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Copenhagen
by Matthew Macfadyen

Many go players experienced a rude shock on the first day of this year’s European Congress, when they arrived a trifle late for the first round to find their clocks already running. Games of go never start on time, and tournaments absolutely never do (except when run by Derek Hunter, but that’s part of history by now). Once you get used to it, however, the effect—the hot curries and cold baths—is not unpleasant. Indeed if the beer vending machine had been as reliable as everything else this would have to go down as the most efficient organisation ever.

The European Championship, separated in the traditional arbitrary way from the main tournament, was poorly attended, especially by Germany and Austria whose sole representative was Stefan Budig from Hamburg (newly promoted to 4 dan). These two countries have produced all except 4 and 1/4 of the European Champions since the tournament began. (Max Rebattu, NL, was in a 3 way tie in 1965) and it was sad to see them so poorly represented.

Ronald Schlemper was obviously the man who needed beating, and there were not many present with the credentials even to aspire to beat him. His countryman Robert Rehm succeeded in doing so (by one point) but only after the result was already clear. In the end Ronald won the tournament with 8/9, Rehm was second with 6/9, and André Moussa (France) won a tie break against me to finish third with 6.

The main tournament was less of a one horse race. The brothers Westhoff were clearly undergraded at 2 dan, and Rene Aaij was even more so at shodan (all Dutch). The only challenge to what started like a Dutch rock crushing exercise came from Britain. Eddie Shaw was our star player, and has been promoted to 2 dan for his efforts. Indeed it only needed Francis Roads to kill Gerald Westhoff’s group in the last round for Eddie to come equal first. In the event, however, the group lived, Gerald won the tournament, and Eddie had to be content with second place.

One of the least exciting parts of the European Congress is usually the European Go Federation’s annual meeting. This year was no exception, the meeting was tedious, long winded, and made more so by the fact that everything had to be translated into German for the benefit of the chairman. One important result did come out of it, though. For next year’s congress, to be held in Edinburgh, the tournament will be run on a MacMahon system including everyone, no separate European Championship, all nationalities welcome. This will mean that all players get a chance to play stronger opposition if they do well, and that non European players will have a chance to play against the best of the Europeans. Hopefully this will mean a good representation of players from the Americas as well as of Oriental players resident in Europe.
A GAME

This is one of the 'crunch' games from the main tournament at Copenhagen. Both players were doing well and playing confidently. Arens Jan Westhoff plays a tough but somewhat uncultured game, not bothering much about correct form as long as there is a weak group he can try to kill. Eddie Shaw produced the only really good British result of the tournament, coming second with 7 wins out of 9. The skillful way in which he sidestepped Westhoff's attacks in this game indicates a capacity to become much stronger than shodan.

White: A.J. Westhoff 2 Dan NL
Black: E. Shaw 1 Dan G9

Black 9 prevents a white invasion of the corner. It is not as secure as 'b' but works better at expanding the upper side.

White 10 is slow. He should treat these stones more lightly, aiming at 'c' or 'd' later.

White 20 should really be on the lower side, but he has spotted a weak stone (Black 11) and is impatient for a taste of blood.

Black 27 - 31 are excellent. White's extra strength toward the right is almost useless since Black is so strong there.

White 34 - 38 are typical of the the man that played them - he is aiming at various tesuji such as 'a', and concentrating all his attention on Black's only weakish group.

White 40 and 42 are optimistic but not ridiculously so. Black replies ably up to 51 and now has to worry about a white play at 95, after which he can only just break out of White's encircling net.

Black 59 offers another target for White to attack. Black's three stones 59, 75 and 79 might be described as the proverbial hook, line and sinker - White gets a lot less than his money's worth in this area but . . .

White 90 threatens damage in both directions. Black is still alright, but he needs to play very accurately for the next few moves.

Fig. 1 (1 - 100)

White 98 loses his chance, what should have been a close fight becomes one sided in Black's favour. The white stones here have weaknesses, but 98 is too blunt a way to protect them. This stone would have been better placed at 99, forcing Black to reply in the centre (he has too few liberties to do anything else) or just to the right of 19, which would threaten to get his corner back by cutting above 85. After 99 Black's centre group is hardly weaker than White's.

White persisted in attacking right to the end, but succeeded only in killing his own group. He could have done better by playing 128 at 131, after which both groups should live (I think) but that would leave him 20 points behind.

