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Following the Official Recommendation by the British Chess
of Mephisto Chess Computers, we introduce to you the Monte Carlo and Academy, market leaders in the march of computer progress in the simulation of human thinking methods at the highest levels of chess.
BOTH have exceptional playing strength with tournament, blitz and other time controls plus special low levels for hobby players not wishing to be overwhelmed! Enjoy the luxury of wooden, fully auto-sensory boards and carved wood felted pieces, together with a full range of superb features, including analysis of any position with evaluation via information displays, memory save of game in progress, hint, position set-up and verification, problem solving, take back and full game replay.
In addition, the Academy has an exclusive training facility designed by Grandmaster Dr Helmut Pfleger to enable the serious player to improve his play in all departments of the game, especially to sharpen and extend his opening repertoire and evaluate both middle and endgame strategies. The Academy's own style of play can even be adjusted to maximise variety in preparing for different types of opposition.


Over 60 other models also in stock - the widest choice of chess computers in the UK including Mephisto, Fidelity, Novag, CXG, Saitek and Conchess. All at the most competitive prices. Full details from Countrywide Computers (0353) 740323.

Mail order a speciality - call us any day, g.Whan to 9.0 pom. Visitons welome Mon-Sat, a.Kham to 5.10 pmom . We are on the main Altiz3, opposite Station IUnd, $1 / 4$ miles west of the Antev/Alo Stretham roundabout Ample parking. Anst range of stock Cast range of suck - all leading models. (renernus part-exchange allowances - Repairs y of most make
Access/Visa welcome.

Victoria House 1 High Street Computers Where we offer you real choice Wilburton, Ely Cambs CB6 3RB太 (0353) 740323
(by Alan Borwell)
Firstly, an apology for the delay with this edition, due entirely to business and domestic demands on our time.

It was with great sadness that we learned of the sudden death on 17 th March of Jopie Mostert, beloved wife of ICCF President Henk Mostert, and we extend our deepest sympathy to him. Jople was an effervescent and talented lady and she will be sadly missed by all of her friends worldwide who have enfoyed her company and friendship at ICCF gatherings.

Scotland's CC players have excelled themselves in recent months with Ken McAlpine achleving his IM title and both Andrew Muir and Mary Inglis scoring $1 / 2$ norms towards their IM titles congratulations to all three of them!

Our International Invitation Tournaments to celebrate the 10 th anniversary of this magazine will have commenced before our next issue is published, as will the 3rd North Atlantic Team Tournament-details next time.

Don't forget the AGM on 10th June - please do your best to attend!

| INDEX OF CONTENTS |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Editorial | Page(s) | Page(s) |  |  |
| Secretarial Notes/AGM Notice | 1 | Book Review | 22 |  |
| Championship/Candidates 88/90 | 3 | Scottish Champs 87/89 | $23 / 30$ |  |
| Championship/Candidates 89/91 | 4 | Games Section | $31 / 49$ |  |
| Premiers/Majors/Quartets | $5 / 6$ | Sinning Continuations | 50 |  |
| Handicap/Openings | $7 / 8$ | Fedor Bohatirchuk Memorial | $51 / 54$ |  |
| Scottish CCA League 1988/9 | 9 | John Kellner Menorial | $56 / 57$ |  |
| Scottish CCA League 1989/90 | $10 / 11$ | International Reports | $58 / 61$ |  |
| Classic Games of Corres Chess | $12 / 13$ | Olympiad XI Prelins | $62 / 63$ |  |
| Centenary Final/Open Tourney | $14 / 16$ | European Tean Ch, Prelins | $64 / 67$ |  |
| Bits ' $n$ ' Pieces | $17 / 22$ | Uinning Cont Solutions ac | 68 |  |

It's mid season now and time to consider our AGM and where the Association is going from here. It is an urgent requirement that more people are prepared to help out the Association even in some small way. Some of the current issues being considered by the Executive are:

- the lack of Controllers, which is putting extra burden on existing office-bearers who are in charge of more than one event.
- the Constitution of the SCCA, and in particular the definition of Scottish nationality as it relates to our Association.
- how best to reach new areas of potential members and with what type of "advertising" campaign.
- how best to achieve full ICCF recognition for Scatland and the SCCA.

These are just a few of the issues under current consideration and if you want to make representations on these, or any other issue, then please come along to our AGM, official notification of which is set out below. If you cannot attend but feel you could support the SCCA by becoming a Controller (an excellent experience - if you have ever had any grievance against a Controller, see if you can do a better job!) then we want to hear from you now!

## HOTICE OF AIHOAL GEEERAL MEETIKG

The Association's Annual General Meeting will be held on Sunday 10th June 1990 at 2.30 pm at Chess Suppliers (Scotland) Ltd., 15 Hope Street, Glasgow (Near Central Station).

## Agenda

5. Election of Office-Bearers
6. President's Remarks
7. Minutes of Previous AGM
8. Election of Auditor
9. Secretary's Report
10. Subscriptions

8, Any other business
If anyone wishes to raise any item of business, notification should be in the hands of the Secretary at least 2 weeks before the meeting.

CHAMPIONSHIP B8-90 Controller; A Maxvell

| Io. |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | B | 0 | 10 | Pts |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | C R BEECHAM | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | 0 |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  |  |
| 2 | G H BIRD |  | $\bullet$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |
| 3 | M T DYER |  | 1 | $\bullet$ | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ |  |
| 4 | R KILPATRICK |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $\bullet$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  |
| 5 | G D PYRICH | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | $\bullet$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ |  |
| 6 | I REEMAN |  | $1 / 2$ |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ | $\bullet$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ |  |
| 7 | M ROSS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | G R SPROTT | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $\bullet$ | $1 / 2$ |  |  |
| 9 | JAB STEVBNSON | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $\bullet$ | $1 / 2$ |  |
| 10 | G B WALLWORK |  |  | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ | $\bullet$ |  |

CANDIDATES 88-90 Controller: CRBeechan

| Io. |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | C | BOYLE | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $71 / 2$ |
| 2 | R | DICKSON | 0 | - |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 3 | K | FRYER | 0 |  | - |  | 1 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 4 | 5 | GOVLAND | 1 | 1 |  | - | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 0 |  | 1 |  |
| 5 | D | HARVEY | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 5 |
| 6 | J | M HERRIES | 0 | 1/2 |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ | - | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  |
| 7 | I | A MARKS | 0 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ | 0 | /12 | - | O | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 8 | H | McBETH | 0 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ | 0 | /12 | 1 | - | 1/2 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 9 | P | Mcgovan | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | - | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| 10 | J | W McINTYRE | 1/2 |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |  |
| 11 | A | TAMKEL | 0 |  |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - |  |

Entries ta Scottish CCA quartets and Handicap events can be made at any time, with games starting as soon as opponents can be arranged. All other individual tournaments and the SCCA League begin towards the end of each year, with entries to reach our Secretary, Alan Hind, by mid-October.

CHAMPIONSHIP 89-91 Controller: A Maxwell

| Io. | I | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Pts |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | A KILPATRICK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | G D PYRICH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | J A B STEVENSON |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | M J MOOHAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | D HARVEY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | I S CAMPBELL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | C F BOYLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T J CRAIG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | A T HISLOP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## CANDIDATES 89-91

| $\mathbf{I o}$ |  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Pts |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | N DOWN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | S GOWLAND |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | S L CLARK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | M MCBETH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | M COOPER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | D A GIBB |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | I A MARKS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | I AIRD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 9 | T THOMSON |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |

PREMIER TOURNAMENTS
Controller: Sections A-C ; I S Campbell; Sections D/E : R S Montgomery

| A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Pts |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | RA GIULIAN | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | M MITCHELL |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | RJ BURRIDGE |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | B GOODWIN |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |
| 5 | JM HERRIES |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| 6 | UM COOK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| B | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Pts |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | NR MCEWAN | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | JS CAIRNEY |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | SR MITCHELL |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | AWI CAMPBELL |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |
| 5 | G REID |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | KD ANDERSON |  |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |



MAJOR TOURNAMENTS Controller: Sections A/B : C A Macgregor

Sections C/D ; G W G Livie


## QUARTETS 1989-90

(Controller - Ian W S Mitchel1)


| 0141 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Pts |  |  | Q142 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 R BEACON | - | 00 |  | 1 |  | 1 | H | 1 McKEAN | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | 0 |  |
| 2 M H DUNN | 11 | - |  |  |  | 2 | D | D G PARSONS |  | $\bigcirc$ | 00 | 00 |  |
| 3 C C McKAY |  |  | - | 11 |  | 3 | J | J PARKER |  | 11 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 |  |
| 4 D SALTER | 0 |  | 00 | $\bullet$ |  | 4 | D | S SALTER | 1 | 11 | 0 | - |  |



| Q145 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Pts |  |  | Q14 | 46 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 M MITCHELL | - |  |  |  |  |  | A | A 1 | MacKay | - |  |  | - |  |
| 2 J S CAIRNEY |  | - |  |  |  |  | E | $E$ A | A BAILEY |  | - |  | - |  |
| 3 S R CAPSEY |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | D R | R CUMMING |  |  | - | - |  |
| 4 D G McROBERTS |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | McGARVA | - | - | - | - | $w / 0$ |


| 0147 |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | Pts |  |  | Q148 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 H McKEAN | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | D R R ELLIS | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2 P J JACKSON |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | M D HOOD |  | - |  |  |  |
| 3 J G BLENCOWE |  |  | - |  |  |  | C | C DONKIN |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
| 4 K J GROSE |  |  |  | - |  |  | A | A ARMSTRONG |  |  |  | - |  |



## HANDICAP TOURNAMENT (by Allan Hislop)

The Handicap got off to a late start in December with 30 players taking part in nearly 100 games starting the new season. I have had requests to show the lay out of the Handicap and this seems sensible since details of all other competitions are published in the Magazine. The table below shows the players in their classes and who they are playing, together with the number of games they requested. The Handicap No, is used by the Controller for pairings and records purposes only in the Handicap itself. A " + " sign at games required means a player has applied for more games since the start of the season and is awaiting further pairings (which hopefully will have been made by magazine date).

| Name | H/cap No | Games Reqd | Pairings/Opponents | H/cap No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class 1 |  |  |  |  |
| G Wallwork | 153 | 1 | 112 |  |
| G A Morton | 112 | 1 | 153 |  |
| Class 2 |  |  |  |  |
| D Harvey | 187 | 3 | 41, 208, 188 |  |
| J P Jack | 41 | 5 | 187, 208, 188, | 104, 113 |
| D Salter | 208 | 3 | 187, 41, 197 |  |
| R Beacon | 188 | $3+3$ | 187, 41, 197 |  |
| P McGowan | 157 | 3 | 112, 208, 188 |  |
| P J Jackson | 104 | 2 | 41, 113 |  |
| S Martin | 201 | 0 (lat |  |  |
| Class 3 |  |  |  |  |
| T Morrison | 113 | 5 | 41, 104, 128, 1 | 176, 193 |
| $K$ Andersan | 128 | 3 | 113, 176, 175 |  |
| Class 4 |  |  |  |  |
| A Armstrong | 176 | 5 | 128, 193, 113, | 175, 183 |
| S Young | 175 | 2 | 176, 128 |  |
| W McGlinchey | 123 | $2+1$ | 197, 188 |  |
| Class 5 |  |  |  |  |
| J Cassidy | 193 | 3 | $176,113,183$ |  |
| M Dunn | 183 | 3 | 207, 193, 176 |  |
| $R$ Ebdon | 207 | $3+3$ | 169, 197, 183 |  |
| M Mitchell | 169 | 2 | 207, 197 |  |
| D Cumming | 197 | $4+2$ | 169, 207, 134, | 165 |
| $V$ A Proudler | 134 | 3 | 202, 165, 197 |  |

# SCOTTISH CCA LEAGUE <br> (Controller : Alan Hind) 

Class 6

| F Ross | 165 | 4 | $134,202,200,197$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| J Taylor | 202 | 6 | $191,190,192,200,165,134$ |
| R Kilpatrick | 200 | 3 | $165,202,192$ |
| M Pearce | 192 | 3 | $202,200,191$ |
| R Pells | 190 | 5 | $202,206,205,204,203$ |
| H McKean | 191 | 3 | $192,206,202$ |
| B Milligan | 206 | 5 | $203,190,191,205,204$ |
| T A H Taylor | 205 | 2 | 190,206 |
| R Dowson | 204 | 1 | 206,190 |
| P Reynolds | 203 | 2 | 206,190 |

## OPENINGS TOURNAMENTS (by Alan Hind)

| Section 011 (Tchigorin's Defence) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | 1 | 2 | 3 | Pls | Pos |
| I J B Blencove | $\bullet$ | 10 | or | 1 | 2= |
| 26 Reid | 01 | - | 00 | 1 | 2: |
| 3 6 Vood | 11 | 11 | - | 4 | 1 |


| Section DT2(Nimzowitsch Defence) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |  | Pts | Pos |
| NA Down | - | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 8 | 1 |
| 20 V 6ibbs | 00 | - | 10 | OO | 11 | 3 | $3=$ |
| 3 - ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 6rant | 00 | O1 | - |  |  | 3 | 3: |
| 16 h horton | 00 | II | 11 | - |  | 6 | 2 |
| 5 6E Vallvork |  |  |  |  |  | - | N/0 |

## Section OT1 (Sicilian 2 c 3 )

|  | 1234 Pts Pos |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 D V Gibbs | - | 00 |  | 0 |  |  |
| 2 S M Young | 11 | - |  |  |  |  |
| 3 M A Ellis |  |  | - |  |  |  |
| 4 T Talbot | 11 |  |  | - |  |  |



> Please send games (preferably annotated) to Games Bditor:

## Douglas M. Bryson, 38 Duncryne Avenue, Mount Vernon,

Glasgow G32 ORQ.

