

Chess

By RICHARD SHORMAN

MECHANICS' INSTITUTE CLUB CHAMPIONSHIP

Nine United States masters and three experts are competing for the \$430 prize fund at stake in the Mechanics' Institute Invitational Championship. The round-robin contest, which began Oct. 5 at the Mechanics' Institute Chess Club, 57 Post St., San Francisco, has already produced some excellent chess.

Annotations to today's game from round one of the closed tournament have been supplied by USCF master Jude Acers.

White: Jude Acers.

Black: George Kane.

San Francisco, October 5, 1969.

French Defense

1 P-K4	P-K3	16 Q-R5	PxN
2 P-Q4	P-Q4	17 PxP	R-K1
3 N-QB3	B-N5	18 P-N6	K-B1
4 P-K5	N-K2	19 Q-N5	B-K3(k)
5 B-Q2 (a)	0-0(b)	20 0-0-0(1)	B-N1!(m)
6 N-B3	P-QB4(c)	21 R-R8	Q-K3!
7 B-Q3	P-B3	22 R/1-R1	N-B3
8 P-KR4	Q-K1	23 R/1-R7(n)	NxKP!
9 N-QN5(d)	BxBch	24 PxN(o)	QxKP
10 QxB(e)	P-B5	25 R-R1	Q-B3(p)
11 N-Q6	Q-B3(f)	26 QxQch	PxQ
12 BxPch!(g)	KxB	27 R/1-R7(q)	R-K2
13 N-N5ch	K-N1(h)	28 RxBch	KxR
14 Q-K2	N-B4!(i)	29 RxR	P-Q5
15 NxN(j)	KPxN	30 RxP	Resigns(r)

(a) This variation was prepared for over a year as a result of some analysis by California expert Peter Grey in the March-April 1968 issue of the California Chess Reporter. The critical question in theory is the variation 5 . . . P-QB4 6 N-B3 QN-B3 7 B-Q3 PxP! N-QN5 BB-4. In my opinion this is the only way to combat White's efforts to build a center bind and control Q6. My opponent's 4th, 5th, 7th, and 9th moves amount to a waste of time.

(b) Loses by force. After the game I discovered that I had worked the winning line out to White's 13th move in home analysis. Correct is a transposition into the variation given above.

(c) Not an effective undermining of White's center. If 6 . . . P-KB4 7 P-QR3 (or 7 Q-K2), with a K-side attack after 0-0-0, QR-KN1, P-KN4, etc.

(d) The crusher.

(e) I considered 10 KxB?! for half an hour, but after 10 . . . P-B5 11 N-Q6 Q-R4! 12 P-KN4 QxNP 13 BxPch K-R1 (not 13 . . . KxB 14 N-N5ch PxN 15 QxQ) White loses. For instance, 14 R-KN1 Q-R4, winning a piece.

(f) Of course, Black avoids 11 . . . Q-R4 12 B-K2.

(g) A pretty two-piece sacrifice, which is absolutely sound.

(h) If 13 . . . PxN 14 PxPch and (1) 14 . . . K-N3 15 Q-K2; (2) 14 . . . K-N1 15 Q-K2 P-KN3 16 Q-N4.

(i) Very fine. I analyzed this position quickly and did not understand the idea Kane had in mind.

(j) I played moves 13-15 confidently, unaware that a flaw exists in my line. Steve Brandwein pointed out a simple conclusion to the combination: 15 Q-R5! N-R3 16 Q-N6 PxN 17 PxP, with the threat of 18 RxN, 19 0-0-0, 20 R-R8ch, and mate in two.

(k) Black's point. White wins after 19 . . . K-N1 20 0-0-0 R-K3 21 R-R5 RxNP 22 Q-Q8ch K-B2 23 R-R8.

(l) Forced. If 20 R-R8ch B-N1 21 QxPch Q-B3 wins.

(m) A nasty shock. I expected 20 . . . N-Q2 21 R-R8ch B-N1 22 QxPch, and now (1) 22 . . . K-K2 23 RxB RxR 24 Q-B7ch, winning; (2) 22 . . . N-B3 23 R/1-R1, etc., with a murderous attack. Kane's problem-like resource is an interesting example of moving an already developed piece, rather than bringing another one up to "aid" the defense.

(n) Threatening 24 RxP.

(o) If 24 RxP N-Q6ch 25 PxN Q-K8ch, forcing mate. Now I decided to prepare a swindle before resigning.

(p) Or 25 . . . Q-K2 26 RxBch KxR 27 R-R8ch KxR 28 Q-R5ch K-N1 29 Q-R7ch K-B1 30 Q-R8mate, a recurring theme. But Black should win with QR-B1-B3 (Brandwein) or P-QN4-N5 (Acers).

(q) Threatens mate in one, and if 27 . . . KR-Q1, then White mates in two.

(r) Black's endgame is hopeless after 30 . . . R-K1 21 K-Q2 P-R4 32 R-KB7 R-KB1 33 RxRch KxR 34 P-QN3. A theoretically important game and a great fight in spite of the blunders.