Black seems to have won this game by playing on a larger scale than White, but there is a sense in which the opposite is true. Arens Jan Westhoff's violent approach to go invariably produces exciting games, and since amateurs play go for fun rather than to win his strategy is foolproof. The ability to sacrifice a whole game in order that playing go will continue to be fun shows really large scale thinking.

Fig. 2 (101 - 143)

White resigns after 143

PROBLEM

There are some ways of killing groups which are so gut-riddingly exciting that, if you were actually to perpetrate one of them in a game it would keep you smiling for weeks. The first step toward doing this is to recognise the positions when they occur. This is one of them - Black to play.

Answer on page 26
British Championship

by Matthew Macfadyen

Jim Barty will be well enough known to regular readers of the British Go Journal as a writer and editor, but until now he has had relatively little experience at the top end of tournament go. Before this year's British Championship he had never played a game with time limits as long as three hours each, while I had the experience of 76 such games to draw on. This disparity was responsible for the one sided result of the match though, as the reader will see, the games got closer as time went on.

In the first game Jim never really got into his stride, but managed to reach a hopeless position without making any really bad moves. In the following commentary, I have tried to explain how the game slipped away from him. Hopefully this will give the reader some idea of the kind of thinking involved in being more than 4 dan.

1 - 15: Up to this point, both players have built standard formations (though the order of 4 and 14 may seem odd) but black is already having difficulties - the problem is that his 'Chinese Fusuki' (black 1, 3, 15) on the right is a large scale, loose formation whose main power lies in its capacity for expansion, but white 4 and 10 are both strongly placed on the third line, which makes it difficult for Black to expand. Black should have played at or near 14 with either 11 or 13.

Black 23 was Jim's best move of the game. It would be bad to play in between 20 and 22, which would allow White to run away in good shape with 22, sacrificing 20 and leaving 21 as an unnecessary stone. The weak white group which resulted from this play gave Black what chances he had of winning this game.

Black 33 may seem reasonable (actually 42 would have been better) but it allowed me to play 34 and 36, offering him the mistake at 37. This is rather a subtle matter, the point is that White 38 is normally bad, the solid connection above 34 is the only move usually recommended and White would get a small live group in the corner leaving good chances for Black to attack the weak white group on the side. In this game, however, the sequence 51-54, which is meant to be the reason for not playing 38, has two serious drawbacks: White connects up to his weak group and 33 is left on the wrong point (it should be two lines to the left).

Black 41 should again have been at 42, and after white 42 it was time for Black to come up with something really imaginative - White's lower side has to be reduced somehow but, as usual in go, trying to do just one thing at a time is not enough. Black should be looking for a combination of three threats: To attack White's group on the right; to invade the lower side; and to make territory in the centre. In the game Jim wasted many of his best chances with the plays from 43 to 57, and it soon became clear that the invasion was not enough.

The sequence from 61 to 83 may look like a success for Black, but even without the unnecessary exchange of 73 for 74, which allowed me to break into the corner in sente, the reducing moves from 94 to 100 would have been enough for me to win.

Black 101 - 112 were another smoothly flowing, dan level sequence but again Jim seemed to end up with his weight on the wrong foot.

Black resigned after 138. He would have difficulty reducing the margin to 15 points.
The second game was held at the Inter Varsity Club in Covent Garden. A small group of enthusiastic kibitzers discussed the game in an adjoining room. Toby Manning was among them, and offers the following commentary to help those who were not there see the game from an immediate bystander's point of view:

"Jim Barry entered the second game with the resolution that he would play more slowly - and he certainly did; at lunch he had taken about 1½ hours as opposed to Matthew's 15 minutes, and only 35 moves had been played. Perhaps the presence of several spectators influenced him.

Matthew was black and played an unorthodox opening - and Jim soon got himself into trouble. The result in the upper right hand corner gave him too little territory to compensate for Black's thickness. The only compensation was that he ended up with sente to play at 20. Although the sequences are somewhat tricky, black 8 should be at 9.

The sequence to 24 was as expected, but Black 25 is somewhat unusual. Black 27 is 'bad shape' but it is hard to counter the cut at 29.

Jim's sequence seemed to be effective - in particular the exchange 30 - 31 took good advantage of Black's bad shape by reducing his group to three liberties.