The final result of last season's Championship was a triple tie between The Establishment, Streatham \& Brixton and Black Knight, each with 7/10 pts. Chess Suppliers "A" and Brutal Realism were relegated, being replaced in Division 1 by Perth Correspondents and Kirkcaldy Kings. Knights of the Square Table and Wandering Dragons "A" were promoted to Division 2 and Glasgow Polytechnic and Endgame were winners of Divisions 4A and 4B respectively.

| Adjudications for 1988/9 were: |  | FIIAL TABLES 1988/9 DIVISIOH 1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division 1 |  | $1=$ | BLACK KNI | GHT | 7 |
| RA Inglis 0 TJ Craig 1 |  |  | STREATHAM | \& BRIXTON | 7 |
| Division 3 |  | $1=$ | THE ESTAB | ISHMENT | 7 |
| A Swann 0 B Eley 1 |  | 4 | CROWWOOD |  | 4/2 |
| G Reid $1 / 2 \mathrm{R}$ Stokes $1 / 2$ |  | 5 | CHESS SUP | PLIERS "A" | 31/2 |
| A Nisbet $1 / 2$ N Down $1 / 2$ |  | 6 | BRUTAL RE | ALISM | 1 |
| FIHAL TABLES 1988/9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DIVISIOR 2 |  |  | DIVISIOI |  |  |
| 1 PERTH CORRESPONDENTS | 81/2 | 1 | kNiGHTS OF THE | square table | 9 |
| 2 KIRKCALDY KINGS | 712 | 2 | WANDERING | DRAGONS "A" | $61 / 2$ |
| 3 IRVINE | 7 | 3 | CROWWOOD | " ${ }^{\text {" }}$ | 6 |
| REAL TELECOM | 4 | 4 | KIRKINTIL | LOCH | $51 / 2$ |
| 5 CATHCART | 2 | 5 | PAISLEY Y | MCA "A" | $2 k$ |
| 6 DALMUIR | 1 | 6 | GOVAN KNI | GHTS | 1/2 |
| DIVISIOM 4A |  |  | DIVISION |  |  |
| 1 GLASGOW POLYTECHNIC | 10 | 1 | ENDGAME |  | 81/2 |
| 2 ABERDEEN | 8 | 2 | VICTORIA |  | 8 |
| 3 CHESS SUPPLIERS "B" | 4 | 3 | Wandering | DRAGONS "B" | 6 |
| $4=$ WANDERING DRAGONS "C" | 2 | 4 | WANDERING | DRAGONS "D" | 4 |
| $4=$ PAISLEY YMCA "B" | 2 | 5 | CROMDALE |  | $21 / 2$ |
| 6 CHESS SUPPLIERS "D" | 0 | 6 | SAUGHTON |  | 1 |

## FI耳AL TABLES 1988/9

 DIVISIOH 1$1=$ STREATHAM \& BRIXTON7731/21DIVISIOI 3ANDERING
CROWWOOD "B"6
PAISLEY YMCA "A" ..... $2 k$Colt$1 / 2$
DIVISION 4
磪 ..... 812
WANDERIUG DRAGONS "B"6saucha2k

|  | SION 1 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | CROWVOOD "A" |  | B | STREATHAK a BRIITOI |  |
| 1 | B Martin | v E1 | 1 | C A McNab | $v$ D1 |
| 2 | D Quinn | v D2 | 2 | S R Gillam | $v$ C2 |
| 3 | P Rodger | $\checkmark$ C3 | 3 | R A Inglis | $v$ F3 |
| 4 | $\checkmark$ Hulme | v B4 | 4 | Mrs M Inglis | v A4 |
| 5 | A Maxwell | v F5 | 5 | R Haldane | v E5 |
| C | BLACK KHIGHT |  | D | THE ESTABLISHMEHT |  |
| 1 | G R Sprott | $v$ F1 | 1 | T S Wickens | v B1 |
| 2 | I S Campbell | v B2 | 2 | C R Beecham | - A2 |
| 3 | 1 Reeman | v A3 | 3 | T J Craig | v E3 |
| 4 | T Johnston | v E4 | 4 | K Fryer | v F4 |
| 5 | G Wood | v D5 | 5 | A Hind | v C5 |
| E | KIRKCALDY KIIGS |  | F | PERTH CORRESPOIDEH |  |
| 1 | G D Pyrich | v A1 | 1 | A P Borwell | v C1 |
| 2 | A Burnett | v F2 | 2 | D A Gibb | $\checkmark$ E2 |
| 3 | I Marshall | $\checkmark$ D3 | 3 | W Rutherford | $\checkmark$ B3 |
| 4 | T Thomson | $\checkmark$ C4 | 4 | J Falconer | v D4 |
| 5 | M C Grayson | v B5 | 5 | P B Grant | v A5 |
|  | VISIOH 2 |  |  |  |  |
| A | IRVIIE |  | B | CATHCART |  |
| 1 | D Gillespie | v E1 | 1 | A Grant | v D1 |
| 2 | G McPeake | v D2 | 2 | A T Hislop | $\checkmark$ C2 |
| 3 | T Barrett | v C3 | 3 | 5 Freed | $\checkmark$ F3 |
| 4 | J Shankland | v B4 | 4 | J R G Linklater | $\checkmark$ A4 |
| 5 | G King | v F5 | 5 | D McRoberts | v E5 |
| C | VAEDERIEG DRAGONS | * ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | D | KNIGHTS OF THE Square T | table |
| 1 | S Gowland | $\checkmark$ F1 | 1 | B Eley | v B1 |
| 2 | D Crichton | v B2 | 2 | R V M Baxter | v A2 |
| 3 | C McKay | v A3 | 3 | T Upton | $\checkmark$ E3 |
| 4 | J Konarski | $v$ E4 | 4 | P Cassar o | $v$ F4 |
| 5 | H Nimmo | v D5 | 5 | N Down | $\checkmark \mathrm{C} 5$ |
| B | Brutal Realish |  | F | CHESS SUPPLIERS * ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| 1 | M Ross | $\checkmark$ A1 | 1 | A J Shaw | v C1 |
| 2 | P Coffield | $\checkmark$ F2 | 2 | G V G Livie | v E2 |
| 3 | J S Murray | v D3 | 3 | C F Boyle | $v$ B3 |
| 4 | B Keenan | v C4 | 4 | D M Livie I | $\checkmark$ D4 |
| 5 | A Thomson | v B5 | 5 | L R McKenzie | v A5 |

DIVISION 3

| A | KIRKIITILLOCH |  | B | CROVYOOD " ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A Swann | $v$ E1 | 1 | D L Gillesple | v D1 |
| 2 | R Turner | $\checkmark$ D2 | 2 | W J Hutchison | $\checkmark \mathrm{C} 2$ |
| 3 | P McConnell | $\checkmark$ C3 | 3 | R Henery | $\checkmark$ F3 |
| 4 | W Harper | $v$ B4 | 4 | C M Hutchison | $\checkmark$ A4 |
| 5 | D Blackett | $v$ F5 | 5 | R P Dunn | v E5 |
| C | glasgov Polytechil | C | D | EMDGAME |  |
| 1 | D Finnie | $v$ F1 | 1 | M Moohan | v B1 |
| 2 | A Tankel | $\checkmark \mathrm{B} 2$ | 2 | P Ferry | v A2 |
| 3 | $J$ Lindsay | $v$ A3 | 3 | A Kilgariff | v E3 |
| 4 | J Watson | v E4 | 4 | M McGhee | v F4 |
| 5 | $J$ Arnold | v D5 | 5 | M Mitchell | v C5 |
| B | VAIDERIIGG DRAGOIS | " ${ }^{\text {" }}$ | F | VICTORIA |  |
| 1 | D Laing | $\checkmark$ A1 | 1 | R E Clapham | $\checkmark \mathrm{Cl}$ |
| 2 | P McCarron 00 | v F2 | 2 | F Stevensan II | v E2 |
| 3 | C Donkin | $v$ D3 | 3 | J Anderson | $v$ B3 |
| 4 | P Young | v C4 | 4 | M Chalmers | $v$ D4 |
| 5 | C Dowle | v B5 | 5 | N Ferrie | v A5 |
| DIVISION 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | VAMDERIEG DRAGOES | ${ }^{*} \mathrm{C}^{\prime \prime}$ | B | SAUGHTOI |  |
| 1 | G Sanderson | v E1 | 1 | D Buchan | $v$ D1 |
| 2 | D Poots | $\checkmark$ D2 | 2 | $V$ McKenzle | $\checkmark$ C2 |
| 3 | Ms A Donkin | v C3 | 3 | B Morrice | $\checkmark$ F3 |
| 4 | C Stewart | v B4 | 4 | C McGuire | $\checkmark$ A4 |
| 5 | D Morgan | $\checkmark$ F5 | 5 | A H Ali | v E5 |
| c | KHIGHT SAC |  | D | HAVICK SUPERKIEGS |  |
| 1 | T Tait | v F1 | 1 | A Armstrong | $v$ B1 |
| 2 | P Tait | v B2 | 2 | $J$ Taylor | $\checkmark$ A2 |
| 3 | R Holland | v A3 | 3 | E Brewster | $\checkmark$ E3 |
| 4 | C Paterson | v E4 | 4 | B Milligan | $\checkmark$ F4 |
| 5 | R Stokes | v D5 | 5 | L Kilday | $v \mathrm{C} 5$ |
| E | ROCKY MEETS MARILYN MONROE |  | F | FLYIIG TEAPOTS |  |
| 1 | G Reid | $v$ A1 | 1 | R D Hirsch | v C1 |
| 2 | A Cowan | $v$ F2 | 2 | J E Fewkes | v E2 |
| 3 | L Stephenson | $v$ D3 | 3 | N W Savage | v B3 |
| 4 | $S$ A McDonald | $\checkmark$ C4 | 4 | M Nesbit | v D4 |
| 5 | R McDonald | $v$ B5 | 5 | D V Gibbs | v A5 |

## CLASSIC GAMES

OF CORRESPONDENCE

CHESSS
by John Hawkes ©
The winner is far less well-known than his opponent Gedeon BARCZA of Hungary.
F. BATIK of Czechoslovakia narrowly falled to quallfy for the first ever CC World Championship Final when he lost to the eventual runner-up to Purdy, Dr. Napolitano. In the next Candidates he made it, but only just, and not without controversy. He, Balogh and Koch all tied on 5 points and a cooked section was suspected. All three were allowed to play in the II Final where Batik had a poor result but did get revenge on the Itallan, and also won against the mightly Ragosin!

I World Champ, Prelims 1947-48
White: F. Batik
Black: G. Barcza
Sicilian; Scheveningen B85

| 1 | e4 | $\cdots$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 1 $\mathbf{1} 3$ | Fc6 |
| 3 | d4 | cxd4 |
| 4 | Exd4 | Hf6 |
| 5 | HC3 | d6 |
| 6 | Be2 | e6 |
| 7 | 0-0 | Be7 |
| 8 | Be3 |  |

In the World Championship match of 1926-27 Alekhine put his $Q B$ in flanchetto against Euwe.

| 8 | $\ldots .$. | a6 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | $\mathrm{f4}$ | $\mathrm{Qc7}$ |
| 10 | Qe1 | $\mathrm{Bd7}$ |
| 11 | Rd1 | $0-0$ |

## 21 耳xa8 Bc6



22 e7!!
A super zwischenzug slicing Black in two.

| 22 | $\ldots .$. | Rg8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23 | hxg3 | Bxa8 |
| 24 | Rxd4 |  |

If 24 Rxf7 Bd5 and Black could organise himself. The play calms down from here a little, but Black has no cohesive play.

| 24 | $\ldots .$. | f6 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 25 | a4 | Bc6 |  |
| 26 | axb5 | Bxb5 |  |
| 27 | c4 | Ba4 |  |
| 28 | c5 | Bb5 |  |
| 29 | Bxb5 | axb5 |  |
| 30 | Rd8 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| beautiful | study-11ke |  |  |
| tion is set up. |  |  |  |



30 ..... $\quad$ C6
31 Ral!
and Black resigned!


- Copyright John E. Hawkes.


## 茴



Douglas M. Bryson, 38 Duncryne Avenue, Mount Vernon,
Glasgow G32 ORQ.

After 5 years of competition and a great tussle in the Final, Ernie Wood from Manchester and Mark Thomas of Sottingham are joint winners of the Centenary Cup with $41 / 2 / 6$ points. In fact, both will be presented with a trophy and they will recelve prizemoney of approx 290 each. There are still a few games to be finished, but the maximum score of the remaining competitors is 4 pts.

|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Pts | Pos |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | J Copley (Shropshire) | $\bullet$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $31 / 2$ |  |
| 2 | E Vood (Manchester) | $1 / 2$ | . | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | $41 / 2$ | $1=$ |
| 3 | D Quinn (Greenock) | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1 |  |  |
| 4 A G B Bird (London) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 5 | K Thomas (Nottinghan) | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $41 / 2$ | $1=$ |
| 6 | V W Griffiths (Northampton) | $1 / 2$ | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 2 |  |
| 7 | D Meil (Carluke) | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |

(by Douglas Livie)

SCOTTISH OPEI TOUREAMETT SEMI-FIHALS



| Section C |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 A Kilgariff | - | 1 |  | - |  |  | 0 |  |
| 2 EE VRIGHT | - | - | 0 |  | - | - | - | - |
| 3 CP BOTHAII |  | 1 | - |  |  |  |  | 12 |
| 4 Jo ACKERS | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| 5 V DILUORTH |  | 1 |  |  | - | 1 | 1 |  |
| 6 R6 HaLKER |  | 1 |  | - | 0 | - |  |  |
| 7 GE VALLVORK | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |
| 8 P CASSAR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

2nd SCOTTISH OPEN TOURNAMENT
(Controller - Douglas Livie)

| Section 1 | 1234567 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pts | Section 2 |  |  |  | 34567 |  |  |  |  |  | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bullet$ | - |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | CF BOYLE | - |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 2 PB McADAM | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | w/o |  | DV GIBBS | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  | W/D |
| 3 C McKAY |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | AWI CAMPBELL |  |  | - |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |
| 4 CF BOYLE |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | MA SUYSTUN |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 GD PYRICH |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | 5 A MUKHERJEE |  | - | 1 |  | - | 1 |  |  |  |
| 6 A Macqueen | 0 | - |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | B MARTIN | 0 |  | 1/2 |  | $\bigcirc$ | - |  |  |  |
| 7 F MACGILCHRIST |  | - |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | D SALTER |  | - |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |


| 1 RJ BURRIDGE | - | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | DR CUMMIN |  | - |  |  |  |  | - | 0 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 P McCONNELL | $1 / 2$ | - | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 MACGILCH |  |  | - |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 3 DR CUMMING |  | - | - |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | CR BEECHA |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| 4 J COPLEY |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | AD KILGAR |  |  |  |  | . |  |  | 1/2 |  |
| 5 MT DYER |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | 5 DRUNSF |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |
| 6 R PELLS |  |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | J McLEAN | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ | 0 |  |
| 7 AGE BIRD |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | - |  |  | A HIND |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | - |  |



| Section 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 DV GlBBS | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | ${ }^{W} / 0$ |
| 2 M McBETH | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 J UATSON | - |  | - |  |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |
| 4 M PEARCE | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 G LYBURN | - |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| 6 A MacMILLEN | - |  | 1 |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |
| 7 K GORDON | - |  | 1/2 |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| 8 S GOWLAND | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |

Top two players from each section qualify for semi-finals.

| 1st prize | $\mathcal{L} 100.50$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2nd Prize | $\mathcal{L} 60.30$ |
| 3rd Prize | $\mathcal{L} 40.20$ |
| 4th Prize | $\mathcal{L} 20.10$ |

All section winners recelve 2 years' free magazine subscription.

ICCF INDIVIDUAL

TOURNAMENTS (by Alan Borwell)

Kenbers of the Scottish Correspondence Chess Association are eligible to compete in ICCP promotion tournaments, which are structured to encourage particlpation by C.C. players of all standards. You can choose between Vorld or European-only sections ranging upwards fron third class, second class to first class. Higher Class and Master Class events require evidence of C.C. playing strength with entries.

Tournaments are organised in 7 or 15 player sections, except Vorld III Class which is 7 -player only. They begin as soon (in theory) as entries have been received from seven different countries. Sometimes, in practice, there are two players from the same country, particularly from USSR or DDR. After you have selected a Class, you need to win a Section to be promoted and to score more than onethird of the pointa to avold relegationt
The entry fee of $\mathbf{2 3 . 5 0}$ (for $\mathbf{7}$-player groups) or $\mathbf{2 4 . 5 0}$ (for 15-player groups) should be made payable to BPCF and sent to Mr. Michael Anderson, 3 Vinterfleld Gardens, Duns, Berwickshire, TDIL 38Z.

