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Tactical Levy
by T. Mark Hall

What is the purpose and reason for the BGA tournament levy? This is hardly the topic on everyone's lips at tournaments and congresses, but it has been raised by club secretaries and treasurers with the BGA treasurer, and, since the levy has been amended with effect from 1st January 1990 and raised slightly, this may be the opportunity to tell all members how it operates.

When a tournament form is received by the BGA treasurer, his normal practice is to send his own entry plus the levy form or to curse if he can't attend and send the form on its own.

The form asks the organiser to count up the number of people who attended and make payment for each full BGA member, student member and non-member for each round of the tournament. This has sometimes been waived where the organiser has genuinely shown that he would make no profit for the club if the levy was paid, and special arrangements are made concerning the London Open and the Northern tournaments. However, most tournaments pay the same standard amount. The question raised has been what does the levy cover and why do we charge it.

Each club that organises a tournament generally relies on the members to provide them with a list of clubs to which forms can be sent and forms are often distributed by the BGA with the Newsletter. Advance notice is also given both in the Journal and the Newsletter of forthcoming tournaments. The BGA also maintains a stock of boards, sets and clocks which are normally available for any tournament, and the BGA will also give assistance and advice to organisers if requested.

The levy has therefore been devised to cover all these services: the co-ordination of clubs and lists, the publicity and the provision of equipment and assistance. If we attempted to impose charges for each separately, we would find that difficult, and clubs might make attempts to avoid using the services thus provided. It is easier for all concerned to have a simple overall charge to cover everything.

If anyone has any further questions, please contact me.
Coming Events

Coventry Tournament: at University of Warwick, in Westcott Hall, Sunday 25th March. Three round McMahon. Contact Mike Lynn, tel: 0675-52753.

British Go Congress: 6th-8th April, at Salford University. Tournament fee Reductions for BGA members and junior players. For further information contact Keith Osborne, tel: 0617-993743.

AGM: at Salford, 7th April. Minutes (1989), Matters arising; reports from President, Secretary, Treasurer and Membership Secretary. Acceptance of accounts. Election of President, Treasurer, Auditor and 5 Council members.

Leicester Tournament: Sunday 17th June at the 66 Club, Albion House, South Albion Street. Contact Eddie Smithers, tel: 0664-69023.

European Go Congress: 22nd July - 4th August, Vienna. Details not yet available.

Shrewsbury Tournament: Sunday 7th October. Contact: Brian Timmins.

Glossary

Aji: a source of annoyance.
Aji-keshi: removing aji.
Atari: threat to capture.
Byo yomi: shortage of time.
Dame: no-man’s land.
Damezumari: shortage of liberties.
Dango: a solid mass of stones.
Furikawa: trade of territory/groups.
Fuseki: opening play on whole board.
Gote: not keeping the initiative.
Hane: a diagonal play in contact with enemy stones.
Hasami: pincer attack.
Hoshi: star-point (where handicap stone may be placed).
Ikkon-tobi: a one-point jump.
Jigo: a draw.
Joseki: a formalised series of moves, usually in a corner.
Kakari: a play which threatens to attack a single corner stone.
Kikashi: a forcing move.
Komi: points given to compensate for Black having first move.
Kosumi: a diagonal move.
Miai: points of exchange, "it for tat."
Moyo: potential territory.
Ogeima: a large knight’s shape.
Ponnuki: empty diamond shape of one colour (4 stones).
Sabaki: a sequence which produces a light shape.
Sanren-sei: plays on three hoshi points along one side.
Sek: a local stalemate.
Sent: keeping the initiative.
Shimari: corner enclosure of 2 stones.
Shodan: one dan level.
Tenuki: to play elsewhere.
Tesuji: a skilful move in a local situation.
Yose: the end-game.

Sponsorship of the European Go Congress 1992

The British Go Association, on behalf of the European Go Federation, is seeking sponsors for the above event, which is to be held at the University of Kent in Canterbury. The sums of money quoted are based on 1989 prices. They are suggestions and are negotiable within limits.

1. Attendance of professional players. 10 @ £1000
2. Hire of tournament rooms £5000
3. Prizes £3000 - £5000
4. Tournament playing equipment £3000
5. Bursaries for young players £1000
6. Financial assistance for East European players 20 - 30 @ £300
7. Printing of publicity material / advertising £1000
8. Hire or loan of closed circuit television equipment £500
9. Hire or loan of public address equipment. £500
10. Insurance. £500
11. Loan of IBM compatible PC equipment for the computer go tournament and the tournament draw.

We are looking for between £10,000 - £15,000 worth of sponsorship from our major sponsor, whose name will appear on all national, local and internal publicity. The Congress will be named after this sponsor as "The (Sponsor's name) European Go Congress". The names of minor sponsors will be acknowledged on publicity material as appropriate.

Produced on behalf of the British Go Association by the 1992 European Go Congress Organising Committee.
This Is Go The Natural Way!

Part Five
by Takemiya Masaki

Translated by Bob Terry. Diagrams by Dave Dyer of Symbolics Corporation, USA.

In the early stages of the opening one aims first at the open corner, second at making an enclosure in the corner or an attack on the opponent's corner, and third at occupying a big point; this is the generally accepted order of evaluating the size of moves.

Diagram 1

However, it is not chiselled in stone that one must necessarily play according to this order of moves, only that one pursue a strategy in keeping with one's strengths and carry it through consistently. In that case, no matter where one plays, one will be sure to realise the full value from one's moves.

Diagram 2

The game in diagram 1 is from the 1970 Nihon Kiin Championship tournament. I am playing Black against Yamabe Toshiro, 9 dan.

After playing on the three star points on the right side, I ignored White 6 to take the big point at 7. These days this method of play has been dubbed "Takemiya-style," and has achieved recognition as a standard strategy, but around the time of this game I was just beginning to play this opening in various tournaments.

Diagram 3

Of course White will naturally counter-attack and Black must be prepared for this. Since White has had his move ignored, fighting spirit dictates that he take some kind of measures against this corner.

If White plays the double attack at 1 in diagram 3, Black will attach and extend with 2 and 4, and up to 8 his marked stone is working effectively. If White plays 1 a point lower at 1a, Black will answer at b, encouraging White to invade at 3-3 point.

Here the immediate invasion at the 3-3 point with White 1 in diagram 4 makes very good sense, but if Black answers by blocking from the opposite direction with 2 he violates the logic of his own strategy. Up to 12, Black makes thickness but White 13 neutralises it.

Diagram 4

But even so, this does not mean that Black 7 is the best move.

