## CLUB DIRECTORY

Details of the advertising rates for this page can be found on the inside front cover. AUCKLAND CHESS ASSOCIATION: Contacts - President, Robert GIBBONS, phone 864-324: Secretary, Winsome STRETCH, 3/33 Sunny Meadows Road, Beach Haven, Auckland.
AUCKLAND CHESS CENTRE: Meets Mondays and Thursdays c.t Cilubrooms 17 Cronmell Street, Mt Eden, phone 602042. Contact - Lindsay CORNFORD, phone 674-705(res) or 276-7154 (bus). Visitors welcome.
HOWICK-PAKURANGA C.C. meets Tuesdays 7.30pm at Howick Bridge Club, Howick Commanit: Complex. Contact - Steve DEVLIN Flat 186 Remuera Road Auckland 5. Phone 502-179.
NORTH SHORE C.C. meets Wednesdays 7.30 pm (tournament and casual play) in St, 'T. Seph's Old Church Hall, cnr Anzac St/Taharoto Rd,Takapuna. Postal address P.O. Box 33-587 Takapuna. Contact Peter STUART phone 456-377(home). Visitors welcome.
REMUERA C.C. meets 7.30prn Wednesdays at the Auckland Bridge Club, 273 Remuera Road' Remuera. Contact - K.WILLIAMS, phone 543-762 (evenings).
WAITEMATA C.C. meets 7.30pm Thursdays at Kelston West Community Centre, cnr Grt North and Awaroa Roads. Postal address P.O. Box 69-005 Glendene, Auckland 8. Contacts - George WILLIAMS phone 834-6618 or Bob SMITH phone 818-4113.
HAMLLTON C.C. MEETS 6.30 pm Sundays at the Students Restaurant Waikato Technical Inst. Hamilton. Contacts - Miss L.McGREGOR 9b Islington Street Hamilton phone 390-228 or Len WHITEHOUSE 165 Galloway Street Hamilton phone 69-582.
HASTINGS/HAVELOCK NORTH C.C. meets 7pm Wednesdays at the Library, Havelock North High School, Te Mata Road, Havelock North. Contact - Mike EARLE phone 776-027.
PALMERSTON NORTH C.C. meets 7.30pm Tuesdays at the Palmerston North Intermediate Normal School, Fergusson Street, Palmerston North. Contact - J. BLATCHFORD 155 Ruahine Street Palmerston North phone 69-575.
CIVIC C.C. meets 7.45 pm Tuesdays at St Peter's Church Hall, Willis Street, Wellington Contact - Brent SOUTHGATE phone 757-604.
HUTT VALLEY C.C. meets 7.30pm Tuesdays at the Hutt Bridge Club, 17 Queen's Road Lower Hutt. Contact - Nathan GOODHUE 28 Waikare Avenue Lower Hutt phone 696-420. UPPER HUTT C.C. meets 7.45 pm Thursdays in the Supper room, Civic Hall Upper Hutt. Contact - Anton REID, 16 Hildreth Stret Upper Hutt phone 288-756.
WAINUIOMATA C.C. meets 7.30 pm on Thursdays (seniors) and 7pm on Fridays (juniors) at: Bilderbeck Hall, Main Road Wainuiomata. Contact - Joe PHILLIPS phone 646-171.
CANTERBURY C.C. meets every Wednesday at 7.30 pm at the Clubrooms, 227 Bealey Avenuc. President John WILKES phone 558-130. Secretary Peter McKENZIE phone 893-463.
CHRISTCHURCH CHESS CENTRE meets Tuesdays at 8 pm at 314 Worcester Street Christchurch. Annual subscription \$8. Contact - Vernon SMALL phone 558-696.
NELSON C.C. meets 7.30pm Thursdays at the Memorial Hall, Stoke. Contact Ton VAN DYK phone Richmond 8178 or 7140 . Visitors welcome.
OTAGO C.C. meets 7.30 pm Wednesdays and Saturdays at 7 Maitland Street Dunedin. Phone 776-919 (clubrooms). Contact - Arthur J. PATTON 26 College Street phone 877-414.
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HAPPY DAYS: GM Ian ROGERS and GM Murray CHANDLER WITH N.Z.C.A. PRESIDENT SIR JOHN MARSHALL (seated) AND VICE PRESIDENT A. BORREN AT THE OPENING OF NEW ZEALAND'S FIRST GRANDMASTER CONTEST.

NEW ZEALAND CHESS is published bi-monthl February, April,June,August, October and December) by the New Zealand Chess Association.
Unless otherwise stated, the views expressed are not neccesarily those of the Association.

## ADDRESS

All articles and letters to the Editor should be sent to the Editor c/o P.O. Box 2185 Wellington. Unpublished manuscripts cannot be returned unless a stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed.
Subscriptions, changes of address and advertising enquiries should be addressed to the Secretary, New Zealand Chess Association, at the same address.

## DEADLINES

The deadline for both copy and advertising is the 15 th of the month prior to publication

## SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Rates are for one year's subscription. Overseas rates in US Dollars.
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ADVERTISING RATES
Full Page $\$ 40$, half page or column 20, half column $\$ 10$
Club Directory listing (one year) 6. Alteration to listing, $\$ 2$.

DOUBLE ISSUE PUBLICATION
Delays in publication of the February issue have carried over into April and June. In an effort to catch up the new Editors have decided to publish a double (April-June) issue. This issue
contains local and international news that will bring readers up to date as far as the end of May 1986. Typed for the most part on the Association's new Sharp Electronic Typewriter, the magazine is the joint work of the N.Z.C.A. Council.

## LONDON/LENINGRAD FOR KASPAROV/KARPON

KASPAROV/KARPOV Round 3 will be played in London and Leniingrad according to a communique released by FIDE. The rematch is due to begin on July 28

The first 12 games will be held in London with games 13-24 in Leningrad. An article in the Information Sheet Soviet News reports that kasparov and his team have completed a 4 week physical training session at zagulba on the Caspian Sea. Kasparov's canch Norair GRIGORYAN, and his Doctor, kinlid GASANOV are reportedly very plessod with now 23 devotes 4 hours daily to sports. He does not smoke, nor does he touch alcohol. If anyone needed telling after the first KK match, it is clear that this time round the need for plivisical fitness in chess is well recogniaed
Kasparov's chess team, GM Iosif DORImaN Master Alexei NIKITIN and Master Alexander SHAKAROV, are carrying out in in depth analysis of Karpov's style, in preparation for the rematch. kasparov has a full list of activities leading up to the match. In March he began giving lessons in a correspondence cheas school for 10-17 year olds. He has joined his former teacher ex world champion
Mikhail BOTVINNIK, in running the school. In June teacher becomes student as Kasparov sits the graduation exans al Azerbaijan Foreign Languages Teacher Training Institute where he studies. An invitation to Spain to receive his 3rd Chess 'Oscar' has been fitted in with a training match against a leading Grandmaster. Readers can look forward to lots of exciting chess in the months to come.
Maya CHIBURDANIDZE will defend her title against Elena AKHMYLOVSFAYA who won the contender's contest in Malmo, Sweden with $9 \frac{1}{2} / 14$. AKHMYLOUSKAYA will be the fourth Russian challenger to play CHIBURLANIDEE for the title, emphasising (if it needs emphasising) the strength of Soviet players of both sexes.
A new chess school accormodating 500 pupils has been opened in Saatly, Azerbaijan, the home of World Champion Garri KASPAROV. Chess is being reintroduced to secondary schools as Soviel surveys show that chessplaying pupils do better at maths and science!

Editor Bob MITCHELL
Consulting Editor: NM Peter STUART
Contributing Editors: IM Ortvin SARAPU, Lev APTEKAR, Rowan WOOD.

## Editorial

The appearance of my name as Editor of New Zealand Chess, though it places me, some might say, in distinguished company, does not provide the sense of satisfaction which one might expect. The truth is that NZCA Council members have collectively taken up the burden that Zyg FRANKEL, through personal circunstances was obliged to lay down. The next issue may well see the name of another Council member at the masthead.
A new Editor is desperately needed. My professional life,added to my secretarial responsibilities will not permit the present situation to last for long, and other Council members are in ruch the same position. I see an obligation to keep faith with subscribers until Decernber 1986 and will do everything possible to ensure that readers receive a full measure of interesting material. Apart from that, the question must be It river froul It receives marginal support fron fewer is highly legre play and is highly is deeply involved in time when NZCA is deeply involved in Arguments about fluctuating quality and Arguments about fluctuating quality and are superficially apealing but the fact is that the magazine received only marginal support in the days when Peter marginal support in the days when Peter STUART turned out an inmaculate product on time nearly all the time. In the past weeks I have learned to dedication that Peter put into his job as Editor.
Of course the magazine is the banner of New Zealand chess, and the main vehicle for keeping the chess players of this country informed. of course it deserves to be maintained, and of course on. If you think that, then be prepared to lend more than vocal support. Instead of writing letters of
complaint, send in an annotated game, or if you feel really upset about something, write your complaint at the foot of your annotations.
To suin up, we need an Editor now. We need material from you, now. We need to know that the effort is worthwhile. Don't tell us. Show us.

## TOURNAMENT DIRECIORS

The Council of NZCA is concerned at the dearth of experienced tournament directors on the local scene. The same but there are all too few 'new boys' coming on and even the more experienced old hands have things to learn.
Since Ted STALLNECHT left for Australia New Zealand has not had a qualified International Arbiter. It might be a while before we get one. Meantime, something needs to be done to take some pressure off the "old guard".
Running a tournament is a matter of following simple sequences,but does involve detailed knowledge of pairing rules and of course the laws of chess! Many players who might make very competent tournament directors lack the confidence to give it a try. Often the most difficult part of arranging a tournanent is to find a DOP!
It is proposed that during 1987, a series of weekend seminars should be held in say, Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin. A small group of experienced tournament directors will provide basic "how to" information, and many of the finer points as well.
An application for part of the funding will be made to the Ministry of Recreation and Sport, but as is usual in such matters, the bulk of the cost will have to be met by the participants.
Let's have some feedback on this topic How many Clubs would be interested in putting a member forward; and how many in taking part in a seminar of this sort?

## Can You See the Combinations?

These diagrams from the library of Lev APTEKAR share a conmon theme. The answers are NOT provided in this issue. Try your hand using the diagrams only to develop


DURAO-CAROZZI
Dublin 1957


MOLDOIARKOV-SANCHELOV U.S.S.R. 1974


NN-IANGERSTRAM
1.

White to move

Black to move


GEORGADZE-KUINDZHI
Tbilisi 1973


From study by


STAHLBERG-BECKER

## SPOT THE MOVE

Just a bit of horsing about. You shouldn't need the board for these similar but subtly different Meredith problems provided from Lev APTEKAR's library. No solutions in this issue. Naturally, White to move and mate in two.


## LOCAL NEWS

## AUCKIAND CHRISTMAS TIOURNAMFNT

by Bob GIBBONS.
The Auckland Chess Centre hosted a small tournament over the Christmas holidays which saw 14 players compete for the 'Ortvin Sarapu Trophy'
This cup was generously presented by Merv MORRISON with the aim of fostering chess competition in Auckland and it is hoped that the tournament will become an annual event

The winners of the inaugural tournament were Simon FITZPATRICK and Martin DREYER with scores of $8 \frac{1}{2} / 10$.
Results: $8 \frac{1}{2}$ S.FITZPATRICK, M.DREYER 7 P.COOPER, $6 \frac{1}{2}$ J.ROBINSON, 6 G.SPENCERSMITH, $5 \frac{1}{2}$ R. BAUMGARINER, 5 M.MORRISON, S.VAN DAM, $4 \frac{1}{2}$ G.MEARS, $3 \frac{1}{2}$ S. BAKER, D.PLUMPION 3 E.LAWS 2 G.JONES $1 \frac{1}{2}$ J. SHIEJDS.

## WAITEMATA CHESS CLUB

Not surprisingly Robert SMITH is the 1985 Waitemata Chess Club Champion. He finished with $4 \frac{1}{2} / 5$ ahead of Nick BRIDGES who held him to a draw in their last round game. The most notable feature was that the half point was the first that Bob had dropped at the Club out a feorge WLLLIAMS who turns time to take rate Club Bulletin found with $4 \frac{1}{2} / 5$ ahead of Charlie mOULE. Junior Club Champion was Chris BAKER, while Andrew MALCOURONNE and Barry MARTIN -BUSS shared the 'Most Improved Player' award.

## COMPUIER WINS!!

January 1986 marked a first for New Zealand chess when a Sci-sys Turbostar Kasparov Computer won a 5 round swi.ss at Papatoetoe Chess Club with $4 \frac{1}{2}$ ahead of
R. BAUMGARTNER ( $3 \frac{1}{2}$ ) who took the prize as first human'. The Summer Cup Tourney in Feb - March also featured an upset when schoolboy Nathan BLAXALI beat off a higher rated field to win with 6 Results: N.BLAXALL 6; K.METGE, G.BANKS $5 \frac{1}{2}$ T. BRUMBY, J. WORN,R.FULJER, 4 $\frac{1}{2}$; R. HAMPTON . COLLTNS, L. PETT, P MCCARTHY, J MCRAE, A WHITPAKER, 4 ; C.BIAXALL,P.CROSBIE, $3 \frac{1}{2}$; DALE, A. GOSLIN,T MARAROA, SITEN, J.HANSSENS $2 \frac{1}{2} ; ~ S . E A S T, D . S T E W A R T$, M.ARMSTRONG,R.NOKES,2.

## AUCKLAND BUSINESSHOUSE TOURNEY 1985 Notes by Peter WEIR.

P.WEIR (Law) W.LEONHARDT (Airchess)
 $5 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{~d} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{NF} 3 \mathrm{Be} 77 \mathrm{Qe} 2 \mathrm{Nbd7} 8 \mathrm{0}-0$ $0-0 \quad 9 \mathrm{~h} 3$ a6 10 Rad1 hb 11 a3 Nb6 12 Bc1 Qe8 13 e5 Nfd5 14 Ne4 de 15 de Rad8 $16 \mathrm{b3} \ldots$ Threatening 17 c 4 winning the knight at d5.
16....c5 17 c 4 bc 18 bc Nc7 19 Na6! Bd6 Forced as 19...Qc6 fails to 20 Be4 20 ed Nca8 Again a forced move and a sad one as $20 \ldots$ Rd6 fails to $21 \mathrm{Bh} 7+$. $21 \mathrm{Ng} 5 \mathrm{~g} 622 \mathrm{Bb} 2 .$. Occupying the long diagonal and threatening the devastating 23 Qh5! when mate is unavoidable ie: $23 .$. hh 24 Bh7.
$22 .$. e5 23 f4 f6


24 fe ! fg 25 e6 ... Threatening 26 Qe5. 25... Rf $1+26$ Rf1 Qc6 27 e7 Resigns.

## NORIH SHORE STMMER CUP

The North Shore Club's 1986 pipe-opener was the usual 8 round Swiss Sumner Cup. Forty two players entered but the event lacked several of the Club's top players Paul GARBEIT won the tournament easily with a possible 8 points while Raj ph HART a large slice of gond fortune in the last round against Greg SPENCER-SMITH who obtained a winning Rook ending but then gave away his extra pawn and later blundered his lady in the ensuing Queen ending.
Results: 1.P.GARBEIT 8; 2. R.HART 7; 3. G.PITI'S 6; 4-5 A.DUHS, P.SNELSON 5 5 ; 6-11 M. HOLLAND, J.MAIHIESON, R.POOR, R.ROUNDIL: J. CHANDLER, DAGGIEY G MEARS G SCIDADE D. SHFAD, P.VAN DER MEY, M.ZAJAC AL ......... 42 players

## HASITINGS JUNIOR TOURNAMENT 1985

The 6th Hastings Junior Tournament drew 313 entries to the Hastings Indoor Stadium from 30 primary and intermediate chools. For the 6th year in a row with 75 entries, and took 6 first places. Steven Donelly (St.Marys) won the junior open class for the 4th consecutive year. other Results: Girls: 7 years Sarah Rice Peterhead) 8 years Indiana Pirere
Peterhead) 9 years Mandy Michaelson Flaxmere Primary) 10 years Lily Bourne Peterhead) 11 years Rawinia Pirere Camberley) Open Junior Linda Samuel (Flaxmere Intermediate)
boys: 7 years Ryan Jennings (Raureka) 8 years Andre Chalmers (Greenmeadows) 9 years Greg Miller (Peterhead) 10 years Section A Stefan Rea (Peterhead) Section B Rowan Sapsford (Peterhead) 11 years section A Arthur David (Ebbett Park) section B Christopher Donelly (St Marys) Open Junior Steven Donelly (St Marys).

## HASTINGS CHESS CLUB RESULIS 1985

Dave LIYNCH who was recently awarded the NZ Master Title, showed his class by winning the three senior events the P.D.LEE: Swiss Open, the Lightening Tournament and the A Grade Trophy. Api ROBIN was second in the A Grade and also received the "most improved player" award. Mike EARIE was third
Paul TURNER won the B Grade ahead of Roy GORDON with Mike DJNNINGHAM third.

## PAPATOEIOE CHESS CLIBB

The 1985 A grade championship resulted in a tie for 1 st between R.HAMPTON and R. BAUMGARTNER. Last year's winner G.BANKS was third. The B Grade provided a N. BLAYALL finished first head of life member C.GOIDWORTHY and .BLAALL. The Handicap tourney was won in a playoff by R.BAUMGARTNER beat R.FULLER to take the trophy STOREY won the annual Lightning competition ahead of R.TAYLOR ( N .Shore) and S.HART.
Interclub Matches:
Remuera - Papatoetoe 3-3
Howick - Papatoetoe $4 \frac{1}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$.

## WAMGANUI CHESS CLJUB

The 1985 A Grade Championship was won for the tenth time by Howard WHIILOCK who played his usual steady brand of chess. Prince VETHERANIAM was denied a share of first when held to a draw in the final game by David BURNHAM.
Numerous departures for other towns and overseas has depleted Club membership to the point where only Monday night play is feasible. Fewer members also created problems in our traditional home and away matches with Palnerston North. This year a single match played over 8 boards resulted in a $4 \frac{1}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$ win to
Wanganui.
The Wanganui City Council commissioned giant chess set for public use on the forecourt of the Memorial Hall. A special isplay match between Club President Charles WARD and Mayor Doug YURNEY was adjudged a draw when mayoral duties intervened
Preparations for the 1986 - 1987 Congress are well under way. Wanganui is looking forward to the support of chess players from far and wide.

## UPPER HUIT CHESS CLUB

Ross CORRY is the 1985 Upper Hutt Chess Club Champion. An unbeaten $7 \frac{1}{2} / 10$ placed him ahead of Allan JOHNSON (7) and Simon BRONN ( $6 \frac{1}{2}$ ). Though by no means highest rated, he was tournament favourite having lost only one club game all year.
The B Grade winners were Joe HOFSTEEDE and Brian BROWN with Chris BELL third. Ken HARRIS won the C Grade and Glen SULLIVAN scored a picket fence in the D grade.
A.BOUGHEN - R.CORRY.

1 d4 d5 2 Nf3 c5 3 e3 Nc6 4 b3 Nf6 $5 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{~cd} 4 \quad 6 \mathrm{Nd} 4$ e6 7 a3 Bd6 8 c4 0-0 9 cd5 ed5 10 Qc2 Bd7 11 Nc6 Bc6 12 Bd3 d4 $13 \mathrm{Bd} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \quad 14 \mathrm{Rg} 1 \mathrm{Bh} 3 \quad 15 \mathrm{Rh} 7+\mathrm{Kh} 8$ 16 Rg5 Bf4 17 Bf6 Qf6 18 Rh5 Bh6 19 QC3 Qe6 $20 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 21 \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{Qg} 4 \quad 22 \mathrm{Rd} 5 \mathrm{Qg} 1+$ $23 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Qf} 1+24 \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 4+\quad 25 \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Qg} 2+$ 26 Kf5 Rae8 27 Re5 Qg6M.
Footnote: Of 72 games played in the $C$ and D Grades of the Club Championship only one gane was drawn. A sign of things to come? Let's hope so.

## AUCKLAND CHESS CENIRE

The 1985 Centre Championship was run as a 9 round Swiss. Michael HOPEWEUU made short work of the opposition in blazing through to $8 \frac{1}{2} / 9$. He dropped the half point to N.Bridges in Round 7 Lindsay CORNFORD was always close behind but a loss to S. VanDam in the last round put him out of second place. P.WHITE also had chances of second place and was the only player to rouble the winner, but went astray in the adjournment and lost
Results: 1 M. HOPEWELL $8 \frac{1}{2} ; 2$ S.VANDAM 7; 3-4 P.WHITE,L.CORNFORD 61 N. HOPEWELU 6; 7-13 N.BRIDGES,R.GIBBONS, .BCMOR,M.HARE,M.MORRISON,L.RANNSH, . ROSE Sy,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { M. HOPEWELL - N.METGE } \\
& \text { Dutch } \\
& \text { Notes by Nigel HOPEWELL. } \\
& 6 \quad 2 \mathrm{c4} 553 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Nf6}
\end{aligned}
$$

1 d4 e6 2 c4 f5 3 Nc3 Nf6 4 Nf3 Bb4!? g3 Bc3+ 6 bc3 b6 7 Bg2 Bb7 8 0-0+ d6? A weakness that Black's position cannot tolerate. $9 \mathrm{~d} 5!\pm$ The standard response. ...e5 10 Ng 5 Bc 8 Black's position is already unbearable. He could also try 10...Na6 followed by ...Nc5, swapping off the Ne6, however this line is likely to meet a similar fate to the text. 11 Ne6 Be6 12 de6 c6 $13 \mathrm{Ba} 3 \mathrm{Ke} 714 \mathrm{e} 4!\quad$ By sacrificing a pawn, White opens up lines against Black's King. $14 . .$. fe4 15 f4! ef 3 16 Qf3 Qc7 17 Rad1 Rd8 18 Qf5 Na6 19 g 4 Resigns. The threat of 20 g 5 cannot be met.

## SUMMER CUP

The Auckland Chess Centre Sunmer Cup was convincingly won by Simon FTIZPAIRICK while Peter Green, playing strong and resourceful middle games came an easy second. Of the remaining players, blndsay Cornfor

1 S.FITZPATRICK
2 P.GREEN
3 L. CORNFORD
4 N. HOPEWEUI
5 M. HOPEWEIJ
6 N.METGE
8 P WHITE

Barry WILJIAMS took out clear first place in the B Grade with $6 / 7$ ahead of M. HARE and S.MCRAE on $4 \frac{1}{2}$.

The C Grade was a thirty player Swiss and C.BYFORD scored an effortless 6/7 to head off R.Jackson on $5 \frac{1}{2}$

Games from the A Grade annotated by Nigel HOPENELL:-
M. HOPEWELL - S.FITZPATRICK.
Alekhine's Defence

1 e4 Nf6 2 e5 nd5 3 d4 d6 4 Nf3 Bg4 $5 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{c} 6{ }^{6} \mathrm{Ng} 5 \mathrm{Be} 27 \mathrm{Qe} 2 \mathrm{de} 8$ de e 9 0-0 Nd7 $10 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{Ne} 711 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Nf5}$
A standard Alekhine position where White has his usual spatial edge. 12 Rd1 Qc7 13 Nf3...
The different move order 13 Bf 4 and then 14 Nf 3 gives Black the opportunity to err with 13..h6? 14 Ne6! fe 15 Oh5+ Kd8 16 Qf7 eyeing e6.
13...Be7 14 bf4 0-0-0 15 Rab1 h6 16 g4! obligatory.
16...Nh4 17 Nh4 g5!!

A superb move! 17..Bh4 is obviously better for White after 18 Ne ; now however, it transpires, Black has the advantage. 18 Ng 6 is the crucial test as after 18...fg6 19 Bg 3 White has a clear advantage. Michael would have played this line had he not been otherwise tempted. Nonetheless Black has an excellent exchange sacrifice with $18 .$. gf4! 19 Nh8 Rh8 20 Re1 Rg8 with the idea of Rg 5 , and h 5 . The reader will see that these possibilities, which favour Black arise because White's QB is relatively out of play and also, due to opposite castling acts as a catalyst to Black's K side initiative. Therefor deployment of the Bishop on the b2-h8 diagonal with 11 b3 intending Bb2, Nod2, etc., was more accurate. 18 Nd5?!