Winning isn't everything, It's the only thing," Vince Lombardi, Green Bay Fackers' cuach, 1968

Well, Vince, I guess I'd agree with you, but you can't win 'em all. And if you can't win, the next best thing would have to be a draw. And if it's going to be a draw, it might as well be a DECENT one ...

White: Ian Marks
Black: Jochen Glosse (BRD)
EU/M/GT/291, 1988-89
QP Blumenfeld A57

| 1 | - 13 | - 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | d4 | c5 |
| 3 | d5 | e6 |
| 4 | c4 | b5 |

I thought the Blumenfeld Counter Gamblt was supposed to have a shaky reputation, although Lev Alburt has been getting good results with it recently. Come to think of 1t, Lev seems to get good results with ANY opening where he can ditch his bpawn. Let's see what the books have to say. Hmmm... lats of not-very-convincing $+=s$. Not much help.

Steinitz used to say that the best way to refute a sacrifice is to accept it, Let's see.

## 5 dxe6

"5 Bg5 provides a thorough refutation." (Reuben Fine) The midnight ofl failed to convince me.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
5 & \cdots & \text { fxe6 } \\
6 & \text { cxb5 }
\end{array}
$$

The good news is that I could actually recall a game with this line: Tarrasch Alekhine, Bad Pistyan 1922. The bad news is that Tarrasch was well and truly hoovered....

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
6 & \ldots & d 5 \\
7 & \text { e3 }
\end{array}
$$

If I had to do it all over again, I'd be tempted to try 7 Bf4 here, (a) to develop the B ; (b) to challenge the b8-h2 diagonal and (c) to shuck the book. But then I've seen what happens in this game.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
7 & \ldots . . & \text { Bd6 } \\
8 & \text { Hbic3 } & \text { Bb7 }
\end{array}
$$

There's a mystery here. In BCO 1, published in 1982, Ray Keene (or is it Garry K?) suggests $9 \ldots$ Nbd7 in a footnote to a $\pm$ main line, yet in AN OPENING REPERTOIRE FOR VHITE, published 2 years later, he makes Black play 9 ... dxe4, as in the BCO main line. Why? Did he forget to read his own book? Even in an October '89 annotation in CHESS LIFE, Jack Peters is still quoting a 1980 BrowneQuinteros game where Black took the P. I don't think Black should EVER play ... dxe4. That phalanx of pawns is worth its weight in gold, so why did Miguel do it? .. Nbd7 is a pretty obvious move. You don't need a book to find $1 t$.

## 10 exd5

10 ... d4 was a threat, since the Ra8 is defended after 11 e5 Bxf3 12 Qxf3 Nxe5. I don't know if exd5 is best. I'm feeling a bit uneasy.... At least it lifts the threat to the e-pawn and clarifies things in the centre.

| 10 | $\ldots .$, | exd5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | Be 2 | $0-0$ |
| 12 | $0-0$ | Qc7 |



Time to take stock. Black is 2 tempi ahead in development (6 cxb5 and 9 e4) with no weaknesses. My next move is designed to take measures against the storm clouds gathering on the K -side. Besides, there aren't that many other reasonable developing moves available.

## 13 Bg 5

After 4 days' thought. I wish there was something more incisive, but if there is, I can't find it.

| 13 | $\ldots$. | Rae8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | Rel | d4 |

Here we go. Why do I get the feeling I'm about to be mugged?

15 Nbl $\Delta$ Nc4!? Yes? No? On a4 it pressurises c5. Maybe I can get in b3 and Nb2 later. Maybe.

```
15 \.... [g4
```

16 Nxd4 Bxh2+ $17 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Bg} 1!!$ is a thing of beauty.

$$
16 \text {..... Rxe2 }
$$

No sweat. I'd analysed this

## 17 hxg4

17 Qxe2 Bxf3 18 gxf3 Nh2 is fun only for Black, The R is attacked and the $\mathrm{Bg}_{5}$ is hanging to ... Nxf3t.
"Suddenly all of my fences have broken,"
Belinda CarIisIe, "Runavay Horses"
One unforced possibility is 19 Be 7 (Bd2!?) Bxe7 20 Qxe7 Nxf3+ $21 \quad \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Q}$ 2 mate. Qe6+ doesn't seem to change things.

$$
17 \text {..... Rxf3 }
$$

... but not THIS. My initial reaction was how ta make it to move 20 and resign with minimum loss of face.

At least the position is analysable: if $I$ avoid $18 \mathrm{gxf} 3 \mathrm{Bh} 2+19 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qg} 3+$ or 19 Kh 1 Bxf3 mate I have a chance of playing on ...

## 18 Qxe2 He5

Now I have to avold $19 \mathrm{gxf3}$ Nxf3+ $20 \mathrm{Kg} 2 / \mathrm{h} 1 \quad$ Nxg5 + 21 Kg 1 Hh3 mate. I often see my opponent's threats. Especially when he's about to carry them out,

| 19 | Bh4 | d3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 | Qe1 | d2 |
| 21 | Qxd2 |  |

I WANTED rid of that P.


21 .....
Rh3
A pretty, if moderately obvious, shot. Now, apart from the postage-saver $22 \mathrm{gxh} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 3+$, I have to
avold the "programmed" $22 \mathrm{Bg} 3 \mathrm{Nf} 3+23 \mathrm{gxf3} \quad \mathrm{Bxf3}$ with doom on h1. This is getting easy. He's making all my decisions for me.
"To the vast majority of mankind nothing is more agreeable than to escape the need for mental exertion... To most people nothing is more troublesome than the effort of thinking,"

James Bryce
22 f4
A breather at last! Perhaps ... Rh3 wasn't the best?

22 ..... Rxh4
22 ... $\mathrm{Mf} 3+$ doesn't work.
23 fxe5
Time to take stock again,

I'm the exchange and 2 Ps up; the black $R$ is offside; the storm has abated.... I MUST be winning, right?
$23 \ldots .$. Bxe5
Oh. How I see that my intended 24 Rxc5 is met by 24 ... Bh2+ 25 Kf2 Qg3+ $26 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Qxg} 2+27 \mathrm{Rf} 2$ (Ke3 Qe4+ 28 Kf2 Bg3+!! It's THAT B again) $Q \times g^{4}+28$ Kd3 Qe4+ $29 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Be} 5+$.
"Foor naked wretches, whereso'er you are,
That bide the pelting of this pitiless storm,
How shall your houseless heads and unfed sides,
Your loop'd and window'd raggedness, defend you,
From seasons such as these?"
King Lear, III, iv,

I'm trying, Will, I'm trying.

## 24 耳хल5

Gets the $N$ back into play, attacks the Bb7 and covers lots of important light squares, especially e4. An additional threat is Ne6 $\Delta$ Rf8 mate. But it's Black's turn.

| 24 | $\ldots .$. | $\mathrm{Bh} 2+$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | Kf 2 | $\mathrm{Qg} 3+$ |
| 26 | Ke 2 | $\mathrm{Qxg} 4+$ |

To open up the 4th rank since ... Qxg2-e4 is no longer on.

```
27 Kd3 28 Ke 2
Qd4 +
```

$28 \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{Qxc} 5+29 \mathrm{~Kb} 1 \Delta Q \mathrm{Qd} 8$ mating, or Qxh4 is calmly refuted by 29 ... Qe7. Pity.

| 28 | $\cdots .$. | Q84+ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 29 | Kd 3 | Qd4+ |

## 30 KeZ

A draw! A draw! Thank You, Lord, for answering my prayers.

$$
30 \text {..... Qxd2t! }
$$

What do You mean, You didn't hear them!?

## 31 Kxd2 Bxg2

As if having to cope with OAE B wasn't enough... The Idea is that Black now wins back the exchange, leaving himself with 2 ENORMOUS runners on the $K$-side, plus B $v$ plodding $N$. As winning tries go, it's a good one, since Black has virtually no losing chances. Jochen shot up 5 places in my people's chart.

## 32 耳e6

I have to give back the exchange anyway. Best to do it by keeping an $R$ on f1 and getting in a threat of my own.

$$
32 \ldots . . \quad \text { Bxf1 }
$$

Killing both mating threats with one stone (33 Rc8 is no longer mate either!).

33 Rxf1
Objectively, this should probably be a draw. Subjectively, I can't take my eyes off those 2 guys on 87 and $\mathrm{h7}$...

$$
33 \text {...... Bd6 }
$$

$\Delta 34 \ldots$ Rb4, so...
34 Rf5 Be7
Mainly to stop Nc6, White's only threat.

35 Ke3

Black's Big Threat is ... Rh2t and Bf6t. Now it can be met by

| 35 | $\ldots .$. | Rh2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 36 | Rf2 | Rxf2 |
| 37 | $\mathrm{Kxf2}$ | $\mathrm{Kf7}$ |
| 38 | Hd4 |  |

$\Delta$ Nc6.


The WK strolls to the K-side and his counterpart strolls to the Q-side. Pity about General Custer on a7.

After that going-over I'm sure that Black must have missed a win somewhere, but I still haven't found anything conclusive. Maybe the $R$ sac wasn't so hot? The march of the d-pawn...?
"The aissing of chances is one of the aysteries of life,"

Sir Alf Ramsey


Editor - In lan's last article, we managed to make a couple of transcription errors and print a wrong diagran - our apologies.

BDCK REVIEW (by Alan Borwell)
The C3 Sicilian by Gary Lane. The Crowood Press, 27.95
A welcome addition to the openings theory repertaire, this 202-page nicely presented book contains detailed analysis and numerous diagrams of 40 complete games in this 1 mportant variation.

The Editor suggests that the best way to use the book is to select the variation which interests you, play through the relevant games fully, go back over the opening stages and examine the various alternatives and finally to keep a note of new material you discover.

Taking his advice as a regular player of the Sicilian, I looked for my favourite set up with black which is to play $e 6 / b 6$ and gain a strong hold on the d5 square. There are only 2 games in this line but, in one of them, black plays Ba6 rather than Bb7. However, the way the analysis is written has provided me with some ideas and surely this is the main benefit from any good openings book!

## $1987-89$

SCOTTISH CHAMPIONSHIP

## (by Ph1lip Giulian)

The 1987-89 Scottish Championship appeared to be one of the most open for years, with most of the players having realistic chances of winning. Undoubted favourite was Alan Shaw, but running Chess Suppliers is very time-consuming and at certain times of the year, this leaves Alan with virtually no time for his correspondence games. George Pyrich was the strongest over-the-board player in the Final and must have had excellent chances if only he could find a bit more consistency in his postal games. On 'normal' form, George Spratt was another possible winner and he seems to be improving recently. Add to this list, regular finalists Robert Kilpatrick and Gearge Livie as well as Tom Johnston, and it is easy to see how open the event was.

From the start of play, it was clear that Alan Shaw was determined that this was to be his championship. Most of his games followed the same pattern of a quiet positional opening, but as things developed Alan demonstrated a greater understanding of the middlegame. Despite his obvious superiority, Alan was not sure of the title until the last game was finished. A victory for George Sprott would have meant a tie between the two players.

Notes are by Alan Shaw.
Thite: A.J. Shaw
Black: G.R. Sprott 9 e4

QGD Slav D12

| Hf3 | d5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| c4 | c6 |
| d4 | dxc4 |
| e3 | Bg4 |
| Bxc4 | e6 |
| h3 | Bh5 |
| Hc3 | Hd7 |
| $0-0$ | Hgf6 |

In the game Ribli-Ljubojevic (Amsterdam 1986), Black chose $9 \quad \ldots \quad$ Bxf3 and play continued 10 Qxf3 Nb6 11 Qd3 Nxc4 12 Qxc4 Be7 13 Rd1 $0-0 \quad 14$ Be3 with a slight advantage for white.

I reached the same position In the Scottish League 1989 against Brian Martin who tried $9 \quad . . \quad \mathrm{Be} 7$ and we followed the game AntunacKovacevic, Yugoslavia 1975, with 10 Bg5 h6 11 Be3 $0-0$ 12 e5 Nd5 13 Nxd5. Brian then varied by recapturing with the e-pawn and White won quickly after 14 Be 2 f 5 15 Nh2 Bxe2 16 Qxe2 b6 17 Rad1 a5 18 Rd3 Nb8 19 Rc1 Na6 20 Bxh6! gxh6 21 Qh5 Bg5 22 Rg3 Ra7 23 h4 c5 24 Qxh6 1-0.

| 9 | $\ldots .$. | b5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | Bd3 | a6 |
| 11 | Qe2 |  |

Black has neglected his kingside development and this combined with his queenside pawn advances have provided White with an early target.

| 11 | $\ldots .$. | Be7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | e5 | Ed5 |
| 13 | lxd5 | cxd5 |
| 14 | a4 | Bxf3 |
| 15 | gxf3 | bxa4 |
| 16 | Rxa4 | $0-0$ |

Black wisely decides to give up a queenside pawn without a struggle, attempting instead to obtain counterplay against the white king.

| 17 | Rxa6 | Rxa6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | Bxa6 | f6 |

17 Rxa6
Rxa6
18 Bxa6
f6
19 14 $\quad 168$
$20 \quad \mathrm{Bb} 5$
To prevent the black knight and queen combining to put pressure on d4.

| 20 | $\ldots .$. | Qb6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | Qd3 | Yc6 |
| 22 | Bxc6 | Qxc6 |
| 23 | Bd2 | Qb6 |
| 24 | b4 | Rc8 |
| 25 | Ra1 |  |

Threatening Ra6.

| 25 | $\ldots .$. | Qc7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26 | Qa6 | Qd7 |
| 27 | b5 | Rc2 |
| 28 | b 6 | Rb2 |

If the bishop is captured the white b-pawn queens.

| 29 | $\mathrm{Qa7}$ | $\mathrm{Qe8}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 30 | $\mathrm{b7}$ | Bf 8 |

Saving a tempo over the immediate Qg6+.

| 31 | Qa8 | Qg6+ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | Kh 2 | Qd3 |

The blshop en prise for 5 moves still cannot be captured as the rook would be lost to 33 Qxf8+ Kxf8 34 b8Q+ Qe8 (any king move allows Ra7 mate) 35 Qb4t.

| 33 | b8Q | Rxb8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 34 | Qxb8 | Qxd2 |

## 35 Kg1 <br> Qxf4

49
Kd3

Best. If 35 ... Qxd4 36 Ra8 Qc5 37 Qe8 etc.