Black usually answers White 1 in diagram 2 with 2. After White 3, Black turns to the big point at 4, and if White continues with a or b a fine game results. However, settling the position with the exchange of Black 2 for White 3, to my way of thinking the areas open to play on the board have narrowed and limitations have been placed on methods of play at one's disposal.
ceeded to 10 (actually Black 17 in the game).

Diagram 5

One cannot declare that this line of play is clearly superior to that in diagram 1, but recently I have come to value highly speed in the opening and therefore started playing the knight's move at 6. After this, White played at a and after Black b and White c, Black started a fight with d.

GAME SUPPLEMENT

White: Ishida Yoshio, Honinbo (age 25)
Black: Takemiya Masaki, 7 dan (age 23)
Played on March 3rd, 1974, at the Nihon Kiin. Komi 5.5 points.

The shoulder hit at Black 31 is a terrible overplay. It would be better to play at 1 in diagram 1. White 2 is the usual answer, and Black can proceed effectively with 3 and 5. If White plays 2 at a, Black b makes good shape. When White counter-attacks at 32, Black is at a loss for a good answer. Black ends up sacrificing his five stones.

Diagram 1

White 36 threatens a play at a and so forces Black to answer, and then 38 eliminates any opportunities Black has to utilise his dead stones.

After White's checking extension at 46, Black 47 to 51 is par for this position.

White 54 and the following moves were unexpected. Instead, invading at the 3-3 point in the lower right corner with 67 would have been usual. With the moves to 65, Black builds up thickness and with the diagonal play at 67, Black has recovered from his blunders in the opening.

Next White should perhaps try to erase Black's territory with a move at b, and if Black answers at c, jump to White d.

In answer to 68 in figure 2, Black 69 is perfectly placed. In so saying it must be added that it is impossible to read out all possible variations that may lead from this move, but one must depend upon intuition to find the strongest move. And in answer to the intuitive play at 69, Ishida also played intuitively with White 70. A wild mêlée breaks out with the following moves, and the question boils down to who kills who. But for Black who is going all out to kill White, the position is not a pleasant one to play.

Figure 2 (68–137)

White 98 is perhaps too forceful a play. If White instead plays 1 in diagram 2, Black will atari at 2 and can connect at 4, and although White abandons the tailend of his group with 5, by living with 7 White can play for a draw-out game.

After Black 137, White's group is finally trapped with only one eye. Black wins by resignation.
Diagram 6 shows the continuation of the game with Yamabe that started with the moves in diagram 1 at the beginning of this chapter. After Black expands his territorial framework with 1, the question is how White should go about dealing with it. Yamabe Sensei chose to plunge in with the attack on the corner with White 2, but there are other ways of thinking about this position.

In answer to White's invasion at 1, Black's first thought is to descend with 2, but although this is a powerful move on the side, it is weak towards the corner. White takes measures to secure his group with the attachment at 3, and through 9 he makes acceptable shape for his stones. Of course White's group is still subject to attack, but it cannot be denied that Black has played mildly here.

The invasion of White 1 in diagram 7 can certainly be considered. This point aims at the vulnerable spots in Black's position on the side of the board, and it is totally out of the question for Black to try to completely capture White's stones here. In addition, there are several cases where, in board positions such as this, White has indeed invaded at this point.

Diagram 7

There is no reason for Black to let White off the hook quite so easily here. After White 1 in diagram 8, Black should play the checking extension of 2. Most likely this way is a more severe approach than the previous diagram. When White slides to 3, Black will absolutely attach at 4, strengthening his position towards the center. Continuing, White 5 through 11 attempt to take profit in the corner, but Black 12 is a severe move. Next, if White a, Black b. Instead of 5, White can draw back at 12, but if that course is distasteful to Black, he can play 4 directly at 12.

Anyway, if we take the two previous diagrams as examples of breaking in through the back door, White 1 in diagram 9 represents a lordly entrance through the front gate. This diagram shows how in response a direct counter from Black would proceed.

The usual method of attack is for Black to play the diagonal attachment of 2 and then play 4; after White 5, Black plays 6. Of course, this is one way of playing but I do not fancy it myself. The reason is that Black has given up the upper side in order to get the chance to play the two marked stones, but White's group here neutralised the effectiveness of those stones to a great extent. On top of that, this course of action probably conforms to the scheme White had in mind when he first played here.

In order to frustrate White's intentions in playing the attack at 1 in diagram 10, Black checked from the side with 2 and now White's only recourse is to enter the 3-3 point with White 3.

Diagram 8

Diagram 9

Diagram 10

The next question is how Black should follow up this move, but basing that judgment on the flow of moves played previously, it may be stated that blocking at Black 4 here is without
merit. Unquestionably, Black builds up considerable thickness with the sequence to 8, but it is the lower side that is the beneficiary of that thickness. In this game the right side is more important, so this line of play is theoretically (and in a practical sense as well) incorrect.

Diagram 11

Generally speaking, it is these undercurrents of thought that led to the sequence up to Black 5 in diagram 6.

The actual game proceeded as in diagram 11. If, in answer to White 1, Black blocks at 2, the sequence up to Black 12 is a one-way street. Black has conformed to his original strategic plan of building a large territorial framework on the right side. At that point White set about to make inroads into this area with 13 and Black attacked with 14. After this the opponents became embroiled in a scrappy fight, and Take-miya finally won.

Anglo-Japanese Friendship Tournament

by Stuart Barthropp

The Anglo-Japanese match was played at the IVC, London, on the 19th November. The CLGC team did well to win with 44 games to 28 games. The size and strength of the teams were increased from previous years, with teams of twenty-four players, and seventeen dan players on the Anglo side. In addition to the abundant prizes provided by the Nippon club, the Asahi Shimbun presented a trophy, and special prizes to those with three wins.

The tournament was the usual three rounds with forty minutes each, sudden death. Players with three wins were:

Harold Lee 3 dan
T. Mark Hall 3 dan
Oliver Schmidt 3 dan
Chris Stevenson 2 dan
David Ward 1 dan
Stuart Barthropp 1 kyu.

Players with three wins from the Japanese side were:

Mr. Noda
Mr. Yasaki
Mr. Yoshimura.

Thanks are due to David Ward for arranging the match and to the Nippon Club and the Asahi Shimbun for providing prizes.

Solution To Teaching Problem

by Francis Roads

I suggest the following three objectives, in descending order of importance:

(1) To have left the newcomer with the impression that go is fun.

(2) To have made him feel that as a beginner he is just as welcome as any other member of your club, and

(3) To have taught him the bare minimum about the rules to enable him to play again.

