12 | W14 | D7 | 3 |
| 6 | Feneridis A. | W14 | L3 | D8 | D11 | W12 | 3 |
| 7 | McLaren L.J. | W11 | W13 | LI | L3 | D5 |  |
| 8 | Corry R.J. | W9 | L2 | D6 | L4 | W16 |  |
| 9 | Marner G. | L8 | D11 | D14 | D12 | W15 |  |
| 10 | Connor B.P. | L5 | L4 | D11 | W16 | W14 |  |
| 11 | Cooper P.R. | L2 | D9 | D10 | D6 | D13 | 2 |
| 12 | Wood R.J. | L7 | W16 | D5 | D9 | L6 | 2 |
| 13 | Boswell T.J. | W16 | L7 | L4 | D15 | D11 |  |
| 14 | Grkow A. | L6 | W15 | D9 | L5 | L10 |  |
| 15 | Frankel Z . | L3 | L14 | W16 | D13 | L9 |  |

B-grade: 1-2 R.S.Mitche11 \& J.N.Tangilau
 Ker \& M.T.Sims 3; 8-9 Novag Constellation \& J.R.Simmons $2 \frac{1}{2} ; \quad 10-11$ A.Archer \& L.R. Jones $1 \frac{1}{2} ; 12 \mathrm{~S}$. Hill 0.
C-grade: 1 s .Wang 4; 2-3 M.A.Gordon \& J. Phillips $3 \frac{1}{2} ; \quad 4$ C. H. Webber 3; 5-6 S. Aburn \& M.Capie 21/2; 7-9 J. Hemela, R. Mowat \& W.B.Jones 2.

Despite many of the decisive games being marred by blunders (possibly caused by nerves - or by the fact that next door to us was a noisy show or church group, so we ope ther is not hired agaln!) chere es, a few of which follow.

COLLINS - KER, Sicilian Dragon:
1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 Ne6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 e4 c5 2 Nf3 Nc6 ${ }^{3}$ d4 cxd4 ${ }^{4}$ Nxd4 Nf6
5 Nc 3 g ?! [Very dubious] 6 Be 3 [6 Nxc6!
 and 6...dxc6 7 Qxd8+ or 6...bxc6 7 e5 are both clearly better for White; the game $\mathrm{Be} 2[7 \mathrm{fj}$ is more dangerous for both sides] $7 . . . \operatorname{Bg} 7 \quad 8 \quad 0-0 \quad 0-0 \quad 9$ Qd2? [ 9 f4] $9 \ldots . . N g 4!$ i...Bg7 $8 \times 0$ 0 $0-0$ Qd2? [9 $44 \mathrm{~J} 9 . . . \mathrm{Ng} 4$ 10 Bxg4 Bxg4 11 f3 Bd7 12 Nxc6 bxc6 13 fine for Black] 14 Ne 2 e5?! [The Bg7 \& Pd6 were probably giving the e-pawn dirty looks for this move] 15 Bc 3 Be 616 Bb 4 Qb6t 17 Khl c5 18 Ba5 Qa6 19 Rfdl Rfe8 20 b4? [20 b3 intending $21 \mathrm{c4}$; if 20...c4 21 Bb4 Bff 22 Nc3 \& Na5 with advantage] 20 ...Rac8 21 a4 cxb4 22 Bxb4 Qc4 23 Bxd6 Qxc2 [Now the bishop pair confers a slight
edge on Black] 24 Qe3 Red8 25 Rd 2 Qc4 26 Qa3 Bh6! 27 Rda2 Qa6 28 Be7 Rd3 29 Qb2 Rd2 30 Qxd2 Bxd2 31 Rxd2 Kf7 32 Bd8 Rxd8 33 Rxd8 Qxe2 $34 \mathrm{Rh} 8 \mathrm{Kg} 735 \mathrm{Re} 8 \mathrm{Bh} 3!?, 0-1$ sufferingj. McLAREN-CLEMANCE, Queen's Pawn:
 e6 5 d4 [Inconsistent with his previous play] 5...Nc6 6 Bd3 Bd6 7 0-0 0-0 $8 \mathrm{Nbd} 2 ?$ [ 8 a3 is preferable] 8...Qe7! tThe opening so far has followed the game Bogol jubow-Capablanca, New York 1924; Clemance knew this game, unlike McLaren. Black's 8 th move threatens both e5 and cxd4 followed by Ba3] 9 Re [Bogol jubowCapablanca went: 9 Ne5 cxd4 10 exd4 Ba3 11 Bxa3 Oxa3 12 Naf3 Bd 13 Nxc Exc6 14 Qa2 Raca 15 c3? ab! 16 Ne5 Rfcs 20 RC2 Nes 21 RfC1 Na6 22 Ne 5 (22 Nc51 - Ne 21 RNO Na Ne5? Ob6! 24 Na3 $0 \times b 325$ Nc5 06626 Pb2 Qb7 27 NaJ Qxb3 25 NCS Qb6 26 Rb2 30 NC5 Nb 51 Re2 Nxa4! 32 cxat 30 Nc5 Nb 1 R8xc5 $0-1$. A fine game by the Cuban Ba3 11 Bxa3 0xa3 12 c3? 10 exd4 Ba3 ll Bxa3 Qxa3 12 c3? [The same
mistake as Bogo's 15th] 12... Ne5 Rac8


14 Re3 Ne7! [A good defensive manoeuvre) 15 Rh 3 ? [White tries to attack but this only wastes time] 15 …Ng6 16 Nxg hxg $6 \quad 17 \mathrm{Re} 3$
$\mathrm{Qb} 2!$ pawn] 18 c4 [Or 18 Rc1 Rxc3 19 Rxc3
 Rael dxc4 23 Bxc4 Bd5 24 Bxd5 Rxd5 $25 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Qb} 4 \quad 26$ Rd3? Rc2! [Decisive White should resign] 27 Rxd5 exd5 28 Odl Rxa2 29 Ocl Rc2 30 Qal Qdd 31 Rf 1 Ra 232 Ob 1 Rb 2 Time press31 Rfl Ra2 32 Qb1 Rb2 [Time pressa6 35 Nf 3 Qc 2 36 Qe1 Qxb3 37 Nd 4 Qd3, $0-1$.
NOBLE-GRKOW, Pirc Defence:
$1 \mathrm{e}^{4} \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 2 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{c} 6$ 5 Be3 Bg7 6 Qd2 0-0? [Experience has shown that black's position is indefensible after committing his
king to the kingside] $7 \mathrm{h4}[7$ Eh6!] 7 ...Re8 8 Bh6 Bh8!? 9 0-0-0 b5 10 g 4 Qb6 [10...b4, $10 \ldots$ as or $10 \ldots$. 0 a 5 might put up a fight but Black's attack has little to aim at while White's plays itselfj 11 hi a6 12 hxg6 hxg playster was 12...Fxg6 although white crashes through on on hi eventuallys 13 Qh2 R47 17 Mh 15718087 Na 19 Rh7 e6 17 Nh3! Ke7 18 Qg7 Kd8 19 Ng 5 20 Qxf7, 1 - 0

NOVAG C. - BENNETT, Sicilian Dragon: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 g6 6 f 4 Bg 7 (Risky unless Black knows what he is doing; usual is $6 \ldots$...NC61 7 e5 dxe5? 8 fxe5 Nd5 9 Bb5+ [With a clear advantage] 9...Kf8

10 Bc 4 ! e6 [10...Nxc3 is met by 11 Ne6+!] 11 0-0 Bxe5 12 Nxe6+ Bxe6 13 Bxd5 Qh4 [Or 13...Bxc3 14 Bxe6 Oxal 15 Bh6t with a decisive attack] $14 \mathrm{h3}$ [14 g3!] 14....Qg3 15 Bxe6! Qh2+ 16 Kf MITCHELL - DUNN, Modern Benoni: 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 Nc3 exd5 5 cxd5 d6 6 e4 g6 7 Bf4 a6 8 a4 Bg 7 9 Nf3 Bg4 10 Be2 Bxf3 11 Bxf3 0-0 12 $0-0$ Qe7?! 13 Rel Nbd7 14 e5! Nxe5 15 Bxe5 dxe5 16 d6 Qd7 17 Rxe5 Rad8 18 Rxc5 b6? they not 18 ... Qxd6 with equality?1 19 Rc6 Rb8 20 Qd3 Rfc8 21 Rxc8+ Qxc8 22 Rdl Nd7 $23 \mathrm{Nd5} \mathrm{Nc} 5$ ? [A faulty combination] $24 \mathrm{Ne7+Kf} 25$ Nxc8 Nxd3 $26 \mathrm{~d} 7,1-0$

# 4th Charles Belton Memorial 

## by Bob Smith

Held at the Auckland Chess Centre on the weekend of $16 / 17$ June, the Charles Belton Memorial Tournament attracted a disappointing field of 17 - especially so because the tournament was the firs held to raise money towards sending the Men's and Women's national teams to this year's Olympiads in Greece. One would have thought that more people might have supported such a cause, even though the tournament did clash with the All Blacks v France rugby test a Eden Park just down the road
As in past years the tournament was a seven-round Swiss with each player having one hour per game.
In the absence of previous winners Ortvin Sarapu and Bob Smith (the Tourario national champion Paul Garbett who was rated more than 200 points above the sell Spiller. The
The top seeds duly won their first two games although Spiller won his first Trundle failed to show up. The reas for this only became apparent during round two when I phoned George from a public telephone and discovered that he was ill; he had tried to contact us but the Auckland Centre's phone was not connected that weekend. George sport ingly did not ask for a refund of his
entry fee.
Back to the chess and in round three the leaders began to clash. Garbett beat Nigel Hopewell while Weir accounted for Spiller although Paul nearly played his way out of trouble in his own time trouble before finally succumbing to the clock. At this stage Greg Spencer-Smith had only $1 / 3$ although, as compensation for losing quickly to Michael Hopewell, he got to see quite a lot of the rugby test on television!
Round four featured a major upset when Michael Hopewell defeated Garbett in a pawn ending. Weir stayed joint leader by beating Nigel Hopewell
Weir continued his run of good form by beating Michael Hopewell in round five on the Sunday morning - a drean result for raul Garbet wh stayed in the race by beating Ralph Hart. At this M Hell 4 ; iller 31 .Hopewell 4; Spiller $3 \frac{1}{2}$
Just as in was struck in round six; with Black aginst Garbett he had his usual result, a zero Meanwhile Michael Hopewell beat Spiller to with just one round to go.
In the final round Garbett faced Spiller who could be counted on to run himself short of time - and so it proved as Sp iller spent far too much time trying to defend a slightly
inferior position and eventually let his flag fall. Michael Hopewell faced brother Nigel and duly won to tie for first place. Meanwhile Weir faced Greg Spencer-Smith who, ominously, had been playing far better in the middle and later rounds. While Weir tried to jazz up the position Spencer-Smith played sensibly and classically with the result that, after being sole leader with two rounds to go, Weir slipped out of the final into a tie for third. M. G. Hopewell 6/7. 3-4 G.A.Garbett M.G. $o$ opewell 6/7; 3-4 G.J.SpencerSmith \& P.B. Weir 5; 5-6 R. Hart \& J.R. Rawnsley, P.S.Spiller \& S.van Dam Liv. Rawnsley, P.S.Spiller \& S.van Dam 31/2; 14 J.A.D'Connor \& B.Martin-Buss 3 ; M. Morrison 2; 16 F.Stynman 1.
Before giving a few games, I would like to thank Merv Morrison for donating $\$ 100$ towards the tournament and the Auckland Chess Centre for allowing our use of their premises free of charge. ther factors which helped to raise a total of $\$ 180$ (not including individual donations to the 0lympiad Appeal which will be acknowledged separately in the magazine) were $\$ 85$ contributed by the writer towards tournament costs and a phich wish topen to other clubs raising events) by the $Z$ ar association be the N.Z. Ches Association which allowed books (in the orm of vouchers) to be offered as prizes at a reduced cost.
Special mention, finally, must be made of Alan Hignett's efforts to provide sustenance for the players during the weekend.
M. HOPEWELL-GARBETT, Caro-Kann: 1 e4 c6 2 Nf3 d5 3 Nc3 $\operatorname{Bg} 4 \quad 4$ d4 dxe4 5 Nxe4 Nf6 6 Nxf6+ gxf6 7 Be2 e6 8 $0-0$ [ 8 bf4 to control the h2-b8 diagonal is a good alternative] 8...Nd7 9 c4 Qc7 10 d5!? [Possibly premature but quite sharp] $10 \ldots \mathrm{c} 5$ [In a later round Paul spiller played 10 ...bd6t? play continuing 11 dxe6 fxe6 12 Na4! h5! 13 f4! BC5 14 Bxg4!? hxg 415 b4 Bxd4+ 16 Qxd4 o-O-0! 17 Qxa7? (Better 17 Be3 intending $g 3$ with a slight pull) Qb6? (1 ...Nb6! is better for Black) 18 Qxb6 11 b41? 11 b4!? [An aggressive idea to gain th 4 square; usual is 11 Be3] 11...Rg8
15 Oxe2 a6 16 dxe6 $0-0-0 \quad 17$ exf7 Qxf7

18 Nf5 Be5 19 Be3 Qe6 20 Bxc5 Qxf5 21 Radl Bc7! [Black has full compensation for the pawn] 22 Be 3 Qe 4 [22.. Qe5!] 23 Qf3 Qxf3 $24 \mathrm{gxf3} \mathrm{Rd} 725 \mathrm{Rxd} 7$ Kxd7 26 Rgl Rg6 27 f4 Kc6? [Time pressure] 28 Rxg6 hxg6 29 f5! gxf5 30 $\mathrm{h} 4 \mathrm{Kd} 7 \quad 31 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{f} 4 \quad 32 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{Ke} 6 \quad 33 \mathrm{Kf} 3$ Kf5 $34 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Kg} 5 \quad 35 \mathrm{~h} 6 \mathrm{Kxh} 6 \quad 36 \mathrm{Bxf} 4+$
 40 a4 Ke7 41 Kg 6 Ke6 $42 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Kd5} 43$ Kxf6, 1 - 0 . Notes by M.Hopewell WEIR - M. HOPEWELL, Sicilian Defence: 1 e4 c5 $2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6{ }^{3} \mathrm{Bb} 5+\mathrm{Bd} 74 \mathrm{Bxd} 7+$ Qxd7 5 0-0 Nf6 6 e5 dxe5 7 Nxe5 Qc7 8 d4! cxd4 9 Bf4 Nc6! 10 Rel 110 Ng6? e5 11 Nxe5 Nxe5 12 Bxe5 Qxe5 13 Rel Ne4 14 f3 o-0-0! 15 Rxe4 $0 b 5$ is good for Blackl 10...Nxe5 11 Bxe5 Qc6 12 Qxd4 e6! $13 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Be} 714 \mathrm{Radl} 0-0 \quad 15 \mathrm{Qf} 4$ Rad8 16 Be7!? Rxdl 17 Rxd1 b5!? [Threatening ...b4 but possibly weakening; better was 17...Rc8 18 Bd6. Bxd6 with equality] 18 Bd6 NdS


19 Nxd5 [19 Rxd5? exd5 20 Bxe7 Res 21 QeS d4! $22 \mathrm{Na5}$ Qxc2
23 h 3 d3 wins for 23 h3 as wins for
Black (But 24 Nf6 Black (But 24 Nf
wins for white Wins for White 20 Qxd6 Qxd6 21 Nf6+ gxf6 22 Rxd6 Kfl b4 25 Ke 2 Kg 7 [White has a slight advantage in view of his queenside pawn majorityl 26 Kdl Kf6 $27 \mathrm{Rd} 7 \mathrm{a} 5 \quad 28 \mathrm{Kd} 2$ Rg8 $29 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{f} 4 \quad 30 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{fxg} 3 \quad 31 \mathrm{hxg} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 4$ 32 Ra7 bxc $3+33 \mathrm{Kxc} 3$ a4? [33...Rg5! with the idea Rd5] 34 Rb 7 Re 435 Rb 4 Re2 36 Rxa4 Rxf2 37 Rd4? [Misplacing the rook; we both had 10 minutes left at this stage] 37...e5 38 Rd3 e4 39 Re3 Ke5 40 a4 Rfl 41 b 4 f 542 a 5 Ra [42...f4 was more logical but white draws easily enough, e.g. 43 gxf4+ Kxf4 $44 \mathrm{Kd2}$ (simplest) Rf2+ $45 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Kf3} 46$ Rxf2+ Kxf2 $47 \mathrm{a6]} 43 \mathrm{~Kb} 2 \mathrm{Ra} 4 \quad 44 \mathrm{~Kb} 3$ Ra1 $45 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Ra} 3+46 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Ra} 2+47 \mathrm{Kel}$ ? [Safer was 47 Kc3 f4!? with equality] 47...Rb2?? [47...Kd4! 48 Rb3 or 48 Re2 draw] $48 \mathrm{Ra} 3!\mathrm{Rxb} 4 \quad 49 \mathrm{a} 6 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \quad 50 \mathrm{a} 7$ Ra8 $51 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \ldots . .1$ - 0 .
STEPHENSON - SPILLER, French Tarrasch: 1 e4 e6 $2 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Nf} 64 \mathrm{e} 5 \mathrm{Nfd7}$ 5 f4 c5 6 c3 Ne6 7 Ndf3 cxd4 8 cxd4 Qb6 $9 \mathrm{Ne} 2 \mathrm{f} 6 \quad 10 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 4+11 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{fxe5}$
 18 Kf1 Rxf3+, $0-1$.