A wild conception! The reader can alyse the position for himself 18 analyse the position for hinself!

21 Rc 7 Kc 722 Qc4+ Kb8 23 Qf4 Bg5
$24 \mathrm{Og} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \quad 25 \mathrm{f} 4$ Bd8 26 d 6 Rg 8 $27 \mathrm{Kh1}$ Rc4 $28 \mathrm{Rf} 1 \mathrm{Rb6} 29 \mathrm{Ob3} \mathrm{Rd} 4$
$33 \mathrm{Re} \mathrm{Rg} 1+34 \mathrm{Rm} \mathrm{Rc}, 32 \mathrm{~kg} 2 \mathrm{Rda}$
$36 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Rg} 1+34$ Kh3 NeS 35 R 2 Rc 1 ne3... The adjouned position, and n interesting one. There are many pack rank problems) 37 d7! Na7 38 ab Re1 39 Rd7 Re3+ 40 0e3 Be3 41 Rf7 Rel 39 Rd $\mathrm{Re} 3+40$ Qe3 Be3 41 Rf However, FITZPATRICK finds an effective forcing variation.
6....Nd7! 37 Qe4 h5! 38 gh f5

39 ef Nf6 40 Qe2 Re1 0-1.
P.GREEN - M. HOPEWELL Neo-Grünfeld
$1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6{ }^{3} \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 4 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \quad 0-0$ 5 0-0 d5 6 c4 dc 7 Qc2 Be6 8 Na3 Nc6 9 e3 Nb4 10 Qe2 Nd3?
The idea was to weaken $d 4$ by forcing Nfd2, however 10...c5! was much better. 11 Nfd2 c5 12 Nac4 Nc1 13 Rac1 od 4 ed Nd5 15 Rfd1 Rc8 16 Ne4.. Reaching an isolated QP position which in view of his excellently centralised Knights, favours White.
16....Bh6?

A strong move were it
not for White's brilliant refutation


17 Nc5! Rc5
White has more than eno compensation after 18 Ne6 etc. 18 dc Bc1 19 Rc1 $\pm$ Qc7 20 Ne5 Rc8 $21 \mathrm{~h} 4 .$. The next phase of the game can best be explained by Black's severe time trouble ( 3 minutes for 15 moves) and White's risky play to exploit it.
21...Qa5 22 h5 Rc5 23 Rd1 Nc3 24 bc3 Re5 25 Qf3 Rh5 26 Q 67 Qc5 $27 \mathrm{Ob} 8+\mathrm{Kg} 728 \mathrm{Oe8} \mathrm{Re} 529 \mathrm{Rd8} \mathrm{Re} 1+$ 30 Bf 1 Bh 3 and Black lost on time
$\qquad$ 0-0
The above games were selected by the winners as their most interesting encounters. Nigel had recourse to his brother's post mortem notes. Nigel MEIIGE had a lean tournament his game against P.WHITE was one of
his better moments


Black has played very strongly; his last move 23...Re2!, has the inmediate threat of Rxb2, whilst also serving as an interference in White's defence (note f3 is no longer under attack.) After White played the natural 24 d4... Black blew White's foundations apart with 24...Nh3! Now if 25 Kh 3 h 5 ! with a powerful initiative. A probable variation runs 26 Rg 1 Rf 427 Ne 2 Rg 428 Rg 4 Qg 429 Kh 2 fe2 with Qh4 to follow. Unfortunately, 25 Ne 2 Og 4 per a little baffled, playe 0-0-0

## CIRTSTCHURCI CHESS CENIRE 40-40

 Report by Adrian LLOYDTony DOWDEN conducted a 40-40 tournament for Christchurch Chess Centre on 8-9 March 1986, and though the good advertising failed to attract some top Cantabrians it did bring a trio of Nelsonians in Tom van DYK John van GINKEL and Dennis BOYCE. After three rounds only Adrian LIOYD had $100 \%$, Tony DOWDEN having lost to promising youngster Dean EDWARDS in the irst round. Tom and Peter van DYK split the point after a spirited tussle. Three rounds later ILOYD still had his picket fence and Stephen LUKEY joined DOWDEN and Tom van DYK on $4 / 6$ Round seven destroyed hopes of a perfect score when LLOYD in the heat of a time cramble queened to find that van GINKEL's King was stalemated.

Tony DOWDEN ran a first rate tournament but could not match the high standard at the board as well.
Results: 1 A.LLOYD 7 $\frac{1}{2}$; 2-3 P.vanDYK,D. EDWARDS $5 \frac{1}{2} ; 4-6$ A. DOWDEN, T.van DYK, S. LUKEY 5; 7-8 E.WILKINSON, T.JORDAN 4 $\frac{1}{2}$; 9--11 D.BOYCE,B.MCMULIAN, J.van GINKEL 4; 12-13 M.WILSON, R.van NOBELEN 3.5; 14-15 G.WAITE,U.CALDER 3; 16 S.TOMLINSON 2年; 17-18 J.HOSEASON,B.LEVETT 1.

## CIVIC EASTER TOURNAMENI

by Rowan WOOD.
The 1986 Civic Easter was a six round Swiss in two grades, 12 players contes ting the A grade and 10 in the B Grade. A discussion point was the implementation of a FIDE recommendation that a playing session be of six hours duration with two time controls: 40 moves in two hours then 20 moves in an hour. The Civic tournament conmittee believed that this would eliminate all but a few adjournments, and ensure that games were a one to one test of ability rather than a battle of seconds. In fact only one adjournnent eventuated, while most other games that would have been adjourned under a four hour playing session were completed inside five hours. grade field was disappointing with a number of top players not competing, eg: Jonathan SARFATI, David BEACH (the D.O.P) Anthony KER (NZ Junior) and the
defending champion, Tom VAN DYK
David BEACH was both an efficient and capable Director, but his presence at the playing board was missed. competition for the title was therefor three NZ to be fought out betwen the DIVE, Greg ALDRIDGE, and Leonard MCLAREN. DIVE started favourite on the strength of his better Congress performance and a splendid win in the Howick-Pakuranga Tournament.

The first two rounds went much as expected with ALDRIDGE, DIVE and MCLAREN winning both games to head the field. Round three saw the first clash of the top three; ALDRIDGE and MCLAREN playing an outright lead with a win over Andrew GRKOW. Scores: DIVE 3; ALDRTDGE MCTARFN 2 $\frac{1}{2}$; MARNER 2. With wins over ALDRIDGE and Gavin MARNER respectively, DIVE and McLAREN were in a commanding position after four rounds. DIVE led with 4 points $\frac{1}{2}$ a point ahead of MCLAREN with ALDRIDGE a full point back in third place. In the only game to go to adjournment, MCLAREN defeated DIVE in 72 moves to take over the lead. Scores going into the final round were: MCLAREN 4늘; DIVE 4; ALDRIDGE $3 \frac{1}{2}$ Fenella FOSTFR and GRKOW 3.
In round 6 McLAREN quickly settled for a draw with Fenella FOSTER, thus giving DIVE a chance to tie for first place. This he duly achieved, beating

Peter COLLINS. ALDRIDGE could only draw with Nathan GOODHUE and he was joined on four points in equal third place by GRKOW. Thus a fairly predictable result with none of the other players being able to make an impact beyond the odd draw, on the top three.

## Petroff - DIVE

1 e4 e5 2 Nff Nf6 3 Ne5 d6 4 Nf3 Ne4 5 Nc3 Nf6 6 d4 d5 7 Bg5 Be7 8 Qd2 Bf5 9 bas ba3 13 Qdi c6 $110-0-0$ nod 12 Rhel 0-0 13 Ne5 Re8 14 Re2 Nf8 15 Rde1 19 bd 2 Bc 3 ? Ne6 17 Be 3 Bb 4 is Qd3 Ne4 23 d5 Nf8 24 Of5 f6 25 Re4 de4 22 Qe4
 $30 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Ke} 631 \mathrm{BC} 5 \mathrm{Kd5} 32 \mathrm{Bb} 6 \mathrm{Kc} 5$ Pc7 Re8 34 Ka 2 Re4 3532566 Ra2 $37 \mathrm{Kc} 1 \mathrm{Ra}+38 \mathrm{~Kb} 2 \mathrm{Rh} 1 \mathrm{39} \mathrm{h} \mathrm{Rh}$ 40 BC5 a6 0-1.
DIVE - MCLAREN
Queen's Gambit

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 Nc3 Nf6 4 Bg5 Be7 5 e3 0-0 6 Nf 3 hb 7 Bh4 Ne4 8 Be7 Qe7 9 Qc2 Nc3 $10 \mathrm{bc} 3 \mathrm{Nbd7} 11 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{dc} 412$
 Rac8 16 Rac1 Nf6 17 Ne5 Rc7 18 Rc2 Rfe8 19 Bd3 Nd6 20 Bd3 Nd6 $21 \mathrm{c4}$ cd4 22 ed4 Qg5 23 g 3 Nf5 24 Bf5 $\mathrm{Qf5} 25 \mathrm{Rc} 3 \mathrm{Rd} 8$ 26 Qe3 Qe4 27 Qe4 Be4 28 f3 Bb7 $29 \mathrm{c5}$ f6 30 C6 BC8 $31 \mathrm{Nd7} \mathrm{Bd} 7 \quad 32 \mathrm{cd7}$ Rc3 33 Rc3 Ra7 $34 \mathrm{Rc} 4 \mathrm{Kf7} 35 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Ke} 736 \mathrm{Ke} 3$ Kd6 $37 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \mathrm{Rc} 7 \quad 38 \mathrm{Rd} 8+\mathrm{Ke} 7 \quad 39 \mathrm{Rg} 8 \mathrm{Kf} 7$ 40 Rb8 Rc3+ 41 Ke4 Ra3 $42 \mathrm{Rb} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 643$ Re7 Ra2 44 Re6 Rh2 45 Re6 Re2+ 46 Kd 3 Re7 47 d5 Kf7 48 Kd4 Rd7 49 f4 4 Re 7 50 f5 b5 51 Kc5 Kd8 52 Re6 b4 53 d6 b3 Rabt 58 Ras Re3 a4 56 Re 4 Ra7 57 Rb4 61 Rb4 Ras 62 Rg Re6 Rab 60 Rg 4 Ra7 xf6 a2 65 Ra7 Re1 66 Ra1 $68 \mathrm{f6} \mathrm{Rg} 169 \mathrm{Kh} 6 \mathrm{Rg} 3 \mathrm{l} 77 \mathrm{Kal}$ $71 \mathrm{f7} \mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{la}_{\mathrm{Kh}} \mathrm{Kf7} 73$ Resigns. 0-1

## DIVE - GOGDHUE

Queen's Gambit
1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 Nc 3 Be 74 Nf 3 Nf 6 5 Bg5 h6 6 Bh4 0-0 7 e3 b6 8 cd5 Nd5 9 Be7 Qe7 10 Nd5 ed5 11 Qc2 c5 12 Be 2 C4 $130-0 \quad$ Nd7 714 b3 b5 15 a4 cb3 16 Qb3 ba4 17 Qd5 Nb6 18 Qc5 $\mathrm{Qc} 5 \quad 19 \mathrm{dc5}$ Nd5 20 Nd4 Nc3 21 Bf 3 Rb 822 Rfc 1 Nb 5 23 Ra4 Nd4 24 ed4 a6 25 d5 Rb2 26 Rd4
 Bb3 Rg5 31 g3 1-0
The B Grade title was won by second seed

Steve ABURN who after winning his first three games, had the luxury of three draws to finish half a point clear of his rivals. Three players finished SCHWASS and Phillip TOYE who was unbeaten in his first tournament; a fine performance for an unrated player.

1 R.DIVE
2 L. MCLAREN
3 G.ALDRIDGE
4 A.GRKOW
5 F.FOSTER
6 N.GOODHUE
8 A BORPEN
8 A.BORREN
9 P.COLEINS
1 . MATNFI
2 R.WOOD

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CIV | W6 | W5 | W4 |
| CIV W10 | W9 | D3 | W7 |
| CIV W7 | W4 | D2 | L1 |
| UH | W11 | L3 | L1 |
| WNU | W12 | L1 | D8 |
| D9 |  |  |  |
| HV | L1 | W12 | L7 |
| WNU | L3 | W11 | W6 |
| L2 |  |  |  |
| HV | D9 | D10 | D5 |
| WNU | D8 | L2 | W10 |
| WEL | D2 | D8 | L9 |
| C11 | D11 |  |  |
| CIV L4 | L7 | D12 | D10 |
| CIV L5 | L6 | D11 | L4 |

G.GRADE RESUTTS: 1 S.ABURN (Wel) $4 \frac{1}{2}$; 2-4 M.SCHWASS (Nel), P.TOYE (Wel) P.KING CIV) $4 ; 5$ S.MOORE ( Wnu) $3 \frac{1}{2} ; 6$ P. CHTN (Da) 21 ) ${ }^{2}$ (Civ) OHNSTON (Civ) 112
10 I.STONES (Civ) $\frac{1}{2}$.

| 5 | 6 | TOT | SOS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| L2 | W9 | 5 | 21.5 |
| W1 | D5 | 5 | 19 |
| W9 | D6 | 4 | 21.5 |
| W8 | W10 | $4:$ | 16 |
| W7 | D2 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| L5 | D3 | 3 |  |
| L5 | D12 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 18 |
| L4 | D11 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 16 |
| L3 | L1 | 2 | 22 |
| W12 | L4 | 2 | 16 |
| L6 | D8 | 11/2 |  |
| L10 | D7 | 1 |  |

0-0-0
NEW ZEAIAND JUNIOR CHAMPIONSHIP

1 A. KER
2 M. VANER HORN
2 M. VANER 3 H.COOPER
4 M.WILSON
4 M.WILSO
6 M.CAPIE
6 M.CAPIE
8 P.DUNN
8 P.DUNN
10 S.LUKEY
11 T. STEVENSON

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | TOT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HV | W2 | W6 | W4 | D3 | W5 | W9 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | SOS |
| HV | L1 | W9 | W10 | W4 | W3 | D5 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| WAN | W5 | D4 | W7 | D1 | L2 | D8 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 23 |
| CAN | W8 | D3 | L1 | L2 | W9 | W6 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 22 |
| HV | L3 | BYE | W11 | W7 | L1 | D2 | $3 \frac{1 / 2}{2}$ | 18.5 |
| HV | W10 | L1 | L9 | BYE | W111 | L4 | 3 | 15.5 |
| CAN | D9 | W11 | L3 | L5 | D8 | BYE | 3 | 14.5 |
| HV | L4 | L10 | BYE | W11 | D7 | D3 | 3 | 14 |
| WEL | D7 | L2 | W6 | W10 | L4 | L1 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| CAN | L6 | W8 | L2 | L9 | BYE | L11 | 2 | 15.5 |
| WEL | BYE | L7 | L5 | L8 | L6 | W10 | 2 | 14.5 |

The New Zealand Junior was held in conjunction with the Civic Easter a small field of 11 players contested the Championship; 7 from Wellington, 3 from Canterbury, and Paul Cooper from Whangarei Auckland players were noticeably absent. With the decline in numbers it seems inevitable and, I believe, necessary that this「ournament become an 8 player round robin with entry by selection.
Defending champion Anthony KER was the odds-on favourite to retain his title, though opposition from Mark WILSON and Paul COOPER was expected.
It took only two rounds for A.KER to take an outright lead in the championship. COOPER and WILSON shared the point in round two to be, along with

Dean EDWARDS, half a point behind. Round three saw the top seeds A.KER and M.WILSON meet. KER improved on his N.Z. Championship result by defeating WILSON to stay half a point clear of COOPER who beat EDWARDS for second place. Mark VAN DER HOORN and
Charles KER were half a point further back on 2 . In round 4 COOPFR became the only player to take even half a point from A.KER This enabled VAN DER HOORN and Charles KER with wins over WILSON and EDWARDS respectively, to join COOPER IN second place.
While it seemed that first place was decided, the battle for second was hotting up. In round 5 VAN DER HOORN defeated COOPER, and consolidated second by beating C.KER in round 6 . Thus, Anthony KER won the right to represent New zealand at the World Junior in Norway, while Mark VAN DER HOORN won eligibility for the Asian Junior.

1 e4 e6 $2 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{d5} 3$ Nc3 $3 \mathrm{nb4} 4$ e5 c5 5 Qg4 Kf8 6 Nf3 Nc6 7 Bd2 f5 8 Of4 $\mathrm{Nge7} 9 \mathrm{dc} 5 \mathrm{Ng} 610 \mathrm{Qg} 3 \mathrm{d4} 11 \mathrm{Ne} 2 \mathrm{Bd} 2+$ 12 Na2 Qa5 $13 \quad 0-0-0$ Qa2 14 Nb 3 a5 15 Nbd4 Qa1+ 16 Kd2 Qb2 17 Nc6 bct 18 Nc3 Kf7 19 Bd3 RA8 20 Rb 1 Qa3 21 Qe3 f4 22 Of3 Ba6 23 Qc6 Bd3 | 24 | Rb7+ | Kf8 | 25 | Rd7 | Rd7 | 26 | Qa8+ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ke7 | 27 | c6 | Re4+ | $0-1$ |  |  |  | Ke7 27 C6 Be4+ 0-1.

M. VAN DER HOORN-A.KER

1 e4 d6 $2 \mathrm{d4} \mathrm{Nf} 6 \mathrm{3} \mathbf{N c} 3 \mathrm{~g} 6 \quad 4 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7$ 5 Be2 0-0 $6000 \mathrm{Bg} 4 \quad 7$ e5 de5 8 Ne5 Be2 9 Qe2!? Qd4 10 Nb 5 Qd8 11 Rd 1 Qc8 12 Bg5! a6 [better was h6 with the thought of $95-\mathrm{Ne} 8-\mathrm{Nd} 6-\mathrm{Ker}] 13$ Nc3 Kh8 14 Qf3! Ra7 15 Qe3?[better to double
 19 Nf3 c5 20 Rh4 Rd8 21 Re1 Qc6 22 Qf4 e5 23 Qg3 Rad7 $24 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{~b} 5 \quad 25 \mathrm{Ne} 4$ Rd1 26 Rd1 Rd1+ 27 Kh2 Nd7 28 Qg4 Ral [If...f5 29 Ne5! with the idea of g4. - KER] 29 Rh5 f5! 30 Rf5 Nh6 31 Qg5 NE5 32 g4 Qe4 0-1.
C.TAN-M.VAN DER HOORN.
Dutch
$1 \mathrm{d4}$ e6 $2 \mathrm{c4} \mathrm{Bb} 4+3 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{Bd} 2+4 \mathrm{Qd} 2 \mathrm{f} 5$ $5 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{0}-0-0 \mathrm{Bb} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 8 \mathrm{Nh} 3$ $0-0 \quad 9 \quad$ Nf2 d6 10 e4 fe4 11 fe4 N8d7 12 Bd3 Qe7 $13 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{c} 514 \mathrm{d5} \mathrm{Ne5} 15 \mathrm{~g} 5$ N6d7 16 Rhg1 Nf3 17 Qe2 Ng1 18 Rg1 Ne5 19 h4 Rf2 20 Ne2 Raf8 21 Qd1 0-1.
A.KER-P.COOPER

Grünfeld
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 g6 3 Nc3 d5 4 Nf 3 Bg 7 5 ca5 Na5 6 Ob3 Nb6 7 Bg5 0-0 8 e3 Be6 9 Qc2 Nc6 10 Rd1 Nb4 11 Ob1 f6 12 Bf4 N4d5 13 Bg 3 Qc 8
 Qe8 18 a3 N4d5 19 Ne4 h6 20 Nc5 e5 21 Nb7 Qe7 22 Na5 e4 23 Nc6 Qe6 24
 $31 \mathrm{Be}^{28} \mathrm{Be} 5 \mathrm{r} 429 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 30$ Rh6 fe3 34 fe3 Qc6 32 Nb3 Nc4 33 Rc4 Qd6 $34 \mathrm{~K} 2 \mathrm{Ne} 35 \quad$ Rc8 Rc8 $36 \mathrm{Rg} 6+$ Qg6
 $43 \mathrm{kf2} \mathrm{Rf8}+4$ 46 Kg 4 Of 644 Bf Qd2+ - $45 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{QgS+}$ 49 Re2 Rd5 50 Re 51 Rb5 Ra8 $52 \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{Rb4} 53 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Kf6} 54 \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{Kq} 5$ $55 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Kg} 4 \quad 56 \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{a5} 57 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Kg}$ 58 Bc6 Kf2 $59 \mathrm{Kd3} \mathrm{Kg} 360 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Ra} 4{ }^{3} \mathrm{~K}$
C.TAN-A.KER

Pirc
1 d4 Nf6 2 Nc3 g6 3 e4 d6 4 Bc 4 Bg 7 5 f3 d6 $\quad 6$ Be3 b5 7 Bb3 a5 8 a4 b4 $9 \mathrm{Nce} 2 \mathrm{Ba6} 10$ e5 Na5 11 Qd2 de5 12 0-0-0 $\mathrm{Ne} 3 \quad 13$ Qe3 ed4 14 NA4 Qc7 15 Nh 3 0-0 16 Rhe1 e5 17 Ne2 Nd7 18 Qg5 Nc5 $19 \quad \mathrm{Ng} 3$ Nb3+ 20 cb 3 f 5 21 Ra2 Rads 22 Red1 Ras 23 Nf1 Rfd8 24 Ne3 Rd2 25 RA2 Rd2 26 Rd2 Qd6+ $27 \mathrm{Kc} 1 \mathrm{Bf6} \quad 28$ Qa3 $\mathrm{f} 4 \quad 29 \quad \mathrm{Nf5}$ Qc5+ 30 Kd2 0-1.

## 0-0-0

## RANK XEROX OTAGO EASTER

The Otago Chess Club Rooms were the venue for the 1986 Rank Xerox Otago venue for the easter Open Tournament which drew 22 players.
Results: 1 A.LTOYD 5/6; 2-5 R.SUTHON A.IOVE, B.MARTIN \& B.ALEXANDER $4 \frac{1}{2} / 6$ 6-7 R.DOWDEN \& J.SUIHFRLAND 4; G.AMCNOSH 14-17 JMAPTTN 14-17 J.MARTIN, R.GONIN,D.CAMERON, B. GLOISTEIN $2 \frac{1}{2} / 6 ; 18-19$ W.JONES \& 21 V. HAY $1 / 6 ; 22$ O.NIEUWENHUYSE 10/6. Report by Ben MARTIN.

0-0-0

## PILIIIPS TOURNAMENT.

The long weekend that included Anzac Day enabled Hutt Valley Chess Club to hold their annual round robin tournament on three consecutive days. Four groups of six players each played a round robin, whilst the remaining eight played a Swiss.
In Section A Anthony KER made short work of the opposition and dropping only a half point to Greg ALDRIDGE, won with $4 \frac{1}{2} / 5$.
Tony BOSWEIL down from Palmerston North shared $3 \frac{1}{2} / 5$ with Andrew GRKOW, but won
In Section B, Mark CAPIE was obliged to default a game through work commitments but still came back to head home the field on tie break with $3 \frac{1}{2} / 5$, head of Brett MULLAN and Ab BORREN. In Section D,C.TAN won with $4 / 5$, a half point clear of Peter KIvg. He ropped a game to Hut Nanley R.MCLEAN at was otherwise untroubled
The 8 player Swiss was won jointly by oith 4/5 with $4 / 5$. Full results on page 41

## PHULIPS TOURNAMFNT RESULTS



1 A. KER
2 G.ALDRIDGE
4 R.DIVE
5 T.VAN DYK
6 P. HAWKES
Section B
1 T. BOSWELL
2 A.GRKOW
3 N.GOODHUE
4 M. v d HOORN
5 J.McDonald
Section C
2 B.MULLAN
3 A. BORREN
5 R.KENT
*default.

Section D
2 P. KING
3 S.ABURN
4 R.MCLEAN
6 S.DOOLEY

## Section E

1 I T.VINCENT (HV) 2年; 6 M. BERRY (HV) 2 . 7 C.NICHOLSON (HV) $1 \frac{1}{2} ; 8$ G.SULIVAN (UH) $\frac{1}{2}$.

ABBREVIATIONS:
CIV:CIVIC, HV: HUTT VALLEY, NEL: NELSON WN: WELLINGTON, TWA: TAKA, UH UPPER HUIT

ABBREVIATIONS FOR TABLE BELOW:
A: AUCKAND CHESS CENIRE, NS: NORTH SHORE, PPK: PAPAKURA.