The key words in the above are “play again.” If he doesn’t come back to the club after the first lesson for a second try, your lesson was a failure, however clear it may have been in your exposition of the tsukenuobi joseki. This is not the first time I or others have written in this journal about teaching beginners. There was also printed, about a dozen years ago if memory serves, a BGA booklet about teaching beginners. By David Mitchell, a four dan player now living in Australia. But nearly all the material so far written is about teaching the actual technique of the game; in what order and how the rules and basic concepts of the game should be taught, etc. I wonder if we have given enough thought to the feelings and impressions with which the male-dominated world of go leaves the beginner.

How many times have you heard a new arrival at the club say, “No thanks, I won’t actually play tonight, I’ll just watch”? Take him at his word at your peril! What he is probably thinking is, “I’d love to have a go, but it all looks very complicated, and I’ll probably make a fool of myself if I play.” Which brings me to my number one hobby horse. It is true that, to an onlooker, a full board game of go, especially near the end, appears very complex. In vain do you protest that the endgame is in fact the easiest part of the game; your beginner will then think, “If they call that easy, what must the rest of it be like?” If only, if only, if only strong players would take 13x13 and 9x9 board go more seriously, what a profound effect it might have on helping the double figure kyu players to bootstrap themselves! It is all very well teaching weaker players on the smaller boards, but they can see for themselves that most serious players play all the while on 19x19: so as long as they are kept on the smaller boards they continue to have a self-image as dunces.

And yet anyone who has taught much go knows the immense benefits of keeping the weaker player on smaller boards. In summary, they are (a) quick games, (b) understandable strategy, and (c) offer the possibility of very large handicaps. If I were dictator of the world, nobody under nine kyu would be allowed to play go on boards larger than 13x13, on pain of ten years in the chess camps, and stronger players would also be required to play a proportion of small board games. What a shame that so many players seem to regard a challenge to a small board game as almost a threat to their virility! I wish they could see those five-dans slugging it out over the 9x9 board at the European and US Congresses.

I would even suggest that a beginner’s first game should be on a 7x7 board. How can you play a meaningful game on such a board? I hear you ask. Who said anything about meaningful?
We're trying to teach him the rules, and give him an impression of how the game works. Meaningfulness can come later, when we teach him more advanced concepts. Like making two eyes.

Which brings me to the next point. Modern education stresses learning by doing, and rightly so. Actually it's not such a modern idea. An ancient Chinese proverb says, "I hear, and I forget; I see, and I remember; I do, and I understand." I know of no better precept for all teaching, in virtually all circumstances. But be honest, when you teach go, how much of the session is your voice, how much looking at actual examples, and how much playing?

The need to spend most time actually playing re-emphasises once more the need to play many quick games on small boards, rather than spending a whole evening agonising over moves on the full board. How often have you seen a beginner think and think and think and think, and at the end of all that thought produce a move that is no better than the one we would have seen if he had played instantaneously? We need to encourage rapid play, though I would not command the use of a clock. Beginners often find the situation tense enough already.

'Your voice,' in the penultimate paragraph, includes the time you spend commenting on his moves. There is another general principle of teaching which applies to go as much as any other field of education. It states simply that most teachers talk too much, and is perhaps no more than a corollary of the first part of the Chinese proverb. There are two dangers to watch out for in your commentary, either during or after a game. One is the well known 'information overload'; the other is the tendency to emphasise all the negative aspects of your pupil's play. If you are criticising every other move, he may understand intellectually (or not), but you may also be engendering the feeling, 'I must be pretty stupid at this if I get so much wrong. Maybe go isn't for me.'

So how do you select moves for commentary? Quite a good discipline for both you and your pupil is to have a particular objective in mind. For example, you might decide in advance to comment primarily on moves which:
(1) could only work if White made no reply, or
(2) are unnecessary defensive moves, or
(3) miss a chance to attack weaknesses in White's position, or
(4) fail to make two eyes at the appropriate moment, or
(5) are good.

You can extend this list ad infinitum. Of course, no good teacher sticks rigidly to his lesson plan. Questions from the pupil or particularly instructive positions may deserve a digression. Do you remember when you were at school the old schoolboy trick of sidetracking the teacher? Did you really think we teachers didn't know what you were up to? Often those digressions were the most valuable part of the lesson!

But there are digressions and digressions. I despair when I see people showing to beginners twelve-move sequences which they might have played. Probably neither teacher nor pupil fully understands them; they won't be remembered or used intelligently; and they contribute to the beginner's bewilderment. Joseki in particular are about the last thing to show a beginner.

Now the lesson, be it the first one or not, is over. Does your club care about the future of British go? About whether go is to remain forever an activity for a somewhat eccentric minority, or to receive the mass interest that it so clearly merits? This important decision is about to be made. Now, here, in your club. What happens to your beginner? Do you abandon him, saying, "I expect someone will give you a game now," to stand around for the rest of the evening as if invisible? If someone does take him on, does their tone of voice and body language say to him, "I suppose I'd better give you a game, or the other chaps will think I'm not pulling my weight. But this is my one chance a week to get out and play go, and I don't really want to waste it playing a weakie." It couldn't happen at your club? Well, I've seen it, on more occasions than you'd think. I think that usually it arises more from thoughtlessness than sheer selfishness, but it is no good telling beginners that they are welcome; they must feel welcome.

And they must feel welcome at tournaments, too. 'What, me, enter a tournament? I am nowhere near strong enough for that,' is what so many weaker players have said to me, when I encourage them to enter. 'Oh, no problem, everybody's welcome, regardless of strength,' I breezily reply. But as I do so, I have my fingers crossed that when in round three he has to be drawn up on nine stones, his opponent is not going to indicate, verbally or otherwise, that this wasn't what he travelled a hundred miles and gave up his Saturday for.

My message must be clear by now. Go is not a game of pure intellect and logic; feelings and intuition play their part. A big part (especially in handicap go!). We ignore the feelings and impressions with which we leave our new members at our peril. We need to let beginners absorb go through experience more than apprehend it through explanation.

If you know anything at all about education, you will have heard of the 'hidden curriculum.' We go players have been ignoring our own hidden curriculum for too long.

Andy Finch, originator of this series to show that great artists were always go players, is at present in Korea. He plans to send articles about Korean go shortly, but meanwhile...
Cheltenham: D. Killen, 33 Broad Oak Way, Up Hatherley, Cheltenham, Glos. Tel: 0242-576524 (home). Meets various places, Thurs 7.30pm.

Chester: D. Kelly, Mount View, Knowle Lane, Buckley, Chwyd. Tel: 0244-544770. Meets at Olde Custom House, Watergate St, Chester, Wed 8pm.