## 7th Waitakere Trust Open

## by Peter Stuart

The Waitemata Chess club successfully staged its seventh open tournament over the weekend of $7 / 8$ July with sponsorship once again by the Waltakere Licen sing Trust. The event celebrated not only the Trust's tenth anniversary, but also the Club s 2lst anniversary an occasion This the tournament.

NZCA unlike inament will be rated by NeA, performed well as Lournament Director, ficult decisions. The time control was 45 moves in $1^{1}$ hours with an extra 15 minutes per player to complete the game. The entry was possibly rather disappointing for the organisers (although we understand the tournament was financially successful) With $\$ 1000$ in the prize fund, they might have expected more than 58 competitors. However, a clash with the General Election a week later would undoubtedly have been worse!
With just eighteen players, of whom more than half were rated above 2000 , the A-grade might have been expected to produce close competition. That it did not turn out this way can be blamed on Paul Garbett! An international flavour was added by the presence of visitors Willi Kaspar (West Germany) and Ralph Jackson (Australia) while Andrei Sharko, a recent arrival in Auckland, also came from Australla. Uncertainty as to the real playing strength of these three players added spice to the proceedings.

The 'top half' managed a princely $5 / 9$ in the first round. In such a small and short tournament four of the high seeds were thus effectively out of the race for first place as things transpired. The Scheveningen is a weapon which has brought much success for Ewen Green but Len Whitehouse, doubtless aided by Ewen's habitual time trouble, played his attack very well to record a nice victory. Lindsay Cornford was happy to give up his queen for rook and two knights but he relaxed too soon and Greg Spencer Smith won back a knight and went on to win. Peter Stuart looked fo have gained the luitiat Shark things very unclear; a time-trouble
mistake by Stuart allowed Sharko to mate in three. Kaspar gave the lie t his mediocre performance at the New Year when he mated Michael Hopewell' queen
Of the top three seeds, Garbett and Smith were untroubled to win their second round games but Sarapu was unable to take advantage of the weak squares in Sharko s position and a draw resetition of moves. Whitehouse was repetition of moves. Whitehouse was not able to repeat his morning result as Peter lol game. Jackson, the other first round white in a Modern Defence, broke through decisively on the queenside after the centre and kingside were completely blocked.
After three rounds only Garbett could boast a perfect score; once again he turned his evil eye on Weir whose exchange sacrifice did not come off as well as he might have hoped. Looking over his shoulder, Paul was probably happy to see Smith and Sarapu drawing their clash. Robert won a pawn but Ortvin, with the two bishops, was able to hold on for a draw.

Sharko, the only other on $1 \frac{1}{2} / 2$, got the down-float to Green; the result was a not-Loo-strenuous draw, one of several in the Saturday night round. Thus Smith was now alone in second place on $2 \frac{1 / 2}{2}$ points while a so-far subdued Sarapu shared third place on 2 points with Weir, Hopewell, Sharko and Kaspar. After his disappointing start, Hopewell had netted two wins with sharp play.
Sarapu came back on the Sunday morning with batteries recharged to recor a nice miniature against Kaspar. Garbett, however, stretched his lead to a full point by defeating Smith with the black pieces; the Waitemata player was forced to jettison materlal after he allowed a rook to be threatened with entrapment on the edge of the board After a strange opening heir and Sharko eventually drew after a fair amount of rover former.
Green and stuart also moved up to a challenging position for the minor respectively but both were ratherler

Hopewell gave away his early advantage, the initiative passing to Green after the exchange of queens, but an easily drawn opposite-colour bishop endgame was nevertheless reached. Hopewell, however, blundered on the board and lost on time simultaneously. Stuart won on time by whiler, a reconcruction control showing that Spiller's flag fell as he made his 45 th move; the final position would probably have been drawn Also reaching $2 \frac{1}{2}$ was Jackson who enefitted from the Spencer Smith trade mark, the loss or sacrifice of the exchange.
Going into the last round, the scores were thus: Garbett 4; Sarapu 3; Smith, Green, Stuart, eir, Jackson \& Sharko $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$;
opewell \& Kaspar 2.
Paul was thus assured of at east $\$ 200$ come what may while prize to himself and a win would would be worth an extra $\$ 50$ for winning all five games. Sarapu who of course needed a win to really better his situation, repeated the variation of his third match game against Chandler last December and at one stage Garbett looked to have an edge. With the transition to the endgame, however, any advantage remaining was with Sarapu and the draw was thereupon agreed.
This result gave those on $2 \frac{1}{2}$ chance for equal second and three very closely fought games ensued. Weir had the better of things against Smith but started to go astray when time pressure et in, the blunder of a plece just before the the conkrol fatal Stuart, withedrely tal. Stuart, with the white lessively against Green but soo atned cougainlay with a soo reffice torplay fiuc paw during the time scramble with Greng he time scramble with being s winning queen ending ang and pam fing a drawn the time control. Sharko $v$

Jackson reached a roughly equal ending which the latter misplayed, eventually losing a pawn nevertheless Jackson reached a drawn position with $K+B$ versus $K+N+P$ when the scoresheet ran out but he then blundered in time-troubl to lose. The scores

Club R. 1 R. 2 R. 3 R. 4 R. 5
1 Garbett PA NS W14 W8 W9 W4 D2 4
$\begin{array}{llllrlllll}2 & \text { Sarapu } & \text { 0 } & \text { NS } & \text { W12 } & \text { D3 } & \text { D4 } & \text { W8 } & \text { D1 } & 3^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \text { 3 } & \text { Sharko } & \text { A } & \text { A } & \text { W7 } & \text { D2 } & \text { D5 } & \text { D9 } & \text { W11 } & 3^{1 / 2}\end{array}$
4 Smith R W $\quad$ Wai W16 W13 $\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { D2 } & \text { L1 } & \text { W9 } & \text { 31 }\end{array}$
5 Green EM $\quad H P \quad$ L10 W11 $\quad$ D3 $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { W6 } & \text { D7 } & 3\end{array}$
6 Hopewell M g A L8 W16 W10 L5 W15 3
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}6 & \text { Hopewell M G A } & \text { L8 W16 W10 } & \text { L5 } & \text { W15 } & 3 \\ 7 & \text { Stuart } P \text { W } & \text { L3 W18 } & \text { D13 } & \text { W14 } & \text { D5 } & 3\end{array}$
8 Kaspar W NS W6 L1 W15 L2 D14 2
9 Weir P B
10 Whitehouse LE
11 Jackson $R$
2 Spain G A W18 W10 L1 D3 14 W5 L9 L6 D12 W17 W17* L5 D14 W13 L3 ${ }^{21}$ 13 Spencer-Smith G NS W15 L4 D7 L11 W18* 2
14 Spiller P S HP L1 W12 D11 L7 D8 2
15 Cornford LH A L13 W17 L8 D16 16 L6 1
16 Walden G J AU
$\begin{array}{rrrrrr}\text { L13 } & \text { W17 } & \text { L8 } & \text { D16 } & \text { L6 } & \mathbf{l}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \text { L6 } & \text { W18 } & \text { D15 } & \text { L12 } & 1^{\frac{1}{2}}\end{array}$
17 Atkinson IE NS L11*L15 L12 W18*L10 1
18 Poor R L NS L9 L7 L16 L17*L13* 0
An asterisk denotes forfeit. Club abbreviations are: $A=$ Auckland Centre, $A U=$ Auckland University, Ham = Hamilton, HP = Howick-Paku ranga, NS = North Shore, Wai = Waitemata.

Nobody could argue with Paul Garbett's conincing victory - a one point margin in a five round tournament speaks for itself. Doubtless most of the other players had their moments and disappointments but perhaps the other stand-out result was that of Andrei Sharko who went through the tournament undefeated to record a performance rating of about 2340 in his first Auckland tournament.

With 40 players in the B-grade, multiple ties at the top were predictable and duly eventuated David Notley and John Robinson each reached 4/4 and were content to draw their last round
oo finish joint first with $4 \frac{1}{2}$ points.
The hard who actually won all his five games at the board位 guently following a oard inctdent which should serve as a warning to all chess players Aother player apparently poit out to Hart that his poitton would have been hopeles if Robincon had played best move at an earlier turn. Rightly or wrongly
the ensuing discussion was interpreted as being about the current position, hence the Director's decision to alter the result. While we feel sure that no cheating was intended or took place, players must realise that any conversation during play runs the risk of being misconstrued with possibly disastrous consequences. This particular episode probably cost Hart nearly $\$ 200$ but wa fortunate indeed for John Robinson.

Final scores: 1-2 D.G.Notley \& J. Robinson $4 \frac{1}{2}$; 3-6 G.Banks, R.Hart, K.M. Okey \& G.Sareczky 4; 7-9 A.J.Booth, T. Brumby \& B.Martin-Buss $3 \frac{1}{2}$; $10-15$ V.J. Burndred, D.A.Gifford-Moore, R.Hames, D.Morse, F.Stynman \& P.Whibley 3; 16 24 R.Beesley, J.Billing, J.K. Boyd, D. Clinton, K.Grace, R.Hampton, M.K.Morrison, B.Savage \& B.K.Stewart $2 \frac{1}{2}$; 25-33 J. Clinton, A.Johnstone, C.Lancaster, J. McRae, J.A.O'Connor, J.Shields, P.
Shields, C.Steico \& R.G.Williams 2; 34 R.A.Pengelly $1 \frac{1}{2} ; ~ 35-38$ K.Jenkinson, A. Malcouronne, M. Sorel \& C.Walker 1; 39 G. Thorne $\frac{1}{2} ; 40 \mathrm{D}$. Savage 0 .

As usual in this tournament the open-all-hours canteen service was very good. A new feature this year was the intro duction of a best game prize in each grade. This was, unfortunately, the one area where the organsers could be criticlsed. We feel the judging could official prizegiving by top Auckland player. Instead it was done some days player. Hy tead it was done some days bers - oxcluding their co player Robert Smith who had himself player Rored a the judges arguably made two wrong docisions in awardin the prizes to Robert Smith (for his game against Walden) and Vivian Burndred (for her game against D. Clinton) as the losers' play was very weak in both games. After reconsideration, however, a second award was made for the A-grade to Len Whitehouse (for hts versus Green) and few will dispute the justice of this.
WHITEHOUSE-E.GREEN, Sicilian 1 Nf3 c5 2 e 4 e6 3 d 4 cxd4 4 Nxd 4
 $\mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \mathrm{9} 0-0 \mathrm{Be} 710 \mathrm{Qe} 2 \quad 0-0 \quad 11 \mathrm{Radl}$ Qc7 12 f4 Rac8 $13 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{b5} 14$ a3 Rfd $15 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Be} 8 \quad 16 \mathrm{~g} 5 \mathrm{Nd} 7 \quad 17 \mathrm{Khl} \mathrm{b4} \quad 18$ axb 52 19f3 Bf8 23 h6 24 Kh7 25 f5 exf5 26 exf5 Bc6 27 Nd

Bxf3+ 28 Nxf3 Qb7 29 Kg 1 [White could have won a piece here by 29 Bxc5 but decided that the king hunt was better 29...Nxc2 [If 29...Be7 30 Bg5! intending Bf6 and Ng5+1 30 Qf6 Nxe3 $31 \mathrm{Ng} 5+$ Kg8 32 h7 mate, l-0.
SMITH-WALDEN, Alekhine Defence:
1 e4 Nf6 2 e5 Nd5 3 Nf3 d6 4 d4 Bg4 5 Be 2 e6 6 0-0 Be7 7 c4 Nb6 8 exd6 cxd6 9 b3 Nc6 10 Bb2 Bf6 [Usual is 10 Bxe2 13 Oxe2 Rc8 14 Nxc6 Rxc6 15 c5 Nd7 16 b4 a6 17 a $40-0 \quad 18$ Nf3 Rc8 $19 \mathrm{b5}$ Oc 720 Ba3 Rfd8 $21 \mathrm{bxa6} \mathrm{bxa6}$ 12 Rab Qc6 23 Qc 2 Rb 824 h 3 b ? Recest lan to help Black carry out the thematic ad vance ...e5. Indicated was $24 \ldots$...Be 7 with vance ...e5. Indicated was 24...Be7 with the idea of ....f and an eventual ...e. Rxbl?! [Losing more time; 25...Be7 was still correct] $26 \mathrm{Rxbl} \mathrm{Rb} 827 \mathrm{Rxb} 8+$ Nxb8 28 Qb3 Nd7 29 Qb 4 h 5 ? [A further weakening of the king position which makes $f 6$ and e5 even harder to carry out] 30 g 3 Kh 7 ? 31 Bc 1 !? Bg7? [Black continues to waste tempi with gay abandon; 31...Be7 was better, again planning f6 and e5 now that the c-pawn is less well defendedl $32 \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 33 \mathrm{Bd} 6$ Bf6? [Aiming to exchange the Ba6 by Ba8 -c7 but why not 33...Bf8] 34 Nel! [From d3 the knight will scan b4, c5 and $f 4$ as well as e5] 34...Bd8 [34...e5? fails to 35 dxe5 Bxe5 36 Bxe5 Nxe5 37 Qb8+1 35 Nd 3 Bc 736 Bxc 7 Qxc7 $37 \mathrm{a5!} \mathrm{Kg} 7$


38 Qa4! e5 [Desperation - but too $\mathrm{Nb} 8 \quad 40 \mathrm{Nxe5} \mathrm{f} 6$ 41 Nd3 Qxc6 lor 41 ...Nxc6 42 Nc5 Kf7 43 Nxa6 winningl 42 Qb 4 Nd 743 Qe7+ Kh6 44 Nf 4 [Finally the king-
side weaknesses are exposed - there is no defence to Ne6J 44...Qcl+ 45 Kg 2 Qc2 46 Qxd7 Qe4+ $47 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Qxd4} 48 \mathrm{Qg} 7+$ Kxg7 49 Ne6+ Kf7 50 Nxd4 Ke7 51 Ne6+ $\mathrm{Kd6} 52 \mathrm{Nb} 4 \mathrm{~d} 4 \quad 53 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Kc} 5 \quad 54 \mathrm{Nxa6} \mathrm{Kc} 4$ $55 \mathrm{Kf} 1 \mathrm{Kc} 356 \mathrm{Ke} 2,1-0$.
WEIR-POOR, Alekhine Defence:
1 e4 Nf6 2 Nc3 d5 3 e5 d4 4 exf6
 Qa4 0 Nr3 Qxb2 9 Rdi Be6 10 Bd3 Nd 14 Oc5 Oc 45015 Bd4 16 Qf4 Bf6 17 14 QcS Qc4 15 Qe3 Bd4 16 Q14 BfG
for his two pawn deficit] 17...Qe5 18 Rfbl h6 19 h4 Qd6 20 Qe3 h5 21 Qa3 Bd5 22 Bf5 Kb8 23 Bf4 Qc6 24 Ng 5 !?