## AUCKLAND EASTER TOURNAMENT

Unfortunately we have no games to print Hopefully some scores will come to light with this tournament table. in time for the August magazine.

| PLAYER | CLUB | , | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | T'tl | SOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 P.A.gARBEIT | NS | W21 | W15 | W2 | W3 | D6 | W5 | W7 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| 2 P.R.GREEN | A | W13 | W4 | L1 | W5 | W8 | W3 | w9 | 6 |  |
| 3 O.SARAPU | NS | W16 | W14 | W7 | L1 | W4 | L2 | W8 | 5 |  |
| 4 R. HART | NS | W19 | L2 | W20 | W15 | L3 | W14 | D6 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| 5 B.MARTIN-BUSS | WAI | W11 | D6 | W14 | L2 | W10 | L1 | D12 | 4 | 32 |
| 6 P.W.STUART | NS | W20 | D5 | D10 | W17 | D1 | L8 | D4 | 4 | 28.5 |
| 7 M.G.HOPEWELL | A | W18 | W9 | L3 | L8 | W17 | W16 | L1 | 4 | 28.5 |
| 8 K.M.METGE | HP | D24 | D22 | W13 | W7 | L2 | W6 | L3 | 4 | 27 |
| 9 R.BAUMGARTNER | HP | W23 | L7 | W16 | D10 | D14 | W15 | L2 | 4 | 26 |
| 10 B.WHEELER | A | D22 | W25 | D6 | D9 | L5 | D11 | W18 | 4 | 23 |
| 11 SARGON III | - | L5 | L20 | W21 | D12 | W25 | D10 | W15* | 4 | 22 |
| 12 L.D.RAWNSLEY | A | D25 | D24 | L17 | D11 | W13 | W23 | D5 | 4 | 20.5 |
| 13 J.CHANDLER | NS | L2 | W19 | L8 | D18 | L12 | W21 | W20 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 25 |
| 14 SCI-SYS TURBOSTAR | - | W26 | L3 | L5 | W24 | D9 | L4 | W16 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 24 |
| 15 G.J.SPENCER-SMITH | NS | W17 | L. 1 | W22 | L4 | W18 | L9 | L11* | 3 | 27.5 |
| 16 G.W.MFARS | NS | L3 | W26 | L9 | W22 | W20 | L7 | L14 | 3 | 23 |
| 17 N. BLAXALL | PPK | L15 | W21 | W12 | L6 | L7 | L18 | W26 | 3 | 22 |
| 18 J.C.SIEVEY | A | L7 | D23 | W24 | D13 | L15 | W17 | L10 | 3 | 22 |
| 19 M.ASHE | WAI | L4 | L13 | D26 | D21 | L23 | W25 | W22 | 3 | 18.5 |
| 20 M.K.MORRISON | A | L6 | W11 | L4 | W23 | L1 16 | D22 | L13 | $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 24 |
| 21 M. HARE | A | L1 | L17 | L11 | D19 | W26 | L13 | W23 | 21/2 | 24 |
| 22 I.MCNALLY | NS | D10 | D8 | L15 | L16 | W24 | D20 | L19 | 21/2 | 21.5 |
| 23 A.MALCOURONNE | WAI | L9 | D18 | W25 | L20 | W19 | L12 | L21 | $2{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 20.5 |
| 24 B. EMEIT | NS | D8 | D12 | L18 | L14 | L22 | L26 | W25 | 2 |  |
| 25 S.BAKER | A | D12 | L10 | L23 | W26 | L11 | L19 | L24 | 1/212 |  |
| 26 A.J.HENDERSON | A | L14 | L16 | D19 | L25 | L21 | W24 | L17 | 11/2 | 18.5 |

NORTH ISLAND CHAMPLONSHIP NEW PLYMOUTH 1986

|  |  |  | R. 1 | R. 2 | R. 3 | R. 4 | R. 5 | R. 6 | R. 7 | R. 8 | T'L | SOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | GREEN P.R. | AC 2178 | W25 | W22 | W7 | D3 | W2 | L4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | SARFATI J.D. | WE 2247 | W35 | W20 | DO | W9 | W2 | W8 | W7 | W9 D 4 | 6 | 42 |
| 3 | SARAPU 0. | NS 2343 | W13 | W28 | W11 | D1 | D8 | D7 | D4 | W10 | 6 | 10 |
| 4 | METGE J.N. | AC 2163 | W29 | D19 | D5 | W33 | W17 | W1 | D3 | W10 | 6 | -1 |
| 5 | STUART P.W. | NS 2135 | W30 | W17 | D4 | D6 | D11 | D22 | W14 | W8 | 6 | 9 |
| 6 | ALDRIDGE G.J. | CI 2082 | W26 | W32 | D2 | D5 | D10 | W28 | D1 | W16 | 6 | 39 $38 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 8 | HOPEWELL M.G. | AC 2121 | W37 | W18 | L1 | W29 | W12 | D3 | L2 | D15 | 5 | $39 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 9 | DIVE R.J. | C1 2149 | W39 | D9 | W42 | W10 | D3 | L2 | W24 | L5 | 5 | $37 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 109 | DREYER M.P. DOWDEN R.A. | AC 1923 | W47 | D8 | W19 | L2 | D15 | W17 | W12 | L1 | 5 | 37 |
| 11 | DOWDEN R.A. | CH 2136 | W43 | D24 | W23 | 18 | D6 | W11 | W22 | L3 | 5 | $36 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 12 | SPAIN G.A. | HA 2143 | W40 | D23 | D24 | W32 | D5 | L10 | D25 | W24 | 5 | $36 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 13 | MARTIN-BUSS B. | WT 1854 | L3 | W36 | W24 | W13 | L7 | W32 | L9 W39 | W25 | 5 | $33 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 14 | SPILLER P.S. | HP 1995 | L23 | W40 | W44 | D18 | W29 | L14 | W39 | W23 | 5 | $33 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 15 | COOPER P.R. | A 1922 | D27 | D31 | W39 | D22 | D9 | D21 | W28 | W22 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \\ & 32 \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ |
| 16 | KER A.F. | HV 2197 | D31 | L11 | W34 | L17 | W19 | W42 | W21 | L6 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| 17 | WHITEHOUSE L.E. | HA 1902 | W41 | L5 | W43 | W16 | 14 | L9 | D30 | W31 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 34 |
| 18 | O'BOYLE D. | UH 1760 | W44 | L7 | W30 | D14 | L22 | L23 | W34 | W28 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 31 |
| 19 | COLLINS P.W. | WN 1863 | W45 | D4 | L9 | L23 | L16 | W44 | W42 | W29 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 30 |
| 20 | BENNETT H.P. | HA 1931 | W34 | L2 | L33 | W44 | W43 | L24 | D23 | W32 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | $29 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 21 | VAN DER HOORN M. | HV 1865 | D42 | D27 | L29 | W46 | W33 | D15 | L16 | W30 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | $28 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 22 | GRKOW A. | UH 1909 | W38 | L1 | W37 | D15 | W18 | D5 | Ll0 | L14 | 4 | $38 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 23 | BOJTOR J. | HP 1659 | W14 | D12 | L10 | W19 | L28 | W18 | D20 | L13 | 4 | 37 |
| 24 | GOODHUE N. | HV 1810 | W46 | D10 | D12 | D28 | D14 | W20 | L8 | L11 | 4 | 35 |
| 25 | STRACY D.M. | TA 1701 | L1 | W34 | L32 | W40 | D31 | W35 | D11 | L12 | 4 | 33 |
| 26 | BELL C.M. | UH 1621 | L6 | L42 | W45 | L30 | W27 | L39 | W41 | W37 | 4 | $27 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 27 | MCNALLY I. | NS 1571 | D15 | D21 | L28 | L35 | L26 | BYE | W40 | W39 | 4 | $26 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 28 | GOFFIN P.B. | AC 1957 | W33 | 13 | W27 | D24 | W23 | L6 | L15 | L18 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 37 |
| 29 | WADDLE M.H. | ME 1677 | L4 | W41 | W21 | L7 | L13 | W33 | D32 | L19 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 35 |
| 30 | BORREN A.M. | HV 1693 | L5 | W38 | L18 | W26 | D35 | D31 | D17 | L21 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 34 |
| 31 | REID A.V. | NS 1707 | D16 | D15 | L13 | W36 | D25 | D30 | D37 | L17 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | $33 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 32 | MCDONALD J. | CI 1747 | BYE | L6 | W25 | L11 | W39 | L12 | D29 | L20 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 31 |
| 33 | CUNNINGHAM P.D. | WN 1588 | L28 | W35 | W20 | 14 | L21 | L29 | D43 | W42 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | $30 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 34 | OKEY K.M. | NP 1580 | L20 | L25 | L16 | W45 | W40 | W38 | L18 | D35 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | $29 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 35 | MARSICK B.H.P. | NP 1710 | L2 | L33 | W47 | W27 | D30 | L25 | D36 | D34 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 29 |
| 36 | AUSTIN K.R. | NP | L11 | L13 | W38 | L31 | L42 | W47 | D35 | W44 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | $26 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 37 | WHITLOCK H.P. | WA 1637 | L7 | W46 | L22 | L39 | W47 | W43 | D31 | L26 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 25 |
| 38 | TRUNDLE G.E. | AC 1560 | L22 | L30 | L36 | D41 | W46 | L34 | BYE | W43 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 22 |
| 39 | EDSON D. | HA | L8 | W45 | L15 | W37 | L32 | W26 | L13 |  |  |  |
| 40 | BLAXALL C. | PK 1621 | L12 | L14 | W41 | L25 | L34 | W46 | L27 | W45 | 3 | $28 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 41 | MORRISON M.K. | NS 1544 | L17 | L29 | L40 | D38 | D44 | W45 | L26 | BYE | 3 | 23 |
| 42 | BLAXALL N. | PK 1517 | D21 | W26 | L8 | L43 | W36 | L16 | L19 | L33 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 32 |
|  | MEARS G.W. | NS 1597 | L10 | W47 | L17 | W42 | L20 | L37 | D33 | L38 | $2{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 28 |
| 4 | VALENTINE B. | NP | L18 | BYE | L14 | L20 | D41 | L19 | W47 | L36 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 26 |
| 45 | BOWLER R. | NP 1375 | L19 | L39 | L26 | L34 | BYE | L41 | W46 | L40 | 2 | 23 |
| 46 | VINCENT T. | HV 1102 | L24 | L37 | BYE | L21 | L38 | L40 | L45 | W47 | 2 | $21 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 4 | STOKELL W. | NP 1204 | L9 | L43 | L35 | BYE | L37 | L36 | L44 | L46 | 1 |  |

ABBREVIATIONS: $A C=A U C K L A N D ~ C E N T R E, ~ C H=C H R I S T C H U R C H$ CENTRE, $C I=C I V I C$
NEW PLYMOUTH, HP = HOWICK-PAKURANGA, HV = HUTT VALLEY, ME = MEDICHESS, NP WA = WANGANUI, WE = WELLINGTON, WN = WAINUIOMATA, WT = WAITEMATA. UPPER HUTT

NORTH ISLAND CHAMPIONSHIP 1986

## By PETER STUART

The Nev Plymouth Chess Club hosted the 1986 North Island Championship during the second week of the May school
holidays at a venue which was quite familiar to many of the players the New Plymouth Girls High School. Toumament Director Bob GIBBONS left home in Auckland at about 3 am on the Monday morning and duly arrived five minutes early! He performed his tasks with his usual competence and the event ran very smoothly.
The field of 47 was both smaller and weaker than in some years although ten of the last NZ Championship field were playing. It was perhaps a pity that two late entries were accepted since this meant there was a bye in each round.
Paul SPILLER was the only victim of a first round upset when he blundered a Rook against BOJTOR - but Julius was to have a very good tournament which grossly belied his 37th ranking. There were several half victims, among them third seed Anthony KER in the following interesting game versus Andrew REID.
A.KER-A.REID

1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 c5 3 Nc3 eds 4 Nc 3 edS
 $\begin{array}{lllllllll}\mathrm{Nf} d 7 & 9 & \mathrm{a} 4 & \mathrm{a} & 10 & \mathrm{Bd} & 0-0 & 11 & \mathrm{Ng} 2\end{array}$
 $15 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Be} 216 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{f} 5 \quad 17 \mathrm{a} 5 \mathrm{Nc} 818$ ef5 Rf5 19 Bg4 Rf8 20 Be6+ Kh8 21 h 4 Nf 6 $22 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{Ne} 7 \quad 23 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{gh} 524 \mathrm{~g} 5$

24. . .Nfd5 [Offering [Offering a piece White shoul . 24 ...Nfg 25 which alternative...24...Nfg8 25 , 45 The looks bad for Black but he still has looks bad for Black but
25 Rh5? [No good was 25 Nd5 NdS 26 Bd5 Qe7+! 27 Kf 1 Qxg5! and White's King is the more exposed, but 25 Bd5!? looks

26 25...Nf4 [But not 25...Nc3? 27 Bd 2 Bd mate in two.] $26 \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{Bc} 3+$ Late castling, 28 Qa2 Ng6 29 0-0-0 the White pieces, seems to be a common feature of KER's play.] 29...Og7!? Also interesting was 29...Rae8 gaining a tempo by hitting the Bishop and preparing Re7 to defend h7 if necessary.] 30 Rdh1! [White would win nicely by 30 Kb 1 Nf 431 Rh7+ Qh7 32 Qc3+ Qg 33 Rh1+ etc were it not for the fact that Black captures on h7 with check! 30...Qa1+ 31 Kc 2 Qa2+ $32 \mathrm{Kc1}$ Qa1+ $33 \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{Qa} 2+34 \mathrm{Kd} 3$ !? [White decides to play for the win even at the cost of sacrificing his Queen.] 34...Ne5+ [The only move as 34...Nf4+ is refuted by 35 Qf4! while 34...Rf3+ loses to 35 Ke4! Rf4+ 36 Qf4! and White can escape from the Queen checks on the Kingside.] 35 Ke4! [ $35 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Rf} 3+$ transposes to the game but other moves lose.] 35...Rf4+! With his Queen and King both in mortal danger, Black finds a beautiful saving resource.] 36 Ke 3 [The Rook cannot be taken: 36 Qf4 Qe2+! 37 Qe3 $\mathrm{Qg} 2+$ $38 \mathrm{Kf5} \mathrm{Rf} 8+39 \mathrm{Bf} 7 \mathrm{Qg} 4+40 \mathrm{kf} 6 \mathrm{Rf} 7$ Mate. 36...Rf3+ 37 Ke4 [Not Ke2? Rf2+] 37...Rf4+ $38 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Rf} 3+39 \mathrm{Ke} 4 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$

Seven players managed to win their second game as well, mostly without serious difficulty. A strange hiccup in mry own gane might have cost me half a point; after white's 58th move he gane WHITEHOUSE-STUAR reached the following position:


Black has just won a piece but, in time trouble, forgot his intended plan of 58...Bc3 59 Kh3 Bf 6 when the White King is locked out and Black wins easily 59 Kh3 Bf2 60 Kh4 Ke4 61 Kh 3 $\begin{array}{lllll}59 \mathrm{Kh} 3 & \mathrm{Bf} 2 & 60 \text { Kh4 Ke4 } 61 \mathrm{Kh} 3 & \text { Leen } \\ \text { correctly realised that } 61 \mathrm{Kh} 5 & \mathrm{Bg} 3\end{array}$ $62 \mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{Bf} 4+63 \mathrm{Kh} 4 \mathrm{Bo5}$ was hopeles
for White] 61 ... KA5 [Black's simple idea was to use his King to hold the fort on the Kingside until the Bishop can return but....] 62 Kh4 Ke6? I realise that so simple. Only now did 62...Be1! gains a tempo, winning after either 63 Kh 3 Ke6 $64 \mathrm{Kh} 4 \mathrm{Kf6} 65 \mathrm{Kh} 5 \mathrm{Rg}$ or 63 Kh 5 Bg 34 Kg 5 Ke 65 Kg Rf4] 63 Kh 3 ? [Fortunately failed to perceive the meffect of the failed to perceive the effect of the
Black King being on e6 instead of e4. White draws by 63 Kh 5 ! Bg3 64 Kg 5 White draws by $63 \mathrm{Kh} 5!\mathrm{Bg} 364 \mathrm{Kg} 5$
since Black is in zugzwang! 63 $64 \mathrm{Kh} 4 \mathrm{Kg} 6 \quad 65 \mathrm{Kh} 3 \mathrm{Bc} 5 \mathrm{~F} 66 \mathrm{Kh} 4 \mathrm{Be} 7+$

Graeme SPAIN tried to wear down BOJTOR in a drawn Rook ending but gave up trying after several sessions while KER featured on the wrong side of another upset when he misplayed the opening and met with forceful play by Nigel HOPENELL

## N. HOPEWELL - A.KER

1 d4 e6 2 c4 c5 3 Nc3 Be7 4 Nf3 Nf6 5 Bg5 0-0 6 e3 h6 7 Bf6 Bf6 8 cas ed5 9 b4 c6 [Better, according to KER, was 9...@d6 aiming to play the pawn to c5 in one move] 10 Be2 Qd6 11 b5 c5 12 0-0 B£5 [KER suggests that 12...Be6 was preferable] 13 dc5 0c5 14 Qa5 Qc3 15 Qf5 $96 \quad 16$ Qe4 Qa5 17 Rad1 $\begin{array}{lllllll}17 & \mathrm{Qb} 7!?] & 17 \ldots \mathrm{a} & 18 & \mathrm{Rd} 6 & \mathrm{Bg} 7\end{array}$ 19 Bc4 ab5 $20 \mathrm{Bb} 3 \mathrm{Kh} 8 \quad 21 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \mathrm{Oc} 7$ 22 Rg6! Nc6 23 Rct bc6 24 Bc2 f5 25 Ng6+ Kg8 26 Ne7+ Kh7 27 Nf5 Rf5 28 Qf5+ Kg8 $29 \mathrm{Oh7}+\mathrm{Rf} 8 \quad 30 \mathrm{Qg} 8+\mathrm{Bf} 8$ 32 Qe6t Be7 33 Qf7+ Kd7 34 Be6+ Kd6 35 Qf4+, 1-0
And then there were two... only Ortvin SARAPU and Peter GREEN, the fourth seed, managed three wins in a row both victims this round being HOPEWEIJS. GREEN's game developed along unusual lines:
M. HOPEWELU - P.GREEN

King's Gambit
1 e4 e5 2 f4 ef4 3 Nf3 d5 4 ed5 Nf6

 11 _ c5 Bb5+ 12 Kd 1 Be7 13 Nc 3 0-0-0 14 Re1 Rhe8 15 Ne5 Nd5 16 Nf7 Nc3+ $17 \mathrm{bc} 3 \mathrm{Ba} 4+18 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Rd} 519 \mathrm{Kd}$ Rf5 20 Ne5 BE6 21 Bd2 Be5 22 Re5 Ree5 23 de5 Bc6 24 Rf1 g5 25 Rf2 Re5 26 Kc4 Kd7 27 h4 h6 28 a3 Ka6 29 Kb4 Kf5, 0 - 1.

The game AIDRIDGE-SARFATI was notable only for its brevity - 11 moves but the game STUART - MEIGE was more exciting though also drawn:

## STUART - METGE <br> English Opening

$\begin{array}{lllllllll}1 & c 4 & e 5 & 2 & \text { nc3 } & \text { Nf6 } & 3 & \text { Nf3 } & \text { e4 }\end{array}$ Ng5 b5 5 d3 ed3 6 Nb5 [6 cb5 is ${ }_{9} 0-0$ 6...c6 7 Nc3 de2 8 Be2 Bb4 Rd1 Be6 13 Bf3 ac7 14 as 12 15 Be6 6 [Nigel decided to $f$ for 17 be3 Nad? as 17 ec3 18 be3 is clearly pawn for White] 18 Pd5? [To clearly better 18 Be 3 leaves white with the betel position. 18 leaves White with the better 20 Od5 Nf6 21 od4 [White has no really 20 Qas Nf6 21 Qd4 (White has no really invites 21...Rd8 when 22 Bf4! restext White's fortunes; Nigel, however, came with a much better reply] 21 . Re4 22 Qd3

22....Ng4! 23 g 3 [Forced as 23 Qe4 allows mate in three while 23 Qg3 loses to 23 ...Oc5! 23 Nf2 24 Rf1 Qc5? This looks a winner but it meets with surprising rejoinder. Correct, as ointed out by Peter GREEN, was 4...Rel! which would have ended the story at once] 25 Ba3! [A move born 27 Kf 2 ? ! 27 Qe4 $25 .$. Qa3 26 Rf2 Rf2 $27 \mathrm{Kf2?!}[27$ Qe4 was to be preferred.
Time trouble was now a factor for both players.] 27...Ob2+ $28 \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{Re8} 29 \mathrm{Rf}$ [Re1] 29...Oh2 30 Rd1 28 Kf 3 Re 829 Rf 1 [Re1] 29...Oh2 30 Rd1 Qa2 31 Kg 4 ?
 wins, eg. $33 \mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{Rg} 8+34 \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{Qg} 4+35$ Ke3 Qg3+ and Black obtains a sinply won $34 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Qe}+3 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qd} 3$, $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$

Round four saw SARAPU play an unusual Stonewall set-up against GREEN's Catalan but the draw was agreed on move 18 with all 32 pieces still on the board. Second seed Jonathan SARFATI caught the leaders with a quick demolition of a defence he
plays himself:
SARFATI - DREYER
Queen's Gambit Accepted
$1 \quad$ d4 $45 \quad 2 \quad$ c4 dc4 3 Nc3 a6 4 e3 e5 5 Bc4 ed4 6 ed4 Nf6 7 Qb3 Qd7 8 Nf3 b5 9 Be2 $\operatorname{Be} 7 \quad 10$ a4 $0-0 \quad 11$ ab5 $\mathbf{~ B b 7 ~}$ $120-0$ ab5 13 Ra8 Ba8 14 Ob5 Qd6 15 Rd1 Nbd7 16 Qf5 Qb6 17 Ne5 Nb8 $\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}18 & \text { Bc4 } & \text { Ob7 } & 19 & 19 & \text { fl } & \text { Nc6 } & 20 & \text { Nf7! } & \text { Nd4 } & 21 \\ \text { RA4 } & \text { Ob6 } & 22 & \text { Be3 } & \text { Bc5 } & 23 & \text { Od3 } & \text { Ob2 }\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { RA4 } & \text { Qb6 } & 22 & \mathrm{Be} 3 & \mathrm{Bc} 5 & 23 & \mathrm{Qd} 3 & \mathrm{Qb2} \\ 24 & \mathrm{Ne} 5+\mathrm{Kh} 8 & 25 & \mathrm{Ng} 6+\mathrm{hg} 6 & 26 & \mathrm{Rh} 4+ & 1-0\end{array}$

Russell DIVE also joined the leaders on $3^{\frac{1}{2}}$ points but I don't know how as the game score is missing. SPAIN won with a standard sacrifice:

SPAIN - MARTIN-BUSS
French Tarrasch
e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Na2 Nf6 4 e5 Nfd7 9 ef6 Nf6 6 NC6 7 Ngf3 cd4 8 od4 f6 9 ef6 N+6 $10000 \mathrm{Bd} 6 \quad 11 \mathrm{Re} 10-0 \quad 12$ Raes 16 Qe2 as 17 bg5 Baf 18 Rad Kh7 19 Oh5 $\mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 20 \mathrm{Qg} 6+\mathrm{Kh8} \quad 21 \mathrm{Rd} 3$ 1-0

KER was in the wars again when he forgot about the clock and overstepped the time limit while making his 40th move in an unclear but probably winning position against WHITFHOUSE.