* Coventry: A. Robinson, 14 Morningside, Earlston, Coventry CV5 6DP. Meets in University of Warwick, Mon in term. Tel: A. Robinson (0203-675040 or M. Lynn (0675-2753). Culcheth High School: R. Bagot (see p.2)

Dundee: R. Philip, 26 Seafield Rd, Dundee DD1 4NS. Tel: 0382-23839.


Falmouth: I. Harris, 15 Windsor Tce, Falmouth, Cornwall TR1 3BP. Tel: 0326-317674.

Furze Platt School: I. Attwell, Northur, Westmorland Rd, Maidhead, Berks. Tel: 0628-76792.


* H-P (Bristol): A. Seaborne, 11 Kimberley Cres, Fishponds, Bristol BS16 5AF.

Huddersfield: D. Giles, 53 Ashdene Drive, Crofton, Wakefield WF4 1HF. Meets at Huddersfield Sports Centre, Tues 7pm.

Hunstanton School: H. Alexander, Flat 4, Northgate Precinct, Hunstanton, Norfolk PE36 6EA.

Ipswich School: H. Holt, Ipswich School, Henley Rd, Ipswich, Suffolk IP1 3SG. Tel: 0473-55313.

Ipswich: V. Baldwin, 58 Heath Rd, Ipswich, Suffolk IP4 5SL. Tel: 0473-729045. Meets at Church Lane, Sprottong, Thurs 7.30pm.

Isle of Man: D. Phillips, 1 Benmahage Ave, Onchan, Isle of Man. Tel: 0624-20386. Meets at Crescent Hotel, Queen's Promenade, Douglas, Mon 8pm.

Leicester: Mrs. H. Holmes, 2 Lime Grove, Kirby Muxloe, Leics. Tel: 0533-392024. Meets at Six Club, Albion House, South Albion St, Leicester, Tues 7.30pm.

Maiden Erleigh School: Mrs. J. Read, Maiden Erleigh School, Silverdale Rd, Reading, Berks. Tel: 0734-524281.

Maidenhead: I. Attwell (see under Furze Platt). Meets various places, Fri 8pm.

Malvern: E. Blockley, 8 Dudley Close, Worcester. Tel: 0905-428850. Meets at Carpenter's Arms, Lower Horsehill Rd, Malvern Link, Mon 7pm.

Manchester: T. Barker, 7 Brocklehurst Ave, Bury, Lancs. BL9 9AO. Tel: 061-705-2040 (home). Meets at The Brewer's Arms, Great Ducie St, near Victoria Station, Thurs 7.30pm.

Melior: A. Rix, 11 Brent Way, Finchley, London N3 1AJ. Tel: 01-346-3303. Meets some Sundays. No-smokers only. Please phone first.

Monmouth: Mrs. M. Kitchens, Kilmalloch, Highfield Rd, Monmouth, Gwent NP3 3HR. Tel: 0800-525256 (home). Meets at The Rising Sun, Cinderhill St, Tues 7.30pm and alt. Sundays various places.

Moreton Say School: Mrs. K. Timmins (as for B. Timmins, see p.2).

* Newcastle: J. Street, 10 Avondale Court, Rectory Rd, Gosforth, Newcastle NE3 1XG. Tel: 091-285-6766. Meets various places, Thurs.

North London: W. Streeter, 10 Parliament Hill, London NW3 2SY. Tel: 01-435-7636. Meets Mon 7.30pm. No smoking.


Norwich: A. Boddie, 2 Lime Tree Rd, Norwich NR2 2NF. Tel: 0603-58611 or 0603-505029. Meets Wed 7.30pm.

Nottingham: A. Dilks, 31 Forsythia House, King's Mill Hospital, Sutton in Ashfield, Notts.

Open University: F. Holroyd, 10 Stacey Ave, Wolverton, Milton Keynes. Tel: 0908-315342. Meets in Common Room, Tues 7.30pm.

Oxford City: N. Wedd, 2 Bartlemans Rd, Oxford OX4 1XX. Tel: 0865-247403. Meets Thurs 8pm.

Oxford University: D. McIntyre, Flat 103, Sunnymead House, Banbury Rd, Oxford OX2 7RD. Meets in St. Edmund's Hall, Wed 7.30pm, and King's Arms. Sun 8pm (in term time).

Reading: J. Clark, 32-28 Granville Rd, Reading, Berks. RG3 3EQ. Tel: 0734-507319 (home), 0833131 (work). Meets at ICL (Reading) Club, 53 Blagrove St, Reading. Tues 8.30pm.

STL (Harlow): A. Macpherson, 5 Red Lion Court, Much Hadham, Herts. Tel: 0279-843188.

Saltcoats: D. Tomely, 43 Barrie Tce, Ardrossan, Ayrshire KA22 8AZ. Tel: 0294-601816. Meets at Argyle Community Centre, Campbell Ave, Saltcoats, Mon & Wed 7pm.

Sheffield: J. Hampton, 7 Farenden Rd, Sheffield S9 3EP. Tel: 0427-437365. Meets at The Jolly Buffer, Ecclesall Rd, Wed 6.30pm.

Shrewsbury: B. Timmins (see p.2). Meets various places, Fri 6.30pm.

South Cotswolds: P. Hays, Robin Way, Chippenham, Bristol BS17 6JR. Tel: 0454-31894. Meets at Bathyn Inn, Wickwar, Mon 7.30pm.

South Devon: T. Widdicombe, Woodlands, Haytor Vale, Newton Abbot, Devon TQ13 9XR. Tel: 03864-470 or 0832-665010. Meets Sun 7pm. (Preferably non-smoking.)

St. Dunstan's College: A. Tanna, St. Dunstan's College, Catford, London SE6 4TY.

Stevenage: J. Allen, 5 Greenways, Stevenage, Herts SG1 3TE. Tel: 0438-729100 (home). - 726611 x 8203 (work). Meets at Marquis of Lorne, High St, Stevenage Old Town, Wed 7pm.

Stowe School: A. Eve, 17 St Peter's Rd, Brackley, Northants. NN13 5UA. Tel: 0295-704561.

University of Warwick: S. Perito-Freeman, Pigeonhole 41, Students' Union, Warwick University, Coventry CV4.


West Cornwall: P. Hunt, 1 St Mary's Place, Penzance TR18 4EE.

West Sussex: C. Williams, 70 Greenhill Way, Farnham, Surrey. Tel: 0252-727306. Meets various places, Mon.
Two Single-Kyu Games

Some time ago I agreed to be a regular contributor to the Journal. As two of the three games I have contributed so far have been ones I lost, I’m readdressing the balance by submitting two that I won.

F. Holroyd.

GAME ONE

Black: Fred Holroyd (3 kyu)
White: Andrew Grant (1 dan)

Handicap: 3 stones

Commentary by Bill Brakes (2 dan)

12: A risky tenuki, especially in a handicap game. 48 is joseki, although Black could try forcing twice with Black 290, White 173, Black 67, White 44, and then play 12, (although White may not co-operate).