The sequence from 39 to 42 seemed almost forced, but black 43 is an effective way of shutting White in; how many of you would have played 44?

By move 54 Jim seemed to be in trouble. He was alive on the left but Black threatened to take a large territory at the top by attacking his group there which was still unsettled. White 54 was an attempt to do something about this, but the crowd felt that it was an overplay, and should have been at 68. In the sequence to 64 it got cut off and did not even seem to be an effective sacrifice.

Black 63 prepared for the later move at 113, removing White's eyes. Black 71 prevented the White stone above 69 from being sente, which would have improved White's eye shape.

White 74 did not appear to threaten any sequences which worked, and was therefore too small at this stage.

White 96 prevents Black from wrecking his shape in the corner with a play at 96 or one point to the right.

Following Black 107 White is really in trouble. He has at most most 30 points (including komi) plus the lower right corner, while Black has at least 45 even assuming that white 104 and 108 live. Jim decided to pin his hopes on a counterattack against 105 and 107.

Black 113 takes out White's eyes, but 122 was surprising. White loses half his group in exchange for the attack with 130 and 132, but this appeared somewhat improbable. On the other hand, had White played 122 at (say) 125 it would have been difficult to save his whole group.

The fight continued, and up to 164 Black was thought to be ahead. Opinions differed: some thought Black would win the seki, some thought a seki would result and some ko. Nobody, however thought that Black would die unconditionally, and there was amazement when the news came. Black 165 seemed to be his error, losing liberties unnecessarily.

Last year, in the fourth game against Terry Stacey, Matthew had lost a completely won game, but he was not going to do so here. Even after losing his group on the lower side he was still ahead.
White needed about 20 points in the lower right area, but with weak stones in the centre this looked an impossible task. His last try was 202 but this did not work (Black should play 203 at 205); after 211 all White can manage is a connection along the edge to his dead stones.

Black 215 connects his groups together along the side, removing White's last chance of finding the 20 points or so that he needs. Jim resigned.

Fig. 5 (201 - 215)

The third game featured some extremely difficult fighting, and I am still not sure what should have happened in several of the positions which arose. The following commentary ignores most of the questionable plays, and concentrates on an attempt to explain how to use counting to find good moves in fights.

With black 36 the main issues of the game begin to emerge. White will try to use his thickness in the centre to attack Black's upper group, not aiming to kill it but to prepare a more severe attack against the other black weak group in the lower right, or perhaps to build a territory on the right side. Black, meanwhile, will try to keep the issues in the upper area small and local, and look for a chance to finish killing white 4.

From 47 to 78 both players seem determined to create as many weak groups as possible. I was feeling very optimistic at this stage but realised when Jim played 79, that my group could not easily make two eyes.

Game 3: Black Jim, White Matthew

Several possibilities arose here, but before embarking on any of them, I counted the game to check that I was attempting something which would be big enough if it worked. Consider first the case where White lives unconditionally on the upper side. Black plays a protective stone in the centre and White gets first go at the lower left: Black has: upper right 20, upper left 15, upper side 5 lower left 10, elsewhere nothing, total 50. White has: right 35, upper left 10, lower side 5, lower left 5 komi 5 total 60. Not decisive but White is thicker in the centre so it looks good.

Accordingly, I took a while to search for ways of living with my group, having confirmed that it was impossible I counted plan B: suppose the group to be unconditionally dead - then White needs to kill something and it looks like having to be the lower right black group. For the purposes of the count assume the sequence 96 - 104 in the game, followed by a black play in the centre and White 113. The count then goes: Black: upper side 75, upper left 15, lower left 25 (he's going to get first play there in this variation), total 115. White: lower right 85, komi 5, total 90 plus the upper left. Can we get 25 points in the upper left area? Probably not, but this looks less hopeless than any of the alternatives.

First a few kikashis - 86 and 88 worry Black's eye space on the left (no chance to win a seii at against this group but maybe we can force Black to take the stones off later). 92 gains liberties, 94 gains 2 points in case we live (this was very greedy - the extra ko threat is almost sure to be more valuable) - and then back to business.

96 - 104 went according to plan but Jim surprised me with his tenki at 113. Now it looks as if counting is not going to come into it - except for counting liberties - White has 8 liberties (see if you agree) and Black, on a naive count, has only 6. White 114 seemed to be a good idea at the time (120 now looks better), and after 117 I could not improve on the ko up to 124.