24...Bxg5? IOverlooking a winning zwischenzug combination; instead 24 ..e6! hitting the bishop and intending ...Be7 may well turn out in Black' Qxb6 [25....axb6 runs into 26 Ral mating] 26 Rxb6 axb6 27 hxg 5 e6 28 Bd 3 h 429 Bb 5 h 3 ? 30 gxh3 Rh4 31 Bxc $7+\mathrm{Kxc} 732 \mathrm{Qg} 3+\mathrm{Kc} 8$ 33 Qxh4 Bf3 34 Qc4+, 1 - 0.
GARBETT-WEIR, Ruy Lopez:
1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba 4 Nf 6 5 0-0 Be7 6 Rel b5 7 Bb3 a6 $4 \mathrm{Ba4} \mathrm{Nf} 6$ $9 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Na} 510 \mathrm{Bc} 2 \mathrm{c} 511 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Cl} 12 \mathrm{Nbd2}$ cxd4 13 cxd4 Bb7 14 d5 Rac8 15 Bd3 Nd7 16 Nfl Nc4 17 b3 Ncb6 18 Bd2 f5 19 Ne3 f4 20 Rel Qb8 21 Nf5

21...Rxf5 22 exf5 Nc5 23 Bbl Nxd5 [Black has only one pawn for the exchange but the white pieces are very restrictedj $24 \mathrm{b4} 4 \mathrm{Nd} 725$ Qb3 h6? 26 Bxf4 $\mathrm{N} 7 \mathrm{f} 6 \quad 27 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Kh} 7$
28 Rxc8 Bxc8 $29 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \mathrm{Bb} 7 \quad 30$ a3 Bd8 31
 Ne6 35 Qe 3 Kh 836 Nf 1 Nd 737 Qd 3 Nr 6 38 Qd2 Bc7 39 Ba 2 Bb 40 Ne 3 e 41 Nxd5 Bh2+ $42 \mathrm{Khl} \mathrm{Nh5} 43 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Nxf} 4$ Rxe4 Nh5 45 Bf2 Ne5 46 f 6 g 547 Qe2 Nxf7 150 $0 \times f 451$ Oxe5+1 Oxe5 52 f8Q
 Kh7 53 Qg8 mate 51 Bd4+ Kg8 52 Bxf7+ Kxf7 53 Qe6+ Kf8 54 Be5+ Kg7 55 Qg6+ Kh8 56 Bd4+, 1 - 0 .
HOPEWELL - WHITEHOUSE, King's Gambit:
1 e4 e5 2 f4 exf4 3 Bc4 d6 4 d4 Nf6 5 Nc 3 Qe 76 Qe2 Nc6 7 Nf3 Bg4 8 Bb 5 Bd7 9 Bxf4 $0-0-0 \quad 10 \quad 0-0-0 \mathrm{~h} 611$ Rhel Re8 12 Qc4 g5 13 Nd5! Qd8 14 Nxf6 Qxf6 15 Bg3 Qg6 16 e5 f5 17 d5 Nxe5 18 Bxe5 Bxb5 19 Qxb5 dxe5 20 Nxe5 Rxe5 21 Rxe5 Bd6 22 Re6 Qh5 23 Rde Rd8 24 Re8 Bxh2 25 d6 Qf7 26 Rle7, 1-0.
STUART-POOR, Symmetrical English:
1 c4 Nf6 2 Ne3 c5 3 Nf3 d5 4 cxd5


Bd3 Nd7 9 0-0 0-0 10 Qe2 cxd4?! cxd4 Re8 12 Rd 1 Qb 613 Rbl Qd6 14 Bd2 e5? [The premature exchange of the c-pawns left the black queen without its usual shelter on c7 and Black has got behind in development; thus the 'equalising thrust' ...es fails here for tactical reasons] 15 Bb 4 Qf 616 dxe5 Nxe5 17 Nxe5 Qxe5 18 Bb5 Bf 519
Bxe8 Rxe8 Bxe8 Rxe8 [Black must cede the exchange as 19...Bxbl 20 Bxf7+ is murderous] 20 Rbcl Be4 21 Re5 Qe6 22 Be3 Bxc3 23 Rxc3 Be6 24 Qc4 Qf5 25 f3 h5 26 Qd $\begin{array}{llll}a 6 & 27 & \text { e4 } 4 \mathrm{Qg} 5 \quad 28 \text { Qd2 Qa5 }\end{array}$


29 Rxc6!? Qxd2 30 Rxg6+ fxg6 31 Rxd2 Re7 32 Kf 2 [32 Rc2! is more precise - taking control of the more distant open filel 32...Kf7 33 h4 [Again, 33
 Ke3 b5 35 Kf4 Re4 $36 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{hxg} 4 \quad 37 \mathrm{Kxg} 4$ Ra4 $38 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{gxh} 5+39 \mathrm{Kxh} 5 \mathrm{Ra} 3 \quad 40 \mathrm{Kg} 4$ b4 41 Kf 4 a 5 [Or 41....Ke6 42 e5 a5 43 Ke4 a4 44 Ra6t Ke7 45 Rb6 winningJ 42 e5 a4 $43 \mathrm{Rd} 7+\mathrm{Ke} 844 \mathrm{Rb} 7 \mathrm{Rxa} 245$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\mathrm{Rxb} & \mathrm{Ral} & 46 \mathrm{Kf} 5 \mathrm{a} 3 & 47 \mathrm{Ra} & \mathrm{a} 2 & 48 \mathrm{f} 4\end{array}$ Kd8 $49 \mathrm{Ra} 7 \mathrm{Kc} 8 \mathrm{~K}_{5} 50 \mathrm{Kf} 6 \mathrm{Rf} 1 \quad 51 \mathrm{Rxa} 2$ Rxf4+ $52 \mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{Rh} 4 \quad 53 \mathrm{Rc} 2+\mathrm{Kb} 7 \quad 54$ e6 $\mathrm{Rh} 7+55 \mathrm{Kd} 6 \mathrm{Rh} 656 \mathrm{Kd7} 7 \mathrm{Rhl} 57 \mathrm{Rb} 2+$ Ka7 58 e7 Rdl+ 59 Ke 8 , 1 - 0. SARAPU-KASPAR, French Closed: 1 e4 e6 $2 \mathrm{~d} 3 \mathrm{~d} 53 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Nf} 64 \mathrm{Ngf3} \mathrm{c} 5$ 5 g3 Nc6 6 Bg2 dxe4 7 dxe4 e5 8 0-0 Bg4 9 c 3 Be 710 Qc2 0-0 11 Nc 4 Qc7 $12 \mathrm{Ne} 3 \mathrm{Be} 613 \mathrm{Ng} 5 \mathrm{Rad8} 14$ Nxe6 fxe6 15 Bh3 Qe8 16 Qb3 Kf7 17 Ne 4 Qb8? [Black's position is already seriously compromised but this allows a speedy execution] 18 Bxe6+! Kxe6 19 Nxe5 Kd6 20 Nf7+ Kc7 21 Bf4+ Bd6 22 Nxd6 Rxd6 23 e5, 1 - 0 .
SMITH-GARBETT, Caro-Kann Defence: 1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 e5 bf5 4 Ne 2 e6 5 Ng 3 Bg $6 \quad 6 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Bh} 7 \quad 8 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{Bxd} 3$
 12 cxd3 c5 13 dxc5 Nc6 [Black can be quite happy with his French-tupe pawn structure without white-square bishops] 14 Nf 3 Bxe5 15 Be3 Bxe3 16 Kxe3 Nge7 17 Racl Rc8 18 Rh4 $0-0 \quad 19 \mathrm{Ra} 4 \mathrm{a} 5!? 20$ a3? [Overlooking the fine reply which wins material due to the unfortunate situations of the white rooks] 20...d4+! 21 Nxd4 [else ...b5] 21...Nxd4 22 Rxc8 Ndf5+ 23 Nxf5 Nxf5+ 24 Ke4 Rxc8 25
$94 \mathrm{Ne} 7 \quad 26 \mathrm{Rxa5} \mathrm{f} 5+\quad 27$ exf6 gxf6 28
 $\mathrm{Rd} 7+32 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 7 \quad 33 \mathrm{b4} \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 34 \mathrm{Rc} 2 \mathrm{Ra} 7$ $35 \mathrm{~g} 5 \mathrm{hxg} 5 \quad 36$ fxg5 fxg5 37 Rg 2 Kf 6 38 h6 Nf5+, 0 - 1
E.GREEN - JACKSON, Modern Defence: $1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 2 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~d} 64 \mathrm{e} 4 \mathrm{Nc} 6$ 5 Be3 e5 6 d5 Nce7 7 c5 f5 8 cxd6 cxd6 9 Bb5+ Kf8 10 f3 Nf6 11 h 3 h 12 Qd2 h4 13 Nge2 Nh5 $14 \quad 0-0-0$ Qa5 15 Kbl a6 $16 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{f} 4 \quad 17 \mathrm{Bf} 2 \mathrm{~b} 5$ ? IIt is White who has the attacking chances on the queenside - not Blackl 18 Nc 1 Ng 3 19 Rhel Bd7 20 Nb 3 Qd8 $21 \mathrm{a} 3 \mathrm{Kf7} 22$ Rc1 Bf6 $23 \mathrm{Rc} 2 \mathrm{Qb} 8 \quad 24 \mathrm{Na} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 825$ Rec1 Rxc2 26 Qxc2 Ne8 27 Na5 Bd8 28 Nc6 Bxc6 29 dxc6 Bc7 30 Qb3+ Kf6 31 $a 4$ bxa4 32 Qxa4 a5 $33 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 7 \quad 34$ Qc Bb6 35 Bxb6 Qxb6 $36 \mathrm{Nd5}+\mathrm{Nxd5} 37$ Qxd5 Qc7 38 Rc3 Rc8 39 Ba6 Ra8 40 Bc 4 Kg 741 Rb 3 Ra 742 Rb 7 Rxb 743 cxb7 Qb8 44 Qg8+, 1 - 0.
BURNDRED-CLINTON, French Tarrasch: 1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd2 a6 4 a3? Ngf3!] 4...c5 5 c3 c4? 6 e5 [Already White can envisage a kingside attack while Black has severe developmental problems ${ }^{6}$ 6...Ne7 $7 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{~g} 68 \mathrm{Ngf3} \mathrm{Bg}$ ) 9 0-0 0-0? [Showing suicidal tendencies against an opponent like Vivian who likes to attack; Black should aim to castle queenside] $10 \mathrm{Rel} \mathrm{Bd7} 11 \mathrm{Nf}$ Qa5 $12 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Re} 813 \mathrm{Qd} 2 \mathrm{Nbc} 6 \quad 14 \mathrm{Ng} 3$ Nf5 15 Nxf5 exf5 16 Bdl? Be6 17 h 4 h5 18 Bf $6 \mathrm{Kh} 7 \quad 19 \mathrm{Qg} 5 \mathrm{Bh} 6 \quad 20 \mathrm{Qg} 3 \mathrm{Kg} 8$ 21 Ng 5

21...Nxd4 (White has built up a tremendous attacking position but her pointless 16 th move allows Black one chance of counterplay] 22 Bxh5! Nc2 23 Bxg6 [Everything wins; 23 Nxf7! and
23 Nxe6 are also good] 23...Nxel?? [Tamely allowing mate in three. Best was 23...fxg6, e.g. 24 Nxe6 Kf7! 25 Ng 5 t Bxg5 26 Qxg5 Nxal 27 h5! Ke6! when White is probably winningl 24 Bh7+ Kf8 25 Nxe6t, l-0.
HART - BANKS, Queen's Gambit:
1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 Nc3 Nf6 4 Bg5 Be7 $5 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nbd} 7 \quad 6$ e 3 c $6 \quad 7$ cxd5 exd5 8 Bd3 $0-0 \quad 9 \quad 0-0$ Ne4 10 Bxe7 Oxe7 11 Bxe4 dxe4 $12 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 13 \mathrm{Oc} 2 \mathrm{Bf} 5 \quad 14 \mathrm{Ne} 2$ Rfe8 15 Rabl Nd5 16 a3 Rac8 17 b4 b6

18 Rfcl f6 19 Rb 2 [Intending to double rooks on the c-filel 19...Bg6 20 Qb Qe6? [After 20...c5! 21 bxc5 bxc5 22 axc5 Rxc5 23 Rxc5 Qxc5 White retains slight advantage but this was probably elack s best chance) 21 a4 kf 22 kbc 2 ho 23 bs rlack's last two moves dia nhich now bears fruit However, Black' hich apparently desperate contel 23 the 444 Nc Nf4!? 25 exf4 e 36 Nde4!
Q84 fxe Bxc 2 and 27 Rxe 3 gives Black plenty of playl $26 \ldots$ Oxf4 $126 \ldots$ Bxe4 27 Nxe4 Rxe4? 28 f3l 27 f3 f5 28 Ne2 044
 bxc6l? white decides to return the material to keep the bishop out of play; 32 Nfe 2 was the alternative] 32 ... gxf4 33 Nd5 Qd6 34 Nxf4 h4 [34...Qxd4 35 Qb3 is similar to the game] 35 Qb3 hxg 336 hxg 3 Qxd4 [Or $36 \ldots \mathrm{Eg} 837$ Qd3] 37 Ne6+ Rxe6 38 Qxe6 e2+ 39 Kg 2 Re8 40 Qxe8+! Kxe8 41 c 7 [The pawn cannot be stopped] 41...Qd1 $42 \mathrm{c} 8 \mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{Kf} 743$ $\mathrm{Rc} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 6 \quad 44 \mathrm{Qe} 8+\mathrm{Kg} 5 \quad 45 \mathrm{Rg} 7+\mathrm{Kh} 646$ Rxh7+ Kxh7 47 Rc7+ Kh6 48 Rc6+ Kg7 $49 \mathrm{Rg} 6+$, 1 - 0.

## BRAIN TEASERS

What do GREED and MONEY add up to? Did Bert win the Downstream Tub Race?

## "DIVERSIONS" by Wilkins

Published by Methuen (NZ)

A book of entertaining and challenging problems and mental amusements, by the author of the $N Z$ Listener "Diversions" feature.