16: Wrong direction. 16 is a less than perfect extension from the hoshi point stone and not an effective attack while the top right hand corner is still open. 16 at 32 or 33 would build Black’s moyo on a grand scale.

18: Too submissive. After White 19, the position of Black’s 16 gets even worse. Black 18 at 229 looks necessary; e.g., after White 18, Black 181, White 156, Black 227, all Black’s stones are working well.

20: 32 is still best.

31: Gives Black a good pincer/extension at 32. White 124 looks better.

39: Overplay.

42: Black should cut somewhere. After White 43, White has had it all his own way in the corner.

44, 46: Good combination. After White 47, Black should probably push through and cut, being prepared to abandon the stones 4, 6 etc. if necessary.

72: A wise decision to treat 62 and 64 lightly.

76: Aji keshi. Expanding the upper side with Black 76 at (say) 253 would simultaneously attack the White stones from a distance, with the threat of running with stones 62, 64 etc. By contrast, 76 and 78 achieve little.

Figure 1 (1-100)

92 at 14, 94 at 87

Black’s lead is down to about 10 points. The game looks good for White, as his centre thickness should enable him to invade the top side successfully.

82. The defensive move 127 looks more appropriate.

84: This has to be at 85; White must not be allowed to settle his invading stones too easily.

95: After this exchange the game is close.

GAME TWO

Over the next fifty moves or so Black’s lead is restored as he plays a number of large points (104, 118, 148) whilst White’s attempt to reduce Black’s lower side territory is only of limited success.

Figure 2 (101-243)

180 at 130. Ko: 193 at 89, 196 at 190; 199, 202, 205. 233 at 17, 236 at 156, 238 at 17.

152: But this is small, worth no more than 4 or 5 points. Black 152 at 133 would be bigger and more prudent.

158: Black is still ahead.

184: If at 185, Black retains a lead of about 10 points.

209: If White plays to 230 to kill the Black group the game is close.

230: Black wakes up first...

(Interjection by Fred: “After my overplay at 184, Andrew believed he could get a ko for the life of my group, and after 189 I believed him; he won the ko, but at the cost of about 15 points. Then at 230 I saw how to get a second ko to save the group, which I won. But Bill doesn’t seem to have spotted that I needn’t have fought the first ko if at 190, 193 or 202 I had simply played at 232, then if White plays at 207 to capture my two stones, I play at 230, making miai of 17 and 231. Alternatively, if White replies to 232 at 230, then the sequence Black 207, White one point below 230, Black 17, White 231, Black 288, White 153 or 155 makes a seki. But if I had seen all this and played correctly, my victory would have been narrower. Funny old game, go!”)

237: White has no sufficient ko threats.

243: Black now has a comfortable lead, which he retains to the end of the game.

Recording stops at 243. Black wins by 24 points.

GAME TWO

Black: Fred Holroyd (3 kyu)
White: David Woodnut (1 kyu)

Handicap: 2 stones

Commentary by Fred Holroyd

8, 10: The normal joseki is to play 8 at 37, but this result seems reasonable.

15: Seems heavy somehow. I’d have thought 53 or tenuki would be better.

21: Peeping one above 24 looks more interesting.

38: The idea was to offer to give up the corner for White’s group, but it was badly timed as 39 must be answered at 40. In any case, playing 38 at 41 defends the corner and attacks the White
group! The sequence to 44 is virtually forced, allowing White to escape at 45. Black seems to have lost his two-stone advantage.

98: Cowardly! Even without this move, White cannot manage to save these stones.

55: It would probably be better to play first in the empty corner.

60-65: A terrible sequence for Black. 60 should be the normal one-space jump, and 64 just has to be at 65. Now White is distinctly ahead.

66: Rescues the centre stones (at least in this game!) and weakens White’s left side. But Black should probably invade the left side immediately, or push at 99. Unfortunately, White just flies 66, trying to kill the Black stones.

94: Black is now back in the game, but would have been clearly ahead if 94 had been at 95. If White then plays 94, a Black play at 181 claims a large corner and is sent against White’s group.

102: This seems to be the point at which the game really swung in Black’s favour. This move threatens White’s centre group and at the same time invades the left side; but actually to kill the group and demolish such a large swathe of territory was more than I deserved! I think White went wrong at 107; the three stones 57 etc. are hard to attack, and 107 at 108 or one below would have been harder for me to answer.

182: Chicken! My attack would have worked if I had now played above 181 to put it in atari. But I was now sufficiently ahead for this not to matter.

Recording stops at 232. Black eventually won by 15 points.
Crossword 5
by Derek Williams

Across
1. Pushes around, hurts in the back street.
6. Producing Viola unto change.
7. Caught in gate.
9. State in article in country.
11. Allusions to screen free movie.
17. Dean is confused about a King in enemy territory.
18. Time to book a rep.
19. It ensigns turn to make aware.
24. Spill rinse over turning.

Down
1. Swindler wore mitt with the shakes.
2. Collect roof fund to finish it.
3. Set aware of the undrinkable.
4. Polaris losing nothing turns and twists.
5. Tree man trees.
8. Deny sailor North for example consumed.
12. Dodge today in the previous day.
13. Tests old morning on Sunday.
14. It happens even to a 'T'.
20. I am a cross goat.
21. I love old holly.
22. Opposite poles are in it now.
23. Continue to be funny.

Solution to Crossword 4

Kosumi Problems
by T. Mark Hall

The kosumi is a diagonal move from your stones which is very useful for making shape and especially eye-shape. In each of the problems below, a kosumi move is played at some point; you have to decide at what point and in which direction.

A. White has cut off some Black stones on the lower edge; White has four liberties. Black three. How can Black get the extra liberties to save his stones?

B. Black has made the inconvenient cut that threatens four White stones. In some games, in similar positions, I have seen players give up the stones and be happy to keep the group. In this position White can keep the lot.

C. White can probably live fairly easily in the corner, but he should at least pick up the two stones and not lose his own.

D. This is a normal joseki with Black to play; which move makes the best shape?

E. A position from one of my own games, a bit tidied up. There are in fact two kosumi moves that save the stones. Nice if you find both!

By the way, to my commentary on my game against Piers Shepperson (last Journal, page 39, move 71), I should add that it is in fact possible for Black to play a geta, though nobody has written in about this.
Draught Letter

Dear Editor,

I was most gratified that my article about unsatisfactory beginners' introductions to go should have provoked not one but two responses. It is good to know that someone out there is actually reading what we contributors write.