Now the counting starts again, with a whole new set of possibilities. It should be pretty clear that White's only sufficient ko threats are ones to save the upper group (the count we already did shows that killing the lower right group is insufficient). It should also be clear that Black cannot win if his centre group dies (All of White's weak groups would be connected by doing that). Thus we expect Black to ignore a White threat, win the ko and continue by attacking the white group on the lower side.
This combination gives the result: Black: left side 15, upper side ?, lower side 60 (at least), total 75+. White: right side 35, komi 5, upper side ?, total 40+, so White needs a ko threat giving him 35 points more than Black gets on the upper side (including the corners). This looks wildly implausible, but it accounts for the fact that Jim did not bother to fight the ko for longer than was necessary.

Since the above count puts Black a long way ahead, he can afford the safety play at 131, making quite sure that his group is alive, but allowing White to play first on the lower side at 138. First, however, he should have played one point to the right of 128. This would have been sente, and allowing White to play 132 and 134 in sente was a clear loss of more than 10 points. After 138 the game had become close enough for counting to be useful again. Let us see what Black needs from his attack on the White group:

Territories are now: Black: upper right 2, upper side 10, upper left 15 (supposing he gets sente to play 189), lower right 5, centre 10, total 42 plus the lower left area. White: right side 35, upper side 25, centre nothing, komi 5, total 65. Black thus needs a little over 20 points in the lower left.

Obviously it would be enough to kill the weak group on the lower side, but it would also be enough to secure a reasonably large corner while attacking the White group. Far too few players perform this type of calculation before leaping into attacking sequences which will be useless unless they actually kill. In this game Jim had spent five hours thinking hard, and was too exhausted to think of looking around the board to see what was necessary.

Up to 145 Jim played with great vigour, but ignoring everything except the lower side. I suddenly saw light at the end of a very black tunnel. I thankfully sacrificed my burdensome group, and took a large corner in compensation. Now Black needed to do something spectacular to the centre group to win.

Jim attacked with 175 and I went into byo-yomi. It was not possible for me to work out the best way to live in just a minute, but I made the job much easier by counting the game to see what was necessary (by this time I had counted most of the territories several times, so it was not hard to do the following quite quickly: Black: upper right 2, lower side 38, left & top 33 (assume Black 189), total 73; White: lower left 22, right 35, top 25, komi 5, total 87. Thus Black needs 14 points from his attack on the centre.

![Diagram](image)

The crucial thing about this calculation is that it means White can afford to sacrifice either his 4 stones in the centre, or the 3 loose stones at the top as long as the bulk of the group lives. I played 176, making one definite eye, and not bothering about trying to connect the 4 stones on the right.

Black 179 showed that Jim had not done the sum. Had this play been at 184 my connection at 180 would still not have worked, and there may have been a chance to kill the whole group.

Black 185 made about 14 points in the centre, but now I had 6 points of my own there, so I was confident by 188 that the komi would be big enough (otherwise I would have played 188 at 189 and hoped to make an eye in the corner).

I lost a point by failing to play 231 and 235 before 230, but the final result, 4½ points to White, agrees well enough with the above count.

In this type of game, where groups are being killed and resurrected all over the board, it is often much easier to find how much you need to do than it is to find the best possible move. Sometimes this will lead you into attempting the impossible, but many a 'hopeless' game has been won in that way.

---

**Problem**

This problem is a classic - you should have seen it before several times, and having glanced at the diagram say to yourself "Oh yes that one - you play there, and if he does that it doesn't work because of that and that". If you haven't seen it before it may help to know that Black is supposed to play and live, or even that the answer appears on page 26.
MANCHESTER This year’s Northern go congress attracted 60 players among whom Terry Stacey collected the red rose shield for winning all six of his games. Andrew Grant and Mike White qualified for next year’s Candidates’ tournament, and so did Terry Barker (the latter due to an administrative error which has been allowed to stand).

WESSEX The Wessex tournament, held as ever in Marlborough town hall (this was the 13th time), was won by M. Macfadyen with 4 wins out of 4. This tournament is always held on the day the clocks go back, so as to allow an extra hour to get there. It is also well timed to give drivers a good look at the autumn colours along the M4 (or whatever other route you may take), so put next year’s date in your diary now. It is Sunday 23 October 1983.