## 36 Qc8!

Not only attacking the pawn on e6, but preparing to defend all the weak points in the White position with Qc3.

| 36 | $\ldots .$. | Qg5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 37 | Kf1 | Qf5 |
| 38 | Qc3 | fxe 5 |
| 39 | dxe5 | 85 |
| 40 | Ra6 | Qb1t |
| 41 | Kg2 | Qe4+ |
| 42 | Qf3 | Qxe5 |
| 43 | Ra7 |  |

Forcing the exchange of queens and finally eliminating the threat of perpetual check.

| 43 | $\ldots .$. | Qf4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 44 | Qxf4 | gxf4 |
| 45 | Kf3 | h6 |
| 46 | Rd7 |  |

If 46 Kxf4 Bc5 47 Ra2 allows the black king to escape from its back rank 1mprisonment.

| 46 | $\ldots .$. | Bc5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 47 | Ke2 | Bf8 |
| 48 | f3 | h5 |

With the white pawns now safe from attack, the king sets out to join forces with the rook to force the win of material.

| 49 | ..... | h4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50 | Kd4 | Bg7+ |
| 51 | Kc5 | Bf8+ |
| 52 | Kc6 | Bb4 |
| 53 | Rb7 | Ba3 |
| 54 | Ra7 | Bf8 |
| 55 | Ra4 | Bh6 |
| 56 | Kd6 | Kf7 |
| 57 | Ke5 | $\mathrm{Bg} 7+$ |
| 58 | Kxf4 | Bc3 |
| 59 | $\mathrm{K}_{8} 5$ | Bf6+ |

I have often heard people say that they cannot understand how players lose at correspondence chess (not players themselves, of course!). Even with all the time in the world and being able to move the pieces, we are all human and prone to outbreaks of blindness. Alan Shaw was a worthy winner of the championship but he was the beneficiary of probably the worst blunder.

After 28 moves of his game $v$ Tom Johnston, the following clearly level position was reached.


The game continued $29 \mathrm{Rc} 7+$ ? Re7 30 Rxe7t?? Kxe? 31 f4 gxf4 $32 \quad$ gxf4 a5 and White resigns as the black pawns cannot be stopped.

Despite losing the critical last game to finish, George Sprott ended in clear second place. He had a fine win over George Pyrich (published in Magazine 31) but he also gained from an astonishing miscalculation by an opponent.

Notes are by George Sprott

White: A.T. Hislop
Black: G.R. Sprott
QG Accepted D21

| 1 | d4 | d5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Hf3 | 1f6 |
| 3 | $c 4$ | dxc4 |
| 4 | Hc3 | Bf5 |

Black plays it simply, avoiding the main line 4 ... a6 5 e4 b5 6 e5 Nd5 7 a4.

```
5 e3 e6
6 Bxc4 Ibd7
```

If $6 \quad \ldots \quad$ Nc6 $7 \quad \mathrm{Bb} 5$ favours White.

| 7 | $0-0$ | c 6 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | Rel | Be 7 |
| 9 | e 4 | Bg 4 |
| 10 | Be 3 | $0-0$ |

The pin on the $f 3$ knight threatens ... e5 and if White plays e5 instead, then Black has good chances after ... Nd5.

| 11 | h3 | Bh5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | Be2 | b5 |

The pin is broken, so Black switches to the $Q$-side hoping to open up lines there.

| 13 | a3 | a5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | Id2 | Bxe2 |
| 15 | Qxe2 | Qc7 |
| 16 | e5 | Id5 |

Championship－both games appeared in Bulletin No． 30.

| 4 | cxd5 | Exd5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | Bg2 | Hb6 |
| 6 | 胃3 |  |

Varying from the 6 d3 Be 7 7 Nh3 played by Norbert Otto（BRD）against me in WT／M／GT／239．That continued 7 （Nh3）Nc6 8 0－0 Be6 9 f4 Qd7 10 Nf2 exf4 11 Bxf4 $0-0$ 12 a3 f5 13 Nb5！？Rfe8 14 Bxc6 bxc6 15 Nc3 Nd5 with level chances（although later 1－0）．

| 6 | $\ldots \cdots$ | Hc6 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 7 | $0-0$ | Be7 |
| B | a3 | $0-0$ |
| 9 | b4 | Be6 |
| 10 | d3 |  |

Of course not 10 b 5 ？Nd4 11 Nxe5？Bb3 etc．

$$
10 \quad \ldots . . \quad a 5
$$

Improving on the 10 （d3） Nd4 11 Nd2 Nd5 12 Bb2 f6 played in the aforementioned game Norris－Pyrich．

| 11 | b5 | Id4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | 耳d2 | c6 |
| 13 | Rbl？！ |  |

Bb 2 as played by Alan Norris was better．

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
13 & \text { I.... } & \text { Id5 } \\
14 & \text { Mxd5 } & \text { cxd5 }
\end{array}
$$

$\begin{array}{lll}15 & \text { e3 }\end{array}$

With a very comfortable position for Black，I now expected 16 Bb2 f6 17 Qe 2 Qb6．Instead Douglas chose to hit out．

| 16 | Hf3 | f6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | d4？！ | e4 |
| 18 | $H d 2$ | a4！ |

Staking out a territorial advantage，Black＇s position now plays itself．

| 19 | Qe2 | Qb6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 | f3 | exf3 |
| 21 | Bxf3 | Rfc8 |
| 22 | Bb2 | Rd6 |
| 23 | Rfc1 | Qxb5 |

And the rest requires little comment．

| 24 | Rxc8＋ | Rxc8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | Bc1 | Qxe2 |
| 26 | Bxe2 | Bf5 |
| 27 | Ra1 | Kf7 |
| 28 | Bd1 | b5 |
| 29 | Bf3 | $\mathrm{Ke6}$ |
| 30 | Kf 2 | $\mathrm{Bd8}$ |
| 31 | $\mathrm{Bd1}$ | $\mathrm{Ba5}$ |
| 32 | $\mathrm{B4}$ | Bg 6 |
| 33 | Ke 2 | Bc 3 |
| 34 | Ra 2 | Bxd 4 |
|  | Resigns |  |

Sharing third place was Robert Kilpatrick who employed the Caro－Cann defence against George Livie．This is one of Black＇s most rellable openings．The idea is to set up a solid formation without weaknesses．In return，White obtains a space advantage and many players don＇t like defending Black＇s cramped position．

White：G．W．G．Livie
Black：R．Kilpatrick
Cara Kann B17

| 1 | e4 | c6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | d4 | d5 |
| 3 | Hc3 | dxe4 |
| 4 | Hxe4 | Bf5 |
| 5 | Hg3 | Bg6 |
| 6 | 耳f3 | Hd7 |
| 7 | h4 |  |

Gaining a space advantage on the kingside before exchanging bishops．

| 7 | $\ldots .$. | h6 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | h5 | Bh7 |
| 9 | Bd3 | Bxd3 |
| 10 | Qxd3 | e6 |
| 11 | Bd2 | Hgf6 |
| 12 | $0-0-0$ | Be7 |
| 13 | Qe2 |  |

All this is fairly standard． Now Black has a choice to make about where to castle． He decides to go kingside
and advance his a－pawn to create weaknesses in front of the white king．

| 13 | $\ldots .$. | a5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | Rhel | $0-0$ |
| 15 | He5 | a4？！ |

Presumably missing White＇s next move．Better is Re8．

16 Hg6！Re8
Of course not 16 ．．．fxg6 17 Qxe6＋Rf7 18 hxg6 winning．

## 17 Hze7t Qxe7

White has created a slight weakening of the black squares but now gets carried away．


Unfortunately $20 \quad 84 \quad$ a3 21 b3 Qxd4 22 Bxh6 Qxg4！？ （or Qa1t drawing） 23 Qxg4 Nog4 is quite playable for Black．

| 20 | $\ldots .$. | a3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | b3 | Qd5 |
| 22 | f3 | e5 |

Probably 22 ．．．Qxh5 is too risky because of Rh1．

Is this sound？Certainly White gets a strong attack after 23 ．．．gxh6 with moves like Nf5 and Qd2．However， Black has an easy way of obtaining an advantage． Simply．

| 23 | $\cdots .$. | Qxd4！ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 24 | Qxd4 | exd4 |
| 25 | B85 | c5 |

Black＇s strategy has worked out superbly．Now that the attack has petered out White is left with a weak $h$－ pawn，an off－side knight and weak black squares．

| 26 | g4 | Hd5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 27 | Bd2 | He5 |
| 28 | 85 | C4 |
| 29 | bxc4 | Hxc4 |
| 30 | Hf5 | Hxd2 |
| 31 | Kxd2 | Hc3 |
| 32 | Ra1 | Rxe1 |

Now White is hopelessly lost．He has to either lose his vital a－pawn or allow Black＇s rook into the attack． Meanwhite，his $k$－side attack is illusory．

| 33 | Rxe1 | 耳xa2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 34 | 86 | 耳c3 |
| 35 | 耳xd4 | Kd5 |
| 36 | Ra1 | Ra5 |

Threatening b5，

| 37 | Hb3 | Ra7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 38 | Re1 | Kf8 |
| 39 | f4？！ | Ra4 |

Not 39 ．．．Nxf4 40 Rf1．

| 40 | f5 | 耳f6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 41 | Yc5？！ | Ra5！ |
| 42 | Kb3 |  |

Now 42 Nxb7 Rb5 wins the knight．

| 42 | ．．．．． | Rxf5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 43 | gxf7 | b5 |
| 44 | Hd4 | Rxh5 |
| 45 | Hc6 | Kxf7 |
| 46 | Hb4 | 85 |
| 47 | Re3 | Rh4 |
| 48 | c3 | Rh2＋ |
| 49 | Kd3 | $8^{4}$ |
| 50 | c4 | a2 |
|  | Resigns |  |

## CHESS

Pergamon CHESS is a big， bright and colourful 32－page A4 magazine with top quality features written by masters worldwide，with regular articles on Opening Theory， Innovations，Endgames， Combinations，How Good is Your Chess，Conputer Chess， Prize Competitions，etc．

Each issue costs 21.75 （annual subscription 217.50 ） and is avallable from newsagents，established chess suppliers or direct from Pergamon Chess，Rallway Road， Sutton Coldfield，B73 6AZ， England．


Congratulations to Ken McAlpine who registered a final norm for the IM title in the European Town Teams Tournament．Another member of the Glasgow team，Andrew Mulr，registered his first norm，I hope to give further details of this tournament as soon as the final positions are available．

Those looking for an answer to 1 d4 might follow Simon Gillam＇s example with the Slav Defence．

He writes：＂In the last two seasons，although I have been concentrating on international games，I have still managed ten games a season in various domestic team competitions．

These team games require a different approach from international play．Solid draws are of limited value to the ambitious team．It is unreasonable to hope to outplay your opponent in the ending，when adjudication afflicts the game after only nine months．Something else must be done to boost the win percentage．

In some games it may be sufficient to play the latest opening theory to achleve a clear plus；some opponents may even mis－ handle well－known old lines． But against strong opponents it is necessary to head for unclear positions，trusting to luck or（preferably）to some home preparation．

In the last two seasons，my luck has mostly held，with eight wins each year．

One of the closest battles was the following effort, played on top board for Killingworth in the Postal Chess League, Division 2. The other game of the pair, in which I enjoyed a rather easter ride, appeared in the December 1989 issue of the magazine."

White: S R G1llam
Black: J A Dodgson
Slav Defence D17

| 1 | d4 | d5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | c4 | c6 |
| 3 | 1f3 | 畀6 |
| 4 | Ic3 | dxc4 |
| 5 | a4 | Bf5 |
| 6 | Ie5!? |  |

This is a good alternative to the standard 6 e3 e6 7 Bxc4 Bb4 $80-0$, with a slight plus for White.

$$
6 \text {..... e6 }
$$

This commits Black to the following plece sacrifice, The alternative is $6 \ldots$ Nbd7 7 Nxc4 Qc7 8 83 e5 9 dxe5 Nxe5 10 Bf4 Rd8 11 Qc1 Bd6 12 Nxd6+ Qxd6, which is now reckoned to be good for White because of the two bishops.

7 f3
Bb4
seems to be copying Karpov. In Pergamon Chess, November 1989, Malcolm Pein suggests the immediate 16 Qe3.
An old line was 10 Qf3 Qxd4 11 Qxf7t, with complications but now reckoned to lead to a draw.

| 10 | ..... | Qxd4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | Hxe4 | Qxe4 + |
| 12 | Qe2 | Bxd2+ |
| 13 | Kxd2 | Qd5 + |
| 14 | Kc2 | Ha6 |
| 15 | Hxc4 | $0-0-0$ |

This is now established as the main book line. In recent years 15 ... 0-0 has been tried in a few GM games, but is now thought to be rather good for White after 16 Qe5 Rfd8 17 Be 2 f 6 18 Qxd5 cxd5 19 Na5 Rac8+ 20 Kb 1 . This line is treated thoroughly by Malcolm Pein in Pergamon Chess of Dctober 1989. In these endings, the Black king is needed on the queenside.

## 16 Qe5

In this opening, both players have to keep on thinking about whether to swap queens. Since the queen-swap now seems drawish, why play 16 Qe5? I don't know, everyone just
if $\begin{array}{llll}16 & \ldots \ldots\end{array}$
17 Qe3
This was first played in GM chess by Karpov, instead of the drawish 17 Qxd5. But after the game John Dodgson told me that he had played it himself in a postal game in 1975/76.

$$
17 \text {..... }
$$

## Kb8!?

I found out later that this was a suggestion by Karpov in Informator 46 , but this seems to be its first outing in practice. From now on, I was on my own.

All the GM games in 1988 had seen $17 \quad \ldots$ c5. The recommended continuation is then 18 Kb3 Nb4 19 Rc1, with advantage to White as in Karpov-HJartarsson at Tilburg and Piket-Chandler at the Olympiad.

## 18 Be 2

I was lucky to avold one line given by Karpov: 18 Kb 3 Nc5+ 19 Ka3 Nxa4! 20 Kxa4 Qb5+ 21 Ka3 Qa6t, picking up the rook.

Another possibility is 18 Rc1. Karpov gives 18 ... Qf5 $+19 \mathrm{~Kb} 3 \mathrm{Nc} 5+20 \mathrm{Ka3} \mathrm{Nd} 3$ as "unclear". I was more worried about 18 ... b5, eg. $19 \mathrm{Na} 3 \mathrm{Nb} 4+20 \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Na} 2+$.

| 18 | W... | Qxg2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 19 | Rhg1 | Qxh2 |
| 20 | Rxg7 | Hb4t |
| 21 | Kb3 | Hd5 |



This is where Karpov's analysis ends, with the assessment "unclear". In my own analysis, $I$ could find no plans for White that gave any clear advantage, but I managed to spot and avold several clear losses.

```
22 Qf3 Hf4
23 Rel
```

The white attacks are too slow. If 23 Rh1 Nxe2 24 Rxh2 Nd4+ wins back the
queen with a decisive advantage. Or $23 \mathrm{Rxb} 7+$ Kxb7 24 Na5+ Kb8 25 Qxc6 Qg3+ $26 \mathrm{Kaz} \mathrm{Qg}^{7}$ and White has nothing clear.

| 23 | $\ldots .$. | Rhg8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 24 | Rxg8 | Rxg |
| 25 | Ka 2 | e 5 |

An alternative would be 25 ... Qg3, aiming to swap queens immediately.

```
26
```

Now White wants to keep the queens on, because only Black would have any winning chances with four pawns for the plece.

## $27 \ldots .$. Q86

The rook on el cannot be taken: 27 ... Qxel would lose to 28 Qxh7 Qb4 29 Qxg8+ Kc7 30 Qf7t, because 30 ... Kxd6 loses the queen to a skewer 31 Qf8+.