Only $\$ 7.95$ post free
Send for your copy now to:
Booklovers,
Kensington Mall,
718 Dominion Road,
Balmoral, Auck
Phone $685-011$.
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## N.Z. Junior Ch'p

Our coverage of the 1984 New Zealand Junior Championship on pages 50-51 of the May issue contained the unfortunate and incorrect suggestion that Michael Hampl was sole New Zealand Junior Champion for 1984 by virtue of his higher tie-break score. Of course, Jonathan Sarfati is co-champion, the title being held jointly. The significance of the tie-break provision lies only in deciding which player has the first option on representing New Zealand in the subsequent World Junior Championship. We apologise to Jonathan for our carelessness!
As our reconstruction of the final scores proved slightly inaccurate (and, of course, incomplete) we now give the full table which eventually reached us several months after the tournament took place.

|  |  | Club | R. 1 | R. 2 | R. 3 | R. 4 | R. 5 | R. 6 | R. 7 | T'1 | SOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Hampl M | c | D5 | W10 | W8 | D3 | W6 | D2 | W7 | 51/2 | 30 |
| 2 | Sarfati J D | W | W9 | W12 | W7 | D5 | W4 | D1 | D3 | 51/2 | 29 |
| 3 | Ker A F | HV | D11 | D8 | W13 | D1 | W5 | W6 | D2 | 5 |  |
| 4 | Dive R J | Twa | W14 | L6 | W16 | w7 | L2 | D5 | W10 | 41/2 |  |
| 5 | Alexander B J | cen | D1 | W11 | W6 | D2 | L3 | D4 | D8 | 4 | 31 |
| 6 | Wilson M C | c | W13 | W4 | L5 | W8 | L1 | L3 | W11 | 4 | $27 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 7 | Jackson I | Cen | W12 | W9 | L2 | 14 | W10 | W13 | L1 | 4 | 27 |
| 8 | Dreyer M P | Civ | W16 | D3 | L1 | L6 | W11 | W9 | D5 | 4 | $26^{1 / 2}$ |
| 9 | Boswell T J | Wan | L2 | L7 | W15 | W13 | W12 | L8 | W14 | 4 | $21^{\frac{1}{2}}$ |
| 10 | Jordan A W | C | D15 | L1 | W11 | W16 | L7 | W12 | L4 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| 11 | Wilkinson E | $c$ | D3 | L5 | L7 | W14 | L8 | W15 | L6 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| 12 | Connor B P | HV | L7 | L2 | D14 | W15 | L9 | L10 | D16 | 2 | 221/2 |
| 13 | Lukey S | Chr | L6 | W14 | L3 | 1.9 | W16 | L7 | L15 | 2 | 221/2 |
| 14 | Edwards D W | $c$ | L4 | L13 | D12 | L11 | D15 | W16 | L9 | 2 | 181/2 |
| 15 | McKenzie $P$ | c | D10 | L16 | L9 | L12 | D14 | LIl | W13 | 2 | 171/2 |
| 16 | Johnson Q | $c$ | L8 | W15 | L4 | L10 | L13 | L14 | D12 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |

Abbreviations: $c=$ Canterbury, Cen = Central, Chr = Christchurch, Civ = Civic, HV = Hutt Valley, Twa = Tawa, $W=$ Wellington, Wan = Wanganui.

## LOCAL NEWS

## TAGO CHESS CLUB

In the first round of the Otago Chess Club's 1984 Championship Tony Love took full advantage of the absence of the other two of Otago's "big three", namey Rtchard Sutton and Tony Dowden, to score a convincing victory with $5 / 5$.
Scores:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | Love A J | x | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 2 | Haase G G | 0 | x | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 3 | Martin B M | 0 | 0 | x | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ |
| 4 | Lichter D | 0 | 0 | 0 | x | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | Sinton P J | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | x | 1 | $1^{\frac{1}{2}}$ |
| 6 | Foord M R R | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | x | 0 |

for some time, was also noteworthy. His only loss came in a game in which he held the advantage early on and later missed a draw just before the time control.
Jackie Sievey (4/5) and Andrew McIntosh (31/2) took the top two places in the the B-grade to earn promotion. The Cgrade was won by W.Martin and the Dgrade by A. Abadie.
With Tony Love moving to Invercargill and Dr David Lichter now gone to Rochester in the USA for the next three years to do post-graduate medical studies there was more room than ever in the A-grade for the younger players in later rounds of the Championship.

In the second round, played just prior to Lichter's departure, young Ben Martin scored a handsome victory, runners-up. The scores:

|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Martin B M | $x$ | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 31/2 |
| 2 | Haase G G | 1/2 | x | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 2 |
| 3 | Sievey J C | 0 | 0 | x | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | Lichter D | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | $x$ | 1 | 11/2 |
| 5 | McIntosh A D | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | $x$ | 1 |

There was a three-way tie for first place in the B-grade between K.M. Boyd, M. R.R. Foord and W.Martin.

## TE AWAMUTU

The Waipa United Chess Tournament on 12 May was the first of what will hopefully be an annual series under the sponsorship of the United Building Society.
A modest field of 16 turned out, nearly all from either Hamilton or Waipa Chess Clubs. The pre-tournament favourite was Graeme Spain who was rated about 300 points ahead of anyone else. Robert Baumgartner and Richard Beesley were expected to give him the most trouble
The five rounds were played in one day with each player having 30 minutes per game. Under the direction of Rickey Takhar (who did not play) the rounds got off to armoth upsets occuring. As expected Graeme to end up with a perfect score. o end up with a perfect score.
finished equal aecond An Johnesting point is that there was not single draw in the whole tournament
A good time was had by all and rext
ear the Watpa club looks forward to a larger field with players from further afield.
Scores: 1 G.A.Spain 5/5; 2-3 R.Baumgartner \& A.Johnstone 4; 4-8 R. Beesley, A.Kingsbury, D.Morse, G.Neilson \& I. A. Kingsbury, D.Morse, G.Neilson \& I. P.Nellson, A.Ladd \& J.Neilson 2; 14-15 A. Burr \& F.Chapman 1; 16 M. Dowty 0.

Report: R.Takhar
The Waipa Chess Club is to be congratulated on its initiative in organising such an event and we hope a horde of
auckland players make the trek south next year - Editor.

## AUCKLAND SCHOOLPUPIL CH'P

This year's tournament, held at the Auckland Chess Centre, attracted a very meagre field of eleven. From 51 entries in 1980 to this is pathetic and reflect the Auckland Chess Assoclations nonexistent effort to promote the game at Hior level
The two favourites, Martin Dreyer and igel Hopewell, easily finished first and second respectively while 13 -year McRae had no problems in comin hird.
Nigel suffered a near catastrophe in ound three when he blundered his queen lowly ranked David Boyd; eventually eng of $R+K N P$ theoretically drawn end ing of $R+K N P V Q+K R P$. In the same round Dreyer had a nice finish against have rebounded.
The first place was effectively deided in round four when Hopewell drew with Dreyer; the remainder of the tourament went as expected with Hopewell earning the Best Game prize for an
aggressive win over McRae.
The leading scores: 1 M.P.Dreyer $7 \frac{1}{2} / 8$ 2 N.H.Hopewell 7; 3 S.McRae 6; 4-5 E. Tanot \& M. Parry 5.
N. HOPEWELL - DREYER, French Defence: 1 e4 e6 2 Nf3 d5 3 Nc3 d4 4 Nce 2 c5 ch 96 Ng 3 Nc 67 Bb Ba7 10 bxc Qa5 11 Qa4 Qxa4 12 Ba4 a6 13 Bxch Bxc6 $14 \mathrm{Ne5}$ [14 a4l retains a slight Bxc6 14 Ne5 (14 a4! retains a slight advantage] 14...Rc8 [14...Ba4!] 15 a4
 21 a5? [Far too impatient; white has a clear advantage and should first improve clear advantage and should first improve the position of his pieces. Also he can play on both wings with h3 and g4]
 Kf2 Bd8 28 Ral a5 29 Ke 2 Ra6 30 Rda2 Rd6 $31 \mathrm{Rd} 2, \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$.

## Report: Michael Hopewell

## CANTERBURY SCHOOLPUPIL CH'P

The Canterbury Schoolpupil Championship, played during the first week of
the May school holidays and directed by Adrian Lloyd, was won by Mark Wilson with $6 \frac{1}{2} / 7$. Next was ben Alexanci Photer MKenzie and Stephen Lukey shared third place with $5^{\frac{1}{2}}$ points.

OTAGO - CHESS FOR FUN!
The Otago Chess Club reports the start of its third year of social teams play, known as "Chess for Fun." Eighteen teams are currently involved in grading matches to determine the composition of the three final groups. Each team of five includes two club players and, in most cases it seems, has a zany name; exples of people wo hav lived (n Zibabe), Flying In, Quick Response (a Fre vice team) and Paroxysmal Seafish

## AUCKLAND TEAMS LIGHTNING

The 1984 Auckland Team Lightning Tournament, held on Queen's Birthday, was predictably won by the North Shore A team (comprising Paul Garbett, Ortvin Sarapu, Peter Stuart \& Wolf Leonhardt) which won all seven matches. In a last
round near upset, however, they could only barely head off the North Shore B team (Ron Feasey, Ra1ph Hart, Peter Weir \& Graham Pitts) by $8 \frac{1}{2}-7 \frac{1}{2}$ and this
allowed Auckland A (Peter Green, Nigel Hopewell, Jon Stephenson \& Michael Hopewell) to close the gap to a respectable two points.
Final scores: 1 North Shore A 89; 2 Auckland A 87; 3 North Shore B 791 $\frac{1}{2}, 4$ Howick-Pakuranga $60 \frac{1}{2}$, 5 Waitemata A $45 \frac{1}{2}, 6$ Auckland B 391 $\frac{1}{2}, 7$ North Shore C $26^{\frac{1}{2}}$, 8 Waitemata B $20 \frac{1}{2}$.
The top individual scorers, with 26 / 28, were Garbett and Sarapu. They were followed by Robert Smith (Waitemata A) 25 $\frac{1}{2}$, Peter Green 24, Nigel Hopewell 23, Feasey $22 \frac{1}{2}$ and Hart 22.

## BLEDISLOE CUP

The Bledisloe Cup semi-final match between Auckland and Otago was played by telephone at the end of June. The score telephone at the close of play was $11-8$ to the at the close of play was $n$ mern team with one game for adjudinorthern team with one game for adjudidispute so the final score is unclear at this point. Wellington had the bye and will meet the winner of the Auckland v Otago match in the final.

5-6 GM Pinter \& GM Sax 51 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2} ; 7} 7 \mathrm{IM}$ Lukacs 5; 8-9 Schneider \& Utas1 4; 10-11 IM Horvath \& GM Csom 3.
PORTISCH - PINTER, QGD Semi-Tarrasch:
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 d5 4 Nc3 c5 5 exd5 Nxd5 6 e4 Nxc3 7 bxc3 cxd4 8 exd4 Ne6 9 Bc4 b5 10 Be2 Bb4+ 11 Bd2 Qa5 12 Bxb4 Qxb4+

 $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { exf5 } 5 \text { exf5 } & 20 & \mathrm{BC} 4 & \mathrm{Ke7} & 21\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llll}\text { d5 Kf6 [DIAGRAM] } & 22 \text { dxc6 }\end{array}$ Rhe8+ $23 \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{Re} 4+24$ $\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Bc} 8 & 25 \mathrm{Racl} \mathrm{Rg} 4+ \\ \mathrm{Kh} 3 & 26\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\mathrm{Kh} 3 & \mathrm{f} 4 & 27 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \mathrm{Kg} 5 & 28\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Nf7 } 7 \mathrm{Kh} 5 \quad 29 & \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Rd} 3+ & 30\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{g} 3 & \mathrm{f} 3 & 31 & \mathrm{Rc} 5+\mathrm{Rg} 5+ \\ \mathrm{g} 4 & \mathrm{Bxg} 4+ & 33\end{array}$ g4 Bxg4+ 33 Kg 3 fxe2+,

## -

SARAJEVO
1 Korchnoi
2 Timman
12345678901234
$\times \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 11 / 2111 \frac{1}{2} 111 \frac{1}{2}$
3 van der Wiel
5 Popovich
6 Drasko
7 Kurajica
8 Romanishin
9 Hulak
10 Dizdar
11 Marjanovic
12 Velimirovic
13 Djuric
The tournament
att tournament was category 12 (average are GMs. Korchno fill incept Drasko and IM Dizdar ries at Wijk aan Zee and Beersheva with his third in 1984. In a period of great activity Korchnoi also played at lugano and then, soon after the Sarajevo event, in the Phillips \& Drew / GLC Kings tournament in London. Timman seems to be approaching the great form he showed several years ago. Apart from van der iel and Drasko, nobody else could claim any degree of success. The Yugoslav players had come straight from the Yugoslav Championship and were likely somewhat jaded.
KORCHNOI - KURAJICA, Réti Opening:
1 Nf3 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 g3 d5 4 Bg2 a6 5 b3 Bd6 $6 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{Qe} 7 \quad 7 \quad 0-0 \mathrm{Nbd} 7 \quad 8 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{dxc} 498 \mathrm{bxc} 4$

 Na5 Bd7 22 Bb4 Bxb4 23 Nxb4 Nc7 24 Nac6

Bxc6 25 Nxc6 Qd7 26 Rfdl f5 27 Qe 5 Rbc 828 Qd6 Re8 29 Na Rcd8 30 Bc6 Qe7 31 Qxe7 Rxe7 $32 \mathrm{Nxb5} \times \mathrm{Nb} 33$ Bxb5 Ra7 $34{ }^{3}$ Na7 $35 \mathrm{Rel} \mathrm{Kf7} 36 \mathrm{Rb4} \mathrm{Nf6} 37$ 40 Bxd5 exd5 41 Rel R8d7 42 405 R6 43 Kf 55 Rb6, 1 - 0 Rb6, 1 - 0
VELIMIROVIC - TIMMAN, French Winawer: 1 e 4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nc 3 Bb4 4 e5 c5 5 a3 Bxc3+ 6 bxc Ne7 7 Bd3 Nbc6 8 Qg4 Qa5 9
 $12 \mathrm{Ng} 5 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 13 \mathrm{Qh} 5 \mathrm{Rf} 8 \quad 14 \mathrm{Nh} 7$



17 Nf6+ gxf6 18 gxf6 Nf5 19 $\mathrm{Rg} 1 \mathrm{Rf} 8 \quad 20 \mathrm{Rg} 7 \quad 0-0-0 \quad 21 \mathrm{Bg} 4$ Nxg7 22 fxg7 Rg8 23 Qxh6 Ne7 24 h 4 Qa 425 Kdl Nf5 26 Bxf5 exf5 27 h5 f4 28 Qg5 Qc6 29 h6 Qe6 30 Bxf4 Qh3 31 Kd 2 Rde8 32 Rg 1 Re 633 Rg 3 Qh1 34 Qf 5 Rxh6 35 Qxf7 Be6 36 Qf8+ Kd7 $37 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Rg} 6 \quad 38 \mathrm{Qe} 7+\mathrm{Kc} 8 \quad 39 \mathrm{Bf} 6$ Qh6t 40 Rg 5 Rxf6 41 Qxf6 Qxf6 42 exf6 $\mathrm{Kd} 7 \quad 43 \mathrm{Re} 5 \mathrm{Re} 8 \quad 44 \mathrm{f} 4$ Bf 745 f5, $1-0$.
TIMMAN - ROMANISHIN, Sicilian Taimanov: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nc6 5 Nc3 a6 6 g3 Nge7 $7 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 8 \quad \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 9$ O-0 Nc8 10 a4 Be7 11 Qe2 0-0 $12 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Qc} 7 \mathrm{l3} \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{Bf} 6 \quad 14 \mathrm{Rfdl}$ $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Rb8 } & 15 & \text { a5 } & \text { Rd8 } \\ 16 & \mathrm{Na} 4 & \mathrm{~N} 6 \mathrm{e} 7 & 17\end{array}$ c3 e5 18 f5 b5 19 Nb6 h6 20 h4 b4 21 c4 Be8 22 Qf $2 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 23$ Qf3 Nxb6 24 Bxb6 Rxb6 25 axb6 Qxb6+ 26 Qf2 Qc7 27 c5 Bb5 28 Racl Nc6 29 cxd6 Rxd6 30 Rd5 Qd8 31 Qd2 Nd4 32 Nxd4 Rxd5 33 exd5 exd4 $34 \mathrm{Qxb4} \mathrm{~d} 3 \quad 35 \mathrm{Bf}$ Be5 36 Kg 2 Qf6 37 Bxh 5 Qxf 38 Qg4 Qf6 39 Rf 1 Qh6 $40 \mathrm{Bxf} 7+$ 1-0.
TIMMAN - DJURIC, Sicilian Kan: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4

Qe2 Nc6 8 Be3 Nf6 9 Bxb6 Qxb6 10 e5 Na5 11 Nld2 Nf4 12 Qe4 Qb4 13 Bc4 Ng6 14 c3 Qe7 $15 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 16$ exd6 Qxd6 $170-0$ b5 $18 \mathrm{f} 5 \mathrm{Nge7}$ 19 fxe6 f5 20 Qd3 Qe5 21 Rael bxc4 22 Nxc Qd5 23 Nd6+ Kd8 24 Nf7+ Ke8 25 Qxd5 Nxd5 26 Nxh8, $1-0$.