Round five was the fifth in three days so tiredness would have had it greatest effect here - the last three rounds were one per day. For the first time we had a sole leader in Peter GREEN whoi quickly obtained a strong nitiative on the Queenside
P.GREEN - J.SARFAT

Symmetrical Englis
1 d4 Nf6 $2 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~cd} 4 \quad 4 \mathrm{Nd4}$ e6 $5 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 6 \quad 6 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \quad 7 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Bc} 3+?!8 \mathrm{bc} 3$ 0-0 9 0-0 Ne5? [this does not do much for Black's development 10 c5 Ne8 [10...Qa5 11 Nb 3 Qc3 12 Bg5 gives White ample compensation for the pawn] 11 Rb 0512 cd6 Na6 13 Bf4 Nec4 $14 \mathrm{Nb5}$ ! Nb 15 Rb5 Qd1 16 Rd1 Nb6 17 Be3 Nd5


18 Bd4! [Much better than the immediate material gain by Bd5. White instead maintains his Queenside pressure] 18 Rd8 19 Rbb1! Rd7 20 c4 Nb6 [Perhaps 20...Ne7 offers more defensive chances but not 20...Nf6 21 Bf6 Rd1+ 22 Rd1 gf6 23 Rd8+ with a decisive advantaqe] 21 Bb6 ab6 22 Ra7 Bd7 23 Bb7 Rb8 [... Ra2? 24 Rd1] 24 Ba6 Kf8 25 Rb4 Bc6
 Bc6 30 cto6 Ra8 $31 \mathrm{Rd} 4+\mathrm{Ke} 7 \quad 32 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{e} 5$ $33 \mathrm{Rb} 4 \mathrm{Kd} 6 \quad 34 \mathrm{Bd} 1 \mathrm{Kc} 5 \quad 35 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \quad \mathrm{Bb} 7 \quad 36$ $\mathrm{Rb} 5+\mathrm{Kd} 4 \quad 37 \mathrm{Bb} 3 \mathrm{BC} 6 \quad 38$ Bd5 $\quad \mathrm{Bd} 5$ 39 Rd5+ Re3 40 a5, 1 - 0.

SARAPU also looked set to win when he built up a commanding position against DIVE. This resulted in the win of a pawn but a time pressure mistake was eventually drawn. MEIGE, with an entertaining win over WHITEHOUSE, and Michael HOPENELL, ditto over SPAIN maintained their challenges but STUART and Nigel HOPENELL drew in 20 moves to drop a little off the pace as did Greg ALDRIDGE who drew with Tony DOWDEN
M. HOPENELL - G.SPAIN

Leningrad Dutch

 e4 fe4 10 Ne4 Ne4 11 Qe4 bf5 12
 $\mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 19 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \mathrm{Bd} 1{ }_{20} 20 \mathrm{Rd} 1 \mathrm{Rad8} 21 \mathrm{d7} \mathrm{Rf} 6$
 $\begin{array}{lllllllll}22 & \text { a3 } & \text { Na6 } & 23 & \text { d5 } & \text { Rd6 } & 24 & \mathrm{Rc} 1 & \mathrm{Od} 5 \\ 25 & \text { Bh3 } & \text { Rf8 } & 26 & \mathrm{~b} 4 & \mathrm{Nb} 8 & 27 & \mathrm{Rc} 7 & \mathrm{Kf6}\end{array}$


 | Rf8 | Nd7 | 32 | Rf5 | Rd6 | 33 | Rh5 | Nf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Re5+ | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

 Rh2 41 Rd7+ Kf6 $42 \mathrm{Rb} 7 \mathrm{Rh} 3 \quad 43 \mathrm{Ra} 7$ Rg3+ $44 \quad$ Kc4 4 Rf3 $45 \quad$ b5 $\quad$ Rf4+ 46 Kc5, 1 - 0 .

The leading scores after five rounds were: GREEN 4 $\frac{1}{2}$; SARAPU, METGE PI $\&$ N.HOPENELL 4; SARFATI, STUARI,

The sixth round produced a new leader when METGE defeated GREFN in a Nimzo indian Saemisch. GREEN's early Kingside initiative soon fizzled out and left his development slightly in arrears and without the usual play on the Queenside.

## N.METGE - P.GREEN

1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 a3 $3 \mathrm{Bc} 3+$ $\begin{array}{llllllll}5 \mathrm{bc} 3 \mathrm{c} 5 & 6 & \mathrm{e} 3 \mathrm{~b} 6 & 7 \mathrm{Bd} & \mathrm{Bb} & \mathrm{Bb} 7 & 8 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Nh} 5\end{array}$

9 Nh3 Qh4＋ 10 Nf2 f5 11 e4 Nf4 12 0－0 Nd3 13 Qd3 0－0 14 d5 eds 15 cds C4 16 Qa4 Na6 17 a4 Nc5 18 Ha3 Rac8 19 Bc5 Rc5 20 a5 d6 21 ab6 ab6 22 Ra7 Rf7 23 Rfal Qd8 24 Nh3 Qh4 25 e5！？Qe7［Perhaps better was 25 ．．． Qd4＋ 26 cd4 Ra5！？when the c pawn may provide counterplay］ 26 e6 Rf8 27 Ng 5 Rb8 28 Nf7 Qf8 29 Re1 Bd5［After 29 ．．．Rd5 one way to win is 30 Qb6 Ba8 31 Qc7 Rc8 32 e7！Qe8 33 Qc8 followed by Queening］ 30 e 7 Qf7 $31 \mathrm{e}=\mathrm{Q}+$ ，1－0．
SARAPU also won a pawn but Michael HOPEWELL was later able to pick off one of Ortvin＇s several weak pawns； the veteran IM was，for the second time in a row，left pondering the might－ have－beens．SARFATI reached a routinel have－beens．SARFATI reached a routinely extra pawn but DIVE managed to drag out proceedings for a long time before proceedings for a long time before Rook versus Queen．
STUART also failed to capitalise on his extra pawn against Andrew GRKOW to record his fourth successive draw but AJDRIDGE moved up to share second place when Peter GOFFIN＇s attack proved to be insufficient for the piece he had invested in it．Tony DOWDEN moved closer to the leaders at the expense of Nigel HOPENELL．
Leading scores：MEIGE 5；SARAPU， SARFATI，GREEN，M．HOPEWELL \＆ALDRIDGE $4 \frac{1}{2}$ ．

METGE held onto at least a share of the lead in the penultimate round when he held a draw with the Black pieces against SARAPU who yet again reached a clearly advantageous position without being able to convert it to a full point． SARFATI won a typical IQP endgame versus Michael HOPENENL to join METGE on $5^{\frac{1}{2}}$ points and ALDRIDGE could have done pikewise had he not agreed a draw with GREEN in a winning position．

STUART set up a defensive wall of pawns from g6 to C 6 and Paul in a fruitless search for a refutation， only to lose a pawn in time trouble． DIVE and DOWDEN also came within half a point of the leaders with wins over GOODHUE and GRKOW respectively． Finally，Martin DREYER joined this group by winning an ending with $\mathrm{N}+7 \mathrm{P}$ vs $2 \mathrm{~B}+4 \mathrm{P}$ against SPAIN．

The final round pairings were METGE v SAREATI（both $5 \frac{1}{2}$ ），DOWDEN v SARAPU（both 5），GREEN v DREYER（both 5），STUART v

DIVE（Both 5）and KER（4⿳亠丷厂彡⿸丆口（）v ALDRIDGE（5） Bearing in mind the strength of opposition each of the players on 5 had already met，these pairings seem quite just but the do not fulfill the principle that the top half should be paired against the bottom half if at all possible．Bob GIBBONS later agreed with me that the pairings should have been：ALDRIDGE v SARAPU，GREEN v DOWDEN，and SIUART $v$ DREYER，leaving DIVE（the middle）to meet KER．
Predictably the two leaders opted for discretion rather than valour although SARFATI had to offer two draws in the course of the 11 moves before METGE would accept．it was now a matter of how many others could equal their six points；up to four could do so．．．．and four did！
GREEN was the first to join them when a defensive error by DREYER ALLOWED Peter a winning combination．

## P．GREEN－M．DREYER

1 d4 d5 2 Nf5 Nf6 3 c4 dc4 4 e3 e6 5 Bc4 c5 6 0－0 Nc6 7 Qe2 cd4 8 Rd1 Be7 9 ed4 Nb4 10 bf4 Nbd5 11 Be5 0－0 12 Nc3 a6 13 a4 b6 14 Rac1 $\operatorname{Bb7} 15$ $\begin{array}{llllllll}\mathrm{Bd} 3 & \mathrm{Qd} & 16 & \mathrm{Ng} 5 & \mathrm{Rf} \text { d8 } & 17 & \mathrm{f} 4 & \mathrm{~g} 6 \\ 18\end{array}$ Kh1 Nc3 19 bc3 Qa4 20 c4 Qd7 21 Rb1 Ne8？


22 Nh7！f6 23 Qg4 fe5 24 Qg6＋Ng7 25 de5 Qe8 26 Nf6t Bf6 27 Qh7＋Kf8 28 ef6 Qf7 29 Oh8 8 Q $98 \quad 30 \quad \mathrm{fg} 7+\mathrm{Ke} 7$ 31 Qg8 Rg8 32 Rb6 Rab8 33 Rdb1 Bg2＋ $\begin{array}{llllllll}34 & \mathrm{Kg} 2 & \mathrm{Rg} 7+ & 35 & \mathrm{Kf} 3 & \mathrm{Rd} 8 & 36 & \mathrm{Rb} 7+\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllll}\text { Kf6 } & 37 & \mathrm{Rg} 7 & \mathrm{Rd} 3+ & 38 & \mathrm{Ke} 4 & 1 & \text {－} & 0 .\end{array}$

The next key game to finish was KER v ALDRIDGE in which Anthony made early attacking gestures on the Kingside；Greg however，eventually himself gained the initiative on that side of the board and broke through to KER＇s King just before the time control．
The two remaining games took rather longer．STUART gained the advantage
around the time control but only after DIVE had had slightly the better of it for much of the game．Both players promoted new queens but SIUART had too many extra pawns．the last game to finish was also closely fought． SARAPU carried an extra pawn into a Rook ending and，for once，he converted the pawn to a full point

Thus six players share the 1986 North Island title，with a one point gap back to nine players on 5 points． There was not a lot of difference in the tie－break scores among the six winners but Ortvin SARAPU could be picked out as the one who could most easily have taken first place alone since he had clear advantages in three of four games he drew and was never in danger of losing．It was Peter GREFN， however，who won on tie－break and thereby qualified automatically for the next New Zealand hampionship．

The under 2000 grade prize was shared by Paul SPILLER，Martin DREYER and Barry MARTIN－BUSS while the under ，un prize was split between Chris BELI Julius BOTTOR，Ian McNALLY．

## $0-0-0$

## CANDIDATES＇PROFILFS

With K－K preparing to slug it out in July it is perhaps timely to take a look at the two players who form cycle．The following profiles are taken from＂Soviet News＂profiles are

$$
\text { SOV Artur YUSUPOV } 2645
$$

GM Artur YUSUPOV 2645
GM YUSUPOV is all about concentration． Strong will and sense of purpose are written into his face．His powerful or wrest rerinnscent of a weightlifter or wrestler．However，the young Muscovite reserves his fighting spirit for the chess board and shows no lack of it there！
Born in 1960 he quickly progressed through the ranks of junior chess，
13 and reaching Grandmaster team at age at age 20．He was World Junior Champion in 1977，and has been on the USSR junior team and the Olympic team， playing in the chess Olympics of 1982 and 1984.
Invariably during play，Artur is to be seen staring continuously at the hess board．
The challengers tournament is his first，but his excellent performance at

Tunis，and his demolition of Jan TIMMAN （games in this issue）show that much can be expected from him．
Artur＇s strong points are his rational positional style，his adeptness in endings and his excellent grasp of openings．He is not an inspirational player like VAGANIAN，laying greater emphasis on industriousness instead．YYSUPOV has maintained a businesslike friendship with GM Sergei DOLMATOV for many years．They regularly train together with mutual benefit． Undoubtedly this 25 year old Grandmaster is still improving．His fighting spirit and excellent form give him every chance to acquit himself well．

## GM Andrei SOKOLOV 2595

GM Andrei SOKOLOV is one of the youngest Grandmasters in the world and an example of a practical minded chess player．He is a model of concentration and never shows signs of impulsiveness．
He was World Junior Champion in 1982 and champion of USSR in 1984．He also took part in the World Chess Olympics in 1984 and the 1985 World Junior games．
Born in the northern city of Vorkuta in 1963，Andrei learned to play chess early． His first teacher was his father Yuri，an army officer and Candidate Chess Master． At the age of twelve，Andrel won the championship of Vorkuta，then when the family moved to Moscow，he joined a group Vladimir Vladimir YURKOV．YURKOV has played a substantial role in moulding SOKOLOV＇s career．
Andrei＇s first top level success came in 1980 when he won a minor Moscow Champ－ open champinis was followed by a larger open chanmionship in which 13 Grandmasters great fighting spirit he denonstrated great fighting spirit Anderstacked experience and a full understanding of the niceties of positional play，and finished next year he tied for third in the same tournament，but the breakt in the same 1984 when he became champion of the Soviet Union．In a crucial gane against BELIAVSKY，his presence of mind showe impressively．
Subsequently the sceptics viewed his winning of the national title as flash in the pan．His performance at aiel in 1985 certainly disproved that．
To reach the quarter finals in the world championship at his age shows that SOKOLOV＇s top－flight career has just begun．

## National Ratings, 1 May 1986

Events rated since the last published list (15.2.85) are: 1985 NZ Junior Ch'p 1985 Auckland Easter (A, B, C, D) 1985 Civic Easter (A, B), NZ Womens Ch'p, 1985 Otago Easter, 1985 Philips, Canterbury S'pupils Ch'p, 1985 North Island Ch'p, Not The NI Trust T'mint $(A, B)$, All Wellington Ch'p(A, B), 1985 South Island Ch'p, NZ S'pupils Ch'p, Winstone T'mnt(A,B), Auckland CC Invitational, Canterbury CC Ch'p, Fletcher Timber Labour W'end (A,B), Auckland November T'mnt, All Canterbury Ch'p, Auckland Christmas T'mnt, NZ Ch'p, Premier Rsve, 1986 Auckland Easter, 1986 Civic Easter, 1986 NZ Junior Ch'p 1986 Otago Easter, 1986 Philips(A-E)
All players active within the last two years are included on the list. Asterisks denote provisional ratings based on fewer than 25 games.
This rating list was produced using software developed by Jim SIMMONS and Rowan WOOD, and a computer generously provided by the Totalisator Agency Board.

| 1 | Small V.A. | 2377 | 45 Lynch D.I. | 2007 |  | Martin-Buss B. | 1854 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Sarapu . 0. | 2343 | 46 Van Dyk P. | 2007 | 90 | Vetharanium P.A. | 1853 |
| 3 | Sutton R.J. | 2334 | 47 Wilson M.C. | 2007 | 91 | Spencer-Smith G.J. | 1852 |
| 4 | Garbett P.A. | 2326 | 48 Feneridis A. | 2004 | 92 | Stephenson J.R. | 1850 |
| 5 | Nokes R.I. | 2280 | 49 Cooper D.J. | 2002 | 93 | Nijman B | 1846 |
| 6 | Lloyd A.J. | 2262 | 50 Hopewell N.H. | 2002 | 94 | Wigbout M. | 1845 |
| 7 | Smith R.W | 2260 | 51 Hensman P.J | 1996 | 95 | Marner G. | 1844 |
| 8 | Sarfati J.D. | 2247 | 52 Sharko A.V. | 1996* | 96 | Lancaster M. | 1842 |
| 9 | Levene M. | 2246 | 53 Spiller P.S. | 1995 | 97 | Roberts M.H. | 1837 |
| 10 | Green E.M. | 2235 | 54 Gibbons R.E. | 1989 | 98 | Rose C.A. | 1836* |
| 11 | Gollogly D.A. | 2226 | 55 Weegenaar D.P. | 1978 | 99 | Rawnsley L.D. | 1828 |
| 12 | Beach D.H. | 2211 | 56 Hampl M. | 1961 | 100 | Earle M.R.W. | 1827* |
| 13 | Wansink R. | 2208 | 57 Power P.W. | 1961 | 101 | Adams D.T. | 1826 |
| 14 | Love A.J. | 2205 | 58 Turner G.M. | 1958 | 102 | Knightbridge W. | 1821 |
| 15 | Ker A.F. | 2197 | 59 Goffin P.B. | 1957 | 103 | Robinson J.P. | 1821 |
| 16 | Green P.R. | 2178 | 60 Hawkes P.D. | 1948 | 104 | Stewart E. | 1821* |
| 17 | Clemance P.A. | 2176 | 61 Walden G.J. | 1948 | 105 | Carter G.S. | 1814 |
| 18 | Metge J.N. | 2163 | 62 Spiller T.W.L. | 1937 | 106 | Goodhhue N . | 1810 |
| 19 | Anderson B.R. | 2162 | 63 Bennett H.P. | 1931 | 107 | Connor B.P. | 1809 |
| 20 | Dive R.J. | 2149 | 64 McKenzie P. | 1930 | 108 | Foord M.R.R. | 1808 |
| 21 | Cordue P.L. | 2148 | 65 Corry R.J. | 1927 | 109 | Boswell T.J. | 1804 |
| 22 | Spain G.A. | 2143 | 66 Calcena A.S. | 1924* | 110 | Metge K. | 1804 |
| 23 | Dowden R.A. | 2136 | 67 Dreyer M.P. | 1923 | 111 | Jackson I. | 1800* |
| 24 | Stuart P.W. | 2135 | 68 Cooper P.R. | 1922 | 112 | Ion G.J. | 1799 |
| 25 | Weir P.B. | 2133 | 69 Leese M. | 1920 | 113 | Wilson R.T. | 1796 |
| 26 | Hopewell M.G. | 2121 | 70 Foster F. | 1917 | 114 | Dunn P. | 1793 |
| 27 | Bates G.T.H. | 2120 | 71 Kaspar W. | 1911 | 115 | Forbes G. | 1793* |
| 28 | Freeman M.R. | 2109 | 72 Grkow A. | 1909 | 116 | McIntosh A.D. | 1787 |
| 29 | Cornford L.H. | 2108 | 73 Whitehouse L.E | 1902 | 117 | Nijman A.J. | 1787 |
| 30 | McLaren L.J. | 2105 | 74 Van Pelt J. | 1901* | 118 | Notley D.G. | 1779 |
| 31 | Noble M.F. | 2094 | 75 Free T.J. | 1900 | 119 | Edwards D.W. | 1777 |
| 32 | Alexander B.J. | 2088 | 76 Yee 5. | 1893 | 120 | Mazur J.J. | 1773 |
| 33 | Aldridge G.J. | 2082 | 77 Haase G.G. | 1891 | 121 | Garnett L. | 1767* |
| 34 | Martin B.M. | 2078 | 78 Wheeler B. | 1888 | 122 | Hepi L. | 1765* |
| 35 | Pomeroy A | 2074 | 79 Van Ginkel J.P | 1886 | 123 | Shead D.B. | 1764 |
| 36 | Baker C.P. | 2048 | 80 Feasey R.A. | 1883* | 124 | Capie M. | 1763 |
| 37 | Fitzpatrick S.P | 2039 | 81 Lynn K.W. | 1878 | 125 | Frankel Z. | 1761 |
| 38 | Jackson R.E. | 2037* | 82 Van Der Hoorn M | 1865* | 126 | O'Boyle D. | 1760* |
| 39 | Walsh B.G. | 2034 | 83 Collins P.W. | 1863 | 127 | Post M.J. | 1758 |
| 40 | Hart R | 2032 | 84 Lukey S. | 1862 | 128 | Roundill R.L. | 1756 |
| 41 | Carpinter B.A. | 2028 | 85 Ker C.M. | 1859 | 129 | Adams J.M. | 1755 |
| 42 | Steadman M.V. | 2027 | 86 Boyd K.M. | 1858 | 130 | Poor K.L. | 1755 |
| 43 | Johnston A.J. | 2023 | 87 Jordan A.W. | 1856 | 131 | Williams B.M. | 1754 |
| 44 | Van Dyk T. | 2018 | 88 Brown S.A. | 1855 | 132 | Wilkinson E.M. | 1753 |


| 133 | Davies G. | 1752 | 194 | Christie D. | 1623* | 255 | Shardy Z . | 1521 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 134 | Moule C. | 1748* | 195 | Bell C.M. | 1621 | 256 | Blaxall N . | 1517 |
| 135 | McDonald J.N. | 1747 | 196 | Blaxall C | 1621 | 257 | Colthart R. | 1515 |
| 136 | Monrad P.G. | 1746 | 197 | Brumby T.J. | 1621* | 258 | Bryant D. | 1514* |
| 137 | Williamson H.G. | 1745 | 198 | Burridge D. | 1621 | 259 | Stewart M.I | 1511 |
| 138 | Booth A.J. | 1743 | 199 | Locke J.M. | 1620* | 260 | Bradley N. | 1510 |
| 139 | Turner M.G. | 1742 | 200 | Murphy C. | 1620* | 261 | Levy R. | 1510 |
| 140 | McRae S.A. | 1741 | 201 | Kelly S . | 1619* | 262 | Dale J. | 1509* |
| 141 | Smith V.J. | 1739 | 202 | Stretch W.R. | 1617 | 263 | Hampton R . | 1509 |
| 142 | Baumgartner R. | 1737 | 203 | Gifford-Mbone D. | 1613 | 264 | Baldwin P. | 1504 |
| 143 | Drake A.S. | 1737 | 204 | Flett A | 1612* | 265 | Lamb D.L. | 1503 |
| 144 | Mitchell R.S. | 1737 | 205 | Bennett P.E. | 1611 | 266 | Brown B. | 1502 |
| 145 | Boyce D.A.L. | 1733 | 206 | Lannie R.M. | 1611 | 267 | Henderson A . | 1497 |
| 146 | Fleming $M$. | 1730 | 207 | Grevers L.P. | 1609 | 268 | Ramsay W. | 1494 |
| 147 | Sutherland J.L. | 1729 | 208 | Wood R.J. | 1609 | 269 | Wilkes J. | 1493 |
| 148 | Pow K. | 1728* | 209 | Bennell D.J. | 1608 | 270 | Wilcock P.R. | 1492 |
| 149 | Hall M. | 1727* | 210 | Lee C.T. | 1607* | 271 | Cook ${ }^{\text {F }}$. | 1489 |
| 150 | Sims M.T. | 1723 | 211 | Weston R.M. | 1606 | 272 | Petrie B. | 1489 |
| 151 | Vetharanium K. | 1720 | 212 | Mears G.W. | 1597 | 273 | Rowland N . | 1489* |
| 152 | Jones C. | 1719* | 213 | Barrow G. | 1596 | 274 | Schwass M.P. | 1488 |
| 153 | Aimers G. | 1716* | 214 | Middleton J | 1589* | 275 | Soon Y.T | 1487* |
| 154 | Weber E. | 1714* | 215 | Cunningham P.D | . 1588 | 276 | McGregor L. | 1485* |
| 155 | Hoskyn G.A. | 1713 | 216 | Sareczky G. | 1587 | 277 | Reid P. | 1481 |
| 156 | Marsick B.H.P. | 1710 | 217 | Brett B. | 1586* | 278 | Langley D.B. | 1479* |
| 157 | Martin J . | 1707* | 218 | Downey B. | 1585* | 279 | Jones W. | 1478 |
| 158 | Reid A.V. | 1707 | 219 | Hames A. | 1584* | 280 | Schuster D. | 1476 |
| 159 | Ferguson R.T. | 1706 | 220 | Morgan B. | 1581* | 281 | Talaic L. | 1475 |
| 160 | Stracy D.M. | 1701 | 221 | Spencer-Snith P.A | 1581 | 282 | Brannigan K . | 1473 |
| 161 | White P. | 1701* | 222 | Okey K.M. | 1580 | 283 | Whibley P. | 1473* |
| 162 | Van Dam S. | 1699 | 223 | O'Connor J.A. | 1578 | 284 | Wood B. | 1470 |
| 163 | Banks G.B. | 1698 | 224 | Kent R. | 1576* | 285 | Atkinson I.E | 1469 |
| 164 | Sinton P.J. | 1698 | 225 | Duhs A.H. | 1572 | 286 | Charberlain $M$. | 1469 |
| 165 | Borren A.M. | 1693 | 226 | McNally I . | 1571 | 287 | Glass B.D. | 1468* |
| 166 | Bridges N.P. | 1693 | 227 | Hare M. | 1569 | 288 | Blatchford J | 1465* |
| 167 | Howard M.I. | 1692 | 228 | Kay J.B. | 1568 | 289 | Brett K.W. | 1459 |
| 168 | Beesley R. | 1689 | 229 | Steel R,G. | 1565 | 290 | Calder R.J. | 1459 |
| 169 | Johnson Q. | 1688 | 230 | Thye K. | 1565* | 291 | Schrader G. | 1459* |
| 170 | Mullan A.B. | 1688 | 231 | Petch W.H. | 1563 | 292 | Gales A.E. | 1458* |
| 171 | Snelson P.R. | 1686 | 232 | Trundle G.E. | 1560 | 293 | Simmons J.R. | 1457 |
| 172 | Boughen A. | 1684 | 233 | Aldridge A.L | 1557 | 294 | Grace K. | 1456* |
| 173 | Waddle M.H. | 1677 | 234 | Morse D.F. | 1557* | 295 | Fitzgitbon P. | 1455* |
| 174 | Shuker R. | 1675 | 235 | Aburn S. | 1555 | 296 | Jones L.R. | 1452* |
| 175 | Gloistein B. | 1669 | 236 | Toye P. | 1553* | 297 | Hipkins B. | 1450 |
| 176 | Capper D.S. | 1667 | 237 | Brownlee L.R. | 1547 | 298 | McIntosh I.H | 1446 |
| 177 | Goodwillie C. | 1661 | 238 | Bennett D. | 1546 | 299 | Oldridge C.B | 1446 |
| 178 | Ruth S. | 1660* | 239 | Morrison M.K | 1544 | 300 | Cole G. | 1444* |
| 179 | Bojtor J. | 1659 | 240 | Seivey J.C. | 1544 | 301 | Healey R. | 1443 |
| 180 | Young $P$. | 1659* | 241 | Winfield $A$. | 1544* | 302 | Dowler C.S. | 1442* |
| 181 | Tan C.H. | 1658* | 242 | Kelly S . | 1540 | 303 | Gibb J.L. | 1440* |
| 182 | Opfermann H.C. | 1652* | 243 | Jackson R. | 1539* | 304 | Wang S . | 1436* |
| 183 | Mathieson J.S. | 1651 | 244 | Boswell W. | 1538 | 305 | Dalziel F. | 1433* |
| 184 | Thomson O.N. | 1647 | 245 | Billing J | 1536* | 306 | Glavin G. | 1433* |
| 185 | Johnstone A.J. | 1644* | 246 | Bell D.I. | 1546 | 307 | Martin L.M. | 1430 |
| 186 | Price A.J. | 1640 | 247 | King P.C. | 1534 | 308 | Currell A. | 1429* |
| 87 | Clinton D. | 1637* | 248 | Baker C. | 1531* | 309 | Stewart B.K. | 1427 |
| 88 | Johnstone R.B. | 1637 | 249 | Byford C. | 1531 | 310 | Van Den Hoen H | 1427* |
| 189 | Whitlock H.P. | 1637 | 250 | Crowe P. | 1531* | 311 | Ward C. | 1421* |
| 90 | Chandler J. | 1631 | 251 | McCormick I.R. | 1530 | 312 | Parlane L.N. | 1420 |
| 91 | Shanahan M. | 1629* | 252 | Sangster A. | 1527 | 313 | Allen E.G. | 1418 |
| , | Gribben B. | 1628* | 253 | McKee D. | 1525* | 314 | Watson M.J. | 1418 |
| 193 | Waite G.S. | 1628* | 254 | Bourke P.D. | 1521* | 315 | Johnston H.S | 1417* |