But Black has other passibilities - eg. 27 ... Nd5 or 27 ... Nxe2 or 27 ... Kc7 or 27 ... Rd8 none of which was I able to analyse to a clear outcome.

## 28 <br> Qb4 Rg7

This is the best defensive move. If 28 ... Qg7 29 Rg 1 Ng6 30 Ba6 b6 31 Qc4 is very good for White. Or if 28 ... b6 29 Qc4 is again very strong,


29 Hf5!?
This shouldn't win against best defence, but is probably the best practical try. If 29 Nxb7 Qf7+! 30 Bc4 Nd5 is good for Black. 29 Ba6 is also possible, but I could see nothing clear in that line.

$$
29 \quad \ldots . . \quad \text { Rd7 }
$$

If $29 \ldots$ Qxf5 30 Qf8 + Qc8 31 Qxg7 is clearly good for White. But what about 29 ... c5!? 30 Qxc5 Qxf5 31 Qf8t Qc8 32 Qxg7 Nxe2!

White then seems to have nothing better than allowing a perpetual check.

## 30 Qf8+ KC7 <br> 31 He 7 Qce!

The best square for the queen. If $31 \ldots \mathrm{Qg}^{3} 32 \mathrm{Qc} 8+$ Kb6 33 a5+! Kxa5 34 Qxd7 Qxe1 35 Qxb7 with the killing threat of $36 \mathrm{Nxc} 6+$ Alternatively, 31 ... Qe4 32 Qc8t Kb6 (or 32 ... Kd6 33 Qxd7+ Kxd7 $34 \mathrm{Bg} 4+$ wins) 33 Qxd7 Qxa4+ 34 Kbl Qe4t $35 \mathrm{Kc} 1 \mathrm{Nxe2}+36 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{wins}$.

## 32 Qc8t Kd6?

At last Black goes fatally astray. It was essential to play $32 \ldots$ Kb6. A possible continuation would be 33 Qxd7 Nxe2 34 Nd5+!? Kc5! (not 34 ... cxd5 35 Qb5+ Kc7 36 Rxe2 winning, nor $34 \ldots$ Ka5 35 Qc7t Kxa4 36 Qxb7! Qc4+ $37 \mathrm{Ka3}$ winning), when White has to enter a drawish ending.

```
33 Rd1+ Id5??
34 Rxd5+
```

Black resigned, because after $34 \ldots$ cxd5 35 Qxc2, the rook and pawns are no match for the queen and bishop.

The blunder on move 33 brought the game to an abrupt end. White would have been winning easily after 33 ... Qxdl $34 \mathrm{Nf5+}$ Ke6 35 Bxd1. Better resistance would have come from $33 \quad \ldots \quad$ Kc5 $34 \quad$ Qxd7 Qxa4+ (if 34 ... Nxe2 35 Qd6t Kb6 (35 ... Kc4 36 Qd2 is an easy endgame win) 36 Nd5+ Ka5 37 Qb4t mates) 35 Kb 1 Nxe2 $36 \mathrm{Qd6t}$ Kb6 $37 \mathrm{Nd} 5+\mathrm{Kb} 538 \mathrm{Nc} 7+\mathrm{Ka5}$ 39 Qc5t b5 40 Rd3! and White wins.

From the Scotland-Italy friendly international

Thite: G Santora
Black: $S$ R Gillam

Slav Defence D18
 Bxd3 11 Qxd3 $0-012$ Rd1

The main book line was $12 . .$. Qe7 13 e4 e5 14 Bg 5 , with some advantage to White. More recently we have seen $12 \ldots$ c5 13 d5 exd5 14 Nxd5 Nxd5 15 Qxd5 \$f6 with equality. But I like the look of 12 ... Qa5!?, not mentioned by the books,

In its first outing OTB, play continued 12 ... Qa5 13 e4 e5 14 B85 exd4 15 Bxf6 Nxf6, when Black already stands slightly better ( R Horner-SR Gillam, 1986).

A later postal game saw 12 ... Qa5 13 Bd2 Rfd8 14 Ne4 Nxe4 15 Qxe4 Nf6, and again Black is fine (C A Rinaldi - $S$ R Gillam, Argentina v Scotland, 86-89)

$$
10 \quad \ldots . . \quad \text { Bxe3!? }
$$

Black can also play 10 ... $0-0$, transposing back to the old main line (8 ... 0-0 9 Qe 2 Nbd7 10 e4 Bg6), which is slightly better for White.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
11 & \mathrm{bxc} 3 & \text { 耳xe4 } \\
12 & \mathrm{Ba} 3 & \text { 耳b6!? }
\end{array}
$$

The most popular line is $12 \ldots$ Qc7, but I did not fancy facing 13 Nh4!? Nxc3 14 Qe3 Nd5 15 Bxd5 cxd5
$16 \mathrm{f4}$. Why has this not been seen in any GM games?

| 13 | Bb3 | Qc7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | Rfc1 | $0-0-0$ |

This may be inaccurate. Probably Black should play 14 ... Nd7, to discourage 15 Ne5. After 14 ... Nd? 15 Qe3 0-0-0 16 a5 a6, White has reasonable play for the pawn (Vaganian Ljubojevic, Amsterdam 1986). In JM Tiplady-SR Gillam (County Postal 88-89), play from this position continued 17 Ne5 Nef6 18 h3 Nd5 19 Bxd5 exd5 20 Nxd7 Qxd7 21 Bc5 Rde8 22 Qg3 Re6 23 Re 1 Rhe8 24 f 3 . Although Black has solved all his problems, the opposite bishops and black square weaknesses leave negligible winning chances.

| 15 | He5 | Hd6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 | a5 | Hd7 |
| 17 | a6 | b6 |
| 18 | f4 | Hxe5 |
| 19 | fxe5 | He8 |
| 20 | Qf3 |  |

The position now looks very good for White. The pawn on a6 forces Black to be constantly vigilant for a sac on b6 or a mating attack on b7.

The knight on e8 has no good square. All this for only one pawn.

| 20 | $\ldots .$. | Kb 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | $\mathrm{Bb} 2 ?!$ | $\mathrm{f} 6!$ |

Taking the chance to break out. The position will still be difficult, but at least there will be some counterplay.

| 22 | Bxe6 | fxe5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23 | dxe5 | Qxe5 |
| 24 | Re1 |  |

Not 24 Qxc6?? Qe3+ 25 Kh 1 Be4 26 Qc4 Bxg2+ 27 Kxg2 Rd2+, mating.

| 24 | $\cdots .$. | Qc5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | Kh1 | Rd3 |
| 26 | Qf4 + | Qd6 |
| 27 | Qxd6+ | Mxd6 |
| 28 | Bg4 | Re8 |
| 29 | Rxe8 + | Ixe8 |
| 30 | c4 |  |



At first sight, Black seems to have emerged into the ending a safe pawn up. But White has ample counterplay. The pawn on a6 remains a constant threat, while the white rook may aim for e?

| 30 | $\ldots$ | Kc7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 31 | Re1 | Kd6 |
| 32 | Bf3 |  |

If $32 \mathrm{Be} 5+\mathrm{Kc} 533 \mathrm{Bb} 8 \mathrm{Ra} 3$ is fine for Black. The alternative 32 Re6+ Kc5 33 Re7 Nf6 34 Bxf6 gxf6 35 Rxa7 is enough to draw, but there is no rush.

| 32 | $\ldots \cdots$ | Mf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33 | Kg1 | h5?! |
| 34 | Be5t | Kc5 |
| 35 | Bxf6 | gxf6 |
| 36 | Re7 | Ra3 |
| 37 | Rxa7 |  |

Compared with the last note, the black kingside is weaker.

| 37 | $\ldots .$. | Bd3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 38 | Re7 | Rxa6 |
| 39 | Rxc6t | Kd4 |
| 40 | Kf2 |  |

The immediate captures seem to achieve nothing. If 40 Bxh5, then 40 ... Ralt 41 Kf 2 Bxc 4 is similar to the game. In the game or in this line, Black only has to
avoid 40 ... Bxc4?? 41 Rxc4. If 40 Rxf6, then Black can try 40 ... h4!?, hoping for 41 Rh6?? Ralt 42 Kf2 Rf1 mate, but 41 Rd6 + Kxc4 looks drawn again.

| 40 | $\ldots .$. | Ra2t |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 41 | $\mathrm{Kg}^{3}$ | Bxc4 |
| 42 | Rxb6 |  |

This leaves White a safe pawn up, but with no real winning chances. There would have been more play left after 42 Rxf6 b5, but Black should still draw.

| 42 | $\ldots .$. | Ke5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 43 | Bxh5 | Bd5 |
| 44 | Bf3 | Bxf3 |

Whichever way White recaptures, he is left with one of the least promising $\mathrm{R}+2 \mathrm{v} \mathrm{R}+1$ endings. He plays on for a few months, but eventually recognises the futility.

| 45 | Kxf3 | Ra3+ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 46 | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{g}} 4$ | Ra4+ |
| 47 | Kh3 | Kf5 |
| 48 | Rb8 | Kg6 |
| 49 | Rg8 ${ }^{+}$ | Kf7 |
| 50 | Rg4 | Ra3+ |
| 51 | $\mathrm{g}^{3}$ | Ra2 |
| 52 | Rf4 | Kg6 |
| 53 | $\mathrm{Rg}^{4+}$ | Kf5 |
| 54 | Rb4 | Kg 5 |
| 55 | Rb5+ | Kg6 |



In "Playing to Win", English GM James Plaskett claims it will saon be necessary to proscribe the Petroff Defence because of "the excrutiatingly bland middlegames it all too frequently generates". Tom Craig reckons it to be the ideal choice against the committed hacker.
"I"ll never forget my last game against Robert Inglis. We met in an 1976 interschool match on Board 1. It was my second last game for Dumfries Academy and our saddest hour. Robert's win against me with the Max Lange Attack was enough to see his team through, on board count, to the Scotsman Final. Thirteen years later, our next meeting is in another prestigious team event and from the outset we both knew that the destiny of the trophy would be heavily influenced by the outcome of our games."

SCCA League 1988/89
Thite: Robert Inglis (Streatham \& Brixton)
Black: Tom Craig
(The Establishment)
Petroff's Defence

| 1 | e4 e5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

The psychology behind my choice of this rather colourless defence, assumed that Robert would choose a lively variation creating the possibility of dynamic counter attacking chances.

3 d4
As White I have played 3 BC4 Nxe4 4 Nc3, and 3 Nxe5 d6 4 Nf3 Nxe4 5 Nc3 in previous correspondence games, but be warned I usually play the King's Gambit.

| 3 | $\cdots .$. | Hze4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | Bd3 | d5 |
| 5 | Kxe5 | Id7 |
| 6 | Qe2 |  |

> White can take a quick draw 6 Nxf7 Kxf7 7 Qh5 K Ke7 8 Qe2 Kf7, unless Black Wishes to chance $7 \ldots$ Ke6!?

$$
6 \text {..... 耳xe5 }
$$

| 7 | Bxe4 | dxe4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | Qxe4 | Be6 |
| 9 | Qxe5 |  |

I find that one of the main differences between correspondence and OTB is that in postal chess it is more tempting to grab material and try to methodically analyse away the gambiter's compensation.

```
9 .....
Qd7
10 सc3
```

10 Be3 0-0-0? 11 Qa5, Hort $v$ Short, West Germany, 1986 is a painful reminder of how quickly this line can go wrong for Black.

| 10 | $\ldots .$. | $0-0-0$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | Be3 | Bb4 |
| 12 | a3? |  |

A wasted move really. $120-0$ f6 $\quad 13$ Qf4 Bd6 14 Qf3 Bg4 15 Qd5 Bxh2+ $16 \mathrm{Kxh} 2 \mathrm{Qxd5}$ 17 Jxd5 and a draw was agreed between Unzicker and Rogoff at Amsterdam in 1980. I would have played 13 .. Bxc3.

```
12 ..... f6
13 Qg3
```

13 Qf4 may be better.

$$
13 \text {..... Bxc3t }
$$

14 ... Bc4 was an attractive possibility but the bishop may be better placed on the h7-b1 diagonal. $14 \ldots \mathrm{~Kb} 8$ to wait and see what White intended to do with his king, pins the black c-pawn. Moving either of the rooks before White commits his king would mean a redeployment of the rooks as a prerequisite to an attack.

## 15 h4

 Bf515 ... Bc4 is a reasonable alternative.

## 16 Kd2

16 0-0 is dangerous, 16 .. g5: 17 hxg5 h4.

| 16 | $\ldots .$. | Qa4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | Ra2 | Rd7 |
| 18 | Rb1 | C |
| 19 | Rab2 | Re8 |

This is an interesting position for those of you who use a chess computer to help you with your correspondence games. The machine would be obsessed with capturing White's apawn. (19 .," Qxa3 20 Qf3 B84 21 Qc6+! bxc6 22 Rb8t Kc7 23 Bf4t Rd6 $24 \quad$ R1b7 mate! - Games Ed.)

I was constantly assessing sacrificing on d4, but always hit against problems like 20 ... cxd4 21 cxd4 Rxd4+ 22 Kcl .

## 21 Qf4 Qc4!?

21 ... 85 ? 22 Qxf6.

| 22 | f3! | Be6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23 | Qe4 | Bf7 |



24 Qf5?
25 Qd3! keeps White in the game.

| 24 | $\ldots .$. | cxd4! |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 25 | Rxb7 |  |
| 25 | cxd4 | Rxe3! |
|  |  |  |
| 25 | $\ldots .$. | dxc34 |
| 26 | Ke1 | Rxe34 |

27 Kf2 Qxh4+

## White resigns

28 Kg1 Relt 29 Rxel Qxelt $30 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Qe} 5+$.


Regular contributor David Salter writes, "In recent months some of my chess positions have met with untimely deaths. They can be explained by factors such as over-adventurous opening plans, dubious development schemes or a touch of carelessness against competent opponents. The following game is a good (or bad?) example of strange early play which was soundly punished. However, it may provide some entertainment to those readers who tire of prolonged endgames."

SCCA Q141

Thite: Robert Beacon
Black: David Salter

Caro-Kann B13

| 1 | e4 | c6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | c4 | d5 |
| 3 | cxd5 | cxd5 |
| 4 | exd5 | Hf6 |
| Having | experienced |  |
| pleasant | sho |  |

With the Scandinavian Defence, I was nat keen to venture 4 ... Qxd5.

| 5 | Hc3 | Hxd5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | Hf3 | Hc6 |
| 7 | d4 | Bg4 |

More solid and theoretical is $7 \ldots$ e6. The start of my traubles?

```
Qb3
Bxf3
```

The pressure on b7 and $d 5$ forces my hand.

```
9 8xf3
```

White need not take risks with 9 Qxb7 Nxd4 when a wild situation takes shape.

| 9 | $\cdots .$. | Hxc3 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | bxc3 | Qc7 |

Exchanges haven't solved Black's problems. Now if $11 \ldots$ e6 12 Bf4 Qxf4 13 Qxb7 matters become unclear, especially if Black offers his a8 rook to the enemy queen. Instead 12 ... Bd6 13 Bxd6 Qxd6 14 Qxb7 0-0 might have been worth a try - White's pawn cover is poor.