## USSR VERSUS THE REST OF THE WORLD

The second USSR $v$ the Rest of the World match took place in London during the last week of June. Earlier reports suggested that the match, celebrating FIDE's diamond jubilee, would be played in Belgrade (the 1970 venue) site but negotiations on behalf of both those cities fell through

The match was organised by FIDE in collaboration with the British Chess Federation; the London Docklands Development Corporation provided sponsorship and the arrangements were successfully concluded when FIDE Vice President Dato Tan Chin Nam and former FIDE Vice President H.M.Hasan also came forward with sponsorship. Hasan also captained the Rest of the World team.
Both teams were reasonably close to full strength although Portisch, Hort and Spassky were notable omissions. Spassky has reportedly refused to represent the Soviet Union henceforth and may even represent France at the Olympiad later this year; he has been living in France since marrying a Frenchwoman in 1976. The USSR won the first match in 1970 by $20 \frac{1}{2}-19 \frac{1}{2}$ and, based on the players' ratings, a similar score was to be expected this time. As can be seen from the scores, however, the Soviet team exceeded their 'quota' of points

SOVIET UNION

| Karpov | $1{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ / $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ | Andersson | 0 | 1/2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kasparov | $\frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1$ | Timman | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  |  |
| Polugaevsky | $\frac{1}{2} \quad 0 \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} 1$ | Korchnoi | 1/2 | 1 |  |
| Smyslov | $01^{1} \frac{1}{2}{ }^{1} \frac{1}{2}$ | Ljubojevic | 1 | 0 | 3/2 |
| Vaganian | $\frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \quad 0$ | Ribli | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  |  |
| Belyavsky | $11^{1 / 2} 1$ | Seirawan | 0 |  | ${ }^{3} 0^{3}$ |
| Tal |  | Nunn | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| Razuvaev | $\frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ | Hübner | 1/2 |  |  |
| Yusupov | $\frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{1}{2} 0^{2}$ | Miles | 1/2 |  | 1 |
| Sokolov | $\begin{array}{llll}0 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} & 0\end{array}$ | Torre | 1 |  |  |
|  | $5651 \frac{1}{2} 4 \frac{1}{2}$ |  | 5 |  | 1/2 $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |

The substitutes used were: 1 Tukmakov, 2 Romanishin, 3 Larsen, 4 Chandler.
The first round bore out predictions of a close result but the Soviet Union took a two point lead in the second round. Alexander Belyavsky was the hatchet man for the USSR as he twice downed American GM Yasser Seirawan - substitute Bent Larsen did not fare much better in the last two rounds against the same opponent. The only win in round three was scored by lal so the USSR had a three-polnt lead going into the last round. Wit tenslon gone the rest of World won the final round but not by enough to serious danger the Soviet lead
As happens so often, the play calibre of the players - this event was billed as the strong event was billed as the strong-
est of all time.

OSLO
Anatoly Karpov scored a narrow victory in a small tournament commemorating the Osio Chess Club's 50th anniversary. Scores: 1 GM Karpov (USR) 6/9; 2-3 GM Miles (ENG) \& GM Makarichev (USR) $5 \frac{1}{2} ; ~ 4-6 \mathrm{GM}$ Adorian (HUN), IM Agdestein (NOR) \& IM de Fir mian (USA) 4,2, GM Hubner (BRD) 4, (CZE) AM IM Wedber (ICE), GM HoNt (CZE) $3 \frac{1}{2}$.

NEW YORK
The New York International played in April was designed to fill the void created by the lapse of the Lone Pine series. GM Roman Dzindzihashvili took the $\$ 18,000$ first prize after defeating top seed Ljubomir Ljubojevic in a dramatic last round clash where the Yugoslav player spurned a draw by repetition in a mutual time scramble only to overlook a neat combination which cost him a rook. Portisch,

Adorian and Gurevich were also tied for first going into the final round but the two Hungarians settled for a quick draw while Gurevich lost to Gennady Sosonko.
Leading scores: 1 GM Dzindzihashvili (USA) 7/9; 2-6 GM Adorian (HUN), GM Kavalek (USA), IM Kogan (USA), GM PortIsch (HUN) (USA) GM Gh (NLD) (2, Gurevich (USA) \& IM Kudrin (USA) 6.

## YUGOSLAV $\mathrm{CH}^{\prime} \mathrm{P}$

The 1984 Yugoslav champion is 23 -year old Predrag Nikolic who scored 11 points In the 18-player field. Top ranked Yugoslav player Ljubojevic did not play because of illness while Borislav Ivkov thdrew ill after four rounds.
Scores: 1 GM P. Nikolic 11; 2-3 GM Kurajica \& GM Velimirovic $10 \frac{1}{2} ; 4 \mathrm{GM}$ Marjanovic 10; 5 IM Cebalo $9 \frac{1}{2}$; 6 IM Rukavina 9; 7 GM Ivanovic 8 $8 \frac{1}{2}$
Veteran Svetozar Gligoric, for a long time Yugoslavia's top player, scored $7^{\frac{1}{2}}$ points for equal twelfth.

## CHRISTIANSEN - RESHEVSKY

Youth overcame experience when Larry Christiansen (28) beat Sammy Reshevsky in an 8-game match played in Los Angeles in June. Reshevsky fell into an old opening trap in the first game (see below). Christiansen also won game six but Reshevsky took the seventh before a short draw in the final game gave the younger player victory $4 \frac{1}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$.
CHRISTIANSEN - RESHEVSKY, Queen's Gambit: 1 d 4 e6 $2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 3 \mathrm{c} 4 \operatorname{cxd} 4 \quad 4 \mathrm{Nxd4}$ vf6 5 Nc3 d5 6 Bg5? [A mistake made famous by the game Fine-Yudovich, Moscow 1937; better is 6 cxd5 Nxd5 7 Bd2 Be7 8 e4 Nb4 9 Be3 N8c6 with equality as in Quinteros-Kasparov, Moscow 1982] 6...e5 7 Ndb5 a6 8 Qa4 [Fine continued 8 Nxd5 axb5 9 Nxf6+ Qxf6! \& White loses a piece; Reshevsky pulls back from the brink but still cannot save the game] 8...Bd7 9 Bxf6 gxf6 10 cxd5 Bxb5 11 Nxb5 axb5 [Winning a piece as 12 Qxa8 loses to $12 . .$. Bb4+ 13 Kdl Qxd5t 14 Kc2 O-O with a quick matel 12 Qxb5+ Nd7 13 a3 Qa5+ 14 Qxa5 Rxa5 15 0-0-0 f5 16 g 3 Bh6+ $17 \mathrm{Kbl} \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 18 \mathrm{Bh} 3 ?!$ Ne4 19 Rel? Bxcl 20 Rxcl Rxd5 21 Rc7

Nd6 22 Bxf5 Nxf5, $0-1$.

## LONDON

Run concurrently with the grandmaster event reported elsewhere in this issue was the Phillips \& Drew / GLC Knights, a round-robin with 15 players. This tournament saw a first-place tie between Australian IM Daryl Johansen and English player Peter Large who scored 10/14. Third was English IM Paul Littlewood on $9 \frac{1}{2}$ and then came Geoff Lawton (ENG) and Roddy McKay (SCO) on 9 .

## WOMEN'S CANDIDATES FINAL

Irina Levitina won the right to play Maya Chiburdanidze for the Women's World Championship by defeating Lydia Semenova by 7-5 at Sochi. The scores were tied after nine games but Levitina won games ten and twelve.

## WORLD CORRESPONDENCE CH'P

Victor Palciauskas became the second American to win the World Correspondence Championship when his closest rivals dropped away near the end of the urent evelth game still Morgado (Argentina) has capted place with $10 \frac{1}{2}$ points.

## NESKAUPSTAD

Another in a string of international tournaments in Iceland this year was held in this small fishing town. Helgi Olafsson made his second GM norm in narrowly winning from American GM Lombardy. Scores: 1 IM H.Olafsson (ICE) $7 \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}_{2}^{2}}$ 2 GM Lombardy (USA) 7; 3-5 IM Hjartarson (ICE), IM Petursson (ICE) \& IM Wedberg (SWE) 6; 6 GM Sigurjonsson (ICE) 5²; 7-8 GM Knezevic (YUG) \& IM Schüss ler (SWE) 5; 9 IM McCambridge (USA) 4 10 Hansson (ICE) 22, 11 Hordarson
(ICE) $\frac{1}{2}$.
As in the previous three tournaments in Iceland the home players enjoyed a luent asure of

## Queen v Pawn(s)

## by Peter Stuart

While this article is aimed at the average club player, it may also provide useful refresher course for the stronger player. In each of the following examples it is White to play.
The ending with queen versus pawns is, naturally enough, 'even more winning than the similar rook ending examined in the May 1984 issue. Unless the defender has a pawn on the verge of queening, the queen usually wins comfortably against any number of pawns. Just as a good knowledge of simple king \& pawn endings is necessary for a full understanding of more complex endings (with pieces which may be exchanged), so the ending with queen $v$ pawn(s) needs to be studied before king a pawn endings can be properly mastered. Indeed, in their book Pawn included a chapter on queen $v$ pawn lncluded a chapter on then endings most frequently arise from king $\&$ pawn endings where one side gets a pawn to the eighth rank before the a pawn
Generally, to have drawing chances with a lone pawn, Black (for convenience 'Black' signifies the defending, or queenless, side in this article) must have his pawn one square from queening with his king alongside. We shall start with an examination of such positions.
White wins against a centre pawn or $P$, diagram 1 illustrating the winning method.


The help of the white king is needed The help of the white king is approach is gained by repeatedly forcing the black king to occupy the queening square. Thus: 1 Qb2+ Kd1 (1...Kd3? 2 Qcl) 2 Qd4+ Kc2 3 Qe3 Kdl 4 Qd3+ Kel $5 \mathrm{Kd} 5 \mathrm{Kf} 26 \mathrm{Qd} 2 \mathrm{Kfl} 7 \mathrm{Qf} 4+\mathrm{Kg} 28 \mathrm{Qe} 3$

Kf1 9 Qf3+ Ke1 10 Ke4 Kd2 11 Qd3 Kel 12 Kf 3 and mate in two follows.
The same winning method is employed against a NP. There are, however, a few exceptional positions where a centre pawn or NP draws; two such positions are the following:


In both examples the white king impedes the queen so that there is no pin or check available and Black cannot, therefore, be prevented from queening. In diagram 2 the queen could also be on f5, g5 or h2 - there are other similar positions with the white king elsewhere on the long diagonal. In diagram 3 the queen could equally well be on g 8 , or the king on f 6 or f 5 .

With a RP Black can draw thanks to a stalemate defence unless the white king is too close. The general draw is seen in diagram 4.


After 1 Qb5+ Kal White has no time to bring up his king due to stalemate. With his king nearby White can sometimes give mate after Black has got his new queen. The winning zone for the white hite king is shown by a solid line in diagram 2 - the king must be able to diagram 2 - the king must be able to
reach b3 in two moves or any of $\mathrm{dl} / \mathrm{d} 2 /$ d3 in one move, the aim being to control the square c 2 .
Example 4A - WK on a5: 1 Qel+ Kb2 2 Qd2+ Kbl $3 \mathrm{~Kb} 4!$ alQ 4 Kb 3 and Black is helpless against the threat of 5 QC2 mate.


This position is exceptional in that White wins despite his king being well outside the winning zone of diagram 4: 1 Kb6 (White avoids the stalemate, at the same time gaining tempi for his king's approach) 1...Kbl $2 \mathrm{Kc} 5+\mathrm{Kal}$ (Or $2 \ldots \mathrm{Kc} 23 \mathrm{Qh} 2+\mathrm{Kbl}_{4} 4 \mathrm{Kb4} \mathrm{etc}$ ) ${ }^{3}$ Kc 4 ! alQ 7 Kb 3 mating as in 4A.
Finally, we examine the $B P$. Here again Black can frequently draw by means of a stalemate defence. Diagram 6 llustrates


1 Qb5+ Ka2 2 Qc4+ Kb2 3 Qb4+ Ka2 4 Qc3 Kb1 5 Qb3+ Kal! and now 6 Qxc2 would be stalemate so white cannot make any progress.
As with the RP White can win here by tactical means if his king is close enough. The solid line in diagram 6 defines the winning zone - the white king nust be able to reach either b3 or $d 2$ in one move.
Example 6A - WK on a4: 1 Qe2 Kb1 2 Q 3 (The careless 2 Kb 3 ? would be punished by $2 \ldots \mathrm{c} 1 \mathrm{~N}+!$ ) 2...Kal (Or 2 .. 23 Qd2 Kb1 4 Kb 3$) 3$ Qaj+ Kb1 4 KbJ Q (4...clint avoids lnmedhate tate but $s$ clearly futle) 5 Qa2 mate.
Example 6B-WK on e3: $1 \mathrm{Qb} 5+\mathrm{Kcl}$ (Or Example 6 C - WK on e2: $1 \mathrm{Qb} 5+\mathrm{Kcl}{ }^{2}$ Example 6 C 4 ( 3 Kd 2 wins easily.