| 316 | Martin S.C. | 1416 | 370 | Watson R. | 1301* | 424 | Clarke T. | 1108* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 317 | Simpson G. | 1413* | 371 | Millar K. | 1301* | 425 | Hoseason J. | 106* |
| 318 | Uszakiewicz G | 1413* | 372 | Meader A.J. | 1294* | 426 | Smith B. | 1103* |
| 319 | Takhar R.S.R. | 1411 | 373 | Tugby B | 1293* | 427 | Vincent $T$. | 1102* |
| 320 | Whitehouse $T$. | 1408* | 374 | Laws E.T. | 1289 | 428 | Plummer B. | 1090* |
| 321 | McAllister C. | 1406* | 375 | Gordon M.A. | 1288 | 429 | Gold H. | 1087* |
| 322 | McLean W. | 1405* | 376 | Shipkov R.T. | 1288* | 430 | Newran D.A. | 1087* |
| 323 | McLean R.E. | 1403* | 377 | Thorne G. | 1286 | 431 | Pronk I. | 1081* |
| 324 | Plumpton D. | 1403* | 378 | Ales H. | 1279* | 432 | Malcouronne A . | 1080*. |
| 325 | Savage B. | 1403* | 379 | Holland M. | 1279* | 433 | Sorel M. | 1079* |
| 326 | Baker S. | 1400 | 380 | Van Kooten M. | 1275* | 434 | Barna I | 1059* |
| 327 | Gonin R.C.E. | 1400* | 381 | Badger A. | 1274* | 435 | Cooling G. | 1059* |
| 328 | Kingsbury $T$. | 1397* | 382 | Morris I. | 1273* | 436 | Glowacki A.J. | 1053* |
| 329 | Robbie C.G. | 1394 | 383 | Rubini B. | 1266* | 437 | Knowles J. | 1048* |
| 330 | Phillips J.N. | 1393 | 384 | Pledger Tr.K. | 1265* | 438 | Henderson $J$. | 1047* |
| 331 | Chin K. | 1388 | 385 | Howard B.E. | 1260* | 439 | Sullivan G.J. | 1044 |
| 332 | Booth S.L. | 1383 | 386 | Williams R.G. | 1254 | 440 | Webber C.H. | 1039 |
| 333 | Hall J. | 1380* | 387 | Shields J.A. | 1250 | 441 | Sinclair M.M | 1037 |
| 334 | Monson M. | 1377* | 388 | Cameron D. | 1248 | 442 | Hince F. | 1036* |
| 335 | Haag G. | 1369* | 389 | Hill S.D. | 1247 | 443 | Zeigman F. | 1036* |
| 336 | Emett B. | 1368* | 390 | Sidwell W. | 1244* | 444 | Smith T.A. | 1030* |
| 337 | Boyd J.K. | 1364 | 391 | Clinton J | 1239* | 445 | Burge D. | 1024* |
| 338 | Hofsteede J. | 1364 | 392 | Scott R.L. | 1239 | 446 | Chamley G. | 1023* |
| 339 | MacLean G.D. | 1363* | 393 | Clarkson B. | 1236* | 447 | Hay V. | 1018 |
| 340 | Copp J. | 1362* | 394 | Pengelly R.A | 1235* | 448 | Boyd D.J. | 1004* |
| 341 | Stynman F . | 1360* | 395 | McRae J. | 1232* | 449 | Goslin A | 1000* |
| 342 | Edwards R. | 1356* | 396 | Hoolihan N. | 1231* | 450 | Abadie A . | 966* |
| 343 | Calder J. | 1353* | 397 | Wehi D. | 1231* | 451 | McIntyre I.M. | 966* |
| 344 | Morris P. | 1350* | 398 | Hodder J. | 1230* | 452 | Veltmeyer G. | 963* |
| 345 | Wastney S. | 1350* | 399 | Smith G.F. | 1230* | 453 | Jenkinson K. | 962* |
| 346 | Gribben C. | 1348* | 400 | Lancaster C. | 1227* | 454 | Bull M. | 954* |
| 347 | Winsor B.M. | 1347 | 401 | Mills G. | 1226* | 455 | Delaney B. | 948* |
| 348 | McDougall M. | 1339* | 402 | Coumbe J . | 1224 | 456 | Haynes S.P. | 945* |
| 349 | Moore S. | 1339* | 403 | Archer A. | 1223* | 457 | Walls C.J. | 944* |
| 350 | Borovskis J. | 1336 | 404 | Hemela J. | 1223 | 458 | Smeed J. | 941* |
| 351 | Stevenson T. | 1333 | 405 | Newman B. | 1219 | 459 | Nicholson C. | 937* |
| 352 | Thornley M. | 1331* | 406 | Cooper M. | 1218* | 460 | Riddering P . | 920* |
| 353 | Somogyvary L. | 1328* | 407 | Jackson A. | 1218* | 461 | Weyers R. | 910* |
| 354 | Van Der Mey P.F | 1325 | 408 | Dunningham M. | 1208* | 462 | Raymond G. | 909* |
| 355 | Wagstaff G. | 1325* | 409 | Jones G.M. | 1205 | 463 | Houlahan M. | 890 |
| 356 | Winter W . | 1325 | 410 | Pacitto D. | 1199* | 464 | Berry M | 858* |
| 357 | Lezard G. | 1324* | 411 | Anderson D.T. | 1196* | 465 | Urquhart $T$ | 855* |
| 358 | Stelco C. | 1322* | 412 | Styche S. | 1186* | 466 | Twiss J. | 836* |
| 359 | Thornby B. | 1321 | 413 | McBride E. | 1180* | 467 | Morrison N . | 829* |
| 360 | Schultz A.E. | 1320* | 414 | Arnull V. | 1175* | 468 | Bolton C. | 821* |
| 361 | Hillier R. | 1314* | 415 | Bake J. | 1175* | 469 | Candy w. | 723* |
| 362 | Ashe M. | 1312* | 416 | Peddie W.S. | 1161* | 470 | Day R.K. | 691* |
| 363 | Singh M. | 1311* | 417 | Walker C. | 1158* | 471 | Nieuwenhuyse D. | 671* |
| 364 | Bartocci K.D. | 1310 | 418 | MacKay M. | 1152* | 472 | Savage D. | 648* |
| 365 | Guerin G. | 1309* | 419 | Sapsford E. | 1150* | 473 | Vucetich D.G. | 618* |
| 366 | Shields P. | 1306* | 420 | Mowat R.J. | 1114* | 474 | Lake T . | 615* |
| 367 | Reilly N . | 1304* | 421 | Jones W.D. | 1139* | 475 | Meyer D. | 541* |
| 368 | Tweddel E. | 1304* | 422 | Stones I.F.E. | 1125* | 476 | Otene E. | 522* |
| 369 | Jones S. | 1302* | 423 | Dooley S. | 1124 | 477 | Laagland M. | 405* |

# FENNIE'S FAVOURITES 

Arcaadi FENERIDIS, former New Zealand Chess Champion and grand old man of the Wellington of us have lived, still likes to look at games, both recent and not so at games, both recent and not so
recent. He describes the best of them as "Modern Immortals". See what you think of this one.

Boris SIFF-GM Isaac KASHDAN

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { New York } 1948 \\
& \text { Nimzoindian }
\end{aligned}
$$

1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 $3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \quad 4 \mathrm{Qc} 2$ d5 5 a3 Be7 6 cd ed $7 \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{c} 6 \quad 8 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{O}$ 0-0 9 e3 Re8 10 Bd3 Nbd7 11 Nf3 Nf8 12 Ne5 Bd6 13 0-0 Ne6 14 Rh2 96 15 Nf3 Ng7 16 Bd6 Qd6 17 Rfc1 Bf5 18 Nd2 Re7 19 b4 Rae8 20 Rab1 Bh3 21 gh3 Re3 22 Bf1 Bf5 23 fe3 Qg3 $24 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Qe} 3+25 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Ng} 3+26 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Of4}$ 30 Qd2 Nhq3+ 31 Kh2 Nf1+ $32 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Oh} 2+$ 33 Nh 2 Nfg 3 Mate.

## 0-0-0

## "A GOOD GAME' ${ }^{\text {n }}$

To any newcomer picking up the reins of editorial responsibility comes material that is difficult to source. The game below has been added as a post script to a letter to the former Editor as far as I can make out though the letter above has been removed. A cryptic note in Zyg's hand indicates that it is a good game and in line with my Editorial I like to receive annotated games. So, here it is. The players are Cantabrians
believe. Notes by the winner

> A.HURL_EY-E.M.WILKINSON
$1 \mathrm{~g} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 2 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 3 \quad \mathrm{~g} 5 \mathrm{~h} 4 \quad 4 \mathrm{~d} 4$ e6 5 Nf3 c5 $\quad 6 \quad \mathrm{c} 3 \quad \mathrm{Nc} 6 \quad 7 \mathrm{Bg} 2$ [A hard

 Qd2 f6 13 Qc 2 [Eyeing $g 6$ and vacating d2 for the N$]$ 13...f5 14 Nbd 2 Bd 6 15 Rad1 e5 16 Nc4 Bc7? [Black is now lost. He should have captured] $17 \mathrm{Nfe5} \mathrm{Ne} 518 \mathrm{Ne} 5$ Be5 19 Rd5 Qd7
 [If22...Ne7 23 Qa4+ Nc6 24 R5d3!] 23 Qa4+ Resigns.

## GRANOMASIER MATCH

The idea of a match between Grandmasters Ian ROGERS and Murray CHANDLER, first nooted by Ian ROGERS during his 1985 isit, came to fruition in May whe DRG CANON together with NZCA and New Zealand Chess Supplies sponsored a 4 game match with two games each
to be held in Wellington and Auckland. The wellington end of the match brought substantial publicity to chess - about $1 \frac{1}{2}$ minutes on the evening news hour, and coverage in the local newspapers.
The first game was begun at the official opening by Sir John MARSHALL. Lev APTEKAR officiated as Arbiter in Wellington nd Bob GIBBONS did the honours in It is understood th
GM ROGERS has agreed to annotate two Auckland Games, but meantime here is the first of the games played in Wellington.

GM CHANDLER - GM ROGERS
French Winawer

1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 $3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \quad 4$ e5 c5 5 a3 cd4 6 ab4 [Theory has it that this line is inferior for Black since White gets the two Bishops, a lead in development, and attacking chances for his pawn.] 6...dc3 7 bc3 Qc7 8 Nf3 nd7 [ROGERS choice of opening has paid ff as CHANDLER has entered a weak line for Write witil 7 bc 3 . 7 Nf 3 ! is favoured by theory, trading the pawn for the initiative. With his ninth mowe CHANDLER departs from a line chosen by Em LASKER against MAROCZY New York 1924 and benefits thereby. 9 Qa4 Ne7 10 Br4 No6 11 Bd3 Bd7 12 0-0 a6 13 Bg5 Ke8 17 Md4 Oa5 18 0a6 Ra6 16 eb4


19 Ra4 ba4 20 Ba6 ba6 21 Nc6 Bc6 22 Qc6+ Ke7 23 Qd6+ resigns. [There is no answer to 24 Rb 1 .]
The second game at Wellington was drawn.

## CORRESPONDENCE CHESS

The New Zealand Correspondence Chess Association is once more an affiliated member of NZCA following a rule change at the 1986 NZCA AGM. The following game won the 1985 A Grade Best Game Award. Judge: Richard SUITION.

50TH NZCCA CHAMPIONSHIP
R.S.MITCHELL - J.R.JACKSON Benoni.
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 NE3 c5 4 d5 ed5 5 cd5 d6 6 Nc3 g6 7 Bf4... This old line is receiving ... attention nowadays as Black finds resources in the main variations. -.a6 8 a4 Bg7 [ $\quad$...Bg7 on move White has a freer position - Sutton 9 e4 o- 10 Na2 Nh5 11 Be 3 Nd 712 Be Ne5 13 0-0 Oh4 14 f4 Ng4 15 Bg 4 Bg 4 16 Qe1 Qe7 Swapping queens here gives White a central edge. Black's action now moves to the Queenside.
17 of2 Rfe8 18 Rae1 b5 19 ab5 ab5 20 Nb 5 Reb8 $21 \mathrm{Na} 3 .$.


Up to here the game followed VUKICHILICH, Yugoslavia Championship 1980 which continued with 21...Nf6. Other games have continued 21...Rxb2 22 Nac4 with central pressure. Blacks elects to try something new. 21...Ra4?! 22 e5 bf5 23 Nac4 Bd3 24 eã6 gd8 The best square. White gains two termpi with his exchange offer. If $22 . . . \mathrm{Rb} 2$ ? 23 ed6 and Black will lose his c pawn as well.
25 b 3 Rb 3 ?! The idea of 25 b 3 was to inhibit Black from using Nc4 as an appetizer before capturing on fl . Possibly better would be 25...RC4 26 Nc4 Bf1 27 Kf 1 Rb 3 when White still has a positional edge. [ It's a pity White's idea was not put to the test. There is beautiful line for Black in $25 .$. Ra2 26 Bc5 Bc4 27 bc4 Rb2 28 Qe3 Rd2 29 Qe8+ Qe8 $30 \mathrm{Re} 8+\mathrm{Bf} 8 \quad 31 \mathrm{Bf} 2 \mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 32 \mathrm{~d} 7$ Rf2! If Black accepts the challenge
and takes the Rook: 26...Bf1 27 Rf 1 Rb 3 28 f5 and Black is under pressure eg; 28...Nf6 29 fg 6 hg 630 Bd 4 or $28 \ldots \mathrm{Qd} 7$ 29 Nb 6 and d7-Suttonl
29 Nb6 and d7-Sutton!
26 Nb3 Rc4 27 Nc5 Rc2?!


I believe I had planned 28 Qf 1 Rc2 was better. 30 Rb 1 Nf 631 Qd3. After the text White must tie himself in a bow to save his Queen so the idea of a Queen offer presents itself. Then the star move isn't hard to find. [after... Bf ] 28 Qf1 Rc2 why not 29 d7 Nf6 30 Qb5 threatening Bd4? - Sutton] 28 d7! Rf2 29 Bf2! Nf6 30 Bh4 Qf8! Since the threats on e8 kept Rf1 safe White has justified his sacrifice. 31 Nd3 Nd7 $32 \mathrm{Re} 7 \mathrm{Bd} 4+33 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Nf} 6$ 34 Rfe1 Kg7 35 d6 Nd5 36 d7! Bb6 Forced.
37 Re8 Qa3 $38 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \mathrm{Nf} 439 \mathrm{Ng} 4!\mathrm{g} 5!$ Losing elegantly in preference to ...Nd5 40 Bf2!
40 Bg5 Nd3 41 Bf6+ Resigns.
White had provided these conditional moves: 41...Kg6 $42 \mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Kf5} 43 \mathrm{Rg} 5+\mathrm{Kf} 4$ $44 \mathrm{~g} 3+\mathrm{Kf} 3 \quad 45 \mathrm{~d} 8=\mathrm{Q} \mathrm{Nf} 2+46 \mathrm{Nf} 2 \mathrm{Kf} 2$ 47 Qd2+ Kf3 48 Qf 4 M . The reader might enjoy finding quicker mates if Black strays from them


## OVERSEAS NEWS AND GAMES <br> <br> By Peter Stuart

 <br> <br> By Peter Stuart}The field for the inauqural World Team Championship, played at Lucerne in November saw one change when the United States withdrew and its place was taken by France. With matches being played on six boards(instead of four as at the Olympiads) the dominance of the Soviet Union could be expected to continue and it did despite a narrow loss to old rival Hungary in round 5. At that stage the U.S.S.R. led by only one point from Hungary and England and the Magyars actually gained half a point in round six. Then, however, the U.S.S.R. beat Africa $6-0$ to open up a three point gap which the others could not close.
well as help in preparation and adjourn ment analysis. The team won one silver medal (MIRALLESS) and two bronze medals (HAIK and SERET)
Viktor KORCHNOI returned to form after his mediocre performance at Montpellier to take first prize on board one with a score of $7 \frac{1}{2} / 9$. MILES and KASRPOV (both 5/7)took 2-3rd prizes. RIBLI was top scorer on board two with $6 \frac{1}{2} / 9$, VAGANIAN on board three with $6 / 8$, PINN'ER on board four with $6 / 9$, HECAT on board 5 with $5 / 8$ CHANDLER on board 6 with $5 \frac{1}{2} / 8$, CHERNIN on board seven with $5 / 7$ and POLUGAEVSKY on board eight with $5 \frac{1}{2} / 7$.

|  |  | 01 | 0203 | 0405 | 06 | 07 | 08 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | U.S.S.R. | xx | 23/2 4 | 41/2 $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 4 | 5 | 412 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 6 | 371/2 |  |
| 2 | Hungary | 31/2 | xx 3 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | $4 \frac{1}{2} 4 \frac{1}{2}$ | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | $2{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 4 | 5 | 34/2 |  |
| 3 | England | 2 | $2 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{xx}$ | $4{ }^{2 \frac{1}{2}}$ | 2 | 4 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 4 | 6 | 301/2 |  |
| 4 | France | 1/1/2 | 11/2 2 | xx 3 | 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 4 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 5 | 281/2 | ( $5 \frac{1}{2}$ ) |
| 5 | Rumania | 21/2 | $1 \frac{1}{2} 3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3 xx | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 31/2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | $28 \frac{1}{2}$ | (5) |
| 6 | Switzerland | 2 | $2 \frac{1}{2} 4$ | 1 $1 \frac{1}{2} 3 \frac{1}{2}$ | x | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 31/2 | 3 | 5 | 271/2 |  |
| 7 | China | 1 | 312 2 | $2 \frac{1}{2} 2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 312 | xx | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 27 |  |
| 8 | Argentina | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 2 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}} 2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 23 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | xX | 4 | 5 | 251/2 |  |
| 9 | West Germany | 212 | 22 | $2 \frac{1}{2} 2$ | 3 | 3 | 2 | xx | 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ | 2312 |  |
| 10 | Africa | 0 | 10 | 11 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 11/2 | x x | 7 |  |

Missing from the winner's line-up was new world champion Gary KASPAROV, but Anatoly KARPOV headed a powerful team: KARPOV, YUSUPOV, VAGANIAN,SOKOLOV,BELYAVSKY, SMYSLOV CHERNIN and POLUGAEVSKY. The Hungarian team was: PORTISCH,RIBLI, SAX, PINTER, ADORIAN, CSOM, FARAGO and GROSZPETER. And the English, MILES, NUNN, SPEELMAN, SHORT, MESTEL, CHANDLER, PLASKETT and FLEAR
France denonstrated that its high placing at Thessaloniki was not a fluke - here they achieved fourth place by irtue of a better match point total than Rumania. Of course, the format of the competition meant that (in additon to the U.S.) countries such as Yugoslavia and Bulgaria were missing Boris SPASSKY, the French top board, does more than garner points for the team. Actually he has not been a great garnerer of points but rather his presence on board one provides a psychological boost for the rest of the team as

KORCHNOI-PANNO
$1 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 2 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{~b} 63 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 4 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{bb} 7$ 5 0-0 g6 6 Nc 3 bg 77 d4 Ne4 8 Ne4 Be4 $9 \mathrm{~d} 50-0 \quad 10 \mathrm{~h} 3 \mathrm{Bf} 311$ ef3 e6 12 Re 1 Bd4 13 Bh6 Re8 14 Qa4 a6 $15 \mathrm{f4}$ Ra7 16 Rad1 b5 17 cb5 Qb6 18 de6 de6 19 ba6 Rd8 20 f5 Ra6 21 Qc4 e5 22 Bg 5
 26 Qc 1 Kh 827 Qh6 1-0.
NUNN - KORCHNOI
French

1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 e5 Nc3 Nf6 4 e5 Nfd7
 9 Qd2 NA4 10 Bd4 Bd4 11 Qd4 Qb6 12 Qb6
 16 Nd4 g6 17 g 3 Bc6 18 Rde1 Nd7 19 c 3 Rag8 $20 \mathrm{Rhf} 1 \mathrm{~g} 5 \quad 21 \mathrm{f} 5 \mathrm{~g} 4 \quad 22 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{~h} 4$ $23 \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{hg} 3 \quad 24 \mathrm{hg} 3 \mathrm{Ba} 4 \quad 25 \mathrm{~Kb} 2 \mathrm{Rh} 3 \quad 26$ Rg1 Rgh8 $27 \mathrm{Ka} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 8!28 \mathrm{~Kb} 2$ [White cannot take the Bishop as he then finds himself in a mating net after 28...Rc3] 28...a6 29 Rgg2 Bd1 30 Re3 Nb6 31 Rf2 Rh1 33 Rd3 Re8 34 f6 Re2 35 b3 1-0.