11 ..... 0-0-0?!

The extraordinary Idea behind this position was to try to take advantage of White's uncastled king.


It becomes painfully and simply clear that White is not obliged to go for 13 dxe5 Qxe5+ $14 \mathrm{Be} 3 \mathrm{Bc5}$ or 13 0-0 exd4 which would give Black activity. Instead...

| 13 | Be6t | Kb8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | d5 | Ma5 |
| 15 | Qc2 | Hc4 |

Black's "check blindness" has meant that the central lines remain blocked White's B and QP impose great limitations.

17 Rg1 Rhf8
White now avolds 18 Rxg7? Nxe3 19 fxe3 Bh4t which loses a R. Also in Black's favour is 18 Qxh7 Nxe3 19 fxe3 Qxc3+.

## 18 Ke2

## Hxe3

Despite the earlier oversights, I was still trying for active play. Keeping the $\mathbb{N}$ in play might have been better.

```
19 fxe3 e4
20 Oxe4 Oxh2+
```

I put too much faith in this. The queen ends up strugging to find a useful square. 20 ... Qxc3 was rejected for fear of the open c-line.

```
21 Kd3 Qb2?
```

Desperate to follow up with an attack on c3 by ... Bf6. However, a $Q$ retreat does little to prevent White from building an attack down the open lines and advancing pawns.

## 23 Rxb7+! Ka8

Naturally 23 ... Kxb7 leads to such horrors as $24 \mathrm{~d} 6+$ Ka6 $25 \mathrm{Bc} 4+\mathrm{Kb} 626 \mathrm{Rb} 1+\mathrm{Ka} 5$ 27 Qd5+ etc.

## 24 Rb3

(24 d6! perhaps - Games Ed)

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
24 & \ldots . . & \text { Qde } \\
25 & \text { c4 } & \text { Rff }
\end{array}
$$

A last hope in the threat .. Rxe6 Qxe6 Qxe6 exploiting the pin.

```
26
2 7 ~ Q x f 3 ~ B f 6 +
```

A final flourish which does nothing to ward off Vhite's threatened p push.

```
28 Kd2
c5
Qh2+
```

Though 29 ... Qxe6 cannot be answered by 30 dxe6, there is the rather final $30 \mathrm{~d} 6++$ !

## 30 Kd3 Resigns

Vith nothing more to consider than lines such as $30 \quad \ldots \quad \mathrm{Rb} 8 \quad 31 \mathrm{~d} 6+\mathrm{Rb} 7$ 32 Qxb7 or Qf8+t, I hope some lessons have been learned!

The Sicilian Defence is considered Black's best opportunity of playing for a win. But is the opening suitable for postal play? With time to analyse his attack, I would guess that White has a very strong win percentage - Black is busted before his counterplay gets going.

Perhaps a Chessbase owner can give us the statistics of Vhite's chances in OTB and postal play against the Sicillan.

Mike Macleod from Stornoway annotates his win from the Lewis Postal Chess Champs.

White: M. Macleod
Black: R, Murray
Stcilian Sozin B87

| 1 | e4 | c5 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Hf3 | d6 |
| 3 | d4 | cxd4 |
| 4 | Hxd4 | Hf6 |
| 5 | Hc3 | a6 |
| 6 | Bc4 | e6 |
| 7 | Bb3 | b5 |
| 8 | $0-0$ | Bb7 |
| 9 | f4 | Hxe4 |
| 10 | 耳xe4 | Bxe4 |
| 11 | f5 |  |

The sequence 9 Be3 Nbd7 $\begin{array}{lllll}10 & \mathrm{f} 4 & \mathrm{~b} 4 & 11 & \text { Na4 } \\ \text { is more }\end{array}$
normal, and would have transposed into VelimirovicSuba, Pineralo 1987 (Informator $43 / 307$ ) which went 11 ... Bxe4 12 f5 e5 13 Ne6 fxe6 14 fxe6 Nb8 15 ㄲb6 and Black was under pressure. That was going to be the model for this game, but owing to a bad hangover I mixed up the move order. I discovered later that A. Burnett - S. Willetts, Dundee Major 1988, continued (with White earlier playing Be3 and Black Be7) 10 ... Nxe4 11 Nxe4 Bxe4 12 f5 e5 13 Ne6 fxe6 14 fxe6 Nc6 15 Qg4 Bg6 16 Bd5 Qc7 17 a4 b4 18 a5 Rc8 19 Bb6 Qb8 20 Be 4 and $1-0$ in 29.

## 11 ..... e5 <br> 12 If3

It is unclear whether the omission of Be 3 made Ne6 unsound, but without the plece sacrifice, White doesn't have quite enough for the pawn.

| 12 | $\ldots .$. | Be7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | Qe2 | Bc6 |
| 14 | Be3 | 耳d7 |
| 15 | Rad1 | Qc7 |

My opponent had a correspondence grading of over 2000, so I had not expected to be allowed back

Into the game. Maybe Black worried about 16 f 6 , but 15 ... 0-0 16 f6 Bxf6 17 Rxd6 Qc7 seems solid.



17 Kxf7 Kxf7
Best may be 17 ... 0-0: 18 Rxd5 Rxf7 <18 ... Bxd5 19 Bxd5 Rxf7 20 Bxa8) 19 Rdd1 is unclear, while $18 \mathrm{Ng} 5 \quad \mathrm{Bxg} 5 \quad 19 \quad \mathrm{Bxg} 5 \quad \mathrm{Qb} 7$ might be okay for Black.

# 18 Qh5 $\quad$ Kf8 <br> 19 Rxd5 Bg5 

This position is diabolical - the rook is a "can't take" since the ruinous ... 86 would be forced. Black's problem is, he must move both minor pleces off the second rank, but if 19 ... Hf6 20 Rd8 + Bxd8 (if 20 ... Be8 21 Qf7 is mate) $21 \mathrm{Bc} 5+$ 19 ... Bb4 20 Rd6 Nf6 21 Rxf6 (21 Rxc6 - Games Ed) $8 \times f 6 \quad 22 \mathrm{Bh} 6+\mathrm{Ke} 7$ 23 Qf7+ Kd8 24 Qxf6+ Kc8 25 Qxh8t is a form of opposite sides castling, but where Black is two pawns down. The text relieves the pressure on $f 7$, due to 20 Bxg5 Bxd5 21 Bxd5 Qc5t.

## 20 Qx85 <br> Bxd5

Probably the last chance was 20 ... Nf6: if 21 Bc5+ Ke8 22 Rd6, White's attack might run out of steam. After 22 ... Bd7 (22 ... Bxg2 23 Re6t intending 24 Bb6 and 22 ... Ne4 23 Re6t Kd7 $24 \mathrm{Re} 7+$ are both better for White) 23 Qxg7 Qxc5+ 24 Kh 1 Qxd6: if 25 Qxh8+ Qf8, while 1f $25 \mathrm{Bf} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 826 \mathrm{Qxh} 8+\mathrm{Ke} 7$ 27 Qg7 Kd8 and White cannot make progress $[23$ Qe3 Ng 4 24 Bf7t Kd8 (24 ... Kxf7 25 Qb3t Ke8 26 Re6t wins)

25 Qg5 + Kc8 26 b4 wins Games Ed].
21 Bxd5
Rc8
22 f6
$\mathrm{g}_{6}$

Or 22 ... Nxf6 23 Rxf6+ gxf6 24 Qxf6+ Ke8 25 Qe6+.

```
23 Qh6t
```



Raymond Burridge from Aberdeen won the Postal Shield last season - notes by the winner.

Postal Shield 1988-89
White: R Burridge
Black: A W I Campbell
Najdorf Poisoned Pawn B97

| 1 | e4 | c5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Hf3 | d6 |
| 3 | d4 4 | cxd4 |
| 4 | Hxd4 | Hf6 |
| 5 | Hc3 | a6 |
| 6 | B85 | e6 |
| 7 | f4 | Qb6 |
| 8 | Qd2 | Qxb2 |

Now White has a choice between the currently fashionable move 9 Rb 1 or the more restrained 9 Nb 3 .
$9 \quad \mathbf{H b 3} \quad$ Hc6

Black also has 9 ... Qa3 or 9 ... Nbd7!?
10 Bxf6 $\quad$ 8xf6

In John Nunn's book "Najdorf for the Tournament Player", he gives 11 Be 2 f 512 exf5 Bg 7 as the main line, favouring Black.

| 11 | $\ldots .$. | Qa3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | Hb6 | Rb8 |
| 13 | Hc4 | Qa4 |
| 14 | a3 | b5 |

Otherwise 15 Bd3 followed by Nb6 or b2.

| 15 | Kxd6t | Bxd6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 | Qxd6 | Qxe4+ |
| 17 | Be2! | Qd5 |

If $17 \ldots$ Qxg2 $18 \quad 0-0-0$ and Black's position is now precarious, eg. 18 ... Qxe2 then 19 Qxc6t with a Q check picking up Rb8. So if 18 ... Bb7 19 Qd7+ Kf8 20 Rhg1!! Qxe2 21 Qd6+ Ke8 (Ne7 22 Qd8+ Rxd8 23 RxR mate) 22 Nc5 with the idea of $\mathrm{Nxb7}$ and Qxc6, or $23 \mathbb{V d 7}$ $24 \mathrm{Nf} 6+$.

Back to reality!
$\begin{array}{lll}18 & \text { Qxd5 } & \text { exd5 } \\ 19 & 0-0-0 & \text { Be6 }\end{array}$

With a small advantage to White according to Boleslavsky. White has compensation for the pawn by active pleces and Black has a weak pawn structure.

| 20 | $\ldots .$. | b4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | a4 (!) | He 7 |
| 22 | Rhe1 | Rc8 |
| 23 | Id4 | Kd7? |
| 24 | f5 | Bxf5 |
| 25 | Hxf5 | Hxf5 |
| 26 | Bg 4 | Rc5 |
| 27 | Bxf5+ | Kc6 |

Although Black has 2 pawns for the bishop, his pawns are either isolated, doubled or easily blockaded, so White's plan is to set about attacking these pawns.

| 28 | Kb 2 | Kb 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 29 | Kb 3 | a 5 |
| 30 | $\mathrm{Re7}$ | Rg 8 |
| 31 | g 3 | h 5 |
| 32 | $\mathrm{Rxf7}$ | h 4 |
| 33 | $\mathrm{Rxf6+}$ | Kc 7 |
| 34 | $\mathrm{~g}^{4}$ | Re 8 |
| 35 | Be 6 | Resigns |
|  | 1 | 0 |

There must be hundreds of
postal games played by
Scottish players each year:
Fhy not share your experiences by annotating one for your magazine?

Please send to our Games Bditor.

The Wandering Dragons
9 f4
0-0

Postal Newsletter continues the Sicilian gloom.
"Earlier this year Tom Thomson became the first person to officially record a win against yours truly (Steve Gowland) when I lost on time in last season's SCCA Premier Tourney. Although I lost on time it is fair to say that I was decidedly worse off and would probably have lost anyway. That first defeat was followed by five other losses last season, bringing me down to Earth with a thump you might say! Thomson could probably have beaten me 2-0 after an unsound sac on my part, but incorrect defence allowed a crushing attack..."

SCCA Premier 1988-89

White: Steve Gowland
Black: Tom Thomson
Sicilian Sozin B87

| 1 | e4 | c5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | [ $\mathbf{f l}$ | d6 |
| 3 | d4 | cxd4 |
| 4 | 耳xd4 | 1f6 |
| 5 | He3 | a6 |
| 6 | BC4 | e6 |
| 7 | Bb3 | b5 |
| 8 | 0-0 | Be 7 |

## 10 f5

10 e5 is probably better.

| 10 | $\ldots .$. | b4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | fxe6?! | bxc3 |
| 12 | exf7t | Kh8 |
| 13 | bxc3 | Hxe4 |
| 14 | Bd5 | Hxc3 |
| 15 | Qf3 |  |

The time control is every 5 moves in the Premier and is a real pain in the neck. It was here that I lost the other game on time,

| 15 | ... | Hxd5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 | Qxd5 | Qb6 |
| 17 | Be3 | Bb7 |
| Leaving | White | with |

## 18 Qh5

Necessary, to keep the ffile open...

| 18 | $\ldots .$. | Bf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 19 | Rxf6 | Bxf6 |
| 20 | Re1!? |  |

White's last chance threatening mate!

Black sees only the $f 7$ pawn as a threat. 20 ... Qb4! looks best, saving a tempo.

| 21 | 耳f5 | Qd5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | Qg | Qxf7 |

Incredibly Black has nothing better!

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
23 & \text { Bh6 } & \text { Rg8 } \\
24 & \text { Re8! } & \text { Resigns }
\end{array}
$$

There are so many varlations passible after 22 Qg4 that I cannot give them all here. Anyway it's more fun if you work thell all out for yourself!

Hint: I looked at 22 ... Rxf7, 22 ... Qxg2t, 22 ... Qxf7 23 Bh6 Qg6, 22 ... Qxf5 etc.

## $\hat{\theta}$

Peter McCarron writes, "I enjoyed the following game because it isn't often you get a chance, to punch huge holes in your opponent's position with nothing but pawn moves! At least it proves one thing: even a 2215 player can put in the odd wobbly performance."

BCCS 1986-87
White: Peter McCarron (1750)
Black: Gordon Scholes (2215)
Sicillan Sozin B89

| 1 | e4 | $c 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Hf3 | d6 |
| 3 | d4 | cxd4 |
| 4 | Hxd4 | Hf6 |
| 5 | Hc3 | Hc6 |
| 6 | Bc4 | e6 |

This is the Sozin System

```
7 Be3 a6
8 Qe2
```

Another try is $80-0$. eg. 8 ... Na5?! 9 Bd3 Qc7 10 Qe2 $\begin{array}{lllllll}\mathrm{Be} 7 & 11 & \mathrm{f} 4 & \mathrm{~b} 5 & 12 & \mathrm{a} 3 \text { ! } & \mathrm{Bb} 7\end{array}$ 13 Rad1 followed by Kh1 and Bc1 with a slight pull.

| 8 | ..... | Qc7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 | 0-0-0 | Be 7 |
| 10 | Вb3 | Ha5 |
| 11 | $\mathrm{g}^{4}$ | b5 |
| 12 | $\mathrm{g}^{5}$ | Hxb3 + |
| 13 | axb3 | Hd7 |
| 14 | h4 | b4 |
| 14 | Ha4 | H05 |
| 16 | Kb1 | Bd7 |

16 ... Nxe4 is, as you'd expect, just too risky. Why?

| 17 | h5 | Bxa4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | bxa4 | Ixa4? |

Whaat? With Black's king still snoozing on e8, such an offside pawn snatch can hardly be good. I was starting to sniff an "upset" here...!

| 19 | g6! | Bf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 | gxf7 | Qxf7 |
| 21 | h6! | 86 |
| 22 | f4 | 耳c5 |
| 23 | e5 | Be7 |
| 24 | exd6 | Bxd6 |



25 55:
Hine successive pawn moves, and every one a hammer blow!

```
\begin{tabular}{lll}
25 & \(\ldots .\). & gxf5 \\
26 & Rhg1 & Resigns
\end{tabular}
```

Devoid of counterplay or king cover, Gordon didn't relish the impending brutality, so 1 guess you could call this an intelligent - if mildly irritating - resignation.
*10O CLUB**
This is a club for members who really would like to help with the development of the Scottish Correspondence Chess Association. Currently there are almost 80 units issued but we need to increase this to 100 - please help us!

