

Russian teen makes rapid rise in chess world

GARY KASPAROV'S RAPID RISE TO WORLD PROMINENCE

Teenager Gary Kasparov of Azertijar (USSR) has been acclaimed as a likely successor to current world champion Anatoly Karpov. At a recent international tournament held in Baku, Kasparov easily achieved his second grandmaster result by finishing first with 11½-3½, ahead of Belyavsky (11), Grigorian, Gufeld, Mikhalchshin (8½), Torre, Chiburdanidze, Chom (8) and eight others.

His copious game annotations reveal a surprisingly mature, highly analytical approach to chess, reminiscent of Botvinnik at his best.

White: Gary Kasparov.
Baku, 1980.

Black: Igor Zaitsev.

Queen's Gambit Declined

1 d4	d5	16 Bd5	Rac8
2 c4	e6	17 Kb1	Na4
3 Nc3	Nf6	18 Qe2	Bd5
4 Bg5	Be7	19 Rd5(f)	Rc4!(g)
5 e3	0-0	20 Rd4	Rfc8(h)
6 Nf3	h6	21 Rhd1(i)	Qg6?
7 Bh4	b6(a)	22 Qd3	Qg2
8 Qc2	Bb7	23 Qf5!(j)	Rf8?
9 Bf6	Bf6	24 Rd8!(k)	Rc7
10 cd	ed	25 Rf8	Kf8
11 0-0-0	c5	26 Nd4!(l)	Re7
12 dc	Nd7!(b)	27 Nb5(m)	Re3(n)
13 Nd5	Nc5(c)	28 Nd6	Rf3(o)
14 Bc4(d)	b5	29 Qc8	Ke7
15 Nf6(e)	Qf6	30 Qe8	Resigns(p)

(Annotations by international master Gary Kasparov, translated from "Shakhmaty v SSSR", No. 8, 1980, pp. 19-20)

(a) One of the most popular modern opening systems, introduced by Tartakover and refined by Bondarevsky and Makagonov. Currently, White usually plays 9 Qb3 here in search of an opening advantage. In this game, I decided to test a sharp plan calling for castling on opposite flanks.

(b) Until recently, theory regarded Black's position after 12 . . . bc 13 Nd5 Bd5 14 Bc4 Nd7 15 Rd5 Rb8 16 b3 as satisfactory, but the games Lapenis—A. Petrosian (1979) and Gavrikov—Lputyan (1980) overturned this verdict. In the first instance, White held on to his extra pawn and maintained his blockade on c4: 16 . . . Qe7 17 h4! Nb6 18 Re5! Qc7 19 Re4. The second example ended in a draw following 16 . . . Qc7 17 Kd1 Rfc8 18 Ke2? Nb6 19 Rd2 Nc4 20 Qc4 Rb4 21 Qa6 c4 22 bc Bc3 23 Rc2 Rb6 24 Qa4 Rb4, but the obvious 18 Nd2! (blockade on c4!) would have given White a clear plus.

Naturally, Black began to pin his hopes on 12 . . . Nd7 instead. The game Lapenis—Klovan (1979) demonstrated that White's material advantage after 13 cb Qb6 is at least balanced by Black's initiative. Playing against the isolated pawn (13 c6) also offers little promise, although White did achieve something in the game Nikitin—Kirpichnikov (1980) with 13 c6 Bc6 14 Nd4 Bb7 15 Be2 Rc8 16 Kb1 Nc5 17 Bg4 Ra8 18 Bf3.

(c) It was also necessary to consider 13 . . . Rc8. The next few moves are then practically forced: 14 Nf6 Qf6 15 Rd7 Bf3 16 gf Rc5 17 Bc4. If Black now allows himself to be enticed into winning a pawn by 17 . . . Qf3, then White's threats assume menacing proportions with 18 Rg1 Qc6 19 Rd4 b5 20 Qc3! g6 (20 . . . bc 21 Rg7! or 20 . . . g5 21 h4) 21 Rg6!! Qg6 22 Bf7 Rf7 23 Rd8, etc. Stronger is 17 . . . Rfc8, confronting White with the choice of entering a queen ending a pawn ahead but virtually no winning chances (18 Rhd1 Rc4 19 Rd8 Rd8 20 Rd8 Qd8 21 Qc4 Qg5!) or of playing into a razor sharp and unclear position (18 b3 b5 19 Rhd1 bc 20 b4). I had decided on the second course, even though risky, as holding out the only real prospects for winning.

(d) The tempting 14 Qf5 encounters the powerful rejoinder, 14 . . . Qc8! 15 Nf6 gf 16 Qc8 Rac8 17 Kb1 Ne4,



Richard Shorman

with the better game.

(e) An effective refutation, complete with queen sacrifice, awaits 15 Bb5 Bd5 16 Bc4 by means of 16 . . . Be4! 17 Rd8 Rfd8 18 Qe2 Rac8, and Black has an overwhelming attack. Black also obtains an excellent game after 15 Bb3 Rc8 (Also good is 15 . . . a5.) 16 Kb1 Nb3 17 Qb3 Rc5, driving the knight off of its dominating position at d5 (18 e4 Re8 19 Rhe1 Re4).