PINTER－SHARIF<br>Queen＇s Gambit

1．d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 d5 4 Nc3 Bb4 $5 \mathrm{Bg5} \mathrm{Nrd7} 6$ e3 c5 7 ad5 ed5 8 Bd 3 12 Nd2 $96{ }^{13} 10$ Bf5 0－0 11 0－0 Re8 12 Nd2 9613 Bh3 Be7 14 Rae1 Nff 15 Of3 NRd7 19 f5 Qar 17 Qd1 Qa6 18 4 de4 22 Nde4 Kg 723 15 Eg 6

## CHANDLER－YE

Ruy Lopez
$1 \mathrm{e} 4 \mathrm{e5} 2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 63 \mathrm{Bb5}$ a6 $4 \mathrm{Ba} 7 \mathrm{Nge7}$ $5 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{~d} 66 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 77 \mathrm{Bb} 3 \mathrm{~h} 6 \quad 8 \mathrm{Na} 3 \mathrm{~g} 5$ 9 de5 de5 10 Bg5 hgs 11 Ng 5 Be6 12 Of3 Bb3 13 ab3 f5 14 Ne6 Qa7 15 ef5 Nc8 16 Rd1 Qf7 17 Nc4 Nd6 18 g4 Rg8 19 h 3 e4 20 Nd6＋ad6 21 Qe4 Kd7 22 Kd2 Re8 $23 \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{Kc} 8 \quad 24 \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{~Kb} 8 \quad 25$ Rhe1 Rc8 26 Kb 1 Ne 727 Nf 8 Rgf8 28 Qe7 Qb3 29 Qd6＋Ka8 30 Qb4 Qb4 31 cb 4 3 Rc4 32 Rf1 Rb4 33 Rd3 Re8 34 f6 Re2 35 b3 1－0．

> RIBLI - QUINTERO
> King's Indian

1 Nf3 c5 2 c4 g6 3 d4 Bg7 4 e4 d6 5 Nc3 Ne6 6 d5 Na5 7 Be2 Nf6 8 a3 b6 $9 \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{Nb} 7 \quad 10$ Bd2 $0-0 \quad 110-0$ e5 12 de6 Be6 13 Rc1 cb4 14 ab 4 a5 15 b5 Nc5 16 Oc2 Re8 17 Rfe 1 Bc8 18 Bd3 Bb 7 19 Nd5 Bd5 20 cas Rc8 21 Nd4 Nd3 22 Oc2 Qd7 $26 \mathrm{Ba} 3 \mathrm{Nb} 727 \mathrm{Kf} 1 \mathrm{Og} 4 \quad 28 \mathrm{Od}$ Oh4 29 h 3 Qf4 30 g 3 Oh6 31 Kg 2 Bf 6 32 e5 de5 33 d6 Re6 34 ods of8 35 Ne7＋Be7 $36 \mathrm{de} 7 \mathrm{Re} 737 \mathrm{Be} 7 \mathrm{De7} 38$ Re5 1－0．

## 0－0－0

TIMMAN V TAL
Jan TIMMAN became the fourth qualifier for the Candidates matches by virtue of his better tie－break score at Montpellier when he and TAL won the second a drawn rook ending but blundered in game．The other four games were drawn

The Candidates semi final pairings are thus YUSUPOV V TIMMAN and VAGANIAN $\checkmark$ SOKOLOV and these matches are sched－ uled for January／February with the Einal to be played in March over 14 games．The Challenger＇s match bet－ ween the loser of the return World Championship match and the winner of the Candidate＇s final will also be over 14 games．The 1986

World Championship Match is scheduled for December．

## 0－0－0

## KASPAROV v ITIMMAN

KASPAROV played another exhibition match in December，this time against Jan TMMAN The World Champion won the first two games but TIMMAN pulled one back in the third． The next two games were drawn and KASPAROV won the sixth and last game to take the match 4－2．

TIMMAN－KASPAROV（3）
1 e4 e5 2 nf3 Ruy Lopez
1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 pb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6






The first gane of the match reached this position after 20 moves，the 11 th and 12 th moves having been omitted．Black＇s last is an improvement over the $20 \ldots$ Rc8 21 Rc1 urg，1979． 23 Nc2 TIMMAN－KARPOV，Tilb－ 21 b5 cb5 $22 \quad \mathrm{Bb} 5 \mathrm{~d} 2$ Game one continued $\begin{array}{lllllllll}21 & \mathrm{~b} 5 & \mathrm{cb} 5 & 22 \text { Bb5 d5 } 23 \text { Ra8 Ba8 } 24 \text { Qa4 Nc5 } \\ 25 & \text { Qc2 Rb8 } 26 & \text { ed5 }\end{array}$ 25 Qc2 Rb8 26 ed5 Na5 27 Nc4 Qc7 28 Ne5 Bg7 29 Nec6 Bc6 30 Bc6 Nf4 31 Bb5 Rb5 32 36 Qc6 Nfe6 $37 \mathrm{Rb} 34 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 35 \mathrm{Qc} 3+\mathrm{Kg} 8$ 36 Qes Nte6 37 Ral Qb7 38 Qd6 h5 39 Kh1 De5 Na4 44 Rb 1 h4 45 Ob8 Oe7 46 Ob4 Of6 47 Of8 Ne2 48 Ral Nf5 49 Qe7 46 Qb4 Qf6

 Qf4 51 Rel Nf1 $0-1$. | $23 . . . Q c 7$ | 24 | Bb 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | 28 Bg 7 Kg 729 eds ne5 30 Ne 4 ！Na3 31 dd2 Ra3 $32 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \mathrm{Re} 1+33 \mathrm{Re} 1 \mathrm{Kf} 634 \mathrm{Oc} 3$ Ne5 35 f4 Ba4 36 fe5t de5 37 d6 Qab 38 of $3+\mathrm{Ke} 7 \quad 39$ Qf7＋Kd8 40 Rd 1 Ra 1 41 Qf6＋1－0

KASPAROV－TIMMAN（6）
Queen＇s Indian
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 4 Nc 3 Bb 4
 9 Oc2 Bc3＋ 10 bc3 d6 11 Bd3 f5 12 d5



18 NA4！ed4 19 cd4 Qf5 20 e4 Qyb 21 Qc3 0－0 22 Rfel Nd7 23 e5 Rb7 24 Re3 b5 25 Qa5 NB6 26 QB5 Qc2 27 ed6 cd6 Rf7 29 Rf7 Kf7 $30 \mathrm{c} 5 \mathrm{Oc4} 31$ Qb1 Qd5 32 Oh7＋Kf6 33 Qh6＋Kf7 34 Og3 dc5 38 Re1 Of7 39 Og5 Na5 40 Oh6＋Kg8 41 Re5 1－0 Qh6＋Kg8 41 Re5 1－0．

## UNITED STAIES CHAMPIONSHIP．

GM Lev ALBURT，the defending champion， wons the 1985 U．S．Championship in October／November at Estes Park，Colorado With only four rounds to play ALBURT held a two point lead but a loss to back marker Vincent McCAMBRIDGF followed by three draws allowed the field to close to half a point． Scores：1．GM ALBURT 9눌； 2 IM BENJAMIN 9；3－4 GM CHRISTIANSEN，GM KAVALEK 8： 5－6 IM FEDORONICZ，IM KOGAN 7；7－8 GM BROWN，IM DLUGY 6年；9－11 GM DE FIRMIAN GM KUDRIN，IM SHIRAZI 5혹ㅇ $12-13$ GM GURE－ VICH，WOLFF 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ；IM MCCAMBRIDGE 4.
In finishing second，IM Joel BENJAMIN secured a Grandmaster norm． Iranian emigrè Kamran SHIRAZI made amends for his dismal $\frac{1}{2} / 16$ last year by winning the first brilliancy prize for the following game：

SHIRAZI－KOGAN
Petroff Defence
$1 \mathrm{e} 4 \mathrm{e} \quad 2 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{~N} \pm 6 \quad 3 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Ne} 4 \quad 4 \mathrm{Bd} 3 \mathrm{~d} 5$ Na7 Ba7 7 0－0 Qf6 8 Nc Qd4 9 Oh5 Nf6 10 Re1＋Be7 11 Qg5 $\mathbf{Q g 4}$


12 Re7＋Ke7 13 Nd5＋Kf8 14 Nf6 gf6 15 Of6 Rg8 16 Rh6＋Ke8 17 Re1＋Be6 18 g3 Kd7 19 Bh7 Rge8 20 Bf4 $\mathbf{~ Q h 5}$

21 Oc3 Re7 22 Be 4 cb 23 Bf 3 Oh 324 Oc 5 RC8 25 Bg5 f6 26 Od4＋Ke8 27 Of6 Roc7 28 Re6 Qef $29 \mathrm{Bh} 5+\mathrm{Kd} 730 \mathrm{Bg} 41-0$

## 0－0－0

## TRENCIANSKE TEPLICE

The Czechoslovakian International Championship in November／December was won by Soviet IM UBILAVE who gained a GM norm with his 10／14．The scores： 2 GM FTACNIK（CZE）9⿺𠃊⿳亠丷厂彡2， 3 GM MOKRY（CZE）8； 4－5 IM MEDUNA（CZE），IM POLGAR（HUN）7 $7 \frac{1}{2}$ 6－9 IM DIZDAR（YUG），GM KNEZEVIC（YUG）， GM SMEJKAL（CZE），IM STOHL（CZE）7；10－11 GM LECHTYNSKY（CZE），VOKAC（CZE） $6 \frac{1}{2}$ ； 12 IM PRANDSTETTER（CZE）6； 13 IM AMBROZ （CZE） $5 \frac{1}{2}$ ；14－15 PECORELLI（CUB），GM PLATCHETKA（CZE） 5.
$0-0-0$
BOR
Soviet IM Vlacheslav EINGORN completed his GM title qualification when he shared first place with Yugoslave GM Petar POP－ OVIC；both players scored 9／13，well clear of third place getters Lev PSAKHIS and Saniel CAMPORA．Scores：1－2 TM EINGORN，GM POPOVIC 9 ；3－4 IM CAMPORA（ARG） GM PSAKHIS 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ；5－7 GM MARJANOVIC（YUG） GM PSAKHIS 7\％；5－7 GM MARJANOVIC（YUG） IM OMTAN（YUG）61，9－10 TM MOROVIC （CHI）GM PLASKETT（ENG），5；11－13 IM BARLOV CIIT），GM TANSA（CZE）GM MARTINOVTC（YUG） $4^{\frac{1}{2}}: 14$ IM Z．NICOLIC $(Y U G) 4$.

0－0－0

## SMEDEREVSKA PALANKA

Sweden＇s Pja CRAMLING won this women＇s tournament in November with a score of $9 / 12$ ．then followed： 2 ERENSKA（POL） $7 \frac{1}{2} ; 3$ MAKSIMOVIC（YUG）7；4－6 ALEKSANDRIA （USR），MARIC（YUG），VEROCI－PETRONIC（HUN $6 \frac{1}{2} ; 7-8$ POLIHRONIADE（RUM）NUTU（RUM） 6. 13 players

## BRITISH CHESS FEDERATION

－26 July Murray JOHNSTONE，Scottish Championships，Troon
8 July－August．World Championship London．Reserved seats $£ 10$ ，season ticket $£ 90$ or back rows $£ 30$ ．
28 July－ 9 August：Kleinwort Grieveson British Championship，Southharmton． 0－18 August：Lewisham International，London 2028 August Loyds Bank Masters，London 5－7 September：Swansea British Isles Open For full details write to：BCF 9a Grand Parade，St Leonards－on－Sea E Sussex TN38 ODD

## hOMEN＇S CANDIDATES

Elena AKHMILOVSKAYA（29）won the right to challenge Maya CHIBURDANIDZE for the


Pia CRAMLING，the highest rated part icipant and the West＇s best hope
for a senior individual World title
scoring only $2 \frac{1}{2} / 7$ in the first half．
Previous challenger Irina LEVITINA fared even worse，finishing second to last． LITINSKAYA was the early leader but a disastrous second half saw her drop back to finish in third place．

## $0-0-0$

## REYKJAVIR

The Reykjavik Open in February／March attracted 22 GMs and 36 IMs in a field of 75．Predrag NIKOLIC won an undisputed first place with his $8 / 11$ and picked up \＄US12，000 in prize money． eading scores： 1 GM P．NIKOLIC（YUG）8； －8 GM GHEORGHIU（RUM），GM HANSEN（DEN） GM HJARTARSON（ICE），GM LARSEN（DEN）， GM MILES（ENG），IM SALOV（USR \＆GM TAL （USR） $7 \frac{1}{2}$ ；9－17 GM ALBURT（USA），IM ARNASON（ICE），GM CHRISTIANSEN（USA）， GM DE FIRMIAN（USA），IM FEDOROWICZ（USA） M KUDRIN（USA），GM H．OLAFSSON（ICE） （FIN） 7.

## LUGANO

The 11 th International open in this Swiss city saw 250 competing over 9 ounds；among them were 20 GMs and 39 thers in first place wat joined by three others in first place but won narrowly 1 GM KORCHNOI（SWI） $7 \frac{1}{2}$ ． 2 －4 scores： （ISR）GM PLASKETT（ENG） $2-4$ M SHOPT（ （ISR），GM PLASKEIT（ENG）\＆GM SHORT（ENG） 7 $1 \frac{1}{2} ;$ 5－8 GM P．NIKOLIC（YUG），GM NUNN （ENG），GM SEIRAWAN（USA）\＆GM TUMAKOV
（USR） 7 ； $9-20$ GM BEL DOIMATOV（USR），GM GEORGIEV（BLL） GM GHEORGHIU（RUM），GM SAX（HUN）．．．．．6年

## YUGOSLAV CHAMPIONSHIP

The 41st Championship of Yugoslavia was held at Budva，on the Adriatic coast，in March．Two thirds of the 18 players were GMs，but it was an IM Dragan BARLOV who took the title for the first time．Defending champion Slavoljub MARJANOVIC was joined in
second place by Petar Popovic．
Scores： 1 IM BARLOV 12；2－3 GM MARJANOVIC \＆GM POPOVIC 11；4－5 GM HULAK \＆GM VELIMIROVIC 10논의 6 GM GLIGORIC 10； 7 IM RUKAVINA 91 $\frac{1}{2}$ ；8－10 IM CVITAN，GM IVANOVIC $\&$ GM RAJKOVIC 9；11－12 GM CEBALO \＆IM Z．
NIKOLIC 8 $\frac{1}{2} ; 13$ IM DRASKO $7^{\frac{1}{2} ;}$ ； $14-15$ GM
KOVACEVIC $\&$ GM SAHOVIC $7 ; 16$ GM DJURIC $6 ;$ 17 GM MARTINOVIC $5 ; 18$ KOSANOVIC 2.

## LONDON

One of he last acts of the Greater London Corporation（GLC），which was recently disbanded by the THATCHER Government，was to sponsor a Category 13 event in March at the Great Eastern Hotel．
Twelve of the fourteen competing were Grandmasters and most of these had to be rated a winning chance．This was not be be however．In one of the most surprising results in chess tournament history，the second lowest rated player in the event， 27 year old IM Glenn FLLEAR，came out on top．
Murray CHANDIER was close to or in the lead for most of the tournament and was co－leader with FLEAR，on 8 points going into the last round．Then however，he lost on time，（in a lost position）to Jim PLASKEIT（the lowest rated player！） while FLEAR drew with John NUNN．
As the cross－table on the next page shows，the tournament was a remarkeable triumph for the British players who took The cont $\bar{r}$ ．ap
SPASSKY and RTBLI on the results of
losses but only three wins between them）and PLASKETT on the other is
quite remarkable，the English Grandmaster

|  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | FLEAR | ENG I 2485 | x | 1／2 | 1／2 | 1／2 | 1／2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | $8 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 2 | CHANDLER | FNG G 2535 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| 3 | SHORT | ENG G 2585 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | x | 1／2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1／2 | 1 | 3／2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  | 1 | 3／2 | 1 | 8 |
| 4 | RIBLI | HUN G 2585 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | 1／2 | 1／2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $7 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 5 | NUNN | ENG G 2585 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1／2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1／2 | x | 0 | 1／2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1／2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $7 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 6 | PORTISCH | HUN G 2610 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1／2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | x | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1 | 1／2 | 0 | 7 |
| 7 | POLUGAEVSKY | USR G 2575 | 1 | 3／2 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 7 |
| 8 | SPASSKY | FRA G 2610 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1／2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | ，$\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 7 |
| 9 | SPEES MAN | ENG G 2560 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1／2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | 0 | 考 | 1 | 立 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 6 |
| 10 | VAGANIAN | USR G 2645 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1／2 | 0 | 1／2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 3／2 | 1 | x | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| 11 | LARSEN | DEN G 2575 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | 0 | 1 | 0 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 12 | PLASkEIT | ENG G 2435 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | x | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 13 | DLUGY | USA I 2545 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 |  | 1 | x | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 4 |
| 14 | MESTEL | ENG G 2525 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1／2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  | 4 |
| CHANDLER－VAGANIAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BRUSSELS |  |  |  |  |

CHANDLER－VAGANIAN
French Winawer
1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 e5 c5 5 a3 Ba5 6 b4 Cd4 7 Nb5 Rc7 8 f4 Bd7 9 Nf3 Bb5 10 bb5＋Nc6 11 0－0 $\begin{array}{lllllll} & \text { Nge7 } & 12\end{array}$ Bd3 a6 13 Kh 1 h 614 Qe 2 Qa 715 Bb 2 Bb6 16 Rae1 Rc8 17 g4 g6 18 Nh4 h5 19 f5 hg $420 \mathrm{fg} 6 \mathrm{Rh} 4 \quad 21 \mathrm{gf} 7+\mathrm{Rf} 8$ 22 BC1 Nf5 23 Bf5 d3 24 Bd 3 g 3


25 Qg2！［White finds an elegant way to finish off his attack］25．．．Rh2＋ 26 Oh2 gh2 27 Bh6＋Ke7 28 Bg5＋Kf8 29 Bh6＋ke7 30 Bg 6 ！Bc7 $31 \mathrm{Bg} 5+\mathrm{Kf} 8$ 32 Bh6＋Ke7 33 f8＝0＋Rf8 34 Bf8＋Kd8 35 Rf7 Qe8 $36 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \mathrm{Ne5} 37 \mathrm{Bf} 6+1-0$.

## NUNN－DLUGY <br> Caro－Kann

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 e5 bf5 4 Nc3 h5 5 bd3 Bd3 6 Qd3 e6 7 Nf3 Nh6 8 0－0 Nf5 9 Ne2 Na7 10 Ng3 Nh4 11 Nh4 Oh4 12 Be 3 Od8 13 Rfd1 Rc8 14 b 3 c 515 c4 cd4 16 cd5！Ne5［Or $16 \ldots$ de3 17 de6 ef2＋ 18 Kf 1 and Black has nothing better than 18．．．fe6 when 19 Qg6＋Ke7 20 Ra6 s decisive］
1 Qd4 Qd5 18 Qa4＋1－0．
［18．．．Qc6 loses to 19 Rc 1$]$ ．

Ten GMs and two locals made up a Category 13 field in the Belgian capital in March．The tournament was a great personal triumph for former world Champions Anatoly KARPOV who showed he has fully recovered from the two matches with KASPAROV．KARPOV annihilated the field in scoring seven wins and four draws，finishing two full points ahead of former title contender Viktor KORCHNOI who took second place．
One cannot but conpare this event with the concurrent London tournament．While the English tournament certainly had a number of fighting players，the Brussel event had more．Unfortunately for the organisers karfov made sure that the race for first place was a non－event

We give two examples of KARPOV＇s technique and a powerfully played game by Jan TIMMAN．

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { KARPOV-LJUBOJEVIC } \\
& \text { French 'Tarrasch }
\end{aligned}
$$

1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd 2 Nf6 4 e5 Nfd7





 $26 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{~b} 5 \quad 27 \mathrm{ab} 5 \mathrm{Rb} 6 \quad 28 \mathrm{Rbg} 1 \mathrm{~h} 5 \quad 29$ Nf4 fe5 $30 \mathrm{Ng} 6+\mathrm{Kh} 7 \quad 31 \mathrm{Ng} 5+\mathrm{Kg} 7 \quad 32$ Ne5 Ne5 33 Nf7＋Kf7 34 de5 1－0．

WINANTS－KARPOV
1 d4 Nf6 $\begin{gathered}\text { Queen＇s Indian } \\ 2\end{gathered}$ 1 d4 Nf6 2 Nf3 e6 3 e3 c5 4 Rd3 od4

5 ed4 b6 6 0-0 $\mathrm{Bb} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{Be} 78 \mathrm{Nbd} 2$ $0-0 \quad 9 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 10 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{Nc} 611 \mathrm{Qe} 2 \mathrm{Qd6}$ 12 Rad1 Rac8 13 Rfel of 414 g 3 Qh6 15 Qf1 Rfd8 16 h 3 Bb 417 Re 3 Bd 2 18 Rd2 Nb4 19 Ne5 Nd3 20 Rdd3 Ne4 21 Rd1 f6 22 Ng4 ohs 23 Nh 2 dc 4 24 bc4 Rc4 25 d5 Rd5 26 Ng4 Ng5 0-1.

## TIMMAN-MILES

Queen's Indian
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 4 Nc3 Bb4 5 Bg5 Bb7 6 e3 h6 7 Bh4 g5 8 bg 3 Ne4 9 Qc2 Bc3+ 10 bc3 Ng3 11 fg 3 g 412 Nh4 Og5 13 Qd2 Nc6 14 Bd3 Rg8 $150-0$ Ke7 16 Rf4 Raf8 17 raf1 h5 18 Qf2 Na8 19 Rf6 Re8 20 e4 d6

| 1 KARPOV | USR G | $x$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 3/2 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 KORCHNOI | SWI G | $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| 3 TORRE | PHI G | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | x | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 3/2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 4 TIMMAN | NLD G | 0 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 612 |
| 5 MLLES | ENG G | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | x | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 6 ROMANISHIN | USR G | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 6 |
| 7 SEIRAWAN | USA G | 0 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 8 IJUBOJEVIC | YUG G | 0 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 0 | I/2 | 0 | x | 3/2 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 5 |
| 9 ZAPATA | COL G | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 5 |
| 10 VEN DER WEIL | NLD G | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | x | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 11 WINANTS | BEL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | x | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 3 |
| 2 JADOUL | BEL | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | x | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ |

## NEW YORK

Thirty-two grandmasters lined up the start of the 1986 New York International Open in March/April. They were joined by 31 IMs and 32 FMs, naking a total field of 95 - no 'patzers as Hungary's Andras ADORJAN perhaps unkindly commented. Altogether hearly one thoussand players competed in seven separate events for $\$$ US 130,000 in prize money. the tournament

The lion's share of the Open prize fund left the shores of America. Joint winners with 7/9, were Gyula SAX and Jan SMEJKAL. These two shared SUS25,000 and then played a short match for another \$US1,000 and the title. The first two ( 30 minute) games were drawn but SMEJKAL won a lightning decider.
Leading scores: 1-2 GM SMEJKAL (CZE) \& GM SAX (HUN) 7 $\frac{1}{2}$; 3-6 IM BARLOV (YUG) GM DJURIC (YUG), IM FEDOROWICZ (USA), \& GM H.OLAFSSON (ICE) $6 \frac{1}{2}$; 7-16 GM ADORJAN (HUN), IM BENJAMIN (USA), GM BENKO (USA), GM DE FIRMIAN (USA)


21 c5 bc5 22 Bb5 Ref8 23 e5 od4 24 ad4 c6 25 bd3 de5 26 Ng6+ Kd7 27 ff $8+$ Rf8 28 d5 ed5 29 Qc5 Ke8 30 R1f5, 1-0.

LOMBARDY-FORMANEK Blumenfeld Gambit
$1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 6 \quad 2 \mathrm{c} 4$ e6 $3 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 4 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{~b} 5$ 5 de6 fe6 6 cb5 d5 $7 \quad \mathrm{~g} 3 \quad \mathrm{Q}=5+$ $8 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{~d} 4 \quad 9 \mathrm{Qa4} \mathrm{Ob6} 10 \mathrm{Nb1} \mathrm{Bd7} 11 \mathrm{Na} 3$ a6 12 0-0 Nh5 13 Qd2 f5 14 Bh6 Ne5 15 ba6+ Kf7 16 Nc4 [White has ample compensation for the exchange but Black's next is a blunder.] 16...Nd5? 17 Ne5+ 1-0.[17...Kg8 18 a7 Ra8 19 Qc6 wins everything.