The subscription is only $\& 1$ per month per unit, with two prizes each month currently approx $\dot{L 22}$ and $\mathcal{L 1 5}$ respectively - members may apply for more than one unit if they so wish!

A monthly bankers order form can be obtained from our Treasurer, George Pyrich, 53 Dunnikier Road, Kirkcaldy, Fife, KY1 2RL. If you return it to him before the 10 th of the month, then you will be eligible to be in the draw for that month.

Recent winners:
Hovember
1st C R Beecham
2nd A Hind December
1st GVG Livie
2nd A P Borwell January
1st G W G Livie
2nd GVG Livie February
1st G D Pyrich
2nd I Mackintosh

WHITE TO MOVE
Solutions on page 68


Streatham \& Brixton has been the top British postal chess team of the last decade. Since 1979, S\&B has taken the British Postal Chess Team Championship seven times. The club has also enjoyed success in the Scottish Correspondence Chess League.

But how did they get started? Who plays for them? Where are Streatham and Brixton? What are they doing in a Scottish competition? Read on .........

Streatham and Brixton are both in South London, in the inner London borough of Lambeth, on the A23 road to Croydon and Brighton. In the national press, Brixton is best known because of the riots in 1981, but Londoners are more likely to think of it as the southern end of the Victoria line on the tube, or as the home of the independent Ritzy cinema and one of the best street markets in London. The tabloids link Streatham with Madame Cyn and her luncheon voucher parties, while readers of the sports pages may know of the Streatham Redskins Ice Hockey team, but the locals of this pleasant leafy suburb are more likely to worry about how to afford the mortgage taken out after the house price boom.

Brixton Chess Club was a founder member of the Surrey League in 1884 and the London League in 1887. In the following 50 years, Brixton captured the Surrey trophy 12 times and the London League on three occasions. One of the leading players was the young Harry Golombek, who won the Surrey Individual Championship in 1931 at the age of 20.

In 1946, Brixton merged with the Streatham Club, which had been formed in 1918. Until the mid-1970s, the combined Streatham \& Brixton Club achieved little of note. Ray Keene was a member in the 1960 s, but left before he went on to international success and the GM title.

The Club's rise started in 1974 with Nigel Povah's return from university and election as Club President. This gave an infusion of new blood to the club, including two very young juniors that Nigel was coaching - Julian Hodgson and Danny King. In 1976, S\&B took the Surrey title for the first time, and won Division 2 of the London League. In 1977 the Surrey success was repeated, while the London League team won the top division.

The next major advance came in season $1981 / 82$, when $S \& B$ scored a London League and Cup double, under the captaincy of Andy Muir. This was not down to the arrival of any new stars, but the result of steady improvement by the top players. The top four - Jultan Hodgson, Glenn Flear, Danny King and Nigel Povah - had been with the club before they were rated over 200 (2200), but in 1981/82 were collecting numerous International Master norms. By the summer Nigel and Danny had completed their IM qualification.

The team spirit, engendered by playing success, efficient organisation and a good social side to the club, boosted the S\&B membership to over 100 players. Among the new members were Mark Hebden, Tony Kosten and Joe Gallagher, who all followed the club pattern by joining before they were IMs, then picking up norms galore.

The team peaked in 1984/85 with another London League and Cup double, then victory in the National Club Championship, scoring victories over Oxford and Cambridge Universities. By then six of the top seven had IM titles, and Joe followed soon after. Three of the victorious side - Glenn, Julian and Danny - have now gone on to attain the GM title, while others have several GM norms.

But this international success was a mixed blessing, as the players spent more of their time competing in Europe. The club rejoiced when Glenn won the 1986 GLC Kings Grandmaster tournament - taking a day off in the middle to get married but the resulting move northwards to find an affordable house meant that he was lost to the club teams. By 1988 Nigel was the only IM still able to turn out regularly for the club teams.

At the same time as $\mathrm{S} \& \mathrm{~B}$ was enfoying its advance in over-theboard play, the club took its first steps into the world of postal chess. The first captain was Mike Singleton, a regular competitor in the individual British Correspondence Championship. Victory in the 1977 BCCL Premier Division was followed by taking the 1978 BCCL Championship, then the 1979 British Postal Chess Team Championship (BPCTC).

In 1984 Mike handed over the captaincy to Tony Corkett, having taken four BPCTC titles in six seasons. The only blemishes on the record were in 1980, when Sutton Coldfield won on tie-break from the Civil Service and S\&B, and then 1984 when S\&B were second to the Inland Revenue.

Tony's team missed out in its first season, again finishing second to the Inland Revenue, but then captured three titles in a row. The 1989 result - 3rd equal - was relatively disappointing, but maintained the club's record of never finishing out of the top four.

Over the years, the team has usually managed to remain unchanged from year to year, using only 17 players in the eleven seasons. This process was assisted for a few years by the existence of a $B$ team, who also managed to reach the BPCTC,

The best season was 1986 , when $S \& B$ scored $15 \% / 18$, to equal the record set in 1969 by Nottingham Mechanics. That season's team (in board order) was John Pigott, Nigel Povah, Colin McNab, Alan Norris, Simon Gillam, Mike Singleton, Ian Upton, Ken Coates and Tony Corkett. To Judge the strength of the team, Nigel Povah is now a postal GM, rated among the world top twenty, while the bottom three are all experienced postal players with over-the-board grades around 200.

Other than the 1986 side, the only other players to feature have been Andy Muir, John Branford, Roger Emerson, Dave Massie, Robin Haldane, Alan Vestwood, Phil Trussler and Chris Holland.

Although Colin McNab and Alan Norris never 1ived in South London, they first got involved with the club in 1982 when they were down in London for tournaments. Alan was then just starting to play postal chess and joined the S\&B B team, progressing to the A team in 1984. Colin, who had appeared in an OTB match for the club, was thinking of starting postal chess in 1986, so offered his services to the team when Andy Muir dropped out,

In the same year, we decided to enter a team in the Scottish League. Although two of the Scottish club members - Tin Upton and Andy Muir - were unavallable, we were able to fleld a strong team of Colin McNab, Alan Norris, Simon Gillam, Robert Inglis and Mary Hay (soon to become Mary Inglis) This team encountered no problems in winning Divisions 3 and 2 in successive seasons, then went straight on to win Division 1 in 1988 with 8k/10.

In 1989, when Alan dropped out at short notice, the team captain was able to field an admirable reserve in Englishman Robin Haldane. Although Robin had been out of the BPCTC team for several seasons, he had shared in the early successes and his peak OTB form was shown by joint victory in the 1976 British Under-21 Championship.

What w1ll the 1990 s hold for $S \& B$ ? In OTB play, although the club is likely to remain among the top ten in the country, it is hard to see them hitting another peak like 1985. But at postal chess, there is no reason for $S \& B$ domination to end. The core of the side over the last decade shows no sign of diminishing enthusiasm, while there is never any shortage of strong reserves waiting in the wings.

## *)

(Editor - now that simon Gillam has set the ball rolling with his interesting article on his club, $I$ vould velcome articles on the origins etc of other teams participating in the Scottish CCA League)
(by Philip Giulian)
Some time after the start of an ICCF World Master Class, I discovered that one of my opponents, Paul Spinath (Canada), was an active chess organiser. In fact with the amount of time he spends on chess, I am surprised he has time for anything else! Now Paul had decided to turn his hand to organising an international correspondence tournament and started to sound people out over its viability. Was I interested in playing? I was delighted to accept.

It did not take Paul long to put a field together and with ICCE approval the IM score was fixed at $8 / 14$. The only problem for me was that the start date was brought forward to December 1989, but the tournament seemed too good to miss. The players look remarkably uniform in standard. Highest rated is Roger Chapman (2485) and the lowest, Ross Siemms, is only 130 points less. Paul Spinath is playing and he is the only one I have played before (we drew our Master Class game), although I am playing Roger Chapman in the 'John Kellner'. The Fedor Bohatirchuk Memorial includes two Bulgarians but so far the stories of slow posts have proved unfounded and these games are proceeding satisfactorily.

All in all, it looks a very good and wide open event. It is entirely possible $I$ could finish anywhere from first to last but my main target remains the IM score of $8 / 14$.

Participants are: V. Groiss (Austria) 2410, Y. Gelemerov (Bulgaria) 2440, D. Gerassimov (Bulgaria) 2415, M. Heitmann (W. Germany) 2425, W. Tönnemann (W. Germany) 2435, S. Chouinard (Canada) 2445, R. Siemms (Canada) 2355 , P. Spinath (Canada) 2360, V. Mathes (E. Germany) 2375, 0. Eriksen (Denmark) 2390, J. Prats (Spain) 2370, P. Giultan (Scotland) 2395, W. Boom (Netherlands) 2455, R. Chapman (New Zealand) 2485, J. Pregal (Argentina) 2375.

## JOHN KELIINER MEMORIAI INVITATIGN TOURNAMENT

Organised by the Correspondence Chess League of Australia, this is the first event which has offered Scotland an "open" invitation. Alan Borwell had one personal invitation a few years ago but, apart from this, Douglas Bryson has been the only Scot in demand abroad. So the SCCA is particularly grateful to the organiser, Ted Lord, for offering us two places in the John Kellner.

When setting up international events it is usual to try to obtain as strong a field as possible but, not content with this, Ted decided to run two sections. It is a reflection of his hard work and dedication that he has managed to assemble such strong fields.

I am playing in Section A which is slightly stronger, Two Americans, C. Bill Jones and J. De Mauro are rated over 2500, while five others are over 2400. The strength of the section can be gauged by the fact that the lowest rated nonAustrallan is Claude Pare (Canada) at 2395. Only Kevin Harrison of the Australlans has an ICCF rating but Ted Lord speaks highly of these players. Proof of strength can also be seen from the performances of Kevin Harrison who is currently playing in the World 3/4-F1nal, and Guy West, the current Australian champion, has represented Australia in over-the-board Olymplads. Unfortunately, the lack of gradings of four of the Australlans has pushed the IM norm up to $81 / 24$.

Section B, in which Simon Gillam is playing, is slightly weaker, with Michael Prizant (England) the highest rated at 2535. Six others are over 2400 with two just below this figure. Of the others, S. James Henri (Australia) is already a y/IM, whilst Mark Noble (New Zealand), the lowest rated, is a rapidly improving player. Even the unrated player, P. Dewar, appears to be strong as he has gone from rank beginner to Master Class in Just five years. In this section, the IM norm is 9/14.

Section A
I J Read (England) 2440, P Stiggar (Norway) 2475, C Bill Jones (USA) 2555, DW Lovejoy (Australia) 2240, A Prystenski (Canada) 2405, 6 Vest (Australia) (2200), P M Giulian (Scotland) 2395, R Wikman (Finland) 2385, J-G Estiot (Australia) (2200), G Peli (Israel) 2460 , J De Mauro (USA) 2540, K J Harrison (Australia) 2330, V Pedersen (Australia) (2200), R Chapman (New Zealand) 2485, C Pare (Canada) 2395

## Section B

8 K D Dehmelt (USA) 2450, A Hariman (Australia) 2200, H F Glaser (Singapore) 2435, S Chouinard (Canada) 2445, S J Henri (Australia) 2355, $M$ Prizant (England) 2535, E Flacker ( $W$, Geraany) 2435, M Ebeling (Finland) 2460, P Dewar (Australia) (2200), S R Gillam (Scotland) 2395, M F Noble (New Zealand) 2280, 6 Mettyear (Australia) (2200), A M Levine (USA) 2390, J N Kolenbrander (Netherlands) 2420, H J Lassen (Denmark) 2490,

## ICCF THEMATIC TOURNAMENTS

Tournaments for sections of 5-7 players, two games against each opponent. The top two players qualify for each final The entry fee is $£ 3.50$ per group (payable to $B P C F$ ) to be sent to: Mr. A. M. Anderson, 3 Vinterfield Gardens, Duns, Berwickshire, TD11 3EZ.

## TT 6/90 EHGLISH

1 c4 e5 2 Nc3 Nf6 3 g3 g6
4 Bg 2 Bg 75 d3 d6 6 Nf 3 Hc 6
7 0-0 0-0
Entries clase 1/7/90
Start 1/10/90
TT 8/90 - SICILIAH HAFDORF
1 e4 c5 2 Nf 3 d6 3 d4 cxd4
4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 a6 6 Be3 e6
7 Qd2 b5 8 f3 Bb7 9 g4
Entries close 15/9/90
Start 1/12/90

## TT 7/90 - KIHGS IIDIAK

1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 g6 3 Nc 3 Bg 7 4 e4 d6 5 Nf3 $0-06 \mathrm{Be} 2$ e5 7 0-0 Nc6
Entries close 15/8/90
Start 15/11/90
TT 1/91 KIMGS GAMBIT
1 e4 e5 2 f4 exf4 3 Nf3 g5
4 h4 g4 5 Ne5
Entries close 1/10/90
Start 5/1/91

## INTERNATIONAL REPORT

 (by Philip Giulian)Three Scots, Ken McAlpine, Andrew Muir and Mary Inglis, have scored IM norms. Remarkably all three have scored their norms whilst being ungraded! Ken McAlpine and Andrew Muir won their final games in the European Town Teams Tournament and finished with $7 / 2 / 10$. For Ken this was his second norm, sufficient to give him the International Master title. Clearly it is a magnificent performance by Ken to secure the title whilst being ungraded but unfortunately it has its disadvantages. Nowadays norms in tournaments are decided by the average grade of the participants and without a grade there appears to be no way that Ken will get the invitations to pursue the Grandmaster title. Andrew Muir looks likely to find himself in a similar position as he seems certain to get his second IM norm in the European Team Championship. CEditor: According to the ICCF Rating Comissioner's letter published later in this magazine, Ken McAlpine should appear in this year's ICCF rating list, providing the results were achieved by $31 / 12 / 89$ and reported by the tournament organiser, I

Mary Inglis scored Scotland's first woman's IM norm on Board 1 of the Ladies Dlympiad. This was Mary's first international event and to score $4 k / 7$ against such strong opposition was an excellent performance. Unfortunately the dearth of Ladies International tournaments probably means that she will have to walt some time for the chance of a second norm and the tftle. On Board 3, Alison McLure has $3 / 5$ and needs to win her two remaining games to score the IM norm. On Board 2, Elaine Hartford has 1 $1 / 6$, whilst on Board 4 Morag McGhee has $2 k / 6$.

The European Town Teams is nearing completion although amazingly we have still not heard whether or not it has already finished! The scores of $7 / k / 10$ by Ken McAlpine and Andrew Muir, were equalled on Board 1 by Douglas Bryson. The only thing keeping our victory in doubt is my own poor performance on Board 4, although ironically it looks like my wins will secure first place for the Glasgow team. With the other three finished, I had two games left. I won one of these and seem certain to win the other, making it virtually 1mpossible for us to be caught.