WOODFORD The British Lightning tournament was rather sparsely attended, particularly by weaker players, which is a pity since they are the ones who normally find the time limits excessive in regular tournaments. Francis Roads’ able organisation gave us plenty of time for eight games of go with enough to spare for a couple of rounds of litar dice in the pub afterwards. The cup was won by M. Macfadyen with B/B.

BIRMINGHAM The British small board championship was won by Desmond Cann with seven wins out of eight. Richard Granville was second, and Toby Manning third.

LONDON A weekend tournament was held on 20 and 21 November. First prize was won by Terry Stacey, with five straight wins. Second, with four wins, was Frank May. Prizes for winning four games also went to B. Brakes, M. Lerner, N. Pollard, and M. Abbot.

MANCHESTER On 4 Sept., during the Northern Congress, a forum for club secretaries was held. Discussion ranged over many of the problems of running go clubs, teaching beginners and generating effective publicity. The idea of offering a large sum of money to the author of an effective go playing computer programme, as a publicity exercise was mooted.

COMPUTER GO The above scheme is to be put into practice as soon as a few minor problems have been solved. The current scheme is that a prize of £10,000 be offered for any programme that can beat the British Champion on 13 stones within the next ten years. Further details will be published in these pages as soon as someone has been found to guarantee the money.

PROMOTIONS: Since our last issue, Nick Webber has been promoted to 3 dan, Eddie Shaw, Piers Shepperson and Richard Hunter to 2 dan, and Toby Bailey to shodan. Congratulations to all of these.

JAPAN: A rundown on the top tournaments: KISE: Fujisawa Shuko still holds the title, he will defend it in the new year against one out of Cho, Rin, Kato and Kobayashi Koichi MEIJIN: Cho Chikun finished crushing Otake 4-1 in October. Players who find it regrettable that professionals rarely try to kill each other’s groups can look forward to seeing the reports of this match in Go World with relish.

HONINBO: Cho Chikun beat Kobayashi Koichi 4-2, finishing in August. There has been quite a bit of excitement in the run up to next year’s match. Hane 9 Dan seemed to be doing well when he knocked Kato and Ishida out of the preliminary tournament, but was eliminated himself by Iwata 9 Dan. In another section of the preliminaries Fujisawa Shuko beat Takagawa (Honinbo 1952-1960) to get himself back into the league. Otake was busy with the title matches for Gosei and Meijin while his crucial match with Awaji Shuzo happened, so he is out of the league for yet another year. It seems ridiculous that Otake, who has been in the title match for Meijin for 7 of the last 8 years, has never even been challenger to the Honinbo. As I write, the new league is just starting. The only decisive looking thing so far is that Fujisawa Shuko has lost three games.

JUDAN: Cho Chikun (heard that name before somewhere?) will defend his title early next year. At present Kato and Otake are doing best in the tournament to select the challenger, Gosei: Otake Hideo managed to beat Cho 3-2 just before their Meijin match started.

TENGEN: Kato is defending his only title (not for long?) with success (1-0 up so far) against Katoaka Satoshi 7 Dan.

OZA: Hashimoto Shoji dethroned Kato last year, but Kato has come back to challenge him. So far this year Hashimoto has done relatively poorly (that is since coming second in the Honinbo league early in the year) so Kato’s 1-0 lead may prove too much for him.

SOVIET UNION A party of go players from Osaka including several of their stronger professionals recently visited Moscow. It seems that some of the rumours of the strength of the Soviet players have been over optimistic, since none of them there were able to beat the 9 year old boy wonder in the Japanese party.

NEW BOOK The Ishi Press long awaited “Handicap Go” is on the high seas, and will be available from the book distributor shortly.

ORGANISERS’ BOOKLET The BGA is producing a booklet for organisers of go clubs and events, with details of tournament systems, advice on teaching beginners, and much else besides. This will be made available free to club secretaries and those actually planning to run events, and will be available from the BGA book distributor to anyone else.

APologies to the several clubs not featured on the cover map. Most of these are school clubs with long names which wouldn’t fit. For the same reason Wanstead & East London club is labelled with its former title ‘Woodford’.
Fathers' Day
from Mike White

Fathers' Day was marked this year by a curious ritual in the aptly numbered room GO20 in Goodricke College of York University. Twenty-six hunched figures sat at tables fiddling with plastic mint imperials, and venting their evident frustration on twin clocks, which they politely took it in turns to strike. A black or white mint imperial was placed on the board to denote whose turn it was to hit the clock. After a couple of hours, the clocks were given a rest and the humans fortified themselves for the afternoon assault.

