

**“ SCARBOROUGH COMMUNITY OF TORONTO
CHESS TALK ”**

Newsletter of / Le Journal de
Scarborough Chess Club

e – mail : scarboro@idirect.ca Website : <http://webhome.idirect.com/~blamb/>
Wexford Seniors' Apartments (Comm. Ctre.), 1860 Lawrence Ave E. (just east of Pharmacy Ave.)
(easy access – Victoria Park Stn./Pharmacy Bus; Lawrence E. Stn./Lawrence W. Bus)

“ FRIENDLY Chess Since 1960; Second LARGEST Can. C. C. ”

ITEMS OF INTEREST TO BOTH MEMBERS & NON-MEMBERS
ISSUE # 8 – December 15, 2000

MERRY CHRISTMAS/HAPPY NEW YEAR 2001 !!

FIDE World Championship 2000
It's Anand vs Shirov !

Again the new FIDE annual knockout tournament format was used, with phase 1 having been played in New Delhi, India. The finals now will move to Tehran, Iran.

The Round 6 semi-finals saw V. Anand of India, defeat M. Adams of England, by a score of 2.5 : 1.5 (Anand won game 2; others were drawn). On the other side of the knockout draw, A. Shirov of Spain defeated A. Grischuk of Russia by 2.5 : 1.5 (Shirov won games 1 & 3, Grischuk game 2, with game 4 drawn).

In contrast to last year, this year's championship will have some credibility, since 2 top-ranked players have risen to the top to contest for the FIDE world championship. A. Khalifman, Fide World Champion 1999, lost in Round 5, to Anand. It is said that even Khalifman himself recognized the weakness of his title, given the number of world grandmasters ahead of him on the FIDE rating list, and the quality of the top players who didn't play in the 1999 tournament.

Canada was ably represented in the draw by Alexander Lesiege. He won both games in Round 1, against R. Vasquez (IM – 2454) of Chile. However, he succumbed in Round 2 to V. Tkachiev (GM – 2657) of France, losing game 1 and drawing game 2. Tkachiev went all the way to the Round 5 quarter-finals, before losing to Grischuk.

FIDE Women's World Championship 2000

The Round 6 final, also played in New Delhi, was an all China affair. J. Xie defeated K. Qin by a score of 2.5 : 1.5 (she won game 1).

The Canadian Women's Champion, Johanne Charest, represented us in Round 1, where she lost to WGM Marta Zielinska (2376) of Poland. Zielinska lost in Round 2.

GTCL Club Team League Update

SCC A defeated second-place DCC B on Mon. Dec. 11, by a convincing score of 3.5 : .5. As of that date, they are now in 2nd/5th, with 4 pts. . Mississauga Polonia A leads with 6 pts. SCC B has 0 pts., and shares last place with High Park.

GTCL 2000/1 Cup Update

In addition to normal league play, GTCL also instituted this year a special club team knockout tournament. The preliminary round, and 3 of the 4 quarter-final knockout matches have been held. SCC B was eliminated by Brampton on Dec. 5 (3:1). SCC A plays its quarter-final match against DCC B on Jan 8. The 2 other teams joining Brampton in the semi-finals to date are DCC A and Polonia A.

“ Impressive Games “ Section of the SCC Bulletin Board

This Issue continues our look at the tactic of the Queen sacrifice; some work (Fischer – Issue # 1 ; Kavalek – Issue # 3); some don't (Anand – Issue # 5). A sacrifice is strongest when refusing it is worse than accepting it, or at least apparently so to the “ sacrificee “. But sometimes a refutation arises from a temporary acceptance, returning the piece, by a counter-sacrifice, at a strategic moment. The timing is everything.

This is illustrated in today's game. This Issue looks at a game in the recently published “ Modern Defence “, between Delchev –Rey, Val Thorens, 1996, where it is very difficult to determine WHEN to employ the Queen-counter-sacrifice :

1.e4 g6 2.d4 Bg7 3.Nc3 c6 4.Nf3 d5 5.h3 Nf6 6.e5 Ne4 7.Nxe4 dxe4 8.Ng5 c5 9.d5 Bxe5 10.Nxe4 0-0 11.c3 b6 12.Bh6 Re8 13.Qf3 Nd7 14.Bb5 Bb7 15.0-0-0 Qc7 16.Rhe1 Red8 17.d6 Bxd6 18.Qxf7+! (the Q-sac) Kxf7 19.Bc4+

- Bl is faced with two options with respect to a Q-counter-sac; how does he do ??

A) 19. Ke8 is rejected, as it leaves Bl facing a “ decisive “ attack – 20.Nxd6 Qxd6 (the counter-sac) 21.Rxd6 etc.;

(Note : the non-sac line 19. e6 is similarly rejected, since it leads to “ devastating “ material loss – 20.Nxd6+ Kg8 21.Bxe6+ Kh8 22.Nf7+ Kg8 23.Nxd8+ Kh8 24.Nf7+ Kg8 25.Ne5+ Kh8 26.Rxd7 etc.);

B) 19. Bd5 is correct, keeping open the counter-sac option – 20.Nxd6+ Qxd6 21.Rxd5

- decision time again; once more he has two Q-counter-sac options; how does he do?

A) 21. Qe6 (Q-counter-sac) ? was chosen – 22.Rxe6 Kxe6 23.Rd3+ Ke5 24.Re3+ Kd6 25.Re6+ Kc7 26.Bf4+ Kb7 27.Rxe7 Kc6 28.a4 a6 29.Be2 Kb7 30.Bf3+ Ka7 31.Bxa8 Kxa8 32.Bc7 1-0.

B) 21.Qf6 should have been the choice - 22.Bg5 Kf8 ! (the Q-counter-sac) 23.Bxf6 Nxf6 24.Rde5 – which though still strong for white, is “ probably not decisive “.

NOTE :

A – Members/ non-members may contact Bob Armstrong, ed. , directly, or through SCC e-mail, to :

1.be added to the e-mail list; 2. submit content (fact, opinion, criticism - recommendations help!).

B – An item in any language may be submitted for publication, if accompanied by an English translation.