Scotland is organising an international event to celebrate ten years of the SCCA Magazine. There will be two sections, each with 15 players, starting probably June 1st. International Master norms will be available and these are likely to require $7 k / 14$ points in Section $A$ and $9 \% / 14$ points in Section B. The following players have agreed to play:

Section A (15 players of average grade 2430 - Category VIII) David Jenkins (Scotland) 2385, David Kilgour (Scotland) 2410, Philip Giulian (Scotland) 2395, Alan Borvell (Scotland) 2295, Cliff Chandler (England) 2445, Richard Callaghan (USA) 2500, Jens Hartung-Nielsen (Denmark) 2495, Odd Rennemo (Norvay) 2425, Arthur Prystenski (Canada) 2405, Ferenc Fabri (Hungary) 2515, Ragnar Vikman (Finland) 2385, Jon Kristinsson (Iceland) 2430, Manfred Bauer (West Germany) 2415, Guido den Broeder (Netherlands) 2440, T de Ruiter (Netherlands) 2505,

Section B (15 players of average grade 2333 - Category IV) Brian Martin (Scotland) 2320, Iain Campbell (Scotland) 2310, Tommy Craig (Scotland) 2290, Richard Beecham (Scotland) 2280, George Pyrich (Scotland) 2225, Aksel Ros (Denmark) 2395, Ted Greiner (USA) 2375, Sven Teichmeister (Austria) 2395, L, R,B, Patterson (Canada) 2290, Antti Nokso Koivisto (Finland) 2385, Bjorn Karlsson (Iceland) 2375, Kari Koistinen (Finland) 2360, Jozsef Vàndorffy (Hungary) 2415, Gerhard Rickers (Vest Germany) 2375 and one Australian nominee (2200),

Results:

| European |  | (Scotland 15k/25) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bd 1 | A J | Muir |  | $v$ Austria |
|  | A | Mulr |  | $v$ Denmark |
|  | A J | Muir |  | v Sweden |
| Bd 3 | S R | Gillam |  | $\checkmark$ Ireland |
| Bd 7 | D H | Dempster |  | $v$ Spain |
| Bd 8 | B | Martin |  | v Denmark |
|  | B | Martin |  | $v$ Austria |
| Bd 9 | A J | Shaw |  | $v$ Sweden |
| Bd 10 | G W | G Livie |  | v Ireland |
|  | G | G Livie |  | $v$ Bulgaria |
|  | G | G Livie |  | $v$ Denmark |
|  | G W | G Livie |  | v Austria |
| Bd 12 | G R | R Sprott |  | v Ireland |

Ladies Olymplad (Scotland 11/2/24)
Bd 1 Mrs M Inglis 0 v USSR
Mrs M Inglis 1 v Poland
Bd 2 Mrs EA Hartford 0 v Poland
Mrs EA Hartford 0 v Finland
Mrs EA Hartford $0 \vee$ W. Germany
Bd 3 Miss A McLure $1 / 2 v$ Iceland
Bd 4 Mrs M McGhee 1 v Finland
Mrs M KcGhee $0 \vee$ USSR
Mrs M McGhee $1 / 2 \mathrm{v}$ Iceland
Mrs M McGhee 0 v W. Germany
Mrs M McGhee $0 \vee$ Austria


| Overseas Subscribers |
| :--- |
| Subscription for one year's |
| editions of the Scottish CCA |
| magazine can be obtained |
| fron the Bditor for 16 p.a. |
| (inclusive of postage) |

## OLYMPIAD REPORT

(by Philip Giulian)
Scotland's challenge for a place in the Olympiad Final is beginning to falter. Since the last issue of our magazine, there have been no Scottish results and so our score remains $194 / 30$, a very healthy $65 \%$. However, a check on the current positions in the rest of the games suggests that we can only expect another 12 points, which would give us a final score of $311 / 2 / 54$. This would take us below $60 \%$ and leave us struggling to fill one of the top two spots.

Unfortunately, at the same time as we have been slipping, our main rivals Czechoslovakia and Hungary have been notching up the points. The Czechs currently lead our section with a massive $73 \%$, while the Hungarians are level with Scotland in second place on $65 \%$. Despite this, there are two factors which should give us encouragement. Firstly, there have been no results between Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Secondly, should either of these countries finish in the top four of the current Olymplad Final, then the third placed team in our section will also qualify. In addition, we can always hope Scotland will obtain more points than looks likely at present!

## EUROPEAN TEAM CHAMPIONSHIP (by Philip Giulian)

Although it is early days yet, it is clear that Scotland are on course for an excellent score. Sa far we have $15 \% / 25$ which is $62 \%$. Leading the way on Board 1 is Andrew Muir, fresh from h1s success in the European Town Teams, which gave him his first IM norm. With a score of $3 / 2 / 4$ and other favourable positions, it will be a major disappointment if Andrew does not secure the International Master title in this event.

Two other players, Brian Martin and George Livie, also deserve special mention at this stage. Both have started with two wins and two draws. I hope I am not tempting fate but with each player only having eight games altogether, both Brian and George must have chances of the IM norm.

C C OLYMPIAD XI PRELIMINARIES （Section 2）

| 1 CZBCHOSLOVAKIA |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A | LAIC | MIT | 2430 |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | 1／2 |  |  |  |
| 2 | J | AMBROZ |  | － |  |  | 1／2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| 3 | H | WEIIER | IM | 2435 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |
| 4 | R | MACHALA |  | 2380 |  |  | 1 |  |  | ／$/ 2$ |  | 1／2 |  |  |
| 5 | J | KOLII |  | 2335 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1／2 |  | 1／2 |  |
| 6 | P | MISEOVSEY |  | 2480 |  |  |  |  | 1／2 |  |  |  |  |  |



| 3 | SIIGAPORE |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | H P GLASER | 2380 | 1／2 |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 0 | ／1／2 | 0 |  |
| 2 | A CHIIA | － | $1 / 2$ | T／2 |  | 아 | $1 / 2$ |  | $1 / 2$ | 0 | O | 0 |
| 3 | K－S TRO | － | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | － | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  |
| 4 | C－V LEOHO | － | － | $\bigcirc$ |  | T／2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 0 |
| 5 | I－Y VOIFI | － |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | 12 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 6 | B TBO | － |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | － |  | 0 |


| 4 | ARGBITIMA |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | B | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | J S MORGADO |  | 2475 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1／2 |
| 2 | B MARCUSSSI |  | 2470 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 3 | P BUJ |  | 2445 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 4 | R A REDOLFI |  | 2385 |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | A Lauremceia |  | 2405 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Q |  | $1 / 2$ |
| 6 | C G PAPPIER | IIM | 2315 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | ORTUGAL |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | F | SILVA | WIM | 2280 |  |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | T／2 | T／2 | $1 / 2$ |  |
| 2 | R | SILVA PERBIRA | WIT | － |  |  |  |  |  | $1{ }_{1}$ | 12 | $1 / 2$ | T／2 |  |
| 3 | H | NB10 | VIM | － |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |
|  | J | D DE SOUSA |  | － |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 |  |
| 5 | A | OLIVEIरA | MIM | － |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | T／2 | $1 / 2$ | 1／2 |
|  |  | QUARESMA |  |  | T／2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | FIMLA面 |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | T PERFAII | 磳1／ 2355 |  | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| 2 | Н SABEL | 2395 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |
| 3 | K TATMI | － | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1 |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 |  |
| 4 | 8 8J砍右 | 2420 | $1 / 2$ |  | 1 |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  |  |
| 5 | C KAUTORET | If 2465 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | ＇／2 |  | 0 |  |  | 1／2 | 1／2 |  |
| 8 | र पiरinin | IT 2405 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ |


|  | BRAZIL |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | O FRAGA PORTILHO | 2355 | 1／2 | 1 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| 2 | 8 HOICE DEA CRESCB | － |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | ¢ BILOS BIAva | MIM 2440 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ |  | $1 / 2$ | 0 | $1 / 2$ |
| 4 | A PACINI H | MIT 2360 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  | T／2 |  |  |
| 5 | 0 ALCAlithra soarns | 2350 | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  | ／1／2 | 1／2 |  |
| 6 |  | － |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | TORVAT |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 ETRADD | WIM 2370 |  |  | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | 14 |  |
| 2 | K STRAID | Ih 2445 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| 3 | F LARSEI | 2325 |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 1／2 | $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ |  | $1 / 2$ |  |
| 4 | P ETIGAR | － | i／2 | $1 / 2$ | 1／2 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $\frac{1 / 2}{1 / 2}$ |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ |
| 5 | D HJERTETES | － |  | 1 |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ |  | ／2 |  |
| 6 | C BREKK | － |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




## IV BUROPEA TEAK CHAMPIOMSHIP PRELIMIEARIES

BOARD 1 - A J MUIR De Bu Sc Po Su CS Sp Ir Au

| Den | Sorensen, B | 2575 | $\bullet$ |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Bul | Kostadinov, K | 2445 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Sco | Muir, A J | $(2225) \mathrm{F}$ | 1 |  | $\bullet$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Por Ferreira, A M A | $(2300) \mathrm{F}$ |  |  | 0 | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Swe | Carlsson, I | 2455 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ |  | $\bullet$ | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |
| CS Bulla, Dr J | 2435 |  | 1 |  |  | $1 / 2$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spa Lanz Calavia, J M | 2355 M |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |
| Ire Ludgate, A T | 2465 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |
| Aus Fleischhanderl, F 2470 | $1 / 2$ |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |

BOARD 2 - A P BORVELLL De Bu Sc Po Sw CS Sp Ir Au


BOARD 3 - S R GILLAM $\quad D e B u S c$ Po $S_{w}$ CS Sp Ir Au


BOARD 4 - D M JENKIMS $D e$ Bu Sc Fo Sw CS Sp Ir Au

| Den | Sorensen, T | 2450 | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bul | Sergiew, S | 2310 |  | $\bullet$ |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sco | Jenkins, D K | 2385 |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Por | Castro, F A P S | 2200 |  | 1 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Swe | Enterfeldt, L | 2385 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| CS | Machala, Dr R | 2395 |  |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  | 1 |  |
| Spa | Paredes Prats, J | 2370 |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |
| Ire | Griffin, J | 2200 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| Aus | Hipfl, W | 2350 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | - |  |

BOARD 5 - G D PYRICH De Bu Sc Fo Sw CS Sp Ir Au

| Den Jensen, IB V II | 2440 | $\bullet$ | $1 / 2$ |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bul | Kostakiev, D | 2200 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sco Pyrich, G D | 2205 | $1 / 2$ |  | $\bullet$ | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Por Cordiero, V L | 2200 |  |  | $1 / 2$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Swe Becker, J | 2390 | 0 |  | 1 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CS Marecek, Ing M | 2340 | 0 |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spa Bonay Toscas, S | 2375 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |
| Ire Montgomery, R | 2345 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |
| Aus Wenger, Dr K | 2200 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |

BOARD 6 - T J CRAIG De Bu Sc Fo Sw CS Sp Ir Au

continued ....

BOARD 7 D H DEUMPTER De Bu Sc Po Su CS Sp Ir Au


BOARD 8 - B J MARTIE De Bu Sc Po Su CS Sp If Au


BOARD 9 - A J SHAW
De Bu Sc Po Su CS Sp Ir Au

| Den | Nielsen, M | 2395 | * |  |  |  | 0 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bul | Atanasov, B P | 2425 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sco | Shaw, A J | 2200 |  |  | - |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |
| Por | Morais, V M | 2200 |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Swe | Rydholm, L | 2215 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| CS | Stodala, J | 2200 |  |  |  |  |  | - |  | I |  |  |
| Spa | Casares R1poll, F | 2200 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |
| Ire | Gallacher, B | 2200 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | - |  |  |
| Aus | Roth, P | 2300 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |

BOARD 11 - J SEYFRIED De Bu Sc Fo Su CS Sp Ir Au


BOARD 10 G G LIVIB De Bu Sc Po Su CS Sp Ir Au


BOARD 12 - G R SPROTT $D e$ Bu Sc Fo Sw CS Sp Ir Au

| Den | Danstrup, N | 2535 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bul | Mintchev, V | (2230) F |  | - |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sca | Sprott, G R | 2200 |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Por | Fonseca, A V V | 2200 |  | 0 |  | - |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |
| Swe | Olsson, S | 2200 |  |  |  |  | - |  | $1 / 2$ |  | 1 |  |  |
| CS | Malac, M | 2200 |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spa | Guillen Marco, J | 2200 |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Ire | Shouldice, A | 2200 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |
| Aus | Urban, Prof F | 2290 | $1 / 2$ |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  |  |  | - |  |  |

ICCF Rating Commissioner, Nol van 't Riat, has responded to Andrew Muir's letter (published in edition 32), as follows:
"On page 70 of your volume of December 1989 I read a suggestion of Mr. Muir about the ratings of ICCF titleholders. First I like to put right some details: the IM and the GM title can both be obtained in 14 games (in one or two tournaments).

To get a rating one has to have played at least 20 rateable games, or one has to have an ICCF title. Article 40 of the Rules of Play says, "Titled players have a fixed rating in any case". So Mr. Muir's suggestion is out of order, as we have already solved his problem, in the best possible way."
 from page 50

SOLUTIONS
A 1 Bxg7+! Bxg7 2 Rxg7 h6 (1f $2 \ldots$... Kxg7 3 Qg3+ Kh8 4 Rg 1 Rg 85 Qxe5+ etc) 3 Qh5! 1:0
Schletka-Antonov, CC 1977
B 1 Nxg6! 1:0
If $1 . .$. hxg6 2 Bd8:
Malinin-Skotorenko, USSR CC.

C 1 Rd1 Qf6 2 Rc7! 1:0 Kafidis-Dr Stern, World CC k-Final 1985-87

D 1 Rxe6! Rxe6 2 Bd5 1:0 Because of the exchanging down to the blshop ending le. $2 \ldots$ Re8 3 Rxe6 Rxe6 4 Qe2 Qd7 5 Ba5! and wins. Popov-Yablonovsky, III USSR CC

B 1 Qe7!! 1:0 If 1 ... Qxe7 2 dxe7 Kb8 3 Bxe4 Kc7 4 Bxh7 Kd7 5 Bd3! with a winning advantage, or 1 ... Bc6 2 Bxe4 wins.
G Estevez-R Perez, CC 1988

F 1 Rd8 $\mathrm{Ch} 72 \mathrm{Rh} 8+$ !
1:0 White mates in two. Brignones-Jouauet, French CC 1988-89

CORRESPONDENCE CHESS STATIONERY

UIndon Envelopes ...................................... 100.......................... 11.80

|  | CORRESPONDENCE SETS <br> as Illustrated <br> Overall size $6.25^{\prime \prime} \times 5.75^{\prime \prime}$ <br> Plastic Pleces. $\qquad$ <br> Supplled In Ring Binder <br> with 12 sets. <br> 615.60 <br> or 10 sets. $\qquad$ <br> or 8 sets. $\qquad$ $[13.60$ <br> Aing Binder only |
| :---: | :---: |
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