Miraculously, no casualties were recorded among the timepieces and prizes (presumably for the most elegant time punishment). The best was awarded to John Rickard (1 dan) of the Cambridge time punshers and Robert Burgess (6 kyu) and Jason Grossman (17 kyu) of Leeds grammar school clock bookers.

John Rickard actually won the competition and he and Paul Smith (2 kyu) are the two qualifiers for next year's Candidates' Tournament.

PROBLEMS

White may seem to have an awful lot of space to make eyes in here - but if you are careful and play the Black stones in exactly the right order, you will find that it is not quite enough. Answer on page 26.

Black has only one eye but White is extremely thin on the right. Find a way to break through the White position - and then check that you have not let him win the seiri or semeai. Answer on page 26.

Tournament Calendar

LEIGH SINTON 12 December
4 rounds, handicap, contact: Richard Newton, 14 Tanhouse Lane, Malvern, Worcs (Malvern 65626)

LONDON 1-4 Jan., 1983
8 rounds, contact: Toby Manning, 110 Mosselle Ave., N22 Tel: 01-889 5247

A Problem of Precision

In this 9x9 board game Black and White have captured an equal number of stones. Black has just played the malicious little sugari at O (not however the best play). White to play and win! After working this out find how Black could have played O to win.

This sort of reading problem should be particularly valuable for middle kyu players, even if they don't manage to solve it. The proper attitude to any piece of reading, be it suime, tesuji, yose or the combination of all three in a real game, is that the aim is to understand all relevant variations not just to come up with one winning play. So one benefits from trying to imagine all possibilities and analysing them to the best of one's ability even if the 'answer' escapes detection. I hope this problem is found rewarding by those who go at it systematically; there aren't too many plausible tries (as Matthew would have it).

Answer overleaf
SOLUTION  to problem on previous page - Do the problem first!

Black's descent to the edge menaces in two directions. The more obvious threat is that Black can start a ko fight to kill White's lower left corner. The veiled threat is to reduce to nothing the area White has in the lower right, as shown in the reference diagram - the result there is seki which White can break only at the cost of two stones.

White must therefore fight the ko if challenged, by following Dia. 1: the unobvious play at 2 ensures 5 points in the corner, while leaving just one ko threat there. Now Black should pass, and on counting the game we find that White wins by 1 point. If Black persists with the ko fight and plays 3, he runs out of ko threats after white 17, and loses by 2 points. However if White errs by playing 2 as in Dia. 2, Black has an extra threat in the lower right corner; now it is White who runs out of threats and Black who wins by 2 points.

Dia. 3 shows what Black should have done. With Black 1 here the ko becomes one in which Black captures first - a crucial difference. White's resistance leads to a clear defeat, but if White allows the sequence of the reference diagram to happen then he is lost also. Black could also win by playing 1 at 4 in this diagram, then continuing at 1, but this seems somewhat eccentric.

THE ART OF COARSE GO

Those little things that mean so much . . .

- As a matter of principle always take back at least three moves in the course of every game - but remember to wait for your opponent to answer it before you snatch your stone back.
- Always say 'atari' if it is only one stone but never if it's twenty.
- When thinking where to play remember to hold a stone hovering over a likely point and take care to obscure as much of the board as possible from your opponent's view (a particularly effective irritant when it is not actually your move).
- Rattle your stones in the bowl whenever your opponent is trying to work out a move.
- If you are forced into a game with a complete beginner make sure you kill all of his groups (weakies need toughening up).
- Never resign.
- When you spot that you're at least 50 points behind carry on playing out the yose nice and slowly (paying particular attention to the one point ko). But when it's finally all over and your opponent is reaching for his prisoners, remark brightly "Don't let's bother to count this one . . . "
- Always nod sagely when your opponent makes a particularly mediocre move.
- Keep alert during dame filling time: this can be a very pleasing way to win.
- If you've got a good ten point lead mean loudly when filling in the dame "Oh I think you've won this one" or "I played really badly this game . . . ."

Next issue - The art of coarse tournament Go
Beware the San-san  by Richard Granville

This article deals with a simple concept which many players seem to ignore. My piece of advice is to "Bear in mind the 3-3 invasion underneath the 4-4 stone".