In diagram 7 the black king is less well placed, being further from the corner; it must cross cl to reach safety safety and this gives the white king an axtra tempo. Thus the winning zone honded coipared to that on diagra ex pow the reach b3 in wo moes or any of flf2l f3 (to threaten Qo 2 mate if B1ack queen f3 (to threaten Qe2 mate if Black queens

In the diagram the king is out
In the dagram the klatg is outside theless, with the king on 45 or $f 5$ theless, with the king on e5 or f5, Qd7+ Kel 2 Qe6+ Kdl 3 Qd5+ $\mathrm{Ke} 2 \quad 4$ Qc4+ Kd2 5 Qa2 (Or 5 Qd4+ Ke2 6 Qc3 Kdl 7 Qd3+ Kcl 8 Ke 4 Kb 2 drawing since the white king remains outside the zone 5...Kc3! (The only move; 5...Kd1? 6 Ke4! 107 Kd 3 forces mate) $60 \mathrm{O} 3+\mathrm{Kd} 27$ Qb2 Kd1 and White cannot improve his position.
Example 7A - WK on g4: 1 Qd7+ Ke2 (Or 1...Kcl 2 Qb5 thwarting Black's aim of reaching the $\mathrm{b}-\mathrm{file}$ and continuing 3 Qb2/b3 pinning the pawn. On the similarly motivated $1 . . . \mathrm{Kc} 3$ White wins only with $2 \mathrm{Qg} 7+$ ! again frustrating Black as 2...Kb3 3 Qal is curtains) 2 Qe6+ Kdl (2...Kd2 3 Qa2 transposes) 3 Qb3 Kd2 4 Qb2 Kd1 5 Kf3! Kd2 (5...clQ 6 Qe2 mate) 6 Qd4+ Kcl (Now White utilises the tempo gained to bring his king into the winning zone of diagram 6) 7 Ke 2 Kbl 8 Qb4+ winning as in 6B.
Example $7 B$ - WK on a5: 1 Qd7+ Ke2 2 Qe6+ Kd2 3 Qd5+ Ke2 (3 Kc3 transposes after 4 Qe5+ Kd2 $5 \mathrm{Qd4} 4+) 4 \mathrm{Qc} 4+\mathrm{Kd} 25$ Qd4 Ke2 (5...Kcl 6 Kb4!) 6 Qc3 Kd1 7 Qd3+ $\mathrm{KCl} 8 \mathrm{Kb4} \mathrm{Kb2} 9 \mathrm{Qd} 2 \mathrm{Kbl} 10 \mathrm{KbJ}$ with the by-now familiar mate to follow Example $7 C-$ WK on d5: draw! Althoug he king is within the winning zone nth case it thite has with the queen action will quen check or 11so dill Also dren
at di, on c7 or e7.
With the pawn two squares from queen ing White wins with greater ease. of course, in the case of a RP or BP, he must be careful not to let the pawn advance to its seventh while his king is outside the winning zone.
A RP on the sixth can be won by the queen alone while a BP can be hamstrung y a queen attack along a diagonal diagram 8).


On 1 Kf7 Black's choice is restricted to 1 ...Kb3 2 Ke6 b2 3 Qal! or I...Kc2 2 Ke6 Kd2 3 Qd4+ Kc2 when the white king comes galloping up.
With the white king blocking the long diagonal, however, there are a numbe of drawn positions, e.g. diagram 9.


Despite the relative proximity of the white king to the winning zone, he is unable to prevent the pawn's march to c2. The result would also be a draw with the queen on $\mathrm{g} 5, \mathrm{~h} 5, \mathrm{~g} 3, \mathrm{~h} 3$ or el. There are a few similar positions with the white king on $\mathrm{f} 6, \mathrm{~g} 7$ or h8.
The presence of a second black pawn is frequently of no benefit to Black. In fact, with a RP or BP on the seventh, the extra pawn is usually disastrous it simply rules out the stalemate defence. On other occasions, however, the second pawn covers an important hecking square and this can add to White's difficulties. The next few examples illustrate some possibilities with doubled pawns - this ending is one of the few times when doubled pawns can prove an asset!

White wins from diagram 10, the rear pawn being an embarrassment to Black: Qb7+ Kc2 2 Qc6+ Kb2 3 Qb6+Kc2 4 c5+ Kb2 5 Q4+ Kc2
al 8 Qc2 a 5 Q Qcl mate.
Example 10A-BP on a5 (instead of a6): Now Black draws since the queen annot check on b4. 1 Qis Kb2 2 Qb5 c2 progress.
Example 10B - BP on a4: Again Black draws, this time denying the queen ccess to b3. $1 \mathrm{Qf5}+\mathrm{Kb} 22 \mathrm{Qb} 5+\mathrm{Kc} 2$

Diagram 11 is the conclusion of a
1959 study by Grigoriev where White wins despite an apparently bad king wins despition: 1 Ka7! (Forcing the pawn to a3; instead 1 Kb 7 ? Kb $22 \mathrm{Ka} 6+\mathrm{Kc} 2$ only draws) $1 . \ldots \mathrm{a} 3 \mathrm{~Kb} 6 \mathrm{~Kb} 23 \mathrm{Ka} 5+$ (Enter ing the winning zone) 3 ...Kc2 4 Qc7+ $\mathrm{Kb} 2 \quad 5 \mathrm{Qb} 6+\mathrm{Kc} 2 \quad 6 \mathrm{Qc} 5+\mathrm{Kb} 2 \quad 7 \mathrm{Qb} 4+\mathrm{Kc} 2$ 8 Qxa3 Kbl and White mates as in 4A.
Positions where Black has two pawns lose to queening are, of course, too humerous for us to give a detailed reatment here. We will content our selves, therefore, with mentioning some f the ideas through the next four xamples.
Against two isolated pawns on the seventh, the winning strategy is to lockade one pawn with the queen; this eads to the win of the blockaded pawn or a completely passive stance by Black which allows the white king to come up Of course, if Black can give up one pawn and retain a $B P$ or RP, the position may be drawn.
Diagram 12 (Cheron, 1945) and diagram 13 (Cheron, 1950) illustrate some of these possibilities.
White wins from diagram 12: 1 Qh7+ $\mathrm{Kc1} 2 \mathrm{Qc} 7+\mathrm{Kdl} 3 \mathrm{Qb} 7 \mathrm{Kcl} 4 \mathrm{Qc} 6+\mathrm{Kd1}$ 5 Qa4+ Kc1 6 Qc4+ Kdl 7 Qd3 Kel (On 7...Kcl White wins a pawn with 8 Qc3+) 8 Qe4+ Kf2 9 Qbl! The black king must now leave his seventh rank when the

white king can approach at leisure.


In diagram 13 the BP saves B1ack: 1 Qc4+ Kd2 (1...Kdl? 2 Qfl+ and 3 Qxf2+ wins) 2 Qf1 b1Q! 3 Qxb1 Ke2 drawing as in example 7. No better is 1 Qe Kd1 $2 \mathrm{Qd} 3+\mathrm{Ke1} 3 \mathrm{Qb} 1+\mathrm{Ke} 24 \mathrm{Qxb} 2+$ $\mathrm{Kf1} 5 \mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{Kgl}$ drawing as in example 6.

With connected passed pawns on the seventh rank the superior side can only win if his king is close at handthe queen alone can hold the position but not win it.

White wins: l Qhl+ Kf2 2 Qh2+ Ke3 White mates after 2..Kf1 3 Kf 3 !) $\mathrm{Qf4+} \mathrm{Kd} 3 \quad 4 \mathrm{Qf} 3+\mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{~F} \mathrm{Qxe}$. This fllustrates the two winning ideas mating or winning one pawn to leave a winning Q v $P$ ending.
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Shifting the position one file to the left sees Black holding the draw since the ultimate $Q v P$ ending is drawn:
 Qxd2 Kbl and we have reached a drawn position similar to diagram 6.

## COMBINATION SOLUTIONS

1. Lasker-Steinitz, 2nd Match Game, 1896: 1 Nec5+! dxc5 2 Nxc5+ Kd6 (or 2...Ke8 3 Rxe7+! Bxe7 4 Rxe7+ Kd8 5 Rxg7+ Ke8 6 Re7+ Kd8 $7 \mathrm{Nb7}+\mathrm{wins}$ easily) 3 Bf4+ Kd5 4 Re5+ Kc4 (4. Kxd4 5 Rle4 mate) 5 Rcl+ Kxd4 (5... mate
2. Lasker-Capablanca, St Petersburg 1914: 1 e5! dxe5 2 Ne4 Nd5 3 N6c5 8 (3...Rdg7? 4 Nxb7 Rxb7 5 Na6t) $8+188$ Nc5, 1 - 0 (8...Nb Rab+
3. Tseshkovsky - Dvoretsky, U S S R 1975 1 Kxd5! Nxg3 2 a6 Bb6 3 a4 Ke8 (3 ...Nf5 4 a 5 日f $25 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Ne} 3+6 \mathrm{Kd6}$ also
wins) 4 a5 Bf 2 (Nd4, l-0.
4. Pribyl-Uhlmann, Prague 1975: 1...Rxd4! 2 Rxd4 Bxe5 3 Rd8 for 3 Rd3 f5+ 4 Kh3 Rxf2 5 Re3 Bf4! 6 Rxe6+ Kh5 wins as in the game) $3 .$. (...g4+ cannot be prevented).
5. Corzo-Capablanca, Havana 1900: 1...f3! 2 gxf3 Nf4 3 Be5 $\mathrm{Rg} 2+$ Kfl Rf2+ 5 Kel Nd3+, $0-1$.
6. Vladimirov-Zilberstein, USSR 1975: 1 Rxc4! bxc4 2 Bd5 (Threat: 3 Rb7) Bb3 Rb4 6 Bxf7+, 1 - 0 ( $6 \ldots$...Kxf7 7 Rxf8+ Kxfe

## Maroczy's Greatest Game?

## by Ralph Hart \& Peter Weir

Eighty-four years ago in Munich a highly complicated game was battled out between two of the leading players of the day - Geza Maroczy of Hungary and David Janowski of Poland. The opening was the romantic Albin Counter Gambit which has a mixed reputation today but in 1900 was often used by attacking players.
The game is found in games collections generally under the heading 'Maroczy's Greatest Game although the authors often fail to mention a fantastic saving possibllity which Janowski could have tried just one move before he resigned. North Shore Chess club halysing the key positions and reviewing previous analysis. We hope that readers will joy this fascinating game as much the authors did We gave deliberately condensed our analysis of the firet hase of the game though that is full of excitement as well!

## JANOWSKI - MAROCZY <br> Albin Counter Gambit <br> Munich 1900

$\begin{array}{lllllll}1 & d 4 \\ d 5 & \text { c4 e5 } 3 & d x e 5 & d 4 & 4 \text { e4? }\end{array}$ Nc6 5 Bf4 Nge7 6 Bg3 h5 7 h 3 ? Better was 7 h4.
 Be7 11 Bd3 Nxh4!? 12 Qe2 $\operatorname{Ng} 6 \quad 13$ e6
13...Bxe6 is met by 14 f 5 while on 13...fxe6 comes 14 e5!

14 Qxg4
On 14 f5 there follows 14...hxg3! 15 fxg6 Rxh1 16 g 7 ! Rxg1+ $17 \mathrm{Nf} 1 \mathrm{Bb} 4+$ and 18...Ke7 winning.
14...Bxe6 15 f5 Bc8! 16 Bh2 Nge5 $17 \mathrm{Qe} 2 \mathrm{Nxd3}+18 \mathrm{Qxd3} \mathrm{Nb4} 19 \mathrm{Qb3} \mathrm{a} 5$ ! Intending 20...a4 and if 20 a4 then 20...d3!

20 Nh3 a4 21 Qd1 Nd3+ 22 Kfl Nxb2 23 Og4 Ra6!

To be able to bring the rook to the kingside in the event of White playing Qg7.

24 Nf4 Kf8! 25 Nd5 Rc6 26 Be5 Rg8 27 Qh5 Bg5 28 Nf3 Nxc4!
Threatening 29... Bxf5. If instead 28 ...Rh6 then 29 Qxh6+ Bxh6 30 Bxc7 Qd7 White stands much better material down, $29 \mathrm{f6} \mathrm{Ne} 3+30 \mathrm{Nxe} 3 \mathrm{Bxe} 3 \quad 31 \mathrm{Rd1} \mathrm{Bg} 4$ 32 Qxh4 Bxf3 33 gxf3 Rc2!


The key position. The issue is whether Janowiski could have saved the game by improving on his 34 th or 35 th moves.

## 34 Bxd4

Instead of this Janowski could have played 34 Qel! threatening to capture on e3 and thus parrying his opponent's main threat of ...Qa8-a6. If Black tries this at once White has at least a draw after 34...Qa8 35 Qb4+ c5 36 Bab+ Ke8 37 Qbst Ka8 38 Qb6t. Here White could also try 38 Bxc5 when either 38...Qa6 39 Qxa6 bxa6 40 Bxd4 or 38 ...Rxc5 39 Qxc5 Qa6+ 40 Kel give the first player good chances.
The main question concerning the 34 Qel! varlation is whether Black can after 35 Pff Bxf2 36 Kxf2 B1...R24. Afe the d pawn by 1 kying 36 ...c5 when 37 Rbl b 638 Rbg 1 (also interesting is 38 Rb 5 intending 39 Rhbl ) leads to a 38 Rb 5 Intending 39 Rhbl) leads to a Kf2 threatening $41 \mathrm{Rg} 1+$ and 42 Rh 1 , the black queen has no active moves.
If Black tries too hard to win he can even lose, e.g. 34 Qel Qd7 35 Qxe 3 Qb5+ 36 Qd3 Qxd3+ 37 Rxd3 Rcl+ 38 Kf2 Rxhl 39 Rxd 4 Ke 840 Bxc 7 followed by Rd8 mate.

## 34...Qa8!

Instead of this Black can win comparatively easily with $34 . .$. Bxd4, e.g. 35 Qh6+ Ke8 36 Qg7 Qxf6! 37 Qxg8+ Ke7 38

Rd3 (Black threatened 38...Qxf3 and 38 ...Qa6+) 38...Qf4! with the idea $39 \ldots$ Qcl+ or even $38 \ldots \mathrm{Rc} 1+39 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rxh} 140$ Kxhl Qh4+ 41 Kg 2 Qf $2+$ winning the white rook in short order.
35 Rd3?
We shall return to discuss the move Janowski missed below.
35...Qa6, 0-1.

Returning to White's 35th move, there are many sharp possibilities in the position arising after the amazing move 35 Ba7! Indeed many annotators have considered that in this position Black cannot win. The idea of the move consists in the fact that Black cannot take the bishop, e.g. 35...Qxa7 36 Rd8 mate or, even more spectacularly, 35... Bxa7 36 Qh6+ Ke8 37 Qg7! Rf8 38 Qxf8+! Kxf8 39 Rh8 mate. Tchigorin also pointed out that a third variation 35 ..Bg5 loses to 36 Qel Bxf6 37 Qb4+ Should Mar Rc6 39 Rh7 Ra6 40 Qb3. have Maroczy's greatest game really
have been Janowski's greatest game?
71 in 35 ! 6 hich M5...b6! (next dagram), a move ront


We examined a number of 1 ines for White. First, 36 Qh5 Qc8 37 Qd5 does not help because of $37 \ldots$.. Qh $3+!38 \mathrm{Rxh} 3$ Rg1 mate. Also unavailing is 36 Qh 7 Qe8! 37 Rd5 (preventing Qb5+) $37 \ldots \mathrm{c} 538$ e 5 Qbs+ 39 Qd3 Qbl+ 40 Qdl Rf2+ 41 Kel Q $4+$ and Black wins. No better is 36 Rd3 Qc8 37 Rxe3 Qab+ 38 Kel Qa5+ 39 KHe
the c8 square covering the erin getion (with the idea of such as 36 endgaie chances) gives Thite a very strong attack, gives White a very 38 Qd8 (ther, check on b5) 38 ... Rc2 39 Rd7 Rcl+ Ke2 Rxhl 41 Oxc7 Bf4 42 Qc5+1 bxc5 4
xc5+ Qe7 44 Rd8 mate.
In this line Black can improve by 38 ...a3! as, on 39 Rd7, Black wins by 39 ...Rf2+ and 40...a2. We then looked for an improvement for White and found 39 Qd5! attacking the Ra2 and winning after $39 \ldots$...Rf2+ 40 Kel a2 41 Bb 8 ! (a brilliant move, discovered by Ralph, which threatens the decisive 42 Qd6 6 ) 41...Bc5 (not 41...Qxb8 42 Qd8+) 42 bxc 7 and Black cannot prevent the check on d 6 .
Black, however, can do better than taking the pawn on a2 by playing $36 .$. Qe8! intending Qb5+. Now we have:

1. 37 Qd7 Qxd7 $38 \mathrm{Rxd7} \mathrm{Ke} 839 \mathrm{Re} 7+$ Kd8 40 Rxf7 Kc8! and White cannot stop mate starting with ...Rd8.
2. 37 Qf5 Bc5 (renewing the threat of Qb5+) 38 Qd7 Rf2+ 39 Kel Rxf3 winning.
3. 37 Rd7 Rcl+ 38 Ke 2 RxhI 39 Qxhl Qxd7 40 Kxe3 Qd6 with a winning advantage for Black
It is a pity that Janowski did not find 35 Ba 7 ! although, as the above analysis shows, Maroczy could have won earlier by 34...Bxd4 or, more sharply after $34 \ldots$.. Qa8! 35 Ba7!, by $35 \ldots$ sharp hen Black has the more dangerous threats.