However, I remain unrepentant about my strictures on the description of go to beginners as resembling 'five games of draughts'. One of the main reasons why 20-kyu players are 20-kyu players and not 15- or 10-kyu is their difficulty in considering the board position as a whole, and their tenacious belief that a stone played affects only its immediate vicinity.

The effect of every stone played, especially in the opening, radiates to the furthest corners of the board. I stoutly maintain that players who cannot yet get their minds around that idea would pick up the game more quickly if they played on smaller boards, as I have argued at greater length elsewhere.

Yours sincerely,
Francis Roads.

Readers of the Independent who follow the Free Speech columns on Saturdays may not have realised that a recent article had been written by a long-standing BGA member. Charles Leedham-Green is Reader in Pure Mathematics at Queen Mary and Westfield College, London. Not surprisingly, his article expressed concern for the need for good mathematical education in schools.

Charles is a member of the Wanstead Go Club, and plays at 1 kyu. His heavy academic commitments make his appearances at tournaments all too rare. - F.R.

Don't Play Go

by Francis Roads

Here part of a game from the Northern Go Tournament. I was White; my opponent was Harold Lee, who went on to win the tournament with 6/6. Harold's individual fuseki style shows in moves 3 and 9, and my own style, which is characterised more by errors than by individuality, shows up in move 28. I intended to provoke the ladder with Black 33, but I'd have done better to play the other atari at 29, followed by an invasion somewhere between 5 and 25.

![Figure 1](image_url)

Nonetheless, I proceeded with my plan by playing a ladder breaker at 34. If Harold now captured at 36, I would play at 35, resulting in a big turn round in the territorial situation in the lower left corner. But Harold decided to protect his corner with 35, so I pulled out the ladder stone at 36, all according to plan.

What should Black do now? White is threatening a ladder of his own at A, capturing two black stones. Should Black extend at A and start a fight? Or is it more subtle to forestall the threatened ladder with a ladder breaker of his own around B? Or, as the nearby White group is already strong, should Black not be too worried about the loss of these two stones, and simply strengthen his side group by making shape at C? Is playing a stone in the path of the original ladder, at points like D or E, worth more than any of these?

Harold's next move was absolutely spot on, I am sorry to say. Can you find it?

Solution, as always, in the next issue.

This one will also explain for the mystified beginner the significance of the title of this article.

Game commentaries are mostly written by dan players. This does not have to be so. If you are a single-figure kyu player, why not offer a commentary on a game played by friends in double figures, or at least a few grades lower down the rungs? Give it a try! Remember, by the way, to include information on ko's and the total number of moves.

Starting Colours

by T. Mark Hall

The purpose of this article is to talk about fuseki style and how you can vary the manner in which you play depending on the colour. The first two games I am using were played in an Anglo-Japanese match.

In the first game, where I am Black, I played the Chinese fuseki and you can see that, with wide extensions at 5 and 7, I cannot expect to make immediate secure territory. The Chinese fuseki is popular among aggressive players who like a fight, and that describes me perfectly.

![Game 1 (1-29)](image_url)

White realises that if he makes another shimari in the upper left corner,
Black will simply extend to the hoshi point along the top side. I think that playing into the corner with 10 was making the game easier for me since 5 is now nicely placed as the extension from my wall.

It may appear that 17 contradicts the idea of large scale moyo and fighting. It would be easy to say that this is simply corner grabbing. However, the main purpose of this move is to prevent White from making a base here; if Black were to play immediately at 27 for example, White could attack at the 3-3 point and would expect to make a small life here, which is not Black's intention.

White plays lightly with 18 and moves out from Black's attack. I played 23 and 25 now for two reasons: first because it is big. Compare the result with that when White plays 25 and connects at 23. White has about 10 points and Black has been reduced by three or four. In the game, White has 6 and Black has lost nothing. Additionally, Black wants to play these moves early to ensure that they are sente. White will not wish to switch elsewhere after 25, leaving the threat to the corner open.

However, if this sequence is played when White has, for example, broken through between 9 and 15 or has made some plays along the top edge, White may consider that a move at 26 does not threaten his life, and te-nuki. Black then plays 27 to make a framework along the bottom edge and White makes the probe of 28 which increases his influence in the centre and reduces Black's territory here. At this point the game became a real hack, thrash and slash which, interesting as it may be, is not what I am trying to illustrate.

In the second game, I am White and you will see immediately that I am playing none of that largescale moyo nonsense here! All good secure corners and third line territory. Strangely enough, this is also a fighting style; White can be fairly sure of starting a fight almost anywhere when his groups are strongly based and secure and Black has to stake the game on making enough with his moyo.

Next, when he approaches at 21, before I get the chance to extend to 18, he has the opportunity to invade this extension. Instead Black approaches the 3-3 at 15, which allows me to settle both stones with free extensions and I finally play a move on the fourth line at 22. I think that Black 23 and 25 are premature since they prompt me to settle the shape. If you now look at the board, White has four groups virtually secure against attack (but technically, only about 40 points of territory) but plenty of opportunities to bust up the Black framework on the top edge, all on the fourth line, which is what I did next.

I have picked the next game because I think it is a reasonable game to look at from the point of fuseki. It was also the only game in which I felt I played anything reasonable in the tournament (the 1989 London Open; my opponent was John Smith, 3 dan).

As White, I have recently gone back to very territory orientated play and I have quite often played up to 20 or 30 moves on the third line. Here Black prompts move 10 on to the fourth line, but initially I don't consider this the right joseki for Black. I have also recently been playing through some old professional games (by old, I mean 200 - 300 years old) where the conventional move would be a diagonal move out to the centre from Black 3. He should then either press down on 6 or drive it out with a move at 12, after White has played at 14.

I erred in my timing with 14, but Black erred even more with 15. However, if you accept that I play 14 at 16 and 20; and Black omits 15 and plays at 17, this would be better for Black, since he has moved out before White gets a move in at 14. So what should have been played? Black should play 15 at 105; this would be followed by 16 at 99, a Black hane to the right of 99 and White is forced to play bad shape at 100. Black then connects solidly and White will have problems settling this group. Letting White play 16 freely was a definite loss for Black (lucky White!).

\[\text{Game 3 (1–136)}\]

96 at 90, 101 at 89; ko: 104, 107, 110, 113, 115.

When I played at 20, John began wearing a mournful look; I think he realised he had let me off the hook, but I wasn't returning the compliment. This move should be instructive to many kyu players because it emphasises what I refer to as the Rule of Four.

There is usually one of four things that any move should be doing: 1) enlarging your territory; 2) reducing your
opponent's territory; 3) securing your group; 4) weakening, attacking or threatening your opponent's group.