I am not referring to the immediate invasion in Dia. 1. The sequence to 12 is well known and the result is normally satisfactory for Black, despite the fact that White retains sente. Black can also play 6 at 11 - look up the continuations in a joseki book if you don't know them.

The normal counter to the 4-4 stone is a knight's move approach. Black sometimes responds in such a way as to take the corner territory immediately, but he usually prefers to concentrate on the outside. In such situations White has the option of switching to the 3-3 point. Even if he does not do so immediately, it is usually a good idea to retain this option by not forcing Black to enclose the corner.

Let us consider an example: Dia. 2 shows the start of a three stone game between a 6 kyu and a 9 kyu. White started at the 4-4 point and answered Black's approach with a one space jump. Black then proceeded to make White's position absolutely solid by playing 5, 7 and 9. Black 11 is a good extension but his position cannot be counted as secure territory; later on White may attack at 'a' or even invade at 'b', 'c' or 'd'. Black can avoid this poor result by omitting the exchange of 5 - 10 and extending immediately as in Dia. 3. Although his position is not as strong as in the game, he has avoided strengthening White.

Dia. 4 shows why Black is not worried about the weakness of his position. If White invades at 1 then Black can invade at the 3-3 point. The continuation if White invades at 1 there Black can invade at the 3-3 point. The continuation if White invades at 1 there Black can invade at 3 or 4, after which he can invade at 1. In that case, however, White has played so many stones in the area that it is enough for Black to reply lightly at 'c'.

White's best continuation is usually the extension at 1 in Dia. 5. After this, Black can still invade at 3, but may prefer to develop the outside with 2 and 4. Once he plays 2, though, it seems necessary to defend at 4, since he has lost the option of Dia. 4.

Returning to the game, we see that White made just this mistake with 14 and 16. Having played 14, he must play 16 at 'g'. If he wishes to play 16, then 14 should be omitted.

Black need not invade immediately at 'e' to expose White's error, but should play 'f' first. White will be reluctant to play an extra defensive stone on the side, but now 'e' is dangerous - the point of playing 'f' is either to give 'e' a friendly stone to connect with, or to prepare an attack against 16, depending which way White chooses Black 'e'.

Go Paradoxes  by Andrew Grant

BENT FOUR IN THE CORNER

This is the first of a series of articles in which Andrew Grant explores positions which range from the unusual to the totally bizarre.

'Vent four in the corner' is the exception to the rule that an eyespace of four points in a row is alive. Dia. 1 shows an example; White can produce a ko by playing 'a', black 'b', white 'c'.

(Continued Overleaf)
This ko possibility has an interesting effect on the position shown in Dia. 2. At first glance Black appears to be alive in seki, but he is much worse off than this. The Japanese rules have a clause specifically stating that Black is dead, the reasoning is as follows:

First we must assume that play has continued until all the yose has been played out and all the dame filled in. Secondly we assume a second phase of the game beyond the normal end of play. During this phase claims about the life and death of groups are justified by continuing until they are physically removed from the board. If a player chooses to pass during this phase he must give his opponent a prisoner, to cancel out the point lost by playing inside his own territory. During this phase, White could go around the board eliminating all of Black’s ko threats, and then continue as in Dia. 3. When White plays 9, Black is in atari. Until now, any black play would only have hastened his demise. Since Black has no ko threats (White removed them all), Black can capture his stones.

Thus Black’s group is helpless, and is effectively dead. According to the Japanese rules White need not go through the laborious process of taking off the black stones, but may simply remove them as prisoners at the end of the game.

Unfortunately there is a flaw in this reasoning. Dia. 4 gives an example; Black has a ko threat (at ‘a’) and White cannot remove this threat, short of Black’s group being captured. Worse still, once White answers this threat, at ‘b’, Black will have another ko threat at the point below ‘b’, and so on — hence Black will have an infinite supply of unerasable ko threats. Even an ordinary seki will Black has an infinite supply of unerasable ko threats (filling in the common liberty) which provide Black with one unerasable threat (filling in the common liberty) which provide Black with one unerasable threat (filling in the common liberty) which provide Black with one unerasable threat (filling in the common liberty).

Black’s threats, which is essential to the above argument.