## LETTER

Dear Sir,
Recently while browsing through the Complete Games of Mikhail Tal, 1960-66 the game Stein-Ta1 1961 (p.47) caught my attention. This seemed very similar to a game played in the Auckland Schoolpupil Championship a few years back. Indeed, upon scrummaging through copies New 1982 aland Chess I found, in the dams the best ha beat game prize for this effort') and, to my astonishment, it was an exact replian stein same against rai. this could be a pure coincidence of course it is too late for action but you'll agree this is an 1 teresting unearthing. Nigel Hopewell
I was the judge; wish I'd known-Editor

## The First Amateur Chess Olympiad

## by Val Zemitis

On 12 July 1924 fifty-four chess masters from eighteen countries took by athletes who had come to Paris to compete in the 8th Olympic Games. Each nation could send four participants; however, the competition and the award of medals were the same as for athletes competing in individual events - gold medal for the first place, silver for the second and bronze for third. All competitors were amateurs and as such had to pay their own passage to the games and take care of their own expenses during their eight-day stay in Paris.
The participants were divided into nine preliminary groups, the winner of each group advancing to the final. The playing conditions were not ideal; the weather was sultry and often players had to play not only two games in on day but also in the evenings had to finish their adjourned games. Under such conditions many well-known masters failed to reach the final; G.Koltanow ski, E.Steiner, K.Hromadka, H.Johner, O. Naegeli, G.C.A.Oksam, E.V
many others were the winners of the preliminary groups The winners of the prellainary gaps (Hary 4/5) M. Euwe (Holland, 4/5) (Hungary, 4/5), M. Lwe ( F /landiek . Colle (Belgium, (some tmes his name Moll (Spain, eek, Have (Hungary, 4立/5) and L.A.Palau (Argentina, $3 \frac{1 / 2}{2} / 5$ ).
In the final it was Hermann Mattison from tatvia who exhibited the steadiest chess and his $5 \frac{1}{2}$ points from eight games was enough for the gold medal. The silver medal went to his countryman Franz Apsenieks on 5 points and the bronze medal went to Edgar Colle with $4 \frac{1}{2}$ points. The next three finishers, Chepurnov, Euwe and Vajda, achieved 4 points and each was awarded a goldplated medallion.
While Mattison's play earned him the gold medal it was the enterprising play of Apsenieks that thrilled the chess world. We give one win from each of these players
The Paris Chess Olympiad, incidentally, was directed by none other than

Alexander Alekhine.
HROMADKA - MATTISON, Vienna Game:
1 e4 e5 $2 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 4$ fxe5
 5...f5 or 5...Nc6] 6 dxc3?! [Leaving 5...f5 or 5...Nc6] 6 dxc3?! TLeaving game Noskov-Kumin 1936 Black played 6 game Noskov-Kumin 1936 Black played 6
 Nf3 Qb6 10 O-O-0 NC5 11 Na4 $0-0-012$ $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Nxe6 fxe6 } \\ \text { vantage] } 7 \text { Bf4 } & 0-0 & 8 & 0-0-0 & \mathrm{c} 6 \\ 9 & \mathrm{Bd} 3\end{array}$ Nd7 10 Nh3 Nc5 11 Qh5 g6 12 Qh6 Bxh3 13 Qxh3 Bg5! 14 Qe3 Bxf4 15 Qxf4 Ne6! $16 \mathrm{Qg} 3 \mathrm{Qg} 5+$ twith the queens off it is only a matter of time before the weak e-pawn falls] 17 Qxg5 Nxg5 18 h 4 Ne6 19 Rhfl Rfe 820 h 5 Kg 721 Rf 6 Nc 522 Rfdl Re7 23 hxg6 hxg6 24 c 4 Nxd3+ 25 cxd3 dxc4 26 dxc4 Rf8 [The rest is a matter of technique; nevertheless it is instructive to see how such won positions are won!] 27 Rel Rfe8 28 Ref1 Rh8 $29 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Rf} 8 \quad 30$ Rel Rfe8 31 Ref1 Rd7 32 Rd6 Rc7 33 Rel Rce7 34 Kc 2 Kf8 35 Kd3 Rxe5 36 Rxe5 Rxe5 37 Rd8 Re8 $38 \mathrm{Rd} 7 \mathrm{Re} 7 \quad 39 \mathrm{Rd} 8+\mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 40 \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{Kf} 6$ 41 a4 $\mathrm{Kg} 5 \quad 42 \mathrm{Rd} 4 \mathrm{f} 5 \quad 43 \mathrm{gxf} 5 \mathrm{gxf} 5 \quad 44$ Rd8 $\mathrm{f} 4 \quad 45 \mathrm{Rf} 8 \mathrm{Kg} 4 \quad 46 \mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Kh} 3 \quad 47 \mathrm{Rf} 8$ Kg3 $48 \mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Kf} 2 \quad 49 \mathrm{~b} 5 \mathrm{cxb} 5 \quad 50$ axb 5 b6 $51 \mathrm{c} 5 \mathrm{bxc} 5 \quad 52 \mathrm{Rg} 5 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{53} \mathrm{Rxc} 5 \mathrm{Kg} 2$ $54 \mathrm{Rg} 5+\mathrm{Kf} 1 \quad 55 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{f} 2 \quad 56 \mathrm{Kdl} \mathrm{Re} 657$ Rg7 a6 58 bxa6 Rxa6 59 Kd 2 Rh6 60 Rg8 Rh2, $0-1$.
APSENIEKS-EUWE, Four Knights' Game: 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Nc 3 Nf 64 Bb 5 вb4 $\quad 5 \quad 0-0 \quad 0-0 \quad 6$ d3 d6 7 Bg5 Вxc3 8 bxc3 Ne7 9 Nh4! c6 [9....Ne8 or 9...Bg4 are considered better] 10 Bc4 d5 [Not 10...Be6? because of 11 Bxf6 gxf6 12 вxe6 fxe6 13 Qg4+ Kf7 14 f4] 11 exd5!? [Theory gives only 11 bb3 Qd6 with equalityl Nfxd5 12 Qel! Kh8 13 d 4 f 14 Bd2 Ng8? 15 dxe5 fxe5 16 Nf3 Rxf3 [Forced] 17 gxf3 Qf6 [If 17...Bh3 then 18 Qxe5] 18 Bd3! Nge7 [If 18...Qxf3 or 18...Bh3 then 19 Qe4] 19 c4! Ng6 [Risky but on 19...Nf4 White simply plays 20 Exf4] 20 cxd5 Nh4 21 Qe4! [Not 21 Qe because of $21 \ldots N x f 3+22 \mathrm{kh} 1 \mathrm{Nx}_{\mathrm{N}} 2121$ ...Bf5

## DIAGRAM

22 Qxh4!! Qxh4 23 Bxf5 Rf8? [This turns out badly; Black should have played 23...cxd5] contd on page 108

## GAMES

The first four games, all annotated by GM Raymond Keene, are taken from the nagnificent daily bulletins of the hillips \& Drew/GLC Kings tournament n London.
The first game, played in round 3 , won the brilliancy prize (a Countdown
chess clock) for Polugaevsky.

## POLUGAEVSKY - TORRE

## Slav Defence

## 1 d4 d5 2 c4 c6

For many years Torre was an adherent of the King's Indian but since 1981 he has been employing the solid Slav and it formed part of his successful repertoire when he qualifted for the Candidates from the 1982 Toluca Interzonal

## 3 Nf3 Nf6 4 Nc 3

Portisch nearly always plays 4 exd5 cxd5 5 Nc3 Nc6 6 Bf4 and has achieved lost on results with this. Torre also lost on the black side of the Exchang Vijk with solid defence it is hard to beieve that Black can be wuch worse with se with a symmetrical pawn structure.
4...dxc4

Polugaevsky - Torre, Moscow 1981, saw 4...e6 5 Bg5 dxc4 6 e4 b5 7 e5, a game which also resulted in a brilliant win for the Soviet grandmaster.
5 a4 Bf5 6 e3
6 Ne5 is also popular, but perhap less effective after 6...Na6 7 f3 Nd7 challenging White's knight.


An unusual move. After 12 e 5 Nd5 13 Nxd5 exd5 14 Qe3 as in Polugaevsky Tan, Manila Interzonal 1976, Black should, according to Batsford Chess openings, play 14...Bg6 with level chances. The point of this bishop retreat is to blunt the power of White's Bd3.
12...Re8 13 e5 Nd5 14 Nxd5 cxd5 15 h3 Be7 16 Rfc 1 a 617 Rc 3 Bxf3

The Philippine grandmaster has conceived a plan to undermine the defence
of White's d-pawn and then attack it by the manoeuvre ...Nb8-c6. Unfortunately, this conception consumes an enormous amount of tempi and also does nothing to challenge White's Bd3. I believe, by analogy with the line above, that Black should try $17 . .$. Bg 6 .

18 Qxf3 Nb8
Consistent but foolhardy. Torre must have totally underestimated the force of White's coming attack


19 Bxh7+! Kxh7 20 Qh5 +Kg 821 Rg 3 g6

If $21 \ldots$ Bf8 22 Bg 5 Be 7 (or 22... Qb6 23 Bf6 Nc6 24 Qh6 with Rxg7+ to follow) 23 Bh6 Bf8 $24 \mathrm{Rxg} 7+\mathrm{Bxg} 725 \mathrm{Qg} 4 \mathrm{Kf} 826$ Qxg7+ Ke7 $27 \mathrm{Bg} 5+$ winning.
22 Rxg6+ fxg6 23 Qxg6+ Kh8 24 Qh6 + Kg8 25 Qxe6+ Kh8 26 Qh6+ Kg8 27 Qg6+ Kh8 28 Qh5
It is obvious that Polugaevsky has a draw but, after a long think, he produces a quiet move which shatters any illusions Torre may have held about erpetual check.
29 Bh6!

29...Bf8

If 29...Bf6 30 Qg6+ Kh8 31 exf6 wins.
30 Qg6+ Kh8 31 Bxf8 Rxf8 32 Qh6+ Kg8 $33 \mathrm{Ra} 3,1$ - 0.
There is no defence, e.g. 33...Kf7 34 Rf3+ Kg8 ( $34 \ldots \mathrm{Ke} 735 \mathrm{Qg} 7+$ ) $35 \mathrm{Rg} 3+\mathrm{Kf} 7$ $36 \mathrm{Rg} 7+$.

The 8th round of the Phillips \& Drew/ GLC Kings featured the pairing Karpov v Korchnoi and it fell on a Saturday. A bumper crowd of 600 turned up to watch this eagerly awaited clash.

## KARPOV - KORCHNOI <br> Grünfeld Defence

## 1 Nf3

Already a surprise; most Karpov v Korchnoi games commence 1 e4.
1...Nf6 2 c4 g6

Heralding a form of Grünfeld, one of Korchnot's favourite defences to the $Q P$ since he has very little faith in the pure King's Indian Defence.
$3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 4 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 5 \mathrm{Bg} 5$
It is difficult to recall earlier games where Karpov has resorted to this variation. One isolated example is Karpov-Adorian, Budapest 1973, given below in my note to White's 8th.
5...Ne4 6 cxd5 Nxg5 7 Nxg5 e6

In Petrosian-Korchnoi, USSR Ch'p 1973, Korchnoi tried the gambit 7...c6!? and Petrosian did not take the pawn. This sort of thing though, is very risky against Karpov who would probably grab the pawn and cling on to it.

8 Nf3
A safer choice than the continuation in the above quoted Karpov-Adorian which continued 8 Qd2 h6 9 Nh3 exd5 10 Nf4 ( 10 Qe3+ Kf8 11 Nf4 c5! is sharp and probably good for Black) 10...0-0. 11 g3 (ll Nfxd5 c6 or 11 e3 c5!) $11 .$. Nc6 12 e3 and 1-0, 43 after hair-
raising complications.
8...exd5 9 e3 0-0 10 b4

The stem game of the whole line was Lasker-Botvinnik, Nottingham 1936, which continued $10 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{c} 61 \mathrm{II} 0-0$ Qe7 12 a3 Be6 13 RcI Nd7 14 Nel Nb6 15 Nd3 Rad8 16 Nc5 Be8 17 b4 Nc4 18 Nb 1 b6 19 Nb3 Ba6 20 Rel Rfe8. Only later (moves 26 and 27) did Botvinnik start his equalising kingside offensive with ... f5 and ...g5. The game was drawn in 4 moves.
10...Be6 $11 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Nd} 7120-0$ f5 13 Rel g5

It is very hard to say where Korchnoi goes wrong in this game. The likelihood
is that all his mistakes were of a strategic nature. Here, for example, he takes the irrevocable decision to adopt an aggressive posture on the kingside but maybe Black's position is not capable of sustaining such a weakening advance. It should be observed how subtle and cunning was Karpov's apparently harmless 13 Re , the point being that
.f4 by Black would open up the e-file for White's rook, e.g. against Black's target bishop on e6. In Korchnoi's desire to carry the struggle to his opponent he probably assumes too pugnacious an attitude.

14 Rc1 Kh8 15 Bd3 c6 $\quad 16$ b5 g4!?


Another highly committal but in many ways logical move. Black cannot play 16...c5 since 17 dxc5 Nxc5 18 Nd 4 leads to the occupation of the key central d slack first chases away this knight from contact with d4. Meanwhile White threatens 17 bxc6 and Na4 sadding Black with a weak pawn on c6. Finally, Black with a weak pawn on c6. F1nall Black's problems; white would threaten a knight incursion on $c 7$ while Black's a knight incursion on c7 while Black's isolated d-pawn is a long-term source of weakness. So in view of what happens in the later course of this game a knight on f 4 , the square abandoned a knight on f 4 , the square abandon
by ...g4) it is easy to criticise Korchnoi's 16 ...g 4 but not so simple to suggest an alternative.
$17 \mathrm{Nd} 2 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 18 \mathrm{dxc} 5$
18 Ne 2 c 419 Nf 4 Bg 8 is okay for
Black.
18...Nxc5 $19 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{Nxb3} 20$ axb3 Rc8

Another moment for difficult decisions; 20...d4? solves the problem of Black's weak d-pawn but, after 21 exd4, White's Rel suddenly menaces the Be6 and 21...Bg8 22 d5! is then good for White. A widely expected alternative to the text was 20...Qh4!? threatening Rf6-
h6 and Qxh2+. However, this neglects the centre and the attack lacks suffilent power, e.g. 20...Qh4!? 21 g 3 QhS (21...Qh3 22 Bfl ) and now White has the out Black's h-file attack totally, or 22 Ne 2 followed by Nf4.
21 Ne 2 Rxcl 22 Qxc1 Qb6 $23 \mathrm{Nf4} \mathrm{Bg} 8$ 24 g 3 d 4 !?

Another big decision but maybe too hasty. However, what should Black do? one threat was 25 Qc2 Qf6 26 Nh 5 exchanging the more valuable of Black's two bishops. Whichever bishop is swapped, vital squares are depleted but it seems to me that it is very importan indeed to preserve the dark-square bishop as otherwise his king becomes seriously exposed on the black squares.
25 Bc4! Rc8 26 Qb1 dxe3 27 Rxe3 Qc5 28 Qel

White now changes course. His plan is to penetrate to 88 with a major piece.