Efficiency of moves means that your stones will be doing more than one thing at a time, and it is arguable that move 20 in this game fulfills all four conditions.

However, I will only claim 3: it threatens to cut his group and also there is a threat to take eyes away in the corner and it secures my group and enlarges the territory along the edge. Once you get used to thinking about the Rule of Four, it becomes automatic to consider any move as fulfilling the conditions; try it in your own games.

Once 20 is in place, it should be obvious that Black's moves in this area are dame points and he would much rather have a stone at 26. However, allowing White to seal in the corner at 25 would be painful gote, since Black probably has to add another stone to live there.

The game is now with 28 and is able to get the extension to 30. Black 31 does little and would probably have been better played as a pincer around 50 or 52.

Black's dissatisfaction with his position can be seen with the move at 49. This attack achieves little; although he settles his large group in sente, he also settles White and gives away influence in the centre. It is now difficult to see any profit coming from an attack on the White group in the top left.

However, Black still has a chance to make things complicated when White plays at 78. Black should immediately play at 89 and follow through with the ko.

In the game, 97 is not so great a threat, but if 85 and 86 have not been played, Black has the threat of the throw-in at 86. Since he would be killing this corner in the process, this ko fight is almost impossible for White. From this it appears that 78 was a slack move and 88 was a little slack.

In the ko fight, Black slipped with 109, which I think should have been at 114 which threatens to isolate 8 and 20 and extends Black's possible eye-space. Black's connection at 115 anticipates another ko around 97 but fails to see that 116 kills the group.

He makes one more desperate attack to try to kill the bottom right group, with 131 being a tesuji that almost works. If I atari 129 on the edge, Black plays at 132; White captures and Black plays at 134, killing the corner. White secures the group up to 136.

At this point John went into byo-yomi and resigned, much to my surprise. I considered that I had the better chances but I had expected him to fight on.

He knew that if he now protected the corner against 88 or played some other yose, this was most likely to be gote and I would start all the sente moves and this would be enough for me to win, though the game is dead even at the moment.

This is what is called an honourable resignation.

Foot Voting
by Francis Roads

Several records were broken at the Wanstead Tournament on 27th January. There were 116 entrants, of whom 22 were female, and nearly half were graded 10 kyu and below. Overall, all was won by Mark Stirling (4 dan, Oxford). Other prize winners with 4.4 were John Washbrook (5 kyu, unattached), Miriam Bros (7 kyu, Oxford), Eddie Ashfield (12 kyu, Cambridge), Robin Blythe (14 kyu, Brakenheath School), S. Brooks (19 kyu, West Surrey); G. Bailey (25 kyu, West Surrey), P. Bailey (30 kyu, West Surrey), and Maya Czajkowski (33 kyu, Furze Platt School). Prize winners in the concurrent 13x13 tournament were Paul Metcalfe (17 kyu, Furze Platt), Roger Norman (5 kyu, CLGC), and Kieran McCabery (10 kyu, Furze Platt).

In view of the non-appearances of the Newslet-ter in which the tournament was supposed to have been advertised in addition to the change in format, I thought attendance might be a bit down. In fact it was slightly up on last year. I take this as a vote of confidence in the new format, which has four rounds in one day, on 45 minute time limits with no byo-yomi. In practice, very few games were lost on time. I daresay a few stronger players stayed away because of the short time limits. (Though you can't call 21 dan players a weak tournament.)

But any absence on their part was amply compensated for by the hordes of double-figure kyu players who descended upon us. For years I have been waffling on, in this journal and elsewhere, about the need to get weaker players along to tournaments. I really pleased that this tournament was a success in that respect. Thanks to France Ellul and Ian Attwell who brought more than one good game along from Brakenheath and Furze Platt schools respectively.

And thanks also to the indefatigable Kevin Rogers. His instilling of the direct directing not having been satisfied by the Asahi Shimbun and London Open Tournaments, he held this one together with very few complaints and (by go players' standards) a degree of punctuality.

An innovation which other tournament direc-
tors might like to consider was the holding of a flash T. A. for the winners after round one. It was for people who registered late, and was on handicap.

See you all next year!

Clubs & Tourna-
ments
by Tony Atkins

Yet again I must start with an apology, this time to Dan Gilder who was promoted to 1 dan with the last batch. I can also report that the grading committee at the London Open, and therefore presumably the high promotion committee, subject to confirmation, so watch out.

The Schools Tournament was held again in the grandiose surroundings of Stowe School. Six teams from three schools played in the main event. The Maidenhead A team were the winners for the sixth year running. Michael Carr, Sam-
uel Beaton and Chris Dawson took the Castledine Trophy back to its usual home.

In the 13x13 tournament newcomers Swann- bourne House School from Buckingham were declared winners, even though they finished behind a scratch team of reserves. Special prizes to Jonathan Cheng (35 kyu) for 10/10, and Sian Lattimer for 7/5, Garry Mills for enthusiasm, Maya Tazkowskii for sportsmanship and Si-mon Chang for lunacy (largest handicap).

However, it had the organisers recovered from winning the Schools Tournament than they were required again, this time for the Brakenheath Go Party. The traditional 13x13 tour-
ament was amended in format to a grouped Swiss, and was won by Jonathan Cheng (now with 6/6) with other good results were from Robin Blyth and Simon Ridd (5/6) and Paul Metcalfe and Richard Davies (4/6).

If you like tesuji problems, penny games, tuition, discussions and simultaneous displays then the third Farnham Teach-in was the place to be in December. 45 players gave up a day to learn more about go, and the learning applies to the dan-grade 'experts' as well as the kyu. As usual the 'experts' cleaned up in the simulta-
neous display (playing on reduced handicaps) with only 1 player for each going to see him do badly (2/0). Richard Granville and James Bond managed clean sweeps; Francis Roads, Simon Goss and Caroline Williams only dropped four among them. Come on, kyu players, get practis-
ing for next year!

The handicap tournament on the Sunday also had a continuous 13x13 this year. R. Carter (N. London), J. Bartlett (W. Surrey), E. Fitzpatrick (Brentwood) and G. Mills (Bath) won prizes.

Main tournament winner was Harold Lee (3 dan, Mellor Club) who completed a string of Autumn wins. Other winners for prizes for wins were E. Lee (Furze Platt), S. Lati-
timer (Furze Platt), and J. Chan (Brakenheath).
Because of Rex Thompson & Partners’ generous sponsorship the following also received prizes for three wins: J. Bond (Reading), T. Atkins (Reading), A. Rix (Melior), P. Barnard (GLG), O. Hopkins (Unatt’d), F. Potkin (Furlough Platt), J. Ranson (Brakenhale), K. Cobby (B’haile), C. Southern (W. Surrey), J. Munro (B’haile), S. Bannister (B’haile), P. Laver (S. W. Surrey), P. Donovan (Unatt’d), S. Bartrhop (CLGC), K. Drake (Bourneminth), D. Finch (Furlough Platt), R. Blaydon (B’haile), and 2/5 wins, G. Bailey (W. Surrey), M. Czajkowski (F. Platt).