In a particular game, it may be true that Black is dead in Dia. 2, but if there are any unerasable ko threats then the status of the Black group in Dia. 2 should be ko (if White is willing to start it) or seki (if he isn’t). Under Chinese rules this is what happens; but under Japanese rules Black is always dead.

There have been many proposals to alter this anomaly in the Japanese rules, but nothing has come of them so far.

---

**THE ADVENTURES OF SUPERDAN**

**Fred, There’s a bloke at the door, called Iwamoto. He sez do yer fancy a game of ‘Get Lost’?**

**Doris!**

**Sigh!**

**Oh! If that’s how you feel I’m going home to mother. Goodbye!**

**Sorry, but I’ve only got half a board and 53 black stones… I’m buying them in instalments.**

**Ah! So! We will go and play Bingo instead.**

**This is a job…**

**Pop!**

**Hey bud, why didn’t ya buy 3 sets of stones from the BGA for £18.00, or even one set for £7.50?**

**You’re right, Superdan… what shall I do?**

---

**Write to the BGA Book Distributor and order some, right away!**

*£7.00 offer for limited period only.*

---

**Are you in a non-going situation at this moment in time? Take advantage of the new BGA offer: 3 sets of plastic stones (5p) for £18, or one set for just £7.*
This issue we discuss the proper way to pull out a cutting stone. Dia. 1 shows the basic shape. Black can capture White’s cutting stone by playing ‘a’, we suppose that it is White’s turn and that he intends to prevent that. Any of the three plays ‘a’, ‘b’, ‘c’ will serve this purpose. The most common play in British go is ‘a’, which is usually the worst shape, this article is mainly an advertisement for ‘c’.

Dia. 2 shows the problem with White ‘a’. Black forces White to make an empty triangle, and furthermore can choose which direction to force him in.

In Dia. 3 we see White playing the better move at ‘b’ in Dia. 1. The result is clearly better for him than Dia. 2. There is a cutting point to aim at at ‘x’ and the White group is farther out into the centre. Black, however, may have a better way to play. Sometimes it is possible for him to play 4 at 5 and capture the white cutting stones. In such cases White has to extend upwards from 1 instead of 3, making an empty triangle. Even with the empty triangle he is usually better off than Dia. 2 due to the cut at ‘x’.

If White 3 in Dia. 3 does not work, it may be better to start at 1 in Dia. 4 (‘c’ in Dia. 1). Now if Black answers to the right of 1, White can revert to Dia. 3 without fear of the Black tesuji.

White 1 in Dia. 4 can, of course, be cut off—Dia. 5 shows the obvious sequence. Comparing this result with Dia. 2 we see that White’s shape is almost the same, but he has added the exchange of his sacrifice stone and Black 7, which is a loss, while Black has added his stone 3, which is almost worthless. Thus Dia. 5 is almost a whole move better for White than Dia. 2.
It may be that the capture at 7 is especially valuable for Black in Dia. 5 – for example his group on that side might be in imminent danger of capture – but he will often find that it is better to play quietly at 2 in Dia. 6, allowing White 3 and then protecting his group on the right. Black gets good shape here, but White’s cutting stone is running smoothly into the centre with no defects or inefficiencies. Herein lies the virtue of White 1 in Dia. 4.

Solutions to Problems

From Page 5

Black 1 and 3 are easily spotted, but 5 is not. After White’s capture at 6 Black can play 5 and get a double snap-back.

From Page 16

Black 1 is correct – White must capture and a ko results. Black ‘a’ may seem to kill White cleanly, but White can reply at 3 and win the seimai.

From Page 13

Black looks good, but white 2, 4 and 6 seem to steal his eye. Black simply connects at 7, however, and after white’s capture at 8 he can play back inside at to complete his eye.

6 at 4, 8 at 2 9 at

BGA SUBSCRIPTIONS 1983

Your subscriptions are now due! If you have not already done so, write to Derek Hunter immediately at 60, Wantage Rd. Reading with your remittance as follows:

- Student member: £2.00
- Club member: £4.00
- Unattached member: £5.00
- Overseas member: £7.00

LONDON OPEN GO CONGRESS NINE 1-4 January 1983

The Inter-Varsity Club, 3/5 The Piazza, London WC2.

Eight round even game tournament

Details from
9th London Open Go Congress,
Toby Manning,
110 Moselle Avenue, London N22 6ET.
Telephone: 01-889 5247