28...Bd4

If 28...Bxc4 29 bxc4 Qxc4 30 Re8+ Rxe8 31 Qxe8+ Qg8 32 Qd7 with domination. If then 32...Qa2 $33 \mathrm{Qc} 8+!\mathrm{Qg} 834$ Qxb7 and Black still cannot free himself.

29 Re 2 Bxc 430 bxc 4 Rg 8
Designed to prevent Re8+. If here 30 ..Qxc4 $31 \mathrm{Re} 8+$ Rxe8 32 Qxe8+ Qg8 33
Qd7! again, with the added ingredient Qxd4+ to cope with. Or, in this line, 32...Kg7 33 Ne6+ Kf6 (33...Kh6 34 Qf8+ Kg6 35 Qg8+) 34 Nxd4 Qxd4 35 Qh8+ winning Black's queen.
31 Qc1!
With Korchno. in appalling timetroudie, Karpov commences an ingenious creeping" manoeuvre (as Kotov describe such things in his book Think Like A Grandmaster) to infiltrate h1s opponent's line of defence.
31...Rc8 32 Qc2 Bg7

Avoiding the transparent 32...Qxc4? 33 Re8+! Rxe8 34 Qxc4 which would, however, have claimed many time-pressure victims.
33 Qd3 Qd4
Trying to block out White's queen from d7, but there is no alternative. 34 Qxf5 Qxc4 $35 \operatorname{Re} 7$

Closing in for the kill. White's pieces converge on Black's king.
35...Rd8 36 Kg 2

Not $36 \mathrm{Rxg} 7 ? ? \mathrm{Rdl}+37 \mathrm{Kg} 2$ Qfl mate.
36...Qb3 37 Qxg4 Rg8 $38 \mathrm{Ng} 6+, 1-0$.

Notes by Ray Keene

After nine rounds Polugaevsky was in second place, a half point behind Karpov, but in the tenth round Speelman unleashed a spectacular serles of sac rices

## POLUGAEVSKY - SPEELMAN

Nimzoindian Defence
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 4 Nc3 Bb4

After 4... Bb7 White would probably have played 5 a3 entering the Petrosia have played 5 an entering the Petrosia the hands of Kasparov. Current thinking is that the move order 4 a3 allowing 4
s that the move order 4 a3 allowing 4 hances for Black.
5 Qc2
This used to be popular in the 1920 s when the Nimzo and Queen's Indian were unexplored territory. It is enjoying a revival at the moment though 5 Bg 5 is also becoming more frequent. The point of 5 Qc2 is to acquire the bishop pair without allowing the c-pawns to be doubled.
5...Bb7 6 a3 Exc3+ 7 Qxc3 a5 8 b3

Speelman tries to improve on 11 ...Ne 4 12 Qc2 f5 13 0-0 Rf6!? seen in Polugaev sky-Psakhis, USSR Ch'p 1983. After the astute 14 c5! speculating on the expo sure of the rook on f 6 to attack from the Bb 2 , White gained the advantage.

Speelman starts the regulation kingide attack which characterises this line.

14 Ne1 Qg5
Impeding f3 and building up pressure against g2.
15 Bc 1 !?
A very strange move wasting a lot of time to try and force through f3 and e4. An alternative deserving consideration is 15 Qe2 with $f 3$ in view.
15...Qg6 $\quad 16$ f3 Ng5 $\quad 17 \mathrm{~h} 4$

Highly ambitious, hoping for $17 . . . \mathrm{Nf} 7$ 18 g 4 and then $\mathrm{Ng} 2-\mathrm{f} 4$ crowding Black's pieces out of the game. Speelman's solution is startling.

17...Ne4!!? 18 h 5 !

The best way of capturing the piece and one which Speelman may have underestimated. After 18 fxe 4 fxe4 19 Be 2 the black pawn on 44 severely hampers the mobility of White's forces. Furthermore, the white h-pawn would soon be lost to Black's rapid concentration of pieces on the kingside.
18...Qxh5 19 fxe4 fxe4 20 Bxe4 If 20 Rxf8+ Rxf8 21 Bxe4 Qh4 22 Bxb7 Qxel+ 23 Kh 2 Rf 1.
20...Rxf1+ 21 Kxfl Rf8 +22 Bf 3

If 22 Kgl Qh4 as above.
22...e5 23 Ke 2 ?

Overlooking a brilliant resource. Correct is 23 Kgl Qh4 24 Qe 2 with chances of beating off the attack.

## 23...Rxf3!!

Speelman now paced the stage with a demonic grin while Polugaevsky became ever more frantic, clutching his head and getting into ever more desperate clock pressure.
24 gxf3 e4 25 d5?

Watching, I thought this forced but it loses. After 25 Kd 2 ! exf3 26 Nd 3 Be 4 it loses. After $25 \mathrm{Kd} 2!$ exf3 26 Nd 3
followed by Qf5 and the advance of
Black's kingside pawns, things remai colossally unclear.
25...exf3+ 26 Nxf3 Ne5 27 Qe4 Bc8 28 Bd 2
On 28 Bb 2 Nxf3 29 Kh 1 Qxh1 30 Qe8 is mate, but $28 . . . \mathrm{Bf} 5$ ! throws a gigantic spanner in White's works.
28...Bf5 $29 \mathrm{Qf4} \mathrm{Nxf3} 30$ e4 Ne5+ 31 $\mathrm{Kf} 1 \mathrm{Bh} 3+32 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Qg} 6+, 0-1$.

Notes by Ray Keene

The World Champion's only loss came too late to affect the results. Torre traps Karpov's rook to record his second win against the Soviet player.

TORRE - KARPOV
Nimzoindian Defence
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e5 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 e3 c5 5 Ne 2
In recent years 5 Bd3 Nc6 6 Nf3 Bxc3+ 7 bxc 3 d 6 followed by the blockading ..ee5 has been shown to give White nothing. A few stubborn classicists such as Gligoric and Portisch have surprisingly clung to this treatment but they have both been slaughtered in droves. White's choice in the present game strives to acquire the bishop pair while avoiding doubled pawns.
5...cxd4 6 exd4 0-0

The most fashionable move though 6... d5 is also possible.
7 a3 Be7 8 d5 exd5 9 cxd5 Bc5!?
The major alternative to this is $9 .$. Re8 which has, however, been failing recently to a sacrifice of the white pawn on d6, e.g. 9...Re8 10 d 6 Bf8 11 g3 and now:
11...Qb6 12 Bg2 Bxd6 13 Be3 Qa6 14 $0-0$ Be5 15 Nf4 d5 16 Ncxd5 Nc6 17 Nxf6+ Bxf6 18 Nd5, Korchnoi-Miles, Wijk aan Zee 1984 (see May, page 58).
b) 11 ...Re6 12 Bf 4 Nh 5 13 $\mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Rxd6} 14$ Qb3 (14 Qc2 Re6 15 Bg2 Nc6 16 O-0 Nf6 17 Radl Re8 18 Nd4 Nxd4 19 Bxd4 d5, Korchnoi-Kindermann, Beersheva 1984 $\left.1 / 2-\frac{1}{2}, 24\right) 14 \ldots \mathrm{Nc} 615 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{~b} 616 \mathrm{Nb} 5$ Re6 17 Ned4 Re7 18 Qd5, Tatai-Hmadi, Lugano 1984 ( $1-0,24$ ).

In view of this, $9 \ldots$...Bc5 is beginning to replace 9...Re8.
$\begin{array}{ccccc}10 \mathrm{~b} 4 & \mathrm{Bb} 6 & 11 \mathrm{Na} 4 \mathrm{~d} 6 & 12 \mathrm{Nxb6} \text { axb6 }\end{array}$ 13 Ng 3
Or 13 g 3 Re 814 Bg 2 Bg 415 Be 3 Nbd 7
 which is better for White,

Aftar, 13 Ng 3 Whee 1984. tionally with his two bishops and superior pawn structure but Black now has time to round up the pawn on d5.
13...Re8+ 14 Be 2 Re5 15 Bb 2 Rxd5
 h3 b5?
B1ack's first mistake. Instead of
this he should play ...Rc8! at once.
20 Racl Bd7
Perhaps hoping to reach c6 but the
bishop never makes It.
21 Rfel
Seirawan thought the immediate 21 f 4 stronger than this. A matter of taste?

## 21...Rc8?

The second and decisive error. Correct is 21...h61

22 Rxc8 Qxc8 23 f4 Ng6
If $23 . \ldots$ Nc 424 Bxc4 bxc4 (or $24 \ldots$ Qxc4 25 Qe7) 25 Bxf6 gxf6 26 Ne 4 followed by Qc3.
24 Bxf6 gxf6 25 Bf3


It is not of such great significance that White can trap the black rook and win the exchange - this is an occupational hazard if you play the adventuopening. What is really serious the is that White still has a very, though, stack against Black's fractur powerful side. .
25...Qc4 $26 \mathrm{Bxd5}$ Qxd5 27 Ne 4 Kg 7 28 Nxf6

Forcing advantageous simplification. If 28 Qc 3 Qf5!
28...Kxf6 29 Qc3+ Ne5

Forced, since 29...Kf5 $30 \mathrm{~g} 4+\mathrm{Kxf4} 31$ Qe3 is mate.
30 fxe5+ dxe5 31 Rf1+ Ke6 32 Qc2 e4
I felt that more reaistance was possible with 32... Bc6 33 Qf5+ Ke7 keeping open the a8-hl diagonal for the
$Q+B$ battery. Still, it is $Q+B$ battery. Still, it is not at all
pleasant.
33 Qc3 f5 34 Qg7 Qd2 35 Qxh7 Qe3+ 36 Kh2 Qg5 37 h4 Qg4 38 Qh6+ Ke5 39 Qg5

Correctly transposing into a winning ending.
39...Qxg5 40 hxg 5 e3 $41 \mathrm{~g} 6 \mathrm{Kf6}$

On 41...f4 Torre intended 42 Kgl :
followed by Rdl. White can then always cope with ...e2 by means of Kf2.
$42 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Be} 643 \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{e} 244 \mathrm{Rel} \mathrm{Bc} 4 \quad 45$ 97, 1 - 0 .
B1ack sealed 45...Kxg7 but resigned without resuming. White uses the front g-pawn as a decoy to bring about a won $\mathrm{K}+\mathrm{P}$ endgame: 45 . . . $\mathrm{Kxg} 746 \mathrm{Kxf5} \mathrm{Kf} 747$ Ke4 Kf6 48 Ke3 Ke5 49 Rxe2 Bxe2 50 Kxe2 and the rear g-pawn decides matters.

Notes by Ray Keene

The following game was played in the last round of the 1984 North Island Champlonshlp at Wanganul. Notes are by the new North Island Champion Robert Smith.

> A.F.KER - R.W.SMITH

Modern Defence
 Nc6
This seems logical in view of White's last move; it would cost a tempo for him to protect the d-pawn with 5 Be3.
5 Nge2
White avoids 5 Nf3 because of $5 \ldots \mathrm{Bg} 4$ with pressure on his centre. Possible was 5 d5 Nd4 6 Nge2 c5 although B1ack seems to have equalised comfortably.
5...h6 6 Bh4

On 6 Be3 Nf6 7 f3 Wh1te's pleces are

## rather tangled.

6...Nf6

Also 6...g5 comes into consideration.
7 f4 0-0 8 h3
To stop incursions by minor pieces on $g_{4}$ but also with an eye to kingside expansion.
8...b5!?

Black would like to open up the game in view of his better development but $8 . . . e 5$ is tactically unsound. The move played is an interesting alternative. 9 a3
The only real challenge to ...b5
would be 9 e5!? when Black has 9 ...Nd7 10 Nxb5 Rb8 11 Nec3 a6 $12 \mathrm{Na} 3 \mathrm{Rxb} 2 \quad 13$ Nc4 Rb8 with an unclear position,
or even 9...Nh7!? with the idea of

| breaking up White's centre by | $\ldots g 5!?$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | Bg2 Nd7 13 0-0 c5

It is essential to strike at White's centre.
14 Bf2 cxd4 $15 \mathrm{Nxd4}$
Possibly better was 15 Bxd4 e5 16 Be3 exf4 17 Nxf4 Ne5 with an unclear position.
15...Nc5 16 Nde2 Qc7 17 Qd2 a5

Parrying the threat of Nb 5 winning a piece.
18 Ng 3 Bc 619 Rabl Na4!? $20 \mathrm{Nxa4}$ Bxa4 21 b3 Bc3?! 22 Qe2 Bc6 23 Qc4 $\mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 24 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{Na} 6$

Handily protecting the queen, thereby relieving Black of threats against the pinned Bc6.

25 Bd4 e5


## 26 fxe5

Inferior was 26 Be3?! exf4 27 Rxf4 (not 27 Bxf4? Qb6+ 28 Khl Bb5) Be5 28 Rf3 Kg7 and Black has a strong-point
on e5 while White's Bg 2 is rather bad 26...dxe5 27 Be3 Qb7 28 Rfdl Rfc8 29 Qd3 Bf8 30 Kh2 Nc5
Black clearly has the upper hand but Black clearly has the upper hand but both players were now into their last move 40 .
31 Qc2 Ne6 $32 \mathrm{Bf} 1 \mathrm{Bb} 533 \mathrm{Bxb5} \mathrm{Qxb5}$ 34 c4 Qc6 35 Qd2 Rd8 36 Qc3 Nd4!
A good move in White's time trouble. White should reply 37 Kg 2 when Black is clearly better and should be able to clearly better and organise ...a the c-pawn. Neverthe-號 less,
37 Bxd4? exd4 38 Rxd4 Qf6 39 Rxd8 Black is also winning after 39 Rd 3 Qf2+ $40 \mathrm{Khl} \mathrm{Bb4} 41 \mathrm{Rxd8}+\mathrm{Rxd8}$ or 39 Rbd1 Of2+ 40 Kh1 Rxd4 41 Rxd4 Bg 7.
39...Qxc3 40 Rxa8 Qc2+ $41 \mathrm{Kgl} \mathrm{Qxb1+}$ 42 Nf1.
"Resigns is stronger" is a facetious comment which, however, few could argue with in this position - Editor.
42...Qxb3 43 Kf 2 Qxc 444 Ne 3 Qxe $45 \mathrm{Rxa5} 5 \mathrm{Bb} 446 \mathrm{Rb} 5 \mathrm{Bel}+47 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 3$ 48 Rc5 Qh1 49 Rc2 Qxh3 50 Rc4 Qh2 $51 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{Kg} 752 \mathrm{Rc} 2 \mathrm{Qh} 3 \quad 53 \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{Bh} 4 \quad 54$ Rc3 Bg5 $55 \mathrm{Nd5}$ Qxg4t 56 Kd 3 Bf 657 Rc4 Qf3 $+58 \mathrm{Ne} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \quad 59 \mathrm{Re} 4 \mathrm{Qxe} 3+$, 0-1.
$\theta$ 今 $\hat{\theta}$
FIRST CHESS OLYMPIAD contd


After $21 \ldots$... 55
24 dxc6! Rxf5 25 cxb7 Rf8 26 Rabl Rb8 27 Rb 4 Qd8 28 Be3 e4 29 Bf4 [Not 29 fxe4 because of Qd7J 29...Qf8 30 Rxe4!, 1-0 [Not 30 Bxbs Qxb4; Black resigned after 30 Rxe4! since, on $30 .$. Rxb7, White wins by 31 Rfel Rf7 32 Bg 3 Qg g 33 ReB Rf8 34 RxfB Qxf8 35 Rblll. The notes are based on those of M.Euwe.
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