## BONIN-GHEORGHIU

Modern Benoni
 5 e4 Bg7 6 NF3 $0-0 \quad 7 \mathrm{h3}$ a6 8 a4 e6 ba3 eds 10 ed5 Re8+ 11 Be 3 Nba 12 0-0 16 Cos 17 Rh6 Nes 15 Re2 Nf6

Bg5 pa5 17 Rfe1 Bd7 18 Be2 NF6 19 bf3 Kg7?


20 Re5! Re5 21 Bf6+ Kf6 22 Ne4+ fe4 23 Qa5 ef3 24 Qc7 Ke7 25 Ra 3 fg 2 26 Re3 Re3 $27 \mathrm{fe} 3 \mathrm{~b} 5 \quad 28 \quad \mathrm{Q} b 7 \mathrm{Rf} 8 \quad 29$ $\mathrm{cb5}$ ab5 30 a5 Rf1+ 31 Kg 2 Rb 132 a 6 $\mathrm{Rb} 2+33 \mathrm{Kf} 3$ 1-0.

0-0-0

## U.S.S.R.CHAMPIONSHIP

The 53rd U.S.S.R Chanpionship was held in Kiev in April. The tournament lacked most of the leading players and reached only a moderate Category 10 on fe fide scale an average FIDE rating of just under 2500 .

The new champion is Vitaly TSESHKOVSKY 42) who finished a full point ahead of bunch of six players.
cores: 1 GM TSESHKOVSKY 11/17; 2 7 GM BALASHOV, BAREEV, IM EINGORN, GM GAVRIKOV, IM LERNER \& IM MALANIUK 10; 8 GM RASHKOVSKY 9; 9-10 IM GUREVICH, \& IM YUDASIN 8 $8 \frac{1}{2} ; 11$ 12 GM DOLMATOV, \& IM HALIFMAN 8; 13-14 GM BELYAVSKY GM LPUTYAN 71 $\frac{1}{2} ; 15$ IM AZMAIPARASHVILI 7 16-18 IM DVOIRIS,IM SMAGIN \& YAKOVICH 6.

0-0-0

## DORIMIND

Zoltan RIBLI scored an undefeated 8/11 to win this Category 10 event in April. la CRAMLING scored a fighting $50 \%$ (only three draws) to edge former World point vassily SMYSLOV by half a Doint. Scores: GM RIBLI (HUN) 8; GM MILFS (ENG) 7. 5-6 GM OUTNTFROS (ARG) CM SHORT (ENG) 61, 7 IM CRAMTM SWE) ( MYSIOV (USR) 5; 10 IM HFRTNHCK (BRD) 4 1 KOH WEYER (BRD) 3, 12 NTMOXICZUK (BRD) NEYER (BRD) 3; 12 NIKOLAICZUK (BRD) $\frac{1}{2}$.

## 0-0-0

## SARAJEVO

The "Bosna 86" tournament in April was chiefly notable for draws not much more than one quarter of the games were decisive. Boris SPASSKY managed one win from his twelve games but Borislav IVKOV went one better drawing the lot for a perfect score! Scores: 1-3 GM GEORGIEV (BUL), GM POR (HUN) \& GM PSAKHIS (USR) 7 $1 \frac{1}{2}$; 4 IM CAMRORA (ARG) 7; 5 GM SPASSKY (FRA) (YUG) \& CM IVKOV (YUG) $6: 9$ CM DETROSIA (USR) 512 10-12 TM DIZDAR (YUG) GITORIC ( YUG ) 12 M GLIGORIC (YUG) \& GM VELIMIROVIC (YUG) 5; 13 IM CEBALO (YUG) $3 \frac{1}{2}$.

## KASPAROV-Mmes

The "Basler Zeitung" sponsored a short exhibition match between the World Champion and England's highest rated player, Iony MILES, in May. The Briton was treated even more harshly than Robert HtlbNER, Ulf ANDERSSON, AND Jan TIMMAN in previous similar matches.
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}\text { KASPAROV USR } & 1 & 1 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 1 & 5 \frac{1}{2}\end{array}$ MILES ENG $\begin{array}{llllllll}0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}\end{array}$
The first game was an interesting struggle with both sides making mistakes in a Czech Benoni. Finally, MILES blundered away a draw on move 40, resigning just two moves later. The second game,a slav Defence, was also also interesting; in a long struggle milies played for the win with his hand and two kiay his hand and eventually lost. Apart in the quiet daw kaspar was rampan in four in 31 moves gandes, winning game four in 31 moves and the last two

26 Re6! Re6 27 QaS Rf6 28 g3 Nf8 29 Bh3 g6 [... Kh8 leaves the back rank too vulnerable] 30 Qa2 Kg7 31 Ne6 Ne6

GM FTACNIK (CZE), GM GHFORGHIU (RUM), GM HULAR (YUG), GM IOBRON (BRD) \& TM MUREY (ISR) 6.

> HULAK-SHAMKOVICH

1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 nc3 Bb4 4 Qc2 c5 5 dc5 0-0 6 Be3 Na6 7 a3 Bc5 8 Bc5 Nf3 Qc7 13 Qb8 14 Qc3 $\mathrm{f} 6 \quad 15$ ef6 Nf6 16 Be2 Bd7 17 0-0 Nc7 18 Nbd4 dc4 19 Bc4 Nod5 20 Qb3 Qd6 21 Rfel a6 22 Rad1 b5 23 Bf1 Rae8 24 Ne5 Qb6 25 Nd7 Nd7
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## WORLD CH'P CYCLE

## CANDIDATFS SEMIFINALS

At Minsk the match between Rafael VAGANIAN (2645) and Andrei SOKOLOV (2595) was expected to go to the older (and higher rated) Armenian, but SOKOLOV won the best-of-ten games contest well
inside the distance.

SOKOLOV
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 1 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 1 & - & - & 6 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & - & - & 2\end{array}$
After a draw in game one Vaganian played a somewhat unusual line in the Winawer but SOKOLOV gained a sizeable edge which he converted to a point when won a better ending in game three and put the outcome of the match virtually beyond doubt in game 4 in which VAGANIAN improved on his play in game 2 and reached a better ending, only to lose eventually on time in a drawn position.

The other match between Jan TIMMAN (2645) and Artur YUSUPOV (2645) was played at Tilburg but the advantage of playing at home did not help the Dutchman

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | - |
| YIMMAN | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | - |
| TIA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TIMMAN had a good start when YUSUPOV failed to find the best defence after Black's exchange sacrifice. The favour was returned in game 5 when TIMMAN missed his best chance in a major piece ending. YUSUPOV sacrificed the exchange in game 6 and his Bishop pair soon controlled the board. Game 7 was a rout after TIMMAN's sharp opening play turned out to be simply bad; thus YÜSUPOV emulated SOKOLOV with a hat trick and TIMMAN's resistance was effectively ended

SOKOLOV - VAGANIAN (2) French Winawer
1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 e5 c5 $\mathrm{Bd} 2+9$ od2 od4 10 Od4 Ne7 11 Nf3 $0-0$ 12 Bd3 Nc6 13 qe3 Ob6 14 Qb6 ab6 15 0-0 Rd8 16 Rfel Kf8 17 h 4 h 6 18 Nd2 Ra4 19 a3 Rd7 20 f4 Nd4 21 c3 Bb5 22 Bb1 Nc6 23 Bc2 Raa8 24 a4 Ba6 25 b4 b5 26 Reb1 Rac8 27 Bd3 Na7 28 Ra3 Rc7 29 a 5 d4 30 od4 Rd4 31 Nf3 Rd8 32 Kf 2 Nc 833 Be4 f5 34 ef6 gf6 35 Re1 Rc4 36 Rb3 b6 37 Bb 1 Rd6
$38 \mathrm{Rb} 2 \mathrm{ba} 539 \mathrm{ha5} \mathrm{Ra} 440 \mathrm{Ba} 2 \mathrm{Ra} 541$ Be6 Bb7 $42 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Bf} 3 \quad 43 \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 744 \mathrm{Kg}$ Rb6 $45 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \mathrm{Ra} 746 \mathrm{Rd8}+\mathrm{Kg} 747 \mathrm{Bb} 3$ 51 Rf8 Rc3 52 Rf7+ Kh8 53 Rf8 Kg7 54 Rf7+ Khs 55 Rd1 Ras 56 Re7 Rb3 Rad7 Rb1 58 Rh7+ Kg8 58 Rdg7+ Kf8 60 Rb7 Kg8 61 Rh6 Rf8 62 Rhh7 Rd8 63 Rbg7 $64 \mathrm{Ra} 7 \mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 65 \mathrm{hb}$ 1-0.

VAGANIAN - SOKOLOV (3) Nimzoindian
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 e3 0-0 5 Bd3 d5 6 a3 dc4 7 Bc4 Bd6 8 Qc2 nbd7 9 Nf3 c5 10 dc5 BC5 $110-0$ b6 12 e4 $\begin{array}{llllll}\mathrm{Bb} 7 & 13 \mathrm{Bg} 5 & \mathrm{Oc} 7 \\ 16 & \text { Qe2 Ne5 }!5 \mathrm{Bf} 6 \mathrm{Nc} 4\end{array}$ 16 Bh4 Ne5 17 Rfd1 Nf3+ 18 Qf3 f5 19 b4 Ba6 20 Qh3 Be5 21 Rac1 Qf7 22 ef5 26 23 Ne2 Racs 24 Rc8 Rc8 25 Bg 3 Bb 2 26 Bf4 Qe6 27 Qd3 Bf6 28 f3 Rd8 29 Bc4 33 Oat Rf7 Ba6 31 Kf2 gs 32 Bcl 36 ha 23 Kf7 34 Ng 3 b 535 Ne 2 f 4 Kf8 86 Ohf Qe5 43 Qat 46 ac2 47 2 45 Kf1 Rd3 50 Al1 5148


SOKOLOV - VAGANLAN (4)
French Winawer
1 e4 e6 $2 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \quad 4$ e5 c5 5 a3 Ba5 $6 \mathrm{Bb} 2 \mathrm{~cd} 4 \mathrm{7}^{7} \mathrm{Nb} 5$ Nc6 8 Nf 3 f 6 9 Nbd4 Nd4 $10 \mathrm{Nd} 4 \mathrm{Bb} 2+11$ Qd2 fe5 12 Bb5+ Kf8 13 Nf3 Qd6 14 Qg5 e4 15 Ne5 Qe7 16 Qe3 Nh6 17 0-0-0 Nf5 18 Qc3 a6 $19 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{bd} 7 \quad 20 \mathrm{Bg} 4 \mathrm{Rc} 8 \quad 21 \mathrm{Qb4}$ Bc6 22 Ob3 Qc7 23 Nc6 bc6 24 Bf5 ef5 25 c4 Ke7 26 od5 cd5t 27 Kb 1 Rhd8 28 Rd5 Rb8 29 Qa2

29...Rb2+! 30 Qb2 RbB $31 \mathrm{Rd} 2 \mathrm{Rb} 2+32$ Rb2 Qd6 33 Rc1 Kf6 $34 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{Qa} 335 \mathrm{Rc} 6+$ Ke5 36 Rc7 Qd3+ 37 Ka 2 Qd5+ $38 \mathrm{Kb1}$ Qd1+ $39 \mathrm{Ka} 2 \mathrm{Qa4+} 40 \mathrm{~Kb} 1 \mathrm{Qd1+} 41 \mathrm{Ka} 2$ Qas+ [ Black apparently decides to go for the win since he eschews the threefold repetition after 41 ...Qa4+ 42 Kb 1 od1+] $42 \mathrm{~Kb} 1 \mathrm{f} 4 \quad 43 \mathrm{Rbc} 2 \mathrm{Kab} 44 \mathrm{Kc} 1 \mathrm{Ob5}$ $45 \mathrm{Rg} 7 \mathrm{e} 3 \quad 46 \mathrm{fe} 3 \mathrm{fe} 347 \mathrm{Roc} 7$ Qa4 48 Rh7 a5 49 Rcg 7 Qc4+ 50 Kb 2 Qe6 51 Ra 7

Qe5+ 52 Kc 2 qe4t $53 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Ob4+} 54 \mathrm{Kd} 3$ Qd2+ 55 Ke4 Kc6 56 Rab7, 1-0 (time)

## SOKOLOV - VAGANIAN (8

Alekhine Defence.
1 e4 nft 2 e5 nd5 3 d4 d6 4 Nf3 nc6 $5 \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{Nb} 66 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Bg} 4 \quad 7$ edt cd6 8 d5 bf3 $9 \mathrm{Bf} 3 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \quad 10 \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{~g} 611 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7$ 12 Bd4 0-0 13 Nc3 Rc8 14 b3 e6 15 f4 edb 16 fe5 dc4 19 0-0 de5 18 bb6 Q66+ 29 Kh1 Rfd8 20 Nas Qc5 21 bc4 b5 22 Rci Bh6 23 Bg4 Bc1 24 Bc8 Bgs 26 Rf6 20 21 29 25 32 Re3 Re3 33 bas 34 Kg 3 Ne $35 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \quad 1-0$.

YUSUPOV - TIMMAN (1 Queen's Indian
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 $4 \mathbf{N c} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 4$ 5 e3 Ne4 6 Qc2 bb7 7 Bd3 f5 8 0-0 Bc3 9 bc3 $0-0 \quad 10 \mathrm{Ne} 1 \mathrm{c} 511 \mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Na6} 12$ Ba3 nab 13 e4 Qe7 14 e5 Nf7 15 f. 4 g5 16 d5 gf4 17 Nf3 Nh8 18 Rael Ng6 19 Bc1 Kh8 20 Qf2 $\mathrm{Qg} 7 \quad 21 \mathrm{~h} 4$ Oh6 22 Ng 5 Oh4 23 Oh4 Nh4 24 Rf4 Ngg 25 Rf3 Rae8 26 Rh3 Re7 27 Rh6 Rg8 28 Kf2 Nf8 29 16 Reg7 $30 \mathrm{Rf} 6 \mathrm{Nb} 831 \mathrm{Rh} 1 \mathrm{Nc6} 32 \mathrm{Bf} 4$

32...Rg5 $33 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Rg} 534 \mathrm{Rf} 8+\mathrm{Kg} 735$ Re8 Ne5 36 Bf1 Ng4+ 37 Ke 1 Nf 6 Re7+ Kg6 39 Rh 3 Bg 240 Re 3 Bc6 0-1
YUSUPOV - TIMMAN (5

Queen's Indian
d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 4 a3 c5 5 d5 Ba6 6 Qc2 ed5 7 cad g6 8 Nc3 Bg7 9 g3 0-0 $10 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{a} 6 \quad 110-0$ Re8 12 Re1 Nbd7 13 h 3 Ne 514 Ne 5 Re 515



18 e5 de5 19 d6 Rc8 20 f5 Nc5 21 Bc5 Rc5 22 Ne4 Ra5 23 g4 Qd7 24 Rad1 Rc8

25 fg6 hg6 26 Qf2 Bb7 27 Nf6t Bf6 28 Bb7 Qb7 29 Qf6 Qd7 30 Qe7 Rd8 31 Rf Rc5? [31...c3!] 32 Rf7 Qe7 $33 \mathrm{Re7}$ b5 34 Ra7 Rc6 $35 \mathrm{Rb7}$ Rdd6 36 Rd6 Rd6 37 Rb5 e4 $38 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Rd} 3 \quad 39 \mathrm{at} \mathrm{c} 3 \quad 40 \mathrm{bc} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 3$ 41 Res Rc4 42 as Ra4 43 Ke 3 Kg 744 g 5

 Ra1 $56 \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{Ke} 557 \mathrm{Kc} 5 \mathrm{Ra} 258 \mathrm{Kb6} 1-0$
TIMMAN - YUSUPOV (6)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Queen's Gambit } \\
& 4 \text { e6 } 3 \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Nff}
\end{aligned}
$$

$1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 2 \mathrm{c4}$ e6 3 Nc3 NF6 $4 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \mathrm{Be7}$ 5 Bg5 h6 bf6 bf6 7 Ob3 c6 $80-0-0$ dc 9 Qc4 b5 10 Ob3 a5 11 e4 a4 12 Oc2 Nd7 13 d 5 cd5 14 ed5 a3 15 de6 ab2t 16 Kbl fé 17 Qef

17...Bc3 18 Qa8 0-0 19 Qc6 b4 20 Bc4 Kh8 21 Qe4 Qc7 $22 \mathrm{NH4} \mathrm{Ne5} 23 \mathrm{Bd3} \mathrm{Nd} 3$ $24 \mathrm{Ng} 6+\mathrm{Kg} 825 \mathrm{Rd} 3 \mathrm{Rf} 226 \mathrm{Rf} 3 \mathrm{Rf} 327$ gf3 Qd6 28 Qc2 e5 29 Nh4 be6 30 Rd1 Bd4 31 Qa4 Qd8 32 Qc6 BdS 33 Rd4 34 Qb5 Qd8 $35 \mathrm{~Kb} 2 \mathrm{Qa} 2+36 \mathrm{Kc} 1$ Qa1
$37 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Qc} 3+38 \mathrm{Kd} \mathrm{Bb} 3+0-1$.
YUSUPOV -. TIMMAN (7)

Na5 5 e4 Nc3 g6 3 nc3 d5 4 cd. Qf3 0-0 9 $12 \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{c} 5 \quad 13 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{~cd} 4 \quad 14 \mathrm{~cd} 4 \mathrm{gh} 5 \quad 15 \mathrm{Rh} 5$ Bb7 16Qd3 RA8 17 Qh7+ Kf8 18 Ne 2 Rd 4 19 Bh6 1-0.

## YUSUPOV - TIMMAN (9)

Grünfeld
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 g6 3 Nc3 d5 4 ad5 Na5 5 e4 Nc3 $6 \mathrm{bc} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad 7 \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 8$ Of $3 \mathrm{O}-0$ 9 Ne 2 Nct 10 h 4 Na 511 bd 3 e5 12 Ba 3 Re8 $13 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{Qd7} 14 \mathrm{Rd} 1 \mathrm{Qa} 415 \mathrm{Bc} 1 \mathrm{c} 5$ 16 d5 Qa2 17 Bh 6 hh8 18 Bb5 Rd8 19 Bg5 Qb3 20 hg 6 fg6 21 Rh 7 Kh 722 Qf7+ Bg7 23 Bf6 Rg8 24 Be8 1-0.

0-0-0

## CHESS QUOIE

The beauty of a game of chess is usually assessed, and not without good reason, according to the sacrifices it contains.
(Source - Maxims of Chess - John W COLLINS)

## Should You Study Pawn Endings?

By Val zenitis
If you can assess these three positions correctly you need not concern yourself with pawn endings for the purpose of improving your pawn endgame technique.



2 White to move


3 White to move

On the other hand, if you had difficulty seeing the intricate manoeuvres and possibilities hidden in these seemingly simple examples, don't despair. A CVETKOV has written a explain all you should know about paw explaing 1 you should know about pawn and lucid work "Pawn Endings". and was published by Chess Enterprises, Inc 107 Crosstree Chess Enterprises, Inc. 107 Crosstree, \$US5.00.

All pawn endgame theory books follow the same method of presentation: first the same method of presentation:
contrived positions are given to illustrate the basic theory, then to show hidden possibilities, endgame studies are shown, especially those composed by GRIGORIEV,MAROCZY, RETI, RINK, MATTISONS, FINE, KERES and other well known endgame composers; finally, exartples from tournament games are presented. This book follows the san format and will teach you how to count moves, how to exploit distant opposition explain the theory of corresponding squares, show how to arrange breaking through a pawn barrier, and most importantly, how to analyse pawn endings.
Because of very restricted material on the board pawn endings appear to be easy but the truth is that such positions conceal add to the difficulty of playing. To add to the diriculty of playing such endings the player must see every utcome of pawn endings almost aluay hinges on one tempo.

The following three studies illustrate the beauty and complexity of pawn endgames. All 6 diagrams on this page are taken from A.CVEIKOV's Book.
Solutions are given on page 65 Solutions are given on page 65



6 White


## Monte Carlo 1903

(An unorthodox book review)

## by Val ZEMITIS

The third Monte Carlo tournament was held between February 10 and March 17, 1903 and was one of the strongest tournaments up to that time. Practically all participants were what we now term "super-grandmasters" with now calculated ELO ratings well over 2500 . It was a 14 man two cycle affair.
The tournament was sponsored by Prince Dadien de MINGRELIEN, a vain and volatile individual. He declined Mikhail CHIGORIN (ELO 2600) participation, even though he was invited and duly arrived several days before the tournament. The Prince arranged for CHIGORIN to receive a sum of 1500 francs (more than 3rd prize money) and sent him on his merry way. CHIGORIN'S "crime" was that he had shown in writing that a brilliancy played by the Prince had gross errors and with correct play should have been won by the Prince's opponent.
Then, "The Water Carrier" an object d'art created another commotion. Made by the well known artist LFFFEBRE, this object had won a special prize in Rome in 1897. According to the wishes of the Prince, the first and second place finishers Doctor TARRASCH and MAROCZY, should have played a short match to determine who should possess such a valuable "object d'art". Both players were of a different opinion and in addition to the object they wanted to compete for a purse of 3000 francs. The annoyed Prince thereupon arranged for the third place finisher, through one of his subordinates, handed Dr.TARRASCH a wine carafe - an item of little value. Such insults Herr Doctor was not willing to accept without conment. He wrote caustically about the affair, and was promotly "overlooked" when the invitations for the 1904 Monte Carlo toumement were sent.
In spite of the faux pas committed by the Prince Dadien de MILGRELIEN, the tournament was ably managed by Arnous de RIVIFRE, the same man who had battled Paul MORPHY in Paris in 1859. There were five rounds per week with the adjourned games session on Wednesdays. Players agreed to play seven hours each day from 10 am to 2 pm and then from 4 pm to 7 pm . No one objected to players themselves analysing games but no consultation was allowed.
Dr TARRASCH emerged as a winner despite three early losses. Considering the opposition his result $20 / 6$ (77\%) is remarkable. 'IARRASCH'S play at this tournament was characterised as 'conservative and careful' and was said to be 'interesting and instructive and at times not devoid of brilliancy.
MAROCZY who achieved 19 points,was second. He played well and displayed 'good positional judgement and keenness of attack.' PILISBURY placed third with $17 \frac{1}{2}$ points. As usual he was a dangerous opponent and could have emerged as a victor had it not been for a severe cold sufferred in the second cycle of the toumament. The youngest participant, Frank MARSHALJ , aged 26 placed ninth.
Now a hard-cover book about the Monte Carlo tournament has been published by the EDITION OLMS (Hagentorwall 7, D-3200 Hildesheim, West Germany). This book is a reprint from "The American Chess Weekly", Special series\#1-5, Philadelphia, April 29 1903-June 18 1903. All 182 games are annotated and there are 49 diagrams dispersed throughout the 112 pages. Considering the excellent execution of the book, the price of DM/Sfr 38.00 (Approx US\$16) is a bargain. This is a book that will delight both the collector and the practical player alike. The following three diagams show how tournament winner Dr TARRASCH scored three losses in the early rounds of the tournament.