On the European scene, Macfadyen and Goddard have been active in scoring Grand Prix points. At Gothenburg Viktor Bogdanov (Soviet Union) was the winner. He beat Matthew by forcing a four step approach ko. Brussels was cancelled, so the next grand prix event was Belgium. This time it was Rostam Sachabudinov (Kazan) who won on the tie-break from Hungarian Tibor Pocsai and Tony Goddard. The Soviets were absent from Greece, so it gave a chance for Luxembourg’s Laurent Heiser to win with 5/5 and Austrian Manfred Wimmer to come above Hungary’s Barnabas Varga on 4/5.

The next Grand Prix was of course the London Open. On the tie-break system the top five results were Zhang, Pietsch, Janssen, Macfadyen and Bogdanov.

The London Open will be remembered as the first time where Russians played the venue was changed from Covent Garden to the Highbury Roundhouse, but the community centre was borrowed for the whole weekend and proved adequate for the event. North London is not quite the same as Central London from the touristic point of view, but at least there were no busskers.

135 players represented 14 countries, and it was not unknown to play opponents from 7 different countries in the 8 games. As well as the dozen Russians we were pleased to have a half-dozen visitors from the USA. Private accommodation was found for all those from abroad who wanted it, so a change was taken to return home in all the players. A quint British custom learnt by many was the après-go of liar dice and pits, and as usual such songs were sung at the New Year’s Eve night out.

Unfortunately the computer draw failed miserably before Day 2, and a manual draw was rigged together, but this only gave more time for the après-go, so who complained? The computer draw was present for two days and Bill Steenhen ably organised two young ladies to provide refreshments all weekend. The American’s Nigerian Kisei technique was still going strong. On the second day the tournament was graced by the presence of Kobayashi Koichi and Otake Hideo who were there for the first time. Dr. Zhang won all his games against the top European players. This left German Hans Pietsch, Dutchman Frank Janssen and our own Matthew Macfadyen to fight it out for the top 3. The game, which they took in that order. Viktor Bogdanov was the highest placed Soviet player and had to be content with being runner-up in the lightning round. In that order.

Prizes were also awarded to Alain Wettach who looks like being the first Belgian shodan, and to the following with 5 wins: N. Symes (CLGC), F. Roads (Wanshead), D. Riedererman (NL), W. Gehman (L), R. Maire (m), P. Kippert (D), R. Solletti (Italy), S. Scarff (Reading), S. Hamlet (Brakenhale), P. Donovan (Unatt’d), M. Bennett (Bourneminth), and for 5 wins, S. Welch (London).

For 5 wins went to: P. Colmez (FR), F. de Vos (NL), J. Barty (London), R. Pehm (NL), C. Gerlach (J), F. Flood (NL), and T. Dinh (F).

D. Macdonald and J. Lewis were the qualifiers, since S. Welch has already qualified.

Many thanks to Geoff Kaniuk, Kevin Roger and the others from London who ran the event.

We have recently received two letters from the USSR as the spirit of glasnost raises our exposure to the go-playing member of the country. The first was from Alexei Vassiliev from Kazan, wishing us "Success, luck in go, happiness" and telling of the formation of the USSR Go Federation, and the second was from President Viktor Astakhin from Leningrad, the home too of Secretary General Nikolov. The state go trainer is Alexander Kovalyov from Moscow.

The other letter was from the Chelyabinsk Go Amateurs, who belong to an "experimental sport club of intellectual games." They wish to partake in the exchange of information, literature and badged, etc., related to go, and extend a welcome to all players if we are interested in their propositions. The contact is Vladimir Kalia, 62, 22, 12 Postbox 7663, Chelyabinsk 45429,

The second German Open at Essen was a big success. There were 24 countries including, for the first time, many East German players. With 67 players at 4 dan or stronger, the tournament was graced by the presence of Kobayashi Koichi and Otake Hideo who were there for the first time. The game of the new German Open was the first between the two countries, and it was won by the Germans. The game was won by the Chinese. The second player was Rin, Kato, Atake, Hashimoto and Sonoda. The main prizes this time were as follows: Bogdanov 31, Zhang 30, Heisser 22, Macfadyen 20 and Lazarev 18.

---

**Price List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>*Level</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>By hand (GBP)</th>
<th>By post (GBP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graded Go Problems For Beginners 1</td>
<td>30-20</td>
<td>GGP1</td>
<td>£5.50</td>
<td>£6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded Go Problems For Beginners 2</td>
<td>25-15</td>
<td>GGP2</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded Go Problems For Beginners 3</td>
<td>20-10</td>
<td>GGP3</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Techniques Of Go</td>
<td>20-0</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Concepts Of Go</td>
<td>5-0</td>
<td>G6</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Beginning</td>
<td>20-10</td>
<td>G10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirty-Eight Basic Joseki</td>
<td>12-1</td>
<td>G11</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesui</td>
<td>15-1</td>
<td>G12</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life And Death</td>
<td>12-1</td>
<td>G13</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack And Defence</td>
<td>12-0</td>
<td>G14</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Go</td>
<td>10-6</td>
<td>G15</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kage's Secret Chronicles Of Handicap Go</td>
<td>5-5</td>
<td>G17</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakthrough To Shodan</td>
<td>7-6</td>
<td>G18</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseki Dictionary 1</td>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>G21</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseki Dictionary 2</td>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>G22</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseki Dictionary 3</td>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>G23</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciating Famous Games</td>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>G25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction Of Play</td>
<td>6-0</td>
<td>G26</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kato’s Attack And Kill</td>
<td>5-0</td>
<td>G27</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons In The Fundamentals Of Go</td>
<td>20-0</td>
<td>G28</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Territorial Frameworks</td>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>G29</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Introduction To Go</td>
<td>20-10</td>
<td>G30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Book Of Go</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>G31</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Power Of The Star-Point</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>G32</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Fusinski</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>G33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Magic Of Go</td>
<td>30-15</td>
<td>G41</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Level: D = dan level. Figures denote kyu level. (Ratings range from 30 kyu to 1, then go to 1 dan.)

---

Only BGA members may purchase items on this list. Cheques should be made payable to "British Go Association." Postage outside UK: add 20% to postage above. Send to R. Bagot (details on page 2).