(f) The threatening knight outpost at a4 coupled with White's somewhat insecure king position forms the basis for Black's counterplay, which, however, he must exploit with haste, else in a move or two White will consolidate. In my analysis, I evaluated the resultant situation in my favor, based on the variation 19 . . . Qg6 20 e4 Qg2 (or 20 . . . Rfe8 21 Re1 Qg2 22 Rb5) 21 Rg1 Qh3 22 Rg3 Qe6 23 Nd4 Qf6 24 Nf5.

(g) A brilliant move that suddenly alters the complexion of the struggle. In reinforcing the threat of Qg6 Black has also created two new ones, Rfc8 and, primarily, Rb4. Taking the pawn at b5 grants Black a fearsome attack after 20 . . . Rfc8, e.g., 21 Ne5 Qa6! 22 Nc4 Qb5 23 Rc1 Rc4! 24 Rc4 Nc3, winning the queen. Weak, too, is 20 Nd4, due to 20 . . . Qg6 and 21 . . . Qg2. White's reply is forced.

(h) It is now already quite clear that Black has full compensation for the sacrificed pawn. But I was far from dejected over my opening setback. After all, the battle had only begun, and Zaitsev had just a little more than 20 minutes left on his clock.

(i) Apparently, 21 Qd3 (21 . . . Rc2 22 Rd8) throws back the attack while retaining the material plus. But 21 . . . Nc5! unexpectedly conjures up unanswerable threats: 22 Rc4 Nd3 23 Rc8 Kh7 24 Rc2 Qg6 or 22 Qe2 Qg6 23 Ka1 Rc1!! 24 Rc1 Nb3 25 ab Rc1 26 Ka2 Qb1 27 Ka3 a5 28 Rd8 Kh7 29 Ng5 (nor does 29 Qd3 stave off mate, on account of 29 . . . Qd3 30 Rd3 Ra1) Kg6 30 Rd6 f6. White also has trouble defending after 21 Rc4 bc.

With 21 Rhd1 White tacitly agrees to give up his queen for two rooks. At first glance, the position following 21 . . . Rc2 22 Qc2 Rc2 23 Kc2 seems to favor Black, who wipes out White's king side with 23 . . . Qg6 24 e4 Qg2 25 Ne5 Qf2 26 Rld2 Qe3. However, White's plan is not so bad as that, and 24 Kd2! Nb2 25 Rc1 Qg2 26 Ke2 keeps the position double-edged.

Not seeing any real profit in 21 . . . Rc2, my opponent, who until now has played splendidly, commits a grievous error by overestimating his chances. With his next two moves he reestablishes material equality, but . . .

(j) All of a sudden White has reformed ranks and is ready for action. Black's king feels the heat even behind his wall of pawns. Black should have opted to trade queens in order to break the force of White's counterattack (23 . . . Qg6) and consent to a distasteful endgame, in which his losing and drawing prospects are about equal.

(k) The move, 24 Rg1, looked most alluring, counting on 24 . . . Qf2 25 Rd2 Qe3 26 Rg7!, mating. But, in response, Black would explode his first bomb: 24 . . . Rc5! 25 Qe4 Rfc8! 26 a3 Qh3, and the danger is past.

(l) Neither 26 Ne5 Qg5 nor 26 Qb5 Rc8 27 Ne5 Nb6, bringing up Black's reserves, delivers the knockout blow.

(m) This move would have proven decisive after 26 . . . Kg8 as well. By capturing the pawn with his knight White

sidesteps the last snare set by an opponent now in severe time trouble, 27 Qb5? Nc3!

(n) On 27 . . . g6, simplest would be 28 Qf4, attacking both knight and pawn at h6.

(o) After 28 . . . Kg8 29 Qc8 Kh7 30 Qc2 Black loses the presumptuous rook.

(p) Black actually played 30 . . . Kf6, but resigned without waiting for the obvious 31 Qf7, which quickly mates.

TARJAN EXHIBITION AT SRI

International grandmaster James Tarjan of Berkeley delivered a chess lecture, held a question-and-answer session and conducted a simultaneous exhibition on 25 boards for the Peninsula Chess League at the Stanford Research Institute International complex in Menlo Park, Jan. 31.

League organizer Chris Kollerer presided over the event, which attracted players and spectators from around the Bay Area. Tarjan's impressive score of 24-1 (no draws!) was bruised only by expert Robert Henry of San Jose.

White: James Tarjan (2565). Black: Robert Henry (2082). SRI International, Menlo Park, Simultaneous Exhibition, Jan. 31, 1981. Sicilian Defense 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cd 4 Nd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 a6 6 Bc4 e6 7 Bb3 b5 8 0-0 Be7 9 f4 0-0 10 e5 de 11 fe Bc5 12 Be3 Nfd7 13 Ne4 Bd4 14 Qd4 Nc6 15 Qc3 Nce5 16 Rad1 Bb7 17 Nc5 Bd5 18 Bd5 ed 19 Nd7 Nd7 20 Rd5 Qe7 21 Bd4 Rac8 22 Qg3 f6 23 Re1 Qf7 24 Qb3 Kh8 25 Rd6 Rc4 26 Qd3 Re8 27 Re8 Qe8 28 Bc3 Rc7 29 h6 30 a3 Kg8 31 Ra6 Nc5 32 Qd5 Kh7 33 Qf5 g6 34 Qf6 Na6 35 Qa6 Qe3 36 Kh1 Qc1 37 Kh2 Qf4 38 Kh1 Rd7 39 Qe6 Rd1 40 Be1 Qf1 41 Kh2 Re1 42 Qd7 Kg8 43 Resigns.