Position after 22...Ra8

Position after 35 Kg 1

Position after 34...Bf2?
. SCHLECTER - TARRASCH: 23 Bc5! dc5 24 d6 Qd6 25 Ne4 Qd8 26 Rd1 Resigns If $26 \ldots$.. Nd7 then 27 gf6 and 28 Rd7! If Black moves the Queen then 27 gf6 decides. 38 TARRASCH - TEICHMAN: 35...Nf5!(Threatening Nh4) 36 Bf5 gf5 37 Rd4 f6
38 Rc1 Oh3 39 White Resigned

## 3. MARCO - TARRASCH: 35 Qc4! Rf8 36 Ra8(Threatening 37 Rc8 and 38 Qf7+

38 Kf2 and Black resigned on move 65. 0-0-0

## IHE MYERS OPENINGS BULLETTI

A Book Review

## Jonathan ADAMS

'THE MYERS OPENINGS BULLETIN' edited and published by Hugh E.MYERS, Iowa U.S.A the issue reviewed is Volume 3 No 12, Oct-Nov 1985)
This fairly new arrival on the periodicals scene concentrates on opening lines that are off the beaten track. MYERS is an American openings exponent with a particular liking for rare debuts. The bulk of the contents of the M.O.B is openings analysis. The rest of the issue is made up of editorials, one full length book review, brief notes on several new books and a short 'miscellany

Openings covered in this issue are the Lasker-Pelikan variation of the Sicilian Defence (less popular lines), Sicilian 2 Nf3 d6 3 e5 (dubbed Mengarini's Variation - the analysis is by Mengarini), Muzio Gambit, Bird's Opening with 1 f4 e5 2 Nh 3 and $1 \ldots$...d5 2 e4. There is a slight lack of narrative in some of the analysis and a shortage of diagrams. Some of the contributors are not very well known, but a welcome international flavour is provided by Jim HENRI, a top rated player in the Correspondence Chess League of Australia, and Games Editor of its magazine, CCLA RECORD. Most of the analysis is of a high standard, though there are a couple of dubious verdicts.
MYERS is certainly not afraid of controversy. The material on the Muzio Gambit constitutes an at times impassioned debate between Stefan BUCKER, and Dutch practitioner Henk SMOUT. furthers knowledge and is well meshed together. seven jam-packed pages
the author of previous articles, It's good reading as it all

The controversy gathers momentum in the Editorials. The first is on 'KKK' (KARPOV/KASPAROV/KEENE), and argues the unusual view (for a Western world writer) that it would be tragic if KASPAROV were to win! MYERS complains strongly about ine sided reporting of the premature close of the first $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}$ match, attributing it to the Batsford connection between KASPAROV, KFENE and others, and the KFENE family connection with the writer for Reuters and the Associated Press, David GOODMAN (KEENE's brother-in-law). The second editorial replies strongly to criticism of MYERS by Jan TIMMAN. MYERS calls him 'Prettyboy'. The third sees MYERS rebutting a letter from Arpad ELO, no less, on ratings. MYERS is not afraid to be rude to 'young grandmasters and elderly statisticians'
MYERS is lucky to have the services of Anthony SOLTIS as a reviewer. He reviews a Swiss reissue of the tournament book of Vienna 1882 in a manner that would gladden

MYER's heart, concentrating on the many unusual openings employed.
One criticism that I believe applies throughout this publication is that the Editor is too ready to interject his own comments (some lengthy) throughout other people's contributions. But this is niggling. It is a very full publication for its size and definitely useful if you are the sort of player who likes surprise his /her opponent in the opening (and aren't we all). It is good value, too at an annual subscription of US\$11.25 letter rate (surface), US\$10.50 printed matter (surface) or US\$15.75, airmail for 6 issues. It can be ordered by writing direct to Hugh MYERS, 1506 $\frac{1}{2}$ Harrison, Davenport, Iowa 52803-4808, U.S.A.
$0-0-0$

## SOLUITONS TO 'SHOULD YOU STUDY PAWN ENDINES?'

1 IJUBOJEVIC - BROWNE, Amsterdam 1972. It should read 'Black to move and win' but BRONNE played 39 ...f5? and after 40 Kb 4 had to be satisfied with a draw. Black wins with $39 .$. Kd5! I If $40 \mathrm{~Kb} 4 \mathrm{Kd} 4!41 \mathrm{Ka} 3 \mathrm{f5} 42 \mathrm{~Kb} 2 \mathrm{f} 443 \mathrm{Kc} 1 \mathrm{Ke} 344 \mathrm{Kd} 1 \mathrm{Kf} 2$ ! $45 \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{f} 346 \mathrm{~b} 5 \mathrm{Kg} 147 \mathrm{~b} 6 \mathrm{f} 248 \mathrm{~b} 7 \mathrm{f} 1=\mathrm{Q}+$. II If 40 b 4 then $\mathrm{f} 541 \mathrm{~b} 5 \mathrm{f} 4 \quad 42 \mathrm{~b} 6$ Kc6! 43 Ka6 £3 44 b7 £2 45 b8=Q f1=Q 46 Ka5 Qa1+ and wins.

2 CHKONIA - SHIVOGIN, USSR 1954. White played 1 g4? and after f5 a draw was agreed, in view of the continuation 2 gf5 gf5 3 f 4 h 54 h 4 which results in a stalemate. The win is achieved as follows: 1.Kc2! and now: I 1...g5 2g4. II 1...h5 2 h 4 f 6 f 3 f : III $1 . . . \mathrm{ff}^{2} \mathrm{~h} 4 \mathrm{~h} 5 \mathrm{f} 4$, or if $2 \ldots \mathrm{~g} 5$ here then 3 hg 5 and 4 g 4 : IV $1 \ldots \mathrm{f5} 2 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{~g} 53 \mathrm{~g} 4$, or if $2 \ldots \mathrm{~h} 5$ here, then 3 f 4 . In all cases White wins easily.

3 ILYIN-ZHENEVSKY - BOTVINNIK, Leningrad 1938. White played 66 Kf4(?) and after 66...G6 a draw was agred. After 66 Kf 3 ! White could have won easily: I 66...g6 $67 \mathrm{hg} 6+\mathrm{Kg} 668 \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{~h} 569 \mathrm{~g} 3$, or II $66 . . \mathrm{Ke} 767 \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{Ke} 668 \mathrm{~g} 3$. In both cases Black is in zugswang and must lose.

4 Study by N.D.GRIGORIEV, 1923. 1.g7 Kf7 2 Kf5! (2 Ke5 kg7 3 Kf5 Kf7 4 Kg 5 Ke draws) 2...Kg8 (Not $2 \ldots \mathrm{Kg} 7$ because of 3 Kg 5 and White wins) $\mathbf{3} \mathrm{Kg} 4$ ! (Not 3 Kg 5 e 4 ! 4 de 4 Kg 7 ) 3...Kf7 (If 3...Kg7 then 4 Kg 5 ; if $3 . . . \mathrm{e} 4$ then 4 de4 Kf 75 Kf 5 Kg 8 6 Kf 6 g 4 7 e5) 4 Kg 5 ! e4 (On 4...Kg7 follows 5 Kf 5 e4 6 Ke 4 ) $5 \mathrm{Kh} 6!$ ! (Not 5 de 4 Kg7) $5 . . . \mathrm{Kg} 8 \quad 6$ de4.
5 Study by SACkMANN, 1913. 1. Kf5! Kb6 2 Kf6! kb7 3 Kf7 Kb8 4 Ke6! Ka7! 5 Ke7! Ka6 6 Kd8 Kb7 7 Kd7 Kb6 8 Kc8 Ka6 9 Kc7 and White wins.

6 Study by H.M.MAITISONS, 1929. 1.f5! (Not 1 Kg 4 because of Kb 52 h 4 Kc 53 h 5 gh 5 $4 \mathrm{Kh} 5 \mathrm{Kd5} 5 \mathrm{Kg} 6 \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{~g} 6 \mathrm{~h} 5$ ! $7 \mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{Kf5} \mathrm{Kh} 6 \mathrm{Kg} 49 \mathrm{f} 5 \mathrm{~h} 4$ ! $10 \mathrm{gh} 4 \mathrm{Kf5}$ or 7 Kh 5 Kf 5

 (Not 9 h 3 ? h5! 10 Kg 5 hg 411 hg 4 Kg 7 ) $9 . . . \mathrm{hs} 10 \mathrm{~h} 4$ ! Kh6 $11 \mathrm{Kg} 6 \mathrm{gh4} 12 \mathrm{~g} 5+\mathrm{Kh} 7$
13 Kf 7 and White wins.

## QUOTES FROM David BRONSTEIN

"Variations can be interesting if they show the beauty of chess; they become useless when they exceed the limits of what a man can calculate; and they are a real evil when they are substituted for the study and clarification of positions in which the outcome is decided by intuition,fantasy and talent." "Without technique, one cannot attain mastery of any form; it is no less impossible in chess."
$0-0-0$
CHESS NOITATION
Notation is the alphabet of chess. Just as a student who does not understand the literary alphabet cannot read, so a chess player cannot study without a knowledge of chess notation. Algebraic
is the official alphabet of chess adopted by FIDE. Though some use the pure form (e2-e4), most prefer an abbreviated form. This issue of $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{Z}$. Chess has been typed in the ultra abbreviated form in order to compress the maximum information into the available space. Future issues wi revert to the slightly fuller style
favoured by FIDE and by many players.

## KERES on Rook and Pawn Endings

by IM Ortvin SARAPU

The 6 hour playing sessions adopted by FIDE, with 40 moves in two hours and a second time control of 20 moves in a the game of chess. As Murray CHANDLER pointed out in the Listener (March1-7), one cannot adjourn and look up the endgane books adyourn and loo must be good in the endgame without must be good in the eno help of boks and teconds
As an exaple, the following recently played television game between two super Grandmasters HEUBNER and TIMMAN a win and a draw being missed!


Black (TIMMAN) to move continued...Kd7 $40 \mathrm{~g} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 2+41 \mathrm{Kh} 3 \mathrm{fg} 3 \mathrm{4} \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Ke}$ ? $?$ [TTMMAN's mistake gives away the win. Correct, according to HORT, is 42 Re ! 43 Kı3 Reb and here 44 Rh5 Kd6 45 Rh
 also play 44 Ras Kc7! (but not Kd6? 45 Ra1! C5 46 Ra6+) 45 Ra1 C5. If 45 Ra2 then Kb6 and "the White Ro
short legs". Also, HEUBNER's short legs". Also, HEUBNER' ${ }^{\text {S }}$
suggestion 44 Rf4 c5 45 Re4 Rd6 gives suggestion 44 Rf 4 c 545 Re4 Rad no escape] The game continued.. no escape] The game continued....
43 Rh5 Kd6 [ Only now TIMMAN realises that $43 . . . \operatorname{Re} 244 \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{Re} 145 \mathrm{Rf} 2$ !Re5 that $43 . . . \mathrm{Re} 244 \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{Re} 145 \mathrm{Rf} 2$ !Re5
$46 \mathrm{Re} 5+\mathrm{Ke} 547 \mathrm{Ke} 3$ leads to a dead pawn endgame.] 44 Rf 3 Rc 5 45 Rh6+
 $\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{Kd} & 46 \mathrm{Ke} & \mathrm{Kc} 4 & 47 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{~Kb} 3 \\ \mathrm{~Kb} 2 & 49 & \mathrm{Kd} 1 & \mathrm{Rc} 1+ \\ 50 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 2+\end{array}$ [Black is trying everything possible [Black is trying everything possible forward!] 51 Kd 1 Rc 3 5 Kd2 Rc2+ 53 Kd1 Rc4 54 Kd2 c5 55 Rds? [ Now it is HEUBNER who makes the mistake! Here 55 Rb6+ leads to a draw - 55...Rb4 56 Rc6 c4 57 Rc8 Kb3 58 Kc 1 Rb7 59 Kb 1 and HORT claims that this position is known as a theoretical draw. I do not know how many chess players know this type of endgame or are familiar with this position?]

55 . . .Rc2+ $56 \mathrm{Kd} 1 \mathrm{c} 457 \mathrm{Rb} 5+\mathrm{Kc} 3 \quad 58 \mathrm{Rh} 5$ Rg2 The White King is on the wrong side and HEUBNER resigned.
Endgames are difficult to play without good knowledge, and even top players make mistakes especially in Rook and pawns endgames. I have in my possession a rather long article by Paul KERES, printed in the Estonian language, and to my knowledge never previously translated into other languages. I wonder why. I believe it to be a great contribution to endgame theory written about 1974 just prior to his death. From here on in it is Paul KERES analysis and my translation.
The endgame is known as one of the most important parts of chess, where achieved advantages are realised. There are fewer pieces on the board, positions seem sinple, and often it is possible to analyse possible hidaen complicaur to the end result. preference for spending time on the openings and midale game, are the reasons onals do not play' endgames well. We onals do not play endgames well. We endgames with Rook and a few pawns, where endgalyses are not easy irrespective of the simple look of the positions.
We begin with the famous position from World Champion Prof. Dr LASKER.
Diagram 1 E.IASKER Dt.Wochenschach 1890


At first glance the position seems to be drawish. How can White achieve an advantage? When the White King moves away from his pawn, Black will check and then return to attack White's pawn again. Black's advanced pawn on h2 prevents the White Rook from defending his King from checks. White has still an interesting and instructive winning manoeuvre.

1 Kb8! Rb2+ 2 Ka8 Rc2 3 Rh6+Ka5 The Black King does better when it stays on the a file so that its Rook 3...Kb5 4 Kb7 wins inmediately 4 Kb7 Pb2t 5 Ka7 Rc 6 Ph5 1 . By repeating the previous manoeuvre White forces his opponent's King down another square. Visibly, nothing decisive has been achieved. The same manoeuvre must be repeated.
$7 \mathrm{~Kb} 7 \mathrm{Rb} 2+8$ Ra6 Rc2 9 Rh4+ Ka3
The Black King is forced back far enough for White to begin the decisive manceuvre.

## $10 \mathrm{~Kb} 6 \mathrm{Rb} 2+$

## 13 Rh2! and White wins

This endgame of LASKER's is well known and very instructive, but has it also a practical use? It is unlikely that in a practical game we would get exactly the same position. In answering this question, one can safely say that LASKER's manoeuvre has not only theoretical, but also practical use. A good example is shown in Diagram 2 It happened in the game OPOCHENSKY KERES Olympiad 1939 Beunos Aires.

Diagram


The position here is clearly different from LASKER's endgame. Black has an extra pawn and White's Rook is in a stalemate position. But both plesitions have sasic sinarities. Black wins by using the same idea
White continued here 1 Ka4?
From our point of view it is unimport ant that phite nissed a draw with an interesting variation. Rgo . If now 1...c2+ $2 \mathrm{Ka} 2!$ (not 2 Ka4? Rh7 etc)

Kd4 $6 \mathrm{Rg} 4+$ and Black is forced to move Kd4 6 Rg 4 and Black is is esily obtoined Neither does the following variation help; 1 Rh7 $2 \mathrm{Rg} 1+\mathrm{Kd} 23 \mathrm{Rg} 2+\mathrm{Ke} 14 \mathrm{Rc} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 75 \mathrm{~Kb} 4!$ a3 6 Rc 3 a 27 Ra 3 etc - draw. $]$
1 ...c2 2 Ka
[In the game OPOCHENSKY played 2 Rg8 and was forced to resign after the
sinple 2...Rh7 3 Kb 3 Kb 1.
After Ka5 Black's problems are somewhat more complicated. Knowing LASKER's manoeuvre, it is not difficult!]
2...Kb2

Here it is interesting to note that because the White Rook is in a stalemate position in front of i.ts passed pawn, on zugswang that is another winning idea based LASKER's manoeuvre. Black plays 2
Rh4! Whiteure. Black plays 2 the b file so after 3 Ka6 Rh5 King to the b file so after 3 Ka6 Rh5 4 Ka 7 Kb 5 Rb8+ Ka3 6 Rc8 Rh7+ etc with an easy win.]

## 3 Rb8+ Ka3 4 Rc8 Rh5 +5 Ra6 Kb3

All continues as in LASKER's endgame. Now the threat is Rh7, forcing White to check again.
6 Rb8+ Ka4 7 Rc8 Rh6+ 8 Ka7 Rh7+ and Black wins easily.
So far, the possibilities examined have been comparitively simple and easily understood, but the finesses in the position are not finished yet. Let's presume that White did not find the saving possibility 1 Rg 8 ! and he did not instead played 1 Ka2 1 Ka4?, but wnstead played we have a new interesting position as in problems is in Here White has the same KERES. The position is changed by reversing the colours.

Diagran
3

P.KERES "CHESS" 1940
[How will White advance his passed c pawn? First we look at the straightforward try. 1 Rh3 Ka7 2 Rh8 (White cannot recreate the starting position with 2 Rh6 as then Black will not play ...Ka8? but 2 (Here the defer 2 ....... not sufficient $\mathrm{Rg} 8+5 \mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{Rg} 7+6 \mathrm{Kf} 6 \mathrm{Cor}$. 50 Kd6 threatening Kd6 - c5-b6 Otc) 3 Ra8+ Kb5 4 Rb + Ka5 Rb 2

It seems that White has achieved his objective as the threat 6 Kb 7 cannot be defended. In reality, Black saves himself with a fine defensive manoeuvre 5...Ka4 $6 \mathrm{~Kb} 7 \mathrm{Ka} 3!$ If now 7 c 7 then $7 \ldots \mathrm{~Kb} 28 \mathrm{c} 8=\mathrm{Q} \mathrm{Rb} 1$ ! and now it is White who will look for saving perpetual checks We realise now that White will not so simply reach his goal.]
$1 \mathrm{Kc} 8!$
[With this move White is taking advantage of the fact that $1 \ldots$ Rc1 2 c7 creates a mate threat by Ra6 and wins the $h$ pawn. Also bad is $1 \ldots \mathrm{Rg} 12 \mathrm{Rh} 2 \mathrm{Rg} 8+3 \mathrm{Kc} 7$ and the King will get to b6.]
1...Ka7 2 Rh7+!
[A necessary finesse to free escaping squares for his King in case of checks from the slas. Ahter 2 cl? Black will get the draw by 2...Rg1! as previously demonstrated.
2...Ka8
[The same position as in the main variation will happen after 2... Ка6 3 c 7 Ka7, where Black will not save himself etc., as in LASKER's variation.]
etc. ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{Ka} 7$
[After 3...Rg1, White wins with 4 Kd7 Rd1+ $5 \mathrm{Kc} 6 \mathrm{Rc} 1+6 \mathrm{~Kb} 6 \mathrm{Rb} 1+7 \mathrm{Ka} 6$ etc] 4 a6!
[This advance is important to prevent 4...Rg1. If now 4...Rg1 there follows $5 \mathrm{Rh} 2 \mathrm{Rg} 8+6 \mathrm{Kd7} \mathrm{Rg} 7+7 \mathrm{Kd} 6 \mathrm{Rg} 6+8 \mathrm{Kd5}$ $5 \mathrm{Rh} 2 \mathrm{Rg} 8+6 \mathrm{Ka7} \mathrm{Rg} 7+7 \mathrm{Kdb} \mathrm{Rgb}+8 \mathrm{Kds}$ 12 Rhs with 13 Rc 6 and White wins by going back with his King to the pawns] 4...Ka8
[After 4....Ka6 5 Kb 8 we have the main lifter
5 Rh6
[Any other waiting move is also good except 5 Rh8]

## 5...Ka7 6 Rh8! Ka6

[ Now Black is forced to capture as after 6...Ka8,7 Kd7+ etc wins for White. From this point in the text, the combination is known to us from LASKER's manoeuvre.] $7 \mathrm{~Kb} 8 \mathrm{Rb} 1+8 \quad \mathrm{Ka} 8 \mathrm{Rc} 19 \mathrm{Rh} 6+\mathrm{Ka} 510$ $\mathrm{Kb} 7 \mathrm{Rb} 1+11 \mathrm{Ka} 7 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \quad 12 \mathrm{Rh} 5+\mathrm{Ka} 413$ Kb7 Rc1+ 14 Ka6 Rc1 15 Rh4+ Ka3 16 Kb6 Rb1+ $17 \mathrm{Ka} 5 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \quad 18 \mathrm{Rh} 3+\mathrm{Ka} 219$ Rh2+ and White has an easy win.
By comparison with LASKER's example, the preceding endgame was much longer and the solution was more complicated It could be assumed that the LASKER idea is now exhausted of all possibil ities, but it is interesting if we extend the idea by moving White's pawn
closer to the centre so that Black has more squares for his King to use and more mobility. Will LASKER's idea work again?

At first it seems that the idea is difficult to complete. For example, if White's pawn is on the d file, Black may place his King on the a file when in order to escape the checks, White must also go to the a file where he will be too far away to protect the pawn after Black plays...Rd1. By more detailed analysis we discover new unexpected possibilities for White which create serious defensive problems for Black. We start from Diagram 4.


Here the White pawn is on the e file but in spite of this White can achieve a decisive advantage. The position of Black's pawn, not on the second, but on the third rank is crucial as it allows White to vary his attacking possibilities White has one rank fewer to force Black's King in order to achieve LASKER's manoeuvre. In addition, White can protect his King from checks in some variations. We will now examine how the game could continue from Diagram 4. 1 Kä8 Rd3+ 2 Kc8 Re3 3 Rh6 [ To begin with all goes according to LASKER's manoeuvre, but here it is not so clear as Black's King cannot be so easily forced to the lower ranks. 3...KC5!
[The best square for the Black King. Bad is 3 ..Kd5 on account of Kd7. After 3 ...Kb5 4 Kd7 Rd3+ 5 Rd6! and
White Queens with check! After the text White continues with LASKER's system, forcing the Black King back another

## rank]

4 Kd7 Rd3+ 5 Kc 7
[Nothing can be gained by 5 Ke8 Re3! and if now 6 Rh8 then 6...Kd6! etc. LASKER's manoeuvre has to be repeated.]
5...Re3 6 Rh5 $+\mathrm{Kb} 4!$
[Now the Black King cannot stay on the c file, as after 6 ... Kc4 White repeats LASKER's manoeuvre with decisive
advantage: 7 Kd7 Rd3+ 8 Kc6 Re3 9 Rh4+ with 10 Rh3 to follow, winning]

## $7 \mathrm{Kd} 7 \mathrm{Rd} 3+8 \mathrm{Kc} 6 \mathrm{Re} 3$ !

[The Black pawn on the third rank prevents the check by 8...Rc3+ as after 9 Kb 6 Re 3 10 Rh4t and 11 Rh3 Black loses. The text means that White can gain nothing by defending the pawn with his King since Black checks on the d file and White has made no progress.
9 Rh4+!
[This check causes Black unpleasant problems. Naturally, the King cannot go to the third rank because of the 10 Rh 3 threat but he cannot feel comfortable on a5.]
9... Ka5 $10 \mathrm{KA6}$ Rd3+
[The threat was 11 Rh 3 etc. With 10 ...Kb6 Black could set a trap: 11 Rh3? Rh3 12 e $8=0 \mathrm{Rd} 3+$ with $13 .$. Re3+ to force a draw. Instead of 11Rh3? White's best continuation would be 11 Rh8 winning.]

11 Kc5! Re3
(Naturally, 11...Rc3+ is hopeless as White replies 12 Kd 4 Rc 813 Rh 3 and wins. Now White will use the mate position the Black King on the sideof the 12 Rh3!
White wins, as after 12 ...Re7 comes 13 Ra3 mate. After 12 ...Re5+ 13 Kd6 it is an easy win. A pleasing combination.]

From this example we can see that LASKER's idea can be used even in more complicated positions. Here it is only one of the methods used by White to gain victory.

This is the first of several articles from KERES promised with translation, by IM Ortvin SARAPU. Other publications may feel free to make use of the material which is free of copyright.

## CHESS MAGIC!

Lev APTEKAR who provided this delightful study says that it is known in Russia as "The Iron Cage". Evidently a tale of a powerful and ruthless overlord who delighted in tormenting his victims provides a setting for a chess jewel.
Perhaps a reader can supply the complete story so that we can publish it along with the solution in a later issue! In the meantime the objective is to move as White in Diagram 1 to force the position shown in Diagram 2 .

Diagram 1
Diagram 2.



## DECEPTIVELY SIMPLE OR SIMPLY DECEPTIVE?

Try to solve these problems without use of a chess board. No solutions are provided in this issue. Lev APIEKAR has provided six cases where hidden resources either save or win the day!

3. White to move and draw

4. White to move and win Study by J.FRIT"


2 White to move and win Study by POCOSIANTS


4 White to move and win Study by GURGENIDZE.


6 White to move and win. Study by POSOSIANTS.


## ATTENTION

We need your material to keep the magazine alive and interesting.

Do not wait to be asked for a contribution about your club's activities. Send one in right after the event. Make a habit of asking the tournament winner to annotate a couple of his 'best games' "for the magazine". Have the Club Secretary or the D.O.P (or anyone else, but SOMBONE!) write up a brief account of the tournament, highlighting interesting games and make sure the game score of those games is included with the report. Don't hoard those game scores,

## CONTRIBUTORS!

send the best of them to us!
We prefer annotated games in algebraic notation but more importantly the scores must be CLFAR. Check those scoresheets for accuracy before you send them for publication. Provide a diagram sketch if you can or at least say where you would like them to be. Typed reports are best but if you send a handwritten report be sure it is legible. Use only one side of the paper to ensure that the gem on page 2 is not missed.
Finally, don't forget to sign the report or at least indicate who wrote it We like to give credit where it is due.


